

Diversity of the Pterasteridae (Asteroidea) in the Southern Ocean: a molecular and morphological approach.

Quentin Jossart, Marc Kochzius, Bruno Danis, Thomas Saucède, Camille V.E.

Moreau

▶ To cite this version:

Quentin Jossart, Marc Kochzius, Bruno Danis, Thomas Saucède, Camille V.E. Moreau. Diversity of the Pterasteridae (Asteroidea) in the Southern Ocean: a molecular and morphological approach.. Zoological Journal of the Linnean Society, 2021, 192 (1), pp.105-116. 10.1093/zoolinnean/zlaa097. hal-03289108

HAL Id: hal-03289108 https://hal.science/hal-03289108v1

Submitted on 21 Feb 2024

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.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial 4.0 International License

DOI: https://doi.org/10.1093/zoolinnean/zlaa097

Diversity of the Pterasteridae (Asteroidea) in the Southern Ocean: a molecular and morphological approach

QUENTIN JOSSART¹, MARC KOCHZIUS¹, BRUNO DANIS², THOMAS SAUCÈDE³, and CAMILLE V. E. MOREAU^{2,3}

¹Marine Biology, Ecology and Biodiversity, Vrije Universiteit Brussel (VUB), Brussels, Belgium ²Laboratoire de Biologie Marine, Université Libre de Bruxelles (ULB), Brussels, Belgium ³Biogéosciences, Université Bourgogne Franche Comté (UBFC), Dijon, France

11 12 13

14 ABSTRACT

An integrative approach is crucial in discrimination of species, especially for taxa that 15 are difficult to identify on a morphological basis. In this study, we combined genetics and 16 morphology to assess the diversity of the Pterasteridae, a sea star family diversified in 17 18 deep-sea and polar environments. Because of their derived anatomy and the frequent loss of characters during preservation, the Pterasteridae are a case in point for an 19 integrative study. The molecular identification of 191 specimens (mostly from the 20 Southern Ocean) suggested 26 to 33 species from 3 genera (Hymenaster, Diplopteraster, 21 Pteraster), which matched the morphological identification in 54 to 62 % of cases. The 22 mismatches were either different molecular units that are morphologically 23 indistinguishable (e.g. *Pteraster stellifer units 2&4*) or, conversely, nominal species being 24 genetically identical (e.g. Hymenaster coccinatus/densus/praecoquis). Several species 25 26 were shared between Northern and Southern Hemispheres (e.g. Pteraster jordani/affinis). In conclusion, the taxonomic status of some groups was confirmed but 27 we found, for others, the need to reevaluate the taxonomy at both the genus and species 28 29 levels. This work significantly increases the DNA barcode library of the Southern Ocean species and merged taxonomic information into an identification key that could be a 30 baseline for future studies (pterasteridae-so.identificationkey.org). 31

1 2

3

4 5

6

7 8

9

10

32 INTRODUCTION

Taxonomy has a pivotal role in biology (Costello et al. 2013). Inaccurate identifications 33 and naming lead to misunderstandings and spurious interpretations of biological 34 processes in various domains of life sciences (Dayrat 2005; Pante et al. 2015). Fifteen 35 vears ago, integrative taxonomy was introduced as a promising approach to 36 complement the traditional, morphology-based taxonomy, using new data and methods 37 (Dayrat 2005). Among these, molecular markers were in the spotlight, considering the 38 39 simultaneous leaps achieved by new genetic methodologies such as DNA barcoding (Stoeckle 2003; Hebert et al. 2003; Hebert & Gregory 2005, Ratnasingham & Hebert 40 41 2007; Fujita et al. 2012). Nowadays, the number of barcoded species is still low compared to the total number of recognized species, less than a quarter of nominal 42 43 species being barcoded in most phyla (Gong et al. 2018). Nevertheless, a plethora of studies have shown the importance of using genetics and morphology alongside for 44 discrimination at all taxonomic ranks (e.g. Richter et al. 2008; Laakmann et al. 2012; 45 46 Pante et al. 2015; Christiansen et al. 2018; Peck et al. 2018; Jossart et al. 2019). Based on the data from the World Register of Marine Species (WoRMS), Appeltans et al. (2012) 47 showed that molecular methods are significantly increasing our knowledge of marine 48 biodiversity by helping in the detection of cryptic species and the establishment of 49 synonymies. This is of particular importance for under-investigated taxa, such as those 50 including numerous species that remain unrevised since their original descriptions. 51

The Asteroidea (*i.e.* sea stars or starfish) is the second most diversified class of echinoderms, with around 1,900 described species assigned to 38 families (Mah & Blake 2012; Mah et al. 2015). They show various ecological traits and are present in a broad variety of ecosystems (Mah & Blake 2012; Lawrence et al. 2013; Moreau et al. 2017). For

the last twenty years, considerable efforts have been made to reevaluate sea star 56 phylogeny using molecular data (Knott & Wray 2000; Janies et al. 2011; Mah & Foltz 57 58 2011a, 2011b; Linchangco et al. 2017; Moreau et al. 2019). However, there is a sharp contrast in our knowledge of sea star diversity, namely amongst families from different 59 biogeographic regions (Feuda & Smith 2015). This is the case of the Pterasteridae 60 Perrier, 1875, the most diverse family in the Order Velatida, which includes around 130 61 nominal species and eight genera: Amembranaster Golotsvan, 1998, Benthaster Sladen, 62 1882, Calyptraster Sladen, 1882, Diplopteraster Verrill, 1880, Euretaster Fisher, 1940, 63 Hymenaster Wyville Thomson, 1873, Hymenasterides Fisher, 1911, Pteraster Müller & 64 Troschel, 1842 (Mah 2020). One unique feature of the Pterasteridae is the presence of 65 66 an additional (supra)dorsal membrane producing abundant quantities of mucus (Mah & Blake 2012, Gale 2018). Between the dorsal and the supradorsal membranes is a 67 68 nidamental cavity where incubation of juveniles takes place in some species (Janies 1995). The taxonomy of the group is complicated for three reasons: (1) morphologies 69 70 are highly derived and only few diagnostic characters are recognized. Most characters commonly used for species identification in other sea stars are not applicable to the 71 72 family (Gale 2018); (2) the few available characters are often indiscernible as specimens are particularly fragile and get damaged by sampling and preservation protocols (Villier 73 et al. 2004); (3) several species are only known from their original description based on 74 few (poorly preserved) specimens (Villier et al. 2004). Consequently, the Pterasteridae 75 76 family is a case in point of a group that could benefit from an integrative taxonomic approach. 77

