

Comparative cytogenetics on eight Malagasy Mantellinae (Anura, Mantellidae) and a synthesis of the karyological data on the subfamily

Marcello Mezzasalma^{1,2}, Franco Andreone³, Gaetano Odierna⁴,
Fabio Maria Guarino⁴, Angelica Crottini^{1,2,5}

1 CIBIO Research Centre in Biodiversity and Genetic Resources, InBIO, Universidade do Porto, Campus Agrário de Vairão, Rua Padre Armando Quintas, No 7, 4485-661 Vairão, Portugal **2** BIOPOLIS Program in Genomics, Biodiversity and Land Planning, CIBIO, Campus de Vairão, 4485-661 Vairão, Portugal **3** Museo Regionale di Scienze Naturali, Via G. Giolitti 36, 10123 Torino, Italy **4** Department of Biology, University of Naples Federico II, Via Cinthia 26, 80126, Naples, Italy **5** Departamento de Biologia, Faculdade de Ciências, Universidade do Porto, 4099-002 Porto, Portugal

Corresponding author: Marcello Mezzasalma (m.mezzasalma@gmail.com)

Academic editor: Rafael Noleto | Received 7 October 2021 | Accepted 20 December 2021 | Published 11 February 2022

<http://zoobank.org/40F08D44-8889-470C-A4D7-94FF17C3CCEA>

Citation: Mezzasalma M, Andreone F, Odierna G, Guarino FM, Crottini A (2022) Comparative cytogenetics on eight Malagasy Mantellinae (Anura, Mantellidae) and a synthesis of the karyological data on the subfamily. *Comparative Cytogenetics* 16(1): 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.3897/compcytogen.v16.i1.76260>

Abstract

We performed a molecular and cytogenetic analysis on different Mantellinae species and revised the available chromosomal data on this group to provide an updated assessment of its karyological diversity and evolution. Using a fragment of the mitochondrial 16S rRNA, we performed a molecular taxonomic identification of the samples that were used for cytogenetic analyses. A comparative cytogenetic analysis, with Giemsa's staining, Ag-NOR staining and sequential C-banding + Giemsa + CMA + DAPI was performed on eight species: *Gephyromantis* sp. Ca19, *G. striatus* (Vences, Glaw, Andreone, Jesu et Schimmenti, 2002), *Mantidactylus (Chonomantis)* sp. Ca11, *M. (Brygoomantis) alutus* (Peracca, 1893), *M. (Hylobatrachus) cowanii* (Boulenger, 1882), *Spinomantis* prope *aglavei* "North" (Methuen et Hewitt, 1913), *S. phantasticus* (Glaw et Vences, 1997) and *S. sp. Ca3*. *Gephyromantis striatus*, *M. (Brygoomantis) alutus* and *Spinomantis* prope *aglavei* "North" have a karyotype of $2n = 24$ chromosomes while the other species show $2n = 26$ chromosomes. Among the analysed species we detected differences in the number and position of telocentric elements, location of NOR loci (alternatively on the 6th, 7th or 10th pair) and in the distribution of heterochromatin, which shows species-specific patterns. Merging our data with those previously available, we propose a karyotype of $2n = 26$ with all banded elements and loci of NORs on the 6th chromosome pair as the ancestral state in the whole family Mantellidae. From this putative ancestral

condition, a reduction of chromosome number through similar tandem fusions (from $2n = 26$ to $2n = 24$) occurred independently in *Mantidactylus* Boulenger, 1895 (subgenus *Brygomantis* Dubois, 1992), *Spinomantis* Dubois, 1992 and *Gephyromantis* Methuen, 1920. Similarly, a relocation of NORs, from the putative primitive configuration on the 6th chromosome, occurred independently in *Gephyromantis*, *Blommersia* Dubois, 1992, *Guibemantis* Dubois, 1992, *Mantella* Boulenger, 1882 and *Spinomantis*. Chromosome inversions of primitive biarmed elements likely generated a variable number of telocentric elements in *Mantella nigricans* Guibé, 1978 and a different number of taxa of *Gephyromantis* (subgenera *Duboimantis* Glaw et Vences, 2006 and *Laurentomantis* Dubois, 1980) and *Mantidactylus* (subgenera *Brygomantis*, *Chonomantis* Glaw et Vences, 1994, *Hylobatrachus* Laurent, 1943 and *Ochthomantis* Glaw et Vences, 1994).

Keywords

Amphibia, chromosome evolution, karyotype, Madagascar, NORs

Introduction

Madagascar is one of the richest biodiversity hotspots and an ideal region to study evolutionary dynamics (Myers et al. 2000; Ganzhorn et al. 2001; Vences et al. 2009). The native amphibians of Madagascar belong to four distinct anuran families: Hyperoliidae, Mantellidae, Microhylidae and Ptychadenidae (Glaw and Vences 2007). Among them, the family Mantellidae includes ca 230 described species (AmphibiaWeb 2021; Frost et al. 2021), representing the most species-rich amphibian group of the island.

Mantellidae are characterized by an extraordinary ecological and morphological diversity (Glaw and Vences 2007; Wollenberg et al. 2011; AmphibiaWeb 2021) and are subdivided into three subfamilies: Laliostominae with an overall low species diversity, including the genera *Laliostoma* Glaw, Vences et Böhme, 1998 (1 species) and *Aglyptodactylus* Boulenger, 1919 (6 species); Boophinae, a species-rich clade of about 80 described species of tree frogs, all belonging to the genus *Boophis* Tschudi, 1838, and Mantellinae, which is by far the most species-rich group including nine genera and more than 140 described species (Glaw and Vences 2007; AmphibiaWeb 2021).

The last three decades have seen the flourishing of the use of molecular techniques, with numerous taxonomic and systematic studies that clarified the relationships among the major groups within this subfamily (Glaw et al. 1998; Vences et al. 1998; Richards et al. 2000; Glaw and Vences 2006; Wollenberg et al. 2011; Kaffenberger et al. 2012). Similarly, these tools have been used in the identification of candidate species (Vieites et al. 2009; Perl et al. 2014) and have later contributed to the formal description of many of them (e.g. Andreone et al. 2003; Crottini et al. 2011a; Cocca et al. 2020; AmphibiaWeb 2021).

However, in contrast to the fast-growing amount of molecular data on Mantellidae, the available chromosomal data remain limited, leaving the karyological diversification of the family mostly unexplored. In particular, available cytogenetic data on the subfamily Mantellinae, obtained using different methods, come from a handful of studies (Morescalchi 1967; Blommers-Schlösser 1978; Pintak et al. 1998; Odierna et

al. 2001; Andreone et al. 2003), together providing the description of the karyotype of ca. 40 species. These studies revealed the occurrence of a conserved chromosome number in most genera ($2n = 26$), but a marked difference in chromosome morphology, location of NORs and heterochromatin distribution (see Odierna et al. 2001 and Andreone et al. 2003). Differences in chromosome number ($2n = 24$) were also identified, with five species of the subgenus *Brygoomantis* all sharing this state, thus suggesting that the state of $2n = 24$ is a derived feature of the group (Blommers-Schlösser 1978).

