

Reptiles

1. Patterns Of Calibration, By Christopher A. Brochu

Slightly older fossils from the Hell Creek Formation (Lancian) of Montana might represent a caiman (Bryant, 1989), but the phylogenetic placement of this form **is unclear**; although it is not directly considered in this study, some of the range extensions applied in our analysis would approximate an alligatorine-caimanine split based on it. Calibration within *Crocodylus* is difficult, both because of the **unclear relationships** among living species and **the uncertain affinities** of many fossils assigned to the group. Page 10

The continental record in South America, where caimans spent much of their history, is sporadic. Many fossils relevant to **the problem of caiman phylogeny** have not yet been analyzed phylogenetically. Caimans have an imperfectly known record, and range extensions further back into the Neogene are not unreasonable. Page 24

But in some cases, these oldest estimates may be much older than the fossil record would suggest, and if older fossils are unavailable for physical reasons (e.g., relevant units were never exposed and cannot be sampled), we may never be able to test these hypotheses, rendering them functionally unfalsifiable. **Debates** over the origins of mammalian and avian orders have been mired in such issues for many years, and without major new discoveries, they are likely to continue into the future. Page 25

The solution lies not only in the continued search for robust phylogenetic hypotheses of fossils, but in the development of better molecular analytical methods. Page 28

2. End-Permian Tetrapod Extinctions, By Kenneth D. Angielczyk

Although these patterns have played a prominent role in **debate** about the taxonomy and phylogenetic relationships of Triassic dicynodont anomodonts, they have received little attention in the wider paleontological literature. Page 528

Although the phylogenetic relationships of anomodonts have been the subject of much scrutiny (e.g., Cluver and King, 1983; King, 1988; Cox, 1998; Modesto et al., 1999, 2003; Modesto and Rychczynski, 2000; Rychczynski, 2000; Angielczyk, 2001, 2002, 2004, 2007; Angielczyk and Kurkin, 2003; Maisch, 2001, 2002; Surkov and Benton, 2004; Vega-Dias et al., 2004; Maisch and Gebauer, 2005; Surkov et al., 2005; Ray, 2006; Frobisch, 2007), a general consensus has yet to be reached and no recent analysis has included a large sample of both Permian and Triassic taxa. Page 535

3. Fossil Snakes, By Olivier Rieppel

The presence of well developed hind limbs in *Pachyrhachis* and *Haasiophis* also creates methodological **problems** for the cladistic analysis of the phylogenetic relationships of these fossil snakes. Scenarios of snake origins are reviewed and found to be deficient in the absence of a well corroborated hypothesis of snake relationships within Squamata. Page 536

The current **debate** on snake relationships and origins has resulted in such a flurry of papers that it is no longer easy for readers, not closely involved in the argument, to follow the details. Page 536

The origin of snakes, as well as the reconstruction of phylogenetic interrelationships among basal snakes, has been **a long standing problem** in herpetology and paleo-herpetology (Rieppel, 1988), but one that has seen an important recent resurgence of interest. Page 536

Scenarios on the origin and early evolution of snakes necessarily remained linked to the search for the “ancestor,” or sister-group, of snakes, but a consensus **failed** to emerge. Page 537

Haas’ descriptions of *Pachyrhachis* and *Estesius* highlight the **problem** of character conflicts that rendered it difficult for him to assess unequivocally the relationships of these fossils. Page 537

Looking back on this **debate** on the origin of snakes and snake interrelationships, several core issues can be identified. These include issues of taxon sampling (Rieppel and Zaher, 2000a; Coates and Ruta, 2000), ambiguities in the diagnosis, or in the use, of higher taxa (Rieppel and Zaher, 2001; Rieppel et al., 2002) and, most importantly, disagreements about character delimitations (Rieppel and Zaher, 2000a, 2000b; Rieppel and Kearney, 2001, 2002). Page 538

With *Haasiophis*, *Pachyrhachis*, and *Podophis* representing macrostomatan snakes, the question of the sister-group relationships of snakes within Squamata, or of snake “origins,” **remains unresolved**. Page 554

Evidently, the ecology of snake origins must remain an open question until their sister-group relationships within Squamata have been determined. Until such time, we would like to close on a cautionary note, once again drawing attention to the fact that the fossil record of snakes is very incomplete (Rage, 1984), for which reason our knowledge of the evolution of limblessness in snakes remains **very incomplete** as well. Page 555

