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Abstract

Introduction: Poorly regulated international trade in ornamental fishes poses risks to both biodiversity and economic activity via invasive alien species and exotic pathogens. Border security officials need robust tools to confirm identifications, often requiring hard-to-obtain taxonomic literature and expertise. DNA barcoding offers a potentially attractive tool for quarantine inspection, but has yet to be scrutinised for many fishes in the aquarium trade. This research examines a DNA barcoding approach for ornamental cyprinid fishes (Teleostei: Cypriniformes), an important group in terms of biosecurity risk.

Methodology and results: A reference library of fishes purchased from the international aquarium trade was assembled, and the specimens were identified to species using morphological characters derived from taxonomic literature. Many species were found to be misidentified in the trade. DNA barcodes were then generated using standardised protocols, and the efficacy of the reference library in making species level identifications was assessed. A total of 172 ornamental cyprinid fish species were sampled, providing baseline molecular data for 91 species currently unrepresented in public reference libraries. DNA barcodes were found to be highly congruent with the morphological assignments, with identification success rates of up to 99%. The cyprinid fish dataset was augmented with sequences from GenBank for an additional 157 species, the benefit of which was additionally evaluated. Here, it was observed that the inclusion of GenBank data resulted in a more comprehensive library, but at a cost to success rate due to the increased number of singleton species.

Identification success rates are known to be sensitive to the choice of identification criterion, and because this may be important for biosecurity applications, a specific focus of this research was to assess these procedures. Here, a variety of different techniques were applied (neighbour-joining monophyly, bootstrap, nearest neighbour, GMYC, percent threshold), and it was found that identification success rates varied between 87% and 99%, according to the method used. The appropriateness of the commonly employed Kimura two-parameter (K2P) model was also examined using an information-theoretic model-selection approach. Despite its ubiquity in the DNA
barcooding literature, the K2P model was not found to be well supported as an appropriate substitution model at the species level. However, using this model did not affect identification success rates overall.

Standard DNA barcoding techniques are known to be inappropriate and potentially misleading in situations where interspecific hybridisation has occurred. Similarly, where cryptic species are suspected, mitochondrial DNA is sometimes insufficient to robustly recognise lineages. As both of these situations are believed to occur in the ornamental fish trade, and using a genomic dataset, a range of candidate nuclear loci were assessed as a complementary marker to COI. The rhodopsin gene was shown to be variable between closely related species, and with 200 sequences from cyprinid fishes, interspecific hybridisation events were confirmed, and unrecognised diversity was highlighted within popular aquarium species.

Traces of degraded environmental DNA present in water can now be used to detect the presence of aquatic species, so diagnostic tests for fish identification were investigated with the aim of developing a new, more efficient biosecurity quarantine tool. The COI barcode library was mined for informative short-length markers using a sliding window analysis of variation through the gene. Species-specific DNA sequences were successfully amplified from aquarium water samples, and at relatively low densities of the target species.

**Conclusions:** This study demonstrates that DNA barcoding can provide a highly effective biosecurity tool for rapidly identifying ornamental fishes. In the small number of cases where DNA barcodes are unable to offer a species level identification, previous studies are improved upon by consolidating supplementary information from multiple data sources in the form of specimen images, morphological characters, taxonomic bibliography, and preserved voucher material. Reference libraries can be utilised to develop new diagnostic approaches using environmental DNA, allowing quarantine facilities to capitalise on non-invasive techniques for detecting high-risk fishes. The biggest obstacles, however, to an operational implementation of DNA barcoding and any future expansions of the reference libraries, are the combined problems of misidentification of reference specimens between labs, and a lack of access to appropriate taxonomic literature to first identify the fishes. If these problems are not addressed by the barcoding and taxonomic communities respectively, this will ultimately compromise the ability of biosecurity agencies to use a DNA barcoding tool.
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Chapter 1

An introduction to DNA barcoding for biosecurity

1.1 Biosecurity in New Zealand

In contrast to many countries, New Zealand has a stringent legal framework for biosecurity, with specific legislation and Acts of Parliament (Meyerson & Reaser, 2002). In 1993, the Biosecurity Act was introduced—legislation administrated by the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry Biosecurity New Zealand (MAFBNZ)—to provide a “legal basis for excluding, eradicating and effectively managing pests and unwanted organisms” (Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, 2011). Unwanted organisms are defined as those “capable or potentially capable of causing unwanted harm to any natural and physical resources or human health” (Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, 2011). The protection of biodiversity, livelihoods, health, and culture, is central to the remit of MAFBNZ. In the context of ornamental fish importation to New Zealand and worldwide, the primary risks regard the introduction of invasive alien species and exotic aquatic pathogens.

1.1.1 Invasive alien species

In 2005, the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (2005) highlighted the economic and social benefits of biodiversity and associated ecosystem services. Along with climate change, habitat destruction, pollution and over-exploitation, the impacts of alien invasive species are frequently cited as a major cause of the anthropogenic biodiversity crisis (Chapin III et al., 2000; Pimentel et al., 2005; Vitousek et al., 1997). This human interference has seen the biotic homogenisation of aquatic communities, with assemblages of cosmopolitan species replacing more complex, unique communities of native, often endemic fishes (Dudgeon et al., 2006; Rahel, 2002, 2007). By breaching natural barriers, global trade has transported freshwater species beyond both administrative boundaries and their biogeographical confines.
Overall, economic losses associated with invasive alien species are significant, and have been estimated at up to US$120 billion per year in the USA (Pimentel et al., 2000, 2005). Several pathways for the global introduction of non-native freshwater fish species have been identified, and include but are not limited to: (1) deliberate legal/illegal introduction for recreational angling; (2) escaped or released bait fish for recreational angling (Rahel, 2007); (3) contaminant species in fish stocking events (Rahel, 2007); (4) escapes from aquaculture facilities and retailers (Naylor et al., 2001; Rixon et al., 2005); (5) creation of canals and waterways linking drainages (Rahel, 2007); (6) discharge of ballast water from shipping (Ricciardi & MacIsaac, 2000); (7) deliberate release for cultural/religious reasons (Lintermans, 2004); and (8) the release of ornamental species by aquarists (McDowall, 2004; Padilla & Williams, 2004; Rixon et al., 2005).

A total of 233 aquatic species are known to have been introduced outside their native range worldwide by 1988, but 49% of the introduction events comprised eighteen common species (Rahel, 2007). The ornamental industry is implicated as the primary transport vector in 37 of the 59 fish introductions in the United States (Rahel, 2007), while more generally across North America, approximately 100 species have been introduced via the aquarium trade, with 40 species having become established (Rixon et al., 2005). In Singapore—a global aquarium fish trading hub—at least 14 invasive ornamental fish species were reported to be resident in 1993 (Ng et al., 1993). In Florida—the centre of the U.S. ornamental aquaculture industry—greater than 75% of freshwater fish introductions have been associated with releases from private aquariums (Padilla & Williams, 2004). A similar figure is reported in Australia, at 65% of 34 species (Lintermans, 2004). Although New Zealand’s narrow climatic/habitat range, and isolated drainage basins make it less vulnerable to fish invasions, it does not diminish the potential harm from the invasion of a more limited selection (McDowall & James, 2005). Geothermal waters in New Zealand have been colonised by three species of “tropical” ornamental fishes: Poecilia latipinna, P. reticulata, and Xiphophorus helleri (McDowall, 2004). These fishes have so far not spread from geothermal sites. However, their impacts although localised, are unknown (McDowall, 2004; McDowall & James, 2005).

1.1.2 Exotic aquatic pathogens

The risks presented by the ornamental industry are not, however, limited to traded invasive fishes. Associated pathogenic organisms such as protozoa, bacteria and
viruses are equally undesirable (Smith et al., 2012), with these exotic pathogens known to cause harm to native species (Gozlan et al., 2005), industrial food aquaculture (Go & Whittington, 2006; McDowall, 2004; Whittington & Chong, 2007), and also the ornamental fish trade itself (Ploeg et al., 2009). The impacts of exotic fish diseases have the potential to interfere with New Zealand’s tourism market (e.g. to close trout fisheries), as well as decrease the production capacity of export industries such as fish farming (Murray & Peeler, 2005). New Zealand’s biosecurity strategy aims to minimise this risk and prevent the transfer of exotic aquatic pathogens to: (1) populations of native fishes and amphibians; (2) populations of non-native but economically important fishes (e.g. salmonids for recreational angling); (3) aquaculture facilities; and (4) ornamental fishes already present in New Zealand.

The ornamental fish industry is recognised as a significant disease pathway (Hine & Diggles, 2005; Whittington & Chong, 2007), with for example in Sri Lanka, 23 of 26 ornamental fish farms being infected with one or more parasites (Thilakaratne et al., 2003). Streptococcal infections of aquarium danios (Danio spp.) imported into Canada were shown to be transmittable to the rainbow trout Oncorhynchus mykiss, an important food fish (Ferguson et al., 1994). In Australia, an outbreak of Megalocytiviruse (Iridoviridae) at a Maccullochella peelli (Murray cod) aquaculture facility was likely to have been passed across the species barrier by imported ornamental Colisa lalia (dwarf gourami) from Asia (Go et al., 2006; Go & Whittington, 2006). New and harmful pathogens are also often associated with invasive species. For example, the introduction of Pseudorasbora parva (topmouth gudgeon) into the River Danube has led to local extirpation of Leucaspius delineatus (sunbleak) due to a rosette-like intracellular eukaryotic parasite, leading to conservation concerns (Gozlan et al., 2005). The pathogenic organisms of interest to New Zealand biosecurity are listed by Hine & Diggles (2005), and include a broad range of groups including viruses, bacteria, fungi, protozoans, myxozoans, monogeneans and crustaceans. Fishes are often mixed at breeding and wholesale export facilities before they are shipped abroad, and it is difficult to predict which pathogens they may have been in contact with. Pathogens can also be host-taxon specific, and possibly require special quarantine measures for some species or groups (MAF Biosecurity New Zealand, 2011; Ploeg et al., 2009; Whittington & Chong, 2007). Compounding this, some pathogens can be vectored by carrier hosts with no clinical signs of disease (Gozlan et al., 2005; Ploeg et al., 2009; Whittington & Chong, 2007).
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1.1.3 International trade and the ornamental fish industry

The ornamental aquatic industry is among the world’s largest transporters of live animals and plants\(^1\), with an annual trade volume estimated at US$15–25 billion (Padilla & Williams, 2004; Ploeg et al., 2009). Aquarium fishes are both wild caught, and captive bred at aquaculture facilities, with over one billion fishes traded through more than 100 countries in 2000 (Whittington & Chong, 2007). In the case of freshwater fishes, \(\geq 90\%\) of the trade volume is in a relatively small number of popular species sourced from commercial farms (Gerstner et al., 2006), while more diverse wild caught exports contribute the remainder. A complex supply chain exists for these ornamental fishes, and before they arrive at a retailer they may have passed through a series of regional and international distribution centres where consignments can be consolidated, reconsolidated and subdivided (Ploeg et al., 2009). This potentially increases the number of access points for undesirable organisms to enter each shipment (Ploeg et al., 2009), as well as opportunities for mislabelling. Figure 1.1 shows such a centre in Singapore.

While statistics are available on total volumes sold, little quantitative data exist on the number and composition of species involved in the aquarium trade, but it has been estimated that over 5,000 species have been available at some point (Hensen et al., 2010; McDowall, 2004). The industry in wild aquatic ornamentals for the aquarium hobby is a dynamic business, with new and undescribed species frequently appearing from new areas. As an example, some, such as *Puntius denisonii* (redline torpedo barb) have quickly moved from obscurity to becoming a major Indian export and a conservation concern within relatively few years (Ali et al., 2010; Raghavan et al., 2007).

1.1.4 Biosecurity management of ornamental species

Biosecurity challenges exist in effectively monitoring and managing the complex pathways involved in international trade (Hulme, 2009; Rubinoff et al., 2011; Wong et al., 2010), with a key issue for risk assessment being the identification of traded biological materials to species (Armstrong & Ball, 2005; Darling & Blum, 2007; deWaard et al., 2010). Effective cataloguing of both known problematic species, and potential propagules (all traded species), can inform risk analyses and facilitate pre- or post-border control measures (i.e. import restrictions and quarantine).

\(^1\)Of additional concern are the introductions of incidental fauna such as invertebrate plankton associated with aquarium fish imports and the aquarium hobby (Duggan, 2010).
Currently in New Zealand, when fishes are inspected by customs officials they are identified visually using morphological features, but there are multiple difficulties associated with this method: (1) literature and keys pertaining to the taxa in question may be unobtainable or inadequate for diagnosis; (2) identifications can be non-standardised and liable to subjectivity between examiners; (3) undescribed species are commonly traded, with little literature published to discern them from currently described species; (4) aquarium guide books are frequently inaccurate for many groups; (5) consultation with appropriate taxonomic expertise can be impossible or time consuming; and (6) specimens may lack important differentiating characters due to factors such as stress during shipment, age, sexual dimorphism or selective breeding. Reviews have identified that fish identification should be a key priority in risk assessment and monitoring procedures in New Zealand (Hine & Diggles, 2005; McDowall, 2004).

Approaches to addressing biosecurity threats from ornamental fishes are varied; the United States and United Kingdom adopt a “blacklist” system, whereby a small group of known high risk species are subject to controls (Copp et al., 2010; Ploeg, 2008). For countries such as Australia and New Zealand who view this industry as a greater biosecurity threat, only fishes included on a “whitelist” of manageable species are permitted, and all others are by default disallowed (MAF Biosecurity New
Zealand, 2011; McDowall, 2004; Ploeg, 2008; Whittington & Chong, 2007). Under Section 22 of the Biosecurity Act 1993 (Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, 2011), the current allowable imports list comprise 1,451 (1,010 freshwater and 441 marine) fish species on the Import Health Standard (MAF Biosecurity New Zealand, 2011, accessed December 2011). For the enforcement of these restrictions, an effective biosecurity procedure requires fast and accurate early detection of potentially harmful fishes at the pre-retail quarantine stage. Biological attributes such as disease vectoring potential and invasiveness are associated with the nomenclature of the species, and it is therefore important that names be both accurate and harmonised throughout the process of risk management, import, and quarantine.

1.2 Molecular diagnostics for biosecurity

Molecular diagnostic technologies are becoming an increasingly important part of biosecurity procedures, especially with regard to economically important agricultural insect pests (Armstrong & Ball, 2005; deWaard et al., 2010). These molecular methods circumvent some of the problems with identifying specimens morphologically in situations when discriminating characters are absent (e.g. immature life stages). Most methods rely on species-specific DNA-sequence variation detected by PCR amplification (e.g. RFLP, RAPD, Multiplex-PCR, SSCP, AFLP), and have been reviewed by Darling & Blum (2007), Ali et al. (2004), Armstrong & Ball (2005), Teletchea (2009), Le Roux & Wieczorek (2009), and Rasmussen & Morrissey (2008). The restriction fragment length polymorphism (RFLP) method has been the most widely used for identifying commercial food fishes (Rasmussen & Morrissey, 2008). This method, which relies on presence/absence of diagnostic restriction sites, allows confirmation of specimen identity due to length variation in cleaved fragments. The primary weakness identified with this, and other previously used methods, is the group specificity of the procedures (e.g. primer design and PCR conditions), the requirement of a priori knowledge of the sequence variation, and therefore the limited size of the species pool for which identifications can be made. Because infrastructure may not be in place for directly comparing data shared between laboratories, this reduces the anticipatory aspect in adapting to changing biosecurity threats and priorities (Armstrong & Ball, 2005). When data are not able to be effectively shared, identification of an unanticipated pest would be potentially time consuming, as new
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1.2.1 DNA barcoding as an identification tool

1.2.1.1 Standardisation and scalability

DNA sequence data contain a higher resolution of information (i.e. discrete nucleotide polymorphisms) when compared to methods such as RFLP fragment length variation. The development of the DNA barcoding method (\textit{sensu} Hebert \textit{et al.}, 2003a) has facilitated a standardised technique using sequence data, overcoming some of the problems identified with previous methods. For animals, DNA barcoding uses sequence data from a short \(\sim 650\) bp fragment from the 5’ region of the protein-coding mitochondrial cytochrome \textit{c} oxidase I gene (COI). The key benefit of a DNA barcoding approach is its standardisation: universal, conserved primers are able to amplify a positionally homologous gene region across diverse realms of life, and further standardisation is achieved through shared lab protocols and data management systems. With each new sequence, the reference database can then be improved and refined in terms of both intra- and interspecific variation (Armstrong \& Ball, 2005; deWaard \textit{et al.}, 2010). The Barcode of Life Data System \textit{BOLD} (Ratnasingham \& Hebert, 2007), represents the centralised, international workbench/portal for barcode data, and can be used in conjunction with the GenBank repository (Federhen, 2011). Such are the benefits in scalability that systems like \textit{BOLD} offer, automated pipelines can also now be implemented for vast biodiversity assessment projects, or bulk routine identifications (Borisenko \textit{et al.}, 2009).

1.2.1.2 Mitochondrial DNA as a molecular marker

The use of a mitochondrial gene is important, as mitochondrial DNA molecules are vastly more abundant in the cell (\(\sim 1,000\times\)), when compared to the nuclear DNA (Avise, 2009; Teletchea, 2009). This improves PCR success in the laboratory, and offers greater chance of recovery from poorly preserved or degraded samples (Linacre \& Tobe, 2011; Teletchea, 2009). Due to a lack of DNA repair enzymes (Brown \textit{et al.}, 1979; Joseph \& Omland, 2009), and/or possible environmental selection (Lane, 2009), mitochondrial genes have high nucleotide substitution rates. In salamanders and beetles, COI has been shown to have one of the fastest mutation rates for a mitochondrial gene, especially at the third position (Mueller, 2006; Pons \textit{et al.}, 2010).
For diploid organisms, mitochondrial loci also reach coalescence generally four times faster than nuclear genes, due to their smaller effective population size (Joseph & Omland, 2009; Zink & Barrowclough, 2008). Protein-coding mitochondrial genes typically lack introns, greatly reducing alignment ambiguity when compared to 12S or 16S rDNA, for example (Hebert et al., 2003a). The largely maternal inheritance of mitochondrial genes and lack of recombination and heterozygosity, further simplifies analytical procedures. Despite these benefits, several complications can arise when making inferences with mtDNA (see Section 1.3).

Historically, sequence data from gene regions other than COI have also been utilised as DNA barcode markers *sensu lato*, the most significant in species-level fish research being mitochondrial cytochrome *b* (Johns & Avise, 1998; Page & Hughes, 2010; Sevilla et al., 2007; Teletchea, 2009). Consequently, there are a large number of sequences for this gene available on GenBank for fishes (Johns & Avise, 1998; Page & Hughes, 2010; Teletchea, 2009). Some studies have shown that cytochrome *b* may be more discriminating, and perform better than COI for specimen identification in some mammal species (Tobe et al., 2010). However, COI was not chosen as the *de facto* animal barcode for an *a priori* assumption of its superior variability over any of the other 12 mitochondrial protein-coding genes; it was chosen due to its highly constrained amino acid sequence, and therefore the reliability of available primer sets to amplify across much of the Metazoa (Hebert et al., 2003a). Importantly, and in contrast to the barcode application of COI, many of the cyt *b* data in GenBank frequently lack the associated voucher specimens essential for a reference library, and are not from consistent regions of the ∼1,140 bp gene (Broughton et al., 2001; Dawnay et al., 2007; Ward et al., 2009). Now, and primarily as a result of the FISH-BOL initiative to DNA barcode all fish species, COI has recently overtaken cyt *b* in terms of number of sequences on GenBank (Becker et al., 2011; Ward et al., 2009). For many taxa, COI barcodes have shown adequate resolution of even closely related species, and especially so for many fishes (Ward, 2009; Ward & Holmes, 2007).

DNA barcoding has now been demonstrated as an effective fish identification tool in food-product consumer protection (Cohen et al., 2009; Lowenstein et al., 2009, 2010), with the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) recently validating DNA barcoding as an identification tool for marketplace seafood (Becker et al., 2011; Stoeckle, 2012; Yancy et al., 2008). A critical benefit of DNA barcoding in this scenario is the possibility to successfully retrieve and amplify full or partial barcodes from cooked, processed, or otherwise degraded samples (Becker et al., 2011; Huxley-Jones et al., 2012; Teletchea, 2009). Other applications for fisheries management
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and conservation have also been demonstrated (Holmes et al., 2009; Ogden, 2008; Steinke et al., 2009b; Wong et al., 2009), while the study of Steinke et al. (2009b) applied the technique to identify fishes in the marine ornamental trade.

1.2.2 DNA barcoding as a biosecurity tool

Armstrong & Ball (2005) were the first to apply a DNA barcoding approach to a biosecurity question; they found potentially invasive organisms—including morphologically indistinct immature life stages such as insect eggs or larvae—could be reliably identified to species level, an invaluable benefit to biosecurity. Even some of the strongest critics of DNA barcoding have supported its application in these kind of situations (e.g. Cameron et al., 2006; Rubinoff et al., 2006). Now, DNA barcoding is demonstrated to be an essential part of the toolkit for the management of invasive species (Darling & Blum, 2007). As part of this, the QBOL (Quarantine Barcode of Life) initiative aims to set up a “sustainable diagnostic resource to enable ‘DNA-barcode identification’ ultimately for all quarantine plant pests or pathogens of statutory importance” through targeted acquisition of pest species and collaboration in data sharing (Bonants et al., 2010).

Classic barcoding for biosecurity may involve identifying to species the hitchhikers on an imported agricultural product, for example, and thereby informing an appropriate biosecurity response based on the pest status of the organism concerned (Armstrong & Ball, 2005; deWaard et al., 2010). For ornamental fish quarantine, it is usually the status of the traded species themselves that is of concern. An extension of this is the use of DNA barcoding for wildlife forensics, where controlled and often endangered species are traded (Alacs et al., 2010; Dawnay et al., 2007; Linacre & Tobe, 2011; Ogden, 2008; Reid et al., 2011). Legal cases involving trade in illicit animals or derivatives thereof, are similar to that of biosecurity, with stakes and responsibilities being considerable, i.e. incorrect prosecutions or valuable shipments unnecessarily destroyed. Validation of the method is therefore important for the admissibility of a DNA test in court (Dawnay et al., 2007). The process of validation is to ensure “that a laboratory procedure is robust, reliable, and reproducible” (Alacs et al., 2010). Dawnay et al. (2007) provided a validation study of laboratory procedures in generating DNA barcode identifications, and examined “reproducibility, heteroplasmy, mixed DNA, DNA template concentration, chemical treatments, substrate variation, environmental conditions and thermocycling parameters”; they reported their protocols as generally robust to these factors.
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1.3 Problems with DNA barcoding

Several challenges to the use of DNA barcodes have been identified since the inception of the method, and important caveats and assumptions need to be made when using these data—and sometimes when using mitochondrial DNA data in general (Funk & Omland, 2003; Galtier et al., 2009; Rubinoff, 2006). Some of these problems that need to be considered with regard to their impact on identification success are outlined below.

1.3.1 NUMTs and heteroplasmy

Mitochondrial genes can be duplicated into parts of the nuclear genome, becoming paralogous copies—NUMTs (nuclear-mitochondrial pseudogenes)—of their cytoplasmic equivalent (Buhay, 2009; Song et al., 2008). Typically, they are relaxed from the strong selection of the functional mitochondrial protein, and are altered substantially by random mutational events, giving rise to length variation, indels, and the presence of in-frame stop codons (Buhay, 2009; Song et al., 2008). Therefore, if NUMTs are confused with authentic mtDNA sequences in reference datasets, identification success may decrease. While a potentially significant pitfall when studying insects or crustaceans, NUMTs have not been identified as a critical issue in fish barcoding (Ward et al., 2009), provided vigilance and quality control of sequences is maintained (Song et al., 2008). However, so-called “cryptic NUMTs” have recently been identified in a beetle species, differing from their orthologues by only 1–3 non-synonymous changes (Bertheau et al., 2011). It is not clear how widespread these are and if they will become a problem, but providing authentic mtDNA is co-amplified, their presence can be identified by double peaks in the sequence chromatograms (Bertheau et al., 2011).

Intra-individual polymorphism in mitochondrial DNA from heteroplasmic tissues can cause ambiguity and bias in estimates of molecular diversity (Magnacca & Brown, 2009; Rubinoff et al., 2006). While this phenomenon has been reported in fishes (Hoarau et al., 2002), it has not been flagged by reviews of fish mtDNA studies as being a significant occurrence (Becker et al., 2011; Teletchea, 2009; Ward, 2009; Ward et al., 2009).
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1.3.2 Non-neutrality

Mitochondrial genes involved in metabolic processes such as respiration (e.g. COI), are assumed to be nearly neutrally evolving, i.e. the protein sequence remains static while synonymous substitutions accumulate at third and first codon positions (Galtier et al., 2009). However, widespread selective sweeps and instances of non-neutrality have been documented (Bazin et al., 2006; Wares, 2009). Through the reduction of intraspecific variation, these phenomena may generally be of benefit to specimen identification using DNA barcodes, but conversely, positive selection from maternally-inherited intracellular endosymbionts such as Wolbachia, is believed to cause both inflated intraspecific divergences and haplotype sharing between species (Hurst & Jiggins, 2005). Although endosymbionts have been reported in vertebrates (Werren & Baldo, 2008), the problem again appears more significant for invertebrates (Galtier et al., 2009; Hurst & Jiggins, 2005).

1.3.3 Rate variation

Mitochondrial evolution does not always occur in a consistent or clock-like manner; some lineages may display significantly faster rates than others (Drummond & Suchard, 2010; Galtier et al., 2009; Hendrich et al., 2010; Rutschmann, 2006). This lack of a constant mutation rate calls into question whether a universal divergence threshold (e.g. Hebert et al., 2003a) can be used to delimit species or even identify specimens (Cognato, 2006; Rubinoff et al., 2006; Vogler & Monaghan, 2007). Furthermore, speciation is independent of mitochondrial sequence divergence (but see Lane, 2009; Shiyang et al., 2012), and perhaps more importantly there may not be an a priori reason to assume all taxa in a group diverged from one another at an equivalent time, i.e. the depth of the coalescent may vary considerably between species (Monaghan et al., 2009).

1.3.4 Non-monophyly

The non-monophyly of mitochondrial DNA trees has been well documented (Funk & Omland, 2003; Joseph & Omland, 2009; McKay & Zink, 2010). Patterns of phylogenetic relationships have therefore been uncovered for some taxa in which putative organismal phylogeny is not reflected in the mtDNA genes sampled. Definition and illustration of following terminology is shown in Figure 1.2. In terms of DNA barcoding, most interpretations of the method require a “barcoding gap”, which
is essentially the same representation of monophyly minus the phylogenetic tree, where all members of each species must be more similar to each other than to a different species (Meyer & Paulay, 2005). When using monophyly as an identification criterion, as is commonly conducted (Meier, 2008; Ross et al., 2008), incorrect or ambiguous identifications can occur when querying para- or polyphyletic species (Meier, 2008). The oft-cited article by Funk & Omland (2003), reported a 23.1% rate of para-/polyphyly across a variety of animals in 584 studies of mtDNA. Reasons for this discord are also presented by Joseph & Omland (2009), as well as Funk & Omland (2003), and are broken down in the following sections.

**Figure 1.2.** Three examples of non-monophyletic relationships: Figure (A) shows monophyly of species X and species Y; Figure (B) shows a paraphyletic species X with regard to a monophyletic species Y; and Figure (C) shows polyphyly of both species X and Y. Coalescent points are shown with white star. Figure copyright ©(Meyer & Paulay, 2005).

### 1.3.4.1 Inadequate phylogenetic signal

If too small a fragment of DNA is used for phylogenetic inference, insufficient information (i.e. synapomorphies) may be present to resolve groups, and the result may also be confounded by homoplasy (Funk & Omland, 2003). Paternal inheritance issues aside (see Zhao et al., 2004), all mitochondrial genes have the same matrilineal history (Avise, 2009), but patterns in single genes or gene fragments can be obscured due to stochastic processes, saturation of substitution, or idiosyncratic rates of mutation (Hendrich et al., 2010; Mueller, 2006). This is a potential problem for
recently diverged groups, but in some situations, sampling further mitochondrial genes may improve the likelihood of recovering reciprocal monophyly (Elias et al., 2007).

1.3.4.2 Incomplete lineage sorting

Patterns similar to those caused by inadequate phylogenetic signal can be observed in mtDNA trees due to incomplete lineage sorting. Under coalescent theory, the time for reproductively isolated lineages to become reciprocally monophyletic (i.e. fixation of exclusive haplotypes), is dependent on the effective population size (Avise, 2009; Funk & Omland, 2003). Thus, recently divergent sister species, or sister species with exceptionally large population sizes may retain some ancestral polymorphisms causing para-/polyphyly. Contrary to patterns caused by inadequate phylogenetic signal, sampling further mtDNA will not resolve monophyletic groups. McKay & Zink (2010) estimate 15.6% of the non-monophyletic patterns they examined from bird studies were caused by incomplete lineage sorting; an additional 21.3% of cases could not be distinguished between hybridisation and incomplete lineage sorting.

1.3.4.3 Introgression

Due to the maternal inheritance of mtDNA, interspecific hybridisation events can obscure true genealogical histories, and may not be detected at all depending on the direction of the introgression (Avise, 2001; Scribner et al., 2001). The most common pattern is with haplotype sharing between species, although this may be difficult to distinguish from incomplete lineage sorting for species with a long history of backcrossing and introgressive hybridisation (Funk & Omland, 2003; Joly et al., 2009). Hybridisation events are additionally difficult to reconcile with standard bifurcating phylogenetic trees, especially where single gene trees are concerned (Kubatko, 2009). Incongruences due to hybridisation are sometimes documented in the DNA barcoding literature, and in particular for birds, which are well studied in this respect (Kerr et al., 2009a). McKay & Zink (2010) estimate 5.7% of the non-monophyletic patterns they examined from bird studies were caused by hybridisation; again an additional 21.3% of cases could not be distinguished between hybridisation and incomplete lineage sorting. The extent to which this affects other groups is less clear, but more broadly, Mallet (2005) estimated at least 10% of animal species hybridise. Regardless, introgressed individuals create problems for mtDNA based
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identification systems (Le Roux & Wieczorek, 2009; Moritz & Cicero, 2004; Teletchea, 2009).

1.3.4.4 Taxonomy

Problems of non-monophyly can arise through human interpretations, and specifically as expressed through taxonomy. McKay & Zink (2010) estimate that 55.7% of the non-monophyletic patterns in the bird studies examined were caused by incorrect taxonomy. This is significant when compared to the lower rates estimated from incomplete lineage sorting and hybridisation (see above). These taxonomic discrepancies can occur in the following ways.

Firstly, imperfect taxonomy: the species hypotheses generated as part of taxonomic studies—and almost exclusively using morphological data—may not be congruent with patterns observed in mtDNA gene trees. Biological reasons that cause these incongruences can exist, and could be due, for example, to incomplete lineage sorting as explained above, or a lack of molecular divergence between the nominal taxa. In these cases, and given that few concepts of species require monophyly at mtDNA loci (Barraclough & Nee, 2001; Meier, 2008), a lack of monophyly cannot refute a hypothesis of speciation in light of other data (de Queiroz, 2007; McKay & Zink, 2010). On the other hand, the taxonomy could simply be incorrect, and the mtDNA tree shows a more accurate relationship (Funk & Omland, 2003); this may be the case in groups that have not received a modern treatment.

Secondly, due to nomenclatural rules and the changing of taxonomic hypotheses, there are more names available than currently valid taxa, i.e. synonyms are prevalent (Eschmeyer, 2010b). If not treated correctly, these kind of discrepancies can create artificially non-monophyletic groups. For undescribed taxa, the situation is worse, with no standardisation between informal “tag-names” (Leschen et al., 2009). The management of names is now becoming a significant hurdle to biodiversity informatics and also DNA barcoding (Patterson et al., 2010). This is potentially a significant problem in ornamental fishes from diverse tropical regions, where taxonomy is yet to stabilise.

Thirdly, when specimens are gathered for molecular study, they may not have been identified competently, by for example, a taxonomist or specialist on the group (Bortolus, 2008; Nilsson et al., 2006; Steinke & Hanner, 2011). Therefore any misidentifications at this stage can again create artificial patterns of non-monophyly similar to that observed in the biological ways listed above.
1.4 Analysing DNA barcode data

Despite much of the standardisation that DNA barcoding has achieved, the methods of data analysis often differ considerably between studies (Casiraghi et al., 2010). In one respect this is to be expected, as individual objectives will differ to some extent. However, a more overarching target is usually to simply calculate the effectiveness of a reference library, i.e. how accurate are the identifications using barcode data. It is here that it is less clear as to what are the accepted methods. Generally, identification success is measured as the overall degree of congruence between a priori specimen identifications based on morphological data (Vogler & Monaghan, 2007). The taxonomic names provide the index for matching the morphological with the DNA barcode identifications. Although unquantified here, there appears to be a discrepancy between studies critically analysing the practical effectiveness and theoretical validity of various methods (e.g. Austerlitz et al., 2009; van Velzen et al., 2012; Virgilio et al., 2010), and the many studies just reporting and describing barcode data. These latter studies will provide a descriptive summary of the data, including for example, mean, minimum and maximum intra-/interspecific variation among taxa, and a histogram showing a distribution of the same data (see Cawthorn et al., 2011); few studies explicitly quantify identification accuracy (Little & Stevenson, 2007). Outlined below are several methods used to measure identification accuracy. This is not intended to be an exhaustive list; Casiraghi et al. (2010), van Velzen et al. (2012), and Goldstein & DeSalle (2011) provide more information.

1.4.1 Similarity methods

1.4.1.1 Genetic distances

Similarity methods using genetic distances are generally the backbone of most DNA barcoding studies. A distance matrix is constructed, with the variable sites between each pairwise comparison within the total ~651 bp alignment providing the proportion of difference between two comparisons (Nei & Kumar, 2000). Therefore, an alignment with 10 base pair differences over 651 sites has a raw genetic distance of 0.0154 (or 1.54%). In most studies, the Kimura two-parameter (K2P) model is used to correct for unobserved substitutions (Casiraghi et al., 2010; Hebert et al., 2003a). An important problem with distances, are that they are phenetic, i.e. they compress multiple individual changes (character state differences) into a single value of overall similarity. Therefore, potentially valuable information can be lost with
this approach (DeSalle, 2007; Will & Rubinoff, 2004; Zhang et al., 2008), especially when the number of nucleotides diagnosing species is small (Lowenstein et al., 2009). Distances can be used directly for identification purposes, or used for constructing phylogenetic trees (see Section 1.4.2). For specimen identification using distance data, there are a variety of different criteria which can be applied (e.g. “best match” or “best close match”); these are outlined by Meier et al. (2006) and Virgilio et al. (2010). Commonly, a per cent threshold or cut-off value is used to distinguish intra- from interspecific variation (also see Section 1.3.3).

1.4.1.2 BLAST

The Basic Local Alignment Search Tool, BLAST, in its many incarnations (initially Altschul et al., 1990), is another similarity method used in barcoding studies (Little & Stevenson, 2007). Unlike the standard genetic distance measures above, it does not require a pre-aligned database, and sequences of variable length can be queried. BLAST searches short motif patterns and scores its closest hits by similarity (Casiraghi et al., 2010). The algorithm is frequently used to match queries against the GenBank database (Lowenstein et al., 2009). BLAST has, however, an array of different parameter settings, and as such is reported to be incorrect and inconsistent under certain conditions (Anderson & Brass, 1998; Koski & Golding, 2001; Munch et al., 2008; Ratnasingham & Hebert, 2007). The results can also be ambiguous to interpret when an identical match is not found in the database (Goldstein & DeSalle, 2011). Little (2011) compared some of the implementations of BLAST, simulating DNA barcoding scenarios using different markers and querying mini-barcodes versus full length sequences.

1.4.2 Tree-based methods

Tree-based methods operate by the hierarchical clustering of sequences, and are visualised in terms of phylogenetic relations in a dendrogram (Page, 2012). Trees can be created using a variety of methods (Baldauf, 2003; Nei, 1996), and these fall into two categories: distance methods, and discrete data methods. The latter includes maximum parsimony (MP), maximum likelihood (ML) and Bayesian inference (BI), and the former include neighbour-joining (NJ) and UPGMA (Unweighted Pair Group Method with Arithmetic means). The discrete data methods resolve more accurate phylogenies, especially for deeper branches (Austerlitz et al., 2009), but are computationally the most demanding (Baldauf, 2003; Nei, 1996). DNA barcode
datasets are typically larger than most phylogenetic datasets, so NJ clustering is the most popular (Casiraghi et al., 2010; Goldstein & DeSalle, 2011). For identification purposes, tree-based methods require monophyletic groupings; thus, species are required to be monophyletic with regard to the query for tree-based methods to give a correct identification (Goldstein & DeSalle, 2011). For this reason and others, tree-based methods have been repeatedly criticised on both philosophical (DeSalle et al., 2005; Goldstein & DeSalle, 2011; Little & Stevenson, 2007; Meier et al., 2008; Will & Rubinoff, 2004), and empirical grounds (Little, 2011; Lowenstein et al., 2009; Virgilio et al., 2010).

1.4.3 Character-based methods

Unlike the phenetic approaches, character-based methods use each nucleotide as an independent source of information (DeSalle et al., 2005). These rely on shared similarity rather than overall similarity (Little, 2011), and are reported to work better for closely related taxa with few or conflicting sequence information separating species (Lowenstein et al., 2009). The most common implementation of character diagnostics is via the CAOS program (Sarkar et al., 2008), but also see DNA-BAR (DasGupta et al., 2005), and DOME-ID (Little & Stevenson, 2007). Character methods are often reported to be superior over distance approaches (DeSalle et al., 2005; Goldstein & DeSalle, 2011; Lowenstein et al., 2009; Rach et al., 2008). However, there have been few studies comparing the two approaches directly (but see Little, 2011; Rach et al., 2008; Reid et al., 2011; Yassin et al., 2010; Zou et al., 2011).

1.4.4 Statistical, coalescent, and machine learning methods

An increasing level of sophistication can be applied to the question of specimen identification, and techniques using methods other than those based on phylogenetics are being developed. Some of these methods are based directly on the sequence data (i.e. character-based), while others operate upon distance matrices (i.e. phenetic). Zhang et al. (2008) and Zhang & Savolainen (2009), presented an artificial intelligence approach using back-propagating neural networks; their method appears effective and promising for cases where species are not monophyletic. Austerlitz et al. (2009) presented a range of supervised classification methods (CART, random forest, and kernel); they found no one method was best in all simulations. Logic methods have also been used, and can offer the desirable quality of a measure of confidence in
each specimen assignment; Bertolazzi et al. (2009) developed a character-based logic mining approach, while Zhang et al. (2012) used a distance-based fuzzy logic technique. Probabilities of identification can also be generated using genealogical and population-genetic approaches, and include the Bayesian-coalescent methods of Nielsen & Matz (2006) and Abdo & Golding (2007), or the statistical phylogenetic methods of (Munch et al., 2008). Statistical methods are particularly attractive to important biosecurity, quarantine, or forensic applications, as a measure of group membership probability can be incorporated (Boykin et al., 2012; van Velzen et al., 2012). However, due to the relatively small amounts of information content in DNA barcodes of closely related species, difficulties may arise in parameterising these probabilistic models (van Velzen et al., 2012). A coalescent technique is also used by Pons et al. (2006) and Monaghan et al. (2009); the general mixed Yule-coalescent (GMYC) models the probability of transition between speciation-level (Yule model) and population-level (coalescent model) processes of lineage branching, and offers a likelihood based test of biological pattern in the data, i.e. approximating the “barcoding gap” of intraspecific versus interspecific variation. The problem of heterogeneous coalescent depth is also overcome with the GMYC, as multiple thresholds can be incorporated. Unlike the other methods mentioned above, the GMYC was not designed as a identification method, but as a parataxonomic or primary species delimitation tool; it can, however, be used for identification purposes.

1.5 Opportunities for new diagnostic approaches

Using novel DNA barcoding sensu lato techniques, and capitalising upon the wealth of information and experimental protocols created from DNA barcoding studies, new possibilities are opening for data to be applied to previously difficult questions (Frézal & Leblois, 2008; Valentini et al., 2009). For forensic applications, and where sufficient population level sampling has taken place, identification of specimens can now proceed without the need for sequencing, with identifications carried out by DNA hybridisation on microarray chips (Hajibabaei et al., 2007; Kochzius et al., 2010; Summerbell et al., 2005; Teletchea, 2009; Teletchea et al., 2008). For more specific/local applications, DNA melting analyses from DNA barcode data can now be used to get rapid identifications with a simple PCR protocol (Winder et al., 2011). Novel ways of extracting DNA from damaged or valuable specimens have also emerged, including from formalin-preserved fish specimens (Zhang, 2010), 80 year
1.6 Research rationale, outline, and objectives

As previously stated, international trade in ornamental fishes is a high volume industry distributing millions of aquatic organisms throughout the world each year. However, it is poorly known in terms of the composition of species that are traded. Consequently, there is a requirement in New Zealand, and internationally, for there to be a more rigorous assessment of the identity of these potentially invasive and disease carrying imports. Molecular approaches (DNA barcoding) have been promoted as a solution, offering potentially both precise and accurate biological identifications. However, limitations may apply to the usefulness of the method, and these are to be explored in this thesis.

Specific objectives and experimental hypotheses are outlined in each chapter introduction. Overall, the aim of the thesis is to assess how effective a DNA barcoding approach can be for a specific biosecurity application: the identification of fishes traded in the ornamental industry. In Chapter 2, the primary objective will be to assemble a DNA barcode reference library of a target fish group, and therefore provide a long term resource for MAFBNZ and other biosecurity agencies to use...
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and build upon. Ornamental fishes will be collected from the trade, identified using morphological data, and then barcoded using standardised protocols. A descriptive summary of the molecular data will be provided, and biological or taxonomic issues such as those highlighted in Section 1.3 will be assessed and discussed in relation to biosecurity priorities.

An important aspect in assessing the utility of molecular data for biosecurity is to thoroughly evaluate the relative merits of current analytical methods for DNA barcoding. Particularly, factors including identification criterion, choice of nucleotide substitution model, presence of singleton species, and data quality from third party sources such as GenBank, have the potential to influence or bias identification success rates in a practical context. Therefore, in Chapter 3 and Chapter 4, identification success will be tested under a variety of these criteria, assumptions and scenarios in order to gauge how robust DNA barcode data are to alternative methods of inference. Recommendations will also be made in respect to the appropriate use of identification and analytical criteria for biosecurity applications.

