

1 ***Cryptocentrus steinhardti* (Actinopterygii; Gobiidae): a new**
2 **species of shrimp-goby, and a new invasive to the**
3 **Mediterranean Sea**

4 Menachem Goren¹ and Nir Stern^{2*}

5 ¹ School of Zoology, The George S. Wise Faculty of Life and Sciences and the Steinhardt Museum
6 of Natural History, Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv, Israel.

7 ² Israel National Institute of Oceanography, Israel Oceanographic and Limnological Research,
8 Haifa, Israel.

9

10 *Corresponding author:

11 Nir Stern²

12 nirstern@ocean.org.il ORCID - 0000-0002-4834-3091

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 **ABSTRACT**

24 A new species of shrimp goby was collected at depths of 60-80 m, off the southern Israeli
25 Mediterranean coast, revealed by a unique 'DNA barcoding' signature (mtDNA *COI* and *Cytb*)
26 that differed from any other previously published goby species. This finding constitutes the third
27 record of an invasive shrimp goby in the Mediterranean Sea, revealing an intriguing ecological
28 consideration regarding possible formation of a fish-shrimp symbiosis in a newly invaded territory.
29 Following a comprehensive morphological and anatomical examinations, this species is being
30 described here as *Cryptocentrus steinhardti* n. sp., clustered phylogenetically with the silt shrimp-
31 gobies group, in which *Cryptocentrus* is the most speciose genus. However, a present phylogenetic
32 analysis demonstrates paraphyly of *Cryptocentrus* hence a generic name for the new species is
33 provisional. ~~This finding constitutes the third record of an invasive shrimp goby in the~~
34 ~~Mediterranean Sea, revealing an intriguing ecological consideration regarding possible formation~~
35 ~~of a fish-shrimp symbiosis in a newly invaded territory.~~
36 Last, describing tropical species in the Mediterranean prior to their discovery in the native
37 distribution is an unusual event, although not the first such case. Several similar examples are
38 provided in the present article below.

Commented [SB1]: No anatomical examination in the description as well as osteological. Description is based on external characetr.

39 **INTRODUCTION**

40 Since the opening of the Suez Canal in 1869 more than 400 multicellular nonnative species of Red
41 Sea origin, including approx. 100 fish species, have been found along the Israeli Mediterranean
42 coast (Galil et al., 2020). Out of this diverse invasive fauna, two species are the shrimp-gobies
43 *Vanderhorstia mertensi* Klausewitz, 1974, (Goren, Stern and Galil, 2013) and *Cryptocentrus*
44 *caeruleopunctatus* (Rüppell, 1830) (Rothman and Goren, 2015). These species are part of a group
45 of near-reef fishes that inhabit sandy and silty habitats and display a remarkable mutualism with
46 burrowing alpheid shrimps, exchanging tunnel construction capabilities and sentinel services
47 (Karplus and Thompson, 2011). Common throughout the tropics, this unique fish-shrimp
48 association is documented from over a 100 fish species that belong to eleven valid genera of
49 gobies: *Amblyeleotris* Bleeker, 1874; *Cryptocentrus* Valenciennes (ex Ehrenberg) in Cuvier &
50 Valenciennes, 1837; *Cryptocentroides* Popta, 1922, *Ctenogobiops* Smith, 1959, *Lotilia*
51 Klausewitz, 1960; *Mahidolia* Smith, 1932; *Myersina* Herre, 1934; *Psilogobius* Baldwin, 1972;
52 *Stonogobiops* Polunin & Lubbock, 1977; *Tomiyamichthys* Smith, 1956 and *Vanderhorstia* Smith,
53 1949 (Karplus, 2014; Ray, Mohapatra and Larson, 2018). An additional genus, *Flabelligobius*
54 Smith, 1956 is considered a synonym of *Tomiyamichthys* (Hoesé et al., 2016; Fricke and
55 Eschmeyer, 2020).

