

Correspondence



https://doi.org/10.11646/zootaxa.4985.1.12 http://zoobank.org/urn:lsid:zoobank.org;pub:50AD1D4C-25E9-4B1B-9131-176E02775EA1

Reports of *Cubiceps baxteri* McCulloch 1923 from Indian Ocean are probably misidentifications of *Cubiceps whiteleggii* (Waite 1894)

V. VIJI^{1*}, K.C. HARISH^{1,2} & B. MADHUSOODANA KURUP^{1,3}

¹School of Ocean Science and Technology, Kerala University of Fisheries and Ocean Studies (KUFOS), Kochi, 682 506, India
² a harishkrishna86@gmail.com; https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3946-5927
³ kurup424@gmail.com; https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1914-1420
*Corresponding author. vijisamod@gmail.com; https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2877-9733

Cubiceps baxteri McCulloch 1923 was described based on a single, imperfect (devoid of a tail) stranded specimen collected from a beach in Lord Howe Island, Tasman Sea. Though *C. baxteri* was reported as a widely distributed tropical species (Butler 1979), it was mainly a result of its incorrect identification (see Agafonova 1994; Stewart and Last 2015). The distribution of C. baxteri is reported to be restricted to the Pacific Ocean, from Japan and eastwards to Baja California (Mexico), southwards to the Hawaiian Islands, New South Wales (Australia), and Lord Howe Island (Tasman Sea) to the Southern parts of Chile (Eschmeyer *et al.* 2017; Mundy 2005; Agafonova 1994).

Several records of *C. baxteri* are available from the Indian Ocean region including the Arabian Sea (Adam *et al.* 1998; Jayaprakash *et al.* 2006; Remesan *et al.* 2016; Sileesh *et al.* 2017; Viji *et al.* 2017) and the Bay of Bengal (Kumar *et al.* 2016, 2017), but none take into account the pioneering work of Agafonova (1994), which is by far the most comprehensive taxonomic account of the genus *Cubiceps* Lowe 1843. While Jayaprakash *et al.* (2006) did not mention the details of literature used for their species-level identification, Kumar *et al.* (2016) cited Alcock (1898, 1899) and FAO (1984) as their source of literature. A critical evaluation of this literature showed that, contrary to claims made by the above authors, no species-level description of *C. baxteri* is available in either of Alcock's works (1898, 1899) or FAO (1984). Therefore, the species identity of *C. baxteri* reported by the above authors is questionable.

Previous studies by Viji *et al.* (2017) and Sileesh *et al.* (2017) followed the brief taxonomic key and description provided in Smith & Heemstra (1986) to identify *C. baxteri* from the Arabian Sea. A critical evaluation of detailed taxonomic characters in Agafonova (1994) and a re-examination of our collection in the Marine Biodiversity Museum, India, (GB.31.99.1.5.1) reveals that previous identification of *C. baxteri* (Viji *et al.* 2016 & Sileesh *et al.* 2017) were incorrect. For example, the species has deciduous scales (Agafonova 1994) but Smith & Heemstra (1986) states that they are adherent. Additionally, Smith & Heemstra (1986) generalized the presence of uniserial teeth on the roof of the mouth and tongue as a generic character, whereas, Agafonova (1994) specifically mentioned the presence of uniserial teeth in the vomer, palatine, and also on the tongue, a valid character for the species-level identification.

Recently, Kumar *et al.* (2017) recorded 27 specimens of *C. baxteri* from the Andaman Sea in the northern Indian Ocean and illustrated the otolith morphology. Although the authors mentioned using Alcock (1898, 1899) and FAO (1984) for species-level identification, interestingly none of these sources have a detailed taxonomic key to identify *C. baxteri* and therefore, the identity of the specimens mentioned in Kumar *et al.* (2017) is questionable. No photographs or morphological characters were provided, nor was there any mention of whether voucher specimens are available. However, Kumar *et al.* (2017; p 4) provided an image of an otolith from a specimen which they had identified as *C. baxteri*. Due to the reasons stated above, it would be highly illogical to consider that the otolith in the image actually represents *C. baxteri*.

