

1 **Marine and freshwater fishes of Alabama: a revised checklist and discussion**
2 **of taxonomic issues**

3
4 JUSTIN C. BAGLEY^{1,2,7}, CAL C. JOHNSON³, STUART W. MCGREGOR⁴, MARIA F.
5 BREITMAN¹, JONATHAN W. ARMBRUSTER⁵, PHILLIP M. HARRIS⁶ & PATRICK E.
6 O'NEIL⁴

7 ¹*Department of Biology and Environmental Science, Auburn University at Montgomery, 301*
8 *Goodwyn Hall, Montgomery, AL 36124, USA.*

9 *jbagley2@aum.edu; https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6737-8380*
10 *mbreitma@aum.edu; https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6964-841X*

11 ²*Department of Biology, Virginia Commonwealth University, 1000 W Cary St., Suite 126,*
12 *Richmond, VA 23284, USA.*

13 ³*Decatur Field Office, Alabama Department of Environmental Management, 2715 Sandlin Rd*
14 *SW, Decatur, AL 35603, USA.*

15 *cal.johnson@adem.alabama.gov*

16 ⁴*Geological Survey of Alabama, Walter B. Jones Hall, 420 Hackberry Lane, Tuscaloosa, AL*
17 *35487, USA.*

18 *smcggregor@gsa.state.al.us*

19 *oneilpe55@gmail.com*

20 ⁵*Department of Biological Sciences, Auburn University, 120 W Samford Ave, Auburn, AL 36849,*
21 *USA.*

22 *armbrjw@auburn.edu; https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3256-0275*

23 ⁶*Department of Biological Sciences, The University of Alabama, 1325 Hackberry Ln,*
24 *Tuscaloosa, AL 35401, USA.*

25 *pharris@ua.edu; https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3215-2167*

26 ⁷*Corresponding author: justin.bagley@adem.alabama.gov; present address: Field Operations*
27 *Division, Alabama Department of Environmental Management, P.O. Box 301463, Montgomery,*
28 *AL 36130, USA.*

29

30

31 **Running Head: BAGLEY ET AL.**

32 **Abstract**

33 Checklists are fundamental and important tools for organizing information about biodiversity
34 that provide a basis for conservation and additional scientific research. While Alabama is
35 recognized as an aquatic biodiversity ‘hotspot’ with the highest native freshwater fish diversity
36 in the contiguous United States, we currently lack an up-to-date list of the state’s fishes. In
37 particular, much has changed over the past ~20 years regarding our knowledge of fishes from
38 Alabama and the Mobile River Basin, rendering past comprehensive treatments by Mettee *et al.*
39 (1996) and Boschung and Mayden (2004) out of date. Here, we provide a revised checklist of
40 marine and freshwater fishes known from the coastal and inland waters of Alabama that includes
41 463 species (335 primarily freshwater fishes, and 128 marine or diadromous fishes) in 35 orders,
42 78 families, and 176 genera. Extant, extirpated, and extinct species are included, as are putative
43 candidate species. The checklist is based on prior work, searches of the literature and online
44 sources, as well as parsing a large compilation of >140,000 fish records for Alabama and the
45 Mobile River Basin from 37 data providers in the global Fishnet2 database (www.fishnet2.net)
46 and >4000 marine survey records from the SEAMAP database
47 (<https://www.gsmfc.org/seamap.php>). After editing and quality control checks, the final
48 combined database contained 144,215 collection records, ~95% of which were georeferenced.
49 We discuss the species descriptions, nomenclatural changes, and updates to marine species that
50 account for changes to the state list, and we close with a discussion of ~13 candidate species
51 forms that remain undescribed, which represent outstanding taxonomic issues in need of further
52 research attention.

53

54 **Key words:** ichthyofauna; marine environments; Mobile River Basin; rivers and streams;
55 systematics; taxonomy

56 **Introduction**

57 Checklists of the species recorded from a region are fundamentally important tools for
58 organizing information about biodiversity and provide a basis for communication by diverse
59 users (e.g., taxonomists, other scientists and managers, policy makers), as well as a basis for
60 conservation and scientific research (e.g., Hamer *et al.* 2012; Hobern *et al.* 2021). While
61 Alabama is widely recognized as an aquatic biodiversity ‘hotspot’ with an exceptionally diverse
62 fish fauna encompassing ~38% of North American freshwater fishes (Lydeard & Mayden 1995;
63 Warren *et al.* 2000; Boschung & Mayden 2004; Jelks *et al.* 2008) and the highest native
64 freshwater and coastal/inshore marine fish diversity of any state in the contiguous U.S. (>400
65 species; Mettee 2008), we currently lack an up-to-date and comprehensive list of the state’s
66 fishes. The first of Alabama’s authoritative ‘fish books’ was published by Smith-Vaniz (1968)
67 and contained taxonomic keys and descriptions of 282 freshwater and marine fish species known
68 from Alabama, crystallized in 209 pages. Subsequently, this work was updated in Boschung
69 (1992) and in comprehensive books by Mettee *et al.* (1996), who reported 327 freshwater and
70 marine species in 42 families from Alabama and the Mobile River Basin, and Boschung and
71 Mayden (2004), who treated 340 fish species in 41 families from the state’s fresh and marine
72 waters. These latter two more recent syntheses were published 19–27 years ago. Since that time,
73 much has changed regarding our knowledge of coastal and inland fishes from Alabama and the
74 Mobile River Basin that drains most of its area, including new phylogenetic inferences and
75 related supraspecific taxonomic changes, new species discoveries and collection records, and
76 new species descriptions (e.g., Bailey *et al.* 2004; Neely *et al.* 2007; Williams *et al.* 2007; Baker
77 *et al.* 2008, 2013; Bagley *et al.* 2011, 2018; Mayden & Allen 2015; Gilbert *et al.* 2017; Kozal *et*
78 *al.* 2017; Tan & Armbruster 2018; Kim *et al.* 2022; Stout *et al.* 2022). Accordingly, scientific
79 progress, as well as the passage of time, has rendered the fish lists in previous comprehensive
80 treatments by Mettee *et al.* (1996) and Boschung and Mayden (2004) out of date, and a new
81 checklist is needed to address and summarize new taxonomic knowledge of the fauna gleaned
82 during the past ~20 years.

83 Here, we meet this need by providing a revised checklist of marine and freshwater fishes
84 known from the coastal and inland waters of Alabama. The present checklist is based on searches
85 of the literature and online sources, our own collection records, and parsing a large compilation
86 of >140,000 fish collection records for Alabama and the Mobile River Basin from the global

87 Fishnet2 database (www.fishnet2.net) as well as a compilation of >4000 marine species records
88 from fisheries-independent bottom longline surveys of Alabama's coastal waters from the
89 Southeast Area Monitoring and Assessment Program's (SEAMAP) database (Eldridge 1988;
90 <https://www.gsmfc.org/seamap.php>). The FishNet2 records are entirely composed of vouchered
91 museum lots, rendering an overwhelming majority of our final combined database supported by
92 voucher specimens. Thus, unlike traditional taxonomic studies of fishes whose source material
93 sometimes remains unverifiable (e.g., 18th and 19th Century morphological species descriptions
94 with no known types), nearly all fish species/lineages in the present checklist are verifiable and
95 supported by museum voucher specimens, including several recently described species (e.g.,
96 Neely *et al.* 2007; Williams *et al.* 2007; Gilbert *et al.* 2017). The only exceptions to this were a
97 few large-bodied marine species (e.g., Tiger Shark, *Galeocerdo cuvier*) and newly identified but
98 undescribed candidate species (e.g., '*Micropterus* sp. cf. *punctulatus*'); Bagley *et al.* 2011;
99 Tringali *et al.* 2015; where, if present, vouchers may be limited or listed under the priority
100 name). After presenting the updated checklist, we round out our paper with a discussion of (i)
101 taxonomic and phylogenetic updates contributing to changes in the checklist (e.g., new species);
102 (ii) sampling effort overall and by habitat; and (iii) future challenges for understanding
103 Alabama's fishes, particularly the ~13 candidate species that presently remain undescribed from
104 the fauna, which represent a set of outstanding taxonomic issues whose resolution will require
105 additional research attention. This paper provides a baseline of information for developing fully
106 annotated checklists (e.g., core synonymized checklists including details of species distributions
107 and taxonomic remarks) of fishes of Alabama and the Mobile River Basin, which is an area of
108 ongoing collaboration by the authors.

109 Methods

110 Our study area was the state of Alabama (30°11' N–35° N, 84°53' W–88°28' W), which is
111 bordered inland by four other U.S. states (Mississippi, Tennessee, Georgia, and Florida) and by
112 the Gulf of Mexico at Mobile Bay, as well as areas of the Mobile River Basin extending into
113 nearby regions of northeastern Mississippi, northwestern Georgia, and southeastern Tennessee
114 (Fig. 1). Historically, since 1953, state submerged lands of the U.S. have extended three nautical
115 miles offshore; hence, we used a distance of three nautical miles from Alabama lands to define
116 the limits of 'coastal' or 'inshore' marine waters of Alabama. As a result, our study area included

117 marine environments of the Mississippi Sound, Mobile Bay, Dauphin Island, and nearby coastal
118 areas of the northern Gulf of Mexico within three nautical miles of the Alabama mainland or
119 Dauphin Island. However, several species meeting this criterion for inclusion in our study based
120 on some records had other records from much farther offshore (see below).

121 We have attempted to present all coastal and inland marine and freshwater fish species
122 known from Alabama and the Mobile River Basin and supported by collections data meeting our
123 criteria in this paper. Extant, extirpated, and extinct species are included, as are putatively
124 distinct forms that are known but remain undescribed (hereafter, ‘candidate species’), to ensure
125 that our list reflects the full spectrum of biodiversity of Alabama’s fishes. While this checklist
126 emphasizes freshwater fishes, marine and euryhaline taxa were included if they occur along
127 Alabama’s coastal or inshore waters as defined above or if they are known to invade Mobile Bay
128 (e.g., near Weeks Bay, a large area of tidal and forested wetlands in Baldwin Co., Alabama) or
129 further inland (e.g., reaching the Mobile–Tensaw Delta) based on vouchered or georeferenced
130 collection records.

131 To construct our checklist, an initial list of species was obtained from Mettee *et al.*
132 (1996) and updated to currently valid names and authorities (Fricke *et al.* 2022). The list was
133 updated by researching undescribed species listed in Mettee *et al.* (1996) and Boschung and
134 Mayden (2004); compiling data on evolutionarily significant units (ESUs), interpreted as
135 candidate species, from the Southeastern Fishes Council (SFC 2022); searching the literature for
136 new species descriptions including material from Alabama (e.g., Google Scholar searches using
137 terms “new species,” “fish,” and “Alabama”); and following up on, and assessing, name-change
138 references from Fricke (2022) given in Eschmeyer’s Catalog of Fishes (Fricke *et al.* 2022).
139 Several freshwater species were added by taking descriptions and redescriptions into account,
140 including taxonomic works elevating subspecies to species status (e.g., Bailey *et al.* 2004;
141 Wernecke & Armbruster 2015).

142 When these resources were exhausted, we compiled a comprehensive database of public
143 fish collections data for the state of Alabama from online sources (*cf.* Doosey *et al.* 2021) and
144 used this database to improve and corroborate the checklist. Our collections database came from
145 two sources. First, we downloaded fish collections for Alabama and the Mobile River Basin as
146 made available from 37 data providers in the FishNet2 (www.fishnet2.net) database (Table 1).
147 The data citation required by FishNet2 for data usage is as follows: “Data were obtained from the

148 Mississippi Museum of Natural Science, Oregon State University, Texas Natural History Science
149 Center – Texas Natural History Collections, North Carolina State Museum of Natural Sciences,
150 University of Alberta Museums, Auburn University Museum of Natural History, Canadian
151 Museum of Nature, University of Kansas Biodiversity Institute – Specimens collection, Sam
152 Noble Oklahoma Museum of Natural History, Cornell University Museum of Vertebrates
153 (CUMV), Los Angeles County Museum of Natural History (LACM), Tulane University
154 Museum of Natural History – Royal D. Suttkus Fish Collection, Swedish Museum of Natural
155 History, Scripps Institute of Oceanography, Field Museum, Florida Museum of Natural History,
156 Ohio State University – Fish Division, University of Michigan Museum of Zoology, Louisiana
157 State University Museum of Zoology, Michigan State University Museum (MSUM), National
158 Museum of Natural History, Smithsonian Institution, California Academy of Sciences, Texas
159 A&M University Biodiversity Research and Teaching Collection, University of Washington Fish
160 Collection, University of Alabama Ichthyological Collection, Royal Ontario Museum, University
161 of Tennessee – Etnier Ichthyological Research Collection, Florida Fish and Wildlife
162 Conservation Commission, Illinois Natural History Survey, University of Kansas Biodiversity
163 Institute – Tissues collection, University of Colorado Museum of Natural History, Yale
164 University Peabody Museum, GBIF-MNHN (Paris), Museum of Southwestern Biology,
165 Academy of Natural Sciences at Philadelphia, Fort Hays Sternberg Museum of Natural History,
166 MCZ-Harvard University (Accessed through the Fishnet2 Portal, www.fishnet2.net, 4/18/2022)."

167 Second, to complement our FishNet2 records and ensure that the representation of marine
168 species in our list was as comprehensive and accurate as possible, we also compiled a database
169 of fisheries-independent observations of marine fish species from the SEAMAP database
170 (Eldridge 1988; <https://www.gsmfc.org/seamap.php>). Our raw SEAMAP fish dataset included
171 observations from bottom longline surveys conducted by SEAMAP in marine waters from
172 March to October. Bottom longlines used for the surveys had 1-nautical mile mainlines (900–
173 1000 lb. test monofilament) rigged with 100 evenly spaced gaggions, each of which consisted of
174 a #15/0 (~235 mm) hook attached to a 3.7 m monofilament leader (730 lb. test strength). The
175 longlines were baited consistently with the same bait across all hooks (e.g., Atlantic Mackerel,
176 *Scomber scombrus*), deployed and set over variable bottom substrate (while monitoring bottom
177 topography with an echosounder), allowed to soak for 1 h, and then retrieved with a large spool
178 or hydraulic reel system. The gear did not target particular species, but instead was designed to

179 be effective for groundfish, including sharks, rays, flounders, and other marine teleosts. We
180 subset these data to observations from marine waters of the state of Alabama spanning the years
181 2010–2022. Using the geographical coordinates for catch data, we reduced this dataset further to
182 observations within approximately three nautical miles of Alabama coastlines and Dauphin
183 Island. We then cleaned the reduced SEAMAP dataset by updating species names in Microsoft
184 Excel to produce a final, cleaned SEAMAP dataset.

185 We parsed and edited our raw FishNet2 dataset using regular expressions, as well as
186 quality-control checks performed ‘by-eye’ in Microsoft Excel (e.g., removing records based
187 solely on otoliths or specimens from local pet shops) while cross-referencing species names
188 against the species list and Eschmeyer’s Catalog of Fishes (Fricke 2022; Fricke *et al.* 2022).
189 North American minnow (Leuciscidae) names were also checked against recent changes
190 proposed by Stout *et al.* (2022), which were given precedence over corresponding names in
191 Fricke *et al.* (2022). During data cleaning, we removed 502 hybrid specimen lots, and we also
192 removed >2000 lots flagged for being geographically out-of-scope, containing nonsense or
193 invalid names, lacking the specific epithet, or for containing likely misidentifications. Over
194 23,000 species name entries and 56,416 family name entries were corrected by hand.

195 We classified species in both datasets as freshwater (‘F’), freshwater and marine (‘F, M’),
196 or primarily marine (‘M’) in habitat based on the literature (e.g., Mettee *et al.* 1996), our prior
197 knowledge of the species, and habitat classifications listed in Fricke *et al.* (2022). The ‘F, M’
198 designations included species known to enter freshwater and marine environments (freshwater
199 and brackish water, or fresh, brackish, and marine waters), as well as diadromous species that
200 migrate between these two habitats (e.g., American Eel, *Anguilla rostrata*). The habitat
201 classifications were added to each collections dataset in a separate habitat column.

202 We collated the fish collections and observations data from our final, cleaned FishNet2
203 and SEAMAP datasets into a combined database of all remaining observations. This ‘final
204 combined database’ was ideal for our study as it represented comprehensive spatial, temporal,
205 and taxonomic coverage for the state’s fish fauna. We interrogated the final combined database
206 (i) to ensure that described species in our checklist were supported by voucher specimens
207 wherever possible and (ii) to search for additional species with good weight of evidence to add to
208 the checklist, indicated by verifiable collections meeting the following criteria. First, given
209 freshwater fishes are generally confined to freshwater rivers and streams, we assumed that

records for these species indicated residency of the species in Alabama. Thus, some rare species, introduced species, and undescribed forms were added to our checklist even if they were only supported by a single collection. Second, in trying to add new marine taxa, we ignored described species whose presence in Alabama was supported by only one or two lots or specimens, and we emphasized the addition of lesser-known species supported by at least three lots. This decision was based on the fact that marine species can often move over large areas in the Gulf of Mexico due to a lack of dispersal barriers; hence, singletons or doubletons might represent waif dispersalists that only occasionally visit our state's marine waters and are not residents. We arbitrarily defined the encounter rate for occasional species as one fish per decade, or 0.1 record/year, and we expected the encounter rate for native or resident marine species to be higher (generally much higher) than this value.

Third, when assessing the final database for additional marine and diadromous species to add to our checklist, we emphasized (i) taxa with 'recent' records supported by collections from the past ~20 years (since ~2000–2003) and (ii) taxa with geographical distributions along coastlines or extending substantially north into Mobile Bay (e.g., north of Weeks Bay; preferably but not always with onshore collections in Mobile and Baldwin counties). Based on historical definitions of state submerged lands (see above), marine species known in our database from over three nautical miles offshore were excluded from our final list, while species with nearshore records and inshore records zero to three nautical miles from shore were retained. Some marine species retained in the final database on the basis of one or more inshore records had additional records from over three nautical miles from shore (sometimes over ~100 miles [~140 km] offshore).

All SEAMAP observations were georeferenced in decimal degrees; however, georeferencing coverage was partial for FishNet2 records. Thus, FishNet2 lots with georeferenced locality data were set apart and a subset of 419 latitude/longitude coordinate pairs were manually georeferenced or corrected by hand, e.g., converting degrees-minutes-seconds format to decimal degrees. Subsequently, latitude/longitude coordinate data from the two datasets were combined and cleaned to remove duplicates, filtered to decimal degrees format, and used to determine a final set of unique collection localities represented by the data. To evaluate the spatial extent and density of sampling in our final combined dataset, all unique coordinate pairs were mapped over a digital elevation model layer with 30 arc-second resolution

241 from WorldClim v2.1 (Fick & Hijmans 2017) and gray hill shade data in QGIS v2.14 Essen
242 (<https://qgis.org/en/site>). We also subsetted the unique coordinates to collections corresponding
243 to primarily freshwater taxa ('F' designations) vs. primarily marine taxa ('M' designations) and
244 generated maps in QGIS that contrasted collections by these habitat types.

245 To more precisely summarize the collection localities by habitat category ('F', 'M', and
246 'F, M' designations), we generated a Venn diagram, and we labeled the three main groups with
247 the total number of unique localities for each group. While maps of collection localities
248 mentioned above relied on unique coordinates determined from the full dataset (allowing no
249 duplicates between habitat categories), this would violate the assumptions of set theory for triple
250 Venn diagrams. Thus, we constructed the Venn diagram on a dataset of collections allowing no
251 duplicates within habitat categories (i.e., sets) but allowing duplicates between them.

252 In our final checklist, orders and families are arranged from the earliest branching
253 (roughly older) lineages to more-recently branching (younger) lineages following recent
254 phylogenetic results (Betancur-R. *et al.* 2013; Mirande 2017; Hughes *et al.* 2018). However,
255 within families, genera and their species names are presented in alphabetical order (*cf.* Artüz &
256 Fricke 2019). With limited exceptions, genus and species names and the corresponding
257 taxonomic references follow the latest version of Eschmeyer's Catalog of Fishes (Fricke *et al.*
258 2022), while family names and their allocation to orders follow the corresponding classification
259 (van der Laan *et al.* 2023). Where institutional abbreviations are mentioned, we follow the
260 updated lists of Sabaj (2020, 2022).

261 Results

262 Our raw FishNet2 dataset contained $n = 146,604$ collection lots representing more than ~ 1.09
263 million individual specimens of freshwater and marine fishes of Alabama and the Mobile River
264 Basin, based on records from $>53,000$ lots with readily discernable counts (although this number
265 is an underestimate). An estimated $\sim 64\%$ of scientific collections of Alabama's fishes for which
266 data were available in FishNet2 (considering records of primarily in-state collections, excluding
267 Tombigbee River sites in Mississippi) are housed in natural history museums located in the state,
268 with $\sim 40\%$ of all Alabama fish collections stored in the University of Alabama Ichthyological
269 Collection (UA) and an additional $\sim 24\%$ of state collections stored at the Auburn University
270 Museum of Natural History collection (AUM) (Table 1). The institution with the next largest

271 holding of Alabama's preserved fish materials is Tulane University (TU), with ~18% of all
272 Alabama fish collections. Beyond these three collections, only five other provider institutions
273 harbor more than 2000 lots of Alabama's fishes, including (in order of decreasing number of
274 lots) the University of Michigan Museum of Zoology (UMMZ); Florida Museum of Natural
275 History (UF); National Museum of Natural History, Smithsonian Institution (USNM);
276 Mississippi Museum of Natural Science (MMNS); and the Cornell University Museum of
277 Vertebrates (CUMV). Only 287 lots of Alabama's fishes are housed internationally in Canada,
278 Sweden, and France (Table 1).

279 Our raw SEAMAP dataset contained $n = 36,611$ catch or observation data records,
280 including a total of $n = 4,448$ records from $n = 233$ bottom longline sampling stations in
281 Alabama waters. We parsed and subset these data to a total of $n = 3,060$ records from within
282 roughly three nautical miles of the Alabama coast or Dauphin Island. The final SEAMAP dataset
283 for this study contained catches or observations from $n = 158$ SEAMAP sampling events from n
284 = 152 unique SEAMAP stations meeting our inclusion criteria, all of which were georeferenced.

285 After parsing, cleaning, and collating our FishNet2 and SEAMAP datasets, the final
286 combined database for this study contained $n = 144,215$ records, including $n = 141,155$
287 vouchered collection lots from FishNet2 and $n = 3,060$ marine fish observations from SEAMAP
288 bottom longline surveys. The final combined database is made available through a Mendeley
289 Data accession available online (Bagley 2023).