Comparative cytogenetics, especially when linked to phylogenetic inference, offers the possibility to identify plesio- and apomorphic states, and recognizes different evolutionary lineages (see e.g. Mezzasalma et al. 2013, 2014, 2017a). However, both the limited taxon sampling and the outdated taxonomy used in most previous works limited the possibility to draw robust comparisons and consistent hypotheses on the evolution of chromosomal diversification in the subfamily.

In this study we performed a comparative cytogenetic analysis on eight mantellid species belonging to the genera *Gephyromantis* Methuen, 1920, *Mantidactylus* Boulenger, 1895 (subgenera *Chonomantis*, *Brygoomantis* and *Hylobatrachus*) and *Spinomantis* Dubois, 1992, using a combination of standard coloration and banding methods. We coupled cytogenetic analyses with the molecular taxonomic identification of the samples and synthesized previously available information on this subfamily to produce an overview of their chromosomal diversity. This, enable us to propose a hypothesis on the chromosome diversification in mantelline frogs.

Material and methods

Sampling

We studied 13 samples of eight mantelline species belonging to the genera *Gephyromantis*, *Mantidactylus* (subgenera *Chonomantis*, *Brygoomantis* and *Hylobatrachus*) and *Spinomantis*. These samples were collected between 1999 and 2004 and conserved as cell suspensions at the University of Naples Federico II.

The list of samples used in this study is provided in Table 1. To provide an overview of the chromosomal data on Malagasy mantelline frogs, we reviewed previously published karyotypes of the subfamily. A complete list of all the considered taxa and karyotypes is provided in Table 2.

Molecular taxonomic identification

DNA was extracted from cell suspensions following Sambrook (1989). A 3' fragment of ca. 550 bp of the mitochondrial 16S rRNA gene was amplified using the primer pair 16Sa (CGCCTGTTTATCAAAAACAT) and 16Sb (CCGGTCTGAAACTCAGATCAGT) (Palumbi et al. 1991). This marker proved to be suitable for amphibian identification (Vences et al. 2005) and has been widely used for Malagasy amphib-

Table 1. Specimens analysed in this study. MRSN = Museo Regionale di Storia Naturale (Turin, Italy); ZMA = Zoological Museum Amsterdam (Amsterdam, Netherlands); FN and FAZC, field numbers of Franco Andreone; GA field numbers of Gennaro Aprea; FG/MV, field numbers of Frank Glaw and Miguel Vences.

Species	Field Number	Sex	Locality
<i>Gephyromantis striatus</i>	MRSN A1988 (FN 7645)	female	Ambatoledama Corridor: Beanjada
<i>Gephyromantis</i> sp. Ca19	MRSN A2109 (FN 7630)	male	Ambatoledama Corridor: Beanjada
<i>Gephyromantis</i> sp. Ca19	MRSN A2075 (FN 7903)	male	Ambatoledama Corridor: Andasin'i Governera
<i>Gephyromantis</i> sp. Ca19	MRSN A2112 (FN 7890)	male	Ambatoledama Corridor: Andasin'i Governera
<i>Gephyromantis</i> sp. Ca19	MRSN A2108 (FN 7566)	female	Ambatoledama Corridor: Beanjada
<i>Mantidactylus (Bryoomantis) alutus</i> (Peracca, 1893)	MRSN A3639 (FN 7945)	female	Ankaratra: Manjakatampo
<i>Mantidactylus (Chonomantis) sp.</i> Ca11	MRSN A3708 (FN 7545)	male	Ambatoledama Corridor: Beanjada
<i>Mantidactylus (Hylobatrachus) cowanii</i> (Boulenger, 1882)	MRSN A2612 (FAZC 11370)	female	Antoetra: Soamazaka
<i>Mantidactylus (Hylobatrachus) cowanii</i>	GA 720	male	Mandraka
<i>Spinomantis prope aglavei</i> "North" (Methuen et Hewitt, 1913)	MRSN A3563 (FN 7543)	male	Ambatoledama Corridor: Beanjada
<i>Spinomantis phantasticus</i> (Glaw et Vences, 1997)	ZMA 19627 (FG/MV 2002-970)	male	Vohidrazana
<i>Spinomantis</i> sp. Ca3	MRSN A3998 (FN 7567)	male	Ambatoledama Corridor: Beanjada
<i>Spinomantis</i> sp. Ca3	MRSN A3999 (FN 7629)	male	Ambatoledama Corridor: Beanjada

ians (e.g. Vieites et al. 2009; Rosa et al. 2012; Crottini et al. 2011b, 2014; Penny et al. 2017). Amplification conditions were: initial denaturation at 94 °C for 5 min, 36 cycles at 94 °C for 30 s, 50 °C for 45s and 72 °C for 45 s, followed by a final step at 72 °C for 7 min. Amplicons were sequenced on an automated sequencer ABI 377 (Applied Biosystems, Foster City, CA, USA) using BigDye Terminator 3.1 (ABI). Chromatograms were checked and edited using Chromas Lite 2.6.6 and BioEdit 7.2.6.1 (Hall 1999). All newly determined sequences were deposited in GenBank (accession numbers: OL830846–OL830858). For taxonomic attribution we compared newly generated sequences with a curated database of reference sequences of the 3' terminus of the 16S gene for all lineages of Malagasy mantellid frogs (Cocca 2020). Taxonomic attribution was performed using a local BLAST analysis against this reference database.

Chromosomal analysis

Cell suspensions were obtained from tissue samples as described in Mezzasalma et al. (2013). In brief, tissues were incubated for 30 min in hypotonic solution (KCl 0.075 M + sodium citrate 0.5%, 1:1) and fixed for 15 min in methanol-acetic acid, 3:1. Fixed tissues were stored at 4 °C and dissociated manually on a steel sieve. Chromosomes were obtained using the air-drying method and stained with conventional col-

Table 2. Available karyological data on mantelline frogs. M = metacentric pairs; sm = submetacentric pairs; st = subtelocentric pairs; t = telocentric pairs; AN = arm number; [#] = NOR bearing chromosome pair; CB = C-banding; F = Fluorochrome; R = references; (1) = Morescalchi (1967); (2) = Blommers-Schlösser (1978); (3) = Pintak et al. (1998); (4) = Odierna et al. (2001); (5) = Andreone et al. (2003); (6) = this study. Nomenclature follows Vieites et al. (2009), updated in Perl et al. (2014).