56 During cruises to sample the benthic biota off Ashdod (southern Israel, Mediterranean Sea), three
57 specimens of an unknown shrimp-goby were collected at depths of 60 to 80 m by a bottom trawl
58 net. Integrative examinations of molecular taxonomy and traditional practices indicated that these
59 fish belong to an undescribed species of *Cryptocentrus* genus.

60 **MATERIALS & METHODS**

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Commented [SB2]: Authors need to add citing to method of count and measurements.

61 Fish specimens were collected from the southern coast of the Israeli Mediterranean by the
62 commercial 240 hp F/V bottom trawler, *Moty*, under captained by L. Ornoy. The fish were
63 preserved in 70% alcohol and stored at the fish collection of The Steinhardt Museum of Natural
64 History, Tel-Aviv University (SMNHTAU). Muscle tissue samples were taken from fresh
65 specimens for genetic analyses and preserved in 96% alcohol.

66 **Genetic analysis**

67 Total genomic DNA was extracted from the three individuals using a micro tissue genomic DNA
68 isolation kit following the manufacturer's protocol (AMBRD Laboratories, Turkey). Next, approx.
69 50 ng of template DNA was used to amplify a 651 bp fragment of the mitochondrial cytochrome
70 c oxidase subunit I gene (*COI*) and 467 bp of the mitochondrial Cytochrome b (*Cytb*). Primers and
71 PCR reactions are detailed in supplementary table S1. The contiguous sequences of both genes,
72 including measurements, photos and its trace files, were uploaded to BOLD system at
73 www.v4.boldsystems.org under the BIM project (Biota of the Israeli Mediterranean) with BOLD
74 Sample IDs: BIM769-20 for the holotype and BIM534-17 and BIM770-20 for the two paratypes.
75 In order to investigate the total genetic divergence of shrimp-associated gobies complex, 101
76 previously published sequences belonging to ten putative genera were mined from BOLD and
77 NCBI to comprise an aligned dataset, with a single sequence of *Gobius niger* as an outgroup
78 (Supplementary Table S2). The genetic vouchers were included in the dataset only if they indicated
79 a precise information on the sampling localities and an unambiguous association with a Barcode
80 Index Number (BIN) of their corresponding taxonomic identifications. In this regard, sequences
81 of *Cryptocentrus yatsui* for example, were excluded from the analyses since they shared a BIN
82 with the gobies *Oligolepis formosanus* and *Redigobius bikolanus* (BIN:BOLD:ADB4723). The
83 best model test for nucleotide substitution was checked for the aligned dataset using Mega X

84 (Kumar et al., 2018) prior to further analyses. Last, phylogenetic reconstruction and genetic
85 distances between species were computed for the dataset using the model HKY+G+I with 5,000
86 replicates.

87 **Nomenclatural acts**

88 The electronic version of this article in Portable Document Format (PDF) will represent a
89 published work according to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature (ICZN),
90 and hence the new name contained in the electronic version is effectively published under that
91 Code from the electronic edition alone. This published work and the nomenclatural acts it contains
92 have been registered in ZooBank, the online registration system for the ICZN. The ZooBank
93 LSIDs (Life Science Identifiers) can be resolved and the associated information viewed through
94 any standard web browser by appending the LSID to the prefix <http://zoobank.org/>. The LSID for
95 this publication is: urn:lsid:zoobank.org:pub:B5279F4D-F5BC-454D-9ED8-3E2A13C69EAE.
96 The online version of this work is archived and available from the following digital repositories:
97 PeerJ, PubMed Central, and CLOCKSS.

98 **RESULTS**

99 ***Cryptocentrus steinhardti* n. sp.**

100 **Figures 1,2**

101 Holotype: SMNH P-16037, Ashdod, Israel (31°44.835 N, 34°24.787 E), depth 80 m, January 8,

102 2018, 19:45_{LT}. Col. N. Stern, Total length (TL) 81.9 mm, BOLD voucher BIM769-20.

