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#### Abstract

A new medium-sized shrew mole species of the genus Uropsilus from Mount Fansipan, Hoang Lien National Park, Lao Cai Province, northwestern Vietnam is described based on morphological and molecular differences. Uropsilus fansipanensis sp. nov. is distinguished from the other Uropsilus species by the combination of the following features: the dorsum is lightly reddish-brown and venter is dark gray; the dark gray tail is long and slender, with a scattered white base and short bristle hairs; orbital process is oriented upwards posteriorly; lacrimal foramen is well developed and much larger than infraorbital foramen; the lower first premolar is approximately the same size as the lower third premolar. Genetic distances in terms of mitochondrial cytochrome $b$ from other Uropsilus species presented pairwise divergences from 8.63 to $20.70 \%$. To date, the new species is known to exist only in the type locality of Mt. Fansipan, a wet and cold temperate climate area with an upper montane forest at an elevation of approximately 2900 m , forming the southernmost distribution of the genus Uropsilus.
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## Introduction

Shrew moles of subfamily Uropsilinae Dobson, 1883 are classified as family Talpidae, order Eulipotyphla, class Mammalia, and are endemic to central and southern China and adjacent Myanmar (Hoffmann 1984; Wan et al. 2013; Kryštufek \& Motokawa 2018; Hu et al. 2021). The subfamily Uropsilinae currently comprises of a single genus, Uropsilus Milne-Edwards 1872 (Kryštufek \& Motokawa 2018). Kryštufek \& Motokawa (2018) suggested that the genus Uropsilus occurs at high altitudes, from 1550 to 4600 m above sea level (asl.). Hu et al. (2021) mentioned that Uropsilus inhabits mountain forests and shrub grasslands and found a shrew mole population from an altitude of 1064 to 1273 m asl. in eastern China. This genus has not yet been recorded in Vietnam.

Milne-Edwards (1872) described U. soricipes from Baoxing, Sichuan (originally Moupin), which is the type species of the genus Uropsilus and possesses 34 teeth and dental formula I $2 / 1$, C $1 / 1$, P $3 / 3, \mathrm{M} 3 / 3=34$ representing number of incisors (I), canines (C), premolars $(\mathrm{P})$, molars $(\mathrm{M})$ in each side of upper and lower dentition. Subsequently, Thomas (1912) described two new shrew mole species, differing in the presence or absence of one or two antemolars from U. soricipes and established two new monotypic genera with two new species Rhynchonax andersoni Thomas, 1911 (I 2/2, C $1 / 1$, P $4 / 3, \mathrm{M} 3 / 3=38$ ) from Mount Emei (originally Omi-san), Sichuan and Nasillus gracilis Thomas, 1911 (I 2/1, C $1 / 1$, P $4 / 4$, M $3 / 3=38$ ) from Mount Jinfo (originally Chin-fu-san) in Nanchuan, Chongqing. Thus, discrimination among genera was based on differences in the dental formula. Later, Thomas (1922) described $N$. investigator from the Kui-chiang-Salween divide at $28^{\circ} \mathrm{N}, 11000$ feet ( $=3353 \mathrm{~m}$ )
altitude, Yunnan. Allen (1923) described R. andersoni nivatus from Yulong Snow Mountain (originally Ssu-shan), Lijiang, Yunnan, and R. andersoni atronates from Mu-cheng, Salween drainage, Yunnan. These two names were described as subspecies of $R$. andersoni, but they were later treated as conspecific with N. gracilis (e.g., Hoffman 1984; Corbet \& Hill 1992; Hutterer 1993, 2005; Wan et al. 2013), because their dental formula is that of Nasillus (I $2 / 1$, C $1 / 1$, P $4 / 4$, M $3 / 3=38$ ).

Ellerman \& Morrison-Scott (1951), Cranbrook (1960), Corbet \& Hill (1980), and Honacki et al. (1982) considered that Rhynchonax and Nasillus are junior synonyms of Uropsilus and that Uropsilus is a monotypic genus consisting of one species ( $U$. soricipes) with five subspecies (U. s. soricipes, U. s. gracilis, U. s. investigator, $U$. s. andersoni, and U. s. nivatus), while Gureev (1979) defended the view that shrew mole consists of three genera and four species (U. soricipes, Nasillus gracilis, N. investigator, and Rhynchonax andersoni). Hoffmann (1984) reviewed shrew moles by examining almost all holotypes and the majority of extant specimens in North American and European museums, and recognized three species (U. soricipes, U. gracilis, and U. andersoni) in a single genus Uropsilus and considered investigator, nivatus, and atronates to be junior synonyms of U. gracilis. Corbet \& Hill (1992) and Hutterer (1993) followed this view. Hutterer (2005) separated U. investigator from U. gracilis based on their morphological differences and sympatric distribution, and consequently recognized four species in the genus Uropsilus (U. soricipes, U. gracilis, U. investigator, and U. andersoni). Hoffmann \& Lunde (2013) followed this classification and recognized four species distributed in China.

Liu et al. (2013) described a new species U. aequodonenia from the Luoji Shan Scenic Area, Puge County, Sichuan, China. The species was suggested to be closely related to $U$. andersoni, while it possesses a distinct dental formula (I $2 / 2$, C $1 / 1$, P $3 / 3$, M $3 / 3=36$ ) that is different from the other Uropsilus species. Based on molecular approaches, Wan et al. (2013) reconstructed a robust phylogeny and found cryptic diversity in Uropsilus, and determined seven distinct species ( $U$. soricipes, $U$. gracilis, $U$. investigator, $U$. andersoni, $U$. aequodonenia, $U$. nivatus and $U$. atronates), as well as five putative and undescribed species. Wan et al. (2018) regenerated gene trees with additional specimens illustrating 15 distinct clades and explained that the diversification of shrew moles in the mountains of Southwest China is largely cryptic owing to niche conservatism and complex topography.

In consideration of Wan et al. (2013), Kryštufek \& Motokawa (2018), and Burgin et al. (2020), seven shrew mole species are recognized in the genus Uropsilus: U. soricipes, U. gracilis, U. investigator, U. andersoni, U. aequodonenia, $U$. nivatus, and $U$. atronates; although the taxonomic statuses of species in Myanmar are unclear. Wan (2015) described six names as new species from China, but the PhD thesis (Wan 2015) is not regarded as published within the meaning of the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature (amended Article 8.1 and 9.12: ICZN 1999, 2012). The six species-group names introduced by Wan (2015), i.e., U. "robustus", $U$. "qinlingensis", $U$. "wulingensis", $U$. "binchuanensis", $U$. "jingdongensis", and $U$. "parva" are thus deemed to be unavailable. Hu et al. (2021) described a new species, U. dabieshanensis from the Dabie Mountains, Anhui, as the easternmost distribution of the genus based on morphological and molecular characteristics. Therefore, the genus Uropsilus currently includes eight species. In addition, Hu et al. (2021) indicated five names (U. "qinlingensis", U. "wulingensis", $U$. "binchuanensis", $U$. "jingdongensis", and $U$. "parva") of Wan (2015) and another name $U$. "rubustus" in the molecular phylogenetic trees, but these six names are not accompanied by a description or definition, and are not available following Article 13 of the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature (ICZN 1999).

To the west of the Red River, the Hoang Lien Son Range of northwestern Vietnam is at the end of the southeastern extension of the Himalayan mountains (Tordoff et al. 1999; Sterling et al. 2006) and Mt. Fansipan, with an altitude of 3143 m asl., is the highest mountain in this range. The Hoang Lien Son Range has risen approximately 65 million years ago and continues to rise till the current day (Sterling et al. 2006). Above 3000 m on Mt. Fansipan, the climate is temperate with freezing temperatures during December and January, and possesses around three snowfall days per year (Sterling et al. 2006; Bain \& Hurley 2011). The mountainous areas in northern Vietnam, close to the Vietnam-China border, host a number of Eulipotyphla species that might also be found in southwestern China and are interesting in zoogeography (Saito et al. 2021).

During our recent fieldwork on Mt. Fansipan, Hoang Lien National Park, Lao Cai province, northwestern Vietnam, two shrew moles were collected. Molecular analyses and morphological examination showed that these specimens represent an undescribed species of the genus Uropsilus, which is distinct from the currently known eight species. In the present study, we describe a new species of the genus Uropsilus in Vietnam.