Genus/subgenus	Species	Karyotype	Banding	R
<i>Mantella</i> Boulenger, 1882	<i>aurantiaca</i> Mocquard, 1900	2n = 26 10m 3sm; AN = 52		(1)
	<i>aurantiaca</i>	2n = 26 10m 3sm; AN = 52		(2)
	<i>haraldmeieri</i> Busse, 1981	2n = 26 9m 4sm; AN = 52		(2)
	<i>ebenaui</i> (Boettger, 1880)	2n = 26 11m 2sm; AN = 52		(2)
	<i>aurantiaca</i>	2n = 26 11m 2sm; AN = 52	CB	(3)
	<i>crocea</i> Pintak et Böhme, 1990	2n = 26 11m 2sm; AN = 52	CB	(3)
	<i>baroni</i> Boulenger, 1888	2n = 26 11m 2sm; AN = 52	CB	(3)
	<i>haraldmeieri</i>	2n = 26 11m 2sm; AN = 52	CB	(3)
	<i>ebenaui</i>	2n = 26 11m 2sm; AN = 52	CB	(3)
	<i>viridis</i> Pintak et Böhme, 1988	2n = 26 11m 2sm; AN = 52	CB	(3)
	<i>laevigata</i> Methuen et Hewitt, 1913	2n = 26 11m 2sm; AN = 52	CB	(3)
	<i>baroni</i>	2n = 26 11m 2sm; AN = 52	Ag-NOR [2], CB	(4)
	<i>ebenaui</i>	2n = 26 11m 1sm; AN = 52	Ag-NOR [2], CB	(4)
	<i>betsileo</i> (Grandidier, 1872)	2n = 26 11m 2sm; AN = 52	Ag-NOR [2], CB	(4)
	<i>cowanii</i>	2n = 26 11m 2sm; AN = 52	Ag-NOR [2], CB	(4)
	<i>expectata</i> Busse et Böhme, 1992	2n = 26 11m 2sm; AN = 52	Ag-NOR [2], CB	(4)
	<i>laevigata</i>	2n = 26 11m 2sm; AN = 52	Ag-NOR [2], CB	(4)
	<i>madagascariensis</i> (Grandidier, 1872)	2n = 26 11m 1sm; 1st AN = 52	Ag-NOR [2], CB	(4)
	<i>nigricans</i> Guibé, 1978	2n = 26 10m 2sm; 1t AN = 48	Ag-NOR [2], CB	(4)
	<i>pulchra</i> Parker, 1925	2n = 26 11m 2sm; AN = 52	Ag-NOR [2], CB	(4)
	<i>viridis</i>	2n = 26 11m 2sm; AN = 52	Ag-NOR [2], CB	(4)
	<i>aurantiaca</i>	2n = 26 11m 2sm; AN = 52	Ag-NOR [2], CB	(4)
<i>Blommersia</i> Dubois, 1992	<i>blommersae</i> (Guibé 1975)	2n = 26 12m 1sm; AN = 52		(2)
	<i>galani</i> Vences, Köhler, Pabijan, et Glaw 2010	2n = 26 12m 1sm; AN = 52		(2)
	<i>grandisonae</i> (Guibé, 1974)	2n = 26 10m 3sm; AN = 52	Ag-NOR [1], CB, F	(5)
<i>Gephyromantis</i>				
<i>Asperomantis</i>	<i>asper</i> (Boulenger, 1882)	2n = 26 6m 3sm 4t; AN = 44		(2)
<i>Duboimantis</i>	<i>granulatus</i> (Boettger, 1881)	2n = 26 8m 4sm 1t; AN050	Ag-NOR [8], CB, F	(5)
<i>Duboimantis</i>	<i>leucomaculatus</i> (Guibé, 1975)	2n = 26 6m 6sm 1t; AN = 50	Ag-NOR [6], CB, F	(5)
<i>Duboimantis</i>	<i>luteus</i> (Methuen et Hewitt, 1913)	2n = 26 6m 4sm 1st 2t; AN = 48		(2)
<i>Duboimantis</i>	prope <i>luteus</i> Methuen et Hewitt, 1913	2n = 26 6m 2sm 1st 4t; AN = 42	Ag-NOR [11], CB, F	(5)
<i>Duboimantis</i>	prope <i>moseri</i> "Masoola" Glaw et Vences, 2002	2n = 26 6m 6sm 1t; AN = 52		(5)
<i>Duboimantis</i>	sp. Ca19	2n = 26 8m 5sm; AN = 52	Ag-NOR [6], CB, F	(6)
<i>Duboimantis</i>	<i>redimitus</i> (Boulenger, 1889)	2n = 26 7m 5sm 1t; AN = 50	Ag-NOR [6], CB, F	(5)
<i>Duboimantis</i>	<i>salegy</i> (Andreone, Aprea, Vences et Odierna, 2003)	2n = 26 5m 7sm 1st; AN = 52	Ag-NOR [6], CB, F	(5)
<i>Duboimantis</i>	<i>zavona</i> (Vences, Andreone, Glaw et Randrianirina, 2003)	2n = 26 9m 4sm; AN = 52	Ag-NOR [6], CB, F	(5)
<i>Laurentomantis</i>	<i>striatus</i>	2n = 24 6m 1sm 5t; AN = 38	Ag-NOR [10], CB, F	(6)
<i>Phylacomantis</i>	<i>pseudoasper</i> (Guibé, 1974)	2n = 26 7m 7sm; AN = 52	Ag-NOR [9], CB, F	(5)
<i>Guibemantis</i>				
Dubois, 1992				
<i>Guibemantis</i>	<i>depressiceps</i> (Boulenger, 1882)	2n = 26 10m 3sm; AN = 52		(2)
<i>Guibemantis</i>	<i>timidus</i> (Vences et Glaw, 2005)	2n = 26 11m 2sm; AN = 52		(2)
<i>Pandanusicola</i>	<i>methueni</i> (Angel, 1929)	2n = 26 11m 2sm; AN = 52		(2)
<i>Pandanusicola</i>	<i>bicalcaratus</i> (Boettger, 1913)	2n = 26 11m 2sm; AN = 52	Ag-NOR [1], CB, F	(4)
<i>Pandanusicola</i>	prope <i>bicalcaratus</i> (Boettger, 1913)	2n = 26 9m 4sm; AN = 52		(2)
<i>Pandanusicola</i>	<i>liber</i> (Peracca, 1893)	2n = 26 11m 2sm; AN = 52		(2)