290 Several freshwater taxa were included in the list despite being rarely encountered.
291 Specifically, three freshwater taxa in the FishNet2 data were included in our checklist even
292 though they were only represented by a single specimen lot, including Mountain Madtom,
293 *Noturus eleutherus*, Brown Madtom, *Noturus phaeus*, and Slough Darter, *Etheostoma gracile*.
294 The resurrected species *Amia ocellicauda* was included in our list based on two collections in the
295 FishNet2 dataset and at least seven collections in Brownstein *et al.* (2022).

296 Several marine taxa in the final combined database were excluded from our checklist
297 because their presence in Alabama waters was only confirmed by one or two specimen lots.
298 These taxa included primarily pelagic, offshore marine fishes from the Gulf of Mexico such as
299 Little Thunny, *Euthynnus alletteratus*, Skipjack Tuna, *Katsuwonus pelamis*, and other scombrids.
300 Other marine fishes were excluded despite having sufficient collections because they are
301 offshore-pelagic or offshore-demersal species, including tunas (e.g., *Thunnus atlanticus*),

302 Common Dolphinfish (*Coryphaena hippurus*), and various serranid and scorpaeniform taxa (e.g.,
303 *Centropristes oxyurus*, *Pontius longispinis*).

304 A total of $n = 136,432$ lots (~95%) in our final combined dataset were georeferenced in
305 decimal degrees, and many of these had duplicate localities. After cleaning and removing
306 duplicates, we determined that these data represented $n = 10,325$ unique collection localities,
307 which are mapped in Fig. 2. The vast majority of these (~98%) were specimen-backed fish
308 collections records from FishNet2. Considering only localities within the state of Alabama, the
309 greatest densities of fish records were registered in and near the main stems of major rivers of the
310 Mobile River Basin and the Tennessee River system, Mobile Bay, and lower-middle reaches of
311 coastal rivers located east of the Mobile River Basin (Fig. 2). Areas with relatively lower
312 sampling densities, indicated qualitatively by less overlap of transparent collection points in Fig.
313 2, included tributaries of the Tombigbee River in West Alabama, parts of the upper Black
314 Warrior River system, southern tributaries to the Tennessee River system in northeastern
315 Alabama, and the upper reaches of the coastal river systems between Mobile Bay and the
316 Chattahoochee drainage. However, viewing our sampling as a whole, we can see that our
317 FishNet2 data includes much less dense sampling of Mobile River Basin areas outside of
318 Alabama. Portions of the Tombigbee River drainage in Mississippi were mainly sampled in these
319 data along the main river channel. Also, relatively fewer records were available from the upper
320 Coosa River drainage in northwestern Georgia as compared to areas of this drainage within
321 Alabama (Fig. 2). Apparently, recent data from the Noxubee River (e.g., Calloway *et al.* 2017)
322 and other Tombigbee River tributaries have not yet been incorporated into FishNet2.

323 Our final combined database highlighted large discrepancies in sampling effort for fishes
324 classified as primarily freshwater vs. marine in habitat, with $n = 8,320$ unique collection
325 localities for freshwater fishes (out of $n = 9,335$ ‘F’ collection localities) but only $n = 665$ unique
326 localities for marine fishes (out of $n = 1,258$ ‘M’ collection localities) (Figs. 3 and 4). Fish
327 species considered to enter both freshwater and marine environments ($n = 1,247$ ‘F, M’
328 collection localities) were largely split between these other two categories, with few ($n = 88$)
329 unique collections, as shown in the Venn diagram (Fig. 4C). Additionally, the Fig. 3 map of
330 marine versus freshwater collection localities revealed the geographical extent of upstream
331 invasions of marine fishes into fresh waters of the Mobile River Basin and Alabama’s other
332 major river systems, which was extensive in some cases but was always limited to areas below

333 the Fall Line.

334 The final, updated checklist of marine and freshwater fishes from coastal and inland
335 waters of Alabama and the Mobile River Basin includes 463 species, including 335 primarily
336 freshwater fishes and 128 marine or diadromous fishes, in 35 orders and 78 families (Table 2).
337 Additionally, the present understanding of taxonomic diversity in the Alabama fish assemblage
338 is expanded in our list to include 176 genera (Table 2). A version of the final combined database
339 subsetted only to species in the final checklist ($n > 137,000$ lots) is provided in our data
340 accession (Bagley 2023). Data on species status are summarized in Fig. 4A, which demonstrates
341 that the overwhelming majority (~93%) of fish species in Alabama's waters are native, while
342 only a combined ~3.5% of species are introduced species. Five species are considered extirpated
343 from Alabama ("Exstate"; ~1%), and two of these, Lake Sturgeon, *Acipenser fulvescens*, and
344 Spotfin Chub, *Erimonax monachus*, have been reintroduced in the state (Table 2; Fig. 4A). Seven
345 species, including Yellowfin Shiner, *Hydrophlox lutipinnis*, Brook Trout, *Salvelinus fontinalis*,
346 Etowah Darter, *Etheostoma etowahae*, Cherokee Darter, *Etheostoma scotti*, Amber Darter,
347 *Percina antesella*, Conasauga Logperch, *Percina jenkinsi*, and Bridled Darter, *Percina kusha*,
348 have status in Alabama of "N/A" in the checklist because they occur in the upper Mobile River
349 Basin regions of northwestern Georgia (e.g., Etowah River in the Coosa River system; Fig. 1)
350 and do not technically occur in Alabama. Of the 128 species reported herein that inhabit or enter
351 marine environments, 53 commonly or occasionally inhabit fresh waters ('F, M') while 75 are
352 considered fully marine ('M'; Fig. 4B). Of the 'F, M' species, six are well known as diadromous,
353 migrating between freshwater and saltwater environments to feed or spawn during their
354 lifetimes: Gulf Sturgeon, *Acipenser desotoi*, American Eel, *Anguilla rostrata*, Blueback Herring,
355 *Alosa aestivalis*, Alabama Shad, *Alosa alabamae*, Atlantic Needlefish, *Strongylura marina*, and
356 Striped Bass, *Morone saxatilis*.

357 Discussion

358 Previous books on the freshwater fishes of Alabama containing checklists of the fauna (Mettee *et*
359 *al.* 1996; Boschung & Mayden 2004) provided an excellent starting point for conducting the
360 present study. Although increasingly outdated, these two prior syntheses are highly cited and
361 remain in wide use by wildlife biologists, environmental scientists, and academics. Readers are
362 referred to these texts for reviews of the history of ichthyology in Alabama, as well as additional

details on the geological and ecological setting in which the state's ichthyofauna is emplaced (also see Lacefield 2013, refs. therein). A brief review of taxonomic and systematic differences between these two sources, upon which the present study is built, is provided in the Appendix S1 file of our data accession (Bagley 2023). By building on these works with a literature search and a large, curated database of >140,000 specimen collections and observations for the fish fauna of the state and its main river basins gleaned from FishNet2 and SEAMAP, we have produced an updated and much improved checklist of marine and freshwater fishes known from the coastal and inland waters of Alabama (Table 2). Below, we describe in detail the new species additions, nomenclatural changes to existing species and supraspecific taxa, and marine species additions and marine invaders registered in the present checklist. We conclude our discussion by summarizing one of the foremost challenges for understanding and conserving the Alabama fauna moving forward: the presence of taxonomic uncertainty as represented by ~13 undescribed, candidate species included in the present checklist.

376 **New Species**

377 This section discusses the names, distributions, and conservation status of 13 fish species that
378 were discovered/delimited and described as new to science since the publication of the last
379 update on fishes of Alabama (Boschung & Mayden 2004) and are included in our list. The
380 Longjaw Minnow, *Ericymba amplamala*, was described by Pera and Armbruster (2006) as a new
381 species for the southern populations of the Silverjaw Minnow, *Ericymba buccata*, and ranges
382 from eastern Louisiana across the Gulf Coast to southwestern Georgia, including all populations
383 formerly considered *E. buccata* in the state of Alabama, as well as a set of disjunct northern
384 Georgia populations. In Alabama, *E. amplamala* is widely distributed below the Fall Line in
385 larger, flowing, sand- and gravel-bottomed streams. The conservation status of *E. amplamala* is
386 generally considered secure, but the species may be vulnerable to extirpation in some parts of its
387 range, e.g., Louisiana.

388 *Macrhybopsis boschungi*, *M. etnieri*, and *M. pallida* were recently described by Gilbert *et*
389 *al.* (2017) from the *Macrhybopsis aestivalis* species complex. Mobile Chub, *Macrhybopsis*
390 *boschungi*, occurs in all large rivers of the Mobile River Basin in Mississippi and Alabama,
391 including the Tombigbee, Alabama, Cahaba, Coosa, and Tallapoosa rivers, and is confined
392 below the Fall Line (Gilbert *et al.* 2017). By contrast, Coosa Chub, *M. etnieri*, is restricted to
393 areas above the Fall Line in the Cahaba, Coosa, and Tallapoosa rivers, and overlaps with *M.*

394 *boschungi* (with no evidence of hybridization at allozyme loci) in a 40-km-long section of the
395 Cahaba River (Gilbert *et al.* 2017). *Macrhybopsis boschungi* and *M. etnieri* are both Mobile
396 River Basin endemics. Pallid Chub, *Macrhybopsis pallida*, is confined to the Conecuh, Yellow,
397 and Choctawhatchee rivers along the Coastal Plain. Dr. Carter Gilbert's work on the *M.*
398 *aestivalis* complex has been known for some time and was reported as forthcoming by Mettee *et*
399 *al.* (1996, p. 30 and p. 219), who referred to them as "M. sp. cf. *aestivalis* (MBE)" and "M. sp.
400 cf. *aestivalis*." Now, with the formal publication of Gilbert *et al.* (2017), no populations of
401 *Macrhybopsis* in Alabama are recognized as *M. aestivalis*; hence, *M. aestivalis* is excluded from
402 our list. The conservation status of the above new species of *Macrhybopsis* remains unclear and
403 is an area in need of research attention, although it seems that their populations are likely to be
404 secure in Alabama.

405 A new catfish species, the Chucky Madtom, *Noturus crypticus*, was described from the
406 Tennessee River basin by Burr *et al.* (2005) based on a very small amount of material, including
407 only eight specimens from populations in Little Chucky Creek in Greene Co., Tennessee. The
408 species is now thought to occur in the Tennessee River drainage in Alabama as well. However,
409 the geographic range of *N. crypticus* is extremely limited, and thus the species has been listed as
410 critically endangered by the IUCN (NatureServe 2013b) and has been federally listed as
411 endangered under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 since 2011 (USFWS 2011). The recovery
412 plan for *N. crypticus* is described in Kuhajda *et al.* (2016).

413 A new sculpin species, the Tallapoosa Sculpin, *Cottus tallapoosae*, was described from
414 the Tallapoosa River in the Mobile River Basin by Neely *et al.* (2007). In the same work,
415 Chattahoochee Sculpin, *C. chattahoochee*, was also described from the Chattahoochee River
416 system, but the analyses were based solely on material from the state of Georgia and it remains
417 unclear whether populations of *C. chattahoochee* exist in Alabama; hence, *C. chattahoochee* was
418 excluded from our checklist. We expect that *C. chattahoochee* might be found at new sites in
419 Alabama after additional field sampling is conducted in the Chattahoochee River system. Both of
420 these new *Cottus* species are considered species of Least Concern under IUCN 3.1 (e.g.,
421 NatureServe 2013a).

422 Since 2004, four new species of black basses from the genus *Micropterus* have been
423 formally described. Specifically, Baker *et al.* (2013) tested the hypothesis of Hubbs and Bailey
424 (1940) that Redeye Bass, *Micropterus coosae*, from the Black Warrior River exhibited

425 morphological variation potentially consistent with a new species. Based on evidence from
426 morphology and mitochondrial DNA genetic relationships, Baker *et al.* (2013) found support for
427 this hypothesis and described four new species of black basses from within the range of Redeye
428 Bass. These included the Warrior Bass, *M. warriorensis*, endemic to the Black Warrior River
429 drainage, Cahaba Bass, *M. cahabae*, endemic to the Cahaba River drainage, Tallapoosa Bass, *M.*
430 *tallapoosae*, endemic to the Tallapoosa River, and Chattahoochee Bass, *M. chattahoochae*,
431 endemic to the Chattahoochee River system (Baker *et al.* 2013). Redeye bass were redescribed as
432 occurring in the Coosa River drainage in Alabama, and Baker *et al.* (2013) considered *M. coosae*
433 from the Altamaha and Savannah river drainages in Georgia and South Carolina as representing
434 a morphologically and genetically distinct lineage (“Bartram’s Bass”; see below). Recent
435 phylogenomic and species delimitation analyses by Kim *et al.* (2022b) based on phylogenomic
436 analyses of double-digest restriction site-associated DNA sequencing (ddRAD-seq) data upheld
437 the validity of the taxonomy proposed by Baker *et al.* (2013), supporting the existence of the five
438 currently recognized species in the *M. coosae* group, as well as undescribed forms (see below).
439 At present, the conservation status of the new *Micropterus* species above has not been finalized
440 and needs more research attention.

441 Among darters and perches in the family Percidae, four new species have been described
442 since 2004 that represent updates in our list. These include the Bankhead Darter, *Percina sipsi*,
443 which was described by Williams *et al.* (2007) from Sipsey Fork of the Black Warrior River in
444 the greater Tombigbee River drainage of the Mobile River Basin. *Percina sipsi* is listed with
445 Vulnerable status by the IUCN 3.1 assessment (NatureServe 2013d). Williams *et al.* (2007) also
446 described the Muscadine Darter, *Percina smithvanizi*, from above the Fall Line in the Tallapoosa
447 River drainage of eastern Alabama and northwest Georgia, as well as Bridled Darter, *Percina*
448 *kusha*, which is restricted to tributaries of the upper Coosa River in Tennessee and northwest
449 Georgia. *Percina smithvanizi* is considered Near Threatened in status under IUCN 3.1
450 (NatureServe 2013e), while *P. kusha* is considered Endangered under IUCN 3.1 (NatureServe
451 2013c) but is not federally listed as threatened or endangered in the United States. Near and
452 Kozal described the Blueface Darter, *Etheostoma cyanoprosopum* from an extremely small zone
453 (<20 km) of Tennessee River drainage tributaries in northwestern Alabama, including the Bear
454 Creek system (Kozal *et al.* 2017). *Etheostoma cyanoprosopum* is part of the snubnose darter
455 group (subgenus *Ulocentra*) and was initially discovered and informally recognized as a distinct

456 form within the range of *E. zonistium* (*E. sp. cf. zonistium*) 22 years before its description, by
457 Kuhajda and Mayden (1995). The conservation status of *E. cyanoprosopum* remains uncertain
458 and is a topic in need of additional research; however, the species restricted distribution suggests
459 it is a candidate for being listed as threatened or endangered. Indeed, a recent population genetics
460 study by Fluker *et al.* (2019) found a lack of historical genetic structuring in *E. cyanoprosopum*,
461 as well as reduced levels of genetic diversity, suggesting that existing populations are susceptible
462 to inbreeding and local extirpation.

463 **Nomenclatural Changes**

464 This section considers changes to the names of existing species and supraspecific taxa that occur
465 in the state of Alabama, and that have occurred since the publication of the last update on fishes
466 of Alabama by Boschung and Mayden (2004). The single largest and most conspicuous
467 nomenclatural change for the Alabama ichthyofauna over the past 19 years, which is registered
468 in our checklist, is that all North American minnows formerly allocated to family Cyprinidae
469 have been reallocated to Leuciscidae, which was previously considered a subfamily of the
470 Cyprinidae (Tan & Armbruster 2018). Another supraspecific change that is reflected in the
471 present list is that Chinese major carps that are introduced in Alabama and were formerly placed
472 in Cyprinidae are now allocated to family Xenocyprididae (Tan & Armbruster 2018). The last of
473 the family-level changes resulted from a new classification of herrings, anchovies, shads, and
474 their allies in the order Clupeiformes. In a recent phylogenomics study of 1,165 filtered exon-
475 capture loci, Wang *et al.* (2022) inferred a non-monophyletic Clupeidae, causing them to elevate
476 three monophyletic clades they identified to family level, as Ehiravidae, Alosidae, and
477 Dorosomatidae. Due to these changes, no clupeiform fish species in Alabama is currently
478 allocated to Clupeidae; instead, representatives of *Alosa* and *Brevoortia* are allocated to
479 Alosidae, while representatives of *Dorosoma* and *Harengula* are allocated to Dorosomatidae
480 (Wang *et al.* 2022).

481 At the genus level, names of all three Atlantic stingrays that occur in Alabama waters
482 have changed since the genus *Hypanus* was resurrected from the synonymy of *Dasyatis* by Last
483 *et al.* (2016). Genus-only name changes in this group apply to Southern Stingray, *Hypanus*
484 *americanus*, and Bluntnose Stingray, *Hypanus say* (Last *et al.* 2016). However, the binomial
485 name of the Atlantic Stingray has also changed from *Dasyatis sabina* to *Hypanus sabinus* as a
486 result of the same study (Last *et al.* 2016).

Also at the genus level, the former subgenus name *Lethenteron* (Creaser & Hubbs 1922) is now applied as the genus name (rather than *Lampetra*) for American Brook Lamprey, *Lethenteron appendix*. *Lethenteron* has been recognized as a distinct genus for over 40 years since Vladykov and Kott (1979; see also Renaud 1997; Potter and Gill 2003). However, it was not until molecular phylogenetic results based on analyses of the mitochondrial cytochrome *b* gene by Lang *et al.* (2009) inferred a largely monophyletic *Lethenteron* that treatment of the genus as distinct, and applied to several species including *L. appendix*, entered into routine modern use (e.g., Page & Burr 2011; Page *et al.* 2013; Fricke *et al.* 2022). This is due, in part, to the fact that additional morphological and DNA evidence (e.g., Naseka & Renaud 2020; Pereira *et al.* 2021) supports the conclusions of Lang *et al.* (2009). In contrast to the above change for *L. appendix*, Least Brook Lamprey is maintained in the genus *Lampetra* in the present checklist, as *Lampetra aepyptera*, following other authors (*cf.* Potter & Gill 2003; Page & Burr 2011). Recent mitochondrial DNA results suggest that *L. aepyptera* is genetically distinct within a polyphyletic “*Lampetra*,” and that it may be best to elevate subgenus *Okkelbergia* for this species (Lang *et al.* 2009; Pereira *et al.* 2021). Nevertheless, single-locus phylogenies do not provide a robust basis for erecting new genera for a single taxon, and the interpretation of *L. aepyptera* remains clouded by lack of a rigorous multilocus phylogeny of lampreys based on comprehensive taxon sampling. We recommend additional phylogenetic studies, and/or a taxonomic revision, of *L. aepyptera* and related taxa based on nuclear DNA and morphological evidence before any further taxonomic interpretations are made regarding this species.

Near and Keck (2005) recognized *Nothonotus* as a genus corresponding to darters in the *Etheostoma* subgenus *Nothonotus* (e.g., Page 1983). Given a lack of morphological apomorphies for *Etheostoma* (e.g., Bailey *et al.* 1954) and molecular evidence for *Etheostoma* polyphyly due to members of *Nothonotus* grouping with other darter genera (e.g., Song *et al.* 1998), they felt genus-level recognition of *Nothonotus* was justified (Near & Keck 2005). Such a treatment has been followed by others (e.g., Robison & Buchanan 2020), including various empirical studies generally supporting the distinctiveness of *Nothonotus* based on mitochondrial markers, nuclear markers, and morphology (e.g., Keck & Near 2008, 2010; Near *et al.* 2011). Following Near and Keck (2005), we also recognize *Nothonotus* as a distinct genus, with seven species occurring in Alabama (Table 2). Similar to these changes, phylogenomic analyses of ddRAD-seq data by MacGuigan and Near (2019) found darters corresponding to *Etheostoma* subgenus *Allohistium* to

518 form a strongly supported monophyletic group that experienced ancient introgression with other
519 darter lineages. As a result, they recognized *Allohistium* as a distinct genus containing three
520 species/lineages (MacGuigan & Near 2019). Following their treatment, we recognize *Allohistium*
521 as a distinct genus in our checklist, treating Ashy Darter as *Allohistium cinereum* and its
522 presumed sister lineage and candidate species known from lower Tennessee River populations as
523 “*A. cinereum* ESU 2.”

524 Based on phylogenomic results from analyzing exon capture markers (1,004 loci; cf.
525 Arcila *et al.* 2017) from *Notropis* minnows and their relatives (Leuciscidae), Stout *et al.* (2022)
526 found that species of several genera, including *Notropis* and *Luxilus* among others, were not
527 resolved as monophyletic. They proposed numerous taxonomic changes for minnows based on
528 the phylogenetic positions of type species for different genera, of which those germane to the
529 Alabama fish fauna are included in our checklist and reviewed here. First, the non-monophyly of
530 *Luxilus* in Stout *et al.* (2022) agrees with a similar pattern in Schönhuth *et al.* (2018) and
531 supports the two Alabama species of *Luxilus* as a distinct lineage of sister taxa. Accordingly,
532 Stout *et al.* (2022) proposed renaming these taxa Warpaint Shiner, *Coccotis coccogenis*, and
533 Bandfin Shiner, *Coccotis zonistius*, with *C. coccogenis* as the type species for the elevated genus
534 *Coccotis* (Table 3). Second, Stout *et al.* (2022) proposed reassessments of taxa within the genus
535 *Notropis* affecting 24 described and candidate species that occur in Alabama. They reassigned
536 these taxa to (1) the valid genera *Alburnops*, *Minielius*, or *Pteronotropis*, (2) the subgenus
537 *Hydrophlox* (Cashner *et al.* 2011), which they elevated to genus level, or (3) the resurrected
538 genus *Paranotropis* (Stout *et al.* 2022), as summarized in Table 3. Note that the names of seven
539 Alabama minnows remain allocated to *Notropis*, including (with genus in single quotes for taxa
540 with uncertain phylogenetic affinities) Popeye Shiner, ‘*Notropis*’ *ariommus*, Emerald Shiner, *N.*
541 *atherinoides*, Taillight Shiner, ‘*N.*’ *maculatus*, Highland Shiner, *N. micropteryx*, Silver Shiner, *N.*
542 *photogenis*, Silverstripe Shiner, *N. stilbius*, and Telescope Shiner, ‘*N.*’ *telescopus* (Stout *et al.*
543 2022).

