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#### Abstract

Phylogenetic relationsships of four nominal Lucanus Scopoli, 1763 species, L. swinhoei Parry, 1874, L. continentalis Zilioli, 1998, L. liuyei Huang \& Chen, 2010, and L. wuyishanensis Schenk, 1999, are assessed based on mitochondrial ( 16 S rDNA, COI) and nuclear ( 28 S rDNA, Wingless) genes. The genetic distance is 0.0072 between $L$. swinhoei and $L$. continentalis, and 0.0094 between $L$. wuyishanensis and $L$. liuyei. Three species-delimitation approaches (ABGD, PTP, and GMYC) consistently showed L. swinhoei + L. continentalis and $L$. wuyishanensis + L. liuyei as two MOTUs. A new synonymy, L. liuyei $=L$. wuyishanensis, is proposed. Synonymy of $L$. swinhoei over $L$. continentalis is confirmed.
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## Introduction

Morphological evidence suggests that the evolution and differences of the mandible of stag-beetles are closely related to environmental heterogeneity (Huang and Lin 2010; Gotoh et al. 2011). Molecular phylogeny also provides evidence for the intraspecific morphological complexity due to environmental heterogeneity in Lucanus (Zhou et al. 2019; Ying et al. 2021; Yuan et al. 2021).

The genus Lucanus Scopoli, 1763 is recognized as the most typical representative of Lucanidae, and Lucanus species (and subspecies) are especially abundant in eastern regions of Asia (including China, India, Laos, Vietnam, and Myanmar), with the majority inhabiting southern China (Wan 2007; Fujita 2010; Huang and Chen 2010; Lin 2017; Chen et al 2020). Hilly topography below 2000 m dominates the central and eastern regions of south China, with many low mountains and valley basins extending from northeast to southwest (Zhou et al. 2006). This unique topography may have hindered gene exchange between species and facilitated population differentiation (Qiu et al. 2011; Zhao et al. 2012; Li et al. 2019). Secondly, sexual dimorphism, male polymorphism, and color pattern polymorphism are significant in Lucanus. Due to the above reasons, this genus is phenotypically rich at the intraspecific level, resulting in some taxonomic confusion. Phylogenetic analysis using molecular markers such as mitochondrial and nuclear genes can clarify many morphology-based species taxonomic positions.

Lucanus wuyishanensis Schenk, 1999 and Lucanus liuyei Huang \& Chen, 2010 are typical representatives of Lucanus. All collecting data indicate that L. wuyishanensis is mainly distributed in southeast China (Zhejiang, Jiangxi, Fujian). Its allied species, L. liuyei in south-central China (Guangxi, Guizhou, Hunan), is morphologically similar to L. wuyishanensis but has a different geographic distribution. Huang (2006) erroneously treated L. wuyishanensis as a synonym of Lucanus klapperichi; however, examination of the male genitalia proved that this species should be treated as distinct (Huang and Chen 2010). Similarly, Wan (2007) also believed that the lateral ridges of the head and the major inner tooth are quite different from those of L. klapperichi. Additionally, Huang and Chen (2013) observed that L. liuyei from Guangxi is closer to L. wuyishanensis, from the border area of Jiangxi, Zhejiang, and Fujian, in terms of external morphology, and classified it as a subspecies of $L$. liuyei by comparing their male and female genitalia. However, the specimens collected in Guangxi were identified by Fujita (2010) as L. wuyishanensis based on morphological characters. In our opinion, the differences between the two species are insignificant and hardly any diagnostic attribute was found to distinguish them except for existing collecting data showing distribution areas and body size ranges (Fig. 1).

In addition, the taxonomic relationship between Lucanus swinhoei Parry, 1874 and Lucanus continentalis Zilioli, 1998 has long been controversial. Zilioli (1998) reported that L. continentalis is a subspecies of L. swinhoei; however, Wan (2007) considered $L$. continentalis as a synonym of $L$. swinhoei based on examination of a

## L. liuyei


L. wuyishanensis


Figure I. Habitus of $L$. wuyishanensis and $L$. liuyei in dorsal view $\mathbf{A}$ major male $\mathbf{B}$ medium male $\mathbf{C}$ minor male $\mathbf{D}$ female. All to scale; scale bar: 20.0 mm .
series of specimens. Huang and Chen (2010) compared the inner teeth, the margin of the basal part of the mandible, the labrum, and the geographical distribution of the two species and concluded that they are separate species, with the former mainly distributed in southeastern China and the latter only in Taiwan. Later, Huang and Chen (2017) relegated L. continentalis to a subspecies of L. swinhoei. So far, the taxonomic positions of $L$. swinhoei have been listed as distinct species, subspecies, or synonyms despite a lack of abundant data to support these modifications (Fig. 2).

