Reconstructing the nonadaptive radiation of an ancient lineage of ground-dwelling stick insects (Phasmatodea: Heteropterygidae)
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Abstract. Stick and leaf insects (Phasmatodea) are large terrestrial herbivorous arthropods known for masquerading as plant parts such as bark, twigs and leaves. Their evolutionary history is largely shaped by convergent evolution associated with adaptive radiations on geographically isolated landmasses that have repeatedly generated ground-dwelling ecomorphs. The members of one lineage, however, the Oriental Heteropterygidae, are morphologically rather uniform, and have a predominantly ground-dwelling lifestyle. The phylogeny of Heteropterygidae that comprises approximately 130 described species is controversial and remains uncertain. In particular, the systematic position of the giant Jungle Nymph Heteropteryx dilatata, whose males are capable of flight and exhibit the most plesiomorphic wing morphology among extant phasmatodeans, is of major interest to the scientific community. Here, we analysed a set of seven nuclear and mitochondrial genes to infer the phylogeny of Heteropterygidae covering the group’s overall diversity. The divergence time estimation and reconstruction of the historical biogeography resulted in an ancestral distribution across Sundaland with long distance dispersal events to Wallacea, the Philippines and the South Pacific. We were able to resolve the relationships among the three principal subgroups of Heteropterygidae and revealed the Dataminae, which contain entirely wingless small forms, as the sister group of Heteropteryginae + Obriminae. Within Heteropteryginae, Haaniella is recovered as paraphyletic in regard to Heteropteryx. Consequently, Heteropteryx must be considered a subordinate taxon deeply embedded within a flightless clade of stick insects. Within Obriminae, the Bornean Hoploclonia is strongly supported as the earliest diverging lineage. Based on this finding, we recognize only two tribes of
equal rank among Obriminae, the Hoplocloniini trib. nov. and Obrimini sensu nov. Within the latter, we demonstrate that previous tribal assignments do not reflect phylogenetic relationships and that a basal splitting event occurred between the wing-bearing clade Mioceramia + Pterobrimus and the remaining wingless Obrimini. The Philippine genus Tisamenus is paraphyletic with regard to Ilocano hebardii, thus, we transfer the latter species to Tisamenus as Tisamenus hebardii comb. nov. and synonymize Ilocano with Tisamenus. We discuss character transformations in the light of the new phylogenetic results and conclude that the current taxonomic diversity appears to be mainly driven by allopatry and not to be the result of niche differentiation. This radiation is thus best described as a nonadaptive radiation.

Introduction

The evolutionary history of stick and leaf insects, commonly referred to as the insect order Phasmatodea, appears to be strongly shaped by convergent evolution as a consequence of repeated adaptive radiations in geographical isolation as has been revealed for the stick insect faunas of Australia, New Caledonia, New Zealand, Madagascar and the Mascarene archipelago (Buckley et al., 2009, 2010; Bradler et al., 2015; Glaw et al., 2019; Simon et al., 2019). Thus, similar morphological forms as well as behavioural traits (Robertson et al., 2018) were often acquired independently due to similar selective pressures associated with adaptations to the same habitat in separate geographic areas. For decades this has deceived taxonomists who tried to recover the phylogeny of Phasmatodea based on morphology alone (Bradler et al., 2014). In contrast to adaptive radiations, where species diversification is driven by the occupation of a variety of ecological roles resulting in considerable phenotypic disparity (Givnish, 1997), nonadaptive radiations might also play a major role in stick insect evolution. Nonadaptive radiation is defined as the diversification from a single ancestor that is not accompanied by relevant niche differentiation (Gittenberger, 1991), resulting in a group of allopatric taxa with little or no ecological and phenotypic variation (Rundell & Price, 2009). Adaptive radiation has been extensively studied in the past, whereas the phenomenon of nonadaptive radiation has been largely neglected and appears to be controversially discussed (Wilke et al., 2010). A clade of Oriental stick insects, the Heteropterygidae may be considered to represent a nonadaptive radiation since its members deploy a number of uniform phenotypic and behavioural characteristics associated with living close to the forest floor. Although often generally referred to as ground-dwellers (Bragg, 1998; Hennemann et al., 2016a; Bradler & Buckley, 2018; Bresseel & Constant, 2018), Heteropterygidae can also be found on bark (e.g. Mearnsiana Rehn & Rehn; Hennemann et al., 2016a) and in the vegetation, in particular during nocturnal feeding, whereas during daytime they mostly rest among leaf litter, pieces of bark or between roots of trees (Bragg, 2001). However, the group exhibits a consistent egg-deposition mode by burying eggs in the soil (Robertson et al., 2018).

The majority of stick and leaf insects are highly adapted to masquerade as plant parts in order to avoid detection by predators. An elongated twig-like morphotype is prevalent, with some stick insects counting among the longest insects worldwide with body lengths of over 30 cm (Hennemann & Conle, 2008). The Heteropterygidae, however, is not known for extremely long and slender insects but for rather robust forms including the large Jungle Nymph Heteropteryx dilatata Parkinson, one of the heaviest insects worldwide with a body weight of over 50 g (Wood, 1976; Beccaloni, 2010). Instead of resembling slender twigs, these stout ground-dwellers are generally coloured brownish and mimic leaf litter or bark (Figs. 1, 2). Adapted to life near the ground, most species are flightless with no or strongly shortened wings, and eggs are always deposited into the soil (Bradler & Buckley, 2018; Robertson et al., 2018). Although these traits limit their dispersal capacity, heteropterygids have managed to disperse across the Indomalayan and Australasian region since their origin approximately 50 million years ago (Robertson et al., 2018; Simon et al., 2019). The radiation gave rise to ~130 described species, which are currently assigned to 27 genera (Brock et al., 2020) of which one, Woodlarkia Günther, is believed not to belong to Heteropterygidae (Hennemann et al., 2016a).

Since the clade was originally introduced as Heteropteryginae by Kirby (1896), various taxa have been added and transferred in a rather disorderly way to and within the four traditional subgroups Anisacanthini, Datamini, Heteropterygini and Obrimini (e.g. Redtenbacher, 1906; Rehn & Rehn, 1938; Günther, 1953; Beier, 1968; Klante, 1976; Bradley & Galil, 1977; Zompro, 2004) and Heteropteryginae was eventually elevated to the rank of a family by Zompro (1996) with its aforementioned tribes considered as subfamilies afterwards (see Hennemann et al., 2016a, for a detailed summary). The Anisacanthinae comprising a group of Malagasy stick insects was later considered to be unrelated to the remaining Heteropterygidae and excluded by Zompro (2004). This view was recently supported by molecular data, which simultaneously provided evidence for a monophyletic group combining all stick insects from Madagascar (Glaw et al., 2019; Simon et al., 2019). Also, the monophyly of Heteropterygidae and its three subordinate clades was demonstrated in various studies using molecular
Molecular phylogenetic studies have been useful for revising the problematic traditional classification of Phasmatodea and have substantiated several taxonomic groups (Buckley et al., 2009; Bradler et al., 2015; Robertson et al., 2018; Glaw et al., 2019). Even the uncertain phylogenetic relationships between the major phasmatodean lineages were recently resolved by a phylogenomic analysis based on transcriptomic data (Simon et al., 2019). Simon et al. (2019) were able to provide clarity on the relationships of most major phasmatodean clades and placed Heteropterygidae as a taxon derived from a rather ancient node and sister group to all remaining members of the species-rich Old World clade Oriophasmata. Notably, the only poorly supported node (49% bootstrap support) in that study happened to occur within Heteropterygidae, illustrating the problematic nature of Heteropterygidae phylogeny. The estimated relationship presented Obriminae as sister to the poorly supported group of Dataminae + Heteropteryginae,
which was already shown in the multi-gene study by Robertson et al. (2018). Although the latter included less sequence data, their sample size comprised five times as many individuals as the transcriptomic study by Simon et al. (2019) contributing to an increase in support to 71% (Bayesian posterior probability) for the same node.