## Material and methods

Sampling. A field survey on small mammals was conducted from April 30 to May 6, 2022, on Mt. Fansipan, along a trail from 2200 m to 2950 m (Hoang Lien National Park, Lao Cai Province). The first shrew mole (field number, Motokawa 837) was collected using a Sherman live trap $(7.5 \times 7.5 \times 24 \mathrm{~cm})$ at $22^{\circ} 18.804 \mathrm{~N}$ and $103^{\circ} 45.92 \mathrm{E}$, at an altitude of 2821 m . The second (field number, Motokawa 914) was trapped by pitfall (plastic cup of height 150 mm $\times$ diameter 95 mm ) at $22^{\circ} 18.783 \mathrm{~N}$ and $103^{\circ} 45.92 \mathrm{E}$, at an altitude of 2840 m .

Specimen examination. Photographing and measurements of the total length (TL), tail length (T), ear length (E), forefoot length (FF1 and FF2, without and with claws, respectively), hindfoot length (HF1 and HF2, without and with claws, respectively), and body mass (Wt) were made. Head-body length (HB) was calculated by subtracting T from TL. The specimens were fixed in $70 \%$ ethanol. The liver samples were preserved separately in $99 \%$ ethanol. Skulls were separated from the body and cleaned. Twelve cranial and dental measurements were taken from each specimen following Thomas (1912), Allen (1923), Hoffmann (1984), and Hu et al. (2021): profile length (PL), from the most anterior point of upper incisor to the most posterior point of the skull; basal length (BL), from the tip of the premaxilla to the posterior margin of the occipital condyles; palatal length (MPL), from the anterior tip of the first incisor to the posterior tip of the palate; greatest neurocranium breadth (GNB), zygomatic breadth (ZB), greatest breadth of snout (GBSn), least breadth between orbits $(\mathrm{LBO})$, braincase height $(\mathrm{BH})$, upper tooth row length including first incisor (UTRL), greatest width across the upper second molars (M2-M2), length of mandible not including first incisor (LM), and mandibular tooth row length including first incisor (MTRL). All measurements were taken using digital calipers to the nearest 0.01 mm . The specimens were deposited at the Department of Vertebrate Zoology, Institute of Ecology and Biological Resources (IEBR), Vietnam Academy of Science and Technology, Hanoi. In addition, we examined five specimens of four Uropsilus species deposited in the Natural History Museum, London: U. soricipes BMNH 1911.9.8.12; U. gracilis BMNH 1911.9.8.13 (holotype); U. investigator BMNH 1922.9.1.16 (holotype); U. andersoni BMNH 1911.2.1.30 and 31. We also referred to photographs in Liu et al. (2013), Wan (2015), and Hu et al. (2021) for non-metric morphological characters of $U$. aequodonenia, U. nivatus, U. atronates, and $U$. dabieshanensis.

Molecular data and phylogenetic analyses. DNA was extracted from tissues preserved in 99\% ethanol using the DNeasy ${ }^{\circledR}$ Blood \& Tissue DNA kit (Qiagen, Hilden, Germany), following the manufacturer's protocol. Polymerase chain reaction (PCR) was performed to amplify partial fragments of mitochondrial DNA of cytochrome $b$ (cytb) and nuclear DNA of recombination activating genes 1 and 2 (RAG1 and RAG2). These genes were amplified using the $2 \times$ Taq plus PCR Master Mix kit (Biosharp, Anhui, China). The primers used were SoriR ( ${ }^{\prime}$ '-TGACATGAAAAATCATCGTTG-3') and SoriF (5'-CCATCTCTGGTTTACAAGAC-3') for cytb (Bui et al. 2020a); Rag1F1851 (5'-ACATGGAAGAAGACATCTTGGAAGG-3') and Rag1R2486 (5'-AATGTCACAGTGAAGGGCATCTATGGAAGG- 3') for RAG1 (Sato et al. 2004); RAG2-F220 (5’-GATTCCTGCTAYCTYCCTCCTCT-3') and RAG2-R995 (5'-CCCATGTTGCTTCCAAACCATA-3') for RAG2 (Teeling et al. 2000). Fragments of these sequences were amplified under the following PCR conditions: $94^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for $5 \mathrm{~min} ; 40$ cycles at $94^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for $30 \mathrm{~s}, 52^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 30 s , and $72^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 2 min ; followed by a final extension step at $72^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 7 min for cytb; and $95^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for $5 \mathrm{~min} ; 35$ cycles at $95^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for $30 \mathrm{~s}, 56.8-61.6^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 45 s , and $72^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for $1 \mathrm{~min} ; 72^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 10 min for RAG1 and RAG2. The PCR products were purified and sequenced by 1st BASE (Selangor, Malaysia). The sequences obtained were deposited in GenBank (accession number: OQ509373, OQ509374 (cytb); OQ509371, OQ509372 (RAG1); OQ512024, OQ512025 (RAG2), Appendix 1). We also used GenBank sequences from 107 individuals of other taxa (Appendix 1).

Chromas Pro software (Technelysium Pty Ltd., Tewantin, Australia) and MEGA 11 (Tamura et al. 2021) were used to edit and align sequences. Alignment was performed using MUSCLE in MEGA 11 (Tamura et al. 2021) using the default settings. The sequences were then assembled by eye to manually confirm the correct sequence alignment. The lengths were 1140 bp for cytb, 1010 bp for RAG1, and 751 bp for RAG2; the concatenated sequences yielded 2901 bp . Of these, 503 were variable, and 465 were parsimony informative. We used maximum likelihood (ML) and Bayesian inference (BI) methods to conduct phylogenetic analyses of concatenated cytb, RAG1, and RAG2 fragment datasets. The ML and BI analyses produced topologies with log-likelihoods of -13113.89 and -13123.36 , respectively. The optimum substitution models for both analyses were selected based on the corrected Akaike information criterion (AIC; Sugiura 1978) using Kakusan 4 (Tanabe 2011). The best-fit models for partition cytb, RAG1, and RAG2 were GTR+G, HKY85+G, and GTR+G, respectively, for ML and BI analyses. The ML
phylogenetic tree was constructed using IQ-TREE (Nguyen et al. 2015) with maximum likelihood bootstrap support (MLBS) evaluated by ultrafast bootstrap approximation with 1000 replicates (Hoang et al. 2018). The BI tree and Bayesian posterior probabilities (PP) were estimated using MrBayes v.3.2.7a (Ronquist \& Huelsenbeck 2012). BI analyses were run with four Markov Chain Monte Carlo analyses for 10 million generations, with trees sampled every 100 generations. The runs were stopped when the average standard deviation of the split frequencies was below 0.01. The convergence of the runs and the effective sample size were checked using Tracer version 1.7.1 (Rambaut et al. 2018). The first $25 \%$ of sampled trees were discarded as burn-in. The remaining trees were summarized, and a $50 \%$ consensus tree was generated. The ML and BI trees were visualized in Figtree 1.4.4 (Rambaut 2018) and were represented using Adobe Illustrator (Adobe Inc. 2022).

Pairwise comparisons of uncorrected sequence divergences ( $p$-distance) were calculated for cyt $b$ fragments in MEGA 11 (Tamura et al. 2021) with variance estimated via bootstrap with 500 replications while gaps $/ \mathrm{missing}$ data were treated using pairwise deletion.

## Results

Phylogenetic analyses. The phylogenetic trees constructed using ML and BI methods were identical in topology, based on the concatenated cytb, RAG1, and RAG2 fragments. We present only the ML tree (Fig. 1). Results of phylogenetic analyses showed that Uropsilus is a highly supported monophyletic group, including the two newly collected specimens from Mt. Fansipan (MLBS $=100 \%$ and $P P=1.0$ ). The monophyly of the two Fansipan specimens was strongly supported by both methods (MLBS $=100 \%$ and $\mathrm{PP}=1.0$ ). The uncorrected $p$-distances (\%, min-max) for cytb between Uropsilus species are shown in Table 1. The Fansipan population differed from other populations in that the uncorrected $p$-distances were in the range from $3.22 \%$ (vs. Uropsilus sp. 6 from Mt. Wuliang and the western slope of Mt. Ailao, Yunnan, China) to $20.7 \%$ (vs. U. investigator). The Fansipan population formed monophyletic clusters with Uropsilus sp. 6 (3.22-3.94\%), followed by $U$. atronates ( $8.63-10.18 \%$ ).

