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#### Abstract

The seven species belonging to the genus Dicronocephalus are a very interesting group with a unique appearance and distinct sexual dimorphism. Only one species among them, $D$. adamsi, has been known in the Korean fauna. This species is recognized as having a wide distribution from Tibet to Korean Peninsula and is currently represented by two subspecies that have separated geographical ranges. The phylogenetic relationships of $D$. adamsi were still unclear. The phylogeny of Dicronocephalus is reconstructed with a phylogenetic study of five species including four subspecies based on a molecular approach using mitochondrial COI and 16 S rRNA genes. Our results are compared with the results obtained by previous authors based on morphological characters. They show that the tested taxa are divided into two major clades. Clade A consists of two species ( $D$. adamsi + D. yui) and Clade B includes the others ( $D$. dabryi + D. uenoi + D. wallichii). This result generally supports Kurosawa's proposal except that $D$. dabryi and $D$. uenoi are newly recognized as members of a monophyletic group. We propose that $D$. adamsi drumonti is a junior subjective synonym of $D$. adamsi adamsi. These results show that three members of the $D$. wallichii group should be treated as species rather than subspecies. However, further research including analyses of different genetic markers is needed to reconfirm our results.
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## Introduction

Genus Dicronocephalus Hope, 1831 is a group of medium- to large-sized beetles with a unique appearance among Cetoniinae representatives. The members of the genus show distinct sexual dimorphism such as antler-like clypeal horns and prolonged tarsomeres in males (Šípek et al. 2008). This genus is composed of seven species including nine subspecies: D. adamsi adamsi Pascoe, 1863; D. adamsi drumonti Legrand, 2005; D. dabryi (Lucas, 1872); D. shimomurai Kurosawa, 1986; D. uenoi uenoi Kurosawa, 1968; D. uenoi katoi Kurosawa, 1968; D. bieti Pouillaude, 1914; D. wallichii wallichii Hope, 1831; D. wallichii bourgoini Pouillaude, 1914; D. wallichii bowringi Pascoe, 1863; D. yui yui Kurosawa, 1968; and D. yui cheni Kurosawa, 1986 (Legrand 2005, Krajcik 2014). Geographically, the genus is widely distributed from the Himalayan foothills of Nepal to Vladivostok in Russia and to Korea, but the distribution of most species and subspecies is rather limited. In particular, D. shimomurai, D. uenoi uenoi, D. uenoi katoi, D. wallichii bourgoini, D. yui yui, and D. yui cheni are endemic to the small island of Taiwan. One species, $D$. dabryi, is only known in West China and Myanmar. The remaining species and subspecies are widely distributed in Asia occurring throughout the Manchuria and Indo-China (Kurosawa 1986, Šípek et al. 2008, Young 2012, Krajcik 2014).

Kurosawa (1986) proposed dividing this genus into three groups on the basis of the morphological characters: 1) the adamsi species-group ( $D$. adamsi, $D$. shimomurai, and $D . y u i)$; 2) the wallichii species-group ( $D$. w. wallichii, $D$. w. bourgoini, $D$. w. bowringi, and $D$. dabryi); and 3) the $D$. uenoi species-group ( $D$. uenoi). However, he did not explain the phylogenetic relationships between these species.

Among the seven species of Dicronocephalus, only D. adamsi is found in the Korean fauna. This species was described from Korea, but it has been known to have a wide range across Korea, China, Tibet, and Vietnam. The range of this species is divided by a wide geographical gap between Liaoning and Shanxi provinces of China (Young 2012). Legrand (2005) divided D. adamsi into two subspecies based on this distribution pattern and morphological differences. He described populations occurring in west China as $D$. adamsi drumonti. This classification was accepted by Krajcik (2014), but not by Young (2012).

The subspecies of $D$. wallichii (D.w. wallichii, D. w. bourgoini, and D.w. bowringi) were originally described as valid species (Hope 1831, Pascoe 1863, Pouillaude 1914). While some authors have treated these taxa as subspecies (Paulian 1960, Mikšić 1971, 1977, Krajčík 1998, Sakai and Nagai 1998, Šípek et al. 2008, Young 2012, Krajcik 2014), some others have treated them as species (Kurosawa 1968, Devecis 2008). The controversy over whether they should be dealt with at the species or sub-species level has continued without in-depth analysis.

During a review of the genus Dicronocephalus, several issues were encountered, such as validation of species or subspecies rank of taxa composing $D$. adamsi and $D$. wallichi (sensu lato) and the lack of phylogenetic analysis of the genus. To resolve these questions, phylogenetic analysis was performed for the genus using cytochrome coxidase subunit $I$ (COI) and 16 ribosomal RNA ( 16 S rRNA) mitochondrial gene sequences as well as examination of their morphological diagnostic characters.

## Materials and methods

## Specimen sampling and examination

Fifty specimens of Dicronocephalus belonging to five species and seven subspecies from four countries were obtained (Fig. 1, Table 1), but we were unable to obtain specimens of the remaining two species, $D$. bieti and $D$. shimomurai. For examining male genitalia, these were extracted from the abdomens and cleaned by heating with $10 \% \mathrm{KOH}$ solution in a WiseTherm ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{HB}-48 \mathrm{P}$ heating block at $60^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for $1 \sim 2$ hours. Male genitalia were preserved in microvials with glycerine after examination. Photographs of external morphology and genitalia were taken with a Canon EOS 10D camera and stacked with a combineZM program (Hadley 2006). Based on previous studies (Pascoe 1863, Pouillaude 1914, Kurosawa 1968, 1986, Young 2012), diagnostic characters were obtained to provide precise criteria for species identification. In this study, the most recent taxonomic scheme by Krajcik (2014) was followed, especially for subspecies treatment of $D$. wallichii. All examined specimens are stored in the Department of Agricultural Biology, National Academy of Agricultural Biology (NAAS), Jeonju, Korea.