The family mainly occurs in cold waters from the deep sea to the Arctic and the Southernoceans (Mah & Blake 2012). Unfortunately, although genetic sequences were available

for specimens from the Northern Hemisphere, no public data was published for 80 Southern Ocean species (source: boldsystems.org). International initiatives of the 81 82 Census of Antarctic Marine Life (CAML) and of the International Polar Year (IPY) have promoted sampling efforts in the Southern Ocean (Schiaparelli et al. 2013) and this 83 momentum was at the origin of many biologic campaigns until today. This significantly 84 enhanced the taxonomic and spatial coverage of the Southern Ocean biodiversity 85 inventory, including the collection of deep-sea representatives of the Pterasteridae. 86 These newly and well-preserved specimens have offered the opportunity to 87 reinvestigate the taxonomy of the family. Based on these new samples, we combined 88 morphological and molecular approaches to verify whether their joint use could better 89 assess the diversity within the Pterasteridae. After an initial morphological 90 investigation, we used a mitochondrial gene (Cytochrome c Oxidase subunit I - COI) to 91 92 verify how it confirms or complements the morphological identification. Subsequently, we reinvestigated (*a posteriori*) specimens using a morphological approach in order to 93 94 identify new characters that may differentiate species. Finally, we synthesized, for the first time, the revised taxonomy of the family and made it available to all potential users 95 in an open-access identification key that includes all the Southern Ocean species 96 (pterasteridae-so.identificationkey.org). 97

98 MATERIAL & METHODS

99 Sampling

Specimens were collected during seventeen international campaigns undertaken at sea 100 from 1998 to 2017 (ACE, ANDEEP-3, ANDEEP-SYSTCO, ARGOS, CEAMARC 2007-2008, 101 JR144, JR179, JR262, JR275, JR15005, MD208, MUSORSTOM 10, POKER II, PS77, PS81, 102 PS96). Available specimens cover a wide distribution within the Southern Ocean (Figure 103 1), including the Patagonian shelf, South Sandwich Islands, South Georgia, South Orkney, 104 Shag Rocks, Kerguelen, Crozet and the Antarctic continental shelf (Adélie Land, 105 Amundsen Sea, Antarctic Peninsula, Weddell Sea). A total of 174 specimens from these 106 locations were included in the analysis. Moreover, in order to increase the taxonomic 107 and geographical scope, as well as the phylogenetic resolution, 20 additional genetic 108 sequences (see below) from specimens outside the Southern Ocean were also added to 109 the dataset (*i.e.* Fiji, South Africa, Pacific and Atlantic coasts of North America, Norway, 110 Russia). Metadata documenting all the 191 samples can be found in Supplementary 111 Material 1. 112

113 Morphological identification

A total of 124 Southern Ocean individuals (preserved in ethanol or frozen) were 114 identified morphologically by the authors using both original descriptions (e.g. Sladen 115 1882, Koehler 1908), identification books (Clark 1962, Clark & Downey 1992, McKnight 116 2006) and contemporary scientific literature (Villier et al. 2004, Gale 2018). 117 Subsequently to genetic analyses (see below), an "*a posteriori*" morphological 118 investigation was carried out to look for new characters to differentiate species when 119 new species delineations and synonymies were suggested by genetic data. Finally, the 120 taxonomy of the family was synthesized and made available online, building an 121 interactive identification key through the Xper³ portal (Figure 2). Xper³ is a web portal 122

with an easy-to-use interface allowing multiple accesses (the key can be started using
any character; Vignes-Lebbe et al. 2016). Specimens and characters were also illustrated
by drawings and macro pictures (photographed using a camera with a macro lens, two
flashes and accessories to diffuse or reflect the light, Figure 2, Figure 3).

127 Genetic data

A fragment of the mitochondrial gene "Cytochrome c Oxidase subunit I (COI)" was sequenced (601 base pairs) for the 191 individuals. These genetic sequences were obtained through laboratory works in our institutes (80 individuals, see protocol below), through our private Barcode of Life Data System project (BOLD; 97 individuals) or mined from public BOLD projects (17 individuals).

DNA extractions were performed on one tube foot (podia) per sample and were based 133 on the salting-out protocol of Sunnucks and Hales (1996). Amplification step was 134 performed using the forward primers "F-COI-PTE-28" (5'-GCTGGAATGATTGGAACTGC-135 3') or "LCOech1aF1" (5' TTTTTTCTACTAAACACAAGGATATTGG") and the reverse 136 universal primer "R-HC02198" (5'- TAAACTTCAGGGTGACCAAAAAATCA'; Folmer et al. 137 1994). Each PCR mix (25 µl) included 12.5 µl of a VWR Mastermix (2.5 units of VWR Taq 138 polymerase, 0.4 mM of each dNTP and 1.5mM of MgCl₂), 10.5 µl of molecular water, 0.5 139 μ l each primer (10 μ M), and 1 μ l of the DNA extract. PCR conditions consisted of 35 140 cycles for each of the three temperature steps [30 s at 95 °C (denaturation), 30 s at 48 °C 141 (annealing), and 30 s at 72 °C (elongation)]. These cycles were preceded by 2 min at 95 142 °C and were followed by 10 min at 72 °C. EXOSAP purification (incubation at 37 °C for 15 143 minutes followed by another at 80°C for 15 minutes) was done before the sending of 144 PCR products to the MACROGEN sequencing service. Sequence editing and alignment 145 were done using the software Geneious (Kearse et al. 2012). The absence of stop codon 146

in the sequence was checked in the same software in order to exclude the presence ofnuclear pseudogenes.