Bradly \& Baker (2001) and Baker \& Bradly (2006) hypothesized that the $2-10 \%$ genetic variation of cytb between mammalian populations could be indicative of valid species, and genetic distances greater than $10 \%$ could indeed indicate the presence of distinct species. Among the eight recognized species of Uropsilus, the uncorrelated $p$ distances were in the range of $7.65 \%$ ( $U$. andersoni vs. $U$. aequodonenia) to $20.37 \%$ ( $U$. atronates vs. U. investigator). This study revealed that the Fansipan population is genetically distinct with an uncorrelated $p$-distance in the range of $8.63 \%$ (vs. $U$. atronates) to $20.70 \%$ (vs. $U$. investigator) from the currently recognized eight species (Table 1); and these values are greater than the intraspecific uncorrelated $p$-distance of the eight species. Furthermore, the Fansipan specimens showed differences in morphological characteristics from the other eight Uropsilus species (Thomas 1912; Allen 1923; Hoffmann 1984; Kryštufek \& Motokawa 2018; Hu et al. 2021). Therefore, we describe a new shrew mole species of the genus Uropsilus, based on specimens collected from Vietnam for the first time.

## Species description

## Uropsilus fansipanensis sp. nov.

urn:lsid:zoobank.org:act:6C15FBA6-D73B-44A0-A72F-0C326F92EB51
Holotype. IEBR-M-8101 (field number Motokawa 837), an adult male, from Mount Fansipan, Hoang Lien National Park, close to the 2900 -m camping station ( $22^{\circ} 18.804 \mathrm{~N}$ and $103^{\circ} 45.92$ E), Lao Cai Province, Vietnam collected by Masaharu Motokawa on May 1, 2022, deposited in the Department of Vertebrate Zoology, Institute of Ecology and Biological Resources (IEBR), Vietnam Academy of Science and Technology, Hanoi. Skull was extracted. The body was preserved in $70 \%$ ethanol as a wet specimen.

Paratype. IEBR-M-8102 (field number Motokawa 914), an adult male, from Mt. Fansipan, Hoang Lien National Park, along the Tram Ton-Fansipan peak trail ( $22^{\circ} 18.783 \mathrm{~N}$ and $103^{\circ} 45.92$ E), Lao Cai Province, Vietnam, collected by Shinya Okabe on May 5, 2022, deposited in the IEBR. Skull was extracted. The body was preserved in $70 \%$ ethanol as a wet specimen.
TABLE 1. Uncorrected $p$-distance matrix showing percentage pairwise genetic divergences (\%, min-max) for the cytb gene between Uropsilus species/population in this study.

|  | Species | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | U. fansipanensis sp. nov. | 0.08 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Uropsilus sp. 6 | $\begin{aligned} & 3.22- \\ & 3.94 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.0- \\ & 1.45 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | U. atronates | $\begin{aligned} & 8.63- \\ & 10.18 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7.99- \\ & 10.43 \end{aligned}$ | 0.0-7.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | U. gracilis | $\begin{aligned} & 9.05- \\ & 9.51 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8.42- \\ & 9.85 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8.43- \\ & 10.28 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.0- \\ & 1.35 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | Uropsilus sp. 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 9.51- \\ & 9.86 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8.75- \\ & 9.68 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9.18- \\ & 10.71 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8.41- \\ & 8.9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.0- \\ & 0.39 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | U. soricipes | $\begin{aligned} & 8.77- \\ & 9.72 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8.77- \\ & 10.31 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9.47- \\ & 11.14 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7.83- \\ & 9.47 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.14- \\ & 4.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.0- \\ & 3.29 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | U. dabieshanensis | $\begin{aligned} & 11.08- \\ & 11.45 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11.18- \\ & 11.83 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11.17- \\ & 13.89 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9.73- \\ & 10.43 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9.82- \\ & 10.33 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10.22- \\ & 11.51 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.0- \\ & 0.39 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | Uropsilus sp. 4 | $\begin{aligned} & 8.29- \\ & 8.44 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8.02- \\ & 8.46 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8.62- \\ & 10.58 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7.22- \\ & 7.81 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8.8- \\ & 9.41 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8.34- \\ & 9.8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12.08- \\ & 12.53 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.0- \\ & 0.47 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 | Uropsilus sp. 3 | $\begin{aligned} & 11.14- \\ & 11.29 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10.25- \\ & 10.67 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9.76- \\ & 11.23 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10.54- \\ & 11.25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10.19- \\ & 10.59 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10.29- \\ & 10.66 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11.81- \\ & 12.02 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9.01- \\ & 9.21 \end{aligned}$ | 0.0-0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | Uropsilus sp. 2 | $\begin{aligned} & 14.37- \\ & 14.73 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13.75- \\ & 14.76 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 15.15- \\ & 16.28 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13.96- \\ & 14.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14.51- \\ & 14.94 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14.01- \\ & 15.25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13.68- \\ & 14.13 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13.91- \\ & 14.45 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14.66- \\ & 14.98 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.0- \\ & 0.31 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | U. nivatus | $\begin{aligned} & 13.99- \\ & 14.69 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13.64 \\ & 15.16 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12.74- \\ & 15.56 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11.46- \\ & 12.58 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13.55- \\ & 14.48 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13.0- \\ & 14.47 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14.88- \\ & 15.52 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11.57- \\ & 12.67 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13.07- \\ & 13.74 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13.81- \\ & 14.7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.0- \\ & 2.36 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | U. andersoni | $\begin{aligned} & 14.95- \\ & 15.55 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 15.21- \\ & 15.87 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14.57- \\ & 16.15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14.19- \\ & 14.86 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14.54- \\ & 14.98 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14.19- \\ & 15.28 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 15.11- \\ & 15.87 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13.65- \\ & 14.74 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 15.03- \\ & 15.37 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13.72- \\ & 14.29 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9.81- \\ & 10.68 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.39- \\ & 0.79 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| 13 | U. aequodonenia | $\begin{aligned} & 15.45- \\ & 16.03 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 15.41- \\ & 16.49 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14.67- \\ & 16.43 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13.81- \\ & 14.66 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13.46- \\ & 14.08 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12.72- \\ & 14.7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 15.97- \\ & 16.44 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14.09- \\ & 14.75 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 15.38- \\ & 15.73 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14.61- \\ & 15.28 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9.61- \\ & 11.07 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7.65- \\ & 8.28 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.08- \\ & 0.39 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| 14 | Uropsilus sp. 1 | $\begin{aligned} & 18.85- \\ & 20.26 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 19.15- \\ & 20.59 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 17.28- \\ & 19.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 16.42- \\ & 18.31 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 16.52- \\ & 17.3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 16.81- \\ & 18.38 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 16.74- \\ & 18.11 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 17.85- \\ & 19.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 17.99- \\ & 18.98 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 17.47- \\ & 18.61 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 16.84- \\ & 18.34 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 17.78- \\ & 18.94 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 17.3- \\ & 18.23 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.0- \\ & 2.44 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 15 | U. investigator | $\begin{aligned} & 20.23- \\ & 20.7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 18.97- \\ & 20.35 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 17.22- \\ & 20.37 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 17.85- \\ & 18.96 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 16.93- \\ & 17.49 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 16.86- \\ & 18.03 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 17.09- \\ & 18.01 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 17.57- \\ & 19.18 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 17.28- \\ & 18.16 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 17.78- \\ & 18.98 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 17.53- \\ & 19.14 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 18.22- \\ & 19.38 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 18.43- \\ & 19.73 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9.67- \\ & 10.29 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.0- \\ & 4.72 \end{aligned}$ |



FIGURE 1. Maximum likelihood (ML) tree based on cytb, RAG1, and RAG2 concatenated sequences for shrew mole species of genus Uropsilus. Maximum likelihood bootstrap support (MLBS) and Bayesian posterior probabilities (PP) are shown at each node (MLBS/PP).

Diagnosis. Medium-sized shrew mole. Body bicolor, dorsum lightly reddish-brown and venter dark gray, but the separation between the dorsum and venter is not obvious. The tip of the fur on the back reddish-brown, and the rest is gray. The tail uniformly dark gray, long, slender, and covered with small scales arranged in rings; gradually darken from base to tip. Short bristle hairs sparsely covering the tail from the base to the tip, and longer at the tip of the tail. The mastoid process developed sideways and pointed out. The interorbital region broad and parallel. The zygomatic arch stouter. The foramen magnum very large. The lacrimal foramen well developed and much larger than the infraorbital foramen. The orbital process oriented upwards anteroposteriorly. Dental formula I 2/1, C 1/1,

P 4/4, M $3 / 3=38$ including teeth of $\mathrm{I} 1, \mathrm{I} 2, \mathrm{C} 1, \mathrm{P} 1, \mathrm{P} 2, \mathrm{P} 3, \mathrm{P} 4, \mathrm{M} 1, \mathrm{M} 2, \mathrm{M} 3 / \mathrm{i} 2, \mathrm{c} 1, \mathrm{p} 1, \mathrm{p} 2, \mathrm{p} 3, \mathrm{p} 4, \mathrm{~m} 1, \mathrm{~m} 2, \mathrm{~m} 3$ in the dentition. The buccal view of the upper fourth premolar ( P 4 ) triangular shape. The lower third premolar ( p 3 ) large in size. The lower first and third premolars ( p 1 and p 3 , respectively) approximately the same size. The lower canine (c1) larger than p 1 .

