

A primary insight into the molecular phylogeny of *Colias* complex of South America

ALEXANDER V. KIR'YANOV

Centro de Investigaciones en Optica

Loma del bosque 115, Col. Lomas del Campestre, Leon 37150, GTO., Mexico

kiryandov@cio.mx

Abstract

Data on the molecular phylogeny of the *Colias* complex of South America, obtained via barcoding a mitochondrial part of genome (a specific 648 base-pair fragment of the cytochrome oxidase subunit I (CO I) – its 5' region), are reported for the first time to the best of my knowledge. Barcoding was trialed employing the BOLD ('Barcoding of Life Database') platform, where a separate console ('South-American COLias' – 'SACOL'), comprising 93 specimens of all South-American *Colias* sp. plus 2 outgroup specimens (*C. philodice guatemalena* from North America), was under study. The data obtained were then aggregated with the data of barcoding the specimens sourced from representatives of overseas (out of South America) *Colias* sp., available in GenBank, to get an overall pattern of the genus' molecular phylogeny. It is shown that barcoding provides a way to address the type of *Colias* speciation in the region, along with guidance for its unbiased comparison with that of overseas *Colias* sp. It is established that all *Colias* sp. from South America form a single monophyletic clade, characterized by notable interspecific mutational divergences (~3.5–4.5%) and moderate intraspecific ones (0.3–0.9%). Particularly, it reveals the occurrence of three 'well-established' (i.e. notably diverged genetically) species (*C. dimera*, *C. vauthierii*, and *C. alticola new st.*, the latter re-raised to sp. level), plus a complex of three 'emerging' species (*C. lesbia*, *C. euxanthe*, and *C. flaveola*) which are weakly differentiated in mitochondrial part of genome, with intersecting haplotypes. Furthermore, fine details of molecular phylogeny at the lower than sp. level are provided for the rest of South-American *Colias*. Among these, only *C. vauthierii cunninghamii* and *C. euxanthe stuebeli* seem to be *bona ssp.*, as both demonstrate higher distances to their nominative counterparts. Meanwhile, the presented analysis disregards – as per molecular phylogeny data – the sp. status of taxa *weberbaueri*, *mossi*, *nigerrima*, *erika*, *blameyi* and *mendozina*; hence, certain evidences are being brought in for considering all these as *ssp.* of a clinal type within 'super-sp.' *C. flaveola s. lat.* Furthermore, the clade formed by South-American *Colias* is found to be sister to the one comprised of all the remaining *Colias* sp. occurring outside the region, i.e. in Eurasia, North America, and Africa (for instance, divergence of the former clade from outgroup *C. philodice guatemalena* exceeds 5.5%). In general, a straightforward comparison of the results obtained for South-American *Colias* with those for occurring worldwide *Colias*, available in GenBank, led me to the conclusion that these two subcomplexes are largely divergent, constituting two genetically well-differentiated and autonomous, or 'autochthonous' (without inter-scattering between the two), parties, and that in fact, they are *s. lat.* subgenera of genus *Colias*. The first subgenus comprising all South-American *Colias* sp. and named herein *Aucolias* ('Austral *Colias*', viz. 'of Southern hemisphere stem') is sister to the second one (comprising all overseas *Colias* sp. of the Old and New Worlds), for which the name *Colias* (*Colias*) *s. str.* is preserved. The proposed subdivision of the genus is advocated by insight into the historical development of the subgenera concept for *Colias*, which reveals that the proposed subdivision schematics might delete the inconsistencies that are inherent to the preceding attempts of the higher than sp. level systematization of *Colias* butterflies.

Keywords: *Colias*, South America, molecular phylogeny, barcoding, genus, subgenus, systematics.

1. INTRODUCTION

The group of *Colias* of South (S.) America is an interesting ‘brick’ of the genus, but so far, it has been poorly investigated. Although all the *sp.*-level entities that form the complex of S. American *Colias* were described in the 19th and 20th centuries, (see e.g. the summarizing works [VERHULST 2000 a-b, VERHULST 2013]), their *ssp.* are still and continuously being described (see e.g. [VERHULST 2016, KIR’YANOV 2017]). On the other hand, data on S. American *Colias* biology are very limited (apart from sporadic insights into their life-cycle, behavior, host plants, genitalias, seasonal, and geographical variability, etc., addressed in [MÜLLER 1957, PETERSEN 1963, SHAPIRO 1985, BERGER 1986, DESCIMON 1986, SHAPIRO 1989 (91), SHAPIRO 1992, SHAPIRO 1993, VERHULST 2000 a-b, LAMAS 2004, VERHULST 2013, GRIESHUBER ET AL. 2014, BENYAMINI ET AL. 2015]), and there are no reports neither on phylogenetic relations among *Colias* taxa within the range (S. America) nor on their relationship as a whole to *Colias sp.* occurring in other continents. Particularly, to the best of the author’s knowledge, none has been reported so far on the molecular phylogeny of S. American *Colias*, though research works concerning *Colias* butterflies, inherent to some regions of the Northern Hemisphere, are progressively developed [WATT 1995, BRUNTON 1998, POLLOCK ET AL. 1998, WANG & PORTER 2004, WHEAT ET AL. 2005, BRABY ET AL. 2006, WHEAT & WATT 2008, LUKHTANOV ET AL. 2009, SCHOVILLE ET AL. 2011, WATT 2013, LAIHO & GUNILLA 2013, WAHLBERG ET AL. 2014, DWYER ET AL. 2015, KRAMP ET AL. 2016, LIMERI & MOREHOUSE 2016]. However, the need for genetic studies that would clarify the phylogeny of *Colias* genus was prospected as early as the mid-20th century [HOWANITZ 1944, HOWANITZ 1957]. In the meantime, note that first studies on the molecular phylogeny of butterflies, characteristic to some areas of S. America, just got recently started (see e.g. [ELIAS ET AL. 2009, LAVINIA ET AL. 2017]).

For anybody who is familiarized with S. American *Colias* (especially, for those with fieldwork experience), it is nearly apparent that this group is different in many aspects from what is known about their relatives, inherent to Eurasia and North (N.) America. Though intuitive, this ‘feeling’ has influenced the author to undertake a study aiming, first, at gaining a primary insight into the molecular phylogeny of ‘proper’ S. American *Colias* as a concise complex and, second, at uncovering the type of its relationship to the whole of *Colias* in the rest of the World.

The method employed here to address the phylogenetic relations within *Colias* as genus is grounded on the concept of ‘barcoding’, where mitochondrial DNA (as a non-recombining maternally-inherited part of the genome) is under scope for treating mutational divergences of organisms at the intra- or inter-specific levels. Note that in this method, a 648 base-pair (bp) region of mitochondrial DNA, corresponding to 5’ segment of the cytochrome oxidase subunit I (CO I), is commonly used as a marker, or ‘DNA-barcode’ [HEBERT ET AL. 2003 a-b]. Recently, barcoding has been framed within a resource, now known as ‘BOLD’ (‘Barcoding for Life Database’, Guelph, Ontario, Canada; see www.boldsystems.com). Its application allowed researchers to get in the following few years some interesting data on barcoding of many insects, including *Colias* butterflies [LUKHTANOV ET AL. 2009, LAIHO & GUNILLA 2013, HUEMER ET AL. 2014, HEBERT ET AL. 2016, SIKES 2017]. Despite some shortages and limitations are inherent to barcoding as a method [LEITE 2012] (see also the references therein), it is invaluable for drawing a general pattern of the phylogenetic relations of a group of organisms under treatment.

In the present study, I report the data on the molecular phylogeny, resulting from a trial that was realized on the BOLD platform, over a set of *Colias* specimens stemming from the S. American continent. The first part of the results to report was obtained on the base of a console ‘SACOL’

(‘South-American COLias’), while the second part was created after combination of the sequences generated within this console (for S. American *Colias*) with the ones, available in Genbank for some overseas *Colias* specimens.

Although the data obtained through barcoding (which handles a single fragment of the mitochondrial part of the genome) might seem to have limited value and, certainly, a more complex research, covering more regions of mitochondrial plus nuclear parts of the genome, would be required [POLLOCK ET AL. 1998, WHEAT ET AL. 2005, BRABY ET AL. 2006, LEITE 2012, WHEAT & WATT 2008, LAIHO & GUNILLA 2013, WATT ET AL. 2013, WAHLBERG, ET AL. 2014, KRAMP ET AL. 2016, MURILLO-RAMOS ET AL. 2016], fortunately, the current study reveals that whence applying this ‘simple’ routine, the generated phylogeny trees are quite stable and reproducible and the statistics of the calculated nearest-neighbor (further – ‘NN’) distances is highly confident, and so forth. This circumstance has been eventually defined by a type of the material under trial, viz. by the fact of the matter that *Colias* of S. America have turned out to be so genetically divergent (at the *sp.*-level) that the data obtained leave one’s little doubts.

