



**HAL**  
open science

## **Barcoding type specimens helps to identify synonyms and an unnamed new species in Eumunida Smith, 1883 (Decapoda: Eumunididae)**

Nicolas Puillandre, Enrique A Macpherson, Josie Lambourdière, Eumunida Smith, Corinne Cruaud, Marie-Catherine Boisselier-Dubayle, Sarah Samadi

### ► **To cite this version:**

Nicolas Puillandre, Enrique A Macpherson, Josie Lambourdière, Eumunida Smith, Corinne Cruaud, et al.. Barcoding type specimens helps to identify synonyms and an unnamed new species in Eumunida Smith, 1883 (Decapoda: Eumunididae). *Invertebrate Systematics*, 2011, 25 (4), pp.322. 10.1071/IS11022 . hal-02458087

**HAL Id: hal-02458087**

**<https://hal.science/hal-02458087>**

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.

1 Barcoding type-specimens helps to identify synonyms and an unnamed new species in  
2 *Eumunida* Smith, 1883 (Decapoda, Eumunididae).

3

4 Nicolas Puillandre<sup>1,\*</sup>, Enrique Macpherson<sup>2</sup>, Josie Lambourdière<sup>3</sup>, Corinne Cruaud<sup>4</sup>,  
5 Marie-Catherine Boisselier-Dubayle<sup>1-3</sup>, Sarah Samadi<sup>1-3</sup>.

6

7 <sup>1</sup> “Systématique, Adaptation et Evolution”, UMR 7138 UPMC-IRD-MNHN-CNRS  
8 (UR IRD 148), Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, Département Systématique et  
9 Evolution, CP 26, 57 Rue Cuvier, F-75231 Paris Cedex 05, France.

10 <sup>2</sup> Centro de Estudios Avanzados de Blanes (CEAB-CSIC), C. acc. Cala Sant Francesc  
11 14, 17300 Blanes, Girona, Spain

12 <sup>3</sup> Service de systématique moléculaire (CNRS-MNHN, UMS2700), Muséum National  
13 d'Histoire Naturelle, Département Systématique et Evolution, CP 26, 57 Rue Cuvier, F-  
14 75231 Paris Cedex 05, France.

15 <sup>4</sup> GENOSCOPE, Centre National de Séquençage, 2 rue Gaston Crémieux, CP 5706,  
16 91057 Evry Cedex France.

17

18 \*: puillandre@mnhn.fr; tel: 33 140 79 31 73; fax: 33 140 79 38 44

19

20

21 Running head: Barcoding type-specimens in *Eumunida*

## 22 **Abstract**

23 The primary purpose of DNA-barcoding projects is to generate an efficient expertise  
24 and identification tool. This is an important challenge to the taxonomy of the 21<sup>st</sup>  
25 century, as the demand increases and the expert capacity does not. However, identifying  
26 specimens using DNA-barcodes requires a preliminary analysis to relate molecular  
27 clusters to available scientific names. Through a case study of the genus *Eumunida*  
28 (Decapoda, Eumunididae), we illustrate how naming molecule based units, and thus  
29 provide an accurate DNA-based identification tool, is facilitated by sequencing type-  
30 specimens. Using both morphological and unlinked molecular markers (COI and 28S  
31 genes), we analyzed 230 specimens from 12 geographic areas, covering two thirds of  
32 the known diversity of the genus, including type-specimens of 13 species. Most  
33 hypotheses of species delimitation are validated, as they correspond to molecular units  
34 linked to only one taxonomic name (and vice-versa). However, a putative cryptic  
35 species is also revealed and three entities previously named as distinct species may in  
36 fact belong to a single one, and thus need to be synonymised. Our analyses, which  
37 integrate the current naming rules, enhance the alpha-taxonomy of the genus and  
38 provide an effective identification tool based on DNA-barcodes. They illustrate the  
39 ability of DNA-barcode, especially when type-specimens are included, to pinpoint  
40 where a taxonomic revision is needed.

41

## 42 **Introduction**

43 When describing a new species, the taxonomists provide a species name and designate  
44 one (or several) type-specimens to which this name is permanently attached. A species  
45 name allows us to designate a testable species hypothesis, and the type-specimens  
46 provide the link with the name of this hypothesis. Designating species hypotheses by  
47 species names allows anyone to associate newly examined specimens to already  
48 proposed species hypotheses. However, proposing species hypotheses, species names  
49 and species identifications are three distinct tasks that should not be confused (Dayrat  
50 2006). They can be distinguished as follows: (i) the scientific task consists of proposing  
51 hypotheses about species boundaries, based on the comparison of characters or on  
52 biological criteria; (ii) the naming task deals with assigning names to such species

53 hypotheses; and (iii) the identification task is to identify specimens in the light of  
54 already named species hypotheses.

55         Within this methodological framework, the primary purpose of DNA barcoding  
56 projects is not to produce new taxonomic hypotheses and to name them – task one and  
57 two – but to facilitate taxonomic identification – the third task – by developing a global  
58 standard for the identification of biological species based on molecular data (Hebert and  
59 Gregory 2005, Schindel and Miller 2005). However, identifying specimens using only  
60 their barcode sequences requires the constitution of a database that includes the  
61 sequences and the corresponding specimen data, authoritatively identified using  
62 morphological characters. Furthermore, a prior analysis of the molecular diversity of the  
63 groups is necessary to confirm (or reject) that DNA barcodes may be used as a  
64 diagnostic character for the species at hand, i.e. that intraspecific and interspecific  
65 genetic distances are separated by a “barcode gap”. In that way, the identification of  
66 new specimens using such a DNA library would follow the opinion of the taxonomist  
67 that has identified the specimens of the DNA barcode library. Here, two problems need  
68 to be addressed. First, a link between DNA-based species hypotheses and already  
69 available morphological species hypotheses (and thus species names) needs to be  
70 assessed. For example, in the Smith's et al. (2007) study, it was not possible to ascertain  
71 the link between genetic clusters and available names with full confidence because no  
72 DNA barcode was obtained for the holotype; this uncertainty in the assignment of  
73 species names to species hypotheses was indicated by indicating the scientific names in  
74 quotation marks. Second, one important by-product of DNA barcoding as an  
75 identification tool for taxonomy is the detection of specimens that cannot be attributed  
76 to any available species hypothesis, and for which a new hypothesis – and thus a new  
77 name – may be proposed (*e.g.* Padial and De La Riva 2007). Once again, the attribution  
78 of available species names to genetic clusters is critical to clearly highlight genetic  
79 clusters that would deserve a new species name. Thus, because DNA barcodes can be  
80 used both to attribute species names to a given specimen and to flag genetic clusters for  
81 which no name is available, we should clarify how names are – or should be – given to  
82 species hypotheses. This can be achieved by the sequencing of type specimens.

83         Using a case study of the genus *Eumunida* Smith, 1883 (Decapoda,  
84 Chirostyloidea, Eumunididae), we here illustrate the difficulties of this naming task, in

85 the context of the development of DNA barcodes as an identification tool. We selected  
86 this genus because the description of most species is recent and the conservation of  
87 name-bearing specimens in the collections allows us to access to molecular characters.  
88 Many species were described using material that has been preserved in 70% ethanol, the  
89 samples are housed in the collection of the Museum National d'Histoire Naturelle in  
90 Paris, having been collected over a quarter of a century exploration in the South West  
91 Pacific area (Bouchet, Héros *et al.* 2008). In this case study we integrate the three tasks  
92 of taxonomy. Our specific aims are thus: (i) to test the robustness of recognized species  
93 hypotheses and if needed to propose new ones, (ii) to name the revised set of species  
94 hypotheses. This way, the efficiency of DNA barcodes as an identification key will also  
95 be evaluated. To that end, we gathered mitochondrial and nuclear data for 230  
96 specimens attributed to the genus *Eumunida*, including type specimens, for a large  
97 proportion of the described species. We also compared the distribution of  
98 morphological characters used in the identification keys over the identified genetic  
99 clusters. The inclusion of type specimens in the dataset unambiguously links genetic  
100 clusters to taxa names.

101

## 102 **Materials and methods**

103

### 104 ***Material and DNA sequencing***

105 From the collections of the Museum National d'Histoire Naturelle, Paris (MNHN) we  
106 selected 230 specimens of *Eumunida* from the South West Pacific and Indian Oceans  
107 (Table 1). Among them, 9 are holotypes and 24 are paratypes, representing 13 different  
108 species. The 197 remaining specimens were morphologically authoritatively identified to  
109 the species level and attributed to 17 valid names of eumunid species. Thus, more than  
110 half of the species diversity currently recognized in the genus *Eumunida* is represented  
111 in our data set (Table 2 and 3). These 17 species hypotheses are represented by 1 to 95  
112 specimens, with an average of 12.05 specimens per species (Table 1). These  
113 morphological identifications were used as primary species hypotheses. The  
114 morphological characters used in species identification for all the species in the genus  
115 were listed and used to build a morphological matrix (Tables 2 and 3).