Description of holotype. Adult male, medium-sized shrew mole with a total length of 140.0 mm and a body mass of 8.0 g (Fig. 2). The reddish-brown dorsal pelage distinct from the dark gray ventral pelage. The tail dark gray, its length ( 62.5 mm ) slightly more than $80 \%$ of the head-body length $(77.5 \mathrm{~mm})$. Nose elongated with nostrils facing outwards; snout bicolored, upper part dark gray and lower part yellowish. The pinna protrudes ( E 8.51 mm ) covered by sparse gray hair. Limbs covered with scales down to the toes with long, sharp, and opaque claws; forefoot short but fat $($ FF1 $=8.66 \mathrm{~mm}, \mathrm{FF} 2=9.66 \mathrm{~mm})$; hindfoot long and slender $(\mathrm{HF} 1=13.41 \mathrm{~mm}, \mathrm{HF} 2=15.16 \mathrm{~mm})$, and the four limbs have the same color as the tail, with small black speckled scales. The small eyes, barely noticeable under the fur.


FIGURE 2. Lateral view of the body (A), lateral view (B), dorsal view (C), and ventral view (D) of the holotype (IEBR-M8101) of Uropsilus fansipanensis sp. nov.

The skull (Fig. 3) long, and pyriform shaped with a short rostrum and a rounded braincase; palate relatively broad and possessing a sudden edge at the posterior end; pterygoid region deeply set; temporal ridges recognizable and converge in an X-shape; squamosal arm of the zygomatic arch sturdy; orbit locating at the midpoint of the skull; squamous processes sharp; bullae incomplete; pterygoid processes pointed saw-shaped; lacrimal foramen well developed and much larger than the infraorbital foramen; orbital process oriented upwards anteroposteriorly (Fig. 4). The mandible long and slender; coronoid process sharp and rear-facing crest; masseteric fossa arachnoid. Dental formula I $2 / 1, \mathrm{C} 1 / 1, \mathrm{P} 4 / 4, \mathrm{M} 3 / 3=38$ including teeth of I1, I2, C1, P1, P2, P3, P4, M1, M2, M3 / i2, c1, $\mathrm{p} 1, \mathrm{p} 2, \mathrm{p} 3, \mathrm{p} 4, \mathrm{~m} 1, \mathrm{~m} 2, \mathrm{~m} 3$ in the dentition (Fig. 3). The upper first incisor (I1) taller than the second incisor (I2); both I1 and I2 lingually concave; the upper canine (C1) slightly larger than the upper first premolar (P1); the upper third premolar (P3) small and the smallest tooth in the upper tooth row. The remaining upper premolars are shown from larger size to smaller size in the following order: upper fourth premolar (P4), upper second premolar (P2), and P1. The upper first molar (M1) larger than the upper second molar (M2); length and width of M1 are almost equal, and the same was observed in M2. The lower first incisor absent; the lower first and third premolars (p1 and p 3 , respectively) approximately the same size; the lower canine (c1) larger than p 1 ; the lower second molar (m2) possesses a large concavity on its lingual side and protoconids from m 2 is the highest cusp in the lower toothrow.

Variation. The discoloration of the scales at the base of the tail showed substantial variation between the holotype and the paratype; the latter is strongly discolored. This is probably because the paratype is older than the holotype.

Etymology. The specific epithet "fansipanensis" refers to the type locality of the new species, Mt. Fansipan. We suggest "Fansipan shrew mole" and "Chuột chũi vòi phan-xi-pan" for the common names in English and Vietnamese, respectively.


FIGURE 3. Dorsal view (A), ventral view (B), lateral view (C) of cranium, lateral view (D), dorsal view (E) of mandible, lower toothrow (right side, lingual view, F), and upper toothrow (right side, lingual view, G) of holotype (IEBR-M-8101) of Uropsilus fansipanensis sp. nov..

Ecological notes. U. fansipanensis was found in a dwarf mountain forest on Mt. Fansipan, at an elevation of approximately $2800-2900 \mathrm{~m}$. The surrounding habitat was grassy with shrubs on a thick and moist humus layer close to a small bamboo forest and a travel trail. During the field survey in May, which corresponds to the end of spring in northern Vietnam, the daily temperature fluctuates from 1 to $20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, and sometimes rain occurs (Fig. 5A).

Distribution. U. fansipanensis is presently known only from the type locality in Mt. Fansipan, Hoang Lien National Park, Lao Cai Province, northwestern Vietnam (Figs. 5B, 6).

Comparisons (measurements are in mm ). All members of Uropsilus have a primary coloration of brown dorsal and gray ventral fur, while they differ in terms of their tail color. U. fansipanensis, U. soricipes, U. gracilis, $U$. andersoni, and $U$. atronates have a uniformly colored tail. On the other hand, $U$. investigator, $U$. nivatus, $U$. aequodonenia, and $U$. dabieshanensis have a bicolor tail, with the upper part being darker than the underside (Table 2; Liu et al. 2013; Wan 2015; Hu et al. 2021).
U. fansipanensis overlaps basic external morphological measurements with most of the other species of Uropsilus (Table 3). Nevertheless, it has a longer tail (T: 61.0-62.5) and hindfoot (HF: 13.41-13.57) than U. dabieshanensis (T: 52.4-54.1, HF: 12.8-12.9), and a shorter tail than U. aequodonenia (T: 67-73).
$U$. fansipanensis shows overlap in most cranial measurements (Table 4) with $U$. soricipes, $U$. nivatus, and U. atronates, except a slightly larger anterior labial margin of the second upper molars than $U$. nivatus and $U$. atronates (M2-M2: 6.36-6.40 vs. 6.15-6.35 vs. 5.95-6.3). Nevertheless, it can be distinguished in several cranial measurements from the other five Uropsilus species as detailed below. U. fansipanensis has smaller upper toothrow length (UTRL: 9.03-9.07 vs. 9.1-10.7), palatal length (MPL: 9.62-9.75 vs. 9.68-11.2), lower toothrow length (MTRL: 8.30-8.31 vs. 8.43-9.09), mandible length (LM: 13.52-13.77 vs. 14.01-15.00), and braincase height (BH: 6.90-6.91 vs. 7.18-7.6) than U. gracilis.
U. fansipanensis has a slightly wider snout (GBSn: 7.39-7.62 vs. 7.13-7.35) and longer mandible length (LM: 13.52-13.77 vs. 11.95-13.42) than $U$. investigator, while it has a shorter upper toothrow length (UTRL: 9.03-9.07 vs. 9.10-9.80).

TABLE 2. Comparison of morphological diagnostic characters among the nine Uropsilus species. Symbols showing: +, presence; $\neg$, absence; $>$, larger; $<$, smaller; $=$, similar size.

| Species | Tail color | Lacrimal foramen vs <br> infraorbital foramen | Orbital process | Number of <br> teeth | P3 | i3 | p3 | c1 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| U. fansipanensis sp. nov. | uniform | larger | upwards | 38 | + | $\neg$ | $=\mathrm{p} 1$ | $>\mathrm{p} 1$ |
| U. soricipes | uniform | similar | downwards | 34 | $\neg$ | $\neg$ | $\checkmark$ | $>\mathrm{p} 1$ |
| U. gracilis | uniform | similar | downwards | 38 | + | $\neg$ | $<\mathrm{p} 1$ | $=\mathrm{p} 1$ |
| U. investigator | bicolored | smaller | downwards | 38 | + | $\neg$ | $<\mathrm{p} 1$ | $>\mathrm{p} 1$ |
| U. andersoni | uniform | similar | downwards | 38 | + | + | $\neg$ | $>\mathrm{p} 1$ |
| U. aequodonenia | bicolored | smaller | downwards | 36 | $\neg$ | + | $\neg$ | $>\mathrm{p} 1$ |
| U. nivatus | bicolored | smaller | downwards | 38 | + | $\neg$ | $<\mathrm{p} 1$ | $>\mathrm{p} 1$ |
| U. atronates | uniform | smaller | downwards | 38 | + | $\neg$ | $<\mathrm{p} 1$ | $=\mathrm{p} 1$ |
| U. dabieshanensis | bicolored | smaller | downwards | 38 | + | $\neg$ | $<\mathrm{p} 1$ | $>\mathrm{p} 1$ |

