CrossMark

Molecular species delimitation in the genus *Eumerus* (Diptera: Syrphidae)

A. Chroni^{1*}, M. Djan², D. Obreht Vidaković², T. Petanidou¹ and A. Vujić²

¹Department of Geography, University of the Aegean, University Hill, 81100, Mytilene, Greece: ²Faculty of Sciences, Department of Biology and Ecology, University of Novi Sad, Trg Dositeja Obradovića 3, 2100, Novi Sad, Serbia

Abstract

Eumerus is one of the most diverse genera of hoverfly worldwide. Species delimitation within genus is considered to be difficult due to: (a) lack of an efficient key; (b) non-defined taxonomical status of a large number of species; and (c) blurred nomenclature. Here, we present the first molecular study to delimit species of the genus by using a fragment of the mitochondrial cytochrome-c oxidase subunit I gene (COI) gene. We assessed 75 specimens assigned to 28 taxa originating from two biogeographic zones: 22 from the western Palaearctic and six from the Afrotropical region. Two datasets were generated based on different sequence lengths to explore the significance of availability of more polymorphic sites for species delimitation; dataset A with a total length of 647 bp and dataset B with 746 bp. Various tree inference approaches and Poisson tree processes models were applied to evaluate the putative 'taxonomical' vs. 'molecular' taxa clusters. All analyses resulted in high taxonomic resolution and clear species delimitation for both the dataset lengths. Furthermore, we revealed a high number of mitochondrial haplotypes and high intraspecific variability. We report two major monophyletic clades, and seven 'molecular' groups of taxa formed, which are congruent with morphology-based taxonomy. Our results support the use of the mitochondrial COI gene in species diagnosis of *Eumerus*.

Keywords: DNA barcoding, COI, species KeyDelimitation, hoverflies, Eumerus

(Accepted 11 July 2016; First published online 30 August 2016)

Introduction

Hoverflies (Diptera: Syrphidae), also known as flower flies, constitute a cosmopolitan and highly diverse insect group with more than 6100 taxa described globally (Thompson *et al.*, 2010). Hoverflies influence ecosystems in many ways, such as: (a) pollinating a wide range of flowering plants; (b) controlling plant pests of which they are effective predators; (c) having phytophagous larvae feeding on bulbs; and (d) effectively recycling nutrients from dead matter (Rotheray & Gilbert, 2011). Because of their heterogeneous character and their wide distribution, hoverflies

*Author for correspondence Phone: +302251036423 Fax: +302251036423 E-mail: a.chroni@geo.aegean.gr constitute an important and diverse group for ecological and biogeographical studies.

One of the most species-rich of the hoverfly genera is Eumerus Meigen, 1822, with 256 species recorded worldwide (Pape & Thompson, 2015), of which 89 occur in the western Palaearctic region (total species number of the entire Palaearctic is 140: Peck, 1988; Speight, 2014) and 72 in the Afrotropical region (Pape & Thompson, 2015). The only existing comprehensive key for Eumerus is that of Stackelberg (1961) based on only some of the Palaearctic taxa, which was used by Speight (2014) to compile a list of European Eumerus. Due to the lack of an up-to-date European identification key, species delimitation is often not feasible, especially for poorly studied areas, e.g., the Mediterranean. In addition, the taxonomic status of a considerable number of taxa is uncertain, with confusing nomenclature and synonymies frequently present (Peck, 1988). It is often unclear to which taxon many names refer, and a broad revision of the genus is needed, perhaps employing more sophisticated taxonomical tools, e.g., molecular systematics.

127

Over the last two decades, DNA barcoding has been introduced to taxonomy and has greatly expedited species identification, assisted in species delimitation and elucidated species evolution and biology (Rubinoff, 2006). DNA barcoding can be a fast and efficient way to identify species, to diagnose new species, and to provide molecular operational units for ecological and biodiversity studies (DeWalt, 2011). However, opposing opinions exist regarding the application of DNA barcoding as a primary means of species delimitation. Rubinoff (2006) claimed that mitochondrial DNA (mtDNA) is not adequate as a sole source of species-defining data because of reduced effective population size and introgression, maternal inheritance, recombination, inconsistent mutation rate, heteroplasmy and compounding evolutionary processes. As a consequence, there are cases where some sister taxa cannot be identified because they have identical or nearly identical DNA barcodes, giving a false negative signal of species differentiation (Moritz & Cicero, 2004). In contrast, taxa with a wide geographical distribution may exhibit relatively large genetic divergence and, thus, might present a false positive signal (i.e., incorrectly indicating the occurrence of differentiated taxa) (Avise, 2000). Notwithstanding the controversy about its effectiveness, DNA barcoding has been highly effective in species identification, especially for resolving insect taxonomy (Ball et al., 2005; Smith et al., 2005). To overcome any false phylogenetic signal, it is recommended to use multiple and complementary tools to better delimit biodiversity ('integrative taxonomy': Dayrat, 2005). This implies that morphological features, and molecular (e.g., DNA sequences) and biochemical (e.g., alloenzymes) data, as well as morphometric data should be utilized for species delimitation (Mengual et al., 2006).

The mitochondrial cytochrome-c oxidase subunit I gene (COI, cox1) is widely used in species identification due to its phylogenetic signal, which can discriminate species (Hebert et al., 2003a, 2010; Hebert & Gregory, 2005). A fragment of approximately 650 bp of the 5' end of the COI, i.e., the 'Folmer' fragment (Folmer et al., 1994), is the most frequently used gene fragment in DNA barcoding of animals, and this approach has been successfully applied to hoverflies (Pérez-Bañón et al., 2003; Ståhls et al., 2009; Gibson et al., 2011; Marcos-García et al., 2011; Radenković et al., 2011). Furthermore, primers amplifying a fragment of the 3' end of the COI have been effectively applied to obtain longer sequences, i.e., >800 bp. According to Hebert et al. (2003b) COI-3' regions present similar sequence divergence profiles as COI-5' fragments, which imply that COI-3' can be used as an alternative DNA barcode. Indeed, the COI-3' region has proven valuable for solving taxonomical uncertainties in various hoverfly genera (Milankov et al., 2005, 2008a, 2009, 2010a, b, 2013; Mengual et al., 2006; Vujić et al., 2012; Francuski et al., 2013).

Molecular and morphological studies have been carried out on many hoverfly genera such as *Merodon* (Milankov *et al.*, 2008*a*, *b*; Ståhls *et al.*, 2009), *Cheilosia* (Ståhls *et al.*, 2004; Milankov *et al.*, 2010*a*, *b*), *Chrysotoxum* (Nedeljković *et al.*, 2013) and tribe Pipizini (Vujić *et al.*, 2013). In these studies, an integrative taxonomic approach was applied, i.e., complementary use of molecular markers (mtDNA and/or nuclear gene fragments) and morphological characters, which often provided rather good taxonomic resolution (Milankov *et al.*, 2008*a*, *b*). However, in certain cases, different taxa shared the same haplotypes (Milankov *et al.*, 2008*b*, 2010*a*, *b*; Ståhls *et al.*, 2009) or possessed character differences of solely one nucleotide (Ståhls *et al.*, 2009; Milankov *et al.*, 2010*b*). In the latter cases, this outcome indicated the insufficiency of a COI-based identification system alone, to delimit species or species complexes within the genus *Merodon* (Milankov *et al.*, 2008*b*; Ståhls *et al.*, 2009), and underlined the importance of integrative taxonomic inference.

Here, our aim is to validate usage of COI-3' region for species delimitation of the genus *Eumerus* using different sequence lengths in order to identify species and explore intra- and interspecific variability. We address two specific questions: (1) Can COI-3' barcoding reveal intra- and interspecific genetic variation in *Eumerus*? (2) Is a short sequence of COI-3' (647 bp) sufficient to accurately resolve species taxonomy compared to a more elongated one (746 bp)?

Materials and methods

Taxon sampling

We used dry pinned specimens deposited in two entomological collections: the Melissotheque of the Aegean located at the University of the Aegean, Greece (M-UAegean; Petanidou et al., 2013); and the collection of the Faculty of Sciences at the Department of Biology and Ecology of the University of Novi Sad, Serbia (FSUNS). The specimens used in this study were collected from 2009 to 2014. In total, 75 specimens were used from two geographical areas: 69 derived from the western Palaearctic and six from Afrotropical region (RSA) (table S1). Initial species identification was based on morphology. Specimens were assigned to 28 taxa (table S1) of which three had been previously undescribed (Eumerus aff. barbarus Coquebert, 1804; E. aff. rubiginosus Lyneborg, in litt. and E. aff. tarsatus Lyneborg, in litt.). The selected taxa are mainly of Palaearctic origin (22 taxa), while six taxa originated from the RSA. Identifications were carried out by Dieter Doczkal (Afrotropical taxa) and Ante Vujić (Palaearctic taxa). Taxa identification for specimens derived from the RSA was based on Lyneborg's revision (Lyneborg, in litt.). A list of the specimens used in the analysis, together with their GenBank accession numbers and collection data, is given in table S1.

To detect intraspecific variation, *Eumerus amoenus* Loew, 1848 was analyzed, since its broad distribution in the Mediterranean appears to be the widest within the genus. Two populations from the Aegean islands of Lesvos (three specimens) and Samos (seven specimens) were assayed. Measurements of interspecific variation were determined through the taxa, *E. pulchellus* Loew, 1848 and *E. pusillus* Loew, 1848 by comparing the genetic distances between adjacent and distant populations. For *E. pulchellus*, molecular diversity indices were calculated by using one specimen for each geographical area (i.e., Chios, Dadia, Lesvos, Limnos, Rhodes, Samos and Sardinia). Molecular diversity indices were also calculated for *E. pusillus*, but in this case, two or more samples per geographical area (Chios, Crete, Karpathos and Naxos) were selected.