116 DNA was extracted from a piece of muscle tissue using the DNeasy<sup>®</sup> 96 Tissue  
117 kit (Qiagen), and specimens were kept as vouchers. Fragments of the  
118 Cytochrome Oxidase I (COI) mitochondrial gene and 28S rDNA nuclear gene were  
119 amplified using universal primers LCO1490 (5'-  
120 GGTCAACAAATCATAAAGATATTGG-3') and HCO2198 (5'-  
121 TAAACTTCAGGGTGACCAAAAAATCA-3') (Folmer, Black *et al.* 1994), and C1'  
122 (5'- ACCCGCTGAATTTAAGCAT-3', (Jovelin and Justine 2001) and D2 (5'-  
123 TCCGTGTTTCAAGACGG-3', (Dayrat, Tillier *et al.* 2001). All PCR reactions were  
124 performed in 25 µl, containing 3 ng of DNA, 1X reaction buffer, 2.5 mM MgCl<sub>2</sub>, 0.26  
125 mM dNTP, 0.3 µM of each primer, 5% DMSO and 1.5 units of Q-Bio Taq, QBiogene  
126 for COI gene and Taq Core Kit 2, QBiogene for 28S rDNA gene. Thermocycles  
127 consisted of an initial denaturation step at 94°C for 4', followed by 30 cycles of  
128 denaturation at 94°C for 30'', annealing at 48°C for COI gene and 56°C for 28S rDNA  
129 gene for 40'' and extension at 72°C for 1'. The final extension was at 72°C for 10'.  
130 Some PCR products were purified using Montage<sup>™</sup> PCR Centrifugal Filter Devices  
131 (Millipore) and sequenced on a Ceq2000<sup>™</sup> automated sequencer (Beckman) –  
132 corresponding to GenBank accession numbers AY800009-800046, AY800048,  
133 AY800050, AY800051, AY800055-800065 and DQ011181-011220. The other PCR  
134 products were purified and sequenced by the Genoscope (GenBank accession numbers  
135 EU243337 - EU243562 for COI gene and EU243574 - EU243663 for 28S rDNA gene).  
136 In all cases, both directions were sequenced to confirm accuracy of each haplotype  
137 sequences.

138

### 139 *Phylogenetic analyses*

140 Sequences were manually aligned for the COI gene, and the Clustal W algorithm  
141 (default parameters) implemented in BioEdit (Hall 1999) was used for alignment of our  
142 28S rDNA sequences. Since all the species analyzed here belong to a single genus, the  
143 sequence variability and the number of gaps for the 28S gene were reduced.  
144 Consequently, we considered that homology was confidently inferred using Bioedit.  
145 The RNAalifold webserver (<http://rna.tbi.univie.ac.at/cgi-bin/RNAalifold.cgi>) was used  
146 to predict a consensus secondary structure for the 28S gene and to identify the loops and  
147 stems. Loops generally correspond to variable regions, as opposed to stems, which are

148 generally more conserved. In consequence, two different models of evolution were used  
149 for the phylogenetic analyses of the 28S data. Best-fit models of evolution were selected  
150 for the COI genes and for the loops and stems partitions of the 28S gene using  
151 Modelgenerator V.85 (Keane, Creevey *et al.* 2006) under the Bayesian Information  
152 Criterion, with four discrete gamma categories. The best-fit models of evolution are the  
153 HKY+I+G (with  $I = 0.6$  and  $\alpha = 0.62$ ) for the COI gene, the TrNef+I+G ( $I = 0.31$ ,  $\alpha =$   
154  $0.15$ ) for the 28S gene, the K80+G ( $\alpha = 0.5$ ) for the loops of the 28S gene and the  
155 K80+G ( $\alpha = 0.25$ ) for the stems of the 28S gene.

156 As distances-based methods are classically used in barcode studies, a genetic  
157 distance matrix including all sequences was calculated for COI gene under the K2P  
158 model and used to reconstruct a Neighbor-Joining (NJ) tree, using MEGA 5 (Tamura,  
159 Peterson *et al.* 2011). To accurately reconstruct the phylogenetic relationships within  
160 *Eumunida*, a Bayesian Analysis (BA) was also conducted using Mr. Bayes  
161 (Huelsenbeck, Ronquist *et al.* 2001); it consisted in two independent analyses (six  
162 Markov chains, 30,000,000 generations, with a sampling frequency of one tree each  
163 5,000 generations). One different model (each with 6 substitution categories, a gamma-  
164 distributed rate variation across sites approximated in four discrete categories and a  
165 proportion of invariable sites) was applied for each partition (COI, 28S loops and 28S  
166 stems). Convergence of each analysis was evaluated using Tracer 1.4.1 (Rambaut and  
167 Drummond 2007), and analyses were terminated when ESS values were all greater than  
168 200. We also used the AWTY application (a system for graphical exploration of  
169 Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) convergence in Bayesian phylogenetic inference)  
170 for each run (two runs for the COI genes and two for the 28S gene): the cumulative split  
171 frequencies were stable after the burnin phase, the split frequencies in run pairs  
172 (“compare” analysis) were strongly correlated and the between-run distance was  
173 included in the range of the within run distances for more than half of the generations  
174 (“var” analysis). A consensus tree was then calculated after omitting the first 25% trees  
175 as burn-in. For both genes, we used *Munida acantha* (Macpherson, 1994) as outgroup to  
176 artificially root the tree (GenBank accession numbers: AY800033 for COI gene and  
177 EU249347 for 28S rDNA gene).

178

179 **Results**

180

181 ***Mitochondrial dataset***

182 We obtained 226 COI sequences of 658 bp in length with 219 polymorphic sites  
183 corresponding mostly to the first (47) and third codon position (164). This dataset is  
184 available in the BOLD project “Eumunida barcodes and taxonomy” under the accession  
185 numbers EUMU001-07 to EUMU226-07. The maximum K2P distance between pairs of  
186 COI sequences of the *Eumunida* genus is 0.158, with a minimum of 0 and a mean of  
187 0.079 (Fig. 1A). The histogram representing all the distances between types and non-  
188 types specimens defines two groups (Fig. 1A): the first, with an upper boundaries of  
189 0.033, includes all the distances between two type-specimens of one species, but also  
190 distances between the holotype of *E. parva* (de Saint Laurent & Macpherson, 1990) and  
191 the type specimens (one holotype and five paratypes) of *E. karubar* (de Saint Laurent &  
192 Poupin, 1996); the second, characterized by a lower boundary of 0.043, includes only  
193 interspecific comparisons between types. NJ and bayesian phylogenetic trees were  
194 highly congruent (only the bayesian tree is shown in Fig. 2A) and revealed 16 terminal  
195 genetic units: genetic distances within each cluster are less than 0.033, and COI  
196 sequences placed in different genetic units are separated by genetic distances greater  
197 than 0.043. Among these 16 genetic units, 13 include several specimens and all are  
198 highly supported (Posterior Probabilities PP=1), and 10 contain 1 or several type  
199 specimens.

200

201 ***Nuclear dataset***

202 The 28S rDNA gene was much more difficult to sequence especially for older museum  
203 specimens and less specimens were sequenced compared to the COI dataset as a  
204 consequence. We obtained 89 sequences of 867 bp. Two groups of K2P distances are  
205 separated by a gap on the genetic distances histogram (Fig. 1B). The short-distance  
206 group has an upper bound of 0.001 and the long-distance group has a lower bound of  
207 0.018. For each pair of specimens, a genetic distance less than 0.001 for this dataset  
208 corresponds to a genetic distance less than 0.033 with the COI gene. Conversely, when  
209 the genetic distance between two 28S rDNA sequences is greater than 0.018, the genetic  
210 distance between COI sequences corresponding to the same specimens is greater than  
211 0.043. The intraspecific distances between type specimens fall in the short-distance



212 group whereas interspecific distances between type specimens fall in the long-distance  
 213 group. The 28S dataset reveals the same monophyletic lineages than the COI dataset:  
 214 among the 16 lineages defined with the COI gene, seven correspond with clusters  
 215 identified by the 28S gene (Fig. 2B). Furthermore, one additional lineage, not  
 216 sequenced with the COI gene, is defined with the 28S gene. The deeper nodes of the 28S  
 217 tree are not as well resolved as the COI tree but the terminals are highly supported in all  
 218 cases.

