Validation of the South Asian cichlid genus *Pseudetroplus* Bleeker (Pisces: Cichlidae)
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Abstract

The South Asian Cichlidae are composed of two clades that together represent the sister group of the Madagascan genus *Paretroplus* Bleeker. *Chaetodon suratensis* Bloch and *Etroplus canarensis* Day are retained in *Etroplus* Cuvier, while *Chaetodon maculatus* Bloch is allocated to *Pseudetroplus* Bleeker. *Pseudetroplus* is distinguished from *Etroplus* in having, among other characters, 11 (vs. 12–13) pleural ribs; 26–27 (vs. 28–29) vertebrae; the anterior half of the median suture between the lower pharyngeal jaw serrated (vs. smooth); the first 6 anal-fin pterygiophores arranged anterior to the first 3 (vs. 2) haemal spines; the supraoccipital-exoccipital prong extending ventrally about half-way across the foramen magnum (vs. not extending into the foramen magnum); and the anterior jaw teeth tricuspid, acuminate (vs. unicuspid, spatulate).

Microgaster Swainson is a synonym of *Pseudetroplus* and a junior homonym of *Microgaster* Latreille in Hymenoptera.
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Introduction

South Asian cichlids represent an interesting example of transoceanic Gondwanan vicariance (Sparks & Smith 2005; see also Friedman et al. 2013). Three species have hitherto been recognized: *Etroplus suratensis* Bloch and *Etroplus canarensis* Day are retained in *Etroplus* Cuvier, while *Chaetodon maculatus* Bloch is allocated to *Pseudetroplus* Bleeker. *Pseudetroplus* is distinguished from *Etroplus* in having, among other characters, 11 (vs. 12–13) pleural ribs; 26–27 (vs. 28–29) vertebrae; the anterior half of the median suture between the lower pharyngeal jaw serrated (vs. smooth); the first 6 anal-fin pterygiophores arranged anterior to the first 3 (vs. 2) haemal spines; the supraoccipital-exoccipital prong extending ventrally about half-way across the foramen magnum (vs. not extending into the foramen magnum); and the anterior jaw teeth tricuspid, acuminate (vs. unicuspid, spatulate). *Microgaster* Swainson is a synonym of *Pseudetroplus* and a junior homonym of *Microgaster* Latreille in Hymenoptera.

Indeed, Bleeker (1862: 125), recognizing a higher-level distinction between *E. maculatus* and *E. suratensis*, established the genus *Pseudetroplus*, with *Etroplus coruchi* Cuvier, 1830 (a synonym of *E. maculatus*) as type species. He distinguished *Pseudetroplus* from *Etroplus* on the basis, among other characters, of the former possessing tricuspid
jaw teeth and scaly sheaths to the dorsal and anal fins. Günther (1862: 266), however, was doubtful of the validity of *Pseudetroplus*, noting that “the characters of the new genus are, tricuspid teeth, and a scaly sheath along the base of the dorsal and anal fins. I find these characters equally developed in *E. suratensis* and in *E. maculatus*, and I can come to no other conclusion than that Dr. v. Bleeker either has a third species, different from both, or that he has taken the characters for *Eтроplus* from a very old specimen of *E. suratensis*, in which the incisions on the front teeth have become obsolete.” *Pseudetroplus* has since been regarded as a synonym of *Etroplus*.

*Etroplus suratensis* and *E. canarensis*, however, possess numerous characters that support their close relationship, as distinct from *E. maculatus*. Here, in order to distinguish these two clades taxonomically and also recognize the diversity that exists within the South Asian Cichlidae, we propose that *Pseudetroplus* Bleeker be recognized as a valid genus.

**Material and methods**

Material referred to in this paper is deposited in the Australian Museum, Sydney (AMS) and the collection of the Wildlife Heritage Trust (WHT), presently deposited in the National Museum of Sri Lanka, Colombo. Measurements were made with digital Vernier callipers and recorded to the nearest 0.1 mm. Osteological descriptions are based on cleared and alizarin-stained specimens following the single-staining method of Taylor & Van Dyke (1985).

