

### Crustaceans

#### **1. Dikelocephalid Trilobites, By Seung-Bae Lee**

However, it is **difficult to evaluate their relationship** due to uncertain generic concepts of some Laurentian dikelocephalids (Raasch, 1951; Robison and Pantoja-Alor, 1968; Taylor and Halley, 1974; Ludvigsen and Westrop, 1983; Fortey, 1994). Page 282

#### **2. Lichidae Trilobita, By H. B. Whittington**

They are present in the earliest Ordovician strata, and range into the Devonian, but their origins remain a **mystery**. Page 306

Until more and particularly entire exoskeletons, is known of these species, it will be **difficult** to discern lichid origins. Page 306

An issue in **debate** is whether to place the Lichidae in a separate higher taxon, ranging from Superfamily to Order (Moore, 1959; Hupe, 1953, 1955; Bergstrom, 1973), or to ally them in an Order with the Odontopleuroidea (Henningsmoen, 1951; Thomas and Holloway, 1988; Fortey, 1990; *in* Kaesler et al., 1997). Page 314

Firstly, that the origin of lichids, of their ancestry in pre-Tremadoc strata, remains **unknown**. Secondly, that there is a great gap in our knowledge of how and where the early diversification and migrations of species occurred, in the time between early Tremadoc and late Arenig. Page 315

#### **3. Epipunctae And Phosphatized Setae, By Jisuo Jin**

[The precise position of the Agnostida within or outside of this clade of trilobites is still the subject of **debate** (e.g., Fortey and Whittington, 1989; Fortey, 1990; Ramskold and Edgecombe, 1991; Shergold, 1991; Bergstrom, 1992; Babcock, 1994; Fortey and Theron, 1994; Fortey and Owens, 1997; and Edgecombe and Ramskold, 1999).] Page 692

The timing of the Cambrian radiation is a topic that has been extensively **debated** (see Gould, 1989; Signor and Lipps, 1992; Fortey et al., 1996; Knoll, 1996; Raff, 1996; and Lieberman, 1999b). Some have argued that the Cambrian radiation significantly predates the Neoproterozoic-Cambrian boundary (e.g., Darwin, 1859; Davidson et al., 1995; Fortey et al., 1996; Fortey and Owens, 1997; Wray et al., 1996; Ayala et al., 1998; Xiao et al., 1998; Fortey, 2001) whereas others have suggested that the radiation occurred just before the start of the Cambrian (McNamara, 1986; Gould, 1989; Hughes, 1991; Valentine et al., 1994). Page 696

#### **4. Paleozoic Beyrichioidean Ostracodes, By Ewa Olempska**

There is also some **debate** concerning relationships of the late Paleozoic ostracodes with cruminate dimorphism, especially paraparchitids, recently incorporated into the Palaeocopida (Jones, 2004; Liebau, 2005), Leiocopida (Whatley et al., 1993; Olempska, 1999; Watabe and Kaesler, 2004; Hoare and Merrill, 2004; Williams et al., 2005), and Podocopida (Becker, 2000). Page 717

The placement of several mid and late-Paleozoic genera with cruminate dimorphism (e.g., the Late Devonian *Bouckaertites* Tschigova, 1977, *Zaninaella* Tschigova, 1977, and the Early Carboniferous “*Bernix*” Jones, 1885, *Pseudoleperditia* Schneider, 1956, *Copelandella* Bless and Jordan, 1971, *Armenites* Tschigova, 1977, *Malnina* Jones, 1989, and several others) is the subject of a **debate** (e.g., Robinson, 1969; Bless and Jordan, 1971; Sohn, 1979; Jones, 1989; Abushik, 1990; Tibert and Scott, 1999). Page 717

There are several lineages within the mid and late-Paleozoic beyrichioideans, and the precise phylogenetic relationships in these species are still far from being clear. Page 726

#### **5. Affinities Of Illaenidae, By Harry B. Whittington**

It is used as a division of equal rank in Fortey's (1990, fig. 19; Fortey and Owens *in* Kaesler, 1997, fig. 196) diagram, however, for a division that includes a heterogeneous assemblage of portions of groups of known ancestry and groups of uncertain ancestry. Page 879

