



HOKKAIDO UNIVERSITY

Title	Wing base structure supports Coleorrhyncha + Auchenorrhyncha (Insecta: Hemiptera)
Author(s)	Yoshizawa, Kazunori; Ogawa, Naoki; Dietrich, Christopher H.
Citation	Journal of zoological systematics and evolutionary research, 55(3), 199-207 https://doi.org/10.1111/jzs.12173
Issue Date	2017-08
Doc URL	https://hdl.handle.net/2115/71153
Rights	This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: Journal of zoological systematics and evolutionary research; 55(3);p199-207, 2017 Aug, which has been published in final form at http://doi.org/10.1111/jzs.12173 . This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Self-Archiving.
Type	journal article
File Information	2017JZS.pdf



1 *1 Systematic Entomology, School of Agriculture, Hokkaido University, Sapporo 060-8589,*
2 *Japan; 2 Illinois Natural History Survey, University of Illinois, Champaign, Illinois 61820,*
3 *USA*

4
5 **Wing base structure supports Coleorrhyncha + Auchenorrhyncha (Insecta:**
6 **Hemiptera)**

7
8 Kazunori Yoshizawa 1, Naoki Ogawa 1 and Christopher H. Dietrich 2

9
10 *Corresponding author:* Kazunori Yoshizawa (psocid@res.agr.hokudai.ac.jp)

11 *Contributing authors:* Naoki Ogawa (ogawa222@res.agr.hokudai.ac.jp), Christopher H.
12 Dietrich (chdietri@illinois.edu)

Abstract

The phylogenetic placement of the moss bugs (Insecta: Hemiptera: Coleorrhyncha) has been highly controversial. Many apparent morphological apomorphies support the close relationship between Coleorrhyncha and Heteroptera (= true bugs). However, a recent phylogenomic study strongly supported a sister-group relationship between Coleorrhyncha and Auchenorrhyncha (planthoppers, leafhoppers, treehoppers, spittlebugs and cicadas). To test these two alternative hypotheses, we examined the fore- and hindwing base structure of the only known extant macropterous species of Coleorrhyncha using binocular and confocal laser scanning microscopes and analyzed the data selected from the wing base phylogenetically. When full morphological data including the wing base characters were analyzed, the sister group relationship between Coleorrhyncha + Heteroptera was supported, agreeing with previous consensus based on morphology. In contrast, when only wing base characters were analyzed separately, the clade Coleorrhyncha + Auchenorrhyncha was recovered, in agreement with the result from the phylogenomic study. The membranous condition of the proximal median plate in the forewing was identified as a potential synapomorphy of the latter grouping, and absence of the tegula was excluded as a potential synapomorphy of Coleorrhyncha and Heteroptera.

Key words: Auchenorrhyncha – Coleorrhyncha – Heteroptera – phylogeny – wing base structure

Introduction

The suborder Coleorrhyncha (moss bugs) is an enigmatic taxon of the order Hemiptera (Insecta). It consists of a single family, Peloridiidae, with fewer than 40 extant species restricted to circumantarctic regions (Burckhardt 2009; Burckhardt et al. 2011). With a combination of plesiomorphic and apomorphic features, the placement of this suborder within Hemiptera had been highly unstable. Traditionally, prior to explicit phylogenetic analyses of Hemiptera as a whole, Coleorrhyncha was regarded as a member of “Homoptera” (now generally regarded as a paraphyletic grade) due to presence of a complete tentorium, origin of the labium on the posteroventral portion of the head (and absence of a gula), discrete pro- and mesothracic ganglia, and eight pairs of abdominal spiracles, all of which are now regarded as plesiomorphies (Carver et al. 1991). In contrast, Coleorrhyncha share some apparent morphological apomorphies with Heteroptera (reviewed in Grimaldi and Engel 2005; Forero 2008; Burckhardt 2009), some of which have been controversial (e.g., Cobben 1978 but see also Schuh 1979). Recent extensive morphology-based cladistic analysis, with revised morphological observations including Coleorrhyncha, strongly supported Coleorrhyncha + Heteroptera (Friedemann et al. 2014). Multiple molecular phylogenetic studies based on 18S rRNA (Wheeler et al. 1993; Campbell et al. 1995; Ouvrard et al. 2000) and multiple gene regions (Cryan and Urban 2012) also provided support for this relationship. Therefore, until recently, available data appear to have converged toward consensus in support of the sister group relationship between Coleorrhyncha and Heteroptera (together referred to as Heteropterodea or Prosorrhyncha) (Grimaldi and Engel 2005; Forero 2008).

However, a recent phylogenomic study of Hexapoda that incorporated data from >1400 gene regions (Misof et al. 2014) casted doubt on this general view, placing Coleorrhyncha consistently as sister to Auchenorrhyncha (infraorder composed of planthoppers, leafhoppers, treehoppers, spittlebugs and cicadas). This result was supported by multiple datasets (i.e., nucleotide and amino acid sequences) and also received strong statistical support by bootstrapping and four-cluster likelihood mapping analyses (Misof et al. 2014, Supplement). The previously accepted sister group relationship between Coleorrhyncha and Heteroptera was also refuted by recent mitochondrial phylogenomic analyses (Cui et al. 2013; Wang et al. 2015). Therefore, an apparent conflict between morphological and molecular data has arisen in the placement of Coleorrhyncha.

The wing base structure comprises sclerites located between the insect thorax and wing. This structure mediates the power produced by the thoracic indirect flight muscles to the wings and also controls proper flapping and folding of the wings. Therefore, evolution of this structure is strongly constrained and, thus, the wing base sclerites appear to evolve very slowly (Hörschemeyer 2002). Because of this unique property, the wing base structure has previously been utilized for resolving controversial branches in hemipteroid phylogeny. For example, although the monophyly of Auchenorrhyncha has been questioned based on morphological (Bourgoin 1986ab 1993; Bourgoin and Huang 1990) and molecular criteria (Campbell et al. 1995; Sorensen et al. 1995; Bourgoin et al. 1997; Ouvrard et al. 2000), examination of wing base morphology provided unambiguous support for Auchenorrhyncha (Yoshizawa and Saigusa 2001). Monophyly of Auchenorrhyncha subsequently received strong support from the molecular phylogenetic (Urban and Cryan 2007; Cryan and Urban 2012) and phylogenomic (Misof et al. 2014) analyses, corroborating the value of wing base structure for resolving difficult higher-level phylogenetic problems (see also Yoshizawa 2011).