## DNA extraction, amplification and sequencing

Genomic DNA (gDNA) was extracted from middle legs removed from dried specimens of all species and accomplished using a QIAamp DNA Mini Kit (Qiagen, Hilden, Germany) in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions. Polymerase Chain Reaction (PCR) was performed in order to amplify the cytochrome $c$ oxidase subunit I gene (COI) and $16 S$ ribosomal RNA gene (16S rRNA) using Accupower PCR PreMix (Bioneer, Daejeon, Korea). The universal primer set LCO1490/HCO2198 (Folmer et al. 1994) for amplifying the DNA barcoding region (658bp) of COI sequences was not successful for all samples; this may be caused by the degraded quality of gDNA (Goldstein and Desalle 2003, Hajibabaei et al. 2006; Wandeler et al. 2007). We applied the PCR methodology for retrieving COI sequences from old specimens given in Han et al. (2014) and designed new primer pairs: LCO-Ceto232F (5'-GCHTTYC-CYCGAATAAATAAYATA-3') corresponding to HCO2198 and HCO-Ceto367R


Figure I. The male habitus of species and subspecies of Dicoronocephalus. A D. adamsi adamsi B D. a. drumonti $\mathbf{C} D$. yui yui $\mathbf{D}$ D. dabryi $\mathbf{E}$ D. uenoi katoi $\mathbf{F}$ D. wallichii bowring $\mathbf{G} D$. w. wallichii $\mathbf{H}$ D. w. bourgoini.
(5'-ACDGTYCADCCNGTTCCTGCNCC-3') corresponding to LCO1490. 16S rRNA was targeted in a 600 bp region with two primers, $16 \mathrm{SB} / 16 \mathrm{SA}$, that successfully amplified in Lucanidae and Elateridae (Hosoya et al. 2001, Hosoya and Araya 2005, Han et al. 2009, 2010). PCR amplification conditions were as follows: for COI, initial denaturation at $94^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 5 min , then 45 cycles at $94^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for $30 \mathrm{~s}, 46^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 25 s, and $72^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 45 s followed by a final extension at $72^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 3 min , and for 16 S rRNA, initial denaturation at $94^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 5 min , then 40 cycles at $94^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for $1 \mathrm{~min}, 50$ ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 1 min , and $72^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 45 s followed by a final extension at $72^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 5 min . The amplicons were purified using a QIA quick PCR Purification Kit (Qiagen, Hilden, Germany) after the product yield was monitored by $0.7 \%$ agarose gel electrophoresis.
Table I. Collection and voucher information for specimens.

| Sample no. | Species | Locality | Data collected | Sex | Voucher no. | Sequencing |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | GBAn of COI | GBAn of 16S |
| 1 | Dicronocephalus adamsi adamsi | Muju, JB, South Korea | 6. VI. 2012 | F | 7258 | KM390855 | KM390809 |
| 2 | Dicronocephalus adamsi adamsi | Sangdaewon-dong, Jungwon-gu, Seongnam, GG, South Korea | 19. V. 2009 | M | 7300 | KM390856 | KM390810 |
| 3 | Dicronocephalus adamsi adamsi | Sangdaewon-dong, Jungwon-gu, Seongnam, GG, South Korea | 19. V. 2009 | M | 7301 | KM390857 | KM390811 |
| 4 | Dicronocephalus adamsi adamsi | Sangdaewon-dong, Jungwon-gu, Seongnam, GG, South Korea | 19. V. 2009 | M | 7302 | KM390858 | KM390812 |
| 5 | Dicronocephalus adamsi adamsi | Sangdaewon-dong, Jungwon-gu, Seongnam, GG, South Korea | 19. V. 2009 | F | 7303 | KM390859 | KM390813 |
| 6 | Dicronocephalus adamsi adamsi | Sangdaewon-dong, Jungwon-gu, Seongnam, GG, South Korea | 25. V. 2013 | M | 7696 | KM390860 | KM390814 |
| 7 | Dicronocephalus adamsi adamsi | Sangdaewon-dong, Jungwon-gu, Seongnam, GG, South Korea | 25. V. 2013 | M | 7697 | KM390861 | KM390815 |
| 8 | Dicronocephalus adamsi adamsi | Tongrim, North Korea | VII. 1995 | M | 7683 | KM390862 | - |
| 9 | Dicronocephalus adamsi adamsi | North Korea | IV. 2002 | M | 7684 | KM390863 | KM390816 |
| 10 | Dicronocephalus adamsi adamsi | Mt. Wu Long, Dandong, Liaoning, China | 15. VII. 2009 | M | 7264 | KM390864 | KM390817 |
| 11 | Dicronocephalus adamsi adamsi | Mt. Wu Long, Dandong, Liaoning, China | 15. VII. 2009 | M | 7265 | KM390865 | KM390818 |
| 12 | Dicronocephalus adamsi adamsi | Mt. Wu Long, Dandong, Liaoning, China | 15. VII. 2009 | M | 7267 | KM390866 | KM390819 |
| 13 | Dicronocephalus adamsi adamsi | Mt. Wu Long, Dandong, Liaoning, China | 15. VII. 2009 | M | 7268 | KM390867 | KM390820 |
| 14 | Dicronocephalus adamsi adamsi | Mt. Wu Long, Dandong, Liaoning, China | 15. VII. 2009 | M | 7269 | KM390868 | KM390821 |
| 15 | Dicronocephalus adamsi adamsi | Mt. Wu Long, Dandong, Liaoning, China | 15. VII. 2009 | M | 7270 | KM390869 | KM390822 |
| 16 | Dicronocephalus adamsi adamsi | Mt. Wu Long, Dandong, Liaoning, China | 15. VII. 2009 | M | 7272 | KM390870 | KM390823 |
| 17 | Dicronocephalus adamsi adamsi | Mt. Wu Long, Dandong, Liaoning, China | 15. VII. 2009 | M | 7273 | KM390871 | KM390824 |
| 18 | Dicronocephalus adamsi drumonti | Sichuan, China | VI. 2008 | M | 7677 | KM390872 | KM390825 |
| 19 | Dicronocephalus adamsi drumonti | Sichuan, China | VI. 2008 | F | 7678 | KM390873 | KM390826 |
| 20 | Dicronocephalus adamsi drumonti | Sichuan, China | VI. 2008 | F | 7679 | KM390874 | - |
| 21 | Dicronocephalus adamsi drumonti | Sichuan, China | VI. 2008 | F | 7680 | KM390875 | KM390827 |
| 22 | Dicronocephalus adamsi drumonti | Mt. Foding, Guizhou, China | - | F | 7688 | KM390876 | KM390828 |
| 23 | Dicronocephalus adamsi drumonti | Tibet, China | - | M | 7685 | KM390877 | - |
| 24 | Dicronocephalus adamsi drumonti | Tibet, China | - | M | 7686 | KM390878 | KM390829 |
| 25 | Dicronocephalus adamsi drumonti | Tibet, China | - | F | 7687 | KM390879 | - |
| 26 | Dicronocephalus adamsi drumonti | Tibet, China | VIII. 2005 | F | 7689 | KM390880 | KM390830 |
| 27 | Dicronocephalus yui yui | A- Li-Shan, Chiayi county, Taiwan | IV. 2012 | F | 7290 | KM390881 | KM390831 |