#### **6. Cladistic Analysis Of Early Trilobites , By Frederick A. Sundberg**

In contrast, using the different species of *Schistometopus* would have created **problems** in a noncladistic phylogenetic analysis or cladistic analyses using representative species or “generic” character states. Page 928

Determining the phylogenetic relationships among these ptychopariids is also **hindered** by the lack of information about the different sclerites for several taxa. Page 929

### **7. The Decapoda, By Rodney M. Feldmann**

Recent attempts to place decapods in a phylogenetic context have yielded widely divergent patterns and, to date, **nothing resembling consensus** has been reached. This is not to say that progress has not been made. Page 1021

The **debate** goes on (Guinot and Tavares, 2001). Thus, it is clear that the arrangement and relationships of the so-called “primitive” crabs is anything but clear. Page 1023, 1024

### **8. Trilobite Systematics, By Richard A. Fortey**

Different approaches to phylogenetics have influenced the way trilobites have been classified. Classical evolutionary taxonomy, the stratigraphical approach, and cladistics have all contributed in different ways to the current classification, which has evolved piecemeal, **and is still unsatisfactory** in some ways. Nonetheless, progress towards a phylogenetic classification has been made, especially as the result of information from ontogenies provided. Page 1141

Many of the outstanding high-level **systematic problems** boil down to understanding and identifying Cambrian sister taxa of known clades, or in some cases challenging the homogeneity of clades once the appropriate relationships are resolved. Ontogenies of Cambrian trilobites are likely to be crucial in this quest. Page 1148

There still seem to me to be some **problems** in the objective appraisal of relationships because the former study only used type species (often imperfectly known) as its basis, and olenelloids are allegedly very plastic in morphology—how do we know that the original basis of these genera was appropriate? Page 1148

### **9. Early Ordovician Ostracods, By Maria Jose Salas**

However, it is clear that without new detailed information from soft anatomy, the relationships between the Ostracoda and Bradoriida remain hypothetical. This phylogenetic hypothesis can only truly be tested when more evidence from fossilized soft tissues becomes available in lowermost Ordovician ostracods and Cambrian bradoriids (other than kunmingellids). Page 1394

### **10. Development and phylogeny of arthropods, By Pat Simpson**

It addressed ways to resolve the still uncertain relationships between the different groups of arthropods and featured talks discussing phylogeny and comparative developmental biology. There seems to be a general consensus that insects and crustaceans are probably sister groups and there is a suggestion that myriapods (millipedes and centipedes) are related to insects and crustaceans. However, the position of the Chelicerates (spiders, scorpions, horseshoe crabs) is still under **debate**. Page 223

### **11. Arthropod Evolution, By D. Osorio**

Insect and crustacean lineages diverged over 500 Myr ago, and there are continuing uncertainties about whether they evolved from a common arthropod ancestor or, alternatively, they evolved independently from annelid worms. Page 419

The evolutionary origins and diversification of the Arthropoda are the subject of continued **debate**, recently enlivened by studies of the arthropod radiation during the mid-Cambrian period. Arguments about evolutionary relationships between the main arthropod groups, and whether the Palaeozoic lineages that survived and prospered were fundamentally fitter than those that perished, have not been resolved by palaeontology or by classical comparative anatomy and embryology. Page 419

### **12. Coral-inhabiting barnacles, By N. Simon-Blecher**

It has been difficult to establish the phylogenetic relationships among Pyrgomatidae because of the apparent convergence of morphological characteristics, and due to the use of non-cladistic systematics, which emphasize ancestor-descendant relationships rather than sister-clade relationships. Page 1333

The phylogenetic relationships among Pyrgomatidae have been difficult to establish due to the use of non-cladistic systematics, which emphasize ancestor-descendant relationships and not sister-clade relationships, and because of the apparent convergence of morphological characteristics, e.g., fusion of opercular plates and wall-plates occurred several times during Pyrgomatidae evolution. Page 1333, 1334

The phylogenetic affinities of these subfamilies have not yet been unequivocally demonstrated. Page 1334

Because the monophyly of Pyrgomatidae is not fully accepted, its phylogenetic position among Balanomorpha has never been resolved. Page 1334

Despite the considerable **debate** concerning phylogenetic relationships of Pyrgomatidae, a molecular based phylogenetic analysis of these organisms has never been conducted. Page 1335