**Results**

*Pseudetroplus* Bleeker

*Pseudetroplus* Bleeker, in Günther, 1862: 266; type species *Etroplus maculatus* (Bloch).

*Pseudetroplus* Bleeker, 1862: 125; type species *Etroplus coruchi* Cuvier.

*Microgaster* Swainson, 1839: 171 (non Latreille, 1804).

**Diagnosis.** *Pseudetroplus* is distinguished from *Etroplus* by having 11 (vs. 12–13) pleural ribs; 26–27 (vs. 28–29) total vertebrae; lateral line incomplete (vs. interrupted), with 1–7 (vs. 13–24) pored scales; possessing an occipital prong (vs. possessing an occipital process; Fig. 1D); postero-dorsal outline of operculum curved, with a well-developed process (postero-dorsal outline of operculum straight, lacking a well-developed process); anterior half of median suture of lower pharyngeal jaw serrated (vs. smooth; Fig. 1B); base of the lateral arm of lower pharyngeal jaw broad (vs. narrow; Fig. 1B); first 6 anal-fin pterygiophores arranged anterior to the first 3 (vs. 2) haemal spines (Fig. 1A); supraoccipital-exoccipital prong well developed, extending ventrally over half-way across foramen magnum (vs. less-well developed, not extending into foramen magnum; Fig. 1C). Further, the anterior jaw teeth in *Pseudetroplus* are acuminate (vs. spatulate in *Etroplus*; Fig. 2). *Pseudetroplus* also differs from *Etroplus* in pigmentation, possessing one or more black blotches on the side of the body (vs. 7–9 prominent dark lateral bars in *Etroplus*); possessing two brown stripes on the dorsal fin (vs. lacking stripes on the dorsal fin); and lacking a black patch on the pectoral fin, near its base (vs. black blotch present on base of pectoral fin).

**Discussion.** The name *Pseudetroplus* was published both by Bleeker in Günther (1862) and by Bleeker (1862). While the date of publication of the former is 8 November 1862 (Eschmeyer, 2014), the date of publication of the latter is unknown and must under ICZN (1999) art. 21.3.2 be assumed to be 31 December, 1862. Bleeker (1862) gave the type species as *Etroplus coruchi* Cuvier, 1830 (type locality: Malabar [Kerala], India), a junior subjective synonym of *Chaetodon maculatus* Bloch, 1795 (type locality: ponds along the Coromandel coast [Tamil Nadu], India), while Bleeker in Günther (1862) specified the type species as *E. maculatus*. The statement in Eschmeyer (2014) that “if [Bleeker in Günther] was first, then *suratensis* is probably the type” is evidently an error, for Günther (1862: 266) wrote: “According to a communication from Dr. v. Bleeker, he intends to separate this species [i.e. *E. suratensis*] generically from *E. maculatus*, retaining the name of *Etroplus* for the former, and adopting that of *Pseudetroplus* for the latter [i.e. *E. maculatus*].” Cuvier (1830) used the spelling *Etroplus coruchi* on p. 491 of his text, which indicated plate 136, on which he employed the name *Glyphisodon koraschi*: as first reviser we here give precedence to the spelling *Etroplus coruchi*.

