1 Two new syntopic species of glassfrogs (Amphibia,

Centrolenidae, Centrolene) from the southwestern

Andes of Ecuador

4 5

2

3

Diego F. Cisneros-Heredia^{1,2}, Mario H. Yánez-Muñoz¹, Juan C. Sánchez-Nivicela^{1,2,3}, Santiago
R. Ron⁴

8

- 9 ¹ Instituto Nacional de Biodiversidad, División de Herpetología, Quito, Ecuador
- ² Universidad San Francisco de Quito USFQ, Colegio de Ciencias Biológicas y Ambientales,
- 11 Instituto de Biodiversidad Tropical IBIOTROP, Laboratorio de Zoología Terrestre, Museo de
- 12 Zoología, Quito, Ecuador
- 13 ³ Universidad Nacional de Colombia, Facultad de Ciencias, Grupo de Investigación en Evolución
- 14 y Ecología de Fauna Neotropical, Bogotá D.C., Colombia
- ⁴ Pontificia Universidad Católica del Ecuador, Escuela de Biología, Museo de Zoología, Quito,
- 16 Ecuador

17

- 18 Corresponding Author:
- 19 Diego F. Cisneros-Heredia
- 20 Universidad San Francisco de Quito USFQ, Colegio de Ciencias Biológicas y Ambientales,
- 21 Instituto de Biodiversidad Tropical IBIOTROP, Laboratorio de Zoología Terrestre, Museo de
- 22 Zoología, Quito, Ecuador
- 23 Email address: diego.cisnerosheredia@gmail.com

24 25

Abstract

- We describe two new species of glassfrogs of the genus Centrolene living in syntopy at La
- 27 Enramada, province of Azuay, southwestern Ecuador. They were found in a small creek in
- 28 montane evergreen forests at 2900 m elevation. The first new species is distinguished from all
- 29 other members of the genus *Centrolene* by having the following combination of characters:
- dentigerous process of vomer absent; sloping snout in lateral view; thick, white labial stripe and
- a faint white line between the lip and anterior ½ of body; humeral spine in adult males; parietal
- 32 peritoneum covered by iridophores, visceral peritonea translucent (except pericardium); ulnar
- and tarsal ornamentation; dorsal skin shagreen with dispersed warts; uniform green dorsum with
- 34 light yellowish green warts; and green bones. This new species is remarkable by being sister to a
- 35 species from the opposite Andean versant, C. condor. The second new species is distinguished
- 36 from all other *Centrolene* by having the following combination of characters: dentigerous
- 37 process of vomer absent; round snout in lateral view; thin, yellowish labial stripe with a row of
- 38 white tubercles between the lip and arm insertion, and a yellowish line between arm insertion
- 39 and groin; uniform green dorsum; humeral spine in adult males; parietal peritoneum covered by

- 40 iridophores, visceral peritonea translucent (except pericardium); dorsal skin shagreen with
- dispersed spicules; ulnar and tarsal ornamentation; and green bones. The second new species is
- 42 the sister to *C. sabini* and an undescribed species of *Centrolene* from southeastern Ecuador.
- 43 Based on nuclear and mitochondrial DNA sequences, we present a new phylogeny for
- 44 *Centrolene* and comment on the phylogenetic relationships inside the genus.

Introduction

- 47 Glassfrogs of the genus Centrolene Jiménez de la Espada, 1872 are distributed across the Andes,
- from the Merida Massif in Venezuela to the Kosñipata Valley in southern Peru (Frost, 2021).
- While no morphological synapomorphies are known for *Centrolene*, its monophyly is well-
- supported (Guayasamin et al., 2009, 2020; Catenazzi et al., 2012; Twomey, Delia & Castroviejo-
- 51 Fisher, 2014). The following combination of morphological characters is helpful to diagnose
- 52 Centrolene: presence of humeral spines in adult males of most species—except Centrolene
- 53 daidalea (Ruiz-Carranza & Lynch, 1991a) and C. savagei (Ruiz-Carranza & Lynch, 1991a);
- 54 liver lobed and covered by translucent hepatic peritoneum; pericloacal warts enamelled; bones
- green in life; background colouration of dorsum in preservative lavender (Ruiz-Carranza &
- 56 Lynch, 1991b; Cisneros-Heredia & McDiarmid, 2007; Guayasamin et al., 2009; Catenazzi et al.,
- 57 2012).

58

- Twelve species of *Centrolene* have been reported from Ecuador: *C. ballux* (Duellman &
- 60 Burrowes, 1989); C. buckleyi (Boulenger, 1882); C. charapita Twomey, Delia, & Castroviejo-
- 61 Fisher, 2014; C. condor (Cisneros-Heredia & Morales-Mite, 2008); C. geckoidea Jimenez de la
- 62 Espada, 1872; C. heloderma (Duellman, 1981); C. huilensis (Ruiz-Carranza & Lynch, 1995), C.
- 63 lynchi (Duellman, 1980), C. medemi (Cochran and Goin, 1970), C. peristicta (Lynch &
- 64 Duellman, 1973), C. pipilata (Lynch & Duellman, 1973), and Centrolene C. sanchezi (Ruiz-
- 65 Carranza & Lynch, 1991c) (Lynch & Duellman, 1973; Cisneros-Heredia & McDiarmid, 2005,
- 66 2006; Cisneros-Heredia & Yánez-Muñoz, 2007a; Cisneros-Heredia & Morales-Mite, 2008;
- 67 Guayasamin et al., 2020). Six of them inhabit the north-western slopes of the Cordillera
- 68 Occidental of the Andes of Ecuador: C. ballux, C. buckleyi, C. geckoidea, C. heloderma, C.
- 69 *lynchi* and *C. peristicta*. Still, only *C. heloderma* has been reported from the southwestern slopes.
- 70 Yánez-Muñoz et al. (2015) preliminarily informed of the presence of C. heloderma in the
- southwestern Andes of Ecuador based on three specimens collected at La Enramada, province of
- 72 Azuay. However, molecular analyses show that they belong to two different and undescribed
- 73 species of *Centrolene* found together at one of the last remnants of montane forests in the region.
- We are pleased to describe these two new species in this publication.

75 76

77

Materials & Methods

- **Ethics statement**
- 78 Our study was authorised under framework contracts for access to genetic resources MAE-DNB-
- 79 CM-2016-0045 and MAE-DNB-CM-2019-0120, issued by the Ministerio del Ambiente del

Ecuador. We followed the standard guidelines for using live amphibians and reptiles in field research by Beaupre et al. (2004).

82 83

84

85

Species concept

We consider species as separately evolving metapopulation lineages, recognisable from an operational point of view to the extent that isolation from their putative sister lineages can be inferred (De Queiroz, 2007).

86 87 88

Taxonomic sampling

- 89 Specimens from the following collections were examined: División de Herpetología, Museo
- 90 Ecuatoriano de Ciencias Naturales, Instituto Nacional de Biodiversidad, Quito (DHMECN);
- 91 University of Kansas Natural History Museum, Lawrence (KU); Museo de Zoología, Pontificia
- 92 Universidad Católica del Ecuador, Quito (QCAZ); National Museum of Natural History,
- 93 Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. (USNM).

94

- 95 Information on species for comparative diagnoses was obtained from the literature (Duellman &
- 96 Schulte, 1993; Señaris & Ayarzaguena, 2005; Cisneros-Heredia & McDiarmid, 2007; Catenazzi
- et al., 2012; Twomey, Delia & Castroviejo-Fisher, 2014; Guayasamin et al., 2020) and the
- 98 following examined specimens: *Centrolene ballux* (12 specimens): ECUADOR: <u>province of</u>
- 99 <u>Carchi</u>: 5 km W La Gruel (KU 202798); <u>province of Pichincha</u>: Las Gralarias (QCAZ 40195–
- 100 97); 14 km W of Chiriboga (KU 164726–32); Quebrada Zapadores (KU 164733). *Centrolene C.*
- 101 *buckleyi* (44 specimens): ECUADOR: province of Bolívar: Guanujo (DHMECN 0866–67);
- province of Carchi: Los Encinos (DHMECN 1246); Cabaña Las Orquídeas Morán (DHMECN
- 103 13375, 13376, 13828, 14180); province of Cotopaxi: Pilalo (USNM 288428); province of Napo:
- Santa Bárbara (USNM 311113–14); province of Pichincha: Quito (USNM 288423); 8.5 km (by
- 105 road) NW of Nono (USNM 286626–27); Machachi (USNM 286628–29); 21.2 km (by road) ESE
- of Chiriboga (USNM 286630–31); 8 km to Chiriboga (USNM 288424); province of Sucumbios:
- near Santa Bárbara (DHMECN 868–893). Centrolene C. condor (7 specimens): ECUADOR:
- 108 province of Zamora Chinchipe: Destacamento Militar Cóndor Mirador (OCAZ 37279); Paquisha
- 109 Alto (DHMECN11208–11210); Concesión Colibrí (DHMECN 12049); Concesión La Zarza
- 110 (DHMECN12053); province of Morona-Santiago: near Reserva Biológica El Quimi (QCAZ
- 111 72514). Centrolene C. heloderma (11 specimens): ECUADOR: province of Pichincha:
- 112 Quebrada Zapadores (USNM 211219–21); 13.1 km NW of Nono (USNM 211216–7); 8.6 km SE
- of Tandayapa (USNM 211218); Reserva Las Gralarias (QCAZ 40200, 50722); 14 km W of
- 114 Chiriboga (QCAZ 44881); province of Carchi: Reserva Dracula, El Guapilal (DHMECN 14999-
- 115 15000). Additional specimens examined during our studies in Centrolenidae are listed in
- 116 Cisneros-Heredia & McDiarmid (2007) and Guayasamin et al. (2020).

