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#### Abstract

Bush frogs of the genus Philautus are a species-rich group of the Asian tree frogs Rhacophoridae, which are known for their diverse reproductive biology. Within Philautus, reproduction has been described via endotrophic tadpoles and by direct terrestrial development. Here, we provide results of phylogenetic analyses based on the most comprehensive sampling of Bornean Philautus to date. As a result of an integrative taxonomic study using mitochondrial and nuclear markers, along with morphological and bioacoustic data, we describe a spectacular new species of this genus from the island of Borneo. The ecology of the new species of Philautus is closely associated with the carnivorous pitcher plant, Nepenthes mollis. The unusually large eggs are laid in the fluid of the pitcher and the endotrophic tadpoles, characterized by reduced mouthparts, small oral orifice and large intestinal yolk mass, complete their development in this environment. Molecular data and synapomorphic larval characters support the sister group relationship of the new species to P. macroscelis: both belong to the early diverged lineages in the Philautus tree, whose phylogenetic relationships could not be fully resolved. The new record of endotrophic tadpoles challenges again the hypothesis that terrestrial direct development is the plesiomorphic mode in this genus. Further, we discuss the nature of the frog-plant interaction that could represent a new case of mutualism. The frog provides the plant with a source of nitrogen by depositing yolk-rich eggs in the liquid of the pitcher. The plant, on the other hand, offers an exclusively protected space for the development of tadpoles in a habitat that otherwise has few permanent bodies of water and many competing frog species.


## KEYWORDS

direct development, endotrophy, evolution, mutualism, Nepenthes


#### Abstract

Abstrakt Die artenreiche Gattung Philautus gehört zu den Ruderfröschen (Rhacophoridae), die für ihre vielfältige Fortpflanzungsbiologie bekannt sind. Innerhalb von Philautus wurde bisher die Fortpflanzung mit endotrophen Kaulquappen und durch Direktentwicklung


[^0]an Landnachgewiesen. In der vorliegenden Arbeit stellen wir die Ergebnisse phylogenetischer Analysen vor, die auf dem bisher umfangreichsten Sample von Philautus von der Insel Borneo basieren. Als Ergebnis dieser integrativen taxonomischen Studie unter Verwendung mitochondrialer und nukleärer Marker, in Kombination mit morphologischen und bioakustischen Daten, beschreiben wir eine spektakuläre neue Art dieser Gattung. Die Ökologie dieser Art ist eng mit der fleischfressenden Kannenpflanze Nepenthes mollis verbunden. Die ungewöhnlich großen Eier werden in der Flüssigkeit der Kannenpflanze abgelegt. Die endotrophen Kaulquappen, die durch ein reduziertesMundfeld, eine kleine Mundöffnung und eine große Dottermasse im Darm gekennzeichnet sind, vollenden ihre Entwicklung in den Kannen. Molekulare Daten und synapomorphe larvale Merkmale unterstützen die Schwestergruppenbeziehung der neuen Art zu P. macroscelis: beide gehören zu den basalen Linien in der Gattung Philautus, deren phylogenetische Beziehungen allerdings nicht vollständig aufgelöst werden konnten. Der neue Nachweis von endotrophen Kaulquappen bei Philautus stellt erneut die Hypothese in Frage, dass Direktentwicklung der plesiomorphe Fortpflanzungsmodus in dieser Gattung ist. Weiterhin diskutieren wir die Art der Frosch-Pflanze-Interaktion, die einen neuen Fall von Mutualismus darstellen könnte. Der Frosch bietet der Pflanze eine Stickstoffquelle, indem er dotterreiche Eier in der Flüssigkeit der Kanne ablegt. Die Pflanze wiederum liefert einen exklusiven, geschützten Raum für die Entwicklung der Kaulquappen in einem Habitat, das ansonsten wenige permanente Gewässer und viele konkurrierende Froscharten aufweist.

## 1 | INTRODUCTION

The inventory of global amphibian diversity remains incomplete although 8,227 species are known to date (Frost, 2020). This can be illustrated by the fact that over the last 16 years, an average of 155 new species descriptions has been published annually (AmphibiaWeb, 2020). This increase is due in large part to the intensified research in the world's biodiversity hotspots, such as Sundaland (Stuart et al., 2008; Myers et al., 2000). The island of Borneo is part of this biogeographical region, which also includes the Malay Peninsula, Sumatra, Java, Bali, and smaller associated islands, together comprising the exposed landmasses of the Sunda shelf. Its high species richness makes Borneo one of the global hotspots for amphibian diversity (de Bruyn et al., 2014). In particular, unraveling the complexes of so-called "cryptic" species accounts for a major part of the new species descriptions in recent years from Sundaland (e.g., Arifin et al., 2018; Dehling et al., 2016; Hamidy \& Matsui, 2014; Hamidy et al., 2012; Matsui et al., 2010, 2016; McLeod, 2010; McLeod et al., 2012; Munir et al., 2018; Shimada et al., 2011; Waser et al., 2017). Alongside this hidden sphere of amphibian diversity, unexpected discoveries of completely new frog species (with obviously distinct morphology and life history) were also reported in Borneo during the last decade (e.g., Ansonia vidua, Hertwig et al., 2014; Chiromantis inexpectatus, Matsui et al., 2014; Glyphoglossus capsus, Das et al., 2014).

The frogs of the family Rhacophoridae are known for their high morphological and reproductive diversity (Delorme et al., 2005; Frost et al., 2006; Grismer et al., 2007; Li et al., 2008, 2009; Liem, 1970; Nguyen et al., 2008; Yu et al., 2008, 2009, 2010). The 431 currently known species are distributed with a few representatives in Sub-saharan Africa, while the vast majority of species occur in southern to eastern Asia, namely, from Sri Lanka, Nepal, and India to Japan, the Philippines, Borneo, and Sulawesi (Frost, 2020). Within the rhacophorids, the bush frogs of the genus Philautus Gistel, 1848 are closely related to Gracixalus Delorme et al., 2005 and Kurixalus Ye et al., 1999 (Chan et al., 2018; Feng et al., 2017; Pyron \& Wiens, 2011; Wostl et al., 2017). Several phylogenetic studies showed that the genus Philautus sensu lato, originally defined by the suggested mode of reproduction (direct development), was not in fact monophyletic (Grosjean et al., 2008; Li et al., 2008; Meegaskumbura et al., 2002; Yu et al., 2008). As a result, most species from India and Sri Lanka were transferred to Pseudophilautus (Laurent, 1943) and Raorchestes (Biju et al., 2010) (Li et al., 2009). Subsequently, Philautus everetti (Boulenger, 1894) and P. macroscelis (Boulenger, 1896)-formerly considered members of Rhacophorus-were included into Philautus (Hertwig et al., 2011). In its current composition, Philautus is regarded a natural group of 53 species, that are mainly distributed in Sundaland and the Philippines, only 13 occur on the Asian mainland from Malaysia to India (Frost, 2020; Hertwig et al., 2011; Li et al., 2013; Wostl et al., 2017). It is in the primary and secondary forests of Borneo that one encounters the highest
diversity of bush frogs, with 22 identified species (AmphibiaWeb, 2020), 19 of which are endemic to the island (Frost, 2020; Inger et al., 2017).

Although the mode of reproduction was formerly used as a diagnostic character for the genus before molecular analyses became generally available, it was confirmed unequivocally only in a few species-either by direct observation or genetic matching of the semaphoronts. Apart from those confirmed cases, the mode of reproduction in the vast majority of Philautus species remains unknown. Anecdotal reports suggest that some species of Philautus lay their eggs on the forest floor in moss (P. mjobergi Smith, 1925; Dring, 1987) and underneath dead leaves ( $P$. tectus Dring, 1987; Dring, 1987), in leaf axils (P. bunitus Inger et al., 1995; Inger et al., 2017) or inside pitcher plants (P. kerangae Dring, 1987; Dring, 1987, P. saueri Malkmus \& Riede, 1996a; Malkmus et al., 2002). Hertwig et al. (2012) genetically matched a clutch of eggs with advanced froglets found underneath leaf litter on the forest floor to P. acutus and hence provided a record for direct development in this species. Tadpoles without beaks, oral suckers, external gills, and operculum were reported for P. hosii (Boulenger, 1895) (Inger, 1966) and P. kerangae Dring, 1987 (Dring, 1987). Similar endotrophic tadpoles were described for P. macroscelis (Boulenger, 1896) based on genetically identified material, however, the actual microhabitat of these larvae remains unclear (Hertwig et al., 2011). The proof of tadpoles, however, suggests that at least two reproductive modes exist in Philautus and that direct aerial development is not necessarily the plesiomorphic state within the genus (Hertwig et al., 2011).

In 2009, we discovered a single male of an unknown frog of the genus Philautus in the Pulong Tau National Park, Sarawak, Malaysia, in north-western Borneo. A second male was collected in 2013. In 2016, we collected a series of adults, eggs, tadpoles, and bioacoustic data of this unknown species. It was found exclusively in close association with the carnivorous Velvet Pitcher-Plant (Nepenthes mollis Danser, 1928), a rare endemic of higher elevations in the interior of Borneo. In this study, we present a comprehensive phylogenetic analysis of Philautus with a focus on Bornean species. We also demonstrate the status of the new taxon as a valid species distinct from known congeners and provide a formal description using morphological, bioacoustic, and genetic data. The results make a significant contribution to our existing knowledge regarding the amphibian diversity of Borneo and in particular of reproductive strategies in the genus Philautus that range from endotrophic tadpoles to direct development. Finally, we discuss possible implications for the ecological interactions between frogs and pitcher plants.

## 2 | MATERIAL AND METHODS

A total of 134 individuals were included in the phylogenetic analyses (41 obtained from Genbank, 95 sequenced in this study (Appendix 1)). Eight adult specimens and nine tadpoles of the type series were used for morphometrical comparisons. Bioacoustic analysis is based on multiple calls from a single individual.

## 2.1 | Taxon sampling

Adult specimens and tissue samples used in this study (Appendix 1) were collected by hand between the years 2009 and 2018 in Sabah and Sarawak, Malaysia. Altogether, eight adult specimens (two females and six males) of the unknown species and their tissue samples were collected in 2013 and 2016 (Appendix 1), respectively, at $2,115 \mathrm{~m}$ a. s. I. in the Pulong Tau National Park, Sarawak, Malaysia, at the edge of Church Camp, a site comprising wooden houses and a church transiently used by the local people from nearby villages at lower elevations in the Kelabit Highlands of northern Sarawak. Adult specimens were photographed in life with a Canon EOS 5D Mark IV (Canon 100 mm macro lens, various flashes) and euthanized in a ca. 1\% aqueous chlorobutanol solution (1,1,1-trichloro-2-methyl-2-prop anol). Tissue samples of adult specimens were taken from liver tissue and femoral muscle tissue and stored in RNALater ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ Stabilization Solution. Specimens were preserved in $4 \%$ neutrally buffered formalin, rinsed in tap water, and transferred to ethanol solution by stepwise increasing the ethanol concentration from $30 \%$ to $50 \%$ to $75 \%$ to minimize shrinkage before long-term storage in $75 \%$ ethanol. Specimens comprising the type series are deposited in the collection of the Naturhistorisches Museum Bern (NMBE) (Appendix 1).

Two groups comprising five and six tadpoles were collected from two pitchers of Nepenthes mollis in 2016. The two samples were pooled. Two specimens were photographed in life (field number 647P) with a Fuji X-T1 camera, Sigma 105 mm macro lens, and two synchronized flashes (Nikon SB-900, Nissin i40). Afterward, all tadpoles were euthanized by adding a few drops of clove oil to the container (Guenette et al., 2007). Subsequently, nine tadpoles were fixed and stored in 4\% neutrally buffered formalin (Histofix ${ }^{\circledR}$, Roth) and two specimens were transferred to RNALater ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ Stabilization Solution for DNA analysis. Tadpoles and adults from the same site were later matched positively by DNA barcoding using a 873 bp fragment of the 16 S rRNA gene. The tadpole specimens are deposited in the collection of the Centrum für Naturkunde (CeNak), University of Hamburg Collection Number ZHM A12303 (Appendix 1).

We included all known Bornean Philautus in our phylogenetic analyses (Appendix 1), except for P. erythrophthalmus (Stuebing \& Wong, 2000), P. gunungensis (Malkmus \& Riede, 1996b), and P. saueri (Malkmus \& Riede, 1996a) for which no sequence data are available. For P. disgregus (Inger, 1989), reference sequences were available but no tissue samples. Rhacophorus reinwardtii (Schlegel, 1840), Kurixalus chaseni (Smith, 1924), and Polypedates leucomystax (Gravenhorst, 1829) were used as outgroup following recently published phylogenetic hypotheses (Chan et al., 2018).

## 2.2 | Morphology

The adult voucher specimens were photographed after fixation to acquire 15 morphological measurements (Table 1). The measurements were selected based on two studies (Watters et al., 2016; Wostl et al., 2017). Full-body photographs for the larger

TABLE 1 Body measurements with abbreviations and description of measured distance

| Abbr. | Trait | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ED | Eye diameter | Largest distance between bony edges of orbit |
| EN | Eye-nostril distance | Anterior tip of bony orbit to anterior end of nostril |
| FAL | Forearm length | Greatest distance from proximal end of palmar tubercle to tip of flexed elbow |
| FOT | Foot length | Distance from proximal end of inner metatarsal tubercle to tip of 4th toe |
| HL | Head length | Distance from posterior end of jaw bone to tip of snout |
| HND | Hand length | Distance from proximal end of palmar tubercle to tip of 3rd finger |
| HW | Head width | Distance between the two angles of the jaw |
| IN | Internarial distance | Distance between inner edges of nostrils |
| 10 | Interorbital distance | Shortest distance between bony orbits |
| SL | Snout length | Distance from anterior corner of orbit to tip of snout |
| SVL | Snout-vent length | Distance from tip of snout to posterior end of vent |
| TAL | Tarsus length | Distance from tibiotarsal articulation to proximal end of inner metatarsal tubercle |
| TBL | Tibia length | Distance from distal point of flexed knee to tibiotarsal articulation |
| THL | Thigh length | Distance from vent to distal point of flexed knee |
| TYD | Tympanum diameter | Largest distance between bony edges of tympanum |

measurements (HW, SVL, TAL, TBL, and THL) were taken with a Canon EOS 700D. Detailed photographs of foot, hand, and head were taken with a calibrated Leica DFC420 camera on a Leica MZ16 Stereomicroscope with motor focus. Measurements were taken from the digital photographs with the software Imagic IMS (Image Bildverarbeitung AG, Glattbrugg, Switzerland). The webbing formula follows Myers and Duellman (1982). Snout shape terms were taken from Savage (2002). Description of the color is based on digital photographs, which were taken in situ the day after capture. Sexes were determined by visual inspection of the internal mouth and throat region to check for vocal sac openings and by screening the ventral abdomen and the inguinal region for eggs. The morphological comparison to other species of Philautus is based on descriptive data from the literature.

Nine tadpole specimens (all except the ones reserved for DNA work) were subject to digital measurements. Dorsal, ventral, and lateral shots were made using a Keyence VHX 5000 digital microscope equipped with a VHZ20 lens (20-200× zoom). Measurements were taken from digital photographs either with the integrated measuring software of the VHX 5000 or ImageJ software (Schneider et al., 2012).

