

Taxonomic inflation does have important consequences for macroecology and conservation. Thus, identifying the cause of this inflation is essential. We suggest that early geopolitical bias, rather than a change in species concept, is the major cause of this inflation. Research is needed to re-determine the levels of genetic diversity that we can expect to find within species.

References

- 1 Isaac, N.J.B. *et al.* (2004) Taxonomic inflation: its influence on macroecology and conservation. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 19, 464–469
- 2 Tautz, D. *et al.* (2003) A plea for DNA taxonomy. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 18, 70–74
- 3 Hendry, A.P. *et al.* (2000) Questioning species realities. *Conserv. Genet.* 1, 67–76
- 4 Ferguson, J.W.H. (2002) On the use of genetic divergence for identifying species. *Biol. J. Linn. Soc.* 75, 509–516
- 5 Ravaoarimanana, I.B. *et al.* (2004) Molecular and cytogenetic evidence for cryptic speciation within a rare endemic Malagasy lemur, the northern sportive lemur (*Lepilemur septentrionalis*). *Mol. Phylogenet. Evol.* 31, 440–448
- 6 Johns, G.C. and Avise, J.C. (1998) A comparative summary of genetic distances in the vertebrates from the mitochondrial cytochrome *b* gene. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 15, 1481–1490
- 7 Avise, J.C. (2001) *Captivating Life: A Naturalist in the Age of Genetics*, Smithsonian Institution Press
- 8 Avise, J.C. *et al.* (1998) Speciation durations and Pleistocene effects on vertebrate phylogeography. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. Ser. B* 265, 1707–1712
- 9 Hewitt, G.M. (2004) Genetic consequences of climatic oscillations in the Quaternary. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. Ser. B* 359, 183–195
- 10 Harris, D.J. (2002) Reassessment of comparative genetic distances in reptiles from the mitochondrial cytochrome *b* gene. *Herpetol. J.* 12, 85–86

0169-5347/\$ - see front matter © 2004 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.
doi:10.1016/j.tree.2004.11.004

Taxonomic inflation, species concepts and global species lists

Sandra Knapp¹, Eimear Nic Lughadha² and Alan Paton²

¹Department of Botany, The Natural History Museum, Cromwell Road, London, UK, SW7 5BD

²Herbarium, Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, Richmond, Surrey, UK, TW9 3AB

In their recent discussion in *TREE* of taxonomic inflation and its effects on conservation [1], Isaac *et al.* identify changing species concepts as a source of instability in species names, but have only brushed the surface of the problems inherent in species lists. Taxonomic inflation, owing to the elevation of infraspecific taxa to the rank of species, is shown by Isaac *et al.* to be the main driver behind the rapidly increasing numbers of species in groups such as primates.

The charismatic vertebrates, such as primates and birds, must, however, be seen as a special case and not representative of the efforts of the taxonomic community to describe and document the diversity of life on Earth. Most of this diversity resides not in these highly visible, and some might say over-studied, groups, but in the less charismatic, highly species-rich groups, such as the insects or fungi. We work with seed plants, also considered charismatic and highly visible, where rates of description of new species have remained fairly stable at $\sim 2000\text{ y}^{-1}$ over the past few decades (evidenced by rates of addition of new records to *Index Kewensis*, R. Davies, personal communication; see <http://www.ipni.org>). Most of these new species are based on type material collected in the 15 years preceding description, suggesting that they represent new discoveries rather than recircumscriptions of known taxa (E. Nic Lughadha and K. Challis, unpublished). Unlike Isaac *et al.*, we cannot tell whether the total number of recognized seed plant species known to science is increasing, because we lack a comprehensive synonymic species list. What is evident for flowering

plants is even more true for understudied groups, such as the insects or fungi.

To assess the effect of species concepts on the rate of recognized species number increase, one needs not only a list, but also an understanding of what species concepts have been applied. However, for plant species, the concept applied is rarely documented, although morphological criteria are most commonly used [2]. Where species concepts vary systematically across groups, comparisons are seriously confounded and the results misleading [3]. Application of the same species concept can result in either increased or decreased numbers of species recognized: for example, in the tomatoes (*Solanum* section *Lycopersicum*), application of morphological difference rather than crossability criteria led to an increase in the number of recognized species, whereas in their sister group, the potatoes (*Solanum* section *Petota*), application of the same criterion, coupled with in-depth molecular analysis rather than the recognition of geographical species, led to a reduction.

A list represents a synthesis of the products of scientific research; it is important for those using lists to see them only as starting points. Biologists (and legislators) using lists must become more aware of the data behind such lists, and must not treat lists as static. Equally, it is incumbent upon the taxonomic community to begin to pull together to produce the baseline data needed to achieve globally agreed targets. Plant biologists are fortunate to have such a goal. The creation of a 'widely accessible working list of known plant species' by 2010 is Target 1 of the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation (GSPC; <http://www.biodiv.org/decisions/default.aspx?dec5VI/9>), which is just what Isaac *et al.* advocate. This synonymic

Corresponding author: Knapp, S. (S.Knapp@nhm.ac.uk).