As discussed in Section 1.3, issues such as interspecific hybridisation—which is not uncommon in ornamental aquaculture—can create potential pitfalls when employing a solely mitochondrial approach to specimen identification in the ornamental fish trade. One solution to this problem is with the addition of genetic data from a nuclear gene. However, standardised nuclear “barcoding” genes have received little attention, so in Chapter 5, candidate nuclear markers will be assessed for suitability, and the resulting data will be applied to assisting with the recognition of both interspecific hybrids, and the putative cryptic species frequently encountered in DNA barcoding studies.

In Chapter 6, new and promising avenues in diagnostic research will be investigated, potentially providing novel methods for improving the capacity of biosecurity agencies to more effectively solve problems emerging from the ornamental fish trade. Specifically, environmental DNA technologies could be a useful quarantine tool, with the potential for reliably detecting high risk organisms in ornamental fish quarantine centres, simply through water sampling. Therefore, whether such a non-invasive sampling approach is effective in providing identifications will be tested. Additionally, factors important when recovering degraded DNA from environmental samples will be explored, and in particular, the variability of small-fragment molecular-markers to make species level identifications will also be assessed.
Chapter 2

An evaluation of DNA barcoding for the identification of ornamental cyprinid fishes

2.1 Introduction

2.1.1 Ornamental cyprinid fishes

Freshwater ornamental fishes comprise a diverse group, with up to 150 families reported to be represented by Hensen et al. (2010). One of the common families is the Cyprinidae (Teleostei: Cypriniformes), and Hensen et al. (2010) record 333 species of this group in the aquarium trade. The global diversity is far higher, however, at over 2,400 species (Nelson, 2006). Many, such as the barbs, danios and rasboras are popular aquarium and pond fishes, being ubiquitously available at low prices from aquarium and general pet-retailers. In particular, the danios and barbs are frequently promoted as being suitable for beginner aquarists.

Cyprinid fishes are naturally found across Africa, Europe, North America and Asia, although many have been introduced outside this range (Berra, 2007). The majority of wild ornamental species are sourced from India, Burma, Thailand, Indonesia, and occasionally Africa (Nigeria or Congo). Farmed species usually arrive in New Zealand via transshippers in Singapore, and are sourced from farms in Florida, Sri Lanka, Israel, and across Southeast Asia (Ploeg et al., 2009).

2.1.2 Biosecurity risk

Cyprinid fishes represent risk in terms of both their potential as invasive species, and as vectors of exotic pathogens (MAF Biosecurity New Zealand, 2011; Ploeg et al., 2009; Rahel, 2007; Whittington & Chong, 2007). In terms of potential for invasiveness among all potential aquarium species imported into New Zealand,
McDowall & James (2005) presented a thorough review. Their key recommendations were that likelihood of invasion is unpredictable, and a precautionary approach should be taken. This meant restricting the breadth of imported fishes at the point of entry, and ascertaining which species were already present at that time in New Zealand. However, in this respect, taxonomic capacity was identified as a limiting factor in MAFBNZ’s ability to respond to difficulties in identifying the vast number of potentially traded species. This is particularly the case where fishes are poorly known or undescribed, their nomenclature has changed, or are traded as juveniles.

Hine & Diggles (2005) made parallel assessment in terms of disease risk of ornamental fish imports to New Zealand. In particular, temperate and subtropical cyprinid fishes such as some *Puntius* and *Barbus* species were identified as a substantial threat in terms of pathogen vectoring, carrying zoonotic diseases such as the bacterium *Edwardsiella*. The study also recommended that species not already present in the country should be determined as new organisms under ERMA (Environmental Risk Management Authority) regulations and the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms (HSNO) Act.

Subsequent to both of these reports (Hine & Diggles, 2005; McDowall & James, 2005), the list of New Zealand permitted species was updated in light of a survey of fishes present in the country, with help of the FNZAS (Federation of New Zealand Aquatic Societies). An Import Health Standard (IHS) is now in place permitting only the import of the species listed (as opposed to genera previously). There are 82 permitted cyprinid fish species now listed on the IHS for import, with 27 of these in the IHS Appendix 2 “high risk” category (in terms of exotic diseases). Imported fishes are now subjected to a four week quarantine period, with additional risk mitigation procedures and targeted disease surveillance in place for the IHS Appendix 2 species (MAF Biosecurity New Zealand, 2011).

### 2.1.3 Sampling strategies and GenBank data

Due to the difficulties in morphological/visual fish identification outlined above, and in Section 1.1.4, molecular methods can be therefore be recommended here, assuming the reference library is correct and the data are able to discriminate effectively. Steinke *et al.* (2009b) provided barcode data for 391 species available in the marine trade, but for freshwater ornamental species, and especially cyprinid fishes, few molecular data are currently available. The sequences available from GenBank are from a variety of mtDNA markers (frequently cyt b), and often have no voucher
material associated with them. Therefore their use is limited for diagnostic purposes (Ward et al., 2009). Ornamental cyprinid fish species are also under-represented in the BOLD database, and the possibilities of making accurate species level identifications solely using this resource are currently poor. DNA barcodes generated in this study will provide the basis for an improved ornamental fish reference library, and will be uploaded to BOLD, along with supplementary information.

Overall, a number of cyprinid fish species are, however, represented with COI sequences on GenBank. Many of these may not be available in the aquarium trade, but a proportion will be congeners to those which are. Therefore, in order to expand taxon coverage, and to assist in identification of target species, the utility of extra data for non-target species in GenBank will be assessed. There will be sequences available for additional, new species, but the databases may also include sequences from misidentified specimens or specimens collected from otherwise unsampled, divergent populations (Harris, 2003; Meier et al., 2006; Ward et al., 2009).

2.1.4 Data presentation

With advances in technology, and subsequently increasing amounts of data, new bioinformatic problems are emerging: one of these is the way in which to effectively present phylogenetic hypotheses (Page, 2012). Typically, in published DNA barcoding studies, NJ phenograms (trees) are displayed as embedded image files. However, embedding text into flattened raster images (image rendered pixel-by-pixel) removes local as well as global (Internet) search engine visibility for those taxa. Vector graphic (image rendered by paths) solutions overcome this problem, but large trees remain unwieldy, even as appendices or supplemental data. There is also the problem of tables of species lists; see Lakra et al. (2011) as an example of where much of the article is occupied with rasterised NJ trees and lists of species sampled. As studies use more and more data, these problems become increasingly untenable. A significant challenge will be the linking of biodiversity information from primary research to that already present in databases, and for it to therefore remain future-proof in terms of nomenclatural stability, and be accessible over time (Patterson et al., 2010). A recently proposed method could potentially address some of these problems simultaneously; Smits & Ouverney (2010) presented a javascript library for scalable vector graphics (SVG), allowing phylogenetic trees to be displayed in a Web browser rather than a document viewer. Importantly, the trees are interactive, containing within the HTML code persistent URLs leading to the database records for
2.1.5 Objectives

The primary objective of this chapter is to sample the cyprinid fishes currently found in the aquarium trade internationally, identify them to species using taxonomic literature, test a fit-for-purpose lab protocol for generating DNA barcodes, and assemble a reference library on BOLD. The DNA barcodes will then be assessed by comparing patterns of congruence with the taxonomic identifications. Summary statistics will be generated along with measures of sampling effort, and taxonomic inconsistencies will also be discussed. New methods of data presentation will also be explored. This chapter is primarily methodological and descriptive, and so does not attempt to quantify identification success (see Chapter 3).

2.2 Materials and methods

2.2.1 Specimen sampling

2.2.1.1 Specimen acquisition

Specimens of ornamental cyprinid fishes were acquired from aquarium retailers, wholesalers and exporters in the United Kingdom, Singapore and New Zealand during 2008 to 2010. The non-cyprinid taxa *Gyrinocheilus* and *Myxocyprinus* were also included due to their ubiquity in the trade and superficial morphological similarity to some cyprinid fishes. Specimens were euthanised with MS-222 (tricaine methane sulfonate), before a tissue sample was excised from the right-hand caudal peduncle and stored at $-20^\circ$C in 100% ethanol. Specimens were subsequently formalin fixed and preserved in 70% ethanol as vouchers, following the procedures outlined by Kottelat & Freyhof (2007). At least one specimen from each sample was photographed alive (left-hand side) prior to tissue sampling, with the remainder photographed after preservation. See Appendix A for further details of how tissue samples were taken, and voucher material preserved. Voucher specimens for each COI barcode were deposited at the Raffles Museum of Biodiversity Research (ZRC), National University of Singapore.
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2.2.2 Assessment of sampling strategy

Whenever possible, multiple individuals of each species were sampled. In order to better assess intraspecific genetic diversity, multiple specimens were purchased at different times and from different vendors. Sampling efficiency was tested by correlating the number of haplotypes observed in each species with the number of individuals collected and the number of samples taken. For this purpose, a sample was considered as all conspecific specimens acquired from the same holding tank at the same premises on the same visit. These analyses were carried out in R version 2.12.1 (R Development Core Team, 2010), using a generalised, linear regression model with poisson distributions for count data; singleton species (species represented by one individual) were omitted. A haplotype accumulation/rarefaction curve was generated to make an assessment of intraspecific variation captured (cf. Gotelli & Colwell, 2001; Zhang et al., 2010). To assess the coverage of the project in terms of species-level sampling, a list of species believed to be in the aquarium trade was consulted as the most up-to-date and accurate guide available at this time (Hensen et al., 2010); the MAFBNZ Import Health Standard list of species was also used to gauge coverage in terms of biosecurity risk species (MAF Biosecurity New Zealand, 2011).

2.2.3 Morphological identification

Specimens were identified using morphological characters from the scientific literature relevant to the group. A bibliography was therefore first assembled by searching the Catalog of Fishes (Eschmeyer, 2010a) for the genera and possible species encountered. Original descriptions were consulted where possible. The taxonomic publications were obtained from current journal subscriptions, hobbyist/scientist contacts, or when out-of-copyright, via the Biodiversity Heritage Library (URL: http://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/). Much of the essential literature was still unavailable, however, through these channels. Therefore, a visit to the Natural History Museum, London was made to access the remaining literature from their extensive library.

The use of “sp.”, “cf.” and “aff.” notation in reference specimen identification follows Kottelat & Freyhof (2007). For analytical purposes, individuals designated “cf.” are treated as conspecific with taxa of the same specific name, while those

---

1It must be noted that this was round trip of over 40,000 km (roughly the circumference of the Earth), and produced over 3.42 metric tons of carbon dioxide.
2.2.4 DNA protocols

2.2.4.1 DNA extraction and PCR

Approximately 2–3 mm$^2$ of white muscle tissue was prepared for genomic DNA extraction using the Quick-gDNA spin-column kit (Zymo Research Corporation) following the manufacturer’s protocol, but scaled to use a 50% volume of pre-elution reagents. Optimised PCR reactions were carried out using a GeneAmp 9700 thermocycler (Applied Biosystems) in 10 µl reactions. Amplification of the COI barcode marker comprised reactions of the following reagents: 2.385 µl ultrapure water; 1.0 µl Expand High Fidelity 10× PCR buffer (Roche Diagnostics); 0.54 µl MgCl$_2$ (25.0 mM); 2.0 µl dNTPs (1.0 mM); 1.5 µl forward and reverse primer (2.0 µM); 1.0 µl DNA template; 0.075 µl Expand High Fidelity polymerase (Roche Diagnostics).

The COI fragment was amplified using one of the following primer pairs: FishF1 and FishR1 (Ward et al., 2005), LCO1490 and HCO2198 (Folmer et al., 1994), or LCO1490A and HCO2198A (Tang et al., 2010). Thermocycler settings for COI amplification were as follows: 2 min at 94°C; 40 cycles of 15 s at 94.0°C, 30 s at 48.0°C (LCO/HCO) or 52.0°C (FishF1/R1), and 45 s at 72.0°C; 7 min at 72.0°C; ∞ at 4.0°C.

2.2.4.2 Sequence data

Prior to sequencing, PCR products were checked visually for quality and length conformity on a 1% agarose gel. Bidirectional sequencing was carried out following the manufacturer’s protocol on a Prism 3130xl Genetic Analyser (Applied Biosystems) using the BigDye Terminator v3.1 Cycle Sequencing Kit (Applied Biosystems). The same primer combinations as for PCR amplification were used for sequencing. Sequencing products were purified using the Agencourt CleanSEQ system (Beckman Coulter Genomics). Steps undertaken here to avoid or identify cross-amplification of nuclear mitochondrial pseudogenes (NUMTs) are outlined by Buhay (2009) and Song et al. (2008). Sequence chromatograms were inspected visually for quality and

---

1 Final concentrations of reagents are as follows: 1× buffer; 2.85mM MgCl$_2$; 0.2 mM dNTPs; 0.3 µM per primer; 0.26 U polymerase.
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exported using FinchTV 1.4 (Geospiza). Trimmed nucleotide sequences were aligned according to the translated vertebrate mitochondrial amino acid code in the program MEGA 4.1 (Tamura et al., 2007). The resulting COI fragment comprised a sequence read length of 651 base pairs (bp), positionally homologous to nucleotides 6,476 through 7,126 of the Danio rerio mitochondrial genome presented by Broughton et al. (2001). Sequence data, chromatogram trace files, images and supplementary information were uploaded to BOLD, and are publicly available in the “Ornamental Cyprinidae” [RCYY] project. See also Appendix B.

2.2.5 GenBank data search

In addition to sequence data generated here, public databases including GenBank and BOLD were searched under the following terms: “Cyprinidae”, “COI”, “CO1” and “COX1”. Records were retained if the taxon in question was believed to occur in the aquarium trade (Hensen et al., 2010), or if congeneric to a species that had already been collected during sampling. For the purposes of simplification, these data are herein termed “GenBank”, although they comprise data from both the GenBank and BOLD databases. To facilitate analysis, nomenclature and spellings of GenBank records were updated or corrected following Eschmeyer (2010a).

2.2.6 Summary statistics

All descriptive statistics and analyses were conducted using SPIDER, the DNA barcode analysis package for R (Brown et al., 2012; Paradis et al., 2004). Distance matrices and NJ phenograms were generated under Kimura’s two-parameter model (K2P/K80) using the APE package (Paradis et al., 2004), with missing data treated under the “pairwise deletion” option. The K2P model was used to ensure consistency and comparability with other barcoding studies, but see Chapter 4 for an analysis of the applicability of the K2P model. Summary statistics were generated using the checkDNA, dataStat, seqStat, nonConDist and maxInDist functions of SPIDER. Negative branch lengths were set to zero (Ross et al., 2003; Saitou & Nei, 1987). Terminology of topological relationships follows phylogenetic nomenclature consistent with literature (e.g. monophyly, paraphyly, polyphyly); however, this does not imply explicit evolutionary relationship. The barcoding gap is defined as the proportion of individuals for which the minimum non-conspecific (i.e. interspecific) distance is greater than the maximum intraspecific distance for that species.
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2.2.7 Data presentation

NJ phenograms were rendered in Web-based jsPhyloSVG format (Smits & Ouverney, 2010), following conversion from Nexus format into PhyloXML using Archaeopteryx (Han & Zmasek, 2009). This creates an interactive vector-graphic phenogram with links to specimen database records and supplementary data (e.g. images) via embedded URLs. Further instructions for viewing the phenogram can be found in Appendix Section B.3.

2.3 Results

2.3.1 Morphological identifications and taxon sampling

A total of 678 cyprinid specimens were collected during the study from the UK (11 retailers throughout the country), Singapore (3 wholesalers, 3 retailers) and New Zealand (6 retailers in Christchurch). These specimens were identified to 172 species in 45 genera using morphological characters from 156 taxonomic references. Ten species were found to differ substantially from published literature and are believed to be possible new species (labelled “sp.” or “aff.”); four could not be assigned to any species given the literature available (labelled “sp. undetermined”); and 29 examples were uncertain members of a species (labelled “cf.”). Refer to Appendix C for a full list of the assignments, characters used for identification, taxonomic comments, and bibliography.

The survey of GenBank and BOLD databases contributed a further 562 COI sequences from 157 species, with 81 of the species represented in both GenBank data and the new data presented here (Table 2.1). With regard to the aquarium trade, the taxon coverage of this study represents 131 (39%) of the 333 aquarium cyprinids listed in Hensen et al. (Hensen et al., 2010), a proportion which increased to 56% coverage when GenBank data were also included. An additional 41 species not present in this inventory (Hensen et al., 2010) were reported from the survey of the trade presented here. In terms of biosecurity risk, the taxon sampling of this study covered 78% (85% including GenBank) of the 27 cyprinid species listed as high-risk allowable imports to New Zealand (MAF Biosecurity New Zealand, 2011); of the total 82 permitted cyprinids, our data represented 79% of these (90% including GenBank).
**Table 2.1.** Summary of descriptive statistics for DNA barcodes from the three data partitions analysed in the study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>This study</th>
<th>GenBank</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individuals</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>1240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species (no. unique sp.)</td>
<td>172 (91)</td>
<td>238 (157)</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean individuals per sp. (range)</td>
<td>3.9 (1–12)</td>
<td>2.4 (1–42)</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singletons</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genera</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean sampling events per sp. (range)</td>
<td>2.32 (1–8)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean seq. length bp (range)</td>
<td>645 (378–651)</td>
<td>639 (441–651)</td>
<td>643 (378–651)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. barcodes &lt; 500 bp</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean haplotypes per species</td>
<td>1.97 (1–7)</td>
<td>1.61 (1–8)</td>
<td>2.07 (1–10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean intraspecific dist. (range)</td>
<td>0.90% (0–14.7%)</td>
<td>0.86% (0–24.1%)</td>
<td>1.13% (0–24.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean smallest interspecific dist. (range)</td>
<td>9.11% (0–23.2%)</td>
<td>8.40% (0–26.0%)</td>
<td>8.06% (0–26.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% intraspecific var. ≤</td>
<td>5.48%</td>
<td>2.13%</td>
<td>6.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% smallest interspecific dist. ≥</td>
<td>1.72%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop. intraspecific dist. &gt; 1%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop. intraspecific dist. &gt; 2%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>5.90%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ranges or subsets are presented in parentheses. Abbreviations: dist. = distance(s); no. = number; prop. = proportion; seq. = sequence; sp. = species; tot. = total; var. = variation. “Combined” refers to data generated in this study combined with collected GenBank/BOLD data.


2.3.2 Barcode sampling

DNA barcodes were successfully amplified from all samples in the study with at least one of the primers reported. All nucleotides translated into functional protein sequences in the correct reading frame, with no stop codons or indels observed in the data. Regarding sequence quality, 100% scored as “high quality” by BOLD (< 1% Ns). In terms of trace quality, 94.6% of the chromatograms (trace files) scored as “high quality” according to BOLD’s criteria. In the COI barcode dataset, each species was represented by an average of 3.9 individuals (2.32 sampling events), with twenty species by one individual (11.6%), and 102 (59%) by ≥ 3 individuals (Table 2.1). The average number of haplotypes per species was 1.97, with sampling effort (sampling events and number of individuals per sp.) and haplotype diversity correlated ($P < 0.001$). The accumulation/rarefaction curve of haplotypes (Figure 2.1) shows no asymptote as sample size increases, with an almost linear relationship.

![Figure 2.1. Haplotype accumulation curve for sequences generated in this study (orange) and when combined with sequences from the same species in the GenBank data (blue). Confidence intervals are shown by coloured shading.](image-url)
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2.3.3 Description of barcode data

A full description of the data, partitioned by source, is given in Table 2.1. Genetic
diversity was generally lower within species than between, with 95% of total in-
traspecific variation less than 5.48% K2P distance. Of the interspecific distances to
a closest non-conspecific neighbour—the “smallest interspecific distance” of Meier
et al. (2008)—95% were above 1.72% K2P distance. Mean distance to closest non-
conspecific was 10\times mean intraspecific distance. Of the intraspecific values, 13.5%
were over 2% K2P distance, while 19.0% were above 1%. A total of 167 of the total
172 species (97%) were recovered as monophyletic for the data generated in this
study. When combined with GenBank data 287 of 329 species (87%) were found to
be monophyletic. A barcoding gap was reported for 655 of the 678 individuals in
this study (97%), and for 1054 of the 1240 individuals when GenBank data were
added (85%). A dotplot representation of the barcoding gap is shown in Figure 2.2.
Species that fell on or below the barcoding-gap line are discussed in Section 2.3.4.
See Chapter 3 for discussion of identification success.

Graphical structure of the distance data (total dataset including GenBank) is
shown in the NJ phenogram presented in online Appendix Section B.3, and indicates
cohesive clusters for the majority of species. This includes many morphologically
similar species such as the Puntius spp. shown in Figure 2.3, which were well
differentiated with DNA barcodes. Links to BOLD and GenBank database records
for all sequences used here are presented as URLs in online Appendix Section B.3.
Sequence data are provided as a text file in FASTA format, and are available in online
Appendix Section B.1.

2.3.4 Incongruences between data

Cases of incongruence and inconsistency for some common aquarium species are
presented in a reduced NJ phenogram (Figure 2.4). These are illustrated by barcode
sharing observed in two groups: between two Eirmotus species (E. cf. insignis and E. cf.
octozona), and between two Rasbora species (R. brigittae and R. merah). Additionally,
a polyphyletic species was observed: an individual of Danio cf. dangila (RC0343)
clustered closer to D. meghalayensis than to other D. dangila.

When GenBank data were added, several additional species were also non-
monophyletic on the COI gene tree, with these added data conflicting with some
barcodes generated in this study. For example, D. albolineatus became polyphyletic
with the inclusion of D. albolineatus HM224143, as did D. roseus when D. roseus
HM224151 was added. In regard to these species, the topology of the NJ phenogram (Figure 2.4) is misleading for identification purposes, however; all *D. roseus* remain diagnosable from *D. albolineatus* by a single transversion at position 564, while the remaining differences in *D. roseus* HM224151 are autapomorphies. Other aquarium species that were affected by GenBank data inclusion include (refer to Figure 2.4): haplotype sharing between a possibly undescribed *Devario* (“TW04”) and *D. annandalei* HM224155; haplotype sharing and polyphyly of *R. daniconius* and *R. cf. dandia*; paraphyly of *Barbonymus schwanenfeldii* by *Balantiocheilos melanopterus* HM536894; paraphyly of *Devario cf. devario* by *D. devario* EF452866; polyphyly of *Paedocypris carbunculus*; paraphyly of *Puntius stoliczkanus* with polyphyletic *P. ticto*; polyphyly of *R. paviana* with regard to *R. hobelmani* HM224229 and *R. vulgaris*
2.4. Discussion

2.4.1 Morphological identification

Accurately assigning correct taxonomic names to voucher specimens and DNA barcodes is a critical first step in assembling a useful reference library for non-expert users. Unlike previous studies of regional ichthyofaunas (e.g. Hubert et al., 2008; Valdez-Moreno et al., 2009), scientific publications covering all taxa likely to be

Figure 2.3. Illustrating the utility of DNA barcodes in biosecurity. *Puntius filamentosus* (A) and *P. assimilis* (B) are two species strikingly similar in appearance; morphological differences are especially difficult to discern when these are exported as juveniles. Here, we demonstrate they can be readily separated by DNA barcodes, with the two specimens pictured here differing by a 17.6% divergence in K2P distance for COI. Also see Appendix B for NJ phenogram.

HM224243; polyphyly of *Esomus metallicus*. It is important to note that this is not a full description of all ambiguous clusters in the full NJ phenogram (Appendix Section B.3). Only a subsample of aquarium species where data were conflicting are described, while conflict between non-aquarium species represented by GenBank data are not discussed.
Table 2.4. Incongruences and inconsistencies in barcode data. This reduced-taxon NJ phenogram highlights cases of haplotype sharing and paraphyly/polyphyly between nominal species. The phenogram shows the same “ingroup” patterns of relationship as the full NJ tree (Appendix Section B.3); i.e. removing taxa did not influence relationships discussed. Data generated in this study are prefixed “RC0”, “YGN” and “EUN” (otherwise GenBank), with anomalous individuals represented in red.
encountered in the aquarium trade were not available. Even after extensive literature was gathered at great expense, identifying some of the specimens remained difficult. Liberal use of the “cf.” notation where specimens examined differed from diagnoses in the literature is testament to the uncertainty in identification based on these data. In some cases, reliable guides to local faunas and up-to-date revisions existed. However, in other cases such as Indian fishes, little taxonomic research has been conducted since the original descriptions from the early 19th century.

Frequently, the morphological characters recorded in early taxonomic works are inadequate for diagnosis, being heavily reliant on subjective terminology, missing explicit comparisons, and often being incompatible with more modern techniques making use of data sources such as colour pattern (e.g. Tan & Kottelat, 2008). Morphometric characters such as relative proportions of anatomical features (e.g. depth of caudal peduncle compared to body length), were found to be almost useless for identification due to the considerable variation observed in small sample sizes and often juvenile material (see Kottelat & Freyhof, 2007, for further discussion). Meristic measurements such as scale and fin ray counts are also common in the literature (Kottelat & Freyhof, 2007). However, these are difficult to accurately take on small fishes, and frequently the distributions between species overlap, and the measurements taken invariably tended to fall within this overlap. Therefore, morphometrics and meristics were avoided where possible. Presence, absence, position, or qualitative description of shape/colour-markings (i.e. cladistic character states), were found to be most informative, but only when these were well documented in the literature.

2.4.2 Assessment of sampling strategy

The survey of the trade revealed that 24% of species available were not listed in the most recent and thorough reference list for the trade (Hensen et al., 2010), indicating a mismatch between actual availability and published literature. Conversely, many species listed in this reference did not appear to be available at the wholesalers and retailers visited. Some of these discrepancies surely arise from identification and nomenclatural issues, but are otherwise likely due to changing export patterns through different regions and time, as data in Hensen et al. (2010) was compiled from historical information.

A strong relationship between haplotype diversity and sample frequency was observed, indicating that expanding the reference library will result in the discovery of further genetic variability. Given the relatively small sample sizes taken here (breadth
in favour of depth), it is to be expected that intraspecific sampling would fail to uncover much of the genetic diversity. Zhang et al. (2010) report that depending on evolutionary and demographic histories, a sample size between 4.5 and 332.9 individuals per species will estimate when most of the diversity has been sampled (i.e. \( \leq 10 \) new haplotypes per 100 individuals sampled).

In terms of the patterns of trade, it is predicted that farmed species will have a lower genetic diversity and fewer observed haplotypes than those of wild caught species, which may make them easier to identify with DNA barcodes. Preliminary investigations have suggested that this may well be the case. However, due to difficulties obtaining reliable source information through the supply chain, and problems with establishing independence of samples (i.e. “independent” samples may have derived from a single source), these observations should be investigated further.

### 2.4.3 DNA barcode generation and description

The laboratory protocols provided worked effectively, resulting in high quality DNA barcodes from all specimens tested. The data generated here were considered “barcode compliant” (Hanner, 2009) by BOLD in terms of all criteria, except one: collection geo-location. This was unfortunately unavoidable due to the nature of the collection method—specimens sampled from aquarium retailers—and so lacked the important country-code data for the real distribution of the organism (Hanner, 2009). The choice of three primer pairs was perhaps unnecessary, but reflected the publication of a new cyprinid-fish primer set (Tang et al., 2010) during laboratory work. The majority of the samples amplified well, however, using the general fish primers FishF1 and FishR1 of Ward et al. (2005). Those which did not amplify well for this set worked with either the standard Folmer et al. (1994) primers, or the Tang et al. (2010) primer pair. Use of these three primer pairs could be recommended as an appropriate procedure. However, the use of the M13-tailed fish primer cocktails presented by Ivanova et al. (2007) could also be considered for high throughput work. The PCR mastermix and cycling parameters appeared not to be an important factor, and generation of the DNA barcodes was found to be robust to variation as far as these were concerned; following the manufacturer’s instructions, most proprietary products should give similar results. A more important consideration, however, is that of DNA extraction, with significantly better results being obtained
using a spin-column kit over some of the lower cost alternatives such as single-tube
digestion methods such as PREP GEM (data not shown).

2.4.4 Patterns in DNA barcode data

Broadly the DNA barcode data agrees with the names provided during the morpho-
logical identification process, with the majority of species recovered as monophyletic.
The variation within and between species was well separated, and the presence of a
barcode gap suggests identification is possible (but see Chapter 3). When using the
kind of sampling strategy adopted here—relatively small intraspecific sample sizes
from a small number of species comprising a much larger group—the presence of
well separated intra- and interspecific diversity is to be expected (Moritz & Cicero,
2004). It is anticipated, however, that intra- and interspecific variation will increase
and decrease respectively, when both species and population level sampling increases
(Meier et al., 2008).

2.4.5 Incongruences between data

Although few in number, cases of incongruence between barcodes require careful
interpretation, especially where the inclusion of GenBank data result in some com-
mon aquarium species becoming ambiguous to distinguish. However, with some
background knowledge inferences can be made, and incongruence falls broadly into
two categories: taxonomic uncertainty (or genetic para-/polyphly), and conflict
due to misidentifications. In the example of barcode sharing in Eirmotus, despite
good quality specimens and the availability of a thorough, modern revision of the
genus (Tan & Kottelat, 2008), our morphological identifications were uncertain (see Ap-
pendix C). DNA barcodes from this cluster could belong to either E. octozona
or E. insignis, which is likely the result of these taxonomic/identification problems.
Topotypic specimens would be required for a better understanding of the problem.
Likewise in the case of Rasbora brigittae and R. merah, individuals of both species
were observed to be inconsistent in diagnostic morphological character states (see Ap-
pendix C). Again, specimens clustering in this group could belong to either species, a
finding which certainly warrants further taxonomic investigation. Haplotype sharing
between the possibly undescribed Devario sp. “TW04” and GenBank D. annandalei
is likely explained also by uncertainty in our identification of this individual, or the
misidentification of the GenBank specimen. Due to the large number of undescribed
Devario species in Asia, and few modern treatments, identification of many wild caught Devario is difficult. The aberrant specimen of Danio dangila (RC0343) displayed slight morphological differences to the other D. dangila, but with only one individual available, it was conservatively regarded as conspecific (see Appendix C). A similar observation was made with Devario cf. devario having divergent barcodes from GenBank D. devario, and an inconsistent morphology to that of the published D. devario literature. The example of Danio albolineatus and D. roseus shows a situation where all specimens from the trade are homogeneous and diagnosable; however, they are rendered polyphyletic when data are included from other GenBank populations. This finding is perhaps expected given D. albolineatus (sensu lato) is a variable species with three synonyms, distributed across much of Southeast Asia (Fang & Kottelat, 2000).

Some examples certainly represent cases of misidentification, with specimens of GenBank “Puntius ticto” from the Mekong, grouping closer to P. stoliczkanus, a species with which it is often confused (Linthoingambi & Vishwanath, 2007). Other examples such as the paraphyly of Barbomyxus schwanenfeldii by a GenBank Balantiocheilos melanopterus individual (HM536894), is probably a case of human error and poor quality control of data, given the marked morphological differences between the two species. Identifications made prior to recently published taxonomic works may also be subject to error. This may explain GenBank’s sequences of Rasbora daniconius, a species formerly considered to be widely distributed but now likely restricted to the Ganges drainage of northern India (Silva et al., 2010).

2.5 Summary

This chapter provides tested laboratory protocols for sampling tissues, imaging and storing specimens, and PCR amplification. DNA barcode data for 678 specimens from 172 species of ornamental cyprinid fish are now published and freely accessible on BOLD. Of these, 91 species were not previously present in GenBank or BOLD. The majority of the recognised biosecurity risk species were represented, and this will contribute greatly towards building a long term library for ornamental fish biosecurity. DNA barcode data were largely congruent with taxonomy. Issues for specific taxa are discussed where barcodes were ambiguous, and/or conflicted with GenBank data. Using morphological characters the identification of voucher specimens to species was difficult, but this process now provides a tangible benefit to both border security
and future taxonomic or barcoding studies by associating this additional data with the vouchered museum specimens as well as the DNA barcodes, trace files, and other supplementary data.

When the morphological identifications were compared to trade names or names in popular references used by the trade (e.g. Baensch & Fischer, 2007), it is estimated that up to 25% of cyprinid species could be mislabelled. The DNA barcode library generated in this study provides an ideal tool to test this preliminary observation in more detail, and provide a future quantified study of supplier mislabelling in the ornamental industry; this work is currently in progress in association with researchers at the National University of Singapore.

Finally, new methods of presenting barcode data were explored, with Web based methods using URLs to link to corresponding database entries and supporting information providing a vast improvement over traditional ways to represent large trees and share data.
Chapter 3

An evaluation of methods for quantifying identification success in DNA barcoding

3.1 Introduction

As discussed in Chapter 1, not all DNA barcoding studies aim to quantify identification success. An effective biosecurity tool incorporating molecular data such as DNA barcodes relies on making accurate identifications to species level, so explicitly making an assessment of how the data perform in identification scenarios is desirable and necessary. For studies where identification is a possible use of the data generated, then an evaluation of identification success should accompany the standard summary statistics (e.g. Chapter 2). As outlined in Section 1.3, issues such as NUMTs, incomplete lineage sorting and conflicting taxonomy can influence identification success. Here the focus will be upon the analytical methods used, however. Three testable factors with the potential to influence identification success in DNA barcoding studies have been identified. These are: (1) the choice of identification criterion, or analytical method; (2) conflict between datasets, especially where third-party data such as those from GenBank are used; and (3) the effect of singleton species (one specimen per species) in the dataset.

3.1.1 Identification criteria

An overview of the broad categories of methods used to measure identification success was presented in Section 1.4. In order to draw conclusions as to which method(s) is/are best for biosecurity situations, a total of six were chosen to test, and are described below. The most widely used measures of specimen identification were selected, as well as some relatively newer ones. More precise details of how each of the criteria are defined and implemented is presented in Section 3.2.2. It
3.1. **INTRODUCTION**

is important to note that with the exception of the GMYC, all analyses are initially based on genetic distances, using the K2P genetic distance matrix (see Chapter 4).

3.1.1.1 **Tree-based monophyly**

Firstly, the phylogenetic measure of species monophyly method was tested. Although criticised (see Section 1.4.2), this is a commonly used metric (Casiraghi *et al.*, 2010; Goldstein & DeSalle, 2011), with nearly all barcoding studies reporting some kind of assessment of monophyly, even if just discussing patterns in NJ phenograms. There is an implicit assumption using this method that all species are monophyletic at mtDNA loci, and that identifications can be made by clustering in NJ trees (Meier, 2008). Testing whether the criticisms are valid is an important step. Another common procedure here is to use bootstrap resampling on the NJ phenograms to gauge support for the identifications made using the criterion of monophyly. Recent studies (Zhang *et al.*, 2012) have reported that success rates are low with a bootstrap approach, as it is a conservative measure. Again, however, it is important to make further assessments of this frequently used technique in the context of biosecurity.

3.1.1.2 **Distance/threshold methods**

The BOLD-IDS identification engine (Ratnasingham & Hebert, 2007) is the main portal for DNA barcode end users to make species level identifications, and therefore possibly the most important assessment in terms of operational usability. Unfortunately the documentation of how BOLD-IDS works is poor, and very little information is provided in its description (Ratnasingham & Hebert, 2007). From what information is known, BOLD-IDS aligns sequences using a hidden Markov model of COI, and carries out a “linear search”, probably similar to those that are used to generate standard genetic distances. The method provides an identification if all sequences within 1% of the query are congruent.

Two additional distance based measures were chosen, being the “best close match” (BCM) method of (Meier *et al.*, 2006) and the $k$-nearest neighbour ($k$-NN) approach of Austerlitz *et al.* (2009). Both of these methods are similar, operating on a match of the query to a single sequence in the dataset, although they are different enough to deserve comparison (see Section 3.2.4.1). Austerlitz *et al.* (2009) reported $k$-NN as well performing in their simulated and real data tests, while Virgilio *et al.* (2010) reported BCM as one of the most effective methods among their comparisons.
CHAPTER 3. QUANTIFYING IDENTIFICATION SUCCESS IN DNA BARCODING

The BCM and BOLD approaches both rely on a molecular divergence threshold to estimate group membership and guard against providing an identification for a query without a conspecific represented in the database (a false negative, type II error). The use of a universal threshold (e.g. 1%, as used by BOLD), has been questioned repeatedly due to rate variation issues in COI (Section 1.3.3; Hickerson et al., 2006; Meier et al., 2006; Meyer & Paulay, 2005; Rubinoff et al., 2006), and it is clear that no single threshold is likely to suit all species. However, error can be minimised across a dataset for different threshold values (Meyer & Paulay, 2005).

3.1.1.3 General mixed Yule-coalescent (GMYC)

Lastly, a tree-based discrete-data method incorporating an estimation of group membership will be tested: the general mixed Yule-coalescent model (GMYC) of Pons et al. (2006) and Monaghan et al. (2009). As described in Chapter 1, using an ultrametric phylogenetic tree as input, the GMYC calculates likelihood of species-like clusters based on branching rates over time and incorporating variable coalescent depths. The method has many desirable properties using sophisticated likelihood and coalescent modelling, and has yet to be used for specimen identification purposes in DNA barcoding (Zaldívar-Riverón et al., 2011, used it to estimate biodiversity). This study provides a test to demonstrate the method’s potential for biosecurity.

3.1.2 GenBank data

As outlined in Section 2.1.3, GenBank contains a considerable amount of potentially useful information, and can be affected by poorly curated data. The problem of how this may impact identification success in the present study will be addressed by conducting separate analyses for: new data generated in Chapter 2, the GenBank data cited in Chapter 2, and both these datasets combined.

3.1.3 Singletons

A particular challenge to biosecurity is the steady change in the number and identity of species that are traded. Any useful identification method must be robust to these changes; i.e. sequences from new species in the trade should not be erroneously matched to species with barcodes in the database, while a good identification technique should maintain accurate identification of species that are already represented. The extent to which uncommon, singleton specimens affect identification success
rates is rarely explored, and is a problem for DNA barcode identification systems (Lim et al., 2012). As few taxon-specific barcoding projects (i.e. databases) can be considered complete (Lim et al., 2012), the aim here is to examine how the identification criteria are affected by singletons.

It is therefore important for analyses to distinguish between two identification scenarios. First, a query specimen belongs to a species that has already been barcoded and whose DNA barcode is maintained in a DNA barcoding database. Once sequenced, the best identification result for such a specimen is a “correct identification”. Second, the query specimen belongs to a species that remains to be barcoded (it is a singleton). The best result here is “no identification”, since the specimen has no conspecific barcode match in the database. The best overall identification technique is one that maximises identification success for scenario one, and yields a “no identification” result under scenario two. In light of this, the results with both singleton species included (scenario two) and excluded (scenario one) will be reported. When the analyses are carried out, however, singletons should remain in the datasets as possible matches for non-singletons.

3.1.4 Objectives

The aim of this part of the study is to test how likelihood of identification success—assigning the correct species name to a query barcode sequence—is affected by experimental (sampling of GenBank data, presence of singletons), and analytical factors (identification method). Improved techniques to carry out comparative analyses of identification success for DNA barcode data will be presented, and appropriate ways to address problems arising from these issues will also be discussed. A large part of this work will also be to implement the range of identification methods using a free, open-source software environment.

3.2 Materials and methods

3.2.1 Data collection

The data used to test the suitability of COI barcodes as a species identification tool were those presented in Chapter 2. This included DNA barcodes generated as part of this research, as well as those acquired from GenBank and BOLD. A summary of the
data used is presented in Table 2.1. Including GenBank data, a total of 1,240 COI sequences were used.

3.2.2 Identification methods

Unless otherwise stated, all analyses were conducted using the SPIDER package for R (Brown et al., 2012; Paradis et al., 2004). Many of the functions in this package were written specifically for this part of the study, in an attempt to address the lack of extensible, open-source, and cross-platform software suitable for analysing barcode data. A tutorial of how to conduct these analyses is presented in Brown et al. (2012), and also in the online Appendix Section B.5. Three tree-based analyses were used as well as three distance-based measures, and these are described in further detail below.

The protocol used to test each method was that of simulating a real identification problem for a biosecurity official by treating each individual as an identification query. In effect, this means that each sequence is considered an unknown while the remaining sequences in the dataset constitute the DNA barcoding database that is used for identification. This is referred to as “leave-one-out” by some authors (e.g. Austerlitz et al., 2009; Zhang et al., 2012). Identification rates for these queries were divided into four categories: “correct” or “incorrect”, and “no identification” or “ambiguous” if applicable to the method.

3.2.3 Tree based analyses

3.2.3.1 NJ monophyly

A tree-based test of species monophyly was conducted, with this measurement reporting the exclusivity of the genetic clusters in the NJ phenograms. As in Section 2.2.6, a genetic distance matrix and NJ phenogram was generated. The procedure implemented in SPIDER (function: monophyly) returns each species as either monophyletic (correct identification), non-monophyletic (incorrect identification) or as a singleton (incorrect identification, as no possible match available). This per-species measure was then scaled to include the number of individuals in each species.
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3.2.3.2 NJ bootstrap

A bootstrap test of node support was also incorporated, with correct identifications scored if taxa were monophyletic (as above), and had bootstrap values greater than 70% (Hillis & Bull, 1993). This was carried out using the monophylyBoot function of SPIDER; 1,000 replications and codon resample constraints (block = 3 option) were used for the bootstrap analysis.

3.2.3.3 GMYC

For the GMYC analyses, following Monaghan et al. (2009), data were first reduced to haplotypes using ALTER (Glez-Peña et al., 2010), with gaps treated as missing data (ambiguous bases were first transformed to gap characters). Next, ultrametric chronograms were generated in BEAST v1.6.1 (Drummond et al., 2006; Drummond & Rambaut, 2007) under the following settings: site models as suggested by the BIC in jModelTest (Guindon & Gascuel, 2003; Posada, 2008); strict molecular clock; $1/x$ Yule tree prior; two independent MCMC chains with random starting topologies; chain length 20 million; total 20,000 trees; burn-in 10%; all other settings and priors default. The GMYC model was fitted in the SPLITS package for R (Monaghan et al., 2009), using the single threshold method under default settings. An individual was scored as a correct identification if it formed a GMYC cluster with at least one other conspecific individual. An incorrect identification was made when an individual clustered with members of other species, and a “no identification” was made when an individual formed a single entity (did not cluster with anything else). Exploratory results (data not shown) suggested that more sophisticated BEAST and GMYC analyses using relaxed clocks, codon partitioned site models, outgroups, and multiple threshold GMYC resulted in a poorer fit to the morphologically identified species names, as did a full dataset (sequences not collapsed into haplotypes).

