

<https://doi.org/10.11646/zootaxa.5729.4.8>

<http://zoobank.org/urn:lsid:zoobank.org:pub:F5916886-5B44-4803-AA7E-9E1B1AF73EF8>

YEGOR SHISHKIN-SKARD (2024) *Sherbetra* nom. n. (gen.) pro *Trisulcus* Popofsky 1913 non Hitchcock 1865 (Amphiactinaria nom. clad. n., Polycystina, Rhizaria), with six new combinations. *Zootaxa*, 5474 (4): 441–444.

1. (p. 441 § 2). The reference to Biard *et al.* (2015) was inadvertently omitted from the reference list and is cited below.

2. Contrary to multiple statements of Popofsky (1913) and some sources after, Haeckel (1887 pp. 891, 893–894) did not consider a *tetraxon* to be the base of a nassellarian skeleton. He outlined four possible scenarios of nassellarian evolution, and one involved a basic “tripod”—*three*-rayed spicule (not a *four*-rayed *Vierstrahler* attributed to him by Popofsky). Hence, in the text of the Correspondence (p. 441 § 3), “This idea was suggested by Haeckel (1887) and further developed by Popofsky (1913).”

should be

“This idea was developed by Popofsky (1913 pp. 220–224) and foreran by Haeckel (1881 p. 425; 1887 pp. 893–894) who considered the “tripod” (*three*-rayed spicule, clarified on p. 891 of Haeckel 1887) as a possible first nassellarian skeleton.”

3. The cover figure was published in the updated and correct version: https://mapress.com/public/journals/1/article_52438_cover_en_US.jpg; <https://mapress.com/zt/article/view/zootaxa.5474.4.6>; <https://mapress.com/zt/issue/view/zootaxa.5474.4> (the links are also archived at <https://web.archive.org/>). At the same time, the part of the text below remained as in the early draft. As a result, there is a disagreement between the published text and the cover figure. “At its first stages of evolution, this amphiactine spicule could be formed as a fusion of two archaeospicularian tetractine spicules (so, the old hypothesis of Haeckel and Popofsky could have a grain of truth)” (p. 441 § 4)

should be consistent with the cover figure:

“The amphiactine spicule may have evolved as an archaeospicularian triactine spicule (the one that develops first—Sheng *et al.* 2020; 1st skeleton in the cover figure) with additional rays arising from its centre and from the free end of one its branch (as reflected in nassellarian ontogeny—Swanberg & Bjørklund 1987; 3rd and subsequent skeletons). A transitional stage with a tetraxon (one additional ray, from the centre) could also be present in this scenario (2nd skeleton). So, the old hypotheses of Haeckel and Popofsky could both have their own grains of truth. Alternatives to this are (another kind of) unfinished duplication of an archaeospicularian tetractine spicule or a fusion of two such spicules. If an alternative is true, then the early ontogeny of the initial spicule does not “recapitulate” ancestral forms. It has already been shown (Sandin *et al.* 2019) that the external test (develops later) is more evolutionarily conserved than the initial spicule (develops earlier). Thus, there is evidence that ontogeny in this lineage does not follow the early conservation model.”

4. (p. 443 Acknowledgements, addendum). “The cover figure (available at the webpages with the article) follows the topology of Nakamura *et al.* (2021).”

5. (p. 444 References). The reference to Sandin *et al.* (2019) contains an incorrect link to their Fig. S2 and a separate (unnecessary and broken) link under the symbols “+ S2”. **The correct version of this reference is the following one:** “Sandin, M.M., Pillet, L., Biard, T., Poirier, C., Bigeard, E., Romac, S., Suzuki, N. & Not, F. (2019) Time Calibrated Morpho-molecular Classification of Nassellaria (Radiolaria). *Protist*, 170 (2), 187–208, figs. S1 (<https://ars.els-cdn.com/content/image/1-s2.0-S143446101830110X-mmcl.pdf>) + S2 (<https://ars.els-cdn.com/content/image/1-s2.0-S143446101830110X-mmcc2.pdf>) <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.protis.2019.02.002>”

References

- Biard, T., Pillet, L., Decelle, J., Poirier, C., Suzuki, N. & Not, F. (2015) Towards an Integrative Morpho-molecular Classification of the Collodaria (Polycystinea, Radiolaria). *Protist*, 166 (3), 374–388.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.protis.2015.05.002>
- Haeckel, E. (1881) Entwurf eines Radiolarien-Systems auf Grund von Studien der Challenger-Radiolarien. *Jenaische Zeitschrift für Naturwissenschaft*, 15 (3), 418–472. <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/35363> [for the date of the 3rd issue, see <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/35363#page/635>]
- Sheng, J., Kachovich, S. & Aitchison, J.C. (2020) Skeletal architecture of middle Cambrian spicular radiolarians revealed using micro-CT. *Journal of Micropalaeontology*, 39 (1), 61–76.
<https://doi.org/10.5194/jm-39-61-2020>
- Swanberg, N.R. & Bjørklund, K.R. (1987) The pre-cephalic development of the skeleton of *Amphimelissa setosa* (Actinopoda: Nassellarida). *Marine Micropaleontology*, 11 (4), 333–341.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/0377-8398\(87\)90005-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0377-8398(87)90005-3)