2. MATERIALS

The individuals submitted for barcoding (in total 95, all belonging to the genus *Colias*) have been obtained in the wild in the Americas, with more than 95% of them collected by the author during the last 15 years. Of these, 93 individuals came from S. America (the territory ranging from Central Colombia to Southern Chile and Argentina), whilst the remaining two – chosen as an ‘outgroup’ reference, *C. philodice guatemalena* [EMMEL 1963], – came from Southern N. America (S. Mexico, Chiapas). The basic set of 93 *Colias* specimens represents almost all the *sp.* and *ssp.* of the genus that are currently recognized for S. America [VERHULST 2000 a-b, GRIESCHUBER ET AL. 2012]: *Colias dimera* (nominotypical *sp.*); *Colias vauthierii* (*ssp. vauthierii* and *cunninghamii*); *Colias lesbia* (*ssp. lesbia, dinora, andina, verhulsti, and misti*); *Colias flaveola* (*ssp. flaveola, mossi, mendozina, blameyi, weberbaueri, nigerrima, and erika*); *Colias euxanthe* (*ssp. euxanthe, coeneni, stuebeli, and alticola*). Note that the chosen subdivision is made after [LAMAS 2004], but with the following warnings: (i) Taxa *flaveola, mossi, mendozina, blameyi, weberbaueri, nigerrima, and erika* are considered herein as *ssp.* of *C. flaveola*, though there exists an alternative viewpoint that all these, but excluding *nigerrima*, are separate *Colias sp.*, see e.g. [VERHULST 2013, BENYAMINI, et al. 2014]; the same (viz. a *sp.* status) is assumed by some authors concerning taxon *verhulsti*, but herein it is assumed to be a *ssp.* of *Colias lesbia*. (ii) *C. euxanthe’s ssp. hermina* is considered herein as synonym of *C. euxanthe euxanthe* because of lack of any diagnostic character that might unambiguously evidence the opposite, i.e. the separateness of these two. (iii) The two other taxa (only), *C. flaveola benyamini* and *C. lesbia mineira*, were off scope here, due to unavailability.

Specimens of these *Colias*, ranging at the *sp.* and *ssp.* levels (see Table 1), served as an experimental basis for the SACOL console in BOLD. For each taxon, 2 to 8 specimens, coming from each locality (except for *C. flaveola mendozina*, available as a single specimen), were taken for barcoding, with the idea being to gain insight into the statistical aspects of genetic divergences (NN distances), counted both within the genus (*Colias*) and within either *sp.* Note that similar actions have been taken, for comparison, at barcoding of overseas *Colias*, available in GenBank (where so far, however, there have been almost no data uploads for *Colias* from the S. American continent).

The whole of the *Colias* individuals that served as a source for the analytical work are preserved in the author's collection (Moscow, Russian Federation). Each butterfly providing a specimen under test was photographed, with the resulting images becoming available at the author's console SACOL in BOLD. Prior to making the analysis – comprised extracting DNA and their further processing at the Canadian Center for DNA barcoding (CCDB, Guelph, Ontario, Canada) – single legs of the animals (henceforth 'specimens') were carefully dissected from bodies and posed into single microcells, filled with 96% ethanol (30 mg). These cells formed a plate that was then delivered to the Center for passing through the standardized barcoding.

Table 1: SACOL project: taxa, their designations, numbers of sequenced specimens, localities, and host plants.

<i>Colias</i> sp. / ssp.	Designation on the map (Fig. 4)	Number of specimens	Country of occurrence	Host plant(s)
<i>C. dimera</i> DOUBLEDAY & HEWITSON <i>dimera</i> DOUBLEDAY & HEWITSON	★	8 8	Columbia Ecuador	<i>Trifolium</i> sp. (<i>repens</i> , <i>dubium</i>)
<i>C. vauthierii</i> GUERIN-MENEVILLE <i>vauthierii</i> GUERIN-MENEVILLE <i>cunninghamii</i> BUTLER	▽ △	14 10 4	Chile Argentina	<i>Adesmia</i> sp.
<i>C. lesbia</i> FABRICIUS <i>lesbia</i> FABRICIUS <i>dinora</i> KIRBY <i>andina</i> STAUDINGER <i>verhulsti</i> BERGER <i>misti</i> KIR'YANOV <i>mineira</i> ZIKÁN	★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★	34 7 6 5 12 4 0	Ecuador Peru Bolivia Chile Argentina Brasilia Uruguay	<i>Medicago sativa</i> <i>Medicago</i> sp. <i>Trifolium</i> sp. <i>Astragalus</i> sp.
<i>C. flaveola</i> BLANCHARD <i>flaveola</i> BLANCHARD <i>massi</i> ROTHSCHILD <i>mendoza</i> BREYER <i>blameyi</i> JÖRGENSEN <i>weberbaueri</i> STRAND <i>nigerrima</i> FASSL <i>erika</i> LAMAS <i>benyamini</i> VERHULST	□ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■	27 3 2 1 3 5 3 10 0	Peru Bolivia Chile Argentina	<i>Astragalus</i> sp. <i>Medicago</i> sp.
<i>C. euxanthe</i> FELDER & FELDER <i>euxanthe</i> FELDER & FELDER = <i>hermina</i> BUTLER = <i>coeneni</i> BERGER <i>stuebeli</i> REISSINGER <i>alticola</i> GODMANN & SALVIN	● ● ● ●	10 4 2 2 2	Columbia Ecuador Peru Bolivia Chile	<i>Astragalus</i> sp., <i>Trifolium</i> sp.
<i>C. philodice</i> GODART <i>guatemalena</i> RÖBER	⊕	2 2	Mexico Guatemala	<i>Trifolium</i> sp.



Figure 1. SACOL project: Distributions of specimens (as percentage of total number) over time elapsed from the butterflies' capture (counted prior to sequencing); each vertical bar shows a year-domain of counting.

The distribution of the specimens over the time elapsed after the capture events, in full accord with the collection members' labels, is presented in Fig. 1. As seen, the majority of these were less than 10 years in age (counted prior to the time of sequencing). In turn, the distribution of specimens over number for each taxon is provided in Table 1. Most of the specimens studied came from *sp. Colias flaveola / C. lesbia*, with the intention being an attempt to differentiate these two *sp.* at the intra- and inter-specific levels.

3. METHODS

DNA extracts were prepared from a single leg of a specimen. On behalf of the author, DNA extractions, polymerase chain reaction (PCR) amplification, cycle sequencing and sequence analyses were performed applying the standardized protocols at CCDB. Sequences, electropherograms, and primers' details for all specimens forming the SACOL console were uploaded to BOLD (in the future, these shall be delivered to GenBank for potential public use). The data were analyzed using the workbenches and tools, available on BOLD [RATNASINGHAM & HEBERT 2007]. Note that all these were pre-analyzed to ensure their quality in terms of lack of contaminants and stop codons (the latter serves to insure a probabilistically negative role of 'pseudogenes', or nuclear mitochondrial DNA [LEITE 2012]), but both were found to be null; neither sequence in the set has been determined as lacking unsuccessful traces. Furthermore, the absence of any subjective misidentification of the specimens was approved by BOLD's identification machine (all of them were pre-identified by the author prior to submitting to BOLD).




Figure 2. SACOL project: Distributions of specimens (as percentage of total number) over sequence lengths in bp of the CO I fragment under test (maximum – 648-bp length); each vertical bar corresponds to 40 bp.

Experimentally, sequence diversity was examined using a HMM (hidden Markov model) profile of a specific 648-bp fragment of the mitochondrial CO I gene (its 5' region). The DNA sequences were PCR-amplified using the primer pair (usually accepted for Lepidoptera) LEP-F1 (forward 5'-ATTCAACCAATCATAAAGATAT-3') and LEP-R1 (reverse 5'TAAACTTCTGGATGTCCAAAAA-3'). For details of cycling, processed via the standardized technique, see e.g. [HEBERT ET AL. 2003 a-b, RATNASINGHAM & HEBERT 2007, HEBERT ET AL. 2016]. Specifically, the specimens were passed 2 to 5 times to ensure repeatability and reliability of the generated sequences; the data were assembled and analyzed using the BOLD Aligner (using a HMM based analysis). To generate neighbor trees in phylogenetics, cladistic, and unrooted versions (see the examples below), the standard Kimura-2-parameter distance model [KIMURA 1981] was employed, without filtering. Note that all data presented below were generated from the sequences obtained at a limit of

>500 bp, a criterium that provides, at worst, 1% uncertainty of base calls. As seen from Fig. 2, such DNA sequences were obtained from more than 99% source specimens, including those stemming from the older material. High confidence in the results obtained (viz., the generic trees and the distance summaries, see Section 4) is ensured by high quality and reliability of the input (viz. the experimental income itself and the generated sequences; see Fig. 3).




Figure 3. SACOL project: Distributions of specimens (as percentage of total number) in terms of sequence quality, ranged by degree of overall confidence (in turn, represented in uncertainty percentage).

Phylogeny trees were built either on the sequences obtained for all 93 S. American *Colias* specimens plus 2 outgroup *Colias philodice guatemalena*, forming the body of SACOL, or, additionally, on their representatives merged with the sequences obtained from *Colias sp.* of overseas provenance plus the ones sourced by 'neighboring' *sp.* of genera *Zerene* and *Aphrissa* [WHEAT ET AL. 2005, BRABY ET AL. 2006, WHEAT & WATT 2008], available in GenBank. In the last case, correctness and easiness of processing was provided by full compatibility of these, given the same analytical resources, standardized at the BOLD platform, employed.

Note that the statistical pairwise analyses of the data were feasible directly on the BOLD platform. The results of such analytical tests are highlighted below in the form of tables where average mutational distances between the correspondent haplotypes (intra-*sp.* divergences) are compared with the ones within haplotypes (inter-*sp.* divergences). The latter data seem to be valuable for making estimates for both internal genetic divergence of S. American *Colias* and as the whole relatively to their overseas sisters and for revealing the types of intra-group divergences, inherent to *Colias* of S. America overall versus to outgroup *Colias sp.* (of the rest of the World).

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The mapping of the material that served as source for the SACOL project is presented in Fig. 4, with collecting places marked by symbols of different kinds that identify each *Colias sp./ssp.* (different colors highlight the ground coloration of males' verso). Note that the explicit information about the barcoded specimens, as well as the sequences generated, are available on BOLD (SACOL console: specimens AVK-001 – AVK-095).