3.2.4 Distance based analyses

3.2.4.1 k-nearest neighbour

The first distance-based analysis comprised the $k$-nearest neighbour ($k$-NN) approach, using a K2P distance matrix (Austerlitz et al., 2009). The $k$-NN analyses was implemented in R, using a script from Austerlitz et al. (2009), and provided by Olivier David (a co-author of that article). The method is now implemented in SPIDER with the nearNeighbour function. A $k$-nearest neighbour ($k = 1$) conspecific with the
query returns a correct identification, otherwise an incorrect identification; singletons (where applicable) are reported as an incorrect identification (as no possible match available), and ties were broken by majority, followed by random assignment.

### 3.2.4.2 Best close match

The “best close match” (BCM) method presented by Meier et al. (2006) is provided in the S\textsc{PIDER} function `bestCloseMatch`. BCM is similar to \(k\)-NN, using a single best match criterion, but matches must be within a pre-specified threshold value (e.g. 1%, but see below) otherwise a no identification result is returned (Meier et al., 2006). In contrast to \(k\)-NN, ties are reported as ambiguous rather than broken by majority.

### 3.2.4.3 Approximating B\textsc{OLD}

The third distance technique is one approximating the threshold method used by the B\textsc{OLD}-IDS identification engine (Ratnasingham & Hebert, 2007), and is named `threshID` in S\textsc{PIDER}. It was not possible to actually use B\textsc{OLD}-IDS itself, due to the custom datasets used, and the requirement for the comparisons between methods to be equal. Therefore, when the B\textsc{OLD} method is referred to in this context, it applies to the interpretation used here. B\textsc{OLD}-IDS will return a positive identification if a query shares a > 99% similar unambiguous match with a reference specimen (Ratnasingham & Hebert, 2007). A correct identification was returned if all matches within 1% of the query were conspecific, an incorrect identification resulted when all matches within the threshold were different species, while an ambiguous identification result was given when multiple species, including the correct species, were present within the threshold. This method is similar to BCM, but operates upon all matches within the threshold, rather than just the nearest neighbour match.

### 3.2.4.4 Distance threshold revision

A range of threshold percent values were tested for their effect on both the false positive (type I) and false negative (type II) error rates. Categorisation of these error rates follows Meyer & Paulay (2005): “False positives are the identification of spurious novel taxa (splitting) within a species whose intraspecific variation extends deeper than the threshold value; false negatives are inaccurate identification (lumping) within a cluster of taxa whose interspecific divergences are shallower than the proposed value” (p. 2230). The optimum threshold is found where cumulative
errors are minimised. True positives were recorded when only conspecific matches were delivered within the threshold percent of the query. False negatives occurred when more than one species was recorded within the threshold, and a false positive was returned when there were no matches within the threshold value although conspecific species were available in the dataset. This analysis was carried out using the \textit{threshOpt} function in \textsc{Spider}. A modification of the \textsc{Bold} and BCM analyses was incorporated, using the revised threshold values generated during this procedure.

### 3.2.5 Singletons

To understand the effects of singletons on identification success rates, analyses were carried out as described above; results were reported with and without the singletons. This means that singletons still remained in the datasets as possible matches for non-singletons. This was carried out using the \textit{rmSingletons} function in \textsc{Spider}.

### 3.3 Results

A breakdown of identification success rate for each method and for each dataset used is presented in Table 3.1 and Figure 3.1. When comparing across methods (Table 3.1), success rates for the data generated in this study were generally high (\(>93\%\)) when singletons were excluded from the results. The only exception was the NJ bootstrap analysis (89.7\%). When GenBank data were added (combined dataset), correct identification rates dropped between 4\% and 15\% depending on identification technique. If singleton species were included in the results, the reduction in success rate was between 2.7\% and 2.9\% for the data generated in this study, and 5.2\% and 7.4\% when GenBank data were combined; when just the GenBank data were considered, success rates decreased between 13.6\% and 20.8\% depending on the method. When thresholds were optimised, values were reported at 1.4\% for the barcodes in this study, and 0.8\% when combined with GenBank (Figure 3.2).

The method with the highest proportion of correct identifications with both singletons included and excluded, and across all data partitions, was \(k\)-NN. The method with the lowest rate of correct identification for both the data from this study, and the combined dataset, was NJ bootstrap (singletons included and excluded). For the GenBank dataset, the method with the lowest correct identification rate with singletons excluded was the GMYC, and for singletons included, were both the GMYC and \textsc{Bold} methods (Table 3.1).
Table 3.1. Identification percent success rates for each of the analytical methods across three data partitions (with singletons both included and excluded from results), plus optimum threshold values from cumulative error estimation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Singleton This (%)</th>
<th>GenBank/BoLD (%)</th>
<th>Combined (%)</th>
<th>Opt.thresh. value</th>
<th>Values in parentheses show failure rate broken down into „misidentification”, „no identification” and „ambiguous” (BCM and BoLD only)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NJ mono.</td>
<td>96.7 (3.3)</td>
<td>64.9 (35.1)</td>
<td>78.1 (21.9)</td>
<td>93.8 (6.2)</td>
<td>This study combined with collected GenBank/BoLD data. Methods with highest and lowest rates of correct identification are presented in bold font. Abbreviations: BCM = best close match; BoLD = bootstrap (&gt; 70%); excl. = excluded; incl. = included; mono = monophyly; op = optimum; thresh. = threshold.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJ mono. boot.</td>
<td>89.7 (10.3)</td>
<td>78.7 (21.3)</td>
<td>74.7 (25.3)</td>
<td>87.0 (13.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k-NN (k = 1)</td>
<td>98.9 (1.1)</td>
<td>93.6 (6.4)</td>
<td>94.8 (5.2)</td>
<td>96.0 (3.9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMYC</td>
<td>94.2 (3.6, 2.1)</td>
<td>72.1 (17.3, 10.5)</td>
<td>82.2 (12.5, 5.3)</td>
<td>91.4 (3.5, 5.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOLD: 1% thresh.</td>
<td>93.2 (0.0, 3.2, 3.6)</td>
<td>75.3 (2.5, 12.8, 9.4)</td>
<td>82.9 (1.5, 6.6, 8.9)</td>
<td>90.4 (0.0, 6.0, 3.6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOLD: opt. thresh.</td>
<td>93.9 (0.0, 2.4, 3.6)</td>
<td>75.3 (2.5, 12.8, 9.4)</td>
<td>83.4 (1.7, 6.9, 8.0)</td>
<td>91.2 (0.0, 5.3, 3.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCM: 1% thresh.</td>
<td>94.8 (0.2, 3.2, 1.8)</td>
<td>77.6 (3.4, 12.8, 6.2)</td>
<td>86.7 (2.4, 6.6, 4.2)</td>
<td>92.0 (0.1, 6.0, 1.8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCM: opt. thresh.</td>
<td>95.6 (0.2, 2.4, 1.8)</td>
<td>77.6 (3.4, 12.8, 6.2)</td>
<td>86.5 (2.4, 6.9, 4.2)</td>
<td>92.8 (0.1, 5.3, 1.8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In parentheses show failure rate broken down into „misidentification”, „no identification” and „ambiguous” (BCM and BoLD only) respectively. Combined refers to data generated in this study combined with collected GenBank/BoLD data. Methods with highest and lowest rates of correct identification are presented in bold font. Abbreviations: BCM = best close match; BoLD = bootstrap (> 70%); excl. = excluded; incl. = included; mono = monophyly; op = optimum; thresh. = threshold.
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Figure 3.1. Identification success for data derived from this study and downloaded from GenBank/BOLD, with both singletons included and excluded. Key: blue = correct identification; green = misidentification; orange = no identification; red = ambiguous. Abbreviations: NJ-mono = neighbour-joining monophyly; NJboot = neighbour-joining monophyly with ≥ 70% bootstrap support; k-NN = k nearest neighbour; GMYC = general mixed Yule coalescent; BOLD = “BOLD method (1% threshold)”; BOLDopt = BOLD method with optimised threshold (Table 3.1); BCM = best close match (1% threshold); BCMopt = best close match with optimised threshold (Table 3.1); sing. excl. = singletons excluded from results; sing. incl. = singletons included in results.

Figure 3.2. Example of cumulative error and threshold optimisation for the combined dataset. False positive (orange) and false negative (blue) identification error rates summed across a range of distance thresholds from 0–10% in 0.2% increments. Definition of errors follows Meyer and Paulay (Meyer & Paulay, 2005). Optimum threshold is 0.8%.
3.4 Discussion

3.4.1 Identification criteria

Many barcoding studies employ terminology describing, for example, species forming “cohesive clusters” differentiated from one another by greater interspecific than intraspecific divergence. This is known as the barcoding gap of Meyer & Paulay (2005). In this study, clustering was measured in terms of monophyly in NJ phenograms, a tree-based method which performed well on data generated here, but suffered when combined with GenBank information. This method requires strict monophyly of each species, resulting in a situation where the inclusion of a single misidentified specimen renders all queries in that species as misidentifications. Although alternative tree-based measures are available (e.g. Ross et al., 2008), the use of NJ trees in general is questionable due their method of construction (Lowenstein et al., 2009; Meier et al., 2006) and topological uncertainty (Meier et al., 2006; Will & Rubinoff, 2004). As discussed already (see Section 1.3.4), for a variety of reasons, “good species” may not always be monophyletic at mtDNA loci, so this method may fail to recognise species with either a history of introgression, or young species with large effective population sizes retaining ancestral polymorphisms (Austerlitz et al., 2009; Elias et al., 2007; Funk & Omland, 2003).

These problems are not resolved through the use of bootstrap values, as a significant reduction (up to 10%) was observed in identification success rate when node support was considered; recently divergent sister species on short branches were often not supported, even if they were monophyletic and diagnosable. DNA barcoding aims to maximise congruence between morphological identifications and sequence information while minimising misdiagnosis. However, this is seriously undermined when bootstrap support values are included. For the reasons stated above, NJ trees are best avoided as a sole identification method (Meier, 2008), although they can be a useful way to visualise and summarise patterns within barcode data. This is discussed further in relation to standard DNA barcoding practices in Section 7.2.3.

The BCM and k-NN methods do not require reciprocal monophyly of each species, but merely that the nearest neighbour (single closest match) is conspecific. Thus, even when conflicting GenBank data were included, identification success could still remain high. In cases of a tied closest match, the k-NN method ignores this uncertainty and will offer an identification based on majority, while the BCM method reports this as ambiguous. Similarly to NJ, practical difficulties can occur with k-NN
when identifying a divergent query from an unsampled species or population, as there is no option for a “no identification”. This is a serious problem for undersampled datasets, but the BCM and BOLD methods are able to offer a “no identification” result by incorporating a heuristic measure of species membership (a threshold of 1% distance divergence).

Despite fundamental criticisms of threshold methods (Section 1.3.3), they at least provide an approximate criterion for separating intraspecific from interspecific variation (Meier, 2008). In assessing whether the threshold of 1% best-fitted data generated in this study, the analysis of cumulative error demonstrated that error was variable depending on the dataset. However, it did not grossly depart from BOLD’s 1% threshold, perhaps justifying the use of this metric at least in the cases presented here. When the BOLD and BCM methods were modified to employ these revised thresholds, slight improvements were found in the identification success rates.

Using the BOLD method of identification, all matches within the threshold need to belong to conspecifics, rather than the single closest match (as in BCM and k-NN). Similarly to NJ monophyly, the BOLD technique is also confounded by even a single misidentified or haplotype sharing specimen in that 1% cluster, and will return an ambiguous result in this situation. This is advantageous when all sources of uncertainty need to be considered, although it can lower the number of successful identifications. As a biosecurity tool, it is worth noting that while the method used by BOLD performed well, identification rates can be improved further by adopting a method such as BCM with a revised, data-derived threshold.

The GMYC incorporates a measure of species membership, but rather than an arbitrary or generalised cut-off, the GMYC employs biological model specification, speciation patterns and coalescent theory in estimating species-like units. As a likelihood based approach, measures of probability and support can be incorporated. Results were highly congruent with the threshold analyses, suggesting the GMYC is picking up the same signal. However, optimising the method for all situations may take prior experience or significant trial and error. Another drawback is that the GMYC is not a particularly user friendly technique, requiring many steps and intensive computation, perhaps precluding its use in some border biosecurity applications where fast identifications may be required (Armstrong & Ball, 2005). Our analysis of 663 haplotypes took approximately five days on a dual processor desktop PC, and although unquantified here, the method also appears sensitive to initial tree-building methodologies.
3.4.2 GenBank data

GenBank certainly offers a formidable resource in terms of taxon coverage and extra information, providing sometimes expert-identified wild-caught specimens with published locality data. However, the absence in many cases of preserved vouchers and justified identifications can undermine the utility of in GenBank data for identification purposes (Harris, 2003; Meier et al., 2006; Ward et al., 2009). BOLD data are certainly better curated, and with higher quality standards, but are also likely to suffer from misidentified specimens to some degree (Meier et al., 2006). Our results do show a decrease in identification success when GenBank data were used, and this was generally due to the higher proportion of singleton species and misidentified specimens, rather than conflicting genetic data per se. However, a large proportion of the sequences on BOLD for species in this study remain in private projects and were not available for comparison. Many of these were in fact observed to be conflicting (see Section 7.1 for a discussion of future implications relating to this).

Realistically, as long as the practitioner is aware of alternative explanations for patterns, and is also aware of the relative disadvantages with each analytical technique, there is every reason for incorporating these additional data, especially when a smaller dataset is unable to provide a match. No database is immune to errors, but in this study identifications are transparent, and characters, photographs and preserved vouchers can be scrutinised and corrected at any time via BOLD. Perhaps a two-step approach is required, where GenBank data are consulted if an identification cannot be made using the library generated here.

3.4.3 Singletons

Results were reported with both singleton species included and excluded (Table 3.1). The exclusion of singletons represents a scenario where a barcode database is complete and no new species are to be encountered. However, this is an unrealistic assumption, as the traded cyprinid species come from a much larger pool not currently available in the trade, and the number of singletons in the trade survey shows that it is likely that more singletons will be encountered in the future. These singleton species were usually rare/expensive species, contaminants, or bycatch. When singletons comprised a large proportion of the reference database (such as with the GenBank data), the correct identification rates were significantly reduced for all methods. However, GMYC, BOLD, and BCM were able to discriminate when a specimen could
not be assigned to species. In this respect, the NJ and $k$-NN methods were poorly performing because they are not sensitive to the presence of singletons in a data set; they will always misidentify a query when a match is not available in the database, and this problem may preclude their use until reference databases are complete.

### 3.5 Summary

This chapter provides an analysis of identification measures. The DNA barcode library generated in Chapter 2 was used to test how different identification methods and sampling strategies influence identification success. The commonly used method based on NJ trees and bootstrap values performed poorly, but alternative and less well known techniques with revised threshold values offered better results (e.g. BCM). The presence of singleton species affected success rates also, and highlighted the need for more complete sampling. GenBank data provided a large number of extra species to fill this gap, although it is not known how accurate the identifications of these specimens are as links to voucher material is often missing (Hanner, 2009; Ratnasingham & Hebert, 2007).
Chapter 4

An evaluation of nucleotide substitution models for specimen identification

4.1 Introduction

As discussed in Section 1.4 and Chapter 3, standard DNA barcoding procedures frequently require genetic distances, and this similarity metric often provides the basis for data summary and specimen identification (Hebert et al., 2003a). Similarity is inferred through pairwise comparison between homologous sequences, and can be expressed as a single value: the number of substitutions per site in a given alignment. These distances are then used in the generation of identification success rates with, for example, nearest-neighbour thresholds or neighbour-joining phylograms. Due to this reliance on distance metrics, a robust and effective estimate of these distances is a prerequisite for non-expert end users of barcode data to have confidence in specimen identifications from public reference databases, such as BOLD (Ratnasingham & Hebert, 2007).

4.1.1 Model choice

In the context of phylogeny estimation, models play an important role in determining our interpretation of evolution. Relationships, branch lengths, and rates over time are all approximated in light of processes assumed by a model (Kelchner & Thomas, 2007), and investigations using simulated and real data have shown that model selection can influence both support values and tree topologies (Buckley & Cunningham, 2002; Cunningham et al., 1998; Lemmon & Moriarty, 2004; Ripplinger & Sullivan, 2008). A model selection procedure aims to identify a model which can best represent mutational processes, while minimising the loss of predictive ability through overparameterisation (Sullivan & Joyce, 2005).
In terms of choosing between models, advances in information theory have allowed for more effective discrimination between competing schemes (Posada & Buckley, 2004). Implementation of information-theoretic approaches such as the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) now allow for assessment of model fit, as well as taking into account increases in variance by penalising over-parameterisation and information loss (Bos & Posada, 2005; Posada & Buckley, 2004; Sullivan & Joyce, 2005). We are now also able to assess relative support for a given set of substitution models using AIC weights (Posada, 2008; Posada & Buckley, 2004). This approach is particularly useful given that an alternative model may be an equally good estimator as the model with the lowest AIC value (Kelchner & Thomas, 2007). These weights approximate probabilities for a given set of models, and evidence ratios between these weights offer a comparison of support for competing models (Anderson, 2008).

### 4.1.2 The K2P model

In terms of generating genetic distances, sequence similarity can be derived directly from observed data as raw \( p \) distances. However, unobserved substitutions at mutational hotspots such as third codon positions can lead to an underestimation of differences between lineages (Sullivan & Joyce, 2005). Mathematical models used in phylogenetics correct for this saturation by applying a more realistic scenario of nucleotide substitution than observed from raw data, and can vary considerably in complexity (Bos & Posada, 2005). In DNA barcoding studies, Kimura's two-parameter model (Kimura, 1980), hereafter referred to as the K2P model, is the de facto standard metric for computing these distances (Ward, 2009). The K2P model provides a substitution framework with a free parameter for both transitions and transversions, accounting for the likely higher substitution rate of transitions in mitochondrial DNA (Kimura, 1980; Wakeley, 1996). Base frequencies are assumed to be equal under this model, although departures from this assumption are common in real datasets and different nucleotide compositions may influence particular types of substitution rate (Galtier & Gouy, 1995; Tamura, 1992; Ward et al., 2005).

The use of the K2P model in DNA barcoding began with Hebert et al. (2003a), who stated: “For the species level analysis, nucleotide-sequence divergences were calculated using the Kimura-two-parameter (K2P) model, the best metric when distances are low (Nei & Kumar 2000) as in this study” (p. 315). Hebert et al. were presumably referring to the following passage in Nei & Kumar (2000): “Even the \( p \) distance becomes very similar to other distance measures when \( p \leq 0.1 \). Therefore
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when one is studying closely related sequences, there is no need to use complex distance measures. In this case, it is better to use a simpler one, because it has smaller variance” (p. 40–41; also see p. 112). This point made by Nei & Kumar is important because at a fundamental level, and despite the widespread use of the K2P model in DNA barcoding, it remains to be demonstrated whether model corrected distances are justified over using the uncorrected \( p \) distances (i.e. can the raw data serve adequately for the purpose required?). Although it has been noted that barcode variation within species is generally low (Hebert et al., 2010; Ward, 2009), it is not clear if simple measures could systematically bias results by underestimating change (Sullivan & Joyce, 2005). In terms of specimen identification, an underestimate of genetic distance may increase the number of false negative “lumping” errors, while overestimating change may increase false positive “splitting” errors (Meyer & Paulay, 2005). This is linked to the principal of the barcoding gap, which relies on individuals within a species being more similar to one another than to the closest individual of another species (Meier et al., 2008; Meyer & Paulay, 2005). It may be that when simple measures such as \( p \) distances are used, this gap is decreased, hindering identification success. For an effective specimen identification system it is important, therefore, to fully understand how measures of inferred similarity (model corrected distances) or observed similarity (uncorrected distances) could affect results.

4.1.3 Objectives

Two recently published studies have investigated the application of substitution models in DNA barcoding, although they offer fundamentally different conclusions. Fregin et al. (2012), based on their analysis of 120 cytochrome \( b \) sequences from 61 acrocephalid bird species, recommended “Only distances based on the optimal substitution model should be used”. In contrast, Srivathsan & Meier (2012) looked at 5,283 published COI sequences from 200 genera, and showed that “the use of uncorrected distances yields higher or similar identification success rates” [compared to K2P correction]. These contradictory findings suggest the question of model specification deserves further attention.

Given the availability of model selection software such as jModelTest (Guindon & Gascuel, 2003; Posada, 2008), it seems an appropriate time to re-examine how sensitive DNA barcode analyses are to alternative models, and ask whether the indiscriminate use of the K2P model is really justified. Using an explicit test of DNA
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bar code data under justifiable model selection criteria, this chapter aims to specifically address the following: (1) is the K2P a well fitting model at the species level; (2) how different are distances generated under a better model to those generated under the K2P model; (3) can applying different models change identification success rates and estimations of the barcoding gap; (4) does model correction in general, perform better than using no model; and (5) how did Fregin et al. (2012) and Srivathsan & Meier (2012) reach such conflicting conclusions?

4.2 Materials and methods

4.2.1 Data acquisition

Fourteen datasets were obtained in FASTA format from project pages on BOLD. These datasets comprised large studies of relatively well known taxonomic groups including butterflies (Dincă et al., 2011; Hajibabaei et al., 2006a; Lukhtanov et al., 2009), birds (Johnsen et al., 2010; Kerr et al., 2009a,b, 2007), fishes (Hubert et al., 2008; Rasmussen et al., 2009; Steinke et al., 2009a,b; Ward et al., 2005; Wong et al., 2009), and bats (Francis et al., 2010). Well known faunas were chosen to minimise discrepancies between the molecular data and taxonomy. BOLD sequence identifiers (taxon names) were trimmed using regular expressions to include only GenBank accession number and taxonomic identification (species name). Alignment was carried out by BOLD, followed by visual editing using translated amino acids in MEGA4 (Tamura et al., 2007).

4.2.2 Species-level model selection

To test whether the K2P is a well fitting model at the species level, each dataset was split into species using the APE package (Paradis et al., 2004) for R (R Development Core Team, 2010), with species delimited by their unique binomials. The individual species data were exported in NEXUS format, and species with less than five individuals were excluded in order to represent a dataset of at least an average intraspecific sample size (Ward et al., 2009). Using nested UNIX shell scripts, the program jModelTest was run as a batch process for each species in each dataset, producing a corresponding jModelTest output file. All eleven substitution schemes were tested (Posada, 2008), along with base frequency and rate variation options (total 44 models). An invariant sites parameter was not included, as species comprising a
single haplotype could not be optimised under this setting in jModelTest. The model frequencies and AIC weights for the best and K2P models were extracted from the jModelTest output files using shell commands.

### 4.2.3 Difference between K2P and best model

To test how different intraspecific K2P distances are from best-model distances, firstly batch processes in PAUP* (Swofford, 2003) were used to calculate pairwise comparisons under standard K2P distance settings (distance = K2P). Next, estimations for the best model were generated as maximum likelihood (ML) distances (distance = ml), with likelihood settings derived from jModelTest’s PAUP* block output. Shell scripting was used to manipulate corresponding likelihood settings from the jModelTest output into the NEXUS file for each species, before initiating PAUP* as a concatenated batch process. K2P distances were then subtracted from best-model estimates for each pairwise comparison. For this analysis using PAUP*, the pairwise deletion option for missing data was used (missdist = ignore), and undefined distances were set to “NA” (undefined=asterisk); all other settings were default. Except for K2P (= K80), abbreviated nomenclature of models follows Posada (2008).

### 4.2.4 Identification success

To test the influence of model selection on identification success rate, both intraspecific and interspecific values were required. Distances were generated from the undivided datasets which also included the previously excluded species with less than five individuals. To illustrate the effects of different substitution schemes, a selection of standard “off the shelf” models in PAUP* were used, offering a variety of parameterisations from simple to complex: JC, F81, K2P, TrN, HKY, HKY+Γ and GTR+Γ. Gamma shape values were derived from jModelTest. Identification success rates were measured using the “best close match” (BCM) criterion of Meier et al. (2006), and was applied as is described in Section 3.2.4. As highlighted in Chapter 3, the BCM method has several desirable properties, such as being able to make correct identifications for non-monophyletic species, and so was chosen as the appropriate measure of identification to be used in this case. The threshold was initially set at the 1% value, as used by the BOLD identification engine (Ratnasingham & Hebert, 2007). Because threshold values are likely to be contingent upon the models they
are generated under, we also optimised new thresholds for each model and dataset. This optimisation procedure minimises false positive (no matches within $x$ of query) and false negative (more than one species match within $x$ of query) errors for a range of threshold values (0.2%–5.0% in 0.2% increments). To assess the effect of model selection on magnitude of the barcoding gap, both maximum intraspecific and minimum interspecific distances were calculated (Meier et al., 2008), with the barcoding gap expressed as minimum interspecific distance divided by maximum intraspecific distance; singletons were not considered for intraspecific variation, and intraspecific values of zero were replaced with a value of 0.001536098 (corresponding to a single nucleotide change over 651 bp). Analyses were carried out in R using the DNA barcoding package SpIDER (Brown et al., 2012; Paradis et al., 2004).

4.3 Results

4.3.1 Species-level model selection

From the fourteen datasets 1,446 species were extracted with $\geq 5$ individuals, resulting in 14,472 DNA barcodes; the mean number of barcodes per species was ten (Table 4.1). For the individual species tested by jModelTest ($n = 1,446$), the model most frequently selected as best (zero AIC $\Delta$ value) was the HKY ($n = 579$), followed by F81 ($n = 312$) and TrN ($n = 264$). Overall, twenty models were selected by the AIC, and the K2P model was never selected as best model (Figure 4.1). Models with a gamma shape parameter were selected on 7.95% of occasions. The AIC weight ($w$) of the best model ranged between 0.08 and 0.64 (mean $w = 0.21$). As an alternative model, the AIC weight for the K2P was no greater than 0.019 (mean $w = 0.000134$). The mean evidence ratio ($E$) for the best model vs. K2P model weight was $E = 1.9 \times 10^{33}$ (range = 10.0 to $2.8 \times 10^{36}$). A representation of the relative model weights is shown in Figure 4.2.

4.3.2 Difference between K2P and best model

In calculating distances within species, a total of 191,402 pairwise comparisons were made. When the K2P distance was subtracted from the best-model distance, 31.2% of the total comprised zero change, and 39.6% were greater than zero and less than 0.1%; 8.12% showed a difference greater than 1%, and 15.6% were negative (K2P distance larger than best-model distance). Average differences were 0.64% (mean)
Table 4.1. Summary and citations for datasets used in this study, with numbers of individuals per species remaining after filtering for \( \geq 5 \) individuals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dataset citation</th>
<th>Taxon</th>
<th>No. spp.</th>
<th>No. indiv. ( \geq 5 ) indiv.</th>
<th>Seqs. per sp.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dincă et al. (2011)</td>
<td>Romanian butterflies</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>1,273</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis et al. (2010)</td>
<td>Southeast Asian bats</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>1,736</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hajibabaei et al. (2006a)</td>
<td>Tropical Lepidoptera</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hubert et al. (2008)</td>
<td>Canadian freshwater fishes</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>1,203</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnsen et al. (2010)</td>
<td>Scandinavian birds</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerr et al. (2007)</td>
<td>North American birds</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>2,386</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerr et al. (2009b)</td>
<td>Argentinian birds</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerr et al. (2009a)</td>
<td>Palearctic birds</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>1,063</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lukhtanov et al. (2009)</td>
<td>Central Asian butterflies</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rasmussen et al. (2009)</td>
<td>North American salmonids</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>116.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steinke et al. (2009b)</td>
<td>Ornamental marine fishes</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>1,169</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steinke et al. (2009a)</td>
<td>Pacific Canadian fishes</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>1,029</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward et al. (2005)</td>
<td>Australian marine fishes</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>921</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wong et al. (2009)</td>
<td>Commercial sharks</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>983</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,446</td>
<td>14,472</td>
<td>10.0 (avg.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations: avg. = mean; indiv. = individuals; spp./sp. = species; seqs. = sequences.

and 0.00012\% (median); range was \(-0.068\%\) to 136.7\%. A density plot illustrating the differences between the K2P model and best-model distances for each dataset is presented in Figure 4.3.

### 4.3.3 Identification success

A total of 21,514 DNA barcodes were used to measure identification success (including species represented by \(< 5\) individuals). Under the 1\% BOLD threshold, differences in identification success for all models varied by no greater than 0.04\%; the two models with gamma shape parameters (HKY+\(\Gamma\) and GTR+\(\Gamma\)) had the lowest correct identification rates of 91.81\% (Table 4.2). Optimised threshold values varied according to dataset (range 0.2\% to 1.2\%), although not by model, except for the GTR+\(\Gamma\) threshold for Dincă et al. (2011) (Table 4.3). Identification success varied by up to 0.28\% under optimised thresholds, with \(p\) distance having the highest value and the GTR+\(\Gamma\) model with the lowest (Table 4.2). Ambiguous identification tended to decrease with model complexity, along with an increase in incorrect and unidentifiable individuals (Table 4.2). In terms of the distribution of the barcoding
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Figure 4.1. Frequency of per-species models selected by jModelTest under the AIC. The K2P model is highlighted in bold (frequency = 0). Except for K2P model, abbreviated nomenclature of models follows Posada (2008). Summary of the properties of these models can also be found in Posada (2008).

gap under different models, for schemes without a gamma parameter, median values remained generally similar with smallest interspecific distances between $12.33 \times$ and $13.17 \times$ maximum intraspecific distances; the models with a gamma parameter had higher median ($16.02 \times$ to $16.59 \times$) and also higher maximum values (Figure 4.4). No barcode gap was found for between 8.72% ($p$ distance) and 8.50% (HKY+$\Gamma$) of individuals. Overall, the effect of model selection on all distances (both intraspecific and interspecific) is represented in Figure 4.5.
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Figure 4.2. Distribution of AIC weights for best and K2P models. Whiskers extend to full range of data; boxes represent quartiles; black lines show median values.

4.4 Discussion

4.4.1 K2P model selection

Although the species level analyses show that the K2P was never selected as the best model, picking a model with the lowest AIC value may ignore credible alternative models that are also good approximators (Alfaro & Huelsenbeck, 2006; Anderson, 2008; Kelchner & Thomas, 2007). Therefore, it could have been possible that the K2P model was a reasonable alternative model. However, when AIC weights and evidence ratios between models were considered to assess support, it was found that the K2P was without exception a poorly approximating model at the species level; the lowest evidence ratio was 10:1 against the K2P. It is likely that the assumption of equal base frequencies led to the rejection of the K2P model in most cases, thus favouring the otherwise similar F81 and HKY models with unequal frequencies (Figure 4.1). In general, substitution schemes tended to be relatively simple at the species level, with either equal rates (F81), or separate transition/transversion rates (HKY) selected. In terms of the suitability of the AIC for answering these questions, other model selection criteria such as likelihood ratio tests or the Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC) could have been considered here, but these measures are considered to be
Figure 4.3. Jittered density plot showing percent difference between best AIC model and K2P model distances for each of 14 datasets. The y-axis limit was set to 10% to assist presentation. The plot was created in R using ggplot2 (Wickham, 2009).

based upon weak philosophical foundations, and the latter has a tendency to give high weights to poorly fitting models (Anderson, 2008; Posada & Buckley, 2004).

4.4.2 Difference between K2P model and best model

Overall there was little difference between intraspecific distances optimised under best model or K2P model parameters. The majority (86.3%) of the difference was either zero or minor (< ±0.1%). The Francis et al. (2010) bat dataset had the largest differences (Figure 4.3). When this dataset was excluded, 93.9% of differences in distance were less than ±0.1%. At least a third of the bat species analysed in this study had multiple divergences of over 2% K2P distance (Francis et al., 2010). This study group reflects a high proportion of underestimated diversity, and this discrepancy between current taxonomy and DNA data indicates that the species-level units from this study were probably not comparable with the other datasets used. Conversely for the other datasets, species level diversity may have been artificially reduced,
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Table 4.2. Identification success rates using the best close match criterion of Meier et al. (2006) across a selection of models for \( n = 21,514 \) individuals. Threshold values were determined from BOLD’s 1% (open values), or were optimised according to error minimisation (values in parentheses); refer to Table 4.3 for optimised threshold values.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dist. measure</th>
<th>Ambig. (%)</th>
<th>Correct (%)</th>
<th>Incorrect (%)</th>
<th>No ident. (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( p ) distance</td>
<td>2.35 (2.31)</td>
<td>91.84 (90.81)</td>
<td>0.91 (0.75)</td>
<td>4.90 (6.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JC</td>
<td>2.34 (2.31)</td>
<td>91.84 (90.77)</td>
<td>0.91 (0.75)</td>
<td>4.91 (6.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F81</td>
<td>2.33 (2.31)</td>
<td>91.85 (90.77)</td>
<td>0.92 (0.75)</td>
<td>4.91 (6.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K2P</td>
<td>2.34 (2.31)</td>
<td>91.84 (90.76)</td>
<td>0.91 (0.75)</td>
<td>4.91 (6.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TrN</td>
<td>2.30 (2.29)</td>
<td>91.85 (90.76)</td>
<td>0.94 (0.78)</td>
<td>4.91 (6.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HKY</td>
<td>2.32 (2.31)</td>
<td>91.85 (90.76)</td>
<td>0.92 (0.76)</td>
<td>4.91 (6.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HKY+( \Gamma )</td>
<td>2.31 (2.29)</td>
<td>91.81 (90.75)</td>
<td>0.93 (0.77)</td>
<td>4.95 (6.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTR+( \Gamma )</td>
<td>2.30 (2.29)</td>
<td>91.81 (90.53)</td>
<td>0.94 (0.77)</td>
<td>4.95 (6.41)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations: ambig. = ambiguous; dist. = distance; ident. = identification.

as it was not clear from the methods sections of the publications cited (Table 4.1) whether code numbers or designations such as cf. were appended to species names during the morphological identification process, or were post-hoc assignments based on barcode divergences. As these would be considered different species in the analysis, an indication of how this may have affected results is necessary; of all 14,472 individuals, only 7% failed to satisfy a regular expression conforming to a correctly constructed binomial (‘[A–Z][a–z]*_[a–z]*’). However, regardless as to the degree of match between barcodes and taxonomic names, optimising intraspecific distances under a more statistically justifiable model than the K2P did not substantially change them in the majority of cases (Figure 4.3).

4.4.3 Identification success under different models

Although most changes in distance observed among models were small, when strict thresholds are used as identification criteria (e.g. by BOLD), in theory even relatively minor differences in distance could change the assignment of an unknown specimen. However, there was only a negligible decrease in identification success rate when more complex models were employed (Table 4.2), and although the BOLD threshold value of 1% was generated from data under the K2P model, when revised thresholds optimised under different models were provided, the identification success rates continued to remain robust to model selection. This is likely due to the observation
Table 4.3. Optimised distance thresholds for each dataset under a selection of models. Thresholds were optimised for a range of values (0.2% to 5.0%) under a procedure that minimises false positive and false negative error rates (Meyer & Paulay, 2005). The threshold varying by model is highlighted in bold.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dataset</th>
<th>$p$ dist. (%)</th>
<th>JC (%)</th>
<th>F81 (%)</th>
<th>K2P (%)</th>
<th>TrN (%)</th>
<th>HKY (%)</th>
<th>HKY+Γ (%)</th>
<th>GTR+Γ (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dincă et al. (2011)</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td><strong>0.2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis et al. (2010)</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hajibabaei et al. (2006a)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hubert et al. (2008)</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnsen et al. (2010)</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerr et al. (2007)</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerr et al. (2009b)</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerr et al. (2009a)</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lukhtanov et al. (2009)</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rasmussen et al. (2009)</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steinke et al. (2009b)</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steinke et al. (2009a)</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward et al. (2005)</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wong et al. (2009)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.6</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations: dist. = distance.

that distance values pertinent to specimen identification (i.e. largest intraspecific and smallest interspecific), were generally low enough not to be significantly affected by model correction (Figure 4.3, Figure 4.5). Overall, genetic distances generated under models without a gamma shape parameter scarcely deviated from estimations made by the K2P model at $p$ distances of $<10\%$, although when a gamma shape parameter was introduced distances had an increased proportion of correction at this level (Figure 4.3). As an indication of how correction may influence a typical dataset, Ward (2009) reported mean interspecific K2P distances of 5.5% for congeneric bird species, while these results for a wider variety of taxa (Table 4.1) report a mean K2P distance of 6.9% for all nearest non-conspecific values, and a mean maximum intraspecific value of 1.0%.
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Figure 4.4. Distribution of variation in the magnitude of the barcoding gap according to model for \( n = 20,643 \) individuals. The barcoding gap is expressed as inter-specific divergence as a multiple of intra-specific divergence, and was calculated by dividing each minimum inter-specific value by the corresponding maximum intra-specific value. Singletons were not considered for intra-specific variation. Whiskers extend to \( 1.5 \times \) interquartile range, black lines show median values, and points represent outlying data.

4.4.4 Discrepancies between previous studies

Regarding the discrepancy between conclusions presented by Fregin et al. (2012) and Srivathsan & Meier (2012), the results of this study were found to be entirely congruent with those of Srivathsan & Meier (2012), in that substitution models have little effect on specimen identification. This study found a slight degree of systematic bias, with more complex models having marginally lower ambiguous identification error rates (inter-specific distances underestimated), although this was countered by a larger proportion of incorrect and unidentifiable specimens (intra-specific distances overestimated). When taking this bias into account, the results shown here demonstrate that for identification purposes, \( p \) distances perform as well, or marginally better (optimised thresholds), than more complex models due to the higher false positive error rates of the latter (Table 4.2). Similarly, increasing model complexity produced an increase in the magnitude of the barcoding gap (Figure 4.4). However, this was not translated into an increase in the number of
individuals for which a gap was present. Increasing parameterisation further, with the inclusion of an invariant sites model (GTR+I+Γ), resulted in another increase in the magnitude of the barcoding gap, and again generated a reduction in identification success (data not shown). Given the assertion of Nei & Kumar (2000) that “when one is studying closely related sequences, there is no need to use complex distance measures”, it should be asked again why models are used in DNA barcoding? Thus, it appears that observed similarity is an acceptable way to identify specimens, unless a user is particularly interested in minimising one error rate over another for a specific application.

Despite their call for better fitting models to be used in studies using genetic distances, a reanalysis of the data presented by Fregin et al. (2012) showed no differences according to model in either identification success rate or proportion of specimens lacking a barcode gap (TrN+Γ and p distances; their Supplementary Table 1). It is not clear to whom their advice is aimed, because their conclusions appear to blur the distinctions between specimen identification and species discovery—
assigning unknowns to a pre-identified reference library vs. species delimitation and description (Padial et al., 2010; Vogler & Monaghan, 2007). Although the same data can be used for both purposes, the objectives remain fundamentally different and each require distinct experimental procedures (Padial et al., 2010, and also see Section 7.2 for further discussion). There appears to be no standard practice regarding model correction for taxonomic questions, and different substitution frameworks are often employed among studies, frequently without a model selection procedure or justification (for references see Fregin et al., 2012). When making taxonomic decisions, understanding evolutionary process is arguably more important than for DNA barcoding, and may be especially critical in circumstances such as supporting a new species status for a divergent taxon. When framed in this context, a greater emphasis on model choice must indeed be recommended, which is therefore in agreement with the conclusions of Fregin et al. (2012).

4.5 Summary

In conclusion, model selection should remain an important consideration in many disciplines, and DNA barcoding should be no different. Practitioners of DNA barcoding may feel reassured that identification rates were not significantly affected by model selection. However, they should also be aware that a model selection process can increasingly influence conclusions when larger distances are being considered. In taxonomic studies where these conclusions are important, statistical uncertainty in distance estimation could certainly be better explored with information-theoretic techniques such as multi-model inference and model averaging.
Chapter 5

An evaluation of nuclear genetic information in detecting interspecific hybrids and assessing cryptic species

5.1 Introduction

One of the aims of DNA barcoding is to provide a universal system of identification, using a standardised mitochondrial DNA reference system (Hebert et al., 2003a). It has been pointed out that there are situations where mitochondrial DNA may be inappropriate or may lack properties desirable to make suitable biological inferences (Section 1.3). In particular, these are the detection of interspecific hybrids (Aliabadian et al., 2009; Dasmahapatra & Mallet, 2006), and the accurate delimitation of morphologically cryptic lineages among species (Dasmahapatra et al., 2010). The use of nuclear genetic information is in theory able to address these problems. Nuclear loci are increasingly used to validate mitochondrial results and also provide an independent, additional source of data for use in identification, systematic, or taxonomic studies (Vogler & Monaghan, 2007). In the case of aquarium fishes, a nuclear marker may also offer advantages in detecting natural introgression patterns, or interspecific hybridisation events that may have occurred during indiscriminate or deliberate breeding at ornamental fish farms.

5.1.1 Interspecific hybrids

As outlined in Section 1.3.4.3, introgression has been shown to be a relatively frequently occurring phenomenon in wild populations of animals. However, in the case of ornamental fishes, identifying captive bred and mass-produced domesticated organisms presents unique problems for both morphological and molecular identification procedures. Loss of diagnostic phenotypic/genotypic characters may occur in ornamental fishes due to the processes of artificial selection and interspecific
hybridisation for retail purposes. Interspecific hybrid organisms may be of biosecurity concern (either or both of the parental species), and specimens of mixed genealogy may be unpredictable in both phenotype and genotype (Mallet, 2005), making them additionally challenging to identify. Interspecific hybrids have long been used in aquaculture to transfer desirable traits such as increased growth rate or environmental tolerances (Bartley et al., 2001). As hormone breeding technologies become more accessible to breeders, the aquarium industry is now producing increasing numbers of novel hybrid organisms for the trade such as loaches and *Synodontis* catfishes (Clarke, 2008; Ng, 2010). These hybrids may be selected for aesthetic reasons, growth rate, or even to be fraudulently passed off as species with a high market value (Ng, 2010). There is also the possibility of accidental, non-deliberate breeding of hybrids at farms.

5.1.1.1 Identifying hybrids with mtDNA

Due to their frequently intermediate phenotypes, hybrids can be difficult to identify using morphological characters. However, DNA barcoding is well suited to identifying specimens with an atypical phenotype created by artificial selection. However, matrilineal inheritance of mtDNA means any hybrid “unknown” will be incorrectly identified as the maternal species only, ignoring its history of introgression (Avise, 2001). Therefore, hybrid consignments may be inadvertently granted access into New Zealand and other countries based upon positive barcode identification of the maternal species. Valuable information could be lost by using the standard COI approach alone, and misleading conclusions could be reached regarding the identification of query specimens. This may have implications for biosecurity risk assessments, with life history data and nomenclature becoming associated with the maternal species only. Hybrids could also have important biological traits (e.g. temperature tolerances or pathogen resistance) associated with one, both, or neither of the parent species (Reyer, 2008; Seehausen, 2004). Testing hypotheses of hybridisation in the ornamental fish trade could quantify the margins of error when making identifications in hybrid-risk groups.