This study assesses the taxonomic relationships between the species pairs L. continentalis and L. swinhoei, and L. wuyishanensis and L. liuyei, by using multilocus data, revisiting for the first time the relationships among these four species from a molecular phylogenetic perspective.


Figure 2. Habitus of $L$. continentalis and $L$. swinhoei in dorsal view $\mathbf{A}$ major male $\mathbf{B}$ medium male C minor male (see Huang and Chen 2010: pl. 35 figs 34-5, 9) D female. Scale bar: 20.0 mm .

## Materials and methods

## Sample collection, handling, and storage

All specimens of Lucanus were netted or light-trap collected for this study and store in ethanol, including 54 samples of the ingroup ( 21 L. wuyishanensis collected from Zhejiang, Fujian, Jiangxi province; 17 L. liuyei from Guangxi, Guizhou, Hunan province; five L. swinhoei from Taiwan; 11 L. continentalis from Fujian and Zhejiang province), and 10 samples of the outgroup (one each of L. parryi Boileau, 1899, L simithii Parry, 1862, L. fryi Boileau, 1911, L. klapperichi Bomans, 1989, and six L. fujianensis Schenk, 2008). Voucher specimens and their extracted genomic DNA are deposited in the research collection at the Museum of Anhui University, China. (Suppl. material 1).

The map with collection localities was generated using ArcGIS v. 10.3 (http://www. esri.com/sofware/arcgis) based on the geospatial data from the National Geomatics

Center of China (Fig. 3). Photographs of the habitus was taken in .jpg format using a Canon 5D Mark IV with Canon $100 \mathrm{~mm} \mathrm{f} / 2.8$ macro lens and a twin flash (Figs 1, 2).

## DNA extraction, amplification, and sequencing

The specimens were preserved in $99.7 \%$ ethanol at $-20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Total genomic DNA was extracted from a small portion of the muscle using DNeasy Blood and Tissue Extraction kit according to the manufacturer's recommendations. The primers used to amplify 28 S rDNA and Wingless were adapted from Abouheif and Wray (2002), Ward and Downie (2005), Monaghan et al. (2007), and Wild and Maddison (2008). For COI and 16 S rDNA, primers were specifically designed in this study (Table 1).


Figure 3. Sample collection sites for this study.

Table I. Summary of paired PCR primers in the present study.

| Gene | Primer | Sequence (5'-3') | References |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| COI | LuCOIF1 | ATAATCATTGCTGTTCCAAC | Present study |
|  | LuCOIR1 | TATCTATGTTCAGCRGGRGGT | Present study |
| 16S rDNA | Lu16SF1 | CTCGAATTTTRGAGGGC | Present study |
|  | Lu16SR1 | AATCCAACATCGAGGTC | Present study |
| 28S rDNA | 28 SDD | GGGACCCGTCTTGAAACAC | Monaghan et al. 2007 |
|  | $28 S F F$ | TTACACACTCCTTAGCGGAT | Monaghan et al. 2007 |
| Wing-less | Wg550F | ATGCGTCAGGARTGYAARTGYCAYGGYATGTC | Wild and Maddison 2008 |
|  | WgAbRZ | CACTTNACYTCRCARCACCARTG | Wild and Maddison 2008 |
|  | Wg578F | TGCACNGTGARACYTGCTGGATG | Ward and Downie 2005 |
|  | WgAbR | ACYTCGCAGCACCARTGGAA | Abouheif and Wray 2002 |