117118

Fieldwork

- 119 Fieldwork was conducted at La Enramada (3.161074 °S; 79.600045 °W, 2900 m), province of
- 120 Azuay, Ecuador, during expeditions of the Instituto Nacional de Biodiversidad INABIO on 21–
- 121 31 March 2015, 13–17 April 2019 and 06–11 December 2022. We used visual encounter surveys
- 122 for herpetological searches (Crump & Scott, Jr., 1994). Only the first expedition in March 2015
- 123 resulted in the collection of specimens of the new species described herein. Individuals were
- 124 photographed alive and euthanised with benzocaine, a muscle tissue sample was extracted and
- 125 preserved in 95% ethanol, and whole specimens were fixed in 10% formalin and preserved in
- 126 75% ethanol.

Morphology and colouration

- 129 Diagnosis, terminology, and adult characters and measurements follow the format and
- definitions proposed by Cisneros-Heredia & McDiarmid (2007). All characteristics reported in 130
- 131 the description of the type series are from adult specimens. Sex and maturity were determined by
- 132 directly examining gonads through dissections and noting the presence of secondary sexual
- 133 characters (i.e., vocal slits and nuptial pads). All morphometric data were measured with a digital
- 134 calliper (0.05 mm accuracy, rounded to the nearest 0.1 mm) under a stereomicroscope, reported
- as a range (mean ± standard deviation), and included: snout-vent length (SVL), head length 135
- 136 (HL), head width (HW), interorbital distance (IOD), eye diameter (ED), internarial distance
- 137 (IND), eye-nostril distance (EN), tympanum diameter (TD), tibia length (TL), foot length (FL),
- 138 hand length (HAL), Finger III disk width (Fin3DW). Colour patterns are described based on
- 139 photographs of live specimens taken in the field. The adjective "enamelled" describes the shiny
- 140 white colouration produced by an accumulation of iridophores (Lynch & Duellman, 1973;
- 141 Cisneros-Heredia & McDiarmid, 2007).

142

143

Phylogenetic analyses and genetic distances

- To assess the evolutionary relationships of the new species, we sequenced three mitochondrial 144
- 145 genes (12S rRNA, 16S rRNA, and NADH dehydrogenase subunit 1 ND1) and two nuclear genes
- 146 (RAG1 and C-MYC 2). DNA was extracted from muscle or liver tissue preserved in 95%
- 147 ethanol or tissue storage buffer using standard phenol-chloroform extraction protocols
- (Sambrook, Fritsch & Maniatis, 1989). PCR amplification was performed under standard 148
- 149 protocols and sequenced by the Macrogen Sequencing Team (Macrogen Inc., Seoul, Korea). We
- also added a short new sequence of C. lynchi QCAZ 40192 (3' end of 16S, tRNA-Leu, and 5' 150
- 151 beginning of ND1) because in a preliminary phylogeny, C. lynchi GenBank sequences QCAZ
- 40192 and QCAZ 40191, from the same population, unexpectedly, came out separate. Upon 152
- 153 further inspection, we realised they lacked overlapping sequences, and the new sequence
- 154 overlapped with a fragment of QCAZ 40191.

155

- 156 Our phylogeny is based on sequences of *Centrolene* from GenBank (published by Guayasamin et
- 157 al., 2008, 2020; Castroviejo-Fisher et al., 2014; Twomey, Delia & Castroviejo-Fisher, 2014) and
- 158 new sequences of the new species. We analysed the mitochondrial genes 12S rRNA, 16S rRNA,

- ND1 and the nuclear genes BDNF, C-MYC 2, CXCR4, POMC, RAG1, SLC8A1, SLC8A3, for a
- total of 10 loci and up to 6355 bp. We also included Genbank sequences of species of
- 161 Allophryne, Celsiella, Chimerella, Cochranella, Espadarana, Hyalinobatrachium, Ikakogi,
- Nymphargus, Rulyrana, Sachatamia, Teratohyla, and Vitreorana. The phylogeny was rooted
- with Allophryne ruthveni (specimen MAD1857; outgroup choice based on Twomey, Delia &
- 164 Castroviejo-Fisher, 2014). The matrix had 61 terminals. GenBank accession numbers for newly
- generated sequences are in Table 1.

- Raw sequences were assembled with Geneious 9.1.8 software (Biomatters Ltd.). Sequences were
- aligned using MAFFT 7.017 and the L-INS-I algorithm (Katoh & Standley 2013). The alignment
- was visually inspected in Mesquite (version 3.61; Maddison & Maddison 2019), and alignment
- 170 errors were adjusted manually. We partitioned the matrix to allow separate evolution models for
- each gene and codon position (except for 12S and 16S non-coding) for a total of 26 partitions.
- We used the command -*m MPF* (Chernomor et al. 2016; Kalyaanamoorthy et al. 2017) in the
- software IQ-TREE multicore version 2.2.0 (Minh et al. 2020). The phylogeny was estimated
- under maximum likelihood using IQ-TREE 2.2.0 under default settings. To assess branch
- support, we made 200 non-parametric bootstrap searches (-b 200 command) and 1000 replicates
- 176 for the SH-like approximate likelihood ratio test (-alrt 1000 command; (Guindon et al. 2010). We
- 177 considered that branches with bootstrap values > 70 and SH-aLRT values > 80 had strong
- support. Pairwise uncorrected p-genetic distances were calculated with the software MEGA
- 179 11.0.13 (Tamura, Stecher & Kumar, 2021). The standard error of the genetic distance was
- 180 estimated with the bootstrap method. For accuracy, we only compared overlapping fragments
- longer than 400 bp.

182 183

Nomenclatural acts

- The electronic version of this article in Portable Document Format (PDF) will represent a
- published work according to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature (ICZN).
- Hence the new names contained in the electronic version are effectively published under that
- 187 Code from the electronic edition alone. This published work and its nomenclatural acts have
- been registered in ZooBank, the online registration system for the ICZN. The ZooBank LSIDs
- 189 (Life Science Identifiers) can be resolved, and the associated information viewed through any
- standard web browser by appending the LSID to the prefix http://zoobank.org/. The LSID for
- this publication is urn:lsid: zoobank.org:pub:A2A88B00-DA2C-443E-BC8B-9922980F8789.
- The online version of this work is archived and available from the following digital repositories:
- 193 PeerJ, PubMed Central and CLOCKSS.

194

195196

197

Results

Phylogenetic relationships

- 198 Our phylogenetic treey (Fig. 1) is generally consistent with previous phylogenetic analysesies of 199 Centrolenidae (e.g., Twomey, Delia & Castroviejo-Fisher, 2014; Guayasamin et al., 2020). 200 Unlike Guayasamin et al. (2020), we found a clade that excludes C. charapita and C. geckoidea 201 and unites two sister subclades: (C. savagei + (C. daidalea + C. sp. Ca01)) + (C. antioquiense + 202 C. peristicta)) and a clade containing all remaining species of Centrolene. The two new species 203 described herein belong to the later subclade. We included two specimens of C. condor in our 204 phylogeny. We identify specimen QCAZ 72514 as C. condor based on its morphology, 205 colouration, and distribution—it was collected near the species' type locality. Specimen QCAZ 44896 is a tadpole and was reported as an undescribed species by Guayasamin et al. (2020), but 206 207 it is closely related to QCAZ 72514 and is herein reported as C. condor. Specimen QCAZ 47338, 208 reported as C. condor by Guayasamin et al. (2020), is considered an undescribed species. 209
- 210 The first new species is strongly supported as sister to C. condor, a species only known from the 211 Cordillera del Cóndor, southeastern Ecuador. The uncorrected-p genetic distance between them 212 is 1.04% (SE = 0.338%) for the gene 12S. In *Centrolene*, at least two pairs of sister species are 213 separated by distances (gene 12S) lower than 1%: C. altitudinale vs C. notosticta (0.8%) and C. 214 peristicta vs C. antioquiense (0.6–0.7%). Therefore, the 12S genetic distance between the first 215 species and C. condor falls within the observed range of interspecific distances for the genus. 216 The genetic distance between C. condor and the first new species for ND1 ranges from 6.1% (SE 217 = 0.786%) to 6.5% (SE = 0.818%). The second new species is sister to a clade composed of C. 218 sabini (from southeastern Peru) and an undescribed species of Centrolene from southeastern 219 Ecuador (MRy 547, referred to as [Ca1] by Amador et al. 2018). The uncorrected p-genetic 220 distance (12S) between the second new species and C. sabini is 2.9% (SE = 0.549%), while the 221 distance with Centrolene sp. (MRy 547) is 3.7% (SE = 0.709%).