Here, we provide an even more comprehensive data set exhaustively covering the overall diversity of Heteropterygidae by including representatives of most genera and spanning across the group’s entire geographic distribution. We used a set of three nuclear and four mitochondrial genes for a phylogenetic analysis to test the monophyly of Heteropterygidae and its subgroups as well as to identify their phylogenetic relationship. One focus was on resolving the systematic position of taxa previously considered as problematic due to the presence of unusual anatomical traits (Bradler, 2009) such as *Hoploclonia* Stål, which is characterized by a unique secondary ovipositor among Heteropterygidae, and *Miroceramia* Günther and *Pterobrimus* Redtenbacher, the only Obriminae taxa with wings or wing remnants (*Pterobrimus*). In particular, we intended to robustly place *Heteropteryx dilatata* among stick and leaf insects, whose prominent male exhibits the most plesiomorphic fore wing among all extant phasmatodeans (Willmann, 2003; Shang et al., 2011). We combined the phylogenetic data with geographical data to reconstruct the historical biogeography and discuss implications for the classification of Heteropterygidae. Furthermore, our phylogeny provides a comparative framework to facilitate the interpretation of evolutionary processes, for instance, to explore size evolution and survey the highly debated hypothesis on the (re-)evolution of wings in stick
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**Fig. 2.** Photographs of representatives of Obriminae. (A) couple of *Tisamenus* sp. (Sibuyan); (B, C) female and male of *Tisamenus hebardi* comb. nov.; (D) couple of *Hoploclonia cuspidata* (Brunei); (E) male of *Brasidas* sp. (Camiguin Island); (F), couple of *Eubulides igorrote* (Mt. Pullo); (G) female of *Aretaon muscosus* (Mulu, Borneo). Photos by Albert Kang. [Colour figure can be viewed at wileyonlinelibrary.com].
Material and methods

Taxonomic sampling and laboratory protocols

For our phylogenetic analysis, we included 123 representatives of Heteropterygidae covering all of the 26 currently recognized genera (excl. Woodlarkia) except for four of which no sample could be obtained (Hainanaphasma Ho, Heterocopus Redtenbacher, Microrestes Bresseel & Constant and Spinodares Bragg). We added 65 outgroup species from other major phasmatoan lineages resulting in a total of 188 specimens (see Table S1 for details). We predominantly chose new, previously unused outgroup taxa in order to assess and corroborate the gross phylogeny of Phasmatoidea based on a novel set of samples. Molecular data of 43 taxa was already published and available on GenBank (Whiting et al., 2003; Buckley et al., 2011; Vera et al., 2012; Schwander et al., 2013; Bradler et al., 2014; Bradler et al., 2015; Goldberg et al., 2015; Robertson et al., 2018; Glaw et al., 2019) and for nine of these we were able to acquire additional material to sequence missing genes.

Samples were either stored in ethanol (70–100%) or dried. A unique sample code was given to every specimen and whenever possible, the voucher was stored at the Biodiversity Museum at the University of Göttingen, at the Royal Belgian Institute of Natural Sciences or in a private collection (see Table S1). Dried tissue was soaked in pure water before dissection. We removed muscle tissue from coxae and/or femora of each specimen. When the amount of gathered tissue was insufficient, one or two whole legs were used. Prior to DNA extraction, complete evaporation of ethanol residues was ensured. DNA was extracted from each sample using the Quick-DNA Miniprep Plus Kit (Zymo Research Europe GmbH, Freiburg, Germany). The manufacturer’s protocol was followed for solid tissues and DNA was eluted in 60 μL of the provided elution buffer.

Polymerase chain reaction (PCR) amplifications were performed in 10 μL reactions containing the following reagent volumes: 5.12 μL water, 1 μL dNTP (2 mM; RotiMix PCR-1, Carl Roth GmbH & Co. KG, Karlsruhe, Germany), 1 μL 10x DreamTaq Green Buffer (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Waltham, U.S.A.), 0.08 μL DreamTaq DNA Polymerase (Thermo Fisher Scientific), 0.4 μL forward primer, 0.4 μL reverse primer and 2 μL template. Three nuclear and four mitochondrial target genes were amplified for each sample. Nuclear data included 18S rRNA (18S), 28S rRNA and Histone subunit 3 (H3) and mitochondrial data was sampled from cytochrome oxidase subunit I and II (COI and COII), 12S rRNA (12S) and 16S rRNA (16S) (Buckley et al., 2009; Robertson et al., 2013). The 18S gene was amplified and sequenced using a combination of three overlapping primer sets (Robertson et al., 2013). The PCR thermal cycling program was set to an initial step of 95°C for 1 min, 40 cycles of 95°C for 1 min, respective annealing temperature for 1 min and 72°C for 1.5 min, followed by a final extension step of 72°C for 8 min. See Table S2 for more information on primers and specific annealing temperatures. Successful amplification of PCR products was verified by gel electrophoresis. We applied an enzymatic cleanup method using 1–2 μL of ExoSAP-IT™ Express (Thermo Fisher Scientific) to purify 2.5–5 μL of PCR product which was subsequently Sanger-sequenced by Microsynth Seqlab (Göttingen, Germany). DNA sequences and corresponding electrophero grams were examined and edited in Geneious v. 11.0.5 (Biomat ters Ltd., Auckland, New Zealand). We used the implementation of BLASTN (Nucleotide Basic Local Alignment Search Tool; Altschul et al., 1990) in Geneious to compare our data to reference sequences available at NCBI and subsequently removed identified contaminants. Final sequences were deposited in GenBank under accession numbers MN924966–MN925870 (see Table S1).

Phylogenetic analysis

Nucleotide sequences were combined with previously published data and aligned for each gene separately with MAFFT v. 7.450 (Katoh & Standley, 2013) under the G-INS-I algorithm using --globalpair --maxiterate 1000. Subsequently, we used MACSE v. 2.03 (Ranwez et al., 2018) to deal with length variability of alignment extremities by trimming each multiple sequence alignment (MSA) from the beginning and the end until a coverage of 50% was reached (--prog trimAlignment -align alignment.fasta -min_percent_NT_at_ends 0.5). Internal gaps (gappy columns) of ribosomal genes (12S, 16S, 18S and 28S) with less than three nucleotides per column were removed using a custom-made Perl script. All MSAs were visually inspected for ambiguously aligned sequence sections and – if necessary – manually corrected in Geneious v. 11.0.5 (www.geneious.com). Protein coding genes (COI, COII and H3) were translated into the corresponding amino acid sequences to ensure the correct frameshift and internal gaps were manually removed.

Concatenation was carried out with FASCONVAT v. 1.1 (Küch & Meusemann, 2010) and resulted in a 5343 bp supermatrix (File S1). We partitioned the supermatrix into 13 data blocks, namely, the four ribosomal genes and each codon position of each of the three protein coding genes. We used PARTITIONFINDER v. 2.1.1 (Guindon et al., 2010; Lanfear et al., 2012; Lanfear et al., 2016) to identify the optimal partitioning scheme and best-fit model (greedy algorithm and linked branch lengths). All models were considered (models = all) and model selection was performed under the corrected Akaike information criterion (AICc: model_selection = aicc). PartitionFinder merged the third codon positions of the COI and COII partitions and kept all other data blocks separate resulting in 12 subsets (Table S3). Topology and support of certain phylogenetic relationships may be affected by missing data or unstable ‘rogue’ taxa (Wilkinson, 1996). We generated single-gene trees for each of the seven loci in IQ-TREE v. 1.6.10 (Nguyen et al., 2015) under default settings and used the partitioned concatenated supermatrix to generate 300 standard nonparametric bootstrap trees (Chernomor et al., 2016). The set of bootstrap trees served as input for ROGUAFOREST v. 1.0 (Aberer et al., 2013), which
we used with default settings to identify rogue taxa. Although several taxa were detected, only *Orestes guangxiensis* scored considerably high (score = 7.197). After viewing the affected single-gene trees for rogue behaviour, we removed the 28S sequence of this taxon from the dataset.

A Maximum Likelihood (ML) phylogeny was inferred from the final supermatrix with a partitioned analysis in IQ-TREE v. 1.6.10 (Nguyen et al., 2015; Chernomor et al., 2016) using the subsets and substitution models suggested by PartitionFinder. The analysis was run with random starting trees and 1000 ultrafast bootstrap pseudo-replicates (UFBoot; Hoang et al., 2018). We also conducted a single branch test by performing the Shimodaira-Hasegawa-like approximate likelihood ratio test with random starting trees and 1000 replicates (SH-aLRT; Guindon et al., 2010). Since both ML trees resulted in the same topology, we wanted to determine the actual best-scoring log-likelihood tree by running 50 independent ML analyses based on random starting trees. We also assessed nodal support by estimating 500 standard nonparametric bootstrap (BS) trees. The support values were mapped on the best-scoring ML tree after the convergence of BS replicates was verified using the ‘bootstopping’ criterion implemented in RAxML v. 8.2.12 (Stamatakis, 2014). All trees were rooted with Asphalmodatidae (sister taxon to Neophasmatodea; Simon et al., 2019) and visualized in FigTree v. 1.4.4 (https://github.com/rambaut/figtree).