TABLE 3. External measurements of nine Uropsilus species in mm. The number of specimens studied is indicated within parentheses.

| Species | Source (n) | TL | T | HB | E | HF1 (HF2) | Wt |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| U. fansipanensis sp. nov. | This study (holotype, IEBR-M-8101) | 140.0 | 62.5 | 77.5 | 8.51 | 13.41 (15.16) | 8.0 |
|  | This study (paratype, IEBR-M-8102) | 135.0 | 61.0 | 74.0 | 8.82 | 13.57 (14.88) | 8.0 |
| U. soricipes | Hoffmann 1984 (17) |  | 50-69 | 66-80 |  | 14-17* |  |
| U. gracilis | Thomas 1912 |  | 55 | 66 | 9 | 13.5 |  |
|  | Jiang \& Hoffmann 2013 |  | 57-73 | 65-81 | 7-10 | - (14-17) |  |
|  | Liu et al. 2013 |  | $67.94 \pm 0.91$ | $70.61 \pm 0.16$ |  | $14.34 \pm 0.04$ |  |
|  | Hoffmann 1984 (13) |  | 67-78 | 69-84 |  | 15-18* |  |
| U. investigator | Hoffmann 1984 (10) |  | 54-75 | 67-83 |  | 13-16* |  |
| U. andersoni | Thomas 1912 (holotype) |  | 67 | 70 |  | 15.5 |  |
|  | Hoffmann 1984 (16) |  | 59-72 | 65-83 |  | 14-17.5* | 7.4-11.2 |
| U. aequodonenia | Liu et al. 2013 (holotype) |  | 70 | 72 | 8 | 14 | 11 |
|  | Kryštufek \& Motokawa 2018 |  | 67-73 | 72-82 |  | 14-16* | 11 |
| U. nivatus | Allen 1923 (1) |  | 60 | 68 |  | - (15) |  |
|  | Hoffmann 1984 (9) |  | 56-62 | 65-77 |  | 14-15* |  |
|  | Kryštufek \& Motokawa 2018 |  | 57.5-65 | 68-74 | 5.5-9 | 12-14.5* | 5.9-7.5 |
| U. atronates | Allen 1923 (holotype) |  | 57 | 67 | 10 | - (14) |  |
|  | Hoffmann 1984 <br> (13-14, Yunnan) |  | 57-65(14) | 65-70 (13) |  | 14-15.5*(14) |  |
|  | Hoffmann 1984 (?, Burma) |  | 61-73 | 67-81 |  | 15-17* |  |
| U. dabieshanensis | Hu et al. 2021 (4) | $\begin{aligned} & 118.6- \\ & 136.4 \end{aligned}$ | 52.4-54.1 |  | 8.1-8.9 | 12.8-12.9 | 6.2-8.9 |

[^0]TABLE 4. Cranial measurements of nine Uropsilus species in mm. The number of specimens studied is indicated within parentheses.

| Species | Source (n) | PL | BL | MPL | GNB | ZB | GBSn | LBO | BH | UTRL | M2-M2 | LM | MTRL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| U. fansipanensis sp. nov. | This study (holotype, IEBR-M-8101) | 20.40 | 16.62 | 9.62 | 10.96 | 10.49 | 7.39 | 5.51 | 6.90 | 9.03 | 6.40 | 13.52 | 8.30 |
|  | This study (paratype IEBR-M-8102) | 20.69 | 16.98 | 9.75 | 11.07 | 10.67 | 7.62 | 5.80 | 6.91 | 9.07 | 6.36 | 13.77 | 8.31 |
| U. soricipes | This study (BMNH 1911.9.8.12) | 21.69 | 17.42 | 10.39 | 11.38 | 11.10 |  | 5.49 | 6.49 | 9.87 | 6.94 | 14.13 | 9.08 |
|  | Hoffmann 1984 (15-19) | 20.0-21.5(15) |  | 9.25-10.5(19) | $\begin{aligned} & 10.75- \\ & 11.85(15) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9.85- \\ & 11.5(15) \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 5.15- \\ & 5.55(14) \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 8.65- \\ & 9.75(19) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6.15- } \\ & 6.85(14) \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
|  | Hu et al. 2021 (9) | 20.36-21.45 | $\begin{aligned} & 16.88- \\ & 17.81 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 10.60- \\ & 11.43 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10.10- \\ & 10.43 \end{aligned}$ | 7.45-7.69 | $\begin{aligned} & 5.36- \\ & 5.58 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6.58- \\ & 7.12 \end{aligned}$ |  | 6.25-6.69 | $\begin{aligned} & 12.18- \\ & 14.30 \end{aligned}$ | 8.15-8.65 |
| U. gracilis | This study (type, BMNH 1911.9.8.13) | 20.51 | 16.36 | 9.27 | 10.25 | 9.57 |  | 4.94 | 7.68 | 8.94 | 6.01 | 13.92 | 8.82 |
|  | Thomas 1912 (type, BMNH 1911.9.8.13) | 20.5 | 16.5 | - | 10 | 10 |  | 5 |  | 9.1 |  |  |  |
|  | Hoffmann 1984 (13) | 21.95-22.9 |  | 10.55-11.2 | $\begin{aligned} & 11.8- \\ & 12.35 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10.2- \\ & 12.05 \end{aligned}$ |  | 5.85-6.3 |  | 10.2-10.7 |  |  |  |
|  | Hu et al. 2021 (4) | 20.58-21.78 | $\begin{aligned} & 16.08- \\ & 17.34 \end{aligned}$ | 9.68-10.26 | $\begin{aligned} & 10.93- \\ & 11.55 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10.12- \\ & 10.30 \end{aligned}$ | 6.70-7.64 | $\begin{aligned} & 5.25- \\ & 5.50 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7.18- \\ & 7.61 \end{aligned}$ |  | 6.19-6.27 | $\begin{aligned} & 14.01- \\ & 15.00 \end{aligned}$ | 8.43-9.09 |
| U. investigator | This study (type, BMNH 1922.9.1.16) | 20.97 |  | 9.46 | 11.11 | 10.27 |  |  | 6.67 | 9.21 | 6.47 | 13.68 | 8.48 |
|  | Hoffmann 1984 (1-10) | $\begin{aligned} & 20.0 \\ & -22.35(8) \end{aligned}$ |  | 9.5-10.25(10) | $\begin{aligned} & 10.9- \\ & 11.45(8) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10.15- \\ & 10.6(5) \end{aligned}$ |  | 5.9(1) |  | $\begin{aligned} & 9.10- \\ & 9.8(10) \end{aligned}$ | 6.7(1) |  |  |
|  | Hu et al. 2021 (4) | 20.51-21.56 | $\begin{aligned} & 16.47- \\ & 17.23 \end{aligned}$ | 9.48-10.03 | $\begin{aligned} & 10.44 \\ & 11.42 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9.70- \\ & 10.66 \end{aligned}$ | 7.13-7.35 | $\begin{aligned} & 5.12- \\ & 5.36 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6.48- \\ & 7.08 \end{aligned}$ |  | 5.58-6.21 | $\begin{aligned} & 11.95- \\ & 13.42 \end{aligned}$ | 8.21-9.06 |
| U. andersoni | This study (BMNH 1911.2.1.30, 31) | 21.35-21.78 | $\begin{aligned} & 17.09- \\ & 17.55 \end{aligned}$ | 10.00-10.24 | $\begin{aligned} & 11.15- \\ & 11.35 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10.01- \\ & 10.31 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 5.32- \\ & 5.58 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6.93- \\ & 7.15 \end{aligned}$ | 9.71-9.99 | 6.61-6.83 | $\begin{aligned} & 14.03- \\ & 14.55 \end{aligned}$ | 9.02-9.19 |
|  | Thomas 1912 (type, BMNH 1911.2.1.25) | 21.7 | 17.5 |  | 11.3 | 11.6 |  | 5.5 |  | 9.7 |  |  |  |
|  | Hoffmann 1984 (6-14) | $\begin{aligned} & 20.65- \\ & 22.1(10) \end{aligned}$ |  | 9.55-10.15(14) | $\begin{aligned} & 11.05- \\ & 11.6(6) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10.2- \\ & 11.4(6) \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 5.2- \\ & 5.7(6) \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 9.25- \\ & 9.95(14) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6.35- \\ & 6.7(6) \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
|  | Hu et al. 2021 (3) | 20.79-22.28 | $\begin{aligned} & 16.37- \\ & 17.50 \end{aligned}$ | 9.84-10.06 | $\begin{aligned} & 11.06- \\ & 11.46 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10.81- \\ & 11.17 \end{aligned}$ | 7.66-7.79 | $\begin{aligned} & 5.34- \\ & 5.54 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6.65- \\ & 7.51 \end{aligned}$ |  | 5.93-6.48 | $\begin{aligned} & 12.22- \\ & 14.64 \end{aligned}$ | 8.49-9.07 |
| U. aequodonenia | Liu et al. 2013 (Holotype) | 21.25 | 16.70 | 9.80 | 11.30 | 10.75 | 7.60 |  | 7.50 | 9.10 | 6.50 | 13.30 |  |
|  | Hu et al. 2021 (3) | 20.75-22.03 | $\begin{aligned} & 17.19 \\ & -17.86 \end{aligned}$ | 9.93-10.31 | $\begin{aligned} & 11.12- \\ & 11.72 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10.64 \\ & 11.18 \end{aligned}$ | 7.42-8.02 | $\begin{aligned} & 5.54- \\ & 5.68 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6.60- \\ & 7.51 \end{aligned}$ |  | 6.21-6.69 | $\begin{aligned} & 14.30- \\ & 14.51 \end{aligned}$ | 8.30-9.22 |