The phylogeny trees generated as the output of barcoding are demonstrated in Figs. 5 to 9. Figs. 5 – 7 provide a resume of the results for S. American *Colias*, framed by SACOL only whilst Figs. 8 – 9 present an extended view on branching pattern of *Colias* as genus (discussed in more detail

in Section 5). In the last case, the data from sequencing SACOL's specimens are combined with those for worldwide *Colias*, available in GenBank. In Fig. 7 are provided the illustrations of some of the adults from which the specimens under study came to facilitate one's understanding of the relationship between the butterflies' phenotypes and their generic positions on the trees generated. Fig. 10 shows the statistical 'fingerprints' (in terms of NN distances) of S. American *Colias* (SACOL's data) against overseas *Colias* sp., stemming from N. America, Eurasia, and Africa (GenBank's data), as the result of barcoding. Tables 1 to 3 permit one to elucidate some of the details, discussed in the text.

In Fig. 4, the localities of capture of all 95 *Colias* butterflies, establishing the whole barcoded specimens (SACOL) are mapped. For easiness of attributing the material, the symbols designating each sp./ssp. in Fig. 4 (as these were a priori determined by the author) are copied to Table 1. As seen from Fig. 4 and Table 1, the collecting range covers the whole S. American continent, from the north (Colombia) to the south (S. Patagonia), while it is mainly restricted to the Andes and adjacent territories, where abundance of *Colias* taxa is the highest (as they mostly prefer temperate environments where their host plants grow in suitable numbers).

As said in Section 1, the *Colias* complex of S. America is composed of a few (only) well-established sp. [LAMAS 2004] sp.: *Colias dimera* (nominotypical sp.: 'sp.' *tolima* is considered to be a synonym of *dimera*); *Colias vauthierii* (ssp. *vauthierii* and *cunninghamii*); *Colias lesbia* (ssp. *lesbia*, *dinora*, *andina*, *verhulsti*, *mineira*, and *misti*); *Colias flaveola* (ssp. *flaveola*, *mossi*, *mendozina*, *blameyi*, *weberbaueri*, *nigerrima*, *erika*, and *benyamini*); *Colias euxanthe* (ssp. *euxanthe*, *hermina* = *euxanthe*, *coeneni*, *stuebeli*, and *alticola*). Namely, the places where all these taxa occur, but excluding *C. flaveola benyamini* and *C. lesbia mineira* (unavailable), are symbolized in Fig. 4. To complete the picture, the locality for outgroup *Colias philodice guatemalena* (S. Mexico) is added: see the map's upper left corner. Note that the points of type localities for the taxa belonging to S. American *Colias* are not marked on the map, but the reader may refer to [BERGER 1986, VERHULST 2000 a-b, VERHULST 2013] to make sure that the collecting places for the SACOL's specimens match them well.

Besides, I found it reasonable to provide on the map the place (highlighted as '?', the Magellan region) of probable provenance of the legendary *Colias ponteni* = *C. imperialis*, a butterfly never again collected after the capture of its type series and descriptions in the mid-19th century [SHAPIRO 1989 (91), SHAPIRO 1993]. The type series of this *Colias* were inaccessible for barcoding; so, this important representative of the *Colias* genus, as the most primitive amongst the others [PETERSEN 1963], was out of scope here.

In Fig. 5, I present the phylogenetic tree obtained after barcoding the SACOL's specimens, i.e. all S. American *Colias* plus outgroup *Colias philodice guatemalena*. Note that in this tree, as well as in the ones shown below, horizontal distance between specimens' positions is a measure (in percentage) of relative mutational divergence. Accordingly, if a few specimens are grouping in clusters (branches), horizontal distance becomes a measure of mutational divergence between such clusters (being the whole, or a part of, subgenus, sp., ssp., 'lineage', or haplotype). As seen from Fig. 5, all SACOL specimens are split into five well-separated and largely distinct clusters, distancing by mutational divergences of ~4.5% in average.

The two outgroup specimens of *C. philodice guatemalena* are joined together, forming the first cluster ('1'), significantly spaced off (by ~5.6%) from the rest of the specimens coming from 'proper' S. America); see also Section 5.



Figure 4. Mapping of collecting places (SACOL console). For details, see Table 1, Fig. 7, and the text.




Figure 5. Hierarchical phylogeny tree (branching in relative distances), generated via 'barcoding' *Colias* specimens (SACOL console).









The presence of two other concise clusters ('2' and '3' in Fig. 5), one comprising all the *Colias dimera* specimens and the other all the *Colias vauthierii* specimens, perfectly supports the *sp.* status of the two entities. In the meantime, whereas the specimens of *C. dimera* are weakly differentiated within own cluster (evidencing nominotypical essence of this *sp.*), the ones of *C. vauthierii* are split into two well-differentiated sub-clusters (spaced by ~1%) that entirely correspond to the phenotypically different *ssp. vauthierii* and *cunninghamii*.

The situation with the rest of S. American *Colias* (*C. lesbia*, *C. flaveola*, and *C. euxanthe*) is more sophisticated and even controversial.

First, in Fig. 5, it is obvious that the two specimens of *C. euxanthe alticola* are 'cut off' from all other specimens of *C. euxanthe* (*ssp. euxanthe*, *coeneni*, and *stuebeli*) by >4% mutational divergence distance, thus establishing its own cluster ('4') in the tree. This casts no doubts that this taxon is, in fact, a separate (*bona sp.*, hereafter referred to as *C. alticola* (*new st.*)). It is worth noting that *C. alticola* had been originally described as a distinct *sp.* with the same name [GODMAN & SALVIN 1891]. Hence, the action performed above is nothing more than the taxon's re-raising to its original rank.

Second, the remnant *ssp.* of *C. euxanthe*, taken together with all *ssp.* of *C. lesbia* and *C. flaveola*, are almost indistinguishable at a glance within cluster '5', comprising the majority of SACOL's specimens. This circumstance is surprising, given that, phenotypically, these three *sp.* are easily differentiable by the eye (Fig. 7), and, besides, they commonly have different plants as hosts (Table 1) and somewhere occur in sympatry. However, genetically, as seen from Fig. 5, these *sp.* deviate from each other slightly, by no more than 0.3%. Besides, the intraspecific divergences within each of these taxa – at the *ssp.* level – are quite comparable, ~0.15–0.2% (see below). Thus, primary overview of the genetic differences among *C. lesbia*, *C. flaveola*, and *C. euxanthe* (but excluding *C. alticola*) leads me to the conclusion that they constitute a complex of weakly deviated taxa of presumably young age, thus pointing their status as 'emerging' *sp.* Interestingly, insight into the fine structure of this complex shows that the haplotypes formed in the fifth cluster (with the tolerance of barcoding) are sometimes shared by these three *sp.* That is, some of the individuals, apparently belonging to one of them, according to their well-established phenotypes, are frequently 'scattered' across the haplotypes, which indicates close relatedness of *C. lesbia*, *C. flaveola*, and *C. euxanthe*.

Table 2: Hybrid 'putative' forms in the complex *C. euxanthe* / *C. lesbia* / *C. flaveola* (a-b-c, e-f-g-h) and white-male form of *C. e. euxanthe* (d); top – males; bottom – females (the asterisked form (h) has passed barcoding, *). Compare the hybrid male-forms with common appearances of males in these *sp.* – see images in Fig. 7.

	<i>C. e. euxanthe</i> / <i>C. f. weberbaueri</i>	<i>C. e. euxanthe</i> / <i>C. l. verhulsti</i>	<i>C. e. euxanthe</i> / <i>C. l. misti</i>	<i>C. e. euxanthe</i> (white male-form)
m	 (a)	 (b)	 (c)	 (d)
	<i>C. e. euxanthe</i> / <i>C. f. nigerrima</i>	<i>C. e. euxanthe</i> / <i>C. l. andina</i>	<i>C. e. weberbaueri</i> / <i>C. l. andina</i>	<i>C. l. misti</i> / <i>C. f. erika</i> (*)
f	 (e)	 (f)	 (g)	 (h)

Furthermore, it is worth noticing that butterflies of these three *sp.* (cluster '5'), when spatially overlapping in Nature – which happens frequently, given by their generally sympatric occurrence, – not rarely tend to copulate, with a variety of 'putative' hybrids produced, a fact known to people familiar with the biology of S. American *Colias*. A few examples of such natural hybridization, figured in Table 2, may serve as support for the entities' genetical neighborhood and close relatedness, and hence, point at introgression and intensive gene flow amongst. In this sense, the presence of stable white-male forms in *C. euxanthe euxanthe* (viz. *dimorpha* aberration), almost coinciding in habitus with white males of *C. flaveola erika* (see panel (d) in the Table), is of mention, too.

On the contrary, there are no data (and the author has never met such examples, either) about hybridizing in the wild between, say, *C. dimera* and *C. alticola* or *C. lesbia dinora* (in Ecuador) or between *C. vauthierii* and *C. lesbia* (in Central Argentina), even in the areas of their close neighborhood or sympatry (though such co-occurrence is rare).

The examples presented to illustrate hybridization among S. American *C. lesbia*, *C. flaveola*, and *C. euxanthe* (a natural phenomenon but correlating with the sharing of the entities' haplotypes, as established by the phylogenetic pattern shown in Fig. 5) recall a many-times visited case of hybridization among N. American *Colias*, e.g. between the genetically close *C. eurytheme*, *C. philodice*, and *C. eriphyle* [GEROULD 1946, AE 1959, HOWANITZ 1963, WATT 1995, WANG & PORTER 2004, PORTER & LEVIN 2007, WHEAT & WATT 2008, ESTOUP & GUILLEMAUD 2010, JAHNER ET AL. 2012, SHAPIRO 2012, WATT ET AL. 2013, DWYER ET AL. 2015]. Note that in the last research, the authors discuss in detail genetic drivers of the phenomenon using the approach of [WANG & PORTER 2004] but conclude on incomplete resolving of the case. Besides, for Eurasia, a well-known example of genetically indistinguishable, on one side, but easily hybridizing, on the other, are *C. erate* and *C. croceus*; see e.g. [LUKHTANOV ET AL. 2009].