In this study, we examined the morphology of the fore- and hindwing base structures of a species of Coleorrhyncha, which were treated as missing characters by Friedemann et al. (2014), to test the alternative hypotheses on the phylogenetic placement of this suborder.

Material and Methods

A dried specimen of *Peloridium hammoniorum* Breddin, 1897 collected in Chile in 2014 by CHD was used. This is the only extant species of Coleorrhyncha known to have flight ability, although most individuals of this species have vestigial hindwings. The individual studied possessed fully developed fore- and hindwings. The specimen was soaked with 10% KOH at room temperature for one night. Later, the pterothorax was separated from the other body parts, washed by distilled water, then 80% ethanol, and finally stored and observed in glycerol.

Observations were made with an Olympus SZX 16 binocular microscope (Olympus Co., Tokyo, Japan) and Leica TCS-SP5 Confocal Laser Scanning Microscope (CLSM) (Leica Microsystems, Wetzlar, Germany). For binocular microscope observation, the dissected specimen was pinned on a polyfoam using micro-pins, with the wings fully opened

but oriented in a slight downstroke position to observe all the sclerites in their natural shapes dorsally. For CLSM imaging, specimens were mounted on a large cover glass (22 x 24 mm) covered by a small cover glass (15 mm $\varnothing$) to facilitate the observation of both dorsal and ventral sides. We used an excitation wavelength of 488 nm and emission wavelength of 510–680 nm. The emission waves were detected using two channels and visualized with two pseudocolors (510–580 nm in green; 580–680 nm in red) (Mikó and Deans 2014). Homology was assessed following Yoshizawa and Saigusa (2001), in which the criteria and landmarks for homology identification of paraneopteran (hemipteroid) wing base sclerites were explained. Terminology of Yoshizawa and Saigusa (2001) was also adopted.

Morphological data selected from the forewing base of *Peloridium* were newly appended to two data matrices created previously: (1) the forewing base character matrix for Paraneoptera, comprising 20 discrete characters, constructed by Yoshizawa and Saigusa (2001), in which Coleorrhyncha was not examined; (2) the full morphological data, comprising 119 characters (including the above as characters 20–39) compiled by Friedemann et al. (2014), with some corrections to character coding as mentioned by Yoshizawa and Lienhard (2016). The genus *Hackeriella* was used in the original full morphological data matrix (Friedemann et al. 2014) but, because this genus lacks flight ability, almost all wing base characters were previously coded as unknown. Here, the same set of wing base characters scored for the separate wing base matrix was newly appended to the matrix. Although this combination of data from two different peloridiid species created a chimeric OTU in the data matrix, members of the family appear to be invariant for most (if not all) of the included characters, so we would not anticipate a different phylogenetic result had we scored all of Friedemann's characters for *Peloridium*. The hindwing base structure was also observed but not included in the phylogenetic analyses to avoid the possibility of over-weighting serially homologous (non-independent) traits, as discussed by Yoshizawa and Saigusa (2001). Data matrices are available as online Supporting Information. The datasets were analyzed by the maximum parsimony method using PAUP* 4a152 (Swofford 2002), with all characters weighted equally and branch-and-bound search performed. The branch-and-bound method uses an exact algorithm that is guaranteed to find the most parsimonious tree(s). Bootstrap and jackknife values were calculated using PAUP* with 1000 replicates (for jackknifing, version 4b10 was used because of problematic values provided by 4a152). For bootstrapping and jackknifing, heuristic searches with

tree-bisection-reconnection algorithm were performed, each with 100 replications and with
maxtrees = 10000. The decay index was calculated by using TreeRot V3 (Sorenson and
Franzosa 2007). The character state changes were calculated using MacClade 4 (Maddison
and Maddison 2001), and unambiguous character state changes were mapped onto the tree.

Results

Forewing base morphology (Fig. 1)

The anterior and median notal wing processes (ANWP and MNWP) are easily
identified as articular points with 1Ax: the former is well projecting but the latter is not. The
posterior notal wing process (PNWP) is less recognizable because it does not project and is
loosely associated with the third axillary sclerite. The tegula (Tg) is apparently present but
weakly sclerotized. The humeral plate (HP) is united with the basisubcostale (BSc). The
basiradiale (BR) is broadly united with BSc anteriorly, and is united with the second axillary
sclerite (2Ax) posteroproximally. The first axillary sclerite (1Ax) is subtriangular in shape
(see Fig. 1A; 1Ax is oriented laterally in Fig. 1B), lacking the anterior arm, with a weak
swelling on the proximal margin which articulates with MNWP. The anterior tip of 1Ax
articulates with the tip of BSc. The posteroproximal margin of 1Ax is also associated with the
notum. Distally, 1Ax articulates with 2Ax at two points; near the anterior tip and near the
posterodistal corner. 2Ax is subdivided into two sclerites, posteroproximal (pp) and
anterodistal (ad), clearly divided by a membranous region and the forked convex axillary fold
line. 2Ax-pp is tightly united with the apex of BSc anteroproximally and is articulated with
the well-developed and narrowly extended anterior arm of the third axillary sclerite (3Ax) at
its distal end. 2Ax-ad is united distally with the first distal median plate, and the convex
axillary fold line forms a border between the two sclerites. The proximal arm of 3Ax is
broadened and loosely articulated with the notum. Distally, it is tightly associated with the
basianal (BA) along the posterior margin (see Fig. 1A,C: in Fig. 1B, 3Ax and BA are
detached but this was caused artificially by slide mounting pressure). BA is well developed,
tightly articulated with the anal vein distally. The region corresponding to the proximal
median plate (PMP) is completely membranous (see Fig. 1C). The distal median plate (DMP)
is subdivided into two elements. DMP1 is enlarged and convex dorsally. It is united
proximally with 2Ax, tightly associated with vein R anteriorly, and tightly articulated with

vein A posterodistally. DMP2 is located distal to DMP1, triangular in shape and very narrowly extending toward the claval fold. The jugum (Jg) is apparently not developed.

