
Sponges

Sponges

1. A History Of Phylogenetic Interpretation, By Stephen M. Rowland

Archaeocyaths are calcareous, conical, Cambrian fossils with a long history of phylogenetic uncertainty and changing interpretations. The history of phylogenetic interpretation of archaeocyaths reveals five distinct schools of thought: the coelenterate school, the sponge school, the algae school, the Phylum Archaeocyatha school, and the Kingdom Archaeata school. Page 1065

Throughout the history of **debate** concerning archaeocyathan phylogeny, relatively little attention had been paid to how the organisms had actually lived. Page 1074, 1075

The isolation in which many paleontologists worked prior to the 1980s almost certainly contributed to the variety of phylogenetic interpretations concerning archaeocyaths. Page 1076

2. An evaluation of support, By Scott A. Nichols

Due to morphological character conflict and simplicity, the relationships between major demosponge lineages remain incompletely resolved and the monophyly of most higher-taxa within the class Demospongiae remains suspect. Page 82

Due to morphological character conflict and simplicity, the relationships between major demosponge lineages remain incompletely resolved and the monophyly of most higher-taxa within the class Demospongiae remains suspect. Page 91

3. Analysis of freshwater sponges, By Martin J. Meixner

The exact position of several sponge taxa and the monophyly of the phylum Porifera is a matter of **debate** (Adams et al., 1999; Borchellini et al., 2004,2001; Cavalier-Smith et al., 1996; Collins, 1998; Medina et al., 2001). Page 882

4. Demosponge EST Sequencing, By Matija Harcet

There is an ongoing **debate** on the molecular phylogeny aspects of basal metazoans (Dohrmann et al. 2008; Srivastava et al. 2008; Philippe et al. 2009; Sperling et al. 2009), and although we did not address this issue directly, we hope that the data provided in this paper will provide further evidence for understanding the complex relations between Porifera, Placozoa, and Eumetazoa. Page 2754

References

1. A History Of Phylogenetic Interpretation, By Stephen M. Rowland, Journal of Paleontology, 2001, Volume 75, Number 6, Pages 1065 To 1078

2. An evaluation of support, By Scott A. Nichols, Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution, 2005, Volume 34, Pages 81–96

3. Analysis of freshwater sponges, By Martin J. Meixner, Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution, 2007, Volume 45, Pages 875–886 Page 92

4. Demosponge EST Sequencing, By Matija Harcet, Molecular Biology And Evolution, 2010, Volume 27, Number 12, Pages 2747–2756

www.creation.com