### **13. Phylogeny of the squat lobsters, By K. E. Schnabel**

It aims to consolidate recent hypotheses into a single framework addressing commonalities and discrepancies in the ongoing and vigorous **debate** over internal anomuran relationships with a specific focus on the status and position of Galatheaidea. Page 158

### **14. Phylogeny of Paramysis, By Asta Audzijonyte**

Finally, the genus *Paramysis* also contains seven more species from the Mediterranean Sea and Northeast Atlantic, and the phylogenetic relationship of these truly marine species to the Ponto-Caspian taxa has been a matter of continued **debate** (Czerniavsky, 1882; Sars, 1907; Derzhavin, 1939). Page 739

The origin of endemic diversity in ancient lakes is a question related to several contentious topics in evolutionary biology, including the importance of sympatric speciation and the roles of long-term environmental stability versus instability in promoting diversification. Page 738

### **15. Branchiopod crustaceans, By Jeremy R. deWaard**

While this provides a unique setting to investigate the exploration of phenotypic space, our understanding of the origin and evolution of these morphological reconfigurations is inhibited by our lack of a robust phylogeny for the group. Page 491

These studies, a diverse assemblage in themselves, have failed to achieve the Holy Grail: a consensus on branchiopod relationships. Page 491

Although the phylogeny of the branchiopods has been redrawn on numerous occasions, many details remain incomplete (Fig. 1). Page 492

How best to approach data collection for phylogenetic estimation remains a contentious issue, and incomplete taxon sampling is often cited as a major source of error in phylogenetic studies. Page 499

In the present study, we naturally do not know the 'true phylogeny' with which to determine with certainty the superior strategy. Page 499

### **16. 37 more arthropods, By Jon Mallatt**

Also **debated** is the position of pycnogonids; that is, whether sea spiders are the sister group to chelicerates (Waloszek and Dunlop, 2002), or are the sister group of all other extant arthropods, which have been termed Cormogonida. Page 785

The relations within Pancrustacea, especially among the major groups of crustaceans, have prompted a century and-a-half of **debate** among morphological taxonomists. Page 786

Much interest and **debate** center around which arthropod group is the nearest relative of hexapods, with recent discussion focusing on whether it is Malacostraca. Page 787

The relations among the entognath groups—collembolans, proturans, and diplurans—are much **debated**. This problem was recently reviewed by several authors. Page 788

Relations among the holometabolan orders are **debated**, but one group that seems firmly established is Trichoptera. Page 789

### **17. The disunity of Crustacea, By Kenneth Meland**

Historically, conflicting ideas on Malacostraca phylogeny have often involved issues concerning monophyly of Mysidacea and Peracarida. Page 1084

### **18. Phylogenetics of the brachyuran crabs, By Shane T. Ahyong**

Since then, **debate** has continued over the status of Podotremata, Heterotremata and Thoracotremata (Tavares, 2003). Page 581

Interrelationships of the eubrachyurans are largely unresolved, though the majoids and Dorippoides lie outside of the remaining eubrachyurans. Page 581

### **19. Phylogenetic relationships within the Mysidae, By T. Remerie**

Mysid phylogeny is poorly understood and few attempts were made over the last decades to revise the earlier established systematic relationships between higher taxonomic levels within the Mysida. Page 770

These studies gave more insight in the evolutionary link between the formerly accepted suborders Lophogastrida and Mysida within the order Mysidacea, which now can be considered different orders while the “old” Mysidacea disappears. However, this ongoing **debate** does not discuss the status of lower taxonomic levels within the order Mysida (families, subfamilies, tribes, and genera). Page 770

Relationships within the Mysini are much less straightforward, since two clades are resolved in the analyses. Page 775

### **20. Rapid radiation and cryptic speciation, By Annie Machordom**

Despite their ecological importance and high diversity, many aspects of the biology of squat lobsters are poorly understood, and there is still much **debate** regarding their systematic and phylogenetic history (McLaughlin and Lemaitre, 1997; Schram, 2001). Page 259