5.1.1.2 Identifying hybrids with allozymes

The use of nuclear allozyme loci was popular in early studies employing molecular techniques for detecting and understanding hybrid organisms using heritable genetic markers (e.g. Avise & Saunders, 1984). Allozymes are different alleles of the same
enzyme, coded at the same locus. Differing biochemical properties of the protein molecules allow the discrimination and genotyping of interspecific variation via a gel electrophoretic assay (Alarcón & Alvarez, 1999; Scribner et al., 2001). The method is both cost effective and fast (van der Bank et al., 2001). However, it requires knowledge and/or fresh tissue samples of both the potential parental species to be effective in detecting a hybrid organism in a biosecurity situation, something which is not always feasible due to the sporadic availability of many species in the trade.

5.1.1.3 Identifying hybrids with microsatellites

Most studies of naturally occurring introgression use allele frequency data from microsatellite markers (Sanz et al., 2009), and this can be combined with mitochondrial or other organellar DNA (Aliabadian et al., 2009; Avise, 2001). For a rough estimate of hybridisation (i.e. F₁), Boecklen & Howard (1997) recommend 4–5 markers, while significantly more complicated situations of advanced backcrossing require over 70. Vähä & Primmer (2006) recommend similar numbers, with 12–24 for F₁, and >48 for detecting backcrossing. Generating and testing protocols for this number of markers takes significant time and effort, and importantly, they need to be generated specifically for each taxon. Despite offering fine-scale information, this type of method cannot be applied universally to any species in the way that DNA barcoding can, so therefore the use of microsatellite markers is limited for biosecurity applications.

5.1.1.4 Identifying hybrids with nDNA sequence data

Nuclear sequence data can be used in a phylogenetic context to identify hybrids, as there will be incongruence between gene trees (Sota & Vogler, 2001). Unfortunately, this requires nuclear and mitochondrial sequence data from both parental species. However, hybrid individuals will frequently have higher levels of heterozygosity than non-hybrids (Sonnenberg et al., 2007), as diploid organisms will carry divergent copies of the same gene from each parent on separate chromosomes. Therefore, a stand-alone test for hybridisation would simply require an nDNA sequence from a single gene to flag the possibility of a hybrid by way of level of heterozygosity, which could then be investigated with other means. Although hybrids between recently diverged sister species would be difficult to detect with this method, reports suggest that in order to create new and “interesting” varieties for sale (Ng, 2010), many of the aquarium hybrids are produced from phylogenetically quite distinct parentage
(sometimes different genera or families). Therefore, cases such as these would be likely to show high levels of heterozygosity.

5.1.2 Cryptic and unrecognised diversity

5.1.2.1 Definitions

Cryptic species are defined as “two or more distinct species that are erroneously classified (and hidden) under one species name” (Bickford et al., 2007). They are thought to be widespread throughout metazoan taxa, and across biogeographic realms (Hebert et al., 2004; Lohman et al., 2010; Pfenninger & Schwenk, 2007). The classification of multiple species as a single species, is usually due to a lack of morphological distinction as reported in the taxonomic description. Some cryptic species are truly morphologically cryptic—at least as far as the currently employed morphological methods allow us to investigate—and can only be detected with genetic data. However, others may have morphological differences which become apparent when the characters are reassessed (Smith et al., 2007); here these are termed “pseudocryptic species”. Another scenario is where a taxon is already recognised as being different (usually with morphological data), and simply remains undescribed; this is termed “unrecognised diversity”.

Morphological similarity can persist for long periods of time, with tens of millions of years of morphological stasis having been documented in the African osteoglosso-morph fish Pantodon (Lavoué et al., 2010). Also, in insects, many previously assumed generalist species are actually a complex of host specifics (Smith et al., 2006). The important crop pest Bemesia tabaci, for example, is thought to comprise a complex of genetically distinct, but morphologically conservative lineages (Boykin et al., 2012).

5.1.2.2 Cryptic species, biosecurity and DNA barcoding

The presence of cryptic species, or species complexes with poorly resolved taxonomy can be a problem for identification, as a seemingly well-sampled barcode library may be lacking important reference specimens from these lineages; estimating sampling breadth using taxonomic names may be an underestimate of the underlying mtDNA diversity. When no reference material exists, the presence of cryptic species can therefore increase the potential for unknowns to fail to be identified by a DNA barcode library. When only a single taxonomic name is given to a species complex, it also raises problems for biosecurity management (Boykin et al., 2012). The boundaries
for evolutionary significant units (ESUs) within a species complex may be fuzzy, and intra-group misidentifications may be common. Therefore, because some of these units can have a higher biosecurity risk than others, it is essential to be able to effectively reference these to ensure information is consistent on databases and between biosecurity organisations.

5.1.2.3 DNA barcoding and species concepts

Given the focus of the thesis on the taxonomic rank of species as a basis for correct identification, it seems appropriate to briefly discuss species concepts with reference to DNA barcoding and cryptic species. As stated by Schindel & Miller (2005), there are two distinct aims of DNA barcoding: specimen identification, and species discovery (this dichotomy is discussed in greater detail in Section 7.2). In terms of both aims, DNA barcoding\(^1\) can be considered independent of the “problem” of species concepts (for a review of species concepts, see de Queiroz, 2007). DNA barcoding for specimen identification relies upon matching genetic data to a priori described taxonomic names via the generation of a reference library of associated voucher material, pre-identified using morphological characters. Consequently, the problem of species concepts and delimitation is addressed by the original taxonomic description of the species. In this context, DNA barcoding is simply concerned with techniques maximising the congruence between the predefined names and the DNA data (Chapter 3).

In situations where “species” are not associated with names—they are part of an undocumented fauna or cryptic complex of species—DNA barcoding can play a part in initially recognising and documenting these lineages. In this respect, the application of DNA barcoding is as a “species discovery” or biodiversity triage tool (Schindel & Miller, 2005). This process can offer information about population structure, speciation events and potential conservation status (Francis et al., 2010), and is therefore useful for rapid biodiversity assessments as well as for ecological or biosecurity applications (Boykin et al., 2012).

Species delimitation methods such as the general mixed Yule coalescent (Monaghan et al., 2009) and the Automatic Barcode Gap Discovery tool (Puillandre et al., 2012), are able to assess species diversity directly from molecular data, and independently of prior taxonomic knowledge. It is important to note, however, that in the context of species discovery, divergent mtDNA groups derived from methods

---

\(^1\)Note the emphasis on DNA “barcoding” rather than DNA “barcodes”.

such as these, or even just a simple monophyletic group above an arbitrary percent divergence threshold, do not require a concept of species either (although this is perhaps arguable). The methods operate by detecting biological pattern, consistent with theoretical expectations and broad empirical observations across multiple, previously defined species from independent studies. In other words, they report species-like groups using heuristic methods, which are typical of expectations as observed from other data. In COI, for example, if intraspecific variation greater than 3% is rare in well circumscribed taxa, then this level of divergence could be more consistent with interspecific variation. This is not however, a formal species hypothesis in a taxonomic sense, although the same underlying data could be used as a next stage in forming part of an integrated taxonomic process (Padial et al., 2010). It is important to note here that basing taxon descriptions on molecular data, and in particular using statistical species-delimitation methods can be difficult, unless also framed in the context of diagnostic characters consistent with relevant nomenclatural codes (Bauer et al., 2011; Lowenstein et al., 2009).

Confusion can also arise between the form of molecular parataxonomy as described above, and with formal DNA taxonomy (cf. Tautz et al., 2003), which is more explicit in promoting a central rather than auxiliary role for DNA in descriptive taxonomic practice (Vogler & Monaghan, 2007). In this respect, DNA taxonomy certainly requires a species concept, or in reference to de Queiroz (2007), an operational criterion for a species hypothesis.

5.1.2.4 Detecting cryptic species

For some applications such as community ecology, crude measures of biodiversity from mtDNA may be all that are required (Valentini et al., 2009). However, for more rigorous applications, heuristic hypotheses from DNA barcoding methods may need to be tested with further data (Smith et al., 2007). Therefore, some authors have questioned the validity of putative cryptic taxa as reported by divergences in mtDNA analyses (Brower, 2006; Dasmahapatra et al., 2010; Dasmahapatra & Mallet, 2006; Elias et al., 2007); they insist that COI is insufficient to robustly recognise a biparental lineage, and that candidate species be additionally supported with independent datasets, thus increasing the degree of corroborative evidence.

With the tendency of DNA barcoding studies to discover putatively cryptic taxa (Zemlak et al., 2009), it is likely that previously unrecognised lineages or candidate species are uncovered in this study. Nuclear markers are an important tool in this
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process and can assist in the critical assessment of these lineage divergences, with concordant patterns from both genomes adding extra support to hypotheses of speciation within morphologically constrained lineages.

Biosecurity decisions are better informed with a good knowledge of the molecular diversity (Boykin et al., 2012). The purpose in this chapter is to assess how valuable nuclear gene information can be in supporting relationships within putatively cryptic species, and for investigating unrecognised diversity in general (undescribed, but morphologically distinct species).

5.1.3 Nuclear marker selection

The a priori choice of an appropriate nuclear marker is difficult. The nuclear genes sequenced for fishes tend to be those used for phylogenetic studies, and as a result are more directed toward resolving relationships at a deeper level than those between closely related species (e.g. Li et al., 2007). Phylogeographic studies, on the other hand, investigate a more appropriate evolutionary level and could be a better source of loci. Historically, most have used mtDNA and microsatellites (Zink & Barrowclough, 2008). Nuclear sequence data are becoming increasingly employed in phylogeography (Edwards & Bensch, 2009; Hare, 2001). However, few genes have been identified so far as suitable in fishes, and de novo generation of potential loci is complicated and time consuming (Lee & Edwards, 2008). Fortunately, nuclear-gene DNA barcoding has to some degree been investigated; Sevilla et al. (2007) assessed nuclear rhodopsin (RHO/Rhod/RH1/RH)—a marker having been observed to show variation at the species level for molecular systematic questions (Fang et al., 2009)—and incorporated it into their multi-locus fish identification tool, while Sonnenberg et al. (2007) used the D1–D2 region of LSU 28S rRNA to distinguish closely related fish species.

5.1.4 Objectives

Here, the aim is to answer two different problems associated with DNA barcoding—detection of interspecific hybrids and cryptic species—with the use of the same tool: DNA sequence data from nuclear loci. A range of potential nuclear markers will be assessed for suitability, and then nuclear barcodes will be generated from a suitable candidate to test how they compare to COI barcodes in detecting species level variation for the same taxa. One of these nuclear markers will then be used to firstly
identify hybrid aquarium species both independently using sequence heterozygosity, and in conjunction with COI data. Secondly, patterns of putatively cryptic speciation or unrecognised diversity will be investigated with nDNA to assess support for hypotheses raised from the COI data.

5.2 Materials and methods

5.2.1 Nuclear marker selection

A three-step screening procedure was used to identify potentially useful genes, and is outlined as follows.

5.2.1.1 Genomic screening

Firstly, a broad range of candidate nuclear loci was selected by reviewing recently published phylogenies of fishes, or studies looking specifically at marker development or specimen identification. Due to the wide range of taxa that have been studied, it was not possible to make a universal comparison across genes using GenBank data from these studies. Instead, the Ensembl Genome Browser (http://www.ensembl.org/) was searched for each gene using the Danio rerio database. Orthologous gene sequences were then downloaded for the other four model teleost fishes (Gasterosteus aculeatus, Oryzias latipes, Takifugu rubripes and Tetraodon nigroviridis). This protocol allowed a crude screening of the more variable loci across a large part of the Acanthopterygii and Ostariophysi, with the assumption being that genes variable across different orders of fishes may correspond to show variability at the species level, and therefore warrant further investigation. To estimate diversity, pairwise $p$ distances were calculated for each gene using MEGA4 (Tamura et al., 2007).

5.2.1.2 Intragenic diversity

Next, a subset of five genes was selected to be tested empirically for intragenic diversity (using uncorrected $p$ distances as above) on a selection of Danio species (D. rerio, D. aff. kyathit, D. kyathit, D. dangila, D. albolineatus and D. margaritatus). For promising loci that did not have published or working primers, new primers were designed from the Ensembl alignments using PRIMER3 with the default settings (Rozen & Skaletsky, 2000).
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5.2.1.3 Comparison with COI

Finally, a single marker was selected for testing across a wider range of species within the Cyprinidae, and to be compared to information from the COI barcode region (as generated in Chapter 2). A subset of 200 individuals was amplified for both markers, comprising 82 species (1–10 individuals per species). Barbs (*Puntius*) and danios (*Danionini*) were targeted, along with other taxa showing putative interspecific COI divergences. Patterns in agreement between matched nuclear and COI subsets were investigated using the NJ monophyly and k-NN methods (as presented in Chapter 3).

5.2.2 PCR protocols for nuclear genes

Nuclear data for the five shortlisted genes (Table 5.2) were generated with the following lab protocol. DNA extractions were as outlined in Section 2.2.4.1. Optimised PCR reactions were carried out using a GeneAmp 9700 thermocycler (*Applied Biosystems*) in 10 µl reactions of:

- 1.7 µl ultrapure water
- 1.0 µl Expand High Fidelity 10× PCR buffer (*Roche Diagnostics*)
- 2.0 µl Q-Solution (*Qiagen*)
- 0.2 µl MgCl2 (25.0 mM)
- 2.0 µl dNTPs (1.0 mM)
- 1.0 µl forward and reverse primer (2.0 µM)
- 1.0 µl DNA template
- 0.1 µl Expand High Fidelity polymerase (*Roche Diagnostics*)

Thermocycler settings for amplification were as follows: 4 min at 94.0°C; 40 cycles of 20 s at 94.0°C, 30 s at 52.0–56.0°C and 60 s at 72.0°C; 7 min at 72.0°C; ∞ at 4.0°C. Primer pairs used are given in Table 5.2. Sequencing protocol was as for the COI data presented in Section 2.2.4.2.

5.2.3 Breeding interspecific hybrids

To compare how effectively sequence data can identify introgression, experimental hybrids were bred in the laboratory under natural aquarium conditions. Two species (*Danio rerio* and *D. aff. kyathit*) were selected as candidates for hybridisation as they are similar in appearance, relatively closely related (Fang *et al.*, 2009; Tang *et al.*, 2010), easy to breed (Cottle, 2010), and readily available in the pet trade. *Danio rerio* was chosen as the maternal species. Breeding procedures followed Cottle (2010), and comprised keeping males and females in separate tanks for conditioning (until females were gravid), followed by adding a single female and male into an empty tank in the evening. The spawning tank was decorated with Java moss (*Taxiphyllum*

---

2Final concentrations of reagents are as follows: 1× buffer; 2.0 mM MgCl2; 0.2 mM dNTPs; 0.2 µM per primer; 0.35 U polymerase.
barbieri), and fitted with an air powered box filter, and importantly, a raised wire mesh across the base to prevent adults eating the eggs after spawning (aquarium set-up is detailed further in Section 6.2.1). The following morning the tank was checked and if spawning was successful, the adults were removed along with the mesh. Fry were fed on liquidised propriety flake food and microworms (Panagrellus redivivus). Permission to carry out the hybridisation experiment was approved by Lincoln University Animal Ethics Committee (code #294; May 29, 2009).

5.2.4 Detecting hybrids

5.2.4.1 Heterozygosity

The proportion of heterozygosity in an individual may indicate recent hybridisation (Sonnenberg et al., 2007). The aim here was to investigate the amount of heterozygosity present in the lab bred hybrid compared to that of the putative non-hybrid cyprinid fishes collected as part of this study, and from fishes more generally. When assessing heterozygosity in the data generated in this study, the polymorphic positions were scored by visually assessing each chromatogram following Sonnenberg et al. (2007). Double peaks should be present in both forward and reverse chromatograms, and with a secondary peak height of at least $\frac{1}{3}$ of total peak height.

To assess the level of heterozygosity of putative non-hybrids in an overall sample, GenBank was searched on the 28th July 2011 for all rhodopsin (RHO) sequences from teleost fishes using the term “Teleostei AND (rhodopsin Rhod gene)”. A total of 1,530 sequences were downloaded. Ambiguous sites were inferred from the sequence data using the standard IUPAC ambiguity code (Cornish-Bowden, 1985), and counted in R using grep and the seqStat command of SLEEPER (Brown et al., 2012; Paradis et al., 2004). The “N” code (all bases) was excluded.

5.2.4.2 Identifying parental species

To test if nuclear sequences can be used to identify both parent species of a hybrid, a composite nuclear DNA sequence was generated in silico. The COI data was used to reveal the maternal species, so a putative paternal nuclear sequence can be calculated by resolving the ambiguities in the hybrid sequence using the information from the maternal species' nuclear sequence. For example, at a given position, if the maternal species (as identified by COI) has a cytosine (C), and the hybrid has a Y (C or T), then the putative paternal sequence was scored as a thymine (T). If ambiguities were
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also present in the maternal nuclear sequence, these remained as ambiguous in the composite sequence. The composite paternal sequence was then identified against the nuclear RHO reference library using the BCM method of identification (see Section 3.2.4.2); the threshold was optimised for the RHO data using the threshOpt function of SPIDER. This method was tested with both the lab bred Danio hybrids and a putative hybrid Puntius purchased in the aquarium trade (RC0171).

In addition to the hybrid Puntius, tissues were available from both museum specimens and the ornamental trade for some putative hybrid catfishes, identified as such morphologically; this included a clariid catfish (RC0739; BMNH:2008.9.17.1-2), a pimelodid catfish (RC0374), and 16 mochokid catfishes (Synodontis spp.). To make a maternal identification, mitochondrial DNA was used, but few COI data were available for these groups in BOLD or GenBank. Instead, as cytochrome b data were available for a large number of species, the specimens here were sequenced for the mitochondrial cytochrome b gene using the primers Glu-2 and Pro-R1 (Hardman & Page, 2003). PCR was carried out with a Veriti thermocycler (APPLIED BIOSYSTEMS) in 10 µl reactions with the following reagents: 1.0 µl ultrapure water; 5.0 µl GoTaq Green Master Mix (PROMEGA); 1.5 µl forward and reverse primer (2.0 µM)\(^3\); and 1.0 µl DNA template. Thermocycler settings comprised: 2 min at 94.0°C; 40 cycles of 20 s at 94.0°C, 30 s at 60°C and 60 s at 72.0°C; 7 min at 72.0°C; ∞ at 4.0°C. The hybrids were also sequenced for RHO using methods outlined previously, to detect polymorphisms.

5.2.5 Cryptic and unrecognised diversity

Using the COI data generated in Chapter 2, divergent lineages consistent with interspecific variation (e.g. > 3%) were found to be present within several common aquarium species. When a sufficient number of specimens were available (≥ 5) for aquarium species showing clear COI clusters, patterns were tested against the nuclear data. Four methods were used in assessing support for unrecognised or cryptic species: mean intergroup K2P distances; a character based approach using diagnostic, fixed character states between lineages\(^4\); bootstrap estimates of NJ clade support (settings as described in Section 3.2.3.2); and Rosenberg’s \(P\), a statistical

\(^3\)Final concentration of each primer 0.3 µM.

\(^4\)These have been referred to as “pure, simple characteristic attributes”, or CAs (Lowenstein et al., 2009; Sarkar et al., 2008)
measure testing the probability of reciprocal monophyly over random branching processes (Rosenberg, 2007).

5.3 Results

5.3.1 Nuclear marker selection

5.3.1.1 Step one: 22 loci

A total of 22 candidate loci were selected from the review of the phylogenetic literature. Names, lengths, Ensembl references, and citations are reported in Table 5.1. The diversity of these genes across the five model organisms is presented in Figure 5.1, where they are ranked according to median levels of divergence. Of these 22 loci, the IRBP, RAG1(exon2), and MLL loci were chosen as sub-candidates due to their greater comparative variability when ranked by median divergence (Figure 5.1). Although the PRLR gene was also highly ranked, the alignment was highly divergent and the homology was questionable. The RAG2 locus was also favourably positioned as a variable nuclear region, although previous studies have suggested limited divergence at the species level (Hardman, 2004). Despite appearing relatively conserved at the ordinal level, the rhodopsin (RHO) gene has been proposed as a nuclear fish barcode (Sevilla et al., 2007), and therefore warranted comparison with other loci identified in this study. Likewise, despite the relatively low divergence for LSU 28S, it has been reported to distinguish closely related species of fish (Sonnenberg et al., 2007), and was therefore also chosen.

5.3.1.2 Step two: five loci

As described above, five loci in total (IRBP, RAG1exon2, MLL, RHO, LSU 28S) were chosen as sub-candidates to be tested on the selected Danio spp. (as outlined in Section 5.2.1). A total of 30 sequences were generated from the six Danio species with these nuclear genes. Primers and citations are presented in Table 5.2. GenBank accession numbers for the sequences generated here are presented in Table 5.3. The nuclear rhodopsin gene (RHO) was chosen as the marker with most potential for within species variation, showing the largest maximum, median and minimum pairwise distances of all comparison nuclear loci (Figure 5.2).
Table 5.1. Names of 22 candidate nuclear loci, with length (bp), citation, and Ensembl reference data (for *Danio rerio* sequences). Nomenclature follows literature cited.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gene</th>
<th>Base pairs</th>
<th>Citation</th>
<th><em>D. rerio</em> Ensembl gene ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BMP4</td>
<td>863</td>
<td>(Cooper et al., 2009)</td>
<td>ENSDARG00000019995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGR1</td>
<td>1071</td>
<td>(Chen et al., 2008)</td>
<td>ENSDARG00000037421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGR2B</td>
<td>1134</td>
<td>(Chen et al., 2008)</td>
<td>ENSDARG00000042826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGR3</td>
<td>1071</td>
<td>(Chen et al., 2008)</td>
<td>ENSDARG00000089156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENC1</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>(Li et al., 2007)</td>
<td>ENSDARG00000035398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLYT</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>(Li et al., 2007)</td>
<td>ENSDARG00000010941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRBP</td>
<td>1236</td>
<td>(Chen et al., 2008)</td>
<td>ENSDARG00000059163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSU 28S</td>
<td>1152</td>
<td>(Sonnenberg et al., 2007)</td>
<td>EF417169 (GenBank)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLL</td>
<td>2624</td>
<td>(Dettai &amp; Lecointre, 2005)</td>
<td>ENSDARG0000004537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYH6</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>(Li et al., 2007)</td>
<td>ENSDARG00000090637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLAGL2</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>(Li et al., 2007)</td>
<td>ENSDARG00000076657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRLR</td>
<td>1193</td>
<td>(Townsend et al., 2008)</td>
<td>ENSDARG00000016570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTR</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>(Li et al., 2007)</td>
<td>ENSDARG0000008249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAG2</td>
<td>1628</td>
<td>(Cooper et al., 2009)</td>
<td>ENSDARG00000052121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAG1 exon2</td>
<td>1140</td>
<td>This study</td>
<td>ENSDARG00000052122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAG1 exon3</td>
<td>1749</td>
<td>(López et al., 2004)</td>
<td>ENSDARG00000052122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHO</td>
<td>1065</td>
<td>(Chen et al., 2003)</td>
<td>ENSDARG0000002193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RYR3</td>
<td>822</td>
<td>(Li et al., 2007)</td>
<td>ENSDARG00000071331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH3PX3</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>(Li et al., 2007)</td>
<td>ENSDARG00000014954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SREB2</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>(Li et al., 2007)</td>
<td>ENSDARG00000068701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBR1</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>(Li et al., 2007)</td>
<td>ENSDARG0000004712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZIC1</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>(Li et al., 2007)</td>
<td>ENSDARG00000015567</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: LSU 28S is not available on Ensembl, so GenBank reference is included.
Abbreviations: ref. = reference.

### 5.3.1.3 Step three: one locus

A total of 200 RHO sequences were generated for 82 species of cyprinid fish (1–10 individuals per species), and are presented in FASTA format (online Appendix Section B.2), and uploaded to BOLD. The RHO fragment corresponded to an 858 bp length (sites 58–915) of the *Astyanax mexicanus* rhodopsin gene: GenBank accession U12328 (Sevilla et al., 2007; Yokoyama et al., 1995).

When comparing suitability of COI and RHO as a species level marker in the reduced, matched datasets, the NJ monophyly analysis yielded 98.6% identification success rate for COI, and 87.8% for RHO. The rates for the nearest neighbour analyses (k-NN) were 99.0% for COI, and 92.2% for RHO. The two genes representing two different genomes produced consistent results. However, the nuclear data performed slightly poorer at discriminating some closely related species. An NJ phenogram
### Table 5.2. Primer names, sequences, and citations for five candidate nuclear loci.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gene</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Primer name</th>
<th>Primer sequence 5’–3’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RAG1 (exon2)</td>
<td>Forward</td>
<td>This study</td>
<td>RAG1ex2F</td>
<td>GGTGGATGTGACAACCGATA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAG1 (exon2)</td>
<td>Reverse</td>
<td>This study</td>
<td>RAG1ex2R</td>
<td>ACGGGTCAGTGACAACAGGT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHO</td>
<td>Forward</td>
<td>(Chen et al., 2008)</td>
<td>RH28F</td>
<td>TACGTGCCTATGTCCAAYGC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHO</td>
<td>Reverse</td>
<td>(Chen et al., 2003)</td>
<td>RH1039R</td>
<td>TGCTTGTTCATGCAGATGTAGA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRBP</td>
<td>Forward</td>
<td>(Chen et al., 2008)</td>
<td>IRBP109F</td>
<td>AACTACTGCTCRCCAGAAAARC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRBP</td>
<td>Reverse</td>
<td>(Chen et al., 2008)</td>
<td>IRBP1001R</td>
<td>GGAAATGCATAGTTGTCTGCAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLL</td>
<td>Forward</td>
<td>This study</td>
<td>MLCypF</td>
<td>GGCCCAGAGAAATTGATTGT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLL</td>
<td>Reverse</td>
<td>This study</td>
<td>MLCypR</td>
<td>ACTGGAAGGGACCGACACTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSU</td>
<td>Forward</td>
<td>(Sonnenberg et al., 2007)</td>
<td>LSU D1-D2 fw1</td>
<td>AGCGGAGGAAAAGAAACTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSU</td>
<td>Reverse</td>
<td>(Sonnenberg et al., 2007)</td>
<td>LSU D1-D2 rev1</td>
<td>TACTAGAAGGTTCGATTAGTC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5.3. GenBank accession numbers for sequences generated from five candidate nuclear loci.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specimen</th>
<th>Accession Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RC0394</td>
<td>JQ624037, JQ624038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC0405</td>
<td>JQ624035, JQ624036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC0129</td>
<td>JQ624040*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC0345</td>
<td>JQ624040*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC0076</td>
<td>JQ624040*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC0107</td>
<td>JQ624040*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC0045</td>
<td>JQ624025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC0076</td>
<td>JQ624026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC0107</td>
<td>JQ624023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC0045</td>
<td>JQ624024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC0076</td>
<td>JQ624021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC0107</td>
<td>JQ624022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC0045</td>
<td>JQ624020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC0076</td>
<td>JQ624019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC0107</td>
<td>JQ624018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC0045</td>
<td>JQ624017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC0076</td>
<td>JQ624016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC0107</td>
<td>JQ624015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC0045</td>
<td>JQ624014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC0076</td>
<td>JQ624013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC0107</td>
<td>JQ624012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC0045</td>
<td>JQ624011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC0076</td>
<td>JQ624010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC0107</td>
<td>JQ624009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC0045</td>
<td>JQ624008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC0076</td>
<td>JQ624007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC0107</td>
<td>JQ624006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC0045</td>
<td>JQ624005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC0076</td>
<td>JQ624004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC0107</td>
<td>JQ624003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC0045</td>
<td>JQ624002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC0076</td>
<td>JQ624001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC0107</td>
<td>JQ624000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: (*): Danio albolineatus sequence from RC0445; (†): Danio aff. kyathit sequence from RC0120.
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Figure 5.1. Uncorrected pairwise \( p \) distance ranges for 22 homologous candidate nuclear loci (and COI) between the following model organisms: Danio rerio, Gasterosteus aculeatus, Oryzias latipes, Takifugu rubripes and Tetraodon nigroviridis. Whiskers extend to full range of data; boxes represent quartiles; black lines show median values.

of RHO data is presented in the online Appendix Section B.4, with links to the specimen pages on the BOLD Web site. Taxa unable to be resolved by RHO, but resolved for COI, include some members of the Puntius conchonius group including \( P. \) padamya, \( P. \) tiantian and \( P. \) manipurensis. Danio Albolineatus and \( D. \) roseus were also unresolved, as were Microdevario kubotai and \( M. \) nana, plus Devario cf. browni and other associated undescribed/unidentified Devario species.

5.3.2 Interspecific hybrids

Interspecific hybrids (Danio rerio \( \times D. \) aff. kyathit) were bred successfully under aquarium conditions. This hybrid had an identical COI sequence to Danio rerio RC0067 (BOLD process ID RCYY001-10), and the overall phenotype of the hybrid
Figure 5.2. Intragenic uncorrected pairwise $p$ distance ranges between candidate nuclear loci from the following *Danio* species: *Danio aff. kyathit*, *D. albolineatus*, *D. dangila*, *D. kyathit*, *D. margaritatus* and *D. rerio*. Whiskers extend to full range of data; boxes represent quartiles; black lines show median values.

is shown in Figure 5.3. This hybrid was then sequenced for four of the short-listed nuclear genes (LSU 28S was not used at this stage due to sequencing problems). Heterozygosity was substantially higher in hybrid over non-hybrid parental species for all nuclear genes (Table 5.4), with the RHO gene showing the most polymorphic positions in the hybrid (32), compared to the other nuclear genes. Figure 5.4 shows a section of a trace file chromatogram for the hybrid *Danio*, with corresponding double peaks in both forward and reverse reads.

For the 200 RHO sequences of putative non-hybrid cyprinid fishes generated in this study, 95% had $\leq 4$ heterozygous positions (median = 0; mean = 0.99; max. = 17). Of these, seven individuals from six species (*Puntius conchonius*, *P. fasciatus*, *P. orphoides*, *P. oligolepis*, *P. aff. gelius* and *P. jerdoni*) had $> 5$ heterozygous positions. However, this had not been flagged as potential hybrids using morphological data. Three individuals from two species had $> 10$ (*P. oligolepis* and *P. jerdoni*). For the 1,530 RHO sequences downloaded from GenBank, 96% had $\leq 1$ polymorphic sites.
5.3. RESULTS

Figure 5.3. Phenotype of laboratory bred *Danio rerio* × *D. aff. kyathit* (C), parental species phenotype of *Danio rerio* RC0067 (A), and *D. aff. kyathit* RC0120 (B).

Figure 5.3. Phenotype of laboratory bred *Danio rerio* × *D. aff. kyathit* (C), parental species phenotype of *Danio rerio* RC0067 (A), and *D. aff. kyathit* RC0120 (B).

(mean = 0; mean = 1.6; max = 35). The GenBank sequences varied in length from 336 to 1062 bp (mean = 561 bp).

Using the *Danio rerio* RHO sequence (RC0394) as the maternal species for the lab bred hybrid, a composite paternal sequence was generated. This sequence was identified as *Danio aff. kyathit* (the correct paternal species) using the BCM method. The sequence had an uncorrected *p* distance of 0.23% from the closest *D. aff. kyathit*, and clustered closest to this species in an NJ phenogram (not shown). The optimised threshold for minimising error of identification was 0.34% for the RHO data.

For the hybrid *Puntius* purchased in the aquarium trade, 14 polymorphic sites were observed in the RHO data (GenBank accession JQ614265). However, the maternal species could not be identified using the current COI library, being over
Table 5.4. Number of heterozygous nucleotide positions at four nuclear loci in a hybrid *Danio* (*D. rerio* × *D. aff. kyathit*) and specimens of its non-hybrid parental species. GenBank accession numbers for the hybrid are also presented.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gene</th>
<th>Size (bp)</th>
<th><em>Danio rerio</em> (RC0394)</th>
<th><em>D. aff. kyathit</em> (RC0405)</th>
<th>Hybrid (RC0455)</th>
<th>GenBank accession</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RAG1 (exon2)</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>JQ624039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHO</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>JQ624041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRBP</td>
<td>859</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>JQ624027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLL</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>JQ624033</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5.4. Chromatogram trace files for interspecific hybrid RC0455 (laboratory bred *Danio rerio* × *D. aff. kyathit*), showing multiple heterozygous positions in both forward (top) and reverse (bottom) reads. Note the low quality scores around the polymorphisms.

3% different from the closest match (*P. arulius*), and well above the 1.4% threshold for this dataset (Table 3.1). The composite sequence approach (using subtraction) was attempted using the closest available sequence of *P. arulius*. The resulting RHO composite could not be satisfactorily identified either, being 0.47% different from the nearest match of *P. denisonii* (threshold 0.34%). However, in the NJ phenogram (not shown) the sequence was nested within the *P. denisonii* cluster, and this species was identified as a potential parent during the morphological identification process having a distinctive red longitudinal stripe, which is present in few *Puntius* species.

Of the catfishes, the hybrid clariid RC0739 sequenced for RHO, was found to have 11 polymorphisms. Due to conflicting GenBank data (multiple species names with identical haplotypes), a species level identification could not be made using
cyt b downloaded from GenBank, or via a BLAST search. However, the specimen nested within the cluster of *Heterobranchus* (NJ phenogram not shown). Data for this specimen were uploaded to GenBank: JQ624018 (RHO); JQ624019 (cyt b). The pimelodid catfish hybrid (RC0374) also had a large number of polymorphisms at 19. This specimen was again unable to be identified to species from cyt b data in GenBank, and clustered within a poorly resolved group comprising several species of *Pseudoplatystoma* (NJ phenogram not shown). Data for this specimen (RC0374) were uploaded to GenBank: JQ624042 (RHO); JQ624020 (cyt b). The 16 hybrid *Synodontis* catfish specimens sequenced for cyt b formed seven distinct NJ clusters (phenogram not shown), four of which were close to species represented in the GenBank data. These specimens did not amplify well for RHO, unfortunately, with the sequences being of poor quality (different primer pairs and combinations were also tried). There also did not appear to be a large number of polymorphic sites in this *Synodontis* RHO data.

### 5.3.3 Cryptic and unrecognised diversity

Aquarium species identified as having significant “within species” variation for COI are reported as NJ phenogram in Figure 5.5; they included: *Danio choprae*, *D. dangila*, *D. kyathit*, *Devario devario*, *Epalzeorhynchos kalopterus*, *Microdevario kubotai*, *Microrasbora rubescens*, *Puntius assimilis*, *P. denisonii*, *P. fasciatus*, *P. gelius*, *P. lateristriga*, *P. stoliczkanus*, *Rasbora dorsiocellata*, *R. einthovenii*, *R. heteromorpha*, *R. maculata*, *R. pauciperforata* and *Sundadanio axelrodi*. Some were expected, based on the morphological examination process, to be unrecognised diversity (noted by “sp.”, “cf.” or “aff.”), and some were divergent in the absence of apparent morphological differences (i.e. so-called cryptic species).

For 11 of the species, greater than five individuals were available for comparisons between both loci to assess whether the COI relationships were supported with nuclear RHO data. Where COI splits were large, the RHO distances were also large, albeit on average 9.9× smaller (range 3.8–22.7×). Discrete character states were observed for all species in both genes, were again fewer at the nuclear locus, and also corresponded to lower bootstrap support. Rosenberg’s *P* statistic of reciprocal monophyly showed significance for all but two comparisons with COI, and all but four comparisons with RHO. A full summary is presented in Table 5.5.
Table 5.5. Exploring unrecognised diversity: undescribed and putative cryptic species were assessed with COI and nuclear RHO data in the context of their closest known congener or conspecifics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taxon comparison</th>
<th>unrecognised taxon</th>
<th>COI/RHO</th>
<th>COI/RHO</th>
<th>Bootstrap %</th>
<th>% No. CA</th>
<th>Rosenberg’s P</th>
<th>Monophyletic</th>
<th>Bootstrap %</th>
<th>% No. CA</th>
<th>Rosenberg’s P</th>
<th>Monophyletic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Danio aff. choprae</strong></td>
<td>6 7.4 / 0.5 23 / 7 100 / 100</td>
<td>42 / 9</td>
<td>10 13.8 / 2.3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1 / 1</td>
<td>0 / 0</td>
<td>100 / 100</td>
<td>95.6 / 0.6</td>
<td>42 / 9</td>
<td>10 13.8 / 2.3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Danio aff. dangila</strong></td>
<td>7 9.0 / 1.3 21 / 7 100 / 100</td>
<td>40 / 4</td>
<td>5 7.8 / 0.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3 / 3</td>
<td>0 / 0</td>
<td>100 / 100</td>
<td>89.9 / 1.5</td>
<td>40 / 4</td>
<td>5 7.8 / 0.4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Danio aff. kyathit</strong></td>
<td>6 7.0 / 1.1 40 / 3</td>
<td>9 100 / 100</td>
<td>47 / 5</td>
<td>97.1 / 7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1 / 1</td>
<td>0 / 0</td>
<td>100 / 100</td>
<td>95.3 / 0.5</td>
<td>47 / 5</td>
<td>97.1 / 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Danio sp. “hikari”</strong></td>
<td>6 8.6 / 0.6 48 / 5</td>
<td>5 100 / 100</td>
<td>47 / 5</td>
<td>99.8 / 0.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1 / 1</td>
<td>0 / 0</td>
<td>100 / 100</td>
<td>97.1 / 7</td>
<td>47 / 5</td>
<td>99.8 / 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Devario sp. “purple cypris”</strong></td>
<td>6 8.1 / 0.6 47 / 5</td>
<td>5 100 / 100</td>
<td>47 / 5</td>
<td>99.8 / 0.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1 / 1</td>
<td>0 / 0</td>
<td>100 / 100</td>
<td>97.1 / 7</td>
<td>47 / 5</td>
<td>99.8 / 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Microrasbora cf. rubescens</strong></td>
<td>5 3.7 / 0.5 23 / 3</td>
<td>7 100 / 100</td>
<td>46 / 5</td>
<td>95.3 / 0.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3 / 3</td>
<td>0 / 0</td>
<td>100 / 100</td>
<td>95.3 / 0.5</td>
<td>46 / 5</td>
<td>95.3 / 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Puntius aff. gelius</strong></td>
<td>7 17.2 / 4.1 76 / 7</td>
<td>27 100 / 100</td>
<td>76 / 7</td>
<td>82.5 / 0.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1 / 1</td>
<td>0 / 0</td>
<td>100 / 100</td>
<td>82.5 / 0.5</td>
<td>76 / 7</td>
<td>82.5 / 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Puntius denisonii</strong></td>
<td>5 7.8 / 0.4 40 / 3</td>
<td>9 100 / 100</td>
<td>40 / 3</td>
<td>95.7 / 0.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2 / 2</td>
<td>0 / 0</td>
<td>100 / 100</td>
<td>95.7 / 0.5</td>
<td>40 / 3</td>
<td>95.7 / 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rasbora aff. dorsiocellata</strong></td>
<td>6 10.9 / 1.5 46 / 8</td>
<td>9 100 / 100</td>
<td>46 / 8</td>
<td>82.5 / 0.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1 / 1</td>
<td>0 / 0</td>
<td>100 / 100</td>
<td>82.5 / 0.5</td>
<td>46 / 8</td>
<td>82.5 / 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rasbora cf. heteromorpha</strong></td>
<td>7 2.2 / 0.2 11 / 1</td>
<td>100 / 100</td>
<td>11 / 1</td>
<td>18.1 / 0.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1 / 1</td>
<td>0 / 0</td>
<td>100 / 100</td>
<td>18.1 / 0.5</td>
<td>11 / 1</td>
<td>18.1 / 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sundadanio cf. axelrodi</strong></td>
<td>10 13.8 / 2.3 42 / 9</td>
<td>9 100 / 100</td>
<td>42 / 9</td>
<td>99.6 / 0.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3 / 3</td>
<td>0 / 0</td>
<td>100 / 100</td>
<td>99.6 / 0.5</td>
<td>42 / 9</td>
<td>99.6 / 0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: (*) renders Danio choprae paraphyletic; (†) monophyly significant to the α = 0.05 level with combined COI data (15 specimens); (‡) species likely described during thesis preparation as Brevibora cheeya (Liao & Tan, 2011). Abbreviations: CA = pure, simple characteristic; α = discrete diagnostic characteristic state; Y = Rosenberg’s P, significant to α = 0.05; N = not significant.
5.4. DISCUSSION

5.4.1 Nuclear marker selection

The relationship between genomic diversity across orders as an indicator of that within species is not necessarily a justified one, as selection or homoplasy may provide substantial sources of bias. As an example, COI is highly variable at the species level, but Figure 5.1 shows that its maximum variation is quite limited—this is likely due to the functional constraints of the mitochondrial protein. Despite this, as a crude way to screen for fast or slowly evolving loci, looking at genomic diversity may help in uncovering potentially useful markers for further testing. Among the nuclear genes tested for diversity within the *Danio* genus, and with the exception of LSU 28S, the chosen loci showed similar levels of diversity (Figure 5.3). As proposed by Sonnenberg *et al.* (2007), LSU 28S appeared a promising marker for species...
level inference. However, as well as the low levels of variability, tests using this marker on Danio and Puntius indicate numerous indels, considerable ambiguity in alignment, and difficulty in both amplification and sequencing (slippage due to long mononucleotide stretches). For these reasons, this marker was abandoned as a tool that could be fit for purpose in a biosecurity diagnostics context. The protein coding nuclear loci offered a considerably easier laboratory procedure, although do not benefit from the homogenisation by concerted evolution as seen in the rRNA genes (Elder & Turner, 1995), and may display some allelic variation (Chen et al., 2008).

The rhodopsin gene was finally selected to investigate variation at the species level, due its variability (Figure 5.2, Table 5.4), wide use in phylogenetics (e.g. Fang et al., 2009), and the availability of published primer sets (e.g. Chen et al., 2003; Sevilla et al., 2007).

When tested on 200 specimens of cyprinid fish, RHO was found to separate species well, broadly agree with morphological assignments, and support COI. Its resolution, however, was not as fine as that of COI, failing to discriminate among some closely related groups. It could not be therefore recommended as a single locus identification system, but does offer a suitable method of verifying mitochondrial results in terms of hybridisation and unrecognised diversity (see below).