TABLE 4. (continued)

| Species | Source (n) | PL | BL | MPL | GNB | ZB | GBSn | LBO | BH | UTRL | M2-M2 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

U. fansipanensis has a shorter profile length (PL: 20.4-20.69 vs. 20.65-22.28), shorter upper (UTRL: 9.03-9.07 vs. 9.25-9.95) and lower (MTRL: 8.30-8.31 vs. 8.49-9.07) toothrow length than $U$. andersoni.
U. fansipanensis has a shorter profile length (PL: 20.4-20.69 vs. 20.75-22.03), basal length (BL: 16.62-16.98 vs. 16.70-17.86), and palatal length (MPL: 9.62-9.75 vs. 9.80-10.31) than $U$. aequodonenia.
U. fansipanensis has a shorter profile length (PL: 20.4-20.69 vs. 21.11-21.76), shorter basal length (BL: 16.6216.98 vs. 17.59-17.98), shorter palatal length (MPL: 9.62-9.75 vs. 10.08-10.32), shorter mandible length (LM: 13.52-13.77 vs. 14.47-15.09), shorter lower toothrow length (MTRL: 8.30-8.31 vs. 8.40-8.79), a narrower snout (GBSn: 7.39-7.62 vs.7.94-8.78), narrower greatest width across the upper second molars (M2-M2: 6.36-6.40 vs. 6.85-7.04), and higher braincase height (BH: 6.90-6.91 vs. 6.57-6.84) than $U$. dabieshanensis.

Moreover, U. fansipanensis is distinguishable from all other Uropsilus species by the orientation of its orbital process (Fig. 4; Table 2). Specifically, the orbital process in U. fansipanensis is oriented upwards posteriorly, whereas in the other eight species, it is oriented downwards (Fig. 4). Lacrimal foramen and infraorbital foramen are separated by the orbital process, and the development of lacrimal foramen is an important morphological character distinguishing the genus Uropsilus from other genera of the family Talpidae (Hutchison 1968; Motokawa 2004). U. fansipanensis has a well-developed lacrimal foramen much larger than the infraorbital foramen, whereas the other eight species have lacrimal foramen smaller or similar in size to the infraorbital foramen (Fig. 4).
U. fansipanensis has 38 teeth in total, similar to $U$. gracilis, $U$. investigator, $U$. nivatus, $U$. atronates, and $U$. dabieshanensis in lacking i3, while different from U. soricipes ( 34 teeth, it lacks P 3 , i 3 , and p 3 ), $U$. aequodonenia ( 36 teeth, it lacks P3 and p3), and U. andersoni (38 teeth, it lacks p3) (Table 2; see Thomas 1912). U. fansipanensis is characterized by the size of p 3 , which is well-developed and approximately equal to the lower first premolar (p1). In contrast, p 3 is smaller than p 1 in $U$. gracilis, U. investigator, $U$. nivatus, $U$. atronates, and $U$. dabieshanensis (Table 2). Additionally, U. fansipanensis is distinguished from $U$. gracilis and $U$. atronates by having c 1 larger than p 1 , while these characteristics are shared with the remaining six species (Table 2; Allen 1923).

## Discussion

This study provides the first record of shrew moles in Vietnam, which demonstrates a close relationship and large sharing fauna between northern Vietnam and southern China. This result expands the confirmed distribution of the genus Uropsilus from southern China to northern Vietnam. Such distributional pattern is also shared by several vertebrate species. For example, Typhlomys chapensis, Episoriculus umbrinus, Euroscaptor orlovi (Mammalia), and Diploderma chapaense (Reptile) are distributed both in northern Vietnam and southern China (Abramov et al. 2017; Cheng et al. 2017; Kryštufek \& Motokawa 2018; Wang et al. 2018).

The two specimens from Vietnam represent the new species $U$. fansipanensis that clearly diverged genetically from the currently recognized eight species of the genus Uropsilus. In addition, U. fansipanensis is characterized by unique morphological characteristics of upwards orientation of orbital process and well-developed lacrimal foramen, which is larger than the infraorbital foramen. These characters have been considered important taxonomic characters in the family Talpidae (Hutchison 1968; Motokawa 2004).
U. fansipanensis was discovered farthest south at an elevation of nearly 2900 m , in a temperate climate zone on the highest mountain in the Hoang Lien Son Range, which is considered the southeasternmost extension of the Himalayan mountains. In addition, Hu et al. (2021) reported the easternmost record of Uropsilus with the description of Uropsilus dabieshanensis in the high mountains above 1000 m and at high latitudes in eastern China. The remaining seven species of this genus are distributed in high mountain areas across central and southern China, ranging from 1500 to 4500 m (Kryštufek \& Motokawa 2018). This distribution pattern provides evidence of the adaptation of Uropsilus to low average temperatures in alpine areas.

Our study, in combination with Wan et al. $(2013,2018)$ and Hu et al. $(2021)$, indicated that the shrew mole genus Uropsilus entertains both high cryptic diversity and largely cryptic diversification. The recently discovered species tend to occupy narrowly distributed regions with wet and cold climatic conditions or isolated alpine areas, especially in the southeasternmost and easternmost ends of mountain ranges where $U$. fansipanensis and $U$. dabieshanensis, respectively, are found. The shrew mole genus Uropsilus currently consists of nine species in addition to six possible undescribed taxa (Wan et al. 2013, 2018; Hu et al. 2021). U. fansipanensis has a relatively small genetic distance of $3.22-3.94 \%$ from Uropsilus sp. 6, a lineage distributed in Yunnan province, southeastern China. This genetic
distance might suggest that Uropsilus sp. 6 might be conspecific with U. fansipanensis, but further research based on morphological comparison is needed to confirm the taxonomic status of Uropsilus sp. 6.


FIGURE 4. Illustrations of orbital process, lacrimal foramen, and infraorbital foremen of Uropsilus fansipanensis sp. nov. (IEBR-M-8101), U. soricipes (BMNH 1911.9.8.12), U. gracilis (BMNH 1911.9.8.13), U. investigator (BMNH 1922.9.1.16), U. andersoni (BMNH 1911.2.1.30), U. aequodonenia (Liu et al. 2013), $U$. nivatus \& U. atronates (Wan 2015), and $U$. dabieshanensis (Hu et al. 2021).

The complex mountain topography can cause geographic isolation in high-altitude areas, which is known as the sky island theory (He \& Jiang 2014; Bui et al. 2020b). Wan et al. (2018) suggested that the speciation of Uropsilus might be related to strong geographical isolation and ecological gradients provided by topographical diversity. Therefore, we believe that the speciation of $U$. fansipanensis is linked to its geographical isolation and the climate around the highest peak in northwestern Vietnam.


FIGURE 5. Habitat (A) and map showing the type locality (B) of Uropsilus fansipanensis sp. nov. in Mt. Fansipan, Hoang Lien National Park, Lao Cai province, northwestern Vietnam.