In addition, we wanted to further test the relationships among the three major heteropterygid groups. In order to assess phylogenetic support and to detect potentially conflicting signal, we performed a four-cluster likelihood mapping analysis (Strimmer & von Haeseler, 1997) on the partitioned supermatrix defining Dataminae, Heteropteryginae, Obriminae and the outgroup as four taxonomic groups (clusters). We conducted this analysis in IQ-TREE with the number of randomly drawn quartets set to 10 000. For revealing potential incongruences among single genes, we repeated the analysis for each gene, separately.

### Divergence time estimation

Phylogenetic relationships and divergence times were obtained by Bayesian Inference (BI) in BEAST v. 2.6.1 (Bouckaert et al., 2019; see File S2 for the input file). We employed the partitioning scheme suggested by PartitionFinder using a linked tree, but leaving clock and site models unlinked. Instead of using the substitution models proposed by the likelihood-based method of PartitionFinder, we chose the model averaging method with transition-transversion split option and empirical frequencies as implemented in the BEAST package MODELLTEST v. 1.2.1 (Bouckaert & Drummond, 2017). We selected the calibrated Yule model and a relaxed clock with lognormal distribution and a clock rate of 1e\(^{-7}\) as tree and clock priors, respectively (Drummond et al., 2006; Heled & Drummond, 2012). Calibration was achieved by assigning an age prior on the most recent common ancestor (MRCA) of all included taxa (Euphasmatodea) applying a normal distribution of 81 ± 7 approximating the time estimates of Simon et al. (2019). An additional MRCA prior was created to enforce monophyly of Neophasmatodea, thus yielding Asphalmodatidae as the outgroup.

The Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) analysis was run for 100 000 000 generations, sampling every 5000 iterations. Convergence and effective sample sizes were assessed in TRACER v. 1.7.1 (Rambaut et al., 2018). Trees sampled before reaching the equilibrium plateau (16%) were discarded as burn-in and remaining trees were summarized in a maximum clade credibility tree using TREEANNOTATOR v. 2.6.0 (BEAST package; Bouckaert et al., 2019; refer to File S3 for the tree file in nexus format). The resulting tree was examined and edited in FIGTREE v. 1.4.4 (https://github.com/rambaut/figtree).

### Ancestral range estimation

The geological history of Southeast (SE) Asia and the Southwest Pacific is quite complex. For estimating ancestral ranges, we first roughly grouped geographical areas in three sections following the division by Wallace’s Line and Huxley’s Line resulting in continental SE Asia West of Huxley’s line, South Pacific SE Asia East of Wallace’s Line and the Philippine Islands between both lines in the North (see Fig. 3). We further subdivided these areas based on prior information on their geological history (Hall, 2002; Lohman et al., 2011) and their present position: Borneo + Palawan Island (B), Northern SE Asia including Cambodia, China, Japan, Tuïwan, Northern Thailand and Vietnam (N), Southern SE Asia including Peninsular Malaysia, Sumatra and Southern Thailand (S), Eastern SE Asia including Buru Island, Serum Island and Viti Levu (E), the Northern Philippine Islands (PN) and the Southern Philippine Islands (PS) (Fig. 3).

Historical biogeographic inference was carried out with BIOGEOBEARS v. 1.1.2 (Matzke, 2013, 2018) as implemented in R 3.5.3 (R Core Team, 2019) using the six defined areas and the time-calibrated BEAST tree with outgroups removed. Every specimen was assigned to one area and the number of possible ranges was restricted to 18 by allowing a maximum of two adjacent areas to form a range except for the three continental areas (B + N + S) and the Philippine Islands with Borneo and Palawan (PN + PS + B) (Table S4). The analysis was performed under the Dispersal-Extinction-Cladogenesis model (DEC; Ree & Smith, 2008) as well as under the ML interpretations of the Dispersal-Vicariance (DIVALIKE; Ronquist, 1997) and the BayArea models (BAYAREALIKE; Landis et al., 2013). We refrained from using the +j parameter associated with long distance dispersal and founder-event speciation due to recent criticism (Ree & Sammartín, 2018). We evaluated the relative probability of each model based on the Akaike information criterion (AIC) model weights.

### Species delimitation

As for most phasmatodean lineages, morphological variability and hidden diversity are also causing contentious species boundaries in Heteropterygidae. In an attempt to create an approximate
Fig. 3. Map of Southeast (SE) Asia including Huxley’s and Wallace’s Lines. Distribution of the three heteropterygid subfamilies are shown as solid line (Obriminae), dotted line (Heteropteryginae) and dashed line (Dataminae). The six geographical areas as used for historical biogeographical analysis are colour-coded according to the inserted caption on the right. [Colour figure can be viewed at wileyonlinelibrary.com].

reference point for the delineation of (molecular) species, we considered two independent approaches. The Poisson Tree Processes (PTP) model determines putative molecular species based on the number of substitutions on a rooted, nonultrametric phylogenetic tree and the implemented bPTP version additionally calculates Bayesian support values (Zhang et al., 2013). We used the ML tree inferred from the concatenated supermatrix, removed the outgroups and ran the bPTP analysis for 200000 generations with a burn-in of 0.15 on the web server (http://species.h-its.org/ptp). Convergence of the MCMC chain was visually checked. In order to compare the suggested number of species, we also performed a multi-locus coalescent-based guide-tree approach using the trinomial distribution model in TR2 (Fujisawa et al., 2016). We generated seven gene trees in iq-tree v. 1.6.10 (Nguyen et al., 2015) and rooted them with Aschiphasmatidae. Since TR2 requires an ultrametric tree, we used the BI tree as guide tree. Outgroups were removed from gene trees and guide tree. The resulting tree was visualized in R using ape v.5.0 (Paradis & Schliep, 2018).

Results and discussion

Phylogenetic analyses

Heteropterygidae have been in the focus of attention in previous studies (Klante, 1976; Zompro, 2004; Hennemann et al., 2016a), but the lack of formal cladistic analyses did not allow for a definitive statement about their phylogenetic relationships. Our dataset with over 100 heteropterygid specimens presents the most comprehensive collection of molecular data used for any subgroup of Phasmatodea so far.

All phylogenetic trees inferred from the partitioned concatenated supermatrix resulted in largely congruent topologies with varying but mostly moderate to strong node support. The monophyly of Heteropterygidae and its subgroups was confirmed, and all phylogenies consistently represent the heteropterygid relationships to be Dataminae + (Heteropteryginae + Obriminae). The ML trees with support values assessed using UFBoot (Figs. 4–6) and SH-aLRT (Fig. S1) share identical topologies and maximum support for the three heteropterygid subgroups Dataminae, Heteropteryginae and Obriminae. However, although Heteropterygidae were resolved with 99 and 100% using SH-aLRT and UFBoot, respectively, the node shared by Heteropteryginae and Obriminae was better supported with UFBoot (93%) than SH-aLRT (74%). The phylogenetic relationships inferred from the search for the best ML tree resulted in an almost identical topology with the only difference being the placement of Haaniella scabra Redtenbacher + H. grayii Westwood (Fig. S2). The standard nonparametric bootstrap support (BS), which was mapped on this tree is generally lower than observed with the other methods, but even a consensus tree generated from the 500 bootstrap trees presents itself with mainly the same topology (data not shown). Slight differences from the ML topologies were found in the BI phylogeny (Figs. S3, 7), especially within Dataminae and Heteropteryginae (see below).
Figure 4. First part of the ML phylogenetic tree inferred from the concatenated dataset featuring the outgroup taxa. The three subfamilies of Heteropterygidae are included. Support values (UFBoot) are given at each node.

Whereas Heteropterygidae and its subgroups were recovered with maximum support (BPP, Bayesian Posterior Probability = 1), the split of Heteropteryginae and Obriminae was only moderately supported (BPP = 0.85).