Hindwing base morphology (Fig. 2)

[Note for CLSM image (Fig. 2B): Due to the less tight articulation of the hindwing sclerites and pressure caused during slide mounting, the positions of many sclerites in the CLSM image are distorted. See the line drawing (Fig. 2A) for their more natural articular condition.]

ANWP and MNWP are recognizable but very loosely articulated with 1Ax, with the former located anterior to the tip of 1Ax. PNWP is well developed and articulated with 3Ax. Tg is absent. HP is united with BSc. BR is only recognizable as a small projection extending from the posterior margin of BSc, and loosely associates with 2Ax at the tip. 1Ax is narrowed over almost its entire length, only weakly broadened medially along the distal margin, with a weakly developed anterior arm. The anterior tip of 1Ax only weakly articulates with the tip of BSc. Distally, 1Ax articulates with 2Ax only at one point. 2Ax is not subdivided as in the forewing but reduced in size and triangular in shape. It tightly articulates with 1Ax only at its anteroproximal corner and also tightly articulates with 3Ax at its posterior tip. 3Ax is well developed, rather loosely articulated with PNWP. Distally, it is tightly associated with the anal vein (distal margin) and DMP (anterodistal corner). BA is indistinguishable from 3Ax. The region corresponding to PMP is completely membranous. DMP is flat, trapezoidal in shape. Jg is large but only weakly sclerotized.

Phylogenetic analyses

The parsimony analysis of the forewing base dataset resulted in only one most parsimonious tree (Fig. 3: treelength = 23; consistency index = 0.91; retention index = 0.93). This tree is completely congruent with that estimated by Yoshizawa and Saigusa (2001), with monophyly of Paraneoptera, Condylgnatha, and Hemiptera all supported. Coleorrhyncha (excluded from the analysis of Yoshizawa and Saigusa 2001) formed a clade together with the auchenorrhynchous infraorders (Cicadomorpha and Fulgoromorpha), supported by one unique, non-homoplasious synapomorphy (decay index = 1): the membranous proximal median plate (Character 13:1).

The parsimony analysis of the full morphology dataset, including the forewing base

characters, resulted in 18 equally parsimonious trees (treelength = 197; consistency index = 0.69; retention index = 0.85). Fig. 4 shows the strict consensus of 18 trees (differences between them mostly concern the arrangements of zero-length branches and do not affect to the following discussion: see Supporting Information for all trees). The tree is congruent with that estimated by Friedemann et al. (2014), with Paraneoptera, Psocodea, Condylgnatha, Hemiptera, Auchenorrhyncha and Heteroptera supported as monophyletic. Coleorrhyncha was placed as sister of Heteroptera, with three apomorphies (including two non-homoplasious ones) supporting this placement. One of the characters selected from the wing base (Character 28:1) provided non-homoplasious support for Hemiptera. The character providing support for Auchenorrhyncha + Coleorrhyncha in the wing base dataset (Character 13:1 in the wing base matrix; 32:1 in the full data matrix) was only ambiguously reconstructed: i.e., either independently evolved between Auchenorrhyncha and Coleorrhyncha or gained in the common ancestor of Auchenorrhyncha + Coleorrhyncha + Heteroptera but reversed in Heteroptera.

Discussion

The wing base structure in Coleorrhyncha largely retains the groundplan condition of the neopteran wing base, except for the absence of a proximal median plate (Figs 1–2). All modifications detected previously and thought to be autapomorphic for Hemiptera in general (Yoshizawa and Saigusa 2001) were also observed in Coleorrhyncha. Overall, the wing base structure of Coleorrhyncha resembles that of Auchenorrhyncha rather than Heteroptera (Yoshizawa and Saigusa 2001; Yoshizawa and Wagatsuma 2012; Ogawa et al. 2015). Maximum parsimony analysis of the wing base characters alone clearly supported the monophyly of Coleorrhyncha + Auchenorrhyncha, with absence of PMP as a synapomorphy (Fig. 3: decay index = 1, bootstrap/jackknife values = 67/51%). As mentioned by Yoshizawa and Saigusa (2001), this is a "reduction" character, i.e., presumably resulting from the loss of a sclerite, which may be regarded as less reliable than a character "gain". However, this character state was previously regarded as an autapomorphy of Auchenorrhyncha, a group once thought to be paraphyletic based on early single-gene molecular phylogenies (e.g., Campbell et al. 1995) but more recently supported as monophyletic by multi-gene molecular phylogenies (Urban and Cryan 2007; Cryan and Urban 2012; Misof et al. 2014). In addition,

the present examination clearly identified the tegula on the forewing of Coleorrhyncha, which invalidates "absence of tegula" as one of the previously proposed synapomorphies of Coleorrhyncha + Heteroptera (Friedemann et al. 2014).

Nevertheless, analysis of the full morphological data still recovered the sister group relationship between the Coleorrhyncha and Heteroptera (Fig 4: Friedemann et al. 2014), although with lower support values (decay index = 1, bootstrap/jackknife values = 52/47%). Synapomorphies supporting this relationship include presence of cephalic trichobothria (54-1), tubular and four-segmented labium (56-2), and four-segmented flagellomeres (59-1). The first two are non-homoplasious characters (Friedemann et al. 2014) in the present dataset. The full morphological matrix constructed by Friedemann et al. (2014) lacked some morphological characters previously suggested as additional synapomorphies of Coleorrhyncha + Heteroptera (Grimaldi and Engel 2005; Forero 2008; Burckhardt 2009; Spangenberg et al. 2013) so it is possible that morphological support for the monophyly of this group is stronger than shown in our analysis.