544 In a similar vein, the scientific name of the Redeye Chub is now recognized as
545 *Pteronotropis harperi* rather than *Notropis harperi* based on molecular phylogenetic analyses of
546 two nuclear genes by Mayden and Allen (2015), which showed that the latter was
547 phylogenetically nested within the genus *Pteronotropis* with strong bootstrap support. Stout *et al.*
548 (2022) also resolved *Pteronotropis* as monophyletic and including *P. harperi*, with strong nodal

549 support, based on analyses of a phylogenomic dataset employing hundreds of markers.
550 Populations of *Macrhybopsis aestivalis* distributed from the Tennessee River drainage (in
551 Alabama and elsewhere) north to the Ohio River drainage, which were originally described by
552 Gilbert (1884) as *Nocomis hyostomus*, were recently redescribed as the Shoal Chub,
553 *Macrhybopsis hyostoma*, by Gilbert *et al.* (2017) in their morphological and genetic study of the
554 *M. aestivalis* species complex.

555 At the species level, Brownstein *et al.* (2022) showed that Bowfin, *Amia calva*, harbors
556 cryptic genetic diversity within its range consistent with two distinct species of bowfins based on
557 morphological differences and detailed phylogeographic and species delimitation analyses of
558 genomic data from ddRAD-seq. They found that the two bowfin species/lineages diverged
559 around ~2 million years ago in the Plio–Pleistocene. On the basis of their findings, Brownstein *et*
560 *al.* (2022) redescribed Bowfin, *A. calva*, as corresponding to bowfin populations from the Pearl
561 River, MS east along the Gulf Coast, throughout Florida, and north throughout Atlantic
562 drainages into Virginia. They resurrected the name *Amia ocellicauda* Todd in Richardson 1836
563 for populations of bowfins found in Gulf Coast drainages from Lake Pontchartrain west
564 throughout the Mississippi Basin, the Great Lakes, and the St. Lawrence and Connecticut rivers
565 (Brownstein *et al.* 2022); therefore, bowfin populations in Alabama’s portion of the Tennessee
566 River Basin are recognized as Emerald Bowfin, *A. ocellicauda* (L.M. Page, pers. comm.).

567 Also at the species level, Kim *et al.* (2022a) showed that the Longear Sunfish (*Lepomis*
568 *megalotis*) complex contained six geographically distinct lineages based on phylogenomics and
569 species delimitation analyses of ddRAD-seq data. They treated each of these six *Lepomis*
570 lineages as distinct species that diverged from one another around ~4–2.5 million years ago in
571 the Plio–Pleistocene. Their results show that Longear Sunfish, *L. megalotis*, populations are only
572 present in northwest Alabama in parts of the Tennessee River Basin located in Lauderdale and
573 Colbert counties, while populations throughout the remainder of the state are included within a
574 separate species, the Sunny Sunfish, *L. solis*, which they resurrected from the synonymy of *L.*
575 *megalotis* (Kim *et al.* 2022a). *Lepomis solis* has a geographical range extending along Gulf
576 drainages from Lake Pontchartrain, LA east to the Choctawhatchee River drainage, as well as the
577 Altamaha River drainage in Georgia, which drains to the Atlantic Ocean (Kim *et al.* 2022a).

578 Also in Centrarchidae, ddRAD-seq phylogeography and species delimitation results for
579 black basses in the genus *Micropterus* have shown that robustly delimited species correspond to

580 two clades within the Largemouth Bass complex, but that these did not match the type localities
581 of recognized species (Kim *et al.* 2022b). In particular, specimens from the type locality of
582 *Micropterus salmoides* nested within the Florida Bass lineage. This prompted Kim *et al.* (2022b)
583 to refer to Florida Bass as *Micropterus salmoides* and to apply *Micropterus nigricans* (removed
584 from synonymy of *M. salmoides*) for Largemouth Bass. We follow these changes in our
585 checklist, and we have also adjusted all names for Largemouth Bass accordingly in our modified
586 FishNet2 dataset (Bagley 2023).

587 At the subspecies level, the scientific name of the Gulf Sturgeon has been elevated from
588 *Acipenser oxyrinchus desotoi* to the species-level name, *Acipenser desotoi*, as of Robins *et al.*
589 (2018). The scientific name of western populations of the Creek Chubsucker, *Erimyzon*
590 *oblongus*, has been elevated from *Erimyzon oblongus claviformis* to *E. claviformis* (Bailey *et al.*
591 2004; Page & Burr 2011). Likewise, a subspecies of Brook Silverside, *Labidesthes sicculus*,
592 named *L. s. vanhyningi* was recently elevated to species level by Wernecke and Armbruster
593 (2015). This species, the Golden Silverside, *L. vanhyningi*, occurs in Gulf and Atlantic slope
594 drainages largely east of the Mississippi River, including Gulf and Atlantic tributaries from
595 Neches River, TX east to Peepee River, SC (Wernecke & Armbruster 2015). Brook Silverside
596 populations in the Mississippi River Basin and other Gulf tributaries from Brazos River, TX to
597 Pascagoula River, MS are still recognized as *L. sicculus* (Wernecke & Armbruster 2015). As a
598 result, *L. sicculus* occur in Alabama's portion of the Tennessee River Basin, while *L. vanhyningi*
599 are found throughout the remainder of the state. Last, Baker *et al.* (2008) described Alabama
600 Bass, *Micropterus henshalli*, from Mobile River Basin populations of Spotted Bass, *M.*
601 *punctulatus*, that were formerly considered the distinct subspecies *M. p. henshalli* by Hubbs and
602 Bailey (1940). As a result, the only populations recognized as *M. punctulatus* in Alabama occur
603 in the Tennessee River drainage, as well as Gulf Slope drainages from the Escambia River east
604 to the Chattahoochee River, but excluding Mobile Bay and its tributaries.

605 **Marine Species Additions and Marine Invaders**

606 On top of the new species descriptions and nomenclatural changes discussed above, another way
607 in which the Alabama state fish checklist has changed in the present iteration is through the
608 addition of marine species based on new data. Whereas Mettee *et al.* (1996) treated 28 marine
609 and diadromous fish species, and Boschung and Mayden (2004) treated a total of 48 of these, our
610 list increases this number to a total of 128 marine and diadromous species known from the state's

611 coastlines, bays, barrier island (Dauphin Island), and nearby waters of the Gulf of Mexico (Table
612 2). The reasons behind this expansion are that vouchered collections in our final FishNet2 dataset
613 allowed us to add 56 species known from marine environments that otherwise may not have been
614 included in our list, while our SEAMAP dataset confirmed several of these and also allowed us
615 to add 15 new marine species to our list. Supplementary tables listing these 71 marine species
616 additions are included in our Mendeley Data accession (Bagley 2023).

617 The updated list of fishes of Alabama herein contains 53 species with an ‘F, M’ habitat
618 designation that are considered to be diadromous, occurring in (or potentially occurring in) fresh
619 waters and brackish/marine waters. These include anadromous species that spend most of their
620 lives in the sea but migrate back to fresh waters in the spring to spawn, as well as catadromous
621 species that are predominantly freshwater taxa but migrate to marine habitats to spawn. The two
622 main anadromous species are Gulf Sturgeon, *Acipenser desotoi*, and Alabama Shad, *Alosa*
623 *alabamae*, while the only catadromous species is American Eel, *Anguilla rostrata* (Mettee *et al.*
624 1996; Boschung & Mayden 2004; Mettee 2008; Robins *et al.* 2018). A third category of
625 diadromous species consists of marine fishes that have only been documented as occasionally
626 entering fresh waters, e.g., at harbors or river mouths, and this group includes species that move
627 northward no further than Mobile Bay, such as the Tiger Shark, *Galeocerdo cuvier*, and multiple
628 gobies including Lyre Goby, *Evorthodus lyricus*, and Violet Goby, *Gobioides broussonetti*. The
629 diadromous species also include 33 fish species that we consider to be ‘marine invaders’ of
630 freshwater habitats, which we review below in roughly phylogenetic order.

631 Among cartilaginous fishes, the Bull Shark, *Carcharhinus leucas* (Carcharhinidae), is
632 notable in being a euryhaline species that regularly invades fresh waters, including areas
633 relatively far inland within Lake Nicaragua in Central America and the Mississippi River Basin
634 in the US (e.g., Thorson 1971; Thomerson *et al.* 1977). In Alabama, *C. leucas* adults and
635 juveniles have been observed to penetrate as far north as the mouth of the Mobile–Tensaw Delta
636 (this study; Drymon *et al.* 2021), which provides a large input of fresh water into Mobile Bay. In
637 light of its distribution in warm coastal waters worldwide as well as its physiological capacity for
638 entering freshwater, these findings suggest that *C. leucas* may invade further into Alabama
639 waters than previously thought, possibly entering the lower Mobile River Basin.

640 Atlantic Stingray, *Hypanus sabinus* (Dasyatidae), is a euryhaline species that can
641 withstand hypoxic conditions and is common to sand- or mud-bottomed beaches, bays, and

642 estuaries around Alabama's coastlines (e.g., Snelson *et al.* 1988; Boschung & Mayden 2004).
643 According to our database, *H. sabinus* invades the Mobile–Tensaw Delta as far north as Gravine
644 Island (UAIC 16053.01, 30.78491° N, 87.92084° W), but it does not substantially invade Gulf
645 Slope river basins.

646 Ladyfish, *Elops saurus* (Elopidae), is a largely pelagic fish that spawns at sea and
647 maintains a distribution of resident populations in the western North Atlantic Ocean, primarily
648 from Cape Hatteras, NC south throughout the Gulf of Mexico to the Yucatán Peninsula (e.g.,
649 McBride *et al.* 2010). Our northernmost record for *E. saurus* comes from Perdido Bay (UF
650 151607, 30.42389° N, 87.40028° W). However, GBIF records (<http://www.gbif.org>) show that,
651 in Alabama, *E. saurus* invades the Mobile–Tensaw Delta as far north as Twelvemile Island and
652 inland to around Gunnison Creek, a tributary to Sara Bayou located just east of Satsuma, AL.

653 Bay Anchovy, *Anchoa mitchilli* (Engraulidae), is a pelagic-coastal species whose
654 distribution extends from Maine south around Florida, throughout the Gulf of Mexico, to the
655 Yucatán Peninsula (Robins & Ray 1986). *Anchoa mitchilli* is highly abundant in shallow waters
656 of the Northern Gulf of Mexico and serves as an important food source for commercial and sport
657 fisheries (e.g., Morton 1989). Based on our dataset, *A. mitchilli* is one of the most prolific marine
658 invaders of fresh waters in our study area and in the southeastern US, being commonly found
659 throughout Alabama's nearshore areas, Mobile Bay, and the Mobile–Tensaw Delta. Others
660 previously showed that populations also extended northward into the lower main-channel
661 reaches of the Tombigbee and Alabama rivers, in which they have become generally distributed
662 as far north as Coffeeville Lake (at Alabama State Route 10 crossing) and Claiborne Lock and
663 Dam, respectively (Mettee *et al.* 1996; Boschung & Mayden 2004). However, a recent record
664 from 2006 (AUM 46908, 32.65543° N, 85.58604° W) registered the inland- and northernmost
665 occurrence of *A. mitchilli* to date at Loblockee Creek, a site located ~195 mi northeast of Mobile
666 Bay and that is a tributary to Saugahatchee Creek in the Tallapoosa River system.

667 Fat Sleeper, *Dormitator maculatus* (Eleotridae), are a less common brackish-water
668 species that have a patchy distribution in the study area. This species invades the Mobile–
669 Tensaw Delta at least as far north as Gravine Island, and at least four records are known from the
670 Delta region (Bagley 2023). Largescaled Spinycheek Sleeper, *Eleotris amblyopsis*, which is a
671 close relative of *D. maculatus*, is included in our checklist but is not considered a marine invader
672 in Alabama, although records from elsewhere show it substantially invades fresh waters in

673 nearby states such as Louisiana (e.g., Doosey *et al.* 2021).

674 Five goby species in the family Gobiidae occur in nearshore marine, coastal, and fresh
675 waters of Alabama. These include Darter Goby, *Ctenogobius boleosoma*, which invades the
676 Mobile–Tensaw Delta as far north as Twelvemile Island; Freshwater Goby, *Ctenogobius*
677 *shufeldti*, and Naked Goby, *Gobiosoma bosc*, both of which invade the Mobile–Tensaw Delta to
678 the same point approximately ~25 mi inland northwest of Stockton, AL (e.g., AUM 21904,
679 31.037482° N, 87.955567° W); Highfin Goby, *Gobionellus oceanicus*, which invades the
680 Mobile–Tensaw Delta upstream in the Mobile River to an area near Big Briar Creek,
681 approximately 6.75 mi E of Satsuma, AL (UAIC 10418.07, 30.8402778° N, 87.9480556° W);
682 and Clown Goby, *Microgobius gulosus*, which are generally found up to the mouth of the
683 Mobile–Tensaw Delta but have one record registered from relatively far inland (~83 mi from
684 Mobile Bay) at Yellow Bluff on Coffeeville Lake, in the Tombigbee River system (UF 150131,
685 31.908610° N, 88.112500° W).

686 Among the eight species of pleuronectoid flatfishes that occur in Alabama with a number
687 and frequency of collections/observations to be included in our list, three of them are considered
688 marine invaders herein. These include Hogchoker, *Trinectes maculatus*, which occurs from
689 Massachusetts south to the Gulf of Campeche, Mexico, and which invades substantially inland in
690 the Mobile River Basin as well as Gulf Slope drainages west and east of Mobile Bay, including
691 the Apalachicola River system. The northernmost record of *T. maculatus* in Alabama comes
692 from Coffeeville Lake on the Tombigbee River (this study; Mettee *et al.* 1987); however, the
693 northernmost record from nearby regions appears to be from ~85 mi inland in the Chickasawhay
694 River in Mississippi. Blackcheek Tonguefish, *Syphurus plagiusa*, is abundant in coastal waters
695 and less abundant inland, but we found that it invades as far as Loxley, AL in the Weeks Bay
696 drainage of Baldwin Co. (TCWC 6822.19, 30.608890° N, 87.742497° W) based on our dataset,
697 and as far north into the Mobile–Tensaw Delta as Whitehouse Bend near Bucks, AL based on
698 GBIF data. Southern Flounder, *Paralichthys lethostigma*, prefers muddy substrate (Boschung &
699 Mayden 2004) and primarily inhabits brackish bays and estuaries, but it also invades past the
700 Mobile–Tensaw Delta and upstream into the Tombigbee River as far north as McIntosh Bluff,
701 ~3.5 mi east of McIntosh, AL. This species northernmost collection record in our database is
702 from around ~4.5 mi south of Claiborne Lock and Dam in the Alabama River (TU 103585,
703 31.558060° N, 87.512500° W).

Two mullet species (Mugilidae) occur in Alabama waters and both are euryhaline species that are considered invaders of freshwater habitats. Striped Mullet, *Mugil cephalus*, has a cosmopolitan distribution throughout warm and temperate waters worldwide but invades fresh waters along the Atlantic and Pacific coasts (Robins & Ray 1986; Fuller 2023). In Alabama, *M. cephalus* invades the Mobile–Tensaw Delta and the lower reaches of the Tombigbee and Alabama rivers and today it typically reaches as far north as Claiborne Lock and Dam; however, historical records from the 1950s and 1960s (e.g., UAIC 2035.01, 32.854722° N, 87.193056° W) demonstrate that *M. cephalus* once invaded as far north as the Cahaba River just south of Centreville, AL prior to widespread impoundment of Alabama's rivers. White Mullet, *Mugil curema*, occurs in the eastern Pacific Ocean, throughout the western Atlantic Ocean, from Maine south to Argentina, and in the eastern Atlantic Ocean (Robins & Ray 1986; Fuller 2023). *Mugil curema* is relatively less common and does not occur as far inland in Alabama as its congener *M. cephalus*. Based on our records, *M. curema* occurs at Dauphin Island and along nearby coastlines; however, based on GBIF records, this species historically may have invaded the Mobile–Tensaw Delta upstream in the Tensaw River as far north as Stockton, AL.

Atlantic Needlefish, *Strongylura marina* (Belonidae), is widely distributed along Atlantic coasts throughout the Americas, from Massachusetts south to Brazil (Robins & Ray 1986). This species is the single most prolific marine invader in the Alabama fish fauna, invading from marine waters into the Mobile–Tensaw Delta, and throughout the Mobile River Basin below the Fall Line, including virtually the entire main stem of the Tombigbee River. The northernmost collection record for *S. marina* in our database comes from Pool B above Glover Wilkins Lock and Dam near Smithville, Monroe Co., MS, which forms part of the Canal Section of the Tennessee–Tombigbee Waterway and is located an astounding ~235 mi inland from Mobile Bay. However, based on historical collections in Mettee *et al.* (1996) and the GBIF database, *S. marina* apparently invaded the Tennessee River system through the Tennessee–Tombigbee Waterway in the later part of the 20th Century, marking the inland-most region where *S. marina* might be encountered today.

Our records indicate nine fish species that, despite having patchy to common distributions along Alabama's coastlines, do not seem to disperse to inland areas of Alabama, but which we still consider to be marine invaders based on additional evidence. Here, the primary example is Rough Silverside, *Membras martinica* (Atherinopsidae), which is recorded in our

735 database as occurring throughout Mobile Bay, and which is distributed throughout the
736 northwestern Atlantic Ocean. While not ranging substantially inland in Alabama, *M. martinica*
737 also occurs several miles inland into the Escatawpa River near the Mississippi–Alabama border
738 and has invaded substantially into the Escambia River in Florida, which suggests that it may also
739 extend into fresh waters of Alabama but has not yet been detected outside of brackish or marine
740 habitats. Other species whose distributions mirror many of these characteristics of *M. martinica*
741 include Diamond Killifish, *Fundulus xenicus* (Fundulidae); Gray Snapper, *Lutjanus griseus*
742 (Lutjanidae); four drum family species (Sciaenidae): Silver Perch, *Bairdiella chrysoura*, Spotted
743 Seatrout, *Cynoscion nebulosus*, Gulf Kingfish, *Menticirrhus littoralis*, and Northern Kingfish,
744 *Menticirrhus saxatilis*; as well as Pinfish, *Lagodon rhomboides* (Sparidae). For example, each of
745 these species can be found around Alabama’s coastlines from Grand Bay to Weeks Bay and also
746 invades the Escatawpa drainage to near the Mississippi–Alabama border. The ninth species in
747 this category is Southern Kingfish, *Menticirrhus americanus* (Sciaenidae), which does not occur
748 in the Mobile–Tensaw Delta but occurs throughout coastal areas including Mobile Bay and has
749 been detected several miles inland as far north as an area of the Perdido River system northeast
750 of Bay Minette, AL.

751 Inland Silverside, *Menidia beryllina*, is also in the family Atherinopsidae, but unlike its
752 counterpart *M. martinica*, *M. beryllina* is a prolific invader of inland fresh waters in Alabama.
753 While *M. beryllina* is not as commonly encountered inland as other species such as *Strongylura*
754 *marina*, it has been detected in patches of habitat as far north as the Tombigbee and Tennessee
755 river drainages.

756 Spotfin Mojarra, *Eucinostomus argenteus* (Gerreidae), is a wide-ranging nearshore
757 marine species found over variable substrates and reefs and occurring in the eastern Pacific
758 Ocean as well as the northwest Atlantic Ocean, including the northern Gulf of Mexico to
759 southeastern Brazil (Robins & Ray 1986). *Eucinostomus argenteus* occurs around Alabama’s
760 coastlines and invades the Mobile–Tensaw Delta in the Tensaw River as far north as Stockton,
761 AL.

762 The next three species of marine invaders share in common the features of being
763 sciaenids that have inland distributions in Alabama mirroring that of *Gobionellus oceanicus*,
764 invading the Mobile–Tensaw Delta upstream to an area near Big Briar Creek east of Satsuma,
765 AL. These include Sand Seatrout, *Cynoscion arenarius*, Spot, *Leiostomus xanthurus*, and

766 Atlantic Croaker, *Micropogonias undulatus*.
767 Two other sciaenids are considered marine invaders of Alabama waters. Black Drum,
768 *Pogonias cromis* (Sciaenidae), is a benthic drum that is found in marine and brackish waters over
769 variable substrate including reef edges and occurs throughout the western Atlantic Ocean, from
770 Maine to Argentina (Robins & Ray 1986). Similar to *Elops saurus*, *P. cromis* invades Alabama
771 waters including Mobile Bay and the Mobile–Tensaw Delta, reaching to the north side of
772 Twelvemile Island. Red Drum, *Sciaenops ocellatus*, is an economically important game fish
773 species that is commonly encountered in estuaries over sand and mud substrate and that is widely
774 distributed in the western Atlantic Ocean, from Massachusetts to northern Mexico (Robins &
775 Ray 1986). Similar to *Dormitator maculatus*, *S. ocellatus* invades the Mobile–Tensaw Delta at
776 least as far north as Gravine Island based on historical collection records from GBIF; however,
777 most recent collections in our database include captures or observations no further inland than
778 Weeks Bay.

779 Sheepshead, *Archosargus probatocephalus* (Sparidae), is a primarily inshore marine fish
780 species found in marine and brackish waters over rocky and other hard or soft bottom habitats,
781 including jetties, armored banks, and rock pilings, and is distributed throughout the northwestern
782 Atlantic Ocean, from Nova Scotia, Canada south to Brazil (Manooch 1984; Robins & Ray 1986).
783 *Archosargus probatocephalus* is a game fish that is widely sought for human consumption and
784 hence is a popular fishing target. In Alabama waters, this species invades the very southernmost
785 portions of the Mobile–Tensaw Delta as far north as Blakeley River near Spanish Fort, AL
786 (AUM 21914, 30.676977° N, 87.926130° W) and it also invades approximately ~13 mi inland in
787 the Escambia River drainage in Florida.