Species descriptions

222223

224225

226

227

228229

230

231232

233

234

Centrolene camposi sp. nov.

LSID urn:lsid:zoobank.org:act:868316B5-0ED5-4A21-AE3A-0488D98E418B (Figs. 2–6)

Centrolene heloderma Yánez-Muñoz et al. (2015)

Centrolene sp. 2. Bejarano-Muñoz, Sánchez-Nivicela & Yánez-Muñoz (2019)

Proposed Spanish common name. Rana de Cristal de Campos

Proposed English common name: Campos' Glassfrog

Holotype. DHMECN 11407 (field number 3566), adult male (Fig. 2–3) from La Enramada
(3.1628°S; 79.5886°W, 2950 m), provincia de Azuay, República del Ecuador, collected by J.
Sánchez-Nivicela on 31 March 2015.

Paratype. DHMECN 11408, adult male, same data as holotype.

239240241

242

243244

245246

247

248

249250

251

252

253

254

255256

257

258259

260

261

262

263

264

265

266

238

Definition. Centrolene camposi sp. nov. is distinguished from all other Centrolenidae by the following combination of characters: (1) dentigerous process of vomer absent; (2) snout rounded to subacuminate in dorsal view, sloping in lateral view; (3) tympanic annulus barely visible, lower ³/₄ visible, tympanic membrane coloured as dorsal skin, supratympanic fold present and low; (4) dorsal skin shagreen with dispersed low and rounded warts, and microspicules and spicules present (at least in males); (5) ventral skin granular, subcloacal area enamelled, strongly granular with two large subcloacal warts and with enamelled cloacal sheath; (6) parietal peritoneum white, iridophores covering 2/3 the parietal peritoneum; pericardium covered by iridophores, all other visceral peritonea clear (condition V1); (7) liver lobed (five lobes) and hepatic peritoneum clear (lacking iridophore layer, condition H0); (8) adult males with projecting humeral spine; (9) basal webbing between fingers I and II, moderate webbing between fingers II and IV, II $(2^{-}-2)-3^{+}$ III $2\frac{1}{2}-2^{+}$ IV; (10) toe webbing I $(1^{-}-1\frac{1}{2})-(2-2^{+})$ II $(0^{+}-1^{-})-(2\frac{1}{2}-1)$ 2^+) III $(1^+-1\frac{1}{2})-2\frac{1}{2}$ IV $2\frac{1}{2}-1\frac{1}{2}$ V; (11) low, enamelled metacarpal fold continuing with elevated, thick, enamelled ulnar fold; elevated, low, enamelled metatarsal and tarsal fold; low tarsal fringe on inner tarsus; (12) nuptial excrescences type I; concealed prepollex; (13) Finger I shorter than Finger II; (14) diameter of eye larger than width of disc on Finger III; (15) colour in life, bright green dorsum, thick yellowish-white labial stripe continuing into a faint yellowish line between lip and anterior ¼ of body, yellowish green flanks, hidden surfaces of limbs and digits, enamelled metacarpal, ulnar, metatarsal and tarsal folds, bones green; (16) colour in preservative, lavender dorsum with translucent spicules, enamelled labial stripe continuing into a faint enamelled line between lip and anterior ¼ of body, faint enamelled metacarpal, ulnar, metatarsal and tarsal folds; (17) iris coloration in life, white background, flesh coloured towards the centre, fine brown reticulations; (18) melanophores present on dorsal surfaces of hands and feet and at the base of Finger IV, Toe IV, and Toe V; (19) males call from upper side of leaves; advertisement call unknown; (20) fighting behaviour unknown; (21) egg masses and parental care unknown; (22) tadpoles undescribed; (23) snout-vent length in adult males 29.1–31.2 mm (n=2), females unknown.

267268269

270

271

272273

274275

276

277

Diagnosis. Centrolene camposi sp. nov. differs from all other glassfrogs, except *C. altitudinale*, *C. buckleyi*, *C. heloderma*, *C. hesperia*, *C. lemniscata*, and *C. venezuelense* by having a combination of the following characters: absence of dentigerous process of vomer, sloping snout in lateral view, light labial stripe, humeral spine in adult males, parietal peritoneum covered by iridophores, visceral peritonea translucent (except pericardium), ulnar and tarsal ornamentation, green bones. Centrolene altitudinale differs from *C. camposi* sp. nov. by having (characters of *C. camposi* sp. nov. in parentheses) truncate snout in dorsal view (rounded to subacuminate), tympanic annulus ½ visible (tympanic annulus barely visible), green dorsum with white dorsal spots in life (uniform green dorsum with light green warts); row of small, non-connected,

enamelled tubercles on outer borders of hand, ulna, and tarsus (enamelled folds). Centrolene buckleyi and C. venezuelense differ by having ulnar and tarsal folds low or absent (elevated and thick ulnar and tarsal folds). Centrolene heloderma differs by having pustular dorsal skin (shagreen with dispersed warts), tympanic annulus completely visible (tympanic annulus barely visible), grey lavender dorsum in preservative (lavender), outer tarsal fold with low white tubercles (enamelled fold without tubercles), and humeral spine distinctly projected from arm (humeral spine curved towards arm). Centrolene hesperia differs by having weakly truncate snout in dorsal view (rounded to subacuminate), less hand webbing, II 2+-3½ III 3--2½ IV (II $(2^{-}-2)-3^{+}$ III $2\frac{1}{2}-2^{+}$ IV). Centrolene lemniscata differs by having round snout in dorsal and lateral views (sloping in lateral view), arms and legs lacking dermal folds (present), and a white lateral stripe extending from arm insertion to groin. The second new species of *Centrolene* described in this work differs from C. camposi sp. nov. (characters of the later in parenthesis) by its round snout in lateral view (sloping), thin yellowish labial stripe (thick, white labial stripe), row of white tubercles between lip and arm insertion (white tubercles absent), yellowish line between arm insertion and groin (faint white line between lip and anterior 1/4 of body), warts and spicules on dorsum with same colour as surrounding dorsal surfaces (warts and spicules on dorsum lighter than surrounding dorsal surfaces). Centrolene condor, sister species of C. camposi sp. nov., differs by having a green dorsum with abundant yellowish-white flecks and abundant dark flecks (bright uniformly green dorsum, sometimes with dark flecks); iris cream yellow with fine dark reticulation (white background, flesh coloured towards the centre, fine brown reticulations); and vomerine teeth present (absent).

278

279

280

281 282

283

284

285

286287

288

289 290

291292

293

294

295

296

297

298

299 300

301 302

303

304

305

306 307

308

309

β10 311

312313

314

315

316

317

Description of the holotype. Adult male, moderate-sized, SVL = 29.1 mm (Figs. 2–5). Head distinct, wider than long, and wider than body; HW/HL = 1.10, HW/SVL = 0.38, HL/SVL = 0.35. Snout short, EN/HL = 0.24; nostrils slightly elevated, producing a shallow depression in the internarial area, loreal region concave; canthus rostralis rounded; lips flared. Small-size eyes, ED/HL = 0.31, directed anterolaterally at about 50° from midline, interorbital area wider than eye diameter, IOD/ED = 1.71, EN/ED = 0.77, EN/IOD = 0.58. Tympanic annulus oriented dorsolaterally, weak supratympanic fold above upper portion of tympanum and extending down to shoulder. Dentigerous processes of vomers absent; choanae rounded, large; tongue rounded, indented posteriorly; vocal slits present, extending from anterior base of tongue to angles of jaws.