149 PartitionFinder2 (BIC criterion, Lanfear et al. 2016) was used within the CIPRES portal (Miller et al. 2010) to select the most suitable substitution models (i.e. TRNEF+I+G for 150 codon position 1, HKY+I+X for codon position 2 and TRN+I+G+X for codon position 3). A 151 Bayesian phylogeny was subsequently produced using BEAST 1.8.4 (Drummond & 152 Rambaut 2007) within the CIPRES portal. Based on a previous phylogeny using multiple 153 genes, *Remaster gourdoni* Koehler, 1912 was used as the outgroup (Linchangco et al. 154 2017). Parameters of the analysis were: partitioned dataset, Yule process tree prior, 155 Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) of 100 x 10⁶ generations sampled every 10,000 156 trees. Tracer v1.6 was used to ensure an appropriate effective sampling size (ESS all 157 above 200). TreeAnnotator v1.8.4 was used to find the most likely tree that was 158 159 visualized in FigTree v1.4.3 (tree.bio.ed.ac.uk/software/figtree). Node support was assessed through posterior probability (pp), with values lower than 0.75 not retained 160 161 and collapsed into polytomies (Huelsenbeck & Rannala 2004). Moreover, the software DensiTree 2.2 was used to verify the potentiality of competing topologies among the set 162 of trees (Bouckaert 2010). 163

Three different methods of species delimitation were used to propose primary species 164 hypotheses: one distance-based (ABGD- Automatic Barcode Gap Discovery: Puillandre et 165 al. 2012) and two tree-based (bPTP-Bayesian Poisson Tree Process: Zhang et al. 2013) 166 167 and GMYC-Generalized Mixed Yule Coalescent: Fujisawa & Barraclough 2013). The ABGD analysis (bioinfo.mnhn.fr/abi/public/abgd) was performed with a relative gap 168 width of 1 and K80 as the genetic distance. The bPTP analysis (species.h-its.org/ptp) 169 was applied using 500,000 generations of MCMC, a thinning of 100 and a burn-in of 25 170 171 %. Finally, the GMYC analysis (species.h-its.org/gmyc) was performed using the single

- 172 threshold method. Haplotype diversity and nucleotide diversity were calculated within
- each species using DnaSP 6 (Rozas et al. 2017).

174 **RESULTS**

175 Initial morphological identification

Among the 124 morphologically investigated individuals, 91 were identified to species 176 level. Thirty-two individuals were identified to genus level and one to family level due to 177 the small size of specimens (juveniles) or poor preservation not permitting observation 178 of diagnostic characters. Thirteen different species and three genera were identified 179 (Figure 3). Four species of Pteraster were found: Pteraster affinis Smith, 1876, Pteraster 180 gibber (Sladen, 1882), Pteraster rugatus Sladen, 1882, and Pteraster stellifer Sladen, 181 1882. The number and type of marginal oral spines were important diagnostic 182 characters to discriminate the different Pteraster species and these characters are 183 usually well preserved. Specimens of *Diplopteraster* were only identified up to the genus 184 level due to the absence of observable characters (e.g. between *Diplopteraster verrucosus* 185 (Sladen, 1882) and Diplopteraster semireticulatus (Sladen, 1882); see discussion). Nine 186 species of *Hymenaster* were identified: *Hymenaster campanulatus* Koehler, 1907, 187 Hymenaster coccinatus Sladen, 1882, Hymenaster densus Koehler, 1908, Hymenaster edax 188 Koehler, 1907, Hymenaster formosus Sladen, 1882, Hymenaster latebrosus Sladen, 1882, 189 Hymenaster perspicuus Ludwig, 1903, Hymenaster praecoquis Sladen, 1882 and 190 Hymenaster sacculatus Sladen, 1882. Some of these Hymenaster species were 191 discriminated based on tenuous morphological differences, such as H. densus and H. 192 193 praecoquis only differentiated based on slight variations in the morphology of the segmental papillae and number of marginal spines (Clark 1962). 194

195 Species delimitation (COI)

Species delimitation methods applied to molecular data gave 26 species hypotheses for ABGD and 33 for bPTP and GMYC (Figure 4). For each species hypothesis, the relationship between haplotype diversity and nucleotide diversity fitted the expected

variation for a single species, except for Pteraster stellifer unit 1 (Goodall-Copestake et 199 al. 2012). Morphological species identification only matched with molecular species 200 201 delimitation in 54 % and 62 % of species for ABGD and GMYC/bPTP, respectively. Within the genus *Pteraster*, species complexes were suggested within the nominal 202 species P. stellifer (3 to 5 units) and P. affinis (2 units). Within the genus Hymenaster, 203 three morphological species appeared to be undifferentiated genetically, suggesting that 204 the diversity of the genus was over-estimated (H. coccinatus, H. densus and H. 205 praecoguis). Moreover, four species are present in both the Southern and Northern 206 Hemispheres: Pteraster jordani/affinis, P. militaris/affinis, Diplopteraster sp1 and P. 207 gibber. In every case, Northern and Southern Hemisphere specimens were closely 208 related within these species (p-distance of 0.3 % for P. jordani/affinis and P. 209 *militaris/affinis*, 0.7 % for *Diplopteraster sp1* and 1.2 % for *P. gibber*). 210