219

### 220 ***Genetic units and species names***

221 Based on separate analyses of the two molecular data sets we are able to define 17  
 222 genetically distinct units (Fig. 2) that may be considered as species hypotheses. Eleven  
 223 of these units include at least one sequence of one type specimen (holotype and/or  
 224 paratypes) for at least one of the two genes, and can be directly linked to a species  
 225 name. Types were included for *E. annulosa* de Saint Laurent & Macpherson, 1990, *E.*  
 226 *bispinata* Baba, 1990, *E. keiji* de Saint Laurent & Macpherson, 1990, *E. marginata* de  
 227 Saint Laurent & Macpherson, 1990, *E. minor* de Saint Laurent & Macpherson, 1990, *E.*  
 228 *multilineata* de Saint Laurent & Poupin, 1996, *E. similior* Baba, 1990, *E. spinosa*  
 229 Macpherson, 2006, *E. squamifera* de Saint Laurent & Macpherson, 1990, *E.*  
 230 *sternomaculata* de Saint Laurent & Macpherson, 1990 and *E. treguieri* de Saint Laurent  
 231 & Poupin, 1996. Four other genetic units do not include type specimens but are based on  
 232 morphological identification key: *E. capillata* de Saint Laurent & Macpherson, 1990, *E.*  
 233 *funambulus* Gordon, 1930, *E. laevimana* Gordon, 1930 and *E. picta* Smith, 1883. The  
 234 name “*E. annulosa*” is attributed to two clades, one including the holotype. Since the  
 235 specimens of the genetic unit without the holotype look like those from *E. annulosa* but  
 236 are not closely related to *E. annulosa* (Fig. 2A and B), and in accordance with the Code  
 237 of Zoological Nomenclature, we named this genetic group *E. aff. annulosa*. Finally, the  
 238 remaining genetic unit unites specimens morphologically assigned to three different  
 239 species (*E. karubar* de Saint Laurent & Poupin, 1996, *E. parva* de Saint Laurent &  
 240 Macpherson, 1990 and *E. smithii* Henderson, 1885). For the COI dataset, the holotype  
 241 of *E. parva*, five paratypes of *E. karubar* and the holotype of *E. karubar* are included  
 242 within the same genetic unit (Fig. 2C). Genetic distances between sequences of  
 243 paratypes and/or holotypes falling into this well supported clade are lower than between

244 other paratypes of a single species name placed in a single clade (e.g. the two paratypes  
245 of *E. bispinata*).

246

## 247 **Discussion**

### 248 ***The barcoding gap***

249 In our analysis, the distribution pattern of genetic distances for the two gene  
250 fragments used allows us to cluster genetically similar individuals that are separated  
251 from each other by relatively large distances. In the bimodal distribution of distances,  
252 the lower bound of the first mode – small distances – and the upper bound of the second  
253 mode – large distances (Meier, Zhang *et al.* 2008) are reliably estimated thanks to the  
254 larger number of specimens analyzed, allowing to assert that the observed gap is not an  
255 artifact resulting from a sampling bias. We are fully aware, like others (*e.g.* Meyer and  
256 Paulay 2005, Costa, deWaard *et al.* 2007, Hajibabaei, Singer *et al.* 2007, Wiemers and  
257 Fiedler 2007, Meier, Zhang *et al.* 2008), of the importance of the sampling scheme to  
258 interpret a gap in the distribution of the pairwise genetic distances, but insist that the  
259 originality of our dataset is the inclusion of type specimens. Interestingly, all the genetic  
260 distances between the paratypes of a given name fall in the first mode whereas genetic  
261 distances among the holotypes (and the paratypes from different names) fall into the  
262 second mode (except for the type specimens of *E. karubar* and *E. parva*), suggesting  
263 that the gap may be used in a first approach as a species threshold.

264

### 265 ***Concordance of most genetic units with primary species hypotheses***

266 Inclusion of a closely related outgroup in the analysis shows that each of the 17 defined  
267 genetic units has its own evolutionary history. Moreover, the two gene trees obtained  
268 with our two unlinked genetic markers are in concordance. This concordance suggests  
269 that genetic exchanges among individuals from different clades are unlikely. A previous  
270 study has shown that in two of these genetic units, gene flow occurs between  
271 populations over the geographic range of each species but not between species (Samadi,  
272 Bottan *et al.* 2006). These 17 genetic units can thus be considered robust species  
273 hypotheses.

274 Among them, 15 units cluster specimens attributed, to a unique species and a  
275 single name using the morphological identification key,. Ten of these fifteen species

276 clusters include also type specimens. These 15 clusters are therefore delimited  
277 unambiguously, even though inclusion of type specimens in such genetic units is the  
278 only way to unambiguously attribute species names to them ; but even though five units  
279 do not include the type specimen for the name attributed from the key, we can define 15  
280 primary species hypotheses as the best ones given the available data to date. However,  
281 our result is not fully congruent with previous species hypotheses of which four are  
282 questioned by the molecular analysis. Indeed our data suggest (i) occurrence of a cryptic  
283 species – *i.e.* not yet identified using morphology – that needs a new name because no  
284 type specimen can be attributed to the corresponding cluster and (ii) the grouping of  
285 three previously admitted species hypotheses into one, and thus the synonymy of three  
286 available species names.

287

#### 288 ***A cryptic species under the name E. annulosa***

289 The genetic divergence found between *E. annulosa* and *E. aff. annulosa* largely exceeds  
290 the average divergence found not only within the other species hypotheses of our data  
291 set, but also within other galatheoid species (Machordom and Macpherson 2004). Since  
292 one of the two clades includes the holotype of *E. annulosa*, the other clade (*E. aff.*  
293 *annulosa*), not yet detected by morphologists, should indisputably be described under a  
294 new name (Fig. 2A & 2B). Although this clade is more closely related to *E. treguieri* in  
295 the tree, morphological characters differ slightly only from those of *E. annulosa* or *E.*  
296 *sternomaculata*. On the basis of morphological characters, these two species are  
297 distinguished by the relative length of the first pair of anterolateral spines, longer in *E.*  
298 *sternomaculata* than in *E. annulosa*, the presence of two (*E. annulosa*) or three (*E.*  
299 *sternomaculata*) distal spines on the carpus of the chelipeds, and the posterior part of  
300 abdominal tergites, after last stria, more smooth in *E. annulosa* than in *E.*  
301 *sternomaculata* (Table 3, characters 6, 9 and 10). The larger specimens of *E. aff.*  
302 *annulosa* display, for these two characters, intermediate states: the relative size of the  
303 first anterolateral spine is intermediate between that described for *E. annulosa* and that  
304 described for *E. sternomaculata* and a 3<sup>rd</sup> distal spine is present on the cheliped carpus,  
305 but generally is very small. However, these morphological characters, on which this  
306 new species may be diagnosed, are difficult to observe on small specimens and thus  
307 useful only for adult specimens identification. Since the two species are morphological

308 very close but do not display sister relationships, they are “cryptic species”, and not  
309 “sibling species”, as defined in Bickford et al. (Bickford, Lohman *et al.* 2007). This  
310 result stresses the importance of molecular analyses to detect such “cryptic species” not  
311 only within this genus, but also in others crustacean decapods (see the review by  
312 Knowlton 2000 and Bickford, Lohman *et al.* 2007). Contrary to most studies, that  
313 provide (at best) molecular data for name bearing specimens of new species names (*e.g.*  
314 Shih, Naruse *et al.* 2010, Ahyong, Chan *et al.* 2010), the inclusion of many name-  
315 bearing specimens into the analysis points to the necessity of a new name for this  
316 “cryptic species”. For such cryptic taxa, the DNA barcode is obviously a more effective  
317 identification tool than a morphological identification key, being informative at all the  
318 life stages and thus having broader applications (*e.g.* De Ley, Tandingam De Ley *et al.*  
319 2005, Savolainen, Cowan *et al.* 2005, Vences, Thomas *et al.* 2005).

320

#### 321 **Synonymy of *E. karubar*, *E. parva* and *E. smithii***

322 Our analysis also suggests that three named species hypotheses (*E. karubar*, *E. parva*,  
323 *E. smithii*) should actually be merged into a single species hypothesis. When using a  
324 morphological identification key, the specimens attributed to one of these three species  
325 names, including the five paratypes, the holotype of *E. karubar* and the holotype of *E.*  
326 *parva*, are scattered among the different sub-clades without displaying any obvious  
327 significant pattern (Fig. 2C and 2D).