DNA extraction and PCR amplification

Total genomic DNA was extracted using the head and/or two to three legs from each specimen. We used the protocol by Chen *et al.* (2010) for Sodium Dodecyl Sulfate (SDS) extraction with the following modifications: (a) RNase A solution was not added; (b) the concentration of proteinase K solution was 40 mg ml⁻¹; and (c) an additional step of chloroform/isoamyl alcohol (24:1) was applied. Samples were re-suspended in 30 µl of TAE buffer.

PCR amplifications of the COI-3' were performed in a total volume of $25 \,\mu$ l, containing 25 ng μ l⁻¹ template DNA, 5 pmol μ l⁻¹ of each primer, 0.08 mM of dNTPs, 1× Reaction Buffer (Thermo Scientific, USA) and 1.25 units of Polymerase (Taq poly or Dream Taq poly, Thermo Scientific, USA). Amplifications were performed in an Authorized PCR Thermal Cycler (Mastercycler[®] personal, Eppendorf, Germany). Thermocycling conditions consisted of initial denaturation at 95°C for 2 min, 29 cycles of 30 s denaturing at 94°C, 30 s annealing at 49°C, 2 min extension at 72°C, followed by a final extension of 8 min at 72°C (Vujić et al., 2013). We employed universally conserved primers to amplify and sequence the COI-3': forward primer C1-J-2183 (5'-CAACATTTATTTTGATTTTTGG-3') (alias JERRY) and reverse primer TL2-N-3014 (5'-TCCAAT GCACTAATCTGCCATATTA-3') (alias PAT) (Simon et al., 1994). Amplified products were run on 1.5% agarose gels for visual inspection. Purification of the PCR products was done with the ExoSap-IT kit (USB, Cleveland, OH, USA) and clean products were thereafter Sanger sequenced in both directions on an ABI 3730 DNA analyzer (Applied Biosystems, USA) at the Sequencing Service laboratory of the Finnish Institute for Molecular Medicine (http://www.fimm.fi).

Sequence alignment

Two datasets of different sequence length were produced. Dataset A comprised sequences of 647 nucleotides in total length, obtained by forward sequencing of the COI-3' region, from 75 *Eumerus* specimens and four outgroups. We chose *Platynochaetus setosus* Fabricius, 1794 (Accession No. KM224512), *Merodon erivanicus* Paramonov, 1925 (Accession No. KT157919) and two species of the genus *Megatrigon* Johnson, 1898 (Accession No. KT157920 and KT157921) as outgroups. Dataset B consisted of full length of the COI-3' (746 nucleotides), acquired through bidirectional sequencing, for the aforementioned 75 *Eumerus* taxa and outgroups. All trees were rooted based on *P. setosus* sequence.

As required, sequences were edited by eye using BioEdit 7.2.5 (Hall, 1999). For multiple sequence alignment we employed the L-INS-i algorithm, which is considered to be more accurate as an iterative refinement method incorporating local pairwise alignment information (Katoh et al., 2005). Alignments were implemented using MAFFT version 7 (http://mafft.cbrc.jp/alignment/server/index.html). Both datasets were trimmed to their final lengths using BioEdit 7.2.5 (Hall, 1999). Polymorphic sites, DNA polymorphism and basic molecular diversity indices were calculated using DnaSP 5.10.01 (Librado & Rozas, 2009), which also generated nexus files. Sequences were checked for possible presence of stop codons (Buhay, 2009) using the Mesquite 2.75 system for phylogenetic computing (Maddison & Maddison, 2011). All sequences were translated using the invertebrate mitochondrial code. The evolutionary models used for maximum-likelihood (ML) and Bayesian inference (BI) analyses were implemented in the HIV sequence database (http://www.hiv.lanl.gov/ content/sequence/findmodel/findmodel.html) (Posada & Crandall, 2001).

Molecular data analysis

PTP models

Several studies have highlighted the ability of Poisson tree processes (PTP) models to reveal and resolve taxonomic issues (Leasi & Norenburg, 2014; Soldati *et al.*, 2014; Tang *et al.*, 2014). Because this approach does not require ultrametrization of trees (and its associated biases), it constitutes a reasonable alternative to other species delineation models such as the General mixed Yule coalescent model (Pons *et al.*, 2006). In PTP models, the numbers of substitutions (branch lengths) represent speciations or branching events and, therefore they only require a phylogenetic input tree. PTP models have previously been implemented to reveal putative molecular species clusters (Zhang *et al.*, 2013). PTP analyses were conducted on the web server for PTP (available at http://species.h-its.org/ptp/) using the best ML tree resulting from the RA × ML analysis (see below).

Maximum parsimony (MP)

MP analyses were performed in the program NONA (Goloboff, 1999), spawned in WINCLADA version 1.00.08 (Nixon, 2002). A heuristic search algorithm with 1000 random addition replicates (mult \times 1000) was performed, holding 100 trees per round (hold/100), max trees set to 100,000, and applying TBR branch swapping.

Maximum likelihood

ML trees were generated using RAxML 8.0.9 (Stamatakis, 2006; Stamatakis *et al.*, 2008) in the Cipres Science Gateway (Miller *et al.*, 2010) under the general time-reversible (GTR) evolutionary model with a gamma distribution (GTR+G) (Rodriguez *et al.*, 1990) and 1000 bootstrap replicates.

Bayesian inference

BI topologies were assessed using MrBayes 3.2.6 (Huelsenbeck & Ronquist, 2001) in the Cipres Science Gateway (Miller et al., 2010) with the GTR + G nucleotide substitution model (Rodriguez et al., 1990) proposed by the Akaike information criterion (AIC). For BI, two analyses were run based on codon partition models: (1) partitioned (MBP), i.e., each codon position was treated separately, as they are subject to different evolutionary rates, and (2) nonpartitioned (MBUP). The settings for the Bayesian Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) process for the non-partitioned dataset A and partitioned datasets A and B included two runs of 10×10^6 MCMC generations (×4 chains) with a sampling frequency of 1000 generations. For the non-partitioned dataset B, the same settings were applied except that the number of MCMC generations, i.e., 15×10^6 , was increased in order to diminish the autocorrelation. The relative burn-in was 10%. MCMC results were checked with the program Tracer 1.6.0 and all trees were displayed using FigTree 1.4.0 (both available at http://tree.bio.ed.ac.uk/software/).

Median-joining (MJ) network

The software NETWORK 4.6.1.2 (Bandelt *et al.*, 1999) (http://www.fluxus-engineering.com/sharenet.htm) was applied to construct the MJ networks aiming to multistate the characters. For MJ reconstructions the mitochondrial haplo-types of outgroups were excluded.

Table 1. Results generated for dataset A (i.e., forward sequencing of the COI-3' region) and dataset B (i.e., bidirectional sequencing) in DNaSP 5.10.01, after excluding the outgroups.

	Dataset A	Dataset B
1. Polymorphic sites		
Number of sites Total number of sites (excluding sites with gaps/missing data) Invariable (monomorphic) sites Variable (polymorphic) sites Total number of mutations Singleton variable sites Parsimony informative sites	647 629 421 208 268 30 178	746 717 474 243 325 37 206
2. DNA polymorphism		
2.1 Without gaps		
Number of Haplotypes (<i>h</i>) Haplotype (gene) diversity (Hd) Variance of Haplotype diversity SD of Haplotype diversity Nucleotide diversity (Pi) Theta (per site) from (Eta) Average number of nucleotide differences (<i>k</i>)	53 0.976 0.00008 0.009 0.07111 0.08717 44.731	56 0.983 0.0005 0.007 0.07350 0.09273 52.699
2.2 With gaps		
Number of pairwise comparisons Average number of sites analyzed Average number of differences Nucleotide diversity (Pi)	2775 646.31 48.586 0.07517	2775 745.07 57.865 0.07766
Analysis at individual sites (column by column)		
Number of sites analyzed Number of polymorphic sites (S) Average number of differences Nucleotide diversity (Pi) Theta-W, per sequence Theta-W, per site	647.00 221 48.720 0.07530 45.22285 0.06990	746.00 261 58.055 0.07782 53.40954 0.07159

Results

The proportion of gaps and completely undetermined characters in the alignment as generated in RA × ML was 0.09 and 0.06% for datasets A and B, respectively; the relevant distinct alignment patterns were 250 and 274. The genetic polymorphism of datasets A and B is shown in table 1.

Molecular analyses vs. morphological delimitation

Initial assignment to species level was based on morphology, with the 75 study specimens classified into 28 taxa. PTP models included the *Eumerus* taxa plus the four outgroups and predicted 32–49 taxa for dataset A and 31–46 taxa for dataset B. MP (figs 1 and 2), ML (figs S1 and S2) and BI analyses (figs 3, 4, S3 and S4) yielded similar tree topologies for both A and B datasets, with two main clusters and the nodes of the putative taxa strongly supported. Bootstrap values in MP and ML trees were generally low for both datasets, whereas posterior probability values were much higher for BI trees.