## 2.3 | Laboratory protocol

DNA was extracted from adult tissue samples with the DNeasy Blood \& Tissue Kit (Qiagen N.V., Hilden, Germany). A total of 14 primer combinations for four mitochondrial loci (12S-Val-16S: partial 12 S rRNA gene, intervening tRNA-Val gene, partial 16 S rRNA gene: 12Sm + 16Sa, 12L1 + 16Sh, 16SC + 16SD; CytB, partial Cytochrome B gene: CB-J-10933 + CytbAR-H) and three partial
sequences of nuclear genes (POMC, Proopiomelanocortin-A: POMC DRV F1 + POMC DRV R1; BDNF, brain-derived neurotrophic factor: BDNF F1 + BDNF R1; NTF3, Neurotrophin 3: NTF3 F3 + NTF3 R3) were used for DNA amplification (Table 2). The PCR solution consisted of the following: $6.5 \mu \mathrm{l}$ nuclease-free water $\left(\mathrm{ddH}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right), 2 \mu \mathrm{l}$ forward primer $(10 \mu \mathrm{M}), 2 \mu \mathrm{l}$ reverse primer (10 $\mu \mathrm{M}$ ), $2 \mu \mathrm{l}$ sample DNA, $12.5 \mu \mathrm{l}$ GoTaq® Hot Start Green Master Mix (Promega, Madiso, U.S.). The annealing temperature was set at $94^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 2 min (3 min for NTF3) followed by 35 (40 for NTF3) cycles. All three cycle steps were adjusted to primer-specific settings (Table 2). Final extension was performed at $72^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 5 min ( 7 min for NTF3). PCR Products of the $16 S$ rRNA gene were cleaned with the Wizard ${ }^{\circledR}$ SV Gel and PCR Clean-up System (Promega, Madiso, U.S.) and sequenced by LGC (LGC Limited, Teddington, UK). All other PCR products were cleaned and subsequently sequenced by LGC (LGC Limited, Teddington, UK). Sequences were managed and checked for ambiguities using Geneious Pro 9.1.8 (Biomatters Ltd., Kearse et al., 2012). The sequences of this study are deposited in GenBank (Appendix 1).

## 2.4 | Phylogenetic analyses

The sequences were aligned with the MAFFT algorithm plugin in Geneious Pro (Katoh et al., 2002; Katoh \& Standley, 2013) and refined with the MUSCLE algorithm plugin in Geneious Pro (Edgar, 2004) with eight iterations. The alignments of each PCR primer combination were checked separately and compared for laboratory or frameshift errors, stop codons and contamination based on preliminary trees obtained with the RAxML-plugin, implemented in Geneious Pro using the GTR GAMMA I nucleotide model, the rapid

TABLE 2 Targeted gene and amplicon length in bold, primer name and primer sequence with corresponding PCR cycle and reference for the used markers. Primer name: F, Forward Primer; R, Reverse Primer. Reference: PHC, Pauly et al. (2004); GDA, Goebel et al. (1999); G, Goebel et al. (1999); P, Pauly et al. (2004); MM, Meegaskumbura and Manamendra-Arachchi (2005); Ve, Vences et al. (2003, 2005); VMW, Vieites et al. (2007); Vi, Vieites et al. (2007); SC, Santos and Cannatella (2010)

| Gene and primer name | Primer Sequence ( $5^{\prime}-3^{\prime}$ ) | PCR cycles |  |  | References |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1st | 2nd | 3rd |  |
| 12S-Val-16S: 12Sm/16Sa: 890-932 bp; 12L1/16Sh: 730-759 bp; 16SC/16SD: 839-885 bp |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12Sm (F) | GGCAAGTCGTAACATGGTAAG | $94^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 30 \mathrm{~s}$ | $48.2{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 30 \mathrm{~s}$ | $72^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 1 \mathrm{~min}$ | PHC |
| 16Sa (R) | ATGTTTTTGGTAAACAGGCG | $94^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 30 \mathrm{~s}$ | $48.2^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 30 \mathrm{~s}$ | $72^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 1 \mathrm{~min}$ | GDA |
| 12 L (F) | AAAAAGCTTCAAACTGGGATTAGTACCCCACT | $94^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 30 \mathrm{~s}$ | $48.2{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 30 \mathrm{~s}$ | $72^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 1 \mathrm{~min}$ | G |
| 16Sh (R) | GCTAGACCATKATGCAAAAGGTA | $94^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 30 \mathrm{~s}$ | $48.2{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 30 \mathrm{~s}$ | $72^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 1 \mathrm{~min}$ | G |
| 16SC (F) | TCAAHTAAGGCACAGCTTA | $94^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 30 \mathrm{~s}$ | $48.2{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 30 \mathrm{~s}$ | $72^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 1 \mathrm{~min}$ | P |
| 16SD (R) | CTCCGGTCTGAACTCAGATCACGTAG | $94^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 30 \mathrm{~s}$ | $48.2{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 30 \mathrm{~s}$ | $72^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 1 \mathrm{~min}$ | P |
| CytB : 603 bp |  |  |  |  |  |
| CB-J-10933 (F) | TATGTTCTACCATGAGGACAAATATC | $95^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 40 \mathrm{~s}$ | $45^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 40 \mathrm{~s}$ | $72^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 40 \mathrm{~s}$ | MM |
| CytbAR-H (R) | TAWARGGRTCYTCKACTGGTTG | $95^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 40 \mathrm{~s}$ | $45^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 40 \mathrm{~s}$ | $72^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 40 \mathrm{~s}$ | Ve |
| BDNF: 645-699 bp |  |  |  |  |  |
| BDNF F1 (F) | ACCATCCTTTTCCTKACTATGG | $94^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 30 \mathrm{~s}$ | $51.5^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 30 \mathrm{~s}$ | $72^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 1 \mathrm{~min}$ | VMW |
| BDNF R1 (R) | CTATCTTCCCCTTTTAATGGTC | $94^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 30 \mathrm{~s}$ | $51.5^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 30 \mathrm{~s}$ | $72^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 1 \mathrm{~min}$ | Vi |
| POMC : 457-471 bp |  |  |  |  |  |
| POMC DRV F1 (F) | ATATGTCATGASCCAYTTYCGCT-GGAA | $94^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 30 \mathrm{~s}$ | $56^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 30 \mathrm{~s}$ | $72^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 1 \mathrm{~min}$ | Vi |
| POMC DRV R1 (R) | GGCRTTYTTGAAWAGAGTCATTAGWGG | $94^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 30 \mathrm{~s}$ | $56^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 30 \mathrm{~s}$ | $72^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 1 \mathrm{~min}$ | Vi |
| NTF3: 556-597 bp |  |  |  |  |  |
| NTF 3NTF3 F3 (F) | TCTTCCTTATCTTTGTTGGCATCCACGCTA | $95^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 30 \mathrm{~s}$ | $52.4{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 30 \mathrm{~s}$ | $72^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 1 \mathrm{~min}$ | SC |
| NTF3 R3 (R) | ACATTGRGAATTCCAGTGTTTGTCGTCA | $95^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 30 \mathrm{~s}$ | $52.4{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 30 \mathrm{~s}$ | $72^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 1 \mathrm{~min}$ | SC |

bootstrapping and search for best-scoring Maximum Likelihood (ML) tree algorithm and 100 bootstrap replicates.

In a first step, we used an alignment of the 873 bp amplicon of the $16 S$ rRNA gene obtained with the primer combination $16 \mathrm{SC}+16 \mathrm{SD}$ to infer a reference tree for genetic barcoding (Figure S1), for comparison with reference sequences obtained from GenBank and to calculate uncorrected pairwise distances (Appendix 1). GenBank sequences of $P$. acutirostris, $P$. acutus, $P$. amoenus, $P$. aurantium, $P$. bunitus, P. davidlabanig, P. disgregus, P. everetti, P. hosii, P. ingeri, P. juliandringi, P. kakipanjang, P. kerangae, P. larutensis, P. macroscelis, P. mjobergi, P. nephophilus, P. refugii, P. surdus, P. tectus, and P. umbra were used to confirm the species identification of our samples. The reference tree was estimated with a Maximum Likelihood analysis using RAxML-NG (Kozlov et al., 2019) with 100 bootstrap replicates and the GTR nucleotide model. To reduce the amount of missing data in our final data set, specimens were excluded from final analyses when only data for the $16 S$ rRNA gene was available. Uncorrected pairwise distances were calculated in MEGA v5.2.2 (Tamura et al., 2011) with transitions and transversions included, without any variance estimation, gaps, and missing data excluded by complete deletion.

For the phylogenetic analyses, the sequences of the $12 S r$ RNA, tRNA-Val, and 16 S rRNA genes were first concatenated and then aligned ( $2,006 \mathrm{bp}, 12 \mathrm{~S}$-Val-16S). The alignments of the different genetic markers were then concatenated into three data partitions:
nuclear data partition (nuDNA: POMC, BDNF, NTF3; 90 sequences), mitochondrial data partition (mtDNA: CytB, 12S-Val-16S; 93 sequences), and combined data partition (combDNA: POMC, BDNF, NTF3, CytB, 12S-Val-16S; 93 sequences). The search for the bestfitting partitioning schemes was conducted with PartitionFinder 2 (Lanfear et al., 2016) using the "greedy" algorithm (Lanfear et al., 2012) and PhyML (Guindon et al., 2010) (Table S1). ML analysis was performed with RAxML using 2,000 bootstrap replicates, the GTR Gamma nucleotide model with invariant sites (GTR Gamma + I) and rapid bootstrapping followed by a careful search for the best-fitting ML tree. Bayesian Inference (BI) was conducted using MrBayes 3.2 (Ronquist et al., 2012), the partitioning schemes selected by PartitionFinder 2 (Table S1), and sampling over 10 million generations ( 20 million for the combined dataset) with a sampling frequency of 1,000 generations. Four independent Markov-Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) runs were performed with four chains each (one cold and three heated chains), a temperature of 0.2 and a burn-in of $10 \%$. The four independent runs were combined with the "sumt" function. The independent runs were visually inspected in Tracer v1.7.1 (Rambaut et al., 2018) to see whether the trees had reached convergence. The analysis was rejected when the effective sample size (ESS) did not reach 200. Bootstrap values above 70\% in ML (Hillis \& Bull, 1993) and posterior probability values above 0.95 in BI (Huelsenbeck \& Ronquist, 2001) were considered as robust support for the corresponding clade. The resulting trees were visualized in FigTree V 1.4.3
(Rambaut, 2016) and annotated and colored in Inkscape v.0.92.4 (Inkscape Project, 2020). The alignments are available online in the Alignments S1-S8.

## 2.5 | Bioacoustics

The call of the holotype was recorded on March 9, 2016 at Church Camp, Pulong Tau National Park, Sarawak, Malaysia using an Olympus Linear PCM Recorder LS-10. The recording level was adjusted manually in the field by balancing the signal peaks at OdB. The advertisement call was analyzed using Raven Pro 1.4 (Bioacoustics Research Program 2014). The call parameters dominant frequency, number of notes per call, note and pulse repetition rates, duration of call, note, pulse, and of intervals were measured in the oscillogram following the step-by-step procedure of Köhler et al. (2017). To eliminate background noise from the sonogram, values below 0.1 db were clipped. A note-centered approach was used, defining the parameters as follows: a call is a series of notes, separated by a long silent interval from other calls. Call duration is measured from the beginning of the first note of a call to the end of the last note of the same call. The silent interval is measured from the end of the last note of the call to the beginning of the first note of the consecutive call. Call repetition rate is the number of calls emitted per minute. A note is a series of pulses, separated from the next note by an internote interval. The internote interval is shorter than the silent interval and is measured from the end of the last pulse of one note to the beginning of the first pulse of the consecutive note. Note duration is measured from the beginning of the first pulse to the end of the last pulse of the same note. Note repetition rate is the number of notes emitted per second. A pulse is a single peak of sound energy, not divisible into subunits. Pulses are separated from each other by strong amplitude modulations. Pulse repetition rate is the number of pulses emitted per second. Dominant frequency is the frequency containing the highest sound energy (Köhler et al. 2017). The call recording is available online in the Data S1 of this document.

## 3 | RESULTS

## 3.1 | Phylogeny

The nuclear data partition comprised 1,770 bp (nuDNA: POMC, BDNF, NTF3) of 90 individuals. The mitochondrial data partition comprised $2,609 \mathrm{bp}$ (mtDNA: CytB, 12S-Val-16S) of 93 individuals. The combined data set consisted of 4,379 bp (combDNA: POMC, BDNF, NTF3, CytB, 12S-Val-16S) of 93 individuals. The best-fitting partitioning scheme was a gamma-shaped rate variation with a proportion of invariable sites $(G T R+I+I)$ for first and second codon positions of the protein-coding genes and 12S-Val-16S, and the gamma model for the third codon position (Table S1). In BI analyses, this output of

PartionFinder was applied, while the model GTR + G + I was used in ML analyses using RaxML.

The genus Philautus is robustly supported as a monophyletic group in all analyses (Figure 1, Figures S2-S5). The new species from Church Camp represents a distinct evolutionary lineage in all analyses and is congruently confirmed as sister group of $P$. macroscelis (Figure 1, Figures S2-S5). Intraspecific pairwise distances, including four adult and five tadpole samples of the new species, are 00.25\% (NMBE 1065920, NMBE 1073711, NMBE 1073601, NMBE 1073602, lot ZMH A123049) based on 819 bp sequences of the $12 S$-Val-16S alignment. The interspecific pairwise distances in comparison with the remaining species of Philautus range from 6.81 to 13.76\% (Table 3, based on 819 bp including four adult specimens of the new species (NMBE 1065920, NMBE 1073711, NMBE 1073601, NMBE 1073602)).

The phylogenetic relationships of $P$. tectus and as a consequence also the early splitting events within Philautus including the relationships ( $P$. hosii $+P$. ingeri) and ( $P$. sp. $+P$. macroscelis) are not congruently and robustly resolved ( $\mathrm{BI}<0.9, \mathrm{ML}<70 \%$, Figure 1, Figures S2-S5). The resolution and branching patterns of combDNA and mtDNA trees are congruent but differ in comparison with the nuDNA results (Figure 1, Figures S2-S5). The monophyletic group comprising the remaining Philautus species and the clades ( $(P$. bunitus $+P$. kerangae $)+(P$. acutus $+P$. aurantium $))$ and $((P$. amoenus $+P$. nephophilus $)+(P$. umbra $+P$. juliandringi $+P$. mjobergi)) are robustly and congruently supported in all analyses. The phylogenetic relationships within the subclade (P. umbra + P. juliandringi + P. mjobergi) and of P. davidlabangi, P. kakipanjang, P. larutensis, $P$. refugii and ( $P$. umbra + P. juliandringi + P. mjobergi) remain unresolved, because they received at most moderate support values or differ between the trees obtained using the separate data partitions (Figure 1, Figures S2-S5). The affected nodes of the species with ambiguous relationships received at most moderate support values in all analyses.

## 3.2 | Bioacoustics

The advertisement call series consists of five calls with each call consisting of three evenly spread notes. The notes are pulsed with visible amplitude modulations. The first note consists of 1-2 lowfrequency pulses, two high pulses which are not always completely distinguishable and 1-2 fading, low and rather long pulses. The second note consists of 5-7 pulses with increasing amplitude, the last two being of higher frequency than the two last pulses in the first note. These are followed by 1-3 fading pulses of low frequency. The third and last note consists of six pulses of increasing amplitude, with the highest pulse being of higher frequency than the highest pulse in the second note. The last note ends with 1-2 fading pulses. The call is not continuous, that is, the intercall interval is visible. Average note duration: 36.33 ms , average internote interval: 62.1 ms , average call duration: 164.4 ms , average note repetition rate: 0.064 notes/s, average number of pulses per note: six, average


FIGURE 1 Total evidence tree based on the combined nuclear (POMC, BDNF, and NTF3) and mitochondrial DNA (CytB, 12S-Val-16S) data partitions (4379 bp, combDNA). Only congruently and robustly supported nodes are shown (BI >0.9 and ML > $70 \%$ ). BI above, ML below branches. See Alignments S1-S8 for the results of the separate analyses of the mitochondrial and nuclear data partitions
note interval: 5.101 s , and average dominant frequency: 2.8125 kHz (Figure 2). The call of the new species differs from the published calls of Bornean Philautus species in varying combinations of the following analytical parameters: number of notes, duration of call, duration of notes, and dominant frequency (for details see below section Comparison).