328 The morphological distinction among *E. parva*, *E. karubar* and *E. smithii* is  
329 based on the occurrence (*E. smithii* and *E. karubar*) or absence (*E. parva*) of ventral  
330 spines on the merus of the chelipeds and on the presence (*E. smithii* and *E. karubar*) or  
331 absence (*E. parva*) of some ventromesial spines on the palm of the chelipeds (Table 3,  
332 characters 8 and 14). The distinction among these species is also based on the length of  
333 the ocular peduncles, shorter in *E. smithii* than in *E. karubar* and *E. parva* (Saint  
334 Laurent and Poupin 1996). By combining data from morphology, geography, and  
335 independent genetic characters, we suggest that the three names are synonymous (this  
336 amounts to considering *E. parva* and *E. karubar* as junior synonyms of *E. smithii*). This  
337 interpretation may yet be challenged by the molecular analysis of the holotype of *E.*  
338 *smithii*. This was not possible because the type specimens for this name were collected  
339 during the Challenger Expedition (1874-1876), are not housed at the MNHN, and tissue

340 was not available for sequencing. In consequence, we used topotypic specimens,  
341 collected from the type locality (Kei Islands, Indonesia). According to our  
342 interpretation, the morphological differences upon which description of new species  
343 hypotheses bearing new species names has been based in the past are the expression of  
344 intraspecific variability. This would imply that variability should be used with caution  
345 as a diagnostic trait at species level in this genus. The alternative hypothesis would be  
346 recent speciation events leading to low genetic divergence.

347 Therefore, we propose that the genus *Eumunida* contains 28 species (see also  
348 Baba, Macpherson *et al.* 2008; Schnabel and Ahyong 2010) including the new cryptic  
349 species of *E. annulosa* and considering *E. parva* and *E. karubar* as junior synonyms of  
350 *E. smithii* ). The diagnosis of *E. smithii* is as follows:

351 **Diagnosis** — Carapace with distinct transverse ridges, laterally armed with 6 spines; 2  
352 spines anterior to posterior cervical groove, anterior spine subequal to posterior spine,  
353 about half as long as lateral supraocular spine. No spine on gastric region. Third  
354 maxilliped merus with median spine and without distal spine on flexor margin. Sternite 3  
355 with paired median spines; sternite 4 unarmed on each side. Cheliped carpus with 3  
356 terminal spines; palm without ventral pad of densely packed hairs, longer than fingers,  
357 relatively massive, covered with short fine setae. Rudimentary pleopods present on  
358 abdominal segments 2-5 in males.

359

360 *Name-bearing specimens integrated into a molecular revision of species hypotheses.*

361 One of the main problems when revising species hypotheses and identifying specimens  
362 in the context of DNA barcoding projects is the naming procedure. An appropriate  
363 sampling effort within species, a large taxonomic coverage within the genus, and the  
364 inclusion of as many type specimens as possible are necessary when confronting  
365 morphological species hypotheses to independent characters (DNA polymorphism) and  
366 various species delimitation criteria. In the case of the genus *Eumunida*, it allowed us (i)  
367 to support most of the morphology-based primary species hypotheses, (ii) to bring up  
368 new hypotheses, and (iii) to point at the necessity of a taxonomic revision. Overall,  
369 although we detected two discrepancies between our data and the current state of the  
370 taxonomy of the genus *Eumunida*, our results suggest that most morphological traits  
371 commonly used in this genus to propose primary species hypotheses stand up when

372 other characters are used. By contrast with most studies, the inclusion of name-bearing  
373 specimens in the molecular study allows us to correctly assign names to the supported  
374 or reformulated species hypotheses and to unquestionably determine whether new  
375 names are needed or whether some names should be considered synonyms of older  
376 names. This point is particularly critical when cryptic species are detected, *i.e.*, when  
377 morphological keys do not help to attribute names to genetic units. Last, even though  
378 several *Eumunida* species are missing in this study and should be barcoded in the  
379 future, our study shows that the COI gene fragment is an effective tool to attribute  
380 species names to specimens, and vice versa, in the genus *Eumunida*, which is the  
381 primary purpose of DNA barcoding.

382

### 383 **Acknowledgments**

384 We are grateful to Bertrand Richer de Forges, cruise leader of several deep-sea cruises  
385 of the Tropical Deep Sea Benthos program on board R/V Alis, that generated the deep-  
386 sea samples used in this study. All material has been collected under appropriate  
387 collection permits and approved ethics guidelines. This work was supported by the  
388 "Consortium National de Recherche en Génomique", and the "Service de Systématique  
389 Mléculaire" of the Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle (UMS 2700 CNRS-MNHN).  
390 It is part of the agreement n°2005/67 between the Genoscope and the Muséum National  
391 d'Histoire Naturelle on the project "Macrophylogeny of life" directed by Guillaume  
392 Lecointre. These data fed the MarBol project supported by the Sloan Foundation. We  
393 are also pleased to thank Anouk Barberousse, Philippe Bouchet, Mande Holford, Line  
394 Le Gall and Simon Tillier for constructive discussions and/or comments on, and English  
395 improvements of, the manuscript, and Julien Brisset and Laure Corbari for the curation  
396 of the collection.

397

### 398 **References**

399

- 400 Ahyong, S.T., Chan, T.-Y., and Bouchet, P. (2010) Mighty claws: a new genus and  
401 species of lobster from the Philippine deep sea (Crustacea, Decapoda, Nephropidae).  
402 *Zoosystema* **32**(3), 525-535.
- 403  
404 Baba, K., Macpherson, E., Poore, G.C.B., Ahyong, S.T., Bermudez, A., Cabezas, P.,  
405 Lin, C.W., Nizinski, M., Rodrigues, C., and Schnabel, K.E. (2008) Catalogue of squat

- 406 lobsters of the world (Crustacea: Decapoda: Anomura - families Chirostylidae,  
407 Galatheidae and Kiwaidae). *Zootaxa* **1905**, 1-220.  
408
- 409 Bickford, D., Lohman, D.J., Sodhi, N.S., Ng, P.K.L., Meier, R., Winker, K., Ingram,  
410 K.K., and Das, I. (2007) Cryptic species as a window on diversity and conservation.  
411 *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* **22**(3), 148-155.  
412
- 413 Bouchet, P., Héros, V., Lozouet, P., and Maestrati, P. (2008) A quarter-century of deep-  
414 sea malacological exploration in the South and West Pacific: Where do we stand? How  
415 far to go? In 'Tropical Deep-Sea Benthos 25. Mémoires du Muséum national d'Histoire  
416 naturelle 196: 9-40.' (Eds. V Héros, RH Cowie and P Bouchet): Paris ISBN: 978-2-  
417 85653-614-8.)  
418
- 419 Costa, F.O., deWaard, J.R., Boutillier, J., Ratsnasingham, S., Dooh, R.T., Hajibabaei,  
420 M., and Hebert, P.D.N. (2007) Biological identifications through DNA barcodes: the  
421 case of the Crustacea. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Science* **64**, 272-295.  
422
- 423 Dayrat, B. (2006) A taxonomic revision of *Paradoris* sea slugs (Mollusca, Gastropoda,  
424 Nudibranchia, Doridina). *Zoological Journal of the Linnean Society* **147**, 125-238.  
425
- 426 Dayrat, B., Tillier, A., Lecointre, G., and Tillier, S. (2001) New clades of Euthyneuran  
427 Gastropods (Mollusca) from 28S rRNA sequences. *Molecular Phylogenetics and*  
428 *Evolution* **19**(2), 225-235.  
429
- 430 De Ley, P., Tandingan De Ley, I.T., Morris, K., Abebe, E., Mundo-Ocampo, M.,  
431 Yoder, M., Heras, J., Waumann, D., Rocha-Olivares, A., Jay Burr, A.H., Baldwin, J.G.,  
432 and Thomas, W.K. (2005) An integrated approach to fast and informative  
433 morphological vouchering of nematodes for applications in molecular barcoding.  
434 *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B* **360**, 1945-1958.  
435
- 436 Folmer, O., Black, M., Hoeh, W., Lutz, R., and Vrijenhoek, R. (1994) DNA primers for  
437 amplification of mitochondrial cytochrome c oxidase subunit I from diverse metazoan  
438 invertebrates. *Molecular Marine Biology and Biotechnology* **3**, 294-299.  
439
- 440 Hajibabaei, M., Singer, G.A.C., Hebert, P.D.N., and Hickey, D.A. (2007) DNA  
441 barcoding: how it complements taxonomy, molecular phylogenetics and population  
442 genetics. *Trends in Genetics* **23**, 167-172.  
443
- 444 Hall, T.A. (1999) BioEdit: a user-friendly biological sequence alignment editor and  
445 analysis program for Windows 95/98/NT. *Nucleic Acids Symposium Series* **41**, 95-98.  
446
- 447 Hebert, P.D.N., and Gregory, T.R. (2005) The promise of DNA Barcoding for  
448 taxonomy. *Systematic Biology* **54**, 852-859.  
449
- 450 Huelsenbeck, J.P., Ronquist, F., and Hall, B. (2001) MrBayes: bayesian inference of  
451 phylogeny. *Bioinformatics* **17**, 754-755.  
452