The results of the four-cluster likelihood mapping analysis substantiated the hypothesized relationships among Heteropterygidae as observed in the phylogenetic analyses (Fig. S4). The recovered sister group relationship of Heteropteryginae + Obriminae was favoured with 57%, whereas the alternative hypotheses presenting sister relationships of Dataminae + Heteropteryginae and Dataminae + Obriminae were weakly supported with 18.6 and 24.4%, respectively. The likelihood mapping conducted for each gene separately showed that only H3 sequence data was clearly favouring an alternative hypothesis with Dataminae + Obriminae (58.1%). The 16S data showed a higher level of support for the same alternative hypothesis with only 35.9%, whereas the principal hypothesis was supported by 32.4%.

Phylogeny and systematics

Our ML and BI topologies, based on a predominantly novel taxon sampling, largely corroborated clades repeatedly recovered in past studies (Fig. 4) such as Aschiphasmatidae, Cladomorphinae, Clitumnini, Diapheromerinae, Gratidiini, Lanceo cercata, Lonchodidae (comprising monophyletic Lonchodinae and Necrosciniae), a Malagasy clade (Achriopterini + Anisacanthidae), Medaurini, Pharnaciini, Phylliidae and Pseudophasmatinae (e.g. Buckley et al., 2009; Bradler et al., 2014, 2015; Robertson et al., 2018; Simon et al., 2019). We found no support for the recently established principal lineages Oriophasmata (Old World Phasmatodea) and Occidophasmata (New World Phasmatodea) (Simon et al., 2019) in the ML trees, which is not surprising since standard Sanger sequencing data has been shown to be largely incapable of resolving the deeper nodes among Phasmatodea. Occidophasmata comprising Diapheromerinae, Agathemera Stål (= Agathamericidae) and Pseudophasmatinae, however, was recovered with overall good support in the BI phylogeny (BPP >0.95; Fig. S3) substantiating the uncertain placement of Agathemera as sister to Pseudophasmatinae, which had only been moderately supported in the transcriptomic study (BS = 76; Simon et al., 2019). In all phylogenies, we found the leaf insects (Phylliidae) to form the sister group of the remaining Neophasmatodea, a pattern observed already in a few studies before (Kômoto et al., 2011; Bradler et al., 2015; Robertson et al., 2018). Albeit there were some noteworthy and well-supported novel results in our...
Fig. 5. Second part of the ML phylogenetic tree including the two heteropterygid subfamilies Dataminae and Heteropteryginae. Support values (UFBoot) depicted at each node. Red branches and diamonds at nodes show point of species delimitation according to the bPTP analysis. [Colour figure can be viewed at wileyonlinelibrary.com].

topology. The Brazilian Cladomorphus phyllinus Gray, eponym of the Cladomorphinae, clustered among the Diapheromerinae and appears to be unrelated to the remaining members of Cladomorphinae. Robertson et al. (2018) already demonstrated that another alleged member of the Cladomorphinae, Otocrania Redtenbacher, belongs to Diapheromerinae and assigned the taxon accordingly. These results highlight the need for a comprehensive taxonomic revision of these two New World lineages that are actually not closely related at all (Simon et al., 2019). Within Cladomorphinae, Pterinoxylus Serville was recovered as sister taxon of Diapherodes Gray, which corroborates the topology of Robertson et al. (2018) and refutes the assumption by Hennemann et al. (2016b) that Pterinoxylus is sister taxon of Hesperophasmatini (= Hesperophasma Rehn + Agamemnon Moxey in our analysis). The African Palophinae that were not represented in the sampling of Simon et al. (2019) are found to form the sister group of Cladomorphinae, which is another result congruent with recent findings (Robertson et al., 2018). We found further support for the subordinate placement of Korinninae within Necrosciinae (Goldberg et al., 2015; Robertson et al., 2018; Büscher et al., 2018a) and confirmed that the yet to be described ootheca-producing taxon investigated by Goldberg et al. (2015) as a member of the Korinninae, since, it is recovered with maximum support as sister taxon to Kalocorinnis wegneri Bragg. Within Necrosciinae, Lopaphus Westwood appears to be polyphyletic with Lopaphus balteatus Chen & He being recovered as sister taxon of Paramenexenus laetus Kirby with maximum support and unrelated to Lopaphus perakensis Redtenbacher. The males of L. balteatus and P. laetus furthermore share a strong synapomorphic character, a male vomer with four apical teeth (Bradler et al., 2014). The taxonomic placement of L. balteatus needs to be further revised to confirm its potential congeneric status with Paramenexenus. We could not corroborate the Clitumninae,
which were suggested to comprise Pharnaciini, Clitumnini and Medaurini by Hennemann & Conle (2008) and recently gained support by transcriptomic data (Simon et al., 2019). As in numerous analyses before (Buckley et al., 2009; Bradler et al., 2014; Robertson et al., 2018), Pharnaciini did not cluster with Clitumnini and Medaurini. Instead, Gratidiini (not included by Simon et al., 2019) appear to be sister group to Clitumnini + Medaurini, and the Clitumnini genus Prosentoria Brunner appears to be closer related to Pharnaciini. Bradler et al. (2015) recovered a clade comprising all four taxa, Clitumnini, Medaurini, Gratidiini and Pharnaciini. Considering all these controversial results, the phylogenetic relationships of these four taxa need further investigation in the future. In contrast, we were able to satisfactorily resolve some long-standing phylogenetic uncertainties in regard to Heteropterygidae.

In accordance with recent molecular analyses, our results reaffirmed that Malagasy Anisacanthinae are not part of Heteropterygidae as initially assumed based on morphology (Redtenbacher, 1906; Günther, 1953; Klante, 1976), but are in fact more closely related to other stick insects from Madagascar (Robertson et al., 2018; Glaw et al., 2019; Simon et al., 2019). As mentioned above, we recovered Heteropterygidae as monophyletic with maximum support in both ML and BI phylogenies (Figs. 4, 7). In earlier molecular studies with fewer
Fig. 7. Divergence times and estimated ancestral ranges for Heteropterygidae. Chronogram derived from BI in BEAST2 with posterior probabilities at nodes (see entire tree in Fig. S3). Inserted map depicts sampled countries in colour and the most likely colonisation routes. Colour code follows the inserted caption on the left. Range distribution of specimens is given at the tips of the tree. Pie charts with the likelihood for ancestral ranges estimated under the DEC model are presented at each node. For nodes with low probability, the most likely range is given in letters corresponding to the inserted caption. P, Pliocene; Q, Quarternary. [Colour figure can be viewed at wileyonlinelibrary.com].
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taxa included, Heteropterygidae were either recovered as not monophyletic at all (Whiting et al., 2003; Buckley et al., 2009; Forni et al., 2021) or as a weakly supported clade (Bradler et al., 2014, 2015; Goldberg et al., 2015; Büscher et al., 2018a). A larger taxon sampling obviously leads to a significantly more robust phylogeny as was also observed by Robertson et al. (2018) who recovered Heteropterygidae with 0.96 BPP.

The enlarged number of taxa also greatly increased support for the three heteropterygid subgroups. The placement of taxa with an inconclusive combination of morphological characters and controversial assignation is now well-supported. Our results confirmed the winged species of Miroceramia as a member of the Obriminae and not as previously assumed as member of the Heteropteryginae (Günther, 1953; Beier, 1968; Bradley & Galil, 1977; Bragg, 1998). In the otherwise flightless clade Obriminae, Miroceramia is the only volant representative and was found to be the sister taxon of Pterobrimus, the only obrimine member with wing remnants (Redtenbacher, 1906).

In addition to the well-supported heteropterygid subgroups, our increased taxon sampling further revealed Dataminae as sister group to Heteropteryginae + Obriminae. This topology has only been obtained once based on molecular data (Bradler et al., 2015), whereas transcriptomic data failed to resolve this relationship yielding a weakly supported clade of Dataminae + Heteropteryginae (BS = 49; Simon et al., 2019). Although the main transcriptomic data set was based on translated amino acid sequences, the analysis based on the nucleotide data set was based on the nucleotide data set in fact recovered Heteropteryginae + Obriminae with slightly higher support (BS = 51). Despite that, our results are in accordance with morphological studies (Klante, 1976; Bradler, 2009) and further corroborate the heteropterygid phylogeny under the inclusion of the aforementioned genera with ambiguous morphological traits.