## 3.3 | Species description

We formally describe the material from Church Camp, the Pulong Tau National Park, Sarawak, Malaysia, as Philautus nepenthophilus sp. nov. based on phylogenetic analyses using mitochondrial and nuclear markers (Figure 1, Figures S2-S5), genetic divergence in 16S rRNA gene (Table 3), and a unique combination of morphological characters of the adults including color pattern, skin structure, head
shape; and of the larval stages including shape of snout, structure of the oral disk, presence of a posteroventral skin flap; as well as on bioacoustic evidence. Philautus macroscelis is the sister species of $P$. nepenthophilus, but can be clearly distinguished by skin structure, color pattern, and snout shape. For details, see the following sections diagnosis, description, comparisons, and larval description. The new species is registered in Zoobank with the number 4C1B7C00-D110-4EFE-9E50-EBD07003F54A.

### 3.3.1 | Holotype

NMBE 1073711 (Figures 3a, b, 4a, b, 5a, b), an adult male collected at Church Camp, (N $3^{\circ} 55.603200$, E 115우0.867600, 2,115m a.s.I.) Pulong Tau National Park, Sarawak, Malaysia on 9 March 2016 by Flury J., Haas A., Hertwig S. T., Pui Y. M., Reichen N.
TABLE 3 Range of uncorrected pairwise distances (\%) inferred with complete deletion, based on 819 bp sequences of the 16 S rRNA gene alignment of all adult Philautus species included in the analyses. P. juliandringi, P. kerangae, and P. umbra are represented by only one sequence each. Min. and max. pairwise distance was identical where no range is given. The large pairwise distance of $P$. mjobergi can be explained by the pooling of sequences from two populations

| Philautus | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) | (10) | (11) | (12) | (13) | (14) | (15) | (16) | (17) | (18) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| acutus (1) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| aurantium (2) | $\begin{aligned} & 2.72- \\ & 3.28 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.00- \\ & 0.63 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| bunitus (3) | $\begin{aligned} & 4.88- \\ & 5.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.44- \\ & 4.79 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.00- \\ & 0.10 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| kerangae (4) | 5.59 | $\begin{aligned} & 4.91- \\ & 5.03 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.47- \\ & 2.58 \end{aligned}$ | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| macroscelis (5) | $\begin{aligned} & 11.16- \\ & 11.45 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11.05- \\ & 11.48 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10.91- \\ & 11.32 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11.21- \\ & 11.50 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.00- \\ & 0.63 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| nepenthophilus (6) | $\begin{aligned} & 12.63- \\ & 12.77 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11.94- \\ & 12.22 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12.19- \\ & 12.46 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13.53- \\ & 13.67 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6.82- \\ & 7.43 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.00- \\ & 0.25 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tectus (7) | 10.93 | $\begin{aligned} & 11.08- \\ & 11.35 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11.06- \\ & 11.19 \end{aligned}$ | 11.49 | $\begin{aligned} & 9.81- \\ & 10.09 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10.81- \\ & 10.94 \end{aligned}$ | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| amoenus (8) | 12.55 | $\begin{aligned} & 11.69- \\ & 11.95 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12.67- \\ & 12.81 \end{aligned}$ | 13.11 | $\begin{aligned} & 10.58- \\ & 10.87 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11.31- \\ & 11.48 \end{aligned}$ | 11.47 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| nephophilus (9) | 12.54 | $\begin{aligned} & 11.54- \\ & 11.94 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11.86- \\ & 11.99 \end{aligned}$ | 12.96 | $\begin{aligned} & 11.13- \\ & 11.42 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11.51- \\ & 11.65 \end{aligned}$ | 11.36 | 3.15 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| juliandringi (10) | 12.89 | $\begin{aligned} & 12.01- \\ & 12.29 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12.23- \\ & 12.37 \end{aligned}$ | 12.00 | $\begin{aligned} & 10.87- \\ & 11.15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12.45- \\ & 12.59 \end{aligned}$ | 11.47 | 7.28 | 7.30 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| umbra (11) | 12.29 | $\begin{aligned} & 11.82- \\ & 12.10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11.51- \\ & 11.64 \end{aligned}$ | 11.63 | $\begin{aligned} & 10.75- \\ & 11.15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11.71- \\ & 11.85 \end{aligned}$ | 10.76 | 6.19 | 5.96 | 6.04 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| mjobergi (12) | $\begin{aligned} & 13.50- \\ & 13.80 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13.01- \\ & 14.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13.00- \\ & 13.43 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13.18- \\ & 13.47 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11.75- \\ & 13.43 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13.78- \\ & 15.83 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12.91- \\ & 13.72 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8.88- \\ & 9.16 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8.93- \\ & 9.21 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8.53- \\ & 8.75 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7.04- \\ & 7.92 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.00- \\ & 5.90 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| kakipanjang (13) | $\begin{aligned} & 11.59- \\ & 12.05 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11.38- \\ & 12.26 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10.93- \\ & 11.51 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11.33- \\ & 11.79 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9.73- \\ & 10.58 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11.94- \\ & 12.49 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11.11- \\ & 11.69 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9.21- \\ & 9.60 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8.95- \\ & 9.21 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9.09- \\ & 9.90 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9.20- \\ & 9.60 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10.83- \\ & 11.63 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.10- \\ & 0.74 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| larutensis (14) | $\begin{aligned} & 10.91- \\ & 11.04 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10.71- \\ & 11.12 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10.62- \\ & 10.89 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11.30- \\ & 11.44 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9.32- \\ & 10.09 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9.95- \\ & 10.22 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10.37- \\ & 10.50 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8.53- \\ & 8.65 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8.54- \\ & 8.67 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8.42- \\ & 8.55 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8.40- \\ & 8.53 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10.00- \\ & 10.77 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7.78- \\ & 8.17 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.00- \\ & 0.10 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |
| davidlabangi (15) | $\begin{aligned} & 11.57- \\ & 11.70 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10.71- \\ & 11.38 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10.96- \\ & 11.22 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11.79- \\ & 11.93 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11.09- \\ & 11.77 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13.16- \\ & 13.72 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10.89- \\ & 11.03 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10.92- \\ & 11.32 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11.08- \\ & 11.47 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10.40- \\ & 10.79 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10.27- \\ & 10.39 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11.11- \\ & 12.69 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9.44- \\ & 10.25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8.94- \\ & 9.45 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.00- \\ & 0.32 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| refugii (16) | 13.46 | $\begin{aligned} & 12.58- \\ & 12.86 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13.58- \\ & 13.71 \end{aligned}$ | 13.19 | $\begin{aligned} & 12.68- \\ & 12.98 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14.56- \\ & 14.71 \end{aligned}$ | 14.03 | 13.57 | 12.61 | 12.13 | 11.05 | $\begin{aligned} & 13.50- \\ & 13.80 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10.97- \\ & 11.26 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10.23- \\ & 10.37 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11.70- \\ & 11.82 \end{aligned}$ | 0 |  |  |
| hosii (17) | $\begin{aligned} & 11.50- \\ & 11.65 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11.78- \\ & 12.22 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11.47- \\ & 11.89 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11.89- \\ & 12.19 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10.96- \\ & 11.40 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12.16- \\ & 12.46 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10.22- \\ & 10.37 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12.48- \\ & 12.64 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12.96- \\ & 13.12 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11.61- \\ & 11.90 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11.98- \\ & 12.27 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13.61- \\ & 14.37 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11.86- \\ & 12.76 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11.22- \\ & 11.51 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11.90- \\ & 12.20 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14.49- \\ & 14.80 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.00- \\ & 0.21 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| ingeri (18) | 13.83 | $\begin{aligned} & 13.51- \\ & 13.94 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12.79- \\ & 12.92 \end{aligned}$ | 13.08 | $\begin{aligned} & 12.64- \\ & 12.95 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12.41- \\ & 12.55 \end{aligned}$ | 11.66 | 13.40 | 12.83 | 13.29 | 12.40 | $\begin{aligned} & 14.58- \\ & 15.05 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11.97- \\ & 12.38 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12.79- \\ & 12.93 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12.58- \\ & 12.72 \end{aligned}$ | 14.56 | $\begin{aligned} & 7.27- \\ & 7.40 \end{aligned}$ | 0 |

Shaded in grey are the values for the new species.


FIGURE 2 Sonogram of one call with three notes of Philautus nepenthophilus


FIGURE 3 Specimens of Philautus nepenthophilus photographed alive on the day after capture (a) Male holotype NMBE 1073711 in dorsolateral view (b) Female paratype NMBE 1073601 in dorsolateral view (c) Holotype NMBE 1073711 in ventral view (d) Female paratype NMBE 1073601 in ventral view

### 3.3.2 | Paratypes

The paratype series consists of seven adults (two females and five males) and five tadpoles (lot ZMH A123049). NMBE 1065920,
an adult male collected at the type locality on March 11, 2013 by Hertwig S. T., Pui Y. M., Keilholz T., Einecke T. NMBE 1073601, an adult female, NMBE 1073602 and NMBE 1073580 (Figure 9a), two adult males collected at the type locality on March 9, 2016 by Flury


FIGURE 4 (a) Dorsal view and (b) Ventral view of holotype NMBE 1073711 of Philautus nepenthophilus (c) Dorsal view and (d) Ventral view of female paratype NMBE 1073577 in preserved condition


FIGURE 5 (a) Ventral view of left hand and (b) Ventral view of left foot of holotype NMBE 1073711 of Philautus nepenthophilus in preserved condition
J., Haas A., Hertwig S. T., Pui Y. M., Reichen N. NMBE 1073577, an adult female (Figure 4c, d), NMBE 1073588, NMBE 1073580 and NMBE 1073591, two adult males and the tadpoles lot ZMH

A123049 collected at the type locality on March 12, 2016 by Flury J., Haas A., Hertwig S. T., Pui Y. M., and Reichen N.

### 3.3.3 | Diagnosis

Philautus nepenthophilus is assigned to the genus Philautus based on a robustly supported phylogenetic hypothesis (Figure 1). Morphological synapomorphies of this genus are currently not known after several revisions using molecular data (Hertwig et al., 2013; Li et al. 2008, 2009; Wostl et al., 2017; Yu et al. 2008, 2009). Species are currently assigned to Philautus on the basis of morphological similarity to already-described species or of molecular evidence (Dehling \& Dehling, 2013; Dehling et al. 2016; Wostl et al., 2017). Diagnostic characters of the adults of the new species in comparison with congeners are as follows: (1) uniform yellow to greenish coloration of head, dorsum, and flanks without a distinct color pattern (Figure 3a, b); (2) low intraspecific variation in color pattern; (3) smooth skin with minuscule keratinous tubercles loosely scattered on eye lids, interorbital region and (in some specimens) snout (Figure S6), enlarged tubercles or projections absent (Figure 4); (4) truncate, rounded, short snout (SL/HL 0.35-0.44) (Figure 6); (5) sexual dimorphism in head shape absent; (6) tympanum moderately large (TYD/ ED 0.42-0.52); (7) medium body size (SVL male: 28.67-32.34 mm, female: 35.22-37.24 mm); (8) advertisement call is short, fast and rattling, the three notes with 6-7 pulses each, average note duration is 36.33 ms and the dominant frequency is at 2.8125 kHz (Figure 2); (9)



Philautus ingeri


Philautus tectus

FIGURE 6 Snout shapes of Philautus species most closely related to Philautus nepenthophilus. Drawings are not to scale to better facilitate shape comparison
presumably endotrophic tadpoles with very short snout, small ventral oral orifice, two pairs of lateral oral papillae, anterolateral nares, unique posteroventral skin flap present (Figure 7c-g); (10) coloration of the tadpoles without iridophores (Figure 7c-g).

### 3.3.4 | Description of Holotype

Medium-sized body (Figure 4a, b), SVL 30.45 mm (Table 4); head moderately large, rounded, slightly longer than wide (HW/HL 0.95), head width slightly over one-third of snout-vent length (HW/SVL 0.36), head length two-fifths of SVL (HL/SVL 0.38); snout in dorsal view truncate, slightly mucronate, two-fifths of head length (SL/HL 0.37), in profile truncate (vertical) and not clearly pointed, not projecting beyond lower jaw, same length as diameter of eye (SL/ED 0.99); nostrils oval, slightly raised with flap of skin, internarial distance is smaller than eye-nostril distance (EN/IN 1.39); canthus rostralis short but distinct, rounded, in dorsal view slightly curved (Figure 6); interorbital distance is double the size of eye diameter (IO/ED 2.02); lores weekly concave; tympanum weakly distinct, diameter large, two-fifths of eye diameter (TYD/ED 0.42); supratympanic ridge distinct, not curved or angled; eye rather small (ED/HL 0.37) with a horizontal pupil; vomerine teeth absent; tongue triangular with two elongated lobes at posterior end, lingual papilla absent; vocal sac opening slit-like; forelimbs slender, hands large (HND/FAL 1.39), one-third of SVL (HND/SVL 0.32), fingers long and slender, relative lengths: I < II < IV < III, disks rounded, webbing absent, subarticular tubercles weakly distinct, metacarpal
tubercles absent, no distinct tubercles on forearm, nuptial pads absent (Figure 5a); Hind limbs long and slender, much longer than SVL ((THL + TBL + TAL + FOT)/SVL 1.73), tibia long (TBL/SVL 0.52), longer than foot (FOT/TBL 0.86) and slightly longer than thigh (TBL/THL 1.13); toe disks rounded, disk of 4th and 5th toe triangular to oval, relative lengths: I < II < III < V < IV, toe webbing moderately developed, generally $2 / 3$. Webbing formula: I1.75-2II1.5-2.75III1.25-3IV2.51.5 V (Figure 5b); tubercles weakly distinct, outer metatarsal tubercle absent, inner metatarsal tubercle small, oval, subarticular tubercle feebly distinct, rounded, no distinct tubercles on tarsus or heel; skin on dorsum smooth, finely granulated, minuscule whitish transparent tubercles scattered on head, snout, and eyelids with keratinous pointed tips, only visible under high magnification (Figure S6); ventral side of abdomen granular (Figure 3c and 4b).

Color in life-Base color is ocher, with small light brown spots scattered lightly over the entire body (Figure 3a, b). The spots on the dorsum are slightly larger than on the abdomen and are distributed more unevenly. The venter has an areolate white pattern. The flanks bear white spots. The hind limbs are brown, showing a darker tone than the forelimbs. A dark brown band runs along the supratympanic ridge. The throat is smooth without a conspicuous color pattern. The tips of fingers and toes are dark brown, showing the same color as the marks on the dorsum. The toe webbing is of a translucent white color. The eyelids are colored in dark ocher with a green tint and small light brown spots. The iris is black and orange marbled with some gold. The tympanum is indistinctly lighter colored with fewer pale brown spots than on the dorsum.