| Sample no. | Species | Locality | Data collected | Sex | Voucher no. | Sequencing |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | GBAn of COI | GBAn of 16S |
| 28 | Dicronocephalus yui yui | A- Li-Shan, Chiayi county, Taiwan | IV. 2012 | F | 7291 | KM390882 | KM390832 |
| 29 | Dicronocephalus yui yui | A- Li-Shan, Chiayi county, Taiwan | IV. 2012 | F | 7292 | KM390883 | KM390833 |
| 30 | Dicronocephalus dabryi | Hanyan, Sichuan, China | $\begin{gathered} \text { 16-17. VI. } \\ 2007 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | M | 7278 | KM390884 | KM390834 |
| 31 | Dicronocephalus dabryi | Hanyan, Sichuan, China | $\begin{gathered} \text { 16-17. VI. } \\ 2007 \end{gathered}$ | M | 7279 | KM390885 | KM390835 |
| 32 | Dicronocephalus dabryi | H-1601m, Env. Xichang city, S. Sichuan, China | 12. VI. 2009 | M | 7375 | KM390886 | KM390836 |
| 33 | Dicronocephalus dabryi | H-1601m, Env. Xichang city, S. Sichuan, China | 12. VI. 2009 | F | 7376 | KM390887 | KM390837 |
| 34 | Dicronocephalus dabryi | China | 2005 | M | 7690 | KM390888 | KM390838 |
| 35 | Dicronocephalus uenoi katoi | Chiayi, Taiwan | VIII. 2011 | M | 7285 | KM390889 | KM390839 |
| 36 | Dicronocephalus uenoi katoi | Chiayi, Taiwan | VIII. 2011 | M | 7286 | KM390890 | KM390840 |
| 37 | Dicronocephalus uenoi katoi | A- Li-Shan, Chiayi county, Taiwan | IV. 2012 | M | 7287 | KM390891 | KM390841 |
| 38 | Dicronocephalus uenoi katoi | A- Li-Shan, Chiayi county, Taiwan | IV. 2012 | M | 7288 | KM390892 | KM390842 |
| 39 | Dicronocephalus uenoi katoi | A- Li-Shan, Chiayi county, Taiwan | IV. 2012 | M | 7289 | KM390893 | KM390843 |
| 40 | Dicronocephalus wallichii bowringi | Mt. Lianyuan, Hunan, China | VII. 2006 | M | 7692 | KM390894 | KM390844 |
| 41 | Dicronocephalus wallichii bowringi | Mt. Lianyuan, Hunan, China | VII. 2006 | F | 7693 | KM390895 | KM390845 |
| 42 | Dicronocephalus wallichii bowringi | Mt. Guangwu, Sichuan, China | - | M | 7694 | KM390896 | KM390846 |
| 43 | Dicronocephalus wallichii bowringi | Mt. Guangwu, Sichuan, China | - | F | 7695 | KM390897 | KM390847 |
| 44 | Dicronocephalus wallichii wallichii | Taeng, Mae, Mai, Ching, N. Thailand | VII. 2010 | M | 7274 | KM390898 | KM390848 |
| 45 | Dicronocephalus wallichii wallichii | Taeng, Mae, Mai, Ching, N. Thailand | IV. 2008 | M | 7275 | KM390899 | KM390849 |
| 46 | Dicronocephalus wallichii bourgoini | Beitou, Taipei, Taiwan | V. 2008 | F | 7277 | KM390900 | KM390850 |
| 47 | Dicronocephalus wallichii bourgoini | Beitou, Taipei, Taiwan | V. 2008 | M | 7280 | KM390901 | KM390851 |
| 48 | Dicronocephalus wallichii bourgoini | Beitou, Taipei, Taiwan | V. 2008 | M | 7281 | KM390902 | KM390852 |


| Sample no. | Species | Locality | Data collected | Sex | Voucher no. | Sequencing |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | GBAn of COI | GBAn of 16S |
| 49 | Dicronocephalus wallichii bourgoini | Beitou, Taipei, Taiwan | V. 2008 | F | 7282 | 198 bp | KM390853 |
| 50 | Dicronocephalus wallichii bourgoini | Beitou, Taipei, Taiwan | V. 2008 | F | 7283 | KM390903 | KM390854 |
| 51 | Protaetia brevitarsis* | Korea | - | - | - | KC775706 | KC775706 |

* denotes outgroup taxa data extracted from GenBank. GBAn is denoted the GenBank accession number.

DNA sequencing was performed using an automated DNA sequencer (ABI 3730xl 96-capillary DNA analyzer; Applied Biosystems, Foster City, CA) with the same primers used for PCR. All sequences (excepting a 198 bp fragment of COI in no. 7282) are available from GenBank under accession numbers KM390855-KM390903 for COI and KM390809-KM390854 for 16S rRNA (Table 1).

## Phylogenetic analysis

For the phylogenetic analyses, three data sets were used, a 658 bp fragment of COI, 520 bp fragment of 16 S rRNA sequences, and the concatenated COI and 16 S rRNA sequences. The data sets were aligned using ClustalW in MEGA 5.2 (Tamura et al. 2011), and genetic distances were calculated using Kimura's two-parameter test (Kimura 1980). The phylogenetic analyses were constructed using maximum likelihood (ML), Bayesian inference methods (BI), and maximum parsimony (MP).