788 **Sampling Effort: Freshwater vs. Marine Collections**

789 Overall, the final combined database that we curated in this study (Bagley 2023) highlights a
790 longstanding history and extensive amount of effort put into sampling and exploration of
791 Alabama's fishes (see also Mettee *et al.* 1996; Boschung & Mayden 2004). The value and extent
792 of this undertaking over the past 169 years, from the oldest record from 1853 (*Hybopsis*
793 *winchelli*, Smithsonian National Museum of Natural History, USNM 2, A. Winchell) to the
794 youngest SEAMAP records from 2022, as well as more recent collections, cannot be overstated.
795 However, while a larger number of studies have been conducted on Alabama's freshwater fish
796 assemblage as compared to its marine fish fauna, a pattern supported by the literature

797 (unpublished results), our findings quantitatively demonstrate discrepancies in sampling effort
798 for fishes from these two broad habitat categories. On one hand, the vast majority of records ($n =$
799 129,634; ~90%) and unique collection localities ($n = 8,320$; ~80.6%) in our final combined
800 database were for taxa that we classified as primarily freshwater in habit. This seems roughly
801 consistent with the observation that the majority (~72%) of all fish species in the state of
802 Alabama are freshwater fishes (Table 2; Figs. 3 and 4). On the other hand, only ~7.6% of records
803 ($n = 10,930$) corresponding to ~6.4% ($n = 665$) of unique collection localities corresponded to
804 marine taxa. Thus, there is a general correlation between sampling effort and species diversity;
805 however, the percentage of lots and observations for marine fishes is much lower than their
806 actual representation of ~16% in the state's fish fauna (Table 2; Figs. 3 and 4). This situation is
807 not desirable and suggests that targeted surveys are needed to bring Alabama marine fish
808 collection records and specimen lots to a level commensurate with the representation of marine
809 fishes in the state ichthyofauna.

810 **Outstanding Taxonomic Issues: Undescribed Candidate Species**

811 Despite much progress over the past ~20 years, many crucial research questions related to our
812 understanding of the Alabama fish fauna remain unanswered. A number of these questions relate
813 to outstanding systematic and taxonomic issues, which create lingering taxonomic uncertainty.
814 Key issues surround our lack of understanding of species limits and formal description of
815 species, a shortcoming known as the 'Linnean shortfall', as well as limitations to our
816 understanding of species geographical distributions, a shortcoming known as the 'Wallacean
817 shortfall' (reviewed by Lomolino 2004; Whittaker *et al.* 2005; Hortal *et al.* 2015). Both kinds of
818 shortfall are scale-dependent and may cause issues for conservation planning and biodiversity
819 accounting if not handled properly, for example if putative distinct forms are excluded from
820 regional lists and conservation planning analyses. Here, we address the Linnean shortfall for
821 Alabama's fishes as it relates to our revised checklist.

822 We find that ~13 distinct morphological forms of fishes identified by previous authors as
823 candidate species warranting further study, and possibly formal description, are known from
824 Alabama waters, and 100% of them are freshwater fishes (species listed as "sp." or "sp. cf." in
825 Table 2). Conservation practitioners in the state have avoided underestimating freshwater fish
826 species diversity at different spatial scales by recognizing these distinct, putative species.
827 However, certain tools in the state still do not reflect these taxonomic updates, including index of

828 biotic integrity (IBI; Karr 1991; Barbour *et al.* 1999) calculations for quantifying human impacts
829 on fish assemblages and water quality. Moreover, while candidate species status needs to be
830 agreed upon, inventoried, and tracked through time to avoid confusion (Padial *et al.* 2010), the
831 story of Alabama's candidate fish species has become fragmented across the literature since the
832 last major update (Boschung & Mayden 2004). In this context, our checklist provides a much-
833 needed, centralized update to species membership of the fauna, as well as signposts of candidate
834 species to guide future research in species delimitation and alpha taxonomy of Alabama's
835 freshwater fishes. Unfortunately, our checklist does not provide such signposts for Alabama's
836 marine fish taxa, because the Linnean knowledge gap is more prominent for them. Hence, the
837 following discussion emphasizes candidate species of freshwater fishes.

838 The undescribed candidate species in our accounting include the "Highlands Stonecat,"
839 *Noturus* sp. cf. *flavus*, which comprises morphologically distinct populations of *Noturus flavus*
840 from Shoal Creek and the Elk River in the Tennessee River system and is thought to be distinct
841 based on color patterns and distributional data (Page & Burr 1991, 2011). Subsequent to Mettee
842 *et al.* (1996), who also noted geographically-based color differences rendering this form distinct
843 in Alabama and Tennessee, a phylogeography study of *N. flavus* by Faber *et al.* (2009) noted that
844 the Highlands Stonecat is a genetically divergent lineage but warranted "a more complete
845 analysis of both genetic and morphological variability, as they may be a distinct species." Two
846 additional metapopulations of catfishes distributed in Alabama are considered distinct, although
847 whether they represent species-level entities remains to be determined. These include the
848 disjunct western and eastern populations of the Frecklebelly Madtom *Noturus munitus*, which are
849 considered ESUs, or historically isolated populations (Ryder 1986; Moritz 1994). *Noturus*
850 *munitus* ESU 1 is composed of populations from the Cahaba River drainage and is referred to
851 herein as the "Cahaba River Population" unit, while *N. munitus* ESU 4 is composed of
852 populations from the Tombigbee River drainage and is referred to informally as the "Tombigbee
853 River Population" unit (Table 2).

854 Among North American minnows in family Leuciscidae, we find five undescribed
855 candidate species (Table 2), including forms that have been hypothesized as distinct for up to 40
856 years. These include (1) the "Coastal Chub," *Hybopsis* sp. cf. *winchelli*, known from coastal
857 drainages east of the Mobile River Basin to the Apalachicola River (Mettee *et al.* 1996;
858 Boschung & Mayden 2004) and initially identified by Clemmer (1971); (2) the "Coosa Longnose

859 Shiner” (informal terminology adopted herein), *Minielius* sp. cf. *longirostris*, a presumed
860 microendemic form known only from the upper Coosa River in northwestern Georgia
861 (previously, “*Notropis* sp. cf. *N. longirostris*”; Straight *et al.* 2021); (3) “Sawfin Shiner,”
862 *Paranotropis* sp. cf. *spectrunculus*, distributed in the Tennessee River drainage in Alabama north
863 to Cumberland River drainage in Kentucky, which was reported by Boschung and Mayden
864 (2004; as “*Notropis* sp. cf. *N. spectrunculus*”) in the Paint Rock River in Jackson Co., Alabama;
865 (4) the “Mobile Mimic Shiner,” *Paranotropis* sp. cf. *volucellus*, identified as morphologically
866 and molecularly distinct by Mayden and Kuhajda (1989) and considered sympatric with the
867 Mimic Shiner, *P. volucellus*, in the Cahaba River drainage (Mettee *et al.* 1996; Boschung &
868 Mayden 2004); and (5) *Pteronotropis* sp. cf. *signipinnis*, comprising populations of *P.*
869 *signipinnis* in coastal rivers of the Gulf Slope located east of Mobile Bay (Mayden & Allen
870 2015). A related area of taxonomic confusion in Alabama’s minnow assemblage is the genus
871 *Campostoma*, which molecular analyses suggest may hold undescribed biodiversity warranting
872 taxonomic revision (Blum *et al.* 2008), and which some workers already informally consider
873 distinct (e.g., *C. sp. cf. oligolepis*, the “Southeastern Largescale Stoneroller”; SFC 2022).
874 However, additional morphological and genetic analyses based on broad spatial and taxonomic
875 sampling will be needed to determine whether or not any new species are delimited within
876 *Campostoma* and occur in Alabama.

877 The sucker family Catostomidae and the cavefish family Amblyopsidae share the feature
878 of containing one potential candidate species each, and these will require further taxonomic
879 study (Table 2). The undescribed catostomid is the “Apalachicola Redhorse,” *Moxostoma* sp. cf.
880 *poecilurum*, which is a form similar to *M. poecilurum* but having dusky gray fins and is known
881 only from the Apalachicola River system in Alabama and Georgia (Page & Burr 2011). This
882 form is sometimes referred to informally as “Grayfin Redhorse,” for example by Mettee *et al.*
883 (1996). In recent phylogenetic analyses, Bagley *et al.* (2018) inferred *Moxostoma* sp. cf.
884 *poecilurum* as either sister to the Gray Redhorse, *M. congestum*, which is native to the Brazos to
885 Rio Grande river drainages in central to southern Texas (Page & Burr 2011), or sister to a clade
886 of *M. congestum* + *M. poecilurum*, but with only moderate Bayesian support. The undescribed
887 cavefish is known as “Tennessee Cavefish,” *Typhlichthys* sp. cf. *subterraneus*, and is considered
888 to represent the distinct eastern populations of Southern Cavefish, *T. subterraneus*, from the
889 Tennessee River drainage in Tennessee into northern Alabama (see range maps in Boschung &

890 Mayden 2004; Page & Burr 1991, 2011).

891 Within the Centrarchidae, approximately three forms of black basses from the genus
892 *Micropterus* remain undescribed but are considered by scientists as morphologically or
893 molecularly distinct candidate species. Only one of these candidate *Micropterus* species occurs
894 in Alabama and thus is included in Table 2. This candidate form is “Choctaw Bass,” *Micropterus*
895 sp. cf. *punctulatus*, which was discovered by Bagley *et al.* (2011) and later Tringali *et al.* (2015)
896 and was considered by these authors to comprise genetically distinct populations from coastal
897 rivers west and just east of the Mobile River Basin along the Gulf Coastal Plain. Bagley *et al.*
898 (2011) found that this form, represented in their Clade IV, was monophyletic and notably
899 genetically distinct, with 3.4–12.9% mitochondrial DNA sequence divergence from other black
900 basses. Tringali *et al.* (2015) subsequently also identified Choctaw Bass as genetically distinct
901 and in need of conservation, and they noted morphological differences between populations of
902 this form and *M. punctulatus*. Recent phylogenomic and species delimitation analyses by Kim *et*
903 *al.* (2022) delimited this lineage as distinct and worthy of formal species-level recognition, but
904 with a geographic range restricted to coastal rivers just east of the Mobile River Basin, from the
905 Escambia River east to the Choctawhatchee River. Given multiple data types support the
906 distinctiveness and delimitation of *Micropterus* sp. cf. *punctulatus*, additional genetic and
907 morphological analyses should be conducted to formally describe this taxon. The other putative
908 candidate species of *Micropterus* that need to be assessed in a formal morphological analysis are
909 “Bartram’s Bass,” which is composed of populations currently allocated to *M. coosae* in the
910 Savannah River drainage of Georgia and South Carolina (Bagley *et al.* 2011; Baker *et al.* 2013;
911 B. Freeman, pers. comm.; Kim *et al.* 2022), and the newly delimited “Altamaha Bass”, which is
912 composed of *M. coosae* populations from the Altamaha River in Georgia (Kim *et al.* 2022).

913 Within the family Percidae, we are aware of at least four undescribed candidate species
914 known from Alabama and in need of further attention from taxonomists (Table 2). These include
915 two undescribed forms within the range of the Warrior Darter, *Etheostoma bellator*: *Etheostoma*
916 sp. cf. *bellator* from Locust Fork of the Black Warrior River drainage, which is known
917 informally as the “Locust Fork Darter,” and *Etheostoma* sp. cf. *bellator* “Sipsey” from the Sipsey
918 River arm of the Upper Tombigbee River, which we informally refer to as the “Sipsey Darter.”
919 Additionally, populations of Coldwater Darter, *E. ditrema*, from the middle reaches of the Coosa
920 River (to which it is endemic; Mettee *et al.* 1996; Boschung & Mayden 2004) are known as an

undescribed form, *Etheostoma* sp. cf. *ditrema*, that we refer to as “Middle Coosa River Populations.” *Etheostoma* sp. cf. *ditrema* from the middle or central Coosa River were initially identified as morphologically distinct in the 1970s and 1980s (e.g., Caldwell 1971; Utter 1984), and the same entity was identified as genetically distinct based on fixed alleles or allele frequency differences at allozyme loci in an analysis of several darters from the subgenus *Oligocephalus* by Mayden *et al.* (2005). Last, Walleye, *Sander vitreus*, populations from the southern parts of the species range in Mississippi and Alabama are considered morphologically distinct and are referred to informally as the “Southern Walleye,” *Sander* sp. cf. *vitreus* (M.W. Sandel, pers. comm.). Southern Walleye are currently in the process of being formally described based on morphological and genetic data, in a paper that also uses next-generation sequencing data to shed light on the species demographic history of divergence and introgression (M.W. Sandel, pers. comm.).

We recommend new empirical studies treating the above candidate species as hypotheses to be tested in the spirit of ‘integrative taxonomy’ (*cf.* Padial *et al.* 2010), using analyses based on multiple data types, including combinations of morphology, molecules, and behavioral and ecological data. We believe that integrative taxonomy provides the best way to test the validity of these forms and to arrive at more robust species descriptions, increasing taxonomic stability in the system. At minimum, statistically rigorous analyses of morphological data (e.g., traditional counts and measures, morphometrics; Hubbs & Lagler 1964; Armbruster & Pera 2006; Armbruster 2012) should be conducted that test for significant differentiation of populations or lineages (e.g., using analysis of variance [ANOVA], multivariate analyses, or discriminant function analysis [DFA] combined with post-hoc tests). One novel approach that is currently gaining traction is the use of machine-learning algorithms, such as ‘Random Forest’ (guided regularized random forest, GRRF; Breiman 2001; Deng 2013), to identify diagnostic characters separating species, which can easily be used to complement more traditional analyses of morphology or genetic data (e.g., Breitman *et al.* 2018; Soares *et al.* 2021). Even so, recent phylogenomics and species delimitation studies discussed above (e.g., MacGuigan & Near 2019; Brownstein *et al.* 2022; Kim *et al.* 2022) demonstrate the kinds of resolution that can be achieved in sorting out species boundaries and taxonomy through rigorous analyses of genetic or combined genetic and morphological datasets, which can highlight areas for further detailed studies using the approaches of integrative taxonomy and alpha taxonomy.

Our discussion of the above undescribed candidate species from the inland fresh waters of Alabama illustrates that the Linnean shortfall for the state's freshwater fish fauna has, at minimum, been probed and outlined roughly in extent. Major work has also been conducted on DNA barcoding of the North American freshwater fish fauna, including many species from Alabama, and has shown evidence of genetically distinct intraspecific lineages (e.g., *Lythrurus*, *Nocomis*; April *et al.* 2011). However, there is a relative paucity of information on candidate species of marine fishes. This likely reflects the smaller overall number of studies on nearshore marine fishes of North America as compared to that for the freshwater fishes of the continent, as well as the much lower sampling effort applied to marine fishes of Alabama's state waters as compared to our freshwater fishes (Fig. 3; 'Sampling Effort: Freshwater vs. Marine Collections' section above). The only way to buttress and close such knowledge gaps would be through direct investment in biodiversity inventories of Alabama's marine fishes, which we envision would be optimally designed to include targeted surveys of marine fish diversity at the genetic, morphological, community, and ecosystem levels. Yet, to date, only a single DNA barcoding study has been published that provides insight into nearshore fish species diversity and molecular species identification in marine regions bordering the state of Alabama, including parts of the Caribbean Sea and Western Atlantic Ocean (Weigt *et al.* 2012). A great deal more investment in this and related areas of research including environmental barcoding (e.g., Valentini *et al.* 2016), phenomics (e.g., Page *et al.* 2015), integrative taxonomy (e.g., Padial *et al.* 2010; Hartop *et al.* 2021), and next-generation DNA sequencing and biomonitoring (reviewed by Porter & Hajibabaei 2017) is recommended to identify groups of marine fishes known from Alabama whose species richness is likely underestimated by current taxonomy. Indeed, it would serve us well to simultaneously apply the new, cost-effective, and scalable "next-gen" approaches to biodiversity analysis listed above, in conjunction with rigorous alpha taxonomy (e.g., integrative taxonomy, expansion of taxonomic expertise), to Alabama's freshwater and marine fish assemblages, not just to fishes from one habitat or the other.

Acknowledgements

We thank Brook Fluker, Scott Glassmeyer, Lee Holt, Grey Hubbard, Bernie Kuhajda, Richard L. Mayden, Maurice F. 'Scott' Mettee, Larry Page, Steve Rider, Michael Sandel, Tom Shepard, J. Brett Smith, and David Werneke for assistance with fieldwork or providing collections

982 information supporting this project, and for many useful discussions on the systematics,
983 taxonomy, and biogeography of Alabama's freshwater fishes. We thank Rachel Bonner for
984 providing comments on an earlier draft of this manuscript, and we thank Mike Doosey and one
985 anonymous reviewer for input during the review process. We thank William Eschmeyer and
986 Ronald Fricke for providing and constantly updating Eschmeyer's Catalog of Fishes, which was
987 an invaluable resource while developing our checklist. We thank the staff at various institutions
988 in Table 1 that provided data to FishNet2 and we thank the principal investigators Hank Bart, Ed
989 Wiley, and Dave Vieglais and their staff for access to these data, which helped us ensure that our
990 list was based on evidence from voucher specimens. We also thank Jeff Rester for kindly
991 providing access to SEAMAP Gulf of Mexico survey data.

992 **References**

- 993 April, J., Mayden, R.L., Hanner, R.H. & Bernatchez, L. (2011) Genetic calibration of species
994 diversity among North America's freshwater fishes. *Proceedings of the National
995 Academy of Sciences*, 108(26), 10602–10607.
996 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1016437108>
- 997 Arcila, D., Orti, G., Vari, R., Armbruster, J.W., Stiassny, M.L.J., Ko, K.D., Sabaj, M.H.,
998 Lundberg, J., Revell, L.J. & Betancur-R, R. (2017) Genome-wide interrogation advances
999 resolution of recalcitrant groups in the tree of life. *Nature Ecology & Evolution*, 1(2), 1–
1000 10.
1001 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41559-016-0020>
- 1002 Armbruster, J.W. (2012) Standardized measurements, landmarks, and meristic counts for
1003 cypriniform fishes. *Zootaxa*, 3586, 8–16.
- 1004 Artüz, M.L. & Fricke, R. (2019) The marine teleost fishes of the Sea of Marmara; an updated
1005 and annotated checklist. *Zootaxa*, 4565(4), 545–565.
1006 <https://doi.org/10.11646/zootaxa.4565.4.9>
- 1007 Bagley, J.C. (2023) Data for: Marine and freshwater fishes of Alabama: a revised checklist and
1008 discussion of taxonomic issues. [Dataset] *Mendeley* Data accession. Available from:
1009 <https://doi.org/10.17632/5y43cn9x4g.3> (accessed 10 February 2023)

- 1010 Bagley, J.C., Mayden, R.L. & Harris, P.M. (2018) Phylogeny and divergence times of suckers
1011 (Cypriniformes: Catostomidae) inferred from Bayesian total-evidence analyses of
1012 molecules, morphology, and fossils. *PeerJ*, 6, e5168.
1013 <https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.5168>
- 1014 Bagley, J.C., Mayden, R.L., Roe, K.J., Holznagel, W. & Harris, P.M. (2011) Congeneric
1015 phylogeographical sampling reveals polyphyly and novel biodiversity within black basses
1016 (Centrarchidae: *Micropterus*). *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society*, 104(2), 346–
1017 363.
1018 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1095-8312.2011.01720.x>
- 1019 Bailey, R.M., Winn, H.E. & Smith, C.L. (1954) Fishes from the Escambia River, Alabama and
1020 Florida, with ecologic and taxonomic notes. *Proceedings of the Academy of natural
1021 Sciences of Philadelphia*, 106, 109–164.
- 1022 Bailey, R.M., Latta, W.C. & Smith, G.R. (2004) An atlas of Michigan fishes with keys and
1023 illustrations for their identification. *Miscellaneous Publications, Museum of Zoology,
1024 University of Michigan*, 192, 1–215.
- 1025 Baker, W.H., Johnston, C.E. & Folkerts, G.W. (2008) The Alabama bass, *Micropterus henshalli*
1026 (Teleostei: Centrarchidae), from the Mobile River basin. *Zootaxa*, 1861(1), 57–67.
- 1027 Baker, W.H., Blanton, R.E. & Johnston, C.E. (2013) Diversity within the Redeye Bass,
1028 *Micropterus coosae* (Perciformes: Centrarchidae) species group, with descriptions of four
1029 new species. *Zootaxa*, 3635(4), 379–401.
1030 <http://dx.doi.org/10.11646/zootaxa.3635.4.3>
- 1031 Barbour, M.T., Gerritsen, J., Snyder, B.D. & Stribling, J.B. (1999) *Rapid Bioassessment
1032 Protocols for use in Streams and Wadeable Rivers: Periphyton, Benthic
1033 Macroinvertebrates, and Fish*, 2nd Edition. EPA 841-B-99-002, U.S. Environmental
1034 Protection Agency, Office of Water, Washington, D.C..
- 1035 Betancur-R., R., Broughton, R.E., Wiley, E.O., Carpenter, K., López, J.A., Li, C., Holcroft, N.I.,
1036 Arcila, D., Sanciangco, M., Cureton Ii, J.C. & Zhang, F. (2013) The tree of life and a new
1037 classification of bony fishes. *PLoS Currents*, 5.
1038 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/currents.tol.53ba26640df0ccaee75bb165c8c26288>

- 1039 Blum, M.J., Neely, D.A., Harris, P.M. & Mayden, R.L. (2008) Molecular systematics of the
1040 cyprinid genus *Campostoma* (Actinopterygii: Cypriniformes): disassociation between
1041 morphological and mitochondrial differentiation. *Copeia*, 2008(2), 360–369.
1042 <https://doi.org/10.1643/CI-06-093>
- 1043 Boschung Jr., H.T. (1992) Catalog of freshwater and marine fishes of Alabama. *Bulletin of the*
1044 *Alabama Museum of Natural History*, 14, 1–266.
- 1045 Boschung Jr., H.T., Mayden, R.L. (2004) *Fishes of Alabama*. Smithsonian Books, Washington,
1046 D.C., 736 pp.
- 1047 Breiman, L. (2001) Random forests. *Machine Learning*, 45, 5–32.
1048 <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1010933404324>
- 1049 Breitman, M.F., Domingos, F.M.C.B., Bagley, J.C., Wiederhecker, H.C., Ferrari, T.B.,
1050 Cavalcante, V.H., *et al.* (2018) A new species of *Enyalius* (Squamata: Leiosauridae)
1051 endemic to the Brazilian Cerrado. *Herpetologica*, 74(4), 355–369.
1052 <https://doi.org/10.1655/Herpetologica-D-17-00041.1>
- 1053 Brownstein, C.D., Kim, D., Orr, O.D., Hogue, G.M., Tracy, B.H., Pugh, M.W., *et al.* (2022)
1054 Hidden species diversity in an iconic living fossil vertebrate. *Biology Letters*, 18(11),
1055 20220395.
1056 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsbl.2022.0395>
- 1057 Burr, B.M., Eisenhour, D.J. & Grady, J.M. (2005) Two new species of *Noturus* (Siluriformes:
1058 Ictaluridae) from the Tennessee R. drainage: description, distribution, and conservation
1059 status. *Copeia*, 2005(4), 783–802.
1060 [https://doi.org/10.1643/0045-8511\(2005\)005\[0783:TNSONS\]2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1643/0045-8511(2005)005[0783:TNSONS]2.0.CO;2)
- 1061 Caldwell, R.D. (1971) Interpopulation variation in the coldwater darter *Etheostoma ditrema*
1062 Ramsey and Suttkus. In: Abstracts of Papers Presented at the 61st Annual Meeting of the
1063 American Society of Ichthyologists and Herpetologists.
- 1064 Calloway, M.T., Roberts, M.E. & Taylor, C.M. (2017) Temporal and spatial patterns of fish
1065 distribution and diversity in the Noxubee River, Mississippi and Alabama. *Copeia*,
1066 105(1), 100–107.
1067 <https://doi.org/10.1643/CI-16-428>