FIGURE 7 Tadpoles of $P$. nepenthophilus photographs not to scale (lot ZMH A12304). (a) Tadpole clinging to the pitcher wall. (b) Group of six tadpoles collected from one pitcher. Note the two different size classes, one specimen being far behind the others in development. Scale 1 cm . (c) Lateral view of specimen 647P-1, showing the short snout and blunt tail tip. (d) Ventral view of the same specimen as in c. The yolk mass in the gut is clearly visible. The circular depression at the gular region and the posteroventral skin flap are difficult to see due to the transparency of the skin. (e) Frontal view of the same specimen as in c, note the far anterior nares, the orbitonasal streak, and the somewhat forward orientation of the eyes. (f) Specimen 647P-2 in frontal view. Note the small head and incompletely developed eyes in this tadpole that was assigned to Stage 27 according to hind limb development. (g) Specimen 647F-1 in ventral view. Lateral oral papilla and posteroventral skin flap indicated by filled and open arrows, respectively

Color in preservation-The color changed to pale brown and sandy white, with darker areas on the dorsum and lighter areas on flanks and abdomen. The areolate white pattern is visible. The tips of toes and fingers are darker brown, like forehead and snout. The dark pattern on dorsum and the brown canthal band are barely visible. The eyelids have a dark gray color (Figure 4a).
 $T H L+T B L+T A L+F O T$

| NMBE-No. | Sex | EN | ED | TYD | SL | HL | 10 | HND | FAL | IN | HW | SVL | THL | TBL | TAL | FOT | TTTF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Holotype |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1073711 | M | 2.62 | 4.27 | 1.81 | 4.24 | 11.55 | 3.65 | 9.73 | 6.98 | 1.88 | 10.94 | 30.45 | 14.18 | 15.97 | 8.86 | 13.77 | 52.78 |
| Paratypes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1065920 | M | 2.37 | 3.87 | 2.03 | 3.94 | 11.24 | 3.82 | 10.35 | 5.58 | 1.6 | 10.82 | 30.45 | 13.57 | 14.76 | 8.2 | 13.64 | 50.17 |
| 1073577 | F | 2.87 | 5.12 | 2.46 | 4.88 | 12.37 | 4.85 | 12.19 | 8.8 | 2.48 | 13.16 | 35.22 | 17.03 | 19.26 | 10.79 | 17.06 | 64.14 |
| 1073580 | M | 2.56 | 4.76 | 2.38 | 4.69 | 10.56 | 4.01 | 10.78 | 7.7 | 2.33 | 11.74 | 32.34 | 15.09 | 16.05 | 9.09 | 15.49 | 55.72 |
| 1073588 | M | 2.73 | 4.31 | 2.13 | 4.49 | 10.64 | 3.8 | 10.95 | 6.56 | 1.74 | 10.97 | 29.91 | 14.72 | 15.92 | 8.12 | 13.24 | 52 |
| 1073591 | M | 2.34 | 4.41 | 2.03 | 4.63 | 11.08 | 3.36 | 10.3 | 6.47 | 2.39 | 11.55 | 31.01 | 14.79 | 15.41 | 8.68 | 13.66 | 52.54 |
| 1073601 | F | 2.95 | 5 | 2.19 | 5.11 | 13.07 | 4.22 | 11.9 | 8.1 | 2.11 | 13.9 | 37.24 | 16.31 | 17.97 | 8.41 | 17.2 | 59.89 |
| 1073602 | M | 1.98 | 4.14 | 1.84 | 3.76 | 10.53 | 3.19 | 10.18 | 6.72 | 2.25 | 10.38 | 28.67 | 14.54 | 14.65 | 8.27 | 13.69 | 51.15 |



FIGURE 8 Situs of the female paratype NMBE 1073601 of Philautus nepenthophilus in preserved condition with three large eggs in the ovaries indicated with arrows

### 3.3.5 | Variation

The shape of the snout varies slightly in the type series. In the specimens NMBE 1073711, NMBE 1073577, NMBE 1073602, NMBE 1073588, and NMBE 1065920, the nostrils form the anterior-most point (truncate snout), in NMBE 1073580, NMBE 1073591, and NMBE 1073601 it is the small, barely visible snout tip (mucronate snout). The nostrils are of a round, oval, or drop-like shape. The canthus rostralis as well as the tympanum are weakly distinct in NMBE 1073588 and NMBE 1073591. The tips of the digits vary in shape between round and triangular with rounded corners. The length of the 3rd toe is smaller (NMBE 1073711, NMBE 1073588, NMBE 1073601) or equal (NMBE 1065920, NMBE 1073577, NMBE 1073602, NMBE 1073580, and NMBE 1073591) to the length of the 5th toe. The extent of webbing between the toes differs slightly. The variation is included in brackets in the following webbing formula: I(1.75-2.25)-(2-2.5) $\|(1.25-1.5)-(2-3) I I(1-1.75)-(2.75-3) I V(2.5-3.25)-(1.25-2) V$. The supratympanic ridge is curved to the arm insertion in NMBE 1065920, NMBE 1073711, NMBE 1073602, NMBE 1073588, NMBE 1073591, NMBE 1073601 and forms a straight line in NMBE 1073577, NMBE 1073580. For variation in measurements, see Table 4.

The female paratype NMBE 1073601 carries three large eggs (diameter: $7.5 \mathrm{~mm}, 7.7 \mathrm{~mm}$, and 5.4 mm ; Figure 8), with visible blood vessels, an indication of fertilized eggs. Additionally, a number of smaller eggs of varying size were found. This suggests that the female produces over a single clutch per year (personal observation by P. H. dos Santos Dias).

Skin-The skin is relatively smooth. The tubercles on the dorsum vary from being rather pronounced to barely distinct. The outer metatarsal tubercle is oval, round, hardly distinct, or completely absent. One specimen (NMBE 1073588) has metacarpal tubercles, one of the females (NMBE 1073601) has a large reniform metatarsal tubercle and a weakly distinct thenar tubercle. On the head, the extent of
the keratinous tubercles varies greatly, from loosely scattered in the interorbital region to fully covering interorbital region, head, eyelids, and snout.

Color-The base color varies from pale brown over ocher to a citreous greenish-yellow color. The brown spots scattered on the head and dorsum show high contrast in some specimens and are nearly absent in others. In one individual (NMBE 1073602), these spots form a "W"-shape on interorbital region. In some individuals, the spots on the hind limbs form indistinctive bands. Other individuals do not show any stripes on the hind limbs. The brown band over the supratympanic ridge is not conspicuous in all specimens, but in some it is distinct. The color of the iris is marbled with black. It ranges from amber to dark orange with a green tint.

Sexual dimorphism-The two females are larger (SVL males: 28.67-32.34 mm, SVL females: 35.22-37.24 mm; Figure 4c, d) and do not possess an oval vocal sac opening. The proportion of head width to head length varies more strongly in males than in females (HW/HL males: 0.95-1.11, females: 1.06). The same applies for IN/EN ratio (males: 0.64-1.11, females: 0.72-0.86), IO/ ED ratio (males: 1.66-2.02, females: 1.93-1.97), and IO/IN ratio (males: 1.41-2.39, females: 1.96-2.00). Conversely, the FOT/TAL ratio is more variable in females than in males (males: 1.55-1.70, females: 1.58-2.05).

## 3.4 | Comparisons

Philautus nepenthophilus (values and character states in bold) can be distinguished from other species of Philautus from Borneo and from P. everetti from Palawan by a unique combination of morphological characters, morphometric measurements (SVL in mean for males and females, respectively), and bioacoustic traits:

Philautus acutus Dring, 1987 (type locality: Camp Three 1,300 m, Gunung Mulu, Fourth Division, Sarawak, Malaysia) is of smaller size (SVL males: 23.4-27.1 mm, female: undescribed vs. males: 28.7-32.3 mm, females: 35.2-37.2 mm), has a red iris and a generally darker skin color. The canthus rostralis is curved in a wider angle than in P. nepenthophilus. The call consists of more notes (89, named "pulses" by Dring, 1987 vs. 3) of longer duration (100 ms vs. 36.33 ms ) and of higher dominant frequency $(2.6-3.6 \mathrm{kHz}$ vs. 2.8 kHz ) (Dring, 1987).

Philautus amoenus Smith, 1931 (type locality: Kamborangah, 2,1950 m., Mt. Kinabalu, Sabah, Malaysia) is smaller (SVL males: 18.1-24.2 mm, females: 28.3-34.7 vs. males: 28.7-32.3 mm, females: 35.2-37.2 mm), has a smaller tympanum ( 25 to $30 \%$ of eye diameter, smaller than outer finger disks vs. TYD/ED 0.42-0.52) and a banded pattern on the lips. The skin has more tubercles, of which some form a clearly defined line from the posterior end of the eye to the dorsum and a cluster on the metatarsals. The call of $P$. amoenus differs in note duration ( 110 ms vs. 36.33 ms ) and internote interval ( 150 ms vs. 62.1 ms ) and has a much lower frequency $(1.8 \mathrm{kHz}$ vs. 2.8 kHz) (Inger, 1966; Malkmus et al., 2002; Malkmus \& Riede, 1996a; Smith, 1931).

Philautus aurantium Inger, 1989 (type locality: Mendolong, Sipitang District, Sabah, Malaysia) is smaller (SVL males: 23.827.7 mm , females: 25.6-26.2 mm vs. males: 28.7-32.3 mm, females: $35.2-37.2 \mathrm{~mm}$ ) and shows bright orange marks in the inner and outer articulation of the thighs (vs. absent). The tympanum is obscured (vs. visibly lighter colored). The frequency of the P. aurantium call is similar to $P$. nepenthophilus ( 2.9 kHz vs. 2.8 kHz ) but consists of many more notes ( $14-30$ vs. 3 ) with a longer duration ( $120-160 \mathrm{~ms}$ vs. 36.33 ms) (Inger, 1989; Malkmus et al., 2002).

Philautus bunitus Inger et al., 1995 (type locality: Mt. Lumaku, 1,350 m, Sipitang District, Sabah, Malaysia) differs in size (SVL males: 34.7-40.8 mm, females: 43.5-46.3 mm vs. males: 28.7-32.3 mm, females: $35.2-37.2 \mathrm{~mm}$ ) and in the presence of vomerine teeth (vs. absence). The green and black color pattern on the dorsum is markedly different from the yellow color in the new species. The webbing is of yellow color (vs. white). Philautus bunitus calls at a lower frequency ( 1.8 kHz vs. 2.8 kHz ) and calls consist of more notes ( $15-25 \mathrm{vs} .3$ ) (Inger et al., 1995; Malkmus et al., 2002).

Philautus davidlabangi Matsui, 2009 (type locality: Gunung Serapi ( $01^{\circ} 36^{\prime} \mathrm{N}, 110^{\circ} 11^{\prime} \mathrm{E}, 330 \mathrm{~m}$ ), Matang Range, in the suburbs of Kuching, Sarawak, Malaysia) has a subequal body size (SVL males: 19.9-20.6 mm, females: undescribed vs. males: 28.7-32.3 mm, females: $35.2-37.2 \mathrm{~mm}$ ) and tympanum diameter ( 1.3 mm vs. TYD $1.8-2.5 \mathrm{~mm}$ ), and the nostrils are situated in closer proximity to the eye (EN 1.8 mm vs. $\mathbf{2 . 0}-\mathbf{3 . 0} \mathrm{mm}$ ). The canthus rostralis is curved in a sharp angle in dorsal view (vs. rounded). Tubercles form a curved row from the posterior end of the eye to the sacrum (vs. absent) and a conspicuous " X "-shaped mark is visible on the dorsum (vs. absent). The general color tone is darker than in P. nepenthophilus. The call consists of only one single note and is emitted over a longer period of time (note duration $50-60 \mathrm{~ms}$ vs. 36.33 ms ) (Matsui, 2009).

Philautus disgregus Inger, 1989 (type locality: Danum Valley Field Centre, Lahad Datu District, Sabah, Malaysia) is much smaller (SVL males: 21.3-23.0 mm, females: 24.4-24.8 mm vs. males: 28.732.3 mm , females: $35.2-37.2 \mathrm{~mm}$ ), has distinct conical tubercles on the upper eye lids (vs. absent) and a black and white color pattern below the eye (vs. plain yellow) (Inger, 1989).

Philautus erythrophthalmus Stuebing \& Wong, 2000 (type locality: Mt. Muruk Mio ( $4^{\circ} 22.715^{\prime} \mathrm{N}, 115^{\circ} 50.125^{\prime} \mathrm{E}$ ), Sipitang District, Sabah, Malaysia) is smaller (SVL males: undescribed, female: 26.2 mm vs. males: 28.7-32.3 mm, females: $35.2-37.2 \mathrm{~mm}$ ) and possesses a distinctly red iris (vs. orange marbled) and bright yellow/golden colored groin (vs. pale brown). The tips of fingers and toes are pinkish (vs. brown). The tympanum is smaller ( $30 \%$ of eye diameter vs. TYD/ ED 0.42-0.52) and barely visible. Lingual papillae are present (vs. absent), and the supratympanic ridge is indistinct (vs. highlighted by a distinct brown marking) (Stuebing \& Wong, 2000).

Philautus everetti Boulenger, 1894 (type locality: Palawan, Philippines) is slightly larger (SVL males: 29.6-35.2 mm, females:
 and differs in the presence of vomerine teeth (vs. absent) and conical tubercles below the anus, along the forearm and on the heels (vs. absent). P. everetti also possesses a flap of skin along the outer edge
of the forearms and hindlimbs (vs. absent). The tympanum is smaller ( $40 \%$ of eye diameter vs. TYD/ED $0.42-0.52$ ), the base color is of a pale beige (vs. greenish-yellow), the iris is of a pale golden color (vs. orange marbled), the skin is finely granulated (vs. smooth), and the snout is rounded (vs. truncate). (Boulenger, 1894; Inger, 1954b).

Like Philautus aurantium, P. gunungensis Malkmus \& Riede, 1996b (type locality: Mixed fagaceae forest above Silau stream ( $1,450 \mathrm{~m}$ ) on the southern slope of Mt. Kinabalu, Sabah, Malaysia) has bright yellow colored thighs (vs. pale brown). It is smaller than P. nepenthophilus (SVL males: 22.1-25.3 mm, females: undescribed vs. males: 28.7-32.3 mm, females: $35.2-37.2 \mathrm{~mm}$ ) and has a much steeper snout slope in profile than P. nepenthophilus and palmar, thenar and subarticular tubercles are more distinct. The call of $P$. gunungensis consists of a greater number of pulses (14-30 vs. 6) and is continuously emitted (vs. not continuous) (Malkmus \& Riede, 1996b).

Philautus hosii Boulenger, 1895 (type locality: Patah River, northern Sarawak, Malaysia) is considerably larger (SVL males: 40.849.1 mm , females: 61.3-62.0 mm vs. males: $\mathbf{2 8 . 7} \mathbf{- 3 2 . 3} \mathbf{~ m m}$, females: $35.2-37.2 \mathrm{~mm}$ ) and has two series of vomerine teeth (vs. absent). The iris is bright green (vs. orange marbled). The hind limbs show dark crossbars and the sides, as well as the axils, have brown spots. There is a faint X -shaped mark on the dorsum (vs. absent) (Boulenger, 1895; Inger, 1966; Wolf, 1936). The snout is longer (Figure 6).

Philautus ingeri Dring, 1987 (type locality: Camp three, 1,300 m, Gunung Mulu, Fourth Division, Sarawak, Malaysia) differs strongly in iris coloration, which is split in an upper pale gray part and a lower, dark brown part (vs. no split). The pattern of the eye continues to the tip of the snout. The snout is sharply pointed (vs. truncate) and longer (Figure 6). The heels bear spiny tubercles (vs. absent) (Dring, 1987).

Philautus juliandringi Dehling, 2010 (type locality: The Pinnacles Trail ( $04^{\circ} 07^{\prime} \mathrm{N}, 114^{\circ} 53^{\prime} \mathrm{E}$ ), northern slope of Gunung Api, approx. $1,100 \mathrm{~m}$, Gunung Mulu N. P., Miri Division, Sarawak, Malaysia) is distinguishable by its small size (SVL males: 14.8-19.2 mm, females:
 and the presence of nuptial pads (vs. absence). The advertisement call consists of only one note per call (vs. 3). The dominant frequency is higher ( 3.2 kHz vs. 2.8 kHz ) (Dehling, 2010; Dring, 1987).