Concerning S. American *Colias* (*C. lesbia*, *C. flaveola*, and *C. euxanthe*), the interrelations of a tendency to hybridize, giving rise to the makeups exemplified in Table 2, and a high degree of sharing of haplotypes (refer to Fig. 5) by these phenotypically different *sp.* seem to be an interesting issue for further studies. In this sense, the questions posed in e.g. [LUKHTANOV ET AL. 2009] deserve attention: whether both effects are explained by recent speciation of these taxa (viz. their current evolutionary stage as 'emerging' *sp.*), or by a balanced character of sympatric occurrence (introgression against selection), in the recent past or presently, as genetically weakly diverged entities, having developed before as allopatric. However, one should account for the fact that phylogenetic identity of these 3 *sp.* is established here as the result of barcoding (where, remind, a sole fragment of mitochondrial DNA was under treatment). Hence, it cannot be ruled out that the mutations that are impactful for the natural separation of these three *sp.* might arise in very few different loci outside this fragment and so unrecoverable by the method used.

It is worth emphasizing that the phylogenic clusters (branches '3' to '5'), embracing *sp.* *C. vauthierii*, *C. alticola*, *C. lesbia*, *C. flaveola*, and *C. euxanthe*, form a single clade, or lineage, separated from the one of *C. dimera* of Northern S. America; furthermore, this group of *sp.* as the whole is largely spaced genetically from *C. philodice guatemalena* of Southern N. America. This allows plotting the results of barcoding S. American *Colias*' in the form of an 'unrooted' tree: see Fig. 6. Note that trees of such type are helpful in addressing the fine structure of a group under scope (see e.g. [WATT ET AL. 2013, DWYER ET AL. 2015]) and, eventually, allowing to define – by means of estimating relative NN distances – a type of components (genera, separate *sp.*, *ssp.*, lineages, populations, etc.) that such a group is composed of, if average relative mutational divergences between evolutionary units of similar groups of organisms of this or genetically adjacent genera are known (or can be reliably estimated) from other sources.




Figure 6. Unrooted phylogeny tree (for relative distances), generated applying barcoding of SACOL's *Colias* specimens.

From Fig. 6, on the one hand, one sees, again, the large genetic divergences between the 'good' (i.e. well established after long-time of separate historical development) *sp.*, viz. *C. dimera*, *C. vauthierii*, *C. alticola*, plus the group of 'emerging' *sp.* *C. lesbia*, *C. flaveola*, and *C. euxanthe*, as these four are spaced out by ~4 to ~5% changes in the mitochondrial DNA. On the other hand, all members of the latter complex (tentatively attributed here as *ssp.* of either of the 'emerging' *sp.*) are split by very small genetic divergences.

Fig. 7 provides a summary of barcoding, focused on intra-specific (at the *ssp.* or populational level) mutational divergences of all S. American *Colias*, framed by SACOL console; it is illustrated by the images of some of the adults, received DNA sequencing.

As seen, all these (including *C. alticola*) are easily identifiable (and separable) by the eye, regardless of fine differences of *ssp.* phenotypes (i.e. deviations in ground coloration, wing shape, size, etc.). Noticeably, the visual perception correlates well with the data of barcoding, proceeded separately for each *sp.*

For instance, the adults of nominative *ssp.* and *ssp. cunninghamii* of *C. vauthierii*, as well as nominative *ssp.* and *ssp. stuebeli* of *C. euxanthe*, are seen to be phenotypically quite distinct; in turn, the genetic divergences between these are considerable, supporting the visual sorting: in the first pair, it is measured by ~0.9%, whereas in the second by ~0.4% (see the two upper panels in Fig. 7).

Of another kind is the circumstance of 'emerging' *sp.* *C. lesbia*, *C. flaveola*, and of *C. euxanthe*: see the panels in the middle part and bottom of Fig. 7.




Figure 7. Subpanels on the left: phylogenetic branches (haplotypes) of the tree plotted in Fig. 5, each generated for each *Colias* sp. covered by SACOL project, revealing their intra-specific divergence; symbols correspond to the legends used for mapping the taxa in Fig. 4. Distance scaling is always provided nearby. Subpanels on the right: images exemplifying the adults sourced for the barcoded specimens. On the upper right corner, the image of one of the type specimens of *C. ponteni* = *C. imperialis* is shown for comparison (the photo was taken on permission of the authorities of the British Museum of Natural History (London, UK)).

For these *sp.*, both intra-specific and inter-populational divergences are notably small (~0.1–0.2%); this result is a bit surprising, because, say, the members (recognized *ssp.*) of *C. lesbia*'s complex are peculiar in overall habitus and ground coloration (e.g. see in the figure dirty-yellowish *C. lesbia misti*). However, notice the inconsistency between intra-specific phenotypic variability (mostly expressed in ground coloration) among *ssp.* of *C. flaveola*, 'fleeting' from snow-white in *ssp. flaveola* and *erika* to almost black in *ssp. nigerrima* and *mossi*, on the one side, and, on the other, their remarkable genetic homogeneity (~0.05% divergence); see the right-bottom panel in Fig. 7.

Finally, note that the case of *C. alticola* was addressed above; in fact, this taxon presents an infrequent example of hidden, or cryptic, *sp.* in the *Colias* genus.

All these trends, established after analyzing Figs. 5–7, are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3: Parameters of intra- and inter-specific relatedness in S. American *Colias*.

sp.	Mean deviations of NN distances within taxon, %	Maximal deviations of NN distances within taxon, %	Average distances to NN within SACOL project's members (between sp.), %	Notes
<i>C. dimera</i>	0.16	0.31	4.25 to <i>vauthierii</i>	homogeneous <i>sp.</i> : no apparent <i>ssp.</i> ; variability on populational level only
<i>C. vauthierii</i> (including <i>ssp. cunninghamii</i>)	0.38	0.93	3.52 to complex <i>lesbia-euxanthe-flaveola</i> as whole	two well-differentiable <i>ssp.</i>
<i>C. vauthierii</i> (excluding <i>ssp. cunninghamii</i>)	0.01	0.01	–	notably homogeneous <i>ssp.</i>
<i>C. vauthierii cunninghamii</i>	0.56	0.93	–	quite inhomogeneous in populations <i>ssp.</i>
<i>C. flaveola</i> (all <i>ssp.</i>)	0.13	0.49	<0.25 to <i>euxanthe</i> (but excluding <i>alticola</i>) and to <i>lesbia</i>	genetically hardly differentiated from <i>lesbia</i> & <i>euxanthe</i> ; has many 'phenotypical' <i>ssp.</i>
<i>C. euxanthe</i> (all <i>ssp.</i> including <i>C. alticola</i> new st.)	1.77	4.73	<0.25 to <i>lesbia</i> & <i>flaveola</i>	genetically hardly differentiated from <i>flaveola</i> & <i>lesbia</i> ; [note: <i>alticola</i> is implied to be separate <i>sp.</i>]
<i>C. euxanthe</i> (all <i>ssp.</i> excluding <i>C. alticola</i>)	0.19	0.46	3.56 to <i>alticola</i>	composed of two well-defined <i>ssp.</i>
<i>C. alticola</i>	0	0	3.56 to all <i>ssp.</i> of <i>euxanthe</i> but excluding <i>alticola</i>	genetically & phenotypically is separate <i>sp.</i>
<i>C. lesbia</i> (all <i>ssp.</i>)	0.17	0.49	<0.25 to all <i>ssp.</i> of <i>euxanthe</i> but excluding <i>alticola</i> and to <i>flaveola</i>	genetically hardly differentiated from <i>flaveola</i> & <i>euxanthe</i> ; has many 'topotypical' (genetically weakly diverging) <i>ssp.</i>
<i>C. philodice guatemalena</i>	0.16	0.16	5.57 to <i>dimera</i>	southernmost <i>ssp.</i> of <i>sp.</i> belonging to a different <i>Colias</i> subgenus

The data presented in the Table may be compared with the ones known for average divergences found in the literature for other (aside S. America) representatives of genus *Colias* [WHEAT ET AL. 2008].

For instance, for closely-related and cryptic *sp.* within the genus, genetic divergences are estimated to be 0.67–1.53%, whereas those for 'solid', or strongly differing in habitus (including the ones belonging to different *Colias* subgenera), *sp.*, these are estimated to be 0.55–2.26%;

meanwhile, the divergences detected on sub- and semi-specific or inter-regional levels for *Colias* do not exceed 0.77%. Upon comparing this set of values with the values presented in Table 3, it becomes clear that, apart from 'emerging' sp. *C. lesbia*, *C. euxanthe*, and *C. flaveola* (almost indistinguishable in barcodes), the rest of S. American *Colias* demonstrate larger or much larger relative divergences: 3.5–4.3%; note that this law is particularly obeyed in the case of the complex of *C. lesbia*, *C. euxanthe*, and *C. flaveola* if it is treated as a single concise unit.

In the meantime, the distance of all S. American *Colias* to outgroup *C. philodice guatemalena* is notably larger (~5.6%): this value is comparable with the distance of the *Colias* genus as a whole from its sister, the genus *Zerene*. This points at the following hypotheses as least: (i) a history of S. American *Colias* as a whole is relatively older than that of overseas *Colias* and (ii) strong genetic diversification within the complex of well-differentiated sp. of S. American *Colias*, indicating independent evolutions for long time and without serious gene flow amongst.

