

Letter to the Editor

The future of nemertean taxonomy (phylum Nemertea) — a proposal

PER SUNDBERG, SÓNIA C. S. ANDRADE, THOMAS BARTOLOMAEUS, PATRICK BECKERS, JÖRN VON DÖHREN, DARIA KRÄMER, RAY GIBSON, GONZALO GIRIBET, ALFONSO HERRERA-BACHILLER, JUAN JUNOY, HIROSHI KAJIHARA, SEBASTIAN KVIST, TOBIAS KÄNNEBY, SHI-CHUN SUN, MARTIN THIEL, JAMES M. TURBEVILLE & MALIN STRAND

Submitted: 15 January 2016
Accepted: 6 March 2016
doi:10.1111/zsc.12182

Sundberg, P., Andrade, S.C.S., Bartolomaeus, T., Beckers, P., von Döhren, J., Krämer, D., Gibson, R., Giribet, G., Herrera-Bachiller, A., Juan, J., Kajihara, H., Kvist, S., Känneby, T., Sun S.-C., Thiel, M., Turbeville, J.M., Strand, M. (2016). The future of nemertean taxonomy (phylum Nemertea) — a proposal. —*Zoologica Scripta*, 00: 000–000.

Corresponding author: Per Sundberg, University of Gothenburg, Department of Marine Sciences, Gothenburg, Sweden. E-mail: per.sundberg@gu.se

Per Sundberg, University of Gothenburg, Department of Marine Sciences, Gothenburg, Sweden. E-mail: per.sundberg@gu.se

Sónia C. S. Andrade, Departamento de Genética e Biologia Evolutiva, IB-Universidade de, São Paulo, Brazil, São Paulo, Brazil. E-mail: soniacsandrade@gmail.com

Thomas Bartolomaeus, Patrick Beckers, Jörn von Döhren, and Daria Krämer, University of Bonn, Institute of Evolutionary Biology and Animal Ecology, Bonn, Germany. E-mails: tbartolomaeus@evolution.uni-bonn.de, pbeckers@evolution.uni-bonn.de, jdoebren@evolution.uni-bonn.de, dkraemer@evolution.uni-bonn.de

Ray Gibson, 94 Queens Avenue, Meols, Wirral, CH47 0NA, U.K. E-mail: bfginc@botmail.co.uk

Gonzalo Giribet, Museum of Comparative Zoology, Department of Organismic and Evolutionary Biology, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA, USA. E-mail: ggiribet@g.harvard.edu

Alfonso Herrera-Bachiller, and Juan Junoy, Departamento de Ciencias de la Vida, Universidad de Alcalá, Madrid, Spain. E-mails: alfonso@herreraabachiller.com, juan.junoy@uab.es

Hiroshi Kajihara, Faculty of Science, Hokkaido University, Sapporo, Japan. E-mail: kazi@mail.sci.hokudai.ac.jp

Sebastian Kvist, Department of Natural History, Royal Ontario Museum, Toronto, Canada and Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada. E-mail: sebastian.kvist@utoronto.ca

Tobias Känneby, Swedish Museum of Natural History, Department of Zoology, Stockholm, Sweden. E-mail: Tobias.Kanneby@nrm.se, tobiaskanneby@gmail.com

Shi-Chun Sun, Institute of Evolution & Marine Biodiversity, Ocean University of China, Qingdao, China. E-mail: sunsc@ouc.edu.cn

Martin Thiel, Facultad Ciencias del Mar, Centro de Estudios Avanzados en Zonas Áridas (CEAZA), Millennium Nucleus Ecology and Sustainable Management of Oceanic Island (ESMOI), Universidad Católica del Norte, Coquimbo, Chile. E-mail: thiel@ucn.cl

James M. Turbeville, Department of Biology, Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, VA, USA. E-mail: jmturbeville@vcu.edu

Malin Strand, Swedish Species Information Centre, The Sven Lovén Centre for Marine Sciences, Strömstad, Sweden. E-mail: malin.strand@slu.se

Sundberg *et al.* (2016). The future of nemertean taxonomy (phylum Nemertea)—a proposal. *Zoologica Scripta* 46,

The species is the most practical biological unit for distinguishing habitats and the obvious first step in exploring biodiversity. Species are entities of generalization in biology, as

all information gathered during different studies on individuals of a given species can be generalized for this species, but not for more inclusive taxa. The correct identification of previously named species, and the description and naming of new species, is thus a crucial and fundamental step not only

just to describe the world's biota, but also to ensure that scientists are talking about the same entity. Taxonomic names are also needed to link species to data, produced by different researchers (or amateurs), so they can be related in various analyses – accurate name to data correspondence is becoming increasingly important in these times of growing and more accessible data bases. If data (e.g. ecological, morphological, molecular) cannot be linked to formal species and well-referenced names, these data will be tremendously diminished in value. Naming and description of species is thus essential, and here, we propose a new standard for describing nemertean (Nemertea) species that would facilitate this process.