The size of Philautus kakipanjang Dehling \& Dehling, 2013 (type locality: From below the summit of Gunung Serapi $\left(01^{\circ} 35.261^{\prime} \mathrm{N}\right.$, $110^{\circ} 11.578^{\prime}$ E; 780 m ), Kubah N. P., Sarawak, Malaysia) is smaller (SVL males: 21.2-23.7 mm, females: undescribed vs. males: 28.732.3 mm , females: $35.2-37.2 \mathrm{~mm}$ ). The presence of small but prominent nuptial pads (vs. absent), the thick and long supratympanic ridge (vs. shorter in P. nepenthophilus) and the concealed tympanum (vs. visibly lighter colored) represent further differences. The call consists of only one note (vs. 3) and has a slightly lower dominant frequency ( $2-2.7 \mathrm{kHz}$ vs. 2.8 kHz ) (Dehling \& Dehling, 2013).

Philautus kerangae Dring, 1987 (type locality: Kerangas camp 200 m, Gunung Mulu N. P., Fourth Division, Sarawak, Malaysia) differs in the presence of vomerine teeth and tubercles on the heel (vs. both absent). There is a conspicuous color pattern with large brown markings on the light green dorsum and the upper side of
the limbs. Likewise, the venter shows blotches of brown on the white, pale blue base color (vs. aerolate white pattern). Philautus kerangae calls in a lower frequency (1.6-3.0 kHz, most strongly at $2.2-2.5 \mathrm{kHz}$ vs. 2.8 kHz ) and emits more notes per call (8-9 vs. 3). The call was described with the call-centered approach and thus notes were defined as pulses (Dring, 1987). According to the sonogram in the publication, these pulses equal the definition of notes in our study.

Distinctive features of Philautus larutensis Boulenger, 1900 (type locality: Larut Hills at 1,220-1,370 m, Perak, Malaysia) are the welldeveloped nuptial pads in males (vs. absent) and the fleshy tubercle on the rostrum of the females, making the snout acutely pointed (vs. truncate). The mandible bears a row of tubercles (vs. absent) (Wostl et al., 2017).

Philautus macroscelis Boulenger, 1896 (type locality: Mt. Kinabalu, Sabah) has two groups of vomerine teeth (vs. absent). There are conical tubercles on the upper eyelids and a row of small tubercles along the outer edge of the forearms and hind limbs (vs. both absent). The forearms and hind limbs bear dark crossbars on the dorsal side (Boulenger, 1896; Inger, 1966; Smith, 1931). The snout is feebly more pointed in dorsal view than that of $P$. nepenthophilus (Figure 6). The tadpole of $P$. macroscelis differs from larvae of P. nepenthophilus in coloration (conspicuous scattered white-bluish iridophores vs. absent), the position of the nares (ventral vs. anterolateral), the relative size of the eyes (larger), relative body width (less broad), and absence of a posteroventral skin flap (vs. present) (Hertwig et al., 2011).

Philautus mjobergi Smith, 1925 (type locality: Mt. Murud, 2,134 m, Fourth Division, Sarawak, Malaysia) has a relatively wider head ("much broader than long" Smith, 1925 vs. HW/HL 0.95-1.11) and a smaller body size (SVL males: 18.7-24.1 mm, females: 22.732.2 mm vs. males: $\mathbf{2 8 . 7 - 3 2 . 3 ~ m m , ~ f e m a l e s : ~ 3 5 . 2 - 3 7 . 2 ~ m m ) . ~ N u p t i a l ~}$ pads are present and there is a tubercle on the heel (vs. both absent). The structure of the call is similar to P. nepenthophilus with $4-8$ notes (vs. 3) but has a slightly higher dominant frequency (2.7-3.5 kHz vs. 2.8 kHz) (Dring, 1987; Malkmus et al., 2002; Smith, 1925).

Philautus nephophilus Dehling, Matsui, \& Yambun, 2016 (type locality: Silau Silau Trail, $6^{\circ} 00^{\prime} 23.2^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{N}, 116^{\circ} 32^{\prime} 44.7^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{E} ; 1,525 \mathrm{~m}$, Kinabalu N. P., Sabah, Malaysia) can be distinguished from the new species by the smaller body size (SVL males: 16.4-18.6 mm, females: 20.3-23.1 mm vs. males: 28.7-32.3 mm, females: 35.2-37.2 mm) along with the presence of nuptial pads and a tubercle on the heel (vs. absence). The supratympanic fold is strongly pronounced with a pale orange stripe along the fold (vs. brown stripe) and the iris is red in color (vs. orange marbled). The call consists of a greater number of notes (4-12 vs. 3) with a longer duration ( $61-80 \mathrm{~ms}$ vs. 36.33 ms ) (Dehling et al., 2016).

Philautus refugii Inger \& Stuebing, 1996 (type locality: Bukit Lanjak, 840 m, Lubok Antu District, Sarawak, Malaysia) is of considerably smaller size (SVL males: 16.5-16.8 mm, females: 18.2-20.5 mm vs. males: 28.7-32.3 mm, females: 35.2-37.2 mm). The females bear a tubercle on the rostrum and the males feature nuptial pads (vs. both absent). The dorsal color pattern resembles an inverted " V "-shape to
some extent and the anterior thighs bear conspicuous brown bars (vs. absent) (Inger \& Stuebing, 1996; Wostl et al., 2017).

Philautus saueri Malkmus \& Riede, 1996a (type locality: Leptospernum-Dacrydium forest east of Paka-Cave, 3,050 m, on southwestern slope of Mt. Kinabalu, Sabah, Malaysia) is smaller (SVL male holotype 21.4 mm, females: undescribed vs. males: 28.732.3 mm , females: $35.2-37.2 \mathrm{~mm}$ ) and bears a light interorbital stripe which is rich in contrast to the dark brown base color (vs. absent). The limbs and sides of the dorsum show a distinct reticulate dark gray pattern on the pale whitish gray base color. The supratympanic fold is steeply curved toward the arm insertion (vs. not curved) and the snout is protruding (vs. not protruding). The call is similar to the call of $P$. nepenthophilus in note duration ( $30-40 \mathrm{~ms}$ vs. 36.33 ms ) but has marginally longer internote intervals ( $70-100 \mathrm{~ms}$ vs. 62.1 ms ) and a subequal frequency (1.9-2.6 kHz vs. 2.8 kHz ) (Malkmus et al., 2002; Malkmus \& Riede, 1996a).

Philautus tectus Dring, 1987 (type locality: Camp five, 150 m, Gunung Mulu N. P., Fourth Division, Sarawak, Malaysia) is different from the new species in body size (SVL males: 20.8-23.4 mm, female: 27.3 mm vs. males: 28.7-32.3 mm, females: 35.237.2 mm ) and in having large nuptial pads (vs. absent). The canthus rostralis is curved in a larger angle in dorsal view (Figure 6) and bears a small dorsal tubercle in close proximity to the proximal end of the eye (vs. absent). The iris is dark brown (vs. orange marbled) (Dring, 1987).

Philautus umbra Dring, 1987 (type locality: Pinnacles Camp, 1,200 m, Gunung Api, Gunung Mulu N. P., Fourth Division, Sarawak, Malaysia) has a distinct, sharply angled canthus rostralis (vs. not curved). Specimens of $P$. umbra possess lingual papilla and rudiments of a nuptial pad (vs. both absent). The uniformly dark brown to dark gray night coloration and the black iris with scattered gray spots are further diagnostic traits that distinguish it from $P$. nepenthophilus. The SVL is similar to the new species (male 24.7-35.1 mm, female 33.3 mm vs. males: $\mathbf{2 8 . 7 - 3 2 . 3} \mathbf{~ m m}$, females: $\mathbf{3 5 . 2 - 3 7 . 2 ~ m m}$ ) but the smaller EN/IN ratio distinguishes $P$. umbra from the new species (EN/IN 1.06 vs. 1.22) (Dring, 1987).

## 3.5 | Larval description

In all larval stages collected, a large mass of yellowish substance was evident through the abdominal body wall. We measured nine formalin-preserved specimens (Table 5). The development of larval features was, however, immature in four early-stage tadpoles, so that we derive the following details on larval morphology from the individuals of advanced stages (Stages 35-38), followed by some comments on the earlier stages (26-27). Color information was obtained from digital color photographs (Figure 7).

Body and tail shape-Maximum total length: 21.55 mm (Stage 38). In dorsal view, the body (here: head and trunk) of the advanced stages is broadly pear-shaped, head slightly narrower than trunk. A soft constriction of the body contour marks the head-to-trunk transition. The maximum body width is anterior to that
TABLE 5 Body measurements of $P$. nepenthophilus larvae in mm, rounded to nearest 0.01 mm

| ID | Stage | BL | BH | BW | BS | ED | ES | IND | IOD | LFH | MTH | NE | OFW | SN | SS | TAL | TMH | TMW | TTL | UFH | FlapL | FlapW |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ZMH A12304 (lot) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 647P-1 | 37 | 6.59 | 3.26 | 4.60 | X | 1.16 | 1.48 | 1.48 | 2.67 | 0.90 | 3.50 | 1.42 | 0.93 | 0.15 | $x$ | 13.09 | 2.00 | 2.04 | 19.68 | 0.79 | 2.49 | 3.12 |
| 647P-2 | 27 | 5.55 | 3.74 | 4.52 | X | X | X | X | X | 1.06 | 3.00 | 0.85 | 0.54 | 0.19 | X | 9.37 | 1.20 | 1.05 | 14.92 | 0.83 | X | X |
| ZMH A12303 (lot) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 647F-1 | 38 | 6.90 | 3.33 | 4.58 | 3.00 | 1.20 | 1.07 | 1.42 | 2.83 | 0.95 | 3.64 | 1.53 | 1.01 | 0.24 | 3.90 | 14.65 | 1.88 | 2.06 | 21.55 | 1.10 | 3.28 | 2.47 |
| 647F-2 | 37 | 6.75 | 3.53 | 4.47 | 2.74 | 1.10 | 1.35 | 1.42 | 2.86 | 0.96 | 3.66 | 1.36 | 0.92 | 0.16 | 4.01 | 13.34 | 1.89 | 2.07 | 20.09 | 1.05 | 3.26 | 2.68 |
| 647F-3 | 35 | 6.49 | 3.31 | 4.54 | 3.60 | 0.91 | 0.88 | 1.22 | 2.37 | 1.03 | 4.00 | 0.68 | 0.90 | 0.20 | 2.89 | 12.95 | 1.69 | 2.00 | 19.44 | 1.04 | 2.30 | 2.51 |
| 647F-4 | 36 | 6.57 | 3.47 | 4.44 | 2.91 | 0.93 | 1.44 | 1.25 | 2.24 | 1.00 | 3.90 | 1.23 | 0.69 | 0.23 | 3.66 | 13.10 | 1.75 | 1.95 | 19.67 | 1.06 | 2.20 | 2.90 |
| 647F-5 | 27 | 4.24 | 3.58 | 4.26 | X | X | X | X | X | 0.72 | 2.50 | X | X | X | X | 10.23 | 1.22 | 1.00 | 14.47 | 0.67 | X | X |
| 647F-6 | 27 | 4.62 | 3.41 | 4.26 | X | X | X | X | X | 0.85 | 2.73 | X | X | X | X | 9.64 | 1.15 | 0.94 | 14.26 | 0.73 | X | X |
| 647F-7 | 26 | 4.74 | 4.03 | 4.19 | X | X | X | X | X | 0.66 | 2.47 | X | X | X | X | 10.17 | 1.21 | 1.02 | 14.91 | 0.59 | X | X |

[^1]constriction (where elbows are), approximately half way along the body. Head and trunk are approximately of the same depth in lateral view (Figure 7c). The snout is very short. In lateral view, it is softly rounded, whereas in dorsal view it is almost truncate, except for a medially protruding soft bulge in the contour (Figure 7b). The body is depressed, wider than deep. The spiracle is sinistral; medial spiracular orifice fused to the body wall, free tube absent. The spiracle is directed posteriorly; spiracular position is clearly ventral to midbody axis. The anal tube runs in the ventral fin and opens sinistrally. A peculiar large discoid flap of skin is present, which we shall term the posteroventral flap. It is confluent medially with the ventral tail fin dorsally and the abdominal skin anteriorly. The posteroventral flap expands ventral to the developing posterior limbs (Figure 7d, g), that are covered by it to the level of the ankles. The posteroventral skin flap and the ventral tail fin form a pocket for each of the limbs. The eye is positioned dorsolaterally; the cornea does not reach the head contour line in dorsal view. The orientation of the eye axes is anterolateral in dorsal view (Figure 7e) suggesting good frontal vision. The naris is much closer to the snout than to the eye; in fact, the naris is positioned almost terminally on the snout in lateral view. The nares are facing anterolaterally, smoothly rimmed, sunken in. A well-developed, unpigmented orbitonasal streak is present (Figure 7e). The tail is only moderately developed. At its base, tail width is approximately $45 \%$ of body width and $56 \%$ of body height. The dorsal and ventral tail fins begin at the body-tail junction. The fins do not arch, but are mostly parallel along most of the tail until they end in a broadly rounded tail tip. Dorsal and ventral fins are approximately of the same height; maximum height of the tail is approximately one-third of tail length.

Color in life-The general appearance of the tadpoles is dark brown to dark gray dorsally (Figure 7b-c). Although there are slightly darker (e.g., brain case) and lighter areas (e.g., branchial), there is no clear patterning or any markings. The dark brown of the upper sides rapidly dissolves at the ventral aspects of head, trunk, posterior limbs, and tail. The trunk coloration continues onto the upper half of the tail, where it fades posteriorly and ventrally. The pigmentation extends to the base of the dorsal fin, whereas the ventral muscular part and ventral fin are devoid of melanophores. The ventral skin of the tadpoles (including oral field and posteroventral flap) is transparent (Figure 7d, g), only finely pigmented in the peripheral ventral oral and gular regions. Viscera are visible through the ventral skin. The heart and gill regions and in the abdomen the yolk mass appear red and cream, respectively, through the skin. No gut coils are visible. Eye ball (sclera) and iris possess black backgrounds with dense iridophores scattered on them. The iris iridophores shine golden, the pupil itself is framed by a narrow silver ring. The iridophores on the scleral parts of the eye are mostly silvery to bluish. The orbital cavity has an unpigmented area at the origin of the orbitonasal streak (Figure 7c).

Oral disk-The oral orifice is ventral. An oral disk, as in most other tadpoles, is absent. Structures that might represent remnants of a highly reduced oral disk are the very thin lips along the
oral orifice and two lateral knobs, or papillae, on each side of the mouth (Figure 7g). The mouth and its surrounding structures are positioned in the anterior part or a circular depression in the ventral gular region. As suggested by observing tadpoles clinging to the pitcher walls, it is possible that this depression functions as a sucker. Keratodonts are absent. Labial Tooth Row Formula: 0/0. Highly reduced keratinized jaw sheaths could be identified as very thin dark lines along the jaws under high magnification. During an observation period of 24 h in a dish for temporary care, no feeding behavior could be observed.

Ontogeny-Although the number of stages examined was limited, some ontogenetic differences could be noted among specimens. The earlier stages in the sample (26-27, Table 5; one specimen in Figure 7b) have more pronounced pear-shaped bodies, a result of their relatively smaller head and relatively larger abdomen. The maximum width is well within the trunk region. The eyes and nares in the four early-stage tadpoles were very small and undifferentiated, possibly non-functional. The posteroventral flap beginning to form at the lower fin and trunk. The early-stage tadpoles, despite being free-swimming and not encapsulated in jelly, appear embryonic in their overall development. The development of the appendages seems accelerated in relation to general somatic differentiation. Because development of hind limbs is crucial for staging in Gosner's (1960) table, the formal stage overestimates overall development in the stages 26-27 examined.

Similar Species-The morphological features of this tadpole, especially the short snout and the very small ventral oral orifice with two pairs of lateral oral papillae, are unique among Bornean species, except for tadpoles of Philautus macroscelis (Hertwig et al., 2011). The latter differs (conditions in parentheses) most notably from $P$. nepenthophilus. in coloration (conspicuous scattered bluish-white iridophores), the position of the nares (ventral), the relative size of the eyes (larger), relative body width (less broad), and the posteroventral skin flap (absent).