4. The Lower Permian Of Germany, By Johannes Muller

The first taxon described from this locality was *Thuringothyris mahlendorffae* Boy and Martens, 1991, a small eureptile of **uncertain phylogenetic** affinities. Page 726

On the basis of the phylogenetic position, short **ghost lineage**, and plesiomorphic anatomy, it is reasonable to use *Thuringothyris* as a starting point for interpretations on the morphological evolution of early captorhinids. Page 737

5. An Early Polycotyloid Plesiosaur, By Tamaki Sato

The Plesiosauria is a clade of Mesozoic marine reptiles known from the Late Triassic to the very end of the Cretaceous. In spite of their widespread occurrence, however, plesiosaurian phylogeny, especially that of Cretaceous forms, is still under **debate**. Page 907

6. The Affinities Of Mosasaurs And Snakes, By Michael S. Y. Lee

Apart from mosasaurs and aigialosaurs, all the marine pythonomorphs are very imperfectly known. For instance, dolichosaurs, *Adriosaurus*, and *Aphanizocnemus* can be coded for less than 35 percent of characters. Such an amount of missing information means that support for their phylogenetic positions **is not very robust**, as indicated by low bootstrap and Bremer support (Fig. 8). Missing information also reduces support throughout the tree, as the poorly-known taxa can fit into many different places with only slight loss in parsimony. Additionally, most of the characters that unite dolichosaurs, *Aphanizocnemus*, and *Adriosaurus* with snakes, to the exclusion of mosasaurs and aigialosaurs, are correlates of body elongation and limb reduction. Thus, the evidence that these taxa are more closely related to snakes than to mosasaurs and aigialosaurs is relatively weak. Page 927

7. Phylogenetically Defined Clade Names, By Walter G. Joyce

This type of definition is especially useful for defining the names of node-based phylo-taxa with **uncertain** internal relationships; that is to say, name application would be fixed by composition regardless of ideas regarding in group relationships. Page 995

The origin of turtles has been hotly **debated** for more than a century, and a consensus is still lacking. The precise composition of *Pantestudines* thus remains unclear. It is now generally agreed that turtles are not sister to a *mammalian* 1 *saurian* (s. Gauthier et al., 1988a) clade within *Amniota* (s. Gauthier, 1984), as was once thought (e.g., Gaffney, 1980). Some paleontologists placed turtles as sister to captorhinids (Gaffney and McKenna, 1979; Gaffney and Meylan, 1988; Gauthier et al., 1988b), but that relationship has been rejected in favor of hypotheses placing turtles as sister to *Sauria* within *Reptilia* (s. Gauthier et al., 1988a, 1988b; Gauthier, 1994), although the exact relationships are still in dispute [i.e., procolophonids (Reisz and Laurin, 1991; Laurin and Reisz, 1995) or pareiasaurs (Lee, 1995, 1997)]. Still other paleontologists take a more divergent view in which turtles are regarded as the sister to *Lepidosauria* (Rieppel and DeBraga, 1996; DeBraga and Rieppel, 1997; Rieppel and Reisz, 1999), and thus within the clade *Sauria* rather than among more basal *amniotes*. Page 996

In addition to its principal crown groups, *Trionychia* and *Kinosternoidea* (see below), *Trionychoidea* is currently thought to include a series of basal turtles from the Early Cretaceous of uncertain phylogenetic relations, making it difficult to fix the ages of its basal divergences. Page 1001

Because the placement of *Platysternon megacephalum* **remains uncertain** to date (see above), we purposefully define *Chelydridae* independent of the phylogenetic placement of *Platysternon megacephalum*. Page 1004

8. A New Genus And Species Of Sea Turtle , By Thomas M. Lehman

Recognition of this new species further increases the known diversity of Cretaceous sea turtles, and is of interest in examining the phylogeny of sea turtles. *T. fischbecki* is likely a primitive protostegid but has several features

generally thought to be synapomorphic for more derived lineages, making its systematic placement uncertain. Page 1163

However, in having somewhat uncertain affinities it is certainly not alone among sea turtles. There has long been disagreement over the placement of some taxa (e.g., *Allopleuron*, *Desmatochelys*, *Notochelone*) and with the recent descriptions of basal representatives of each sea turtle lineage, the morphological boundaries between the three traditional clades have become less distinct. Page 1176