Skin of dorsal surfaces of head, body and limbs shagreen with dispersed low warts, some warts are non-clustered translucent spicules, and the skin is covered by non-clustered microspicules, infratympanic area with spicules. Skin of ventral surfaces of body granular, on throat, chest, and limbs fairly granular. Cloacal opening directed posteriorly at upper level of thighs, distinct enamelled cloacal sheath; subcloacal area enamelled and granular, with a pair of large, round, flat subcloacal warts on ventral surfaces of thighs below vent.

Upper arm thin, forearm moderately robust. Humeral spine present and externally visible, but not piercing the skin. Relative lengths of fingers III > IV > II > I; finger discs wider than the adjacent phalanx, nearly truncate; disc on third finger about the same size than those on toes, ED/Fin3DW = 1.48; subarticular tubercles rounded and elevated, supernumerary tubercles present; palmar tubercle large, rounded, elevated; thenar tubercle elliptic. Concealed prepollex, unpigmented nuptial excrescences present, Type I on dorsolateral side of thumbs.

Hind limbs slender; TL/SVL = 0.54, FL/SVL = 0.49. Inner metatarsal tubercle large and elliptical; outer metatarsal tubercle indistinct. Subarticular tubercles rounded and low, supernumerary tubercles small, rather indistinct. Toe discs bluntly truncate, no papillae on tip of disc of toes.

 Colouration of holotype in life. (Fig. 2–3) Bright green dorsal colouration, with some warts slightly lighter green; thick, yellowish-white labial stripe continuing into a faint yellowish line between lip and anterior ¼ of body; yellowish-green flanks and hidden surfaces of limbs; enamelled metacarpal, ulnar, metatarsal, and tarsal folds; yellowish white venter. Iris with grey background, fleshed coloured towards the centre, fine brown reticulations. Discs orange to red in Fingers II, III and IV on the left hand, Fingers II and IV on the right hand, and Toe V on both feet. Yellowish green webbing between fingers and toes. Bones green.

Colouration of holotype in ethanol. (Figs. 4–5) Lavender dorsum with translucent spicules; enamelled labial stripe continuing into a faint enamelled line between lip and anterior ½ of body; flanks lighter lavender than dorsal surfaces; faint enamelled metacarpal, ulnar, metatarsal, and tarsal folds; venter cream. Melanophores present on dorsal surfaces of hands and feet and at the base of Finger IV, Toe IV, and Toe V. Parietal peritoneum white, iridophores covering 2/3 the parietal peritoneum; pericardium covered by iridophores, all other visceral peritonea clear.

Measurements in mm: Measurements of the holotype are followed by those of the paratype in parentheses: SVL = 29.1 (31.2), HL = 10.1 (11.1), HW = 11.1 (11.5), IOD = 5.3 (5.7), ED = 3.1 (3.4), IND = 2.7 (2.9), EN = 2.4 (2.4), TD = 1.0 (1.2), TL = 15.8 (17.0), FL = 14.3 (14.8), HAL = 11.1 (11.6), Fin3DW = 2.1 (2.2).

 Variation. Morphologically the paratype is very similar to the holotype, except for its snout subacuminate in dorsal view. Morphometric variation is reported in the previous section. The paratype shows dorsal warts lighter green than the holotype, almost looking like bright yellowish green dots, and has some dorsal dark flecks. The enamelled line on the anterior ½ of the body is thinner than in the holotype.

Etymology. The specific name of this new taxon is patronymic in honour of Felipe Campos-Yánez, a distinguished Ecuadorian zoologist, free thinker, and passionate conservationist. His

biological collections are deposited in the country's main museums, and he has left a legacy of contributions to biodiversity conservation throughout his 30 years of professional career.

Distribution and Natural History. *Centrolene camposi* sp. nov. is known only from its type locality in the province of Azuay, near the border with the province of El Oro, on the southwestern slopes of the Cordillera Occidental of the Andes of Ecuador (Fig. 7), inhabiting montane evergreen forests at 2900 m elevation. This ecosystem is characterized by trees greater than 15 m in height and densely loaded with epiphytes, such as bromeliads, mosses, and orchids. Both individuals of *C. camposi* sp. nov. were found together with *C. ericsmithi* sp. nov., in a steep creek. *Centrolene camposi* sp. nov. is also sympatric with *Pristimantis allpapuyu* Yánez-Muñoz, Sánchez-Nivicela & Reyes-Puig, 2016, four undescribed species of *Pristimantis*, and one *Gastrotheca*.

Centrolene ericsmithi sp. nov.

Centrolene heloderma Yánez-Muñoz et al. (2015) Centrolene sp. 1. Bejarano-Muñoz, Sánchez-Nivicela & Yánez-Muñoz (2019)

Proposed Spanish common name: Rana de Cristal de Smith **Proposed English common name:** Smith's Glassfrog

Holotype. DHMECN 11406 (field number 3546), adult male (Fig. 2–3) from La Enramada (3.1628°S; 79.5886°W, 2950 m), provincia de Azuay, República del Ecuador, collected by J. Sánchez-Nivicela on 31 March 2015.

Diagnosis. Centrolene ericsmithi sp. nov. is distinguished from all other Centrolenidae by the following combination of characters: (1) dentigerous process of vomer absent; (2) snout round in dorsal and lateral views; (3) tympanic annulus barely visible, lower ³/₄ visible, tympanic membrane coloured as dorsal skin, supratympanic fold present and low; (4) dorsal skin shagreen with dispersed spicules, and covered by microspicules; (5) ventral skin granular, subcloacal area enamelled, strongly granular with two slightly larger subcloacal warts and enamelled cloacal sheath; (6) parietal peritoneum white, iridophores covering ¹/₂ parietal peritoneum; pericardium covered by iridophores, all other visceral peritonea clear (condition V1); (7) liver lobed and hepatic peritoneum clear (lacking iridophore layer, condition H0); (8) adult males with projecting humeral spine; (9) basal webbing between fingers I and III, moderate webbing between fingers III and IV, III 2²/₃ –2¹/₂ IV; (10) toe webbing I 2⁻–2⁺ II 1⁻–2¹/₃ III 2⁻–2¹/₂ IV 2¹/₂–2⁻ V; (11) enamelled metacarpal area without fold continuing with low, slightly elevated,

enamelled ulnar fold; low, enamelled metatarsal and tarsal fold; low tarsal fringe on inner tarsus; (12) nuptial excrescences type I; concealed prepollex; (13) Finger I shorter than Finger II; (14) diameter of eye larger than width of disc on Finger III; (15) colour in life, bright green dorsum, thin yellowish labial stripe continuing with a row of white tubercles towards arm insertion, yellowish line between arm insertion and groin, enamelled metacarpal area, enamelled ulnar, metatarsal and tarsal fold, bones green; (16) colour in preservative, lavender dorsum with translucent spicules, enamelled labial stripe, enamelled line between arm insertion and groin; (17) iris coloration in life, flesh colour background, fine brown reticulations; (18) few melanophores present on dorsal surfaces of hands and feet and at the base of Finger IV, Toe IV, and Toe V; (19) males call from upper side of leaves; advertisement call unknown; (20) fighting behaviour unknown; (21) egg masses and parental care unknown; (22) tadpoles undescribed; (23) snout-vent length (SVL) in adult male 27.3 mm (n=1), females unknown.

409 410 411

412

413

414

415 416

417

418

419

420

421

422

423 424

425

426

427 428

429

430

431 432

433

434

435

436

437

398

399

400

401

402

403

404

405

406

407

408

Comparisons. Centrolene ericsmithi sp. nov. differs from all other glassfrogs, except from C. altitudinale, C. buckleyi, C. heloderma, C. hesperia, C. lemniscata, C. sabini, and C. venezuelense by having a combination of the following characters: absence of dentigerous process of vomer, light labial stripe, uniform green dorsum, humeral spine in adult males, parietal peritoneum covered by iridophores, visceral peritonea translucent (except pericardium), ulnar and tarsal ornamentation, green bones. Centrolene altitudinale differs from C. ericsmithi sp. nov. by having (characters of *C. ericsmithi* sp. nov. in parentheses) truncate snout in dorsal view (rounded), tympanic annulus ½ visible (tympanic annulus barely visible), dorsum shagreen with small spicules (shagreen with large spicules), green dorsum with white dorsal spots in life (uniform green dorsum); row of small, non-connected, enamelled tubercles on outer borders of ulna and tarsus (enamelled folds). Centrolene buckleyi and C. venezuelense differ by having sloping snout (round), supratympanic fold moderately heavy (low), outer tarsal fold absent (present); iris with a horizontal brown stripe (brown stripe absent). Centrolene camposi sp. nov. differs by having sloping snout in lateral view (round), thick, white labial stripe (thin yellowish labial stripe), absence of row of white tubercles between lip and arm insertion (present), faint white line between lip and anterior ½ of body (yellowish line between arm insertion and groin), warts and spicules on dorsum lighter than surrounding dorsal surfaces (warts and spicules on dorsum with same colour as surrounding dorsal surfaces). Centrolene heloderma differs by having pustular dorsal skin (shagreen with dispersed spicules), tympanic annulus completely visible (tympanic annulus barely evident), grey lavender dorsum in preservative (lavender); outer tarsal fold with low white tubercles (enamelled fold without tubercles), and humeral spine distinctly projected from arm (humeral spine curved towards arm). Centrolene hesperia differs by having weakly truncate snout in dorsal view (rounded) and white labial stripe continuous with stripe along the flanks to the groin (labial stripe separate from body line by a row of tubercles). Centrolene lemniscata differs by arms and legs lacking dermal folds (present) and white labial stripe continues along the body to the groin (labial stripe separate from body line by a row of tubercles). Centrolene sabini differs by having sloping snout in lateral view (round), dorsum

