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Abstract:

Introduction:
The relationships within the *Pyrrhura* species complex are partly unresolved. In this study, a comprehensive phylogenetic analysis of the *Pyrrhura picta-leucotis* complex was carried out, covering all species except *P. subandina*.

Material and Methods:
We made a morphological analysis of 745 preserved specimens of all the taxa in different museums. Nucleotide sequences of the mitochondrial cytochrome gene were generated and used to reconstruct a molecular phylogeny of *Pyrrhura*.

Results and Discussion:
Our results show that the complex is divided into 6 main groups comprising 15 species. *P. dilutissima*, regarded up to now as a subspecies of *P. peruviana*, acquires species status and three new subspecies are described. We also provide evidence that *P. roseifrons* is a paraphyletic group, indicating the existence of probably 3 lineages of which 2 deserve species status.

1. INTRODUCTION


Joseph [5] provided the first excellent characterization of the taxa of the *picta-leucotis* group in the Amazon basin. However, Arndt [7] pointed out that the criteria used by Joseph [5] to characterize various forms and the colouring of the breast feathers were insufficient. The range of variation within the taxa is considerable. Coloration of the individual breast feathers and the breast in total is variable among individuals of the forms investigated, and therefore can only be used in combination with other characters to determine the various taxa. Nonetheless the taxa as circumscribed by Joseph are corroborated by our examination of the specimen material. Ribas, *et al.* [6] were able to support the validity of some species by molecular genetic means. However, this work demonstrated the limits of DNA analysis for the
precise taxonomic judgments. This situation is not unusual and occurs in other young species complexes [10, 11]. The most probable explanation for the *picta-leucotis* complex is that the splitting up of populations and taxa is very recent and reproductive isolation is still incomplete. In such situations, it is possible that morphological differences are more apparent than genetic ones (M. Schaefer, in litt.). Our molecular phylogeny research, which includes many taxa than previous studies, highlights this problem and shows that only a combination of phylogenetic, morphological, ecological and ethological data allow more precise taxonomic judgments.

Joseph [5] already pointed out that the use of the biological species concept [12] is problematic in the *picta-leucotis* complex. This applies likewise for the morphological or phylogenetic species concepts. We also have noted Gill’s “new null hypothesis for species designation” [13], which, in the absence of any natural tests of reproductive isolation, considers genetically and phenotypically distinct taxa as full species, but agree with Joseph [5], that probably the complex is best characterized if it is regarded from the viewpoint of the Comprehensive Biologic Species Concept for birds [14]. This considers avian species as systems of populations representing essentially monophyletic, genetically cohesive and genealogically concordant lineages of individuals on independent evolutionary trajectories [5].

The method used by us for assigning species rank by Tobias, et al. [15] and Helbig, et al. [16] is based on the BSC. This is especially problematic for allopatric taxa, as without geographical contact reproductive isolation cannot be tested directly, which can lead to subjective results [12, 17 - 19]. However, Tobias, et al. [15] point out that this does not need to be fatal as arbitrariness can be minimised using direct comparisons with related sympatric species [14, 20].

We present in this work the most detailed distributional information to date, particularly for the taxa represented in the Amazon basin and Peru, which in part differ considerably from the known range descriptions (Appendix 1, Map 1-5). This was possible through the combination of museum specimen material and sightings in the wild, for the most part published on the Internet. However, the failure rate in the identification of species/subspecies appearing for Internet data is relatively high. Therefore, only those records, which were clearly supported by photos or detailed descriptions are considered in the maps.

The maps of the various taxa in the Amazon basin reveal their largely parapatric distributions and their relatively strict confinement to the diverse river systems Fig. (1). Thus one finds *amazonum* in the lower catchment area of the Rio Tapajós, Rio Xingu and Rio Tocantins/Rio Araguaia, *lucianii* along the middle Rio Amazonas, Rio Madeira and Rio Purus and *roseifrons* in the area of the upper Amazon/Rio Ucayali, Rio Jurua and Rio Madre de Dios. *Pallescens* holds a special position by occupying the upper catchment area of the Rio Madeira, Rio Tapajós and Rio Xingu. This distribution is probably explained by the forest refugium theory, which posits that during the Pleistocene period isolated areas of forest produced new species. The work of Bush and Oliveira [21] and Haffer and Prance [22] as well as Prance [23] and Haffer [24] discuss these forest refugia, showing that in parts of current distribution of *P. pallescens* such refugia are likely to be found.

The area over which the *picta-leucotis* occurs is huge, and between its many constituent taxa there are large gaps which may or may not be real. Nonetheless, there are a few localities where the ranges of different taxa have been shown to be parapatric. Thus *pallescens* and *amazonum* meet in the outermost north-east Mato Grosso in the area between Confresa and Alo Brasil for a few kilometres, *picta* and *amazonum* on the Rio Trombetas, and *roseifrons* comes into contact in Peru with *lucianii* on the Rio Orosa and Madre Selva as well as with *parvifrons* on the Rio Cusshabatay. The same is true for *pallescens* and *lucianii* in the area of Porto Velho and *roseifrons* and *dilutissima* in the Peruvian Rio Perene valley.

Relatively small isolated populations have developed in the Peruvian Andes in the larger river valleys. These are highly restricted in their extent of occurrence, have a movement radius of only a few kilometres and confined to certain altitudes. Klauke, et al. (in press) [25] have demonstrated this for *Pyrrhura orcesi* and Arndt and Gonzales Pinedo [26] for *P. parvifrons*. Klauke, et al. [25] point out that this strong site fidelity greatly affects population development and the conservation status of threatened (sub) populations, as the birds are unable to move to other areas, even if these seem easily accessible and are just a few hundred metres higher or lower. Field observations by TA, who visited practically all the larger Peruvian and Brazilian populations between 2008 and 2015, suggest that this behaviour is characteristic for all Peruvian representatives of *Pyrrhura* in the Andes region.
Fig. (1). Map of northern South America showing specimen locations (full dots) and sightings (stars), which could be unequivocally identified, for the *P. picta* complex within the Amazon basin; the boundary lines show the likely total distribution ranges of the taxa under consideration of river systems and habitat requirements. Not shown are the taxa *eisenmanni*, *subandina* and *caeruleiceps* in the north and *leucotis*, *griseipectus* and *pfrimeri* in the south, as their distribution areas are well known and clearly defined.

This unusually low dispersal range can be explained by certain typical behavioural patterns. According to previous observations (e.g. [27], field observations by TA) most if not all *Pyrrhura* representatives have traditional roosting/nesting trees, which have been used for decades by small groups of up to 10 birds and probably make them very conservative in their dispersive abilities. The birds mainly use living trees such as *Albizia polycephala* and *Inga* sp [27], and the absence of these trees appears to be a significant limiting factor in the ability of birds to occupy otherwise seemingly suitable habitat.

The specific habitat requirements of most of the Peruvian *Pyrrhura* species are still incompletely known, but it seems that many populations require intact mountain rain forest with tall tree species. They forage at lower elevations in more fragmented areas at certain times of the year, but are generally absent from forested areas, which have been affected by human activities. This suggests special habitat requirements, which result in localised occurrence.

Moreover, Klauke *et al.* (in press) [25] have shown in the case of *Pyrrhura orcesi* that even small geographical barriers such as valleys, which could be easily overflown, create obstacles that limit the dispersal of the birds. They have demonstrated that geographical barriers promote genetic divergence in quite small spaces.

The populations north and south of the Amazon basin occur allopatrically and are found, with the exception of *P. leucotis*, in isolated mountain areas with differing habitats and ecological as well as biogeographical histories, which have favoured their genetic divergence. This can be seen in the molecular phylogeny data for *eisenmanni*, *caeruleiceps*, *emma*, *pfrimeri* and *griseipectus*.

Here, for the first time we examine the *Pyrrhura picta-leucotis* complex through the combination of genetic (sequences of mitochondrial cytochrome b) and morphological analyses. Adding biogeographic and ethological data enabled us to understand the species-level systematics of the different taxa more precisely as well as to propose taxonomical changes. In addition, new findings were gained on the distribution of the taxa.
2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1. Phenotypic Analysis

Museum Specimens and Biometric Data

Altogether we were able to examine 745 specimens of all known species and subspecies of the *Pyrrhura picta leucotis* complex, of which 7 were available as photographs and 578 were measured (wing, tail and bill, 4 from living birds) from specimens curated in the following museums: American Museum of Natural History in New York (AMNH), Carnegie Museum of Natural History in Pittsburgh (CM), Colección Ornitológica Phelps in Caracas (COP), Field Museum of Natural History in Chicago (FMNH), Louisiana State University Museum of Natural Science in Baton Rouge (LSUMZ), Museo de Historia Natural “Javier Prado” de la UNMSM in Lima (MJPL), The Natural History Museum in Tring (NHM), Museu Goeldi in Belém (MPEG), Staatliches Museum für Tierkunde in Dresden (MTD), Museu de Zoologia da Universidade de São Paulo in São Paulo (MZUSP), Netherlands Centrum voor Biodiversiteit in Leiden (RMNH), Forschungsinstitut and Museum Senckenberg in Frankfurt am Main (SMF), Museu Nacional in Rio de Janeiro (UFRJ), United States National Museum in Washington (USNM), Universidade de São Paulo in São Paulo (USP), Museum für Naturkunde der Humboldt-Universität in Berlin (ZMB), and Zoologische Staatssammlung München (ZSM).

The colour terminology for describing the type specimens is based on Smithe [28].

Vocal Analysis

Differences in voice are often indicative of geographic and genetic isolation; vocalisations are not only used for determining the species, but above all to establish whether we are dealing with closely related allopatric speciation or not [29].

We used for this purpose a very simplified method to compare calls and highlight probable differences between those of different taxa, without claiming to prove them definitively.

Call sequences were taken either from xeno-canto.org and ibc.lynxed.com or from our own collection, using Raven Pro 1.5 as the analysis program. Calls were selected on the basis of their comparability (homology); usually they were flock calls. A spectrogram was created in Raven Pro from these sound samples and was examined if it exclusively contained *Pyrrhura* calls. Other calls or noises were removed. Finally, the peak frequency was determined.

2.2. Taxon Sampling for DNA Studies

Blood and Tissue Samples

For this research, we included nucleotide sequences of 49 samples from GenBank. The sequence dataset was extended by 33 new sequences generated in our own laboratory (Appendix 2). The comprehensive dataset covers the entire *picta-leucotis* complex with the exception of *P. subandina*.

2.3. DNA Extraction, Amplification, Sequencing and Analysis

DNA was obtained from blood samples stored in a modified EDTA buffer at -20°C, in 80% ethanol, or dried on filter paper until processing in the Heidelberg laboratory. Total DNA was isolated using standard proteinase K (Merck, Darmstadt) and phenol/chloroform procedures [30, 31].

We amplified the mitochondrial cytochrome b gene (> 900 nucleotides; nt) as an informative marker gene which has been used by us before for a phylogenetic reconstruction of many other bird taxa. The PCR amplifications were performed in 50 µl reaction volumes containing 1 × PCR buffer (Bioron, Ludwigshafen), 100 µM dNTPs, 0.2 units of *Taq* DNA polymerase (Bioron, Ludwigshafen), 200 ng of DNA and 5 pmol of primers.

Thermal cycling was carried out under the following conditions: 5 min at 94°C, followed by 35 cycles of 40 s at 94°C, 40 s at 52.0°C, 1 min at 72°C and a final extension at 72°C for 10 min. PCR products were precipitated with 4 M NH₄Ac and ethanol (1:1:6) and a centrifugation for 15 min (13,000 rpm).

Sequencing was performed using the ABI 3730 automated capillary sequencer (Applied Biosystems, CA, USA) with the ABI Prism Big Dye Terminator Cycle Sequencing Ready Reaction Kit 3.1 (carried out by STARSEQ GmbH, Mainz, Germany). For sequencing, the same primers were used as for the initial PCR amplifications.
2.4. Phylogenetic Analyses

The nucleotide sequences were aligned manually with BioEdit version 7.0.9.0. No internal stop codons or frame-shifts were observed in the sequences, which were translated entirely by using the chicken mitochondrial code.

Phylogenetic trees were reconstructed using the Maximum Likelihood (ML) algorithm in MEGA version 7 [32] with related parrot species as outgroups. The percentage of trees in which the associated taxa clustered together is shown next to the branches. Initial tree(s) for the heuristic search were obtained automatically by applying Neighbor-Join and Bio NJ algorithms to a matrix of pairwise distances estimated using the Maximum Composite Likelihood (MCL) approach, and then selecting the topology with superior log likelihood value. A discrete Gamma distribution was used to model evolutionary rate differences among sites (5 discrete Gamma categories +G, parameter = 0.4968). The rate variation model allowed for some sites to be evolutionarily invariable (+I, 33.6773% sites). The tree is drawn to scale, with branch lengths measured in the number of substitutions per site. The analysis involved 84 nucleotide sequences. Codon positions included were 1st+2nd+3rd+Noncoding. There were a total of 1140 positions in the final dataset. Evolutionary analyses were conducted in MEGA7.

Sequence data have been submitted to GenBank (accession numbers listed in Appendix 2, taxon samplings).

2.5. Method for Assigning Species Rank

Practically all the taxa of our dataset show a parapatric or allopatric distribution. Because the phylogeny of the *picta-leucotis* complex reveals well-separated lineages, the "guidelines for assigning species rank" by Helbig et al. [16] as well as the "quantitative criteria for species delimitation" established by Tobias et al. [15] provide a basis for a quantitative delimitation of the species and subspecies in this complex. A parapatric taxon can be diagnosed using the Helbig system (e.g. showing at least two unique characters) but to meet this criterion it should not hybridise. Allopatric taxa must be clearly diagnosable by at least one character and the level of divergence must be equivalent to that between the two most closely related sympatric species.

Tobias et al. [15] use a quantitative system in which points are given as follows: for each minor character (a weak difference, e.g. a change in shade) 1, medium character (a clear difference reflected, e.g. by a distinct hue rather than different colour) 2, major character (a pronounced and striking difference in the colour or pattern of a body part, or in a measurement or vocalisation) 3, and exceptional difference (a radically different coloration or pattern) 4 points. In the evaluation system only three plumage characters, two biometric characters, two vocal characters and one behavioural or ecological character may be scored. The minimum number of points for species status is 7.