Available online 11 November 2004

list will be important not only to facilitate the work of others, but also to enable assessment of progress towards the goal set at the World Summit for Sustainable Development in Johannesburg in 2003, to 'reduce the rate of biodiversity loss by 2010'. But such a list cannot be achieved without the broad participation of the entire community; we must come together to produce such global resources, rather than falling into the trap of endlessly discussing whose fault it is while biodiversity disappears.

Letters Response

Response to Harris and Froufe, and Knapp *et al.*: Taxonomic inflation

James Mallet¹, Nick J.B. Isaac² and Georgina M. Mace²

¹Galton Laboratory, University College London, 4 Stephenson Way, London, UK, NW1 2HE

²Institute of Zoology, Zoological Society of London, Regent's Park, London, UK, NW1 4RY

In their critique of our paper [1], Harris and Froufe [2] point out that species status is sometimes advocated on molecular grounds if genetic divergence is large enough. Typically, mitochondrial DNA (mtDNA) is used for such purposes, and this approach has recently been formalized as 'DNA barcoding' (<http://www.barcodinglife.com>). According to Harris and Froufe, however, genetic divergence within species has been underestimated, depending too heavily on north-temperate species that recolonized the region after the ice ages. The consequent bottlenecks tended to reduce genetic diversity of more northerly species compared with parent populations further south [3]. In the more-stable tropics, effective population sizes have often remained stable and fairly large. Therefore, Harris and Froufe argue that taxonomic inflation in the tropics will result from overestimation of species diversity from genetic data.

Although this might be true in some cases, most revisions leading to inflation include other factors, such as geographical separation of divergent lineages. Geographically coherent lineages are considered under the phylogenetic species concept to constitute separate species [1], whereas locally mixed mitochondrial lineages with similar levels of divergence would provide evidence for a single species.

In any case, we do not consider a threshold value of divergence at mtDNA to be a useful criterion for delimiting species. Some tropical species have little divergence between them (e.g. <0.5% at the mitochondrial gene *COI* as found in *Astraptes* skipper butterflies [4], even though DNA barcoders had previously advocated a sixfold higher species level threshold of 3% *COI* divergence [5]). Meanwhile, values of up to 2% *COI* divergence within tropical species are common (e.g. in *Heliconius* butterflies [6] or more in other groups). Time since speciation (τ) and effective population size (θ) jointly determine the level of DNA divergence between species, whereas within-species variability is determined entirely by θ [7]. The coalescence

References

- 1 Isaac, N.J.B. *et al.* (2004) Taxonomic inflation: its influence on macroecology and conservation. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 19, 464–469
- 2 McDade, L.A. (1995) Species concepts and problems in practice: insight from botanical monographs. *Syst. Bot.* 20, 606–622
- 3 Mace, G.M. (2004) The role of taxonomy in species conservation. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. Ser. B* 359, 711–719

0169-5347/\$ - see front matter © 2004 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.
doi:10.1016/j.tree.2004.11.001

theory underlying these ideas assumes neutral evolution, which is probably approximately correct for most sequence divergence between closely related or sister species. Contrary to what Harris and Froufe suggest, if speciation is rapid and recent in tropical radiations, τ is small and low divergence is expected between species, as in *Astraptes*. However, with effective population sizes generally more stable than at higher latitudes, as Harris and Froufe suggest, θ will be large and high levels of polymorphism are expected within species, so that within- and between-species divergences might overlap. Such effects are found among rapidly diversifying cichlid fish [8], for example. As more data accumulate, it will be interesting to see if a general trend of tropical versus temperate species emerges. In any case, insight from coalescence theory argues against simplistic 'barcoding' or other methods to delimit species depending on genealogical monophyly, especially if based on a single mitochondrial gene [9].

Knapp *et al.* [10] point out that many new species descriptions do not contribute to taxonomic inflation (elevation of already known subspecific taxa to species rank [1]). In our abstract [1], we made a rather misleading statement: 'Species numbers are increasing rapidly. This is due mostly to taxonomic inflation, where known subspecies are raised to species as a result of a change in species concept'. We should have phrased this differently. We intended to refer to the charismatic vertebrates of major conservation and macroecology interest that were the main focus of our argument. We apologise to the many systematists who might feel aggrieved by our unintended slur.

Knapp *et al.* also point out that species-level taxonomy is a living process that inevitably leads to change in scope of species taxa as more data accumulate, regardless of whether a single species concept is applied consistently. Even with excellent knowledge of geographical distributions, morphology and genetics, the activities of 'lumpers' and 'splitters' are unlikely to stop, so that species-level nomenclature will remain unstable; furthermore, the degree of

Corresponding author: Mallet, J. (j.mallet@ucl.ac.uk).

Available online 21 November 2004