103 Paratypes: SMNH P-14556₂, Ashdod, Israel (31°45.202 N, 34°27.036 E), depth 60 m, February

104 12, 2012, night_{LT}. Col. N. Stern, TL 71.5, BOLD voucher BIM534-17; SMNH P-16038, Ashdod,

105 Israel (31°45.589 N, 34°27.282 E), depth 60 m, December 11, 2016, 19:45_{LT}. Col. N. Stern, TL 72.8

106 mm, BOLD voucher BIM770-20.

107 **Diagnosis**

108 A *Cryptocentrus* species with 598-61 rows of cycloid scales along the body, 20-21 pre-dorsal
109 scales, reaching ca. 3/4 of the distance to eye (Figure 2) and 1920-21 transverse rows. Scales cover
110 abdomen and pre-pelvic region. First dorsal fin with six spines; second dorsal fin with a single
111 spine and ten segmented rays (last one branched). Anal fin with one spine and nine segmented rays
112 (last one branched). Pectoral fins with 14-15 rays. Pelvic fins completely united, with a well-
113 developed fraenum. Caudal fin with 17 segmented rays, 13 of them branched. Gill rakers: 7-8 on
114 outer gill arch, two on upper arehlimb, one at the angle, and 4-5 on lower arehlimb. Head sensory
115 papillae in transverse pattern.

116 **Description**

117 Body elongate and compressed. Upper profile of head convex. Mouth oblique. Maxilla reaching
118 to below a vertical from-at posterior margin of eye. Upper jaw with outer row of 16 caniniform
119 teeth (eight on each side of the jaw) curved backward. Internal teeth in 1-2 rows small, pointed,
120 curved backward. -Lower jaw with outer 2-3 rows of small caniniform teeth, curved backward.
121 Internal teeth in a single row of six large canines (three on each side of the jaw). No teeth on
122 vomer. Tongue rounded.

123 Gill opening moderate, extending forward to below posterior margin of pre-opercleulum,
124 restricted by a membrane at lower part. Lower margins of opercleula intersect at isthmus. Gill
125 membrane connected to side of isthmus. Gill rakers short, 7-8 rakes on outer arch, two on upper
126 arehlimb, one at the angle, and 4-5 on lower arehlimb. Anterior nostril, a tube, close above upper
127 lip. Posterior nostril, a pore, in front of eye.

128 Scales: Body covered with cycloid scales, including abdomen and pre-pelvic region; 59-61 scales
129 in longitudinal series; 20-21 mid-pre-dorsal scales reaching ca. 3/4 of the distance between dorsal
130 fin and interorbital; 19-21 series of scales from origin of first dorsal fin to mid-abdomen.

131 Fins: First dorsal fin with six spines, third and fourth spines elongate reaching the third ray of
132 second dorsal fin. Second dorsal fin with a single spine and ten segmented rays (last one branched).

133 Rays long, the last three reach the caudal fin. Anal fin with one spine and nine segmented rays
134 (last one branched). Pectoral fins with 14-15 rays. Pelvic fins completely united to form of disc,
135 with a well-developed fraenum. Caudal fin with 17 segmented rays, 13 of them branched.

136 Selected meristic characteristics and proportions are given in Table 1.

137 Cephalic sensory system: The skin of the head of all three type specimens was severely damaged
138 in the commercial trawl net, hindering detection of the cephalic canal and papillae. Figure 2
139 presents the cephalic system of the best-preserved-specimen in the best condition (holotype).

140 Nasal pores (pair) in front of eye, close to second-posterior nostril poreopening. Anterior
141 interorbital pore (single) is above anterior margin of eye. Posterior interorbital pore is above 1/6
142 posterior of eye. Post-orbital pores (pair) are above posterior margin of eye. Three pores in anterior
143 oculoscapular canal. Posterior canal could not be detected (or does not exist). Two pre-opercular
144 pores. Papillae on head arranged in a transverscal pattern (Fig. 2).