- 453 Jovelin, R., and Justine, J.-L. (2001) Phylogenetic relationships within the  
 454 Polyopisthocotylean monogeneans (Plathyhelminthes) inferred from partial 28S rDNA  
 455 sequences. *International Journal for Parasitology* **31**(4), 393-401.  
 456
- 457 Keane, T.M., Creevey, C.J., Pentony, M.M., Naughton, T.J., and McInerney, J.O.  
 458 (2006) Assessment of methods for amino acid matrix selection and their use on  
 459 empirical data shows that ad hoc assumptions for choice of matrix are not justified.  
 460 *BMC Evolutionary Biology* **6**, 1-17.  
 461
- 462 Knowlton, N. (2000) Molecular genetic analyses of species boundaries in the sea.  
 463 *Hydrobiologia* **420**, 73-90.  
 464
- 465 Machordom, A., and Macpherson, E. (2004) Rapid radiation and cryptic speciation in  
 466 galatheid crabs of the genus *Munida* and related genera in the South West Pacific:  
 467 molecular and morphological evidence. *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution* **33**,  
 468 259-279.  
 469
- 470 Meier, R., Zhang, G., and Ali, F. (2008) The use of mean instead of smallest  
 471 interspecific distances exaggerates the size of the "Barcoding Gap" and leads to  
 472 misidentification. *Systematic Biology* **57**(5), 809-813.  
 473
- 474 Meyer, C.P., and Paulay, G. (2005) DNA Barcoding: error rates based on  
 475 comprehensive sampling. *PLoS Biology* **3**(12), 1-10.  
 476
- 477 Padial, J.M., and De La Riva, I. (2007) Integrative taxonomists should use and produce  
 478 DNA barcodes. *Zootaxa* **1586**, 67-68.  
 479
- 480 Rambaut, A., and Drummond, A.J. (2007) Tracer v1.4. In '!' (Available from  
 481 <http://beast.bio.ed.ac.uk/Tracer> )  
 482
- 483 Saint Laurent, M.d., and Poupin, J. (1996) Crustacea, Anomura: Les espèces indo-ouest  
 484 pacifiques du genre *Eumunida* Smith, 1880 (Chirostylidae). Description de six espèces  
 485 nouvelles. In 'Résultats des Campagnes MUSORSTOM, volume 15. Vol. 168.' (Ed. A  
 486 Crosnier) pp. 337-385. (Mémoires du Museum National d'Histoire Naturelle, Paris)  
 487
- 488 Samadi, S., Botton, L., McPherson, E., Richer De Forges, B., and Boisselier, M.C.  
 489 (2006) Seamount endemism questioned by the geographic distribution and population  
 490 genetic structure of marine invertebrates. *Marine Biology* **146**, 1463-1475.  
 491
- 492 Savolainen, V., Cowan, R.S., Vogler, A.P., Roderick, G.K., and Lane, R. (2005)  
 493 Towards writing the encyclopedia of life: an introduction to DNA barcoding.  
 494 *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B* **360**, 1805-1811.  
 495
- 496 Schindel, D.E., and Miller, S.E. (2005) DNA barcoding a useful tool for taxonomists.  
 497 *Nature* **435**, 17.  
 498
- 499 Schnabel, K.E., and Ahyong, S.T. (2010) A new classification of the Chirostyloidea  
 500 (Crustacea: Decapoda: Anomura). *Zootaxa* **2687**, 56-64.



- 501  
502 Shih, H.-T., Naruse, T., and Ng, P.K.L. (2010) *Uca jocelynae* sp. nov. a new species of  
503 fiddler crab (Crustacea: Brachyura:Ocypodidae) from the Western Pacific. *Zootaxa*  
504 **2337**, 47-62.  
505
- 506 Smith, A.M., Wood, D.M., Janzen, D.H., Hallwachs, W., and Hebert, P.D.N. (2007)  
507 DNA barcodes affirm that 16 species of apparently generalist tropical parasitoid flies  
508 (Diptera, Tachinidae) are not all generalists. *Proceedings of the National Academy of*  
509 *Sciences* **104**, 4967-4972.  
510
- 511 Tamura, K., Peterson, D., Peterson, N., Stecher, G., Nei, M., and Kumar, S. (2011)  
512 MEGA5: Molecular Evolutionary Genetics Analysis using Maximum Likelihood,  
513 Evolutionary Distance, and Maximum Parsimony Methods. *Molecular Biology and*  
514 *Evolution*, 10.1093/molbev/msr121.  
515
- 516 Vences, M., Thomas, M., Bonett, R.M., and Vieites, D.R. (2005) Deciphering  
517 amphibian diversity through DNA barcoding: chances and challenges. *Philosophical*  
518 *Transactions of the Royal Society B* **360**(1462), 1859-1868.  
519
- 520 Wiemers, M., and Fiedler, K. (2007) Does the DNA barcoding gap exist? – a case study  
521 in blue butterflies (Lepidoptera: Lycaenidae). *Frontiers in Zoology* **4**, 1-16.  
522  
523