In all trees, i.e., those generated by MP, ML and BI, the two major clades comprised the same groups of taxa in each dataset (table 2; figs 1–4 and S1–S4). One clade consisted of taxa belonging to the *tricolor* group (six taxa) with the second comprising the remaining 22 taxa. Our molecular-derived topologies revealed seven different groups of taxa, with all but eight of the 28 taxa assignable to one of these groups. We named these seven groups basalis, minotaurus, ornatus, pulchellus, strigatus, sulcitibius and tricolor (for more details see table 2). The eight 'ungrouped' taxa were E. torsicus Grković et Vujić, 2015, E. aff. rubiginosus, E. aff. tarsatus, E. alpinus Rondani, 1857, E. argenticornis Lyneborg, in litt., E. clavatus Becker, 1923, E. hungaricus Szilady, 1940, and E. tarsatus Lyneborg, in litt. (table 2). Slight differences were apparent in the topologies generated by datasets A and B. In dataset B, E. argenticornis, E. tarsatus, E. aff. rubiginosus and E. aff. tarsatus clustered together, close to the ornatus group (see figs 2, 4, S2 and S4), but in dataset A they appeared altogether, dispersed or clustered differently (see figs 1, 3, S1 and S3). Other observed discrepancies were as follows: (a) E. clavatus was in the sulcitibius group in all but the MP analysis of dataset B (fig. 2); (b) the position of *E. alpinus* differed in each analysis, and (c) branching topology for the tricolor group was only similar in MP, MBP and MBUP analysis of dataset A (figs 1, 3 and S3) and ML and MBUP analyses of dataset B (figs S2 and S4). Branching topology for the ornatus group was consistent across all analyses.

Among the 28 taxa, three were previously undescribed, but were closely related to known taxa and, thus, were named *E*. aff. *barbarus* (collected in Morocco), *E*. aff. *rubiginosus* and *E*. aff. *tarsatus* (both collected in South Africa). Both molecular (high nodal support) and morphological (clear diagnostic features) aspects strongly supported the species delimitation of these three taxa. The *E*. aff. *barbarus* was included in the



Fig. 1. Maximum parsimony analysis for dataset A produced 72 equally parsimonious trees; the strict consensus tree is illustrated here. Length 989 steps, Consistency index (CI) = 33, Retention index (RI) = 71; filled circles denote unique changes, open circles non-unique. Bootstrap support values (>50) are illustrated above the branches.

sulcitibius group, whereas the other two taxa were not collapsed to any of the seven supported groups (table 2).

We noted artifacts of Long Branch Attraction (LBA) artifacts in the ML and BI analyses of both datasets, but not in MP. LBA was due to sequences EU106, EU108, EU109, EU111, EU115 and EU117 (figs 1–4 and S1–S4). MJ network reconstructions supported our other analyses with sequences from both datasets grouping similarly to the clusters present in MP, ML and BI trees. Furthermore, the number of mutational steps between haplotypes was consistent with our phylogenetic reconstructions (figs 5 and 6).

Intra- and interspecific variability

In both datasets A and B, we recorded a high number of mtDNA COI haplotypes and very rich haplotype (Hd > 0.95)

and nucleotide diversity (Pi > 0.005) (table 3). No shared haplotypes between delimitated species were obtained (table 3).

The basic molecular diversity indices for *E. amoenus*, *E. pulchellus* and *E. pusillus* were calculated and are shown in table 3. For *E. amoenus*, the MJ network for dataset A showed one to nine mutational steps among haplotypes detected in the Lesvos population, and one to three mutational steps among haplotypes in the Samos population (fig. 5). The MJ network constructed using dataset B revealed one to eight mutational steps among haplotypes from Lesvos and one to four among haplotypes found in the Samos population (fig. 6). When selecting one specimen of *E. pulchellus* from each of seven geographical origins the MJ network analysis of dataset A showed one to six mutational steps, and dataset B one to seven mutational steps (figs 5 and 6). For *E. pusillus*, two or more samples from four different geographic origins were analyzed and MJ network reconstructions showed one



Fig. 2. Maximum parsimony analysis for dataset B produced 30 equally parsimonious trees; the strict consensus tree is illustrated here. Length 1153 steps, Consistency index (CI) = 32, Retention index (RI) = 71; filled circles denote unique changes, open circles non-unique. Bootstrap support values (>50) are illustrated above the branches.

mutational step for both datasets among different *E. pusillus* haplotypes (figs 5 and 6).

Discussion

A COI gene-based system has been successfully employed for species delimitation in various hoverfly genera such as the *ruficornis* group of the genus *Merodon* (Milankov *et al.*, 2008b; Vujić *et al.*, 2012), the *Cheilosia vernalis* complex (Ståhls *et al.*, 2008), the genus *Chrysotoxum* (Suk & Han, 2013; Nedeljković *et al.*, 2015), the Afrotropical hoverflies (Jordaens *et al.*, 2015) and the genus *Platycheirus* (Young *et al.*, 2016). Our study is the first implementation of molecular tools to infer species delimitation in the genus *Eumerus*. We assessed the feasibility of using COI-3' fragment for *Eumerus* taxonomic inference on 75 specimens assigned to 28 putative 'taxonomical' taxa clusters. Various tree inference approaches on genetic data conformed to morphological species assignment. Since species delimitation (through conventional classical taxonomy) of *Eumerus* has proven challenging in the past, generation of barcode sequences to diagnose species within this genus can prove very useful. A DNA barcode library for *Eumerus* is currently under construction, with more than 130 sequences having been generated in the last 6 months. The present study contributes to enriching accessible barcode records; an assessment of GenBank records on 11 March 2016 revealed that this study has provided more than 50% of the available *Eumerus* sequences and species to date. In addition, our study extends representation of both the number and geographic distribution of *Eumerus* species.

We generated two datasets that differed in terms of sequence length in order to test whether longer sequences improved taxonomic resolution by support values for nodes. Dataset B was 99 nucleotides longer and possessed 28 more



Fig. 3. Bayesian analysis of the dataset A (partitioned data). Values indicate Bayesian probability.

parsimony-informative sites compared to dataset A. However, dataset A still provided high taxonomic resolution, confirming the efficacy of a COI system based on approx. 650 bp for species delimitation. Due to sample unavailability arising from fieldwork limitations (and the absence of available sequences in barcoding databases), few sequences – in some cases even only one – were obtained for some taxa. Ahrens *et al.* (2016) discussed the issue of the singletons' (the only representative sequence of a species) issue in DNA-based species delimitation studies and ascertained that 'a high proportion of singletons has little impact on the accuracy of inferred species limits,

and thus rarity (and singletons) should not be conflated with the much more pertinent population genetics parameters'.

The outcomes of our analyses were congruent for both datasets and indicated that the genus *Eumerus* is divided into two main lineages: the *tricolor* group and a lineage consisting of all the other taxa (both grouped and the 'ungrouped'). Tree topologies differed slightly within and between dataset(s). Although longer sequences improved phylogenetic resolution, they did not fully resolve the position of some taxa, e.g., *E. argenticornis*, *E. tarsatus*, *E.* aff. *rubiginosus* and *E.* aff. *tarsatus*. As singletons were used in a few cases, employment of replicate reference



Fig. 4. Bayesian analysis of the dataset B (partitioned data). Values indicate Bayesian probability.

specimens could be beneficial in determining the phylogenetic positions of unresolved *Eumerus* taxa. Our is only the second study to date presenting a hypothetical *Eumerus* phylogeny; Doczkal & Pape (2009) found indications of the genus being paraphyletic based on morphological characters (although this was not corroborated nor further investigated by them). Even if it was not the purpose of this study to deliberate the genus' phylogeny, based on our results *Eumerus* could be monophyletic with two main lineages. In addition, the formation of several groups within the genus reveals certain affinities among the species. Such affinities have never been discussed before, except in Speight (2014) who only commented on the *strigatus* group that included the taxa *E. consimilis* Šimić et Vujić, 1996, *E. narcissi* Smith, 1928, *E. ruficornis* Meigen, 1822, *E. sogdianus* Stackelberg, 1952, and *E. strigatus* (Fallen), 1817. Based on our data, *strigatus* group is composed of at least two taxa (*E. amoenus* and *E. consimilis*) but we did not have sequences for the other taxa considered by Speight (2014) to incorporate them into our analyses. However, our findings do suggest that *E. amoenus* has a probable (genetic) affinity with the other taxa of Speight's (2014) *strigatus* group, but this needs further verification.

A. Chroni et al.

	Table	2.	Taxa	group	ing as	formed	after	the im	pleme	ntation	of t	he M	P, M	L and	d BI	analy	ses an	nd th	e M	[networl	k recoi	nstructi	ions.
--	-------	----	------	-------	--------	--------	-------	--------	-------	---------	------	------	------	-------	------	-------	--------	-------	-----	-----------	---------	----------	-------

'Molecular' taxa groups (supported by morphology)	Таха
basalis	E. basalis Loew, 1848 and E. pusillus Loew, 1848
minotaurus	E. minotaurus Claussen et Lucas, 1988 and E. niehuisi Doczkal, 1996
ornatus	E. argyropus Loew, 1848, E. ornatus Meigen, 1822, E. paulae Herve-Bazin, 1913 and E. politus Lyneborg, in litt.
pulchellus	E. emarginatus Loew, 1848 and E. pulchellus Loew, 1848
strigatus	E. amoenus Loew, 1848 and E. consimilis Šimić et Vujić, 1996
sulcitibius	E. aff. barbarus Coquebert, 1804 and E. sulcitibius Rondani, 1868
tricolor	<i>E. aurofinis</i> Grković, Vujić et Radenković, 2015, <i>E. armatus</i> Ricarte et Rotheray, 2012, <i>E. grandis</i> Meigen, 1822, <i>E. niveitibia</i> Becker, 1921, <i>E. sinuatus</i> Loew, 1855 and <i>E. tricolor</i> (Fabricius), 1798
'Ungrouped' taxa	<i>E. torsicus</i> Grković et Vujić, 2015, <i>E. aff. rubiginosus</i> Lyneborg, in litt., <i>E. aff. tarsatus</i> Lyneborg, in litt., <i>E. alpinus</i> Rondani, 1857, <i>E. argenticornis</i> Lyneborg, in litt., <i>E. clavatus</i> Becker, 1923, <i>E. hungaricus</i> Szilady, 1940 and <i>E. tarsatus</i> Lyneborg, in litt.