## 3.6 | Etymology

The name nepenthophilus is composed of two words which refer to the close ecological relationship of this species to the carnivorous plant Nepenthes mollis. "Nepentho" stands for Nepenthes
 [phílos] that means "which is loved or important." The name is masculine.

## 3.7 | Type locality

Eastern edge of Church Camp ( $\mathrm{N} 3^{\circ} 55.603200$ E $115^{\circ} 30.867600$ ), at $2,115 \mathrm{~m}$ a.s.l., about 3.7 km straight line north-east of the summit of Gunung Murud, within the Pulong Tau National Park, Sarawak, Malaysia (Borneo) (Figure 9b, c).


FIG URE 9 (a) Paratype NMBE 1073580 of Philautus nepenthophilus on Nepenthes mollis. (b) The type locality of Philautus nepenthophilus at the edge of Church Camp. (c) View along the Gunung Murud ridge near the type locality Church Camp. (d) A specimen of Philautus nepenthophilus hiding in the pitcher of Nepenthes mollis

## 3.8 | Distribution, Habitat, \& Ecology

This species is currently only known from the type locality at the Gunung Murud ridge in the Pulong Tau National Park (Figure 9c). A single specimen morphologically similar to P. nepenthophilus. was observed and photographed in a pitcher plant (Nepenthes hurrelliana, subsequently reduced to synonymy with N . mollis) from near Gunung Lumaku, Sabah, Malaysia ( 108 km north of Gunung Murud) in 1999 (personal observation by C. C. Lee \& A. Lamb) (Phillipps, Lamb, \& Lee, 2008). A confirmation of the taxonomic status of this population is lacking, because vouchers and tissue samples are not available from that area. All specimens collected or observed so far were found near or around Church Camp, perching at night on or close to Nepenthes mollis, usually associated with the aerial (upper) pitchers of the plant, at the edge of montane Kerangas forest (Figure 9a). Males perch and call from the pitchers. Several individuals escaped into the pitchers after being disturbed and dived into the liquid (Figure 9d).

All tadpoles were discovered in pitchers of Nepenthes mollis, 2-4 m above the ground. They seemed inactive in the pitcher, resting among bottom debris that had accumulated in the pitcher or at the pitcher wall (Figure 7a). Tadpoles were able to hold position at the pitcher wall suggesting some sort of adhesive mechanism. We observed two markedly different stage groups per pitcher (Figure 7b). This suggests that tadpoles from successive spawning may utilize the same pitcher together. It remains unclear whether or not the tadpoles from the two age classes came from the same female. The tadpoles co-occurred in the same pitcher with an adult. The following anuran species were recorded sympatrically: Philautus ingeri (Dring, 1987) and P. mjobergi, Nyctixalus pictus (Peters, 1871),

Rhacophorus baluensis (Inger, 1954a), Pelophryne linanitensis (Das, 2008) and P. murudensis (Das, 2008), Limnonectes aff. kuhlii, L. palavanensis (Boulenger, 1894), and Leptobrachium montanum (Fischer, 1885).

## 4 | DISCUSSION

## 4.1 | Phylogeny

This study provides a comprehensive phylogenetic analysis of Bornean Philautus based on a broad sample of numerous geographic populations. The genus Philautus is robustly supported as a natural group (Figure 1, Figures S2-S5). Philautus nepenthophilus, described in this study as a distinct species based on an integrative approach considering molecular, morphological, and bioacoustic evidence, represents a separate lineage of Philautus, that is the sister taxon to $P$. macroscelis. The taxonomic status of $P$. nepenthophilus as a valid species in accordance with the phylogenetic species concept (Cracraft, 1992), and the unified species concept (de Queiroz, 2007) is justified by the phylogenetic signal in mitochondrial and nuclear markers, by the high uncorrected pairwise genetic distance in the $16 S$ rRNA gene sequence (6.81-13.76\% interspecific vs. 0-0.25\% intraspecific), but also by the presence of several autapomorphic characters in external adult and larval morphology and by bioacoustic data (see Diagnosis and Comparison). The sister group relationship to P. macroscelis (Hertwig et al., 2011) is not only supported by genetic data, but also by larval characters. The tadpoles of $P$. macroscelis and $P$. nepenthophilus share unique features: short snout, a very small, ventral oral orifice, isolated lateral oral papillae, absence of keratodonts and oral disk, and highly reduced keratinized jaw sheaths.

The phylogenetic relationships of the clade, consisting of $P$. nepenthophilus and $P$. macroscelis and of the remaining early divergent lineages within this genus, $P$. tectus and the $P$. hosii $+P$. ingeri clade, however, could not be resolved robustly and congruently due to at most moderate support values and conflicting topologies of the separate analyses of the different data partions (Figure 1, Figures S2S5). In previous studies, the P. hosii + P. ingeri clade represented the first branching lineage (Dehling et al., 2016) or formed the sister clade to P. tectus (Chan et al., 2018; Hertwig et al., 2013; Wostl et al., 2017). However, the support values of the early branching events within Philautus were consistently low in all previous studies (Chan et al., 2018; Dehling et al., 2016; Hertwig et al., 2011, 2013; Wostl et al., 2017). We interpret the weak support of the affected nodes and the incongruencies between the obtained trees as an indication of a hard polytomy that could probably only be resolved by significantly larger data sets in future studies. Within the monophyletic group comprising the remaining species of Philautus, the phylogenetic relationships of $P$. davilabangi, P. kakipanjang, P. larutensis, and P. refugii remain unresolved and conflicting in a comparable manner (see also Dehling et al., 2016; Hertwig et al., 2011, 2013; Wostl et al., 2017).

Apart from the unresolved nodes, our hypothesis concerning the intrageneric phylogenetic relationships of Philautus is mainly congruent to results of previous molecular studies (Dehling et al., 2016; Chan et al., 2018; Hertwig et al., 2011; Hertwig et al., 2013; but see Wostl et al., 2017). The traditional intrageneric systematics with formerly recognized species groups (aurifasciatus, hosii, tectus, vermiculatus group, respectively) defined by Dring (1987) using external morphological characters (as in Malkmus et al., 2002; Malkmus \& Riede, 1996a, 1996b) is not confirmed by the outcomes of our analyses. The characters used for diagnosing these species groups-like the absence or presence of vomerine teeth and nuptial pads, pulsed advertisement call with frequency modulation-are highly variable and homoplastic within Philautus.

## 4.2 | Frog-plant interaction

We observed calling males of $P$. nepenthophilus perching on the pitcher of Nepenthes mollis and collected tadpoles, eggs, and empty egg capsules in the fluid of the pitchers (Figures 9a, d, and 7a). Potential food items for tadpoles in the pitchers were insect larvae, detritus, and algae. The reduced mouthparts and small oral orifice, as well as the large intestinal yolk mass seen in each of the larvae examined, however, suggest that the tadpoles of $P$. nepenthophilus are endotrophic and do not feed on matter in the phytotelm pitcher. Given the circumstances of collection and the morphology of the tadpoles, it appears plausible that $P$. nepenthophilus is a montane phytotelm specialist using Nepenthes pitchers for reproduction. Whether the use of pitchers of Nepenthes is mandatory or whether other phytotelmata could be used if Nepenthes pitchers were not available, remains unknown.

The carnivorous pitcher plants of the genus Nepenthes are adapted to grow in habitats with nutrient-deficient soils. They use
different nutrient acquisition strategies to compensate for the scarcity of essential nutrients, particularly nitrogen and phosphorus, in their substrates, ranging from carnivory by trapping arthropods with their pitchers (jug-shaped leaf organs) to complex mutualism with ants (Bazile et al., 2012) or small mammals (Grafe et al., 2011; Greenwood et al., 2011). Consequentially, the recorded infauna of Nepenthes pitchers is quite diverse, including fly and midge larvae, spiders, mites, ants, and crabs, but also small vertebrates like bats and frogs (Beaver, 1979; Clarke, 1997; Das \& Haas, 2010; Grafe et al., 2011; Mogi \& Yong, 1992; Ng \& Lim, 1987; Phillipps et al., 2008; Tan \& Ng, 2008).

In frogs including several, phytotelm-breeding evolved several times convergently in different major groups of anurans (Lehtinen et al., 2004). In several genera of the Rhacophoridae, the use of tree holes or bamboo stumps for deposition of eggs and the development of tadpoles has been observed (e.g., Biju et al. 2016; Haas et al., 2012; Inger et al. 2017; Meegaskumbura et al., 2015; Pham et al., 2019; Yang \& Chan, 2018). Dover (1928) was the first author who reported breeding by anurans in Nepenthes ampullaria, although the species identity of the observed tadpoles remains unclear (Das \& Haas, 2010). Subsequently, in several species of microhylids, free-swimming tadpoles that hatch and finish their development in Nepenthes pitchers were recorded: Kalophrynus "pleurostigma" (possibly K. limbooliati) (Lim \& Ng, 1991, N. ampullaria), Kalophrynus cf. heterochirus (Phillipps et al., 2008, N. stenophylla), Microhyla nepenthicola (Das \& Haas, 2010; Gorin et al., 2020, N. ampullaria), and M. borneensis (Parker, 1934, N. ampullaria). In some species of the genus Philautus, for which terrestrial direct development is assumed, deposition and incubation of the eggs in pitchers of Nepenthes have been described: P. aurifasciatus (Yong et al., 1988, N. sanguinea); P. kerangae (Dring, 1987, from N. bicalcarata), P. mjobergi (Smith, 1925, unspecified Nepenthes; Phillipps \& Lamb, 1988, N. villosa), and P. saueri (Malkmus et al., 2002, N. villosa), unspecified species of Philautus (Kiew, 1987, N. ampullaria; Clarke, 1997, N. bicalcarata; Phillipps et al., 2008, N. hurrelliana). In the majority of these anecdotal cases, however, the species assignment of the eggs or larvae was not confirmed unequivocally.

The observed strategy of $P$. nepenthophilus to breed in Nepenthes could represent a further case of mutualism (Lam \& Tan, 2018, 2019), because frogs and tadpoles provide essential nutrients like nitrogen and phosphorus to the plant. The adult frogs leave their excrements, skin fragments, and egg capsules and the tadpoles produce feces and waste after consuming their yolk in the fluid of the pitchers. In return, the plant offers an exclusive domicile, a permanent water body, and protection in the relatively safe interior of the pitchers for the tadpoles. At higher elevations of the steep Bornean mountains, permanent bodies of water are scarce or indeed absent, despite a high amount of precipitation due to local geomorphological conditions (such as steep inclination and porous soils with only a thin layer of organic substrate). The specific strategy of phytotelm breeding in Nepenthes pitchers is beneficial for the anuran larvae as it not only reduces the risk of predation and competition, but also limits the chance of
desiccation or of being washed away. From our observations, it appears that adults and tadpoles of $P$. nepenthophilus are associated solely with the upper pitchers of $N$. mollis, produced by the climbing sections of the host plant. These are held aloft among the supporting vegetation and are morphologically distinct from the lower pitchers which are typically resting on the ground. Whether this is true in all instances of their association, and whether or not upper pitchers are specifically selected for their particular shape, fluid properties, or spatial location, has yet to be determined. In addition, P. nepenthophilus has not yet been recorded from any other pitcher plant species despite the presence of four other Nepenthes taxa growing in sympatry around Church Camp. Three of these Nepenthes ( $N$. muluensis, $N$. murudensis, and $N$. tentaculata) have extensive regions of wax crystals lining the inner surface of their upper pitchers, a feature which is much reduced or absent in pitchers of $N$. mollis. This slippery waxy zone is associated with arthropod prey retention and may render the pitcher walls of these species similarly unscalable for amphibians. The fourth sympatric Nepenthes, N. lowii, has highly specialized upper pitchers designed to facilitate mammal visitation (see below) with their pitchers typically containing a high amount of animal feces and may consequently be unsuitable as a habitat for amphibians. It needs to be tested whether $P$. nepenthophilus is totally dependent on $N$. mollis as a breeding site in the sense of a nepenthebiont (sensu Clarke, 1997), or if this species also accepts other Nepenthes species or even opportunistically uses alternative phytotelmata. Furthermore, the degree to which $N$. mollis benefits from the nitrogen input provided by the reproduction of $P$. nepenthophilus remains to be investigated.

A record of mutualism already exists for the ant Camponotus schmitzi (myrmecotrophy) and N. bicalcarata, a lowland species that grows in the Bornean peat swamp forests (Bazile et al., 2012; Beccari, 1885; Bonhomme et al., 2011). In cases, where N. bicalcarata is occupied by C. schmitzi, ant-waste-derived nutrition constitutes $42 \%$ of the foliar nitrogen (Bazile et al., 2012). Several species of small mammals defaecate in the pitchers of Nepenthes when they visit the plants for roosting, resting, or feeding on the nectar provided by the plant. The woolly bat (Kerivoula hardwickii) roosts in dead pitchers of $N$. bicalcarata and N. ampullaria, but prefers the pitchers of $N$. hemsleyana. The shape of these pitchers makes them an ideal roost for bats; they are easily detected by echolocation, and the waxy texture of the pitchers' inner wall is an excellent insect deterrent, resulting in a pest-free home for the bats. When the bats sleep during the day they defaecate into the pitchers (Grafe et al., 2011; Schöner et al., 2017). Nepenthes lowii, $N$. macrophylla, and $N$. rajah are all engaged in a mutualism with the mountain treeshrew, (Tupaia montana), and N. rajah also with the summit rat (Rattus baluensis) (Chin et al., 2010; Clarke et al., 2010; Greenwood et al., 2011). The plants produce modified pitchers that produce copious amounts of sugary exudates that serve as a food source for the mammals. The exudates are only accessible to mammals when they position their hindquarters over the pitcher orifice. Consequentially, the mammals regularly defaecate into the
pitchers when they feed on the nectar secretions on the pitchers' lids and provide fecal nitrogen to the plant (Chin et al., 2010; Clarke et al., 2010; Greenwood et al., 2011). Although the basis of this mutualism between plants and frogs in general and the case of $P$. nepenthophilus and N. mollis described here for the first time, seems plausible, most aspects of interactions and potential mutual benefits are unclear.

## 4.3 | Evolution of reproductive biology

The size of the eggs found during the dissection of the females is above-modal size, and the number of eggs is comparatively low for rhacophorid frogs of the same size (Bahir et al., 2005; Gururaja \& Ramachandra, 2006; Patil \& Kanamadi, 1997). Eggs of P. kerangae are much smaller ( 3.6 mm inside female, 10 mm when froglets hatch) and clutches slightly larger (6-8 eggs per clutch) despite the larger size of the female (SVL 43 mm ) (Dring, 1987). Hertwig et al. (2011) found a clutch of three eggs from P. acutus, which measured 13 mm in diameter, including the outer jelly. Eggs of a diameter as large as the ones from P. nepenthophilus are usually found in frogs with direct development.

The posteroventral skin flap is a unique feature of the $P$. nepenthophilus tadpole (Figure 7 g ). Due to the limited sample size, we did not want to apply destructive techniques and can only speculate about the function of the skin. In external examination, the skin flap appears without musculature. The flap may be a (passive) device for attaching to the wall of the pitcher or a structure of improved gas exchange by increased skin area. A flap of skin dorsally at the head was reported in the tadpole of Shismaderma carens (Charter \& MacMurray, 1939) and suggested that it might serve gas exchange purposes. In P. nepenthophilus, capillaries are clearly present in the flap, a necessary condition for an organ of gas exchange.