211 COI phylogeny

Three main groups were identified: one *Hymenaster* group (A) and two 212 213 *Diplopteraster/Pteraster* groups (B and C; Figure 4). The relationship of group B with the two other groups was unclear, as illustrated by the low posterior probability and the 214 competing topologies from the DensiTree output (Figure 4; Supplementary material 2). 215 Within group A (Hymenaster), H. campanulatus and unidentified specimens was the 216 sister group of all other Hymenaster (pp = 1). Among these, H. sacculatus formed a 217 subclade with H. formosus, Н. perspicuus and Н. pellucidus, while Н. 218 219 coccinatus/densus/praecoquis formed another subclade with H. edax and H. latebrosus (pp = 0.85). Group B (*Diplopteraster/Pteraster*) included *Pteraster rugatus* as well as the 220 Within 221 *Diplopteraster/Pteraster* stellifer complex (pp 1). group С (Diplopteraster/Pteraster), Pteraster gibber was close to P. obscurus, P. tesselatus units 222

1&2 and *Diplopteraster sp1* (pp = 1); while the other subclade included the *Pteraster affinis* and *P. militaris* complexes (pp = 1).

225 A posteriori morphological re-investigation

Subsequently to species delimitation and phylogenetic analysis, new morphological 226 investigations were performed to clarify the mismatch between morphological and 227 molecular data and the status of ambiguous taxa. For unrecognized molecular units, new 228 discriminant morphological characters were potentially identified. First, we found a 229 different number of marginal oral spines (5 versus 3) in two genetic entities initially 230 identified under the same species name P. affinis (i.e. P. jordani/affinis and P. 231 *militaris/affinis*). Secondly, the presence of a large, clavate suboral spine was found in 232 several specimens of the *Diplopteraster/P. stellifer* complex, all belonging to *P. stellifer* 233 unit 1 and P. stellifer unit 5. Thirdly, the morphological re-examination of two closely 234 235 related molecular units (Pteraster gibber and Diplopteraster sp1) showed that a character state was shared by all specimens of these units. In fact, these specimens had a 236 237 single web (for two oral plates) among marginal oral spines while the other Pteraster/Diplopteraster specimens harbored free marginal oral spines or a separate 238 web for each plate. 239

240 Xper³ identification key

The Xper3 identification key included 33 distinct species (Figures 2 and 3), namely all the species currently accepted in the Register of Antarctic Marine Species (RAMS; Jossart et al. 2015; De Broyer et al. 2020). Moreover, an asterisk (and related comment) was attached to each species name, for which there was a mismatch between genetic and morphological identification (*i.e. Pteraster affinis, P. stellifer, Diplopteraster clarki, D. hurleyi, D. peregrinator, D. semireticulatus, D. verrucosus, Hymenaster coccinatus, H. densus, H. praecoquis*). Fourteen characters were selected, namely the number of arms,

the type and number of paxillar spines, the type and number of adambulacral spines, the 248 number of rows of tube feet, the type and number of suboral/marginal oral spines, the 249 morphology of the segmental papillae, the presence of granular bodies in the 250 supradorsal membrane, the opacity of the supradorsal membrane ,the presence of 251 muscle fibres holding the supradorsal membrane and the number of oscular spines. 252 Several previously used descriptors were evaluated but not retained, because they were 253 not accurately quantifiable (e.g. osculum diameter, density of spiraculae) or 254 undistinguishable in most specimens (e.g. body convexity). Potential new diagnostic 255 characters that could be used in the *Pteraster affinis* (different number of marginal oral 256 spines) and Diplopteraster/Pteraster stellifer (clavate suboral spine) complexes were 257 mentioned as comments within the key. A particular attention was devoted to make this 258 identification key as user-friendly as possible: (1) the Xper³ platform allows the user to 259 260 easily detect the remaining taxa and characters throughout the identification process (Vignes-Lebbe et al. 2016); (2) Any number of characters can be used in any order 261 (multiple accesses key); (3) Numerous macro-pictures and drawings are available, 262 illustrating both whole specimens, characters and character states. This identification 263 key is accessible through the following link: pterasteridae-so.identificationkey.org. 264

265 **DISCUSSION**

Our integrative approach was successful to revise species identity and phylogenetic 266 relationships. The results call for a revision of the taxonomic status of both species and 267 genus within the family Pterasteridae. Such a revision would not be possible without a 268 joint use of morphological investigations and molecular analyses. We identified three of 269 the four genera of Pterasteridae documented in the Southern Ocean: Diplopteraster, 270 *Hymenaster* and *Pteraster*, with *Calyptraster* the only genus not being encountered (Mah 271 2020). Thirty-three species were identified by the bPTP and GMYC molecular 272 approaches, which was concordant with 54 to 62 % of the morphology-based 273 identifications. Mismatches between morphological and genetic identifications were 274 either due to different molecular units that are morphologically similar or, conversely, to 275 morphological species being genetically identical (see below). Several cases of species 276 shared between high latitudes of the Northern and Southern Hemispheres were found, 277 which could correspond either to cosmopolitanism or bipolarity (species with disjunct 278 distribution *sensu* Darling et al. 2000). Following the molecular analyses, the return to 279 morphological samples allowed identification of potential new characters that can be 280 used as diagnostic features to define molecular species that were previously 281 282 undifferentiated based on morphology alone. Merging available morphological and molecular results, we synthesized the taxonomy of the Pterasteridae from the Southern 283 284 Ocean and built a synthetic, polytomous and open-access identification key that is intended to serve as a precious baseline for future taxonomic and ecological studies. 285 286 Finally, this work significantly increases the DNA barcode library for Southern Ocean species. Prior to this study, no genetic sequence of Southern Ocean Pterasteridae was 287 publicly available on GenBank or BOLD platforms. Moreover, the addition of 174 288 sequences extends by more than three times the public barcode library of the whole 289

family, which also represents a 2.5 % extension for the Asteroidea class and a 0.6 %
extension for the Echinodermata phylum (source: boldsystems.org).