PCR amplification reactions for the three loci (COI, $16 \mathrm{~S} \mathrm{rDNA}, 28 \mathrm{~S} \mathrm{rDNA}$ ) were performed in a $25 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ volume containing $1 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ of each primer (forward and reverse) at $10 \mu \mathrm{M}, 2 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ of template DNA solution, $12.5 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ of $2 \times$ EasyTaq SuperMix (+ dye), and $8.5 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ of sterile double-distilled water to make up the final volume of $25 \mu \mathrm{~L}$. WG was amplified by nested PCR, first PCR containing $1 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ of each primer (forward and reverse) at $10 \mu \mathrm{M}, 1 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ of template DNA solution, $7.5 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ of $2 \times$ Easy Taq SuperMix (+ dye), and $4.5 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ of sterile double-distilled water, and finally use the $1 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ first amplification product as a template, including $1 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ of each primer (forward and reverse) at $10 \mu \mathrm{M}, 12.5 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ of $2 \times$ EasyTaq SuperMix (+ dye), and $9.5 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ of sterile doubledistilled water. The polymerase chain reaction amplifications were performed under the following conditions: initial denaturation at $94^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 2 min , followed by $35-37$ cycles of denaturation at $94^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 40 seconds, annealing at $52-60^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 50 seconds, and elongation at $70^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 1 min , and then a final extension step at $72^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 7 min , stored at $4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ at room temperature. Amplifications were purified using Template DNA Amplify Kit (Ensure Biologicals).

Sequencing was performed using the ABI PRISM BigDye Terminator v. 3.1 Cycle Sequencing Kit (Life Technologies, USA), and cycle sequencing reactions were performed on ABI PRISM 3730xl automated sequencers (Life Technologies, USA) at Sangon Biotech Company, China. All sequences generated in this study were submitted to GenBank under accession numbers (Suppl. material 1).

## Sequence alignment, genetic distances, and phylogenetic analyses

Sequences of forward and reverse strands were assembled using GENEIOUS PRIME 2019.1.1 (https://www.geneious.com) and then aligned using MEGA 11. Genetic divergences among taxa were estimated using MEGA 11 (Kumar et al. 2018) via K2Pdistance. The COI gene of Lucanus was assembled for genetic distance analyses. Finally, we concatenated alignments using PHYLOSUITE 1.2.1 (Zhang et al. 2020). The concatenated dataset was partitioned according to the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) with PARTITIONFINDER 2.1.1 (Lanfear et al. 2017) for phylogenetic analyses.

Phylogenetic inferences were conducted using four gene markers based on maximum likelihood inference (ML), and Bayesian inference (BI). The BI tree was implemented in MRBAYES 3.2.6 (Ronquist et al. 2012). PARTITIONFINDER 2.1.1 was used to determine the best-fit models. Bayesian inference was conducted using MRBAYES 3.2.6 with two simultaneous runs of $5 \times 10^{7}$ generations. Samples were drawn every 1,000 Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) step. The average standard deviation of split frequencies should be less than 0.01 , with the initial $25 \%$ of trees discarded as burn-in. ML analyses were performed using IQ-TREE webserver (Trifinopoulos and Lam-Tung 2016). The "Auto" option was set under optimal evolutionary models, and the phylogenetic trees were constructed using an ultrafast bootstrap approximation approach with 10,000 replicates. Phylogenetic trees were visualized and edited in FIGTREE 1.4.3 (http://beast.bio.ed.ac.uk/figtree).

## Species delimitation

When defining species relationships by using molecular-set data, there are a variety of analytical approaches available. The Automatic Barcode Gap Discovery (ABGD) analysis was performed in this study for COI using a web interface (https://bioinfo. mnhn.fr/abi/public/abgd/abgdweb.html), which detects a gap in divergence distribution, which corresponds to differences between intraspecific and interspecific distances. When the gap exists, the process works well for species delimitation (Puillandre et al. 2012). An unrooted ML tree was generated in IQ-TREE webserver under the auto options. Poisson Tree Processes (PTP) was performed on a single, unrooted tree in the bPTP server (https://species.h-its.org/). A total of $5 \times 10^{5}$ generations were run with the first $10 \%$ as burn-in (Zhang et al. 2013). General Mixed Yule Coalescent model (GMYC) analysis was conducted using BEAST 2.6.0 under a relaxed clock Exponential mode and ESS values assessed convergence. A burn-in with $25 \%$ was set to obtain an optimal consensus tree. Delimitation approach in the software R with the package 'splits' (available at http://r-forge.r-project.org/projects/splits) using the single-threshold method (Pons et al. 2006; Monaghan et al. 2009).