The groups are in concordance with the taxa morphology. Taxa groups are separated with \geq 19 mt steps.



Fig. 5. The median-joining network of the haplotypes of the dataset A, as it was constructed by Network software ver. 4.6.1.2 (http://www. fluxus-engineering.com). Circle sizes are proportional to haplotype frequencies. The number of mutational steps is the one between each pair of haplotypes. When not stated, one mutational step interferes between the nodes/OTUs. Taxa and molecular taxa groups (supported by morphology) are depicted (apart of *basalis* and *sulcitibius* group).

The large number of mitochondrial haplotypes we generated underlines the high genetic diversity of *Eumerus*, despite the employment of only one genomic region. Species did not exhibit shared haplotypes and were well separated as shown by the number of mutational steps in the MJ networks. This is not always the case for hoverflies (e.g., the genus *Melanostoma* Schiner, 1860, Haarto & Stahls, 2014). Therefore, in *Eumerus*, a COI gene-based system can yield unique, distinguishing mtDNA haplotypes between species.

We also studied intraspecific variation for *E. amoenus*, *E. pusillus* and *E. pulchellus* for which we had more abundant sequences and geographic spread. These taxa are considered



Fig. 6. The median-joining network of the haplotypes of the dataset B, as it was constructed by Network software ver. 4.6.1.2 (http://www. fluxus-engineering.com). Circle sizes are proportional to haplotype frequencies. The number of mutational steps is the one between each pair of haplotypes. When not stated, one mutational step interferes between the nodes/OTUs. Taxa and molecular taxa groups (supported by morphology) are depicted (apart of *basalis* group).

'common', i.e., they are widely distributed in all the Mediterranean peninsulas (Anatolian, Apennine, Balkan and Iberian). Eumerus amoenus, E. pulchellus and E. pusillus were analyzed further, for intraspecific genetic diversity. Eumerus pulchellus exhibited the highest haplotype diversity, with each single specimen per geographic origin having a different haplotype. Genetic distances among haplotypes inferred from the number of mutational steps and geographic distances between sampling locations (Greece, Italy and Montenegro), showed no clear pattern. Eumerus amoenus also presented very high haplotypic diversity, which was to be expected because sampling was performed over a wider geographical area. MJ network analysis of haplotypes generated a star-like pattern for this latter taxon, suggestive of past expansion (Bandelt et al., 1995). Nucleotide diversity values were similar for E. pulchellus and E. amoenus for dataset A, whereas they appeared to be a bit higher for E. amoenus and E. pusillus based on dataset B. Eumerus pulchellus and E. pusillus were represented by more than two specimens from neighboring and remote geographical areas, and in general showed the lowest values for molecular diversity indices among the three analyzed taxa. The star-like patterns observed for MJ haplotype networks for both datasets for *E. pusillus* may indicate a recent expansion of this taxon, resulting in the observed lower genetic diversity. *Eumerus pusillus* specimens originating from Crete, Karpathos and Naxos (one sequence, EU66) shared the same haplotypes in datasets A and B. Specimens from Chios and others from Naxos presented different haplotypes in both datasets. Further conclusions from these discrepancies are limited due to the low sample sizes for the population genetic analyses and, in order not to be speculative, we encourage further intraspecific analyses.

LBA is a sensitive issue in phylogenetic analyses. We used maximum parsimony and likelihood based methods (including BI), with these latter having been proven to be less sensitive to LBA-artifacts compared with maximum parsimony (Bergsten, 2005). Nevertheless, long branches appeared in both ML- and BI-derived phylogenetic trees, but not for MP, with datasets A and B sharing the same LBAs. LBA-artifacts can arise due to several factors, such as poor taxon sampling and selection of highly divergent outgroups (for more details, see the review by Bergsten, 2005). Here, our MJ network

A. Chroni et al.

Table 3. Results generated for dataset A (i.e	., forward sequencing of the CO	I-3' region) and dataset B (i.e.,	bidirectional sequencing) in
DNaSP 5.10.01 for E. amoenus (18 sequences	, E. pulchellus (seven sequences) a	and <i>E. pusillus</i> (11 sequences).	