Table 1: Description of the specimens analysed in this study

MNHN ID	Geographic area	Morphological ID	Status	GenBank COI	GenBank 28S	BOLD ID
IU-2008-13009	Norfolk Ridge	<i>sternomaculata</i>	holotype	EU243561	EU243662	EUMU225-7
IU-2008-13010	Norfolk ridge	<i>annulosa</i>	holotype	EU243515	EU243646	EUMU179-7
IU-2008-13627	Norfolk ridge, Brachiopode	<i>sternomaculata</i>		EU243484	EU243635	EUMU148-7
IU-2008-13628	Norfolk ridge, Kaimon Maru	<i>annulosa</i>		EU243507	EU243644	EUMU171-7
IU-2008-13642	Norfolk ridge, Introuvable	<i>sternomaculata</i>		EU243481	EU243633	EUMU145-7
IU-2008-13736	Norfolk ridge, Kaimon Maru	<i>annulosa</i>		EU243506	EU243643	EUMU170-7
IU-2008-13747	Norfolk ridge, Jumeau est	<i>annulosa</i>		EU243469	EU243623	EUMU133-7
IU-2008-13748	Norfolk ridge, Jumeau est	<i>annulosa</i>		EU243470		EUMU134-7
IU-2008-13749	Norfolk ridge, Eponge	<i>annulosa</i>		EU243467	EU243621	EUMU131-7
IU-2008-13750	Norfolk ridge, Eponge	<i>annulosa</i>		EU243468	EU243622	EUMU132-7
IU-2008-13751	Norfolk ridge, Crypthelia	<i>annulosa</i>		EU243460		EUMU124-7
IU-2008-13752	Norfolk ridge, Crypthelia	<i>annulosa</i>		EU243461	EU243618	EUMU125-7
IU-2008-13753	Norfolk ridge, Crypthelia	<i>annulosa</i>		EU243462		EUMU126-7
IU-2008-13754	Norfolk ridge, Crypthelia	<i>annulosa</i>		EU243463	EU243619	EUMU127-7
IU-2008-13755	Norfolk ridge, Crypthelia	<i>annulosa</i>		EU243464		EUMU128-7
IU-2008-13756	Norfolk ridge, Crypthelia	<i>annulosa</i>		EU243465		EUMU129-7
IU-2008-13757	Norfolk ridge, Crypthelia	<i>annulosa</i>		EU243466	EU243620	EUMU130-7
IU-2008-13758	Norfolk ridge, Introuvable	<i>annulosa</i>		EU243474	EU243626	EUMU138-7
IU-2008-13759	Norfolk ridge, Introuvable	<i>annulosa</i>		EU243473	EU243625	EUMU137-7
IU-2008-13760	Norfolk ridge, Stylaster	<i>annulosa</i>		EU243471	EU243624	EUMU135-7
IU-2008-13761	Norfolk ridge, Stylaster	<i>annulosa</i>		EU243472		EUMU136-7
IU-2008-13762	Norfolk ridge, Jumeau ouest	<i>annulosa</i>		EU243489		EUMU153-7
IU-2008-13763	Norfolk ridge, Jumeau ouest	<i>annulosa</i>		EU243490	EU243637	EUMU154-7
IU-2008-13764	Norfolk ridge, Jumeau ouest	<i>annulosa</i>		EU243491		EUMU155-7
IU-2008-13765	Norfolk ridge, Jumeau ouest	<i>annulosa</i>		EU243492		EUMU156-7
IU-2008-13766	Norfolk ridge, Jumeau ouest	<i>annulosa</i>		EU243493	EU243638	EUMU157-7
IU-2008-13767	Norfolk ridge, Jumeau ouest	<i>annulosa</i>		EU243494	EU243639	EUMU158-7
IU-2008-13768	Norfolk ridge, Jumeau est	<i>sternomaculata</i>		EU243456	EU243615	EUMU120-7
IU-2008-13769	Norfolk ridge, Jumeau est	<i>sternomaculata</i>		EU243457		EUMU121-7
IU-2008-13770	Norfolk ridge, Jumeau est	<i>sternomaculata</i>		EU243458	EU243616	EUMU122-7
IU-2008-13771	Norfolk ridge, Jumeau est	<i>sternomaculata</i>		EU243459	EU243617	EUMU123-7
IU-2008-13772	Norfolk ridge, Brachiopode	<i>annulosa</i>		EU243435		EUMU099-7
IU-2008-13773	Norfolk ridge, Brachiopode	<i>annulosa</i>		EU243436		EUMU100-7
IU-2008-13775	Norfolk ridge, Antigonina	<i>annulosa</i>		EU243443		EUMU107-7
IU-2008-13776	Norfolk ridge, Antigonina	<i>annulosa</i>		EU243444		EUMU108-7
IU-2008-13777	Norfolk ridge, Antigonina	<i>annulosa</i>		EU243445		EUMU109-7
IU-2008-13778	Norfolk ridge, Crypthelia	<i>annulosa</i>		EU243447		EUMU111-7
IU-2008-13779	Norfolk ridge, Munida	<i>annulosa</i>		EU243448		EUMU112-7
IU-2008-13780	Norfolk ridge, Munida	<i>annulosa</i>		EU243449	EU243612	EUMU113-7
IU-2008-13781	Norfolk ridge, Munida	<i>sternomaculata</i>		EU243450		EUMU114-7
IU-2008-13782	Island of Pines	<i>annulosa</i>		EU243451	EU243614	EUMU115-7
IU-2008-13785	Norfolk ridge, Jumeau est	<i>spinosa</i>		EU243533	EU243655	EUMU197-7
IU-2008-13786	Norfolk ridge, Jumeau est	<i>spinosa</i>		EU243534	EU243656	EUMU198-7
IU-2008-13787	Norfolk ridge, Jumeau est	<i>spinosa</i>		EU243535		EUMU199-7
IU-2008-13788	Norfolk ridge, Jumeau est	<i>spinosa</i>		EU243536	EU243657	EUMU200-7
IU-2008-13789	Norfolk ridge, Jumeau est	<i>spinosa</i>		EU243537		EUMU201-7
IU-2008-13790	Norfolk ridge, Jumeau est	<i>spinosa</i>		EU243538		EUMU202-7
IU-2008-13791	Norfolk ridge, Jumeau est	<i>spinosa</i>		EU243539		EUMU203-7
IU-2008-13792	Norfolk ridge, Jumeau est	<i>spinosa</i>		EU243540		EUMU204-7
IU-2008-13793	Norfolk ridge, Jumeau est	<i>spinosa</i>		EU243541		EUMU205-7
IU-2008-13794	Norfolk ridge, Jumeau est	<i>spinosa</i>		EU243542		EUMU206-7
IU-2008-13795	Solomon Islands	<i>laevimana</i>		EU243508		EUMU172-7
IU-2008-13796	Solomon Islands	<i>laevimana</i>		EU243509		EUMU173-7
IU-2008-13797	Guadeloupe	<i>picta</i>		EU243556	EU243661	EUMU220-7
IU-2008-13798	Guadeloupe	<i>picta</i>		EU243557		EUMU221-7
IU-2008-13799*	Guadeloupe	<i>picta</i>		EU243558		EUMU222-7
IU-2008-13801	Norfolk ridge, Jumeau est	<i>sternomaculata</i>		EU243455		EUMU119-7
IU-2008-13803	Norfolk ridge, Jumeau est	<i>sternomaculata</i>		EU243452		EUMU116-7
IU-2008-13804	Norfolk ridge, Jumeau est	<i>sternomaculata</i>		EU243453		EUMU117-7
IU-2008-13805	Norfolk ridge, Jumeau est	<i>sternomaculata</i>		EU243454		EUMU118-7
IU-2008-13806	Norfolk ridge, Stylaster	<i>sternomaculata</i>		EU243400		EUMU064-7
IU-2008-13876	Norfolk ridge, Aztèque	<i>annulosa</i>		EU243383		EUMU047-7
IU-2011-5396	Norfolk ridge, Jumeau Ouest	<i>annulosa</i>		EU243365		EUMU029-7
IU-2011-5397	Norfolk ridge, Eponge	<i>annulosa</i>		EU243370		EUMU034-7
IU-2011-5398	Norfolk ridge, Eponge	<i>annulosa</i>		EU243371		EUMU035-7
IU-2011-5399	Norfolk ridge, Eponge	<i>annulosa</i>		EU243372		EUMU036-7
IU-2011-5400	Norfolk ridge, Eponge	<i>annulosa</i>		EU243412	EU243597	EUMU076-7
IU-2011-5401	Norfolk ridge, Eponge	<i>annulosa</i>		EU243413	EU243598	EUMU077-7
IU-2011-5402	Norfolk ridge, Eponge	<i>annulosa</i>		EU243414	EU243599	EUMU078-7