FIGURE 6. Distribution map of Uropsilus in China (re-illustrated from Hu et al. 2021) and Vietnam. Base map is from Google Earth.

Information on cryptic species plays a crucial role in the accurate assessment of biodiversity and conservation (Bickford et al. 2007; Beheregaray \& Caccone 2007; Leys et al. 2016; Fišer et al. 2018). Shrew moles of the genus Uropsilus are a prime example of cryptic species in mountainous regions which involves several isolated alpine areas with altitudes of more than 2000 m . On the basis of our finding of the new species and the new distribution of the genus Uropsilus, it is implied the existence of further cryptic biodiversity in northern Vietnam. It is desirable to conduct further study for taxonomy and biodiversity assessment for future conservation there.
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APPENDIX 1. List of accession numbers of GenBank sequences

| Species | Specimen voucher | Location |  | GenBank Accession Number |  |  | Reference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Area | Province | cytb | RAG1 | RAG2 |  |
| U. fansipanensis sp. nov. | IEBR-M-8101 | Mt. Fansipan | Lao Cai | OQ509373 | OQ509371 | OQ512024 | This study |
|  | IEBR-M-8102 | Mt. Fansipan | Lao Cai | OQ509374 | OQ509372 | OQ512025 | This study |
| U. soricipes | SAF-09700 | Mt. Jiajin | Sichuan | MH209649 | MH210208 | MH210330 | Wan et al., 2018 |
|  | KIZ-028553 | Mt. Emei | Sichuan | KF778191 | KF778317 | KF778350 | Wan et al., 2013 |
|  | KIZ-028554 | Mt. Emei | Sichuan | KF778192 | KF778318 | KF778351 | Wan et al., 2013 |
|  | KIZ-028555 | Mt. Emei | Sichuan | KF778194 | KF778320 | KF778373 | Wan et al., 2013 |
|  | KIZ-028556 | Mt. Emei | Sichuan | KF778193 | KF778319 | KF778374 | Wan et al., 2013 |
|  | KIZ-0905019 | Beichuan | Sichuan | MH209650 | MH210209 | MH210331 | Wan et al., 2018 |
|  | KIZ-0905021 | Beichuan | Sichuan | MH209651 | MH210210 | MH210332 | Wan et al., 2018 |
|  | KIZ-0905059 | Beichuan | Sichuan | MH209652 | MH210211 | MH210333 | Wan et al., 2018 |
|  | KIZ-0905060 | Beichuan | Sichuan | MH209653 | MH210212 | MH210334 | Wan et al., 2018 |
|  | KIZ-0905083 | Beichuan | Sichuan | MH209654 | MH210213 | MH210335 | Wan et al., 2018 |
|  | KIZ-0905409 | Mt. Daxiangling | Sichuan | MH209734 | MH210284 | MH210409 | Wan et al., 2018 |
|  | SAF-092069 | Minjiang | Sichuan | MH209719 | MH210269 | MH210394 | Wan et al., 2018 |
| U. gracilis | KIZ-028544 | Mt. Jinfo | Chongqing | KF778208 | KF778312 | KF778368 | Wan et al., 2013 |
|  | KIZ-028545 | Mt. Jinfo | Chongqing | KF778209 | KF778311 | KF778369 | Wan et al., 2013 |
|  | KIZ-028546 | Mt. Jinfo | Chongqing | KF778206 | KF778313 | KF778371 | Wan et al., 2013 |
|  | KIZ-028547 | Mt. Jinfo | Chongqing | KF778207 | KF778310 | KF778370 | Wan et al., 2013 |
|  | KIZ-028548 | Mt. Jinfo | Chongqing | KF778205 | KF778309 | KF778372 | Wan et al., 2013 |
|  | KIZ-0810137 | Mt. Jiaozishan | Yunnan | MH209658 | MH210217 | MH210339 | Wan et al., 2018 |
|  | KIZ-0810159 | Mt. Jiaozishan | Yunnan | MH209659 | MH210218 | MH210340 | Wan et al., 2018 |
|  | KIZ-0810160 | Mt. Jiaozishan | Yunnan | MH209660 | MH210219 | MH210341 | Wan et al., 2018 |
|  | KIZ-0810191 | Mt. Jiaozishan | Yunnan | MH209661 | MH210220 | MH210342 | Wan et al., 2018 |
|  | KIZ-0810488 | Mt. Jiaozishan | Yunnan | MH209662 | MH210221 | MH210343 | Wan et al., 2018 |
|  | KIZ-0811175 | Mt. Jiaozishan | Yunnan | MH209664 | MH210223 | MH210345 | Wan et al., 2018 |
| U. investigator | KIZ-028527 | Mt. Gaoligong | Yunnan | KF778154 | KF778269 | KF778364 | Wan et al., 2013 |
|  | KIZ-028530 | Mt. Gaoligong | Yunnan | KF778155 | KF778270 | KF778366 | Wan et al., 2013 |
|  | KIZ-201211136 | Mt. Gaoligong | Yunnan | MH209680 | MH210236 | MH210359 | Wan et al., 2018 |
|  | KIZ-201211149 | Mt. Gaoligong | Yunnan | MH209685 | MH210241 | MH210364 | Wan et al., 2018 |
|  | KIZ-201211160 | Mt. Gaoligong | Yunnan | MH209686 | MH210242 | MH210365 | Wan et al., 2018 |
|  | KIZ-201211169 | Mt. Gaoligong | Yunnan | MH209687 | MH210243 | MH210366 | Wan et al., 2018 |
| U. andersoni | SAF-06948 | Mt. Erlang | Sichuan | MH209738 | MH210288 | MH210413 | Wan et al., 2018 |
|  | KIZ-Z201405738 | Mt. Emei | Sichuan | MH209675 | MH210232 | MH210354 | Wan et al., 2018 |
|  | KIZ-Z201405739 | Mt. Emei | Sichuan | MH209676 | MH210233 | MH210355 | Wan et al., 2018 |
| U. aequodonenia | KIZ-0906042 | Mt. Daliangshan | Sichuan | MH209766 | MH210315 | MH210424 | Wan et al., 2018 |
|  | KIZ-0906074 | Mt. Daliangshan | Sichuan | MH209767 | MH210316 | MH210425 | Wan et al., 2018 |
|  | KIZ-0906075 | Mt. Daliangshan | Sichuan | MH209768 | MH210317 | MH210426 | Wan et al., 2018 |
|  | SAF-04010 | Mt. Erlang | Sichuan | MH209699 | MH210254 | MH210379 | Wan et al., 2018 |
|  | SAF-07940 | Mt. Erlang | Sichuan | MH209698 | MH210253 | MH210378 | Wan et al., 2018 |