We have modified this point system and used it for all taxa, especially for those that are not clearly genetically defined in their group (see 3.10 taxonomic results), but take into account the demands of Helbig et al. [16] that in all allopatric taxa the level of divergence must be equivalent to that found in related sympatric species. In cases where a recognisable genetic difference exists between two taxa, we have weighted this with 1 to 4 points as one of the two possible biometric characteristics. For this evaluation, either bootstrap values or genetic distances can be used. Both result in about the same values. For bootstrap values the scoring would be: <80 = 0 point; 80-84 = 1 point; 85-90 = 2 points; 91-97 = 3 points; >97 = 4 points. We used genetic distances (uncorrected p distance) (Appendix 3), which describe the genetic differences more clearly. To determine the minimum and maximum distance values (1 = 100%) for the scoring we used the values of *amazonum/pallescens* (0.0052) and closely related *Pyrrhura* species pairs (*molinai/frontalis*: 0.0182; *lepida/perlata*: 0.0147; *rhodocephala/hoffmanni*: 0.0182). We scored with: < 0.0060 = 0 point; 0.0060-0.0089 = 1 point; 0.0090-0.0119 = 2 points; 0.0120-0.0149 = 3 points; > 0.0150 = 4 points. This system allows a considerable influence for genetic data, so that taxa with the maximum possible four points achieve already more than half the necessary score for species status.

In establishing biometric characters, we have limited ourselves to bill, wing and tail measurements and used the "Cohen’s d" value required by Tobias et al. [15].

As we are using a very simplified form of the vocal analysis, we have only allowed one point where differences in the peak frequency were established, so as not to over-value this character.

The assessment of ecological data as a species character is only partially helpful, as indicated also by Tobias et al. [15], because at least widespread *Pyrrhura* taxa such as *amazonum*, *pallescens* and *roseifrons* vary geographically in their microhabitat requirements. We have drawn not only on published information but also on the findings of our own fieldwork. In evaluating the species rank system we were very cautious and only awarded one point where the habitat
use clearly indicated specialisation.

2.6. Cluster Analysis

To control and confirm the results of the species rank method we carried out a cluster analysis using 31 character groups (24 plumage and soft parts, 4 biometrics, 2 ecological, 1 allopatric/parapatric disjunction) in 91 characters. The results of the analysis are shown in (Fig. 2).

![Cluster analysis diagram](image_url)

Fig. (2). Cluster analysis using 31 character groups (24 plumage and soft parts, 4 biometrics, 2 ecological, 1 allopatric/parapatric disjunction) and 91 characters.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. Sequence Characteristics

The dataset (without outgroups) comprises 139 sequences of 1143 nt length; 254 sites are variable and 197 parsimony-informative. Variable sites are documented in (Table 1) which clearly indicates the positions, which are informative and characteristic for each taxon.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taxon</th>
<th>Nucleotide Sequence</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#PYRRHURA_PERLATA_AY751647</td>
<td>AGCTTCGCAATTCTACT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#PYRRHURA_PERLATA_AY751646</td>
<td>AGCTTCGCAATTCTACT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#PYRRHURA_PARVIFRONS_79373</td>
<td>AGCTTCGCAATTCTACT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#PYRRHURA_PARVIFRONS_65834</td>
<td>AGCTTCGCAATTCTACT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#PYRRHURA_MOLINAE_KUMNH_1526</td>
<td>AGCTTCGCAATTCTACT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#PYRRHURA_MELANURA_FJ899163</td>
<td>AGCTTCGCAATTCTACT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#PYRRHURA_MELANURA_FJ899161</td>
<td>AGCTTCGCAATTCTACT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#PYRRHURA_MELANURA_FJ899162</td>
<td>AGCTTCGCAATTCTACT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#PYRRHURA_MELANURA_FJ899161</td>
<td>AGCTTCGCAATTCTACT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#PYRRHURA_MELANURA_FJ899162</td>
<td>AGCTTCGCAATTCTACT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#PYRRHURA_MELANURA_FJ899162</td>
<td>AGCTTCGCAATTCTACT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#PYRRHURA_MELANURA_FJ899162</td>
<td>AGCTTCGCAATTCTACT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#PYRRHURA_LUCIANII_77901</td>
<td>AGCTTCGCAATTCTACT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#PYRRHURA_LUCIANII_77896</td>
<td>AGCTTCGCAATTCTACT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#PYRRHURA_LEUCOTIS_LGEMA_3923</td>
<td>AGCTTCGCAATTCTACT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#PYRRHURA_LEUCOTIS_AY751633</td>
<td>AGCTTCGCAATTCTACT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#PYRRHURA_LEUCOTIS_AY751644</td>
<td>AGCTTCGCAATTCTACT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#PYRRHURA_HOFFMANI_NMNH_B05272</td>
<td>AGCTTCGCAATTCTACT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#PYRRHURA_HOFFMANI_AY751654</td>
<td>AGCTTCGCAATTCTACT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#PYRRHURA_GRISEIPECTUS_LGEMA_3915</td>
<td>AGCTTCGCAATTCTACT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#PYRRHURA_GRISEIPECTUS_AY751631</td>
<td>AGCTTCGCAATTCTACT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#PYRRHURA_GRISEIPECTUS_AY751629</td>
<td>AGCTTCGCAATTCTACT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#PYRRHURA_GRISEIPECTUS_AY751627</td>
<td>AGCTTCGCAATTCTACT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#PYRRHURA_FRONTALIS_LSUMNS_B25884</td>
<td>AGCTTCGCAATTCTACT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#PYRRHURA_EMMA_AY751623</td>
<td>AGCTTCGCAATTCTACT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#PYRRHURA_EMMA_AY751622</td>
<td>AGCTTCGCAATTCTACT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#PYRRHURA_CRUENTATA_LGEMA_2228</td>
<td>AGCTTCGCAATTCTACT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#PYRRHURA_CRUENTATA_AY751633</td>
<td>AGCTTCGCAATTCTACT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#PYRRHURA_AMAZONUM_MICROTERA_77903</td>
<td>AGCTTCGCAATTCTACT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#PYRRHURA_ALBIPECTUS_AY751639</td>
<td>AGCTTCGCAATTCTACT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Variable sites of cytochrome b sequences of the study taxa.
Fig. (3). Phylogenetic tree. Molecular Phylogenetic Analysis by Maximum Likelihood. The evolutionary history was inferred by using the Maximum Likelihood method based on the Tamura-Nei model [33]. The tree with the highest log likelihood (-3141.3109) is shown. Robustness of nodes was assessed by bootstrap analysis (300 bootstrap replications).
3.2. Phylogenetic Analyses

Phylogenetic trees were reconstructed with Maximum Likelihood (Fig. 3).

The following clades could be recovered with good bootstrap support: Clade I (comprising *amazonum* and *pallescens*), Clade II (with *leucotis* and *griseipectus*), Clade III (with 2 lineages of *pfrimeri*), Clade IV (with *eisenmanni* and *caeruleiceps*), Clade V (with *emma* and *picta*) and Clade VI (with *peruviana*, *dilutissima*, *parvifrons*, *luciani* and 3 lineages of *roseifrons*). The positions of *eisenmanni* and *caeruleiceps* are unresolved on the basis of bootstrap values. However, most clades can be identified by specific and characteristic nucleotide substitutions Table 1, even if they lack high bootstrap support, because of a low number of nucleotide substitutions.

Clades I to III describe taxa with an eastern and central distribution in northern South America, clades IV and V show a northern and clade VI a western and central distribution pattern (Fig. 3).

3.3. Cluster Analysis

The cluster analysis of morphological and ecological characters almost entirely confirmed the results of the species rank method Fig. (2). The values for taxa achieving species status lay between 0.08 and 0.1. All values below this indicated a subspecies according to the species rank method. The only exception arose with *cuchivera*; this form clustered with *pallescens* because of its obvious similarities.

3.4. Amazonum / Pallescens Group

**Specimens Examined**

*Pyrrhura amazonum*

Altogether, there were 25 preserved specimens of *amazonum* (north of the Amazon) and 87 of *microtera* (south of the Amazon) available for the assessment of this form.

Joseph [5] pointed out that a few *amazonum* specimens have red feathers on the bend of wing, which could reflect hybridisation with *picta*. However, in fact only two specimens had isolated red feathers. Otherwise, they showed no tendency of any kind towards *picta*, so that the morphological division between the two forms was very clear. None of the *picta* representatives showed tendencies to *amazonum* in their colouring.

Representatives of *amazonum* as well as *microtera* varied considerably in breast colour (but not in breast feather markings), undermining the case for a division into two subspecies. Joseph [5] pointed out, however, that *microtera* is on average smaller, and our measurements confirm this (Appendix 4). It has to be taken into account that the Amazon provides a natural barrier, which prevents gene-exchange, and *microtera* is spread over three river systems (Rio Tapajós, Rio Xingu and Rio Tocantins/Rio Araguaia). The average wing length of *amazonum* is 117.9 mm (n = 23). The specimens of *microtera* highlighted a clear west-east division. The measurements of birds from Rio Tapajós are 113.8 mm (n = 43), from Rio Xingu 111.3 mm (n = 13) and from Rio Tocantins/Araguaia 109.2 mm (n = 23). A molecular genetic comparison of the populations north and south of the Amazon was unfortunately not possible, so for the moment we regard it as premature to lump *microtera* with *amazonum*.

Following the appearance in Brazilian and European live bird collections of a clearly different form of the *Pyrrhura amazonum* group, supposedly originating from the Rio Tocantins, we extended our specimen examination to the most important Brazilian museums. This revealed that the species occurred along the Tocantins as well as the Rio Araguaia, an evidence, which had been largely overlooked. Pacheco and Olmos [34], for example, cite *P. pfrimeri* in their list of birds of Tocantins, but not *amazonum*. TA was able finally to link three specimens from Santana do Araguaia, Faz. Fartura, Pará (MZUSP 89888, 89889 and 89890) to the unknown form and confirm this by several visits to the area concerned. It became evident that the form, named above as *araguaiaensis*, lives in the seasonal forest typical of the Mato Grosso, which extends locally to the river system of the Araguaia.

*Pyrrhura pallescens*

Altogether 90 specimens of this taxon were available to us. Despite the relatively large range and a significant variation in the breast feather markings and colouring, all specimens could immediately be assigned to *pallescens* by their broad, pointed breast feather edging, which extends to the lower cheeks. This makes a confusion with other taxa unlikely. Birds from Jacareacanga on the Rio Tapajós, which were identified by Ribas et al. [6] as *snethlageae* (now
pallescens), belong to microtera (the authors confused Jacareacanga, Rio Tapajós, with Jacareacanga, Rio Bonito, where pallescens actually occurs).

Arndt [7] separated the birds from Rio Teles Pires at the mouth of the Rio Cristalino near to Alta Floresta and from the Rio Peixote de Azuvedo as the subspecies lucida, as they were paler in breast feathering and generally smaller, with more blue to the forehead. However, Gaban-Lima and Raposo [9] showed that P. pallescens melanoides is the valid senior name for P. snethlageae lucida. Careful further investigation of the specimen material revealed that the entire pallescens population can be split into two large groups: representatives from the upper catchment area of the Rio Madeira and the Rio Juruena (pallescens: little or no blue on the forehead; larger, but smaller bill [15.0 mm; n = 27]) and birds of the upper Rio Tapajós and Rio Xingu (melanoides: marked blue forehead; smaller, but larger bill [16.1 mm; n = 15]). The Cohen's d value for the difference in bill size was 1.27. The paler breast was marked in melanoides, but was also present as a trend in pallescens.

Biogeographic and Ethological Analysis

As mentioned above amazonum and pallescens cannot be separated by sequence data although an identification is possible. In this regard, our extended data do not differ from what Ribas et al. [6] already found out. However, if ecological, vocal and ethological differences are taken into account, it becomes obvious that these outweigh the genetic aspect. Although, both amazonum and pallescens inhabit primarily moist forest, they show differences in the preferred altitudes Table (2). In addition, there is the fact that microtera/araguaiaensis in northern Brazil meet pallescens in a semi-circle for 1,500 km (Appendix 1, Map 1) without any recorded hybridisation between the two species. This situation would be extremely unusual for parrot subspecies and there is no comparable situation within the family. The separation is especially clear in the outermost part of northeastern Mato Grosso where the taxa remain strictly on their own river system, but approach each other to within a few kilometres.

Table 2. Genetic, morphological, ecological and ethological differences within the amazonum/pallescens group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taxon</th>
<th>DNA</th>
<th>Morphological between Species</th>
<th>Morphological within Species</th>
<th>Ecological*</th>
<th>Altitude</th>
<th>Call Frequences Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>amazonum</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Major to pallescens</td>
<td>Minor (size)</td>
<td>Yes (Uatuma-Trombetas moist forest, Monte Alegre varzea)</td>
<td>&lt; 200 m</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>microtera</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Major to pallescens</td>
<td>Minor (size)</td>
<td>Yes (Tapajós-Xingu moist forest, Xingu-Tocantins-Araguaia moist forest)</td>
<td>&lt; 200 m</td>
<td>16.1 kHz / 18.4 kHz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>araguaiaensis</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Major to pallescens</td>
<td>Medium (breast colouration)</td>
<td>Yes (Mato Grosso seasonal forest)</td>
<td>&lt; 250 m</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pallescens</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Major to amazonum</td>
<td>Minor (breast colouration, forehead, size)</td>
<td>Yes (Madeira-Tapajós moist forest, Tapajós-Xingu moist forest)</td>
<td>100 - 350 m</td>
<td>22.1 kHz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>melanoides</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Major to amazonum</td>
<td>Minor (breast colouration, forehead, size)</td>
<td>Yes (Mato Grosso seasonal forest)</td>
<td>200 - 450 m</td>
<td>20.7 kHz</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* different habitat types based on Fund [35]

In addition to the morphological differences in breast markings and size there is a vocal difference. The species differ in the tone pitch they emit. We have for comparison drawn on four sound recordings with comparable flock calls (microtera: XC11420, XC119952; pallescens: XC37963, XC118834), where without doubt further detailed investigation would be helpful.