$\hline E. anoenus E. pulchellus E. pusillus E. anoenus E. pulchellus E. pusillus E. anoenus E. pulchellus E. pusillus E. pusillus$		Dataset A			Dataset B				
1. Polymorphic sites 636 645 646 737 746 746 Total number of sites 636 645 646 737 746 746 Invariable (monomorphic) sites 636 636 642 716 736 740 Variable (polymorphic) sites 11 9 4 21 10 6 Total number of mutations 16 10 4 22 11 5 Singleton variable sites 8 5 4 12 11 5 Parsimony informative sites 8 4 0 9 4 1 2. DNA polymorphism 2.1 13 7 5 16 7 6 Applotype (gene) diversity (Hd) 0.928 1.000 0.618 0.987 1.000 0.727 Variance of Haplotype diversity 0.00268 0.00783 0.02701 0.000530 0.00163 0.00163 SD of Haplotype diversity 0.0552 0.076 0.164 0.023 0.00616 0.00530 0.00267 Average number of nucleotide differences (k) <th></th> <th>E. amoenus</th> <th>E. pulchellus</th> <th>E. pusillus</th> <th>E. amoenus</th> <th>E. pulchellus</th> <th colspan="2">E. pusillus</th>		E. amoenus	E. pulchellus	E. pusillus	E. amoenus	E. pulchellus	E. pusillus		
Total number of sites 636 645 646 737 746 746 Invariable (monomorphic) sites 636 636 642 716 736 740 Variable (polymorphic) sites 11 9 4 21 10 6 Total number of mutations 16 10 4 22 11 6 Singleton variable sites 8 5 4 12 11 5 Parsimony informative sites 8 4 0 9 4 1 2. DNA polymorphism 2.1 Without gaps 0.0228 1.000 0.618 0.987 1.000 0.727 Variance of Haplotype diversity 0.00252 0.076 0.164 0.023 0.0766 0.144 Nucleotide diversity (Pi) 0.00554 0.00568 0.00113 0.00662 0.00275 Average number of nucleotide differences (k) 3.523 3.667 0.727 4.542 3.952 1.236 2.2 With gaps 153 21 55 153 21 55 53 3.952 1.236	1. Polymorphic sites								
(excluding sites with gaps/missing data) Invariable (monomorphic) sites636636636642716736740Variable (polymorphic) sites119421106Total number of mutations1610422116Singleton rariable sites85412115Parsimony informative sites8409412. DNA polymorphism2.1 Without gapsNumber of Haplotype (h)13751676Variance of Haplotype diversity0.00280.0005830.0227010.0005330.00583Variance of Haplotype diversity0.0520.0760.1640.0230.005800.00143Nucleotide diversity (Pi)0.005540.005680.001130.006160.005300.00166Net eight from Eta0.007510.006330.002110.008680.006620.002522.2 With gaps2951532155Number of pairwise comparisons15321551532155Average number of sites analyzed645.27646.43646.82744.59746.00746.00Average number of sites analyzed645.27646.433.6670.9275.8633.9521.236Number of sites analyzed647.00647.00647.00746.00746.00746.00Average number of sites analyzed647.00647.00 <t< td=""><td>Total number of sites</td><td>636</td><td>645</td><td>646</td><td>737</td><td>746</td><td>746</td></t<>	Total number of sites	636	645	646	737	746	746		
Invariable (monomorphic) sites 636 636 642 716 736 740 Variable (polymorphic) sites 11 9 4 21 10 6 Total number of mutations 16 10 4 22 11 5 Parsimony informative sites 8 5 4 12 11 5 Parsimony informative sites 8 4 0 9 4 1 2. DNA polymorphism 2.1 100 0.618 0.987 1.000 0.727 Variance of Haplotype (h) 13 7 5 16 7 6 Haplotype (gene) diversity 0.00268 0.00583 0.02701 0.00053 0.00583 0.02084 SD of Haplotype diversity 0.00554 0.00568 0.00113 0.00668 0.00062 0.00275 Average number of nucleotide differences (k) 3.523 3.667 0.727 4.542 3.952 1.236 2.2 With gaps 153 21 55 153 21 55 Nucleotide diversity (Pi) 0.00800 0.00567	(excluding sites with gaps/missing data)								
Variable (polymorphic) sites119421106Total number of mutations1610422116Singleton variable sites85412115Parsimony informative sites8409412. DNA polymorphism2.1 Without gapsNumber of Haplotypes (h)13751676Haplotype (gene) diversity (Hd)0.9281.0000.6180.9871.0000.727Variance of Haplotype diversity0.002680.005830.027010.000530.005830.02084SD of Haplotype diversity (Pi)0.005540.005680.001130.006160.005300.00166Nucleotide diversity (Pi)0.005540.006680.002110.008680.0006020.00275Average number of nucleotide differences (k)3.5233.6670.7274.5423.9521.236Number of pairwise comparisons15321551532155Nucleotide diversity (Pi)0.008000.005670.001430.007870.005300.00166Number of sites analyzed645.27646.43646.82744.59746.00746.00Average number of differences5.1633.6670.9275.8633.9521.236Number of sites analyzed647.00647.00647.00746.00746.00746.00Average number of differences5.5873.6670.927	Invariable (monomorphic) sites	636	636	642	716	736	740		
Total number of mutations 16 10 4 22 11 6 Singleton variable sites 8 5 4 12 11 5 Parsimony informative sites 8 4 0 9 4 1 2. DNA polymorphism 2.1 Without gaps 5 16 7 6 Haplotype (gene) diversity (Hd) 0.928 1.000 0.618 0.987 1.000 0.727 Variance of Haplotype diversity 0.00268 0.00833 0.02701 0.00053 0.00583 0.0284 SD of Haplotype diversity (Pi) 0.00554 0.00633 0.00211 0.00868 0.000602 0.00275 Average number of nucleotide differences (k) 3.523 3.667 0.727 4.542 3.952 1.236 2.2 With gaps Number of pairwise comparisons 153 21 55 153 21 55 Nucleotide diversity (Pi) 0.00800 0.00567 0.00143 0.00787 0.00530 0.00166 Nucleotide	Variable (polymorphic) sites	11	9	4	21	10	6		
Singleton variable sites85412115Parsinony informative sites8409412. DNA polymorphism2.1 Without gapsNumber of Haplotypes (h)13751676Haplotype (gene) diversity (Hd)0.9281.0000.6180.9871.0000.727Variance of Haplotype diversity0.002680.005830.027010.000530.005830.0208Sto of Haplotype diversity0.0520.0760.1640.0230.0760.144Nucleotide diversity (Pi)0.005540.005680.001130.006160.005300.00166Average number of nucleotide differences (k)3.5233.6670.7274.5423.9521.2362.2 With gapsNumber of sites analyzed645.27646.43646.82744.59746.00746.00Nucleotide diversity (Pi)0.008000.005670.001430.007870.005300.00166Average number of sites analyzed647.00647.00647.00746.00746.00Analysis at Individual Sites (column by column)229526106Number of sites analyzed647.00647.00647.00746.00746.00746.00Average number of differences5.5873.6670.9276.1843.9521.236Nucleotide diversity (Pi)0.008630.005670.001430.008290.005300.00166Average	Total number of mutations	16	10	4	22	11	6		
Parsimony informative sites 8 4 0 9 4 1 2. DNA polymorphism 2.1 Without gaps 1.000 0.618 0.987 1.000 0.727 Variance of Haplotype diversity 0.00268 0.00583 0.02701 0.00053 0.00583 0.02084 SD of Haplotype diversity 0.0052 0.076 0.164 0.023 0.0076 0.144 Nucleotide diversity (Pi) 0.00554 0.00533 0.00211 0.00868 0.000602 0.00275 Average number of nucleotide differences (k) 3.523 3.667 0.727 4.542 3.952 1.236 2.2 With gaps 2.1 55 153 21 55 Number of pairwise comparisons 153 21 55 153 21 55 Average number of sites analyzed 645.27 646.43 646.82 744.59 746.00 746.00 Average number of differences 5.163	Singleton variable sites	8	5	4	12	11	5		
2. DNA polymorphism 2.1 Without gaps Number of Haplotypes (h) 13 7 5 16 7 6 Haplotype (gene) diversity (Hd) 0.928 1.000 0.618 0.987 1.000 0.727 Variance of Haplotype diversity 0.00268 0.00583 0.02701 0.00053 0.00583 0.02084 SD of Haplotype diversity 0.00554 0.0076 0.164 0.0023 0.076 0.144 Nucleotide diversity (Pi) 0.00554 0.00613 0.00616 0.00330 0.00166 Theta (per site) from Eta 0.00731 0.00633 0.00211 0.00868 0.00602 0.00225 Average number of nucleotide differences (k) 3.523 3.667 0.727 4.542 3.952 1.236 Number of pairwise comparisons 153 21 55 153 21 55 Average number of differences 5.163 3.667 0.927 5.863 3.952 1.236 Nucleotide diversity (Pi) 0.00800 0.00567 0.001	Parsimony informative sites	8	4	0	9	4	1		
2.1 Without gaps Number of Haplotypes (h) 13 7 5 16 7 6 Haplotype (gene) diversity (Hd) 0.928 1.000 0.618 0.987 1.000 0.727 Variance of Haplotype diversity 0.00268 0.00583 0.02701 0.00053 0.00583 0.02084 SD of Haplotype diversity 0.052 0.076 0.164 0.023 0.076 0.144 Nucleotide diversity (Pi) 0.00554 0.00668 0.00113 0.00616 0.00500 0.00275 Average number of nucleotide differences (k) 3.523 3.667 0.727 4.542 3.952 1.236 2.2 With gaps Number of pairwise comparisons 153 21 55 153 21 55 Average number of differences 5.163 3.667 0.927 5.863 3.952 1.236 Nucleotide diversity (Pi) 0.00800 0.00567 0.00143 0.00787 0.00530 0.00166 Average number of differences 5.163 3.667 0.927 5.863 3.952 1.236 Nucleotide diversity (Pi)	2. DNA polymorphism								
Number of Haplotypes (h) 13751676Haplotype (gene) diversity (Hd)0.9281.0000.6180.9871.0000.727Variance of Haplotype diversity0.002680.005830.027010.000530.005830.02084SD of Haplotype diversity0.0520.0760.1640.0230.0760.144Nucleotide diversity (Pi)0.005540.005680.001130.006160.005300.00166Theta (per site) from Eta0.007310.006330.002110.006680.006020.00227Average number of nucleotide differences (k)3.5233.6670.7274.5423.9521.2362.2 With gapsNumber of sites analyzed645.27646.43646.82744.59746.00746.00Average number of differences5.1633.6670.9275.8633.9521.236Nucleotide diversity (Pi)0.008000.005670.001430.007870.005300.00166Average number of sites analyzed647.00647.00647.00746.00746.00746.00Auerage number of differences5.5873.6670.9276.1843.9521.236Nucleotide diversity (Pi)0.008630.005670.001430.008290.005300.00166Nucleotide diversity (Pi)0.008630.005670.001430.008290.005300.00166Nucleotide diversity (Pi)0.008630.005670.001430.008290.00530 <td>2.1 Without gaps</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	2.1 Without gaps								
Haplotype (gene) diversity (Hd) 0.928 1.000 0.618 0.987 1.000 0.727 Variance of Haplotype diversity 0.00268 0.00583 0.02701 0.00053 0.00583 0.02084 SD of Haplotype diversity 0.052 0.076 0.164 0.023 0.076 0.144 Nucleotide diversity (Pi) 0.00554 0.00568 0.00113 0.00616 0.00330 0.00166 Theta (per site) from Eta 0.00731 0.00633 0.00211 0.00868 0.00602 0.00275 Average number of nucleotide differences (k) 3.523 3.667 0.727 4.542 3.952 1.236 2.2 With gaps 55 153 21 55 55 55 Number of sites analyzed 645.27 646.43 646.82 744.59 746.00 746.00 Average number of differences 5.163 3.667 0.927 5.863 3.952 1.236 Nucleotide diversity (Pi) 0.00800 0.00567 0.00143 0.00787 0.00530 0.00166 Average number of differences 5.587 3.667 0.927 5.863 3.952 1.236 Nucleotide diversity (Pi) 0.00863 0.00567 0.00143 0.00787 0.00530 0.00166 Number of sites analyzed 647.00 647.00 746.00 746.00 746.00 746.00 Number of differences 5.587 3.667 0.927 6.184 3.952 1.236 </td <td>Number of Haplotypes (<i>h</i>)</td> <td>13</td> <td>7</td> <td>5</td> <td>16</td> <td>7</td> <td>6</td>	Number of Haplotypes (<i>h</i>)	13	7	5	16	7	6		
