1 **Mini-barcodes are equally useful for species identification and more suitable**

2 **for large-scale species discovery in Metazoa than full-length barcodes**

4 Running Title: mini-barcodes for species discovery

14 **Darren Yeo[1], Amrita Srivathsan[1], Rudolf Meier[1*]**

16 *[1]Department of Biological Sciences, National University of Singapore, 14 Science 8*

17 *Drive 4, Singapore 117543*

18 *[*]Corresponding author: meier@nus.edu.sg*

Abstract

New techniques for the species-level sorting of millions of specimens are needed in order to accelerate species discovery, determine how many species live on earth, and develop efficient biomonitoring techniques. These sorting methods should be reliable, scalable and cost-effective, as well as being largely insensitive to low-quality genomic DNA, given that this is usually all that can be obtained from museum specimens. Mini-barcodes seem to satisfy these criteria, but it is unclear how well they perform for species-level sorting when compared to full-length barcodes. This is here tested based on 20 empirical datasets covering ca. 30,000 specimens and 5,500 species, as well as six clade-specific datasets from GenBank covering ca. 98,000 specimens for over 20,000 species. All specimens in these datasets had full-length barcodes and had been sorted to species-level based on morphology. Mini-barcodes of different lengths and positions were obtained *in silico* from full-length barcodes using a sliding window approach (3 windows: 100-bp, 200-bp, 300-bp) and by excising nine mini-barcodes with established primers (length: 94 – 407-bp). We then tested whether barcode length and/or position reduces species-level congruence between morphospecies and molecular Operational Taxonomic Units (mOTUs) that were obtained using three different species delimitation techniques (PTP, ABGD, objective clustering). Surprisingly, we find no significant differences in performance for both species- or specimen-level identification between full-length and mini-barcodes as long as they are of moderate length (>200-bp). Only very short mini-barcodes (<200-bp) perform poorly, especially when they are located near the 5' end of the Folmer region. The mean congruence between morphospecies and mOTUs is ca. 75% for barcodes >200-bp and the congruent mOTUs contain ca. 75% of all specimens. Most conflict is caused by ca. 10% of the specimens that can be

45   identified and should be targeted for re-examination in order to efficiently resolve

46   conflict. Our study suggests that large-scale species discovery, identification, and

47   metabarcoding can utilize mini-barcodes without any demonstrable loss of

48   information compared to full-length barcodes.

50   Keywords: DNA barcoding, mini-barcodes, species discovery, metabarcoding

Introduction

The question of how many species live on earth has intrigued biologists for centuries, but we are nowhere close to having a robust answer. We do know that fewer than 2 million have been described and that there are an estimated 10-100 million multicellular species on the planet (Roskov et al. 2018). We also know that many are currently being extirpated by the "sixth mass extinction" (Ceballos et al. 2015; Sánchez-Bayo and Wyckhuys 2019), with potentially catastrophic consequences for the environment (Cafaro 2015). Monitoring, halting, and perhaps even reversing this process is frustrated by the "taxonomic impediment". This impediment is particularly severe for "invertebrates" that collectively contribute much of the animal biomass (e.g., Stork et al. 2015; Bar-On et al. 2018). Most biologists thus agree that there is a pressing need for accelerating species discovery and description. This very likely requires the development of new molecular sorting methods because the traditional approach involving parataxonomists or highly-trained taxonomic experts is either too imprecise (Krell 2004) or too slow and expensive. However, any replacement method based on DNA sequences should be accurate, but also (1) rapid, (2) cost-effective and (3) and largely insensitive to DNA quality. These criteria are important because tackling the earth's biodiversity will likely require the processing of >500 million specimens, even under the very conservative assumption that there are only 10 million species (Stork 2018) and a new species is discovered with every 50 specimens processed. Cost-effectiveness is similarly important because millions of species are found in countries with limited funding and only basic research facilities. On the positive side, many species are already represented as unsorted material in museum holdings, but such specimens often yield degraded DNA (Cooper 1994). Therefore, methods that require DNA of

high-quality and quantity are not likely to be suitable for large-scale species

discovery in invertebrates.