Evolution of morphological traits

Hennemann et al. (2016a) have already discussed morphological traits that support the sister group relationship of Heteropteryginae + Obriminae such as the spinose area apicalis. The number of ventral sensory areas is also mentioned in this context: Although Obriminae have two on the basisternite and Heteropteryginae have a central one on the furcasternite, all three are present in Dataminae (Redtenbacher, 1906; Hennemann et al., 2016a). Our phylogeny substantiates that the presence of three sensory areas is a potential groundplan characteristic of Heteropterygidae, which was retained in Dataminae and independently reduced in Heteropteryginae and Obriminae. In contrast, other trait combinations have not been considered in detail by Hennemann et al. (2016a), for instance, the secondary ovipositor. Since this structure is lacking in Dataminae, they concluded that its presence in Heteropteryginae and Obriminae supports their close relatedness. However, Bradler (2009) clarified that the secondary ovipositor of Hoploclonia (Obriminae) is formed dorsally by a different segment than in all remaining Obriminae as well as Heteropteryginae and questioned the taxonomic placement of Hoploclonia and the single origin of this structure. In fact, our topology recovered Hoploclonia as sister group to all remaining Obriminae with strong support and is in consequence clearly refuting all previously established obrimine tribes (Zompro, 2004; Hennemann et al., 2016a). Hoploclonia has been traditionally regarded as closely related to Ilocano Rehn & Rehn and Tisamenus Stål (Zompro, 2004; Hennemann et al., 2016a). Rehn & Rehn (1938) had even temporarily synonymized Hoploclonia with the latter and recognized the lineage to be distinct from the remaining Obriminae. The possession of a secondary ovipositor dissimilar to that of all other Heteropterygidae (formed dorsally by the tenth abdominal segment instead of the epiproct, which corresponds to the tergum of the 11th segment) was already outlined by Redtenbacher (1906), but was obviously overlooked or even misinterpreted by subsequent authors (Günther, 1953; Bragg, 1998) until this knowledge was revived by Bradler (2009). Hennemann et al. (2016a) acknowledged this morphological difference, yet assumed the secondary ovipositor formed dorsally by the epiproct to be a synapomorphy of Heteropteryginae + Obriminae and the genus Hoploclonia to be a subordinate taxon among Obriminae, which reduced the ancestral secondary ovipositor and evolved an alternatively formed novel one. Since no intermediate state between the two ovipositor types appears conceivable, this transformation is hard to explain. Moreover, the assumption of Hennemann et al. (2016a) is not supported by our phylogeny. With Hoploclonia recovered as sister to all remaining Obriminae, we are able to propose a more reasonable and straightforward scenario: The secondary ovipositor that was primarily absent in Heteropterygidae (i.e. as in Dataminae) evolved three times independently within this group, (i) in Hoploclonia, (ii) in the remaining Obriminae and (iii) in the Heteropteryginae, thereby convergently involving the epiproct in the two latter lineages.

Another feature is the peculiar presence of wings in Heteropterygidae. Although all Dataminae are entirely wingless and all Heteropteryginae have wings or wing remnants, there are only two-winged obrimine genera as mentioned above. Pterobrimus exhibits only wing remnants in the form of small, lobiform tegmina (Redtenbacher, 1906), which prompted Rehn & Rehn (1938) to assume that Pterobrimus is not even related to the other Obriminae. Miroceramia, in contrast, has long tegmina and hind wings similar to those of the male of Heteropteryx dilatata (cf. Bradler, 2009), explaining its previously assumed position among the winged Heteropteryginae (Redtenbacher, 1906; Günther, 1953; Bradley & Galil, 1977; Bragg, 1998).

The well-developed wings in Miroceramia, males of Heteropteryx dilatata and some male Haaniella not included in this study (H. mecheli, H. macroptera, H. parva, H. aculeata) suggest the capability of active flight, whereas all remaining winged heteropterygids are brachypterous. Considering the canopy-dwelling H. dilatata female in an otherwise ground-dwelling clade, Bradler & Buckley (2018) proposed that a secondarily arboreal adaptation might have triggered an atavistic regain of wings. Our results place both volant lineages Heteropteryx and Miroceramia as subordinate taxa within otherwise flightless groups and as close relatives to partially winged taxa. Whether wings were lost in Dataminae
and Obriminae (excluding Miroceramia + Pterobrimus) or were primarily lacking in Heteropterygidae and re-evolved in Heteropteryginae and Obriminae is part of an on-going debate on the possibility of character regain (Collin & Miglietta, 2008). Whiting et al. (2003) proposed the possibility of wing regain in stick insects, which was controversially discussed and deemed unlikely by some (Stone & French, 2003; Telford & Budd, 2003; Trueeman et al., 2004; Goldberg & Igić, 2008). For the ancient lineage of ground-dwelling Heteropterygidae and sister group to all remaining Oriophasmata, we argue that wings might have been primarily absent and re-evolved in the common ancestor of Heteropteryginae and Obriminae, which has been most recently also corroborated by Forni et al. (2020), who analysed wing evolution across the whole phasmatodean diversity. The regain of wing structures in a ground-dwelling lineage was advantageous not necessarily for the purpose of flight but for the possession of a stridulatory or timbal organ, which is present in all winged females and partially winged males (Carlberg, 1989; Bradler, 2009; Hennemann et al., 2016a). Although most obrimine lineages secondarily lost or reduced wings, further development of the wings involving the capability of flight has independently evolved in Miroceramia and male Heteropteryx. The aforementioned fully winged male Haaniella species (e.g. H. macroptera) are in fact morphologically similar to H. erringtoniae and might therefore be closely related to its sister taxon Heteropteryx. However, Forni et al. (2020) recovered H. macroptera as sister to brachypterous H. erringtoniae (referred to as H. muelleri therein). It is furthermore noteworthy that the male of Heteropteryx displays a set of tegmina that is rather unique among extant stick insects (Bradler, 2009) substantiating the hypothesis that an atavistic regain of an ancestral trait is possible in Phasmatodea (Whiting et al., 2003).

**Heteropterygidae systematics and taxonomy**

As stated before, our results do not corroborate previous assumptions concerning the internal relationships of Obriminae that were divided into several tribes by past authors. Zompro (2004) introduced three tribes, the Miroceramiini (comprising the winged Miroceramia and the wingless Mearn-siana), Eubulidini (Eubulides Stål, Heterocopus, Ilocano, Pterobrimus, Stenobrimus Redtenbacher, Theramenes Stål, Tisamenus) and Obrimini (containing all remaining Obriminae genera). This arrangement was criticized by Hennemann et al. (2016a) who considered Zompro’s tribes as being poorly supported. In light of our recovered phylogeny, we can confirm that none of the tribes Zompro (2004) established are monophyletic. For instance, Mearn-siana is not at all related to Miroceramia, and instead of being a high-ranking taxon among Obriminae the genus is rather subordinate as sister taxon to Are-taon (Fig. 6). However, the new tribal arrangement proposed by Hennemann et al. (2016a) has not been corroborated by our data either. According to Hennemann et al. (2016a), Miroceramini consists solely of Miroceramia and their newly proposed tribe Tisamenini comprises Ilocano, Hoploclonia, Pterobrimus and the eponymous Tisamenus. The latter are described by the authors as the ‘basalmost forms amongst the subfamily Obriminae with the two very closely related and exclusively Philippine Tisamenus Stål, 1875 and Ilocano Rehn & Rehn, 1939 being more basal than the Bornean Hoploclonia Stål, 1875′ (Hennemann et al., 2016a: 20). Despite ‘basalmost’ and ‘basal’ being inappropriate terms for describing taxa in a phylogenetic context in general (Krell & Cranston, 2004), Tisamenini must be refuted as being polyphyletic, as must their newly arranged Obrimini. Based on the compelling evidence provided here and before (Bradler, 2009; Robertson et al., 2018), we can only recognize two tribes within Obriminae that reflect its two principal lineages of equal rank (as sister groups) as recovered before (Robertson et al., 2018), consisting of Hoploclonia, corresponding to Hoploclonini trib. nov. and all remaining Obriminae, forming the Obrimini sensu nov.

**Hoploclonini trib. nov.**

http://zoobank.org/D95474E2-4D6D-492B-B0B6-A4796FB0D53B

Type genus. Hoploclonia Stål, 1875: 7397.