9. Archosaur Phylogenetics, By Christopher A. Brochu

A few extinct groups remain controversial, such as the pterosaurs, and **debate** persists over the phylogenetic relationships among extant bird lineages, which have proved difficult to resolve, and divergence timing estimates within Aves and Crocodylia remain the source of contention. Page 1185

We also encounter interesting conflicts between fossil and molecular data sets regarding lineage divergence timing within both birds and crocodylians, and at least some sequence-based analyses argue that turtles belong within Archosauria. These challenges lie at the interface between paleontology and neontology. Page 1185

The only pseudosuchian lineage to survive the Triassic is Crocodylomorpha, which includes an assemblage of gracile “sphenosuchians” (the monophyly of which is **debated**, e.g., Benton and Clark, 1988; Walker, 1990; Sereno and Wild, 1992; Wu and Chatterjee, 1993; Clark et al., 2000) and crocodyliforms. Page 1187

Because we cannot actually *know* the true phylogeny, deciding between these scenarios will be difficult. Page 1193

Other interesting fossils, when considered in a phylogenetic framework, imply even more ghost lineages in the Cretaceous (Hope, 1998; Stidham, 1998a), though the identifications are not always accepted (Dyke and Mayr, 1999). Page 1195

10. Basal Sauropodomorphs, By T. S. Kuttly

At present, the relationships of basal sauropodomorphs and the origins of sauropods represent two of the more confused and controversial aspects of dinosaur phylogeny (see Yates, 2003a; Wilson, 2005). Page 1236

11. Distinguishing heat from light, By Philip C. J. Donoghue

Debate over the affinity of chaetognaths, sea spiders, Xenoturbella and even familiar organisms such as snakes and turtles, is testament to the endurance of this problem: the identification of homology requires, among other criteria, an a priori hypothesis of grouping at some level before the process of comparative anatomical interpretation can proceed. Page 180

12. Ribosomal RNA genes, By Jon Mallatt

The position of turtles in amniotes, however, is **debated**. Page 1017

Turtles. There has been much **debate** over whether turtles are primitively ‘anapsids’ (with no temporal opening in the skull) or whether their anapsid condition was secondarily derived from a diapsid ancestor. Page 1017

13. Horned lizard phylogeny, By Wendy L. Hodges

By fully exploring the data and with all available analytical techniques, it became evident that certain patterns are present in the data, yet the data were insufficient in their power to resolve the basal relationships in Phrynosoma. Although progress has been made in our analyses, additional data are needed to tease apart basal relationships within this genus. Some of these data sources could be found in additional molecular sequences (perhaps nuclear genes), fossil data, or more detailed morphological analyses. Page 969

14. South African limbless lizard, By Savel R. Daniels

Although monophyly of the Acontinae is well supported (Greer, 1970), phylogenetic relationships among the three genera within this subfamily have been the subject of considerable **debate** (Branch, 1998; Broadley, 1968; Rieppel, 1982). Page 315

In the absence of fossil data for this group with which to test biogeographic hypotheses, it is difficult to calibrate rates of molecular evolution. Page 322

15. Low genetic divergence, By Jennifer M. Hay

Interpretation of the trees is confounded by the lack of a suitable outgroup. As in other cases of conflicting nuclear and mitochondrial data sets, the different data sets likely reveal different aspects of the animals evolutionary history, and introgression is not uncommon between species pairs. Page 1

Interpretation of tuatara phylogenetic trees is confounded by the absence of an appropriate outgroup, so the trees are unrooted and directionality of nucleotide substitutions cannot be determined. Page 13

16. The Phylogeny of Xantusiid Lizards, By Brian I. Crother

The search for the best estimate of phylogenetic relationships among taxa is the ultimate goal in the reconstruction of the pattern of evolutionary history. The appropriate methods to achieve that goal have been and remain the subject of much **debate** (e.g., this paper and a plethora of others), but studies such as Hillis et al. (1992) may help identify the most reliable methods for reconstructing evolutionary history. Even though **debate** exists, most of the methods favored by “phylogeneticists” are those to which at least some of the basic tenets and philosophy can be traced back to Hennig (1966). Page 292

17. Molecular phylogeny of *Vipera*, By Thomas Garrigues

No molecular phylogeny of *V. aspis* subspecies has yet been published, although studies based on morphology have generated considerable **debate** (Nauulleau, 1997; Saint Girons, 1978; ZuY, 2002). Page 36