145 Color (preserved): Body yellow with dark brown pigmentation that becomes denser on back and
146 head. Three irregular wide darker bars on each side of body: the first bar under 1st dorsal fin and
147 second and third bars under anterior and posterior parts of 2nd dorsal fin.

148 **Genetic analysis**

149 Comparing the genetic sequences of both *COI* and *Cytb* with previously published data have
150 shown great differences with any known gobies, with minimum distances of 17.41% of nucleotide

151 diversity between the new species and *Cryptocentrus albidorsus* and *C. nigrocellatus* (BOLD
152 vouchers GBGCA2109-13 and GBGCA1963-13, respectively) in *COI* (Table 3), and 12.8%
153 differences between *C. cinctus* in *Cytb* (NCBI voucher MT199211). Although clustered with
154 relatively low bootstrap values, phylogenetic analysis of available *COI* sequences has shown
155 monophyletic relationship for *Cryptocentrus* species, including the newly described species, as
156 well as clustering with all species of silt shrimp gobies (Thacker and Roje, 2011) from the genera
157 *Lotilia*, *Myersina* and *Stonogobiops*, and sister-grouping with *Mahidolia* spp. (Fig. 3). Other
158 phylogenetic studies regarding these taxa, have also related *Stonogobiops* and *Mahidolia* spp.
159 within the *Cryptocentrus* species-complex clade, while *Lotila* and *Myersina* were absent from their
160 dataset (Thacker and Roje, 2011; Thacker, 2015; McCraney, Thacker and Alfaro, 2020). In fact,
161 to the best of our knowledge this present study is the first to incorporate these genera, as well as
162 *Psilogobius* spp. in a phylogenetic evaluation of shrimp-associated gobies.

163 Moreover, the cluster of reef shrimp gobies has revealed two possible misidentifications: (1)
164 *Tomiyamichthys lanceolatus*, which may be regarded as a *Vanderhorstia* species (see Fig. 1 in
165 Thacker, Thompson and Roje 2011), (2) and *Vanderhorstia mertensi*, which is shown here based
166 on a single sequence from its invasive population in the Mediterranean Sea. Both putative species
167 in this case are suspected to be a result of a wrong assignment, considering the weak diagnostic
168 characteristics of the genus (Shibukawa and Suzuki, 2004).

169 Etymology

170 The new species is named after Michael H. Steinhardt in recognition of his immensely important
171 contribution to the establishment and construction of the Steinhardt Museum of Natural History at
172 Tel Aviv University, Israel.

173 DISCUSSION

Commented [SB3]: This is not true. With inclusion in analysis *Lotilia*, *Mahidolia*, and *Psilogobius*, the present analysis confirms proposal by Hoese & Larson (2004) that the genus *Cryptocentrus* is paraphyletic. The generic name *Cryptocentrus* is available for *C. cryptocentrus* and close related species. Hence generic name for *C. steingardti* is provisional and more species of "Cryptocentrus" should be included in further analysis. More likely group of species with white mid-predorsal band forms a monophyletic group and may be form a separate genus. A low bootstrap support of *Lotilia* and *C. reingardti* cannot show a real relationships of them with other *Cryptocentrus* previously assigned to that genus (i.e. from *C. leptocephalus* to *C. maudae*).
i.e. authors need to add more details in discussion of the result of phylogenetic analysis.

Commented [SB4]: Change name to *Vanderhorstia lanceolata* in the tree to avoid confusion. Authors need to add *Tomiyamichthys oni*, included in Thacker et al. (2011).

174 As evident from the genetic results of this study, as well as from the findings of Thacker and Roje
175 (2011), Thacker (2015) and McCraney et al. (2020), the generic status and validity of some shrimp-
176 associated gobies are yet to be settled, and required further revisional examinations with more
177 species involved. In the present study, we followed the status of the genera and species as presented
178 by Fricke et al. (2020).