**Diagnosis.** The tribe Hoploclonini trib. nov. is well-supported by molecular data (see above) and characterized also by a unique autapomorphic trait among Heteropterygidae found in the female sex: the possession of a secondary ovipositor (oviscapt) ventrally formed by the operculum (abdominal sternum 8) and dorsally by the longitudinally deeply incised abdominal tergum 10 (Bradler, 2009: Fig. 15c therein).

Included taxa. Hoploclonini trib. nov. only contains the genus Hoploclonia with currently three described and one undescribed species from Borneo.

Obrimini, Brunner v. Wattenwyl, 1893 sensu nov.

Type genus. Obrimus Stål, 1875: 7431.

**Diagnosis.** The tribe is well-supported as monophyletic within Obriminae with females whose secondary ovipositor is dorsally formed by the enlarged epiproct (tergum of abdominal segment 11).

Included taxa. The Obrimini sensu nov. comprise the bulk of species of Obriminae including Are-taon, Brasidas, Eubulides, Euobrimus, Mearn-siana, Miroceramia, Obrimus, Pterobrimus, Stenobrimus, Sungaya, Theramenes, Tisamenus, Trachyaretaon and probably also Heterocopus that could not be included in this study.

Also in accordance with the study of Robertson et al. (2018), Miroceramia + Pterobrimus are recovered as sister group to all other, predominantly Philippine Obrimini. The latter clade can be further divided into the sister lineages Ther-amenes + Tisamenus (including Ilocano) and Stenobrimus + all remaining Obrimini genera. The latter comprises two major groups of taxa: (i) Brasidas, Euobrimus and Obrimus, a clade already suggested before based on the presence of metasternal pseudoforelimbs (Zompro, 2004) and (ii) Eubu-lides + (Sungaya + Trachyaretaon) and Are-taon + Mearn-siana. We corroborated most currently recognized genera of Obriminae...
as being monophyletic, albeit with uncertainty regarding the taxonomic boundaries of *Euobrimus* and *Brasidas* that need further investigation. Moreover, we clearly demonstrate that the monotypic *Ilocano* is deeply nested within the species-rich *Tisamenus*. Since our phylogeny renders *Tisamenus* paraphyletic, we hereby transfer *Ilocano hebardii* to *Tisamenus*, establishing *Tisamenus hebardii* comb. nov. and *Ilocano* becoming a junior synonym of *Tisamenus*.

The Dataminae and Heteropteryginae have never been divided into tribes, yet there are some well-defined internal clades present. Within Dataminae, it remains unclear whether the predominantly Bornean *Dares* (BI tree) or a clade formed by *Dares* + *Epidares* (ML tree) are the sister group to all remaining genera, with the latter also recovered by Robertson et al. (2018). *Pylaemenes* appears to be paraphyletic according to our analyses with the species from mainland Asia and Wallacea forming two distinct lineages unrelated to the Bornean species. This issue might be elucidated by the inclusion of further datamine species from other parts of the Greater Sunda Islands (e.g. Sumatra, Java). The monophyly of *Orestes* could be confirmed and the position of *Orestes krijsii* as sister taxon to all remaining species is in fact coinciding with morphological analysis of the egg, which is distinct to other *Orestes* (Bresseel & Constant, 2018). Heteropteryginae consists of two currently recognized genera *Haaniella* and *Heteropteryx* of which the former appears to be paraphyletic with some *Haaniella* spp. closer related to *Heteropteryx* as demonstrated before. This clearly contradicts current views on the monophyly of *Haaniella* (Zompro, 2004; Hennemann et al., 2016a) and has to be further investigated under inclusion of the type species *Haaniella muelleri* Haan.

**Species delimitation**

The two approaches we applied yielded different species delineations (Figs. 5, 6, S5). Although each method was based on either the BI or the ML phylogeny, we deemed the analyses to be comparable, since most topological differences affected deeper nodes and not the specimens in question. The trinomial distribution model used by tr2 delineated significantly fewer species than PTP/bPTP. Evidently, accurate calculations could not be performed in many cases, thus many nodes remained unresolved, especially those involving short terminal branches (hash signs; see Fig. S5). The poor performance of the software, which is built to accept hundreds of loci, is probably due to the low number of gene trees and their varying amounts of species coverage. Additionally, the lack of information and the accumulation of unresolved splits caused the software to excessively merge otherwise separate species.

We assumed the analysis performed under the bPTP model to be more reliable, since it is based on the differences in the number of substitutions and therefore rather independent of missing data. We conclude that this method is a better fit for our data, since the results show only few ambiguously resolved species boundaries. In total, a sensible number of 88 molecular species was estimated (Figs. 5, 6) with four instances where the support to merge or split the species was only slightly higher than the alternative (Brasidas sp. 6, Dares sp. 2, Sungaya sp. 2 + 3 and *Tisamenus* sp. 11 + 12; see Table S5).

Within Dataminae, the *Epidares* individuals from different localities with varying colouration and armature represent one single species, highlighting once more the enormous intraspecific disparity a species can exhibit. We reveal two undescribed *Dares* species, one from Mt. Pagon (Brunei) and one with specimens from several localities, which is recovered as a distinct species from its sister taxon *Dares alula* Westwood. Furthermore, the *Dares* sp. individual from Tambunan is conspecific with *Dares murudensis* Bragg. The two specimens identified as *Pylaemenes sepilokensis* Bragg from Sepilok and Tawau are revealed not to be conspecific. The *Orestes* sp. from the Tay Yen Tu Nature Reserve (Vietnam) appears to be identical to the *Orestes* sp. listed as being from India by Robertson et al. (2018), which raises doubts on the locality given by these authors. Several specimens allegedly representing *Orestes mouhotii* Bates do not cluster together, most probably because of erroneous identifications in previous studies (Kômoto et al., 2011; Goldberg et al., 2015; Robertson et al., 2018). The true *O. mouhotii* is represented by an individual from the Kirirom National Park (Cambodia: Bresseel & Constant, 2018), which is the sister species of a yet undescribed *Orestes* species from the Andaman Islands. The erroneous remaining *O. mouhotii* individuals are in fact members of *O. draegeri* Bresseel & Constant, as are the *Orestes* spp. members from Tanjung Bungah, and Pu Mat and Bach Ma National Park. A potentially new species is represented by the *Orestes* sp. from Ba Be National Park in Northern Vietnam.

Within Heteropteryginae, our most spectacular discovery is that of a second Jungle Nymph species of the hitherto monotypic *Heteropteryx* from Khao Lak (Thailand) that is genetically clearly separated from *H. dilatata* occurring in Peninsular Malaysia. In *Haaniella*, we reveal a high degree of cryptic diversity among the Bornean individuals that were identified as *H. echinata* Redtenbacher, suggesting the existence of three separate species in this lineage (one from Brunei and Sabah (Malaysia), and two from Sarawak (Malaysia): Mulu National Park and Similajau National Park). The *Haaniella* sp. from Mt. Bawang (West Kalimantan) was recovered to be identical to *H. gravii*.

Within Obriminae, we corroborate the view of Robertson et al. (2018) that *Hoploclonia abercrombiei* Bragg and *H. cuspidata* Redtenbacher are separate species (in contrast to Seow-Choen, 2016) and reveal a further presumably undescribed *Hoploclonia* sp. from Mt. Pagon (Brunei). Among the numerous species and forms of *Tisamenus* (including the former *Ilocano syn. nov.*), we analysed 18 individuals that represent 13 different species. The specimens from isolated Philippine Islands such as Camiguin, Sibuyan, Cebu, Palau were all confirmed as separate species. Since no exhaustive taxonomic comparison with type specimens was conducted, the species revealed here do not necessarily represent undescribed taxa. The two specimens we included as *Stenobrimus bolivari* in our analyses are probably comprising two distinct species, *Euobrimus* sp. 1 (Mt. Pulog, Bicol) and sp. 2 (Rapu-Rapu Island) appear to be conspecific with *E. cavernosus* Stål from
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Mt. Pulog (Bicol, Luzon). Among Brasidas, we found Brasidas spp. 1–5 (and potentially sp. 6) and Euobrimus dohrni Rehn & Rehn to represent Brasidas foveolatus Redtenbacher, whereas Brasidas sp. 7 from Camiguin Island was found to be likely a new species. Meaarsiana is represented by two species, with Meaarsiana sp. 1 from Mt. Apo (Mindanao) confirmed to be M. bullosa Rehn & Rehn and Meaarsiana sp. 2 from Mt. Redondo (Dinagat Island) representing a new, undescribed species for this so far monotypic genus. In contrast, the Aretaon sp. from Palawan appears to be the same as Aretaon asperrimus Redtenbacher, thus revealing a range extension for this species. The three forms of Eubulides igorrote Rehn & Rehn have been confirmed as one species, however with low support (64%) when compared to other splits in our analysis. The presently monotypic Sungaya is revealed to comprise three, maybe even four different species. Although the originally described asexual population of S. inexpectata Zompro from Sungay and the sexual population from Benguet represent most probably different species, there is only little support for the individuals from Limay and Ilanin Forest to be conspecific (51%, see Table S5). In any case, the male from Limay described as the alleged male of S. inexpectata by Lit & Eusebio (2008) is based on a specimen pertaining to a yet undescribed Sungaya species. All included Trachyaretaon spp. appear to represent distinct species, with Trachyaretaon sp. 1 (Mt. Pullol, Luzon) and sp. 5 (Sierra Madre, Luzon) probably being conspecific (61%). The results from the presented species delimitation analysis will hopefully serve as a helpful and reliable foundation to facilitate numerous future taxonomic descriptions.