Aside from their taxonomy, the phylogenetic affinities among the squat lobsters are **poorly understood**. The systematics of the group has not been fully resolved, and current taxonomic treatments divide genera into several large groups based on the number of male pleopods, general spinulation and the shape of the carapace and abdomen (Baba, 1988; Baba and de Saint Laurent, 1996; Macpherson and Machordom, 2001). Page 260

Moreover, given there is **no fossil record** to clarify the time of divergence of the different groups, nor are there any clear marine barriers that could justify the isolation of the ancestors of these species, we did not undertake molecular clock calibration of the divergences found. Page 274

### **21. Testing the new animal phylogeny, By Sarah J. Bourlat**

The interrelationships among living phyla of metazoans have been the subject of controversy for a century, and represent a challenge in both morphological and molecular terms. Page 23

The phylogenetic position of the pycnogonids leads to **debate** concerning the origin of arthropod head appendages. The **debate** centres around the suggested homology of pycnogonid chelifores to the protocerebral ‘great appendages’ of certain Cambrian stem-group arthropods rather than to the deutocerebral chelicerae of spiders (Maxmen et al., 2005). If true, this would support the idea of the pycnogonids as a basal branch of the arthropods (Budd and Telford, 2005). Page 26

### **22. Estimation of decapod phylogeny, By Megan L. Porter**

Phylogenetic relationships among all of the major decapod infraorders have never been estimated using molecular data, while morphological studies produce conflicting results. Page 355

Unfortunately, there are as many hypotheses of decapods phylogenetic relationships as there are experts with opinions (Schram, 2001), with no consensus in sight (Fig. 1). Page 356

Even with a large number of conflicting hypotheses regarding decapod phylogenetic relationships, there appears to be general agreement on the monophyly of the suborder Pleocyemata and the informal ‘Reptantia.’ Page 357

However, it is not the final answer to the long **debate** regarding decapod relationships; indeed, it appears to add yet another scheme to the already large set of hypotheses concerning decapod phylogenetic relationships. Page 365

### **23. Molecular phylogeny of the Calanoida, By Leocadio Blanco-Bercial**

The order Calanoida includes some of the most successful planktonic groups in both marine and freshwater environments. Due to the morphological complexity of the taxonomic characters in this group, subdivision and phylogenies have been complex and problematic. Page 103

Our understanding of the evolutionary history of the calanoid copepods has been markedly limited by the lack of a fossil record and the complex effects of environmental variation over the geological history of the oceans. Page 103

Although the reliability of phylogenies based on nuclear ribosomal RNA genes is still in **debate** (von Reumont et al., 2009; Wägele and Mayer, 2007), these genes have been widely used to resolve phylogenetic relationships among many taxa as single-gene analyses. Page 110

### **24. Erratic rates of molecular evolution, By Oive Tinn**

Dating evolutionary origins of taxa is essential for understanding rates and timing of evolutionary events, often inciting intense **debate** when molecular estimates differ from first fossil appearances. For numerous reasons, ostracods present a challenging case study of rates of evolution and congruence of fossil and molecular divergence time estimates. On the one hand, ostracods have one of the densest fossil records of any metazoan group. Page 157

We also report multiple cases of significant incongruence between fossil and molecular estimates of divergence times in Ostracoda. Page 157

As a result, the two primary estimation methodologies are often **debated**. The classical paleontological method uses first fossil appearance as an estimate for the evolutionary origin of a taxon. Critics argue these estimates may be unreliable because they require fossil preservation of taxonomically important characteristics, reliable phylogenetic placement, and accurate stratigraphic dating. Furthermore, true first fossil appearances should systematically underestimate actual origins of taxa (Smith and Peterson, 2002). Page 157

Despite their voluminous fossil record, estimating divergence times in Ostracoda may be difficult for at least two reasons. First, ostracod taxonomy is controversial (Horne et al., 2005; Martin and Davis, 2001; Schram, 1986). Page 158

Low preservational potential of myodocopes is further supported by the rarity of sub-fossil carapaces in habitats where living individuals are known (Eagar, 1995) and by a low total number of myodocope fossils compared to podocopes and may explain the completely missing fossil record of the myodocope families. Page 166

Instead, we view fossil taxonomy as a difficult problem in Ostracoda that probably contributed to the observed incongruence. Page 166