18. Phylogeny for Marine Turtles, By Peter H. Dutton

However, **debate** continues over the phylogenetic relationships within the Cheloniidae, with uncertainties existing at almost all taxonomic levels. Pages 511–521

19. The phylogeny of tortoises, By James F. Parham

Despite boasting a rich fossil record (AuVenberg, 1974) and diverse living members (Ernst and Barbour, 1989), the evolutionary relationships of tortoises remain poorly known. Sadly, the uncertainties about the history of tortoises are matched by uncertainties about their future. Page 51

However, the underlying mechanisms responsible for associated rates of molecular and morphological evolution remain unclear, and such correlations are still **debated** (e.g., Bromham et al., 2002; Marko and Moran, 2002). Page 58

20. A puzzling phylogenetic problem, By Saverio Vicario

Because phylogenetic relations within Xantusiidae could be affected by alternative outgroup topologies, which are themselves the subjects of **debate**, we also explicitly tested the effects of topological uncertainties among potential outgroups on ingroup phylogeny. Page 245

21. Phrynosomatine sand lizards, By James A. Schulte

The phrynosomatine sand lizards are a well-studied clade of squamate reptiles for which several alternative phylogenetic hypotheses have been proposed. Page 700

22. The phylogeny of pit vipers, By Todd A. Castoe

The deepest phylogenetic divergences among pit vipers have yet to be resolved with strong support. Page 92

Currently, there are twelve genera of New World pit vipers recognized (Campbell and Lamar, 2004) and the relationships among these remain poorly understood and inconsistent across studies. Page 92

Despite the efforts of numerous authors, phylogenetic relationships within the subfamily Crotalinae remain controversial, particularly at the intergeneric level (e.g., Gutberlet and Harvey, 2004; Malhotra and Thorpe, 2004; Parkinson et al., 2002). Three issues have likely played major roles in the generation of inconsistent conclusions or poor resolution across studies. Page 92

23. A nesting of vipers, By Wolfgang Wüster

Despite their medical interest, the phylogeny of the snake family Viperidae remains inadequately understood. Page 445

Colubroidea: the age of the basal divergence of the Colubroidea (i.e., between the vipers and their sister clade in the context of this study) remains subject to considerable **debate**. Page 451

24. The turtle family Geoemydidae, By Phillip Q. Spinks

The turtle family Geoemydidae represents the largest, most diverse, and most poorly understood family of turtles. Little is known about this group, including intrafamilial systematics. The only complete phylogenetic hypothesis for this family positions geoemydids as paraphyletic with respect to tortoises, but this arrangement has not been accepted by many workers. Page 164

In spite of these analyses, phylogenetic relationships and the taxonomy derived from those relationships within the Geoemydidae remain uncertain. The widespread confusion regarding the phylogenetic content and relationships of the Geoemydidae stems from at least three issues. Page 167

25. Gene tree parsimony, By James A. Cotton

The trees also all **fail** to resolve relationships within the reptiles, or present a somewhat unusual phylogeny within this group. Page 306

There is no doubt that lizards and snakes form part of a monophyletic radiation of diapsid reptiles, although there has been some **debate** about the exact relationships between the different extant lineages within this radiation, as discussed above. Similarly, there has been **debate** about the exact relationships between hagfish, lampreys and gnathostomes (Delarbre et al., 2002; Janvier, 1996), but the only hypotheses supported by recent work are that lampreys and hagfish form a monophyletic cyclostomes group, or that hagfish are the most basal vertebrates, with lampreys a sister-group to the gnathostomes. Page 306

26. Phylogeography of endemic toads, By Maria Tereza C. Thomé

However, genetic diversity within and among morphospecies is **unknown**, and their phylogenetic relationships have not been established. Page 1020

Although these four clades are well-supported and largely uncontested, the relationships among them have been the subject of considerable **debate** (reviewed by Wilgenbusch and de Queiroz, 2000). Page 700

27. Chinese toad-headed lizards, By Xianguang Guo

The toad-headed lizards of genus Phrynocephalus are distributed from northwestern China to Turkey and are one of the major components of the central Asian desert fauna. To date, published morphological and molecular phylogenetic hypotheses of Phrynocephalus are only partially congruent, and the relationships within the genus are still far from clear. Page 643