IU-2011-5403	Norfolk ridge, Eponge	<i>annulosa</i>	EU243415		EUMU079-7
IU-2011-5404	Norfolk ridge, Eponge	<i>annulosa</i>	EU243416		EUMU080-7
IU-2011-5405	Norfolk ridge, Eponge	<i>annulosa</i>	EU243417		EUMU081-7
IU-2011-5406	Norfolk ridge, Jumeau Ouest	<i>annulosa</i>	EU243366	EU243585	EUMU030-7
IU-2011-5407	Norfolk ridge, Jumeau Ouest	<i>annulosa</i>	EU243367	EU243586	EUMU031-7
IU-2011-5408	Norfolk ridge, Jumeau Ouest	<i>annulosa</i>	EU243368		EUMU032-7
IU-2011-5409	Norfolk ridge, Eponge	<i>sternomaculata</i>	EU243475	EU243627	EUMU139-7
IU-2011-5410	Norfolk ridge, Eponge	<i>sternomaculata</i>	EU243476	EU243628	EUMU140-7
IU-2011-5411	Norfolk ridge, Eponge	<i>sternomaculata</i>	EU243477	EU243629	EUMU141-7
IU-2011-5412	Norfolk ridge, Stylaster	<i>sternomaculata</i>	EU243478	EU243630	EUMU142-7
IU-2011-5413	Norfolk ridge, Stylaster	<i>sternomaculata</i>	EU243480	EU243632	EUMU144-7
IU-2011-5414	Norfolk ridge, Stylaster	<i>sternomaculata</i>	EU243479	EU243631	EUMU143-7
IU-2011-5415	Norfolk ridge, Brachiopode	<i>sternomaculata</i>	EU243482	EU243634	EUMU146-7
IU-2011-5416	Norfolk ridge, Brachiopode	<i>sternomaculata</i>	EU243483		EUMU147-7
IU-2011-5417	Norfolk ridge, Brachiopode	<i>sternomaculata</i>	EU243485		EUMU149-7
IU-2011-5418	Norfolk ridge, Brachiopode	<i>sternomaculata</i>	EU243486		EUMU150-7
IU-2011-5419	Norfolk ridge, Brachiopode	<i>sternomaculata</i>	EU243487		EUMU151-7
IU-2011-5420	Norfolk ridge, Brachiopode	<i>sternomaculata</i>	EU243488	EU243636	EUMU152-7
IU-2011-5421	Norfolk ridge	<i>sternomaculata</i>		paratype	
IU-2011-5422	Norfolk ridge	<i>sternomaculata</i>		paratype	
IU-2011-5423	Tuamotu	<i>kejiji</i>	EU243337		EUMU001-7
IU-2011-5424	New-Caledonia	<i>kejiji</i>	EU243338		EUMU002-7
IU-2011-5425	New-Caledonia	<i>kejiji</i>	EU243339		EUMU003-7
IU-2011-5426	Wallis	<i>kejiji</i>	EU243340		EUMU004-7
IU-2011-5427	New-Caledonia	<i>capillata</i>	EU243341		EUMU005-7
IU-2011-5428	New-Caledonia	<i>capillata</i>	EU243342		EUMU006-7
IU-2011-5429	Indonesia, Kai Island	<i>capillata</i>	EU243343		EUMU007-7
IU-2011-5430	Indonesia, Tanimbar Island	<i>capillata</i>	EU243344		EUMU008-7
IU-2011-5431	New-Caledonia, Surprise	<i>parva</i>	EU243345		EUMU009-7
IU-2011-5432	New-Caledonia, Surprise	<i>parva</i>	EU243346		EUMU010-7
IU-2011-5433	Norfolk Ridge, Jumeau Est	<i>karubar</i>	EU243347	EU243574	EUMU011-7
IU-2011-5434	Norfolk Ridge, Jumeau Est	<i>karubar</i>	EU243348		EUMU012-7
IU-2011-5435	Norfolk Ridge, Jumeau Est	<i>karubar</i>	EU243349	EU243575	EUMU013-7
IU-2011-5436	Indonesia, Tanimbar and Kai Islands	<i>smithii</i>	EU243350		EUMU014-7
IU-2011-5437	Indonesia, Tanimbar and Kai Islands	<i>smithii</i>	EU243351		EUMU015-7
IU-2011-5438		<i>treguieri</i>	EU243352	EU243576	EUMU016-7
IU-2011-5439	Norfolk ridge, Introuvable	<i>annulosa</i>	EU243353	EU243577	EUMU017-7
IU-2011-5440	Norfolk ridge, Introuvable	<i>annulosa</i>	EU243354	EU243578	EUMU018-7
IU-2011-5441	Norfolk ridge, Introuvable	<i>sternomaculata</i>	EU243355		EUMU019-7
IU-2011-5442	Norfolk ridge, Introuvable	<i>sternomaculata</i>	EU243356	EU243579	EUMU020-7
IU-2011-5443	Norfolk ridge, Introuvable	<i>annulosa</i>	EU243357	EU243580	EUMU021-7
IU-2011-5444	Polynesia, Raivavae	<i>treguieri</i>	EU243358	EU243581	EUMU022-7
IU-2011-5445	Tuamotu, Mururoa	<i>treguieri</i>	EU243359	EU243582	EUMU023-7
IU-2011-5446	Norfolk ridge, Introuvable	<i>annulosa</i>	EU243360	EU243583	EUMU024-7
IU-2011-5447	Norfolk ridge, Stylaster	<i>annulosa</i>	EU243361	EU243584	EUMU025-7
IU-2011-5448	Norfolk ridge, Stylaster	<i>annulosa</i>	EU243362		EUMU026-7
IU-2011-5449	Norfolk ridge, Stylaster	<i>annulosa</i>	EU243363		EUMU027-7
IU-2011-5450	Norfolk ridge, Stylaster	<i>annulosa</i>	EU243364		EUMU028-7
IU-2011-5451	Norfolk ridge, Eponge	<i>annulosa</i>	EU243369		EUMU033-7
IU-2011-5452	Norfolk ridge, Introuvable	<i>annulosa</i>	EU243373		EUMU037-7
IU-2011-5453	Norfolk ridge, Introuvable	<i>annulosa</i>	EU243374		EUMU038-7
IU-2011-5454	Norfolk ridge, Introuvable	<i>annulosa</i>	EU243375		EUMU039-7
IU-2011-5455	Norfolk ridge, Introuvable	<i>annulosa</i>	EU243376		EUMU040-7
IU-2011-5456	Norfolk ridge, Jumeau Est	<i>annulosa</i>	EU243377		EUMU041-7
IU-2011-5457	Norfolk ridge, Jumeau Est	<i>annulosa</i>	EU243378		EUMU042-7
IU-2011-5458	Norfolk ridge, Jumeau Est	<i>annulosa</i>	EU243379		EUMU043-7
IU-2011-5459	Norfolk ridge, Jumeau Est	<i>annulosa</i>	EU243380		EUMU044-7
IU-2011-5460	Norfolk ridge, Mont n°2	<i>annulosa</i>	EU243381		EUMU045-7
IU-2011-5461	Norfolk ridge, Mont n°2	<i>annulosa</i>	EU243382		EUMU046-7
IU-2011-5462	Norfolk ridge, Mont n°2	<i>sternomaculata</i>	EU243384	EU243587	EUMU048-7
IU-2011-5463	Norfolk ridge, Mont n°1	<i>sternomaculata</i>	EU243385	EU243588	EUMU049-7
IU-2011-5464	Norfolk ridge, Mont n°1	<i>sternomaculata</i>	EU243386	EU243589	EUMU050-7
IU-2011-5465	Norfolk ridge, Mont n°1	<i>sternomaculata</i>	EU243387		EUMU051-7
IU-2011-5466	Norfolk ridge, Mont n°1	<i>sternomaculata</i>	EU243388	EU243590	EUMU052-7
IU-2011-5467	Norfolk ridge, Stylaster	<i>sternomaculata</i>	EU243389		EUMU053-7
IU-2011-5468	Norfolk ridge, Stylaster	<i>sternomaculata</i>	EU243390		EUMU054-7
IU-2011-5469	Norfolk ridge, Stylaster	<i>sternomaculata</i>	EU243391		EUMU055-7
IU-2011-5470	Norfolk ridge, Stylaster	<i>sternomaculata</i>	EU243392		EUMU056-7
IU-2011-5471	Norfolk ridge, Eponge	<i>sternomaculata</i>	EU243393		EUMU057-7
IU-2011-5472	Norfolk ridge, Eponge	<i>sternomaculata</i>	EU243394		EUMU058-7
IU-2011-5473	Norfolk ridge, Eponge	<i>sternomaculata</i>	EU243395		EUMU059-7
IU-2011-5474	Norfolk ridge, Introuvable	<i>sternomaculata</i>	EU243396	EU243591	EUMU060-7
IU-2011-5475	Norfolk ridge, Introuvable	<i>sternomaculata</i>	EU243397		EUMU061-7