More details of unusual appearance of S. American *Colias* against their relatives, occurring in the rest of the World, can be uncovered via straightforward comparison of these two subcomplexes; the results are highlighted in Figs. 8–10. Here, the barcoding data of (i) the representatives of S. American *Colias* framed by the SACOL console and (ii) the ones of most overseas *Colias* sp. (from Eurasia, N. America, and N. Africa), sequences of which stemmed from GenBank, are provided. The combined set of the latter data has passed analytical processing, analogous to the one applied when handling solely the SACOL specimens (as described in Section 3). To ensure reliability of the trees generated, a sequence available in GenBank for *C. lesbia* (the only data for a sp. belonging to S. American *Colias* in the database) was in this case incorporated *ab initio* as input. This fact, together with the fact that sequences for *C. philodice guatemalena* (the reference outgroup *Colias* in the SACOL console) had many sequences in GenBank, received from its close relatives in N. America, *C. philodice* ssp. and *C. eurytheme* ssp., provided a good base for an independent cross-check of the results.

The type of the hierarchical phylogeny tree shown in Fig. 8 permits to reveal the following laws.

First, all S. American *Colias* (including *C. dimera*) form a separate segment of the tree, largely divergent from *Colias* sp. inhabiting other continents, by more than 4.5% of relative distance (as measured relatively to the closest *C. hyale* / *C. alfacariensis* lineage). Second, the internal structure of the subcomplex comprising all S. American *Colias* (viz. sp. *C. vauthierii*, *C. alticola*, *C. lesbia*, *C. euxanthe*, *C. flaveola*, and *C. dimera*) is not altered by biasing the 'outside' worldwide *Colias* sp., i.e. no 'cross-talks' between the former and the latter subcomplexes were ever generated. Third, the last subcomplex, comprising all *Colias* of the Old and New (but excluding S. American *Colias*) Worlds, appears to be generally of quite different, more polyphyletic, essence. Fourth, once considered as the whole, this subcomplex clearly becomes sister to the one comprising all S. American *Colias* (with *C. dimera*'s lineage of Northern S. America being its nearest relative). Fifth (in turn), for these two subcomplexes, the subgenera *stat.* can be of worthiness only (but see Section 5 for a more comprehensive treatment, though). Sixth, a detail that may validate reliability and stability of the tree built is that the reference elements chosen to enter the combined data set – *C. philodice guatemalena* from the SACOL console and *C. lesbia* from GenBank – are 'properly' nested by barcoding on the phylogeny tree; that is, they occupy the places explicitly adherent to their closest relatives – *C. philodice* and *C. eurytheme* of GenBank and *C. lesbia* (cluster '5', SACOL), correspondingly.

Note that the *Colias* subgenera, after [BERGER 1986], ‘wrapped’ as legends inside the tree plotted in Fig. 8, are more explicitly discussed in Section 5, where the issue of *Colias* genus’ subdivision is addressed in detail.

In Fig. 9, I show the unrooted phylogeny tree, built on some of the characteristic elements that constitute the hierarchical tree (Fig. 8), as an illustration that helps one to ‘snapshot’ the basic novelties that the present study brings in. Namely, in Fig. 9 are delimited all the lineages formed by the subcomplex of *Colias* of S. America (ranged in terms of clusters ‘2’ to ‘5’ in Fig. 5), plus a few ones of the subcomplex of overseas *Colias*: (i) the one, represented by the reference *sp. C. philodice* / *C. eurytheme* and (ii) the other, composed of *sp. C. hyale* / *C. alfacariences*, closest in NN distances to S. American *Colias*. The neighboring genera, *Aphrissa* and *Zerene*, being genetic sisters to *Colias* [WHEAT ET AL. 2005], are kept in the mapping for a comprehensive comparison.

The dashed ellipses in Fig. 9 topologically specify single branches, or clades, of the tree, the first covering all S. American *Colias* *sp.* (thus, advocating its ‘proper’ status) and the second covering the ‘remnant’ (worldwide) *Colias* *sp.* The first clade – I believe I act unambiguously – is named herewith ‘*Aucolias*’, viz. ‘*Austral Colias*’, highlighting the region of S. America as provenance, or ‘the Southern Hemisphere’, i.e. ‘*Austral America*’. In fact, it should be considered as a well-supported new subgenus (hereafter *Aucolias* *new s.*) of the *Colias* genus, having been detached at its primary branching from a hypothetical ancestor, and subsequently splitting into its own lineages.

As seen from comparison of Figs. 8 and 9, the subgenus *Aucolias* is sister to the group that comprises the rest of worldwide *Colias*, which accordingly becomes the other *Colias* subgenus. Note that, in accordance to the history of the *Colias* subgenera concept (see Section 5), the name *Colias* as subgenus should be preserved for the latter group of *sp.* (with the type *sp.* being *Colias hyale*).

It is emphasized that *Colias (Colias)* – in contrast to *Aucolias (Colias)*, composed of 6 *sp.* only – is highly diverse in internal splitting, eventually yielding >70 *Colias* *sp.* In accord, these two subgenera ought to have one, and the same, ancestor, thus revealing monophyly of the *Colias* genus, gathering these two without any ‘cross-talk’. An event possibly underlying such splitting is schematized in Fig. 9 by the orange asterisk.

To the end of this section, the tabulation summarizing the data presented above in the form of phylogenetic trees is given in Fig. 10, allowing one’s overall view on their statistical parameters.

5. DISCUSSION AND NOTES ON THE INTERNAL SYSTEMATICS OF COLIAS AS GENUS

As known, the *Pieridae*, as a family, remain the most poorly investigated diurnal butterflies, and only recently have some attempts been made to bring in more clarity into its systematics, based on molecular phylogeny. The same unhappy circumstance, but with more ‘internal’ mess, is still preserved with *Colias* as genus and its subgenera [BRABY 2005], and with the relationship of these as a whole with systematically close genera, among which the closest one, as has been recently established, is *Zerene* [POLLOCK ET AL. 1998]. First unambiguous actions to clarify and fixate the situation with the higher than *sp.* level systematics of *Colias* have been also attempted, employing contemporary molecular phylogenetics methods [POLLOCK ET AL. 1998, WHEAT ET AL. 2005, BRABY ET AL. 2006, WHEAT ET AL. 2008, LAIHO ET AL. 2013, WAHLBERG, ET AL. 2014, KRAMP ET AL. 2016]; however, none of these studies dealt with S. American *Colias*. The two exclusions are the recent researches [MURILLO-RAMOS ET AL. 2016, LAVINIA ET AL. 2017]: in the first work, the case of *C. dimera*, but sole among the other representatives of American *Coliadinae*, is considered from the metamorphological point of view, while in the second one, the position of *C. lesbia* is defined, employing barcoding, among the complex of butterflies of S. Argentina.




Figure 8. Hierarchical phylogeny tree (for relative distances), generated applying sequencing, built on the basis of the combination of the data stemming from ‘barcoding’ S. American *Colias* (SACOL project: highlighted in grey) and the ones obtained using an analogous routine from GenBank, sourced from characteristic representatives (*sp.*) of genus *Colias* from outside S. America, as well as from representatives (*sp.*) of genetically closest genera *Zerene* (sister to genus *Colias*) and *Aphrissa* (sister to genera *Zerene* / *Colias*); the whole of the data stemming from GenBank are highlighted in red. Warning: in italics (see also dashed boxes) is indicated the currently used subdivision on 8 subgenera of *Colias* genus [BERGER 1986], apparently inconsistent with the data of molecular phylogeny.




Figure 9. Unrooted phylogenetic tree, generated applying ‘barcoding’ made on the basis of the representative data stemming from the SACOL project (refer to Fig. 6), combined with such ones stemming from GenBank, sourced from specimens of the few genetically closest *Colias* sp. outside S. America (*C. philodice*, *C. eurytheme*, *C. hyale*, and *C. alfacariensis*), and one more S. American specimen (*C. lesbia*). Also, the data of ‘barcoding’ of representatives of taxonomically closest genera (*Zerene*: sister to *Colias*) and *Aphrissa* (sister to *Zerene*) are added. The orange asterisk tentatively marks the ‘bifurcation point’, adherent to a process that might have led to separating subgenus *Aucolias* (*Colias*) of S. America from its counterpart (now sister) subgenus *Colias* (*Colias*).




Figure 10. Histograms of NN distance statistics (as percentage of the total number of specimens covered by the analyses) for *Colias* sp. within the genus (on the left), and within each sp., treated separately (on the right). The two upper histograms are built on the data base from GenBank (excluding the ones from the SACOL project), and the two lower ones are built exclusively on the SACOL data base.

Thus, the present study is the first one dedicated to examination of the complex of S. American *Colias* by means of molecular phylogeny. As demonstrated above, this, yet primary, insight has allowed uncovering interesting patterns of NN divergences among S. American *Colias* themselves (treated as a separate concise complex), as well as between these and ‘remaining’ *Colias* sp., distributed worldwide (but off S. America).