292 Species delimitation

The molecular identification confirmed the species status of several species previously 293 described on a morphological basis only (e.g. Hymenaster campanulatus, H. sacculatus, 294 *Pteraster rugatus*). On the other hand, discrepancies between morphological and genetic 295 delineations were observed. These are not surprising and illustrate taxonomic 296 uncertainties of the family already discussed in other studies (Clarke & Downey 1992; 297 McKnight 2006). For example, Clark & Courtman-Stock (1976) highlighted the 298 'ludicrous' situation in *Hymenaster*, to which more than 50 nominal species have been 299 ascribed over the last 100 years. This is well illustrated in our study by the two genetic 300 301 entities gathering distinct nominal species: the unit Hymenaster 302 coccinatus/densus/praecoquis and the unit *Diplopteraster peregrinator/semireticulatus/verrucosus*. Such a taxonomic issue can be related to the 303 304 inadequacy of morphological characters used to discriminate species, to diagnostic characters between species rather corresponding to intraspecific variations or to the 305 lack of taxonomic investigations of these species since they were originally described 306 (Clark 1962; Clark & Downey 1992). On the other extreme, an interesting case study is 307 provided by the species *Pteraster steliffer* that corresponds to a species complex (3 to 5 308 species). Variations within *P. stellifer* were already noticed by Clark (1962) who had 309 310 proposed to distinguish two subspecies, "Pteraster stellifer stellifer Sladen, 1882" and "Pteraster stellifer hunteri Koehler, 1920", distinct from each other by their geographic 311 distribution and the shape of the paxillar spinelets. Our results also suggest that 312 *Pteraster affinis* should encompass several distinct species that, interestingly, are closely 313 related to species recorded in the Northern Hemisphere (see below). Some species 314

within these complexes correspond to unrecognized diversity as we found *(a posteriori)*potential diagnostic characters (e.g. clavate suboral spines in *Pteraster stellifer units 1&5*). Some others might represent true cases of cryptic diversity as the morphological
re-investigation did not reveal any diagnostic character (e.g. among *Pteraster stellifer unit 2 and 4*).

320 Phylogenetic relationships

As expected for a single gene phylogeny, some relationships remained partially 321 unresolved (Gontcharov et al. 2004; Christiansen 2008; Sands et al. 2008), but most of 322 them are supported by high posterior probabilities. Considering the uncertainty 323 associated with the placement of group B, on the one hand, the relationship between the 324 325 Hymenaster genus and the two other genera remains unresolved. On the other hand, both Diplopteraster and Pteraster were retrieved in groups B and C. This was also found 326 327 in previous multiple-gene phylogeny based on Northern Hemisphere species of these two genera (Mah & Foltz 2011b). This also matches our morphological observations that 328 329 diagnostic characters of the genus *Diplopteraster*, are doubtful (Clark & Downey 1992, Villier et al. 2004). First, the presence of four rows of tube feet per arm might be 330 incorrect. The close examination of all specimens at hand reveals that they rather 331 possess two rows of overlapping tubefeet. Secondly, the alternating arrangement of 332 adambulacral plates is very difficult to observe. Finally, the presence of an enlarged 333 central paxillar spinelet could not be observed on most specimens. Therefore, we 334 335 recommend a taxonomic revision of these two genera using both genetic and morphological data. Finally, we did not find any species belonging to the genus 336 *Calyptraster* in our collection. According to previous studies, it is the sister taxon of the 337 genus *Hymenaster*, but only a small number of species, records and diagnostic characters 338 339 are recognized (Clark & Downey 1992; Villier et al. 2004). Moreover, there is no genetic

data available (regardless of the gene) for a *Calyptraster* species. We thus recommend a
thorough re-investigation of this genus in order to verify whether it should not be
synonymized with *Hymenaster*.

The molecular phylogeny confirmed the relationships of species already recognized as 343 closely related species such as Hymenaster sacculatus and H. perspicuus (Clark 1962). 344 Moreover, the phylogeny highlighted species relationships that were previously 345 unknown, such as the close relationships between *Pteraster gibber* and *P. affinis*, rather 346 than with *P. stellifer*. Another unprecedented result is the affinity of the species *P.* 347 348 jordani/affinis, P. militaris/affinis, Diplopteraster sp1 and P. gibber, recorded both in the Northern and Southern Hemispheres. Depending on the species, this could correspond 349 350 either to cosmopolitanism or bipolarity. This might indicate a recent migration between the two hemispheres, which would notably be facilitated by deep-sea dispersal routes 351 352 (Strugnell et al. 2008, 2011; Laakmann et al. 2012). In fact, the Pterasteridae are known to be highly diverse and abundant in the deep sea, being one of the most represented sea 353 star families in abyssal basins worldwide (Sibuet 1979; Danis et al. 2012). 354