green with yellowish-green spots and patches (uniformly green), white labial stripe continuous with stripe along the flanks (labial stripe separate from body line by a row of tubercles), and strongly protruding nostrils (not strongly protruding). *Centrolene lynchi* differs by having snout truncate to sloping in lateral view (round), dorsal skin shagreen in males and females, males with low, white warts, and spicules and spiculated warts on sides of head (dorsal skin shagreen with dispersed spicules); dorsum dull green with minute yellowish—white warts and small diffuse black spots (green dorsum), tarsal fold absent (present), nuptial pad Type II (Type I), and humeral spine distinctly projected from arm (humeral spine curved towards arm). Molecular analyses clearly differentiate *C. ericsmithi* sp. nov. from morphologically similar species found in the Andes.

Description of the holotype. Adult male, moderate-sized, SVL = 27.3 mm (Fig. 2–5). Head slightly distinct, wider than long, and wider than body; HW/HL = 1.06, HW/SVL = 0.33, HL/SVL = 0.31. Snout short, EN/HL = 0.21; nostrils slightly elevated, producing a shallow depression in the internarial area, loreal region concave; canthus rostralis rounded; lips not flared. Small-size eyes, ED/HL = 0.33, directed anterolaterally at about 50° from midline, interorbital area wider than eye diameter, IOD/ED = 1.43, EN/ED = 0.64, EN/IOD = 0.70. Tympanic annulus oriented dorsolaterally, weak supratympanic fold above upper portion of tympanum and extending down to shoulder. Dentigerous processes of vomers absent; choanae squarish, large; tongue rounded, indented posteriorly; vocal slits present, extending from anterior base of tongue to angles of jaws.

 Skin of dorsal surfaces of head, body and limbs shagreen, covered by non-clustered translucent spicules, spicules more concentrated on body surfaces, infratympanic area with few, slightly enlarged spicules. Dorsal surfaces with non-clustered microspicules. Skin of ventral surfaces of body granular, on throat, chest, and limbs fairly shagreen. Cloacal opening directed posteriorly at upper level of thighs, distinct enamelled cloacal sheath; subcloacal area enamelled and granular, with a pair of slightly large, round, flat subcloacal warts on ventral surfaces of thighs below vent.

 Upper arm thin, forearm slightly robust. Humeral spine present and externally visible, but not piercing skin. Relative lengths of fingers III > IV > II > I; finger discs wider than the adjacent phalanx, truncate; disc on third finger about the same size than those on toes, ED/Fing3DW = 1.87; subarticular tubercles rounded and elevated, supernumerary tubercles present, small, and flat; palmar tubercle large, rounded, elevated; thenar tubercle elliptic. Concealed prepollex, unpigmented nuptial excrescences present, Type I on dorsolateral side of thumbs.

Hind limbs slender; TL/SVL = 0.55, FL/SVL = 0.47. Inner metatarsal tubercle large and elliptical; outer metatarsal tubercle indistinct. Subarticular tubercles rounded and low, supernumerary tubercles small and flat, rather indistinct. Toe discs bluntly truncate, no papillae on tip of disc of toes.

 Colouration of holotype in life. (Fig. 2–3) Bright, uniform green dorsum, thin yellowish labial stripe continuing with a row of white tubercles towards arm insertion, yellowish line between arm insertion and groin, enamelled metacarpal area, enamelled ulnar, metatarsal, and tarsal fold, yellowish white venter. Iris flesh colour background, fine brown reticulations. Fingers, toes, and membrane yellowish green. Bones green.

Colouration of holotype in ethanol. (Figs. 4–5) Lavender dorsum with translucent spicules, enamelled labial stripe, enamelled line between arm insertion to groin. Faint enamelled metacarpal area, faint enamelled ulnar, metatarsal, and tarsal fold. Few melanophores present on dorsal surfaces of hands and feet and at the base of Finger IV, Toe IV, and Toe V. Parietal peritoneum white, iridophores covering ½ parietal peritoneum; pericardium covered by iridophores, all other visceral peritonea clear.

492 Measurements of the holotype: SVL = 27.3, HL = 8.5, HW = 9.0, IOD = 4.0, ED = 2.8, IND =
493 2.5, EN = 1.8, TD = 0.9, TL = 15.1, FL = 12.8, HAL = 9.4, Fin3DW = 1.5.

Etymology. The specific name of this new taxon is patronymic in honour of Eric Nelson Smith, U.S. herpetologist and curator of the amphibian and reptile collections at The University of Texas at Arlington. Eric is a prodigious collector that has described more than 60new species of amphibians and reptiles from the most remote corners of the planet for almost three decades. This is a small recognition of his extensive contributions.

Distribution and Natural History. *Centrolene ericsmithi* sp. nov. is currently known only from its type locality in the province of Azuay, on the southwestern slopes of the the Cordillera Occidental of the Andes of Ecuador (Fig. 7). *Centrolene ericsmithi* sp. nov. and *C. camposi* sp. nov. are syntopic. Both new species vocalized during the samplings in March 2015, but unfortunately, no recordings were taken. Other relevant information is described in the section corresponding to *C. camposi*.

Discussion

Due to their sympatry, with overlapping microhabitat occupancy, Yánez-Muñoz et al. (2015) initially assumed that the three specimens of *Centrolene* from La Enramada, province of Azuay, belonged to the same species and were phylogenetically close to *C. heloderma*. However, the phylogenetic reconstruction showed they were two different, syntopic, not closely related lineages, *C. camposi* sp. nov. and *C. ericsmithi* sp. nov.

The two new <u>species of Centrolene</u> described herein inhabit the montane evergreen forests in the south-western Andes of Ecuador. *Centrolene camposi* shows an unusual biogeographic pattern because it is sister to a species from the opposite versant of the Andes (Fig. 7). Both species are

separated by relatively low genetic distances (average 1.08% for gene 12S), suggesting a recent divergence. The Andes are a formidable dispersal barrier for amphibians, resulting in almost entirely different amphibian communities on opposite versants of the Andes of Ecuador, despite having ecologically similar forests. In Centrolenidae, only two other sister species occur on opposite versants of the Andes, T. amelie (Cisneros-Heredia & Meza-Ramos, 2007) + Teratohyla pulverata (Peters, 1873) and Cochranella granulosa (Taylor, 1949) + C. resplendens (Lynch & Duellman, 1973) (Guayasamin et al., 2020). Teratohyla amelie and T. pulverata diverged 15 My ago, suggesting vicariant speciation due to the Andean uplift. Cochranella granulosa + C. resplendens are old lineages, diverging over 7 My ago (Guayasamin et al. 2020). In contrast, C. camposi + C. condor likely diverged much more recently because their genetic distances are at the lower end for species pairs within Centrolenidae. Species of the genus Centrolene occupy much higher elevations than other species of Centrolenidae; thus, trans-Andean distributions might have been possible until more recent geological periods. This unusual biogeographic pattern suggests a unique combination of topography and environmental history in the Andes of southern Ecuador. The pattern of southwestern Andean clades in Ecuador and Peru having a closer relationship with eastern Andean clades should be much more common in species with high dispersal ability like spiders (e.g., Gasteracantha cancriformis [Linnaeus, 1758], Salgado-Roa et al., 2022) and birds (e.g., *Pachyramphus* spp., Musher & Cracraft, 2018).