Genus/subgenus	Species	Karyotype	Banding	R
<i>Pandanusicola</i>	<i>pulcher</i> (Boulenger, 1882)	2n = 26 9m 4sm; AN = 52		(2)
<i>Pandanusicola</i>	prope <i>punctatus</i> (Blommers-Schlösser, 1979)	2n = 26 10m 3sm; AN = 52	Ag-NOR [1], CB, F	(4)
<i>Pandanusicola</i>	<i>punctatus</i> (Blommers-Schlösser, 1979)	2n = 26 9m 4sm; AN = 52		(2)
<i>Mantidactylus</i>				
<i>Bryoomantis</i>	<i>alutus</i>	2n = 24 12m; AN = 48	Ag-NOR [6], CB, F	(6)
<i>Bryoomantis</i>	<i>ambohitombi</i> Boulenger 1918	2n = 24 9m 3sm; AN = 48		(2)
<i>Bryoomantis</i>	<i>betsileanus</i> (Boulenger, 1882)	2n = 24 5m 6sm 1t; AN = 46		(2)
<i>Bryoomantis</i>	prope <i>biporus</i> (Boulenger, 1889)	2n = 24 8m 4sm; AN = 48		(2)
<i>Bryoomantis</i>	sp. Ca19	2n = 24 7m 5sm; AN = 48		(2)
<i>Bryoomantis</i>	prope <i>ulcerosus</i> (Boettger, 1880)	2n = 24 8m 2sm 1st 1t; AN = 46		(2)
<i>Chonomantis</i>	prope <i>aerumnalis</i> (Peracca, 1893)	2n = 26 10m 2sm 1t; AN = 50		(2)
<i>Chonomantis</i>	sp. Ca11	2n = 26 10m 2sm 2t; AN = 50		(6)
<i>Chonomantis</i>	<i>paidroa</i> Bora, Ramilijaona, Raminosoa et Vences, 2011	2n = 26 6m 7sm; AN = 52		(2)
<i>Hylobatrachus</i>	<i>cowanii</i> (Boulenger, 1882)	2n = 26 12m 1t; AN = 50	Ag-NOR [6], CB, F	(6)
<i>Hylobatrachus</i>	<i>lugubris</i> (Duméril, 1853)	2n = 26 9m 3sm 1t; AN = 50		(2)
<i>Mantidactylus</i>	<i>guttulatus</i> (Boulenger, 1881)	2n = 26 11m 2sm; AN = 52		(2)
<i>Ochthomantis</i>	prope <i>femorialis</i> (Boulenger, 1882)	2n = 26 9m 3sm 1t; AN = 50		(2)
<i>Spinomantis</i>				
	<i>aglavei</i> (Methuen et Hewitt, 1913)	2n = 24 9m 3sm; AN = 48		(2)
	prope <i>aglavei</i> “North”	2n = 24 10m 2sm; AN = 48	Ag-NOR [7], CB, F	(6)
	<i>peraccae</i> (Boulenger, 1896)	2n = 26 7m 6sm; AN = 48		(2)
	<i>phantasticus</i>	2n = 26 13m; AN = 52		(6)
	sp. Ca3	2n = 26 12m 1sm; AN = 52	Ag-NOR [6], CB, F	(6)

orations (5% Giemsa solution at pH 7), Ag-NOR staining (Howell and Black 1980), C-banding according to Sumner (1972) and sequential C-banding + Fluorochromes (CMA+DAPI) following Mezzasalma et al. (2015). Ag-NOR and C-banding staining were not performed on *M. sp. Ca11* and *S. phantasticus*, because quantity and quality of metaphase plates were not adequate for additional staining methods. Karyotype reconstruction was performed using at least five plates per sample.

Results

Molecular taxonomic identification

The selected 16S fragment was successfully amplified and sequenced from all analysed samples. All newly generated sequences showed identity scores > 97% with homologous sequences available in the mantellid frogs database generated in Cocca (2020). We followed the nomenclature used in Vieites et al. (2009), updated in Perl et al. (2014) (see Table 1).

Cytogenetic analysis

The studied specimen of *Gephyromantis striatus*, *Mantidactylus* (*Bryoomantis*) *alutus* and *Spinomantis* prope *aglavei* “North” have a karyotype of 2n = 24 chromosomes, with the first six pairs distinctively larger than the other six pairs (Fig. 1; Table 3). In




Figure 1. Giemsa stained karyotypes of **A** *Gephyromantis striatus* (FN 7645) **B** *Mantidactylus* (*Brygoomantis*) *alutus* (FN 7945) **C** *Spinomantis* prope *aglavei* “North” (FN 7543) **D** *Gephyromantis* sp. Ca19 (FN 7630) **E** *Mantidactylus* (*Chonomantis*) sp. Ca11 (FN 7545) **F** *Mantidactylus* (*Hylobatrachus*) *cowanii* (FAZC 11370) **G** *Spinomantis* sp. Ca3 (FN 7567) and **H** *Spinomantis phantasticus* (FG/MV 2002-970). Insets represent NOR-bearing pairs stained with Giemsa (down in the insets) and Ag-NOR method (up in the insets).

G. striatus, the pairs 1–6, 8 are biarmed while the other pairs are telocentric, with the pair 10 bearing the NOR loci (Fig. 1A; Table 3). In *M. (Brygoomantis) alutus* and *S. prope aglavei* “North” all pairs are biarmed and NOR loci were detected on the 6th and 7th pair (Fig. 1B, C), respectively.

The samples of the other five species (*G. sp. Ca19*, *M. (Chonomantis) sp. Ca11*, *M. (Hylobatrachus) cowanii*, *S. phantasticus* and *S. sp. Ca3*) presented a karyotype of $2n = 26$ chromosomes, with the first five pairs distinctively larger than the remaining eight pairs (Fig. 1D–H). In these species, all chromosome pairs resulted biarmed, with the exception of *M. cowanii* and of *M. (Chonomantis) sp. Ca11*, whose karyotype showed one (pair 12) and two pairs (10 and 12) composed of telocentric elements, respectively (Fig. 1E, F). The sixth pair is the NOR bearing one in *G. sp. Ca19*, *M. cowanii* and *S. sp. Ca3* (Fig. 1D, F, G).

Table 3. Chromosome morphometric parameters of the study species. LR%= % Relative Length (length of a chromosome/total chromosome length*100); CI = centromeric index (ratio between short arm/chromosome length*100). Sh = chromosome shape (m = metacentric; sm = submetacentric; t = telocentric).

Sp.	<i>G. striatus</i>	<i>M. alutus</i>	<i>S. prope aglavei</i>	<i>G. sp. Ca19</i>	<i>M. sp Ca11</i>	<i>M. cowanii</i>	<i>S. sp. Ca11</i>	<i>S. phantasticus</i>
Chr.	LR%-CI (sh)	LR%-CI (sh)	LR%-CI (sh)	LR%-CI (sh)	LR%-CI (sh)	LR%-CI (sh)	LR%-CI (sh)	LR%-CI (sh)
1	16.8–41.6 (m)	15.1–44.0 (m)	16.9–40.7 (m)	15.0–46.3 (m)	12.3–39.3 (m)	18.6–48.8 (m)	16.1–37.8 (m)	16.2–38.5 (m)
2	12.7–36.9 (m)	11.8–48.5 (m)	14.0–32.0 (sm)	13.7–35.6 (sm)	12.0–34.9 (sm)	12.9–42.3 (m)	14.2–42.8 (m)	13.8–30.9 (sm)
3	11.8–36.7 (sm)	11.6–34.1 (sm)	12.1–26.0 (sm)	12.4–40.8 (m)	11.2–43.9 (m)	12.8–37.2 (sm)	12.4–38.2 (m)	11.5–34.8 (sm)
4	10.9–39.0 (m)	10.6–41.1 (m)	11.9–34.3 (sm)	11.3–42.8 (m)	11.1–38.4 (m)	11.3–40.0 (m)	12.1–30.6 (sm)	11.4–38.5 (m)
5	10.2–45.2 (m)	10.2–44.6 (m)	9.7–44.7 (m)	10.6–36.1 (sm)	10.0–41.7 (m)	19.2–44.8 (m)	9.1–36.0 (sm)	10.4–35.1 (sm)
6	9.7–48.7 (m)	10.1–48.2 (m)	9.7–42.6 (m)	6.4–31.1 (sm)	6.2–44.7 (m)	5.3–47.3 (m)	5.5–38.2 (m)	6.2–33.2 (sm)
7	6.0–0 (t)	5.9–49.0 (m)	4.5–33.0 (m)	5.0–40.1 (m)	6.1–46.2 (m)	5.3–49.3 (m)	5.5–38.7 (m)	6.2–42.9 (m)
8	5.6–39.0 (m)	5.9–41.4 (m)	4.1–47.0 (m)	4.8–29.3 (sm)	6.1–41.0 (m)	4.8–49.6 (m)	5.1–39.8 (m)	5.9–44.5 (m)
9	5.4–0 (t)	5.8–45.8 (m)	3.9–47.0 (m)	4.4–48.8 (m)	5.9–43.8 (m)	4.4–34.4 (sm)	4.9–43.9 (m)	4.4–48.8 (m)
10	4.6–0 (t)	4.9–43.0 (m)	3.5–39.3 (m)	4.3–42.9 (m)	5.5–0 (t)	4.3–41.7 (m)	4.2–44.1 (m)	3.8–48.8 (m)
11	3.4–0 (t)	4.1–45.0 (m)	3.3–49.0 (m)	4.3–37.4 (sm)	5.5–47.5 (m)	4.2–40.8 (m)	3.6–41.7 (m)	3.7–44.1 (m)
12	2.9–0 (t)	4.0–46.3 (m)	3.1–47.4 (m)	4.2–37.4 (sm)	4.2–0 (t)	4.0–0 (t)	3.4–38.0 (m)	3.5–49.6 (m)
13				3.6–43.5 (m)	4.1–42.6 (m)	3.8–38.2 (m)	3.2–46.1 (m)	3.0–43.8 (m)