Despite considerable previous morphological, allozyme, karyological, osteological, and ethological work, the phylogenetic and taxonomic relationships within the toadheaded lizards remain controversial and largely unresolved (e.g., Arnold, 1999; Dunayev, 1996; Golubev, 1993; Macey et al., 1993, and references therein), especially those among the approximately 18 Chinese species (Zhao and Alder, 1993; Pang et al., 2003). Page 644

28. History of the snake-eyed lizards, By P. Kyriazi

The snake-eyed lizards of the genus Ophisops (Lacertidae) have been through a series of taxonomical revisions, but still their phylogenetic relationships remain uncertain. Page 795

29. Indian Ocean tortoises, By Eric P. Palkovacs

The evolution and pattern of island colonization of Dipsochelys have remained a topic of much **debate**. Page 217

30. Early history of snakes, By Nicolas Vidal

This last point has important bearing on the origin of snakes, one of the most controversial fields in vertebrate evolution since the 19th century. The **debate** has been recently fuelled by the discovery of fossils of three marine snake species (“pachyophiids”) with small but welldeveloped hindlimbs (genera Pachyrhachis, Haasiophis, and Eupodophis) (Caldwell and Lee, 1997; Rage and Escuillie, 2000; Rieppel et al., 2003; Tchernov et al., 2000). Page 786

31. Distribution in night snakes, By Daniel G. Mulcahy

However, the timing of events is **debated**. Page 537

Currently, there is **debate** in the geological literature regarding the exact timing of the Cape separation from mainland Mexico: 7.5-8.2 mya (Oskin and Stock, 2003) versus 12-14 mya (Ferrari, 1995; see also Henry and Aranda-Gomez, 2000). Page 542

32. Phylogeography of the spotted skink, By Stephanie N. J. Greaves

The relative impacts of these processes on biogeographic patterns in New Zealand taxa has long been a subject of **debate**. Page 730

However, the taxonomic status of southern populations as a separate species has been **debated**. Page 734

33. Caribbean Rock Iguana, By Catherine L. Malone

Unfortunately, the geological history of this area is unclear and the origin of its biota is a subject of intense **debate** (Crother and Guyer, 1996; Hedges, 1996a; Hedges et al., 1992, 1994; Kluge, 1988; Williams, 1989). The controversy centers on the relative importance of vicariance versus dispersal in shaping the distribution of the founding Caribbean biota. Page 270

34. The false gharial, By Ray E. Willis

The morphological versus molecular **debate** continues because both sets of data appear to be robust; albeit deriving totally different conclusions. Page 793

35. Lizard Anolis Carolinensis, By Peter A. Novick

The respective importance of these different factors is unclear and remains a matter of **debate** (Eickbush and Furano 2002; Furano et al. 2004; Neafsey et al. 2004; Kordis et al. 2006; Song and Boissinot 2007). Page 1812

36. DNA Sequences of the Green Turtle, By Yoshinori Kumazawa

Turtles have highly specialized morphological characteristics, and their phylogenetic position has been under intensive **debate**. Page 784

Recent intensive **debate** on the phylogenetic position of turtles has raised the more general and fundamental question of how evolutionary processes of morphologically specialized organisms like turtles can best be understood (see, e.g., Rieppel and deBraga 1996). Page 791

37. Origin and Evolution of the Snake Venom, By B. G. Fry

The evolution of the venomous function of snakes and the diversification of their toxins has been of tremendous research interest and considerable **debate**. Page 870

References

1. Patterns Of Calibration, By Christopher A. Brochu, Journal of Paleontology, 2004, Volume 78, Number 1, Pages 7 To 30
2. End-Permian Tetrapod Extinctions, By Kenneth D. Angielczyk, Journal of Paleontology, 2008, Volume 82, Number 3, Pages 528 To 542 Page 79
3. Fossil Snakes, By Olivier Rieppel, Journal of Paleontology, 2003, Volume 77, Number 3, Pages 536 To 558
4. The Lower Permian Of Germany, By Johannes Muller, Journal of Paleontology, 2006, Volume 80, Number 4, Pages 726 To 739
5. An Early Polycotylid Plesiosaur, By Tamaki Sato, Journal of Paleontology, 2000, Volume 74, Number 5, Pages 907 To 914
6. The Affinities Of Mosasaurs And Snakes, By Michael S. Y. Lee, Journal of Paleontology, 2000, Volume 74, Number 5, Pages 915 To 937