ML analysis was performed with GARLI 2.0 (Zwickl 2011), and the analysis was initiated at a random start tree using GTR $+\mathrm{I}+\mathrm{G}$ model parameters selected by $\mathrm{Mr}-$ ModelTest (Nylander 2004), with a 10,000 generation search algorithm and 1,000 bootstrap replications. The frequencies with which to log the best score ("logevery") and to save the best tree to file ("saveevery") were set to 10,000 and 10,000 respectively, and the number of generations without topology improvement required for termination ("genthreshfortopoterm") was set to 5,000 . At the end of the analysis, there was no improvement in the tree topology by a log likelihood of 0.01 or better. The bootstrap values were calculated using the SumTrees program of the DendroPy package (Sukumaran and Holder 2010).

BI analysis was performed with MrBayes 3.1.2 (Ronquist and Huelsenbeck 2003). Metropolis-coupled Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) analyses were run with one cold and three heated chains (temperature set to 0.2 ) for 5,000,000 generations and tree sampling every 100 generations. The posterior probabilities were then obtained and a majority-rule consensus tree was generated from the remaining trees after discarding the first $25 \%$ of samples.

MP analysis was performed with TNT 1.1 (Goloboff et al. 2008). The analyses, followed by tree bisection reconnection (TBR) branch swapping, used default options that performed 100 random additional sequences and saved up to ten trees per replication. To obtain the strict consensus tree, symmetric resampling (Goloboff et al. 2003) with a $33 \%$ change probability and jack-knifing with a $36 \%$ removal probability were implemented using a traditional search with 1,000 replications. Each set of results was summarized in terms of absolute frequency, and the group support values were analyzed. For bootstrap value (BP) in ML and MP, and posterior probability value (PP) in BI, supporting values of $<70 \%$ as "weak", $70-79 \%$ as "moderate", $80-89 \%$ as "strong", and $\geq 90 \%$ as "very strong" support were used.

## Results

## Nucleotide information for COI and 16 S rRNA

The data set of COI, with no evidence of indel (insertion/deletion) events, had 144 (21.9\%) variable sites (Vs). Of these, 140 (21.3\%) were parsimoniously informative sites (PIs). The data set of 16 S rRNA, with indel events at three sites, consisted of 43 (8.3\%) Vs, of which 41 ( $7.9 \%$ ) were PIs. There was about 2.6 times more variability and the level of PIs was about 2.7 times greater in COI than in that in 16 S rRNA.

## Phylogenetic analyses of COI

Phylogenetic inferences based on three analyses (ML, BI, and MP) reconstructed the same topologies for COI (Fig. 2; for BI, ML and MP tree data not shown, see Suppl. material 1 for sequences), and there was separation into two major clades (A and B) with very strong supporting values (100\%), except for ML. Eight ingroup taxa representatives including subspecies were clearly clustered into seven monophyletic groups corresponding to nominal species; the two subspecies of $D$. adamsi formed one cluster. Their terminal nodes were well supported, but the values of ML and BI were very low in D. yui yui ( $<50 \%$ in ML and $53 \%$ in BI) and D. wallichii bowringi ( $<50 \%$ in ML and $56 \%$ in BI).

The intra-specific distances of COI were rather low, ranging from $0-2.3 \%$. The inter-specific divergences were highly variable, ranging from $2.7 \%-16.7 \%$. The distances between the ingroup and outgroup taxa ranged from $16.1 \%-20.1 \%$ (Table 2).

Clade A is composed of D. adamsi adamsi, D. a. drumonti, and D. yui yui with strong bootstrap support ( $>72 \%$ ). The two subspecies of $D$. adamsi did not separate into two distinct subgroups. The genetic divergences between the two subspecies were relatively low ( $0-1.7 \%$ ); moreover, D. a. drumonti shared haplotypes with $D$. a. adamsi from Korea and China. D. yui yui was sister to $D$. adamsi with distinct inter-specific divergences (5.6\%-7.3\%).

Clade B is composed of $D$. dabryi, $D$. uenoi katoi, and three subspecies of $D$. wallichii with strong bootstrap supports by ML and BI, but relatively low support ( $56 \%-62 \%$ ) by MP. Among the members of Clade B, D. dabryi and D. uenoi katoi formed a monophyletic group with very strong supporting values in all analyses and with distinct inter-specific divergences $(5.6 \%-8.9 \%)$. The intra-specific divergences of these two species ( $0-1.5 \%$ in $D$. dabryi, $0.2 \%-2.3 \%$ in $D . u$. katoi) were explicitly lower than their inter-specific values. The three subspecies of $D$. wallichii were clustered as a monophyletic group and clearly subdivided. D. w. bowringi diverged early from an ancestor, and then $D . w$. wallichii and $D$. w. bourgoini underwent subsequent separation with strong bootstrap supports by ML (83\%) and BI (99\%); however, despite low divergences within each subspecies ranging from $0.3 \%-0.8 \%$, the


Figure 2. Phylogenetic relationships among Dicronocephalus species reconstructed with Bayesian inference using COI sequences. Numbers above branches indicate ML bootstrap values and Bayesian posterior probabilities. Numbers below branches are bootstrap, symmetric resampling, and jacknife support from parsimony searches, respectively. Scale bar represents $10 \%$ nucleotide mutation rate.
genetic divergences between these subspecies were unexpectedly variable ranging from $2.7 \%-8.1 \%$. Genetic divergences were larger between $D$. w. bowringi and both $D$. w. wallichii (4.3\%-5.0\%) and D. w. bourgoini (4.8\%-8.1\%), than those between D. w. wallichii and D. w. bourgoini ( $2.7 \%-5.7 \%$ ).

## Phylogenetic analyses of 16 S rRNA

ML, BI, and MP analyses of 16 S rRNA resulted in considerably similar topologies to those of COI (Fig. 3 for BI, ML and MP tree data now shown, see Suppl. material 2 for sequences), but a polytomy was found in $D$. yui yui and paraphyly in $D$. w. bowringi with respect to $D$. w. wallichii.