The reduced mouthparts of the tadpoles and very small, ventral oral orifice (Figure 7 g ), the egg size as well as the large intestinal yolk mass seen in each of the larvae, even in the more advanced stages of P. nepenthophilus examined (Figure 7d), suggest that these tadpoles are endotrophic/lecithotrophic and do not feed on matter in the pitcher phytotelm. In P. macroscelis, the sister species of $P$. nepenthophilus, the almost completely reduced oral disk, absence of keratinized structures, narrow gill region, and the thick, yellowish intestine indicating a rich load of yolk, were also interpreted as evidence of an endotrophic mode of development (Hertwig et al., 2011). Such combination of morphological characters has been confirmed as evidence of endotrophy by histological examination in different anuran species (e.g., Das \& Haas, 2010; McDiarmid \& Altig, 1999). In Philautus, similar tadpoles were described also for P. hosii based on direct observation of the hatching and development of larvae (Inger, 1966). All three species with comparable larval stages belong to the early diverging lineages within this genus.

Anecdotal and unconfirmed observations of lecithotrophic tadpoles exist for P. kerangae (Dring, 1987) and P. mjobergi (Mjöberg in Smith, 1925). Endotrophic tadpoles are remarkable in Philautus,
because most species are believed to use direct aerial development as a reproductive strategy (Chen et al., 2020). The vast majority of rhacophorid tree frogs have free-swimming, ectotrophic tadpoles, but in many species of the genera Philautus (Gistel, 1848), Pseudophilautus (Laurent, 1943), and Raorchestes (Biju et al., 2010) from South and Southeast Asia, direct aerial development was recorded (Alcala \& Brown, 1982; Brown \& Alcala, 1982; Grosjean et al., 2008; Hertwig et al., 2011, 2014). This mode of reproduction is hypothesized as an adaptation to habitats with few or no permanent bodies of surface water depending on local climatic or geomorphological conditions (Alcala, 1962; Callery et al., 2001; Marmayou et al., 2000; Wells, 2007). However, in Philautus, aerial direct development has only been recorded in few species (Hertwig et al., 2012: P. acutus; Malkmus et al., 2002: P. saueri; Yong et al., 1988: P. aurifasciatus). In the vast majority of Philautus species, including most representatives from Borneo, however, the effective breeding behavior has actually never been confirmed by direct observations, captive breeding or genetic barcode matching of semaphoronts to each other. The closely related genera Kurixalus, Gracixalus, and Nasutixalus (Chan et al., 2018; Chen et al., 2020) are known to have free-swimming tadpoles (e.g., Biju et al., 2016; Haas et al., 2012; Pham et al., 2019; Yang \& Chan, 2018).). The genera in which direct development was confirmed in several species (Philautus, Pseudophilautus, and Raorchestes) have never been supported as a monphyletic group, rather, direct development was confirmed as having convergently evolved in the two separate lineages Philautus in Southeast Asia and Pseudophilautus/Raorchestes in the western part of the Asian distribution of the Rhacophorinae (Chan et al., 2018; Chen et al., 2020; Hertwig et al., 2013), respectively. Although the basal phylogenetic relationships of Philautus have not yet been resolved in this and all previous studies, the new record of endotrophic larvae in P. nepenthophilus questions again the hypothesis that direct development was the plesiomorphic condition in this genus (Hertwig et al., 2011; Hertwig et al., 2012; Hertwig et al., 2013; in contrast to Chen et al., 2020). The cases of $P$. macroscelis and $P$. nepenthophilus can be interpreted either as an evolutionary transition from ancestral taxa with tadpoles to more derived taxa with direct development, or in the alternative, less parsimonious scenario, as reversals from ancestral taxa with direct development to free-swimming tadpoles in the P. nepenthophilus/P. macroscelis clade and eventually independently in $P$. hosii. In order to clarify these open questions, published observations of the reproductive behavior of more Philautus species and phylogenetic analyses, that can shed light on the early evolution within that genus, are needed.
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APPENDIX 1
Sequences used to calculate the phylogenies and the reference tree for correct species identification in this study. Reference sequences were only used in the reference tree based on the $16 S$ rRNA gene for the confirmation of species identification, thus no other accession numbers can be found in the table. Location is in Malaysia if no other country is stated. ACD, Arvin Diesmos field series, specimen deposited at the National Museum of the Philippines (PNM); BORN, BORNEENSIS, stored at the Institute for Tropical Biology and Conservation, University Malaysia, Sabah, Malaysia; CAS, California Academy of Sciences, San Francisco, California, US; FM, FMNH, Field Museum Chicago, Chicago, Illinois, USA; KUHE, Graduate School of Human and Environmental Studies, Kyoto University, Kyoto, Japan; LSUHC, La Sierra University, Riverside, California, US; MZB, Museum Zoologicum Bogorinese, Bogor, Java, Indonesia; NMBE, Naturhistorisches Museum der Burgergemeinde Bern, Bern, Switzerland; RMB, Fieldno. by Rafe H. Brown; UNIMAS, Museum of Universiti Malaysia Sarawak, Kota Samarahan, Sarawak, Malaysia; ZMH, Zoological Museum of Hamburg, Germany. References: DD13, Dehling and Dehling (2013); D16, Dehling et al. (2016); DC04, Darst and Cannatella (2004); HA12, Haas et al. (2012); H11, Hertwig et al. (2011); H12, Hertwig et al. (2012); H13, Hertwig et al. (2013); G14, Gonzalez et al. (2014); M11, Meegaskumbura et al. (2011); M14, Matsui et al. (2014); W17, Wostl et al. (2017); WDTO2, Wilkinson et al. (2002).

Name in analysis Voucher No. Kurixalus appendiculatus

Kurixalus NMBE 1056476
appendiculatus
Philautus acutirostris
Ref.P.acutirostris
Philautus acutus
8898
09-223
09-224
Philautus amoenus

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Sabah, Gunung Kinabalu Park: Laban } \\
& \text { Rata Trail } \\
& \text { Sabah, Kinabalu National Park, Summit } \\
& \text { trail } \\
& \text { Sabah, Kinabalu National Park, Summit } \\
& \text { trail } \\
& \text { Sabah, Kinabalu National Park, Summit } \\
& \text { trail } \\
& \text { Sabah, Kinabalu National Park, Summit } \\
& \text { trail }
\end{aligned}
$$

ACD 6322
Philippines: Surigao Island, Surigao

- Province, Municipaility of Del Carmen

Philippines: Davao City
AY326059
JN705366

MW356581
JX091304 JX091305
 H12, this study $\begin{array}{ll}\mathrm{H} 13 & -\end{array}$

This study This study $\frac{\lambda}{\vec{n}}$
$\frac{n}{5}$
$\frac{n}{F}$ This study This study
KC961076

| Name in analysis | Voucher No. | Location | Reference | 12 r rRNA | 16 S rRNA | CytB | POMC | BDNF | NTF3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kurixalus appendiculatus |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Kurixalus appendiculatus | NMBE 1056476 | Sarawak: Gunung Mulu Natl. Park: Camp 5 | H13 | KC961248 | KC961091 | - | KC961189 | KC961139 | - |
|  | ACD 6322 | Philippines: Surigao Island, Surigao Province, Municipality of Del Carmen | G14 | - | - | KF933126 | - | - | - |
| Philautus acutirostris |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ref.P.acutirostris | RMB 589 | Philippines: Davao City | DC04 | - | AY326059 | - | - | - | - |
| Philautus acutus |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ref.P.acutus | NMBE 1056431 | Sarawak, Gunung Mulu National Park, Camp 3 | H12 | - | JN705366 | - | - | - | - |
| 8898 | NMBE 1064022 | Sarawak, Gunung Mulu National Park, Camp 3 | This study | MW356581 |  | MW356349 | MW356502 | MW356263 | - |
| 09-223 | NMBE 1056429 | Sarawak, Gunung Mulu National Park | H12, this study | JX091304 | JX091301 | MW356347 | MW356500 | MW356261 | MW356415 |
| 09-224 | NMBE 1056430 | Sarawak, Gunung Mulu National Park | H12, this study | JX091305 | JX091302 | MW356348 | MW356501 | MW356262 | MW356416 |
| Philautus amoenus |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ref.P.amoenus | UNIMAS 8052 | Sabah, Gunung Kinabalu Park: Laban Rata Trail | H13 | - | KC961076 | - | - | - | - |
| SH-1160 | NMBE 1075442 | Sabah, Kinabalu National Park, Summit trail | This study | MW356595 |  | MW356360 | MW356512 | MW356271 | MW356428 |
| SH-1161 | NMBE 1075443 | Sabah, Kinabalu National Park, Summit trail | This study | MW356597 |  | MW356361 | MW356515 | MW356315 | MW356429 |
| SH-1162 | NMBE 1075444 | Sabah, Kinabalu National Park, Summit trail | This study | MW356596 |  | MW356362 | MW356514 | MW356272 | MW356431 |
| SH-1166 | NMBE 1075446 | Sabah, Kinabalu National Park, Summit trail | This study | MW356598 |  | MW356363 | MW356513 | MW356273 | MW356430 |