A further indication of the proximity of two species is revealed by the comparison with P. perlata and P. lepida, whose ranges are virtually identical with those of pallescens and amazonum and which are clearly genetically two species. Helbig et al. [16] put forward such a comparison with sympatric species for the assessment of allopatric taxa.

Species Rank Analysis

A comparison of pallescens with amazonum shows the following: the taxa occur parapatrically (3), pallescens is significantly larger [Cohen's d winglength = 2.00; tail length = 1.25] (2), with a brown forehead (1), brown breast with a strong V marking and very broad edging (3), different voice (1) and different habitat (not scored). The total score is 10.

The comparison suggests that species status for pallescens is justified.
3.5. Leucotis / Griseipectus Group

**Phylogenetic Analysis**

The results for these two taxa in the paper by Ribas *et al.* [6] are not clear. As only captive birds were available to these authors, there is the possibility of misidentification. In addition, *griseipectus* was once (as a subspecies of *P. leucotis*) just as correctly identified as *Pyrrhura leucotis*. We have therefore analysed our own samples with indisputable identifications as well as representatives of *griseipectus* (AY751633, AY751634) from GenBank (although AY751634 was listed as *leucotis*).

**Table 3. Genetic, morphological, ecological and ethological differences within the leucotis / griseipectus group.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taxon</th>
<th>DNA</th>
<th>Morphological</th>
<th>Ecological*</th>
<th>Altitude</th>
<th>Call Frequencies Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>leucotis</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes (breast coloration, bill size)</td>
<td>Yes (lowland Atlantic forest)</td>
<td>&lt; 500 m</td>
<td>16.3 kHz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>griseipectus</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes (breast coloration, bill size)</td>
<td>Yes (humid mountain forests grade into semi-deciduous forest)</td>
<td>&gt; 500 m</td>
<td>17.4 kHz</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Different habitat types based on Olmos *et al.* [38]

**Specimens Examined**

Altogether, there were 42 preserved specimens of *Pyrrhura leucotis* and 23 of *P. griseipectus* available for assessing these forms, which were all clearly identifiable and displayed clear differences. A detailed description of the diagnostic characters can be found in Olmos *et al.* [36, 37], which especially highlight the differences in bill shape. *P. griseipectus* has a longer, broader and deeper bill, which gives the species the appearance of a larger head. Our measurements confirm this impression: the average bill length of *leucotis* is 14.5 mm (12.9-15.7 mm, n = 31) and of *griseipectus* 15.8 (14.5-16.6 mm, n = 16). Our wing and tail measurements (Appendix 4) show that *griseipectus* has slightly shorter wings, but a noticeably longer tail.

**Biogeographic and Ethological Analysis**

*Pyrrhura leucotis* and *griseipectus* are not only genetically separated, which is plausible because of geographical distance (ca. 1,500 km) between them, but also have ecological and ethological differences Table (3). Thus in addition to the clear differences in the habitat type used and altitude, there are differences in vocal pitch, which Olmos *et al.* [38] already indicated. For comparison we used two sound recordings with comparable flock calls (*leucotis*: XC85379; *griseipectus*: XC16808).

**Species Rank Analysis**

A comparison of *leucotis* with *griseipectus* provided the following results: the taxa occur allopatrically (0), with major genetic differences (3), *griseipectus* has a clearly stronger bill [Cohen’s d culmen length = 2.44] (2) and longer tail [Cohen’s d tail length = 0.98] (not scored), but shorter wing [Cohen’s d wing length = 1.24] (1), and differs in plumage in breast colour and breast edging (3) as well as vocally (1) and in habitat (1). The total score is 11.

The comparison shows that species status for *griseipectus* is justified.

3.6. Pfrimeri Group

**Phylogenetic Analysis**

Five sequences were available to us from the GenBank on *Pyrrhura pfrimeri* as well as 3 of our own sequences.

**Specimen Examined**

We examined 9 specimens of this taxon, which were all clearly identifiable and showed well-defined morphological differences to all other taxa of the *picta-leucotis* complex.

**Biogeographic and Ethological Analysis**

*Pyrrhura pfrimeri* is regarded today as a valid species, which is confirmed both by our genetic analysis and by the morphology and ecology of the taxon. *Pfrimeri* is the only form of the complex to live in caatinga habitat with deciduous or semi-deciduous dry forest growing on limestone outcrops or limestone-derived soils [36].
Species Rank Analysis

A comparison of *pfrimeri* with all other taxa of the *picta-leucotis* complex (apart from *emma* and *auricularis*) shows the following: the taxon occurs allopatrically (0), the differences are genetically exceptional (4), *pfrimeri* differs morphologically through its blue forehead colour, which extends to the nape (2), blue breast colour with narrow edging (2) and red-brown ear-coverts (2) as well as habitat (1). The total score is 11.

The comparison confirms species status for *P. pfrimeri*.

3.7. *Eisenmanni* / *Subandina* / *Caeruleiceps* Group

Phylogenetic Analysis

Just 2 sequences of *P. eisenmanni* (AY751598, AY751599) were available to us from GenBank and 2 of *P. caeruleiceps* of our own.

Specimens examined

Altogether 2 preserved specimens of *Pyrrhura eisenmanni*, 6 of *P. subandina*, 10 of *caeruleiceps* and 2 of *pantchenkoi* were available for the assessment of these forms, which all clearly showed their differences in colour (Table 4) and size (Appendix 4).

Table 4. Plumage differences in the *eisenmanni*, *subandina*, and *caeruleiceps* group of taxa.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taxon</th>
<th>Breast marking</th>
<th>Forehead colour</th>
<th>Ear-coverts</th>
<th>Cheeks</th>
<th>Bend of wing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>eisenmanni</em></td>
<td>Grey, broad edging</td>
<td>Red / brown</td>
<td>Dull whish</td>
<td>Reddish brown</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>subandina</em></td>
<td>Brown, narrow edging</td>
<td>Red / brown, blue tinge</td>
<td>Dull brown</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>caeruleiceps</em></td>
<td>Brown, broad edging</td>
<td>Red/blue</td>
<td>Dull brown</td>
<td>Red-brown</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>pantchenkoi</em></td>
<td>Greybrown, broad edging</td>
<td>Brown/blue</td>
<td>Dull brown</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The subspecies *P. caeruleiceps pantchenkoi* was described by Phelps [39], Joseph [4], examining one of the two preserved specimens of *pantchenkoi*, established that this form does not differ from *caeruleiceps*. In succeeding publications [5, 40] *pantchenkoi* was generally treated as a synonym of *caeruleiceps*. In fact, however, the holotype of *pantchenkoi* (AMNH 73168), which is clearly an immature with dull, brownish plumage, and the (probably adult) example in the Colección Ornitológica Phelps (COP 73169), both show a clear difference from *caeruleiceps* in the lores and eye area: these are coloured dark brown whilst nine adult *caeruleiceps* in USNM clearly show a red colour. The only other immature example (USNM 372618) has dark brown lores and eye area but lacks the dark blue cheek colour of both *pantchenkoi* specimens. Another difference relates to the breast feathers, which are more greyish with a paler edging in *pantchenkoi*. Observations and photos from the field confirm these differences (R. Strewe, pers. comm.). It is therefore not appropriate to treat *pantchenkoi* as a synonym of *caeruleiceps*, but for the time being it seems advisable to classify it as a subspecies of *Pyrrhura caeruleiceps* because of the colour differences.

Biogeographic and Ethological Analysis

*Pyrrhura eisenmanni* is currently recognised as a valid species, but this does not always apply to *subandina* and *caeruleiceps*, which, for example, are listed by the “South American Classification Committee” along with *emma* as subspecies of *Pyrrhura picta*. The Zoological Nomenclature Resource (www.zoonomen.net) follows this classification, but separates *emma* as a species. This does not make sense, as all the results to date show that the genetic relationships of the taxa within the *picta-leucotis* complex are also congruent to their geographical proximity. Distinctive morphological, ecological and ethological differences suggest that *subandina* is not a subspecies of *P. picta*, as *emma* and *caeruleiceps* occupy ranges between them. Although we do not expect this, at most it would be possible that *subandina* (and *caeruleiceps*) is a subspecies of *P. emma*, whose species status is genetically supported. But if it would be accepted that *subandina* is not an independent species, then its distribution and morphological similarity rather would suggest a close relationship to *eisenmanni*. In fact, all five taxa (*picta, emma, caeruleiceps, subandina and eisenmanni*) are geographically isolated from each other and, as would be expected, also show ecological and ethological differences (Table 5).
Table 5. Genetic, morphological, ecological and ethological differences within the *eisenmanni / subandina / caeruleiceps* and *picta / emma* group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taxon</th>
<th>DNA</th>
<th>Morphological between Species</th>
<th>Morphological within Species</th>
<th>Ecological*</th>
<th>Altitude</th>
<th>Call Frequences Peak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>eisenmanni</td>
<td>Yes (to all taxa of the complex)</td>
<td>Mayor to subandina, caeruleiceps, emma, picta</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Yes (moist tropical rainforest / low mountain rainforest)</td>
<td>100 - 1660 m</td>
<td>18.3 kHz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subandina</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Mayor to eisenmanni, caeruleiceps, emma, picta</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Yes (Magdalena Valley montane forests)</td>
<td>20 - 1200 m</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>caeruleiceps</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Mayor to eisenmanni, subandina, emma, picta</td>
<td>Minor (cheek colouration)</td>
<td>Yes (Cordillera Oriental Montane Forests)</td>
<td>400 - 2200 m</td>
<td>16.2 kHz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pantchenkoi</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mayor to eisenmanni, subandina, emma, picta</td>
<td>Minor (cheek colouration)</td>
<td>Yes (Cordillera Oriental Montane Forests)</td>
<td>400 - 2200 m</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emma</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mayor to eisenmanni, subandina, caeruleiceps, picta</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Yes (Cordillera La Costa montane forests, humid and wet forest)</td>
<td>250 - 1700 m</td>
<td>16.0 kHz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>picta</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mayor to eisenmanni, subandina, caeruleiceps, emma</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Yes (humid terra firme, varzea, tepuis slopes, coastal sand ridge, savanna forest)</td>
<td>0 - 1800 m</td>
<td>18.3 kHz</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* different habitat types based on Fund [41]; altitude of *caeruleiceps* based on Botero-Delgadillo & Paez [42], *eisenmanni* based on Forshaw [43], *emma* and *picta* based on Hilty [44]

As mentioned before it is possible that *caeruleiceps* is merely a subspecies of *P. emma*. But our genetic analysis already confirmed species status for both taxa, which have long been isolated from each other; the shortest distance between *caeruleiceps* and *emma* is some 350 km.

Apart from some differences in the habitat types occupied (significant differences exist only between *picta* and the rest of the mentioned taxa (Table 5) and altitudes there are differences in the tonal pitch of the calls between *emma* and *eisenmanni* as well as between *caeruleiceps* and *eisenmanni*. We have drawn on four sound recordings with comparable flock calls (*eisenmanni*: XC107007; *emma*: XC202466; *picta*: XC65210; source: www.xeno-canto.org; *caeruleiceps*: Lynx_24395_Luis Eduardo Urueña, Source: www.ibc.lynxeds.com), although further detailed investigation would also be necessary.

**Species Rank Analyses**

The comparison between *subandina* and *eisenmanni* shows that both occur allopatrically (0), *subandina* is distinctly smaller (1), differs morphologically through the brown breast colour with narrow edging (3), the light blue tinge to the forehead and the blue lower cheeks (2) and the dull brown ear-coverts (2) as well as habitat (not scored). The total score is 8.

The comparison of *subandina* with *picta*, *emma* and *caeruleiceps* shows that all occur allopatrically (0), *subandina* is the taxon with the smallest size [*caeruleiceps/subandina*: Cohen’s d wing length = 1.10; tail length = 1.46] (1), differs morphologically through the brown forehead with only a light blue tinge (2), the brown breast colour with narrow edging (2) and the green bend to the wing (3) as well as habitat (not scored). The total score is 8.

A comparison of *eisenmanni* with *picta*, *emma* and *caeruleiceps* shows the following: the taxa occur allopatrically (0), the differences are genetically exceptional (4), *eisenmanni* differs morphologically through the brown forehead (3), the brown breast colour with narrow edging (2) and the green bend to the wing (3) as well as habitat (not scored). The total score is 12.

A comparison of *caeruleiceps* with *emma* shows the following: the taxa occur allopatrically (0), the differences are genetically exceptional (4), *caeruleiceps* differs morphologically through the breast colour with broad edging (3), the red colour to the forehead and lores (2), the dull brown ear-coverts and the brown colour of the nape (1, not evaluated) as well as habitat (scored), but not vocally (0). The total score is 9.

The comparison of *caeruleiceps* with *picta* shows the following: the taxa occur allopatrically (0), the differences are genetically exceptional (4), *caeruleiceps* is smaller with a relatively longer tail {Cohen’s d winglength = 1.20; tail length = 0.18} (1) and differs in plumage through the breast colour with broad edging (3), the red colour to the forehead...
and lores (2) and the brown nape and cheek colour (not evaluated) as well as habitat (1) and vocally (1). The total score is 12.

The comparisons show that species status is not only justified for *eisenmanni*, but also for *subandina* and *caeruleiceps*.

3.8. *Picta / Emma Group*

**Phylogenetic Analysis**

Of this group 7 sequences of *P. picta* and 6 of *P. emma* were available to us from GenBank, which were supplemented by our own sequence for *emma*.

**Specimens Examined**

Altogether there were available for the assessment of these taxa 165 specimens of *Pyrrhura picta*, 38 of *emma*, 73 of *auricularis*, which were all unequivocally identifiable as *picta* or *emma/auricularis* and exhibited clear morphological differences in colour (Table 6) as well as in size (Appendix 4). Due to the only small differences between *emma* and *auricularis* it is not always possible to determine the subspecies without knowing the bird's origin.

Examining the range of variation in *P. picta* was not the intention of this study, but the seven specimens from the Río Cuchivero in COP stood out because of their pointed V-markings on the breast feathers, which strongly resembled that of *pallescens*, and their smaller size (Appendix 4); Phelps and Phelps [45] gave the name *chuchivera* for the population from which these specimens came. The validity of the taxon is worth future investigation.