In contrast, morphological support for the Coleorrhyncha + Heteroptera may not be as robust as generally assumed. For example, the position of abdominal spiracle 2 on an epipleurite was previously suggested as a potential synapomorphy of Coleorrhyncha and Auchenorrhyncha (Sweet 1996). However, because almost all other morphological characters supported a closer relationship between Coleorrhyncha and Heteroptera, Sweet (1996) concluded that the spiracle condition was independently gained by Coleorrhyncha and Auchenorrhyncha. The cephalic trichobothria (54-1) were scored as present for Coleorrhyncha and Heteroptera (Friedmann et al. 2014) and identified as one of their non-homoplasious synapomorphies (Fig. 3). However, the cephalic trichobothria were not illustrated or reported in the recent detailed study of the adult head of *Hackeriella* (Spangenberg et al. 2013) so the status of this character as a synapomorphy of Coleorrhyncha + Heteroptera is questionable. Spangenberg et al. (2013) further reviewed morphological evidence supporting the monophyly of Coleorrhyncha + Heteroptera but pointed out that the homologies of some potential synapomorphies (e.g., the number of antennomeres) remain uncertain while others (e.g., absence of cervical sclerites) are homoplasious. They also noted several potential synapomorphies of Coleorrhyncha and Auchenorrhyncha, or Coleorrhyncha and "Homoptera" in general. Some of the latter, including absence of a gula and presence of a complete tentorium, were interpreted as plesiomorphic for Hemiptera as a whole, but

presence of Evans' organ (Bourgoin 1986b) may be another unique synapomorphy of Coleorrhyncha and Auchenorrhyncha or an autapomorphy of "Homoptera" (including Coleorrhyncha). Characters of the cephalic musculature were found that support either Coleorrhyncha + Heteroptera or Coleorrhyncha + "Homoptera" (Spangenberg et al. 2013).

The results from recent phylogenomic analyses (Misof et al. 2014) and the present wing base examination suggest that some of the above-mentioned morphological similarities between Coleorrhyncha and Auchenorrhyncha may be their true synapomorphies. In addition, some of the features previously interpreted as synapomorphies of Coleorrhyncha and Heteroptera (Schlee 1969) have already been considered as "superficial and probably not significant" (Cobben 1978; but see also Schuh 1979 for critique). Based on our study, we also exclude "absence of the tegula" (20-1) as a synapomorphy of Coleorrhyncha + Heteroptera. This resulted in a decrease in branch support for this clade from decay index of three (Friedemann et al. 2014) to only one (Fig. 4). Further morphological investigations, including re-evaluation of the previously proposed synapomorphies of Coleorrhyncha and Heteroptera and incorporation of these and various cephalic characters mentioned by Spangenberg et al. (2013) into an explicit phylogenetic analysis, are needed to elucidate the extent of conflict between morphology and phylogenomics and between different morphological character systems.

Acknowledgments

This study was partly supported by Japan Society for the Promotion of Science pre-doctoral fellowship program (15J03697) to NO and U.S. National Science Foundation grant DEB-1239788 to CHD.

References

- Bourgoin T (1986a) Morphologie imaginaire du tentorium des Hemiptera Fulgoromorpha. *Int J Ins Morph Embryo* **15**:237–252.
- Bourgoin T (1986b) Valeur morphologique de la lame maxillaire chez les Hemiptera; remarques phylogénétiques. *Ann Soc Entomol France (NS)* **22**:413–422.
- Bourgoin T (1993) Female genitalia in Hemiptera Fulgoromorpha, morphological and phylogenetic data. *Ann Soc Entomol France (NS)* **29**:225–244.

- Bourgoin T, Huang J (1990) Morphologie comparée des genitalia mâles des Trypertimorphini et remarques phylogénétiques (Hemiptera: Fulgoromorpha: Tropiduchidae). *Ann Soc Entomol France (NS)* **26**:555–564.
- Bourgoin T, Steffen-Campbell JD, Campbell BC (1997) Molecular phylogeny of Fulgoromorpha (Insecta, Hemiptera, Archaeorrhyncha). The Enigmatic Tettigometridae: Evolutionary Affiliations and Historical Biogeography. *Cladistics* **13**:207–224.
- Breddin G (1897) Hemipteren (Hemiptera). *Ergebnisse der Hamburger magalhaensischen Sammelreise, 1892/93, vol. 2. L. Friederichsen and Co., Hamburg.*
- Burckhardt D (2009) Taxonomy and phylogeny of the Gondwanan moss bugs or Peloridiidae (Hemiptera, Coleorrhyncha). *Dtsch Entomol Ztg* **56**:173–235.
- Burckhardt D, Bochud E, Damgaard J, Bibbs GW, Hartung V, Larivière MC, Wyniger D, Zürcher I (2011) A review of the moss bug genus *Xenophyes* (Hemiptera: Coleorrhyncha: Peloridiidae) from New Zealand: systematics and biogeography. *Zootaxa* **2923**:1–26.
- Campbell BC, Steffen-Campbell JD, Sorensen JT, Gill RJ (1995) Paraphyly of Homoptera and Auchenorrhyncha inferred from 18S rDNA nucleotide sequences. *Syst Entomol* **20**:175–194.
- Carver M, Gross GG, Woodward TE (1991) Hemiptera (Bugs, leafhoppers, cicadas, aphids, scale insects etc). In: CSIRO (ed), *The Insects of Australia*. 2nd edition. Cornell University Press, New York, pp 429–509.
- Cobben RH (1978) Evolutionary trends in Heteroptera Part II. Mouthpart-structures and feeding strategies. *Mededelingen Landbouwhogeschool Wageningen* **78**(5):1–407.
- Cryan JR, Urban JM (2012) Higher-level phylogeny of the insect order Hemiptera: is Auchenorrhyncha really paraphyletic? *Syst Entomol* **37**:7–21.
- Cui Y, Xie Q, Hua J, Dang K, Zou J, Liu X, Wang G, Yu X, Bu W (2013) Phylogenomics of Hemiptera (Insecta: Paraneoptera) based on mitochondrial genomes. *Syst Entomol* **38**:233–245.
- Forero D (2008) The systematics of the Hemiptera. *Rev Columbiana Entomol* **34**:1–21.
- Friedemann K, Spangenberg R, Yoshizawa K, Beutel RG (2014) Evolution of attachment structure in the highly diverse Acercaria (Hexapoda). *Cladistics* **30**:170–201.
- Grimaldi D, Engel MS (2005) *Evolution of the Insects*. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge.