Among these protein-coding nuclear genes, several potential pitfalls may occur. Many cyprinid fishes have undergone historical whole-genome duplication events, and are therefore polyploid and highly diverse in terms of alleles, even before hybridisation (Chen et al., 2008). Furthermore, it is questionable whether some of these nuclear loci represent neutral markers (see Galtier et al., 2009), as for example, substantial adaptation to local spectral environments has been documented in the RHO gene—a vision pigment—for a Pomatoschistus goby (Larmuseau et al., 2009). This may call into question the utility of the gene for accurately recovering phylogenetic relationships or even offering species level identifications; does sequence similarity between two groups reflect convergent adaptation, conspecificity, or lack of variation and incomplete lineage sorting?

5.4.2 Interspecific hybrids

The breeding of aquarium hybrids in a controlled environment provided an important opportunity to test how effectively screening with an nDNA marker can detect interspecific hybridisation events. When both mtDNA and nDNA data were available for the maternal species, it was possible to accurately predict the paternal species of
the hybrid using the polymorphisms in the RHO data, as was the case with the lab bred hybrid, and to some degree the hybrid *Puntius* from the trade. For taxa where these extra data were not available (hybrid catfishes), the high level of heterozygosity in the nDNA was able to independently suggest potential for hybrid origin.

Separating the hybrid and non-hybrid individuals with nDNA data required a difference in the proportion of heterozygosity. The background level of heterozygosity for RHO in putatively natural populations is estimated here to be low, with most (95%) of the cyprinid fishes surveyed having less than four polymorphic sites across 858 bases. The data taken from GenBank proved to be even less heterozygous (96% with < 1 polymorphism). However, it is almost a certainty that the bulk of this data were not investigated as thoroughly for polymorphisms as those presented here, and were scored using the automated base calling in programs such as Sequencher. Many of the GenBank sequences were also shorter than those used here, so fewer polymorphic sites are to be expected.

The lab produced hybrid had a considerably higher levels of heterozygosity at 32 positions, than these putative background levels, as did the hybrid *Puntius* purchased in the aquarium trade (14 positions). The two catfish (clariid and pimelodid) species sourced, also showed high levels (11 and 19 respectively). Therefore, an individual with an arbitrary level of heterozygosity of over ten bases in 858 appears indicative of a hybrid, and less than five bases, of a non-hybrid. However, some specimens with intermediate to large values were reported, and did not appear to be hybrids. It is possible that these high values were caused by large intrapopulation variation (potentially due to adaptive selection), polyploidy, or interspecific hybridisation that was not detected by examining the morphology of the fishes.

The *Synodontis* catfishes are well known subjects of hybridisation in the aquarium trade (Ng, 2010). However, the RHO protocol used here failed to yield consistently clean PCR products or sequence data. From those that were sequenced, the amount of polymorphism appeared to be low (frequently < 5). This may have been a consequence of the primers binding to only one allele, the RHO gene being insufficiently variable in this group, or that these putative hybrids were not in fact hybrids. Regardless, using the measure of heterozygosity as presented here to detect hybrids may not be effective in all cases, especially where primers are poorly fitting.

Whether the method can be applied to a wider variety of groups remains to be tested more thoroughly, and is dependent upon getting tissue samples of specimens with known hybrid and non-hybrid pedigrees. It is also unlikely that the method will be sufficiently sensitive to detect hybridisation among natural populations of closely
related species in hybrid zones for example, as this would require a considerably more sophisticated approach using multiple microsatellite markers (see Section 5.1.1). Fortunately, many of the hybrids created for the aquarium trade are selected for novel phenotypes, and therefore more distantly related species are deliberately chosen. A crude test for heterozygosity should therefore in theory be able to detect the more egregious examples of the practices undertaken by ornamental fish breeders. However, it is unknown how heterozygosity is affected by the further breeding of hybrid and backcrossed generations past F$_1$, something which may well be taking place in the trade.

### 5.4.3 Cryptic and unrecognised diversity

In terms of unrecognised diversity and potentially cryptic species, significant within-species COI diversity was observed in several common ornamental species, and cases of otherwise unreported morphological variation was also recognised. For an exemplar group of aquarium species, and where sufficient numbers of individuals were available, additional support for these divergent COI lineages was assessed with the nuclear RHO marker using statistical and character-based analyses, successfully demonstrating evidence in both genomes. The RHO supported most of the relationships proposed by COI, indicating that both genes are effective and complimentary tools in assisting in species delimitation for poorly known taxa.

Implications for conservation and sustainable management of fisheries are apparent here; _Puntius denisonii_—a species at risk of over-exploitation (Raghavan et al., 2007)—was found to possibly comprise at least two structured and morphologically cryptic lineages. As highlighted by Rosenberg’s $P$, sample sizes were relatively small, and this may indicate where further sampling would be beneficial.

Supporting methods using nuclear data attempt to build on the solely mitochondrial approach by providing congruence with an external dataset (Dasmahapatra et al., 2010; Dasmahapatra & Mallet, 2006; Elias et al., 2007). Of course, if taxonomic work is also undertaken, then specimens with known locality data should be sourced. However, the hypotheses generated here certainly warrant further investigation into species limits of these particular taxa, and this process provides useful reference points for closer examination. Until this work is carried out, data are made available in the BOLD database, and identifications of fishes in the ornamental trade will have to be made using tag names.
5.5 Summary

In this chapter, the benefits of incorporating nDNA data into a DNA barcoding approach are apparent. The ability of a simple nDNA test to detect fishes of interspecific hybrid origin was assessed, and which worked as predicted for controlled, lab bred hybrids, plus some examples from the trade. Identification of both parental species was even possible when sufficient reference data were available. Unfortunately, other hybrids purchased from the aquarium trade were unable to be identified as such, indicating a universal and simple method to detect fish hybrids through nDNA sequencing requires further work (possibly with allozymes). Taxonomically unrecognised lineages as well as morphologically cryptic ones were deemed biologically plausible with the support of data from the nuclear genome. This assists in verifying the authenticity of patterns in the mtDNA data, and can provide additional hypotheses for taxonomic investigation.
Chapter 6

An evaluation of environmental DNA for biosecurity applications

6.1 Introduction

Environmental DNA (eDNA) can now be accessed from a diverse range of substrates, opening up new areas of biodiversity research in terms of both microbiological and macrobiological samples (Thomsen et al., 2012; Venter et al., 2004). In aquatic ecosystems, assessment of species’ distribution can now be made using eDNA present in water, an approach allowing the detection and monitoring of invasive species (Ficetola et al., 2008; Jerde et al., 2011), rare and secretive species (Goldberg et al., 2011), or community composition as a whole (Minamoto et al., 2012). In terms of invasive species monitoring, Ficetola et al. (2008) reliably detected the presence of invasive bullfrogs in both controlled conditions and in natural ponds, while Jerde et al. (2011) delimited invasion fronts of two Asian carp species in the Laurentian Great Lake system of the United States. Despite the relatively recent introduction of the technique, eDNA analyses are quickly becoming recognised as an important tool for invasion biologists and ecosystem managers (Darling & Mahon, 2011).

6.1.1 Border quarantine

Immediately upon import at the border, ornamental fishes in many countries are subjected to a period of quarantine (Ploeg et al., 2009). This is particularly the case for Australia and New Zealand, where fish imports are restricted, and shipments are monitored for exotic pathogens (MAF Biosecurity New Zealand, 2011; McDowall, 2004; Whittington & Chong, 2007). Freshwater fishes imported into New Zealand are currently quarantined at transitional facilities for no fewer than four weeks, in order to allow manifestation of infection or mortality (MAF Biosecurity New Zealand, 2011). The quarantine stage therefore also offers an opportunity to identify the
shipped species, and monitor the imports for the presence of clandestine hitchhikers (i.e. contaminant or bycatch species).

The benefits of molecular over morphological approaches for border biosecurity identification of specimens have been acknowledged elsewhere (Chapter 1; Armstrong & Ball, 2005; McDowall, 2004). However, there are also several benefits of using eDNA over tissue sampling of imported fishes (i.e. standard DNA barcoding). First of all, tissue sampling procedures are invasive in terms of damage to the organism tested. Fin clips or swabs can be taken, but may leave the fish susceptible to infections through breaking the skin, or the removing the protective mucous layer (Le Vin et al., 2011). On the other hand, destructively sampling entire individuals may not be possible if the fish is valuable or only a single example is available.

Using eDNA, we have the ability to detect presence of a target species among multiple individuals of a shipment, rather than that of the single specimen chosen for testing; this may be important in terms of identifying mixed consignments. Environmental DNA techniques therefore have the potential to assess abundance and composition of fishes in a shipment. Because water will to some degree hold a “molecular memory” of the species present in it, eDNA protocols can therefore track the historical presence of a species in a water sample. This may be of benefit if a particular high-risk taxon in terms of pathogen vectoring potential has been in recent close contact with an otherwise low-risk species at a wholesaler or transshipper. This would perhaps justify added precautions to be taken in terms of disease risk and quarantine.

### 6.1.2 Transport of live fishes

Internationally, live ornamental fishes are transported by air freight. This entails securely packing the fishes to enable their survival for a minimum of approximately 48 hours (Ploeg et al., 2009). Packaging requirements depend on various factors such as the sensitivity, size, and value of the species concerned. However, densities are usually maintained at the highest possible, to maximise cost-effective shipping (Cole et al., 1999). Fishes are typically placed in plastic bags with 20–35% water, inflated with oxygen, sealed, and then shipped in polystyrene boxes. Bag size varies, but large bags (37.5 cm × 37.5 cm × 55 cm) will contain up to seven litres of water and between 10 and 500 fish depending on their size (Cole et al., 1999); individual fishes are bagged in smaller volumes. In contrast to the low concentrations of eDNA from samples of natural water bodies, due to the high packing densities of traded
fishes, retrieving eDNA in this situation may in some respects be less complicated (notwithstanding the potential for PCR inhibition due to fish metabolites in the transport water).

### 6.1.3 eDNA targets

Mitochondrial DNA is the preferred target for aquatic eDNA studies, although microsatellites have been genotyped from degraded substrates such as faecal matter (Taberlet et al., 1996). Mitochondrial DNA offers a higher copy number than nDNA, and therefore better amplification likelihood essential when dealing with potentially degraded samples (Valentini et al., 2009; Willerslev & Cooper, 2005). This is also due partly to “cellular location, chromatin structure and transcriptional activity” (Foran, 2006). As a result, most studies of aquatic eDNA focus on short amplicons of mtDNA between 80 and 300 bp (Ficetola et al., 2008; Jerde et al., 2011; Thomsen et al., 2012). Fortunately, the high variability of the standard DNA barcode marker COI, can allow species discrimination using mini-barcode fragments much smaller than the standard ~650 bp (Hajibabaei et al., 2006b; Shokralla et al., 2011).

The choice of which mini-barcode regions best differentiate taxa is important, but rarely explored. Roe & Sperling (2007) in their analysis of COI and COII, found significant substitutional heterogeneity through these genes and across taxa; they found no one region was best in all cases. Ideally, however, the most informative regions should be chosen for a specific study taxon, although to some degree the choice is limited by the availability of suitable priming sites (Ficetola et al., 2010). Sliding window analyses can therefore be used as a tool to evaluate variability though a gene alignment and find informative regions flanked by less variable priming locations, or, for species specific applications, to locate diagnostic sites for probe design (Boyer et al., 2012). A sliding window method “extracts all possible windows of a chosen size in a DNA alignment” and performs various analyses on these subsets of the full alignment (Boyer et al., 2012). Alternatively, for larger scale meta-barcoding projects (cf. Andersen et al., 2012; Valentini et al., 2009), use of software such as ecoPrimers (Riaz et al., 2011) can now utilise huge genomic datasets to automate and optimise selection of primer sets for informative short length markers.
6.1.4 Environmental persistence of eDNA

DNA molecules have been shown to persist in the environment for some considerable time—many hundreds of thousands of years if preserved in favourable conditions (Pääbo et al., 2004; Willerslev & Cooper, 2005). DNA is shed by organisms via their faeces, urine and epidermal cells (Thomsen et al., 2012), and can survive in an extracellular state for some time. The persistence of eDNA can be expressed as the presence of viable nucleic acids in the environment at a given rate of degradation, after the removal of its source (i.e. living tissues), while its detection depends on the concentration in the sample and the sensitivity of the test (Darling & Mahon, 2011; Dejean et al., 2011). The aquatic environment is not one suited to the long term preservation of DNA, and most studies acknowledge that the observation of eDNA reflects only the relatively contemporary presence of the target (Thomsen et al., 2012). Numerous mechanisms accelerate eDNA decomposition, and are outlined by Hofreiter et al. (2001) and Pääbo et al. (2004). They include: endogenous nucleases, microorganisms, oxidation, radiation, and hydrolysis, with these being influenced in turn by factors such as temperature, pH or light (Thomsen et al., 2012). Dejean et al. (2011) experimentally demonstrated the decrease in detection ability of eDNA in freshwater, with detection possible up unto approximately 30 days under their controlled conditions.

6.1.5 Techniques for eDNA extraction

Compared to tissue sampling, successfully retrieving viable nucleic acids dissolved at low concentrations in water presents challenges. Two techniques are currently available to achieve this: filtration and precipitation. Filtration by vacuum can pass large volumes of water though a micropore filter (0.5–1.5 µm), before extractions are carried out on the filter material (Goldberg et al., 2011; Jerde et al., 2011). Alternatively, dissolved DNA can be precipitated out of water directly by adding an ethanol and sodium acetate solution before centrifugation at high speeds to concentrate the DNA (Ficetola et al., 2008; Minamoto et al., 2012). Although filtration is unlikely to recover DNA as efficiently as precipitation, due to the limitations in the volumes that can be centrifuged, filtration remains the primary option where very low concentrations of eDNA are expected, and water sample volumes are required to be measured in litres rather than millilitres (Thomsen et al., 2012).
6.1.6 Objectives

The primary objective of this study is to create a proof-of-concept for the amplification and subsequent identification of ornamental fishes using eDNA in aquarium water. Secondly, a standardised protocol will be outlined to further develop the method to encompass more species. The sliding window method of marker evaluation and design will be assessed, and technical aspects of eDNA detection will also be tested, particularly in reference to relaxing some of the published requirements in terms of water volume and PCR repetition.

6.2 Materials and methods

6.2.1 Fish husbandry

To test a mini-barcode eDNA approach, experimental fishes were maintained in stock aquariums. Fishes chosen were the hybrids of *Danio rerio* and *D. aff. kyathit*, as bred in Chapter 5. They are maternally *D. rerio* and have the mitochondrial DNA of this species (haplotype of RC0067, BOLD process ID RCYY001-10), and are from here on referred to as *D. rerio*. The experimental fishes were kept in 50 cm × 25 cm × 25 cm aquariums (~30 litre). Tanks were individually filtered with an EHEIM internal power filter, and supplementary aeration was provided via an airstone. Tank decoration comprised either a bare or inert sand substrate, along with Java moss (*Taxiphyllum barbieri*). Fishes were fed twice daily with proprietary flake food (TETRA brand). Temperature was ambient lab temperature at approximately 18–24°C). A 75% water change was carried out weekly with untreated tapwater at approximately tank temperature; Lincoln University tapwater is not chlorinated.

6.2.2 Primer design using sliding windows

The COI DNA barcode reference library as generated in Chapter 2 was chosen as the base for mining a short length *Danio rerio* specific marker\(^1\). The alignment of COI sequences for all *Danio* species was analysed for suitable mini-barcodes using the *slideAnalyses* (sliding window) function of the DNA barcoding package SPIDER (Brown et al., 2012). The sliding window function takes a fixed length section of DNA (e.g. 100 bp), and from the first base, moves down the entire alignment at set

\(^1\)During initial tests, attempts were made to amplify full length DNA barcodes from water samples, but these proved unsuccessful (data not shown).
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intervals (e.g. every one or three bases). For each window, a series of calculations are made on the information content or discriminatory power. For this analysis the following measures were used: species monophyly, proportion of species with non-zero distances to nearest non-conspecifics (i.e. proportion of species that do not have identical sequence to a different species), mean K2P distance for all distance comparisons, and the number of diagnostic sites for each species, i.e. pure, simple characteristic attributes (Sarkar et al., 2008). The resulting plots can then be viewed, and primers designed using information from the output. Design of final primer pair is described in Results (Section 6.3.2).

6.2.3 Primer specificity

6.2.3.1 In vitro PCR

The in vitro analysis comprised testing for PCR amplification success of the mini-barcode primers against previously extracted tissue samples of all sampled Danio spp., plus representatives of closely related genera (e.g. Devario, Microrasbora, Microdevario). Tissue extractions had been stored in elution buffer at $-20^\circ$C, and were between 18 and 38 months old (see Section 2.2.4.1 for protocol). A list of species is presented in Table 6.2; at least two specimens of each species were tested, comprising different haplotypes where possible. As a control for DNA degradation since extraction, full length DNA barcodes were also amplified in parallel on the same tissue extractions.

Optimised PCR reactions were carried out using a Veriti thermocycler (Applied Biosystems) in 10 µl reactions with the following reagents: 2.5 µl ultrapure water; 5.0 µl GoTaq Green Master Mix (Promega); 1.0 µl forward and reverse primer (2.0 µM)$^2$; and 0.5 µl DNA template. The primer pair used for the mini-barcode amplicon are presented in Section 6.3.2. Primers used to amplify the full DNA barcode were either LCO1490A and HCO2198A (Tang et al., 2010), or FishF1 and FishR1 (Ward et al., 2005). A negative (water) and positive (D. rerio template) PCR control was also used for both the mini and full barcode amplification reactions. Thermocycler settings for the mini-barcode reaction comprised: 2 min at 94.0$^\circ$C; 35 cycles of 15 s at 94.0$^\circ$C, 30 s at 61.0$^\circ$C and 30 s at 72.0$^\circ$C; 7 min at 72.0$^\circ$C; $\infty$ at 4.0$^\circ$C. Thermocycler settings for the full barcode comprised: 2 min at 94.0$^\circ$C; 35 cycles of 15 s at 94.0$^\circ$C, 30 s at 48–52$^\circ$C and 45 s at 72.0$^\circ$C; 7 min at 72.0$^\circ$C; $\infty$ at 4.0$^\circ$C.

$^2$Final concentration of each primer 0.2 µM.
PCR products were visualised over ultraviolet light on a 4% agarose gel, stained with RedSafe (CHEM BIO), according to the manufacturer’s protocol. Electrophoresis was run for 15 min (170 V, 50 mA) in a sodium hydroxide and borate buffer (pH 8.5); 6 µl of PCR product was added directly to the well.

6.2.3.2 *In silico* PCR

To test if organisms other than the immediately related ones (i.e. those tested in the *in vitro* experiment) are likely to amplify with the mini-barcode primers, an *in silico* search was made using the program MFE PRIMER (Qu *et al.*, 2009). MFE PRIMER is able to evaluate the “specificity of PCR primers based on multiple factors, including sequence similarity, stability at the 3’ end of the primer, melting temperature, GC content and number of binding sites between the primer and DNA templates” (Qu *et al.*, 2009). All COI sequences were downloaded from the GenBank nucleotide database (date: 02/02/2012), under the search term “COI” (total 810,305 sequences). A local installation of MFE PRIMER was run under both default settings (word size 11, and *e* value 1,000), and more stringent settings (word size 7, and *e* value 10,000).

Primer specificity was also tested against a larger set of published data in GenBank (i.e. targets other than COI, as well as COI), using the PRIMER-BLAST tool available online at http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/tools/primer-blast/ (Altschul *et al.*, 1990; Rozen & Skaletsky, 2000). Template DNA was entered as the target *Danio rerio* sequence, and primers used were as presented in Table 6.1. The reference database selected was set to “nr” (all nucleotide records in GenBank), misprimed product size deviation was set to 100 bp to minimise hits on products that will be identifiable by significant length variation, and all other settings remained as default. Total allowed mismatches with at least one primer were set from between one to nine.

6.2.4 eDNA detection

6.2.4.1 Experimental treatments

Environmental DNA experiments were carried out in 20 litre containers, each with an airstone—from a single air pump supply—to ensure animal welfare during the experiments. Water used for each experiment was tapwater at the same temperature as the stock aquariums. Fishes were caught from the stock tanks with a sterilised net, and transferred to the container minimising dripping water. Fish were left in
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the container overnight in a dark room for 16 hours. The air pump was turned off 10 minutes prior to the collection of water, to allow any detritus to settle. When water was collected, the fish remained in the water; samples were collected from the surface in clean, 50 ml Falcon tubes.

Two density treatments were used: (A) a single fish in four litres of water (∼0.24 g fish per litre); and (B) a single fish in 12 litres of water (∼0.08 g fish per litre). Each treatment was repeated four times in sets of four and included one negative control container on each occasion (total 12 repetitions with fish, and four without fish); i.e. for every three replicates, each container was in turn used as a negative control (no fish added). Average fish mass was estimated by placing 25 fish in a water-filled beaker on a zeroed digital balance, and a mean taken (0.95 g). The experiment otherwise proceeded as outlined below.

All equipment was sterilised after each experiment for a minimum of three hours with 1.25% sodium hypochlorite solution (one part 5% bleach solution to three parts water) (Champlot et al., 2010; Kemp & Smith, 2005). As both fishes and DNA molecules are sensitive to chlorine (Brungs, 1973; Champlot et al., 2010; Kemp & Smith, 2005), after rinsing with freshwater three times, any remaining chlorine was neutralised with Seachem Prime at quadruple the recommended dosage (to account for the increased chlorine content of the diluted bleach solution). Containers were rinsed again with tap water.

Three 15 ml water samples were taken from each container, and immediately added to a premixed Falcon tube containing 33 ml of pure ethanol and 1.5 ml of 3 M sodium acetate (pH 5.2) at −20°C following Valiere & Taberlet (2000), and Ficetola et al. (2008). They were incubated at −20°C overnight, and then centrifuged for 1 hour at 10,000 × g and 6°C in an Eppendorf 5810R centrifuge (cf. Minamoto et al., 2012). The supernatant was then poured off and the tube placed horizontally to air dry for approximately three hours at room temperature. The DNA pellet was then subjected to a spin column extraction using the Quick-gDNA spin-column kit (Zymo Research Corporation). The Genomic Lysis Buffer (250 µl) was added directly to the Falcon tube, vortexed for 20 seconds and then the three samples from each fish container were pooled into a single spin column. The extraction followed the manufacturer’s protocol, but was scaled to use a 50% volume of pre-elution reagents. Fish experiments and DNA extractions were carried out in dedicated rooms, free of PCR product contamination. An outline of experimental procedure for a single replication of water sampling from one container is shown in Figure 6.1.
PCR protocols remained as for the specificity experiment (Section 6.2.3.1), but the number of thermocycles was increased to 45, and the proportion of some reagents was changed: 1.0 µl DNA template, 1.5 µl of forward and reverse primer, and 1.0 µl ultrapure water. Again, a negative (water) and positive (eDNA extraction template of *D. rerio*) PCR control was used. Following the multi-tubes approach (Taberlet *et al.*, 1996), to reduce stochastic variation in amplification success from low DNA concentrations (i.e. that a failure to amplify is not due to chance), three PCRs were carried out on each of the DNA extractions from the pooled samples (Jerde *et al.*, 2011). Gel electrophoresis was carried out as above. A positive identification comprised a single band at the expected length (∼100 bp) in at least one of the three PCRs for each extraction. From both of the two density treatments, four positive PCR

3Final concentration of each primer 0.3µM.
products were chosen at random to be bidirectionally Sanger sequenced (protocol as Section 2.2.4.2).

6.2.4.2 Operational testing

To test the technique in an operational, biosecurity context, water samples from a shipment of the target species (*Danio rerio*) were taken at a MAF Biosecurity New Zealand transitional (quarantine) facility. The fishes were identified visually by officials, and six 15 ml water samples were taken from the shipment bag. Two replicates were carried out, using as above, $3 \times 15$ ml shipment water per sample (plus a negative extraction control). DNA precipitation, extraction and PCR procedures were also as outlined above, but the DNA precipitation and extraction steps were performed at a separate laboratory to the PCR stage. From the resulting PCRs, a single random product was Sanger sequenced (protocol as Section 2.2.4.2).

6.2.4.3 Relaxed protocol

A further experiment was carried out to test whether these published protocols could be relaxed, and DNA recovered in less time using smaller volumes of reagents, fewer tubes, fewer PCRs, and more portable equipment. The protocol outline above was scaled down into a 1.7 ml EPPENDORF tube, containing 1,000 µl ethanol, 454.5 µl tank water and 45.5 µl of sodium acetate. Samples were incubated at $-20^\circ$C for only one hour, and centrifuged (10,000 $\times$ g) at room temperature on a bench-top EPPENDORF centrifuge (5415D). Water was taken from the *Danio* stock aquarium, with a density of 30 fish in 30 litres of water. DNA extractions and PCR reactions were performed as above, and carried out for both pooled samples (three water samples resulted in one DNA extraction) and not-pooled samples (one water sample resulted in one DNA extraction). The not-pooled experiment was repeated 12 times, with four negative controls from a biologically mature aquarium (fishes, plants, algae, molluscs etc), without the target *Danio* species. The pooled experiment was carried out five times with two of the same negative controls. Three PCR reactions were carried out on each extraction to test if a single PCR would be reliable.
6.3 Results

6.3.1 Sliding window analysis

When the sliding window was set to 100 bp, there was considerable variation in the information content across the COI barcode marker for the Danio species analysed (Figure 6.2). Mean genetic K2P distance varied from 7.9% to 18.1% through the windows. The proportion of species with a non-conspecific nearest-neighbour distance of zero varied from 5.5% to 22.0%. The proportion of monophyletic species varied between 47.4% and 73.7%. The optimum window, in terms of information content, started at base pair 531, where the proportion of monophyletic species was maximised, and the proportion of zero non-conspecific nearest-neighbour distances was minimised.

Information content does not, however, always equal suitable priming sites for species specific markers. Assessment of diagnostic nucleotides for Danio rerio shows that no species specific nucleotides are present in any windows past 300 bp, despite the higher information content and species discrimination power of that region (Figure 6.3). The highest frequency of diagnostic nucleotides is within the first 100 bases of the barcode marker. Primer design was therefore targeted in this area.

6.3.2 Primer design

Primers for the Danio rerio specific eDNA fragment were named eDR3fwd and eDR3rev, and are presented in Table 6.1. Primers were designed manually, and checked for Tm (melting temperature) and GC base content using PRIMER3 with default parameters (Rozen & Skaletsky, 2000). The amplicon comprised a total of 95 base pairs, and starts at position 6,456 through position 6,551 of the Danio rerio mitochondrial genome (Broughton et al., 2001).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primer name</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Primer sequence 5′–3′</th>
<th>Length (bp)</th>
<th>Tm (°C)</th>
<th>GC (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>eDR3fwd</td>
<td>Forward</td>
<td>ATCATAAAGACATTGGCACCCTG</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>62.28</td>
<td>43.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eDR3rev</td>
<td>Reverse</td>
<td>GCTAAGTTCAGCTCGATTAAG</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>57.52</td>
<td>45.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 6.2. Three measures of mini-barcode discriminatory power (mean genetic distance, distance to nearest non-conspecific neighbour, and species monophyly) for a 100 base pair sliding window across the COI barcode marker for the genus *Danio*. Red line illustrates best window for discrimination at position 531.
6.3.3 Primer specificity

The in silico tests of primer specificity using the MFEPRIMER program under default settings made three matches from the local COI database that could potentially produce a PCR product; all three of these were from the target species Danio rerio. Under the more stringent settings, two additional matches were found; these were from a South American bird (Jacamerops aureus), and a bacterium (Bacillus pseudofirmus). The latter was a bacterial genome sequence that satisfied the “COI” search term, but had a PCR product length of 2,304 bp.

The test of specificity using PRIMER-BLAST showed the number of species hits increased as more mismatches were permitted to unintended targets (Figure 6.4). For specified mismatches of no less than four, two of the 129 BLAST hits did not have a mismatch on the terminal 3' base of either of the primers. This number increased to three for mismatches greater than five. These three species comprised a salamander (Batrachuperus pinchonii), and two birds (Orthotomus sutorius and Tolmomyias assimilis).

For in vitro tests of primer specificity, full length DNA barcodes were amplified from all 46 specimens tested from 25 Danio and closely related species (Table 6.2). The mini-barcode eDNA primers amplified three individuals tested (RC0679, RC0067 and RC0394). These all corresponded to specimens identified as either D. rerio or D.
6.3. RESULTS

Figure 6.4. Primer-BLAST results for eDR3 Danio rerio specific primers according to 1–9 specified mismatches within each of the primer pairs. Only hits from unintended (non-rerio) targets are shown.

cf. rerio (= D. rerio). No species other than D. rerio were amplified. Figure 6.5 shows an example agarose gel, with only D. rerio being amplified.

6.3.4 eDNA detection

6.3.4.1 Experimental treatments

For density treatment A (single fish in four litres of water) a total of 48 PCRs were carried out, with three PCR reactions for each replicate (container with/without fish); 12 PCRs were the negative experimental control (no fish in container). All PCR reactions (three per replicate) were positive for Danio rerio (amplicon present of expected length). None of the negative experimental controls showed a band of expected length. Both the positive and negative PCR controls were positive and negative respectively. Results for density treatment B (single fish in twelve litres of water) were identical to treatment one. The subsample of four PCR products for
Table 6.2. PCR specificity reported for 46 specimens of 25 species from the genus *Danio* and other closely related taxa.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species Code</th>
<th>Process ID Barcode PCR</th>
<th>eDNA PCR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chela dadyburjori</td>
<td>RC0333 RCY262-11</td>
<td>✓ –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danio aesculapii</td>
<td>RC0111 RCY082-11</td>
<td>✓ –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danio aesculapii</td>
<td>RC0706 RCY518-11</td>
<td>✓ –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danio aff. choprae</td>
<td>RC0523 RCY376-11</td>
<td>✓ –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danio aff. choprae</td>
<td>RC0525 RCY378-11</td>
<td>✓ –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danio aff. dangila</td>
<td>RC0564 RCY409-11</td>
<td>✓ –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danio aff. dangila</td>
<td>RC0561 RCY406-11</td>
<td>✓ –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danio aff. kyathit</td>
<td>RC0065 RCY049-11</td>
<td>✓ –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danio aff. kyathit</td>
<td>RC0121 RCY092-11</td>
<td>✓ –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danio albolineatus</td>
<td>RC0076 RCY105-11</td>
<td>✓ –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danio albolineatus</td>
<td>RC0445 RCY327-11</td>
<td>✓ –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danio cf. dangila</td>
<td>RC0343 RCY272-11</td>
<td>✓ –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danio cf. kerri</td>
<td>RC0267 RCY224-11</td>
<td>✓ –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danio cf. kerri</td>
<td>RC0270 RCY227-11</td>
<td>✓ –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danio cf. rerio</td>
<td>RC0679 RCY501-11</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danio choprae</td>
<td>RC0060 RCY045-11</td>
<td>✓ –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danio choprae</td>
<td>RC0164 RCY129-11</td>
<td>✓ –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danio choprae</td>
<td>RC0446 RCY328-11</td>
<td>✓ –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danio dangila</td>
<td>RC0123 RCY094-11</td>
<td>✓ –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danio dangila</td>
<td>RC0345 RCY274-11</td>
<td>✓ –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danio erythromicron</td>
<td>RC0599 RCY433-11</td>
<td>✓ –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danio erythromicron</td>
<td>RC0705 RCY517-11</td>
<td>✓ –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danio feegradei</td>
<td>RC0246 RCY204-11</td>
<td>✓ –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danio feegradei</td>
<td>RC0249 RCY207-11</td>
<td>✓ –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danio kyathit</td>
<td>RC0090 RCY066-11</td>
<td>✓ –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danio kyathit</td>
<td>RC0129 RCY098-11</td>
<td>✓ –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danio margaritatus</td>
<td>RC0107 RCY081-11</td>
<td>✓ –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danio margaritatus</td>
<td>RC0139 RCY108-11</td>
<td>✓ –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danio meghalayensis</td>
<td>RC0567 RCY412-11</td>
<td>✓ –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danio meghalayensis</td>
<td>RC0568 RCY413-11</td>
<td>✓ –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danio nigrofasciatus</td>
<td>RC0081 RCY060-11</td>
<td>✓ –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danio nigrofasciatus</td>
<td>RC0242 RCY200-11</td>
<td>✓ –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danio rerio</td>
<td>RC0067 RCY001-10</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danio rerio</td>
<td>RC0394 RCY315-11</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danio roseus</td>
<td>RC0126 RCY095-11</td>
<td>✓ –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danio roseus</td>
<td>RC0547 RCY396-11</td>
<td>✓ –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danio sp. “hikari”</td>
<td>RC0264 RCY221-11</td>
<td>✓ –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danio sp. “hikari”</td>
<td>RC0266 RCY223-11</td>
<td>✓ –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danio tinwini</td>
<td>RC0062 RCY046-11</td>
<td>✓ –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danio tinwini</td>
<td>RC0158 RCY123-11</td>
<td>✓ –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devario malabaricus</td>
<td>RC0462 RCY333-11</td>
<td>✓ –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devario sondhii</td>
<td>RC0113 RCY084-11</td>
<td>✓ –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devario sp. “giraffe”</td>
<td>RC0687 RCY508-11</td>
<td>✓ –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esomus metallicus</td>
<td>RC0655 RCY478-11</td>
<td>✓ –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microdevario kubotai</td>
<td>RC0492 RCY354-11</td>
<td>✓ –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microrasbora rubescens</td>
<td>RC0662 RCY485-11</td>
<td>✓ –</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: ✓ = successful PCR amplification (band of expected length apparent).
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Figure 6.5. A 4% agarose gel showing *Danio rerio* specificity of the eDR3 primers. Top lanes four and seven are tissue extractions of *D. rerio*, and were amplified successfully using the mini-barcode envDR3 primer pair; no other *Danio* species amplified. Bottom lanes are successful PCRs for the same tissue extractions using the full DNA barcode region: primer pair LCO1490A and HCO2198A (Tang *et al.*, 2010). Lane eight was the negative PCR control. Strongest band in the DNA ladder is at 50 bp, while the longest band is at 300 bp.

which sequences were obtained showed clean chromatograms identical to the *D. rerio* mitochondrial genome (NC_002333).

6.3.4.2 Operational testing

The two sets of water samples taken from a shipment bag of *Danio rerio* at the quarantine facility both tested positive for this species in all six PCR reactions. The sequenced PCR product was, again, unambiguously *D. rerio*. The extraction and PCR controls were both negative.

6.3.4.3 Relaxed protocol

For the experiments where protocols were relaxed, three PCRs were also carried out for each replicate. For the experiment where extractions were not pooled, of the 12 replicates, three were positive for a minimum of one PCR reaction out of the three. For the five replicates of the pooled extractions, all five were positive for at least one PCR out of three.
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Figure 6.6. A 4% agarose gel showing a single experiment for treatment A (one fish in four litres of water). In the top row of lanes, three PCR reactions were carried out on each of the four containers, and show a positive PCR result of a clean amplicon at the expected length (95 bp) for containers with fish (lanes 1–9). Lanes 10–12 are negative experimental control with no fish present in the container. The bottom row of lanes show a positive PCR control in lane 1 and a negative PCR control in lane 2. Strongest band in the DNA ladder is at 50 bp. The longest band in DNA ladder is at 300 bp.

6.4 Discussion

6.4.1 Primer design and specificity

The sliding window analysis was found to be a useful tool in identifying target regions of DNA alignments for the development of species specific primers. The primers designed here were specific to the target for all in vitro PCR reactions of closely related species, and the positive tissue-sample controls showed that stored DNA extractions had not deteriorated below a point where a standard DNA barcode could be amplified. As measured by the in silico experiment using both MFEPRIMER and PRIMER-BLAST, there appears to be a low likelihood of non-target amplification, with a small number of hits for well corresponding sequences. As stringency of the PRIMER-BLAST parameters was relaxed, however, the number of potential misamplifications increased, but almost all of these had terminal 3' mismatches. Of course, this conclusion is entirely dependent on the breadth of sequence data present in GenBank, and bias here cannot therefore be entirely avoided.
6.4. DISCUSSION

6.4.2 eDNA detection and sources of error

In both experimental and operational experiments, it has been shown that eDNA can be extracted from aquarium water samples of varying fish densities, and be reliably used to detect the presence of the target species. These densities correspond to those well below the densities at which fishes are typically exported; amplification was successful at fish densities of both 0.08 g/L and 0.24 g/L, while an import of large danios could be up to 40 g/L (300 fish in seven litres water Cole et al., 1999). The technique could therefore be sufficiently sensitive to detect single specimens within mixed shipments.

Due to the sensitive nature of PCR reactions using large numbers of cycles, eDNA monitoring for biosecurity will require a rigorous assay design to ensure confidence in the results (Darling & Mahon, 2011; Willerslev & Cooper, 2005). Tests must be robust to errors, and these errors need to be well understood if the method is to be endorsed for use in management situations where there are political, financial, and legal stakes (Darling & Mahon, 2011). It is also important to distinguish between false positive and false negative errors caused by either the process or the method used (see Fig. 1 of Darling & Mahon, 2011).

Assuming a null hypothesis \( H_0 \) of the target species not being present, a false positive (type I) error will erroneously indicate presence where there is none. A false negative (type II) error will erroneously offer a test result of not present when the species is in fact present. There are trade-offs to be made between the different types of error, and the degree of false positive errors may be a result of the sensitivity of the test and a lack of specificity in the primers. Early detection and monitoring of threats is generally regarded as more cost effective than management of organisms post-invasion (Finnoff et al., 2007; Leung et al., 2002), despite the potential of increased false positives when using sensitive eDNA technologies (Darling & Mahon, 2011). Therefore, the ornamental fish quarantine stage should be regarded as a first line of defence, and certainly false negative results are considered more serious than false positives in terms of potential risk. However, excessive false positives may erode relationships with the aquarium trade.

6.4.2.1 False positive error

There are multiple sources of false positive errors. The most serious of these is perhaps laboratory contamination. Negative controls need to be carried at a high ratio to that of the tests; for ancient DNA (aDNA) work, it is recommended there be
a 1:5 ratio for DNA extractions, and a 1:1 ratio for PCR, due to the irregularity in
detecting low level background contamination (Willerslev & Cooper, 2005). Results
should always be repeated, lab surfaces and equipment kept decontaminated, and
positive controls should also be avoided or used with care (Willerslev & Cooper,
2005). Probe design is also important in preventing false positives through non-target
amplification. This can be overcome to some degree by the routine sequencing of
PCR products, which would confirm any non-specific priming problems. This should
be carried for around 5% of the samples (Darling & Mahon, 2011). In silico methods
can also be used, as they have here, to assess the likelihood of primers exhibiting
this behaviour (Ficetola et al., 2010; Qu et al., 2009).

A sensitive protocol may also detect the presence of target DNA in water when
the target organisms are no longer present. This may well occur with imports of
aquarium species, as the shipping water may have derived from a source containing
target DNA, but the species shipped is a different one. DNA may persist in these
kind of environments for up to 30 days (Dejean et al., 2011), so differentiating
these two scenarios is important, and while it may appear a problem, is perhaps
also a considerable benefit for biosecurity. Knowing whether a shipment has been
associated with water from a high risk species would be quite useful in terms of
disease risk management. A quantification approach to compare densities of eDNA
could be carried out by using either a meta-barcoding approach on for example
a 454 pyrosequencing platform, or by using qPCR to allow quantification of DNA
concentrations against a fixed standards.

6.4.2.2 False negative error

False negative results may occur when organisms are present in the water, but no
eDNA is detected. This may be due to the method being insufficiently sensitive at that
centration of DNA, but improvements in assay sensitivity can be made by further
optimising the extraction and PCR techniques (see Rohland & Hofreiter, 2007).
Further work could be carried out in evaluating how environmental conditions of the
water samples may affect degradation rate of the eDNA at varying concentrations.
PCR inhibitors may also be present in the sample, and this could theoretically be
possible for densely packed aquarium fish shipments, which may contain metabolites
released by the fish in transit, or chemical additives used by fish exporters to remove
these metabolites (Cole et al., 1999).
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6.4.3 Relaxing protocols

Because eDNA protocols typically require an intensive laboratory procedure, involving time, repetition, and large quantities of reagents, it may be difficult to incorporate into a routine and fast method for biosecurity. Therefore, it was tested whether protocols could be relaxed, both in terms of time, and the volumes of water and reagents required. It was found that when the protocol was scaled into a 1.7 ml Eppendorf tube with a water sample of 454.5 ml, DNA could be repeatedly isolated from a moderate fish density (0.95 g/L), but only when three samples were pooled. When samples were not pooled, but extracted individually, the likelihood of a successful PCR amplification was lower due to stochastic effects at reduced DNA template concentrations (Willerslev & Cooper, 2005). Repeating the PCR up to nine times did frequently, however, increase the chance of a detection (data not shown), but this perhaps defeats the purpose of a relaxed protocol. When densities of fish are expected to be high, a scaled-down protocol can potentially be incorporated as part of a high throughput routine surveillance system. However, it must be noted that with such an approach, the risk of false negative results is likely to increase due to the likelihood of not recovering sufficient quantities of eDNA from the water.

6.5 Summary

The results here support the usefulness of eDNA as a biosecurity tool for ornamental fishes, and represents a framework for developing the procedure further. The availability of large volumes of COI data from databases such as BOLD, for example, can allow mining of useful new markers for single species or groups of species. As part of the standardised DNA barcode system, these mini-barcodes remain compatible with the voucher specimens and supplementary data associated with those records, adding confidence to identifications. Environmental DNA surveys offer advantages over traditional techniques such as visual examination and barcoding from tissue samples, as they are non-destructive and potentially more sensitive at low population densities of target organisms. Refinement and up-scaling of the method opens up prospects for long term monitoring of entire quarantine facilities or ornamental fish retailers using either meta-barcoding technologies, or mini-barcode microarray systems (Andersen et al., 2012; Hajibabaei et al., 2007).
Chapter 7
Summary and conclusions

Despite the challenge of getting accurate identifications for many of the species collected here, a large database of demonstrably identified fishes and associated barcodes was assembled. For biosecurity applications, relying upon the names provided by aquarium fish suppliers is likely to be highly inaccurate, and therefore DNA barcoding represents not only a defensible approach, but a significant move forward in providing identification tools for aquarium species in biosecurity situations.