The intra-specific pairwise distances of 16 S rRNA were relatively low, ranging from $0-0.4 \%$. The inter-specific divergences ranged from $0.8 \%-6.3 \%$. The distances between the ingroup and outgroup taxa ranged from $9.7 \%-11.8 \%$ (Table 3). The
Table 2. Pairwise distance of COI within and between Dicronocephalus spp.

|  | No. of samples | Within species | Between subspecies \& species |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | D. a. adamsi + D. a. drumonti | D. yui yui | D. dabryi | D. uenoi katoi | D. w. bowringi | D. w. wallichii | D. w. bourgoini |
| D. adamsi adamsi + D. adamsi drumonti | 26 | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.006 \\ (0-0.017) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| D. yui yui | 3 | $\begin{gathered} 0.011 \\ (0.002-0.017) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.062 \\ (0.056-0.073) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| D. dabryi | 5 | $\begin{gathered} 0.008 \\ (0-0.015) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.150 \\ (0.130-0.162) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.140 \\ (0.130-0.149) \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| D. uenoi katoi | 5 | $\begin{gathered} 0.013 \\ (0.002-0.023) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.150 \\ (0.131-0.167) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.135 \\ (0.128-0.150) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.069 \\ (0.056-0.089) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |
| D. wallichii bowringi | 4 | $\begin{gathered} 0.006 \\ (0.003-0.008) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.120 \\ (0.104-0.131) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.117 \\ (0.105-0.127) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.139 \\ (0.130-0.152) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.117 \\ (0.105-0.134) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |
| D. w. wallichii | 2 | $\begin{gathered} 0.006 \\ (0.006-0.006) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.133 \\ (0.126-0.141) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.123 \\ (0.121-0.124) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.132 \\ (0.125-0.137) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.135 \\ (0.125-0.144) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.048 \\ (0.043-0.050) \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| D. w. bourgoini | 5 | $\begin{gathered} 0.003 \\ (0-0.006) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.123 \\ (0.109-0.134) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.122 \\ (0.120-0.124) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.146 \\ (0.131-0.163) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.128 \\ (0.104-0.147) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.060 \\ (0.048-0.081) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.047 \\ (0.027-0.057) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |
| Protaetia brevitarsis* | 1 | - | $\begin{gathered} 0.175 \\ (0.168-0.179) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.168 \\ (0.164-0.170) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.196 \\ (0.192-0.201) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.191 \\ (0.188-0.196) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.179 \\ (0.166-0.188) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.198 \\ (0.197-0.199) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.176 \\ (0.161-0.189) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
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Figure 3. Phylogenetic relationships among Dicronocephalus species reconstructed with Bayesian inference using 16S rRNA sequences. Numbers above branches indicate ML bootstrap values and Bayesian posterior probabilities. Numbers below branches are bootstrap, symmetric resampling, and jacknife support from parsimony searches, respectively. Scale bar represents $10 \%$ nucleotide mutation rate.
lowest inter-specific divergence range ( $0.8 \%-1.2 \%$ ) was revealed between $D$. adamsi and $D$. yui yui, and this is rather similar to the divergence ranges of the $D$. wallichii subspecies ( $0.8 \%-1.6 \%$ ).

Dicronocephalus adamsi was clustered as a sister to D. yui yui in Clade A with strong bootstrap support ( $>90 \%$ ), while the remaining taxa were clustered into Clade B with relatively low supporting values ( $>76 \%$ ) in BI and MP. The monophyly of $D$. adamsi, D. uenoi katoi, D. w. wallichii, and D. w. bourgoini was well supported by bootstrap analyses ( $>84 \%$ ). In contrast, in all analyses a polytomy was found in D. yui yui and ML and BI showed paraphyly of D. w. bowringi. We showed that these phenomena were caused by few parsimony-informative nucleotide variations in conserved regions. A comparison of each of those sequences, showed that D. y. yui has different substitutions at 326 nucleotide position. Two samples (7290 and 7291) have "C", while one sample (7292) has "T". On the other hand, D. w. bowringi has a substitution occurred in 196 nucleotide position. The 7693 sample has "G", while the other samples (7692, 7694 , and 7695 ) and two samples (7274 and 7275) of D. wallichii have " $A$ " at this site (Suppl. material 2).
Table 3. Pairwise distance of $16 S$ ribosomal RNA within and between Dicronocephalus spp.

|  | No. of samples | Within species | Between subspecies \& species |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | D. a. adamsi + D. a. drumonti | D. yuiyui | D. dabryi | D. uenoi katoi | D. w. bowringi | D. w. wallichii | D. w. bourgoini |
| D. a. adamsi + D. a. drumonti | 22 | $\begin{gathered} 0.000 \\ (0.000-0.002) \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| D. yui yui | 3 | $\begin{gathered} 0.001 \\ (0.000-0.002) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.009 \\ (0.008-0.012) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| D. dabryi | 5 | $\begin{gathered} 0.002 \\ (0.000-0.004) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.057 \\ (0.054-0.060) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.050 \\ (0.046-0.052) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| D. uenoi katoi | 5 | $\begin{gathered} 0.001 \\ (0.000-0.002) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.059 \\ (0.058-0.063) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.052 \\ (0.050-0.054) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.020 \\ (0.018-0.022) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |
| D. wallichii bowringi | 4 | $\begin{gathered} 0.001 \\ (0.000-0.003) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.046 \\ (0.042-0.055) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.039 \\ (0.034-0.049) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.035 \\ (0.028-0.047) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.036 \\ (0.032-0.047) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |
| D. w. wallichii | 2 | $\begin{gathered} 0.000 \\ (0.000-0.000) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.050 \\ (0.050-0.050) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.043 \\ (0.042-0.044) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.030 \\ (0.030-0.032) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.034 \\ (0.034-0.036) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.009 \\ (0.008-0.011) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| D. w. bourgoini | 5 | $\begin{gathered} 0.001 \\ (0.000-0.002) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.048 \\ (0.048-0.048) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.041 \\ (0.040-0.042) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.032 \\ (0.028-0.034) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.034 \\ (0.032-0.036) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.012 \\ (0.008-0.016) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.015 \\ (0.014-0.016) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |
| Protaetia brevitarsis* | 1 | - | $\begin{gathered} 0.104 \\ (0.104-0.106) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.102 \\ (0.101-0.104) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.103 \\ (0.101-0.104) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.104 \\ (0.104-0.104) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.103 \\ (0.097-0.118) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.099 \\ (0.099-0.099) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.101 \\ (0.099-0.102) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
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Figure 4. Phylogenetic relationships among Dicronocephalus species reconstructed with Bayesian inference using COI and 16 S rRNA sequences. Numbers above branches indicate ML bootstrap values and Bayesian posterior probabilities. Numbers below branches are bootstrap, symmetric resampling, and jacknife support from parsimony searches, respectively. Scale bar represents $10 \%$ nucleotide mutation rate.