Reptiles

7. **Phylogenetically Defined Clade Names**, By Walter G. Joyce, *Journal of Paleontology*, 2004, Volume 78, Number 5, Pages 989 To 1013
8. **A New Genus And Species Of Sea Turtle**, By Thomas M. Lehman, *Journal of Paleontology*, 2004, Volume 78, Number 6, Pages 1163 To 1178
9. **Archosaur Phylogenetics**, By Christopher A. Brochu, *Journal of Paleontology*, 2001, Volume 75, Number 6, Pages 1185 To 1201
10. **Basal Sauropodomorphs**, By T. S. Kuttu, *Journal of Paleontology*, 2007, Volume 81, Number 6, Pages 1218 To 1240
11. **Distinguishing heat from light**, By Philip C. J. Donoghue, *Bio Essays*, 2009, Volume 31, Pages 178–189
12. **Ribosomal RNA genes**, By Jon Mallatt, *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, 2007, Volume 43, Pages 1005–1022
13. **Horned lizard phylogeny**, By Wendy L. Hodges, *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, 2004, Volume 31, Pages 961–971
14. **South African limbless lizard**, By Savel R. Daniels, *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, 2002, Volume 24, Pages 315–323
15. **Low genetic divergence**, By Jennifer M. Hay, *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, 2003, Volume 29, Pages 1–19
16. **The Phylogeny of Xantusiid Lizards**, By Brian I. Crother, *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, 1992, Volume 1, Number 4, Pages 289-294
17. **Molecular phylogeny of Vipera**, By Thomas Garrigues, *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, 2005, Volume 35, Pages 35–47
18. **Phylogeny for Marine Turtles**, By Peter H. Dutton, *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, 1996, Volume 5, Number 3, Pages 511–521
19. **The phylogeny of tortoises**, By James F. Parham, *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, 2006, Volume 38, Pages 50–64
20. **A puzzling phylogenetic problem**, By Saverio Vicario, *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, 2003, Volume 26, Pages 243–261
21. **Phrynosomatine sand lizards**, By James A. Schulte, *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, 2008, Volume 47, Pages 700–716
22. **The phylogeny of pit vipers**, By Todd A. Castoe, *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, 2006, Volume 39, Pages 91–110
23. **A nesting of vipers**, By Wolfgang Wüster, *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, 2008, Volume 49, Pages 445–459
24. **The turtle family Geoemydidae**, By Phillip Q. Spinks, *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, 2004, Volume 32, Pages 164–182
25. **Gene tree parsimony**, By James A. Cotton, *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, 2003, Volume 29, Pages 298–308 Page 91
26. **Phylogeography of endemic toads**, By Maria Tereza C. Thomé, *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, 2010, Volume 55, Pages 1018–1031

Reptiles

27. Chinese toad-headed lizards, By Xianguang Guo, *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, 2007, Volume 45, Pages 643–662
28. History of the snake-eyed lizards, By P. Kyriazi, *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, 2008, Volume 49, Pages 795–805
29. Indian Ocean tortoises, By Eric P. Palkovacs, *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, 2002, Volume 24, Pages 216–227
30. Early history of snakes, By Nicolas Vidal, *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, 2004, Volume 31, Pages 783–787
31. Distribution in night snakes, By Daniel G. Mulcahy, *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, 2009, Volume 53, Pages 537–546
32. Phylogeography of the spotted skink, By Stephanie N. J. Greaves, *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, 2007, Volume 45, Pages 729–739
33. Caribbean Rock Iguana, By Catherine L. Malone, *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, 2000, Volume 17, Number 2, Pages 269–279
34. The false gharial, By Ray E. Willis, *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, 2007, Volume 43, Number, Pages 787–794
35. Lizard *Anolis Carolinensis*, By Peter A. Novick, *Molecular Biology And Evolution*, 2009, Volume 26, Number 8, Pages 1811–1822
36. DNA Sequences of the Green Turtle, By Yoshinori Kumazawa, *Molecular Biology And Evolution*, 1999, Volume 16, Number 6, Pages 784–792
37. Origin and Evolution of the Snake Venom, By B. G. Fry, *Molecular Biology And Evolution*, 2004, Volume 21, Number 5, Pages 870–883

www.creation.com