179 Thacker et al. (2011) recognized two different clades in this group: one clade includes the genera
180 *Amblyeleotris*, *Ctenogobiops* and *Vanderhorstia* and the other includes *Cryptocentrus*, *Mahidolia*,
181 *Tomiyamichthys* and *Stonogobiops*. Later studies by Thacker (2015) and McCraney et al. (2020)
182 followed this approach and assigned the genera *Amblyeleotris*, *Ctenogobiops* and *Vanderhorstia*
183 to the lineage *Asterropteryx* and the eight other genera to the lineage “*Cryptocentrus*”.

184 The shrimp-associated gobies belonging to the *Asterropteryx* lineage are all characterized by
185 longitudinal suborbital papillae rows (*sensu* Miller, 1986), while the species of the lineage
186 *Cryptocentrus* are characterized by transverse rows (with the exception of *Tomiyamichthys*).

187 *Cryptocentrus steinhardtii* differs from species of *Cryptocentroides* spp. by its wide gill opening,
188 reaching to below the pre-opercular margin, while *Cryptocentroides* species are characterized by
189 a restricted gill opening, extending to below pectoral-fin base. *Lotilia* spp. and *Mahidolia* spp.
190 differ from the new species by their naked nape and lower scale count along the body (less than
191 53 in *Lotilia* spp. and less than 40 in *Mahidolia* spp.). *Myersina* spp. differ from *C. steinhardtii* by
192 their lack of scales on mid nape. *Psilogobius* spp. differ from the new species in possessing ctenoid
193 scales on body, at least on its posterior part. *Stonogobiops* spp. differ from the new species by their
194 large vomerine teeth.

195 The genus *Cryptocentrus* currently comprises 36 species (Froese and Pauly, 2020). Allen and
196 Randall (2011) distinguished a group of four species characterized by possessing fewer than 70

Commented [SB5]: Authors incorrectly interpreted Thacker, Thompson & Roje 2011 where these authors focused on shrimp-associated gobies. They clearly showed and in other articles too (e.g. McCraney) two clades. *Asterropteryx* is not associated with shrimps, and it is clear from analysis in all these articles. So unclear why authors of present article decided that *Amblyeleotris*, *Ctenogobiops* and *Vanderhorstia* belongs to lineage *Asterropteryx*. This is a wrong conclusion.

Commented [SB6]: Should be re-written, see comment above

Commented [SB7]: Authors omitted important article Hoese & Larson (2004) where authors noted that the genus paraphyletic and proposed species groups.

197 ~~series of~~ scales in longitudinal series along the body. They included the following four species in
198 this group: *C. caeruleomaculatus* (Herre, 1933), *C. cyanospilotus* Allen & Randall, 2011, *C.*
199 *insignitus* (Whitley, 1956) and *C. strigilliceus* (Jordan & Seale, 1906). The group was expanded
200 with the descriptions of *C. epakros* Allen, 2015 ~~-(Allen, 2015) -~~and *C. altipinna* Hoese, 2019
201 (Hoese, 2019). None of these species have been reported to date from the Red Sea (Golani and
202 Fricke, 2018).

203 *Cryptocentrus steinhardti* differs from all other members of this group, except *C. insignitus*, in
204 possessing cycloid scales only. It differs from *C. insignitus* in possessing a higher number of scales
205 along the body and the presence of mid-pre-dorsal scales (Table 2).

206 The finding of a new Indo-Pacific invasive species in the Mediterranean prior to its discovery in
207 the Indo-Pacific Ocean or Red Sea is an unusual event, although other such events have been
208 documented. The snapping shrimp *Alpheus migrans* Lewinsohn & Holthuis, 1978, which belongs
209 to an Indo-Pacific species group, was first described from the Mediterranean (Lewinsohn and
210 Holthuis, 1978); the jellyfish *Marivagia stellata* Galil and Gershwin, 2010 was described from the
211 Mediterranean and later on also reported from India (Galil, Kumar and Riyas, 2013); ~~t~~he flounder
212 *Arnoglossus nigrofilamentosus* Fricke, Golani and Appelbaum-Golani 2017 (Fricke, et al. 2017)
213 that is probably a Red Sea species, and the jellyfish *Rhopilema nomadica* Galil, Spanier &
214 Ferguson, 1990 (Galil et al., 1990) was described on the basis of types from the Mediterranean
215 although it is an Indo-Pacific species.