Variance of Haplotype diversity 0.00268 0.00583 0.02701 0.00053 0.00583 0.02084 SD of Haplotype diversity 0.052 0.076 0.164 0.023 0.076 0.144 Nucleotide diversity (Pi) 0.00554 0.00568 0.00113 0.00616 0.00530 0.00166 Theta (per site) from Eta 0.00731 0.00633 0.00211 0.00868 0.00602 0.00275 Average number of nucleotide differences (k) 3.523 3.667 0.727 4.542 3.952 1.236 Number of pairwise comparisons 153 21 55 153 21 55 Average number of differences 5.163 3.667 0.927 5.863 3.952 1.236 Nucleotide diversity (Pi) 0.00800 0.00567 0.00143 0.00787 0.00530 0.00166 Average number of differences 5.163 3.667 0.927 5.863 3.952 1.236 Nucleotide diversity (Pi) 0.00800 0.00567 0.00143 0.00787 0.00530 0.00166 Analysis at Individual Sites (column by column)Number of differences 5.587 3.667 0.927 6.184 3.952 1.236 Number of differences 5.587 3.667 0.927 6.184 3.952 1.236 Nucleotide diversity (Pi) 0.00863 0.00567 0.00143 0.00829 0.00530	Haplotype (gene) diversity (Hd)	0.928	1.000	0.618	0.987	1.000	0.727		
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Variance of Haplotype diversity	0.00268	0.00583	0.02701	0.00053	0.00583	0.02084		
Nucleotide diversity (Pi) 0.00554 0.00568 0.00113 0.00616 0.00530 0.00166 Theta (per site) from Eta 0.00731 0.00633 0.00211 0.00868 0.00602 0.00275 Average number of nucleotide differences (k) 3.523 3.667 0.727 4.542 3.952 1.236 2.2 With gapsNumber of pairwise comparisons 153 21 55 153 21 55 Average number of sites analyzed 645.27 646.43 646.82 744.59 746.00 Average number of differences 5.163 3.667 0.927 5.863 3.952 1.236 Nucleotide diversity (Pi) 0.00800 0.00567 0.00143 0.00787 0.00530 0.00166 Analysis at Individual Sites (column by column) 22 9 5 26 10 6 Number of sites analyzed 647.00 647.00 647.00 746.00 746.00 746.00 Average number of differences 5.587 3.667 0.927 6.184 3.952 1.236 Number of polymorphic sites (S) 22 9 5 26 10 6 Average number of differences 5.587 3.667 0.927 6.184 3.952 1.236 Nucleotide diversity (Pi) 0.00863 0.00567 0.00143 0.00829 0.00530 0.00166 Nucleotide diversity (Pi) 0.00863 0.00567 0.00143 0.00829 0.00530 0.00166 <td>SD of Haplotype diversity</td> <td>0.052</td> <td>0.076</td> <td>0.164</td> <td>0.023</td> <td>0.076</td> <td>0.144</td>	SD of Haplotype diversity	0.052	0.076	0.164	0.023	0.076	0.144		
Theta (per site) from Eta 0.00731 0.00633 0.00211 0.00868 0.00602 0.00275 Average number of nucleotide differences (k) 3.523 3.667 0.727 4.542 3.952 1.236 2.2 With gapsNumber of pairwise comparisons 153 21 55 153 21 55 Average number of sites analyzed 645.27 646.43 646.82 744.59 746.00 746.00 Average number of differences 5.163 3.667 0.927 5.863 3.952 1.236 Nucleotide diversity (Pi) 0.00800 0.00567 0.00143 0.00787 0.00530 0.00166 Analysis at Individual Sites (column by column) 22 9 5 26 10 6 Number of sites analyzed 647.00 647.00 647.00 746.00 746.00 746.00 Average number of differences 5.587 3.667 0.927 6.184 3.952 1.236 Number of polymorphic sites (S) 22 9 5 26 10 6 Average number of differences 5.587 3.667 0.927 6.184 3.952 1.236 Nucleotide diversity (Pi) 0.00863 0.00567 0.00143 0.00829 0.00530 0.00166 Theta-W, per sequence 6.45560 3.67347 1.71915 7.60792 4.08163 2.04850 Theta-W, per site 0.00998 0.00568 0.00266 0.01020 0.00547 0.0027	Nucleotide diversity (Pi)	0.00554	0.00568	0.00113	0.00616	0.00530	0.00166		
Average number of nucleotide differences (k) 3.5233.6670.7274.5423.9521.2362.2 With gapsNumber of pairwise comparisons15321551532155Average number of sites analyzed645.27646.43646.82744.59746.00746.00Average number of differences5.1633.6670.9275.8633.9521.236Nucleotide diversity (Pi)0.008000.005670.001430.007870.005300.00166Analysis at Individual Sites (column by column)229526106Number of sites analyzed647.00647.00647.00746.00746.00746.00Number of sites analyzed5.5873.6670.9276.1843.9521.236Number of differences5.5873.6670.9276.1843.9521.236Nucleotide diversity (Pi)0.008630.005670.001430.008290.005300.00166Theta-W, per sequence6.455603.673471.719157.607924.081632.04850Theta-W, per site0.009980.005680.002660.010200.005470.00275	Theta (per site) from Eta	0.00731	0.00633	0.00211	0.00868	0.00602	0.00275		
2.2 With gaps Number of pairwise comparisons 153 21 55 153 21 55 Average number of sites analyzed 645.27 646.43 646.82 744.59 746.00 746.00 Average number of differences 5.163 3.667 0.927 5.863 3.952 1.236 Nucleotide diversity (Pi) 0.00800 0.00567 0.00143 0.00787 0.00530 0.00166 Analysis at Individual Sites (column by column) 0.00800 647.00 647.00 746.00 746.00 746.00 Number of sites analyzed 647.00 647.00 647.00 746.00 746.00 746.00 Average number of differences 5.587 3.667 0.927 6.184 3.952 1.236 Number of polymorphic sites (S) 22 9 5 26 10 6 Average number of differences 5.587 3.667 0.927 6.184 3.952 1.236 Nucleotide diversity (Pi) 0.00863 0.00567 0.00143 0.00829 0.00530 0.00166 Theta-W, per sequence 6.45560	Average number of nucleotide differences (k)	3.523	3.667	0.727	4.542	3.952	1.236		
Number of pairwise comparisons15321551532155Average number of sites analyzed 645.27 646.43 646.82 744.59 746.00 746.00 Average number of differences 5.163 3.667 0.927 5.863 3.952 1.236 Nucleotide diversity (Pi) 0.00800 0.00567 0.00143 0.00787 0.00530 0.00166 Analysis at Individual Sites (column by column) 22 9 5 26 10 6 Number of sites analyzed 647.00 647.00 647.00 746.00 746.00 746.00 Number of polymorphic sites (S) 22 9 5 26 10 6 Average number of differences 5.587 3.667 0.927 6.184 3.952 1.236 Nucleotide diversity (Pi) 0.00863 0.00567 0.00143 0.00829 0.00530 0.00166 Theta-W, per sequence 6.45560 3.67347 1.71915 7.60792 4.08163 2.04850 Theta-W, per site 0.00998 0.00568 0.00266 0.01020 0.00547 0.00275	2.2 With gaps								
Average number of sites analyzed 645.27 646.43 646.82 744.59 746.00 746.00 Average number of differences 5.163 3.667 0.927 5.863 3.952 1.236 Nucleotide diversity (Pi) 0.00800 0.00567 0.00143 0.00787 0.00530 0.00166 Analysis at Individual Sites (column by column) Average number of sites analyzed 647.00 647.00 647.00 746.00 746.00 746.00 Number of sites analyzed 647.00 647.00 647.00 746.00 746.00 746.00 746.00 Number of polymorphic sites (S) 22 9 5 26 10 6 Average number of differences 5.587 3.667 0.927 6.184 3.952 1.236 Nucleotide diversity (Pi) 0.00863 0.00567 0.00143 0.00829 0.00530 0.00166 Nucleotide diversity (Pi) 0.00863 0.00567 0.00143 0.00829 0.00530 0.00166 Nucleotide diversity (Pi) 0.00863 0.00567 0.00143 0.00829 0.00530 0.00166 <t< td=""><td>Number of pairwise comparisons</td><td>153</td><td>21</td><td>55</td><td>153</td><td>21</td><td>55</td></t<>	Number of pairwise comparisons	153	21	55	153	21	55		
Average number of differences 5.163 3.667 0.927 5.863 3.952 1.236 Nucleotide diversity (Pi) 0.00800 0.00567 0.00143 0.00787 0.00530 0.00166 Analysis at Individual Sites (column by column) 0.00787 0.00530 0.00166 Number of sites analyzed 647.00 647.00 647.00 746.00 746.00 746.00 Number of polymorphic sites (S) 22 9 5 26 10 6 Average number of differences 5.587 3.667 0.927 6.184 3.952 1.236 Nucleotide diversity (Pi) 0.00863 0.00567 0.00143 0.00829 0.00530 0.00166 Theta-W, per sequence 6.45560 3.67347 1.71915 7.60792 4.08163 2.04850 Theta-W, per site 0.00998 0.00568 0.00266 0.01020 0.00547 0.00275	Average number of sites analyzed	645.27	646.43	646.82	744.59	746.00	746.00		
Nucleotide diversity (Pi) 0.00800 0.00567 0.00143 0.00787 0.00530 0.00166 Analysis at Individual Sites (column by column)	Average number of differences	5.163	3.667	0.927	5.863	3.952	1.236		
Analysis at Individual Sites (column by column) Number of sites analyzed 647.00 647.00 746.00 746.00 746.00 Number of polymorphic sites (S) 22 9 5 26 10 6 Average number of differences 5.587 3.667 0.927 6.184 3.952 1.236 Nucleotide diversity (Pi) 0.00863 0.00567 0.00143 0.00829 0.00530 0.00166 Theta-W, per sequence 6.45560 3.67347 1.71915 7.60792 4.08163 2.04850 Theta-W, per site 0.00998 0.00568 0.00266 0.01020 0.00547 0.00275	Nucleotide diversity (Pi)	0.00800	0.00567	0.00143	0.00787	0.00530	0.00166		
Number of sites analyzed647.00647.00647.00746.00746.00746.00Number of polymorphic sites (S)229526106Average number of differences5.5873.6670.9276.1843.9521.236Nucleotide diversity (Pi)0.008630.005670.001430.008290.005300.00166Theta-W, per sequence6.455603.673471.719157.607924.081632.04850Theta-W, per site0.009980.005680.002660.010200.005470.00275	Analysis at Individual Sites (column by column)								
Number of polymorphic sites (S)229526106Average number of differences5.5873.6670.9276.1843.9521.236Nucleotide diversity (Pi)0.008630.005670.001430.008290.005300.00166Theta-W, per sequence6.455603.673471.719157.607924.081632.04850Theta-W, per site0.009980.005680.002660.010200.005470.00275	Number of sites analyzed	647.00	647.00	647.00	746.00	746.00	746.00		
Average number of differences5.5873.6670.9276.1843.9521.236Nucleotide diversity (Pi)0.008630.005670.001430.008290.005300.00166Theta-W, per sequence6.455603.673471.719157.607924.081632.04850Theta-W, per site0.009980.005680.002660.010200.005470.00275	Number of polymorphic sites (S)	22	9	5	26	10	6		
Nucleotide diversity (Pi) 0.00863 0.00567 0.00143 0.00829 0.00530 0.00166 Theta-W, per sequence 6.45560 3.67347 1.71915 7.60792 4.08163 2.04850 Theta-W, per site 0.00998 0.00568 0.00266 0.01020 0.00547 0.00275	Average number of differences	5.587	3.667	0.927	6.184	3.952	1.236		
Theta-W, per sequence 6.45560 3.67347 1.71915 7.60792 4.08163 2.04850 Theta-W, per site 0.00998 0.00568 0.00266 0.01020 0.00547 0.00275	Nucleotide diversity (Pi)	0.00863	0.00567	0.00143	0.00829	0.00530	0.00166		
Theta-W, per site 0.00998 0.00568 0.00266 0.01020 0.00547 0.00275	Theta-W, per sequence	6.45560	3.67347	1.71915	7.60792	4.08163	2.04850		
	Theta-W, per site	0.00998	0.00568	0.00266	0.01020	0.00547	0.00275		