A critical comparison of the otolith morphology of *C. baxteri* provided in Kumar *et al.* (2017, p 4) with that illustrated by Agafonova (1994; p 120) clearly showed that they are distinct. It is also evident from these comparative illustrations that the specimens identified as *C. baxteri* by Kumar *et al.* (2017) are *C. whiteleggii* (Waite 1894) (Fig:1), a species that has been previously recorded from the Indian Ocean including the Andaman Sea (Rajan *et.al.* 2013; Agafonova 1988,1994; Venu & Kurup 2002; Butler1979).

In the context of misidentifications made in previous studies (Adam *et al.* 1998; Jayaprakash *et al.* 2006; Remesan *et al.* 2016 and Kumar *et al.* 2016, 2017), it is now pertinent to question the validity of all earlier reports of *C. baxteri* from the Indian waters. The voucher specimens (BMNH 1997.9.17.27—Adam *et al.* (1998); GB.31.99.1.1—Manissery *et al.*

(2012); and SAIAB 200204, 35584, 17784,17186 (Western Indian Ocean); SAIAB 203613 (Andaman Sea)) of this species are available from the Indian Ocean. However, it is also possible that specimens report by Jayaprakash *et al.* (2006) and Kumar *et al.* (2016; 2017) might still be available in the collections of their respective institutions. A re-examination of all such material following the key of Agafonova (1994) and a comparison with the holotype of available at the Australian Museum (IA 686; image available from the museum website) and additional topotypic specimen at the Natural History Museum, London (BMNH 1926.6.30.50) could be useful in establishing the correct identity of the *Cubiceps* species occurring in the Indian waters. Until such confirmation is made, we wish to caution researchers in identifying specimens of *Cubiceps* from India's oceanic waters as *C. baxteri*. Until this taxonomic fiasco is resolved, further research may result in publications pertaining to a species that does not exist in the Indian Ocean".



FIGURE 1. Holotype of Cubiceps whiteleggii (Waite 1894), Maroubra, New South Wales, AMS I.3297.

Acknowledgments

The authors undertook this work as a part of the DSDWF project "Biology, Resource characteristics and Stock Assessment of Deep-Sea Finfishes and Prawns in the depth of 200–1200 m along the Southern and Central Indian Ocean" funded by the Ministry of Earth Science (MoES), Government of India, and the Center for Marine Living Resources and Ecology (CMLRE). We are thankful to Sally Reader and Mark McGrouther, Ichthyology, Australian Museum for providing the photo and description of the holotype. The authors are also grateful to Rajeev Raghavan, Department of Fisheries Resource Management, Kerala University of Fisheries and Ocean Studies (KUFOS) for his critical comments and suggestions on the draft manuscript.

References

- Adam, S.M., Merrett, N.R. & Anderson, C.V. (1998) An annotated Checklist of the Deep Demersal Fishes of the Maldive Islands. *Ichthyological Bulletin*, 67 (1), 1–19.
- Agafonova, T.B. (1988) New data on the taxonomy and distribution of Cigarfishes (Cubiceps, Nomeidae) of the Indian Ocean. *Journal of Ichthyology*, 28 (6), 46–61.
- Agafonova, T.B. (1994) Systematics and distribution of Cubiceps (Nomeidae) of the World Ocean. *Journal of Ichthyology*, 34 (5), 116–143.
- Alcock, A.W. (1898) Natural history notes from H.M. Indian marine survey ship Investigator, Commander T.H. Heming, R.N., commanding. Series II. No. 25. A note on the deep-sea fishes with descriptions of some new genera and species including another probably viviparous ophidioid. *Annals and Magazine of Natural History*, Series 7, 2 (8), 136–156.
- Alcock, A.W. (1899) A descriptive catalogue of the Indian deep-sea fishes in the Indian Museum: being a revised account of the

deep-sea fishes collected by the Royal Indian marine survey ship Investigator. Trustees of the Indian Museum, Calcutta, 211 pp.