IU-2011-5476	Norfolk ridge, Introuvable	<i>sternomaculata</i>		EU243398		EUMU062-7
IU-2011-5477	Norfolk ridge, Introuvable	<i>sternomaculata</i>		EU243399		EUMU063-7
IU-2011-5478	Norfolk ridge, Stylaster	<i>annulosa</i>		EU243401		EUMU065-7
IU-2011-5479	Norfolk ridge, Stylaster	<i>annulosa</i>		EU243402	EU243592	EUMU066-7
IU-2011-5480	Norfolk ridge, Stylaster	<i>annulosa</i>		EU243403		EUMU067-7
IU-2011-5481	Norfolk ridge, Stylaster	<i>annulosa</i>		EU243404	EU243593	EUMU068-7
IU-2011-5482	Norfolk ridge, Stylaster	<i>annulosa</i>		EU243405		EUMU069-7
IU-2011-5483	Norfolk ridge, Stylaster	<i>annulosa</i>		EU243406		EUMU070-7
IU-2011-5484	Norfolk ridge, Introuvable	<i>annulosa</i>		EU243407	EU243594	EUMU071-7
IU-2011-5485	Norfolk ridge, Introuvable	<i>annulosa</i>		EU243408		EUMU072-7
IU-2011-5486	Norfolk ridge, Introuvable	<i>annulosa</i>		EU243409		EUMU073-7
IU-2011-5487	Norfolk ridge, Introuvable	<i>annulosa</i>		EU243410	EU243595	EUMU074-7
IU-2011-5488	Norfolk ridge, Introuvable	<i>annulosa</i>		EU243411	EU243596	EUMU075-7
IU-2011-5489	Norfolk ridge, Jumeau Est	<i>annulosa</i>		EU243418	EU243600	EUMU082-7
IU-2011-5490	Norfolk ridge, Jumeau Est	<i>annulosa</i>		EU243419		EUMU083-7
IU-2011-5491	Norfolk ridge, Jumeau Est	<i>annulosa</i>		EU243420	EU243601	EUMU084-7
IU-2011-5492	Norfolk ridge, Jumeau Est	<i>annulosa</i>		EU243421		EUMU085-7
IU-2011-5493	Norfolk ridge, Jumeau Est	<i>annulosa</i>		EU243422	EU243602	EUMU086-7
IU-2011-5494	Norfolk ridge, Stylaster	<i>sternomaculata</i>		EU243423	EU243603	EUMU087-7
IU-2011-5495	Norfolk ridge, Stylaster	<i>sternomaculata</i>		EU243424		EUMU088-7
IU-2011-5496	Norfolk ridge, Stylaster	<i>sternomaculata</i>		EU243425	EU243604	EUMU089-7
IU-2011-5497	Norfolk ridge, Stylaster	<i>sternomaculata</i>		EU243426		EUMU090-7
IU-2011-5498	Norfolk ridge, Stylaster	<i>sternomaculata</i>		EU243427	EU243605	EUMU091-7
IU-2011-5499	Norfolk ridge, Stylaster	<i>sternomaculata</i>		EU243428		EUMU092-7
IU-2011-5500	Norfolk ridge, Eponge	<i>sternomaculata</i>		EU243429	EU243606	EUMU093-7
IU-2011-5501	Norfolk ridge, Eponge	<i>sternomaculata</i>		EU243430		EUMU094-7
IU-2011-5502	Norfolk ridge, Eponge	<i>sternomaculata</i>		EU243431		EUMU095-7
IU-2011-5503	Norfolk ridge, Eponge	<i>sternomaculata</i>		EU243432	EU243607	EUMU096-7
IU-2011-5504	Norfolk ridge, Eponge	<i>sternomaculata</i>		EU243433		EUMU097-7
IU-2011-5505	Norfolk ridge, Eponge	<i>sternomaculata</i>		EU243434	EU243608	EUMU098-7
IU-2011-5506	Norfolk ridge, Brachiopode	<i>annulosa</i>		EU243437	EU243609	EUMU101-7
IU-2011-5507	Norfolk ridge, Brachiopode	<i>annulosa</i>		EU243438	EU243610	EUMU102-7
IU-2011-5508	Norfolk ridge, Kaimon Maru	<i>annulosa</i>		EU243439		EUMU103-7
IU-2011-5509	Norfolk ridge, Kaimon Maru	<i>annulosa</i>		EU243440		EUMU104-7
IU-2011-5510	Norfolk ridge, Kaimon Maru	<i>annulosa</i>		EU243441		EUMU105-7
IU-2011-5511	Norfolk ridge, Kaimon Maru	<i>annulosa</i>		EU243442	EU243611	EUMU106-7
IU-2011-5512	Norfolk ridge, Crypthelia	<i>annulosa</i>		EU243446		EUMU110-7
IU-2011-5513	Norfolk ridge, Jumeau ouest	<i>annulosa</i>		EU243495		EUMU159-7
IU-2011-5514	Norfolk ridge, Jumeau ouest	<i>annulosa</i>		EU243496		EUMU160-7
IU-2011-5515	Solomon Islands	<i>laevimana</i>		EU243497		EUMU161-7
IU-2011-5516	Madagascar	<i>similior</i>	holotype	EU243498		EUMU162-7
IU-2011-5517	Indonesia, Tanimbar and Kai Islands	<i>treguieri</i>		EU243499		EUMU163-7
IU-2011-5518	Norfolk ridge, Jumeau est	<i>spinosa</i>	paratype	EU243500	EU243640	EUMU164-7
IU-2011-5519	Norfolk ridge, Jumeau est	<i>spinosa</i>	paratype	EU243501	EU243641	EUMU165-7
IU-2011-5520	Loyalty ridge	<i>minor</i>		EU243502		EUMU166-7
IU-2011-5521	Norfolk ridge, Introuvable	<i>sternomaculata</i>		EU243503		EUMU167-7
IU-2011-5522	Norfolk ridge, Introuvable	<i>sternomaculata</i>		EU243504	EU243642	EUMU168-7
IU-2011-5523	Norfolk ridge, Introuvable	<i>sternomaculata</i>		EU243505		EUMU169-7
IU-2011-5524	Solomon Islands	<i>laevimana</i>		EU243510		EUMU174-7
IU-2011-5525	Polynesia, Tubuai	<i>treguieri</i>	paratype	EU243511		EUMU175-7
IU-2011-5526	Polynesia, Tubuai	<i>treguieri</i>	paratype	EU243512		EUMU176-7
IU-2011-5527	Norfolk ridge, Jumeau est	<i>spinosa</i>	holotype	EU243513	EU243645	EUMU177-7
IU-2011-5528	New-Caledonia	<i>keiji</i>	paratype	EU243514		EUMU178-7
IU-2011-5529	Tuamotu	<i>treguieri</i>	paratype	EU243516	EU243647	EUMU180-7
IU-2011-5530	Tuamotu	<i>treguieri</i>	paratype	EU243517	EU243648	EUMU181-7
IU-2011-5531	New-Caledonia	<i>parva</i>	holotype	EU243518		EUMU182-7
IU-2011-5532	Norfolk ridge, Stylaster	<i>annulosa</i>		EU243519	EU243649	EUMU183-7
IU-2011-5533	Norfolk ridge, Stylaster	<i>annulosa</i>		EU243520	EU243650	EUMU184-7
IU-2011-5534	New-Caledonia, Surprise	<i>parva</i>		EU243521		EUMU185-7
IU-2011-5535	New-Caledonia, Surprise	<i>parva</i>		EU243522	EU243653	EUMU186-7
IU-2011-5536	New-Caledonia, Surprise	<i>parva</i>		EU243523		EUMU187-7
IU-2011-5537	New-Caledonia, Surprise	<i>parva</i>		EU243524		EUMU188-7
IU-2011-5538	New-Caledonia, Surprise	<i>parva</i>		EU243525	EU243654	EUMU189-7
IU-2011-5539	New-Caledonia, Surprise	<i>parva</i>		EU243526		EUMU190-7
IU-2011-5540	New-Caledonia, Surprise	<i>parva</i>		EU243527		EUMU191-7
IU-2011-5541	Indonesia, Kai island	<i>karubar</i>	paratype	EU243528		EUMU192-7
IU-2011-5542	Indonesia, Kai island	<i>karubar</i>	paratype	EU243529		EUMU193-7
IU-2011-5543	Indonesia, Kai island	<i>karubar</i>	paratype	EU243530		EUMU194-7
IU-2011-5544	Indonesia, Kai island	<i>karubar</i>	paratype	EU243531		EUMU195-7
IU-2011-5545	Indonesia, Kai island	<i>karubar</i>	paratype	EU243532		EUMU196-7
IU-2011-5546	New-Caledonia	<i>marginata</i>	holotype	EU243543		EUMU207-7
IU-2011-5547	Madagascar	<i>bispinata</i>	paratype	EU243544		EUMU208-7
IU-2011-5548	Madagascar	<i>bispinata</i>	paratype	EU243545		EUMU209-7

IU-2011-5549	Madagascar	<i>multilineata</i>	paratype	EU243546		EUMU210-7
IU-2011-5550	Madagascar	<i>minor</i>		EU243547		EUMU211-7
IU-2011-5551	Norfolk ridge	<i>minor</i>	paratype	EU243548		EUMU212-7
IU-2011-5552	Norfolk ridge	<i>minor</i>	paratype	EU243549		EUMU213-7
IU-2011-5553	Loyalty ridge	<i>minor</i>	holotype	EU243550		EUMU214-7
IU-2011-5554	Loyalty ridge	<i>minor</i>	paratype	EU243551		EUMU215-7
IU-2011-5555	Loyalty ridge	<i>minor</i>		EU243552		EUMU216-7
IU-2011-5556	Loyalty ridge	<i>minor</i>		EU243553		EUMU217-7
IU-2011-5557	Loyalty ridge	<i>minor</i>		EU243554		EUMU218-7
IU-2011-5558	Philippines	<i>funambulus</i>			EU243658	
IU-2011-5559	Indonesia, Kai island	<i>karubar</i>	holotype	EU243555	EU243659	EUMU219-7
IU-2011-5560		<i>treguieri</i>			EU243660	
IU-2011-5561	Namibia	<i>squamifera</i>	paratype	EU243559		EUMU223-7
IU-2011-5562	Namibia	<i>squamifera</i>	paratype	EU243560		EUMU224-7
IU-2011-5563	Polynesia, Tuamotu	<i>treguieri</i>	holotype	EU243562	EU243663	EUMU226-7

Table 2: Description of morphological characters (numbered from 1 to 16).

<b>Characters</b>	<b>States</b>
1 Thoracic spines	YES=1, NO=0
2 Posterior region of carapace with complete striae	YES=1, NO=0
3 Number of anterolateral spines on each side	one spines=1, two spines=0
4 Pad on palm of cheliped	Yes=1, NO=0
5 Epigastric spines	YES=1, NO=0
6 Posterior part of abdominal tergites, after last stria, smooth	YES=1, NO=0
7 Depressed area on branchial region of carapace	YES=1, NO=0
8 Mesiodorsal row of spines on cheliped palm	YES=1, NO=0
9 First anterolateral spine less than half lateral supraorbital	YES=1(less), NO=0 (more)
10 Distal spines on carpus of chelipeds	1=2 sp, 0=3 sp
11 Distal spine on merus of third maxilliped	YES=1, NO=0
12 Male Pleopods	YES=1, NO=0
13 Six to seven spines upper margin of propodus walking leg	YES=1, NO=0
14 Row of ventral spines on merus of chelipeds	1=5-8sp, 0=1sp
15 Ocular peduncles short, not reaching end of lateral supraorbital spines	YES=1, NO=0
16 Lateral surface of 4th pereopod with spine	YES=1, NO=0





### Figure captions


Fig. 1: Histogram of genetic distances for (A) the COI gene and (B) the 28S gene datasets. Black bars: pairs of type-specimens. Grey bars: pairs of non-type-specimens.

Fig. 2: (A). Bayesian tree for COI gene dataset, with posterior probabilities indicated for each node. Clades are collapsed in triangles, with the height representing the number of specimens and the width the length of the branches. \*: units including a type specimen; (B) Bayesian tree for the 28S gene dataset; (C) Detail of the COI gene tree for the *E. parva*/*E. karubar*/*E. smithii* clade. (D) Detail of the 28S gene tree for the *E. parva*/*E. karubar*/*E. smithii* clade.




**A****B**

A



B



C

D