In *G. striatus*, NOR associated heterochromatin was C-banding positive (CMA + and DAPI -) and tiny centromeric C-bands were present on some chromosome pairs (Fig. 2A, A', A"). *Mantidactylus alutus* and *Spimomantis prope aglavei* "North" showed centromeric and telomeric C-bands and NOR associated heterochromatin which were positive to CMA and DAPI negative (Fig. 2B, B', B" and C, C', C"). *Mantidactylus (Brygoomantis) alutus* also presented an additional bright centromeric band on the chromosomes of pair nine. *Gephyromantis* sp. Ca19 showed centromeric and telomeric C-bands, which were CMA and DAPI positive (Fig. 2D, D', D"). *Spimomantis* sp. Ca3 showed solid telomeric C-bands and NOR associated heterochromatin, which resulted CMA positive and DAPI negative (Fig. 2E, E', E"). *Mantidactylus (Hylobatrachus) cowanii* had centromeric C-bands on all chromosomes, which were CMA and DAPI negative (Fig. 2F, F', F"). No heteromorphic or completely heterochromatic chromosome were found in any of the studied samples.




Figure 2. Metaphase plates of *Gephyromantis striatus* (A, A', A''), *Mantidactylus (Brygoomantis) alutus* (B, B', B''), *Spinomantis prope aglawei* "North" (C, C', C''), *Gephyromantis* sp. Ca19 (D, D', D''), *Spinomantis* sp. Ca3 (E, E', E'') and *Mantidactylus (Hylobatrachus) cowanii* (F, F', F'') stained with C-banding + Giemsa (A-F), + CMA (A'-F') + DAPI (A''-F''). Arrows point at NORs while arrowheads highlight other heterochromatin blocks.

Discussion

We here provide new karyological data on eight frog species belonging to the subfamily Mantellinae and discuss the available chromosome data on this subfamily to provide a first comprehensive assessment of its karyological diversity.

Available data on representatives of the other two Mantellidae subfamilies (Boophinae and Laliostominae) highlight the occurrence of a conserved karyotype structure in terms of chromosome number and morphology. In particular, the first karyological studies by Blommers-Schlössers (1978) on 12 species of *Boophis* (Boophinae) and on *Aglyptodactylus madagascariensis* (Duméril, 1853) (Laliostominae) revealed a conserved karyotype of $2n = 26$ with all biarmed chromosomes.

Following studies by Aprea et al. (1998, 2004) expanded the knowledge on the karyological uniformity to the position of NORs loci, invariably on the sixth chromosome pair both in *Boophis* and *A. madagascariensis*, but evidenced different patterns of heterochromatin composition and distribution. Similar karyological characters were described also in different species of the genus *Mantella* (belonging to the subfamily Mantellinae), all showing a karyotype of $2n = 26$ with all biarmed chromosomes (Blommers-Schlössers 1978; Odierna et al. 2001). A karyotype of $2n = 26$ with all biarmed elements should thus be considered the primitive condition in the whole family Mantellidae, as it is highly conserved in all subfamilies, genera and most subgenera (see Blommers-Schlösser 1978; Aprea et al. 1998, 2004; Odierna et al. 2001, see Table 2). Nevertheless, species of other genera of the subfamily Mantellinae show a wider karyological variability, both concerning chromosomes number, morphology, localizations of NORs loci and heterochromatin composition and distribution (Blommers-Schlösser 1978; Odierna et al. 2001; present study) (see also Table 2).




Figure 3. Hypothesized general model of chromosome reduction in Mantellinae from $n = 13$ ($2n = 26$) to $n = 12$ ($2n = 24$) by means of chromosome fusions. Red dots highlight the NOR bearing chromosome.

Concerning the variability of the chromosome number, a $2n = 26$ karyotype is still the most common chromosomal configuration, but karyotypes with a reduced chromosome complement ($2n = 24$) have been documented in 9 species of three different genera (6 species of *Mantidactylus* (subgenus *Brygoomantis*), 2 *Spinomantis* and *Gephyromantis striatus*) (See Fig. 1 and Table 2). Furthermore, while the $2n = 26$ configuration occurs in all three subfamilies of the family Mantellidae (Mantellinae, Boophinae and Laliostominae) (e.g. Aprea et al. 1998, 2004; present study), karyotypes with $2n = 24$ seem to occur in just a few phylogenetically lineages (genus *Gephyromantis*, *Mantidactylus* and *Spinomantis*), where the $2n = 26$ configuration is also present (Blommers-Schlösser 1978; present study). In turn, the subfamily Boophinae, with all the species showing a $2n = 26$ karyotype (Aprea et al. 1998, 2004), has been depicted as a basal group in the Mantellidae radiation (see e.g. Wollenberg et al. 2011). These evidences suggest that a reduction of the chromosome number from $2n = 26$ to $2n = 24$ occurred repeatedly and independently in different lineages of the subfamily Mantellinae, probably involving chromosome inversions and a fusion (translocation) between two elements of the smallest pairs (6–13), giving rise to an additional large (6th) chromosome pair in several species (e.g. *G. striatus*, *M. (Brygoomantis) alutus*, and *S. prope aglavei* “North”) (Fig. 3; Table 3). Interestingly, a similar reduction of the chromosome number driven by tandem fusions (from $2n = 26$ to 24) has been documented also in the family Ranidae (Miura et al. 1995).