As seen from the above reported data (see Figs. 5 to 9 and the notes therein), the complex comprising all S. American *Colias* is a monophyletic clade, was never reported before. Its main essence is extremely large (larger or much larger than in overseas *Colias*) relative NN distances, or divergences, discriminating their entries (*sp.*). The internal structure of S. American *Colias* is characterized in terms of four clusters, with three of them being monospecific (defined and represented by *C. dimera*, *C. vauthierii*, and *C. alticola*), and the fourth gathering three weakly differentiating, or emerging, *sp.* (*C. lesbia*, *C. flaveola*, and *C. euxanthe*). Besides, once this complex is straightforwardly characterized in terms of phylogenetic relations to the one comprising all other worldwide *Colias* (refer to Figs. 8 and 9), it becomes apparent that there are notable separation and distinction of the two. It is worth mentioning that S. American *Colias* sp. and overseas *Colias* are never intermixed in the phylogeny trees built as the result of barcoding. This has forced me to assign the clade formed by all S. American *Colias* (viz. ‘solid’ *sp.* *C. dimera*, *C. vauthierii*, and *C. alticola*, plus the group of emerging *sp.* *C. lesbia*, *C. flaveola*, and *C. euxanthe*) as a new subgenus, *Aucolias* (*Colias*).

Certainly, a more detailed research would be required to seek additional evidences in support of the proposed schematics of *Colias*’ phylogeny, say, via a phylogenetic trial based on more versatile fragments of the mitochondrial part of genome or/and its nuclear part. However, it seems to be doubtful that the highlighted internal structure of S. American *Colias* as a complex would become different in its key aspects.

Furthermore, let me try to gain here insight into the current (but prior to this study) *Colias*’ systematics in terms of gradating the genus on subgenera. In Table 4, a resume of how subdivision on subgenera of the *Colias* genus developed historically is snapshotted. Note that, in all attempts to deal with the issue, the authors dealt with phenomenological terms, viz. with the butterflies’ phenotypes, genitalia’s details, geographic distributions, etc. As seen from the Table, to the end of the 20th century, it was created mess in the pattern; e.g., see the inconsistencies highlighted (in bold) the different subgenera being created whereas based on same type taxa).


Table 4: Historical view on the development of the *Colias*’ subgenera concept. Highlighted are: in yellow – subgenera proposed for S. American *Colias*; in bold – differently named subgenera but based on same type entities.

Subgenus	Type sp.	Range
<i>Colias</i> Fabricius, 1807	<i>C. hyale</i>	Eurasia
<i>Eurymus</i> Horsfield, 1829	<i>C. hyale</i> [in fact, <i>C. erate</i>]	Eurasia
<i>Scaledoneura</i> Butler 1871	<i>C. euxanthe</i>	S. America
<i>Eriocolias</i> Watson, 1895	<i>C. edusa</i> [= <i>C. croceus</i>]	Europe and N. Africa
<i>Caliastes</i> Hemming, 1931	<i>C. hyale</i>	Eurasia
<i>Mesocolias</i> Petersen, 1963	<i>C. vauthierii</i>	S. America
<i>Protocolias</i> Petersen, 1963	<i>C. imperialis</i> [= <i>C. ponteni</i>]	S. America or Pacific
<i>Palaecolias</i> Berger, 1986	<i>C. ponteni</i> [= <i>C. imperialis</i>]	S. America or Pacific
<i>Neocolias</i> Berger, 1986	<i>C. erate</i>	Eurasia
<i>Eucolias</i> Berger, 1986	<i>C. palaeno</i>	N. Eurasia and N. America
<i>Paracolias</i> Berger, 1986	<i>C. dimera</i>	S. America
<i>Similicolias</i> Berger, 1986	<i>C. lesbia</i>	S. America
<i>Asiocolias</i> Korb, 2005	<i>C. christophi</i>	C. Asia

Probably, this unsatisfactory situation forced L. BERGER [BERGER 1986] to revise the internal systematics of *Colias* as genus; this was a historically recent action to stabilize its subdivision,

which – with higher or lower confidence – is utilized to-date. It is worthwhile noting that BERGER’s systematics was grounded on dealing with an only few morphological characters, sometimes weakly diagnosable in *Colias* butterflies, which led him to propose 6 (!) new subgenera for *Colias*, with some of these insufficiently supported. BERGER’s view on the matter has since then been criticized many times by experienced specialists. Recently, when the point of *Colias* genus’ subdivision was revisited by M. BRABY [BRABY 2005], it was stated that “BERGER’s subgenera”, besides *Colias (Colias)*, “can only be listed tentatively until further studies”.

Therefore, because of mist dazed on *Colias* systematics (as shown above), on the one hand, and, on the other hand, given that the data on the molecular phylogenetics of S. American *Colias* reported in Section 4 gave real news about their place in the *Colias* phylogeny tree, it is reasonable to propose here an alternative systematics for *Colias*.



Genus	Subgenera	Lineages (ex-subgenera)	Type sp.	Number of sp.	Scattering of NN distances within lineage, %
<i>Colias</i> Fabricius 1807	<i>Colias</i> s. str.	<i>Colias</i> s. str.	<i>C. hyale</i>	3	0.31
		<i>Eriocolias</i> Watson 1895	<i>C. croceus</i>	71	0.19
	<i>Aucolias</i> nov.	<i>Paracolias</i> Berger 1986	<i>C. dimera</i>	1	0.16
		<i>Mesocolias</i> Petersen 1963	<i>C. vauthierii</i>	1	0.38
		<i>Scaledoneura</i> Butler 1871	<i>C. euxanthe</i>	3	0.18
		<i>Altocolias</i> nov.	<i>C. alticola</i>	1	0.00

Figure 11. Top: hierarchical phylogeny of *Colias* as genus (generalized scheme); bottom: tabulated list of *Colias*’ higher-than-sp. classification (genus, subgenera, lineages, type sp., number of sp., and average divergences within each lineage).

The phylogram shown in Fig. 11 specifies the novel *Colias*’s subdivision into – as I believe – more supported subgenera and lineages (former subgenera) that are now the internal elements of the former; see the Table in the figure. This scheme is built on main ‘bricks’ being typic *sp.* designating each of all *Colias* lineages (instead of former BERGER’s subgenera), whilst it accounts for the new knowledge received after barcoding S. American *Colias*. As seen, the last group is a necessary

chain – unintentionally omitted or overlooked by researches in the past – in the revised structure of *Colias* as genus. Note that, where it was possible and non-contradicting with the laws established in the above made phylogenetic reconstruction, the primary subdivision elements within the genus are preserved in accord with the hierarchy (refer to Table 4), to maintain historical continuity of the terms.

Eventually, *Colias* genus is split in 2 subgenera: *Colias (Colias)* and *Aucolias (Colias)*. The first of them includes, in total, 74 *Colias sp.* occurring in Eurasia, N. America, and Africa, while the second (new) one comprises 6 *Colias sp.* of S. America. Each of the new subgenera is composed of a few lineages (most of which recall some of the former subgenera): for *Colias (Colias)*, these are *Colias* (3 sp. – *C. hyale*, *C. alta*, and *C. alfacariensis*) and *Eriocolias* (71 sp. – all other Eurasian, N. American, and African *Colias*); for *Aucolias (Colias)*, they are *Paracolias* (1 sp. – *C. dimera*), *Mesocolias* (1 sp. – *C. vauthierii*), *Scaledoneura* (3 sp. – *C. euxanthe*, *C. lesbia*, and *C. flaveola*), and *Altocolias* (new name) (1 sp. – *C. alticola new st.*).

6. CALLS FOR FUTURE WORK

Supposedly, the proposed version of the higher than *sp.* level *Colias'* systematics may instill motivation for further studies in the field by interested people, especially by means of molecular phylogeny methods.

First, a quite interesting point regarding S. American *Colias* is the relationships between numerous 'white-to-black' (in dorsal coloration of males) entities, gathered in the present study under the name *C. flaveola* (after [LAMAS 2004]): refer to Table 1 and Fig. 7 (right-hand panel at bottom). The group of these taxa is hard to be systemized beyond doubt. Some authors treat all these taxa as *ssp.* of one, and the same, *sp.* ('super-*sp.*'), as [LAMAS 2004]. Others consider all these as separate *sp.*, as [VERHULST 2000 a-b, VERHULST 2013]. Meanwhile, in the recently published catalog [GRIESCHUBER ET AL. 2012], this complex is considered to comprise 3 *sp.*: (i) nominotypical *sp. C. mossi*; (ii) *sp. C. flaveola* with its *ssp. flaveola* (nominative) and *mendozae*, plus recently described *ssp. benyamini*; (iii) *sp. C. weberbaueri* with its *ssp. weberbaueri* (nominative), *nigerrima*, *blameyi*, and *erika*. Although there are some evidences in support of such internal systematics (viz. quite different phenotypes, behaviors, environmental conditions, host plants, etc., inherent to each taxon), a final decision on real relationships between them is a matter of future studies (e.g. molecular phylogeny). The current work, where the method of barcoding a single mitochondrial fragment of the CO I subunit was employed, unfortunately turned out to be powerless in resolving the problem: all 'black-to-white' *Colias* taxa of S. American are indistinguishable in the trial. Hence, more diversified phylogenetic studies (including molecular ones) might be required in the future to address the point properly.

Then, one of the most intriguing issues is a position in the phylogeny tree of the legendary *C. ponteni* = *C. imperialis*. (Note that this *sp.* is not listed in Fig. 11 to avoid any confusing misinterpretation.) This butterfly – being the most primitive *sp.* among *Colias* on all sides – may be one of key elements that would help to understand the true hierarchy and evolutionary history of *Colias* as genus (if it either presents a 'lost' chain in between *Zerene* and *Colias*, or poses 'inside' the latter), or may not be (if it exemplifies a kind of 'archipelago' *sp.* that has received its primitive appearance because of long-time occurrence in non-alternating by genes flow ambience in the absence of neighboring relatives).