### Table 6. Plumage differences in the *picta/emma* group of taxa.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taxon</th>
<th>Breast Marking</th>
<th>Forehead Colour</th>
<th>Ear-coverts</th>
<th>Band to Nape</th>
<th>Cheeks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>picta</em></td>
<td>Brown, V-edging</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Whitish</td>
<td>Narrow, blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>cuchivera</em></td>
<td>Brown, pointed V marking</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Whitish</td>
<td>Amall, blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>emma</em></td>
<td>Blue-grey, narrow edging</td>
<td>Brown/blue</td>
<td>Whitish</td>
<td>Broad blue</td>
<td>Red-brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>auricularis</em></td>
<td>Blue-grey, narrow edging</td>
<td>Brown/blue</td>
<td>Whitish</td>
<td>Broad blue</td>
<td>Red-brown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Joseph [4], to whom 27 preserved specimens of *auricularis* and just 2 *emma* were available, established that *auricularis* is not diagnosable and should be synonymised with *emma*. Our research, however, demonstrated that both taxa have diagnosable differences. For Zimmer and Phelps [46] *auricularis* possesses larger and clearer white auricular patches, a slightly darker and less yellowish green on the back and flanks, and slightly longer bill, wings and tail. Our measurements support this (Appendix 4), although the differences in green tone are not as great as stated in the original description. In addition we measured the width of the ear patch, which resulted in *emma* in an average of 7.5 mm (6.0-10.5 mm; n = 34) and in *auricularis* an average of 9.8 mm (6.9-14.0 mm; n = 44). The Cohen’s d width of the ear patch for males = 3.11, for females = 2.75.

**Biogeographic and Ethological Analysis**

As expected, the taxa also exhibit ecological and ethological differences (Table 3). Apart from the clear differences in the habitat type and altitudes occupied there are the differences in tone pitch of the calls between *emma* and *picta*. We have used two sound recordings with comparable flock calls (*emma*: XC202466, *picta*: XC65210), although again further detailed investigation would be necessary.

**Species Rank Analysis**

A comparison of *picta* with *emma* shows the following: *picta* and *emma* occur allopatrically (0), *emma* is smaller (1), the genetic differences to *picta* are medium (2), *emma* differs morphologically through the breast colour with narrow edging (3), the very broad blue band to the nape (1) and the blue lower cheeks (1) as well as habitat (1) and vocally (1). The total score is 10.

The comparison indicates that species status is justified for *emma*. 
3.9. Roseifrons / Parvifrons / Peruviana / Dilutissima / Lucianii Group

Phylogenetic Analysis

From this group we had available: roseifrons 8 GenBank and 5 of our own sequences; parvifrons 2 of our own; peruviana 2 GenBank and 1 of our own; dilutissima 4 of our own and lucianii 6 of our own.

This is without doubt the most complicated group within the complex. It is divided into five sub-groups, which, however, only partially form clearly defined units:

a. dilutissima (including pereneensis, described above)
b. roseifrons II (probably Rio Juruá*)
c. peruviana and parvifrons
d. lucianii (including orosaensis, described above) and roseifrons III (Rio Madre de Dios)
e. roseifrons I (Rio Ucayali / Río Amazonas)

*samples from captivity in Brazil of uncertain origin

Specimens Examined

Altogether for the assessment of these taxa were 82 specimens of Pyrrhura roseifrons, 26 of parvifrons, 18 of peruviana, 5 of dilutissima, 2 (+ 2 living birds) of pereneensis, 29 of lucianii and 13 of orosaensis. Unique to this group is that two taxa are difficult or impossible to determine without knowledge of origin (dilutissima and peruviana as well as parvifrons and orosaensis). P. lucianii and roseifrons are clearly determined; however, roseifrons splits into several sub-groups depending on the river system, which is also partly reflected in their size (Appendix 4). Plumage differences of the taxa are shown in (Table 7).

Table 7. Plumage differences in the roseifrons, parvifrons, peruviana, dilutissima, and lucianii group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taxon</th>
<th>Breast Marking</th>
<th>Head Colour</th>
<th>Ear-coverts</th>
<th>Nape</th>
<th>Bend of Wing</th>
<th>Cheeks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>roseifrons</td>
<td>Brown/green, narrow edging</td>
<td>Varibly red, often entire head</td>
<td>Whiteish to dull brown</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Varibly with red</td>
<td>Red or blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parvifrons</td>
<td>Brown/green, narrow edging</td>
<td>Variable on forehead to front crown</td>
<td>Dull brown</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peruviana</td>
<td>Brown, broad edging</td>
<td>Brown, blue tinge to forehead</td>
<td>Dull brown</td>
<td>Little blue</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dilutissima</td>
<td>Brown, broad edging</td>
<td>Brown, blue tinge to forehead</td>
<td>Dull brown</td>
<td>Little blue</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pereneensis</td>
<td>Brown, medium sized edging</td>
<td>Varibly red to forehead</td>
<td>Dull brown</td>
<td>Little blue</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lucianii</td>
<td>Brown, narrow edging</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Dark brown</td>
<td>Dark brown</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>orosaensis</td>
<td>Brown, narrow edging</td>
<td>Varibly red to forehead</td>
<td>Dark dull brown</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Roseifrons

The genetic division of roseifrons into three populations is not surprising as their distribution is determined by the big river systems (Ucayali- Amazonas {I}, Juruá {II} and Madre de Dios {III}). While our data show that both the Peruvian populations are closely related, the Brazilian population {II} appears to have diverged genetically, which could be due to its inhabiting varzea and adjacent habitat, although we could find no differences in the plumage colour between the three populations. The representatives from southern Peru and Bolivia {III} are significantly smaller (Appendix 4). Genetically this population is also nearer to lucianii, which belongs to the same river system as roseifrons from the Rio Ucayali. A species rank analysis, however, shows clearly that separation of the three populations is impossible at the moment. The comparison of I with II achieves 6 points, I with III 2 points and of II and III maximum 6 points.

In addition, there is the situation that a genetic comparison for roseifrons II was based on available samples from captive birds of uncertain origin, while for roseifrons III only one sample was available to us.

Once we have more data we will examine the roseifrons complex more closely, in particular to determine whether a split into two species might be justified.
Parvifrons

This taxon was described by Arndt [7] as a species. The author still considered there exists a western (Shanusi, Yurimaguas and Sarayacu) and an eastern population (Santa Cecilia, Quebrada Vainilla and Rio Orosa), although he pointed out that the eastern population differs slightly from Pyrrhura lucianii. He accepted that representatives from Tarapoto, which had a broad red forehead but identical breast markings like parvifrons specimens from Yurimaguas, are intermediate with roseifrons and both taxa possibly even occur sympatrically along the Rio Cushabatay.

Several visits and fieldwork in the area of the western population as well as the eastern population, where samples could be collected, have surprisingly shown that the birds from Santa Cecilia, Quebrada Vainilla and Rio Orosa belong genetically to P. lucianii (see lucianii below). Birds from Yurimaguas to Tarapoto form one group, although the proportion of birds with a broad red forehead, which somewhat resemble roseifrons, increases the further one travels in the direction of Tarapoto [26]. A renewed examination of the specimen material from Tarapoto (USNM 108269, LSUMZ 116350, SMF 26052-4) confirms that it does not represent roseifrons, but belongs with parvifrons.

This also applies to a series of five examples (LSUMZ 161562, LSUMZ 161563, LSUMZ 161564, MJPL 7749, MJPL 808) from the Rio Cushabatay (77 and 84 km WNW from Contamana), which Arndt [7] still considered as representatives of roseifrons and parvifrons occurring sympatrically. After further examination of the skins, we consider them all as parvifrons and no longer accept that roseifrons and parvifrons co-occur, which would be unique within the picta-leucotis complex, but we assume that the taxa are parapatric and meet in the area of the confluence of Rio Cushabatay and Rio Uyacali.

It is still noteworthy that parvifrons lives in a white river sand area, a habitat that clearly differs from the southwest Amazon moist forest occupied by roseifrons as well as that by peruviana and dilutissima [26, 47].

Peruviana

This taxon was described as a species by Hocking, Blake and Joseph [5] and according to our research is the sister group of parvifrons, but differs from it very clearly in morphology. Joseph [5] as well as Arndt [7] accepted that there is a northern and southern population, which our data do not support (see under dilutissima).

The main range of peruviana lies in the lower Rio Marañón and the Rio Santiago valley and their tributaries. However, there are also strays in the area of Chyavitas (NHM1889.1.30.151, RMNH 42 Cat 3, RMNH 43 Cat 2) and Chamicuros (NHM1869.5.25.107-8, NHM1890.6.1.89, ZMB 19399). A female from Chyavitas (= Chayahuitas, today Challavitas) shows the typical plumage colour of peruviana, but has few little red feathers to the base of the bill, which demonstrates the relationship and geographic proximity to parvifrons. At the same time the three Chyavitas specimens support the distribution of peruviana southwards along the Andes slopes, although Chyavitas lies on the most easterly tributary of the Marañón and with some certainty provides the border to the neighbouring parvifrons population. It is probable that both taxa meet in this area as the distance between Chyavitas and the Rio Paranapu, which belongs to the river system of parvifrons, is just 5 km.

It is more difficult to interpret the four typical specimens of peruviana from Chamicuros. They were collected at approx. 175 m, which is not the typical habitat and altitude of peruviana. The species normally inhabits mountain regions at altitudes up to approx. 1,350 m along the rivers, and only comes into the valleys at certain times of the year for a short period for the fruit ripening of certain food plants. This is the main reason why a search for the species is often unsuccessful and why even the local people do not know the bird. Chamicuros lies too far from the nearest Andes area (ca. 100 km) for seasonal foraging to occur. An incorrect description of the locality where the specimens were collected is rather unlikely, as all were collected by Edward Bartlett, who was active for a while in Chamicuros. In fact, there is naturally the possibility that the distribution of peruviana is not limited to the area of the lower Andes, but stretches along the Rio Marañón to the Rio Huallaga. Specimen material from this scarcely known sector of the Rio Marañón is not available.

Dilutissima

This taxon was described by Arndt [7] as a subspecies of P. peruviana based on the duller and washed-out edging to the breast. Joseph [5] pointed out that the northern population of peruviana noticeably differed morphologically from the southern, which our examples also showed. Dilutissima is significantly larger (Appendix 4), which is indicated above all by the bill measurements. The average bill length of peruviana is 15.3 mm (14.0-17.1 mm, n = 13) and of dilutissima 16.9 (15.0-18.5 mm, n = 9). Taking sexual dimorphism into account, the differences are even more
apparent: the average bill length of *peruviana* males is 15.5 mm (14.0-17.1 mm, n = 7) and of *dilutissima* males 17.0 (16.5-17.4 mm, n = 2), while the measurements of *peruviana* females is 15.1 mm (14.2-15.8 mm, n = 6) and of *dilutissima* females 16.8 (15.0-18.5 mm, n = 7).

Additional fieldwork in the area of the upper Rio Ené (May 2009, February and August 2014) and along the Rio Perené (August 2013), where blood samples were also taken, showed surprisingly on the one hand that *dilutissima* differs genetically from all other taxa of the group and on the other that the Rio Perené population differs so clearly from the neighbouring Rio Ené population, owing to its somewhat narrower breast edging and a variable red marking on the front of the forehead, that a subspecific separation is justified (see also the *dilutissima* rank analysis).

**Lucianii**

Joseph [5] brought clarity to the circumscription of *lucianii*. This made possible an exact determination of museum specimens as well as the birds in the wild, which in turn led to new information about the distribution of this taxon. The surprising result is that the distribution of *lucianii* is not just along the Rio Purus but also along the Rio Madeira, where the species meets *P. pallescens*. Specimens of both taxa exist from Porto Velho (*lucianii*: MN8297, MN 8298, MN 8960; *pallescens*: AMNH148193, MZUSP 37.926-29). It had long been accepted that *pallescens* existed along the Rio Madeira, but in fact it has proven to occur only along a comparatively short section of that river.

Specimens from Amazonas / Rio Purus and the Rio Madeira show no differences in colour or size.

Joseph [5] accepted that *P. parvifrons* (he addressed them in his paper as “no 6 birds” as *parvifrons* was not named at this time) consisted of two populations (Shanusi, Yurimaguas and Sarayacu as well as the region of Santa Cecilia, Quebrada Vainilla and Rio Orosa), which are connected to each other, and accordingly their occurrence is squeezed between the populations of *P. roseifrons* and *P. peruviana*. Arndt [7] likewise attributed both populations to *parvifrons*, but pointed out that there is no evidence for this connection and that it has rather more to do with two isolated populations. He accepted that the eastern population was genetically influenced by *P. lucianii* and originally spread westwards from the mouth of the Rio Tefé along the Amazon. The contact with *P. roseifrons* led to its displacement and isolation today. This would explain why the specimens of this eastern population no longer differ greatly from *P. lucianii*. The extremely limited occurrence of this population was caused by the absence of larger tributaries of the Amazon in this area, which would have facilitated its spread southwards.

Our genetic research has in fact indicated that the populations of Santa Cecilia, Quebrada Vainilla and Rio Orosa must be allocated to *P. lucianii* or *roseifrons* and not *parvifrons*. The morphological differences to *roseifrons* are, however, clear. Additionally, *roseifrons* comes into contact with this population on the Rio Orosa without any sign of hybridization, which would be unusual for subspecies. The morphological similarities with *lucianii* are, however, striking (Appendix A1), group 6, photos A1 and 6). Seven of the 11 specimens available to us from Rio Orosa have somewhat broader breast edges than *lucianii*, while the remaining four as well as the two specimens from Quebrada Vainilla do not differ from *lucianii*. All have the strong red marking to the front of the forehead, which is missing only on four birds and appears to support a separation as subspecies *orosaensis*, described above.