- 1068 Cashner, M.F., Piller, K.R. & Bart, H.L. (2011) Phylogenetic relationships of the North
1069 American cyprinid subgenus *Hydroplox*. *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, 59(3),
1070 725–735.
1071 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ympev.2011.03.019>
- 1072 Clemmer, G.H. (1971) The systematics and biology of the *Hybopsis amblops* complex. Ph.D.
1073 dissertation, Tulane University, New Orleans, LA.
- 1074 Deng, H. (2013) Guided random forest in the RRF package. *arXiv*, 1306.0237, 1, 1–2.
- 1075 Dimmick, W.W., Fiorino, K.L. & Burr, B.M. (1996) Reevaluation of the *Lythrurus ardens*
1076 (Cypriniformes: Cyprinidae) complex with recognition of three evolutionary species.
1077 *Copeia*, 1996(4), 813–823.
1078 <https://doi.org/10.2307/1447642>
- 1079 Doosey, M.H., Bart Jr., H.L. & Piller, K.R. (2021) Checklist of the inland fishes of Louisiana.
1080 *Southeastern Fishes Council Proceedings*, 1(61)(3), 59–73.
1081 <https://doi.org/10.7290/SFCP>
- 1082 Drymon, J.M., Schweiss, K.E., Seubert, E.A., Lehman, R.N., Daly-Engel, T.S., Pfleger, M. &
1083 Phillips, N.M. (2021) Swimming against the flow—environmental DNA can detect bull
1084 sharks (*Carcharhinus leucas*) across a dynamic deltaic interface. *Ecology and Evolution*,
1085 11(1), 22–28.
1086 <https://doi.org/10.1002/ece3.7101>
- 1087 Eldridge, P.J. (1988) The southeast area monitoring and assessment program (SEAMAP): a
1088 state-federal-university program for collection, management, and dissemination of
1089 fishery-independent data and information in the southeastern United States. *Marine
1090 Fisheries Review*, 50, 29–39
- 1091 Faber, J.E., Rybka, J. & White, M.M. (2009) Intraspecific phylogeography of the stonecat
1092 madtom, *Noturus flavus*. *Copeia*, 2009(3), 563–571.
1093 <https://doi.org/10.1643/CG-08-066>
- 1094 Fick, S.E. & Hijmans, R.J. (2017) WorldClim 2: new 1-km spatial resolution climate surfaces for
1095 global land areas. *International Journal of Climatology*, 37(12), 4302–4315.
1096 <https://doi.org/10.1002/joc.5086>
- 1097 Fluker, B.L., Jones, K.D. & Kuhajda, B.R. (2019) Genetic structure and diversity of the blueface
1098 darter *Etheostoma cyanoprosopum*, a microendemic freshwater fish in the southeastern

- 1099 USA. *Endangered Species Research*, 40, 133–147.
1100 <https://doi.org/10.3354/esr00986>
- 1101 Fricke, R. (Ed.) (2022) Eschmeyer's Catalog of Fishes: References. Online version. Available
1102 from:
1103 <http://researcharchive.calacademy.org/research/ichthyology/catalog/fishcatmain.asp>
1104 (accessed 21 April 2022)
- 1105 Fricke, R., Eschmeyer, W.N. & van der Laan, R. (Eds.) (2022) Eschmeyer's Catalog of Fishes:
1106 Genera, Species, References. Online version. Available from:
1107 <http://researcharchive.calacademy.org/research/ichthyology/catalog/fishcatmain.asp>
1108 (accessed 1 April 2022)
- 1109 Gilbert, C.H. (1884) A list of fishes collected in the East Fork of White River, Indiana, with
1110 descriptions of two new species. *Proceedings of the United States National Museum*,
1111 7(423), 199–205.
- 1112 Gilbert, C.R., Mayden, R.L. & Powers, S.L. (2017) Morphological and genetic evolution in
1113 eastern populations of the *Macrhybopsis aestivalis* complex (Cypriniformes: Cyprinidae),
1114 with the descriptions of four new species. *Zootaxa*, 4247(5), 501–555.
1115 <https://doi.org/10.11646/zootaxa.4247.5.1>
- 1116 Hamer, M., Victor, J. & Smith, G.F. (2012) Best practice guide for compiling, maintaining and
1117 disseminating national species checklists, version 1.0. Global Biodiversity Information
1118 Facility, Copenhagen. Online version. Available from:
1119 http://www.gbif.org/orc/?doc_id=4752 (accessed 1 April 2022)
- 1120 Hartop, E., Srivathsan, A., Ronquist, F. & Meier, R. (2022) Large-scale Integrative Taxonomy
1121 (LIT): resolving the data conundrum for dark taxa. *Systematic Biology*, 71(6), 1404–
1122 1422.
1123 <https://doi.org/10.1093/sysbio/syac033>
- 1124 Hobern, D., Barik, S.K., Christidis, L., T. Garnett, S., Kirk, P., Orrell, T.M., Pape, T., Pyle, R.L.,
1125 Thiele, K.R., Zachos, F.E. & Bánki, O. (2021) Towards a global list of accepted species
1126 VI: The Catalogue of Life checklist. *Organisms Diversity & Evolution*, 21(4), 677–690.
1127 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13127-021-00516-w>

- 1128 Hortal, J., de Bello, F., Diniz-Filho, J.A.F., Lewinsohn, T.M., Lobo, J.M. & Ladle, R.J. (2015)
1129 Seven shortfalls that beset large-scale knowledge of biodiversity. *Annual Review of
1130 Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics*, 46, 523–549.
1131 <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-ecolsys-112414-054400>
- 1132 Hubbs, C.L. & Bailey, R.M. (1940) A revision of the black basses (*Micropterus* and *Huro*) with
1133 descriptions of four new forms. *Miscellaneous Publications of the Museum of Zoology,
1134 University of Michigan*, 48, 1–51.
- 1135 Hubbs, C.L. & Lagler, K.F. (1964) *Fishes of the Great Lakes Region*. University of Michigan
1136 Press, Ann Arbor, MI, 213 pp.
- 1137 Hughes, L.C., Ortí, G., Huang, Y., Sun, Y., Baldwin, C.C., Thompson, A.W., Arcila, D.,
1138 Betancur-R., R., Li, C., Becker, L. & Bellora, N. (2018) Comprehensive phylogeny of
1139 ray-finned fishes (Actinopterygii) based on transcriptomic and genomic data.
1140 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 115(24), 6249–6254.
1141 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1719358115>
- 1142 Jelks, H.L., Walsh, S.J., Burkhead, N.M., Contreras-Balderas, S., Diaz-Pardo, E., Hendrickson,
1143 D.A., Lyons, J., Mandrak, N.E., McCormick, F., Nelson, J.S. & Platania, S.P. (2008)
1144 Conservation status of imperiled North American freshwater and diadromous fishes.
1145 *Fisheries*, 33(8), 372–407.
1146 <https://doi.org/10.1577/1548-8446-33.8.372>
- 1147 Karr, J.R. (1991) Biological integrity: a long-neglected aspect of water resource management.
1148 *Ecological Applications*, 1(1), 66–84.
1149 <https://doi.org/10.2307/1941848>
- 1150 Keck, B.P. & Near, T.J. (2008) Assessing phylogenetic resolution among mitochondrial, nuclear,
1151 and morphological datasets in *Nothonotus* darters (Teleostei: Percidae). *Molecular
1152 Phylogenetics and Evolution*, 46(2), 708–720.
1153 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ympev.2007.08.015>
- 1154 Keck, B.P. & Near, T.J. (2010) Geographic and temporal aspects of mitochondrial replacement
1155 in *Nothonotus* darters (Teleostei: Percidae: Etheostomatinae). *Evolution*, 64(5), 1410–
1156 1428.
1157 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1558-5646.2009.00901.x>

- 1158 Kim, D., Bauer, B.H. & Near, T.J. (2022a) Introgression and species delimitation in the longear
1159 sunfish *Lepomis megalotis* (Teleostei: Percomorpha: Centrarchidae). *Systematic Biology*,
1160 71(2), 273–285.
1161 <https://doi.org/10.1093/sysbio/syab029>
- 1162 Kim, D., Taylor, A.T. & Near, T.J. (2022b) Phylogenomics and species delimitation of the
1163 economically important Black Basses (*Micropterus*). *Scientific Reports*, 12(1), 1–14.
1164 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-022-11743-2>
- 1165 Kozal, L.C., Simmons, J.W., Mollish, J.M., MacGuigan, D.J., Benavides, E., Keck, B.P. & Near,
1166 T.J. (2017) Phylogenetic and morphological diversity of the *Etheostoma zonistium*
1167 species complex with the description of a new species endemic to the Cumberland
1168 Plateau of Alabama. *Bulletin of the Peabody Museum of Natural History*, 58(2), 263–286.
1169 <https://doi.org/10.3374/014.058.0202>
- 1170 Kuhajda, B.R., George, A.L. & Chance, S. (2016) Recovery implementation strategy: Chucky
1171 Madtom (*Noturus crypticus*). U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (see Supplemental Material,
1172 Reference S2), Washington, D.C.
- 1173 Kuhajda, B.R. & Mayden, R.L. (1995) Discovery of a new species of snubnose darter (Percidae,
1174 *Etheostoma*) endemic to the Cumberland Plateau in Alabama. *Association of
1175 Southeastern Biologists Bulletin*, 42, 111–112.
- 1176 Lacefield, J. (2013) *Lost Worlds in Alabama Rocks: A Guide to the State's Ancient Life and
1177 Landscapes*, Revised Edition. Alabama Geological Society, Tuscaloosa, AL.
- 1178 Lang, N.J., Roe, K.J., Renaud, C.B., Gill, H.S., Potter, I.C., Freyhof, J., Naseka, A.M., Cochran,
1179 P., Pérez, H.E., Habit, E.M., Kuhajda, B.R., Neely, D.A., Reshetnikov, Y.S., Salnikov,
1180 V.B., Stoumboudi, M.T. & Mayden, R.L. (2009) Novel relationships among lampreys
1181 (Petromyzontiformes) revealed by a taxonomically comprehensive molecular data set. In:
1182 Brown, L.R., Chase, S.D., Mesa, M.G., Beamish, R.J. & Moyle, P.B. (Eds.) *Biology,
1183 Management, and Conservation of Lampreys in North America*, American Fisheries
1184 Society Symposium 72, pp. 41–55.
- 1185 Last, P.R., Naylor, G.J. & Manjaji-Matsumoto, B.M. (2016) A revised classification of the
1186 family Dasyatidae (Chondrichthyes: Myliobatiformes) based on new morphological and
1187 molecular insights. *Zootaxa*, 4139(3), 345–368.
1188 <http://doi.org/10.11646/zootaxa.4139.3.2>

- 1189 Lomolino, M.V. (2004) Conservation biogeography. In: Lomolino, M.V. & Heaney, L.R. (Eds.)
1190 *Frontiers of Biogeography: New Directions in the Geography of Nature*. Sinauer
1191 Associates, Sunderland, MA, pp. 293–296.
- 1192 Lydeard, C. & Mayden, R.L. (1995) A diverse and endangered aquatic ecosystem of the
1193 southeast United States. *Conservation Biology*, 9(4), 800–805.
- 1194 McBride, R.S., Rocha, C.R., Ruiz-Caruso, R. & Bowen, B. (2010) A new species of ladyfish, of
1195 the genus *Elops* (Elopiformes: Elopidae), from the western Atlantic Ocean. *Zootaxa*,
1196 2346(1), 29–41.
- 1197 MacGuigan, D.J. & Near, T.J. (2019) Phylogenomic signatures of ancient introgression in a
1198 rogue lineage of darters (Teleostei: Percidae). *Systematic Biology*, 68(2), 329–346.
1199 <https://doi.org/10.1093/sysbio/syy074>
- 1200 Manooch, C.S. (1984) *Fisherman's Guide: Fishes of the Southeastern United States*. North
1201 Carolina State Museum of Natural History, Raleigh, NC, 372 pp.
- 1202 Mayden, R.L. & Allen, J.S. (2015) Molecular systematics of the phoxinin genus *Pteronotropis*
1203 (Otophysi: Cypriniformes). *BioMed Research International*, 2015, 298658.
1204 <https://doi.org/10.1155/2015/298658>
- 1205 Mayden, R.L., Knott, K.E., Clabaugh, J.P., Kuhajda, B.R. & Lang, N.J. (2005) Systematics and
1206 population genetics of the coldwater (*Etheostoma ditrema*) and watercress (*Etheostoma*
1207 *nuchale*) darters, with comments on the Gulf darter (*Etheostoma swaini*) (Percidae:
1208 subgenus *Oligocephalus*). *Biochemical Systematics and Ecology*, 33, 455–478.
1209 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bse.2004.11.006>
- 1210 Mayden, R.L. & Kuhajda, B.R. (1989) Systematics of *Notropis cahabae*, a new cyprinid fish
1211 endemic to the Cahaba River of the Mobile Basin. *Bulletin of the Alabama Museum of*
1212 *Natural History*, 9, 1–16.
- 1213 Mettee, M.F. (2008) Fishes of Alabama. *Encyclopedia of Alabama*. Online resource. Available
1214 from: <http://encyclopediaofalabama.org/Article/h-1586> (accessed 21 April 2022)
- 1215 Mettee, M.F., O'Neil, P.E. & Pierson, J.M. (1996) *Fishes of Alabama and the Mobile Basin*.
1216 Oxmoor House, Birmingham, AL.
- 1217 Mettee, M.F., O'Neil, P.E., Suttkus, R.D. & Pierson, J.M. (1987) Fishes of the lower Tombigbee
1218 River system in Alabama and Mississippi. *Geological Survey of Alabama Bulletin*, 107,
1219 1–186.

- 1220 Mirande, J.M. (2017) Combined phylogeny of ray-finned fishes (Actinopterygii) and the use of
1221 morphological characters in large-scale analyses. *Cladistics*, 33(4), 333–350.
1222 <https://doi.org/10.1111/cla.12171>
- 1223 Moritz, C. (1994) Defining ‘evolutionarily significant units’ for conservation. *Trends in Ecology
1224 & Evolution*, 9(10), 373–375.
- 1225 Morton, T. (1989) Species Profile: Life Histories and Environmental Requirements of Coastal
1226 Fishes and Invertebrates (mid-Atlantic): Bay Anchovy. US Fish and Wildlife Service
1227 Biological Report, 82(11.97), 1–13.
- 1228 Naseka, A.M. & Renaud, C.B. (2020) Morphology-based taxonomic re-assessment of the Arctic
1229 lamprey, *Lethenteron camtschaticum* (Tilesius, 1811) and taxonomic position of other
1230 members of the genus. *ZooKeys*, 991, 1–67.
1231 <https://doi.org/10.3897%2Fzookeys.991.54938>
- 1232 NatureServe (2013a) *Cottus chattahoochee*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2013:
1233 e.T202657A15363801. Available from: [https://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2013-
1.RLTS.T202657A15363801.en](https://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2013-
1234 1.RLTS.T202657A15363801.en) (accessed 14 May 2022)
- 1235 NatureServe (2013b) *Noturus crypticus*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2013:
1236 e.T202682A19035273. Available from: [https://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2013-
1.RLTS.T202682A19035273.en](https://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2013-
1237 1.RLTS.T202682A19035273.en) (accessed on 5 April 2022)
- 1238 NatureServe (2013c) *Percina kusha*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2013:
1239 e.T202581A19032676. Available from: [https://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2013-
1.RLTS.T202581A19032676.en](https://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2013-
1240 1.RLTS.T202581A19032676.en) (accessed on 14 May 2022)
- 1241 NatureServe (2013d) *Percina sipsi*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2013:
1242 e.T202594A19033831. Available from: [https://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2013-
1.RLTS.T202594A19033831.en](https://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2013-
1243 1.RLTS.T202594A19033831.en) (accessed on 14 May 2022)
- 1244 NatureServe (2013e) *Percina smithvanizi*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2013:
1245 e.T202595A19033701. Available from: [https://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2013-
1.RLTS.T202595A19033701.en](https://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2013-
1246 1.RLTS.T202595A19033701.en) (accessed on 14 May 2022)
- 1247 Near, T.J. & Keck, B.P. (2005) Dispersal, vicariance, and timing of diversification in *Nothonotus*
1248 darters. *Molecular Ecology*, 14(11), 3485–3496.
1249 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-294X.2005.02671.x>

- 1250 Near, T.J., Bossu, C.M., Bradburd, G.S., Carlson, R.L., Harrington, R.C., Hollingsworth Jr.,
1251 P.R., Keck, B.P. & Etnier, D.A. (2011) Phylogeny and temporal diversification of darters
1252 (Percidae: Etheostomatinae). *Systematic Biology*, 60(5), 565–595.
1253 <https://doi.org/10.1093/sysbio/syr052>
- 1254 Neely, D.A., Williams, J.D. & Mayden, R.L. (2007) Two new sculpins of the genus *Cottus*
1255 (Teleostei: Cottidae) from rivers of eastern North America. *Copeia*, 2007(3), 641–655.
1256 [https://doi.org/10.1643/0045-8511\(2007\)2007\[641:TNSOTG\]2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1643/0045-8511(2007)2007[641:TNSOTG]2.0.CO;2)
- 1257 Padial, J.M., Miralles, A., De la Riva, I. & Vences, M. (2010) The integrative future of
1258 taxonomy. *Frontiers in Zoology*, 7(1), 1–14.
1259 <https://doi.org/10.1186/1742-9994-7-16>
- 1260 Page, L.M. (1983) *Handbook of Darters*. T.F.H. Publications, Neptune City, NJ, 272 pp.
- 1261 Page, L.M. & Burr, B.M. (1991) *A Field Guide to Freshwater Fishes of North America north of*
1262 *Mexico*. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, Boston, MA, 448 pp.
- 1263 Page, L.M. & Burr, B.M. (2011) *A Field Guide to Freshwater Fishes of North America north of*
1264 *Mexico*. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, Boston, MA, 663 pp.
- 1265 Page, L.M., Espinosa-Pérez, H., Findley, L.D., Gilbert, C.R., Lea, R.N., Mandrak, N.E., Mayden,
1266 R.L. & Nelson, J.S. (2013) *Common and Scientific Names of Fishes from the United*
1267 *States, Canada, and Mexico*, Seventh Edition. American Fisheries Society, Special
1268 Publication 34, 384 pp.
- 1269 Page, L.M., MacFadden, B.J., Fortes, J.A., Soltis, P.A. & Riccardi, G. (2015) Digitization of
1270 biodiversity collections reveals biggest data on biodiversity. *BioScience*, 65(9), 841–842.
1271 <https://doi.org/10.1093/biosci/biv104>
- 1272 Pera, T.P. & Armbruster, J.W. (2006) A new species of *Notropis* (Cypriniformes: Cyprinidae)
1273 from the southeastern United States. *Copeia*, 2006(3), 423–430.
1274 [https://doi.org/10.1643/0045-8511\(2006\)2006\[423:ANSONC\]2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1643/0045-8511(2006)2006[423:ANSONC]2.0.CO;2)
- 1275 Pereira, A.M., Levy, A., Vukić, J., Šanda, R., Levin, B.A., Freyhof, J., Geiger, M., Choleva, L.,
1276 Francisco, S.M. & Robalo, J.I. (2021) Putting European lampreys into perspective: a
1277 global-scale multilocus phylogeny with a proposal for a generic structure of the
1278 Petromyzontidae. *Journal of Zoological Systematics and Evolutionary Research*, 59(8),
1279 1982–1993.
1280 <https://doi.org/10.1111/jzs.12522>

- 1281 Potter, I.C. & Gill, H.S. (2003) Adaptive radiation of lampreys. *Journal of Great Lakes*
1282 *Research*, 29, 95–112.
1283 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0380-1330\(03\)70480-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0380-1330(03)70480-8)
- 1284 Porter, T.M. & Hajibabaei, M. (2018) Scaling up: a guide to high-throughput genomic
1285 approaches for biodiversity analysis. *Molecular Ecology*, 27(2), 313–338.
1286 <https://doi.org/10.1111/mec.14478>
- 1287 Renaud, C.B. (1997) Conservation status of northern hemisphere lampreys (Petromyzontidae).
1288 *Journal of Applied Ichthyology*, 13(3), 143–148.
1289 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1439-0426.1997.tb00114.x>
- 1290 Robins, R.H., Page, L.M., Williams, J.D., Randall, Z.S. & Sheehy, G.E. (2018) *Fishes in the*
1291 *Fresh Waters of Florida: An Identification Guide and Atlas*. University of Florida Press,
1292 Gainesville, FL, 447 pp.
- 1293 Robins, C.R. & Ray, G.C. (1986) *A Field Guide to Atlantic Coast Fishes: North America* (Vol.
1294 32). Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, New York, NY, 354 pp.
- 1295 Robison, H.W. & Buchanan, T.M. (2020) *Fishes of Arkansas*. University of Arkansas Press,
1296 Fayetteville, AR, 994 pp.
- 1297 Ryder, O.A. (1986) Species conservation and systematics: the dilemma of subspecies. *Trends in*
1298 *Ecology & Evolution*, 1, 9–10.
1299 [https://doi.org/10.1016/0169-5347\(86\)90059-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0169-5347(86)90059-5)
- 1300 Sabaj, M.H. (2020) Codes for Natural History Collections in Ichthyology and Herpetology.
1301 *Copeia*, 108(3), 593–669. <https://doi.org/10.1643/ASIHCODONS2020>
- 1302 Sabaj, M.H. (2022) Codes for Natural History Collections in Ichthyology and Herpetology
1303 (online supplement). Version 9.0 (14 February 2022). Available from: <https://asih.org>,
1304 American Society of Ichthyologists and Herpetologists, Washington, D.C.
- 1305 Schönhuth, S., Vukic, J., Sanda, R., Yang, L. & Mayden, R.L. (2018) Phylogenetic relationships
1306 and classification of the Holarctic family Leuciscidae (Cypriniformes: Cyprinoidei).
1307 *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, 127(5), 781–799.
1308 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ympev.2018.06.026>
- 1309 Smith, D.G. (2012) A checklist of the moray eels of the world (Teleostei: Anguilliformes:
1310 Muraenidae). *Zootaxa*, 3474(1), 1–64.
1311 <https://doi.org/10.11646/zootaxa.3474.1.1>