216 Finding this-the new shrimp-associated goby, however, which is also the third such goby to be
217 documented as an invasive species in the Mediterranean, raises the question of its current
218 association with an alpheid shrimp. Since this taxon of gobies possesses either an obligatory or
219 facultative association with shrimps (Lyons, 2013), pairing with one of the approx. twenty

Commented [SB8]: Another example is *Hazeus ingressus* Engin, Larson & Irmak, 2018 was described from Turkey but later was found by reviewer (i.e. me) from Abu Dabab, Egypt.

220 candidate species of alpheid shrimp from the Mediterranean and the Red Sea (Karplus, 2014) is
221 a key factor for its survival and population establishment success in the invaded territory.
222 Unfortunately, the catch of *C. steinhardtii* in this study was not associated with any shrimp species,
223 thus the question of its possible symbiosis in the Mediterranean remains open and required further
224 observations.

225 *Cryptocentrus steinhardtii* was collected at depths of 60 to 80 m during night trawls. Finding this
226 species during the period of dark and beyond the depth limits of recreational diving, despite this
227 possibly having been accidental, could be an additional reason for overlooking this species and its
228 possible shrimp associates to date in its native origin.

229 ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

230 We thank Mr. O. Rittner for the photographs of the fish and to Ms. N. Paz for editing the
231 manuscript.

232 REFERENCES

- 233 Allen, G. R. (2015) 'Descriptions of two new species of shrimp gobies (Gobiidae: *Cryptocentrus*
234 and *Tomiyamichthys*) from Papua New Guinea', *Journal of the Ocean Sciences Foundation*,
235 16, pp. 67–81.
- 236 Allen, G. R. and Randall, J. E. (2011) 'Two new species of shrimp-associated gobies (Gobiidae:
237 *Cryptocentrus*) from the Western Pacific', *Marine Biology Research*, 7(6), pp. 554–564. doi:
238 10.1080/17451000.2010.530545.
- 239 Fricke, R., Eschmeyer, W. N. and van der L. R. (2020) *Eschmeyer's Catalog of Fishes:*
240 *Genera, Species, References.*
- 241 Fricke, R., Golani, D. and Appelbaum-Golani, B. (2017) '*Arnoglossus nigrofilamentosus* n. sp., a
242 new species of flounder (Teleostei: Bothidae) from off the Mediterranean coast of Israel,

Commented [SB9]: Whitley (1956) cited in Table 2 but missing in References

243 probably a new case of Lessepsian migration', *Scientia Marina*, 81(4), pp. 2457-265. doi:
244 10.3989/scimar.04684.07a.

245 Froese, R. and Pauly, D. (2020) *Fishbase. World Wide Web electronic publication., FishBase.*

246 Galil, B. S., Spanier, E., and Ferguson, W. W. (1990) 'The Scyphomedusae of the Mediterranean
247 coast of Israel, including two Lessepsian migrants new to the Mediterranean.', *Zoologische*
248 *mededelingen*, 64(7), pp. 95–105.

249 Galil, B. S. *et al.* (2020) 'Non-indigenous species along the Israeli Mediterranean coast: tally,
250 policy, outlook', *Hydrobiologia*. doi: 10.1007/s10750-020-04420-w.

251 Galil, B. S., Kumar, B. A. and Riyas, A. J. (2013) '*Marivagia stellata* Galil and Gershwin, 2010
252 (Scyphozoa: Rhizostomeae: Cepheidae), found off the coast of Kerala, India', *BioInvasions*
253 *Records*, 2(4), pp. 317–318. doi: 10.3391/bir.2013.2.4.09.