For the small percentage of cases where DNA barcodes fail to offer unambiguous identifications, additional data such as Web-based images of live specimens, morphological characters, and nuclear loci can be called upon to resolve these problematic specimens. Benefits from barcoding extend beyond a simple quarantine tool, and provide a basis for the generation of accurate and consistent trade statistics, allowing auditing, record keeping and harmonisation between jurisdictions and agencies (Gerson et al., 2008). Benefits within the ornamental fish industry are also apparent, with accurately identified livestock providing a value added product suitable for export in compliance with international certification or legal standards (Ploeg et al., 2009). Any country vulnerable to aquatic invasions of ornamental species can benefit, with barcode databases offering free and instant access to information. Additional benefits to conservation efforts arise in documenting the ornamental pet trade, with examples such as stock management, traceability, and effective regulation/enforcement of endangered and CITES controlled species (Steinke et al., 2009b).

Development of operational databases such as BOLD rely on solid taxonomic foundations (Dincă et al., 2011; Meyer & Paulay, 2005; Padial et al., 2010), and it is important to note that for identification purposes, molecular data do not circumvent morphology, but merely standardise its application via taxonomic assignments (assuming agreement between morphological and DNA data). In situations where current taxonomy is inadequate, studies such as these support taxonomy in generating new hypotheses as well as adding a suite of fine-scale characters and lab protocols, easily accessible via the Web (Padial et al., 2010). Nuclear data are especially valuable in providing support to the conclusions made from COI data.
(Chapter 5; Clare, 2011; Dasmahapatra et al., 2010), can assist in distinguishing hybrids (Chapter 5), and can also be used in species delimitation efforts and interim parataxonomy for diverse complexes of closely-related cryptic-species important in biosecurity (Boykin et al., 2012).

Although the success of DNA barcoding for practical applications depends most importantly upon the accuracy in taxonomic determination of voucher specimens, analytical/bioinformatic methods used to provide the subsequent molecular identifications will also impact how effective the reference libraries can be. A selection of identification criteria were tested in Chapter 3, and success rates were found to differ among methods, sometimes considerably. The “best close match” (BCM) method was justified to be the best when reference libraries are incomplete (as is commonly the case, especially with ornamental fishes). The structure and composition of the reference library was also found to affect identification success, with data from the GenBank repository providing useful extra information, but also a large number of unidentifiable singleton species. In Chapter 4 it was found that the K2P model is not well supported as an evolutionary model in DNA barcode datasets, but misspecification of nucleotide substitution models in estimating genetic distances had little effect on overall rates of specimen identification. These are important findings in terms of understanding appropriate applications and limitations of DNA barcoding in biosecurity.

As demonstrated in Chapter 6, DNA barcode databases can also be used as a data source for developing new techniques in biosecurity. Diagnostic methods are no longer limited to destructively sampling quarantined organisms, or even to the contemporary presence of an organism. Using targeted probes to detect extracellular environmental DNA, high risk species can be detected during routine surveillance of water associated with ornamental fish imports.

Despite the advances and advantages outlined above for using DNA barcodes for biosecurity, challenges remain in being able to make full and confident use of barcode reference libraries. These are outlined below, and are discussed in terms of database management, data analysis, and use within an operational environment.
7.1 Challenges for DNA barcode databases

7.1.1 Incomplete information

Of the main challenges to real-world use of DNA barcoding are the composite problems of incomplete information and conflicting information. It has been shown that where DNA barcode libraries are complete, then the barcodes generally perform well for identification (Chapter 3; Ekrem et al., 2007). Problems occur where queries are not matched with a conspecific in the database (the singleton problem). Here a operator would need to decide if the degree of match will place it with a represented or unrepresented species. In the short term, optimised distance thresholds can be used to determine intra- versus interspecific variation, but more sophisticated techniques such as those using fuzzy-set-theory, for example, should eventually be adopted (e.g. Zhang et al., 2012). Ultimately, however, the most effective approach is to actually sample these missing species (Ekrem et al., 2007).

Unfortunately, the ability to build upon current reference libraries is significantly hampered due to difficulties in accessing specimens, and for the species that are available, problems exist in accessing taxonomic literature for their accurate identification (Section 2.4.1; Monbiot, 2011; Taylor, 2012). Despite the ongoing digitisation efforts of organisations such as the Biodiversity Heritage Library, many of the required publications are hidden in obscure, old journals, or the modern treatments are published in highly specialised journals that few institutional libraries have electronic or even hard-copy access to. Ornamental fishes have a range almost throughout the world’s tropics and subtropics, so informative literature can rarely be obtained from a single museum library. As outlined in Chapter 2, considerable effort was undertaken here to obtain scientific literature for cyprinid fishes. Given these problems, the prospects for an organisation such as MAFFNZ to be able to extend this barcoding approach to all ornamental taxa exported to New Zealand are poor. DNA barcoding, is however, a global effort, and other laboratories together with initiatives such as FISH-BOL may be able to take up a lot of this slack (but see below). Unfortunately, freshwater fishes in Africa, Asia, and South America have been very poorly sampled by FISH-BOL (Becker et al., 2011), but these are precisely the regions where aquarium fishes are derived.

1It is important here to note an obvious point: the problem of accessing taxonomic literature may prove an equally significant problem for any biosecurity agency wishing to identify fishes using morphological or visual methods.
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7.1.2 Conflicts due to misidentifications

Of the most serious limitations to barcoding as an applied resource for regulation and molecular diagnostics, is not necessarily biological problems associated with mitochondrial DNA (e.g. numts, heteroplasmy, symbionts, introgression, paraphyly), but rather human error and uncertainty in creating and curating reference libraries. Becker et al. (2011) identify this as the primary source of error in FISH-BOL data. Conflicting identifications can be made when multiple labs are working on the same taxa, and in the process of their morphological identifications are ascribing different taxonomic names to the same species. As a case in point, any biosecurity official wanting to identify tissue from a *Danio rerio* sample—this species comes in a multitude of selectively bred phenotypes under many different trade names—will be unable to, using the current BOLD system. The problem here is that when BOLD 3.0 is queried using a default database search with a *D. rerio* sequence (28/01/12; URL: http://v3.boldsystems.org/index.php/IDS_OpenIdEngine), the system reports that “A species level match could not be made, the queried specimen is likely to be one of the following: *Danio rerio*, *Danio cf. rerio*, *Danio sp.*, *Brachydanio froskei*, *Brachydanio rerio*.”. Given that as a model organism, and of all 40,000+ fish species, *D. rerio* is arguably the one most studied scientifically, this is perhaps surprising and worrying. So, based on this information, an operator would have to make the decision of either destroying the shipment, or taking the time to attempt to resolve the ambiguity, thereby defeating the point of a fast, universal, and reliable identification system.

Overall, prospects for a universal identification system do not appear to be any better. In an analysis of the BINs (Barcode Index Numbers)—BOLD’s as yet unpublished interim taxonomic and identification system—for the sequences generated in this work (BOLD project RCYY), a total of 54 BINs contain data from other, external projects (13/02/12; URL: http://v3.boldsystems.org/). Of this total, 19 (35%) contain more than one species name, and BOLD would be therefore unable, again, to offer a species level identification. Most of these discrepancies appear to be misidentifications, and indicates the severity of the potential problem. It is important to note, again, that because many records remain in private BOLD projects, the conflicting data described above were not available for direct comparison in this study. Therefore, the relatively few conflicts observed between the data partitions in Chapter 2 and Chapter 3, may be misleading.

There are currently few safeguards against a BOLD contributor misidentifying a specimen, and once a name has been added into a database, it may be difficult
for a third party to demonstrate that it should be changed. An important asset to the standardised barcoding protocol is the maintenance of records, supporting information, and importantly vouchers—this is what sets BOLD apart from GenBank (Ratnasingham & Hebert, 2007). A new feature of BOLD 3.0 is a wiki-like framework for community based annotation of barcode data (Ratnasingham & Hebert, 2011). However, pre-emptive solutions are perhaps a better use of time. To this effect, a system of identification confidence has been proposed, which rates identifications according to the degree of expertise and effort made in their generation (Steinke & Hanner, 2011). This will encourage data managers to be increasingly diligent about how identifications are generated and justified. The importance of accurate identification is obvious (Bortolus, 2008), and providing a bibliography of reference material and morphological characters used for identification should be mandatory for publication; these additional data may be extremely valuable in correcting mistakes without recourse to the effort of loaning and re-examining voucher material.

An extension of this would be to question whether the identifications made in this study are correct? This is an important question regarding the reliability of using the library created here as an operational barcoding tool, and should certainly be tested empirically in collaboration with independent, expert taxonomic specialists.

7.2 Challenges for DNA barcode analyses

Despite the broad benefits that DNA barcoding can bring to non-systematic endeavours such as food product regulation, conservation, and investigating species interactions, many of the principles inherent to DNA barcoding are based on those of systematic biology; it is here that shortcomings of the experimental design and analytical procedures inherent in some of the DNA barcoding literature are apparent. Most of these concerns have been raised previously in the literature (see references below), but should nevertheless be reiterated due to the repercussions of biosecurity decisions, and the possibility of DNA barcode data becoming admissible evidence in wildlife crime cases (Alacs et al., 2010; Linacre & Tobe, 2011).

The main concern is over the goal of DNA barcoding (DeSalle, 2006; Goldstein & DeSalle, 2011; Moritz & Cicero, 2004; Rubinoff et al., 2006; Taylor & Harris, 2012). Here, it is acknowledged that DNA barcoding can comprise two distinct aims: (1) specimen identification, i.e. assigning taxonomic names to unknown specimens using a DNA reference library of morphologically pre-identified vouchers (Schindel &
Miller, 2005); and (2) species discovery, i.e. a triage tool for sorting new collections into species-like units (Schindel & Miller, 2005). These aims are uncontroversial, provided that they are clearly defined. However, several authors have raised repeated concerns regarding the blurring of these boundaries (e.g. DeSalle, 2006; DeSalle et al., 2005; Goldstein & DeSalle, 2011; Meier, 2008; Vogler & Monaghan, 2007), and it seems impossible to separate these objectives in many examples from the barcoding literature. This provides the basis for many of the criticisms outlined below.

7.2.1 The use of the term “species identification”

The term “species identification” is ubiquitous in the DNA barcoding literature, but this terminology is misleading, and reflects a long-standing confusion between the two sub-disciplines of DNA barcoding (specimen identification vs. species discovery; see above). Here, “species identification” is interpreted as shorthand for: identification of biological material—a specimen—to the level of species. However, it can also be seen in terms of identifying groups of species-like units, i.e. species discovery and delimitation (as used in Ferguson, 2002). One way to minimise this confusion and to clarify the distinct role of each of the two separate objectives, is to use the terms “specimen identification” or “species discovery” in place of “species identification”, as appropriate. This more objectively states what hypotheses are being tested, and better ensures that identification is not confused with delimitation. Both of these aims fall within the purview of DNA barcoding, but they should be clearly distinguished as they require different methodological and analytical approaches.

7.2.2 Failure to set clear hypotheses

Perhaps one of the most problematic areas in many barcoding studies is the lack of clearly stated, objective hypotheses. A “typical” barcoding study (e.g. “DNA barcoding the [insert taxon] of [insert geographic region]”) aims to: (1) assemble a reference library with specimens identified to species using morphological characters; (2) test how effective this library is for identification purposes; and then (3) explore previously unrecognised diversity apparent in the DNA barcodes. However, it is in regard to these three steps that there is often confusion in how hypotheses are generated and tested. Too frequently, objectives 2 and 3 are conflated, and methodological approaches do not appear to reflect these different goals (Goldstein
& DeSalle, 2011; Meier, 2008). Analytical techniques presented in many studies do not explicitly set out to test identification success (objective 2) by simulating a quantified identification scenario. Rather, they tend to employ the same method (usually a neighbour-joining tree) to test both objectives 2 and 3, and usually present a descriptive rather than analytical summary of the data. If the data collected are intended to be used as an identification tool, then they should be tested as such. Studies should define each objective more clearly in the methods section of the work, and explicitly separating the experimental procedures used to achieve each aim.

### 7.2.3 Inappropriate use of neighbour-joining trees

Almost all DNA barcoding studies present a neighbour-joining (NJ) tree, and perhaps as a graphical summary of the data can be considered appropriate (but see Goldstein & DeSalle, 2011). However, problems occur when NJ trees are presented as the sole analytical method, and when identification rates from the NJ trees are not quantified (Little & Stevenson, 2007). It has been well documented, both empirically and theoretically, that NJ trees perform poorly for specimen identification purposes (Little, 2011; Meier et al., 2006; Virgilio et al., 2010; Zhang et al., 2012). It is important to note at this point that problems with NJ trees are not resolved by using any other tree inference method such as maximum likelihood or parsimony. The problem is with relying on phylogeny—and specifically the strict monophyly of mtDNA lineages—as an identification criterion.

Few species concepts require reciprocal monophyly (Meier, 2008), and in any case, monophyly is often an unrealistic scenario in closely related groups (Funk & Omland, 2003; Zhang et al., 2012). Tree-based methods offer no assessment of possible group membership in the presence of incomplete taxon sampling (but see Ross et al., 2008), and frequently resolve closely related taxa incorrectly (Lowenstein et al., 2010). Furthermore, when conspecifics are not present in the reference library, tree-based methods are unable to provide the desired “no identification” result, and in the case of recently diverged paraphyletic species, will often result in ambiguous or incorrect identifications.

Despite the popularity and intuitiveness of NJ trees, identification success generally improves when using more accurate techniques, which are usually based directly on the genetic distance matrix. The single “best close match” method has been shown to be reliable, predictable, computationally tractable, and able to make identifications even in the presence of paraphyly (Chapter 3; Meier et al., 2006). Alternatively, many
other criteria are also available for measuring identification success (see Casiraghi
et al., 2010), and comparisons of performance between some of these have already
been made (Austerlitz et al., 2009; Little & Stevenson, 2007; Meier et al., 2006; Ross
et al., 2008; Virgilio et al., 2010; Zhang et al., 2012). It is important to note, however,
that a quantification of monophyly still remains a useful description of the data, and
should still be used in conjunction with other methods.

Ultimately, phenetic (similarity) methods using genetic distances may be re-
garded as something of a stop-gap solution. In the near future, the problem of
accurately assigning identifications is likely to be addressed by either likelihood-
based information-theoretic approaches, or machine learning and statistical tools,
such as supervised classification and pattern recognition (e.g. Austerlitz et al., 2009;
Zhang et al., 2008). A newly developed fuzzy-set-theory technique (Zhang et al.,
2012) appears promising, offering a group membership parameter that provides
additional information lacking in threshold-based implementations. Bayesian MCMC
coalescent methods promise similar advantages, but may be too computationally
inefficient in their current incarnations (Zhang et al., 2012).

In some cases, character-based methods using diagnostic nucleotide combinations
may be preferable (DeSalle, 2007), and this is particularly the case for small groups
of closely related taxa where similarity methods perform poorly (e.g. Lowenstein
et al., 2009). However, character based approaches such as those implemented in the
CAOS software (Sarkar et al., 2008), have yet to be fully characterised in terms of their
sensitivity to taxon sampling and homoplasy, and are therefore at present perhaps
limited to restricted cases (Kerr et al., 2009a). The use of discrete characters could
be seen in terms of “DNA barcoding 2.0”, potentially offering additional benefits after
sampling is extended beyond simply collecting baseline data.

7.2.4 Inappropriate use of bootstrap resampling

The use of bootstrap resampling in DNA barcoding studies typifies the confusion
between species discovery and specimen identification. When using DNA barcodes
for species discovery—a “molecular parataxonomy” process analogous to sorting
specimens into morphospecies (Brower, 2006)—it is required that there is a test
of distinctiveness. The bootstrap, along with reciprocal monophyly, is one method
among many that can be used to test whether groups (i.e. species-like clusters), are
well supported. Bootstrapping in this situation also helps address problems with NJ
trees such as taxon-order bias and tied trees (Lowenstein et al., 2009; Meier, 2008).
However, the use of bootstrapping for specimen identification is somewhat perplexing. The aim of DNA barcoding is to maximise congruence with \textit{a priori} defined species, \textit{viz.} the taxonomic names from a morphological identification process. A species with low bootstrap support does not falsify a species hypothesis when this assessment is based on independent data (i.e. morphology from the original description). In many cases, recently diverged sister species on short branches will have low support and therefore fail to be identified, even if they are morphologically distinct \textit{and} diagnosable by unique mutations (Lowenstein \textit{et al.}, 2009). Thus, using a bootstrap value as a cut-off for correct identification severely compromises the efficacy of a reference library (Chapter 3; Zhang \textit{et al.}, 2012), and exacerbates the previously outlined weaknesses of using tree-based methods in general. On top of this, bootstrap resampling does not make an assessment of the uncertainty in identification; an unknown can group with a taxon at 100% bootstrap support, and yet be an entirely different species. Perhaps a better way to measure uncertainty in identification is to calculate group membership probabilities (e.g. Zhang \textit{et al.}, 2012), and to make explicit “caveats in relation to the breath of sampling” (Moritz & Cicero, 2004).

\subsection*{7.2.5 Inappropriate use of fixed distance thresholds}

The use of distance thresholds has been extensively debated (Chapter 1; Puillandre \textit{et al.}, 2012; Virgilio \textit{et al.}, 2012; Zhang \textit{et al.}, 2012), but in the context of providing an overview of the challenges for DNA barcoding, the aim here is to re-emphasise these points already made. A threshold is essential when identifying specimens using genetic distance data; in the absence of complete sampling, distance thresholds aim to minimise misidentifications of unknowns that do not have conspecifics represented in the reference library (Virgilio \textit{et al.}, 2012). However, there is no \textit{a priori} reason to assume a universal threshold is applicable, as coalescent depths among species will vary considerably due to differences in population size, rate of mutation, and time since speciation (Monaghan \textit{et al.}, 2009).

A generic threshold such as 1\% is perhaps not an unreasonable heuristic in some cases (e.g. Chapter 3), but it can be considered arbitrary, and is likely to suffer from varying rates of false positive and false negative error, depending on the data. Rather than relying on prescribed cut-offs, optimised thresholds can be generated directly from the data itself (Meyer & Paulay, 2005; Virgilio \textit{et al.}, 2012). Computer programs or protocols are now available to calculate optimised thresholds, and for species
discovery, these can even be generated in the absence of taxonomic names (Brown et al., 2012; Puillandre et al., 2012; Virgilio et al., 2012).

### 7.2.6 Use of the K2P model

As outlined in Chapter 4, DNA barcoding studies use Kimura’s two-parameter substitution model (K2P) as the *de facto* standard for constructing genetic distance matrices. Distances generated under this model then provide the basis for most downstream analyses, but uncertainty in model choice is rarely explored and could potentially affect how reliably DNA barcodes discriminate species. This is an important question, as the K2P model is so widely used, and assumed to be correct.

Chapter 4 shows that the K2P is a poorly fitting model at the species level; it was never selected as the best model, and very rarely selected as a credible alternative model. Despite the lack of support for the K2P model, differences in distance between best model and K2P model estimates were usually minimal, and importantly, identification success rates were largely unaffected by model choice even when interspecific threshold values were reassessed. Although these conclusions may justify using the K2P model for specimen identification purposes, simpler metrics such as $p$ distance performed equally well, perhaps obviating the requirement for model correction in DNA barcoding. Conversely, when incorporating genetic distance data into taxonomic studies, a more thorough examination of model uncertainty is advocated.

### 7.2.7 Incorrectly interpreting the barcoding gap

The barcoding gap as proposed by Meyer & Paulay (2005) can represent two distinct scenarios: one for specimen identification (an individual being closer to a member of its own species than a different species), and one for species discovery (a distance that equates to a threshold applicable to all species; see Figure 7.1). The two scenarios are frequently confused, and this again demonstrates conflation of the two objectives of DNA barcoding.

Many DNA barcoding studies present histograms showing frequency distributions of both intra- and interspecific divergences for all pooled species analysed in a study. Overlap between the two distributions can be interpreted as a failure of DNA barcoding, but the only failure demonstrated in this case is that of defining a universal cut-off value. In this regard, and as stated previously, it is widely acknowledged that
coalescent depths vary among species, and substantial overlap between intra- and interspecific distances may be the rule, rather than the exception (Virgilio et al., 2010). Therefore, for specimen identification purposes this type of presentation is wholly uninformative, as intraspecific distances for one species can exceed interspecific distances for other species in the analysis, but without compromising identification success.

A better display of distance data for specimen identification is a dotplot in which, for each individual in the dataset, the distance to the furthest conspecific is plotted against the distance to the nearest non-conspecific, with a 1:1 slope representing the point at which the difference between the two is zero (i.e. no barcoding gap). An example of this method is illustrated in Figure 2.2.

![Figure 7.1](image)

**Figure 7.1.** An illustrative barcoding gap, showing no overlap (A), and substantial overlap (B) between intraspecific and interspecific variation. This shows how distances are considered overall, but is not informative for specimen identification purposes. Figure copyright (Meyer & Paulay, 2005).

### 7.2.8 Improving analytical procedures

In conclusion, more care should be taken in setting clear hypotheses for barcoding studies, and choosing appropriate methods for answering each distinct question. Future barcoding studies should make more use of alternative methods, and push forward improvements in data analysis. One possible problem identified in the
limited uptake of many of these methods, has been due to a lack of platform to carry out these analyses (Sarkar & Trizna, 2011). Comparison between different methods is important, and fortunately now increasingly possible in universal open-source environments such as R language, which should supersede the current inflexible and piecemeal software applications (Freckleton, 2009). This will ultimately encourage better use, sharing and benchmarking of new techniques between labs. The publication of the R package Spider (Brown et al., 2012), as part of this thesis helps to address this.

7.3 Challenges for biosecurity

7.3.1 Import Health Standard

One potential source of confusion when implementing a DNA barcode reference library such as the one generated in this study, is the discrepancy in names between the identified voucher specimens in the DNA barcode reference libraries, the Import Health Standard (IHS) list of permitted species (MAF Biosecurity New Zealand, 2011), and the trade literature. Some species commonly traded under a well known scientific names may not actually belong to that taxon. Therefore, enforcement of the current names on the IHS may prevent assumed-to-be benign species that are already present in the country from entering the country in future, and could perhaps more worryingly, allow new imports of species that have potentially never been in the country. As follows are several examples of where problems may occur, but it is important to note that the fishes discussed were purchased from the trade in several locations (UK, NZ and Singapore), and comments are based on anecdotal observations of traded species and trade names in these countries, and not just for New Zealand. The IHS status of the fishes collected in the study and any common trade misidentifications, are listed in Appendix C.

A very commonly sold fish in the aquarium trade, the Siamese algae eater “Crossocheilus siamensis” (Smith), is a junior subjective synonym of Crossocheilus oblongus Kuhl & van Hasselt. Both of these names are listed on the IHS, but C. oblongus was not present in this survey of the trade (Chapter 2). All fishes purchased in the trade during this study as C. siamensis, were according to morphological features more likely to be C. langei, C. cf. atrilimes or Garra cambodiensis (Appendix C). None of these species are listed on the IHS, and it is possible that C. oblongus is rare in the trade and has scarcely been exported.
This may not be an isolated incidence, however, as a similar general pattern was observed across several genera and for several commonly traded species. For example: tinfoil barbs often sold under the name *Barborynus schwannfeldii* were frequently *B. altus* (a species not on the approved IHS list); the “arulius” barb named on the IHS was more likely to be *Puntius tambraparniei* rather than *P. arulius*, and so the fishes sold in the trade under this latter name are not therefore listed on the approved IHS list; the fish sold as the clown barb *P. everetti* was more likely to be *P. dunckeri* (not on the approved IHS list); imports of *P. lineatus* were *P. johorensis* (not on the approved IHS list); and the ticto barb “*P. ticto*” was most frequently either *P. stoliczkanus* or *P. padamya* (neither are on the approved IHS list).

Many species not listed on the IHS may also be sold as, or mixed with, species otherwise approved on the IHS list. For example, fishes sold as *Puntius gelius* were often a mixture of bona fide *P. gelius*, and a likely undescribed and not listed as approved *Puntius* (*P. aff. gelius*); shipments of *Danio kyathit* may be the more common but undescribed species *D. aff. kyathit*, rather than genuine *D. kyathit*; the filament barb *P. filamentosus* can comprise exports of both this species and the not listed as approved *P. assimilis*; and *Devario aequipinnatus* exports were usually *D. malabaricus* (both species are listed as approved on the IHS, however).

There are also scenarios where names have changed due to recent taxonomic work. An example of the latter is *Danio* sp. “pantheri”, a species named on the IHS, but now described as *D. aesculapii* (not listed as approved on the IHS). It shows that maintaining a link between these names and keeping up-to-date with taxonomic progress is important, if moving away from qualitative visual identifications to a repeatable system based on often third-party-generated data from DNA barcode reference libraries and vouchered museum specimens. This requires a more adaptable and flexible solution to respond to changing nomenclature, trade patterns and scientific progress.

The current list could perhaps be re-evaluated in light of the problems highlighted above. There are no reasons to assume these discrepancies are limited to the Cyprinidae. Groups such as the loricariiid and callichthyiid catfishes are very poorly known taxonomically, and the staggering number of *nomina nuda* listed on the IHS for this latter group suggests a high likelihood of mistaken identities. Due to the plasticity in trade patterns, there is every reason to assume that the species listed above as potentially permitted misidentifications will appear, and therefore be erroneously allowed. This was the case with the arulius barb, known for decades in
the trade as *P. arulius*, until a new species was imported, and the true identities of *P. arulius* and *P. tambraparniei* became known (Ford, 2011).

### 7.3.2 Risk assessment

Assessment of risk from the ornamental fish trade can be seen in terms of both disease vectoring and of the potential pest status of the fishes themselves (Section 1.1). Although the majority of concern is based upon the risk of the former (Hine & Diggles, 2005), an accurate assessment pertaining to the latter may remain important. Previous management decisions were based upon the best information available at the time, but the potential climate match information for species’ invasibility was based upon highly questionable, subjective, and unreferenced data derived from aquarium literature (McDowall & James, 2005). Risk assessment techniques for potentially harmful species using climate modelling and occurrence data have improved since (Hulme, 2012). Based on the Australian Weed Risk Assessment (see McGregor *et al.*, 2012), the Fish Invasiveness Scoring Kit, FISK (Copp *et al.*, 2005, 2009), applies common criteria to prediction of potential problem species. Applying this method to aquarium imports would therefore refine the current IHS list, identify harmful species with a better degree of accuracy, and potentially result in more species being available to the aquarium hobby.

### 7.3.3 Identification procedures using DNA barcodes

As outlined in Chapter 3, the probability of getting the correct identification for a given query sample can vary according the technique employed, and several other studies have reached the same conclusion using various algorithms under different scenarios (Austerlitz *et al.*, 2009; Little & Stevenson, 2007; van Velzen *et al.*, 2012; Virgilio *et al.*, 2010). The methods outlined and critiqued in the previous section relate to making an academic comparison and assessing empirical support for conclusions as to the effectiveness of a barcode library, but operational considerations should also be taken into account. Ease of use is important, especially when biosecurity officials rather than bioinformaticians are conducting the analyses.

Available online, BOLD-IDS natively uses the most up-to-date reference library, therefore a fresh database version does not need to be downloaded each time a query is made locally. All that is required is that the query sequence is pasted into the browser, and then a species level result is returned on screen. It must be noted,
however, that BOLD will return a higher proportion of ambiguous identifications than other methods tested here (see Chapter 3). A case in point being the differentiation of *Danio albolineatus* from *D. roseus* (Chapter 2). Both are very similar in terms of morphology (Figure 7.2), both are common in the aquarium trade, but unlike *D. albolineatus*, *D. roseus* is not listed on the IHS for import into New Zealand. Telling them apart is therefore important, and this is the kind of problem DNA barcoding was promoted as being able to resolve (Hebert *et al.*, 2003b). Data presented here show that they are indeed closely related, and polyphyletic (Section B.3). The method used by BOLD is unable to separate the two species and gives an ambiguous result, despite discriminating sites existing between the two species. The single closest match methods (*k*-NN or BCM) identify the two species correctly. If operational strategy prioritises ease-of-use over identification accuracy, it must be accepted that the latter will be compromised.

Where conflicts in identifications arise, and BOLD is unable to provide an unambiguous result, it is also important to assess the competency and thoroughness of the work invested in identifying the vouchers that the DNA barcodes are derived from. As outlined above, there now exists the ability to annotate BOLD records and see the confidence in the identifications (Steinke & Hanner, 2011). These features should be used to their fullest potential, to ensure consistency between community curated data.

### 7.3.4 Possible future goals

Due to the discrepancies outlined above, and the more general difficulty in identifying many imported fishes, an ongoing monitoring program of aquarium fish imports could be implemented, thereby enabling an informed assessment of risk posed to New Zealand (i.e. exactly which species are being traded). In practice, a monitoring program would involve tissue sampling, and identifying using DNA barcodes, individuals from all cyprinid fish imports into New Zealand. For cyprinid fishes having been DNA barcoded in this study, the data generated here can be used as the basis for the reference library. If the monitoring program were required to be extended beyond cyprinids to all imported fishes, it would be required that before being used as reference material, fishes be first accurately identified using demonstrable morphological characters and appropriate taxonomic literature, rather than aquarium guide books which are frequently incorrect (but see Section 7.1.1 regarding taxonomic literature).
This work could also be carried out in conjunction with an assessment of how effective the reference library compiled for this study actually is in real operational terms, i.e. is it fit for purpose? This would involve sampling from each shipment of cyprinid fish, generating genuine barcode queries, and testing the congruence of names derived from this process against a formal a posteriori identification using morphological characters. This would assess the thoroughness of the taxon sampling, the identification power of the DNA barcodes, and the likelihood of encountering unsampled species (Chapter 3). Few studies have conducted this kind of analysis as to the actual end-user benefits of DNA barcoding (Cameron et al., 2006), and this would be a worthwhile study and contribution to the scientific record.

7.4 Concluding remarks

This study provides a comprehensive sampling of the cyprinid fishes in the aquarium trade, together with the publication of reproducible lab protocols to effectively recover DNA barcodes from these fishes. Furthermore, a template is provided for the extension of the library to other groups of problematic ornamentals, especially with
regard to conducting the sampling, storage, and morphological identification. Problems were identified in setting up and using reference libraries, and in particular with regard to a lack of access to taxonomic literature, and the conflict among existing and new barcode data. Nuclear data were found to be useful for detecting interspecific hybrids, and clarifying problems with unrecognised diversity. However, appropriate nuclear sequence data can be difficult to access for species-level identification work, but a comparison among candidates indicated some potentially suitable markers. A critical investigation of some of the widespread assumptions of barcode identification methods was also carried out, and recommendations made as to how best analyse data when conducting future barcoding studies. New diagnostic techniques using traces of environmental DNA in water were also investigated, with this method having the potential to become a powerful tool in the routine detection of high risk species.
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Appendix A

Photographing and preserving fishes for molecular studies: a step-by-step guide to voucher preparation

Voucher specimens are important in molecular studies, almost maybe as important as for morphological studies. A good voucher will be useful to both molecular and morphological research for many years to come. A good voucher will also allow any misidentified specimens to be easily corrected, and will permit any interesting molecular results to be effectively corroborated with morphology. But generating good vouchers in molecular studies is hard.

Formalin, the fixative chemical of choice for ichthyologists, degrades DNA and makes extraction/PCR difficult (but see Zhang, 2010). Instead, ethanol can be used as a fixative, but ethanol fixed specimens are often brittle, faded, and of poorer long-term quality. It's often best to take a tissue sample from your specimen, store this in ethanol, and formalin fix the rest of the fish as a voucher. This is fine, but you'll want to know which tissue sample comes from which specimen, and for small fishes it's not possible to permanently attach the label to the specimen without causing damage. Of course, you could put them all in individual jars, but you could soon run out of jars or space. Transporting them is a big problem too, and this is where you really need to save space.

So, after trying out some quite unsatisfactory methods, I have developed a nice method of generating quality molecular vouchers. Of course, these bags have not been tested for long-term (i.e. indefinite) storage, and are only recommended as a temporary (< 5 yr) storage or transport solution. In addition, although I haven’t yet tested it, this method could hopefully be adapted for use in the field. As follows are the steps required.
Step 1. (see Figure A.1)

Fill vials for tissue samples with high-grade 100% ethanol. Label the tubes internally with pencil on archive quality “goatskin” paper, and externally with permanent marker pen. The vouchers can be kept separate using small polythene zip-seal bags. They need to be perforated first, however, with a paper hole punch (do several at a time). They should also have their bottom corners cut off to allow the bags to drain. Place another label in the bag.

Figure A.1. Prepare storage vessels.
Step 2. (see Figure A.2)

Get everything ready in advance. Here I have:

- Latex gloves
- 10% formalin (clearly labelled)
- MS-222 (fish anaesthetic)
- Spirit burner to decontaminate tools
- Variety of forceps and scalpel
- Pencil
- Squares of cardboard to use as a clean surface for tissue preparation
- Vials for tissue samples
- Bags for voucher

Figure A.2. General preparation.
Step 3. (see Figure A.3)

Assemble your light source and photo rig. Here I use an adjustable microscopy light (halogen desk lamps can be substituted) and a shallow white tray. I used a piece of folded graph paper as a scale for these photos. Now, mix up your MS-222 (overdosed) and water into a shallow clear tray (the lid of a tube rack), and the fish can now be added (wait for 10 mins to ensure death). Make sure the fish is only just covered.

Figure A.3. Photo rig.
Step 4. (see Figure A.4 and Figure A.5)

Adjust the light angle and photograph the left-hand side of the fish, always adding the label. Remember to set your camera’s white balance correctly (usually using the custom mode). The picture can then be cropped and the file name changed.

![Figure A.4. Set up camera.](image)

![Figure A.5. Adjust image.](image)
Step 5. (see Figure A.6)

Take the fish out of the solution and place on the card sheet. Use the scalpel to carefully excise a tissue sample from the right-hand side of the fish. Pectoral fin clips can also be taken to cause less damage, but on small fishes this won’t yield much tissue, and using mitochondrion rich muscle may reduce the likelihood of NUMTs (see Section 1.3.1). Note: don’t cut from the caudal peduncle area if characters such as caudal peduncle scale counts may be important for identifying your fish.

Figure A.6. Tissue sample.
Step 6. (see Figure A.7 and Figure A.8)

Next, place the fish into the plastic bag with the forceps, and place into the formalin. The position of the fish and fins can be manipulated through the holes in the bag with the forceps. This ensures the fish is not bent and the fins are not folded down.

![Figure A.7. Bag and label specimen.](image1)

![Figure A.8. Formalin fixation.](image2)
Step 7.

Throw away the card sheet and replace with new. Clean the implements with a wet tissue and then sterilise with the spirit burner. Repeat process for rest of specimens.

Step 8. (see Figure A.9)

Leave vouchers in formalin for approximately three days (longer for larger fishes). After three days, remove from formalin and wash thoroughly with water. Leave in water for 24 hours to dilute remaining formalin. Place into weak 35% alcohol (ethanol or clear methylated spirit) solution for three days before final storage in 70% alcohol. The voucher will have lost a lot of its colour by now, but can be photographed again to document the preserved colour pattern.

![Image](image.png)

**Figure A.9.** Preserved colouration (same specimen as previously).
Appendix B

Online supplementary information

B.1 COI sequences

Text file containing all COI sequences used/generated in the study (FASTA format); available online at the following stable and permanent URL: http://goo.gl/N0h22.

B.2 RHO sequences

Text file containing all RHO sequences used/generated in the study (FASTA format); available online at the following stable and permanent URL: http://goo.gl/0GGM8.

B.3 COI NJ tree

Interactive NJ phylogram (COI data) of all specimens (this study plus GenBank data), in phyloXML SVG (scalable vector graphic) format available at the following URL: http://goo.gl/avnuz. Data including identifiers, sequences, trace files, museum voucher codes and specimen images are accessed via the BOLD and GenBank Web sites using URLs embedded in the taxon names. This figure is best viewed with Mozilla Firefox to fully enjoy the benefits of SVG and URL linking. May take up to one minute to load. A scripting “error” may appear in some browsers—this is the browser taking time to render the complex diagram. Phylogram can be saved as a pdf by printing to file using a custom paper size (approximately 3,600 mm height). Links can be opened in a new tab using Ctrl+LeftClick. Stable and permanent archived version is available at: http://goo.gl/Uvokm; may require open-source archiving software such as “7-Zip” to unpack.
B.4 RHO NJ tree

Interactive NJ phylogram (reduced RHO data), in phyloXML SVG (scalable vector graphic) format, available at: http://goo.gl/h9sY5. Data including identifiers, sequences, trace files, museum voucher codes and specimen images are accessed via the BOLD and GenBank Web sites using URLs embedded in the taxon names. This figure is best viewed with Mozilla Firefox to fully enjoy the benefits of SVG and URL linking. May take up to one minute to load. A scripting “error” may appear in some browsers—this is the browser taking time to render the complex diagram. The phylogram can be saved as a pdf by printing to file using a custom paper size (approximately 750 mm height). Links can be opened in a new tab using Ctrl+LeftClick. Stable and permanent archived version is available at: http://goo.gl/oGoyo; may require open-source archiving software such as “7-Zip” to unpack.

B.5 SPIDER tutorial

The R package SPIDER (SPecies IDentity and Evolution in R) was developed in part to address the lack of cross-platform analytical methods for DNA barcode data in this study. A tutorial on the use of this R package can be accessed at http://spider.r-forge.r-project.org/tutorial/tutorial.pdf, and was written with Samuel D. J. Brown.

B.6 Web-log

In addition to publishing work in scientific journals, additional research outputs were published on the Web, and can be found at the following blog address: http://boopsboops.blogspot.com. Appendix A comprises one of these. Examples include:

1. A method of photographing and preserving fishes for molecular studies: URL.

2. Batch extracting GenBank data from journal articles: URL.

Appendix C

Table of morphological identifications

Below is presented a table of nomenclature and taxonomic authorities for each species sampled, along with project code numbers (same as BOLD specimen IDs). Nomenclature follows Eschmeyer (2010a), unless otherwise stated. Morphological characters and bibliography of references used to make each identification are included. The use of “sp.”, “cf.” and “aff.” notation in reference specimen identification follows Kottelat & Freyhof (2007). Individuals designated “cf.” are treated as conspecific with taxa of the same specific name, while those designated “aff.” are treated as non-conspecific.