**Biogeographic and Ethological Analysis**

As expected the representatives of this group also exhibit ecological and ethological differences (Table 8).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taxon</th>
<th>DNA</th>
<th>Morphological</th>
<th>Ecological*</th>
<th>Altitude</th>
<th>Call Frequences Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>roseifrons</em> I</td>
<td>Yes (to <em>roseifrons</em> II and III)</td>
<td>Yes (red head, breast colouration)</td>
<td>Yes (Ucayali and Southwest Amazon moist forest)</td>
<td>&lt; 1800 m</td>
<td>16.3 kHz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>roseifrons</em> II</td>
<td>Yes (to <em>roseifrons</em> I)</td>
<td>Yes (red head, breast colouration)</td>
<td>Yes (varzea and moist forest)</td>
<td>&lt; 400 m</td>
<td>16.4 kHz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>roseifrons</em> III</td>
<td>Yes (to <em>roseifrons</em> I)</td>
<td>Yes (red head, breast colouration, smaller)</td>
<td>Yes (Southwest Amazon moist forest)</td>
<td>&lt; 1600 m</td>
<td>16.4 kHz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>parvifrons</em></td>
<td>Yes (to <em>lucianii</em> and <em>dilutissima</em>)</td>
<td>Yes (red to the forehead, long tail)</td>
<td>Yes (White sand vegetation)</td>
<td>&lt; 900 m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>peruviana</em></td>
<td>Yes (to <em>lucianii</em> and <em>dilutissima</em>)</td>
<td>Yes (broad breast edging, nearly similar to <em>dilutissima</em>)</td>
<td>Yes (Napo and Ucayali moist forest)</td>
<td>&lt; 1000 m</td>
<td>16.4 kHz</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Apart from the differences in the habitat types and altitudes occupied there are differences in the tone pitch of the calls of *roseifrons*, *peruviana* and *dilutissima* to *lucianii*. There are plainly no differences between the three *roseifrons* populations. We have taken six sound recordings with comparable flock calls (*roseifrons* I: XC 34386; *roseifrons* II: XC164646; *roseifrons* III: XC 2984; *pereneensis*: XC 104839; *lucianii*: XC 74133; Source: www.xeno-canto.org; *peruviana*: own data, TA) although further detailed research would be necessary.

### Species Rank Analyses

**Parvifrons Species Rank Analyses**

A comparison of *parvifrons* with *roseifrons* shows the following: the taxa occur parapatrically (3), the genetic differences are minor (1), *parvifrons* is smaller with somewhat shorter wings, but has a longer tail {Cohen’s d wing length = 0.51; Cohen’s d tail length = 1.10} (2), they differ morphologically through the breast colour and breast edging (1) as well as in head colour (2) and habitat (1). The total score is 10.

A comparison of *parvifrons* with *peruviana* shows the following: the taxa occur parapatrically (3), there are no significant genetic differences (0), *parvifrons* has a longer tail {Cohen’s d wing length = 0.05; Cohen’s d tail length = 1.17} (1), they differ morphologically through the breast colour and breast edging (1) as well as head colour (2) and habitat (1). The total score is 8.

A comparison of *parvifrons* with *dilutissima* shows the following: the taxa occur allopatrically (0), there are exceptional genetic differences (4), *parvifrons* is much smaller, but has a relatively longer tail {Cohen’s d wing length = 1.16; Cohen’s d tail length = 0.07} (2), they differ morphologically through the breast colour and breast edging (2) as well as the head colour (1) and habitat (1). The total score is 10.

A comparison of *parvifrons* with *lucianii* shows the following: the taxa occur allopatrically (0), there are clear genetic differences (3), *parvifrons* is smaller with somewhat shorter wings, but has a longer tail {Cohen’s d wing length = 0.22; Cohen’s d tail length = 0.67} (2), they differ morphologically through the breast colour and breast edging (1) as well as the head colour (1) and habitat (1). The total score is 8.

A comparison of *parvifrons* with *orosaensis* shows the following: the taxa occur allopatrically (0), there are clear genetic differences (2), *parvifrons* is smaller with somewhat shorter wings, but has a longer tail {Cohen’s d wing length = 0.51; Cohen’s d tail length = 0.20} (2), they differ morphologically through the breast colour and breast edging (1) and in habitat (1). The total score is 6.

These analyses show that *parvifrons* reaches species status in comparison with four of the five compared taxa and only fails with *orosaensis*. This was to expect as the morphological similarities of both taxa are significant and other data (e.g. comparison of sound calls) are not available yet. Nevertheless, the sum of our analyses indicates that species status for *parvifrons* is justified.

**Peruviana Species Rank Analyses**

A comparison with *peruviana* with *roseifrons* shows the following: the taxa occur parapatrically (3), the genetic differences are minor (1), *peruviana* is much smaller {Cohen’s d wing length = 1.05; Cohen’s d tail length = 1.47} (1), they differ morphologically through the breast colour and breast edging (2) as well as head colour (3) and only...
marginally in habitat (0). The total score is 11.

A comparison of *peruviana* with *dilutissima* shows the following: the taxa occur allopatrically (0), the genetic differences are major (3), *peruviana* is smaller \{Cohen’s d wing length = 1.24; Cohen’s d tail length = 0.56\} (1), they differ morphologically through the breast colour and breast edging (1) as well as the subspecies *pereneesis* in the head colour (2) and only marginally in habitat (0). The total score is 7.

A comparison of *peruviana* with *lucianii* shows the following: the taxa occur allopatrically (0), the genetic differences are major (2), they show scarcely any size difference \{Cohen’s d wing length = 0.31; Cohen’s d tail length = 0.03\} (0), they differ morphologically through the breast colour and edging (2) as well as the head colour (1), vocally (1) and in habitat (1). The total score is 7.

This comparison as well as that with *parvifrons* (see there) indicates that species status for *peruviana* is justified.

### Dilutissima Species Rank Analyses

A comparison of *dilutissima* with *roseifrons* shows the following: the taxa occur parapatrically (3), the genetic differences are major (3), *dilutissima* is somewhat larger, but has a somewhat shorter tail \{Cohen’s d wing length = 0.69; Cohen’s d tail length = 0.23\} (1), they differ morphologically through the breast colour and breast edging (2) as well as head colour (3) and marginally in habitat (0). The total score is 12.

A comparison of *dilutissima* with *lucianii* shows the following: the taxa occur allopatrically (0), the genetic differences are exceptional (4), *dilutissima* is somewhat larger \{Cohen’s d wing length = 1.01; Cohen’s d tail length = 0.43\} (1), they differ morphologically through the breast colour and edging (2) as well as head colour (1), vocally (1) and in habitat (1). The total score is 10.

A comparison of *dilutissima* with *pereneensis* shows the following: the taxa probably share a mixed zone in the area where the Río Ené and Río Perené meet (1), no genetic differences are apparent (0), both taxa are the same size \{Cohen’s d has not been calculated on account of the small sample size\} (0), they differ morphologically through the breast edging (2) as well as the head colour (2), but not in habitat (0). The total score is 5.

These comparisons as well as those with *parvifrons* and *peruviana* (see above) indicate that the species status for *dilutissima* is justified, but *pereneensis* can be separated as merely a subspecies.

### Lucianii Species Rank Analyses

A comparison of *lucianii* with *roseifrons* shows the following: the taxa occur parapatrically (3), the genetic differences are minor (1), *lucianii* is somewhat smaller, but has a somewhat longer tail \{Cohen’s d wing length = 0.36; Cohen’s d tail length = 0.34\} (1), they differ morphologically through the breast colour and edging (2) as well as head colour (3), vocally (1) and clearly in habitat (1). The total score is 12.

A comparison of *lucianii* with *orosaensis* shows the following: the taxa occur allopatrically (0), there are no genetic differences (0), both taxa are the same size, but *lucianii* has a shorter tail \{Cohen’s d wing length = 0.00; Cohen’s d tail length = 0.60\} (1), they scarcely differ morphologically in the breast colour and edging (0), but clearly in the forehead colour (2) and scarcely in habitat (0). The total score is 3.

These comparisons as those with *parvifrons*, *peruviana* and *dilutissima* (see above) indicate that species status for *lucianii* and subspecies status for *orosaensis* are justified.

Surely, the *Pyrrhura picta-leucotis* complex is one of the most difficult in South America. But we have already came some good steps ahead with our knowledge and understanding of the complex. Nevertheless, some basic understanding are still lacking and our paper is certainly to be considered as work in progress. Thus the paraphyly and polyphyly in clade 1 (amazonum/pallescens) cannot be satisfactorily explained. Though McKay and Zink [49] found a common cause of paraphyly to be incomplete lineage sorting due to recent speciation, they also point out that the mtDNA analyses, as used in our research, is not useful for delimiting species and other criteria, e.g. DNA markers with a higher resolution, must be employed.

In clade 6 there is still a need for research. This applies not only to the *roseifrons* populations, which might consist of two species, but also to the populations that are located along the Andes between the ranges of *P. parvifrons* and *P. dilutissima*. We expect even one or another surprising result from this area.

Currently, it seems, as in Peru two major groups (*roseifrons* / *peruviana/parvifrons* and *roseifrons*
II(dilutissima/lucianii) stand in competition and during this displacement process they already genetically influenced each other. It remains to be seen, if this hypothesis is true, how far this process has progressed and e.g. to which group the roseifrons III population belongs.

The new data on the distribution of taxa in Brazil indicate that the whole Amazon basin is inhabited by the Pyrrhura picta group (in contrast to previous assumptions). Map 1) indicates the areas for which data are still missing. So, it is not known which species are located in the area southwest of Manaus, the distribution limit of amazonum and pallescens needs to be determined more accurately, and for lucianii data are missing from the southwest of the assumed range.

3.10. Taxonomic Results

The research shows that the Pyrrhura picta-leucotis group consists of six cladistic/main groups, which can each be regarded as superspecies:

Clade I: amazonum/pallescens
Clade II: leucotis/griseipectus
Clade III: pfrimeri
Clade IV: eisenmanni/subandina*/caeruleiceps (* not sequenced)
Clade V: picta/emma
Clade VI: roseifrons/parvifrons/peruviana/dilutissima/lucianii

Within clades I and VI the relationships are not entirely clear and a species or subspecies designation is not possible solely according to phylogenetic, morphological or ecological evidence but requires a combination of these and in individual cases support by ethological aspects.

We postulate a division of the Pyrrhura picta-leucotis complex into the following species and subspecies shown in (Fig. 4):

Clade I: Amazonum / Pallescens

1. Pyrrhura amazonum amazonum Hellmayr 1906

Hellmayr’s Parakeet


Distribution: North of Amazonas between Monte Alegre and Oriximiná, Pará, Brazil (Appendix 1, Map 1).

Pyrrhura amazonum microtera Todd 1947

Lesser Hellmayr’s Parakeet

(Pyrrhura picta microtera Todd, 1947, Annals Carn. Mus. 30: 335)

Distribution: Eastern Amazon area south of Amazonas along the Rio Tapajós from Santarem to Jacareacanga in the west eastwards over the lower Rio Xingu to Paraguminas and Imperatriz in the east, then south along the Rio Tocantins to Palmas (Appendix 1, Map 1).

Pyrrhura amazonum araguaiaensis ssp. nov.

Rio Araguaia Parakeet

Type: MZUSP 89888, adult male, Mato Grosso, Santana do Araguaia, Faz. Fartura

Diagnosis

This new form shares with Pyrrhura amazonum a narrow blue forehead and lower cheeks colouring, V-shaped broad edging to the throat and breast feathers, and a green bend of wing, but it differs from all other subspecies through the dark brown-grey breast colouring and the broad whitish to dull brown edging to individual feathers, on average much paler than the other Pyrrhura amazonum representatives; thus it appears generally to be more contrasting. Also the forehead has a more pronounced broad blue stripe, which stretches to the back of the eye area; the ear-coverts are paler dull brown; and the bird is smaller than the other amazonum subspecies.
A similar breast edging is found in *P. picta*, which has a blue forehead and forecrown and a red bend of wing. *P. pallescens* is larger and with significant narrow V-shapes of the throat and breast feathers resulting in very broad edgings. Additionally, it has no or less blue to the forehead. *P. luciani* is much darker in the head colouring, has no or nearly no blue to the forehead and narrower edgings to the throat and breast feathers. Most closely *araguaiaensis* resembles *P. peruviana* and *P. dilutissima* from Peru, which however are much larger, with less contrasting edging to the throat and breast feathers, and less blue to the forehead. All other taxa differ clearly by either having red on the bend of wing or on the head.

**Description of Type**

Basic colour green (Parrot Green, 260); head dark brown (darker Vandyke Brown, 121); forehead blue (darker than Sky Blue 66); area beneath eye reddish brown; a few blue feathers on the cheeks; ear-coverts pale dull brown (Pale Horn Color, 92); lower cheeks, neck and breast feathers dark greyish brown (Dark Grayish Brown, 20), becoming slaty grey on the lower breast; neck and breast feathers broadly edged whitish (brighter than Cream Color, 54) or dull yellow; abdomen, lower back, rump and upper tail feathers reddish brown (between Burnt Sienna, 132, and Brick Red, 132A); primaries and secondaries blue (Turquoise Blue, 65).

Size of type, flattened wing: 113 mm; tail: 116 mm; upper bill length: 13.4 mm

**Distribution**

Presently only known from the area of the middle Rio Araguaia and its tributaries from Pau D'Arco, Tocantins, and the neighbouring areas of Pará to Confresa, Mato Grosso, Brazil (Appendix 1, Map 1).

2. *Pyrrhura pallescens pallescens* *Miranda-Ribeiro 1926*

Madeira Parakeet


Distribution: from Porto Velho, Rondônia, and Periquito, Amazonas, southeast to Rio Paucerna, Bolivia, and Pyrineus-Pires, Mato Grosso, Brazil (Appendix 1, Map 1).

*Pyrrhura pallescens melanoides* *Miranda-Ribeiro 1926*

Cristalino Parakeet


**Distribution**

From Novo Progresso and the upper Rio Iriri, Amazonas, southwards over the area of Rio Teles Pires as far as Vera and Canarana, Mato Grosso, Brazil (Appendix 1, Map 1).

**Remarks**

As can be seen from Fig. (3) and (Table 1), *amazonum* (and its subspecies) and *pallescens* are extremely closely related; there are no common nucleotide substitutions which would help to separate the taxa in Clade I.

* The recently used names *Pyrrhura snethlageae snethlageae* Joseph and Bates [5] and *Pyrrhura snethlageae lucida* Arndt 2008 are both junior synonyms as explained by Gaban-Lima and Raposo [9].