## Abbreviations

| ABGD | Automatic Barcode Gap Discovery; |
| :--- | :--- |
| BBP | Bayesian posterior probability; |
| BI | Bayesian inference; |
| GMYC | General Mixed Yule Coalescent; |
| K2P | distance, Kimura 2-parameter distance; |
| ML | maximum likelihood; |
| MBL | maximum likelihood bootstrap; |
| MOTU | molecular operational taxonomic unit; |
| PCR | Polymerase Chain Reaction; |
| PTP | Poisson Tree Processes. |

## Results

## Morphological comparison

External morphological characteristics of two clades are compared in the table (Suppl. material 2). Lucanus swinhoei and L. continentalis differ slightly in body size, maintaining an overall range of $27-58 \mathrm{~mm}$. Major males display the following features: mandibles strongly incurved at basal $1 / 3$ and at apex; apical teeth bifurcated, upper branch teeth usually larger or equal in size with lower branch teeth; major mandibular tooth located at basal $1 / 3$, triangular, proceeded by more than five inner small teeth. Medium-sized
males have the following features: mandibles strongly incurved at basal $1 / 3$, usually straight at apex; apical teeth bifurcated, upper branch teeth usually equal to or smaller than lower branch teeth; major mandibular tooth located at basal $1 / 3$, triangular, proceeded by four or five inner small teeth. Minor males indicate the following features: mandibles weakly incurved at basal $1 / 3$, straight at apex; apical teeth bifurcated, upper branch teeth usually equal to or smaller than lower branch teeth; major mandibular tooth located at basal $1 / 3$, triangular, proceeded by fewer than four inner small teeth.

Lucanus wuyishanensis and L. liuyei differ slightly in body size, maintaining an overall range of $28-53 \mathrm{~mm}$. Major males indicate the following features: mandible weekly incurved at basal $1 / 3$, straight at the middle then strongly incurved at apical $1 / 4$; the major inner mandibular tooth located $2 / 3$ from the apical mandibular fork, sharp, triangular protruding forward and inflated on both sides, four separated small inner mandibular teeth attached below the major inner mandibular tooth, four or five unclear, minor inner mandibular teeth continuously located along the midlength of basal mandibles; four small inner mandibular teeth densely distributed between the major tooth and the apical fork. Medium-sized males indicate the following features: major inner mandibular tooth somewhat triangular, weekly inflated on both sides; more than four unclear, minor inner mandibular teeth continuously located along the midlength of basal mandibles, and more than four small inner mandibular teeth densely distributed between the major tooth and the apical fork. Minor males indicate the following features: major inner mandibular tooth weekly developed, single-point and not triangular; less than two separated small inner mandibular teeth attached below the major inner mandibular tooth; more than three unclear, minor inner mandibular teeth continuously located on $1 / 2$ of basal mandible; more than two small inner mandibular teeth densely distributed between the major tooth and the apical fork.

## Phylogenetic analyses

A concentrated matrix with 2489 aligned positions for data was obtained comprising COI, 16 S rDNA, 28 S rDNA, and Wingless genes. The phylogenetic analyses using both BI and ML inferences recovered overall a consistent topology (Fig. 4). As outgroups, L. smithii, L. fryi, and L. parryi were separated from other species with high support, forming an independent clade. In addition, the clade L. klapperichi was sister to the clade $($ L. liuyei + L. wuyishanensis) $(\mathrm{BPP}=1, \mathrm{MLB}=94)$. The clade L. fujianensis was sister to the clade (L. swinhoei $+L$. continentalis) $(\mathrm{BPP}=1, \mathrm{MLB}=100)$. Nested structures of $L$. liuyei and $L$. wuyishanensis occur in all geographic populations.

## Genetic distance

Genetic distances (K2P-distances) were calculated for all taxa using COI genes (Table 2). The results showed that the average genetic distance between L. wuyishanensis and L. liuyei populations in each collection area was a low mean range ( $0.0067-0.0110$ )


Figure 4. Phylogenetic inferences based on four genes (COI, 16 S rDNA, Wingless, and 28 S rDNA) by maximum-likelihood inference (MLI) and Bayesian inference (BI) with posterior probability. Both posterior probabilities of MLI (above/left of branch) and bootstrapping values of BI (below/right of branch) are shown at nodes.
(Suppl. material 3) and mean genetic distance of 0.0094 in all taxa (Table 2); the mean genetic distance between L. swinhoei and L. continentalis was 0.0072 (Table 2). The numbers were lower than the minimum mean genetic distances of 0.1592 among interspecific taxa and far less than the mean genetic distance of 0.2090 between interspecies of Lucanus (Lin 2017).