- Hörschemeyer T (2002) Phylogenetic significance of the wing-base of the Holometabola (Insecta). *Zool Scripta* **31**:17–29.
- Maddison DR, Maddison WP (2001) *MacClade 4: Analysis of Phylogeny and Character Evolution*. Sinauer Inc., Sunderland.
- Mikó I, Deans AR (2014) The second axillary in Hymenoptera. *PeerJ PrePrints* **2**:e428v1. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7287/peerj.preprints.428v1>
- Misof B, Liu S, Meusemann K et al. (2014) Phylogenomics resolves the timing and pattern of insect evolution. *Science* **346**:763–767.
- Ogawa N, Maruyama M, Yoshizawa K (2015) Wing base morphology of Aetalionidae (Hemiptera: Cicadomorpha) and its phylogenetic implications. *Entomol Sci* **18**:262–265.
- Ouvrard D, Campbell BC, Bourgoin T, Chan KL (2000) 18S rRNA secondary structure and phylogenetic position of Peloridiidae (Insecta, Hemiptera). *Mol Phylog Evol* **16**:403–417.
- Schlee D (1969) Hennig's principles of phylogenetic systematics, and 'intuitive statisticophenetic taxonomy'? A reply to Dr. Coless' paper 'The phylogenetic fallacy'. *Syst Zool* **18**:127–134.
- Schuh RT (1979) Review: Evolutionary Trends in Heteroptera. Part II. Mouthpart-Structure and Feeding Strategies. By R. H. Cobben. *Syst Zool* **28**:653–656.
- Sorensen JT, Campbell BC, Gill RJ, Steffen-Campbell JD (1995) Non-monophyly of Auchenorrhyncha (“Homoptera”), based upon 18S rDNA phylogeny: Eco-evolutionary and cladistic implications within pre-Heteropterodea Hemiptera (s.l.) and a proposal for new monophyletic suborders. *Pan-Pacific Entomol* **71**:31–60.
- Sorenson MD, Franzosa EA (2007) *TreeRot*, Version 3. Boston Univ., MA.
- Spangenberg R, Wipfler B, Friedemann K, Pohl H, Weirauch C, Hartung V, Beutel RG (2013) The cephalic morphology of the Gondwanan key taxon *Hackeriella* (Coleorrhyncha, Hemiptera). *Arthropod Struct Dev* **42**:315–337.
- Sweet MH (1996) Comparative external morphology of the pregenital abdomen of the Hemiptera. In: Schaefer, C.W. (ed), *Studies on Hemipteran Phylogeny*, Entomological Society of America, Maryland, pp 119–158.
- Swofford DL (2002) *PAUP*: Phylogenetic Analysis Using Parsimony (* and Other Methods)*, Version 4. Sinauer Inc., Sunderland.

- Urban JM, Cryan JR (2007) Evolution of the planthoppers (Insecta: Hemiptera: Fulgoroidea).
Mol Phylog Evol **42**:556–572.
- Wang Y, Chen J, Jiang LY, Qiao GX (2015) Hemipteran mitochondrial genomes: Features,
structures and implications for phylogeny. Int J Mol Sci **16**:12382–12404.
- Wheeler WC, Schuh RT, Bang R (1993) Cladistic congruence among higher groups of
Heteroptera: congruence between morphological and molecular data sets. Entomol
Scandinavica **42**:121–137.
- Yoshizawa K (2011) Monophyletic Polyneoptera recovered by wing base structure. Syst
Entomol **36**:377–394.
- Yoshizawa K, Lienhard C (2016) Bridging the gap between chewing and sucking in the
hemipteroid insects: new insights from Cretaceous amber. Zootaxa **4079**:229–245.
- Yoshizawa K, Saigusa T (2001) Phylogenetic analysis of paraneopteran orders (Insecta:
Neoptera) based on forewing base structure, with comments on monophyly of
Auchenorrhyncha (Hemiptera). Syst Entomol **26**:1–13.
- Yoshizawa K, Wagatsuma M (2012) Phylogenetic relationships among superfamilies of
Cicadomorpha (Hemiptera: Auchenorrhyncha) inferred from the wing base structure.
Entomol Sci **15**:408–421.

Figure caption

Fig. 1. Forewing base structure of Coleorrhyncha. A. Line drawing, dorsal view. B. Image taken by CLSM, dorsal view. The base of the anal vein is strongly expanded and covers most of the membranous PMP (see also C). Note: the detachment between 3Ax and BA is an artifact caused by slide-mounting pressure (see A and C for their natural relationship). C. Ventral view of wing base, showing PMP region and surrounding structures. The structure in the background of the completely membranous PMP is the expanded base of the anal vein (see B for comparison).

Fig. 2. Hindwing base structure of Coleorrhyncha. A. Line drawing, dorsal view. B. Image taken by CLSM, dorsal view. Note: distortion in relative position of the notum and axillary sclerites are an artifact caused by slide-mounting pressure (see A for their natural relationship).

Fig. 3. The most parsimonious tree estimated from the wing base data (outgroups are omitted), with characters and their changes noted on the branched. A red square indicates a non-homoplasious change, and a gray triangle indicates a homoplasious change. Circled numbers are decay indices, and numbers in a square indicate bootstrap/jackknife values of adjacent branches.

Fig. 4. The strict consensus of 18 equally parsimonious trees estimated from the full morphological data set. See Fig. 3 for further explanations. Polytomies were treated as hard polytomy for character state reconstruction. Outgroups are omitted from the figure.

Appendix: Characters and their state used for phylogenetic analyses.