- 1312 Smith-Vaniz, W.F. (1968) *Freshwater Fishes of Alabama*. Auburn University Agricultural
1313 Experimental Station, Auburn, AL, 211 pp.
- 1314 Snelson Jr, F.F., Williams-Hooper, S.E. & Schmid, T.H. (1988) Reproduction and ecology of the
1315 Atlantic stingray, *Dasyatis sabina*, in Florida coastal lagoons. *Copeia*, 1988, 729–739.
1316 <https://doi.org/10.2307/1445395>
- 1317 Soares, Y.F.F., Aquino, P.P.U., Bagley, J.C., Langeani, F. & Colli, G.R. (2021) Two new species
1318 of *Hypostomus* suckermouth armored catfishes (Teleostei: Loricariidae) from Central
1319 Brazil. *Journal of Fish Biology*, 99(3), 905–920.
1320 <https://doi.org/10.1111/jfb.14777>
- 1321 Song, C.B., Near, T.J. & Page, L.M. (1998) Phylogenetic relations among percid fishes as
1322 inferred from mitochondrial cytochrome *b* DNA sequence data. *Molecular Phylogenetics*
1323 and *Evolution*, 10(3), 343–353.
1324 <https://doi.org/10.1006/mpev.1998.0542>
- 1325 Southeastern Fishes Council (SFC) (2022) Southeastern Fishes Council List of Fishes. Available
1326 from: <https://sfc8.wildapricot.org/Fishes> (accessed 16 June 2022)
- 1327 Stout, C., Schönhuth, S., Mayden, R., Garrison, N.L. & Armbruster, J.W. (2022) Phylogenomics
1328 and classification of *Notropis* and related shiners (Cypriniformes: Leuciscidae) and the
1329 utility of exon capture on lower taxonomic groups. *PeerJ*, 10, e14072.
1330 <https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.14072>
- 1331 Straight, C.A., Albanese, B. & Freeman, B.J. (2021) *Fishes of Georgia*. Georgia Museum of
1332 Natural History [Online]. Available from: <http://fishesofgeorgia.uga.edu> (accessed 17
1333 April 2022)
- 1334 Tan, M. & Armbruster, J.W. (2018) Phylogenetic classification of extant genera of fishes of the
1335 order Cypriniformes (Teleostei: Ostariophysi). *Zootaxa*, 4476(1), 6–39.
1336 <https://doi.org/10.11646/zootaxa.4476.1.4>
- 1337 Thomerson, J.E., Thorson, T.B. & Hempel, R.L. (1977) The bull shark, *Carcharhinus leucas*,
1338 from the upper Mississippi River, near Alton, Illinois. *Copeia*, 1977, 166–168.
- 1339 Thorson, T.B. (1971) Movement of bull sharks, *Carcharhinus leucas*, between Caribbean Sea
1340 and Lake Nicaragua demonstrated by tagging. *Copeia*, 1971(2), 336–338.
1341 <https://doi.org/10.2307/1442846>

- 1342 Tringali, M.D., Strickland, P.A., Krause, R.A., Seyoun, S., Barthel, B.L., Alvarez, A. &
1343 Puchulutegui, C. (2015) Conservation status of Shoal Bass in the Chipola River, Florida:
1344 the threat of hybridization with native and nonnative congeners. In: Tringali, M.D., Long,
1345 J.M., Birdsong, T.W. & Allen, M.S. (Eds.) *Black Bass Diversity: Multidisciplinary*
1346 *Science for Conservation*. American Fisheries Society Symposium 82, Bethesda, MD, pp.
1347 523–536.
- 1348 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) (2011) Endangered status for the Cumberland darter,
1349 rush darter, yellowcheek darter, chucky madtom, and laurel dace. *Federal Register* 76,
1350 48722–48741.
- 1351 Utter, P.S. (1984) A taxonomic review of the darters referred to *Etheostoma swaini* and *E.*
1352 *ditrema* (Pisces: Percidae) in the Coosa–Alabama River Drainage. M.Sc. Thesis, Auburn
1353 University, Auburn, AL.
- 1354 Valentini, A., Taberlet, P., Miaud, C., Civade, R., Herder, J., Thomsen, P.F., Bellemain, E.,
1355 Besnard, A., Coissac, E., Boyer, F. & Gaboriaud, C. (2016) Next-generation monitoring
1356 of aquatic biodiversity using environmental DNA metabarcoding. *Molecular Ecology*,
1357 25(4), 929–942.
1358 <https://doi.org/10.1111/mec.13428>
- 1359 van der Laan, R., Fricke, R. & Eschmeyer, W.N. (Eds.) (2023) Eschmeyer's Catalog of Fishes:
1360 Classification. Online version. Available from:
1361 <http://www.calacademy.org/scientists/catalog-of-fishes-classification/> (accessed 10 July
1362 2023)
- 1363 Vladkov, V.D. & Kott, E. (1979) List of Northern Hemisphere lampreys (Petromyzontidae) and
1364 their distribution. *Miscellaneous Special Publication* 42, *Department of Fisheries and*
1365 *Oceans, Ottawa*, 1–30.
- 1366 Wang, Q., Dizaj, L.P., Huang, J., Sarker, K.K., Kevrekidis, C., Reichenbacher, B., Esmaeili,
1367 H.R., Straube, N., Moritz, T. & Li, C. (2022) Molecular phylogenetics of the
1368 Clupeiformes based on exon-capture data and a new classification of the order.
1369 *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, 175, 107590.
1370 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ympev.2022.107590>
- 1371 Warren Jr., M.L., Burr, B.M., Walsh, S.J., Bart Jr, H.L., Cashner, R.C., Etnier, D.A., Freeman,
1372 B.J., Kuhajda, B.R., Mayden, R.L., Robison, H.W. & Ross, S.T. (2000) Diversity,

- 1373 distribution, and conservation status of the native freshwater fishes of the southern United
1374 States. *Fisheries*, 25(10), 7–31.
- 1375 [https://doi.org/10.1577/1548-8446\(2000\)025%3C0007:DDACSO%3E2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1577/1548-8446(2000)025%3C0007:DDACSO%3E2.0.CO;2)
- 1376 Weigt, L.A., Baldwin, C.C., Driskell, A., Smith, D.G., Ormos, A. & Reyier, E.A. (2012) Using
1377 DNA barcoding to assess Caribbean reef fish biodiversity: expanding taxonomic and
1378 geographic coverage. *PLoS One*, 7(7), e41059.
1379 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0041059>
- 1380 Werneke, D.C. & Armbruster, J.W. (2015) Silversides of the genus *Labidesthes* (Atheriniformes:
1381 Atherinopsidae). *Zootaxa*, 4032(5), 535–550.
1382 <https://doi.org/10.11646/zootaxa.4032.5.4>
- 1383 Whittaker, R.J., Araújo, M.B., Paul, J., Ladle, R.J., Watson, J.E.M. & Willis, K.J. (2005)
1384 Conservation biogeography: assessment and prospect. *Diversity and Distributions*, 11, 3–
1385 23.
1386 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1366-9516.2005.00143.x>
- 1387 Williams, J.D., Neely, D.A., Walsh, S.J. & Burkhead, N.M. (2007) Three new percid fishes
1388 (Percidae: *Percina*) from the Mobile Basin drainage of Alabama, Georgia, and
1389 Tennessee. *Zootaxa*, 1549, 1–28.

1390 **Tables**

1391 **TABLE 1.** List of 37 partner institutions that provided data to FishNet2 that were used in the present study, along with their symbolic
1392 codes (Sabaj 2020, 2022), and the number of records (lots) from Alabama. Summary data shown here were calculated after removing
1393 a large set of over 2000 Tombigbee River records from Mississippi in order to focus on material sampled primarily from Alabama.

Ichthyological Collection	Symbolic Code	No. Records
University of Alabama Ichthyological Collection	UA	55935
Auburn University Museum of Natural History	AUM	34147
Tulane University Museum of Natural History - Royal D. Suttkus Fish Collection	TU	25749
University of Michigan Museum of Zoology	UMMZ	4352
Florida Museum of Natural History	UF	3704
National Museum of Natural History, Smithsonian Institution	USNM	2940
Mississippi Museum of Natural Science	MMNS	2706
Cornell University Museum of Vertebrates	CUMV	2387
Texas A&M University Biodiversity Research and Teaching Collection	TCWC	1603
Illinois Natural History Survey	INHS	1583
University of Washington Fish Collection	UWFC	1476

Yale University Peabody Museum	YPM	1071
Ohio State University - Fish Division	OSUM	706
Academy of Natural Sciences at Philadelphia	ANSP	546
University of Kansas Biodiversity Institute - Specimens	KU	527
University of Kansas Biodiversity Institute - Tissues	KU	392
Harvard University	MCZ	368
Royal Ontario Museum	ROM	210
California Academy of Sciences	CAS	175
Field Museum	FMNH	151
North Carolina State Museum of Natural Sciences	NCSM	133
Texas Natural History Science Center - Texas Natural History Collections	TNHC	129
Louisiana State University Museum of Zoology	LSUMZ	120
Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission	FSBC	111
University of Tennessee - Etnier Ichthyological Research Collection	UT	75
Los Angeles County Museum of Natural History	LACM	74
Canadian Museum of Nature	CMN	61

Michigan State University Museum	MSUM	58
Museum of Southwestern Biology	MSB	16
Sam Noble Oklahoma Museum of Natural History	SNM	14
Fort Hays Sternberg Museum of Natural History	FHSM	11
Swedish Museum of Natural History	NRM	11
University of Alberta Museums	UAMZ	8
Oregon State University	OS	7
Scripps Institute of Oceanography	SIO	6
GBIF–Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle	MNHN	5
University of Colorado Museum of Natural History	UCM	2

1395 **TABLE 2.** Checklist of marine and freshwater fishes known from inland and coastal waters of the state of Alabama and the Mobile
1396 River Basin. Following the order and family names, each species scientific name and author(s) is given along with its Common Name,
1397 Status (in Alabama), and Habitat details. Evolutionarily significant unit (ESU) names represent candidate species, modified after data
1398 from the Southeastern Fishes Council (SFC 2022). Abbreviations: Exstate, extirpated from the state; F, freshwater; I, introduced
1399 species; M, marine; N, native; N/A, not applicable (no state status because species does not occur within state borders); Reint,
1400 reintroduced in state.

Taxon	Common Name	Status	Habitat
Order Petromyzontiformes			
Petromyzontidae Bonaparte 1831—Lampreys			
<i>Ichthyomyzon bdellium</i> (Jordan 1885)	Ohio Lamprey	N	F
<i>Ichthyomyzon castaneus</i> Girard 1858	Chestnut Lamprey	N	F
<i>Ichthyomyzon gagei</i> Hubbs & Trautman 1937	Southern Brook Lamprey	N	F
<i>Ichthyomyzon greeleyi</i> Hubbs & Trautman 1937	Mountain Brook Lamprey	N	F
<i>Lampetra aepyptera</i> (Abbott 1860)	Least Brook Lamprey	N	F
<i>Lethenteron appendix</i> (DeKay 1842)	American Brook Lamprey	N	F
Order Orectolobiformes			
Ginglymostomatidae Gill 1862—Nurse sharks			

<i>Ginglymostoma cirratum</i> (Bonnaterre 1788)	Nurse Shark	N	M
Order Carcharhiniformes			
Triakidae Gray 1851 —Houndsharks			
<i>Mustelus canis</i> (Mitchill 1815)	Smooth Dogfish	N	M
Carcharhinidae Jordan & Evermann 1896 —Requiem sharks			
<i>Carcharhinus acronotus</i> (Poey 1860)	Blacknose Shark	N	M
<i>Carcharhinus brevipinna</i> (Valenciennes 1839)	Spinner Shark	N	M
<i>Carcharhinus isodon</i> (Valenciennes 1839)	Finetooth Shark	N	M
<i>Carcharhinus leucas</i> (Valenciennes 1839)	Bull Shark	N	F, M
<i>Carcharhinus limbatus</i> (Valenciennes 1839)	Blacktip Shark	N	M
<i>Carcharhinus plumbeus</i> (Nardo 1827)	Sandbar Shark	N	M
<i>Rhizoprionodon terraenovae</i> (Richardson 1836)	Atlantic Sharpnose Shark	N	M
Galeocerdonidae Poey 1875 —Tiger sharks			
<i>Galeocerdo cuvier</i> (Péron & Lesueur 1822)	Tiger Shark	N	F, M
Sphyrnidae Bonaparte 1840 —Hammerhead sharks			
<i>Sphyrna lewini</i> (Griffith & Smith 1834)	Scalloped Hammerhead	N	M
<i>Sphyrna mokarran</i> (Rüppell 1837)	Great Hammerhead	N	M

<i>Sphyrna tiburo</i> (Linnaeus 1758)	Bonnethead	N	M
Order Myliobatiformes			
Dasyatidae Jordan & Gilbert 1879 —Whiptail stingrays			
<i>Hypanus americanus</i> (Hildebrand & Schroeder 1928)	Southern Stingray	N	M
<i>Hypanus sabinus</i> (Lesueur 1824)	Atlantic Stingray	N	F, M
<i>Hypanus say</i> (Lesueur 1817)	Bluntnose Stingray	N	M
Rhinopteridae Jordan & Evermann 1896 —Cownose rays			
<i>Rhinoptera bonasus</i> (Mitchill 1815)	Cownose Ray	N	M
Mobulidae Gill 1893 —Mantas or devil rays			
<i>Mobula birostris</i> (Walbaum 1792)	Giant Manta	N	M
Order Acipenseriformes			
Acipenseridae Bonaparte 1831 —Sturgeons			
<i>Acipenser fulvescens</i> Rafinesque 1817	Lake Sturgeon	Reint	F
<i>Acipenser desotoi</i> Vladykov 1955	Gulf Sturgeon	N	F, M
<i>Scaphirhynchus platorynchus</i> (Rafinesque 1820)	Shovelnose Sturgeon	Exstate	F
<i>Scaphirhynchus suttkusi</i> Williams & Clemmer 1991	Alabama Sturgeon	N	F
Polyodontidae Bonaparte 1835 —Paddlefishes			

<i>Polyodon spathula</i> (Walbaum 1792)	Paddlefish	N	F
Order Amiiformes			
Amiidae Bonaparte 1831 —Bowfins			
<i>Amia calva</i> Linnaeus 1766	Bowfin	N	F
<i>Amia ocellicauda</i> Todd in Richardson 1836	Emerald Bowfin	N	F
Order Lepisosteiformes			
Lepisosteidae Agassiz 1832 —Gars			
<i>Atractosteus spatula</i> (Lacepède 1803)	Alligator Gar	N	F
<i>Lepisosteus oculatus</i> Winchell 1864	Spotted Gar	N	F
<i>Lepisosteus osseus</i> (Linnaeus 1758)	Longnose Gar	N	F
<i>Lepisosteus platostomus</i> Rafinesque 1820	Shortnose Gar	Exstinct	F
Order Elopiformes			
Elopidae Valenciennes 1847 —Tenpounders and ladyfishes			
<i>Elops saurus</i> Linnaeus 1766	Ladyfish	N	F, M
Megalopidae Jordan & Gilbert 1883 —Tarpons			
<i>Megalops atlanticus</i> Valenciennes 1847	Tarpon	N	M
Order Anguilliformes			

Anguillidae Linnaeus 1758—Freshwater eels

Anguilla rostrata (Lesueur 1817) American Eel N F, M

Ophichthidae Günther 1870—Snake eels and worm eels

Myrophis punctatus Lütken 1852 Speckled Worm Eel N M

Ophichthus gomesii (Castelnau 1855) Shrimp Eel N M

Ophichthus rex Böhlke & Caruso 1980 King Snake Eel N M

Order Hiodontiformes

Hiodontidae Valenciennes 1847—Mooneyes

Hiodon alosoides (Rafinesque 1819) Goldeye Exstate F

Hiodon tergisus Lesueur 1818 Mooneye N F

Order Clupeiformes

Alosidae Svetovidov 1952—Shads and sardines

Alosa aestivalis (Mitchill 1814) Blueback Herring I F, M

Alosa alabamae Jordan & Evermann 1896 Alabama Shad N F, M

Alosa chrysocloris (Rafinesque 1820) Skipjack Herring N F, M

Brevoortia patronus Goode 1878 Gulf Menhaden N F, M

Dorosomatidae Gill 1861—Thread herrings

<i>Dorosoma cepedianum</i> (Lesueur 1818)	Gizzard Shad	N	F, M
<i>Dorosoma petenense</i> (Günther 1867)	Threadfin Shad	N	F, M
<i>Harengula jaguana</i> Poey 1865	Scaled Herring	N	M
Engraulidae Gill 1861—Anchovies			
<i>Anchoa hepsetus</i> (Linnaeus 1758)	Striped Anchovy	N	M
<i>Anchoa lyolepis</i> (Evermann & Marsh 1900)	Dusky Anchovy	N	M
<i>Anchoa mitchilli</i> (Valenciennes 1848)	Bay Anchovy	N	F, M
Order Cypriniformes			
Cyprinidae Rafinesque 1815—Carps			
<i>Carassius auratus</i> (Linnaeus 1758)	Goldfish	I	F
<i>Cyprinus carpio</i> Linnaeus 1758	Common Carp	I	F
Xenocyprididae Günther 1868—East Asian minnows or sharpbellies			
<i>Ctenopharyngodon idella</i> (Valenciennes 1844)	Grass Carp	I	F
<i>Hypophthalmichthys molitrix</i> (Valenciennes 1844)	Silver Carp	I	F
<i>Hypophthalmichthys nobilis</i> (Richardson 1845)	Bighead Carp	I	F
Leuciscidae Bonaparte 1835—Minnows			
<i>Alburnops asperifrons</i> (Suttkus & Raney 1955)	Burrhead Shiner	N	F

<i>Alburnops baileyi</i> (Suttkus & Raney 1955)	Rough Shiner	N	F
<i>Alburnops candidus</i> (Suttkus 1980)	Silverside Shiner	N	F
<i>Alburnops chalybaeus</i> (Cope 1867)	Ironcolor Shiner	N	F
<i>Alburnops edwardraneyi</i> (Suttkus & Clemmer 1968)	Fluvial Shiner	N	F
<i>Alburnops hypsilepis</i> (Suttkus & Raney 1955)	Hightscale Shiner	N	F
<i>Alburnops petersoni</i> (Fowler 1942)	Coastal Shiner	N	F
<i>Alburnops texanus</i> (Girard 1856)	Weed Shiner	N	F
<i>Alburnops xaenocephalus</i> (Jordan 1877)	Coosa Shiner	N	F
<i>Campostoma oligolepis</i> Hubbs & Greene 1935	Largescale Stoneroller	N	F
<i>Campostoma pauciradii</i> Burr & Cashner 1983	Bluefin Stoneroller	N	F
<i>Chrosomus erythrogaster</i> (Rafinesque 1820)	Southern Redbelly Dace	N	F
<i>Clinostomus funduloides</i> Girard 1856	Rosyside Dace	N	F
<i>Coccotis coccogenis</i> (Cope 1868)	Warpaint Shiner	N	F
<i>Coccotis zonistius</i> (Jordan 1880)	Bandfin Shiner	N	F
<i>Cyprinella caerulea</i> (Jordan 1877)	Blue Shiner	N	F
<i>Cyprinella callistia</i> (Jordan 1877)	Alabama Shiner	N	F
<i>Cyprinella callitaenia</i> (Bailey & Gibbs 1956)	Bluestripe Shiner	N	F

<i>Cyprinella galactura</i> (Cope 1868)	Whitetail Shiner	N	F
<i>Cyprinella gibbsi</i> (Howell & Williams 1971)	Tallapoosa Shiner	N	F
<i>Cyprinella lutrensis</i> (Baird & Girard 1853)	Red Shiner	I	F
<i>Cyprinella spiloptera</i> (Cope 1867)	Spotfin Shiner	N	F
<i>Cyprinella trichroistia</i> (Jordan & Gilbert 1878)	Tricolor Shiner	N	F
<i>Cyprinella venusta</i> Girard 1856	Blacktail Shiner	N	F
<i>Cyprinella whipplei</i> Girard 1856	Steelcolor Shiner	N	F
<i>Ericymba amplamala</i> Pera & Armbruster 2006	Longjaw Minnow	N	F
<i>Erimonax monachus</i> (Cope 1868)	Spotfin Chub	Reint	F
<i>Erimystax dissimilis</i> (Kirtland 1840)	Streamline Chub	N	F
<i>Erimystax insignis</i> (Hubbs & Crowe 1956)	Blotched Chub	N	F
<i>Hemitremia flammea</i> (Jordan & Gilbert 1878)	Flame Chub	N	F
<i>Hybognathus hayi</i> Jordan 1885	Cypress Minnow	N	F
<i>Hybognathus nuchalis</i> Agassiz 1855	Mississippi Silvery Minnow	N	F
<i>Hybopsis amblops</i> (Rafinesque 1820)	Bigeye Chub	N	F
<i>Hybopsis lineapunctata</i> Clemmer & Suttkus 1971	Lined Chub	N	F
<i>Hybopsis winchelli</i> Girard 1856	Clear Chub	N	F

<i>Hybopsis</i> sp. cf. <i>winchelli</i>	“Coastal Chub”	N	F
<i>Hydrophlox chrosomus</i> (Jordan 1877)	Rainbow Shiner	N	F
<i>Hydrophlox lutipinnis</i> Jordan & Brayton 1878	Yellowfin Shiner	N/A	F
<i>Luxilus chrysocephalus</i> Rafinesque 1820	Striped Shiner	N	F
<i>Lythrurus alegnotus</i> (Snelson 1972)	Warrior Shiner	N	F
<i>Lythrurus atrapiculus</i> (Snelson 1972)	Blacktip Shiner	N	F
<i>Lythrurus bellus</i> (Hay 1881)	Pretty Shiner	N	F
<i>Lythrurus fasciolaris</i> (Gilbert 1891)	Scarlet Shiner	N	F
<i>Lythrurus fumeus</i> (Evermann 1892)	Ribbon Shiner	N	F
<i>Lythrurus lirus</i> (Jordan 1877)	Mountain Shiner	N	F
<i>Lythrurus roseipinnis</i> (Hay 1885)	Cherryfin Shiner	N	F
<i>Lythrurus umbratilis</i> (Girard 1856)	Redfin Shiner	N	F
<i>Macrhybopsis boschungi</i> Gilbert & Mayden 2017	Mobile Chub	N	F
<i>Macrhybopsis etnieri</i> Gilbert & Mayden 2017	Coosa Chub	N	F
<i>Macrhybopsis hyostoma</i> (Gilbert 1884)	Shoal Chub	N	F
<i>Macrhybopsis pallida</i> Gilbert & Mayden 2017	Pallid Chub	N	F
<i>Macrhybopsis storeriana</i> (Kirtland 1845)	Silver Chub	N	F