**Clade II: Leucotis / Griseipectus**

3. *Pyrrhura leucotis* *Kuhl 1820*

White-eared Parakeet


**Distribution**

Southeast Brazil south of the Rio Jequitinhonha, Bahia, south to Espírito Santo and southeast Minas Gerais; in earlier times also São Paulo (Appendix 1, Map 2).
Fig. (4). Overview of the plumage patterns of all taxa of the *Pyrrhura picta-leucotis* complex.
* Teixeira [50] maintained that Kuhl’s *P. leucotis* is just a synonym for *Pyrrhura anaca* (Gmelin 1788) and therefore Gmelin’s name has precedence.

4. *Pyrrhura griseipectus* Salvadori 1900
Grey-breasted Parakeet

(*Pyrrhura griseipectus* Salvadori, 1900, *Ibis* 672)

**Distribution**
Northeast Brazil in the Serra do Baturité and Quixadá, Ceará; formerly also in the Serra de Ibiapaba, Ceará, and the Serra Negra, Pernambuco (Appendix 1, Map 1).

**Remarks**
*Leucotis* and *griseipectus* cluster together in Clade II; they share a number of common nucleotide substitutions; they differ from each other by 9 nucleotide substitutions (Table 1).

**Clade III: pfrimeri**

5. *Pyrrhura pfrimeri* Ribeiro 1920
Maroon-faced Parakeet


**Distribution**
Serra Geral in Goiás and Tocantins, Brazil (Appendix 1, Map 2)

**Clade IV: eisenmanni / subandina* / caeruleiceps (* not sequenced)**

Azuero Parakeet


**Distribution**
Western parts of the Azuero peninsula, Panama (Appendix 1, Map 3).

7. *Pyrrhura subandina* Todd 1917
Sinú Parakeet


**Distribution**
Lower Sinú Valley, Sierra de Quimarí and Sierra de Murrucucú, northwest Colombia; probably already extinct (Appendix 1, Map 3).

8. *Pyrrhura caeruleiceps caeruleiceps* Todd 1947
Todd’s Parakeet


**Distribution**
Spurs of the eastern Andes east of Aguachica, Cesar, and the adjoining Andes regions of Norte de Santander in northeast Colombia (Appendix 1, Map 3).

*Pyrrhura caeruleiceps pantchenko* Phelps 1977
Pantchenko’s Parakeet

Distribution

Perijá mountains on the border of Colombia and Venezuela (Appendix 1, Map 3).

Clade V: Picta / Emma

9. *Pyrrhura picta* (P.L.S. Müller 1776)
   Painted Parakeet
   (*Psittacus pictus* P.L.S. Müller, 1776, Natursyst., Suppl., 1776: 75)

Distribution

Venezuela (Amazonas, Bolívar, in the Delta Amacuro south of the Orinoco), Guyana, Suriname, French Guiana, northern Brazil (Amapá, northeast Pará) (Appendix 1, Map 4).

10. *Pyrrhura emma emma* Salvadori 1891
   Emma’s Parakeet:
   (*Pyrrhura emma* Salvadori, 1891, Cat. Birds Brit. Mus. 20: 212 and 217, pl. 1)

Distribution

Coastal cordillera of northern Venezuela from Yacacuy and Carabobo to Miranda (Appendix 1, Map 4).

*Pyrrhura emma auricularis* Zimmer & Phelps 1949
   Monagas Parakeet
   (*Pyrrhura emma auricularis* Zimmer & Phelps, 1949, Am. Mus. Novit. no. 1395, p. 3.)

Distribution

Coastal cordillera of northern Venezuela from Anzoátegui to Sucre and northern Monagas (Appendix 1, Map 4).

Remarks

*Emma* and *picta* cluster together in Clade V; they share many nucleotype substitutions, but differ by 11 substitutions from each other, indicating that they constitute “good” species.

Clade VI: Roseifrons / Parvifrons / Peruviana / Dilatissima / Lucianii

11. *Pyrrhura parvifrons* Arndt 2008
   Amazon Red-fronted Parakeet

Distribution

Catchment area of Río Shanusi and Río Caynarachi from Yurimaguas, Loreto, to Tarapoto, San Martín, Peru; birds from the area of Sarayacu and the upper Río Cushabatay, both Loreto, belong with some certainty also to *parvifrons* (Appendix 1, Map 5).

12. *Pyrrhura peruviana* Hocking, Blake and Joseph 2002
   Wavy-breasted Parakeet

Distribution

Northwest Peru from Chiriaco along the Río Marañón and Río Santiago and their tributaries as far as Nantip in southeast Ecuador as well as the areas of Chyavitas and Chamicuros (Appendix 1, Map 5).
Remarks

According to sequence data, *parvifrons* and *peruviana* are almost identical and cannot be differentiated Fig. (3)

13. *Pyrrhura lucianii lucianii* (Deville 1851)

Deville’s Parakeet:

(*Conurus lucianii* Deville, 1851, Rev. et Mag. Zool [2], 3: 211)

Distribution

In the triangle of Alvaraes, Novo Aripuana, Brazil, and the Rio Yata, Bolivia; possibly found along the Rio Purus in the most easterly part of Peru (Appendix 1, Map 5).

*Pyrrhura lucianii orosaensis* ssp. nov.

Orosa Red-fronted Parakeet

Type: AMNH 230868, adult male; NE Peru, Orosa, Rio Amazonas.

Diagnosis

Identifiable as conspecific with *Pyrrhura lucianii* by its dark head colouring caused by the nearly completely lack of blue to the forehead, slightly darker reddish brown cheeks and dull dirty brown to dark brown ear-coverts, with narrow throat and breast feather edging, but differs by a variable red forehead colouring, which is limited to fewer red feathers on the base of the bill or in a few (presumably young) birds is completely missing.

*P. parvifrons* is almost identically coloured, but the feather edging to the breast and throat is on average broader, the red part of the forehead much more extensive, and the reddish brown cheeks and the ear-coverts are paler. *P. peruviana* and *P. dilutissima* (including the new subspecies, described below which also has red to the forehead, but much more extensive) have broader edging to the throat and breast feathers and blue to the forehead. *P. snethlageae* is larger and with significant narrow V-shapes on the throat and breast feathers resulting in very broad edgings. *P. amazonum* has a broader edging to the throat and breast feathers and blue to the forehead. All other taxa differ clearly by either having red to the bend of wing or to the area around the eyes.

Description of Type

Basic colour green (Parrot Green, 260); small forehead patch red (Geranium, 12); bordering forehead area with faint blue tinge (darker than Sky Blue 66); head dark brown (darker Vandyke Brown, 121); upper cheeks dark reddish brown; a few blue feathers on the cheeks; ear-coverts dirty greyish-brown; lower cheeks, throat and breast feathers dark brown (Dark Grayish Brown, 20); throat and breast feather edging narrow and whitish (brighter than Cream Color, 54) or yellowish; abdomen, lower back, rump and upper tail feathers reddish brown (between Burnt Sienna, 132, and Brick Red, 132A); primaries and secondaries blue (Turquoise Blue, 65).

Measurements of Type

Flattened wing: 122 mm; tail: 119 mm; upper bill length: 15.7 mm

Distribution

Santa Cecilia region and Quebrada Vainilla along the Amazon to the mouth of the Rio Orosa and along this river (Appendix 1, Map 5).

Remarks

*Orosaensis* differs from *lucianii* by 7 nucleotide substitutions Table (1); in the phylogram this taxon clusters basal to the *lucianii*/*roseifrons* clade. Its phylogenetic position is thus unresolved and needs to be further clarified.


Red-crowned Parakeet:

Distribution

São Paulo de Olivença and Rio Javari, Brazil, southwest to eastern Peru; the southern population stretches from Itahuania, Peru, south to Teoponte, Bolivia (Appendix 1, Map 5).

Remarks

Sequence data indicate the existence of 3 lineages in this complex. Lineages I and III are closely related, whereas lineage II clusters basal to *peruviana/parvifrons/lucianii/roseifrons* I, III Fig. (3). *Roseifrons* II differs by 8 nucleotide substitutions from *roseifrons* I and III Table (1), suggesting that the latter two represent a new *Pyrrhura* species.

Rio Ené Parakeet

*(Pyrrhura peruviana dilutissima* Arndt, 2008, Papageien 21: 280)

Distribution

Area of Rio Ené from the mouth of the Rio Perené south to the area around Kimbiri and Luisiana in the cordillera Vilcabamba, central Peru (Appendix 1, Map 5).

*Pyrrhura dilutissima pereneensis* ssp. nov.

Rio Perené Parakeet

Type: MJPL 26713; adult male; Sondobeni, Junin, central Peru; collector Peter Hocking.

Diagnosis

Typical for *Pyrrhura dilutissima* is a combination of a broad, pale yellow edging of the breast feathers, the blue forehead colouring and a green bend of the wing. These features are also found in *pereneensis*. It differs from *dilutissima* by a variable red forehead colouring, which range from a few red feathers on the base of the bill (presumably in females and young birds) to nearly a complete red centre of the forehead and a slightly narrower edging to the throat and breast feathers.

*P. parvifrons* and *orosaensis* have also a red colouring to the forehead, but the brown head colouring is paler and the feather edging to the breast and throat is more clearly indicated. It appears thereby to be less dull and washed out than in *pereneensis*. *P. peruviana* has broader and less washed out edging to the throat and breast feathers and lacks the red to the forehead. *P. pallescens* has significant narrow V-drawings of the throat and breast feathers resulting in very broad edgings. *P. amazonum* lacks the red to the forehead, is smaller and has more blue to the forehead. All other taxa differ clearly by either having red to the bend of wing or to the area around the eyes.

This subspecies differs from all the other taxa described here by a combination of a broad, pale yellow edging of the breast feathers, the blue forehead colouring with a variable narrow red marking and a green bend to the wing. The feather edging is not so clearly indicated as in *peruviana*, and the edging to the breast thereby appears to be much duller and more washed out. This form differs from *dilutissima* by a somewhat narrower breast feather edging and the red marking to the forehead, which is lacking in young birds.

Description of the Type

Basic colour green (Parrot Green, 260); head dull brown (Vandyke Brown, 121); forehead light blue (darker than Sky Blue 66) with a narrow red patch on the base of the bill (Geranium, 12); cheeks under the eyes reddish brown; a few blue feathers on the cheeks; ear-coverts pale dull brownish (darker than Pale Horn Color, 92); lower cheeks, throat and upper breast feathers brown (Grayish Brown, 20), becoming green in the lower breast feathers; throat and breast feathers broadly edged pale cream or dull yellow; abdomen, lower back, rump and upper tail redish brown (between Burnt Sienna, 132, and Brick Red, 132A); primaries and secondaries blue (Turquoise Blue, 65).

Measurements of Type

Flattened wing: 124 mm; tail: 122 mm; upper bill length: 17.4 mm
**Distribution**

Area of lower Río Peréné and its tributaries, central Peru (Appendix 1, Map 5).

**Remarks**

This new form is genetically very close to the race *dilutissima*; because we had only a single specimen of *d. dilutissima*, it is difficult to say if the sequence differences are common with *d. dilutissima* or due to individual sequence variation.

**APPENDIX 1. MAP AND ILLUSTRATION**

Map. (1). Map 1: distribution areas of *Pyrrhura amazonum*, *P. pallescens*, *P. pfrimeri* and part of *P. lucianii* showing specimen locations (full dots) and sightings (stars) within the river systems of the Río Purus, Río Madeira, Río Tapajós, Río Xingu and Río Tocantins/Rio Araguaia.

Map. (2). Distribution areas of *Pyrrhura pfrimeri*, *P. griseipectus*, *P. leucotis* and part of *P. amazonum*. 
Map. (3). Distribution areas of *Pyrrhura eisenmanni*, *P. subandina*, *P. caeruleiceps*, *P. emma* and part of *P. picta*.

Map. (4). Distribution areas of *Pyrrhura emma*, *P. picta* and part of *P. amazonum*. 
Map. (5). distribution areas of the species within the western part of the Amazon basin showing specimen locations (full dots) and sightings (stars), which could be unequivocally identified: *Pyrrhura luciani* (Rio Purus, Rio Madeira, Rio Amazonas), *P. roseifrons* (roseifrons I: Rio Ucayali; roseifrons II: Rio Jurú; roseifrons III: Rio Madre de Dios), *P. peruviana* (Rio Marañón, Rio Santiago), *P. parvifrons* (Rio Shanusi, Rio Caynarachi, Rio Cushabatay), *P. dilutissima* (Rio Ené, Rio Perené), and part of *P. pallescens*; the different head colouring in *P. parvifrons* and *P. roseifrons* demonstrates the morphological variation within the species; the roseifrons I bird without red on the head is an immature.