## Phylogenetic analyses of COI and 16S rRNA

In the combined data set of COI and $16 S$ rRNA, phylogenetic reconstructions produced topologies congruent with the COI analyses. The nodal supporting values were improved compared with the analyses based on each gene (Fig. 4, see Suppl. material 3 for sequences). Monophyly of the seven taxa including subspecies was strongly supported by bootstrap values $>90 \%$, except for low support of $53 \%$ and $55 \%$ in ML and BI , respectively, for the terminal node of D. w. bowringi. D. w. wallichii was grouped as a sister to $D$. w. bourgoini based on the results of the COI analyses with a high value in BI (94\%) and moderate value in ML (74\%), but not in MP (Fig. 4).

## Re-examination of morphological diagnostic characters

The 19 diagnostic characters used to classify species or subspecies were re-examined in order to determine whether they are suitable for identification (Table 4). Of these characters,

Table 4. Diagnostic characters of Dicronocephalus.

| Character |  | states | Reference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Body | 1. Color in male (Fig. 1) | 0) grayish brown | Kurosawa (1968) |
|  |  | 1) dark brown |  |
|  |  | 2) yellowish brown |  |
|  |  | 3) dark yellowish brown |  |
|  |  | 4) green-yellowish brown with pale purple on elytra |  |
|  | 2. Color in female | 0) dark blackish body without marking | Kurosawa (1986) |
|  |  | 1) not dark blackish body |  |
|  | 3. Pronotal and elytral colors (Fig. 1) | 0) pronotum and elytra different | Pouillaude (1914) |
|  |  | 1) pronotum and elytra similar |  |
|  | 4. Dorsal surface | 0) pilose with brownish semirecumbent hairs | Pouillaude (1914) <br> Kurosawa (1968) |
|  |  | 1) almost hairless |  |
|  |  | 2) sparsely pilose with hair |  |
| Head | 5. Development of antlers | 0 ) a pair of antlers in male very short, undeveloped, approximate to each other anteriorly | Kurosawa (1968) |
|  |  | 1) antlers in male long and well developed, curving upwards apically and broadly separated from each other |  |
|  | 6. Inferior dentation of antlers | 0) clearly projected upward | Kurosawa (1968) |
|  |  | 1) weakly prominent |  |
|  |  | 2) absent |  |
|  | 7. Shape of anterior edge of clypeus (Fig. 5) | 0) simple without angular projection | Pouillaude (1914) |
|  |  | 1) with an angular projection |  |
|  | 8. Circular indentation of clypeus | 0 ) with a strong or weak circular indentation on the edge | Pouillaude (1914) |
|  |  | 1) without circular indentation on the edge |  |
| Pronotum | 9. Pronotal bands | 0) reaching posterior border | Pouillaude (1914) Young (2012) |
|  |  | 1) not reaching posterior border |  |
|  | 10. Central carinae | $0)$ carinae defined | Pascoe (1866) |
|  |  | 1) carinae nearly indistinct |  |
|  | 11. Extending of carinae | 0) extending beyond the middle | Kurosawa (1968) |
|  |  | 1) never extending beyond the middle |  |
|  |  | 2) no carina |  |
|  | 12. The widest portion | 0 ) widest near the middle | Kurosawa (1968) |
|  |  | 1) widest in front of the middle |  |
| Elytra | 13. Surface | 0 ) with two black dots | Young (2012) |
|  |  | 1) without black dot |  |
|  | 14. Shoulder (Fig. 6) | $0)$ with triangular umbone | Pascoe (1866) |
|  |  | 1) without triangular umbone |  |
|  | 15. Apicosutural angle (Fig. 7) | 0) rounded | Pouillaude (1914) |
|  |  | 1) projected |  |
| Metasternum | 16. Metasternal process | 0 ) obtuse, rather rounded | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Kurosawa (1968) } \\ & \text { Young (2012) } \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | 1) rectangular or acute, moderately produced |  |
|  |  | 2) triangularly and sharply produced |  |


| Character |  | states | Reference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Abdomen | 17. Abdominal sternites in male | L) covered with yellowish grey powder | 1) normal, not covered with yellowish <br> grey powder |
|  |  |  |  |



Figure 5. Anterior edge of clypeus of Dicronocephalus. A D. adamsi adamsi B D. a. drumonti C D. yui yui $\mathbf{D}$ D. dabryi $\mathbf{E}$ D. uenoi katoi $\mathbf{F}$ D. wallichii bowringi $\mathbf{G}$ D. w. wallichii $\mathbf{H}$ D. w. bourgoini.
mentioned in previous studies, 13 are clearly suitable for species or subspecies identification; however, we recognized six characters that are ambiguous and not applicable (Table 5). For example, Pouillaude (1914) mentioned three diagnostic characters as follows: 1) D. dabryi has a different color of the pronotum and the elytra compared with $D$. wallichii subspecies (Fig. 1); 2) D. w. wallichii can be separated from the others ( $D$. adamsi, D. w. bowringi, $D$. w. bourgoini, $D$. dabryi, and $D$. beiti) by having no angular projection at the base of the anterior edge of the clypeus (Fig. 5); and 3) D. w. bourgoini can be distinguished from the others by the projected apicosutural angle of the elytra (Fig. 6). However, none of these characters has proven to be suitable for species identification. We observed that the color of the pronotum and the elytra of $D$. dabryi was the same with grayish powder in freshly collected specimens, but it has faded gradually in old specimens (Fig. 1D). Also the anterior edge of the clypeus of $D$. w. wallichii (Fig. 5G) was sinuate in the middle, similar to that of D.w. bourgoini (Fig. 5 H ), and did not match the description by Pouillaude. We therefore consider that these characters might have been mistakenly described and illustrated by Pouillaude (1914). In addition, the projection of the apicosutural angle of the elytra of D. w. bourgoini was not distinct and could not separate this taxon from the other
Table 5. Data matrix for Dicronochephalus species in this study.