355 CONCLUSION

Our work has confirmed the relevance of using molecular tools to complement 356 357 morphology-based taxonomy. This is especially true for taxa that are complex to identify on a morphological basis such as the Pterasteridae. In every genus investigated, we 358 found several species for which the taxonomy should be reevaluated and revised. These 359 taxonomic issues generate either unrecognized or conversely, overestimated diversity. 360 Formal taxonomic revision of these species and genera would be premature at this 361 stage. Further analyses are therefore needed to obtain a better picture of the diversity of 362 the family and precise phylogenetic relationships. This implies an extensive 363 investigation of numerous specimens, a thorough taxonomic revision and morphological 364

survey of holotypes. Some characters seem promising as new diagnostic features of 365 species (*e.g.* oral spines), while other characters currently used should be abandoned 366 (e.g. opacity of the supradorsal membrane), considering their intraspecific variability 367 and their problematic preservation in collection specimens. The investigation of arm 368 ossicles through X-ray photography and electron microscopy (SEM) also constitutes a 369 promising prospect. Former studies of ossicle arrangement and morphology provided 370 useful taxonomic information in different asteroid groups (Gale 2018, Fau & Villier 371 2019). In the case of Pterasteridae, primary radials (supporting the osculum) and 372 adambulacrals seem the most pertinent ossicles to be investigated (Gale 2018). Besides 373 morphological studies, the use of additional nuclear genes would be interesting to 374 properly turn the primary species hypotheses proposed here into secondary species 375 hypotheses (Sands et al. 2008; Abdelkrim et al. 2018). In addition, the use of multiple 376 377 genomic markers would be key to fully resolve phylogenetic relationships within the family and analyze phylogeographic patterns within species. This is, for example, a 378 necessary condition to test different colonization scenarios between the two 379 hemispheres for cosmopolitan or bipolar species. 380

381 FIGURES

FIGURE 1 - Sampling locations of the Pterasteridae specimens from the Southern Ocean.

ADE: Adelie Land, AMU: Amundsen Sea, APEN: Antarctic Peninsula, CRO: Crozet, DSSA:

384 Deep-Sea South Atlantic, KER: Kerguelen, PAT: Patagonian shelf, SHAG: Shag Rocks, SG:

South Georgia, SORK: South Orkney, SSAND: South Sandwich, WED: Weddell Sea.



FIGURE 2 – Interface of the Xper³ identification key (top) and two examples of integrated drawings illustrating diagnostic characters (adambulacral spines: bottom left;

388 oscular spines: bottom right).

389 390



FIGURE 3 – Aboral view of Pterasteridae species illustrating their Southern Ocean
diversity. A: Diplopteraster sp; B: Hymenaster campanulatus; C: Hymenaster praecoquis;
D: Hymenaster edax; E: Hymenaster sacculatus; F: Pteraster gibber; G: Pteraster affinis; H:
Pteraster koelheri; I: Pteraster stellifer. Scale bars : 1 cm.



FIGURE 4 – Bayesian phylogeny based on mitochondrial Cytochrome c Oxidase subunit I (COI) sequences. Values at each node are the posterior probabilities (nodes with support lower than 0.75 were collapsed into polytomies). The dashed line (associated to the group B) indicate competing topologies from the software DensiTree. Assignments for each species delimitation method are reported as black bars (GMYC-bPTP on the left and ABGD on the right). Distinct GMYC-bPTP and ABGD assignments are highlighted by grey bars for the ABGD assignments.



402 **REFERENCES**

Abdelkrim J, Aznar-Cormano L, Buge B, Fedosov A, Kantor Y, Zaharias P,
Puillandre N. 2018. Delimiting species of marine gastropods (Turridae, Conoidea) using
RAD sequencing in an integrative taxonomy framework. *Molecular Ecology* 27(22):
406 4591-4611

- 407 Appeltans W, Ahyong ST, Anderson G, Angel MV, Artois T, Bailly N, ... & Błażewicz408 Paszkowycz M. 2012. The magnitude of global marine species diversity. *Current Biology*409 22(23): 2189-2202.
- 410 Bouckaert RR. 2010. DensiTree: making sense of sets of phylogenetic trees.
 411 *Bioinformatics* 26(10): 1372-1373.
- 412 Christiansen H, Dettai A, Heindler FM, Collins MA, Duhamel G, Hautecoeur M, Van
- de Putte AP. 2018. Diversity of Mesopelagic Fishes in the Southern Ocean-A
 Phylogeographic Perspective Using DNA Barcoding. *Frontiers in Ecology and Evolution* 6:
 120.
- 416 Clark AM. 1962. Asteroidea. Reports of B.A.N.Z. Antarctic Research Expedition, 1929–
 417 1931. *Series B (Zoology and Botany)* 9: 1–104.
- 418 Clark AM, Courtman-Stock J. 1976. The echinoderms of southern Africa. British
 419 Museum (Natural History) Publications 766: 277 pp.
- 420 Clark AM, Downey ME. 1992. Starfishes of the Atlantic. *Chapman & Hall identification*421 *guide* 3: 794p.
- 422 Costello MJ, Wilson S, Houlding B. 2013. More taxonomists describing significantly
 423 fewer species per unit effort may indicate that most species have been discovered.
 424 Systematic Biology 62(4): 616-624.
- 425 Danis, B, Jangoux M, Wilmes J. 2012. Antarctic Starfish (Echinodermata, Asteroidea)
 426 from the ANDEEP3 expedition. *Zookeys* 185: 73-78.
- 427 Darling KF, Wade CM, Stewart IA, Kroon D, Dingle R, Brown AJL. 2000. Molecular
 428 evidence for genetic mixing of Arctic and Antarctic subpolar populations of planktonic
 429 foraminifers. *Nature* 405(6782): 43-47.
- 430 Dayrat B. 2005. Towards integrative taxonomy. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society*431 85(3): 407-417.
- 432 De Broyer C, Clarke A, Koubbi P, Pakhomov E, Scott F, Vanden Berghe E, Danis B.
 433 2020. Register of Antarctic Marine Species. Accessed at
 434 http://www.marinespecies.org/rams on 2020-01-28.
- 435 Drummond AJ & Rambaut A. 2007. BEAST: Bayesian evolutionary analysis by
 436 sampling trees. *BMC Evolutionary Biology* 7: 214.
- **Fau M & Villier L**. 2019. Comparative anatomy and phylogeny of the Forcipulatacea: insights from ossicle morphology. *Zoological Journal of the Linnean Society* **189(3)**: 1-32.