Centrolene condor is endemic to the Cordillera del Condor, a sub-Andean mountain range running parallel to the southeastern Andes of Ecuador, about 140 km W from the type locality of C. camposi (Fig. 7) (Cisneros-Heredia & Morales-Mite, 2008; Almendáriz & Batallas, 2012; Guayasamin et al., 2020). Centrolene sabini is only known from the Kosñipata valley in the southeastern Andes of Peru, more than 1400 km south of the type locality of C. ericsmithi. (Catenazzi et al., 2012; Catenazzi, 2017). The undescribed Centrolene sp. [Ca1] was collected in the province of Zamora-Chinchipe, in the southeastern Andes of Ecuador, about 120 km W from the type locality of C. ericsmithi (Amador et al., 2018). The undescribed Centrolene sp. [Ca1] is more closely related to the geographically distant C. sabini than to the geographically close C. ericsmithi sp. nov., a relationship that counters the usual isolation by distance pattern of genetic differentiation among populations of a single species. Lack of consistency with isolation by distance suggests the existence of reproductive barriers between the three populations (i.e., the populations belonging to three species).

The diversification and adaptation of a high diversity of vertebrates in southwestern Ecuador, specifically in the province of Azuay and El Oro, is apparently due to the topographic complexity of the area, with the presence of the River Jubones basin and the Gulf of Guayaquil, the Andes and its proximity to the Pacific coast, and the biogeographic influence of different climatic zones (INABIO, 2015; Arteaga et al., 2016, 2017, 2018; Yánez-Muñoz, Sánchez-Nivicela & Reyes-Puig, 2016; Torres-Carvajal et al., 2020; Brito et al., 2022). Evidence accumulated in several clades of small vertebrates suggests that the River Jubones basin might be

an important isolation barrier between lineages north and south of the Andes of Ecuador, including frogs of the genera *Pristimantis*, *Elachistochleis*, *Hyloscirtus* and *Nymphargus*, lizards *Anadia*, *Enyalioides* and *Stenocercus*, and snakes *Atractus*, *Dipsas* and *Leptodeira* (Torres-Carvajal, 2007; Passos, Cisneros-Heredia & Salazar-V, 2007; Cisneros-Heredia & Yánez-Muñoz, 2007b; Passos et al., 2012; INABIO, 2015; Arteaga et al., 2016, 2018; Yánez-Muñoz, Sánchez-Nivicela & Reyes-Puig, 2016; Sánchez-Nivicela et al., 2018, 2019, 2020; Betancourt et al., 2018; Guayasamin et al., 2020; Torres-Carvajal et al., 2020; Yánez-Muñoz et al., 2021).

The Andes of southern Ecuador show high geologic, geographic, and environmental heterogeneity (Gentry, 1982; Duque-Caro, 1990; Veblen, Young & Orme, 2015; Morrone, 2017). The combination of these factors has fostered the evolution of a complex and rich biological diversity, with several local hotspots concentrating high levels of endemism (Chapman, 1917, 1926; Gentry, 1982; Cracraft, 1985; Duellman, 1988; Dodson & Gentry, 1991; Morrone, 2014, 2015, 2017). Unfortunately, its biodiversity remains poorly studied and heavily threatened by unceasing habitat loss, degradation, and fragmentation due to legal and illegal logging, expansion of the agricultural frontier, and mining activities (MAE, 2012, 2015; MAE et al., 2013; Sierra, 2013). The remnants of native montane forests in the provinces of Azuay and El Oro are restricted and scarce. Even though we have carried out extensive surveying of amphibians in the region, no more individuals or localities of the new species have been reported, so we consider that both species should be assigned to the IUCN Red List category Data Deficient at the national and global levels (Ortega-Andrade et al., 2021). The discovery of these new species of anurans in small Andean remnants evidences the need to carry out urgent conservation actions, to avoid the collapse of these ecosystems in southwestern Ecuador (INABIO, 2015; Ortega-Andrade et al., 2021).

Conclusions

We provide congruent lines of evidence supporting the diagnosis and description of two new species of *Centrolene* from the southwestern high Andes of Ecuador. These new species were found sympatric in a steep creek covered by montane evergreen forest at 2900 m at La Enramada, province of Azuay, near the border with the province of El Oro, on the southwestern slopes of the Andes of Ecuador. Our phylogeny places *C. camposi* sp. nov. as the sister species of *C. condor* and *C. ericsmithi* as the sister to a clade composed of *C. sabini* and an undescribed species of *Centrolene* from southeastern Ecuador.

The Andes have historically been a formidable dispersal barrier for amphibians, resulting in distinct amphibian communities on opposite versants of the Andes, despite having similar ecosystems. The unusual biogeographic pattern observed in the clade composed of *C. camposi* and *C. condor* suggests a unique combination of topography and environmental history in the Andes of southern Ecuador. In addition, the River Jubones basin is an important isolation barrier

597	for small vertebrates in the western Andes of Ecuador. The study highlights the importance of
598	studying geologic and biogeographic events' role in shaping species' diversity and distribution.
599	
600	Acknowledgements
601	We express our gratitude to the Gobierno Autónomo Provincial de El Oro for their support
602	during field and lab work through the project "Amphibians, Reptiles and Birds of the El Oro
603	Province" executed by INABIO. We thank the following people for their support at their
604	respective institutions: Diego Inclán, Francisco Prieto, César Garzón, and Miguel Urgiles-
605	Merchán (INABIO); William E. Duellman, Linda Trueb, Juan M. Guayasamin and Elisa
606 607	Bonaccorso (KU); George Zug, Roy McDiarmid, Ron Heyer, Robert Reynolds, Kenneth A. Tighe, Steve W. Gotte, Carole C. Baldwin, and Mary Sangrey (USNM); Carolina Reyes-Puig
608	and Emilia Peñaherrera (Museo de Zoología, Universidad San Francisco de Quito). Emilia
609	Peñaherrera provided help with the map. Mario Yánez-Muñoz is especially thankful to Patricia
610	Bejarano-Muñoz and Juan Carlos Sánchez-Nivicela to Lorena Orellana for their continuous
611	support and patience during the long days in the field. Diego F. Cisneros-Heredia thanks María
612	Elena Heredia, Laura Heredia, and Jonathan Guillemot for their constant support. We are
613	thankful to Evan Twomey and Diego Armijos-Ojeda, for their encouraging words and detailed
614	comments.
615	
616	References
617	Almendáriz A, Batallas D. 2012. Nuevos datos sobre la distribución, historia natural y el canto
618	de Centrolene condor Cisneros-Heredia y Morales-Mite 2008 (Amphibia: Anura:
619	Centrolenidae). Revista Politécnica 30:42-53.
620	Amador L, Parada A, D'Elía G, Guayasamin JM. 2018. Uncovering hidden specific diversity of
621	Andean glassfrogs of the Centrolene buckleyi species complex (Anura: Centrolenidae).
622	PeerJ 6:e5856. DOI: 10.7717/peerj.5856.
623	Arteaga A, Mebert K, Valencia JH, Cisneros-Heredia DF, Peñafiel N, Reyes-Puig C, Vieira-
624	Fernandes JL, Guayasamin JM. 2017. Molecular phylogeny of Atractus (Serpentes,
625	Dipsadidae), with emphasis on Ecuadorian species and the description of three new taxa.
626	ZooKeys 661:91–123. DOI: 10.3897/zookeys.661.11224.
627	Arteaga A, Pyron RA, Peñafiel N, Romero-Barreto P, Culebras J, Bustamante L, Yánez-Muñoz
628	MH, Guayasamin JM. 2016. Comparative phylogeography reveals cryptic diversity and

629	repeated patterns of cladogenesis for amphibians and reptiles in northwestern Ecuador.
630	PLOS ONE 11:e0151746. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0151746.
631	Arteaga A, Salazar-Valenzuela D, Mebert K, Peñafiel N, Aguiar G, Sánchez-Nivicela JC, Pyron
632	RA, Colston TJ, Cisneros-Heredia DF, Yánez-Muñoz MH, Venegas PJ, Guayasamin JM
633	Torres-Carvajal O. 2018. Systematics of South American snail-eating snakes (Serpentes,
634	Dipsadini), with the description of five new species from Ecuador and Peru. ZooKeys
635	766:79–147. DOI: 10.3897/zookeys.766.24523.
636	Beaupre SJ, Jacobson ER, Lillywhite HB, Zamudio KR. 2004. Guidelines for use of live
637	amphibians and reptiles in field and laboratory research. American Society of
638	Ichthyologists and Herpetologists.
639	Bejarano-Muñoz P, Sánchez-Nivicela JC, Yánez-Muñoz MH. 2019. Compendio de especies de
640	anfibios y reptiles de la provincia de El Oo. In: Anfibios, reptiles y aves de la provincia
641	de El Oro: una guía para la identificación de especies del páramo al manglar. Quito:
642	Instituto Nacional de Biodiversidad, 223–255.
643	Betancourt R, Reyes-Puig C, Lobos SE, Yánez-Muñoz MH, Torres-Carvajal O. 2018.
644	Sistemática de los saurios Anadia Gray, 1845 (Squamata: Gymnophthalmidae) de
645	Ecuador: límite de especies, distribución geográfica y descripción de una especie nueva.
646	Neotropical Biodiversity 4:83–102. DOI: 10.1080/23766808.2018.1487694.
647	Boulenger GA. 1882. Catalogue of the Batrachia Salientia s. Ecaudata in the Collection of the
648	British Museum. London: Taylor & Francis.
649	Brito J, Tinoco N, Pinto CM, García R, Koch C, Fernandez V, Burneo S, Pardiñas UFJ. 2022.
650	Unlocking Andean sigmodontine diversity: five new species of Chilomys (Rodentia:

651	Cricetidae) from the montane forests of Ecuador. PeerJ 10:e13211. DOI:
652	10.7717/peerj.13211.
653	Castroviejo-Fisher S, Guayasamin JM, Gonzalez-Voyer A, Vilà C. 2014. Neotropical
654	diversification seen through glassfrogs. Journal of Biogeography 41:66-80. DOI:
655	10.1111/jbi.12208.
656	Catenazzi A. 2017. Centrolene sabini (Sabin's Glass Frog). The IUCN Red List of Threatened
657	Species 2017:e.T78457419A89226082. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2017-
658	3.RLTS.T78457419A89226082.en.
659	Catenazzi A, May RV, Lehr E, Gagliardi-Urrutia G, Guayasamin JM. 2012. A new, high-
660	elevation glassfrog (Anura: Centrolenidae) from Manu National Park, southern Peru.
661	Zootaxa 3388:56–68. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.215385.
662	Chapman FM. 1917. The distribution of bird-life in Colombia; a contribution to a biological
663	survey of South America. Bulletin of the American Museum of Natural History 36:1–729.
664	Chapman FM. 1926. The distribution of bird-life in Ecuador; a contribution to a study of the
665	origin of Andean bird-life. Bulletin of the American Museum of Natural History 55:1-
666	784.
667	Cisneros-Heredia DF, McDiarmid RW. 2005. Amphibia, Centrolenidae, Centrolene peristictum,
668	Centrolene prosoblepon, Cochranella cochranae, Cochranella midas, Cochranella
669	resplendens, Cochranella spinosa, Hyalinobatrachium munozorum: range extensions and
670	new provincial records. Check List 1:18–22. DOI: 10.15560/1.1.18.
671	Cisneros-Heredia DF, McDiarmid RW. 2006. A new species of the genus Centrolene
672	(Amphibia: Anura: Centrolenidae) from Ecuador with comments on the taxonomy and
673	biogeography of Glassfrogs. Zootaxa 1244:132.

674	Cisneros-Heredia DF, McDiarmid RW. 2007. Revision of the characters of Centrolenidae
675	(Amphibia: Anura: Athesphatanura), with comments on its taxonomy and the description
676	of new taxa of glassfrogs. Zootaxa 1572:1–82.
677	Cisneros-Heredia DF, Meza-Ramos P. 2007. An enigmatic new species of glassfrog (Amphibia:
678	Anura: Centrolenidae) from the Amazonian Andean slopes of Ecuador. Zootaxa
679	1485:33–41.
680	Cisneros-Heredia DF, Morales-Mite M. 2008. A new species of glassfrog from elfin forests of
681	the Cordillera del Cóndor, southeastern Ecuador. Herpetozoa 21:49-56.
682	Cisneros-Heredia DF, Yánez-Muñoz M. 2007a. Amphibia, Anura, Centrolenidae, Centrolene
683	balionotum, Centrolene geckoideum, and Cochranella cariticommata: distribution
684	extension, new provincial records, Ecuador. Check List 3:39-42. DOI: 10.15560/3.1.39.
685	Cisneros-Heredia DF, Yánez-Muñoz MH. 2007b. A new species of glassfrog (Centrolenidae)
686	from the southern Andean foothills on the West Ecuadorian region. South American
687	Journal of Herpetology 2:1–10. DOI: 10.2994/1808-9798(2007)2[1:ANSOGC]2.0.CO;2.
688	Cracraft J. 1985. Historical biogeography and patterns of differentiation within the South
689	American avifauna: areas of endemism. Ornithological Monographs:49-84. DOI:
690	10.2307/40168278.
691	Crump ML, Scott, Jr. NJ. 1994. Visual encounter surveys. In: Heyer R, Donnelly MA,
692	McDiarmid RW, Hayek L-AC, Foster MS eds. Measuring and Monitoring Biological
693	Diversity: Standard Methods for Amphibians. Washington, DC.: Smithsonian Institution
694	Press, 84–92.
695	De Queiroz K. 2007. Species concepts and species delimitation. <i>Systematic biology</i> 56:879–886.

696	Dodson CH, Gentry AH. 1991. Biological extinction in Western Ecuador. Annals of the Missouri
697	Botanical Garden 78:273–295. DOI: 10.2307/2399563.
698	Duellman WE. 1980. The Identity of Centrolenella grandisonae Cochran and Goin (Anura:
699	Centrolenidae). Transactions of the Kansas Academy of Science (1903-) 83:26. DOI:
700	10.2307/3627268.
701	Duellman WE. 1981. Three new species of centrolenid frogs from the Pacific versant of Ecuador
702	and Colombia. Occasional papers of the Museum of Natural History, The University of
703	Kansas 88:1–9.
704	Duellman WE. 1988. Patterns of species diversity in anuran amphibians in the American tropics.
705	Annals of the Missouri Botanical Garden 75:79–104. DOI: 10.2307/2399467.
706	Duellman WE, Burrowes PA. 1989. New species of frogs, Centrolenella, from the Pacific
707	versant of Ecuador and southern Colombia. Occasional papers of the Museum of Natural
708	History, The University of Kansas 132:1–14.
709	Duellman WE, Schulte R. 1993. New species of centrolenid frogs from northern Peru.
710	Occasional papers of the Museum of Natural History, the University of Kansas. 155:1-
711	33.
712	Duque-Caro H. 1990. The Choco block in the northwestern corner of South America: structural,
713	tectonostratigraphic, and paleogeographic implications. Journal of South American Earth
714	Sciences 3:71–84. DOI: 10.1016/0895-9811(90)90019-W.
715	Frost DR. 2021. Amphibian Species of the World: an Online Reference. Available at
716	https://amphibiansoftheworld.amnh.org/(accessed April 17, 2021). DOI:
717	doi.org/10.5531/db.vz.0001.

718	Gentry AH. 1982. Neotropical floristic diversity: phytogeographical connections between
719	Central and South America, Pleistocene climatic fluctuations, or an accident of the
720	Andean orogeny? Annals of the Missouri Botanical Garden 69:557–593. DOI:
721	10.2307/2399084.
722	Guayasamin JM, Castroviejo-Fisher S, Ayarzagüena J, Trueb L, Vilà C. 2008. Phylogenetic
723	relationships of glassfrogs (Centrolenidae) based on mitochondrial and nuclear genes.
724	Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution 48:574–595. DOI:
725	10.1016/j.ympev.2008.04.012.
726	Guayasamin JM, Castroviejo-Fisher S, Trueb L, Ayarzagüena J, Rada M, Vilà C. 2009.
727	Phylogenetic systematics of Glassfrogs (Amphibia: Centrolenidae) and their sister taxon
728	Allophryne ruthveni. Zootaxa:1–97.
729	Guayasamin JM, Cisneros-Heredia DF, McDiarmid RW, Peña P, Hutter CR. 2020. Glassfrogs of
730	Ecuador: diversity, evolution, and conservation. Diversity 12:222. DOI:
731	10.3390/d12060222.
732	INABIO. 2015. Anfibios, reptiles y aves de la provincia de El Oro: Una guía para ecosistemas
733	andino-costeros. Quito: Instituto Nacional de Biodiversidad.
734	Jiménez de la Espada M. 1872. Nuevos batrácios americanos. Anales de la Sociedad Española
735	de Historia Natural 1:84–88.
736	Linnaeus C. 1758. Systema naturae per regna tria naturae, secundum classes, ordines, genera,
737	species, cum characteribus, differentiis, synonymis, locis. Holmiae: Impensis Direct.
738	Laurentii Salvii. DOI: 10.5962/bhl.title.542.