### **25. Relationships among the sea spiders, By Susan E. Masta**

Pycnogonids, or sea spiders, are an enigmatic group of arthropods. Their unique anatomical features have made them difficult to place within the broader group Arthropoda. Page 59

Pycnogonida, or sea spiders, are arthropods with anatomical features so unique that their relationships to other members of Arthropoda have been enigmatic. Page 59

More data, including data from different sources, is necessary to resolve the placement of Pycnogonida within Arthropoda. Pycnogonids typically possess anterior appendages termed chelifores, and the lack of clear homology of these appendages with other arthropod appendages has fueled **debate** over the closest relatives of pycnogonids. Page 59

### **26. Relationships in the crayfish genus, By Peter Trontelj**

Despite these research efforts relationships and biogeography of the eastern populations of *A. pallipes* remain uncertain, as do nearly all systematic questions concerning *A. torrentium*. Page 213

Thus, apart from a taxonomic revision, a re-evaluation of biogeographic data is needed to reach consistent phylogeographic and systematic conclusions. Page 213

### **27. The branchiopod *Artemia*, By Ilias Kappas**

The significance of natural hybridization has been among the most heated **debates** in evolutionary research. Primarily sparked by the opposing views of prominent zoologists and botanists (Mayr, 1963; Lewontin and Birch, 1966; Arnold, 1997; Rieseberg, 1997), the controversy over the frequency and role of hybridization in evolutionary change still remains unsettled to a large extent. Page 192

### **28. Uroptychus naso complex, By Gary C. B. Poore**

Despite the considerable **debate** related to the exact position and origins of the biogeographic breaks mentioned, it is unquestionable that the composition and geographical patterns of marine and terrestrial biota are influenced by the complicated geological history of the zone. Page 168

### **29. Austropotamobius italicus, By Carlos Pedraza-Lara**

The **debate** is therefore still open, and more exhaustive studies and robust databases are needed to provide convincing explanations for the phylogeographic structure and history of *A. italicus*. Page 328

### **30. The giant freshwater prawn, By Mark de Bruyn**

Much **debate** has surrounded the systematic relationships of many species within this group (e.g., Holthuis, 1950, 1995; Johnson, 1973; Pereira, 1997), which has until recently been based exclusively on comparisons of external morphological characteristics. Page 251

### **31. Afrotropical Freshwater crab, By Savel R. Daniels**

Consequently, phylogenetic and biogeographic affinities among invertebrates that also appear to have undergone a radiation on Madagascar remain enigmatic and the subject of vigorous **debate** (Bott, 1955, 1965; Ng et al., 1995; Ortmann, 1902; Rodriguez, 1986; Von Sternberg et al., 1999). Page 228

Noticeably, several taxonomic authorities have questioned the validity of the superfamilies and their stability (Cumberlidge, 1999; Holthuis, 1979; Ng, 2004; Ng and Sket, 1996; Ng and Tan, 1998; Von Sternberg et al., 1999) further fueling the biogeographic **debate** over freshwater crab origins. Page 228

### **32. Phylogeography of the common shrimp, By Joana Campos**

Frequent recombination would need to be invoked, but the evidence for recombination in animal mitochondria is still under **debate** (see Barr et al., 2005 for a review). Page 1020, 1021

### **33. Divergence within Crustacea, By T. Lefébure**

Nevertheless, almost all **debate**s were developed on theoretical grounds while utility and consequences of the use of DNA in taxonomy have not been tested on broad datasets. Page 435

### **34. Relationships within the Phyllopoda, By Anke Braband**

The phylogenetic relationships within the Phyllopoda are nevertheless a matter of **debate**.

### **35. Relationships within the Phyllopoda, By Anke Braband**

The phylogenetic relationships within the Phyllopoda are nevertheless a matter of **debate**. Page 229