Forewing base data (modified from Yoshizawa and Saigusa 2001)

1. Tg: (0) present; (1) absent: ci = 1, ri = 1.
2. Tg: (0) small; (1) enlarged, with broad extension encircling the entire margin: ci = 1, ri = 0.
3. Tg: (0) with small attachment to body wall; (1) with broad attachment to body wall: ci = 1, ri = 0.
4. HP and BSc: (0) separate from each other; (1) united with each other: ci = 1, ri = 1.
5. BSc: (0) distant from 2Ax; (1) close proximity to anteroproximal corner of 2Ax; (2) fused with anteroproximal part of 2Ax: ci = 1, ri = 1.
6. BR and HP + BSc: (0) fused with each other; (1) separated from each other: ci = 1, ri = 0.
7. BR and 2Ax: (0) separate from each other; (1) fused: ci = 0.5, ri = 0.
8. 2Ax: (0) nearly flat; (1) anterior region swollen: ci = 1, ri = 1.
9. 2Ax: (0) not divided; (1) divided into two sclerites (2Ax-pp and -ad): ci = 1, ri = 1.
10. PMP: (0) located distal to 2Ax; (1) located posterodistally to 2Ax: ci = 1, ri = 1.
11. PMP: (0) nearly flat; (1) deeply concave: ci = 1, ri = 1.
12. PMP: (0) almost evenly sclerotized; (1) distal margin sclerotized more strongly than its other regions: ci = 1, ri = 1.
13. PMP: (0) well sclerotized; (1) reduced, often completely membranous: ci = 1, ri = 1.
14. DMP: (0) not divided; (1) divided into 2 sclerites: ci = 1, ri = 1.
15. DMP: (0) distant from 2Ax; (1) placed next to 2Ax, articulating along a convex hinge: ci = 1, ri = 1.
16. DMP: (0) large; (1) reduced in size: ci = 1, ri = 0.
17. Distal arm of 3Ax and DMP: (0) articulate with each other; (1) not articulate with each other: ci = 1, ri = 1.
18. Anterior arm of 3Ax: (0) present; (1) absent: ci = 0.5, ri = 0.
19. 3Ax and BA: (0) separate from posterior margin of forewing base; (1) situated on posterior margin of forewing base: ci = 1, ri = 0.
20. BA and PMP: (0) separate from each other; (1) fused with each other: ci = 1, ri = 1.

Full morphology data (modified from Friedmann et al. 2014)

1. Rupturing mechanism at the base of the antennal flagellum: (0) absent; (1) present: ci = 1,

- 431 ri = 1.
- 432 2. Exposure of mouthparts: (0) largely or completely exposed; (1) left mandible enclosed in a
433 pouch formed by anteclypeal wall, labrum, stipes, and hypopharynx; (2) bases of
434 mandibular and maxillary stylets articulate inside head with mandibular and maxillary
435 plates: ci = 1, ri = 1.
- 436 3. Right mandible: (0) present; (1) reduced: ci = 1, ri = 0.
- 437 4. Shape of mandibles: (0) not elongated; (1) elongated: ci = 0.5, ri = 0.92.
- 438 5. Cardo: (0) present; (1) strongly reduced or absent; (2) fused with stipes: ci = 1, ri = 1.
- 439 6. Lacinia: (0) absent; (1) present: ci = 1, ri = 1.
- 440 7. Insertion of lacinia: (0) on stipes; (1) detached from stipes: ci = 0.5, ri = 0.86.
- 441 8. Lacinia: (0) not elongate and stylet-like; (1) elongate and stylet-like: ci = 1, ri = 1.
- 442 9. Labial rostrum: (0) absent; (1) present: ci = 1, ri = 1.
- 443 10. Labial palps: (0) absent or strongly reduced; (1) comprising at least 2 segments: ci = 0.5,
444 ri = 0.86.
- 445 11. Cibarial water-vapour uptake apparatus: (0) absent; (1) present: ci = 0.5, ri = 0.80.
- 446 12. Jugal "bar": (0) absent; (1) present: ci = 1, ri = 1.
- 447 13. Abdominal ganglia: (0) more than two separate ganglia; (1) two separate ganglia; (2) one
448 single ganglionic mass: ci = 1, ri = 1.
- 449 14. Eyes of immature stages: (0) persist; (1) disintegrate or pulled back proximally into
450 cerebrum: ci = 1, ri = 1.
- 451 15. External wing buds: (0) present; (1) absent: ci = 1, ri = 1.
- 452 16. Pupal stage: (0) absent; (2) present: ci = 0.5, ri = 0.5.
- 453 17. Appearance of compound eyes: (0) before ultimate immature stage; (1) in ultimate
454 immature stage: ci = 1, ri = 1.
- 455 18. Ocelli of immature stages: (0) present; (1) absent: ci = 1, ri = 1.
- 456 19. Cerci of immature stages: (0) present; (1) absent: ci = 1, ri = 1.
- 457 20. Tegulae of the forewing: (0) present; (1) absent: ci = 1, ri = 1.
- 458 21. Size and shape of tegulae: (0) small; (1) enlarged, with broad extension encircling the
459 entire margin: ci = 1, ri = 1.
- 460 22. Attachment of tegulae to body wall: (0) narrow; (1) broad: ci = 0.5, ri = 0.
- 461 23. HP and BSc: (0) separated from each other; (1) connected with each other: ci = 1, ri = 0.
- 462 24. BSc: (0) distant from 2Ax; (1) closely adjacent with the anteroproximal corner of 2Ax;

463 (2) fused with anteroproximal part of 2Ax: $ci = 0.67$, $ri = 0.67$.

464 25. BR and HP + BSc: (0) fused with each other; (1) separated from each other: $ci = 1$, $ri = 0$.

465 26. BR and 2Ax: (0) separated from each other; (1) fused: $ci = 0.5$, $ri = 0$.

466 27. 2Ax: (0) nearly flat; (1) anterior region inflated: $ci = 1$, $ri = 1$.

467 28. 2Ax: (0) not divided; (1) not divided: $ci = 1$, $ri = 1$.

468 29. Position of PMP: (0) distad 2Ax; (1) posterodistad 2Ax: $ci = 1$, $ri = 0$.

469 30. PMP: (0) nearly flat; (1) deeply concave: $ci = 1$, $ri = 0$.

470 31. PMP: (0) almost evenly sclerotized; (1) distal margin sclerotized more strongly than its
471 other regions: $ci = 1$, $ri = 0$.

472 32. PMP: (0) well sclerotized; (1) reduced, often completely membranous: $ci = 0.5$, $ri = 0.86$.

473 33. DMP: (0) not divided; (1) divided into 2 sclerites: $ci = 1$, $ri = 0$.