739	Lynch JD, Duellman WE. 1973. A review of the Centrolenid frogs of Ecuador, with descriptions
740	of new species. Occasional Papers of the Museum of Natural History, The University of
741	Kansas 16:1–66.
742	MAE. 2012. Línea base de deforestación del Ecuador Continental. Quito: Ministerio del
743	Ambiente.
744	MAE. 2015. Sistema Nacional de Bosques y Vegetación Protectora.
745	MAE, Galeas R, Guevara JE, Medina-Torres B, Chinchero MÁ, Herrera X (eds.). 2013. Sistema
746	de Clasificación de Ecosistemas del Ecuador Continental. Quito: Ministerio del
747	Ambiente del Ecuador MAE, Subsecretaría de Patrimonio Natural.
748	Morrone JJ. 2014. Biogeographical regionalisation of the Neotropical region. Zootaxa 3782:1-
749	110.
750	Morrone JJ. 2015. Biogeographical regionalisation of the Andean region. Zootaxa 3936:207-
751	236.
752	Morrone JJ. 2017. Neotropical biogeography: regionalization and evolution. Boca Raton: CRC
753	Press, Taylor & Francis Group.
754	Musher LJ, Cracraft J. 2018. Phylogenomics and species delimitation of a complex radiation of
755	Neotropical suboscine birds (Pachyramphus). Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution
756	118:204–221. DOI: 10.1016/j.ympev.2017.09.013.
757	Ortega-Andrade HM, Rodes Blanco M, Cisneros-Heredia DF, Guerra Arévalo N, López de
758	Vargas-Machuca KG, Sánchez-Nivicela JC, Armijos-Ojeda D, Cáceres Andrade JF,
759	Reyes-Puig C, Quezada Riera AB, Székely P, Rojas Soto OR, Székely D, Guayasamin
760	JM, Siavichay Pesántez FR, Amador L, Betancourt R, Ramírez-Jaramillo SM, Timbe-
761	Borja B, Gómez Laporta M, Webster Bernal JF, Oyagata Cachimuel LA, Chávez Jácome

762	D, Posse V, Valle-Piñuela C, Padilla Jiménez D, Reyes-Puig JP, Terán-Valdez A,
763	Coloma LA, Pérez Lara MaB, Carvajal-Endara S, Urgilés M, Yánez Muñoz MH. 2021.
764	Red List assessment of amphibian species of Ecuador: A multidimensional approach for
765	their conservation. PLOS ONE 16:e0251027. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0251027.
766	Passos P, Cisneros-Heredia D, Rivera DE, Schargel WE. 2012. Rediscovery of Atractus
767	microrhynchus and reappraisal of the taxonomic status of A. emersoni and A. natans
768	(Serpentes: Dipsadidae). Herpetologica 68:375–392. DOI:
769	https://doi.org/10.1655/HERPETOLOGICA-D-11-00078.1.
770	Passos P, Cisneros-Heredia DF, Salazar-V D. 2007. Rediscovery and redescription of the rare
771	Andean snake Atractus modestus. The Herpetological Journal 17:1–6.
772	Peters WCH. 1873. Über eine neue Schildkrötenart, Cinosternon effeldtii und einige andere neue
773	oder weniger bekannte Amphibien. Monatsberichte der Königlichen Preussische
774	Akademie des Wissenschaften zu Berlin 1873:603–618.
775	Ruiz-Carranza PM, Lynch JD. 1991a. Ranas Centrolenidae de Colombia III: Nuevas especies de
776	Cochranella del grupo granulosa. Lozania 59:1-18.
777	Ruiz-Carranza PM, Lynch JD. 1991b. Ranas Centrolenidae de Colombia I: Propuesta de una
778	nueva clasificación genérica. Lozania 57:1-32.
779	Ruiz-Carranza PM, Lynch JD. 1991c. Ranas Centrolenidae de Colombia II. Nuevas especies de
780	Centrolene de la Cordillera Oriental y Sierra Nevada de Santa Marta. <i>Lozania</i> 58:1–26.
781	Ruiz-Carranza PM, Lynch JD. 1995. Ranas Centrolenidae de Colombia VIII. Cuatro nuevas
782	especies de Centrolene de la Cordillera Central. Lozania 65:1-16.
783	Salgado-Roa FC, Chamberland L, Pardo-Diaz C, Cisneros-Heredia DF, Lasso E, Salazar C.
784	2022. Dissecting a geographical colourful tapestry: phylogeography of the colour

785	polymorphic spider Gasteracantha cancriformis. Journal of Zoological Systematics and
786	Evolutionary Research 2022:1–11. DOI: 10.1155/2022/8112945.
787	Sambrook J, Fritsch EF, Maniatis T. 1989. Molecular Cloning: a Laboratory Manual.
788	Sánchez-Nivicela JC, Celi-Piedra E, Posse-Sarmiento V, Urgilés VL, Yánez-Muñoz M,
789	Cisneros-Heredia DF. 2018. A new species of Pristimantis (Anura, Craugastoridae) from
790	the Cajas Massif, southern Ecuador. ZooKeys 751:113–128. DOI:
791	10.3897/zookeys.751.20541.
792	Sánchez-Nivicela JC, Peloso PLV, Urgiles VL, Yánez-Muñoz MH, Sagredo Y, Páez N, Ron S.
793	2020. Description and phylogenetic relationships of a new trans-Andean species of
794	Elachistocleis Parker 1927 (Amphibia, Anura, Microhylidae). Zootaxa 4779:323-340.
795	DOI: 10.11646/zootaxa.4779.3.2.
796	Sánchez-Nivicela JC, Urgiles VL, Navarrete MJ, Yánez-Muñoz MH, Ron S. 2019. A bizarre
797	new species of Lynchius (Amphibia, Anura, Strabomantidae) from the Andes of Ecuador
798	and first report of Lynchius parkeri in Ecuador. Zootaxa 4567:1. DOI:
799	10.11646/zootaxa.4567.1.1.
800	Señaris JC, Ayarzaguena J. 2005. Revisión taxonómica de la familia Centrolenidae (Amphibia;
801	Anura) de Venezuela. Sevilla: Comité español del programa MAB de la UNESCO.
802	Sierra R. 2013. Patrones y factores de deforestación en el Ecuador continental, 1990-2010 y un
803	acercamiento a los próximos 10 años. Quito: Conservación Internacional Ecuador &
804	Forest Trends.
805	Tamura K, Stecher G, Kumar S. 2021. MEGA11: Molecular Evolutionary Genetics Analysis
806	Version 11. Molecular Biology and Evolution 38:3022–3027. DOI:
807	10.1093/molbev/msab120.

808	Taylor EH. 1949. Costa Rican frogs of the genera Centrolene and Centrolenella. The University
809	of Kansas Science Bulletin 33:257–270. DOI: 10.5962/bhl.part.16128.
810	Torres-Carvajal O. 2007. Phylogeny and biogeography of a large radiation of Andean lizards
811	(Iguania, Stenocercus). Zoologica Scripta 36:311–326. DOI: 10.1111/j.1463-
812	6409.2006.00284.x.
813	Torres-Carvajal O, Sánchez-Nivicela JC, Posse V, Celi E, Koch C. 2020. A new species of cat-
814	eyed snake (Serpentes: Dipsadinae: Leptodeirini) from the Andes of southern Ecuador.
815	Zootaxa 4895:357–380. DOI: 10.11646/zootaxa.4895.3.3.
816	Twomey E, Delia J, Castroviejo-Fisher S. 2014. A review of Northern Peruvian glassfrogs
817	(Centrolenidae), with the description of four new remarkable species. Zootaxa 3851:1-
818	87.
819	Veblen TT, Young KR, Orme AR (eds.). 2015. The Physical Geography of South America.
820	Oxford University Press.
821	Yánez-Muñoz MH. 2015. Bosques Montanos. In: Anfibios, reptiles y aves de la provincia de El
822	Oro: Una guía para ecosistemas andino-costeros. Publicación Miscelánea. Quito:
823	Instituto Nacional de Biodiversidad, 167–184.
824	Yánez-Muñoz MH, Reyes-Puig JP, Batallas-Revelo D, Broaddus C, Urgilés-Merchán M,
825	Cisneros-Heredia DF, Guayasamin JM. 2021. A new Andean treefrog (Amphibia:
826	Hyloscirtus bogotensis group) from Ecuador: an example of community involvement for
827	conservation. <i>PeerJ</i> 9:e11914. DOI: 10.7717/peerj.11914.
828	Yánez-Muñoz MH, Sánchez-Nivicela JC, Reyes-Puig CP. 2016. Tres nuevas especies de ranas
829	terrestres <i>Pristimantis</i> (Anura: Craugastoridae) de la Provincia de El Oro, Ecuador. ACI
830	Avances en Ciencias e Ingenierías 8:5–25. DOI: 10.18272/aci.v8i1.455.