Other than tandem fusions, chromosome inversions of primitive biarmed elements also had a significant role in the morphological chromosome diversity observed in mantelline frogs. These mechanisms generated a variable number of telocentric elements in different evolutionary lineages (see Figs 1, 3 and Table 2).

Considering the position of the loci of NORs, our results and available literature data (Aprea et al. 1998, 2004; Odierna et al. 2001; Andreone et al. 2003), show that NORs occurrence on the sixth chromosome pair can be considered a primitive state, as it is described for all analysed species belonging to the genus *Boophis*, *A. madascariensis* and most *Gephyromantis*, *Mantidactylus* (subgenus *Brygoomantis*), and *Spinomantis*. On the other hand, a derivate configuration of NOR loci seems to have emerged multiple times in distinct lineages. The different positions of NOR loci in mantelline frogs suggest that these elements were also differently involved in the hypothesized chromosome fusions from $2n = 26$ to $2n = 24$, providing further support to multiple, independent rearrangements leading to similar karyotype configurations. In fact, while in *M. (Brygoomantis) alutus* the sixth large chromosome pair likely derived from a fusion involving the primitive NOR bearing pair and another smaller pair, in *G. striatus* and *S. prope aglavei* “North” the pair 6 does not include NOR loci, which are found on the 7th and 10th chromosome pair, respectively (see Fig. 1). In other species of *Gephyromantis*, *Blommersia*, *Guibemantis* and *Mantella* the relocation of NORs involved different pairs (1st, 2nd, 8th, 9th, 10th or 11th) (Odierna et al. 2001; Andreone et al. 2003; this study). It should be noted that Ag-NOR staining only evidences active NORs, and the existence of different inactive sites in the karyotypes of the studied species cannot be excluded based only on this analysis. However, we found correspondence in NOR

location using both Ag-NOR and C-banding + CMA (in Figs 1, 2), which also has the power to uncover rDNA clusters (Schmid 1982; Zaleśna et al. 2017).

Various mechanisms may be responsible for NOR relocation, such as cryptic structural rearrangements, minute insertions, reintegration of rDNA genes amplified during ovogonial auxocytosis or the activation of silent sites (Nardi et al. 1977; Schmid 1978; King 1980; Mahony and Robinson 1986; Schmid and Guttenbach 1988; Mezzasalma et al. 2018). These mechanisms may be independent to other rearrangements, despite the resulting change in the configuration of NORs is a significant indicator of lineage divergence at different taxonomic level (e.g. Pardo et al. 2001; Mezzasalma et al. 2015, 2018, 2021).

Sequential C-banding did not evidence the occurrence of any sex-specific, largely heterochromatic chromosomes (generally related to differentiated heterogametic sex chromosomes, a condition not yet documented in the family Mantellidae), B chromosomes, or interchromosomal rearrangements leading to heteromorphic autosome pairs (e.g. Mezzasalma et al. 2014, 2016, 2017b; Sidhom et al. 2020). Nevertheless, C-banding showed a heterogeneous heterochromatin distribution in Mantellidae (see also Aprea et al. 1998, 2004; Odierna et al. 2001; Andreone et al. 2003), highlighting the occurrence of species-specific banding patterns. For example, *G. striatus* and *M. (Hylobatrachus) cowanii* show different amount and location of C-banding positive heterochromatin in comparison with closely related species with the same chromosome number and similar morphology (e.g. *G. sp. Ca19* and *M. (Brygoomantis) alutus*). Interspecific variations in heterochromatin are generally due to different levels of amplification of highly repetitive DNA (Charlesworth et al. 1994). These differences mostly occurred without modifications of the chromosome morphology in Mantellidae (see also Aprea et al. 1998, 2004; Odierna et al. 2001; Andreone et al. 2003), probably by means of symmetrical addition/deletion of heterochromatin. The occurrence of distinctive species-specific banding patterns may be useful in evolutionary cytogenetic and cytotaxonomic studies in the subfamily, but comprehensive comparative analyses would benefit from more banding data on species of different genera and subgenera.

Finally, we also highlight the importance of a preliminary molecular taxonomic identification of mantellid frogs for a consistent karyotype attribution, and that future cytogenetic studies should focus on *Laliostoma* Glaw et al., 1998, *Wakea* Glaw et Vences, 2006, *Boehmantis* Glaw et Vences, 2006 and *Tsingymantis* Glaw et al., 2006, as well as on different undersampled genera and subgenera.

Conclusions

We provide new chromosomal data on eight species belonging to the subfamily Mantellinae, advancing the knowledge on their karyotype diversity, and suggesting that a reduction in the chromosome number and the relocation of NORs loci occurred repeatedly and independently in different genera of this subfamily. We hypothesize a

karyotype of $2n = 26$ with all biarmed elements and loci of NORs on the 6th chromosome pair as the ancestral state in the whole family Mantellidae and propose a model for the reduction of the chromosome number from $2n = 26$ to $2n = 24$ by means of tandem fusions.

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to Malagasy authorities for granting research and export permits. Numerous colleagues helped us in the field: Gennaro Aprea, Frank Glaw, Miguel Vences. Portuguese National Funds through FCT (Foundation for Science and Technology) support the 2020.00823.CEECIND/CP1601/CT0003 contract to AC and the IC-ETA 2020-37 contract to MM. This work was supported by National Funds through FCT under the PTDC/BIA-EVL/31254/2017 project.

References

- AmphibiaWeb (2021) University of California, Berkeley, CA, USA. <https://amphibiaweb.org> [Last Accessed 01 March 2021]
- Andreone F, Aprea G, Vences M, Odierna G (2003) A new frog of the genus *Mantidactylus* from the rainforests of north-eastern Madagascar, and its karyological affinities. *Amphibia-Reptilia* 24(3): 285–303. <https://doi.org/10.1163/156853803322440763>
- Andreone F, Rosa GM, Noël J, Crottini A, Vences M, Raxworthy CJ (2010) Living within dry palm leaves: the discovery of an unknown *Blommersia* (Mantellidae: Anura) reveals a new reproductive strategy in the amphibians of Madagascar. *Naturwissenschaften* 97(6): 525–543. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00114-010-0667-x>
- Aprea G, Andreone F, Capriglione T, Odierna G (1998) Chromosome banding in several Malagasy anuran species belonging to the genera *Aglyptodactylus*, *Boophis* and *Mantidactylus*. Abstracts of the 9th Ordinary General Meeting of the Societas Herpetologica Europaea. Chambéry, August 25–29, 1998, Chambéry, 21–21.
- Aprea G, Andreone F, Capriglione T, Odierna G, Vences M (2004) Evidence for a remarkable stasis of chromosome evolution in Malagasy treefrogs (*Boophis*, Mantellidae). *Italian Journal of Zoology* 71(2): 237–244. <https://doi.org/10.1080/11250000409356641>
- Blommers-Schlösser RMA (1978) Cytotaxonomy of the Ranidae, Rhacophoridae, Hyperoliidae (Anura) from Madagascar with a note on the karyotype of two amphibians of the Seychelles. *Genetica* 48(1): 23–40. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.0060118>
- Charlesworth B, Sniegowski P, Stephan W (1994) The evolutionary dynamics of repetitive DNA in eukaryotes. *Nature* 371: 215–220. <https://doi.org/10.1038/371215a0>
- Cocca W (2020) Studying the processes of species diversification using the adaptive radiation of the mantellid frogs of Madagascar (Anura: Mantellidae) as a model system. Ph.D. Dissertation, Porto, Portugal, University of Porto. <https://repositorio-aberto.up.pt/handle/10216/130002?locale=en>