- Feuda R, Smith AB. 2015. Phylogenetic signal dissection identifies the root of starfishes. *PLoS One* 10(5): e0123331.
- Folmer O, Black M, Hoeh W, Lutz R, Vrijenhoek R. 1994. DNA primers for
 amplification of mitochondrial cytochrome c oxidase sub- unit I from diverse metazoan
 invertebrates. *Molecular Marine Biology and Biotechnology* 3(5): 294–299.
- **Fujisawa T, Barraclough TG**. 2013. Delimiting species using single-locus data and the generalized mixed yule coalescent (GMYC) approach: a revised method and evaluation on simulated datasets. *Systematic Biology* **62**: 707-724.
- Fujita MK, Leaché AD, Burbrink FT, McGuire JA, Moritz C. 2012. Coalescent-based
 species delimitation in an integrative taxonomy. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 27(9):
 480-488.
- Gale AS. 2018. Origin and phylogeny of velatid asteroids (Echinodermata,
 Neoasteroidea)—new evidence from the Jurassic. *Swiss Journal of Palaeontology* 137(2):
 279-318.
- **Goodall-Copestake WP, Tarling GA, Murphy EJ.** 2012. On the comparison of population-level estimates of haplotype and nucleotide diversity: a case study using the gene cox1 in animals. *Heredity* **109(1)**:50–56.
- 456 Gong S, Ding Y, Wang Y, Jiang G, Zhu C. 2018. Advances in DNA Barcoding of Toxic
 457 Marine Organisms. *International Journal of Molecular Sciences* 19(10): 2931.
- Gontcharov AA, Marin B, Melkonian M. 2004. Are combined analyses better than
 single gene phylogenies? A case study using SSU rDNA and rbc L sequence comparisons
 in the Zygnematophyceae (Streptophyta). *Molecular Biology and Evolution* 21(3): 612624.
- Hebert PDN, Cywinska A, Ball SL, deWaard JR. 2003. Biological identifications
 through DNA barcodes, *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 270: 313321.
- Hebert PDN, Gregory TR. 2005. The Promise of DNA Barcoding for Taxonomy. *Systematic Biology* 54 (5): 852–859.
- Huelsenbeck JP, Rannala B. 2004. Frequentist properties of Bayesian posterior
 probabilities of phylogenetic trees under simple and complex substitution models. *Systematic Biology* 53(6): 904-913.
- Janies DA. 1995. Reconstructing the evolution of morphogenesis and dispersal among
 velatid Asteroids. *PhD thesis University of Florida*: 125pp.
- Janies DA, Voight J, Daly M. 2011. Echinoderm Phylogeny Including *Xyloplax*, a
 Progenetic Asteroid. *Systematic Biology* 60(4): 420–438.
- Jossart Q, Moreau C, Agüera A, De Broyer C, Danis B. 2015. The Register of Antarctic
 Marine Species (RAMS): a ten-year appraisal. *Zookeys* 524:137-145.

Jossart Q, Sands CJ, Sewell MA. 2019. Dwarf brooder versus giant broadcaster:
combining genetic and reproductive data to unravel cryptic diversity in an Antarctic
brittle star. *Heredity* 123: 622-633.

Kearse M, Moir R, Wilson A, Stones-Havas S, Cheung M, Sturrock S, ..., Thierer T.
2012. Geneious Basic: an integrated and extendable desktop software platform for the
organization and analysis of sequence data. *Bioinformatics* 28(12): 1647-1649.

- 482 **Knott KE, Wray GA**. 2000. Controversy and consensus in asteroid systematics: new 483 insights to ordinal and familial relationships. *American Zoologist* **40(3)**: 382-392.
- Koehler R. 1908. Astéries, Ophiures et Echinides de l'Expedition Antarctique National
 Ecossaise. Scottish National Antarctic Expedition. *Report on the scientific results of the voyage of S.Y. Scotia during the years 1902, 1903, and 1904*: 193-313.
- Laakmann S, Auel H, Kochzius M. 2012. Evolution in the deep sea: biological traits,
 ecology and phylogenetics of pelagic copepods. *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*65: 535–546.
- Lanfear R, Frandsen PB, Wright AM, Senfeld T, Calcott B. 2016. PartitionFinder 2:
 new methods for selecting partitioned models of evolution for molecular and
 morphological phylogenetic analyses. *Molecular Biology and Evolution* 34(3): 772-773.
- 493 Lawrence JM. 2013. Starfish Biology and Ecology of the Asteroidea. John Hopkins
 494 University Press: 288p.
- Linchangco Jr GV, Foltz DW, Reid R, Williams J, Nodzak C, Kerr AM., ..., Janies DA.
 2017. The phylogeny of extant starfish (Asteroidea: Echinodermata) including *Xyloplax*,
 based on comparative transcriptomics. *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution* **115**: 161170.
- Mah CL, Foltz DW. 2011a. Molecular Phylogeny of the Valvatacea (Asteroidea,
 Echinodermata). *Zoological Journal of the Linnean Society* 161: 769–788.
- Mah CL, Foltz DW. 2011b. Molecular Phylogeny of the Forcipulatacea (Asteroidea:
 Echinodermata). *Zoological Journal of the Linnean Society* 162: 646–660.
- 503 **Mah CL, Blake DB.** 2012. Global Diversity and Phylogeny of the Asteroidea 504 (Echinodermata). *Plos One* **7(4)**: e35644.
- Mah CL, Linse K, Copley J, Marsh L, Rogers A, Clague D, Foltz D. 2015. Description of a
 new family, new genus, and two new species of deep-sea Forcipulatacea (Asteroidea),
 including the first known sea star from hydrothermal vent habitats. *Zoological Journal of the Linnean Society* 174(1): 93-113.
- 509Mah CL. 2020. World Asteroidea Database. Pterasteridae Perrier, 1875. Accessed510through:WorldRegisterofMarineSpeciesat:511http://www.marinespecies.org/aphia.php?p=taxdetails&id=123142 on 2019-06-05
- 512 **McKnight DG**. 2006. The marine fauna of New Zealand, Echinodermata: Asteroidea 513 (Sea-stars). 3. Orders Velatida, Spinulosida, Forcipulatida, Brisingida with addenda to 514 Paxillosida, Valvatida. *NIWA Biodiversity Memoir* **120**: 1-187.