reconstructions for each dataset explain the LBAs as those taxa having the highest numbers of mutational steps. In addition, the geographic origins of samples should be taken into account. It is important to clarify that the *ornatus* clade included taxa from very geographically distant areas, i.e., Greece (Dadia) and South Africa (KwaZulu-Natal), so LBAs were to be expected. Given that long branched taxa occurred in all trees, we claim that our topologies remain robust. Adding more samples for LBA taxa could lessen the impact of the LBAs. However, taxon sampling can remain an issue for molecular and other data. We felt that inclusion of as many taxa as possible in our analyses was paramount and so we chose not to exclude any taxa.

To conclude, the present study reveals the adequacy of the COI gene fragment to delimit species in the genus *Eumerus*. Forward and bidirectional sequencing datasets led to similar results; the forward sequencing dataset appeared to be sufficient to identify taxa within *Eumerus* and the more enriched sequence dataset, i.e., bidirectional, provided slightly more information and mitigated certain (though not all) analytical problems. Moreover, we reveal high intraspecific diversity and a high number of mitochondrial haplotypes. Our findings confirm the potential of an integrative approach – combined usage of a COI barcoding system and morphological

characters – to diagnose and delimit species within the genus *Eumerus*. For a complete revision of the genus, including phylogenetic inferences, we endorse the usage of additional molecular markers and/or longer mitochondrial sequence (>800 bp). More taxa and more specimens per taxa should also be sought in order to overcome the drawbacks faced in the present study.

Supplementary material

The supplementary material for this article can be found at http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0007485316000729.

Acknowledgements

This research was co-financed by the European Union (European Social Fund – ESF) and Greek national funds through the Operational Program 'Education and Lifelong Learning' of the National Strategic Reference Framework (NSRF) – Research Funding Program: THALES. Investing in knowledge society through the European Social Fund. We thank John O'Brien for proof reading and making constructive suggestions to the text.

Conflict of interest statement

We certify that there is no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this manuscript.

References

- Ahrens, D., Fujisawa, T., Krammer, H.J., Eberle, J., Fabrizi, S. & Vogler, A.P. (2016) Rarity and incomplete sampling in DNA-based species delimitation. *Systematic Biology* 65(3), 478–494.
- Avise, J. (2000) *Phylogeography: The History and Formation of Species*. Masahousette, Harvard University Press.
- Ball, S.L., Hebert, P.D.N., Burian, S.K. & Webb, J.M. (2005) Biological identifications of mayflies (Ephemeroptera) using DNA barcodes. *Journal of the North American Benthological Society* 24, 508–524.
- Bandelt, H.J., Forster, P., Sykes, B.C. & Richards, M.B. (1995) Mitochondrial portraits of human populations using median networks. *Genetics* 141, 743–753.
- Bandelt, H.J., Forster, P. & Rohl, A. (1999) Median-joining networks for inferring intraspecific phylogenies. *Molecular Biology and Evolution* 16, 37–48.
- Bergsten, J. (2005) A review of long-branch attraction. Cladistics 21, 163–193.
- Buhay, J.E. (2009) 'Coi-Like' sequences are becoming problematic in molecular systematic and DNA barcoding studies. *Journal* of Crustacean Biology 29, 96–110.
- Chen, H., Rangasamy, M., Tan, S.Y., Wang, H.C. & Siegfried, B. D. (2010) Evaluation of five methods for total DNA extraction from western corn rootworm beetles. *PLoS ONE* 5(8), 1–6.
- Dayrat, B. (2005) Towards integrative taxonomy. Biological Journal of the Linnean Society 85, 407–415.
- DeWalt, R.E. (2011) DNA barcoding: a taxonomic point of view. Journal of the North American Benthological Society 30, 174–181.
- Doczkal, D. & Pape, T. (2009) Lyneborgimyia magnifica gen. et sp.n. (Diptera: Syrphidae) from Tanzania, with a phylogenetic analysis of the Eumerini using new morphological characters. Systematic Entomology 34(3), 559–573.
- Folmer, O., Black, M., Hoeh, W., Lutz, R. & Vrijenhoek, R. (1994) DNA primers for amplification of mitochondrial cytochrome c oxidase subunit I from diverse metazoan invertebrates. *Molecular Marine Biology and Biotechnology* 3, 294–299.
- Francuski, L., Djurakic, M., Ludoški, J. & Milankov, V. (2013) Landscape genetics and spatial pattern of phenotypic variation of *Eristalis tenax* across Europe. *Journal of Zoological Systematics and Evolutionary Research* 51, 227–238.
- Gibson, J.F., Kelso, S., Jackson, M.D., Kits, J.H., Miranda, G.F.G. & Skevington, J.H. (2011) Diptera-specific polymerase chain reaction amplification primers of use in molecular phylogenetic research. *Annals of the Entomological Society of America* 104, 976–997.
- **Goloboff, P.** (1999) NONA (no name). Version 2. Published by the Author, Tucuman, Argentina.
- Haarto, A. & Ståhls, G. (2014) When mtDNA COI is misleading: congruent signal of ITS2 molecular marker and morphology for North European *Melanostoma* Schiner, 1860 (Diptera, Syrphidae). *ZooKeys* 431, 93–134.
- Hall, T.A. (1999) BioEdit: a user-friendly biological sequence alignment editor and analysis program for Windows 95/98/ NT. Nucleic Acids Symposium Series 41, 95–98.

- Hebert, P.D.N., Cywinska, A., Ball, S.L. & DeWaard, J.R. (2003a) Biological identifications through DNA barcodes. *Proceedings* of the Royal Society B – Biological Sciences **270**, 313–321.
- Hebert, P.D.N., Ratnasingham, S. & deWaard, J.R. (2003b) Barcoding animal life: cytochrome c oxidase subunit 1 divergences among closely related species. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B – Biological Sciences* 270, S96–S99.
- Hebert, P.D.N. & Gregory, T.R. (2005) The promise of DNA barcoding for taxonomy. *Systematic Biology* 54, 852–859.
- Hebert, P.D.N., deWaard, J.R. & Landry, J.F. (2010) DNA barcodes for 1/1000 of the animal kingdom. *Biology Letters* 6, 359–362.
- Huelsenbeck, J.P. & Ronquist, F. (2001) MRBAYES: bayesian inference of phylogenetic trees. *Bioinformatics* **17**, 754–755.
- Jordaens, K., Goergen, G., Virgilio, M., Backeljau, T., Vokaer, A. & De Meyer, M. (2015) DNA barcoding to improve the taxonomy of the Afrotropical Hoverflies (Insecta: Diptera: Syrphidae). *PLoS ONE* **10**(10), e0140264.
- Katoh, K., Kuma, K., Toh, H. & Miyata, T. (2005) MAFFT version 5: improvement in accuracy of multiple sequence alignment. *Nucleic Acids Research* 33, 511–518.
- Leasi, F. & Norenburg, J.L. (2014) The necessity of DNA taxonomy to reveal cryptic diversity and spatial distribution of meiofauna, with a focus on Nemertea. *PLoS ONE* 9, e104385.
- Librado, P. & Rozas, J. (2009) DnaSP v5: a software for comprehensive analysis of DNA polymorphism data. *Bioinformatics* 25, 1451–1452.
- Maddison, W.P. & Maddison, D.R. (2011) Mesquite: a Modular System for Evolutionary Analysis. Version 3.03. Available online at http://mesquiteproject.org
- Marcos-García, M.Á., Vujić, A., Ricarte, A. & Ståhls, G. (2011) Towards an integrated taxonomy of the *Merodon equestris* species complex (Diptera: Syrphidae) including description of a new species, with additional data on Iberian Merodon. *Entomological Society of Canada* **143**, 332–348.
- Mengual, X., Ståhls, G., Vujić, A. & Marcos-García, M.Á. (2006) Integrative taxonomy of Iberian *Merodon* species (Diptera, Syrphidae). *Zootaxa* 1377, 1–26.
- Milankov, V., Stamenković, J., Ludoški, J., Ståhls, G. & Vujić, A. (2005) Diagnostic molecular markers and the genetic relationships among three species of the *Cheilosia canicularis* group (Diptera: Syrphidae). *European Journal of Entomology* 102, 125–131.
- Milankov, V., Ståhls, G., Stamenković, J. & Vujić, A. (2008a) Genetic diversity of populations of *Merodon aureus* and *M. cinereus* species complexes (Diptera, Syrphidae):integrative taxonomy and implications for conservation priorities on the Balkan Peninsula. *Conservation Genetics* 9, 1125–1137.
- Milankov, V., Ståhls, G. & Vujić, A. (2008b) Molecular diversity of populations of the *Merodon ruficornis* group (Diptera, Syrphidae) on the Balkan Peninsula. *Journal of Zoological Systematics and Evolutionary Research* 46, 143–152.
- Milankov, V., Ludoški, J., Ståhls, G., Stamenković, J. & Vujić, A. (2009) High molecular and phenotypic diversity in the *Merodon avidus* complex (Diptera, Syrphidae): cryptic speciation in a diverse insect taxon. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society* 155, 819–833.
- Milankov, V., Francuski, L., Ludoški, J., Ståhls, G. & Vujić, A. (2010a) Estimating genetic and phenotypic diversity in a northern hoverfly reveals lack of heterozygosity correlated with significant fluctuating asymmetry of wing traits. *Journal* of Insect Conservation 14, 77–88.
- Milankov, V., Francuski, L., Ludoški, J., Ståhls, G. & Vujić, A. (2010b) Genetic structure and phenotypic diversity of two

northern populations of *Cheilosia* aff. *longula* (Diptera: Syrphidae) has implications for evolution and conservation. *European Journal of Entomology* **107**, 305–315.