|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D. adamsi adamsi | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | ? | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 (rarely 0) | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| D. adamsi drumonti | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | ? | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 (rarely 0) | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| D. yui yui | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 (or 1) | 1 | 1 (rerely 0) | ? | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| D. dabryi | 0 | 1 | 0 (or 1) | 1 | 1 | ? | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 (rarely 0) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| D. uenoi katoi | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | ? | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| D. w. bowringi | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 (or 1) | 0 (or 1) | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| D. w. wallichii | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 (or 1) | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| D. w. bourgoini | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 (rarely 0) | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Results of examination | C | C | U | C | C | U | U | C | C | C | C | U | C | U | U | C | C | C | C |

Boldic numbers indicate additionally examined diagnostic characters at each species in this study.
Parentheses denote the characteristic represeted by our examination.
Question marks indicate the ambiguous character state to be difficult determination in our examination.
' C ' is clear and ' U ' is unclear characters resulted in this study.


Figure 6. Apicosutural angle of Dicronocephalus. A D. adamsi adamsi B D. a. drumonti $\mathbf{C}$ D. yui yui D D. dabryi $\mathbf{E}$ D. uenoi katoi $\mathbf{F}$ D. wallichii bowringi $\mathbf{G}$ D.w. wallichii $\mathbf{H}$ D. w. bourgoini.
species and subspecies (Fig. 6H). We consider that using another character such as "the posterior margin of the elytra is round or truncated" may more diagnostic than the former character as shown in Fig. 6. Pascoe (1863) used the triangular umbone on the shoulder of the elytra (Fig. 7) to distinguish D. a. adamsi from D.w. bowringi. But, we consider that the presence of a triangular umbone is as an unsuitable character. We found this state also in some specimens of $D$. adamsi, although the size of the triangular umbone was small and variable in each specimen. Kurosawa (1986) used the widest portion of the pronotum as a distinguishing character state, but this was variable in all specimens of D. w. bourgoini and not distinct enough to be used in species and subspecies identification.

Legrand (2005) used six diagnostic characters to distinguish between the two subspecies, D. a. adamsi and D. a. drumonti. Among them, we found four characters, namely body size, general body shape, longitudinal bands on the pronotum, and the shape of the triangular umbone of the elytra, to be ambiguous. He also illustrated the metasternal process and the parameres and explained in the key to subspecies that the ridge of the metasternal process does not reach the plate, and the process is weakly raised and more rounded anteriorly in $D$. a. drumonti. Also, the parameres of D. a. drumonti are shorter and with more acute lateral angles than of D. a. adamsi. However, we found that these characters were variable in the specimens from the two geographically isolated populations (Fig. 8). For example, the shape of the lateral angles of the parameres of Tibetan D. a. drumonti (Fig. 8C, D) is similar to that of a D. a. adamsi from South Korea (Fig 8K, L), and another specimen of D. a. drumonti from Sichuan, China (Fig. 8G, H) resembles a D. a. adamsi from Dandong, China (Fig. 8S, T). We did not find any significant diagnostic characters to separate the two subspecies and therefore the new synonymy is here proposed (Dicronocephalus adamsi drumonti Legrand, 2005 = Dicronocephalus adamsi adamsi Pascoe, 1863, syn. nov).


Figure 7. Umbone (in the circle) of shoulder of Dicronocephalus. A D. adamsi adamsi B D. a. drumonti $\mathbf{C} D$. yui yui $\mathbf{D} D$. dabryi $\mathbf{E}$ D. uenoi katoi $\mathbf{F} D$. wallichii bowring $\mathbf{G} D$. w. wallichii $\mathbf{H} D$. w. bourgoini.

## Discussion

From the results inferred from ML, BI, and MP methods using COI and 16 S rRNA genes, the genus Dicronocephalus includes two major lineages, one with $D$. adamsi and $D$. yui yui and another with $D$. dabryi, D. uenoi katoi, D. w. bowringi, D. w. wallichii, and $D$. w. bourgoini (Figs 1-3). The specimens of eight taxa including subspecies clustered into seven groups and their monophyly was strongly supported in all analyses. However, D. w. bowringi was found to be paraphyletic and the monophyly of D. yui yui was not confirmed in the 16 S rRNA based analyses. In the same analyses we also failed to identify the monophyly of D. yui yui (Fig. 3). Paraphyly or polytomy of the two species was the result of a few pasimony-informative nucleotide substitutions. This has a significant effect on phylogenetic reconstructions when the genetic divergences within and between species are low.

In all topologies, $D$. adams is sister to $D$. yui yui; the same was suggested by Kurosawa (1986). He grouped D. adamsi, D. shimomurai, and D. yui as the adamsi speciesgroup and mentioned that the female dark blackish body without markings might be the main characteristic of this group. The abdomen covered with whitish powder is also a trait that is only shared by $D$. adamsi and $D$. yui among the examined species (Pouillude 1914, Kurosawa 1986).