Also, of separate interest may be addressing – via a more detailed analysis – relations, in terms of molecular phylogeny (desirably, accounting for data on more versatile fragments of the mitochondrial part of the genome and/or its nuclear part), between the closest lineages: *Colias s. str. (Colias)* (constituted by a few *sp. C. hyale*, *C. alta*, and *C. alfacariensis*) and *Paracolias (Aucolias)* (constituted by the nominotypical *sp. C. dimera*), and also between these two and the

representatives of genus *Zerene*, sister to genus *Colias* (see Fig. 11). Such a study shall shed more light on an event of their splitting in the past (see Fig. 9 and the notes therein).

The other point deserving attention is why despite the burst of speciation happened in the past (yet relatively recent) with *Colias* of the Northern hemisphere, including Eurasian and N. American ones belonging to subgenus *Colias (Colias)*: refer to Figs. 8 and 11, none reminiscing that happened with subgenus *Aucolias (Colias)* of S. America? Can explanations be global periods of glaciation and fading, sustained in Eurasia and N. America (which might lead to such types of inter-continental genes migrating – and hence speciation – as, say, trans-Beringia scenario [ESTOUP ET AL. 2010, VILA ET AL. 2012]), or the presence of local hot-spots of survival-in-refuge with posterior invasions and reinvasions into nearby areas at climate's cycling? Both kinds of processes are likely to be argued in the attempt to address the speciation boom in the past and, hence, the current overall diversity, of subgenus *Colias (Colias)* of the Northern hemisphere. In the meantime, only the second explanation is likely to impact, but with a limited effect, the own evolution of subgenus *Aucolias (Colias)* of S. America, probably evolving in 'autonomous mode' after splitting from a common ancestor shared with *Colias (Colias)*. The mentioned controversies might underline notable speciation growth in the first case (in *Colias* of the Northern hemisphere) but its lower productivity in the second one (in *Colias* of the Southern hemisphere). It cannot be presumably ruled out that the mentioned trans-Beringia scenario might have been gone, in the case of *Colias* evolution, 'forward' (from America to Eurasia) and 'backward' (from Eurasia to America), with the first 'move' being a kind of the Camelid scenario. As was argued by SHAPIRO [SHAPIRO ET AL. 2007], the high-altitude *Pierini* of S. America and Eurasia are not each other's close relatives, but as seen from the whole of the phylogeny data presented above (refer to Figs. 8, 9, and 11, e.g.), this may apply to *Colias*. Besides, an ancestor of sister genera *Colias* and *Zerene* [POLLOCK ET AL. 1998] lived, most probably, in the Americas, as no *Zerene* are found to the North of California (this 'law' may hold for a common ancestor of *Coliadinae* [BRABY ET AL. 2006], too). Splitting of *Colias* and *Zerene* might have happened in Central or S. America a few million years (Myr) back. Indeed, NN distance between the genera is ~11% (see Figs. 9 and 11), which corresponds to ~8 Myr, if one uses the estimate [BRABY ET AL. 2006] for the rate of mutations in mitochondrial CO I part of the genome, ~1.5% per 1 Myr. In turn, splitting of subgenera *Aucolias (Colias)* and *Colias (Colias)* might have happened ~5 Myr back (NN distance between these subgenera is ~7%). Accordingly, speciation startup within *Aucolias* subgenus of S. America might have been brought in about 3 Myr, i.e. earlier – at least, by ~1 Myr – than that within *Colias (Colias)* of the Northern hemisphere. The latter estimates stem from the type of branching in the common phylogeny tree (Figs. 8 and 11), and, also, from the data summarized in Fig. 10 (refer to its left subpanels: as seen, gravity center of the NN-distance histogram for the members of subgenus *Aucolias (Colias)* (but excluding emerging and genetically indistinguishable *sp. C. lesbia*, *C. euxanthe*, and *C. flaveola*) is nearly 5%, which is a bigger value than that for subgenus *Colias (Colias)*: <4%.

The hypotheses sketched above for the (yet) intriguing points can guide a track for the future in molecular phylogeny studies of *Colias* and related taxa.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Author is gratefully thankful to Arthur Shapiro (USA), Ward Watt (USA), Robert Worthy (UK), Evgeny Zakharov (Canada), and Robert Borth (USA) for valuable comments and kind assistance.

REFERENCES

- AE, S.A. 1959 "A study of hybrids in *Colias* (Lepidoptera, Pieridae)", *Evolution*, vol. 13, 64-88.
- BERGER, L. 1986 "Systématique du genre *Colias* F. (Lep., Pieridae)", *suppl. Lambillionea*, vol. 86, 1-68.

- BENYAMINI, D., UGARTE, A., SHAPIRO, A.M., HERMANN, O., MIERKLE H., PYRSCZ, T., & BALINT, Z. 2014 "An updated list of the butterflies of Chile (Lepidoptera, Papilionoidea and Hesperioidea) including distribution, flight period and conservation status: Part I, comprising the families: Papilionidae, Pieridae, Nymphalidae (in part) and Hesperidae describing a new species of *Hypsochila* (Pieridae) and a new subspecies of *Yramea modesta* (Nymphalidae)", *Boletín del Museo Nacional de Historia Natural, Chile*, **vol. 63**, 9-31.
- BRABY, M.F. 2005 "Provisional checklist of genera of the Pieridae (Lepidoptera: Papilionoidea)", *Zootaxa*, **vol. 832**, 1-16.
- BRABY, M.F., VILA, R., & PIERCE, N.E. 2006 "Molecular phylogeny and systematics of the Pieridae (Lepidoptera: Papilionoidea): higher classification and biogeography", *Zoological Journal of the Linnean Society*, **vol. 147**, 239-275.
- BRUNTON, C.F.A. 1998 "The evolution of ultraviolet patterns in European *Colias* butterflies (Lepidoptera, Pieridae): a phylogeny using mitochondrial DNA", *Heredity*, **vol. 80**, 611-616.
- DESCIMON, H. 1986 "Origins of Lepidopteran faunas in the High Tropical Andes", In: F. Vuilleumier & M. Sarmiento (Ed.), *High Altitude Tropical Biogeography*. Oxford Univ. Press, New York, Oxford, 500-532.
- DWYER H.E, Jasieniuk, M., Okada, M., & SHAPIRO, A.M. 2015 "Molecular evidence for hybridization in *Colias* (Lepidoptera: Pieridae): are *Colias* hybrids really hybrids?", *Ecology and Evolution*, **vol. 5**, 2865–2877.
- ELIAS, M., JORON, M., WILLMOTT, K., SILVA-BRANDAO, K.L., KAISER, V., ARIAS, C.F., GOMEZ PIÑERAZ, L.M., URIBE, S., BROWER, A.V.Z., FREITAS, A.V.L., & JIGGINS, C.D. 2009, "Out of the Andes: patterns of diversification in clearwing butterflies", *Molecular Ecology*, **vol. 18**, 1716-1729.
- EMMEL, T.C. 1963 "*Colias philodice* in Chiapas, Mexico", *Journal of Research on the Lepidoptera*, **vol. 1**, 194.
- ESTOUP, A. & GUILLEMAUD, T. 2010 "Reconstructing routes of invasion using genetic data: Why, how and so what?", *Molecular Ecology*, **vol. 19**, 4113–4130.
- GEROULD, J.H. 1946 "Hybridization and female albinism in *Colias philodice* and *C. eurytheme*. A New Hampshire survey in 1943 with subsequent data", *Annals of the Entomological Society of America*, **vol. 39**, 383–396.
- GODMAN, F. & SALVIN, O. 1891 "Lepidoptera Rhopalocera", in WHYMPER, *Supplementary appendix to travels amongst the great Andes of the Equator. App.*, p. 107.
- GRIESCHUBER, J., WORTHY, B., & LAMAS, G. 2012. The Genus *Colias* FABRICIUS, 1807 (Jan HAUGUM's annotated catalogue of the Old World *Colias* (Lepidoptera, Pieridae)), Tschikolovets Publ., Pardubice.
- HEBERT, P.D.N., CYWINSKA, A., BALL, S.L., & DEWAARD J.R. 2003 "Biological identifications through DNA barcodes", *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London - Series B: Biological Sciences*, **vol. 270**, 313-321.
- HEBERT, P.D.N., RATNASINGHAM, S., & DEWAARD J.R. 2003 "Barcoding animal life: cytochrome c oxidase subunit I divergences among closely related species", *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London - Series B: Biological Sciences*, **vol. 270**, S96-S99.
- HEBERT, P.D.N., RATNASINGHAM, S., ZAKHAROV, E.V., TELFER, A.C., LEVESQUE-BEAUDIN, V., MILTON, M.A., PEDERSEN, S., JANNETTA, P., & DEWAARD, J.R. 2016 "Counting animal species with DNA barcodes: Canadian insects", *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B*, **vol. 371**, art. 20150333.
- HOWANITZ, W. 1944 "The distribution of gene frequencies in wild populations of *Colias*", *Genetics*, **vol. 29**, 31-60.
- HOWANITZ, W. 1957 "The role of genetics in the taxonomy of the Lepidoptera", *The Lepidopterists' News*, **vol. 11**, 10-12.
- HOWANITZ, W. 1963 "The origin of a sympatric species in *Colias* through the aid of natural hybridization", *Journal of Research on the Lepidoptera*, **vol. 1**, 261-274.
- HUEMER, P., MUTANEN, M., SEFC, K.M., & HEBERT, P.D.N. 2014 "Testing DNA barcode performance in 1000 species of European Lepidoptera: large geographic distances have small genetic impacts", *PLOS one*, **vol. 9**, art. 115774.
- JAHNER, J.P, SHAPIRO, A.M., & FORISTER, M.L 2012 "Drivers of hybridization in a 66-generation record of *Colias* butterflies", *Evolution*, **vol. 66**, 818-830.