474 34. DMP: (0) distant from 2Ax; (1) placed next to 2Ax, articulating along a convex hinge: ci
475 $= 1$, $ri = 1$.

476 35. DMP: (0) large; (1) reduced in size: $ci = 1$, $ri = 0$.

477 36. Distal arm of 3Ax and DMP: (0) articulating with each other; (1) not articulating with
478 each other: $ci = 1$, $ri = 0$.

479 37. Anterior arm of 3Ax: (0) present; (1) absent: $ci = 0.5$, $ri = 0$.

480 38. 3Ax and BA: (0) separate from posterior margin of forewing base; (1) attached to
481 posterior margin of forewing base: $ci = 1$, $ri = 0$.

482 39. BA and PMP: (0) separate from each other; (1) fused with each other: $ci = 1$, $ri = 0$.

483 40. Lateral hypopharyngeal arm (0) present; (1) absent: $ci = 0.5$, $ri = 0.88$.

484 41. Ovarioles: (0) not polytrophic; (1) polytrophic; (2) telotrophic; (3) panoistic: $ci = 0.75$, ri
485 $= 0.92$.

486 42. Maxillary palps: (0) present, with four segments or more; (1) absent or reduced number of
487 segments: $ci = 0.33$, $ri = 0.8$.

488 43. Abdominal sternite 1: (0) present; (1) absent: $ci = 0.5$, $ri = 0.8$.

489 44. Number of axonemes in spermatozoans: (0) zero; (1) one; (2) two; (3) three: $ci = 0.75$, ri
490 $= 0.83$.



491 45. Gonangulum: (0) not fused with tergum IX; (1) fused with tergum IX: $ci = 0.5$, $ri = 0.8$.


492 46. Pretentorium: (0) absent or if present not connecting internal extremities of mandibular
493 lever and corpotentorium; (1) unites internal extremities of mandibular lever and
494 corpotentorium: $ci = 1$, $ri = 1$.

- 495 47. Lacinial gland: (0) absent; (1) present: ci = 0.5, ri = 0.
- 496 48. Male genitalia: (0) symmetrical, or if asymmetrical, asymmetry not involving pregenital
497 segments; (1) asymmetrical, this asymmetry often involving pregenital segments: ci =
498 0.5, ri = 0.
- 499 49. Accessory salivary glands generally: (0) not tubular; (1) of the tubular type: ci = 1, ri = 0.
- 500 50. Number of eye trichobothria of first instars: (0) one or absent; (1) two: ci = 1, ri = 0.
- 501 51. Number of ommatidia in first-instar larvae: (0) 4-5; (1) more than five: ci = 0.5, ri = 0.
- 502 52. Number of tarsomeres in first-instar larvae: (0) one; (1) two: ci = 1, ri = 1.
- 503 53. Forewings: (0) completely uniform or if differentiated, not forming a distinct
504 corium-clavus and membrane; (1) forewing divided into a distinct corium-clavus and
505 membrane: ci = 0.5, ri = 0.
- 506 54. Cephalic trichobothria: (0) absent in adults; (1) present in adults: ci = 1, ri = 1.
- 507 55. Metathoracic scent gland system: (0) absent; (1) present: ci = 1, ri = 1.
- 508 56. Labium: (0) not tubular; (1) tubular labium with three segments; (2) tubular labium with
509 four segments: ci = 1, ri = 1.
- 510 57. Insertion of tubular labium: (0) posteriorly on the head, (1) anteriorly on the head: ci = 1,
511 ri = 1.
- 512 58. Dorsal abdominal glands in immature stages: (0) absent; (1) present: ci = 1, ri = 1.
- 513 59. Number of antennal flagellomeres: (0) more than 4, (1) 4 or less: ci = 0.33, ri = 0.75.
- 514 60. Articulations between the mesomere, anterodorsal extension of ventral plate and posterior
515 end of basal plate: (0) absent; (1) present: ci = 0.5, ri = 0.5.
- 516 61. Length of basal apodeme of the phallic organ: (0) short; (1) long, longer than basal plate:
517 ci = 1, ri = 0.
- 518 62. Third posterodorsal corner of basal plate: (0) not extended; (1) extended posteriorly: ci =
519 1, ri = 0.
- 520 63. Basal apodeme of the phallic organ: (0) present; (1) absent: ci = 1, ri = 1.
- 521 64. Width of basal apodeme: (0) narrow; (1) as broad as or broader than basal plate: ci = 1, ri
522 = 1.
- 523 65. Ventral plates 1: (0) separated; (1) partly fused anteriorly: ci = 1, ri = 1.
- 524 66. Ventral plates 2: (0) separated or partly fused; (1) completely fused: ci = 1, ri = 0.
- 525 67. Mesomere of the aedeagus: (0) rounded posteriorly; (1) pointed posteriorly: ci = 0.5, ri =
526 0.5.