## References

1. Dikelocephalid Trilobites, By Seung-Bae Lee, *Journal of Paleontology*, 2011, Volume 85, Number 2, Pages 279 To 297
2. Lichidae Trilobita, By H. B. Whittington, *Journal of Paleontology*, 2002, Volume 76, Number 2, Pages 306 To 320
3. Epipunctae And Phosphatized Setae, By Jisuo Jin, *Journal of Paleontology*, 2007, Volume 81, Number 4, Pages 666 To 683
4. Paleozoic Beyrichioidean Ostracodes, By Ewa Olempska, *Journal of Paleontology*, 2008, Volume 82, Number 4, Pages 717 To 736
5. Affinities Of Illaenidae, By Harry B. Whittington, *Journal of Paleontology*, 2000, Volume 74, Number 5, Pages 879 To 889
6. Cladistic Analysis Of Early Trilobites , By Frederick A. Sundberg, *Journal of Paleontology*, 2004, Volume 78, Number 5, Pages 920 To 940

7. The Decapoda, By Rodney M. Feldmann, *Journal of Paleontology*, 2003, Volume 77, Number 6, Pages 1021 To 1039
8. Trilobite Systematics, By Richard A. Fortey, *Journal of Paleontology*, 2001, Volume 75, Number 6, Pages 1141 To 1151
9. Early Ordovician Ostracods, By Maria Jose Salas, *Journal of Paleontology*, 2007, Volume 81, Number 6, Pages 1384 To 1395
10. Development and phylogeny of arthropods, By Pat Simpson, *Bio Essays*, 2006, Volume 28, Pages 223–224
11. Arthropod Evolution, By D. Osorio, *Bio Essays*, 1994, Volume 16, Pages 419-424
12. Coral-inhabiting barnacles, By N. Simon-Blecher, *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, 2007, Volume 44, Pages 1333–1341
13. Phylogeny of the squat lobsters, By K. E. Schnabel, *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, 2011, Volume 58, Pages 157–168
14. Phylogeny of Paramysis, By Asta Audzijonyte, *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, 2008, Volume 46, Pages 738–759
15. Branchiopod crustaceans, By Jeremy R. deWaard, *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, 2006, Volume 39, Pages 491–502
16. 37 more arthropods, By Jon Mallatt, *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, 2006, Volume 40, Pages 772–794
17. The disunity of Crustacea, By Kenneth Meland, *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, 2007, Volume 44, Pages 1083–1104
18. Phylogenetics of the brachyuran crabs, By Shane T. Ahyong, *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, 2007, Volume 45, Pages 576–586
19. Phylogenetic relationships within the Mysidae, By T. Remerie, *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, 2004, Volume 32, Pages 770–777
20. Rapid radiation and cryptic speciation, By Annie Machordom, *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, 2004, Volume 33, Pages 259–279
21. Testing the new animal phylogeny, By Sarah J. Bourlat, *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, 2008, Volume 49, Pages 23–31
22. Estimation of decapod phylogeny, By Megan L. Porter, *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, 2005, Volume 37, Pages 355–369
23. Molecular phylogeny of the Calanoida, By Leocadio Blanco-Bercial, *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, 2011, Volume 59, Pages 103–113
24. Erratic rates of molecular evolution, By Oive Tinn, *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, 2008, Volume 48, Pages 157–167
25. Relationships among the sea spiders, By Susan E. Masta, *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, 2010, Volume 57, Pages 59–70
26. Relationships in the crayfish genus, By Peter Trontelj, *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, 2005, Volume 34, Pages 212–226

## Crustaceans

---

27. The branchiopod *Artemia*, By Ilias Kappas, *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, 2009, Volume 52, Pages 192–204
28. *Uroptychus naso* complex, By Gary C. B. Poore, *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, 2011, Volume 60, Pages 152–169
29. *Austropotamobius italicus*, By Carlos Pedraza-Lara, *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, 2010, Volume 57, Pages 327–342
30. The giant freshwater prawn, By Mark de Bruyn, *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, 2004, Volume 30, Pages 251–257
31. Afrotropical Freshwater crab, By Savel R. Daniels, *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, 2006, Volume 40, Pages 227–235
32. Phylogeography of the common shrimp, By Joana Campos, *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, 2008, Volume 46, Number, Pages 1015–1030
33. Divergence within Crustacea, By T. Lefébure, *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, 2006, Volume 40, Number, Pages 435–447
34. Relationships within the Phyllopoda, By Anke Braband, *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, 2002, Volume 25, Number, Pages 229–244
35. Relationships within the Phyllopoda, By Anke Braband, *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, 2002, Volume 25, Number, Pages 229–244

[www.creation.com](http://www.creation.com)