APPENDIX 2. TAXON SAMPLINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>GenBank Accession Number</th>
<th>Taxa</th>
<th>Voucher no</th>
<th>Collection Locality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>AY751585 / AY751669</td>
<td><em>P. roseifrons</em> III ¹</td>
<td>FMNH 397723</td>
<td>Madre de Dios, Peru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>AY751586 / AY751671</td>
<td><em>P. roseifrons</em> I ²</td>
<td>LSUMNS B10802</td>
<td>Pucallpa, Peru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>AY751587 / AY751661</td>
<td><em>P. roseifrons</em> I ³</td>
<td>LSUMNS B10804</td>
<td>Pucallpa, Peru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>AY751588 / AY751662</td>
<td><em>P. roseifrons</em> I ³</td>
<td>LSUMNS B10847</td>
<td>Pucallpa, Peru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>AY751589 / AY751663</td>
<td><em>P. roseifrons</em> I ³</td>
<td>LSUMNS B10849</td>
<td>Pucallpa, Peru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>AY751590 / AY751664</td>
<td><em>P. roseifrons</em> I ³</td>
<td>LSUMNS B11085</td>
<td>Pucallpa, Peru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>AY751591 / AY751665</td>
<td><em>P. roseifrons</em> I ³</td>
<td>LSUMNS B11281</td>
<td>Pucallpa, Peru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>AY751592 / AY751666</td>
<td><em>P. roseifrons</em> I ³</td>
<td>LSUMNS B11282</td>
<td>Pucallpa, Peru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>AY751582 / AY751660</td>
<td><em>P. peruviana</em></td>
<td>USP 5084</td>
<td>Cordillera del Condor, southeast Ecuador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>AY751583 / AY751659</td>
<td><em>P. eisenmanni</em></td>
<td>USP 5085</td>
<td>Cordillera del Condor, southeast Ecuador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>AY751598 / AY751686</td>
<td><em>P. eisenmanni</em></td>
<td>ANSP 5758</td>
<td>Veraguas, Panama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>AY751599 / AY751687</td>
<td><em>P. eisenmanni</em></td>
<td>ANSP 5759</td>
<td>Veraguas, Panama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>AY751600 / AY751690</td>
<td><em>P. picta</em></td>
<td>FMNH 395728</td>
<td>Vila Surumu, RO, Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>AY751601 / AY751689</td>
<td><em>P. picta</em></td>
<td>KUMNH 1196</td>
<td>Iwokrama Reserve, Guyana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>AY751602 / AY751691</td>
<td><em>P. picta</em></td>
<td>KUMNH 1198</td>
<td>Iwokrama Reserve, Guyana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>AY669400 / AY751688</td>
<td><em>P. picta</em></td>
<td>NMNH B09287</td>
<td>Baramita, Guyana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>AY751603 / AY751692</td>
<td><em>P. picta</em></td>
<td>NMNH B09631</td>
<td>Baramita, Guyana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>AY751604 / AY751693</td>
<td><em>P. picta</em></td>
<td>NMNH B10941</td>
<td>Acari, Guyana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>AY751605 / AY751694</td>
<td><em>P. picta</em></td>
<td>NMNH B10944</td>
<td>Baramita, Guyana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>GenBank Accession Number</td>
<td>Taxa</td>
<td>Voucher no</td>
<td>Collection Locality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>AY751593 / AY751677</td>
<td><em>P. pallescens pallescens</em></td>
<td>LSUMNS B12781</td>
<td>Santa Cruz, Bolivia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>AY751594 / AY751678</td>
<td><em>P. pallescens pallescens</em></td>
<td>LSUMNS B12782</td>
<td>Santa Cruz, Bolivia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>AY751606 / AY751681</td>
<td><em>P. pallescens pallescens</em></td>
<td>USP 4976</td>
<td>Porto Velho, RO, Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>AY751607 / AY751679</td>
<td><em>P. pallescens pallescens</em></td>
<td>FMNH 389694</td>
<td>Cach. Nazare, RO, Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>AY751608 / AY751680</td>
<td><em>P. pallescens pallescens</em></td>
<td>FMNH 389695</td>
<td>Cach. Nazare, RO, Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>AY751610 / AY751683</td>
<td><em>P. pallescens melanoides</em></td>
<td>USP 2930</td>
<td>Alta Floresta, MT, Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>AY751611 / AY751684</td>
<td><em>P. pallescens melanoides</em></td>
<td>USP 2931</td>
<td>Alta Floresta, MT, Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>AY751612 / AY751685</td>
<td><em>P. pallescens melanoides</em></td>
<td>USP 2933</td>
<td>Alta Floresta, MT, Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>AY751613 / AY751674</td>
<td><em>P. pallescens melanoides</em></td>
<td>USP 2934</td>
<td>Jacareacanga, Pousada Thaimacu, PA, Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>AY751614 / AY751673</td>
<td><em>P. amazonum microtera</em></td>
<td>NMNH B06897</td>
<td>Altamira, PA, Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>AY751615 / AY751675</td>
<td><em>P. amazonum microtera</em></td>
<td>NMNH B07027</td>
<td>Altamira, PA, Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>AY751616 / AY751676</td>
<td><em>P. amazonum microtera</em></td>
<td>NMNH B07033</td>
<td>Altamira, PA, Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>AY751617 / AY751696</td>
<td><em>P. pfrimeri</em></td>
<td>USP 3912</td>
<td>Captive bird</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>AY751618 / AY751697</td>
<td><em>P. pfrimeri</em></td>
<td>USP 3913</td>
<td>Captive bird</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>AY751619 / AY751698</td>
<td><em>P. pfrimeri</em></td>
<td>USP 4041</td>
<td>Terra Ronca, GO, Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>AY751620 / AY751695</td>
<td><em>P. pfrimeri</em></td>
<td>USP 4044</td>
<td>Terra Ronca, GO, Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>AY751621 / AY751700</td>
<td><em>P. emma</em></td>
<td>USP 3513</td>
<td>Captive bird</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>AY751622 / AY751701</td>
<td><em>P. emma</em></td>
<td>USP 3514</td>
<td>Captive bird</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>AY751623 / AY751702</td>
<td><em>P. emma</em></td>
<td>USP 3515</td>
<td>Captive bird</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>AY751624 / AY751703</td>
<td><em>P. emma</em></td>
<td>USP 4247</td>
<td>Captive bird</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>AY751625 / AY751704</td>
<td><em>P. emma</em></td>
<td>USP 4248</td>
<td>Captive bird</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>AY751626 / AY751705</td>
<td><em>P. griseipectus</em></td>
<td>USP 1069</td>
<td>Captive bird</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>AY751627 / AY751706</td>
<td><em>P. griseipectus</em></td>
<td>USP 1070</td>
<td>Captive bird</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>AY751628 / AY751707</td>
<td><em>P. griseipectus</em></td>
<td>USP 3914</td>
<td>Captive bird</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>AY751630 / AY751708</td>
<td><em>P. griseipectus</em></td>
<td>USP 3915</td>
<td>Captive bird</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>AY751631 / AY751709</td>
<td><em>P. griseipectus</em></td>
<td>USP 3916</td>
<td>Captive bird</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>AY751632 / AY751712</td>
<td><em>P. leucotis</em></td>
<td>USP 3921</td>
<td>Captive bird</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>AY751633 / AY751710</td>
<td><em>P. griseipectus</em></td>
<td>USP 3922</td>
<td>Captive bird</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>KY356369</td>
<td><em>P. leucotis</em></td>
<td>IPMB 60410</td>
<td>Captive bird</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>KY356370</td>
<td><em>P. leucotis</em></td>
<td>IPMB 60411</td>
<td>Captive bird</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>KY356367</td>
<td><em>P. griseipectus</em></td>
<td>IPMB 60412</td>
<td>Captive bird</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>KY356368</td>
<td><em>P. griseipectus</em></td>
<td>IPMB 60413</td>
<td>Captive bird</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>KY356384</td>
<td><em>P. pfrimeri</em></td>
<td>IPMB 60414</td>
<td>Captive bird</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>KY356390</td>
<td><em>P. pfrimeri</em></td>
<td>IPMB 60415</td>
<td>Captive bird</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>KY356385</td>
<td><em>P. pfrimeri</em></td>
<td>IPMB 60416</td>
<td>Captive bird</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>KY356353</td>
<td><em>P. amazonum araguaiaensis</em></td>
<td>IPMB 60417</td>
<td>Captive bird</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>KY356354</td>
<td><em>P. amazonum araguaiaensis</em></td>
<td>IPMB 60418</td>
<td>Captive bird</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>KY356366</td>
<td><em>P. emma</em></td>
<td>IPMB 65038</td>
<td>Captive bird, Loro Parque 966501009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>KY356368</td>
<td><em>P. roseifrons</em>II</td>
<td>IPMB 65039</td>
<td>Captive bird, Loro Parque 003017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>KY356378</td>
<td><em>P. lucianti orosaensis</em></td>
<td>IPMB 65834</td>
<td>Rio Orosa, Loreto, Peru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>KY356383</td>
<td><em>P. persivania</em></td>
<td>IPMB 76251</td>
<td>Rio Cenapa, Peru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>KY356363</td>
<td><em>P. dilutissima pereneensis</em></td>
<td>IPMB 76252</td>
<td>Alto Sondobeni, Junin, Peru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>KY356364</td>
<td><em>P. dilutissima pereneensis</em></td>
<td>IPMB 76253</td>
<td>Alto Sondobeni, Junin, Peru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>KY356365</td>
<td><em>P. dilutissima pereneensis</em></td>
<td>IPMB 76254</td>
<td>Alto Sondobeni, Junin, Peru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>KY356387</td>
<td><em>P. roseifrons</em>II</td>
<td>IPMB 77881</td>
<td>Captive bird (Pedro Teles, Brasilien)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>KY356391</td>
<td><em>P. roseifrons</em>II</td>
<td>IPMB 77882</td>
<td>Captive bird (Pedro Teles, Brasilien)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>KY356388</td>
<td><em>P. roseifrons</em>II</td>
<td>IPMB 77885</td>
<td>Captive bird (Pedro Teles, Brasilien)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>KY356389</td>
<td><em>P. roseifrons</em>II</td>
<td>IPMB 77887</td>
<td>Captive bird (Pedro Teles, Brasilien)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>KY356356</td>
<td><em>P. amazonum araguaiaensis</em></td>
<td>IPMB 77888</td>
<td>Captive bird (Pedro Teles, Brasilien)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>KY356357</td>
<td><em>P. amazonum araguaiaensis</em></td>
<td>MZUSP-Probe</td>
<td>Santana do Araguaia, Para, Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>KY356371</td>
<td><em>P. lucianti lucantii</em></td>
<td>MZUSP-Probe</td>
<td>Abuna</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 3. GENETIC DISTANCES

Mean values of genetic distances ($p$ distances) within the 6 clusters; cluster 3 also contains some comparative values with other clusters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clade 1</th>
<th>Clade 2</th>
<th>Clade 3</th>
<th>Clade 4</th>
<th>Clade 5</th>
<th>Clade 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyrrhura pallescens</td>
<td>0.0052</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyrrhura amazonum</td>
<td>0.0052</td>
<td>0.0139</td>
<td>0.0251</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyrrhura leucotis</td>
<td>0.0139</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyrrhura pfrimeri</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyrrhura caeruleiceps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyrrhura picta</td>
<td>0.0244</td>
<td>0.0090</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyrrhura emma</td>
<td>0.0090</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyrrhura roseifrons</td>
<td>0.0283</td>
<td>0.0080</td>
<td>0.0068</td>
<td>0.0063</td>
<td>0.0147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyrrhura parvifrons</td>
<td>0.0080</td>
<td>0.0023</td>
<td>0.0095</td>
<td>0.0152</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyrrhura peruviana</td>
<td>0.0311</td>
<td>0.0068</td>
<td>0.0023</td>
<td>0.0086</td>
<td>0.0147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyrrhura lucianii</td>
<td>0.0063</td>
<td>0.0095</td>
<td>0.0086</td>
<td>0.0159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyrrhura dilutissima</td>
<td>0.0147</td>
<td>0.0152</td>
<td>0.0147</td>
<td>0.0159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX 4. WINGS AND TAIL MEASUREMENTS OF THE EXAMINED SPECIMENS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taxon</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Unsexed</th>
<th>Wing (n)</th>
<th>Wing length</th>
<th>Tail (n)</th>
<th>Tail length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>amazonum</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>117.9 mm (105-125 mm)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>111.5 mm (98-126 mm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>microter a</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>112.1 mm (101-124 mm)</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>103.3 mm (89-115 mm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>araguaiaensis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>110.3 mm (105-113 mm)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>110.0 mm (101-116 mm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pallescens</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>122.5 mm (114-129 mm)</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>115.7 mm (98-133 mm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>melanoides</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>115.7 mm (110-125 mm)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>107.6 mm (90-118 mm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leucotis</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>119.4 mm (113-127 mm)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>120.9 mm (106-134 mm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>griseicepsus</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>116.4 mm (110-122 mm)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>126.8 mm (116-138 mm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pfrimeri</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>118.1 mm (113-123 mm)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>127.3 mm (110-140 mm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eisenmanni</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>118 mm</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>120 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subandina</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>110.9 mm (106-115 mm)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>110.4 mm (104-122 mm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>caeruleiceps</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>115.6 mm (107-122 mm)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>117.8 mm (111-127 mm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pantchenkoi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>122.5 mm (121-124 mm)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>120 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>picta</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>121.3 mm (112-130 mm)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>116.9 mm (93-132 mm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cuchivera</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>116.3 mm (115-119 mm)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>109.4 mm (107-117 mm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emma</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>113.8 mm (107-124 mm)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>116.1 mm (100-132 mm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>auricularis</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>115.3 mm (108-124 mm)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>121.5 mm (115-135 mm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>roseifrons</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>121.1 mm (112-129 mm)</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>113.0 mm (99-135 mm)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remarks: GenBank and Ribas et al. (2006) list some of the taxa as: 'P. roseifrons', 'P. snethlageae', 'P. amazonum', 'P. leucotis.'
### APPENDIX 5. PHOTOS

All photos from T. Arndt unless stated otherwise
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**Fig. (A5_1).** Group 1-4: photo 1 - *microtera* (Serro dos Carajas, Brazil); photo 2 - *araguaiaensis* (captivity); photo 3 - *pallescens* (Rio Cristalina, Brazil; photo: K.-H. Lambert), photo 4 - *leucotis* (captivity); photo 5 - *griseipectus* (captivity); photo 6 - *pfrimeri* (captivity); photo 7 - *eisenmanni* (Cerro Hoya, Panama); photo 8 - *panchenkoi* (La Jagua de Ibirico, Colombia; photo: C. Navarro).
Fig. (A5_2). Group 5: photo 1 - *picta* (captivity); photo 2 - *emma* (captivity).

Fig. (A5_3). photo 1 - *roseifrons* III (Río Madre de Dios, Peru; photo: K.-H. Lambert); photo 2 - *parvifrons* (Río Shanusi, Peru; see variation); photo 3 - *peruviana* (Río Cenepa, Peru), photo 4 - *dilutissima* (Río Ené, Peru); photo 5 - *pereneensis* (Sondobeni, Río Perené, Peru); photo 6 - *orosaensis* (Río Orosa, Peru); photo 7 - *luciani* (Rio Madeira, Brazil).
APPENDIX 6. SPECIMENS EXAMINED

**P. amazonum amazonum** (25). All localities in Brazil. Cachoeira do Tronco: UFRJ 3657; Lago Cuiteua (= Cupeua): MZUSP 15739-42; Monte Alegre: MPEG 4412, MPEG 4862-3, MPEG 12998-9, SMF 26055-6, SMF 26058, ZMB no2, ZMB 311931, UFRJ 3653, UFRJ 3656; Obidos: AMNH 414612-4, MZUSP 10651-2, ZMB 311930, ZMB 311933; Rio Trombetas: MZUSP 63957.