- Cocca W, Andreone F, Belluardo F, Rosa GM, Randrianirina JE, Glaw F, Crottini A (2020) Resolving a taxonomic and nomenclatural puzzle in mantellid frogs: synonymization of *Gephyromantis azzurrae* with *G. corvus*, and description of *Gephyromantis kintana* sp. nov. from the Isalo Massif, western Madagascar. *ZooKeys* 951: 133–157. <https://doi.org/10.3897/zookeys.951.51129>
- Crottini A, Glaw F, Casiraghi M, Jenkins RKB, Mercurio V, Randrianantoandro JC, Randrianirina JE, Andreone F (2011a) A new *Gephyromantis* (*Phylacomantis*) frog species from the pinnacle karst of Bemaraha, western Madagascar. *ZooKeys* 81: 51–71. <https://doi.org/10.3897/zookeys.81.1111>
- Crottini A, Barbuto M, Casiraghi M, Andreone (2011b) A rapid amphibian survey at Itremo-Ambatofinandrahana, central Madagascar, with confirmed absence of chytrid fungus and recommendations for future monitoring activities. *North-Western Journal of Zoology* 7(2): 346–351. <http://biozoojournals.ro/nwjl/content/v7n2/nwjl.111214.Crottini.pdf>
- Crottini A, Bollen A, Weldon C, Dalton DL, Kotze A, Noël J, Iambana B, Andreone F (2014) Amphibian survey and current absence of *Batrachochytrium dendrobatidis* (Bd) in Ivoloina Park, Toamasina (eastern Madagascar). *African Journal of Herpetology* 63(1): 70–78. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21564574.2013.833994>
- Frost DR (2021) Amphibian species of the world: an online reference. Version 6.1. Electronic Database accessible at <https://amphibiansoftheworld.amnh.org/index.php>. American Museum of Natural History, New York, USA. <https://doi.org/10.5531/db.vz.0001>
- Ganzhorn JU, Lowry II PP, Schatz GE, Somme S (2001) The biodiversity of Madagascar: one of the world's hottest hotspots on its way out. *Oryx* 35(4): 346–348. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-3008.2001.00201.x>
- Glaw F, Vences M (2006) Phylogeny and genus-level classification of mantellid frogs (Amphibia, Anura). *Organisms, Diversity and Evolution* 6(3): 236–253. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ode.2005.12.001>
- Glaw F, Vences M (2007) A Field Guide to the Amphibians and Reptiles of Madagascar. 3rd edn. Vences M and Glaw F, Verlags GbR, Köln, 496 pp.
- Glaw F, Vences M, Böhme W (1998) Systematic revision of the genus *Aglyptodactylus* Boulenger, 1919 (Amphibia: Ranidae), and analysis of its phylogenetic relationships to other Madagascan ranid genera (*Tomopterna*, *Boophis*, *Mantidactylus*, and *Mantella*). *Journal of Zoological Systematics and Evolutionary Research* 36(1–2): 17–37. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1439-0469.1998.tb00775.x>
- Howell WM, Black DA (1980) Controlled silver staining of nucleolus organizer regions with a protective colloidal developer: a 1 step method. *Experientia* 36(8): 1014–1015. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01953855>
- Kaffenberger N, Wollenberg KC, Köhler J, Glaw F, Vieites DR, Vences M (2012) Molecular phylogeny and biogeography of Malagasy frogs of the genus *Gephyromantis*. *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution* 62(1): 555–560. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ympev.2011.09.023>
- King M (1980) C-banding studies on Australian hylid frogs: Secondary constriction structure and the concept of euchromatin transformation. *Chromosoma* 80(2): 191–217. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00286300>

- Mahony MJ, Robinson ES (1986) Nucleolar organiser region (NOR) location in karyotypes of Australian ground frogs (Family Myobatrachidae). *Genetica* 68(2): 119–127. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02424409>
- Mezzasalma M, Andreone F, Aprea G, Glaw F, Odierna G, Guarino FM (2017a) Molecular phylogeny, biogeography and chromosome evolution of Malagasy dwarf geckos of the genus *Lygodactylus* (Squamata, Gekkonidae). *Zoologica Scripta* 46(1): 42–54. <https://doi.org/10.1111/zsc.12188>
- Mezzasalma M, Andreone F, Aprea G, Glaw F, Odierna G, Guarino FM (2017b) When can chromosomes drive speciation? The peculiar case of the Malagasy tomato frogs (genus *Dyscophus*). *Zoologischer Anzeiger* 268: 41–46. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcz.2017.04.006>
- Mezzasalma M, Andreone F, Branch WR, Glaw F, Guarino FM, Nagy ZT, Odierna G, Aprea G (2014) Chromosome evolution in pseudoxyrhophiine snakes from Madagascar: a wide range of karyotypic variability. *Biological Journal of Linnean Society London* 112(3): 450–460. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bij.12280>
- Mezzasalma M, Andreone F, Glaw F, Petraccioli A, Odierna G, Guarino FM (2016) A karyological study of three typhlopoid species with some inferences on chromosome evolution in blindsnakes (Scoleophidia). *Zoologischer Anzeiger* 264: 34–40. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcz.2016.07.001>
- Mezzasalma M, Andreone F, Glaw F, Odierna G, Petraccioli A, Guarino FM (2018) Chromosome aneuploidy in an endemic Malagasy gecko (Gekkonidae: *Geckolepis*). *Salamandra* 54(1): 56–62. <http://www.salamandra-journal.com>
- Mezzasalma M, Andreone F, Glaw F, Guarino FM, Odierna G, Petraccioli A, Picariello O (2019) Changes in heterochromatin content and ancient chromosome fusion in the endemic Malagasy boid snakes *Sanzinia* and *Acrantophis* (Squamata: Serpentes). *Salamandra* 55(2): 140–144. <http://www.salamandra-journal.com>
- Mezzasalma M, Glaw F, Odierna G, Petraccioli A, Guarino FM (2015) Karyological analyses of *Pseudhymenochirus merlini* and *Hymenochirus boettgeri* provide new insights into the chromosome evolution in the anuran family Pipidae. *Zoologischer Anzeiger* 258: 47–53. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcz.2015.07.001>
- Mezzasalma M, Guarino FM, Aprea G, Petraccioli A, Crottini A, Odierna G (2013) Karyological evidence for diversification of Italian slow worm populations (Squamata, Anguillidae). *Comparative Cytogenetics* 7(3): 217–227. <https://doi.org/10.3897/compcytogen.v7i3.5398>
- Mezzasalma M, Odierna G, Petraccioli A, Veith M, Guarino FM (2021) Karyological diversification in the genus *Lyciasalamandra* (Urodela: Salamandridae). *Animals* 11(6): 1709. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ani11061709>
- Miura I, Nishioka M, Borkin LJ, Wu Z (1995) The origin of the brown frogs with $2n = 24$ chromosomes. *Experientia* 51(2): 179–188. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01929366>
- Morescalchi A (1967) Le relazioni tra il cariotipo di anuri diplasioceli. I. Il corredo cromosomico di alcuni Ranidae. *Caryologia* 20(1): 65–85. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00087114.1967.10796248>