254 Golani, D. and Fricke, R. (2018) Checklist of the Red Sea Fishes with delineation of the Gulf of
255 Suez, Gulf of Aqaba, endemism and Lessepsian migrants, *Zootaxa*, 4509(1), pp. 1-215. doi:
256 10.11646/zootaxa.4509.1.1.

257 Goren, M., Stern, N. and Galil, B. S. (2013) 'Bridging the gap: First record of Mertens' prawn-
258 goby *Vanderhorstia mertensi* in Israel', *Marine Biodiversity Records*, 6. doi:
259 10.1017/S1755267213000419.

260 Hoese, D. (2019) 'A review of the *Cryptocentrus strigilliceus* complex (Teleostei: Gobiidae), with
261 description of a new species', *Journal of the Ocean Science Foundation*, 32, pp. 23–38. doi:
262 10.5281/zenodo.2539733.

263 Hoese D.F., Shibukawa, K. and Johnson, J. W. (2016) 'Description of a new species of
264 *Tomiyamichthys* from Australia with a discussion of the generic name', *Zootaxa*, (4079(52)), pp.
265 582–594. doi: 10.11646/zootaxa.4079.5.5.

266 Karplus, I. (2014) *Symbiosis in fishes: the biology of interspecific partnerships*. John Wiley &
267 Sons. doi: 10.1002/9781118759769.

268 Karplus, I. and Thompson, A. R. (2011) ‘The partnership between gobiid fishes and burrowing
269 alpheid shrimps’, in *The Biology of Gobies* pp. 559-607. doi: 10.1201/b11397-29.

270 Kumar, S. *et al.* (2018) ‘MEGA X: molecular evolutionary genetics analysis across computing
271 platforms’, *Molecular biology and evolution*, 35(6), pp. 1547–1549.

272 Lewinsohn, C. and Holthuis, L. B. (1978) ‘On a new species of *Alpheus* (Crustacea Decapoda,
273 Natantia) from the eastern Mediterranean’, *Zoologische Mededelingen*, 53, pp. 75–82.

274 Lyons, P. J. (2013) ‘The benefit of obligate versus facultative strategies in a shrimp-goby
275 mutualism’, *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*, 67(5), pp. 737-745. doi: 10.1007/s00265-
276 013-1497-6.

277 McCraney, W. T., Thacker, C. E. and Alfaro, M. E. (2020) ‘Supermatrix phylogeny resolves goby
278 lineages and reveals unstable root of Gobiaria’, *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, 151,
279 106862. doi: 10.1016/j.ympev.2020.106862.

280 Miller, P. J. (1986) ‘Gobiidae’, in P. J. P. Whitehead, M.-L. Bauchot, J.-C. Hureau, J. N. and E. T.
281 (ed.) *Fishes of the North-eastern Atlantic and the Mediterranean*.

282 Ray, D., Mohapatra, A. and Larson, H. K. (2018) ‘First record of the shrimp-associate gobiid fish
283 *Cryptocentrus filifer* (Valenciennes) from the Indian coast’, *Indian Journal of Geo-Marine*
284 *Sciences*, 47(4), pp. 798–801.

285 Rothman, S. B. S. and Goren, M. (2015) ‘First record of the Red Sea shrimp-goby *Cryptocentrus*
286 *caeruleopunctatus* in the Mediterranean Sea’, *Marine Biodiversity Records*, 8. doi:
287 10.1017/S1755267215001323.

288 Shibukawa, K. and Suzuki, T. (2004) ‘*Vanderhorstia papilio*, a new shrimp-associated goby from

289 the Ryukyu Islands, Japan (Perciformes: Gobiidae: Gobiinae), with comments on the limits of
290 the genus', *Ichthyological Research*, 51(2), pp. 113-119. doi: 10.1007/s10228-004-0206-x.