In contrast with the molecular data of the adamsi species-group, our results for the other congeners do not support the view of Kurosawa (1986). D. uenoi katoi is treated


Figure 8. Metasternal process (in the circle) and aedeagi of Dicronocephalus adamsi drumonti and D. a. adamsi. A, B, C, D D. a. drumonti (Tibet) E, F, G, H D. a. drumonti (Sichuan) I, J, K, L D. a. adamsi (South Korea) M, N, O, P D. a. adamsi (North Korea) Q, R, S, T D. a. adamsi (Dandong, China).
as a separate group in his paper, but it appears a sister taxon of $D$. dabryi in our study, although the general appearance of $D$. uenoi katoi is rather similar to that of $D$. yui yui. Especially, these two species share two characters: the pronotal bands reaching the
posterior border and the obtuse metasternal process. Pouillaude (1914) also noted that D. dabryi has tawny erect hair on the pronotum and elytra. We could observe that the pronotum and elytra are sparsely pilose and the hairs are much denser and longer on the ventral side compared with the other congeners. Furthermore, in the male genitalia, the parameres of the two species are similar and much shorter than those of other species. In this study, the pilose body, which is represented as a unique character of D. uenoi katoi by Kurosawa (1986), is considered as autapomorphy, which may have been rapidly acquired during allopatric speciation in Taiwan because D. uenoi katoi was isolated from a continental ancestor. This interpretation disagrees with Kurosawa's presumption that $D$. uenoi katoi is the most primitive in this genus.

Regarding the status of the subspecies of $D$. adamsi, Legrand (2005) recognized discontinued distribution and morphological differences between two geographically separated populations; however, we consider almost all of the diagnostic characters as being unsuitable for distinguishing these two subspecies. Furthermore, the molecular data indicates that the two subspecies form a monophyletic group with low genetic divergences ( $0-1.7 \%$ ) and individuals of the both subspecies share haplotypes. Therefore, our results provide strong evidence that $D$. a. drumonti should be synonymized with D. a. adamsi.

The three subspecies of $D$. wallichii were originally described as separate species (Hope 1831, Pascoe 1863, Pouillaude 1914). Subsequently their status was lowered to subspecific (Paulian 1960, Mikšić 1971, 1977, Krajcik 1998, Sakai and Nagai 1998, Šípek et al. 2008, Young 2012, Krajcik 2014). However, Kurosawa (1968) disagreed with Paulian (1960) as he considered that there were significant morphological differences between them such as the characteristics of the antlers, the clypeus, the marginal carinae of the pronotum, and the metasternal process. Devecis (2008) also proposed that the taxa be restored as species based on the morphological differences such as color of the dorsal setation, shape of the antlers, and length of the pronotal bands. Results of our molecular analyses showed that the three subspecies of $D$. wallichii form a monophyletic group with high supporting values and large genetic distances. The average pairwise distances $(4.7 \%-6.0 \%)$ of COI between $D$. wallichii bowringi + D. wallichii wallichii and $D$. wallichii bowringi + D. wallichii bourgoini. D. wallichii wallichii $+D$. wallichii bourgoini were slightly lower than the average inter-specific distances of $D$. adamsi + D. yui yui $(6.2 \%)$ and $D$. dabryi + D. uenoi katoi (6.9\%) (Table 2). Also, in 16 S rRNA analysis, the pairwise distances between the three subspecies of D. wallichii were similar to $(0.8 \%-1.6 \%)$ the distance between $D$. adamsi and D. yui yui ( $0.8 \%-1.2 \%$ ) (Table 3). Our phylogenetic analyses explicitly explain their evolutionary history. $D$. w. bowringi is the most primitive among this group and $D$. w. wallichii might be separated by parapatric speciation in the continental region. Also, $D$. w. bourgoini might have undergone allopatric speciation after colonizing the volcanic island of Taiwan. Our results support specific rather than subspecific rank of the three members of $D$. wallichii. We revealed them as being in a monophyletic cluster (Mishler and Theriot 2000, Wiens and Penkrot 2002) with each other separated by distinct genetic gaps in the COI and COI +16 S analyses, although not in the 16 S rRNA analy-
sis. Also, our study showed two distinguishable morphological characters, namely the color of the dorsal body side in males and the shape of the metasternal process (Table 5). However, this evidence is not strong enough to propose specific rank for each of them. A recent study showed that the high genetic divergence of COI alone cannot be a reason for species separation in Cetonia aurata aurata (Ahrens et al. 2013). There is a need for additional analyses with representative sample sizes and the use of multiple genetic loci to reconfirm our results.
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## Supplementary material I

COI sequences dataset of Dicronocephalus species in this study.
Authors: Ga-Eun Lee, Taeman Han, Jongchel Jeong, Seong-Hyun Kim, In Gyun Park, Haechul Park
Data type: (DNA sequences)
Explanation note: This COI data includes 50 individual sequences of the examined Dicronocephalus species and subspecies in this study
Copyright notice: This dataset is made available under the Open Database License (http://opendatacommons.org/licenses/odbl/1.0/). The Open Database License (ODbL) is a license agreement intended to allow users to freely share, modify, and use this Dataset while maintaining this same freedom for others, provided that the original source and author(s) are credited.

## Supplementary material 2

16S rRNA sequences data set of Dicronocephalus species in this study.
Authors: Ga-Eun Lee, Taeman Han, Jongchel Jeong, Seong-Hyun Kim, In Gyun Park, Haechul Park
Data type: (DNA sequences)
Explanation note: This 16 S rRNA data includes 46 individual sequences of the examined Dicronocephalus species in this study.
Copyright notice: This dataset is made available under the Open Database License (http://opendatacommons.org/licenses/odbl/1.0/). The Open Database License (ODbL) is a license agreement intended to allow users to freely share, modify, and use this Dataset while maintaining this same freedom for others, provided that the original source and author(s) are credited.

## Supplementary material 3

The combined dataset of COI and 16 S rRNA of Dicronocephalus species in this study. Authors: Ga-Eun Lee, Taeman Han, Jongchel Jeong, Seong-Hyun Kim, In Gyun Park, Haechul Park
Data type: (DNA sequences)
Explanation note: There is the concatenated sequences of COI and 16 S rRNA genes correspondence with each sample.
Copyright notice: This dataset is made available under the Open Database License (http://opendatacommons.org/licenses/odbl/1.0/). The Open Database License (ODbL) is a license agreement intended to allow users to freely share, modify, and use this Dataset while maintaining this same freedom for others, provided that the original source and author(s) are credited.
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