- Myers N, Mittermeier RA, Mittermeier CG, da Fonseca GAB, Kent J (2000) Biodiversity hot-spots for conservation priorities. *Nature* 403(6772): 853–858. <https://doi.org/10.1038/35002501>
- Nardi I, Barsacchi-Pilone G, Batistoni R, Andronico F (1977) Chromosome location of the ribosomal RNA genes in *Triturus vulgaris meridionalis* (Amphibia, Urodela). II. Intraspecific variability in number and position of the chromosome for 18S and 28S ribosomal RNA. *Chromosoma* 64(1): 67–84. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00292889>
- Odierna G, Vences M, Aprea G, Lötters S, Andreone F (2001) Chromosome data for Malagasy poison frogs (Amphibia: Ranidae: *Mantella*) and their bearing on taxonomy and phylogeny. *Zoological Science* 18(4): 505–514. <https://doi.org/10.2108/zsj.18.505>
- Palumbi SR, Martin A, Romano S, Mcmillan WO, Stice L, Grabowski G (1991) The Simple Fool's Guide to PCR, Version 2.0. Privately published, University of Hawaii.
- Pardo BG, Bouza C, Castro J, Martínez P, Sánchez L (2001) Localization of ribosomal genes in Pleuronectiformes using Ag-, CMA₃-banding and in situ hybridization. *Heredity* 86(5): 531–536. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2540.2001.00802.x>
- Penny SG, Crottini A, Andreone F, Bellati A, Rakotozafy LMS, Holderied MW, Schwitzer C, Rosa GM (2017) Combining old and new evidence to increase the known biodiversity value of the Sahamalaza Peninsula, Northwest Madagascar. *Contribution to Zoology* 86(4): 273–296. <https://doi.org/10.1163/18759866-08604002>
- Perl RGB, Nagy ZT, Sonet G, Glaw F, Wollenberg KC, Vences M (2014) DNA barcoding Madagascar's amphibian fauna. *Amphibia-Reptilia* 35(2): 197–206. <https://doi.org/10.1163/15685381-00002942>
- Pintak T, Vences M, Glaw F, Böhme W (1998) Comparative chromosome morphology of Malagasy poison frogs (Amphibia: Ranidae: *Mantella*). *Folia Zoologica* 47(3): 197–204.
- Richards CM, Nussbaum RA, Raxworthy CJ (2000) Phylogenetic relationships within the Madagascan boophids and mantellids as elucidated by mitochondrial ribosomal genes. *African Journal of Herpetology* 49(1): 23–32. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21564574.2000.9650013>
- Rosa GM, Andreone F, Crottini A, Hauswaldt JS, Noël J, Rabibisoa NH, Randriambahinirime MO, Rebelo R, Raxworthy CJ (2012) The amphibians of the relict Betampona low-elevation rainforest, eastern Madagascar: an application of the integrative taxonomy approach to biodiversity assessments. *Biodiversity and Conservation* 21(6): 1531–1559. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10531-012-0262-x>
- Sambrook J, Fritsch EF, Maniatis T (1989) *Molecular Cloning: A Laboratory Manual*, 2nd edn. Cold Spring Harbor Lab Press, New York.
- Schmid M (1978) Chromosome banding in Amphibia. II. Constitutive heterochromatin and nucleolar organizer regions in Ranidae, Microhylidae and Rhacophoridae. *Chromosoma* 77: 83–103. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00287145>
- Schmid M (1982) Chromosome Banding in Amphibia VII. Analysis of the Structure and Variability of NORs in Anura. *Chromosoma* 87: 327–344. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00327634>
- Schmid M, Guttenbach M (1988) Evolutionary diversity of reverse (R) fluorescent chromosome bands in vertebrates. *Chromosoma* 97(2): 101–114. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00327367>

- Sidhom M, Said K, Chatti N, Guarino FM, Odierna G, Petraccioli A, Picariello O, Mezzasalma M (2020) Karyological characterization of the common chameleon (*Chamaeleo chamaeleon*) provides insights on the evolution and diversification of sex chromosomes in Chamaeleonidae. *Zoology* 141: 125738. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.zool.2019.125738>
- Sumner AT (1972) A simple technique for demonstrating centromeric heterochromatin. *Experimental Cell Research* 75(1): 304–306. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0014-4827\(72\)90558-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0014-4827(72)90558-7)
- Vences M, Glaw F (2005) A new species of *Mantidactylus* from the East Coast of Madagascar and its molecular phylogenetic relationships within the subgenus *Guibemantis*. *Herpetological Journal* 15(1): 37–44.
- Vences M, Glaw F, Mausfeld P, Böhme W (1998) Comparative osteology of Malagasy poison frogs of the genus *Mantella* (Amphibia: Ranidae: Mantellinae). *Bonner zoologische Beiträge* 48: 205–215. <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/page/44945242#page/221/mode/1up>
- Vences M, Thomas M, van der Meijden A, Chiari Y, Vieites DR (2005) Comparative performance of the 16S rRNA gene in DNA barcoding of amphibians. *Frontiers in Zoology* 2(1): 5. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1742-9994-2-5>
- Vences M, Wahl-Boos G, Hoegg S, Glaw F, Spinelli Oliveira E, Meyer A, Perry S (2007) Molecular systematics of mantelline frogs from Madagascar and the evolution of their femoral glands. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society* 92(3): 529–539. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1095-8312.2007.00859.x>
- Vences M, Wollenberg KC, Vieites DR, Lees DC (2009) Madagascar as a model region of species diversification. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 24(8): 456–465. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2009.03.011>
- Vieites DR, Wollenberg KC, Andreone F, Kohler J, Glaw F, Vences M (2009) Vast underestimation of Madagascar's biodiversity evidenced by an integrative amphibian inventory. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 106(20): 8267–8272. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0810821106>
- Wollenberg KC, Vieites DR, Glaw F, Vences M (2011) Speciation in little: the role of range and body size in the diversification of Malagasy mantellid frogs. *BMC Evolutionary Biology* 11(1): 217. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2148-11-217>
- Zaleśna A, Florek M, Rybacki M, Ogielska M (2017) Variability of NOR patterns in European water frogs of different genome composition and ploidy level. *Comparative Cytogenetics* 11(2): 249–266. <https://doi.org/10.3897/CompCytogen.v11i2.10804>

ORCID

Marcello Mezzasalma <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7246-9831>

Franco Andreone <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9809-5818>

Fabio Maria Guarino <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1511-7792>

Angelica Crottini <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8505-3050>