- 527 68. Posteromedian part of basal plate: (0) membranous; (1) sclerotized: ci = 1, ri = 1.
- 528 69. Anterior end of mesomere: (0) articulated with basal plate; (1) articulated with paramere:
529 ci = 1, ri = 0.
- 530 70. Paired ocelli in nymphs or larvae: (0) absent; (1) present: ci = 1, ri = 1.
- 531 71. Intrinsic antennal muscles (Mm. scapopedicellares) in immature stages: (0) absent; (1)
532 present: ci = 1, ri = 1.
- 533 72. Ventral metasternal process: (0) absent; (1) present: ci = 1, ri = 1.
- 534 73. Sensory plate organs of pedicel: (0) absent; (1) present: ci = 1, ri = 1.
- 535 74. Evan's organ: (0) absent, (1) present: ci = 0.5, ri = 0.86.
- 536 75. Ductus ejaculatorius: (0) normal; (1) modified as a sperm pump: ci = 1, ri = 1.
- 537 76. Proximal abdomen pediculate by reduction of the 1st and 2nd segment: (0) absent; (1)
538 present: ci = 1, ri = 1.
- 539 77. Hind coxae: (0) normally developed; (1) broad, closely adjacent: ci = 1, ri = 1.
- 540 78. Proboscis: (0) absent; (1) shifted posteriorly between bases of procoxae; (2) not shifted
541 posteriorly between bases of procoxae: ci = 0.67, ri = 0.94.
- 542 79. Posterior parts of the head capsule: (0) sclerotized; (1) membranous: ci = 1, ri = 1.
- 543 80. Connective tissue occluding occipital foramen: (0) absent; (1) present: ci = 0.5, ri = 0.
- 544 81. Ovipositor simplified: (0) absent; (1) present: ci = 0.5, ri = 0.5.
- 545 82. Spiracular glands: (0) absent; (1) present: ci = 0.5, ri = 0.
- 546 83. Extension of the occipital apodeme reaching into the thorax: (0) absent; (1) present: ci =
547 0.5, ri = 0.
- 548 84. Pronotum and procoxae: (0) not fused; (1) fused: ci = 1, ri = 1.
- 549 85. Position of anterior tentorial pits: (0) frontal side of head; (1) absent; (2) shifted dorsally:
550 ci = 1, ri = 1.
- 551 86. Fusion of head and thorax: (0) absent; (1) present: ci = 1, ri = 1.
- 552 87. Body and head: (0) not flattened; (1) dorsoventrally flattened: ci = 0.25, ri = 0.67.
- 553 88. Hind femora: (0) not enlarged; (1) enlarged: ci = 0.33, ri = 0.6.
- 554 89. Meso- and metanotum: (0) not fused; (1) fused: ci = 1, ri = 1.
- 555 90. Compound eyes: (0) not reduced; (1) only 2 ommatidia or less: ci = 0.5, ri = 0.86.
- 556 91. Labial palp: (0) present; (1) absent: ci = 0.5, ri = 0.88.
- 557 92. Complex tymbal acoustic system: absent (0); present (1): ci = 1, ri = 1.
- 558 93. Aristate antennal flagellum: (0) absent; (1) present: ci = 0.5, ri = 0.86.

- 559 94. Malpighian tubules: (0) more than six; (1) six; (2) four or less: ci = 1, ri = 1.
- 560 95. Labrum: (0) not narrowed; (1) narrowed: ci = 1, ri = 1.
- 561 96. Mandibular and lacinial stylets: (1) unicondylar; (0) dicondylar: ci = 1, ri = 1.
- 562 97. Pedunculate eggs (with stalk): (0) absent; (1) present: ci = 1, ri = 1.
- 563 98. Gut with filter chamber containing Malpighian tubules: (0) absent; (1) present: ci = 1, ri =
- 564 1.
- 565 99. Coronal (= median epicranial) suture: (0) absent; (1) present: ci = 0.33, ri = 0.33.
- 566 100. Parempodia on unguitractor plate: (0) absent; (1) elongate and setiform, inserted in an
- 567 alveolus: ci = 0.5, ri = 0.5.
- 568 101. Number of tarsal segments: (0) one; (1) two; (2) three; (3) more than three. State 3 is
- 569 adopted for Mydiognathus: ci = 0.33, ri = 0.65.
- 570 102. Arolium: (0) absent; (1) present; (2) eversible; (3) bilobed: ci = 0.33, ri = 0.45.
- 571 103. Sticky terminal lip of arolium: (0) absent; (1) present: ci = 0.5, ri = 0.67.
- 572 104. Pulvilli: (0) absent; (1) present: ci = 0.33, ri = 0.6.
- 573 105. Euplantulae: (0) absent, (1) present: ci = 0.33, ri = 0.33.
- 574 106. Number of claws: (0) one; (1) two; (2) reduced into spoon-shaped plates; (3) main claw
- 575 plus accessory claw: ci = 0.75, ri = 0.67.
- 576 107. Claw teeth: (0) absent; (1) present: ci = 0.33, ri = 0.33.
- 577 108. Protuberance with microtrichia on distolateral side of the pretarsus: (0) absent; (1)
- 578 present: ci = 1, ri = 0.
- 579 109. Sensorial setae on mesal side of arolium: (0) absent; (1) present: ci = 1, ri = 1.
- 580 110. Adhesive claw setae: (0) absent; (1) present: ci = 1, ri = 0.
- 581 111. Eversible structure between tibia and tarsus: (0) absent; (1) present: ci = 0, ri = 0.
- 582 112. Tibial thumb-like process: (0) absent; (1) present: ci = 1, ri = 0.
- 583 113. Empodial paronychium: (0) absent; (1) present: ci = 1, ri = 0.
- 584 114. Tarsal apophysis on the ventral side of the tarsus: (0) absent; (1) present: ci = 1, ri = 0.
- 585 115. Two dorsal capitate setae: (0) absent; (1) present: ci = 1, ri = 0.
- 586 116. Flag-like sensilla on the 1st tarsal segment: (0) absent; (1) present: ci = 1, ri = 0.
- 587 117. Fingerlike process below claw: (0) absent; (1) present: ci = 1, ri = 0.
- 588 118. Ventral brush: (0) absent; (1) present: ci = 0.5, ri = 0.





[illegible]

Phylogenetic tree of Cicadellidae showing relationships between Cixius, Javasella, Dictyophara, Philaneus, Cicadetta, Centrotus, and Cicadella. The tree is rooted at the bottom with a node labeled 3 [88/85]. The tree shows several nodes with bootstrap values in brackets. The tree is divided into two main clades by a horizontal line. The top clade includes Cixius, Javasella, Dictyophara, Philaneus, Cicadetta, Centrotus, and Cicadella. The bottom clade includes a single node labeled 3 [88/85].

Key nodes and bootstrap values (in brackets):

- Node 3 [88/85] (Root)
- Node 3 [88/85] (Cicadella)
- Node 1 [60/51] (Cicadetta)
- Node 4 [99/92] (Cixius)
- Node 3 [94/88] (Cicadetta)
- Node 1 [80/71] (Cicadella)

COLEORRHYNCHA

Systellodere

Ceratocombus

370:1
49:0>1
101:1>2
104:0>1
50:1>0
480:1
20:0>1
52:1>0
55:0>1
57:0>1
58:0>1
100:0>1
102:1>0
6 100/99
54:0>1
56:1>2
59:0>1
1 52/47