SH-1166
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| Name in analysis | Voucher No. | Location | Reference | 12 SrRNA | 16 S rRNA | CytB | POMC | BDNF | NTF3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SH-1168 | NMBE 1075447 | Sabah, Kinabalu National Park, Summit trail | This study | MW356599 |  | MW356364 | MW356516 | MW356275 | MW356432 |
| Philautus aurantium |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ref.P.aurantium1 | FM233226 | Sabah, Sipitang District | H13 | - | KC961078 | - | - | - | - |
| Ref.P.aurantium2 | FMNH233226 | not available | unpublished | - | GQ204705 | - | - | - | - |
| Ref.P.aurantium3 | UNIMAS 8666 | Sabah, Crocker Range National Park | H12 | - | JN705367 | - | - | - | - |
| HEP-02669 | NMBE 1072612 | Sabah, Tawau Hills National Park, Sungei Tawau | This study | MW356582 |  | MW356350 | MW356503 | MW356264 | MW356417 |
| HEP-02670 | NMBE 1072613 | Sabah, Tawau Hills National Park, Sungei Tawau | This study | MW356583 |  | MW356351 | - | MW356269 | MW356418 |
| SH-0350 | NMBE 1072161 | Sabah, Tawau Hills National Park, Mountain Hostel | This study | MW356584 |  | - | MW356505 | MW356265 | MW356419 |
| SH-1023 | NMBE 1075221 | Sabah, Kinabalu National Park, Liwagu trail | This study | MW356585 |  | MW356352 | MW356504 | MW356270 | MW356420 |
| SH-1041 | NMBE 1075222 | Sabah, Kinabalu National Park, Liwagu trail | This study | MW356586 |  | MW356353 | MW356508 | MW356266 | MW356421 |
| SH-1062 | NMBE 1075642 | Sabah, Kinabalu National Park, Liwagu trail | This study | MW356588 |  | MW356355 | MW356506 | MW356285 | MW356422 |
| SH-1073 | NMBE 1075573 | Sabah, Kinabalu National Park, Liwagu trail | This study | MW356587 |  | MW356354 | MW356510 | MW356286 | MW356423 |
| SH-1093 | NMBE 1075290 | Sabah, Kinabalu National Park, Poring, Langanan trail and fall | This study | MW356589 |  | MW356356 | MW356509 | MW356267 | MW356424 |
| SH-1094 | NMBE 1075291 | Sabah, Kinabalu National Park, Poring, Langanan trail and fall | This study | MW356590 |  | MW356357 | MW356507 | MW356268 | MW356425 |
| Philautus bunitus |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ref.P.bunitus | UNIMAS 9045 | Sabah, Kinabalu National Park, Sayap | H12 | - | JN705368 | - | - | - | - |
| 8668 | NMBE 1063964 | Sabah, Crocker Range National Park | This study | MW356591 |  | MW356358 | - | - | MW356426 |
| SH-0568 | NMBE 1073897 | Sarawak, Payeh Maga, high camp, short cut trail | This study | MW356593 |  | - | - | - | - |
| SH-0570 | NMBE 1073899 | Sarawak, Payeh Maga, high camp, short cut trail | This study | MW356592 |  | - | - | - | - |
| Philautus davidlabangi |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ref.P.davidlabangi1 | KUHE: 19594 | Sarawak | M14 | - | AB847127 | - | - | - | - |
| Ref.P.davidlabangi2 | NMBE 1056444 | Sarawak, Batang Ai National Park, Hilton Loghouse Resort | H12 | - | JN705386 | - | - | - | - |
| Ref.P.davidlabangi3 | ZMH A10429 | Sarawak, Kubah National Park, Belian Trail | H12 | - | JN705387 | - | - | - | - |
| MD09-046 | NMBE 1068259 | Sarawak, Kubah National Park | This study | MW356666 |  | MW356390 | MW356563 | MW356342 | MW356476 |
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| Name in analysis | Voucher No. | Location | Reference | 12 SrNA | 16 S rRNA | CytB | POMC | BDNF | NTF3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MD09-073 | NMBE 1068284 | Sarawak, Kubah National Park | This study | MW356667 |  | MW356391 | MW356564 | MW356343 | MW356477 |
| Philautus disgregus |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ref.P.disgregus1 | FMNH231141 | not available | Unpublished | - | GQ204704 | - | - | - | - |
| Ref.P.disgregus2 | FM231141 | Sabah, Lahad Datu District | H13 | - | KC961077 | - | - | - | - |
| Philautus everetti |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ref.P.everetti | KU 309610 | Philippines: Palawan, Municipality of Brooke's Point: Boundary of Barangay Samarinana and Saubg: Mt. Mantalingahan: Area Pitang | H11 | - | JN705377 | - | - | - | - |
| Philautus hosii |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ref.P.hosii1 | NMBE 1057287 | Sarawak, Usun Apau National Park | H12 | - | JN705384 | - | - | - | - |
| SH-0475 | NMBE 1074000 | Sarawak, Payeh Maga, big stream below camp 1 | This study | MW356637 |  | MW356410 | MW356568 | MW356300 | MW356481 |
| SH-0493 | NMBE 1073990 | Sarawak, Payeh Maga, big stream below camp 2 | This study | MW356641 |  | MW356413 | MW356569 | MW356301 | MW356482 |
| SH-0583 | NMBE 1073884 | Sarawak, Payeh Maga, old camp 3 | This study | MW356638 |  | MW356411 | MW356571 | MW356302 | MW356484 |
| SH-0623 | NMBE 1073841 | Sarawak, Merarap Hot Spring Lodge | This study | MW356642 |  | MW356414 | MW356566 | MW356303 | MW356483 |
| SH13-106 | NMBE 1065969 | Sarawak, Paya Maga | This study | MW356636 |  | MW356408 | MW356565 | MW356298 | MW356478 |
| SH13-108 | NMBE 1065971 | Sarawak, Paya Maga | This study | MW356640 |  | MW356409 | MW356567 | MW356299 | MW356479 |
| SH13-198 | NMBE 1066061 | Sarawak, Paya Maga | This study | MW356639 |  | MW356412 | MW356570 | MW356312 | MW356480 |
| Philautus ingeri |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ref.P.ingeri1 | NMBE 1056435 | Sarawak, Gunung Mulu National Park, Camp 3 | H12 | - | JN705385 | - | - | - | - |
| Ref.P.ingeri2 | FMNH239280 | not available | unpublished | - | GQ204706 | - | - | - | - |
| 09-249 | NMBE 1056435 | Sarawak, Gunung Mulu National Park | H12, H13, this study | JN705354 | JN705385 | - | KC961173 | KC961114 | MW356485 |
| HJ12-062 | NMBE 1061706 | Sarawak, Pulong Tau NP, Gunung Murud, Lepo Bunga | This study | MW356643 |  | - | MW356572 | MW356305 | MW356486 |
| HJ12-065 | NMBE 1061677 | Sarawak, Pulong Tau NP, Gunung Murud, Lepo Bunga | This study | MW356650 |  | - | MW356573 | MW356306 | MW356487 |
| HJ12-095 | NMBE 1061675 | Sarawak, Pulong Tau NP, Gunung Murud, Lepo Bunga | This study | MW356644 |  | - | MW356574 | MW356307 | MW356488 |
| SH-0693 | NMBE 1073776 | Sarawak, Pulong Tau NP, Gunung Murud, Lepo Bunga, Trail to Churchcamp | This study | MW356647 |  | - | MW356578 | MW356310 | MW356492 |
| SH-0703 | NMBE 1073758 | Sarawak, Pulong Tau NP, Gunung Murud, Lepo Bunga, Trail to Churchcamp | This study | MW356649 |  | - | MW356579 | MW356314 | MW356493 |
| SH-0717 | NMBE 1073744 | Sarawak, Pulong Tau NP, Gunung Murud, Lepo Bunga, Trail to Churchcamp | This study | MW356648 |  | - | MW356580 | MW356311 | MW356494 |
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| Name in analysis | Voucher No. | Location | Reference | 12 SrRNA | 16S rRNA | CytB | POMC | BDNF | NTF3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SH13-235 | NMBE 1066098 | Sarawak, Pulong Tau NP, | This study | MW356651 |  | - | MW356575 | MW356308 | MW356489 |
| SH13-243 | NMBE 1066106 | Sarawak, Pulong Tau NP, | This study | MW356645 |  | - | MW356576 | MW356309 | MW356490 |
| SH13-244 | NMBE 1066107 | Sarawak, Pulong Tau NP, | This study | MW356646 |  | - | MW356577 | MW356313 | MW356491 |
| Philautus juliandringi |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ref.P.juliandringi | NMBE 1056439 | Sarawak, Gunung Mulu National Park, Gunung Api | H12 | - | JN705378 | - | - | - | - |
| 09-064 | NMBE 1056438 | Sarawak, Gunung Mulu National Park | This study | MW356607 |  | MW356365 | MW356523 | MW356329 | MW356447 |
| Philautus kakipanjang |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ref.P.kakipanjang2 | not stated | Western Sarawak | DD13 | - | KF240718 | - | - | - | - |
| AH11-075 | NMBE 1065356 | Sarawak, Gunung Penrissen | This study | MW356618 |  | MW356377 | - | MW356281 | MW356452 |
| HH10-328 | NMBE 1057558 | Sarawak, Borneo Highlands | This study | MW356621 |  | MW356379 | - | MW356279 | MW356453 |
| HJ12-225 | NMBE 1061521 | Sarawak, Borneo Highlands Resort, Mount Penrissen | This study | MW356623 |  | MW356380 | MW356541 | MW356280 | MW356456 |
| HJ12-239 | NMBE 1061504 | Sarawak, Borneo Highlands Resort, Mount Penrissen | This study | MW356622 |  | MW356378 | MW356542 | MW356282 | MW356454 |
| JMD-466 | NMBE 1060428 | Sarawak, Gunung Gading National Park | This study | MW356619 |  | MW356381 | MW356545 | MW356284 | MW356455 |
| JMD-472 | NMBE 1060429 | Sarawak, Gunung Gading National Park | This study | MW356620 |  | MW356382 | MW356543 | MW356283 | - |
| Philautus kerangae |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ref.P.kerangae1 | NMBE 1056437 | Sarawak, Gunung Mulu National Park, Mentawai Ranger Station | H13 | - | KC961079 | - | - | - | - |
| AH-08-005 | NMBE 1063696 | Sarawak, Gunung Mulu National Park | This study | MW356594 |  | MW356359 | MW356511 | MW356295 | MW356427 |
| Philautus larutensis |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ref.P.cf.larutensis | NMBE 1056443 | Sarawak, Gunung Mulu National Park, Camp 3 | H12 | - | JN705381 | - | - | - | - |
| Ref.P.larutensis1 | MZB. <br> Amph. 26152 | Indonesia: Sumatra, Lampung | W17 | - | KY435424 | - | - | - | - |
| Ref.P.larutensis2 | MZB. <br> Amph. 26866 | Indonesia: Sumatra, Aceh | W17 | - | KY435425 | - | - | - | - |
| Ref.P.larutensis3 | LSUHC_8872 | Perak | W17 | - | KY435426 | - | - | - | - |
| HJ12-018 | NMBE 1061456 | Sarawak, Gunung Murud, Sungai Bur, Pa Rabata | This study | MW356624 |  | MW356383 | MW356534 | MW356330 | MW356440 |
| HJ12-019 | NMBE 1061457 | Sarawak, Gunung Murud, Sungai Bur, Pa Rabata | This study | MW356626 |  | MW356384 | MW356535 | MW356331 | MW356441 |
| HJ12-037 | NMBE 1061443 | Sarawak, Gunung Murud, Sungai Bur, Pa Rabata | This study | MW356627 |  | MW356385 | MW356536 | MW356332 | MW356451 |
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| Name in analysis | Voucher No. | Location | Reference | 12 SRNA | 16 S rRNA | CytB | POMC | BDNF | NTF3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SH-0735 | NMBE 1073734 | Sarawak, Lepo Bunga, stream below camp | This study | MW356629 |  | MW356386 | MW356538 | MW356334 | MW356444 |
| SH-0736 | NMBE 1073735 | Sarawak, Lepo Bunga, stream below camp | This study | MW356628 |  | MW356387 | MW356539 | MW356335 | MW356445 |
| SH-0737 | NMBE 1073736 | Sarawak, Lepo Bunga, stream below camp | This study | MW356630 |  | MW356387 | MW356540 | MW356336 | MW356446 |
| SH13-208 | NMBE 1066071 | Sarawak, Pulong Tau National Park | This study | MW356625 |  | MW356389 | MW356537 | MW356333 | MW356443 |
| Philautus macroscelis |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ref.P.macroscelis1 | NMBE 1056486 | Sarawak, Gunung Mulu National Park, Sungai Tapin | H12 | - | JN705375 | - | - | - | - |
| SH-0738 | NMBE 1073737 | Sarawak, Lepo Bunga, stream below camp | This study | MW356654 |  | MW356394 | MW356552 | MW356289 | MW356473 |
| SH-0761 | NMBE 1073704 | Sarawak, Lepo Bunga, camp and trail to Churchcamp | This study | MW356653 |  | MW356393 | MW356553 | MW356290 | MW356474 |
| SH-0762 | NMBE 1073705 | Sarawak, Lepo Bunga, camp and trail to Churchcamp | This study | MW356655 |  | MW356395 | MW356554 | MW356291 | MW356475 |
| SH-0983 | NMBE 1075643 | Sabah, Kinabalu National Park, Silau Silau trail | This study | MW356656 |  | MW356396 | MW356555 | MW356292 | MW356463 |
| SH-0987 | NMBE 1075426 | Sabah, Kinabalu National Park, Silau Silau trail | This study | MW356657 |  | MW356397 | MW356556 | MW356293 | MW356464 |
| SH13-258 | NMBE 1066121 | Sarawak, Pulong Tau National Park | This study | MW356652 |  | MW356392 | MW356551 | MW356288 | MW356462 |
| Philautus mjobergi |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ref.P.mjobergi1 | NMBE 1056434 | Sarawak, Gunung Mulu National Park, Camp 3 | H12 | - | JN705380 | - | - | - | - |
| Ref.P.mjobergi2 | FMNH 252411 | not available | unpublished | - | GQ204708 | - | - | - | - |
| 09-211 | NMBE 1056446 | Sarawak, Gunung Mulu National Park | This study | MW356615 |  | MW356373 | MW356532 | MW356319 | MW356470 |
| 09-212 | NMBE 1056447 | Sarawak, Gunung Mulu National Park | This study | MW356617 |  | MW356374 | MW356530 | MW356320 | MW356471 |
| 09-257 | NMBE 1056440 | Sarawak, Gunung Mulu National Park | This study | MW356613 |  | MW356371 | MW356529 | MW356317 | MW356468 |
| 09-258 | NMBE 1056441 | Sarawak, Gunung Mulu National Park | This study | MW356614 |  | MW356372 | MW356531 | MW356318 | MW356469 |
| 09-263 | NMBE 1056449 | Sarawak, Gunung Mulu National Park | This study | MW356616 |  | MW356375 | MW356533 | MW356321 | MW356472 |
| HJ12-012 | NMBE 1061483 | Sarawak, Gunung Murud, Sungai Bur, Pa Rabata | This study | MW356612 |  | MW356367 | MW356525 | MW356325 | MW356448 |
| HJ12-022 | NMBE 1061460 | Sarawak, Gunung Murud, Sungai Bur, Pa Rabata | This study | MW356611 |  | MW356368 | MW356526 | MW356326 | MW356442 |
| HJ12-164 | NMBE 1061588 | Sarawak, Gunung Murud, Palungan | This study | MW356609 |  | MW356370 | MW356527 | MW356324 | MW356449 |
| HJ12-181 | NMBE 1061571 | Sarawak, Gunung Murud, Palungan | This study | MW356608 |  | MW356366 | MW356524 | MW356316 | MW356495 |

APPENDIX 1 (Continued)

| Name in analysis | Voucher No. | Location | Reference | 12 SrNA | 16 S rRNA | CytB | POMC | BDNF | NTF3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SH13-334 | NMBE 1065915 | Sarawak, Kelabit Highlands, Pulong Tau National Park | This study | MW356610 |  | MW356369 | MW356544 | MW356327 | MW356450 |
| Philautus nepenthophilus |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SH13-341 | NMBE 1065920 | Sarawak, Pulong Tau National Park, Churchcamp | This study | MW356658 |  | MW356398 | MW356557 | MW356344 | MW356465 |
| SH-0768 | NMBE 1073711 | Sarawak, Pulong Tau National Park, Churchcamp | This study | MW356659 |  | MW356400 | MW356558 | MW356345 | MW356466 |
| SH-0794 | NMBE 1073601 | Sarawak, Pulong Tau National Park, Churchcamp | This study | MW356660 |  | - | - | - | - |
| SH-0795 | NMBE 1073602 | Sarawak, Pulong Tau National Park, Churchcamp | This study | MW356661 |  | MW356399 | MW356559 | MW356346 | MW356467 |
| 647 | ZHM A12303 | Sarawak, Pulong Tau National Park, Churchcamp | This study | - | MW394613 | - | - | - | - |
| E685 | ZHM A12303 | Sarawak, Pulong Tau National Park, Churchcamp | This study | - | MW394617 | - | - | - | - |
| E686 | ZHM A12303 | Sarawak, Pulong Tau National Park, Churchcamp | This study | - | MW394615 | - | - | - | - |
| E689 | ZHM A12303 | Sarawak, Pulong Tau National Park, Churchcamp | This study | - | MW394614 | - | - | - | - |
| E690 | ZHM A12303 | Sarawak, Pulong Tau National Park, Churchcamp | This study | - | MW394616 | - | - | - | - |
| Philautus nephophilus |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ref.P.nephophilus | BORN 22666 | Sabah, Kinabalu | D16 | - | KT445971 | - | - | - | - |
| SH-0982 | NMBE 1075644 | Sabah, Kinabalu National Park, Silau Silau trail | This study | MW356600 |  | - | MW356517 | MW356276 | MW356433 |
| SH-0992 | NMBE 1075429 | Sabah, Kinabalu National Park, Silau Silau trail | This study | MW356601 |  | - | MW356518 | MW356277 | MW356434 |
| SH-0993 | NMBE 1075430 | Sabah, Kinabalu National Park, Silau Silau trail | This study | MW356604 |  | - | MW356522 | MW356278 | MW356435 |
| SH-0998 | NMBE 1075431 | Sabah, Kinabalu National Park, Silau Silau trail | This study | MW356602 |  | - | MW356519 | MW356322 | MW356436 |
| SH-1021 | NMBE 1075224 | Sabah, Kinabalu National Park, Liwagu trail | This study | MW356605 |  | - | MW356520 | MW356323 | MW356437 |
| SH-1039 | NMBE 1075645 | Sabah, Kinabalu National Park, Liwagu trail | This study | MW356603 |  | - | MW356521 | MW356323 | MW356438 |
| Philautus refugii |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ref.P.refugii1 | NMBE 1057544 | Sarawak, Borneo Highlands Resort | H12 | - | JN705382 | - | - | - | - |

APPENDIX 1 (Continued)

| Name in analysis | Voucher No. | Location | Reference | 12 SrNA | 16 S rNA | CytB | POMC | BDNF | NTF3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ref.P.refugii2 | ZMH A10415 | Sarawak, Kubah National Park, Summit Road | H12 | - | JN705383 | - | - | - | - |
| SH-1567 | NMBE 1078425 | Sarawak, Gunung Gading | This study | MW356631 |  | MW356403 | MW356546 | MW356337 | MW356457 |
| SH-1569 | NMBE 1078426 | Sarawak, Gunung Gading | This study | MW356632 |  | MW356404 | MW356549 | MW356341 | MW356458 |
| SH-1572 | NMBE 1078427 | Sarawak, Gunung Gading | This study | MW356633 |  | MW356405 | MW356550 | MW356338 | MW356461 |
| SH-1577 | NMBE 1078428 | Sarawak, Gunung Gading | This study | MW356634 |  | MW356406 | MW356547 | MW356340 | MW356459 |
| SH-1584 | NMBE 1078429 | Sarawak, Gunung Gading | This study | MW356635 |  | MW356407 | MW356548 | MW356339 | MW356460 |
| Philautus surdus |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ref.P.surdus | CAS 219932 | not available | WDTO2 | - | AF458138 | - | - | - | - |
| Philautus tectus |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ref.P.tectus1 | NMBE 1056451 | Sarawak, Gunung Mulu National Park, Deer Cave Trail | H12 | - | JN705370 | - | - | - | - |
| Ref.P.tectus2 | NMBE 1057080 | Sarawak, Kubah National Park: Summit Road | H12 | - | JN705369 | - | - | - | - |
| 09-073 | NMBE 1056452 | Sarawak, Gunung Mulu National Park | This study | MW356662 |  | - | MW356560 | MW356294 | MW356496 |
| AH-08-009 | NMBE 1063700 | Sarawak, Gunung Mulu National Park | This study | MW356663 |  | - | MW356561 | MW356295 | MW356499 |
| SH13-196 | NMBE 1066059 | Sarawak, Paya Maga | This study | MW356665 |  | MW356401 | - | MW356297 | MW356497 |
| SH13-197 | NMBE 1066060 | Sarawak, Paya Maga | This study | MW356664 |  | MW356402 | MW356562 | MW356296 | MW356498 |
| Philautus umbra |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ref.P.umbra | NMBE 1056454 | Sarawak, Gunung Mulu National Park: Gunung Api | H12 | - | JN705379 | - | - | - | - |
| 09-066 | NMBE 1056453 | Sarawak, Gunung Mulu National Park | This study | MW356606 |  | MW356376 | MW356528 | MW356328 | MW356439 |
| Polypedates leucomystax |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Polypedates leucomystax | NMBE 1057524 | Sarawak: Borneo Highlands Resort | H13 | KC961245 | KC961082 | - | KC961183 | KC961127 | - |
|  | FMNH 255296 | Laos | M11 | - | - | GQ204517 | - | - | - |
| Rhacophorus reinwardtii |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rhacophorus reinwardtii | NMBE 1056517 | Sarawak: Batang Ai Natl. Park: Bebyong Trail | HA12 | KC961245 | JN377366 | - | KC961155 | KC961097 | - |
|  | FMNH 235034 | Malaysia | M11 | - | - | GQ204530 | - | - | - |


[^0]:    Contributing authors: Laurence Etter (laurence_etter@bluewin.ch), Alexander Haas (alexander.haas@uni-hamburg.de), Chien C. Lee (mail@wildborneo.com.my), Pui Yong Min (YongMin. Pui@sarawakenergy.com), Indraneil Das (idas@unimas.my)
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     photography). Specimens of lot A12303 were taken as formalin samples (F, Formalin). They all form the same fieldnumber (647).