*Microgaster* Swainson, 1839 (type species *E. coruchi* Cuvier, in Cuvier & Valenciennes, 1830), while a senior synonym of *Pseudetroplus*, is a junior homonym of *Microgaster* Latreille (1804: 175) in Hymenoptera.
FIGURE 1. Osteology of 1, *Pseudetroplus maculatus*, WHT 11087, 54.6 mm SL, Kerala, India; 2, *Etroplus suratensis*, WHT 11088, 63.1 mm SL, Bellanwila, Sri Lanka; 3, *E. canarensis*, WHT 11084, 48.3 mm SL, Natravedi River, Bengal, India. A, Anterior caudal vertebrae and associated structures in right lateral view; B, lower pharyngeal jaw; C, posterior view of neurocranium, showing foramen magnum; D, lateral view of supraoccipital crest and associated structures. Abbreviations: Hsp.1, first haemal spine; Apt 1–2, anal pterygiophore 1–2; La, lateral arm of lower pharyngeal jaw; Ms, median suture of lower pharyngeal jaw in lingual view; Sec.pr, supraoccipital-exoccipital prong; Fm, foramen magnum; Soc.cr, supraoccipital crest; Occ.pg, occipital prong; Occ.pr, occipital process. Scale bar 1 mm.
FIGURE 2. Anterior premaxillary dentition of A, *Pseudetroplus maculatus*, AMS B. 8099, 70.5 mm SL, Madras (Tamil Nadu), India; B, *Etroplus suratensis*, AMS I. 4478, 73.4 mm SL, Madras (Tamil Nadu), India; C, *E. canarensis*, AMS B.8148, 61.5 mm SL, Canara (Karnataka), India.

Sparks (2008) and Stiassny et al. (2001) distinguished the South Asian cichlids from their sister group, the Madagascan genus *Paretroplus*, by the former possessing more than a single row (vs. only a single row) of teeth in each jaw; the presence of a single lacrimal plate (lachrymal bifurcated in *Paretroplus*); and an asymmetrical displacement of the first anal-fin pterygiophore behind and the second in front of the haemal spine complex (vs. first anal-fin pterygiophore in front of and the second behind the haemal spine complex). While our results are consistent with this description, we note that the arrangement of anal-fin pterygiophores differs consistently between *Pseudetroplus* and *Etroplus*, with the former having the first 6 pterygiophores falling anterior to the first 3 haemal spines, whereas in the latter the first 6 pterygiophores fall anterior to the first 2 haemal spines: see Fig. 1A). Furthermore, whereas in both *Pseudetroplus* and *Etroplus* all lateral jaw teeth and the inner rows of the anterior teeth are tricuspid, the anterior jaw teeth are acuminate in adult *Pseudetroplus* and spatulate in adult *Etroplus*.

Sparks (2008) noted also that the monophyly of the “*Etroplus suratensis + Etroplus canarensis* clade” (i.e. *Etroplus* sensu stricto) was supported by the presence of a blunt snout with a steeply sloping profile in lateral view (particularly in specimens < about 75mm SL); the presence of seven to nine prominent dark lateral bands; and an unique, unreversed character: a prominent black patch on the pectoral fin near its base. These, together with the dental and osteological characters mentioned in the Diagnosis, above, serve to distinguish *Pseudetroplus* from *Etroplus*.

Day (1877: 415) noted that specimens of *P. maculatus* from Madras (the then presidency, now part of Tamil Nadu
State, in which the type locality, Tharangambadi, is located) possessed 17–18 dorsal-fin and 11–12 anal-fin spines, whereas those in southern Karnataka possessed 19–20 and 14–15 spines, respectively. Should the populations of *Pseudetroplus* in the eastern and western regions of the Indian peninsula prove specifically different, the name *P. coruchi* Cuvier, in Cuvier & Valenciennes, 1830, is available for the latter.

The difference in anterior jaw dentition in *Pseudetroplus* and *Etroplus* appears related to diet, the former being piscivorous, whereas adults of the latter feed on filamentous algae, detritus, aquatic plants and diatoms (Bindu & Padmakumar, 2008).

**Material examined**

*Pseudetroplus maculatus*: AMS B.8099, 70.5 mm SL, Madras [Presidency], India; F. Day (1865–1883); WHT 11087, 54.6 mm SL and WHT 11095, 54.6 mm SL, Kerala, India (c&s).

*Etroplus suratensis*: AMS I.4478, 73.4 mm SL, Madras [Presidency], India; F. Day (1865–1883); WHT 11088, 63.1 mm SL and WHT 11082, 49.0 mm SL, Bellanwila, Sri Lanka (c&s).

*Etroplus canarensis*: AMS B.8148, 61.5 mm SL, putative syntype, Canara [Karnataka], India; F. Day (1865–1883); WHT 11084, 48.3 mm SL, Natravedi River, Bengal, India (c&s).
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