**Historical biogeography**

The DEC biogeographical model, featuring parameters for narrow and subset sympatry as well as narrow vicariance, was inferred as best-fitting model for ancestral range estimation based on the time-calibrated BI tree (see Table S6 and File S4 for details). The divergence time analysis estimated the radiation of Heteropterygidae to have started ∼45.5 mya (56.1–34.9 mya; Fig. S3), a range of dates similar to previous estimates derived from fossil dating (Bradler et al., 2015; Robertson et al., 2018; Simon et al., 2019). These were however recently challenged by Tihelka et al. (2020), who proposed a significantly older origin – an age that cannot be satisfactorily determined from the data they provided but which we assume to be approximately 90 mya for this clade (misspelled by the authors as ‘Heteropterygida’). This discrepancy can be partly explained by the usage of different sets of fossils as calibration points. Tihelka et al. (2020) included fossils that were intentionally excluded in the study by Robertson et al. (2018), such as Echinonomiscus primoticus Engel & Wang, a fossil insect preserved in Cretaceous amber (∼99 mya) described as an adult male related to a subordinate lineage comprising Lonchodinae and Clitumninae (Engel et al., 2016). However, this extremely small fossil most probably does not belong to Phasmatodea at all (Bradler & Buckley, 2018) and was used as calibration point for Phasmatodea or Euphasmatodea (Simon et al., 2019; Forni et al., 2020; Forni et al., 2021), whereas Tihelka et al. (2020) included it as calibration point within the much more subordinate Oriophasma. Another important fossil specimen included by Tihelka et al. (2020) is a Jurassic heelwalker (Mantophasmatodea) described by Huang et al. (2008) that needs to be critically reassessed. Bradler & Buckley (2011) emphasized the importance of rigorously interpreted and unambiguously placeable fossils as reliable calibration points on phylogenetic trees. In addition to the usage of different fossils, also the varying definition of upper bounds appears to result in incongruent divergence time estimations. Although the rising discussion on the contradictory phasmatodean divergence times deserves further attention (see also Forni et al., 2021 for another significantly older estimation), a full-fledged analysis and discussion of this topic is beyond the scope of the present study. Since the general divergence times of extant Euphasmatodea estimated by Simon et al. (2019) based on phasmatodean fossils largely correspond to those obtained by Misof et al. (2014) based on a broad array of nonphasmatodean fossils across all hexapod lineages (but see Tong et al., 2015 and Kjer et al., 2015 for a critical discussion), we consider our time estimation to be a scientifically sound basis for reconstructing the Heteropterygidae radiation.

Ancestral range estimates under the DEC model favoured the common ancestor of Heteropterygidae to have originated in Borneo (Fig. 7). Borneo, however, was part of continental Sundaland, an expansion of the South Asian peninsula joining the Thai-Malay Peninsula, Western Indonesia and Borneo. Despite sea level fluctuations, Sundaland, namely the geographic areas B + N + S (Borneo, Northern and Southern SE Asia; Fig. 3), was considered as one connected terrestrial area from Eocene to Early Miocene (Hall, 2002). Hence, we assume the ancestral range of Heteropterygidae and its early descendants to be Sundaland, neglecting any inconsistencies caused by the ancestral range estimates.

Diversification of Dataminae was estimated to have started in Borneo (=Sundaland) between 45.6 and 28.1 mya (36.4 mya). Our analysis suggests that dispersal may have happened primarily to the North and East of Sundaland. The split between lineages distributed in the North and in Borneo can be explained by the advancing South China Sea, separating continental Asia from present Borneo since the Late Oligocene (Hall, 2002; Hall, 2013). Subsequent dispersal was mainly via temporarily available land bridges between adjacent areas such as Borneo or the Malay Peninsula (Planispectrum bengalense Redtenbacher) or continental Asia and Taiwan and Okinawa (Orestes). The invasion of Wallacea by Pylaemenes coronatus Haan (and other species not included here) may be attributed to long-distance dispersal, but remains unclear due to the lack of data.

The divergence of Heteropteryginae and Obriminae occurred in Sundaland in the Middle Eocene (∼43.6 mya; 54.0–33.4 mya) causing the former lineage to occupy the Southwestern region and the latter to colonize the East. Extant species of Heteropteryginae began to radiate in the early Miocene (∼22.1 mya; 28.2–16.0 mya) and split into two lineages, of which one dispersed to Southern continental SE Asia and the other diversified in Borneo, including a secondary colonisation of Southern and Northern SE Asia by Haaniella.
Hennemann et al. and H. gorochovi Hennemann et al. Note that these two species are more closely related to the other non-Bornean species in the ML tree, thus resulting in two geographically separated heteropterygine clades (Fig. 5).

The reconstruction of ancestral ranges for Obriminae is far more challenging, since the geological history of the involved regions of oceanic SE Asia and Southwest Pacific counts among the most complex (Hall, 2002; Schellart et al., 2006). Countless land connections and separations as well as constant shifts of terrestrial areas render numerous alternative dispersal routes (Hall, 1998). The ancestral distribution of Obriminae was estimated to be Borneo or Eastern SE Asia and may be interpreted as Eastern Sundaland. Hoplocloniini diverged from Obrimini between 48.3 and 29.6 mya (~38.7 mya) and remained in Borneo, whereas Obrimini expanded to the East and may have colonized Western Sulawesi before its separation from Borneo and the formation of the Makassar Straits in the Middle Eocene (Hall, 2002, 2009, 2013). The ancestral range of Obrimini is however estimated to be Southern Philippines and Eastern SE Asia corresponding to the divergence into a Philippine and a Wallacean clade. The lineage splitting off at ~36.3 mya (44.68–27.23 mya) to disperse eastwards and colonize regions from Wallacea to the Southwest Pacific, is comprised of Miroceramia (Sulawesi + Seram) and Pterobrimus (Fiji), whose capability of flight was likely to have facilitated the dispersal using locally emergent land as stepping stones. Hennemann et al. (2016a) questioned the type locality of Pterobrimus being Fiji, but here we reaffirm that the Pterobrimus specimen used here and before by Buckley et al. (2009) was collected by Daniel Otte (Philadelphia) on Viti Levu (Fiji). The dispersal to Fiji may be explained by long-distance dispersal and founder-event speciation, yet, our divergence time estimates coincide with the existence of the Vitiaz arc, a continuous volcanic arc extending from the Philippines to Fiji in the Late Eocene to Early Oligocene (Rodda, 1994; Hall, 2002). The Vitiaz arc has likely contributed to biotic migration processes across the whole Southwest Pacific (Oliver et al., 2018) and has already been considered to explain the colonisation of Fiji (e.g. Duffels & Turner, 2002; Liebherr, 2005). The geological dynamics of the fractured landmasses might have triggered diversification of the obrimine Wallacean lineage and its distribution across the entire arc (Oliver et al., 2018), but subsequently led to the extinction of most species. Consequently, the few known species presently show a disjunct distribution, yet, represent the oldest lineage within our taxon sample (32.2 mya; 40.2–22.0 mya).