<i>Minielius albizonatus</i> (Warren & Burr 1994)	Palezone Shiner	N	F
<i>Minielius ammophilus</i> (Suttkus & Boschung 1990)	Orangefin Shiner	N	F
<i>Minielius boops</i> (Gilbert 1884)	Bigeye Shiner	N	F
<i>Minielius longirostris</i> (Hay 1881)	Longnose Shiner	N	F
<i>Minielius</i> sp. cf. <i>longirostris</i>	“Coosa Longnose Shiner”	N	F
<i>Minielius melanostomus</i> (Bortone 1989)	Blackmouth Shiner	N	F
<i>Minielius uranoscopus</i> (Suttkus 1959)	Skygazer Shiner	N	F
<i>Nocomis leptocephalus</i> (Girard 1856)	Bluehead Chub	N	F
<i>Nocomis micropogon</i> (Cope 1865)	River Chub	N	F
<i>Notemigonus crysoleucas</i> (Mitchill 1814)	Golden Shiner	N	F
<i>Notropis ariommus</i> (Cope 1867)	Popeye Shiner	N	F
<i>Notropis atherinoides</i> Rafinesque 1818	Emerald Shiner	N	F
<i>Notropis maculatus</i> (Hay 1881)	Taillight Shiner	N	F
<i>Notropis micropteryx</i> (Cope 1868)	Highland Shiner	N	F
<i>Notropis photogenis</i> (Cope 1865)	Silver Shiner	N	F
<i>Notropis stilbius</i> Jordan 1877	Silverstripe Shiner	N	F
<i>Notropis telescopus</i> (Cope 1868)	Telescope Shiner	N	F

<i>Opsopoeodus emiliae</i> Hay 1881	Pugnose Minnow	N	F
<i>Paranotropis buchanani</i> (Meek 1896)	Ghost Shiner	N	F
<i>Paranotropis cahabae</i> (Mayden & Kuhajda 1989)	Cahaba Shiner	N	F
<i>Paranotropis leuciodus</i> (Cope 1868)	Tennessee Shiner	N	F
<i>Paranotropis</i> sp. cf. <i>spectrunculus</i>	“Sawfin Shiner”	N	F
<i>Paranotropis volucellus</i> (Cope 1865)	Mimic Shiner	N	F
<i>Paranotropis</i> sp. cf. <i>volucellus</i>	“Mobile Mimic Shiner”	N	F
<i>Paranotropis wickliffei</i> (Trautman 1931)	Channel Shiner	N	F
<i>Phenacobius catostomus</i> Jordan 1877	Riffle Minnow	N	F
<i>Phenacobius mirabilis</i> (Girard 1856)	Suckermouth Minnow	N	F
<i>Phenacobius uranops</i> Cope 1867	Stargazing Minnow	N	F
<i>Pimephales notatus</i> (Rafinesque 1820)	Bluntnose Minnow	N	F
<i>Pimephales promelas</i> Rafinesque 1820	Fathead Minnow	I	F
<i>Pimephales vigilax</i> (Baird & Girard 1853)	Bullhead Minnow	N	F
<i>Pteronotropis cummingsae</i> (Myers 1925)	Dusky Shiner	N	F
<i>Pteronotropis euryzonus</i> (Suttkus 1955)	Broadstripe Shiner	N	F
<i>Pteronotropis grandipinnis</i> (Jordan 1877)	Apalachee Shiner	N	F

<i>Pteronotropis harperi</i> (Fowler 1941)	Redeye Chub	N	F
<i>Pteronotropis hypselopterus</i> (Günther 1868)	Sailfin Shiner	N	F
<i>Pteronotropis merlini</i> (Suttkus & Mettee 2001)	Orangetail Shiner	N	F
<i>Pteronotropis signipinnis</i> (Bailey & Suttkus 1952)	Flagfin Shiner	N	F
<i>Pteronotropis</i> sp. cf. <i>signipinnis</i>	“Eastern Flagfin Shiner”	N	F
<i>Pteronotropis welaka</i> (Evermann & Kendall 1898)	Bluenose Shiner	N	F
<i>Rhinichthys obtusus</i> Agassiz 1854	Western Blacknose Dace	N	F
<i>Scardinius erythrophthalmus</i> (Linnaeus 1758)	Rudd	I	F
<i>Semotilus atromaculatus</i> (Mitchill 1818)	Creek Chub	N	F
<i>Semotilus thoreauianus</i> Jordan 1877	Dixie Chub	N	F
Catostomidae Agassiz 1850—Suckers			
<i>Carpiodes carpio</i> (Rafinesque 1820)	River Carpsucker	N	F
<i>Carpiodes cyprinus</i> (Lesueur 1817)	Quillback	N	F
<i>Carpiodes velifer</i> (Rafinesque 1820)	Highfin Carpsucker	N	F
<i>Catostomus commersonii</i> (Lacepède 1803)	White Sucker	N	F
<i>Cycleptus elongatus</i> (Lesueur 1817)	Blue Sucker	N	F
<i>Cycleptus meridionalis</i> Burr & Mayden 1999	Southeastern Blue Sucker	N	F

<i>Erimyzon claviger</i> (Girard 1856)	Western Creek Chubsucker	N	F
<i>Erimyzon suetta</i> (Lacepède 1803)	Lake Chubsucker	N	F
<i>Erimyzon tenuis</i> (Agassiz 1855)	Sharpfin Chubsucker	N	F
<i>Hypentelium etowanum</i> (Jordan 1877)	Alabama Hog Sucker	N	F
<i>Hypentelium nigricans</i> (Lesueur 1817)	Northern Hog Sucker	N	F
<i>Ictiobus bubalus</i> (Rafinesque 1818)	Smallmouth Buffalo	N	F
<i>Ictiobus cyprinellus</i> (Valenciennes 1844)	Bigmouth Buffalo	N	F
<i>Ictiobus niger</i> (Rafinesque 1819)	Black Buffalo	N	F
<i>Minytrema melanops</i> (Rafinesque 1820)	Spotted Sucker	N	F
<i>Moxostoma anisurum</i> (Rafinesque 1820)	Silver Redhorse	N	F
<i>Moxostoma breviceps</i> (Cope 1870)	Smallmouth Redhorse	N	F
<i>Moxostoma carinatum</i> (Cope 1870)	River Redhorse	N	F
<i>Moxostoma duquesnei</i> (Lesueur 1817)	Black Redhorse	N	F
<i>Moxostoma erythrurum</i> (Rafinesque 1818)	Golden Redhorse	N	F
<i>Moxostoma lacerum</i> (Jordan & Brayton 1877)	Harelip Sucker	Extinct	F
<i>Moxostoma lachneri</i> Robins & Raney 1956	Greater Jumperock	N	F
<i>Moxostoma macrolepidotum</i> (Lesueur 1817)	Shorthead Redhorse	N	F

<i>Moxostoma poecilurum</i> Jordan 1877	Blacktail Redhorse	N	F
<i>Moxostoma</i> sp. cf. <i>poecilurum</i>	“Apalachicola Redhorse”	N	F
Cobitidae Swainson 1838 —Spined loaches			
<i>Misgurnus anguillicaudatus</i> (Cantor 1842)	Pond Loach	I	F
Order Siluriformes			
Ictaluridae Gill 1861 —North American freshwater catfishes			
<i>Ameiurus brunneus</i> Jordan 1877	Snail Bullhead	N	F
<i>Ameiurus catus</i> (Linnaeus 1758)	White Catfish	N	F
<i>Ameiurus melas</i> (Rafinesque 1820)	Black Bullhead	N	F
<i>Ameiurus natalis</i> (Lesueur 1819)	Yellow Bullhead	N	F
<i>Ameiurus nebulosus</i> (Lesueur 1819)	Brown Bullhead	N	F
<i>Ameiurus serracanthus</i> (Yerger & Relyea 1968)	Spotted Bullhead	N	F
<i>Ictalurus furcatus</i> (Valenciennes 1840)	Blue Catfish	N	F
<i>Ictalurus punctatus</i> (Rafinesque 1818)	Channel Catfish	N	F
<i>Noturus crypticus</i> Burr, Eisenhour & Grady 2005	Chucky Madtom	Exstate	F
<i>Noturus eleutherus</i> Jordan 1877	Mountain Madtom	N	F
<i>Noturus exilis</i> Nelson 1876	Slender Madtom	N	F

<i>Noturus flavus</i> Rafinesque 1818	Stonecat	N	F
<i>Noturus funebris</i> Gilbert & Swain 1891	Black Madtom	N	F
<i>Noturus gyrinus</i> (Mitchill 1817)	Tadpole Madtom	N	F
<i>Noturus leptacanthus</i> Jordan 1877	Speckled Madtom	N	F
<i>Noturus miurus</i> Jordan 1877	Brindled Madtom	N	F
<i>Noturus munitus</i> Suttkus & Taylor 1965	Frecklebelly Madtom	N	F
<i>Noturus munitus</i> ESU 1	“Cahaba River Population”	N	F
<i>Noturus munitus</i> ESU 4	“Tombigbee River Population”	N	F
<i>Noturus nocturnus</i> Jordan & Gilbert 1886	Freckled Madtom	N	F
<i>Noturus phaeus</i> Taylor 1969	Brown Madtom	N	F
<i>Pylodictis olivaris</i> (Rafinesque 1818)	Flathead Catfish	N	F
Ariidae Bleeker 1858 —Sea catfishes			
<i>Ariopsis felis</i> (Linnaeus 1766)	Hardhead Catfish	N	F
<i>Bagre marinus</i> (Mitchill 1815)	Gafftopsail Catfish	N	F
Order Esociformes			
Esocidae Rafinesque 1815 —Pikes			
<i>Esox americanus</i> Gmelin 1789	Redfin Pickerel	N	F

<i>Esox niger</i> Lesueur 1818	Chain Pickerel	N	F
Order Salmoniformes			
Salmonidae Jarocki / Schinz 1822 —Trout and charr			
<i>Oncorhynchus mykiss</i> (Walbaum 1792)			
	Rainbow Trout	I	F, M
<i>Salmo trutta</i> Linnaeus 1758			
	Brown Trout	I	F, M
<i>Salvelinus fontinalis</i> (Mitchill 1814)			
	Brook Trout	N/A	F, M
Order Percopsiformes			
Amblyopsidae Bonaparte 1845 —Cavefishes			
<i>Speoplatyrhinus poulsoni</i> Cooper & Kuehne 1974			
	Alabama Cavefish	N	F
<i>Typhlichthys subterraneus</i> Girard 1859			
	Southern Cavefish	N	F
<i>Typhlichthys</i> sp. cf. <i>subterraneus</i>			
	“Tennessee Cavefish”	N	F
Aphredoderidae Bonaparte 1845 —Pirate perches			
<i>Aphredoderus sayanus</i> (Gilliams 1824)			
	Pirate Perch	N	F
Order Gadiformes			
Phycidae Swainson 1838 —Phycid hakes			
<i>Urophycis floridana</i> (Bean & Dresel 1884)			
	Southern Codling	N	M
Order Aulopiformes			

Synodontidae Gill 1861—Lizardfishes

Synodus foetens (Linnaeus 1766)

Inshore Lizardfish

N

M

Order Batrachoidiformes

Batrachoididae Jordan 1896—Toadfishes

Opsanus beta (Goode & Bean 1880)

Gulf Toadfish

N

M

Order Gobiiformes

Eleotridae Bonaparte 1835—Sleepers

Dormitator maculatus (Bloch 1792)

Fat Sleeper

N

F, M

Eleotris amblyopsis (Cope 1871)

Largescaled Spinycheek Sleeper

N

F, M

Gobiidae Cuvier 1816—Gobies

Ctenogobius boleosoma (Jordan & Gilbert 1882)

Darter Goby

N

F, M

Ctenogobius shufeldti (Jordan & Eigenmann 1887)

Freshwater Goby

N

F, M

Evorthodus lyricus (Girard 1858)

Lyre Goby

N

F, M

Gobioides broussonetii Lacepède 1800

Violet Goby

N

F, M

Gobionellus oceanicus (Pallas 1770)

Highfin Goby

N

F, M

Gobiosoma bosc (Lacepède 1800)

Naked Goby

N

F, M

Microgobius gulosus (Girard 1858)

Clown Goby

N

F, M

<i>Microgobius thalassinus</i> (Jordan & Gilbert 1883)	Green Goby	N	F, M
Order Syngnathiformes			
Syngnathidae Bonaparte 1831 —Pipefishes and seahorses			
<i>Syngnathus louisianae</i> Günther 1870	Chain Pipefish	N	M
<i>Syngnathus scovelli</i> (Evermann & Kendall 1896)	Gulf Pipefish	N	M
Order Scombriformes			
Pomatomidae Gill 1863 —Bluefishes			
<i>Pomatomus saltatrix</i> (Linnaeus 1766)	Bluefish	N	M
Scombridae Rafinesque 1815 —Mackerels, tunas, and bonitos			
<i>Scomberomorus maculatus</i> (Mitchill 1815)	Atlantic Spanish Mackerel	N	M
Stromateidae Rafinesque 1810 —Butterfishes			
<i>Peprilus burti</i> Fowler 1944	Gulf Butterfish	N	M
<i>Peprilus paru</i> (Linnaeus 1758)	American Harvestfish	N	M
Trichiuridae Rafinesque 1810 —Cutlassfishes			
<i>Trichiurus lepturus</i> Linnaeus 1758	Largehead Hairtail	N	M
Order Carangiformes			
Sphyraenidae Rafinesque 1815 —Barracudas			

<i>Sphyraena barracuda</i> (Edwards 1771)	Great Barracuda	N	M
<i>Sphyraena guachancho</i> Cuvier 1829	Guachanche Barracuda	N	M
Carangidae Rafinesque 1815—Jacks			
<i>Caranx cryos</i> (Mitchill 1815)	Blue Runner	N	M
<i>Caranx hippos</i> (Linnaeus 1766)	Crevalle Jack	N	M
<i>Chloroscombrus chrysurus</i> (Linnaeus 1766)	Atlantic Bumper	N	M
<i>Hemicaranx amblyrhynchus</i> (Cuvier 1833)	Bluntnose Jack	N	M
<i>Oligoplites saurus</i> (Bloch & Schneider 1801)	Leatherjacket	N	M
<i>Selene setapinnis</i> (Mitchill 1815)	Atlantic Moonfish	N	M
<i>Selene vomer</i> (Linnaeus 1758)	Lookdown	N	M
<i>Trachinotus carolinus</i> (Linnaeus 1766)	Florida Pompano	N	M
Echeneidae Rafinesque 1810—Remoras and sharksuckers			
<i>Echeneis naucrates</i> Linnaeus 1758	Sharksucker	N	M
<i>Echeneis neucratoides</i> Zuiew 1789	Whitefin Sharksucker	N	M
<i>Remora remora</i> (Linnaeus 1758)	Remora	N	M
Rachycentridae Gill 1896—Cobias			
<i>Rachycentron canadum</i> (Linnaeus 1766)	Cobia	N	M

Achiridae Rafinesque 1815—American soles

Achirus lineatus (Linnaeus 1758) Lined Sole N F, M

Trinectes maculatus (Bloch & Schneider 1801) Hogchoker N F, M

Cyclopsettidae Campbell et al. 2019—Large-toothed flounders

Citharichthys spilopterus Günther 1862 Bay Whiff N M

Etropus crossotus Jordan & Gilbert 1882 Fringed Flounder N M

Cynoglossidae Jordan 1888—Tonguefishes

Sympodus plagiusa (Linnaeus 1766) Blackcheek Tonguefish N F, M

Paralichthyidae Regan 1910—Sand flounders

Ancyloplitta quadrocellata Gill 1864 Ocellated Flounder N M

Paralichthys lethostigma Jordan & Gilbert 1884 Southern Flounder N F, M

Paralichthys squamilentus Jordan & Gilbert 1882 Broad Flounder N M

Order Mugiliformes

Mugilidae Jarocki 1822—Mullets

Mugil cephalus Linnaeus 1758 Striped Mullet N F, M

Mugil curema Valenciennes 1836 White Mullet N F, M

Order Cichliformes

Cichlidae Bonaparte 1835—Cichlids

<i>Oreochromis aureus</i> (Steindachner 1864)	Blue Tilapia	I	F
<i>Oreochromis mossambicus</i> (Peters 1852)	Mozambique Tilapia	I	F
<i>Oreochromis niloticus</i> (Linnaeus 1758)	Nile Tilapia	I	F

Order Gobiesociformes

Gobiesocidae Bleeker 1859—Clingfishes

<i>Gobiesox strumosus</i> Cope 1870	Skilletfish	N	M
-------------------------------------	-------------	---	---

Order Beloniformes

Belonidae Bonaparte 1835—Needlefishes

<i>Strongylura marina</i> (Walbaum 1792)	Atlantic Needlefish	N	F, M
--	---------------------	---	------

Order Atheriniformes

Atherinopsidae Fitzinger 1873—New World silversides

<i>Labidesthes sicculus</i> (Cope 1865)	Brook Silverside	N	F
<i>Labidesthes vanhyningi</i> Bean and Reid 1930	Golden Silverside	N	F
<i>Membras martinica</i> (Valenciennes 1835)	Rough Silverside	N	F, M
<i>Menidia beryllina</i> (Cope 1867)	Inland Silverside	N	F, M
<i>Menidia peninsulae</i> (Goode & Bean 1879)	Tidewater Silverside	N	M

Order Cyprinodontiformes

Cyprinodontidae Wagner 1828—Killifishes

Cyprinodon variegatus Lacepède 1803

Sheepshead Minnow

N F

Fundulidae Günther 1866—Topminnows and killifishes

Fundulus albolineatus Gilbert 1891

Whitelined Topminnow Extinct F

Fundulus bifax Cashner & Rogers 1988

Stippled Studfish N F

Fundulus blairae Wiley & Hall 1975

Western Starhead Topminnow N F

Fundulus catenatus (Storer 1846)

Northern Studfish N F

Fundulus chrysotus (Günther 1866)

Golden Topminnow N F

Fundulus cingulatus Valenciennes 1846

Banded Topminnow N F

Fundulus confluentus Goode & Bean 1879

Marsh Killifish N M

Fundulus dispar (Agassiz 1854)

Starhead Topminnow N F

Fundulus escambiae (Bollman 1887)

Russetfin Topminnow N F

Fundulus grandis Baird & Girard 1853

Gulf Killifish N M

Fundulus jenkinsi (Evermann 1892)

Saltmarsh Topminnow N F

Fundulus notatus (Rafinesque 1820)

Blackstripe Topminnow N F

Fundulus notti (Agassiz 1854)

Bayou Topminnow N F

<i>Fundulus olivaceus</i> (Storer 1845)	Blackspotted Topminnow	N	F
<i>Fundulus pulvereus</i> (Evermann 1892)	Bayou Killifish	N	F
<i>Fundulus similis</i> (Baird & Girard 1853)	Longnose Killifish	N	F
<i>Fundulus stellifer</i> (Jordan 1877)	Southern Studfish	N	F
<i>Fundulus xenicus</i> (Jordan & Gilbert 1882)	Diamond Killifish	N	F, M
<i>Leptolucania ommata</i> (Jordan 1884)	Pygmy Killifish	N	F
<i>Lucania goodei</i> Jordan 1880	Bluefin Killifish	N	F
<i>Lucania parva</i> (Baird & Girard 1855)	Rainwater Killifish	N	F
Poeciliidae Bonaparte 1831—Livebearers			
<i>Gambusia affinis</i> (Baird & Girard 1853)	Western Mosquitofish	N	F
<i>Gambusia holbrooki</i> Girard 1859	Eastern Mosquitofish	N	F
<i>Heterandria formosa</i> (Girard 1859)	Least Killifish	N	F
<i>Poecilia latipinna</i> (Lesueur 1821)	Sailfin Molly	N	F
Order Acanthuriformes			
Ephippidae Bleeker 1859—Spadefishes and batfishes			
<i>Chaetodipterus faber</i> (Broussonet 1782)	Atlantic Spadefish	N	M
Gerreidae Bleeker 1859—Mojarras			

<i>Eucinostomus argenteus</i> Baird 1855	Spotfin Mojarra	N	F, M
<i>Eucinostomus gula</i> (Quoy & Gaimard 1824)	Silver Jenny	N	M
Lobotidae Gill 1861 —Tripletails and tigerfishes			
<i>Lobotes surinamensis</i> (Bloch 1790)	Atlantic Tripletail	N	M
Order Perciformes			
Cottidae Bonaparte 1831 —Sculpins			
<i>Cottus bairdii</i> Girard 1850	Mottled Sculpin	N	F
<i>Cottus carolinae</i> (Gill 1861)	Banded Sculpin	N	F
<i>Cottus paulus</i> Williams 2000	Pygmy Sculpin	N	F
<i>Cottus tallapoosae</i> Neely, Williams & Mayden 2007	Tallapoosa Sculpin	N	F
Percidae Rafinesque 1815 —Perches and darters			
<i>Allohistium cinereum</i> (Storer 1845)	Ashy Darter	Exstinct	F
<i>Allohistium cinereum</i> ESU 2	“Lower Tennessee River Populations”	N	F
<i>Ammocrypta beanii</i> Jordan 1877	Naked Sand Darter	N	F
<i>Ammocrypta bifascia</i> Williams 1975	Florida Sand Darter	N	F
<i>Ammocrypta meridiana</i> Williams 1975	Southern Sand Darter	N	F
<i>Ammocrypta vivax</i> Hay 1882	Scaly Sand Darter	N	F