| Species | Specimen voucher | Location |  | GenBank Accession Number |  |  | Reference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Area | Province | cytb | RAG1 | RAG2 |  |
| U. nivatus | KIZ-022469 | Mt. Biluo | Yunnan | KF778166 | KF778292 | KF778359 | Wan et al., 2013 |
|  | KIZ-022473 | Mt. Biluo | Yunnan | KF778168 | KF778291 | KF778356 | Wan et al., 2013 |
|  | KIZ-022974 | Mt. Biluo | Yunnan | KF778170 | KF778293 | KF778360 | Wan et al., 2013 |
|  | KIZ-022975 | Mt. Biluo | Yunnan | KF778167 | KF778294 | KF778361 | Wan et al., 2013 |
|  | KIZ-022976 | Mt. Biluo | Yunnan | KF778169 | KF778284 | KF778362 | Wan et al., 2013 |
|  | KIZ-016768 | Mt. Yulong | Yunnan | KF778174 | KF778282 | KF778347 | Wan et al., 2013 |
|  | KIZ-016769 | Mt. Yulong | Yunnan | KF778171 | KF778287 | KF778344 | Wan et al., 2013 |
|  | KIZ-016770 | Mt. Yulong | Yunnan | KF778173 | KF778289 | KF778346 | Wan et al., 2013 |
|  | KIZ-016783 | Mt. Yulong | Yunnan | KF778172 | KF778288 | KF778345 | Wan et al., 2013 |
|  | KIZ-016797 | Mt. Yulong | Yunnan | KF778175 | KF778290 | KF778348 | Wan et al., 2013 |
|  | KIZ-022467 | Mt. Diancang | Yunnan | KF778176 | KF778285 | KF778352 | Wan et al., 2013 |
|  | KIZ-022468 | Mt. Diancang | Yunnan | KF778178 | KF778295 | KF778353 | Wan et al., 2013 |
|  | KIZ-022470 | Mt. Diancang | Yunnan | KF778177 | KF778283 | KF778357 | Wan et al., 2013 |
|  | KIZ-022471 | Mt. Diancang | Yunnan | KF778179 | KF778286 | KF778358 | Wan et al., 2013 |
| U. atronates | KIZ-H2004 | Wayao | Yunnan | MH209712 | MH210262 | MH210387 | Wan et al., 2018 |
|  | KIZ-H2040 | Wayao | Yunnan | MH209713 | MH210263 | MH210388 | Wan et al., 2018 |
|  | KIZ-H2054 | Wayao | Yunnan | MH209714 | MH210264 | MH210389 | Wan et al., 2018 |
|  | KIZ-H2056 | Wayao | Yunnan | MH209715 | MH210265 | MH210390 | Wan et al., 2018 |
|  | KIZ-H2078 | Wayao | Yunnan | MH209718 | MH210268 | MH210393 | Wan et al., 2018 |
|  | KIZ-2012121120 | Laowo | Yunnan | MH209711 | MH210261 | MH210386 | Wan et al., 2018 |
|  | KIZ-H2413 | Laowo | Yunnan | MH209708 | MH210258 | MH210383 | Wan et al., 2018 |
|  | KIZ-201211251 | Mt. Gaoligong | Yunnan | MH209688 | MH210244 | MH210367 | Wan et al., 2018 |
|  | KIZ-0904339 | Caojian | Yunnan | MH209655 | MH210214 | MH210336 | Wan et al., 2018 |
|  | KIZ-0904402 | Caojian | Yunnan | MH209657 | MH210216 | MH210338 | Wan et al., 2018 |
|  | KIZ-028532 | Mt. Yongde | Yunnan | KF778184 | KF778304 | KF778333 | Wan et al., 2013 |
|  | KIZ-028533 | Mt. Yongde | Yunnan | KF778183 | KF778308 | KF778334 | Wan et al., 2013 |
|  | KIZ-028534 | Mt. Yongde | Yunnan | KF778185 | KF778302 | KF778337 | Wan et al., 2013 |
|  | KIZ-028535 | Mt. Yongde | Yunnan | KF778186 | KF778305 | KF778338 | Wan et al., 2013 |
|  | KIZ-028536 | Gengma | Yunnan | KF778181 | KF778267 | KF778335 | Wan et al., 2013 |
|  | KIZ-028537 | Gengma | Yunnan | KF778182 | KF778268 | KF778336 | Wan et al., 2013 |
|  | KIZ-0212334 | Mt. Laobieshan | Yunnan | MH209478 | MH210298 | MH210423 | Wan et al., 2018 |
| U. dabieshanensis | AE1612YLP017 | Mt. Dabie | Anhui | MT199125 | MT211605 | MT211608 | Hu et al., 2021 |
|  | AE1807FZL007 | Mt. Dabie | Anhui | MT199126 | MT211606 | MT211609 | Hu et al., 2021 |
|  | AE1907FZL001 | Mt. Dabie | Anhui | MT199127 | MT211607 | MT211610 | Hu et al., 2021 |
|  | AE2005YLP001 | Mt. Dabie | Anhui | MT710697 | MT710698 | MT710699 | Hu et al., 2021 |


| Species | Specimen voucher | Location |  | GenBank Accession Number |  |  | Reference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Area | Province | cytb | RAG1 | RAG2 |  |
| Uropsilus sp. 1 | KIZ-TC1304166 | Mt. Gaoligong | Yunnan | MH209736 | MH210286 | MH210411 | Wan et al., 2018 |
|  | KIZ-TC1304268 | Mt. Gaoligong | Yunnan | MH209737 | MH210287 | MH210412 | Wan et al., 2018 |
|  | KIZ-020527 | Mt. Gaoligong | Yunnan | KF778159 | KF778274 | KF778367 | Wan et al., 2013 |
|  | KIZ-020539 | Mt. Gaoligong | Yunnan | KF778160 | KF778275 | KF778331 | Wan et al., 2013 |
|  | KIZ-028526 | Mt. Gaoligong | Yunnan | KF778156 | KF778271 | KF778363 | Wan et al., 2013 |
|  | KIZ-028528 | Mt. Gaoligong | Yunnan | KF778158 | KF778272 | KF778365 | Wan et al., 2013 |
|  | KIZ-028529 | Mt. Gaoligong | Yunnan | KF778157 | KF778273 | KF778330 | Wan et al., 2013 |
| Uropsilus sp. 2 | KIZ-028549 | Mt. Jiajin | Sichuan | KF778161 | KF778280 | KF778376 | Wan et al., 2013 |
|  | KIZ-028550 | Mt. Jiajin | Sichuan | KF778162 | KF778277 | KF778375 | Wan et al., 2013 |
|  | KIZ-028551 | Mt. Jiajin | Sichuan | KF778165 | KF778279 | KF778329 | Wan et al., 2013 |
|  | KIZ-028552 | Mt. Jiajin | Sichuan | KF778163 | KF778281 | KF778377 | Wan et al., 2013 |
|  | KIZ-028557 | Mt. Jiajin | Sichuan | KF778164 | KF778278 | KF778328 | Wan et al., 2013 |
| Uropsilus sp. 3 | SAF-06040 | Mt. Wushan | Hubei | MH209692 | MH210247 | MH210371 | Wan et al., 2018 |
|  | SAF-06042 | Mt. Wushan | Hubei | MH209693 | MH210248 | MH210372 | Wan et al., 2018 |
| Uropsilus sp. 4 | KIZ-BC1110001 | Mt. Wuding | Yunnan | MH209643 | MH210202 | MH210324 | Wan et al., 2018 |
|  | KIZ-BC1110002 | Mt. Wuding | Yunnan | MH209648 | MH210207 | MH210329 | Wan et al., 2018 |
|  | KIZ-BC1110012 | Mt. Wuding | Yunnan | MH209644 | MH210203 | MH210325 | Wan et al., 2018 |
|  | KIZ-BC1110129 | Mt. Wuding | Yunnan | MH209645 | MH210204 | MH210326 | Wan et al., 2018 |
|  | KIZ-BC1110180 | Mt. Wuding | Yunnan | MH209646 | MH210205 | MH210327 | Wan et al., 2018 |
|  | KIZ-BC1110202 | Mt. Wuding | Yunnan | MH209647 | MH210206 | MH210328 | Wan et al., 2018 |
| Uropsilus sp. 5 | KIZ-016096 | Mt. Qinling | Shannxi | KF778195 | KF778266 | KF778339 | Wan et al., 2013 |
|  | KIZ-016099 | Mt. Qinling | Shannxi | KF778198 | KF778315 | KF778343 | Wan et al., 2013 |
|  | KIZ-016101 | Mt. Qinling | Shannxi | KF778199 | KF778276 | KF778340 | Wan et al., 2013 |
|  | KIZ-016109 | Mt. Qinling | Shannxi | KF778196 | KF778314 | KF778341 | Wan et al., 2013 |
|  | KIZ-016219 | Mt. Qinling | Shannxi | KF778197 | KF778296 | KF778342 | Wan et al., 2013 |
| Uropsilus sp. 6 | KIZ-019509 | Mt. Wuliang | Yunnan | KF778187 | KF778301 | KF778324 | Wan et al., 2013 |
|  | KIZ-019515 | Mt. Wuliang | Yunnan | KF778189 | KF778316 | KF778322 | Wan et al., 2013 |
|  | KIZ-019517 | Mt. Wuliang | Yunnan | KF778188 | KF778307 | KF778323 | Wan et al., 2013 |
|  | KIZ-028538 | Mt. Wuliang | Yunnan | KF778190 | KF778306 | KF778354 | Wan et al., 2013 |
|  | KIZ-AL1303012 | Mt. Ailao | Yunnan | MH209638 | MH210197 | MH210319 | Wan et al., 2018 |
|  | KIZ-AL1305058 | Mt. Ailao | Yunnan | MH209639 | MH210198 | MH210320 | Wan et al., 2018 |
|  | KIZ-AL1305099 | Mt. Ailao | Yunnan | MH209640 | MH210199 | MH210321 | Wan et al., 2018 |
|  | KIZ-AL1305152 | Mt. Ailao | Yunnan | MH209641 | MH210200 | MH210322 | Wan et al., 2018 |
|  | KIZ-AL1305230 | Mt. Ailao | Yunnan | MH209642 | MH210201 | MH210323 | Wan et al., 2018 |


[^0]:    * The original source did not distinguish between HF1 and HF2.