**P. amazonum araguaiaensis** (3). All localities in Brazil. Santana do Araguaia, Faz. Fartura: MZUSP 89888-90.

**P. pallescens pallescens** (67). All localities in Brazil unless stated otherwise. Allianca, Rio Madeira, AMNH 474694; Arredores Forte Principe da Beira: UFRJ 37823; Cachoeira Nazaré: FMNH 330240, MPEG 39384-9, MPEG 39385; Calama: AMNH 474677-82, ZSM 576; Costa Marques: USNM 121052-5; Estreito, Rio Tapajós: MPEG 15584; Fazienda Sopeza, Tapajós: MZUSP 80358; Fortilandia: MZUSP 58204, MZUSP 62598, MZUSP 63032, MZUSP 63035, MZUSP 64819, MZUSP 64821, MZUSP 64828-9, MZUSP 66531; Goiatins, Rio Tapajós: MZUSP 86371-7; Gorotire, Rio Fresco: MZUSP 42673-5; Monte Christo, Rio Tapajós: MZUSP 46408; Para: ZMB 30138; Río Tapajós: MZUSP 4866; Santarem: AMNH 50216, AMNH 50222, MZUSP 3416-7; São José do Rio Claro: MZUSP 30, MZUSP 47; São Vicente, Rio Machados: ZSM 1063.


**P. leucotis** (42). All localities in Brazil. Bahia: AMNH 474694, USNM 115223-5; Baixo Girardi: AMNH 474693; Casajeiras, Rio Gongoju: AMNH 241752; Colatina Municipio: MZUSP 24562; Esperito Santo: MZUSP 6604-8; Itabuna: MZUSP 10165; Lagoa Juparana: USNM 368164-5; Rio [de Janeiro]: AMNH 474693; Rio Doce, Espirito Santo: AMNH 317275-76, ZSM 576; Costa Marques: USNM 37788; Maruins, Rio Machados: SMF 25934-6; ZSM 1000-2, ZSM 1037-38; Monicori: MPEG 57513; Periquo, Rio Aripuaná: MZUSP 62367-75; Porto Velho: AMNH 148193, MZUSP 37,926-9; Rio Aripuaná, Foz do Rio Guará: UFRJ 30920-33; Río Paucerna, Bolivia: LSUMZ 136840-1; Roosevelt River: AMNH 127347-9; São José do Rio Claro: MZUSP 30, MZUSP 47; São Vicente, Rio Machados: ZSM 1063.


**P. eisenmanni** (2). Locality in Panama. Las Piraguales del Corteso de Tonosu, Los Santos Prov.: AMNH 824933, AMNH 824181.


**P. caeruleiceps pantchenkoi** (2). Locality in Venezuela. Frontera, Sierra de Perija: AMNH 73168, COP 73169.


**P. picta** (163). All localities in Guyana unless stated otherwise. Abacy River: USNM 587505; Acari Mountains, North
side: USNM 625107; Albina, Maroni River, Surinam: RMNH 213655-6; Amapa, Rio Tracajatuba, 25 km E Ferreira Gomes, Brazil: USNM 51469093; Anai: AMNH 474668; Baramita: USNM 586307; Berbice: RMNH Cat. 7-8; British Guyana: RMNH 3713; Camp Jaime Benitez, Cerro El Negro, Venezuela: AMNH 42336, USNM 444105-6; Camp Rosenberg: MZUSP 6491, MZUSP 6496; Cayari Island, Uassa Swamp, Amapa, Brazil: AMNH 233718; Cano Demerara: AMNH 474669; Cavaire, Río Paragua, Bolívar, Venezuela: COP 81753; Cerro Parú, Falda Oeste, Caño Laguna, Amazonas, Venezuela: COP 47056-61; Cerro Yavi, Cerro, Falda Este, Amazonas, Venezuela: COP 37579; COP 37585; Cerro Yavi, Cerro, Falda Oriental, Amazonas, Venezuela: COP 37580-4; Clevelandia, Amapá, Brazil: UFRJ 3658; Commetewane, Surinam: RMNH 213651-2; El Dorado, Bolívar, Venezuela: COP 17445-6; El Palmar, Bolívar, Venezuela: COP 17686-7; El Venamo, Bolívar, Venezuela: COP 67836-44; Guiana: ZMB 66.609; Igarapé Novo, Amapá, Brazil: MPEG 16548, MPEG 28534; MPEG 29120, MPEG 29426; Ilha de Maicá, Roraima, Brazil: MPEG 39014-6; Imataca, Sierra de, Altiplanicie de Nuria, Bolívar, Venezuela: COP 16838-41; Jaua, Meseta, Rio Marajano, Bolivar, Venezuela: COP 65790; Kabalebo, Surinam: RMNH 37888; Kabel, Surinam: RMNH 14559; Kwata, Surinam: AMNH 474661-64; La Paragua, Bolívar, Venezuela: COP 15874-5, COP 15877, COP 15879-85; La Pricion, Caura R., Venezuela: AMNH 474656-59; La Union, Caura, Venezuela: AMNH 76096-105; Makalla: ZMB no 2-4; Manoa, Delta Amacuro, Venezuela: COP 1271-2; Marapanim, Brazil: RMNH 1152, RMNH 1158; Maura River, French Guiana: AMNH 233717; Mirico Creek, Surinam: RMNH 35209; Mt Duida, Foothills Camp, Venezuela: AMNH 272377; Mt Marahuacia, Venezuela: USNM 444105-06; Mucajai, Roraima, Brazil: MPEG 45655-63; Paramaribo, vicininity of, Surinam: AMNH 313405-06, AMNH 474667, ZMB 1857.2.8; Perú, El Callao, Bolivar, Venezuela: COP 74280; Pied Saut, French Guiana: AMNH 233719; Phedra, Surinam: RMNH 35779; Quonga: USNM 145687-92; Río Caura, Salto Pará, Bolívar, Venezuela: COP 25029-33; Río Chiguao, Cerro Tigre, Bolívar, Venezuela: COP 15876, COP 15878, COP 15886; Río Cuchivero, Cerro El Negro, Cumbre, Bolívar, Venezuela: COP 42330-4; Río Cuchivero, Cerro El Negro, Venezuela: COP 42335-6; Río Cunucunuma, Cueva del Gúacharo, Monagas: COP 74877; Río Maracá, Amapá, Brazil: MPEG 19880, MZUSP 42862-3; Río Paru de Leste, Para, Brazil: UMSP 31539; Río Surumu, Roraima, Brazil: MZUSP 73286; Río Tracajatuba, Amapá, Brazil: MPEG 43645; Seco, Mte Duida, Venezuela: AMNH 270445; Sierra Pacaraima, Cerro Urutani, Bolívar, Venezuela: COP 73507; Sierra Parima, Frontera 3, Amazonas, Venezuela: COP 71418-9, Suapure, Venezuela: AMNH 474660; Surinam: AMNH 474665-66; Valle de los Monos, Mte Duida, Venezuela: AMNH 272371, AMNH 272373-75; Venezuela: COP 19011-5; Vila Velhado Capicore, Amapá, Brazil: MPEG 19877-9; Villa Nova, Para, Brazil: MPEG 28151.

P. emma (38). All localities in Venezuela. Acevedo, Distrito, Cerro Negro, Falda Este, Miranda: COP 31255-8; Carenero, Miranda: COP 8413-4; El Guapo, Miranda: COP 80751; Hacienda Panchito, Yaracuy: COP 5312-6; Sierra de Aroa, Bucaral, Yaracuy: COP 26716; Sierra de Aroa, Cerro El Candelo, Yaracuy: COP 63892-6; Sierra de Aroa, Finca El Jaguar; Quebrada El Charal, Yaracuy: COP 77268-74; San Casimiro, Aragua: COP 80223; San Casimiro, Cerro Golfo Triste, Aragua: COP 19011-5; San José de Los Caracas, Distrito Federal: COP 18003-5; Los Caracas, DF: AMNH 387973; Sta Lucia, Miranda: USNM 389625.

P. emma auricularis (73). All localities in Venezuela. Bergantin, Quebrada Bonita, Anzoátegui: COP 15504-8; Caripe, Monagas: COP 79145-6; Caripe, Cerro Negro, Monagas: COP 22830-4; Caripe, Cueva Media Rio, Monagas: COP 78471; Cristobal Colon: AMNH 120353-61, COP 44368-73; Cueva del Guacharo, Monagas: COP 78776; El Tigre, Anzoátegui: COP 82335; Falda Sur, Cerro Humo: AMNH 41008; Irapa, Cerro Humo, Falda Oeste, Sucre: COP 44140; Irapa, Cerro Humo, Falda Sur, Sucre: COP 56811-4, COP 41006-11; Irapa, Cerro Humo, Falda Norte, Sucre: COP 56815-6; Los Altos, Sucre: COP 15166-8, COP 85659; Macuro, Puerto Cristobal Colón, Sucre: COP 40630-9; Quebrada Seca, South of Cumana: AMNH 474683-90; Río Neveri: AMNH 188162-65; Trinidad: USNM 145684-85; Uquire, Sucre: COP 75806.

P. roseifrons (82). All localities in Peru unless stated otherwise. Abra Aguachini, ca 30 km SW Puerto Bermudez: LSUMZ 130085-7; Aguas Calientes, Contamana: FMNH 320233-4, MJPL 7561, MJPL 7578, MJPL 7584; Aguas Calientes, 75 km E Shintuya: FMNH 397723; Carabaya, Yahuarmayo: ZSM 1910; Cerro de Pantiacolla, above Rio Palatona: FMNH 320430; Cerro Tahauyo, SE slope, ca 65 km ENE Pucallpa: LSUMZ 156182-3, MJPL 4422; Conchapel: FMNH 285078; Hacienda Santa Elena, ca 35 km NE Tingo Maria: LSUMZ 72175; Itaúhuana: FMNH 222875-80; Joao Pessoa, Rio Jurúá, Brazil: MZUSP 183717; MZUSP 16260-1, MZUSP 20385, MZUSP 20393-4, MZUSP 20476, MZUSP 21045, MZUSP 22483; Juanjui, 86 km SE of: LSUMZ 170686-8; La Pampa, Sandia: AMNH 145927; Lima, Alto Rio Moa, Brazil: MPEG 52706; Nevati: FMNH 297882-3; Nusiniscato: FMNH 208169-70; Palcazu: AMNH 474703-4, MJPL 17037, MJPL 17046; Pucallpa: MJPL 1799, MZUSP 21048, MZUSP 64912;
Requena Ucayali: AMNH 40678-9; Río Ene at mouth of Río Shesha, west bank, ca 65 km ENE Río Pucallpa: LSUMZ 156184-6, MJPL 11443-4, MJPL 11625; Río Javari, Amazonas, Brazil: MPEG 16965-77, UFRJ 29054; Río Pachita: MJPL 19170; Porongaba, Río Jurúa, Brazil: MPEG 48046; Río Jurúa, Brazil: AMNH 474705, MZUSP 3502-4, SMF 26057; Río Shesha, casa Río Abujao: MJPL 4702; São Paulo de Olivença, Río Solimões, Brazil: CM 32984; Vila Taumataguiu, Río Jurúa, Brazil: MPEG 28152; Yurinaqui Alto: FMNH 278311, MJPL7573, MJPL 30587.

*P. parvifrons* (26). All localities in Peru. Contamana, ca 77 km WNW of, Río Cushabatay: LSUMZ 161563-4; Sarayacu, R. Ucayali: AMNH 237723; Río Cushabatay, north-east bank, 84 km WNW of Contamana: LSUMZ 161562, MJPL 808, MJPL 7749; Shanusi: AMNH 474697-702, MPEG 28153, MZUSP 2275, SMF 26050-1, SMF 88363/2193, USNM 145680-1, ZMB 20267-8; Tarapoto: SMF 26052-4, USNM 108269; Tarapoto road to Yurimaguas, km 20: LSUMZ 116350.

*P. peruviana* (18). All localities in Peru. Bashium, Río Kagka: LSUMZ 33998; Betel, Río Santiago: FMNH 296580; Chamicuros: NHM1869.5.25.107-8, NHM1890.6.1.89, ZMB 19399; Chyavitas: NHM1889.1.30.151, RMNH 42 cat 3, RMNH 43 cat 2; Cordillera EL Condor: MJPL 11857; Puerto Galilea, Río Santiago: FMNH 278312-4; Oberer Amazonas: SMF 26059; Río Santiago: AMNH 406881; Tutinum, Río Cenepa: LSUMZ 33996-7; Villa Gonzalo, Río Santiago: MJPL 6765.

*P. dilutissima dilutissima* (5). All localities in Peru. Luisiana, 2 km E, Cordillera Vilcabamba: AMNH 819816; Luisiana, 6 km E, Cordillera Vilcabamba: AMNH 819871; Pumorini, Kimbiri Alto: MJPL (2 skins without number); Río Ene at mouth of R. Quipachiri: AMNH 820834.

*P. dilutissima pereneensis* (2). All localities in Peru. Sondobeni, Junin: MJPL 21081, MJPL 26713.

*P. lucianii lucianii* (29). All localities in Brazil unless stated otherwise. Abuna, Río Madeira: MZUSP (2 skins without number); Abuna, Barreiro 11: MZUSP (3 skins without number); Arimã, Río Purú: CM 93531, CM 93581; Brasil: RMNH 335 Cat 1; Caicara, Barreiro 19: MZUSP (skin without number); Humaità: AMNH 474675; Hyutanahan, Río Purú: CM 86406, CM 86546-50, CM 86620-1, CM 86660, CM 86964; Mujica Nova: MZUSP 76578-80; Oberer Amazonas: MTD 3486; Porto Velho, Río Madeira: UFRJ 8297-8, UFRJ 8960; Río Yata, Bolivia: ZMB 431.276; Santa Isidoro, Tefé: AMNH 308975.

*P. lucianii orosaensis* (13). All localities in Peru. Orosa River: AMNH 230866-74, MJPL 114613-4; Quebrada Vainilla, east bank, ca 10 km SSW mouth Río Napo: LSUMZ 114613-4.
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