- JASSO-MARTINEZ, J.M., CASTANEDA-SORTIBRAN, A.N., POZO, C., GARCIA-SANDOVAL, R., PRADO, B.R., LUIS-MARTINEZ, A., LLORENTE-BOUSQUETS, J., & RODRIGUEZ-ARNAIZ, R. 2016 "The *Enantia jethys* complex: insights from COI confirm the species complex and reveal a new potential cryptic species", **vol. 41**, 1005-1020.
- KIMURA, M. 1981 "A simple method for estimating evolutionary rate of base substitutions through comparative studies of nucleotide sequences", *Journal of Molecular Evolution*, **vol. 16**, 111-120.
- KIR'YANOV, A.V. 2017 "A new subspecies of *Colias lesbia* FABRICIUS, 1775 from the Arequipa province, Southern Peru (Lepidoptera, Pieridae, Coliadinae)", *Lambillionea*, **vol. 117**, 111-120.
- KRAMP, K., CIZEK, O., MADEIRA, P.M., RAMOS, A.A., KONVICKA, M., CASILHO, R., & SCHMITT, T. 2016 "Genetic implications of phylogeographical patterns in the conservation of the boreal wetland butterfly *Colias palaeno* (Pieridae)", *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society*, **vol. 119**, 1068-1081.
- LAIHO, L. & GUNILLA, S. 2013 "DNA barcodes identify Central-Asian *Colias* butterflies (Lepidoptera, Pieridae)", *ZooKeys*, **vol. 365**, 175-196.
- LAMAS, G. 2004 Checklist: Part 4A. Hesperioidea – Papilionoidea, in Atlas of Neotropical Lepidoptera, J. B. Heppner [ed.], vol. 5A, Association for Tropical Lepidoptera/Scientific Publishers, Gainesville.
- LAVINIA, P.D., NUÑEZ BUSTOS, E., KOPUCHIAN, C., LIJMAER, D.A., GARCIA, N.C., HEBERT, P.D.N., & TUBARO, P.L. 2017 "Barcoding the butterflies of southern South America: species delimitation efficacy, cryptic diversity and geographic patterns of divergence", PLOS one, **vol. 12**, art. 0186845.
- LEITE L.A.R. 2012 "Mitochondrial pseudogenes in insect DNA barcoding: differing points of view on the same issue", *Biota Neotropica*, **vol. 12**, 301-308.
- LIMERI, L.B. & MOREHOUSE, N.I. 2016 "The evolutionary history of the 'alba' polymorphism in the butterfly subfamily Coliadinae (Lepidoptera: Pieridae)", *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society*, **vol. 117**, 716-724.
- LUKHTANOV, V.A., SOURAKOV, A., ZAKHAROV, E.V., & HEBERT, P.D.N. 2009 "DNA barcoding Central Asian butterflies: increasing geographical dimension does not significantly reduce the success of species identification", *Molecular Ecology Resources*, **vol. 9**, 1302-1310.
- MITTER, K.T., LARSEN T.B., DE PRINS, W., DE PRINS, J., COLLINS, S., WEGHE, G.V., S'AFI'AN, SZ., ZAKHAROV, E.V., HAWTHORNE, D.J., KAWAHARA, A.K., & REGIER, J.C. 2011 "The butterfly subfamily Pseudopontiinae is not monobasic: marked genetic diversity and morphology reveal three new species of *Pseudopontia* (Lepidoptera: Pieridae)", *Systematic Entomology*, **vol. 36**, 139–163.
- MURILLO-RAMOS, L., HERNANDEZ-MEJIA, & LLORENTE-BOUSQUETS, J. 2016 "The phylogenetic position of *Aphrissa* (Lepidoptera: Pieridae: Coliadinae) within its relatives the ancient American *Catopsilia*", *Zootaxa*, **vol. 4147**, 538-550.
- MÜLLER, A. 1957 "Zur morphologie der schuppen des flügelrandes der gattung *Colias* FABRICIUS (Lepidopt.)", *Mitteilungen der münchener entomologischen Gesellschaft*, **vol. 47**, 200-222.
- PETERSEN, B. 1963 "The male genitalia of some *Colias* species", *Journal of Research on the Lepidoptera*, **vol. 1**, 135-156.
- POLLOCK, D.D., WATT, W.B., RASHBROOK, V.K., & IYENGAR, E.V. 1998 "Molecular phylogeny for *Colias* butterflies and their relatives (Lepidoptera, Pieridae)", *Annals of the Entomological Society of America*, **vol. 91**, 524-531.
- PORTER, A.H. & LEVIN, E.J. 2007 "Parallel evolution in sympatric, hybridizing species: Performance of *Colias* butterflies on their introduced host plants", *Entomologia Experimentalis et Applicata*, **vol. 124**, 77-99.
- RATNASINGHAM & HEBERT, P.D.N. 2007 "BOLD: The Barcode of Life Data System (www.barcodinglife.org)", *Molecular Ecology Notes*, **vol. 7**, 355-364.
- SCHOVILLE, S.D., STUCKEY, M., & RODERICK, G.K. 2011 "Pleistocene origin and population history of a neoendemic alpine butterfly", *Molecular Ecology*, **vol. 20**, 1233-1247.
- SHAPIRO, A.M. 1985 "Behavioral and ecological observations of Peruvian high-Andean Pierid butterflies (Lepidoptera)", *Studies on Neotropical Fauna and Environment*, **vol. 20**, 1-12.
- SHAPIRO, A.M. 1989 (91) "The zoogeography and systematics of the Argentine Andean and Patagonian Pierid fauna", *Journal of Research on the Lepidoptera*, **vol. 28**, 137-238.

- SHAPIRO, A.M. 1992 "Why are there so few butterflies in the high Andes?", *Journal of Research on the Lepidoptera*, **vol. 31**, 135-56.
- SHAPIRO, A.M. 1993 "The proposed Magellanic type-locality of *Colias imperialis* BUTLER (Lepidoptera: Pieridae)", *Acta Entomologica Chilena*, **vol. 18**, 77-82.
- SHAPIRO, A.M., FORISTER, M.L., & FORDYCE, J.A. 2007 "Extreme high-altitude Asian and Andean Pierid butterflies are not each others' closest relatives", *Arctic, Antarctic and Alpine Research*, **vol. 39**, 137-142.
- SHAPIRO, A.M. 2012 "The correspondence between John Gerould and William Hovanitz and the evolution of the *Colias* hybridization problem (Lepidoptera: Pieridae)", *Journal of Research on the Lepidoptera*, **vol. 45**, 27-37.
- SIKES, D.S. 2017 "DNA barcoding Alaska's butterflies", *AKES Newsletter*, **vol. 10**, 9-16.
- VERHULST, J. 2000 *Les Colias du Globe - Monograph of the Genus Colias* [vol. 1, texte], GOECKE & EVERS, Keltern.
- VERHULST, J. 2000 *Les Colias du Globe - Monograph of the Genus Colias* [vol. 2, planches], GOECKE & EVERS, Keltern.
- VERHULST, J. 2013 "Discussion à propos des *Colias* FABRICIUS, 1807 néotropicaux (Lepidoptera, Pieridae, Coliadinae)", *Lambillionea*, **vol. 94**, 213-219.
- VERHULST, J. 2016 "Description d'une nouvelle sous-espèce de *Colias flaveola* BLANCHARD, 1852 (Lepidoptera, Pieridae, Coliadinae)", *Lambillionea*, **vol. 116**, 105-115.
- VILA, R., BELL, C.D., MACNIVEN, R., GOLDMAN-HUERTAS, B., REE, R.H., MARSHALL, C.R., BALINT, Z., JOHNSON, K., BENYAMINI, D., & PIERCE, N.E. 2011 "Phylogeny and palaeoecology of *Polyommatus* blue butterflies show Beringia was a climate-regulated gateway to the New World", *Proceedings of the Royal Society B*, **vol. 278**, 2737-2744.
- WANG, B. & PORTER, A. 2004 "An AFLP-based interspecific linkage map of sympatric, hybridizing *Colias* butterflies", *Genetics*, **vol. 168**, 215-225.
- WAHLBERG, N., ROTA, J., BRABY, M.F., PIERCE, N.E., & WHEAT, C.W. 2014 "Revised systematics and higher classification of pierid butterflies (Lepidoptera: Pieridae) based on molecular data", *Zoologica Scripta (Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences)*, **vol. 434**, 641-650.
- WATT, W.B., CHEW, F.S., SNYDER, L.R.G., WATT, A.G., & ROTHSCHILD, D.E. 1977 "Population structure of pierid butterflies. I. Numbers and movements of some montane *Colias* species", *Oecologia*, **vol. 27**, 1-22.
- WATT, W.B. 1995 "Descent with modification: Evolutionary study of *Colias* in the tradition of Charles Remington", *Journal of Lepidopterists' Society*, **vol. 49**, 272-283.
- WATT, W.B., HUDZON, R.R., WANG, B. & WANG, E. 2013 "A genetic polymorphism evolving in parallel in two cell compartments and in two clades", *Evolutionary Biology*, **vol. 13**, art. 9.
- WHEAT, C.W., WATT, W.B., & BOUTWELL C.L. 2005 "A reconnaissance of population genetic variation in arctic and subarctic sulfur butterflies (*Colias*: Lepidoptera, Pieridae)", *Canadian Journal of Zoology*, **vol. 83**, 1614-1623.
- WHEAT, C.W. & WATT, W.B. 2008 "A mitochondrial-DNA-based phylogeny for some evolutionary-genetic model species of *Colias* butterflies (Lepidoptera, Pieridae)", *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, **vol. 47**, 893-902.