<i>Crystallaria asprella</i> (Jordan 1878)	Crystal Darter	N	F
<i>Etheostoma artesiae</i> (Hay 1881)	Redspot Darter	N	F
<i>Etheostoma bellator</i> Suttkus & Bailey 1993	Warrior Darter	N	F
<i>Etheostoma</i> sp. cf. <i>bellator</i> 1	“Sipsey Darter”	N	F
<i>Etheostoma</i> sp. cf. <i>bellator</i> 2	“Locust Fork Darter”	N	F
<i>Etheostoma blennioides</i> Rafinesque 1819	Greenside Darter	N	F
<i>Etheostoma blennius</i> Gilbert & Swain 1887	Blenny Darter	N	F
<i>Etheostoma boschungi</i> Wall & Williams 1974	Slackwater Darter	N	F
<i>Etheostoma brevirostrum</i> Suttkus & Etnier 1991	Holiday Darter	N	F
<i>Etheostoma caeruleum</i> Storer 1845	Rainbow Darter	N	F
<i>Etheostoma chermocki</i> Boshung, Mayden & Tomelleri 1992	Vermilion Darter	N	F
<i>Etheostoma chlorosoma</i> (Hay 1881)	Bluntnose Darter	N	F
<i>Etheostoma colorosum</i> Suttkus & Bailey 1993	Coastal Darter	N	F
<i>Etheostoma coosae</i> (Fowler 1945)	Coosa Darter	N	F
<i>Etheostoma corona</i> Page & Ceas 1992	Crown Darter	N	F
<i>Etheostoma crossopterum</i> Braasch & Mayden 1985	Fringed Darter	N	F
<i>Etheostoma cyanoprosopum</i> Near & Kozal 2017	Blueface Darter	N	F

<i>Etheostoma davisoni</i> Hay 1885	Choctawhatchee Darter	N	F
<i>Etheostoma ditrema</i> Ramsey & Suttkus 1965	Coldwater Darter	N	F
<i>Etheostoma</i> sp. cf. <i>ditrema</i>	“Middle Coosa River Populations”	N	F
<i>Etheostoma duryi</i> Henshall 1889	Blackside Snubnose Darter	N	F
<i>Etheostoma edwini</i> (Hubbs & Cannon 1935)	Brown Darter	N	F
<i>Etheostoma flabellare</i> Rafinesque 1819	Fantail Darter	N	F
<i>Etheostoma fusiforme</i> (Holbrook 1855)	Scalyhead Darter	N	F
<i>Etheostoma gracile</i> (Girard 1859)	Slough Darter	N	F
<i>Etheostoma histrio</i> Jordan & Gilbert 1887	Harlequin Darter	N	F
<i>Etheostoma jessiae</i> (Jordan & Brayton 1878)	Blueside Darter	N	F
<i>Etheostoma kennicotti</i> (Putnam 1863)	Stripetail Darter	N	F
<i>Etheostoma lachneri</i> Suttkus & Bailey 1994	Tombigbee Darter	N	F
<i>Etheostoma lynceum</i> Hay 1855	Brighteye Darter	N	F
<i>Etheostoma neopterum</i> Howell & Dingerkus 1978	Lollypop Darter	N	F
<i>Etheostoma nigripinne</i> Braasch & Mayden 1985	Blackfin Darter	N	F
<i>Etheostoma nigrum</i> Rafinesque 1820	Johnny Darter	N	F
<i>Etheostoma nuchale</i> Howell & Caldwell 1965	Watercress Darter	N	F

<i>Etheostoma nuchale</i> ESU	“Roebuck Spring Population”	N	F
<i>Etheostoma parvipinne</i> Gilbert & Swain 1887	Goldstripe Darter	N	F
<i>Etheostoma phytophilum</i> Bart & Taylor 1999	Rush Darter	N	F
<i>Etheostoma phytophilum</i> ESU 1	“Turkey Creek Population”	N	F
<i>Etheostoma phytophilum</i> ESU 2	“Upper Locust Fork Population”	N	F
<i>Etheostoma phytophilum</i> ESU 3	“Sipsey Fork Population”	N	F
<i>Etheostoma proeliare</i> (Hay 1881)	Cypress Darter	N	F
<i>Etheostoma ramseyi</i> Suttkus & Bailey 1994	Alabama Darter	N	F
<i>Etheostoma rupestre</i> Gilbert & Swain 1887	Rock Darter	N	F
<i>Etheostoma scotti</i> Bauer, Etnier & Burkhead 1995	Cherokee Darter	N/A	F
<i>Etheostoma stigmaeum</i> (Jordan 1877)	Speckled Darter	N	F
<i>Etheostoma swaini</i> (Jordan 1884)	Gulf Darter	N	F
<i>Etheostoma tallapoosae</i> Suttkus & Etnier 1991	Tallapoosa Darter	N	F
<i>Etheostoma tennesseense</i> Powers & Mayden 2007	Tennessee Darter	N	F
<i>Etheostoma trisella</i> Bailey & Richards 1963	Trispot Darter	N	F
<i>Etheostoma tuscumbia</i> Gilbert & Swain 1887	Tuscumbia Darter	N	F
<i>Etheostoma zonale</i> (Cope 1868)	Banded Darter	N	F

<i>Etheostoma zonifer</i> (Hubbs & Cannon 1935)	Backwater Darter	N	F
<i>Etheostoma zonistium</i> Bailey & Etnier 1988	Bandfin Darter	N	F
<i>Nothonotus camurus</i> (Cope 1870)	Bluebreast Darter	N	F
<i>Nothonotus chuckwachatte</i> (Mayden & Wood 1993)	Lipstick Darter	N	F
<i>Nothonotus douglasi</i> (Mayden & Wood 1993)	Tuskaloosa Darter	N	F
<i>Nothonotus etowahae</i> (Mayden & Wood 1993)	Etowah Darter	N/A	F
<i>Nothonotus jordani</i> (Gilbert 1891)	Greenbreast Darter	N	F
<i>Nothonotus rufilineatus</i> (Cope 1870)	Redline Darter	N	F
<i>Nothonotus wapiti</i> (Etnier & Williams 1989)	Boulder Darter	N	F
<i>Perca flavescens</i> (Mitchill 1814)	Yellow Perch	I	F
<i>Percina antesella</i> Williams & Etnier 1977	Amber Darter	N/A	F
<i>Percina aurolineata</i> Suttkus & Ramsey 1967	Goldline Darter	N	F
<i>Percina austroperca</i> Thompson 1995	Southern Logperch	N	F
<i>Percina brevicauda</i> Suttkus & Bart 1994	Coal Darter	N	F
<i>Percina burtoni</i> Fowler 1945	Blotchside Logperch	N	F
<i>Percina caprodes</i> (Rafinesque 1818)	Logperch	N	F
<i>Percina crypta</i> Freeman, Freeman & Burkhead 2008	Halloween Darter	N	F

<i>Percina evides</i> (Jordan & Copeland 1877)	Gilt Darter	N	F
<i>Percina jenkinsi</i> Thompson 1985	Conasauga Logperch	N/A	F
<i>Percina kathae</i> Thompson 1997	Mobile Logperch	N	F
<i>Percina kusha</i> Williams & Burkhead 2007	Bridled Darter	N/A	F
<i>Percina lenticula</i> Richards & Knapp 1964	Freckled Darter	N	F
<i>Percina maculata</i> (Girard 1859)	Blackside Darter	N	F
<i>Percina nigrofasciata</i> (Agassiz 1854)	Blackbanded Darter	N	F
<i>Percina palmaris</i> (Bailey 1940)	Bronze Darter	N	F
<i>Percina phoxocephala</i> (Nelson 1876)	Slenderhead Darter	N	F
<i>Percina sciera</i> (Swain 1883)	Dusky Darter	N	F
<i>Percina shumardi</i> (Girard 1859)	River Darter	N	F
<i>Percina sipsi</i> Williams & Neely 2007	Bankhead Darter	N	F
<i>Percina smithvanizi</i> Williams & Walsh 2007	Muscadine Darter	N	F
<i>Percina suttkusi</i> Thompson 1997	Gulf Logperch	N	F
<i>Percina tanasi</i> Etnier 1976	Snail Darter	N	F
<i>Percina vigil</i> (Hay 1882)	Saddleback Darter	N	F
<i>Percina westfalli</i> (Fowler 1942)	Westfalls Darter	N	F

<i>Sander canadensis</i> (Griffith & Smith 1834)	Sauger	N	F
<i>Sander vitreus</i> (Mitchill 1818)	Walleye	N	F
<i>Sander</i> sp. cf. <i>vitreus</i>	“Southern Walleye”	N	F
Serranidae Swainson 1839—Sea basses			
<i>Centropristes philadelphica</i> (Linnaeus 1758)	Rock Sea Bass	N	M
<i>Diplectrum formosum</i> (Linnaeus 1766)	Sand Perch	N	M
Triglidae Rafinesque 1815—Searobins			
<i>Prionotus longispinosus</i> Teague 1951	Bigeye Searobin	N	M
<i>Prionotus rubio</i> Jordan 1886	Blackwing Searobin	N	M
<i>Prionotus scitulus</i> Jordan & Gilbert 1882	Leopard Searobin	N	M
<i>Prionotus tribulus</i> Cuvier 1829	Bighead Searobin	N	M
Uranoscopidae Bonaparte 1831—Stargazers			
<i>Astroscopus y-graecum</i> (Cuvier 1829)	Southern Stargazer	N	M
Order Centrarchiformes			
Centrarchidae Bleeker 1859—Sunfishes and black basses			
<i>Acantharchus pomotis</i> (Baird 1855)	Mud Sunfish	N	F
<i>Ambloplites ariommus</i> Viosca 1936	Shadow Bass	N	F

<i>Ambloplites rupestris</i> (Rafinesque 1817)	Rock Bass	N	F
<i>Centrarchus macropterus</i> (Lacepède 1801)	Flier	N	F
<i>Enneacanthus gloriosus</i> (Holbrook 1855)	Bluespotted Sunfish	N	F
<i>Enneacanthus obesus</i> (Girard 1854)	Banded Sunfish	N	F
<i>Lepomis auritus</i> (Linnaeus 1758)	Redbreast Sunfish	N	F
<i>Lepomis cyanellus</i> Rafinesque 1819	Green Sunfish	N	F
<i>Lepomis gulosus</i> (Cuvier 1829)	Warmouth	N	F
<i>Lepomis humilis</i> (Girard 1858)	Orangespotted Sunfish	N	F
<i>Lepomis macrochirus</i> Rafinesque 1819	Bluegill	N	F
<i>Lepomis marginatus</i> (Holbrook 1855)	Dollar Sunfish	N	F
<i>Lepomis megalotis</i> (Rafinesque 1820)	Longear Sunfish	N	F
<i>Lepomis microlophus</i> (Günther 1859)	Redear Sunfish	N	F
<i>Lepomis miniatus</i> Jordan 1877	Redspotted Sunfish	N	F
<i>Lepomis solis</i> (Valenciennes 1831)	Sunny Sunfish	N	F
<i>Micropterus cahabae</i> Baker, Johnson & Blanton 2013	Cahaba Bass	N	F
<i>Micropterus cataractae</i> Williams & Burgess 1999	Shoal Bass	N	F
<i>Micropterus chattahoochae</i> Baker, Johnson & Blanton 2013	Chattahoochee Bass	N	F

<i>Micropterus coosae</i> Hubbs & Bailey 1940	Redeye Bass	N	F
<i>Micropterus dolomieu</i> Lacepède 1802	Smallmouth Bass	N	F
<i>Micropterus henshalli</i> Hubbs & Bailey 1940	Alabama Bass	N	F
<i>Micropterus nigricans</i> (Cuvier 1828)	Largemouth Bass	N	F
<i>Micropterus punctulatus</i> (Rafinesque 1819)	Spotted Bass	N	F
<i>Micropterus</i> sp. cf. <i>punctulatus</i>	“Choctaw Bass”	N	F
<i>Micropterus tallapoosae</i> Baker, Johnson & Blanton 2013	Tallapoosa Bass	N	F
<i>Micropterus warriorensis</i> Baker, Johnson & Blanton 2013	Warrior Bass	N	F
<i>Pomoxis annularis</i> Rafinesque 1818	White Crappie	N	F
<i>Pomoxis nigromaculatus</i> (Lesueur 1829)	Black Crappie	N	F
Elassomatidae Jordan 1877—Pygmy sunfishes			
<i>Elassoma alabamae</i> Mayden 1993	Spring Pygmy Sunfish	N	F
<i>Elassoma evergladei</i> Jordan 1884	Everglades Pygmy Sunfish	N	F
<i>Elassoma zonatum</i> Jordan 1877	Banded Pygmy Sunfish	N	F
Order N/A—Eupercaria incertae sedis			
Moronidae Jordan & Evermann 1896—White basses			
<i>Morone chrysops</i> (Rafinesque 1820)	White Bass	N	F

<i>Morone mississippiensis</i> Jordan & Eigenmann 1887	Yellow Bass	N	F
<i>Morone saxatilis</i> (Walbaum 1792)	Striped Bass	N	F, M
Lutjanidae Gill 1861—Snappers			
<i>Lutjanus campechanus</i> (Poey 1860)	Red Snapper	N	M
<i>Lutjanus griseus</i> (Linnaeus 1758)	Gray Snapper	N	F, M
<i>Lutjanus synagris</i> (Linnaeus 1758)	Lane Snapper	N	M
Haemulidae Gill 1885—Grunts			
<i>Orthopristis chrysoptera</i> (Linnaeus 1766)	Pigfish	N	M
Sciaenidae Cuvier 1829—Croakers and drums			
<i>Aplodinotus grunniens</i> Rafinesque 1819	Freshwater Drum	N	F, M
<i>Bairdiella chrysoura</i> (Lacepède 1802)	Silver Perch	N	F, M
<i>Cynoscion arenarius</i> Ginsburg 1930	Sand Seatrout	N	F, M
<i>Cynoscion nebulosus</i> (Cuvier 1830)	Spotted Seatrout	N	F, M
<i>Cynoscion nothus</i> (Holbrook 1848)	Silver Seatrout	N	M
<i>Larimus fasciatus</i> Holbrook 1855	Banded Drum	N	M
<i>Leiostomus xanthurus</i> Lacepède 1802	Spot	N	F, M
<i>Menticirrhus americanus</i> (Linnaeus 1758)	Southern Kingfish	N	F, M

<i>Menticirrhus littoralis</i> (Holbrook 1847)	Gulf Kingfish	N	F, M
<i>Menticirrhus saxatilis</i> (Bloch & Schneider 1801)	Northern Kingfish	N	F, M
<i>Micropogonias undulatus</i> (Linnaeus 1766)	Atlantic Croaker	N	F, M
<i>Pogonias cromis</i> (Linnaeus 1766)	Black Drum	N	F, M
<i>Sciaenops ocellatus</i> (Linnaeus 1766)	Red Drum	N	F, M
<i>Stellifer lanceolatus</i> (Holbrook 1855)	Star Drum	N	F, M
Order Spariformes			
Sparidae Rafinesque 1818 —Porgys and seabreams			
<i>Archosargus probatocephalus</i> (Walbaum 1792)	Sheepshead	N	F, M
<i>Lagodon rhomboides</i> (Linnaeus 1766)	Pinfish	N	F, M
Order Lophiiformes			
Antennariidae Jarocki 1822 —Fibonacci frogfishes			
<i>Fowlerichthys radiosus</i> (Garman 1896)	Singlespot Frogfish	N	M
Order Tetraodontiformes			
Balistidae Rafinesque 1810 —Triggerfishes			
<i>Balistes capriscus</i> Gmelin 1789	Gray Triggerfish	N	M
<i>Canthidermis maculata</i> (Bloch 1786)	Rough Triggerfish	N	M

Diodontidae Billberg 1833—Porcupinefishes and burrfishes

Chilomycterus schoepfii (Walbaum 1792) Striped Burrfish N M

Monacanthidae Nardo 1843—Filefishes

Stephanolepis hispida (Linnaeus 1766) Planehead Filefish N M

Tetraodontidae Bonaparte 1831—Puffers

Sphoeroides parvus Shipp & Yerger 1969 Least Puffer N M

1401


1402 **TABLE 3.** Summary of recent taxonomic changes proposed by Stout *et al.* (2022) for 26 Alabama minnow species (Leuciscidae)
1403 formerly assigned to the genera *Luxilus* and *Notropis*. This list includes proposed changes for described species and candidate species.
1404 New species names are given under “Proposed Name,” and type species for genera are indicated by asterisks (*).

Former Name	Proposed Name	Common Name
<i>Luxilus coccogenis</i> (Cope 1868)	<i>Coccotis coccogenis</i> (Cope 1868)*	Warpaint Shiner
<i>Luxilus zonistius</i> Jordan 1880	<i>Coccotis zonistius</i> (Jordan 1880)	Bandfin Shiner
<i>Notropis albizonatus</i> Warren & Burr 1994	<i>Minielurus albizonatus</i> (Warren & Burr 1994)	Palezone Shiner
<i>Notropis ammophilus</i> Suttkus & Boschung 1990	<i>Minielurus ammophilus</i> (Suttkus & Boschung 1990)	Orangefin Shiner
<i>Notropis asperifrons</i> Suttkus & Raney 1955	<i>Alburnops asperifrons</i> (Suttkus & Raney 1955)	Burrhead Shiner
<i>Notropis baileyi</i> Suttkus & Raney 1955	<i>Alburnops baileyi</i> (Suttkus & Raney 1955)	Rough Shiner
<i>Notropis boops</i> Gilbert 1884	<i>Minielurus boops</i> (Gilbert 1884)	Bigeye Shiner
<i>Notropis buchanani</i> Meek 1896	<i>Paranotropis buchanani</i> (Meek 1896)	Ghost Shiner
<i>Notropis cahabae</i> Mayden & Kuhajda 1989	<i>Paranotropis cahabae</i> (Mayden & Kuhajda 1989)	Cahaba Shiner
<i>Notropis candidus</i> Suttkus 1980	<i>Alburnops candidus</i> (Suttkus 1980)	Silverside Shiner
<i>Notropis chalybaeus</i> (Cope 1867)	<i>Alburnops chalybaeus</i> (Cope 1867)	Ironcolor Shiner
<i>Notropis chrosomus</i> (Jordan 1877)	<i>Hydrophlox chrosomus</i> (Jordan 1877)	Rainbow Shiner
<i>Notropis cummingsae</i> Myers 1925	<i>Pteronotropis cummingsae</i> (Myers 1925)	Dusky Shiner


<i>Notropis edwardraneyi</i> Suttkus & Clemmer 1968	<i>Alburnops edwardraneyi</i> (Suttkus & Clemmer 1968)	Fluvial Shiner
<i>Notropis hypsilepis</i> Suttkus & Raney 1955	<i>Alburnops hypsilepis</i> (Suttkus & Raney 1955)	Hightscale Shiner
<i>Notropis leuciodus</i> (Cope 1868)	<i>Paranotropis leuciodus</i> (Cope 1868)*	Tennessee Shiner
<i>Notropis longirostris</i> (Hay 1881)	<i>Minielius longirostris</i> (Hay 1881)	Longnose Shiner
<i>Notropis lutipinnis</i> (Jordan & Brayton 1878)	<i>Hydrophlox lutipinnis</i> Jordan & Brayton 1878	Yellowfin Shiner
<i>Notropis melanostomus</i> Bortone 1989	<i>Minielius melanostomus</i> (Bortone 1989)	Blackmouth Shiner
<i>Notropis petersoni</i> Fowler 1942	<i>Alburnops petersoni</i> (Fowler 1942)	Coastal Shiner
<i>Notropis</i> sp. cf. <i>spectrunculus</i>	<i>Paranotropis</i> sp. cf. <i>spectrunculus</i>	“Sawfin Shiner”
<i>Notropis texanus</i> (Girard 1856)	<i>Alburnops texanus</i> (Girard 1856)	Weed Shiner
<i>Notropis uranoscopus</i> Suttkus 1959	<i>Minielius uranoscopus</i> (Suttkus 1959)	Skygazer Shiner
<i>Notropis volucellus</i> (Cope 1865)	<i>Paranotropis volucellus</i> (Cope 1865)	Mimic Shiner
<i>Notropis wickliffi</i> Trautman 1931	<i>Paranotropis wickliffi</i> (Trautman 1931)	Channel Shiner
<i>Notropis xaenocephalus</i> (Jordan 1877)	<i>Alburnops xaenocephalus</i> (Jordan 1877)	Coosa Shiner

1406 **Figures and Figure Legends**

Author Copy - Article in Press




1408 **FIGURE 1.** Map of the study area. Boundaries of Alabama and neighboring states are shown (thin black and gray lines; names in bold
1409 inside white boxes) along with some major physiographic elements, including the Fall Line (thick red line), major river courses (blue
1410 lines), and the outline of the Mobile River Basin (light gray shading). Tick marks along figure margins are 1-degree graticules. The
1411 inset map shows an overview of the study area in the context of Central–Eastern North America and the Gulf of Mexico as a whole,
1412 and Alabama is shaded black in the main map and inset.
1413



ESS


1415 **FIGURE 2.** Map of the study area and specimen records for marine and freshwater fishes of Alabama in the final combined database
1416 of FishNet2 and SEAMAP records collated herein. Boundaries of Alabama and neighboring states are shown (thin black and gray
1417 lines), and the background includes a 30 s-resolution digital elevation model from WorldClim v2.1 (Fick & Hijmans 2017) rendered in
1418 a continuous green–black palette with increasing elevation, as well as gray hill shade layers (shaded relief). The Fall Line (thick red
1419 line) and the outline of the Mobile River Basin (light gray shading) are shown for reference. Tick marks along figure margins are 1-
1420 degree graticules. Points (50% transparent black circles) represent $n = 10,325$ unique, georeferenced localities corresponding to fish
1421 collections and observations in our final combined database (see text and accompanying Mendeley Data accession for additional
1422 details; Bagley 2023).

1423



1425 **FIGURE 3.** Map of collections records for freshwater fishes ('F' designations; blue circles) vs. primarily marine fish species ('M'
1426 designations; red circles) known from Alabama based on our final combined database. Map extent, data layers, and physiographic
1427 features are the same as in Fig. 2 (see captions of Figs. 1 and 2 for additional details).

1428



1429

1430 **FIGURE 4.** Summary of state status (A), habitat classifications (B), and collection localities by habitat classification (C) of marine
1431 and freshwater fishes of Alabama in the present checklist. Non-duplicate collection localities for species that were classified as
1432 primarily freshwater ('F' designations), primarily marine ('M' designations), and freshwater and marine ('F, M' designations) in habit

1433 are summarized in a Venn diagram in panel C, where the total number in each area sums to the total number of unique collection
1434 localities in our final dataset ($n = 10,325$). Abbreviations: Exstate, extirpated from the state; F, freshwater; I, introduced species; M,
1435 marine; N, native; N/A, not applicable (no state status because species does not occur within state borders); Reint, reintroduced in
1436 state.