291 Thacker, C. E. (2015) 'Biogeography of goby lineages (Gobiiformes: Gobioidae): Origin,
292 invasions and extinction throughout the Cenozoic', *Journal of Biogeography*, 42(9), pp. 1615–
293 1625. doi: 10.1111/jbi.12545.

294 Thacker, C. E. and Roje, D. M. (2011) 'Phylogeny of Gobiidae and identification of gobiid
295 lineages', *Systematics and Biodiversity*, 9(4), pp. 329–347.
296 doi: 10.1080/14772000.2011.629011.

297 Thacker, C. E., Thompson, A. R. and Roje, D. M. (2011) 'Phylogeny and evolution of Indo-Pacific
298 shrimp-associated gobies (Gobiiformes: Gobiidae)', *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*,
299 59(1), pp. 168–176. doi: 10.1016/j.ympev.2011.02.007.

Table 1 Selected meristic characteristics and proportions (Measurements in mm; proportion in %)

Measurements and counts	Fish catalogue number (SMHTAU)		
	16037	16038	14556
Total length	81.9	72.8	71.46
Standard length	58.5	51.1	49.95
Head length	14.8	14.2	12.9
Body depth	8.9	7.8	7.6
Head width	5.8	5.4	5.1
Eye diameter	3.44	4	3.6
Interorbital	1.1	1.1	1
Distance snout to origin of first dorsal fin	18	16.9	14.8
Distance snout to origin of second dorsal fin	30.2	29.2	25.8
Distance snout to origin of anal fin	33.4	30.5	28
No. of scale series along the body	61	59	60
No. of scale in transversal series	20	21	19
No. pre-dorsal scales	21	20	20
No. of spines in first dorsal fin	6	6	6
No. of spines/ segmented rays in second dorsal fin	$I_2 \pm 10$	$I_2 \pm 10$	$I_2 \pm 10$
No. of spines/ segmented rays in anal fin	$I_2 \pm 9$	$I_2 \pm 9$	$I_2 \pm 9$
No. of rays in pectoral fin (left side)	15	15	15
No. of caudal rays	17	17	17
Count of gill rakers on upper areh limb	2	2	2
Count of gill rakers on upper areh limb	5	4	4
Count of gill rakers at arch angle	1	1	1
Total count of gill rakers	8	7	7
Proportions (in %)			
Standard length of total length	71.4	70.2	69.9
Head length of standard length	25.3	27.8	25.8
Body depth of standard length	15.2	15.3	15.2
Eye diameter of head length	23.2	28.2	27.9
Interorbital space of head length	7.4	7.7	7.8
Distance snout to origin of first dorsal fin	30.8	33.1	29.6
Distance snout to origin of second dorsal fin	51.6	57.1	51.7
Distance snout to origin of anal fin	57.1	59.7	56.1

Table 2 Selected meristic counts of “*Cryptocentrus* low scale count” group.

Species	LL	2 nd D	A	PreD-Mid line
<i>Cryptocentrus steinhardti</i> n. sp.	59-61 ¹	I ₂ ±10	I ₂ ±9	20-21
<i>Cryptocentrus cyanospilotus</i>	49-59 ²	I ₂ ±10	I ₂ ±9	10-13
<i>Cryptocentrus caeruleomaculatus</i>	60 ²	I ₂ ±10	I ₂ ±9	none
<i>Cryptocentrus strigilliceus</i>	50-71 ²	I ₂ ±10	I ₂ ±9	“Predorsal midline and sides scaled to a point just before to just behind posterior preopercular margin” (Hoese, 2019)
<i>Cryptocentrus insignitus</i>	52-55 ¹	I ₂ ±12	I ₂ ±11	Nape and shoulders incompletely scaled (Whitley, 1956).
<i>Cryptocentrus altipinna</i>	56-65 ²	I ₂ ±10	I ₂ ±9	none
<i>Cryptocentrus epakros</i>	47 ²	I ₂ ±10	I ₂ ±9	19

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Formatted: Font: Not Italic