https://doi.org/10.5962/bhl.title.4684

- Butler, J.L. (1979) The nomeid genus *Cubiceps* (Pisces) with a description of a new species. *Bulletin of Marine Science*, 29 (2), 226–241.
- Eschmeyer, W.N., Fricke, R. & Van der Laan, R. (2017) Catalog of Fishes, Genera, Species, References. Available from: http:// researcharchive.calacademy.org/research/ichthyology/catalog/fishcatmain.asp (accessed 5 October 2017)
- FAO. (1984) Bony fishes Family Nomeidae. In: Fischer, W. & Bianchi, G. (Eds.), FAO species identification sheets for fishery purposes. Western Indian Ocean Fishing Area 51. Vol. 3. Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations, Rome, pp. 1–5.
- Jayaprakash, A.A., Kurup, B.M., Sreedhar, U., Venu, S., Thankappan, D., Pachu, A.V., Hashim M., Thampy, P. & Sudhakar, S. (2006) Distribution, diversity, length-weight relationship and recruitment pattern of deep-sea finfishes and shellfishes in the shelf-break area off southwest Indian EEZ. *Journal of the Marine Biological Association of India*, 48 (1), 56–67.
- Kumar, A.K.V., Sudhakar, M., Hashim, M., Deepa, K.P. & Thomy, R. (2016) Length-weight relationship of six deep-sea fish species from the shelf regions of western Bay of Bengal and Andaman waters. *Journal of Applied Ichthyology*, 32 (6), 1334–1336.

https://doi.org/10.1111/jai.13164

Kumar, A.K.V., Nikki, R., Oxona, K., Hashim, M. & Sudhakar, M. (2017) Relationships between fish and otolith size of nine deep-sea fishes from the Andaman and Nicobar waters, North Indian Ocean. *Journal of Applied Ichthyology*, 33 (6), 1187–1195.

https://doi.org/10.1111/jai.13467

- Manisseri, M.K., Antony, G., George, R.M., Nair, R.J., Joshi, K.K. & Geetha, P.M. (2012) Marine Biodiversity Museum (A Designated National Repository) Catalogue. No. 107. Central Marine Fisheries Research Institute, Kochi, 222 pp.
- McCulloch, Allan, R. (1923) Notes on fishes from Australia and Lord Howe Island. Vol. 14. Records of the Australian Museum, Australian Museum, Sydney, 17 pp.

https://doi.org/10.3853/j.0067-1975.14.1923.822

Mundy, B.C. (2005) Checklist of the fishes of the Hawaiian Archipelago. Bulletins in Zoology, 6, 1-703.

- Rajan, P.T., Sreeraj, C.R. & Immanuel, T. (2013) Fishes of Andaman and Nicobar Islands: A Checklist. *Journal of the Andaman Science Association*, 18 (1), 47–87.
- Remesan, M.P., Prajith, K.K., Raj, F.D., Joseph, R. & Boopendranath, M.R. (2016) Investigations on Aimed Midwater Trawling for Myctophids in the Arabian Sea. *Fishery Technology*, 53, 190–196.
- Sileesh, M.S., Korath, A., Harish, K.C. & Viji, V. (2017) Species assemblages and community structure of deep-sea demersal ichthyofauna of the South-eastern Arabian Sea (SEAS). *Journal of the Marine Biological Association of the United Kingdom*, 98 (7), 1775–1781.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0025315417001151

- Smith, M. & Heemstra, P.C. (1986) *Smith's Sea Fishes*. Springer -Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg, London, 1047 pp. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-82858-4
- Stewart, A.L. & Last, P.R. (2015) Family Nomeidae. In: Roberts, C.D., Stewart, A.L. & Struthers, C.D. (Eds.), The Fishes of New Zealand. Vol. 4. Systematic Accounts. Te Papa Press, New, Wellington, pp. 1662–1667.
- Venu, S. & Kurup, B.M. (2002) Distribution and abundance of deep-sea fishes along the west coast of India. *Fishery Technology*, 39, 20–26.
- Viji, V., Harish, K.C., Korath, A. & Sileesh, M.S. (2017) A critical analysis of diet in seventeen deep sea fishes along the Southeastern Arabian Sea. *Indian Journal of Fisheries*, 64 (2), 17–21. https://doi.org/10.21077/ijf.2017.64.2.67233-03