For the obrimine Philippine clade, we inferred one invasion of the Philippine Islands, which gave rise to a remarkable radiation resulting in the most species-rich lineage of Heteropterygidae. However, recovering the route and order of colonisation is difficult due to the oceanic and tectonic origin of the islands (Hall, 2002) and, correspondingly, the proposal of numerous alternative scenarios regarding their reconstruction. In this regard, several potential colonization routes have been illustrated (Esselstyn & Oliveros, 2010; Matsui et al., 2010; Lohman et al., 2011; Brown et al., 2013; Kyriazis et al., 2018; Huang et al., 2019), but the most common routes via Palawan or the Sulu archipelago are not compatible with our data, since they only affect more recent invasions from Borneo during the Late Miocene and the Pliocene. Our data, however, suggests a colonization event from the South, potentially from Sulawesi, which was temporarily close to the Southern Philippine Islands during the Oligocene (Hall, 2002; King & Ebach, 2017). The Sangihe-Talaud archipelago, an island arc similar to the fragmental landmasses of the Vitiaz arc, was already suggested to have served as stepping stones for other terrestrial animals (Evans et al., 2003; Lohman et al., 2011; Setiadi et al., 2011). Alternatively, the ancestral range shared by Obrimini in the Late Eocene was the Vitiaz arc itself, which permitted the Wallacean lineage to disperse eastwards and the Philippine clade to disperse North. The presence of one representative of Obrimini (Theramenes olivaceus Westwood, not included in this study) on the Talaud Islands is an indication for the probability of this route and the inclusion of this species within a biogeographic framework might illuminate the ancestral distribution of the clade even further. Within the Philippine clade, the genus Theramenes has a Southern distribution and is sister group to members mostly from the Northern island of Luzon. Generally, we observe a distributional pattern from South to North among most lineages as well as at least two secondary invasions to the South. Although the biogeographic analysis estimated a joining of the island groups in the Oligocene, geological reconstructions suggest that the proximity of the current configuration of the Northern and Southern landmasses was not reached until the Late Miocene (Hall, 2002). Hence, diversification of most lineages probably started before the colonization of the North and dispersal among the entire archipelago occurred more recently, most likely during sea-level lowstands in the Pliocene and Pleistocene. We also propose that the invasion of Borneo by Aretaon did not occur in the Early Miocene as estimated, but instead via the fragmental Sulu island arc in the Middle/Late Miocene (Hall, 2013). The dispersal to Palawan occurred subsequently from Borneo during low sea levels in the Pliocene or Pleistocene.

Nonadaptive radiation

Stick and leaf insects repeatedly underwent adaptive radiations as demonstrated in the past for various geographic areas, often islands, such as Madagascar, the Mascarene archipelago, New Caledonia and New Guinea (Buckley et al., 2009, 2010; Bradler et al., 2015; Simon et al., 2019). These radiations are characterized by extensive niche differentiation accompanied by morphological and behavioural adaptations that regularly misled previous scientists who underestimated the degree of evolutionary convergence exhibited by phasmatoceans. For instance, the Madagascan radiation includes slender giant-sized, winged canopy-dwellers such as Achiroptera and closely related sturdily, flightless ground-dwelling ecomorphs such as Parectatosoma (Glaw et al., 2019), the latter originally assumed to be a subgroup of Heteropterygidae (Klante, 1976). In contrast, the Heteropterygidae are generally uniform ground-dwelling ecomorphs exhibiting a stocky body form, predominantly brownish colouration, inability of flight (with exception of male Heteropteryx, long-winged Hauniella
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spp. and possibly *Microceramia*) and consistent egg deposition into the soil, which is a derived strategy applied by comparatively few taxa (Goldberg et al., 2015; Robertson et al., 2018). This oviposition strategy is most achieved by the use of the aforementioned secondary ovipositors in Heteropteryginae and Obriminae (see video, File S5) or by burying the egg with the fore legs after an acrobatic shot between the antennae (see video, File S6) as also described by Abercrombie (1992). Yet, the Heteropterygidae vary significantly in body size, with Dataminae being comparatively small phasmatodeans whereas Heteropteryginae can be impressively large. The tarsal attachment microstructures have been suggested to be partly associated with body size in Heteropterygidae, although the nonuniformity of this trait may be indicative of the occupation of different niches (Büscher et al., 2018a, 2018b, 2019) as they reflect adaptations towards different substrate conditions (Büscher & Gorb, 2019; Büscher et al., 2020). Nevertheless, no notable niche differentiation appears to have occurred in Heteropterygidae, the only exception being *Heteropteryx* whose green, leaf-imitating females and flighted males adapted to a secondary tree-dwelling life style (Bradler & Buckley, 2018). Whether *Microceramia* retained a ground-dwelling life style despite the well-developed wings is not known, since no ecological information was ever documented. A change in colour as in *Heteropteryx* has however not occurred (Bates, 1865; Günther, 1934).

Our results emphasize the nonadaptive radiation of Heteropterygidae and that speciation was mainly driven by allopatry (or parapatry) due to jump dispersal events and colonization of new areas. Unlike adaptive radiations, the allopatric populations continued to occupy the same niches and retained the ancestral ecological traits (Gittenberger, 1991; Rundell & Price, 2009). Poor dispersers have generally a higher potential for allopatric and nonecological speciation, especially when occupying disruptive landmasses (Czekanski-Moir & Rundell, 2019). This is particularly true for Obriminae, which dispersed across highly fragmented and isolated areas (Philippine Islands) resulting in the highest diversity among heteropterygids. In contrast to nonadaptive radiations associated with cryptic diversity (e.g. Kozak et al., 2006; Slavenko et al., 2020), Heteropterygidae have undergone slight trait diversification. However, these morphological differences have possibly accumulated after speciation and derived from minor ecological differences in the respective microhabitats in vicariant isolation (Rundell & Price, 2009). Additionally, phenotypic divergence might have occurred via character displacement as ranges of allopatric species overlapped (Brown & Wilson, 1956). Shifts in body size in Dataminae and Heteropteryginae may have resulted from (secondary) co-occurrence, a pattern observed in allopatric as well as sympatric animal species (Moritz et al., 2018). Although the morphospace among heteropterygids is rather uniform, the potential for disparification appears to be generally common. In fact, some conspecific populations have been suggested to be distinct species but were here recovered as phenotypic variations with minimal genetic difference (e.g. *Epidares nolimetangere* Haan, *Euclidides iggoritro, Haaniella echinata*). The phenotypic disparity among extant heteropterygid species may even be explained by ancestral plasticity (Levis & Pfennig, 2016; Czekanski-Moir & Rundell, 2019) that was not caused by adaptations to new environments, a process that is difficult to assess and to discern from alternative or concurrent evolutionary mechanisms. Future extensive morphological examinations are crucial to fully understand the evolutionary patterns that shaped the nonadaptive radiation of Heteropterygidae.

**Conclusions**

Our study demonstrates that a comparatively small genetic data set of a limited number of loci may still resolve phylogenetic questions regarding the relationships of evolutionary younger lineages even in the era of phylogenomics. Considering that the recovered phylogenetic relationships of Heteropterygidae are in conflict with previous molecular phylogenies based on fewer taxa, but agree with hypotheses and analyses based on morphological characters, the usage of an increased and comprehensive taxon sampling proved essential to obtain optimal support. The historical biogeography of Heteropterygidae and its ancestral range in Sundaland (mainland Asia) coincides with the origin of Oriophasmata in the Oriental region. Despite their low vagility, heteropterygids have expanded their distribution across the Oriental and towards the Australian region during a relatively short time period and provide an example of potential dispersal routes applicable to other Oriophasmata lineages such as Lanceoceracta, Lonchodinae or Phyllidae. In contrast to other phasmatodean lineages, diversification in Heteropterygidae resulted from allopatric speciation without subsequent ecological divergence (nonadaptive radiation). Therefore, morphological and behavioural traits associated with adaptations to the forest floor were essentially retained. The occurrence of disparate traits among conspecific individuals in Heteropterygidae is not uncommon and may provide an insight into preceding nonadaptive processes leading to diversification via character displacement. Having provided a basis for species delineation, future studies should focus on morphological examination to assess whether a specific morphological trait lies within the scope of phenotypic disparity or delimits species’ boundaries. Ultimately, the combination of morphological and molecular analyses will further improve our understanding of trait evolution and diversification in nonadaptive radiations and how these evolutionary processes shaped the diversity of these lineages.
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**File S5.** Video of oviposition in Obriminae (Tisamenus sp. ‘Cagayan’). The beak-like secondary ovipositor is used to insert the egg(s) into the soil.
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