- Milankov, V., Ludoški, J.L.F., Ståhls, G. & Vujić, A. (2013) Genetic and phenotypic diversity patterns in *Merodon albifrons* Meigen, 1822 (Diptera: Syrphidae): evidence of intraspecific spatial and temporal structuring. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society* **110**, 257–280.
- Miller, M.A., Pfeiffer, W. & Schwartz, T. (2010) Creating the CIPRES Science Gateway for inference of large phylogenetic trees, pp. 1–8 in Gateway Computing Environments Workshop (GCE), New Orleans, LA.
- Moritz, C. & Cicero, C. (2004) DNA barcoding: promise and pitfalls. PLoS Biology 2, 1529–1531.
- Nedeljković, Z., Ačanski, J., Vujić, A., Obreht, D., Dan, M., Ståhls, G. & Radenković, S. (2013) Taxonomy of Chrysotoxum festivum Linnaeus, 1758 (Diptera: Syrphidae) – an integrative approach. Zoological Journal of the Linnean Society 169, 84–102.
- Nedeljković, Z., Ačanski, J., Dan, M., Obreht-Vidaković, D., Ricarte, A. & Vujić, A. (2015) An integrated approach to delimiting species borders in the genus *Chrysotoxum* Meigen, 1803 (Diptera: Syrphidae), with description of two new species. *Contributions to Zoology* 84(4), 285–304.
- Nixon, K.C. (2002) WINCLADA ver. 1.00.08. New York, University of Ithaca.
- Pape, T. & Thompson, F.C. (*Eds*) 2015. Systema Dipterorum. Version 1.5. Available online at http://www.diptera.org/ (accessed 18 September 2015).
- Peck, L.V. (1988) Syrphidae, pp. 11–230 in Soos, A. & Papp, L. (Eds) Catalogue of Palaearctic Diptera. Budapest, Akaddémiai Kiadó.
- Pérez-Bañón, C., Rojo, S., Ståhls, G. & Marcos-García, M.Á. (2003) Taxonomy of European *Eristalinus* (Diptera: Syrphidae) based on larval morphology and molecular data. *European Journal of Entomology* **100**, 417–428.
- Petanidou, T., Ståhls, G., Vujić, A., Olesen, J.M., Rojo, S., Thrasyvoulou, A., Sgardelis, S., Kallimanis, A.S., Kokkini, S. & Tscheulin, T. (2013) Investigating plantpollinator relationships in the Aegean: the approaches of the project POL-AEGIS (The pollinators of the Aegean archipelago: diversity and threats). *Journal of Apicultural Research* 52 (2), 106–117.
- Pons, J., Barraclough, T.G., Gomez-Zurita, J., Cardoso, A., Duran, D.P., Hazell, S., Kamoun, S., Sumlin, W.D. & Vogler, A.P. (2006) Sequence-based species delimitation for the DNA taxonomy of undescribed insects. *Systematic Biology* 55, 595–609.
- Posada, D. & Crandall, K.A. (2001) Selecting the best-fit model of nucleotide substitution. *Systematic Biology* 50, 580–601.
- Radenković, S., Vujić, A., Ståhls, G., Pérez-Bañón, C., Rojo, S., Petanidou, T. & Simić, S. (2011) Three new cryptic species of the genus *Merodon* Meigen (Diptera: Syrphidae) from the island of Lesvos (Greece). *Zootaxa* 2735, 35–56.
- Rodriguez, F., Oliver, J.L., Marin, A. & Medina, J.R. (1990) The general stochastic-model of nucleotide substitution. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* 142, 485–501.
- Rotheray, G.E. & Gilbert, F. (2011) *The Natural History of Hoverflies*. UK, Ceredigion.
- Rubinoff, D. (2006) Utility of mitochondrial DNA barcodes in species conservation. *Conservation Biology* 20, 1026–1033.
- Simon, C., Frati, F., Beckenbach, A., Crespi, B., Liu, H. & Flook,
 P. (1994) Evolution, weighting, and phylogenetic utility of mitochondrial gene-sequences and a compilation of

conserved polymerase chain-reaction primers. *Annals of the Entomological Society of America* **87**, 651–701.

- Smith, M.A., Fisher, B.L. & Hebert, P.D.N. (2005) DNA barcoding for effective biodiversity assessment of a hyperdiverse arthropod group: the ants of Madagascar. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B – Biological Sciences* 360, 1825–1834.
- Soldati, L., Kergoat, G.J., Clamens, A.L., Jourdan, H., Jabbour-Zahab, R. & Condamine, F.L. (2014) Integrative taxonomy of New Caledonian beetles: species delimitation and definition of the *Uloma isoceroides* species group (Coleoptera, Tenebrionidae, Ulomini), with the description of four new species. *Zookeys* **415**, 133–167.
- Speight, M.C.D. (2014) Species accounts of European Syrphidae (Diptera). Syrph the Net, the database of European Syrphidae, vol. 78, pp. 321. Syrph the Net publications, Dublin.
- Suk, S.W. & Han, H.Y. (2013) Clarification of previously confused Chrysotoxum sapporense and Chrysotoxum graciosum (Insecta: Diptera: Syrphidae) in East Asia based on morphological and molecular data. Animal Cells and Systems 17(4), 277–289. doi: 10.1080/19768354.2013.814588.
- Stackelberg, A.A. (1961) Palaearctic species of the genus *Eumerus* Mg. (Diptera, Syrphidae). *Trudy vses.ent.*, Obshch 48, 181–229.
- Ståhls, G., Stuke, J.H., Vujić, A., Doczkal, D. & Muona, J. (2004) Phylogenetic relationships of the genus *Cheilosia* and the tribe *Rhingiini* (Diptera, Syrphidae) based on morphological and molecular characters. *Cladistics – the International Journal of the Willi Hennig Society* 20, 105–122.
- Ståhls, G., Vujić, A. & Milankov, V. (2008) Cheilosia vemalis (Diptera, Syrphidae) complex: molecular and morphological variability. Annales Zoologici Fennici 45, 149–159.
- Ståhls, G., Vujić, A., Pérez-Bañón, C., Radenković, S., Rojo, S. & Petanidou, T. (2009) COI barcodes for identification of *Merodon* hoverflies (Diptera, Syrphidae) of Lesvos Island, Greece. *Molecular Ecology Resources* 9, 1431–1438.
- Stamatakis, A. (2006) RAxML-VI-HPC: maximum likelihoodbased phylogenetic analyses with thousands of taxa and mixed models. *Bioinformatics* 22, 2688–2690.
- Stamatakis, A., Hoover, P. & Rougemont, J. (2008) A rapid bootstrap algorithm for the RAxML web servers. *Systematic Biology* 57, 758–771.
- Tang, C.Q., Humphreys, A.M., Fontaneto, D. & Barraclough, T.G. (2014) Effects of phylogenetic reconstruction method on the robustness of species delimitation using single-locus data. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* 5, 1086–1094.
- Thompson, F.C., Rotheray, G.E. & Zimbado, M.A. (2010) Syrphidae (flower flies), pp. 763–792 in Brown, B.V., Borkent, A., Cumming, J.M., Wood, D.M., Woodley, Norman, E. & Zumbado, M.A. (*Eds*) Manual of Central American Diptera. Ottawa, NRC Research Press.
- Vujić, A., Radenković, S., Ståhls, G., Ačanski, J., Stefanović, A., Veselić, S., Andrić, A. & Hayat, R. (2012) Systematics and taxonomy of the *ruficornis* group of genus *Merodon* Meigen (Diptera: Syrphidae). *Systematic Entomology* 37, 578–602.
- Vujić, A., Ståhls, G., Ačanski, J., Bartsch, H., Bygebjerg, R. & Stefanović, A. (2013) Systematics of Pipizini and taxonomy of European Pipiza Fallen: molecular and morphological evidence (Diptera, Syrphidae). *Zoologica Scripta* 42, 288–305.
- Young, A.D., Marshall, S.A. & Skevington, J.H. (2016) Revision of *Platycheirus* Lepeletier and Serville (Diptera: Syrphidae) in the Nearctic north of Mexico. *Zootaxa* 4082(1), 001–317.
- Zhang, J.J., Kapli, P., Pavlidis, P. & Stamatakis, A. (2013) A general species delimitation method with applications to phylogenetic placements. *Bioinformatics* 29, 2869–2876.