## Species delimitation

Species delimitation is shown in Fig. 5. Analysis of COI gene by all methods (ABGD, PTP, and GMYC) resulted in two molecular MOTUs, L. wuyishanensis + L. liuyei and L. swinhoei + L. continentalis (Fig. 5). For the concatenated dataset, all three methods suggested that $L$. wuyishanensis $+L$. liuyei were one MOTU, whereas GMYC divided L. swinhoei and $L$. continentalis into two MOTUs.

## Taxonomic account

## Lucanus swinhoei Parry, 1897

Lucanus swinhoei Parry, 1874: 370.
Lucanus continentalis Zilioli, 1998: 145, synonymy by Wan (2007).

Material examined. China • 1 male; Zhejiang Province, Yunhe County; 18 Jul. 2019; ZH Zhan leg. • 3 males; same locality as for preceding; 5 Jul. $2021 \cdot 3$ males; Zhejiang Province, Baishanzu County; 23 Jul. 2015 • 2 males; Zhejiang Province, Longquan County; 6 Jul. 2019 • 1 male; Fujian Province, Shanghang County; 12 Jul. 2021; LY Zhou leg. 1 male; same locality as for preceding; 22 Jul. 2011; Q Zhang and YY Cao leg. • 2 males; Taiwan Island, Nantou County; 12 Jun. 2019; JZ Lin leg. • 2 males; same locality as for preceding; 6 Jun. 2020.

Diagnosis. Males of L. swinhoei could be distinguished from related species by following characters: 1) mandibles incurved at basal $1 / 3$, straight along the midlength and incurved apically; 2) apical teeth bifurcated; major mandibular tooth located at basal $1 / 3$, triangular, not flat on both sides; 3) elytra metallic luster at disc and along

Table 2. The mean genetic distances among studied species (K2P-distances).

|  | L. liuyei | L. <br> wuyishanensis | L. <br> continentalis | L. swinhoei | L. <br> fujianensis | L. <br> klapperichi | L. fryi | L. <br> smithii | L. <br> parryi |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| L. liuyei |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L. wuyishanensis | 0.0094 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L. continentalis | 0.1949 | 0.1924 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L. swinhoei | 0.1906 | 0.1872 | 0.0072 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L. fujianensis | 0.2131 | 0.2142 | 0.1617 | 0.1592 |  |  |  |  |  |
| L. klapperichi | 0.1946 | 0.1977 | 0.1925 | 0.1872 | 0.1929 |  |  |  |  |
| L. fryi | 0.2067 | 0.2086 | 0.2321 | 0.2280 | 0.1885 | 0.1955 |  |  |  |
| L. smithii | 0.2246 | 0.2245 | 0.2150 | 0.2176 | 0.2230 | 0.2434 | 0.1962 |  |  |
| L. parryi | 0.2280 | 0.2306 | 0.2193 | 0.2164 | 0.2054 | 0.1840 | 0.1774 | 0.1987 |  |



Figure 5. Delimitation of the studied Lucanus species based on COI. Columns are taxonomic identification based on three molecular delimitation methods: ABGD, PTP, and GMYC. The phylogenetic tree is based on the GMYC analysis.
the suture, reddish to brownish; less punctate and without any yellowish setae. The females of most species in Lucanus are not easy to distinguish due to their significant similarities in morphology. Typical female of L. swinhoei could be identified by the following subtle differences: elytra without a marked pubescence, metasternum not densely hairy and the canthi not markedly outside of the eyes.

Distribution. China (Zhejiang, Fujian, Taiwan Island).

## Lucanus wuyishanensis Schenk, 1999

Lucanus wuyishanensis Schenk, 1999: 114.
Lucanus liuyei Huang \& Chen, 2010: 93-94, syn. nov.