515 **Miller MA, Pfeiffer W, Schwartz T.** 2010. Creating the CIPRES Science Gateway for 516 inference of large phylogenetic trees in *Proceedings of the Gateway Computing* 517 *Environments Workshop (GCE), 14 Nov. 2010, New Orleans*: 1 - 8.

518 **Moreau C, Saucède T, Jossart Q, Agüera A, Brayard A, Danis B.** 2017. Reproductive 519 strategy as a piece of the biogeographic puzzle: a case study using Antarctic sea stars 520 (Echinodermata, Asteroidea). *Journal of Biogeography* **44(4)**:848–860.

- Moreau C, Danis B, Jossart Q, Eléaume M, Sands C, Achaz G, Agüera A, Saucède T.
 2019. Is reproductive strategy a key factor in understanding the evolutionary history of
 Southern Ocean Asteroidea (Echinodermata)? *Ecology and Evolution* 9(15): 8465-8478.
- **Pante E, Schoelinck C, Puillandre N.** 2015. From integrative taxonomy to species description: one step beyond. *Systematic Biology* **64(1)**: 152-160.
- 526 **Peck LS, Clark MS, Dunn NI.** 2018. Morphological variation in taxonomic characters of 527 the Antarctic starfish *Odontaster validus*. *Polar Biology* **41(10)**: 2159-2165.
- Puillandre N, Lambert A, Brouillet S, Achaz G. 2012 ABGD, Automatic Barcode Gap
 Discovery for primary species delimitation. *Molecular Ecology* 21(8):1864-1877.
- **Ratnasingham S, Hebert PD.** 2007. BOLD: The Barcode of Life Data System
 (http://www.barcodinglife.org). *Molecular Ecology Notes* 7(3): 355-364.
- **Richter C, Roa-Quiaoit HA, Jantzen C, Zibdeh M, Kochzius M.** 2008. Collapse of a new
 living species of giant clam in the Red Sea. *Current Biology* 18: 1349-1354.
- 534 Rozas J, Ferrer-Mata A, Sánchez-DelBarrio JC, Guirao-Rico S, Librado P, Ramos-
- **Onsins S E, Sánchez-Gracia A.** 2017. DnaSP 6: DNA sequence polymorphism analysis of
- large data sets. *Molecular Biology and Evolution* **34(12)**: 3299-3302.
- Sands CJ, Convey P, Linse K, McInnes SJ. 2008. Assessing meiofaunal variation among
 individuals utilising morphological and molecular approaches: an example using the
 Tardigrada. *BMC Ecology* 8(1): 7.
- Schiaparelli S, Danis B, Wadley V, Stoddart DM. 2013. The Census of Antarctic Marine
 Life: the first available baseline for Antarctic marine biodiversity. In *Adaptation and Evolution in Marine Environments* 2: 3-19.
- 543 Sibuet M. 1979. Distribution and diversity of asteroids in Atlantic abyssal basins. *Sarsia*544 64(1-2): 85-91.
- 545 Sladen WP. 1882. The Asteroidea of H.M.S. Challenger Expedition, pt. 1. Pterasteridae.
 546 *The Journal of the Linnean Society* 16: 189-246.
- 547 **Stoeckle M**. 2003. Taxonomy, DNA, and the bar code of life. *BioScience* **53**: 2-3.
- 548 **Strugnell JM, Rogers AD, Prodöhl PA, Collins MA, Allcock AL.** 2008. The thermohaline 549 expressway: the Southern Ocean as a centre of origin for deep-sea octopuses. *Cladistics*
- 550 **24(6)**: 853-860.

- Strugnell JM, Cherel Y, Cooke IR, Gleadall IG, Hochberg FG, Ibáñez CM, ..., Vecchione
 M. 2011. The Southern Ocean: source and sink? *Deep Sea Research Part II* 58(1-2): 196204.
- **Sunnucks P, Hales DF**. 1996. Numerous transposed sequences of mitochondrial cytochrome oxidase I-II in aphids of the genus *Sitobion* (Hemiptera: Aphididae). *Molecular Biology and Evolution* **13(3)**: 510–524.
- Vignes-Lebbe R, Chesselet P, Thi MHD. 2016. Xper³: nouveaux outils pour le travail
 collaboratif, la formation et la transmission des connaissances sur les phénotypes
 végétaux. *Botanists*: 228.
- Villier L, Blake DB, Jagt JW, Kutscher M. 2004. A preliminary phylogeny of the
 Pterasteridae (Echinodermata, Asteroidea) and the first fossil record: Late Cretaceous of
 Germany and Belgium. *Paläontologische Zeitschrift* 78(2): 281-299.
- **Zhang J, Kapli P, Pavlidis P, Stamatakis A.** 2013. A general species delimitation method with applications to phylogenetic placements. *Bioinformatics* **29(22)**: 2869-2876.