Taxa highlighted in red are approved to be imported into New Zealand under the current Import Health Standard (MAF Biosecurity New Zealand, 2011). Where common misidentifications occur in the trade, the scientific name of the taxon they are frequently confused with is listed; note that these are personal observations made by the author over a number of years, and do not constitute data collected during this study or any other.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identification</th>
<th>Characters</th>
<th>Citations</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Specimens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barbatichilus melangrypanus (Bleeker)</td>
<td>Barbels absent; snout pointed; last unbranched dorsal ray serrated; lower lip lacks posteriorly to form pouch; pectoral, anal, caudal and dorsal with wide black margins (&gt;50% in pectoral and anal); body silver (Hs.).</td>
<td>Kottelat (2001); Ng &amp; Kottelat (2007).</td>
<td></td>
<td>RC0215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbus glossa Brüning</td>
<td>Barbels absent; lateral line absent; visible humeral organ; one pair fenshaped nostrils; dorsal origin anterior to pectorals; prominent anal and caudal; large eye (approx. 45% HL); 5-12 dorsal branched rays; 5-12 branched anal rays; scattered melanophores on flanks; black spot on caudal base; orange/red body colour (Hs.).</td>
<td>Conway &amp; Moritz (2006).</td>
<td></td>
<td>RC0280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbonemus altus (Günther)</td>
<td>Two pairs barbels; short rostrum; last unbranched dorsal ray strongly serrated; lateral line complete (31-32 scaled): 7-12 scales between dorsal origin and lateral line; dark pigments at base of scales; caudal lobes lacking distinct black submarginal stripe; red colour to pectorals and caudal (Hs.).</td>
<td>Gante et al. (2008); Kottelat (2001).</td>
<td>Frequently sold as Barbonemus schwansfeldi.</td>
<td>RC0179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbonemus schwansfeldii (Bleeker)</td>
<td>As B. altus, but: lateral line with 33-34 scaled; distinct black submarginal stripe to caudal lobes.</td>
<td>Gante et al. (2008); Kottelat (2001).</td>
<td></td>
<td>RC0643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbus callipterus Boulenger</td>
<td>Two pairs barbels; mouth subterminal; last unbranched dorsal ray not serrated; lateral line complete, curving ventrally (24-25 scaled); dorsal slightly concave with 8-12 branched dorsal rays; 5-12 branched anal rays; scales with dark bases; 3 distinct midlateral black spots (second and third slightly elongate).</td>
<td>Boulenger (1907).</td>
<td>Description brief, but best match available.</td>
<td>RC0517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbus fasciolatus (Günther)</td>
<td>Two pairs barbels; maxillary length - eye diameter; body slender; lateral line complete (25-30 scaled); 8-12 branched dorsal rays; 5-12 branched anal rays; approx. 10-15 black vertical bands, last forming spot on caudal peduncle; spot at anal origin.</td>
<td>Günther (1868); Skelton (2001).</td>
<td>Frequently sold as Barbus barilioides.</td>
<td>RC0035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbus tripliatus (Bleeker)</td>
<td>Two pairs barbels (maxilla as long as eye diameter, maxilla approx. 1.5 x eye diameter); mouth subterminal; last unbranched dorsal ray not serrated; lateral line complete, curving ventrally (24-25 scaled); dorsal slightly concave with 8-12 branched dorsal rays; 5-12 branched anal rays; scales with dark bases; 3 distinct midlateral black spots (second and third slightly elongate).</td>
<td>Günther (1868); Hopson (1965).</td>
<td>Slightly lower lateral line scale count and shorter barbel length than reported by Hopson (1965).</td>
<td>RC0607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chela dalibouri (Menon)</td>
<td>Barbels absent; lateral line incomplete (up to 4 scaled); superobital groove present; dorsal origin posterior to that of anal; 7-12 branched dorsal rays; 11-12 branched anal rays; elongated posterior fins; dark midlateral stripe ending at caudal base, with 3-4 distinct superimposed spots; no markings on fins.</td>
<td>Fang (2003); Menon (1992); Pethiyagoda et al. (2008).</td>
<td>Spelling of specific name follows Pethiyagoda et al. (2008).</td>
<td>RC0033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossocheilus cf. atrillimis Kottelat</td>
<td>Two pairs barbels (maxilla rudimentary or absent in larger specimens); maxilla capribrate; free rostral kbe absent; lower lip papillae; 8-12 branched dorsal rays; approx. 1-12 scaled between anus and anal fin; black midlateral stripe extending to end of median caudal ray; fins with no distinct markings; distinct black marking between anus and anal fin; two rows of dark dots below midlateral stripe (absent in small specimens); proximal yellow colour to fins in large specimens.</td>
<td>Kottelat (2000); Kottelat &amp; Widjanarti (2005); Tan &amp; Kottelat (2009).</td>
<td>Identification tentative, an inconsistency among specimens in some characters (e.g. barbels and markings). Frequently sold as Crossocheilus atrimers.</td>
<td>RC0277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossocheilus langei Bleeker</td>
<td>Two pairs barbels (maxilla rudimentary in larger specimens); maxilla capribrate; free rostral kbe absent; lower lip papillae; 8-12 branched dorsal rays; approx. 3-21 scaled between anus and anal fin; black midlateral stripe extending to end of median caudal ray; fins with no distinct markings; distinct black marking between anus and anal fin; two rows of dark spots below midlateral stripe (absent in small specimens); proximal yellow colour to fins in large specimens.</td>
<td>Kottelat (2000); Kottelat &amp; Widjanarti (2005); Tan &amp; Kottelat (2009).</td>
<td>Barbels reduced/absent in RC0737; treated as C. cf. langei. Frequently sold as Crossocheilus atrimers.</td>
<td>RC0287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossocheilus nigricola Poey</td>
<td>Two pairs barbels; maxilla capribrate; free rostral kbe absent; lower lip papillae; 8-12 branched dorsal rays; midlateral black stripe continuing onto caudal kbe; red marginal stripes and tips to caudal (Hs.).</td>
<td>Kottelat et al. (2003); Reid et al. (2000); Roberts (1989).</td>
<td></td>
<td>RC0735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossocheilus reticulatus (Fowler)</td>
<td>Two pairs barbels (maxilla rudimentary or absent in larger individuals); maxilla capribrate; free rostral kbe absent; lower lip papillae; 8-12 branched dorsal rays; large dark blotch on caudal base; dark scale margin; reticulate pattern; no distinct markings in fin.</td>
<td>Baranescu (1980); Fowler (1934, 1935); Kottelat (2001); Rainboth (1996); Roberts (1989).</td>
<td></td>
<td>RC0037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>Reference(s)</td>
<td>Additional Information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Cyclocheilichthys panthochir</em></td>
<td>One pair barbels (minute); lateral line complete; pare on head forming dense parallel rows; black midlateral stripe; dorsal red with black anterior margin (He); caudal red with black marginal stripe (Hc).</td>
<td>Kottelat et al. (1993); Roberts (1989).</td>
<td>RC0014 RC0015 YGN291</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Cyprinella latenevia</em> (Baird &amp; Girard)</td>
<td>Barbell absent; lateral line complete (33 paired scales); 8-2 branched anal rays; well developed tubercles on head; metallic blue body (life); dark bar behind operculum; pectoral and caudal red (He); dorsolateral surface of body red (Hc); body with reticulate scale pattern.</td>
<td>Boschung &amp; Maudet (2004); Matthews (1987).</td>
<td>Large number of synonyms in this species. RC0207 RC0208</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Cyprinus carpio</em> Linnaeus</td>
<td>Two pairs barbels; lateral line complete (31-1 paired scales); long concave dorsal; caudal deeply emarginate; but unbranched anal ray spinous and serrate posteriorly.</td>
<td>Kottelat &amp; Freyhof (2007).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Danio aesculapii</em> Kullander &amp; Fang</td>
<td>Two pairs barbels (rostral not extending past pectoral base); 6-1 1⁄2 branched dorsal rays; lateral line incomplete; approx. 6 short lateral bars anteriorly, continuing into parallel rows of spots/dots; distinct A-stripe.</td>
<td>Kullander &amp; Fang (2009a).</td>
<td>Frequently sold as Danio sp. “pantheri”, or D. sp. “F003”. RC0111 RC0112 RC0107 RC0108 RC0109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Danio albolineatus</em> (BLth)</td>
<td>Two pairs long barbels (rostral extending to eye); lateral line incomplete (up to 9 paired scales); 7-2 branched dorsal rays; body devoid of stripes except a dark P-stripe posterior on body, bordered above by light A-stripe, ending on caudal base; blue/pink colouration in life.</td>
<td>Fang &amp; Kottelat (1999, 2000).</td>
<td>The <em>D. albolineatus</em> complex is poorly characterised and requires systematic attention. Numerous synonyms exist, but these specimens are regarded by the oldest available name. RC0070 RC0077 RC0089 RC0043 RC0045</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Danio choprae</em> HoRa</td>
<td>Two pairs long barbels (rostral not extending past pectoral base); 7-1 1⁄2 branched dorsal rays; lateral line absent; 6-8 short lateral bars anteriorly, continuing into rows of spots and P-stripe on caudal peduncle; P+1 and P-1 stripes continue onto caudal; distinct A and D stripes.</td>
<td>HoRa (1928); Kullander &amp; Fang (2009a).</td>
<td>Spelling of specific name follows Kullander &amp; Fang (2009a). Frequently sold as <em>Danio choprae</em>. RC0089 RC0090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Danio aff. choprae</em> HoRa</td>
<td>As <em>D. choprae</em>, but barbels longer (rostral extending past pectoral base); lateral line incomplete (1-3 paired scales); anterior lateral bars broken up with intermediate spots; larger size; overall grey rather than orange colouration (He).</td>
<td>HoRa (1928); Kullander &amp; Fang (2009a).</td>
<td>Likely an undescribed species, differing in several characters from <em>D. choprae</em>. Spelling of specific name follows Kullander &amp; Fang (2009a). RC0023 RC0024 RC0025 RC0069 RC0070</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Danio dangila</em> (Hamilton)</td>
<td>Two pairs long barbels (maxillary reach past operculum); supraorbital groove absent; lateral line complete (32-36 paired scales); 9-2-11/2 branched dorsal rays; 15-12 branched anal ray; well defined vertically elongated clinal spot; network of P-stripes (blue in He) and interspaces forming spots and rings; P-stripe continue onto caudal anal with 2-3 A-stripes.</td>
<td>Day (1875); Hamilton (1922); See &amp; Day (1985); Takhar &amp; Jhingran (1991).</td>
<td>RC0343 appears different, with darker pattern, larger size; wider P-stripes, smaller interspace spots, a distinct axial streak, and a clinal spot not elongated vertically. This specimen is regarded here as <em>Danio cf. dangila</em>. RC0122 RC0123 RC0343 RC0344 RC0345 RC0346 RC0347 RC0348</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Danio aff. dangila</strong> (Hamilton)</td>
<td>As <em>D. dangila</em>, but with stripes on dorsal and caudal forming distinct and discreet spots.</td>
<td>Day (1875); Hamilton (1822); Sen &amp; Day (1985); Talwar &amp; Jhingran (1991).</td>
<td>Likely an undescribed <em>Danio</em> closely related to <em>D. dangila</em>. Purportedly sourced from Myanmar.</td>
<td>RCO060, RCO061, RCO062, RCO063, RCO064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Danio erythromicron</strong> (Annandale)</td>
<td>Barbels absent; lateral line absent; 7½ branched dorsal rays; supramaxillary groove absent; snout short and blunt; mouth well defined dark spot at caudal base, fin without stripes; up to 12 narrow lateral bars, from operculum to caudal peduncle.</td>
<td>Annandale (1918); Conway et al. (2008).</td>
<td></td>
<td>YGN014, YGN338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Danio fanguii</strong> Ho</td>
<td>Two pairs long barbels (maxillary extends past operculum); lateral line incomplete (approx. 36 rowed scales); 8½ branched dorsal rays; 13½ branched anal rays; clefted spot absent; dark P-stripe narrowing posteriorly and terminating in spot on caudal base, with light A-stripe above posteriorly (on caudal peduncle and base); light spots in two rows anteriorly.</td>
<td>Ho (1937).</td>
<td></td>
<td>RCO245, RCO246, RCO247, RCO248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Danio cf. kerri</strong> Smith</td>
<td>Two pairs barbels (rostral extends past eye, maxillary beyond pectoral base); 7½ branched dorsal rays; lateral line incomplete (up to 9 rowed scales); two complete lateral stripes (P and P+1) with two light interspaces; widening posteriorly and joining in a loop behind the operculum; fins darkly with weak pigmentation.</td>
<td>Smith (1931).</td>
<td>Smith (1931) reports no rowed lateral line scales in <em>D. kerri</em>, so this material is regarded as <em>D. cf. kerri</em>.</td>
<td>EUN035, RCO267, RCO269, RCO270, RCO271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Danio kyathit Fang</strong></td>
<td>Two pairs long barbels (maxillary extends past operculum); supramaxillary groove absent; lateral line incomplete (8½ rowed scales); 13½-14½ branched anal rays; D-stripe and 3 A-stripe present; 5-7 P-stripes broken almost entirely into spots; P, P+1 and P-1 extending onto caudal; caudal without stripes on lobes.</td>
<td>Fang (1998); Kullander et al. (2009).</td>
<td>Conforms to holotype of <em>D. kyathit</em> Fang (1998).</td>
<td>RCO064, RCO090, RCO129, RCO130, RCO131, YGN014, YGN138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Danio aff. kyathit Fang</strong></td>
<td>As <em>D. kyathit</em>, but: P-stripe as stripes rather than spots; P-1 and P-2 stripes slightly ventrally slanting.</td>
<td>Fang (1998); Kullander et al. (2009).</td>
<td>A likely undescribed species with distinct colour pattern from <em>D. kyathit</em> s.s. holotype (Fang, 1998). A paratype of <em>D. kyathit</em> from Kamaing (Ayeyarwaddy drainage) shows a similar pattern. Similar also to <em>D. quagga</em> Kullander, Liao &amp; Fang, but barbels appear longer here, and <em>D. quagga</em> is a poorly known species. Frequently sold as <em>D. kyathit</em>.</td>
<td>EUN041, EUN179, RCO065, RCO066, RCO120, RCO121, RCO125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Danio margaritatus</strong> (Roberts)</td>
<td>Barbels absent; lateral line absent; 7½ branched dorsal rays; supramaxillary groove absent; snout short and blunt; D-stripe, A-stripe and A-1 stripe present; P+1 and P-1 stripes extend onto caudal; 5-6 irregular rows of spots; distinctive blue, red, gold colouration (live).</td>
<td>Conway et al. (2008); Roberts (2007).</td>
<td></td>
<td>RCO032, RCO033, RCO107, RCO138, RCO139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Danio meghala</strong> Sen &amp; Day</td>
<td>Two pairs barbels (maxillary not reaching past operculum, rostral just extending past eye); suprarostral groove absent; lateral line complete (33–34 scaled rays); 8⅔ branched dorsal rays; 10⅓–11⅓ branched anal rays; no distinct caudal spot; 5 P-stripes, with interspaces forming broken golden (Life) spots and stripes anteriorly; P-stripes continue onto caudal; anal with A-stripe.</td>
<td>Day (1875); Hamilton (1822); Sen &amp; Day (1985); Talwar &amp; Jhingran (1991).</td>
<td>RC0665 RC0666 RC0667 RC0668</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Danio nigrofasciatus</strong> (Day)</td>
<td>One pair barbels (maxillary, reaching past eye); P and P+1 stripes uniform unbroken, extending into caudal; no stripe above P+1; stripes below P broken into spots; anal and pelvic spots spotted; D-stripe present.</td>
<td>Fang (1998); Kullander &amp; Fang (2009).</td>
<td>EUN034 RC0081 RC0082 RC0242 RC0243 RC0244</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Danio rerio</strong> (Hamilton)</td>
<td>Two pairs long barbels (maxillary extends past operculum, rostral not extending past eye); lateral line absent, except in RC0679 (4 scaled rays); D-stripe and 3 A-stripes present; 3 well defined parallel P-stripes, with P, P+1 and P-1 extending onto caudal; caudal with stripes on lobes.</td>
<td>Fang (1998); Hamilton (1822); Kullander et al. (2009).</td>
<td>RC0088 RC0079 YGN148</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Danio roseus</strong> Fang &amp; Kottelat</td>
<td>As <em>D. albolineatus</em>, but: smaller; slimmer; slightly shorter barbels; posterior light and dark P/I stripes absent or v. indistinct.</td>
<td>Fang &amp; Kottelat (1999, 2000).</td>
<td>The <em>D. albolineatus</em> complex is poorly characterised and requires systematic attention.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Danio sp. &quot;Keri&quot;</strong></td>
<td>Two pairs barbels (maxillary extends past operculum, rostral beyond pectoral); 7½ branched dorsal rays; lateral line incomplete; two complete lateral stripes (P and P+1) with two light interstipes, not joining in a loop behind the operculum; distinct D-stripe, A and A-1 stripes.</td>
<td>Smith (1931).</td>
<td>Similar to <em>D. keri</em>, but likely an undescribed species.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Danio tinwini</strong> Kullander &amp; Fang</td>
<td>One pair barbels (maxillary); lateral line absent; 6½ branched dorsal rays; 3 P-stripes, broken into rows of discrete spots; anal, dorsal and pelvic spots spotted.</td>
<td>Fang (1998); Kullander &amp; Fang (2009).</td>
<td>Frequently sold as *Danio sp. &quot;Burma&quot; or D. sp. &quot;TW02&quot;.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Danionella dracula</strong> Britz, Conway &amp; Rüber</td>
<td>Scales absent; miniature size (up to 17 mm SL); remnant larval caudal fin-folds; 13 total anal rays; 16 principal caudal rays; genital papilla not developed as a conical projection; body transparent with yellow/green lateral stripe (Life).</td>
<td>Britz (2009); Britz et al. (2009); Roberts (1965).</td>
<td>YGN118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Devario cf. acuticeps</strong> (Horn)</td>
<td>Barbels absent; lateral line absent; suprarostral groove present; 10⅓ branched anal rays; caudal not truncate; pectorals not pointed and not reaching pelvic base; broad longitudinal stripe; no markings on fins.</td>
<td>Barman (1991); Barman &amp; Mukerji (1933); Talwar &amp; Jhingran (1991).</td>
<td>Specimen in poor condition, identification therefore tentative. Does not disagree with <em>D. acuticeps</em>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Devario aequipinnatus** *(McClayland)*

- Two pairs barbels (rostral longer than maxillary); lateral line complete (31–36 pored scales); infraorbital process 101 present; 101–211 branched dorsal rays; 121–131 branched anal rays; cleithral spot round and well defined; P-stripes interrupted anteriorly; P-stripe extending onto median caudal rays.
- Identification tentative, as the concept of *D. aequipinnatus* varies considerably among authors, and is poorly characterised: following Day (1875) here.

**Devario aurupurpureus** *(Annamdale)*

- Barbels absent; snout sharply pointed; narrow elongate body; origin of dorsal slightly anterior to anal; lateral line complete (approx. 37 pored scales); branched dorsal rays 712; branched anal rays 1412–1612; approx. 16 bluish flecks on fins.
- Identification tentative: not entirely consistent with characters of *D. aurupurpureus*. Tentative identification: not entirely consistent with characters of *D. aurupurpureus* presented by Fang (above). Fin ray counts are reported to be quite varied in different populations of *D. aurupurpureus* (Fang, 2000).

**Devario cf. browni** *(Regan)*

- Two pairs barbels (v. small); infraorbital process 101 present; branched dorsal rays 912–1012; branched anal rays 1212; predorsal scales 14–15; cleithral spot present; 3 wavy P-stripes (P-stripe continues onto caudal).
- Identification tentative: not entirely consistent with characters of *D. browni* presented by Fang (2009). The P+1 and P+2 stripes should meet to form a loop anteriorly; this character is not present in all material here, and the loop is positioned too far anteriorly for *D. browni* (above and pectorals). Fin ray counts are reported to be quite varied in different populations of *D. browni* (Fang, 2000).

**Devario cf. chrysotaeniatus** *(Chu)*

- Two pairs barbels ( nostril approx. 12 eye diameter, maxillary tiny); infraorbital process 101 present; branched dorsal rays 712–812; branched anal rays 1212; cleithral spot present; dorsal and anal with faint median stripe; P-stripe strong; starting above pelvics and continuing onto caudal; small P+1 and P+2 stripes; interspace stripes break up anteriorly into dots.
- Tentative identification: *D. chrysotaeniatus* should not have a process on infraorbital 101. Alternative identification could be *D. browni* (Pellegrin & Fang).

**Devario cf. dusena** *(Hamilton)*

- One pair barbels (small); lateral line complete (44–46 pored scales); infraorbital process 101 absent; 1512–1612 branched dorsal rays; 1612–1712 branched anal rays; deep chondridal body shape; cleithral spot absent; three stripes on posterior of body (blue in life); network of spots and stripes in anterior of body (blue and yellow in life).
- Tentative identification: *D. dusena*. This material has small but obvious barbels, so may not be conspecific with *D. dusena*.

**Devario malabaricus** *(Jordan)*

- Two pairs barbels; lateral line complete (36–40 pored scales); infraorbital process 101 absent; 1112 branched dorsal rays; 1412–1512 branched anal rays; snout pointed; cleithral spot present as vertical mark; 4–5 lateral stripes breaking up into spots anteriorly (blue in life).
- Frequently sold as *Devario aequipinnatus*.

**Devario pathiana** *(Kottelat & Pethiyagoda)*

- Two pairs barbels; lateral line complete; infraorbital process 101 present; 7–11 irregular parallel bars (dark blue in life); longitudinal stripe on caudal peduncle continuing onto median caudal rays; dark median stripe in dorsal.

**Devario sordidii** *(Hose & Maukej)*

- Barbels absent; lateral line incomplete (8–30 pored scales); supraorbital groove present; dorsal 712 branched rays; cleithral spot present; lateral stripe on posterior of body; sides covered with small pigmented dots; no markings on fins.
### APPENDIX C. TABLE OF MORPHOLOGICAL IDENTIFICATIONS

#### Darwini sp. “giraffe”
- Two pairs barbels (c. small); infraorbital process IO1 present; deep, bulby body shape; lateral line complete (approx. 31–34 paired scales); branched dorsal rays 9:2–11:2; branched anal rays 12:1–14:2; predorsal scales 14–15; cleithral spot not distinct; P-stripes and interspaces broken up anteriorly into spots, rings and vertical bars.
- Cottell (2010); Fang (2000); Fang & Kottelat (1999); Fang & Kullander (2000); Kottelat (2001); Regan (1907).
- Presented here as an undescribed species; does not match literature, although many nominal Darwini sp. are very poorly known. Appears very similar to D. sp. “giraffe” and D. cf. malabaricus as presented by Cottell (2010).

#### Darwini sp. “purple cypris”
- Barbel absent; snout blunt, rounded; supralabial groove present; infraorbital process IO1 absent; lateral line complete; approx. 9–10 lateral bars; fine dark granulation on fins (no stripes). Barbel absent; infraorbital process IO1 absent; lateral line complete (approx. 33 paired scales); branched dorsal rays 9:2; branched anal rays 11:2; predorsal scales 14; cleithral spot absent; three P-stripes, with P+1 and P-1 stripes jutting irregularly; two rows of metallic pink colored scales along dorsal midline.
- Annandale (1918); Barman (1984b); Fang (1997b, 2000); Fang & Kottelat (1999).
- Literature unable to confidently place to known species. Possibly conspecific with D. kakhienensis (Anderson), but not positive enough to apply the name. Conservatively, it is presented as an unidentified (i.e. an unidentifiable or undescribed) species. Many nominal Darwini sp. are poorly known. Sold as D. zingerla (Myers).

#### Darwini sp. “TV04”
- Two pairs barbels (central longer than maxillary, and less than half eye width); lateral line complete (20–30 paired scales); infraorbital process IO1 present; 11:2–12:2 branched dorsal rays; 12:1–13:2 branched anal rays; cleithral spot present; 4–5 P-stripes, breaking up anteriorly; P-stripe wider, and extending onto median caudal rays; dusky narrow stripe in dorsal.
- Fang (1997b, 2000); Fang & Kottelat (1999); Kottelat (2001); Myers (1924).
- Possibly conspecific with D. kakhienensis (Anderson), but not positive enough to apply the name. Conservatively, it is presented as an unidentified (i.e. an unidentifiable or undescribed) species. Many nominal Darwini sp. are poorly known. Purportedly sourced from Myanmar, and sold as D. sp. “Blom” or “Himalayan lemon”.

#### Darwini sp. “undet. (1)”
- Two pairs barbels (oral longer than maxillary, and less than half eye width); lateral line complete (30–32 paired scales); infraorbital process IO1 present; 11:2–12:2 branched dorsal rays; 10:1–11:2 branched anal rays; cleithral spot present; 3–4 P-stripes; P-stripe wider, and extends onto median caudal rays; bright green/yellow coloration (He).
- Fang (1997b, 2000); Fang & Kottelat (1999); Kottelat (2001); Myers (1924).
- Identification tentative, as pigmentation on last unbanded dorsal and anal rays extending entire length of ray rather than proximal half/base. Diagnoses in Tan & Kottelat (2008) difficult to reconcile with these specimens. Freely sold as Eirmotus octonius. Eirmotus furcatus Tan & Kottelat

#### Eirmotus furcatus Tan & Kottelat
- Barbel absent; mouth terminal; cephalic papillae present on head (arranged in rows); lateral line incomplete; but unbranched dorsal ray serrated; 8 dark conspicuous bars, with width of bar 5 greater than 1:12 scales; mark on posterior of dorsal adjacent to bar 6; but unbranched dorsal ray entirely pigmented; distinct black mark anterior to anus; back upper margin of pectoral; body and fins dusky with scattered chromatophores on fin rays.
- Frequently sold as Eirmotus octonius. Eirmotus cf. insignis Tan & Kottelat

#### Eirmotus cf. insignis Tan & Kottelat
- Barbel absent; mouth terminal; cephalic papillae present on head (arranged in rows); lateral line incomplete (2–4 paired scales); last unbranched dorsal ray serrated (approx. 21 serrae); 8 dark bars, with width of bar 5 approx. 1:12 scales; row median dark spots on dorsal; mark on posterior of dorsal adjacent to bar 6; unbranched dorsal rays entirely pigmented; unbranched anal ray pigmented in some specimens.
- Identification tentative, as pigmentation on last unbranched dorsal and anal rays extending entire length of ray rather than proximal half/base. Freely sold as Eirmotus octonius. Eirmotus octonius Schultz

#### Eirmotus octonius Schultz
- Barbel absent; mouth terminal; cephalic papillae present on head (arranged in rows); lateral line incomplete; but unbranched dorsal ray serrated (approx. less than 20 serrae); 8 dark bars, with width of bar 5 approx. 1 scale; row median dark spots on dorsal absent; unbranched dorsal rays entirely pigmented; unbranched anal ray unpigmented.
- Identification tentative, as count of unbranched dorsal ray serrae fall short of the 25–31 expected in E. octonius. Diagnoses in Tan & Kottelat (2008) difficult to reconcile with these specimens. Eirmotus octonius Schultz

#### Eirmotus octonius Schultz
- Barbel absent; mouth terminal; cephalic papillae present on head (arranged in rows); lateral line incomplete; but unbranched dorsal ray serrated (approx. 21 serrae); 8 dark bars, with width of bar 5 approx. 1 scale; row median dark spots on dorsal absent; unbranched dorsal rays entirely pigmented; unbranched anal ray unpigmented.
- Identification tentative, as count of unbranched dorsal ray serrae fall short of the 25–31 expected in E. octonius. Diagnoses in Tan & Kottelat (2008) difficult to reconcile with these specimens.
| **Epalzeorhynchos bicolor** *(Smith)* | Two pairs barbels (black); fimbriate mental cap with free lateral lobe not terminating in sharp tubercle; upper lip poorly developed; lower lip not papillate; body and fins uniform dark colour; caudal orange/red (Ho); dorsal with white edge; dark spots behind operculum and above pectoral. | Kottelat et al. (1993); Roberts (1989); Smith (1931); Zhang & Kottelat (2006). | EU1080 | RC0321 | RC0322 | YGN1019 |
| **Epalzeorhynchos frenatum** *(Fowler)* | Two pairs barbels; fimbriate rostral cap with free lateral lobe not terminating in sharp tubercle; upper lip poorly developed; lower lip not papillate; well-defined, broad lateral stripes (snout tip to median caudal rays). | Kottelat (1998, 2001); Rainbow (1996); Roberts (1989); Zhang & Kottelat (2006). | EU1079 | RC0519 | RC0562 | YGN061 | YGN127 | YGN373 | YGN400 | YGN489 |
| **Epalzeorhynchos kalopterus** *(Bleeker)* | Two pairs barbels (rostral black, maxillary pale); fimbriate rostral cap with free lateral lobe terminating in sharp tubercle; upper lip poorly developed; lower lip not papillate; well-defined, broad lateral stripes (snout tip to median caudal rays). | Kottelat et al. (1993); Roberts (1989); Zhang & Kottelat (2006). | EU1081 | RC0213 | RC0924 | YGN032 |
| **Esomus metallicus** *Ahl* | Two pairs barbels (rostral extending past eye, maxillary extending past pelvic base); supraorbital groove absent; lateral line single and incomplete (extends to approx. between pelvic and anal); lateral stripes more intense posteriorly, terminating at caudal base; no markings on fins. | Fang (2003); Ho & Mukerji (1928); Kottelat (2001); Talwar & Jhingran (1991); Tilak & Jain (1990). | RC0553 | RC0564 | RC0555 | RC0556 | RC0567 | YGN090 |
| **Garra cambodgensis** *(Tirant)* | Mouth inferior; upper and lower lips continuous, with lower lip modified into sucking disc; snout tuberculated; one pair barbels (rostral); wide midlateral stripe (approx. 2 scales width); two dark bands (proximal and distal) in dorsal; caudal fin with red margins (Ho). | Kottelat (2001); Rainbow (1996). | Frequently sold as *Crossocheilus siamensis*. | RC0716 | YGN399 |
| **Garra cf. ceylonensis** *(Bleeker)* | Mouth inferior; ventral surface of head and body flattened; upper and lower lips continuous, lateral line complete (32 pored scales); dark spot on gill opening; distance of anus from anal fin origin less than 4× in distance between pelvic fin origin and anal fin origin; interorbital width greater than 0.5× HL; dark spots at dorsal base absent; dark midlateral stripe with several narrow light and dark longitudinal stripes posteriorly. | Menon (1964); Talwar & Jhingran (1991). | Tentative identification as many Garra spp. are poorly known. Keys out as *G. cambodgensis* in Talwar & Jhingran (1991), but *G. mullay Sykes* is a plausible alternative identification, a species with a wider distribution. | RC0717 | YGN039 |
| **Garra flavata** *(Kullander & Fang)* | Mouth inferior; ventral surface of head and body flattened; upper and lower lips continuous, with lower lip modified into sucking disc; pectoral absent; two pairs barbels; lateral line complete (28 pored scales); 7½ branched dorsal rays; shallow rostral furrow; rostral lobe present; tubercles on rostral lobe and snout; abdomen scaled; black spot at gill opening; 3 yellow contrasting bars (Ho); wide, dark distal band and white tip to dorsal; subdorsal band to caudal; spots on caudal. | Kullander & Fang (2004). | Individual species appear juvenile, and lacking pectoral fins. | EU1163 | RC0317 | RC0318 | YGN106 | YGN1195 | YGN376 |
| **Garra gotyla** *(Gray)* | Mouth inferior; ventral surface of head and body flattened; upper and lower lips continuous, with lower lip modified into sucking disc; two pairs barbels; upper lip not tuberculate; chest and ventral surface scaled; no distinct pectoral or rostral fold; lateral line complete (31–32 pored scales); 8½ branched dorsal rays; dark blotch on caudal base; longitudinal stripes on posterior of body; dark posterior margin to dorsal and caudal; red/pinkish fins (Ho). | Menon (1964); Talwar & Jhingran (1991); Vishwanath et al. (2007). | Individuals appear juvenile, and lacking pectoral fins. | YGN062 | YGN106 | YGN219 | YGN478 | RC0930 | RC0931 |
### Appendix C. Table of Morphological Identifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>References</th>
<th>Identification Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Garra grassei</em> (Annandale)</td>
<td>Mouth inferior; ventral surface of head and body flattened; upper and lower lips continuous, with lower lip modified into sucking disc; unbranched lateral lines; 8-12 branched dorsal rays; lower lip opercular; dark spot at upper opening of operculum.</td>
<td>Unable to count diagnostic circumpeduncular scales due to tissue erosion from this area; estimated from photograph to be approx. 12.</td>
<td>RC0272, RC0273</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Garra rufa</em> (Heckel)</td>
<td>Mouth inferior; ventral surface of head and body flattened; upper and lower lips continuous, with lower lip modified into sucking disc; lateral lines complete (32 pore scales); yellowish base of dorsal fin; black midlateral stripe.</td>
<td>Unable to confidently place to known species.</td>
<td>RC0386, RC0387</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Garra sp.</em> &quot;undet. (1)&quot;</td>
<td>Mouth inferior; ventral surface of head and body flattened; upper and lower lips continuous, with lower lip modified into sucking disc; lateral lines complete (approx. 33 pore scales); 8-12 branched dorsal rays; no spots on dorsal base; dark bar at base of caudal; fins with no distinct markings; no longitudinal red stripes posteriorly; no spot behind circumpeduncular fin; with no distinct markings.</td>
<td></td>
<td>RC0396, RC0397</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hypancistrus nunseni</em> (Tiran)</td>
<td>Spines above operculum; dorsal with 9-12 branched rays; caudal spotted; dark spot posterior to spine.</td>
<td></td>
<td>EUN164, RC0395, RC0396, YGN018, YGN033, YGN120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hypostomus plecostomus</em> Kuhl &amp; van Hasselt</td>
<td>One pair barbels; mouth large, extending past anterior margin of eye; last unbranched dorsal ray finely serrated; lateral lines complete (25-27 pore scales); narrow black bar between dorsal and anal origin; black bar on caudal peduncle; caudal bar (H6) with black submarginal stripes.</td>
<td>Di &amp; Tshibawayabwa et al. (2001); Roberts &amp; Kottelat (1999).</td>
<td>RC0536, RC0537</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hypostomus plecostomus</em> (Smith)</td>
<td>Lateral line complete; 412 scales between lateral line and dorsal origin; 2 rows of scales between anus and anal origin; last unbranched dorsal ray serrated; distance between distal dorsal seme greater than width of their base; 8 branched pelvic rays; shallow groove in lower lip between jaws; dark scale bases, reticulated pattern; pectorals, pelvic and anal yellow/orange color (H6).</td>
<td>Unable to count circum-peduncular scales, so cannot entirely rule out <em>H. malcolmi</em> (Smith).</td>
<td>RC0180, RC0181, YGN1430</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Labrus c. biga</em> (Hamilton)</td>
<td>One pair minute maxillary barbels; upper lip covered by metal cap; lateral line complete (38 pore scales); 412 scales between lateral line and pelvic base; 912 branched dorsal rays; 512 branched anal rays; dark spot above pectoral; dark bar on caudal peduncle.</td>
<td>Hamilton (1822); Tan &amp; Kottelat (2009).</td>
<td>RC0671, RC0672</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Labrus chauliodon</em> (Bleeker)</td>
<td>Two pairs barbels; lips fimbriated; upper lip covered by metal cap with broad lateral fold; dorsal large, with straight margin and 1812 branched rays; black body and fin colour.</td>
<td>Kottelat (2001); Tan &amp; Kottelat (2009).</td>
<td>RC0369, RC0370</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Labrus cyclochilus</em> Bleeker</td>
<td>Two pairs barbels (maxillary barbel and trace); lips fimbriated; upper lip covered by broad metal cap; dorsal deeply concave with 1212 branched rays; variegated body colour pattern.</td>
<td>Tel &amp; Bousoulas et al. (2000); Tel &amp; Bousoulas &amp; Tang (2005).</td>
<td>RC0506, RC0507</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Labrus cyclochilus</em> (Valenciennes)</td>
<td>Two pairs barbels (maxillary barbel not reaching centre of eye, rostral short); lips fimbriated; lateral line complete (36 pore scales); long dorsal fin (2412 branched rays); 512 branched anal rays; approx. 10 rows spots forming longitudinal stripe.</td>
<td>Kottelat (2001); Tan &amp; Kottelat (2009).</td>
<td>RC0370</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Labrus cyclochilus</em> (Heckel)</td>
<td>Two pairs barbels; lips fimbriated; scales small (61 pore lateral line scales); long dorsal fin (2812 branched rays); no lateral stripe; opalescent humeral spot; opalescent spot on caudal peduncle and caudal base; fins without markings.</td>
<td>Kottelat et al. (1993); Roberts (1994).</td>
<td>RC0274, RC0275</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Labrus cyclochilus</em> (Hueck)</td>
<td>Two pairs barbels (maxillary barbel not reaching centre of eye); lateral line complete, terminating on ventral half of caudal peduncle; 412 scales between lateral line and dorsal origin; 712 branched dorsal rays; no black blotch posterior to operculum; black midlateral stripe approx. 12-1 scale width; caudal lobes without black submarginal stripes; pectoral, anal, caudal red/orange (H6).</td>
<td>Kottelat (2001); Kottelat et al. (1993); Rainboth (1996); Roberts (1993); Tan &amp; Kottelat (2009).</td>
<td>RC0290, RC0291</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lepomis cyanellus</em> (Fowler)</td>
<td>Two pairs barbels (maxillary barbel not reaching centre of eye); lateral line complete, terminating on ventral half of caudal peduncle; 412 scales between lateral line and dorsal origin; 712 branched dorsal rays; no black blotch posterior to operculum; black midlateral stripe approx. 12-1 scale width; caudal lobes without black submarginal stripes; pectoral, anal, caudal red/orange (H6).</td>
<td>Kottelat (2001); Kottelat et al. (1993); Rainboth (1996); Roberts (1993); Tan &amp; Kottelat (2009).</td>
<td>RC0290, RC0291</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lucioperca ilus</strong> (Linnaeus)</td>
<td>Barbels absent; mouth terminal; lateral line complete (53-56 scaled scales); 812-912 branched dorsal rays; 1112 branched pectoral rays; posterior margin of anal concave.</td>
<td>Kottelat &amp; Frachow (2007).</td>
<td>Ornamental blue variety.</td>
<td>RC0570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lucioperca antennarius</strong> (Valenciennes)</td>
<td>Two pairs barbels (well developed); mouth large; snout strongly pointed; 712 branched dorsal rays; 612 branched anal rays; pelvic filaments extend to anal origin; semi-circle of tubercles between post-labial region; scattered tubercles on lower jaw and snout; caudal positioned in posterior half of body; dark spots on caudal absent; midlateral stripe of indistinct spots, continuing onto caudal as submarginal stripe of upper lobe; median caudal ray not pigmented.</td>
<td>Kottelat (2001); Kottelat et al. (1993); Rainboth (1990); Roberts (1869).</td>
<td>RC0294</td>
<td>RC0295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Microdevaria kubotai</strong> (Kottelat &amp; Witten)</td>
<td>Barbels absent; lateral line absent; preopercular scales 10; narrow infraorbital 4; 712-1012 branched anal rays; concave distal margin of anal and dorsal; wide midlateral stripe, diffuse anteriorly; caudal spot absent; no stripes on fins; black anal papilla absent; thin axial streak from above anus to caudal base.</td>
<td>Fang et al. (2009); Jiang et al. (2008); Kottelat &amp; Witten (1999).</td>
<td>RC0234</td>
<td>RC0235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Microdevaria nama</strong> (Kottelat &amp; Witten)</td>
<td>As M. kubotai, but: distinct dark spot on tip of dorsal; diffuse spot on tip of anal; 1012-1112 branched anal rays; thin midlateral stripe; diffuse anteriorly; unpainted fins yellowish (Ha).</td>
<td>Fang et al. (2009); Jiang et al. (2008); Kottelat &amp; Witten (1999).</td>
<td>EUN161</td>
<td>RC0618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Micro rasb o ra rubescens</strong> Annandale</td>
<td>Barbels absent; supraorbital groove present; wide infraorbital 4; lateral line absent; predorsal scales 13; 712-812 branched dorsal rays; 1012-1112 branched anal rays; caudal spot absent; no stripes on fins; black anal papilla; bright orange/red coloration with bright lateral stripe (Ha).</td>
<td>Annandale (1918); Cottle (2010); Fang (2003); Fang et al. (2008); Jiang et al. (2008); Kottelat &amp; Witten (1999).</td>
<td>RC0681</td>
<td>RC0682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Micro rasb o ra rubescens</strong> Annandale</td>
<td>As Micro rasb o ra rubescens, but: larger (4.3 cm TL), deeper bodied and bullier; duller pinished/orange hue (Ha).</td>
<td>Annandale (1918); Cottle (2010); Fang (2003); Fang et al. (2008); Jiang et al. (2008); Kottelat &amp; Witten (1999).</td>
<td>RC0681</td>
<td>RC0682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mystacoleucus australis</strong> (Day)</td>
<td>Two pairs barbels; lateral line complete; precambria preopercular spine; body deep and laterally compressed; eyes large; 812 branched dorsal rays; last unbranched dorsal ray serrated; 612 branched anal rays; dorsal origin anterior to pelvic origin; anal with concave distal margin; dorsal with black distal margin, becoming fainter posteriorly; strong black margin to caudal absent; dark scale base crescents absent.</td>
<td>Kottelat (2001); Talwar &amp; Jhingan (1991).</td>
<td>EUN049</td>
<td>RC0203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Myloperca anatina</strong> (Bloch)</td>
<td>Barbels absent; mouth small and inferior; lips papillated; ventral surface flat; high body, strongly laterally compressed; dorsal origin just posterior to pectoral base; dorsal, soft fins, terminating at caudal peduncle; unmarked coloration with 4 dark bars.</td>
<td>Gaio et al. (2008).</td>
<td>MYL006</td>
<td>MYL007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nelimacheilus cf. stachyi</strong> (Day)</td>
<td>Two pairs barbels; lateral line complete (242-2 scaled scales); last unbranched dorsal ray not serrated; 912 branched dorsal rays; post labial groove interrupted (no median flabellate lobes on lower lip) tubercles on sides of snout and below eye; 312 rows scales between dorsal origin and lateral line; dark midlateral stripe; back bronze and belly silver (Ha).</td>
<td>Chen et al. (1999); Day (1875); Kottelat (2001); Vishnuvasan &amp; Kottelat (2003).</td>
<td>RC0365</td>
<td>RC0366</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Opsanus betaeri (Day)  
One pair barbels (minute); lateral line incomplete; 10½–11½ branched dorsal rays; 13½ branched anal rays; single row 10–12 middorsal short barb spots; becoming more elongated anteriorly; anal, dorsal and pelvic with black distal and white proximal stripes; caudal with white margins to lobes, and upper lobe with submarginal black blotch anteriorly.

Oreobrycon constans  
Barbels absent; snout pointed; scales between pelvic origin and dorsal midline: 12, 6, 12; cephalic papillae present on head (arranged in rows); lateral line incomplete (5–6 rows); last branched dorsal ray not serrated; 8½ branched dorsal ray; 5½ branched anal ray; scales with dark bases; reticulate pattern; no spot on caudal peduncle; anal with indistinct median stripe/kilte; black subdorsal margin on dorsal.

Oreobrycon finidens  
Barbels absent; snout blunt; scales between pelvic origin and dorsal midline: 12, 7, 12; cephalic papillae present on head (arranged in rows); lateral line incomplete; last branched dorsal ray not serrated; 8½ branched dorsal ray; 5½ branched anal ray; scales with dark bases; reticulate pattern; no spot on anal; spot on caudal base greater than 13 of peduncle depth; distal anterior blotch on dorsal in females.

Oreobrycon parvis Smith  
Barbels absent; snout pointed; scales between pelvic origin and dorsal midline: 12, 6, 12; cephalic papillae present on head (arranged in rows); lateral line incomplete (6–7 rows); last branched dorsal ray not serrated; 8½ branched dorsal ray; 5½ branched anal ray; scales with dark bases; reticulate pattern; spot on caudal base less than 12 of peduncle depth; anal with spot; dark marking on tip of dorsal.

Oreobrycon “red fin”  
Barbels absent; scales between pelvic origin and dorsal midline: 12, 6, 12; cephalic papillae present on head (arranged in rows); lateral line incomplete (5–6 rows); last unbranched dorsal ray not serrated; 8½ branched dorsal rays; 5½ branched anal rays; scales with dark bases; reticulate pattern; blotch covering almost entire caudal peduncle; anal with spot; anterior subdistal blotch on dorsal continuing as median stripe (females), with no spot on dorsal in male; red colouration on body, caudal, dorsal and pelvic, anal in males (H6).

Osteochilus bleekeri  
Two pairs barbels; lips plicate; dorsal strongly concave anteriorly (11½ branched rays); last unbranched dorsal ray not serrated; 5½ branched anal ray; black blotch on proximal-anterior end of dorsal; 6–7 rows lateral spots.

Osteochilus microcephalus (Valenciennes)  
Two pairs barbels; lips fin-like and folded; mouth subinferior; tubercles at end of snout; 22 gill rakers; dorsal with 11½ branched rays; last unbranched dorsal ray not serrated; 5½ branched anal ray; scale midlateral stripe from operculum to caudal base; two rows of spots on dorsal.

Osteochilus vitatus (Valenciennes)  
Two pairs barbels; lips fin-like and folded; mouth subinferior; snout tubercles absent; 5½ scale rows between dorsal origin and lateral line; last unbranched dorsal ray not serrated; scale rows with dark spots forming faint stripes; midlateral stripe absent; medium-sized blotch on caudal peduncle; fins red colour (H6).

Pseudocepria cf. carbusculus  
Britz & Kottelat  
Scales absent; miniature size (up to 30 mm SL); modified fin shape in males forming bent-sided “flange and hook” on anterior ray; pre-anal body fin fold in females; single irregular row of mid-dorsal chromatophores; head blotch w-shaped; head-luminal pigment present; chest spots present; well-developed chest blotch; opercular and branchiostegal rows of pigment; lips not heavily pigmented; red colour (H6).

Pseudocepria cf. micromegastes Kottelat, Britz, & Witte  
Scales absent; miniature size (up to 30 mm SL); modified fin shape in males forming bent-sided “flange and hook” on anterior ray; single row of mid-dorsal chromatophores; head-luminal pigment absent; overall, lightly pigmented; chest blotch present (distinct); red colour (H6).
**Pectenopsis korthausae**

Kottelat

Barbels absent; symphysial knob present; pointed snout; elongate body shape; v. large number comb-like gill rakers (not counted); 7-12 branched dorsal rays; 5-12 branched anal ray; last unbranched dorsal ray not serrated; dorsal origin above pelvic; lateral line incomplete (8-13 sequenced); round black spot on caudal base occupying 50% of peduncle; axial streak from operculum to caudal peduncle.