Material examined. China - 2 males; Jiangxi Province, Pingxiang County; 15 Jun. 2017; ZH Zhan leg. • 4 males; Jiangxi Province, same locality as for preceding; 03 Jun. 2021; Q Qi leg. • 6 males; Zhejiang Province, Mount Longquanshan; 18 July. 2019. - 1 male; Fujian Province, Mount Wuyishan; 18 Jul. 2011. • 2 males; Fujian Province, Mount Wuyishan; 14 Jul. 2011; Q Zhang and YY Cao leg. • 4 males; Fujian Province, same locality as for preceding; 12 Jun. 2020; ZH Zhan leg. • 2 males; Fujian Province, same locality as for preceding; 20 Jun. 2021; ZL Zhou leg. • 1 male; Guangxi Province, Mount Maoershans; 20 Jul. 2011. - 3 males; same locality as for preceding; 20 Jul. 2017; Q Qi leg. • 2 male, 1 female; same locality as for preceding; 20 Jul. 2021; ZH Zhan leg. • 2 male, 2 female; Guizhou Province, Mount Fanjingshan; 20 Jun. 2017; ZH Zhan leg. • 2 males; same locality as for preceding; 08 Jul. 2015; LX Zhu leg. • 1 male; Hunan Province, Zhangjiajie County; 20 Jun. 2015 • 4 males; same locality as for preceding; 21 May 2019; ZH Zhan leg.

Diagnosis. Males of $L$. wuyishanensis could be distinguished from related species by the following characters: 1) mandibles weekly incurved at basal $1 / 3$, straight extending to the mid-length and strongly incurved at $1 / 4$ anteriorly; 2) two separated, small, inner mandibular teeth attached below the major inner mandibular tooth; 2-4 small inner mandibular teeth densely distributed between the major tooth and the apical fork; 3) elytra reddish to brownish, usually bicolored with head and pronotum; oval, widest at the apical $1 / 4$, strongly narrow at basal. Females of $L$. wuyishanensis are also similar in appearance to those of other Lucanus members. There are the following slight differences: dorsal surface covered with a vestiture of small and significant, yellowish-amber setae; head surface punctate heavily, mandible snout, strongly incurved anteriorly.

Distribution. China (Sichuan, Guangxi, Guizhou, Fujian, Hunan, Jiangxi).

## Discussion

Phylogenetic inferences by applying ML and BI analyses showed consistent patterns, which show that the Lucanus klapperichi clade is sister to the clade (L. wuyishanensis + L. liuyei $)(\mathrm{MLB}=94 \%, \mathrm{BPP}=1)$. Lucanus wuyishanensis and
L. liuyei collected from different provinces were all clustered in a highly supported clade. The subclade $L$. swinhoei + L. continentalis is nested in the same clade ( $M L B=100 \%$, $\mathrm{BPP}=1$; Fig. 4). The K2P genetic distances between L. wuyishanensis and L. liuyei were ( $0.0067-0.0110$ mean genetic distance of 0.0094 ), indicating that two forms belong to one species. The K2P distance between L. swinhoei and L. continentalis (0.0072) suggests that the former most likely represents an island population of the latter, similar to the forms distributed on Hainan Island (Zhou et al. 2019). Three species-delimitation approaches (ABGD, PTP, and GMYC) based on the COI gene also consistently showed $L$. swinhoei + L. continentalis and $L$. wuyishanensis + L. liuyei as two MOTUs (Fig. 5). Based on the concatenated dataset analysis, three methods suggested L. wuyishanensis and L. liuyei were one MOTU, whereas GMYC divided L. swinhoei and $L$. continentalis into two MOTUs. GMYC typically over-splits species, owing to low genetic diversity across lineages and overlap of interspecific and intraspecific divergences, as well as a lack of reciprocal monophyly within sister clades (Talavera et al. 2013; Pentinsaari et al. 2016; Stokkan et al. 2018; Yuan et al. 2021).

The genus Lucanus is susceptible to several pressures, such as habitat selection, sexual selection, and food resources, and only occurs in wooded alpine areas above 800 m with more demanding environmental conditions and tiny ecological niches (Switala et al. 2014; Chen et al. 2020). Hilly topography with below 2000 m dominates the central and eastern regions of south China, with many low mountains and valley basins extending from the northeast to the southwest (Zhou et al. 2006). Therefore, we think that the small phenotypic differences previously examined are attributable to phenotypic divergence due to geographic and climatic variables.

All our results indicate that $L$. continentalis is a junior subjective synonym of L. swinhoei and that $L$. liuyei as a junior subjective synonym of $L$. wuyishanensis. It is also clear, that in case of closely related species of the genus, an integrative approach utilizing both morphological and molecular data should be used. Molecular data can provide insight into the status of the forms with weak morphological differences. It is especially important for Lucanus and majority of other stag beetles because molecular traits are not prone to allometric variability.
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