Every taxonomic group has its own standard and culture when it comes to species descriptions, the part (together with the holotype) that connects a name with biological entity, the species. Some of these standards are consequences of the animals themselves — it is obviously easier, and possible, to base species descriptions on external characters in a group like Crustacea, while it is more problematic for taxa like Platyhelminthes that exhibit less external morphological complexity. But, differences in species description standards are also due to culture developed by active researchers for each taxon. When it comes to phylum Nemertea (nemerteans, ribbon worms), the current standard for a species description includes detailed accounts of external and internal characters, the latter only traditionally accessible through histological sectioning, although new techniques (like, e.g. confocal laser scanning microscopy in Chernyshev 2015) may change this picture in the future. Sundberg & Strand (2010) have pointed out problems with this approach, and here, we will only emphasize some main — as we see it — problems. First, histological sectioning is time-consuming and needs special equipment, competence and training. Shrinking research budgets in many academic departments have led to cuts in the number of technical staff, with a corresponding loss of competence and experience when it comes to histological work. Second, characters are often quite difficult to interpret from sections, and intraspecific variation furthermore confuses the taxonomic conclusions of the characters, something pointed out by Sundberg (1979). Strand *et al.* (2014) furthermore showed that morphological characters are not the panacea to good taxonomy as is often stated in nemertean literature. For example, one of the repeated statements is that nemerteans can only be securely identified from internal characters (see, e.g., Gibson 1985) or in the words of Roe *et al.* (2007: 221): 'Identification of most nemertean species is difficult and time-consuming, usually requiring study of internal anatomy by means of light microscopy on serial sections'.

Our common experience is, on the contrary, that external characters can identify many species, especially if you

are working in a particular geographical area. Furthermore, we doubt that internal characters will help in difficult situations where there are groups containing species with similar external appearance, or in the cases of cryptic species. Even in good, valid, species, it may be difficult to find apomorphic internal characters (see, e.g., Envall & Sundberg 1993; Strand *et al.* 2005, 2014; Sundberg *et al.* 2009). We furthermore doubt that anyone will actually bother to section a specimen in order to identify it to species level when it comes to the identification of nemerteans in, for example marine surveys. Schander & Willassen (2005) showed that around 95% of the nemerteans in the samples were identified to just '*Nemertea* sp.' in the inventories they had surveyed, without mentioning any other taxonomic rank. Of course, examples of crypticism where a reliance on external features alone would be quite misleading also exist (e.g. *L. viridis*/*L. ruber* in Krämer *et al.* in press). Here, molecular evidence proves most efficient for distinguishing the species.

So, we conclude that internal characters are not, and will not, be used for identification and hence are not really needed when it comes to *identification* in biodiversity research questions. Internal characters will still be very useful in phylogeny estimates and for addressing a number of interesting biological questions about internal organ systems functionality and evolution, but should they be a formal requirement in species descriptions as currently often assumed? Currently, we face a situation where nemertean taxonomists over the world have many sampled specimens of new species waiting to be described and named. Considering the constraints pointed out above, we estimate that many of these species will remain undescribed unless we accelerate the pace of species description. Therefore, we as a group of researchers working on the group Nemertea have decided to accept species descriptions that will not meet the 'standard' of detailed accounts of internal characters as described above. If we do not transform the requirements, which are governed by tradition rather than empirical evidence, we are convinced that many species will remain undescribed and that this will lead to an underestimate of nemertean species diversity. It will also bias the geographical distributions of species, knowledge that could be useful not just for the taxonomists, but also for our understanding of global biodiversity. Similar approaches have already been successfully applied to other invertebrate groups, where species are described despite the lack of diagnosable morphological characters (Murphy *et al.* 2015).

We also want to approach the question of redescribing species. Many nemertean species are inadequately described, and it is often impossible to assign a sampled specimen to a particular name, due to poor descriptions and to the fact that types may not be available or properly

preserved. In these cases, it is tempting to designate it as a new species, but we would encourage taxonomists to redescribe species if considered appropriate and justified. One question in that case is whether a redescription has to be based on a specimen from the type locality. Today, the main cost of taxonomy and systematics is associated with collecting specimens, and on top of that, there are collecting permit requirements that can be almost impossible to meet for some countries. We therefore suggest relaxing the condition of requiring specimens from the type locality and accepting specimens sampled in the vicinity of the locality. We understand that ‘vicinity’ is a vague concept, which relies on the individual researcher’s judgement and competence.

Nemertean taxonomy in the future

We suggest that a species description should be considered acceptable if it contains all of the following:

- reference to DNA sequence(s) (considering the fast development in molecular techniques, we are not prepared to make a set decision of which molecular marker(s) to be used, currently COI is one preferred marker, but we also encourage authors to add more markers whenever possible)
- a description of the external characters (overview and detail colour photographs are highly desirable and essential for the description to be useful), including comments on the ecology of the species. In supplementary material, we suggest a checklist for what should be included.
- a holotype, and voucher specimen(s) preferably paratypes in ethanol, or another preservative (e.g. RNAlater® Ambion, Inc.) to ensure that DNA can be extracted.