Kottelat (1982); Tan & Kottelat (2009).

**P树脂ius normani**

Smith

Two pairs barbels; mouth inferior; lateral line complete (28-30+6-3 sequenced); lateral line with accessory ventral pore; last unbranched dorsal ray serrated; well defined dark stripes along margins of caudal lobes; yellow caudal (life).


**P. proctozonon**

(Bleeker)

Barbels absent; lateral line complete; last unbranched anal ray thick and serrated posteriorly; last unbranched dorsal short, not reaching caudal; body plain with no markings; fins without orange colour.

Kottelat (2001); Kottelat et al. (1993); Tani & Katsuyama (1979).

**P. arulius**

One pair maxillary barbels; mouth subterminal; lateral line complete; last unbranched dorsal ray smooth; dark band across caudal lobe absent; three large blotches on body (> 2 scales); large blotch mid body above pelvic origin, dark blotch above anal, dark blotch on caudal base; dorsal filaments absent in males.

Devi et al. (2010); Knight et al. (2011); Pathiyagoda & Kottelat (2005).

**P. assimilis**

Lateral line complete; smooth last unbranched dorsal ray; one pair maxillary barbels (long); mouth inferior; dark band across caudal lobe; dark posterior lateral blotch; no markings on body anterior to anal origin.

Devi et al. (2010); Pathiyagoda & Kottelat (2005).

**P. assimilis**

Lateral line complete; smooth last unbranched dorsal ray; one pair maxillary barbels (long); mouth inferior; dark band across caudal lobe; dark posterior lateral blotch; no markings on body anterior to anal origin.

Devi et al. (2010); Pathiyagoda & Kottelat (2005).

Individual lacks iridescent pigments.

**P. chola**

Hamilton

One pair barbels (maxillary); mouth subterminal; 812 branched dorsal rays; spot on caudal peduncle; proximal-anterior spot on dorsal branched rays 1-4; median-proximal row of dots above spot on dorsal.

Hamilton (1822); Silva et al. (2008); Takahr & Jhingran (1991).

**P. chola**

Hamilton

One pair barbels (maxillary); mouth subterminal; 812 branched dorsal rays; spot on caudal peduncle; proximal-anterior spot on dorsal branched rays 1-4; median-proximal row of dots above spot on dorsal.

Hamilton (1822); Silva et al. (2008); Takahr & Jhingran (1991).

**P. chola**

Hamilton

One pair barbels (maxillary); mouth subterminal; 812 branched dorsal rays; spot on caudal peduncle; proximal-anterior spot on dorsal branched rays 1-4; median-proximal row of dots above spot on dorsal.

Hamilton (1822); Silva et al. (2008); Takahr & Jhingran (1991).

**P. chola**

Hamilton

One pair barbels (maxillary); mouth subterminal; 812 branched dorsal rays; spot on caudal peduncle; proximal-anterior spot on dorsal branched rays 1-4; median-proximal row of dots above spot on dorsal.


**P. conchonius**

Hamilton

Barbels absent; lateral line incomplete (6-13 sequenced); 812 branched dorsal rays; deep body; dark blotch on caudal peduncle (no anterior blotches); dorsal with thick distal band.

Hamilton (1822); Takahr & Jhingran (1991); Vishwanath et al. (2007).
### APPENDIX C. TABLE OF MORPHOLOGICAL IDENTIFICATIONS

| **Puntius denisoni** (Day) | One pair barbels (maxillary); lateral line complete (28-pored scales); smooth last unbranched dorsal ray; mouth inferior; no pronounced snout; black midlateral stripe with scarlet stripe above anteriorly; caudal with oblique dark distal band. | Day (1865); Menon et al. (1999); Prasad et al. (2008); Talwar & Jhingan (1991). | RC0020
| | | | RC0106
| | | | RC0119
| | | | RC0190
| | | | RC0151
| | | | RC0712
| | | | YGN1015
| | | | YGN1114

| **Puntius dunckeri** (Ahl) | Two pairs long barbels; lateral line complete; 8 1/2 branched dorsal rays; last unbranched dorsal ray not serrated; colour pattern: see comments. | Ahl (1929); Kottelat et al. (1993). | RC0017
| | | | RC0018
| | | | RC0145
| | | | RC0146
| | | | RC0147

| **Puntius erythromystax** (Kullander) | Barbels absent; lateral line incomplete; lateral scale row curved; last unbranched dorsal ray serrated; 8 1/2 branched dorsal rays; humeral marking absent; dark band around caudal peduncle; snout red (He). | Kullander (2008). | RC0603
| | | | RC0675
| | | | RC0676
| | | | RC0677
| | | | RC0678

| **Puntius fasciatus** (Jerdon) | Two pairs barbels (maxillary longer than eye diam.); last unbranched dorsal ray not serrated; three scale rows between mid-dorsal row and lateral line; lateral line complete; four wide, irregular dark bars viz. oblique band between eyes, bar above pelvic, bar above anal, bar on caudal base. | Jayaram (1990); Jerdon (1849); Pethiyagoda & Kottelat (2005); Talwar & Jhingan (1991). | Possible diversity within the species, as four other names available in synonymy of *P. fasciatus*. Have chosen oldest available name in absence of modern treatment. Frequently sold as *P. melanampyx*. | RC0221
| | | | RC0222
| | | | RC0101
| | | | RC0102
| | | | RC0168
| | | | RC0169
| | | | RC0170
| | | | RC0333
| | | | RC0354
| | | | YGN267
| | | | YGN395
**Puntius elongatus**

*Valenciennes*)

One pair maxillary barbels (short); lateral line complete; last unbranched dorsal ray not serrated; mouth subterminal; dark band across caudal lobes; dark posterior lateral blotch; no markings on body anterior to anal origin.


Frequently sold as *Puntius ornatus*. RC0007 RC0008 RC0101 RC0102 RC0103 RC0204 RC0290 RC0688

---

**Puntius ornatus**

Kottelat (1982); Kottelat et al. (1993).

Frequently sold as *Puntius assimilis*. RC0098 RC0099 RC0100 RC0695 RC0696

---

**Puntius elongatus**

*Hamilton*)

Barbels absent; lateral line incomplete (up to 5 red scales); last unbranched dorsal ray strongly serrated; 8-12 branched dorsal rays; black band around caudal peduncle; black anterior spot on anal (not extending onto body); distinct black spots on pelvis; black spot on anterior base of dorsal; last unbranched dorsal ray not pigmented posterior to spot.

Bordoloi & Baishya (2006); Hamilton (1822); McClelland (1839); Vishwanath & Laisram (2004). 

RC0135-RC0137 appear a larger fish with different form, but do not deviate significantly from the description. Frequently sold as *Puntius canius*. RC0038 RC0039 RC0135 RC0136 RC0137 RC0604 RC0605

---

**Puntius ornatus**

*Hamilton*)

Barbels absent; lateral line incomplete (up to 4 scales); last unbranched dorsal ray strongly serrated; 8-12 branched dorsal rays; black band around caudal peduncle; black anterior spot on anal (extending onto body); distinct black spots on pelvis absent; black spot on anterior base of dorsal; last unbranched dorsal ray pigmented posterior to spot.

Bordoloi & Baishya (2006); Hamilton (1822); McClelland (1839); Vishwanath & Laisram (2004). 

Diffs from description of *P. gelius* in lacking spots on pelvis (RC0741 has faint marking). Also differs from my *P. ornatus* in the anal fin spot extending well onto body and the pigmentation of last unbranched dorsal extending to tip (vs. not extending, and no dark pigmentation to tip). Appears as a smaller, more translucent fish. The description of *P. canius* (Hamilton) does not mention the pelvic spots, but Hamilton's illustrations published by McClelland (1839) show spots. *Puntius ornatus* is described as a smaller fish with a reddish hue; my material does not show a red colour, but the may be a seasonal, breeding effect. Bordoloi & Baishya (2006) report this coloration from specimens of "*P. ornatus"* Vishwanath & Laisram from Assam, and the specimens they picture appear similar, but are not *P. ornatus* as described (only markings being a band around caudal peduncle). I am reluctant to call my specimens *P. canius* or *P. ornatus*, and await further study. Frequently sold as *P. canius* or *P. gelius*. RC0466 RC0469 RC0600 RC0740 RC0741
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Additional Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Puntius hexazo (Webber &amp; de Beaufort)</td>
<td>Two pairs barbels; lateral line complete (but see comments); 5 1/2 scales between dorsal and lateral line; six dark bars; dark spot below posterior base of dorsal absent.</td>
<td>Alfred (1963); Kottelat et al. (1993).</td>
<td>Specimens RC0361 and RC0362 appear to have incomplete lateral lines. They are referred as Puntius cf. hexazo. Frequently sold as P. pentazona.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puntius jerdoni (Day)</td>
<td>Two pairs barbels (maxillary = eye diameter, mental shorter); last unbranched dorsal ray not serrated; lateral line complete; 5 1/2 scales between dorsal and lateral line; 12 predorsal scales; colour silvery (Hs); fin orange (Hs) and tipped with black.</td>
<td>Day (1870, 1875); Talwar &amp; Jhingran (1991).</td>
<td>Perhaps better referred to Hypselobarbus, but will follow Talwar &amp; Jhingran (1991) in the absence of a modern treatment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puntius johorensis (Duncker)</td>
<td>Two pairs barbels; 4-5 dark stripes (wide, approx. 1 scale); stripes +1 and -1 on scale rows +2 and -2; no distinct axial streak below dorsal fin base.</td>
<td>Kottelat (1996).</td>
<td>Assigned as P. johorensis, but indistinct axial streak present on RC0641; number of stripes mostly lower than that reported by Kottelat (1996), but fits P. johorensis better than alternative species.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puntius lateristriga (Valenciennes)</td>
<td>Two pairs barbels; deep body; lateral line complete; last unbranched dorsal ray serrated; two sides (2-4 scales) dark bars: first above pectoral, second wider, between dorsal and pelvic; dark midlateral stripe (1-2 scales) commencing anterior to anal, continuing onto caudal; spot above anterior of anal; RC0515 and RC0516 with more indistinct patterning comprising series of dark scale bases rather than solid lines, and midlateral stripe not extending into caudal.</td>
<td>Talwar &amp; Jhingran (1991).</td>
<td>Six forms from the Malay Peninsula were recognised by Tweedie (1961): RC0302, RC0109 and RC0208 conform to the Johore form, while RC0515 and RC0516 conform to Pecks and Kedah form; these forms are not regarded as conspecific in analysis, but the name Barbus zelleri Ahl may apply to Malay fishes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puntius lineatus (Duncker)</td>
<td>Barbels absent; 5 1/2 scale rows between dorsal origin and lateral line; mouth subinferior; flashy lower lip forming continuous postoral groove; longitudinal dark stripes.</td>
<td>Kottelat (1996).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puntius marigrenae Arunkumar &amp; Tombi Singh</td>
<td>Barbels absent; lateral line incomplete (67-70 scales); 8 1/2 branched dorsal rays; last unbranched dorsal ray serrated; small (one scale) humeral spot (not bar); small (one scale) caudal peduncle spot; 2-3 faint rows of spots in dorsal; spots absent from pelvic and anal; pigmented scale base; red colouration (Hs).</td>
<td>Arunkumar &amp; Tombi Singh (2003); Kulbeeder &amp; Bitts (2008); Liothrinogambi &amp; Velhoanath (2007); Menon et al. (2000).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puntius nigrofasciatus (Günther)</td>
<td>Barbels absent; mouth subterminal; lateral line complete; last unbranched dorsal ray serrated; three complete dark bars above pectoral, pelvic and anal fin; oblique bar between eyes; scales with dark pigment at base.</td>
<td>Günther (1868); Kottelat &amp; Pethiyagoda (1991); Pethiyagoda (1991); Talwar &amp; Jhingran (1991).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puntius oligolepis (Blanchard)</td>
<td>One pair barbels; lateral line incomplete (6-7 scale rows); last unbranched dorsal ray not serrated; parallel rows of papillae on head; no bars or stripes; black distal margin to dorsal and anal; dark crescents along scale rows.</td>
<td>Kottelat et al. (1993); Tan &amp; Kottelat (2008).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puntius opalescens (Valenciennes)</td>
<td>Two pairs barbels; last unbranched dorsal ray serrated; lateral line complete (29-31 scale rows); blotch on caudal peduncle; spot below dorsal origin; dark bar immediately anterior to operculum; caudal red with dark marginal stripes; dots along scale rows.</td>
<td>Kottelat (2001); Rainboth (1996).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Characteristics</td>
<td>References</td>
<td>Codes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Puntius padam</em> Kullander &amp; Britz</td>
<td>One pair barbels (maxilla; small); lateral line incomplete (5-8 scales); last unbranched dorsal ray serrated; 2-3 rows dark spots on dorsal, pelvic and anal (males); vertical humeral blotch covering 3 scales; dark blotch on caudal peduncle; red coloration; base of scales heavily pigmented.</td>
<td>Kullander &amp; Britz (2008). Frequently sold as <em>Puntius ticto</em>.</td>
<td>RC043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RC044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RC045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RC0152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RC0153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RC0711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>YGN041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>YGN056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>YGN196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>YGN404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Puntius pentazona</em> (Boulenger)</td>
<td>Two pairs barbels; lateral line complete; 5+2 scales between dorsal and lateral line; six dark bars; dark spot below posterior base of dorsal.</td>
<td>Alfred (1963); Kottelat et al. (1993).</td>
<td>RC012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RC0304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RC0152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RC0153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RC0154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RC0155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RC0156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>YGN076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>YGN139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Puntius rhombocellatus</em> Koumans</td>
<td>Two pairs barbels; lateral line complete; 5+2 branched anal rays; 4+2 scales between dorsal origin and lateral line; six irregular black bars with &quot;rhombic&quot; widening midlaterally; no spots between bars.</td>
<td>Alfred (1963); Kottelat (1982); Kottelat et al. (1993); Roberts (1989).</td>
<td>EUN232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RC0023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RC0024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RC0025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RC0154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RC0155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>YGN076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>YGN139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Puntius sahyadronia</em> Silas</td>
<td>Barbels absent; mouth subterminal; dorsal profile strongly convex; last unbranched dorsal ray not serrated, and also dark; pelvic black with white distal margin; scales with dark margin; up to seven irregular spots or vertical marks on sides.</td>
<td>Silas (1953).</td>
<td>RC0036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RC0037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RC0040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RC0341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RC0342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Puntius cf. sahara</em> (Hamilton)</td>
<td>Two pairs barbels; lateral line complete (3+3 scales); last unbranched dorsal ray not serrated; deep body; diffuse dark round blotch on caudal peduncle; rows of spots forming indistinct lateral stripes running along base of scales.</td>
<td>Hamilton (1822); Kottelat &amp; Pathiyagoda (1991); Pathiyagoda (1991).</td>
<td>RC0074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RC0080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RC0081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Puntius semiesocellatus</em> (Günther)</td>
<td>One pair barbels, small; last unbranched dorsal ray serrated and shorter than adjacent branched ray; lateral line complete; series (up to seven) of irregular lateral marks (spots or bars), with last bar forming spot on caudal base.</td>
<td>Chang et al. (2006); Günther (1868); Kottelat (2001). Frequently sold as <em>Puntius anchii</em>.</td>
<td>RC0040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RC0041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RC0042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RC0093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RC0142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RC0673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RC0674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Puntius schalyani</em> Yazdani &amp; Talukdar</td>
<td>Barbels absent; lateral line incomplete (up to 11 pored scales); dark axial streak; last unbranched dorsal ray strongly serrated; 7+2 branched dorsal rays; prominent first dark spot on peduncle above posterior of anal; indistinct second spot on caudal base; base of scales dark.</td>
<td>Yazdani &amp; Talukdar (1975). Yazdani &amp; Talukdar (1975) reports orange/black fins, perhaps the material is immature?</td>
<td>RC0485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RC0486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RC0487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RC0488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RC0489</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX C. TABLE OF MORPHOLOGICAL IDENTIFICATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Identification Details</th>
<th>Source(s)</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Puntius cf. sopho re</em> (Hamilton)</td>
<td>Barbels absent; mouth terminal; lateral line complete; last unbranched dorsal ray smooth; 8-9 branched dorsal rays; dark proximal spot on branched dorsal rays 3, 4 and 5; dark spot on caudal peduncle and base; golden blotch on operculum; pelvic and anal yellow (Hb).</td>
<td>Hamilton (1822); Silva et al. (2008); Talwar &amp; Jhingran (1991).</td>
<td>Much uncertainty in identification, with five available names in synonymy of <em>P. sopho re</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Puntius sp. &quot;hybrid&quot;</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Purported to be a hybrid of <em>P. denisonii</em> and <em>P. everetti</em>. Does not convincingly match any known <em>Puntius</em> species. The presence of a weak red stripe above the black midlateral stripe suggests <em>P. denisonii</em> may indeed be a parent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Puntius stoliczkanus</em> (Dac)</td>
<td>Barbels absent; lateral line complete; 8-9 branched dorsal rays; last unbranched dorsal ray serrated (11-16 serrae); black vertical blotch on scales 3-6 above pectoral; black blotch on caudal peduncle; 2 black rows of spots on dorsal.</td>
<td>Hamilton (1822); Kottek et al. (2001); Linthiongambi &amp; Vishwanath (2007).</td>
<td>Frequently sold as <em>Puntius ticto</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Puntius tambapamii</em> (Silas)</td>
<td>One pair barbels; mouth terminal; lateral line complete; last unbranched dorsal ray not serrated; dark band across caudal lobes absent; four large blotches on body: two dark narrow bars under dorsal; dark blotch above anal; dark bar on caudal base; dorsal filaments present in males.</td>
<td>Devi et al. (2010); Knight et al. (2011); Pathiyagoda &amp; Kottek (2005).</td>
<td>Some specimens small, but salient features discernible. Frequently sold as <em>Puntius arulius</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Puntius tetrazona</em> (Bleeker)</td>
<td>One pair barbels; last unbranched dorsal ray serrated; lateral line incomplete; four vertical dark bars; dark proximal band on dorsal not extending onto body.</td>
<td>Alfred (1963); Kottek et al. (1993).</td>
<td>Specimens here have an incomplete lateral line, but with 10-13 post dorsal scales. Kottek et al. (1993) reports 8-9 post dorsal scales for <em>P. tetrazona</em>, and illustrates a fish with black pelvics (as does BMNH syntype 1867.11.26.376), but there is no mention on this in the literature. Identified as <em>P. tetrazona</em> (Bleeker) over <em>P. anchisporus</em> (Valentini). Additional material (RC0736-RC0743) has 6-7 post dorsal scales and 12 cuneiform scales, also conforming to <em>P. tetrazona</em>. Photos of wild (live) <em>P. anchisporus</em> with a clearly complete lateral line are nearly identical looking to the aquarium tiger barb. Photos of wild putative <em>P. tetrazona</em> with black pelvics are a quite different looking fish, although there has been a long history of selective breeding this fish. Retained for time being as <em>P. tetrazona</em>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Puntius trivirgata** Kullander & Fang

One pair barbels (mandible, rudimentary); mouth subterminal; lateral line complete; 8+2 branched dorsal rays; last unbranched dorsal ray thin and weakly serrated; large dark humeral bar; large dark blotch on caudal peduncle forming indistinct band.


**Puntius toto** (Hamilton)

Barbels absent; lateral line incomplete (up to 11 pored scales); 24 scales in lateral series; 8+2 branched dorsal rays; 5+2 branched anal rays; last unbranched dorsal ray not serrated; lateral line complete (27+3 pored scales); 4/3 scales between lateral line and dorsal origin; 2+1 scale row between lateral line and pelvic origin; dorsal origin closer to eye than caudal base; weak midlateral stripe (1 scale width) from operculum to caudal peduncle, superimposed onto axial streak.

Hamilton (1822); Linthoingambi & Vishwanath (2007); Menon et al. (2000).

**Puntius triticeps** Denajagala

One pair barbels; incomplete lateral line (3-5 pored scales); last unbranched dorsal ray weakly serrated; dark midlateral stripe from lip extending into caudal; bright red colour (life).


**Puntius vitatus** Day

Barbels absent; mouth terminal; last unbranched dorsal ray not serrated; lateral line incomplete (3-4 pored scales); scales with dark base and dotted margins; vertical blotch on dorsal; dark spot at base of caudal; pigmented anus.


**Rasbora cf. aurotaenia** Trist

Barbels absent; symphyseal knob present; 7+1 branched dorsal rays; 5+1 branched anal rays; last unbranched dorsal ray not serrated; lateral line complete (27+3 pored scales); 4/3 scales between lateral line and dorsal origin; 2+1 scale row between lateral line and pelvic origin; dorsal origin closer to eye than caudal base; weak midlateral stripe (1 scale width) from operculum to caudal peduncle, superimposed onto axial streak.


Specimens in poor condition, so identification tentative.

**Rasbora barbora** (Blanchard)

Barbels absent; symphyseal knob present; 7+1 branched dorsal rays; 5+1 branched anal rays; last unbranched dorsal ray not serrated; lateral line complete (20-22 pored scales); diffuse midlateral stripe superimposed over prominent axial streak; supra-anal stripe and subpeduncular streak present; caudal base red/orange (life); fine unpigmented except prominent anterior subdistal spot on anal.

Siebert (1997).

Much variation in the size and position of the anal spot between batches. Perhaps a complex of species?

**Rasbora lepiliotus** Smith

Barbels absent; symphyseal knob present; 7+2 branched dorsal rays; 5+2 branched anal rays; last unbranched dorsal ray not serrated; lateral line incomplete (13-14 pored scales); midlateral stripe from operculum to caudal base, yellow/olive coloration above (life); supra-anal stripe and subpeduncular streak present; caudal base red/orange (life); fine otherwise without color.

Kottelat (2001); Smith (1934).

**Rasbora triguttata** Vogt

As *R. meeki*, but: midlateral blotch and midlateral stripe confluent; red spots on caudal lobe (life).

Conway (2005); Conway & Kottelat (2011); Kottelat (1991); Kottelat & Vidthayanon (1993).

Characters do not appear consistent between *R. triguttata* and *R. meeki*. Some examples of *R. meeki* have confluent lateral stripes, but red spots on caudal, and examples of *R. triguttata* have red spots on caudal, but midlateral blotch resembling *R. meeki*. Generic assignment follows Tang et al. (2010).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Identification</th>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rasbora britzkei (Axelrod)</td>
<td>Barbels absent; symphysial knob absent; pointed snout; elongate body shape; 15 predorsal scales; 7½ branched dorsal rays; 5½ branched anal rays; last unbranched dorsal ray not serrated; dorsal origin posterior to pelvic; lateral line incomplete (10 pored scales), descending in steps; black spot on caudal base occupying 50% of peduncle.</td>
<td>Axelrod (1976); Kottekat (1991, 2008b); Liao et al. (2010); Tan &amp; Kottekat (2009).</td>
<td>Generic assignment follows Tang et al. (2010).</td>
<td>EUN017 RC0030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rasbora caudimacula (Weite)</td>
<td>Barbels absent; symphysial knob present; 7½ branched dorsal rays; 5½ branched anal rays; last unbranched dorsal ray not serrated; lateral line complete; midlateral stripe present; but v. weak axial streak present; supralabial stripe confluent with sub-peduncular streak; scale pigments giving distinct reticulated pattern throughout body; caudal with black tips; other fins without markings.</td>
<td>Brittan (1972); Kottekat et al. (1993).</td>
<td></td>
<td>EUN050 RC095 RC0006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rasbora cf. cheena (1) (Liao &amp; Tan)</td>
<td>Barbels absent; body bulky; symphysial knob present; 7½ branched dorsal rays; 5½ branched anal rays; last unbranched dorsal ray not serrated; lateral line complete, and not arranged in &quot;step-like&quot; pattern; dorsal origin anterior to pelvic origin; 9 predorsal scales; large eyes; dark blotch in centre of dorsal, more like a bar; dorsal anterior to blotch, green-yellow colour (Ib).</td>
<td>Brittan (1972); Duncer (1904); Grant (2002); Liao et al. (2010); Liao &amp; Tan (2011).</td>
<td></td>
<td>RC0066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rasbora cf. cheena (2) (Liao &amp; Tan)</td>
<td>Barbels absent; body bulky; symphysial knob present; 7½ branched dorsal rays; 5½ branched anal rays; last unbranched dorsal ray not serrated; lateral line complete, and not arranged in &quot;step-like&quot; pattern; dorsal origin anterior to pelvic origin; 9 predorsal scales; large eyes; dark blotch in dorsal fin; fine, dark granulated chromatophores scattered evenly on head, body and fins.</td>
<td>Brittan (1972); Duncer (1904); Grant (2002); Liao et al. (2010); Liao &amp; Tan (2011).</td>
<td>Specimens in poor condition, but closest to Brevibora cheena. Differs, however, in predorsal scale count (should be 10-11) and lateral line shape (should be &quot;step-like&quot;). Not regarded as conspecific to RC0066 due to distinct pigment colour pattern on body and fins.</td>
<td>GYN431 UE3004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rasbora daniconius (Valenciennes)</td>
<td>Barbels absent; symphysial knob not pronounced; mouth terminal; 7½ branched dorsal rays; 5½ branched anal rays; last unbranched dorsal ray not serrated; lateral line complete; midlateral dark stripe greater than one scale width on caudal peduncle, and extending to median caudal rays; greenish lateral stripe above dark stripe (Ib).</td>
<td>Kotttekat (1998, 2001); Silva et al. (2010).</td>
<td>Identification tentative. Does not conform to R. daniconius (Hamilton) s.s., but could be conspecific with Indo-chinese R. daniconius s.l. However, does not disagree with diagnosis of D. danica, and so the name is used here conservatively in the absence of information on Indo-chinese R. daniconius.</td>
<td>RC0051 RC0052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rasbora endemicella Duncer</td>
<td>Barbels absent; body slender; symphysial knob present; 7½ branched dorsal rays; 5½ branched anal rays; 8-11 predorsal scales; dorsal origin anterior above pelvic; last unbranched dorsal ray not serrated; lateral line incomplete (7-8 pored scales), arranged in &quot;step-like&quot; pattern (see comments); round, dark blotch in centre of dorsal, not reaching last 2 branched rays, not bar-like.</td>
<td>Brittan (1972); Duncer (1904); Grant (2002); Liao et al. (2010); Liao &amp; Tan (2011).</td>
<td>Liao et al. (2010) reports symphysial knob absent. The &quot;step-like&quot; pattern of the pored lateral line scales was not clear in all specimens (some damaged), with variation apparent. Generic assignment follows Tang et al. (2010).</td>
<td>EUN051 RC0201 RC0063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rasbora demissennis (Eliezer)</td>
<td>Barbels absent; mouth subterminal; symphysial knob present; 7½ branched dorsal rays; 5½ branched anal rays; last unbranched dorsal ray not serrated; lateral line complete (26-33 pored scales); 10-11 predorsal scales; dorsal origin posterior to pelvic origin; 15-20 scales between lateral line and dorsal origin; 3 scale rows between lateral line and midventral row; dorsal origin close to eyes than caudal base, diffuse midlateral stripe from operculum to caudal peduncle; axial streak ventral to midlateral stripe; weak black posterior margin to caudal.</td>
<td>Kotttekat (1998, 2001, 2005); Kottekat (1993).</td>
<td>Generic assignment follows Tang et al. (2010).</td>
<td>EUN051 RC0201 RC0063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>References</td>
<td>Codes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Rastracanthus</em> <em>cincheranii</em> (Bleeker)</td>
<td>Barbeck absent; symphysial knob present on lower jaw; 712 branched dorsal rays; 512 branched anal rays; last unbranched dorsal ray not serrated; lateral line complete (28+2 pored scales); uneven, ventrally curved lateral stripe from snout to end of median caudal ray; reticulated scale pattern on dorsal-anterior of body; purple hue (He).</td>
<td>Brittan (1972); Kottelat et al. (1993); Tan (2009).</td>
<td>RC0363, RC0364</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Rastracanthus</em> cf. <em>semulapis</em> Roberts</td>
<td>Barbeck absent; symphysial knob present; 712 branched dorsal rays; 512 branched anal rays; last unbranched dorsal ray not serrated; lateral line incomplete (26-27 pored scales); 10-11 predorsal scales; 2 rows of scales between lateral line and pelvic origin; caudal peduncle narrow; wide midsidial stripe (2 scales width), more intense posteriorly and superimposed over anal stripe; precaudal spot absent; supramedian stripe present; reticulate pattern weak; anterior anal ray weakly pigmented.</td>
<td>Kottelat (2000); Kottelat et al. (1993); Roberts (1990); Siebert &amp; Gory (1990). Poor match to <em>R. annulospinis</em>, a species with 24-25 pored lateral line scales and a strongly reticulated scale pattern (Roberts, 1990). Roberts (1999) reported a sample from the Kapuas drainage with 10-11 predorsal scales and a lighter pattern. He regarded these as <em>R. cf. semulapis</em>.</td>
<td>RC0660, RC0661</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Rastracanthus</em> <em>epsi</em> Maekinen</td>
<td>As <em>R. heteromorpha</em>, but: slimmer, less deep bodied; triangular, posterior black stripe smaller, markedly concave ventrally, forming distinct &quot;ham bcho&quot; shape.</td>
<td>Kottelat (1991); Liao et al. (2010).</td>
<td>EU0584, EU0235, RC0202, RC0409, RC0509, YGN170, YGN464, YGN417</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Rastracanthus</em> <em>gradelli</em> Kottelat</td>
<td>Barbeck absent; symphysial knob absent; slender body shape; pointed snout; triangular-shaped operculum; 712 branched dorsal rays; 512 branched anal rays; last unbranched dorsal ray not serrated; dark high and strongly pointed; lateral line incomplete (6-4 pored scales); anal concave with elongated anterior rays; conspicuous, wide midsidial stripe continuing onto caudal; slender caudal peduncle.</td>
<td>Kottelat (1991); Liao et al. (2010).</td>
<td>YGN432, YGN418</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Rastracanthus</em> <em>lengeli</em> Maekinen</td>
<td>As <em>R. heteromorpha</em>, but: slimmer, less deep bodied; triangular, posterior black stripe markedly smaller; distance between pelvic origin and lower anterior edge of stripe equal to greatest width of stripe; coloration generally muted, with grey background color and bright orange stripe above lateral stripe (He).</td>
<td>Brittan (1972); Duncker (1904); Kottelat et al. (1993); Kottelat &amp; Witte (1999); Maekinen (1956).</td>
<td>YGN418, YGN432, YGN464, YGN506</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Rastracanthus</em> <em>heteromorpha</em> Duncker</td>
<td>Barbeck absent; symphysial knob present on lower jaw; 712 branched dorsal rays; 512 branched anal rays; last unbranched dorsal ray not serrated; dark high and strongly pointed; convex body (back) shape posterior to opercul; lateral line incomplete (up to 8 pored scales); conspicuous black stripe commencing posterior to dorsal origin, broader anteriorly covering most of body as triangle, or wedge shape, not concave ventrally; dark pigmentation to anterior dorsal and anal rays; pink/orange/red background color to body (He).</td>
<td>Brittan (1972); Duncker (1904); Kottelat et al. (1993); Kottelat &amp; Witte (1999); Maekinen (1956).</td>
<td>EUN236, EUN235, RC0309, RC0597, YGN410, YGN506</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Rastracanthus</em> cf. <em>heteromorpha</em> Duncker</td>
<td>As <em>R. heteromorpha</em>, but: more slender, lacking convexity posterior to opercul; pigmentation on anterior dorsal/anal rays less distinct; orange/yellow anterior-subdistal blotch in anal.</td>
<td>Brittan (1972); Duncker (1904); Kottelat et al. (1993); Kottelat &amp; Witte (1999); Maekinen (1956).</td>
<td>Possibly an undescribed species. Generic assignment follows Tang et al. (2010).</td>
<td>YGN417, YGN406, YGN404, YGN201, RC0307, RC0409, RC0406, RC0610, RC0611, YGN139, YGN133, YGN170, YGN377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Rastracanthus</em> <em>halocha</em> (Bleeker)</td>
<td>Barbeck absent; symphysial knob weak or absent; miniature size; slender caudal peduncle; 712 branched dorsal rays; 512 branched anal rays; 10-9 principal caudal rays; dark lateral stripe anterior to pelvis (larger than pupil); black spot on caudal base; red and black pigmentation on anterior of dorsal and anal (He); conspicuous pigmentation absent between eyes and maxilla.</td>
<td>Lin (1995); Tan (2009).</td>
<td>Lin (1995); Tan (2009).</td>
<td>RC0450, RC0451, YGN113, YGN170, YGN377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Rastracanthus</em> <em>maculate</em> Duncker</td>
<td>Barbeck absent; pored lateral line absent; symphysial knob weak or absent; miniature size; slender caudal peduncle; 712 branched dorsal rays; 512 branched anal rays; 10-9 principal caudal rays; dark lateral stripe anterior to pelvis (larger than pupil); black spot on caudal base; red and black pigmentation on anterior of dorsal and anal (He); conspicuous pigmentation absent between eyes and maxilla.</td>
<td>Conway (2005); Conway &amp; Kottelat (2013); Kottelat (1991); Kottelat &amp; Vidthayanon (1993).</td>
<td>Germany assignment follows Tang et al. (2010).</td>
<td>RC0203, RC0202, RC0103, RC0102, YGN132, YGN178</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### R. briggittae
Barbels absent; scales present; lateral line absent; symphysial knob weak or absent; miniature size; slender caudal peduncle; 7+2 branched dorsal rays; 5+2 branched anal rays; 7 pectorals; oval, longitudinally elongate midlateral blotch between pectoral and pelvic origin (surrounded by area free of pigment); irregular midlateral stripes from above anal origin to caudal peduncle; supramaxal spot; black spot on caudal base; black spot at caudal base; red spot on anterior of dorsal (He); conspicuous pigmentation absent between eyes and maxilla; last unbranched anal ray pigmented; red coloration to body (He).

### R. narvass
As *R. maculatus*, but: 9+8 principal caudal rays; sexually dimorphic lateral blotch (smaller in females). Conways (2005); Conway & Kottelat (2011); Kottelat & Vidthayanon (1993).

### R. pauciperforata
Barbels absent; scales present; lateral line absent; symphyseal knob weak or absent; miniature size; slender caudal peduncle; 7+2 branched dorsal rays; 5+2 branched anal rays; last unbranched dorsal ray not serrated; lateral line incomplete (6 pored scales); anal concave with elongated anterior ray; midlateral stripe ending at caudal base, with lighter red spot above (He); series vertical streaks on anterior scales below midlateral stripe; supramaxal stripe and subpeduncular streak confluent.

### R. paucisqualis
Barbels absent; scales present; lateral line absent; symphyseal knob not distinct; slender body shape; pointed snout; triangular-shaped operculum; 7+2 branched dorsal rays; 5+2 branched anal rays; lateral line incomplete (15-16 pored scales); no dorsal tubercles; elongate body; midlateral stripe diffuse anteriorly, ventral to axial streak anteriorly, becoming intense posteroirly and ending on caudal base; width of midlateral stripe 1.8 scale rows; no precaudal spot; supramaxal stripe distinct; reticulate pattern weak, fin with no coloration.

### R. paviana
Barbels absent; symphysial knob not distinct; slender body shape; pointed snout; triangular-shaped operculum; 7+2 branched dorsal rays; 5+2 branched anal rays; last unbranched dorsal ray not serrated; lateral line complete; distinct midlateral stripe starting at operculum, narrow anteriorly (12 scale rows width), terminating in contiguous diamond-shaped blotch on caudal base; axial streak superimposed on midlateral stripe for much of length; weak supra-anal pigments; fin with no markings.

### R. pavlobora (Hamilton)
Barbels absent; symphysial knob present; mouth terminal; 7+2 branched dorsal rays; 5+2 branched anal rays; last unbranched dorsal ray not serrated; lateral line complete; weak supra-anal stripe; diffuse lateral stripe from operculum to caudal base; subpeduncular streak present; scale segments giving weak reticulated pattern; caudal yellow (He) with black bars and posterior margin.

### R. sp. "cubana"
Barbels absent; symphysial knob present; 7+2 branched dorsal rays; 5+2 branched anal rays; lateral line complete; distinct midlateral stripe starting at operculum, narrow anteriorly (12 scale rows width), terminating in contiguous diamond-shaped blotch on caudal base; axial streak superimposed on midlateral stripe for much of length; weak supra-anal pigments; fin with no markings.
**Rasbora uniphthalmoidea** Kottelat

Barbels absent; scales present; lateral line absent; symphysial knob weak or absent; miniature size (up to 12.4 mm SL); slender caudal peduncle; 7 1/2 branched dorsal rays; 5 1/2 branched anal rays; midlateral stripes from operculum to caudal peduncle; black spot at caudal base; conspicuous pigmentation present between eye and maxilla; last unbranched dorsal ray pigmented; red spots on caudal base absent (Ha). Consens (2005); Consens & Kottelat (2011); Kottelat (1991); Kottelat & Vidthayanon (1993).

**Rasbora vulcanus** Tan

Barbels absent; symphysial knob present; 7 1/2 branched dorsal rays; 5 1/2 branched anal rays; last unbranched dorsal ray not serrated; lateral line complete; 10 predorsal scales; midlateral stripe from operculum to caudal base; supra-anal stripe and subpeduncular streak present; dorsal, anal and caudal with weak subdorsal dark margins; axial streak not distinct; distinct reticulate scale pattern; golden orange colour of body and fins (Ha). Tan (1999).

**Rasbora wilpita** Kottelat & Pethiyagoda

Barbels absent; symphysial knob pronounced; well developed lateral maxillary process; body depth 25-28% in SL; 7 1/2 branched dorsal rays; 5 1/2 branched anal rays; last unbranched dorsal ray not serrated; lateral line complete (29-31 predorsal scales); 1, 2, 4, 1, 13 scales in transverse line between dorsal and pelvic origin; 13 predorsal scales; midlateral dark stripe greater than one scale width on caudal peduncle; upper margin of stripe distinct, with lower margin indistinct giving jagged appearance. Silva et al. (2010). Silva et al. (2010).

**Rhabdodentes watsonii** (Denanjoy)

Barbels absent; symphysial knob present; deep laterally compressed body shape; 7 1/2 branched dorsal rays; 6 1/2 branched anal rays; posterior midlateral stripes, starting after pelvic base; caudal with red median stripe (Ha); white anterior margin of pelvis (Ha); 2 rows of white spots along median dorsal rays (Ha). Brittan (1972); Denanjoy (1930); Pethiyagoda (1991).

**Rhodias ocellatus** (Kner)

Barbels absent; anal origin before end of dorsal base; lateral line incomplete (up to 4 predorsal scales); 12 1/2 branched dorsal and anal rays; posterior midlateral stripe, starting after pelvic base; caudal with red median stripe (Ha); white anterior margin of pelvis (Ha); 2 rows of white spots along median dorsal rays (Ha). Arni & Aki (1988); Nakabo (2002). Conforms to *R. ocellatus ocellatus*. Conforms to *R. ocellatus ocellatus*.

**Robetsis agilis** Sykes

Barbels absent; lateral line complete; 8 1/2 branched dorsal rays; 13 1/2 branched anal rays; last unbranched dorsal ray serrated; ventral edge of body oval and bell-like between pelvic and anal; procumbent predorsal spine (co-ossified by scales); body deep and laterally compressed; silvery colour (Ha); with 5 black bars; spot on caudal peduncle. Day (1865); Sykes (1839, 1841); Talwar & Jhingran (1991). Matches Talwar & Jhingran (1991) and Day (1865) well, but Sykes (1839) does not mention black bars. Specimen may be a juvenile. RC0600.

**Sambba splendidens** Annandale

Barbels absent; scales absent; last unbranched dorsal ray serrated; 7 1/2 branched dorsal rays; 5 1/2 branched anal rays; body with scattered chromatophores. Annandale (1918). EUN173 EUN174 EUN175 EUN176 EUN177.

**Sundadanio cf. acestridii** (Brittan)

Barbels absent; lateral line absent; symphysial knob present; head blunt; caudal peduncle slender; miniature size (up to 20 mm TL); 6 1/2 branched dorsal rays; 5 1/2 branched anal rays; posterior margin of anal concave; sexually dichromatic, males with more intense colouration. Brittan (1976); Kottelat & Wittte (1995); Roberts (1989). Sold in aquarium trade as three colour varieties: red, blue, green. Likely a complex of species. Mostly female specimens here, so hard to characterize diagnostic male colour pattern and match specimen to type material, so all regarded here as *S. cf. acestridii*. EUN199 EUN231 RC0036 RC0037 RC0038 RC0039 YGN073 YGN119 YGN120 YGN121.
### APPENDIX C. TABLE OF MORPHOLOGICAL IDENTIFICATIONS

#### Tanichthys himantegus (Günther)

- One pair barbels (greater than eye diameter); anal origin before end of dorsal base; lateral line complete; 8½ branched dorsal rays; 10½ branched anal rays; median row of elongated spots on dorsal membrane; anal with black distal stripe and red median stripe (He); midlateral stripe starting above pectoral base, widening posteriorly and continuing onto caudal; red distal band on dorsal (He); upper of iris red (He); midlateral spot above pectoral.

- Conforms to *T. himantegus himantegus*. RC0466

#### Tanichthys albonubes Lin

- Barbels absent; symphyseal knob absent; posterior and anterior nostrils confluent; 6½ branched dorsal rays; 8½ branched anal rays; row of tubercles on snout of male; dark midlateral stripe terminating as spot on caudal base, with light stripe above; dark stripe narrower than light stripe; distance between dorsal origin and top of light stripe half of distance between anal origin and bottom of dark stripe; body below dark midlateral stripe dark coloured; dusky caudal with red blotch at centre and base (He).

- Freyhof & Herder (2001); Liang et al. (2008); Weitzman & Chan (1966). EUN234

#### Tanichthys micagemmae Freyhof & Herder

- As *T. albonubes*, but: dark midlateral stripe wider than light midlateral stripe; distance between dorsal origin roughly equal or greater than distance between anal origin and dark stripe; body below dark midlateral stripe light coloured.

- Freyhof & Herder (2001); Liang et al. (2008); Weitzman & Chan (1966). EUN011
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RC0467

RC0468

RC0469

EUN011

RC0470

YGN259

YGN420

APPENDIX C. TABLE OF MORPHOLOGICAL IDENTIFICATIONS