We suggest that, when redescribing a species, the description is likewise acceptable if it includes:

- reference to DNA sequence(s), as above.
- reference to external characters, as above
- a neotype if no holotype available, and voucher specimen(s) in ethanol, or another preservative to ensure that DNA can be extracted

Although we argue that histology is not mandatory for describing a new species, we would like to encourage that, whenever possible, specimens from the same batch should be fixed for potential histological studies. Although these are not necessarily required for describing the new species, they offer the chance for future access to structural information pertinent for phylogenetic analyses and for

understanding the evolution of the morphology of nemerteans and assessing organ function.

We finally argue that this approach might also be applicable to other soft-bodied invertebrates for which species identification is traditionally based on internal characters, but which feature distinct colour patterns, for example flatworms and nudibranchs. Due to the challenges of species identification, these taxa are often under-represented in data repositories (Kvist 2013). Species descriptions of these taxa also increasingly include DNA sequences and colour photographs (e.g. Lemos *et al.* 2014; Pola & Gosliner 2015), and thus, the modified taxonomic approach proposed herein for Nemertea will also provide useful for other groups.

Acknowledgements

This work is financially supported by the Swedish Research Council (to PS), DAAD German Academic Exchange Service (57044996) (to DK), the National Natural Science Foundation of China (31471957) (to SCS) and the Norwegian Taxonomy Initiative (to MS).

References

- Chernyshev, A. V. (2015). CLSM analysis of phalloidin-stained muscle system of the nemertean proboscis and rhynchocoel. *Zoological Science*, 32, 547–560.
- Envall, M. & Sundberg, P. (1993). Intraspecific variation in nemerteans (Nemertea): synonymization of genera *Paroerstedtia* and *Oerstedtiella* with *Oerstedtia*. *Journal of Zoology (London)*, 230, 293–318.
- Gibson, R. (1985). The need for a standard approach to taxonomic descriptions of nemerteans. *American Zoologist*, 25, 5–14.
- Krämer, D., Schmidt, C., Podsiadlowski, C., Horn, L. & von Döhren, J. (in press). Unraveling the *Lineus ruber/viridis*-species complex (Nemertea, Heteronemertea). *Zoologica Scripta*.
- Kvist, S. (2013). Barcoding in the dark? A critical view of the sufficiency of zoological DNA barcoding databases and a plea for broader integration of taxonomic knowledge. *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, 69, 39–45.
- Lemos, V. S., Cauduro, G. P., Valiati, V. H. & Leal-Zanchet, A. M. (2014). Phylogenetic relationships within the flatworm genus *Choeradoplana* Graff (Platyhelminthes: Tricladida) inferred from molecular data with the description of two new sympatric species from Araucaria moist forests. *Invertebrate Systematics*, 28, 605–627.
- Murphy, N. P., King, R. A. & Delean, S. (2015). Species, ESUs or populations? Delimiting and describing morphologically cryptic diversity in Australian desert spring amphipods. *Invertebrate Systematics*, 29, 457–467.
- Pola, M. & Gosliner, T. M. (2015). A new large and colourful species of the genus *Doto* (Nudibranchia: Dotidae) from South Africa. *Journal of Natural History*, 49, 2465–2481.
- Roe, P., Norenburg, J. L. & Maslakova, S. (2007). Nemertea. In J. T. Carlton (Ed) *The Light and Smith Manual: Intertidal Invertebrates from Central California to Oregon*. 4th ed.(pp. 221–

- 233). Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Schander, C. & Willassen, E. (2005). What can biological barcoding do for marine biology. *Marine Biology Research*, *1*, 79–83.
- Strand, M., Hjelmgren, A. & Sundberg, P. (2005). Genus *Baseodiscus* (Nemertea: Heteronemertea): molecular identification of a new species in a phylogenetic context. *Journal of Natural History*, *39*, 3785–3793.
- Strand, M., Herrera-Bachiller, A., Nygren, A. & Kånneby, T. (2014). A new nemertean species: what are the useful characters for ribbon worm descriptions? *Journal of the Marine Biological Association of the United Kingdom*, *94*, 317–330.
- Sundberg, P. (1979). Statistical analysis of variation in characters in *Tetrastemma laminariae* (Nemertini), with a redescription of the species. *Journal of Zoology (London)*, *189*, 39–56.
- Sundberg, P. & Strand, M. (2010). Nemertean taxonomy—time to change lane? *Journal of Zoological Systematics and Evolutionary Research*, *48*, 283–284.
- Sundberg, P., Thuróczy Vodoti, E., Zhou, H. & Strand, M. (2009). Polymorphism hides cryptic species in *Oerstedia dorsalis* (Nemertea, Hoplonemertea). *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society*, *98*, 556–567.

Supporting Information

Additional Supporting Information may be found in the online version of this article:

Table S1. Character checklist.