High-throughput species discovery with barcodes

Conceptually, species discovery and description can be broken up into three

steps. The first is obtaining specimens, the second, species-level sorting, and the

third, species identification or description. Fortunately, centuries of collecting have

gathered many of the specimens that are needed for large-scale species discovery.

Indeed, for many invertebrate groups it is likely that the museum collections contain

more specimens of undescribed than described species; i.e., this unsorted collection

material represents vast and still underutilized source for species discovery (Lister et

al. 2011; Kemp 2015; Yeates et al. 2016). The second step in species

discovery/description is species-level sorting, which is in dire need of acceleration.

Traditionally, it starts with sorting unsorted material into major taxa (e.g., order-level

in insects). This task can be accomplished by parataxonomists but may in the future

be guided by robots utilizing neural networks (Valan et al. 2019). In contrast, the

subsequent species-level sorting is usually time-limiting because the specimens for

many invertebrate taxa have to be dissected and slide-mounted before they can be

sorted to species-level by highly-skilled specialists; i.e., the traditional techniques are

neither rapid nor cost-effective. This impediment is likely to be responsible for why

certain taxa that are known to be abundant and species-rich are particularly poorly

studied (Bickel 1999).

An alternative way to sort specimens to species-level would be with DNA

sequences. This approach is particularly promising for metazoan species because

most multicellular animal species can be distinguished based on cytochrome c

oxidase subunit I (*cox1*) barcode sequences (Hebert et al. 2003). However, such

sorting requires that every specimen is barcoded. This creates cost- and scalability

problems when the barcodes are obtained with Sanger sequencing (see Taylor and

Harris 2012). Such sequencing is currently still the standard in many barcoding

studies because the animal barcode was defined as a 658-bp long fragment of *cox1*

("Folmer region": Folmer et al. 1994), although sequences >500-bp with <1%

ambiguous bases are also considered BOLD-compliant (Barcode Of Life Data

System: BOLDsystems.org). The 658-bp barcode was optimized for ABI capillary

sequencers but it has become a burden because it is not suitable for cost-effective

sequencing with Illumina platforms.

Due to these constraints, very few studies have utilized DNA barcodes to sort

entire samples into putative species (but see Fagan-Jeffries et al. 2018). Instead,

most studies use a mixed approach where species-level sorting is carried out based

on morphology before a select few specimens per morphospecies are barcoded (e.g.

Riedel et al. 2010). Unfortunately, this two-step process requires considerable

amounts of skilled manpower and time and does not allow for an unbiased

assessment of congruence-levels between morphology and DNA barcodes.

Obtaining Barcodes with High Throughput Sequencing

Fortunately, scalability and cost-effectiveness are hallmark features of the

new high throughput sequencing (HTS) technologies. These technologies are

particularly suitable for sequencing the kind of degraded DNA that is typical of

museum specimens. Indeed, hybrid capture has already been optimized for the use

with old museum specismens (Bi et al. 2013; Guschanski et al. 2013; Blaimer et al.

2016) and is likely to play a major role for the integration of rare species into

taxonomic and systematic projects. It will be difficult and expensive, however, to

apply enrichment methods to millions of specimens because such methods require

time-consuming and expensive molecular protocols (e.g., specimen-specific

libraries). Fortunately, for most species the initial species-level pre-sorting can be

achieved using barcodes that can be obtained via "tagged amplicon sequencing" on

a variety of next-generation sequencing platforms ("NGS barcodes": Wang et al.

2018; Yeo et al. 2018).

Until recently, obtaining full-length NGS barcodes via tagged amplicon

sequencing was difficult because the reads of most next-generation-sequencing

platforms were too short for sequencing the full-length barcode. This has now

changed with the arrival of third-generation platforms (ONT: MinION: Srivathsan et

al. 2018, 2019; PacBio: Sequel: Hebert et al. 2018). These platforms, however,

come with drawbacks; *viz* elevated sequencing error rates and higher cost. These

problems are likely to be overcome in the future (e.g. Yang et al. 2018), but this

would still not solve the main challenge posed by full-length barcodes; i.e., problems

with reliably obtaining amplicons from museum specimens with degraded DNA (e.g.

Hajibabaei et al. 2006). We thus submit that it is time to use empirical evidence to

determine at which length and in which position mini-barcodes are as effective for

pre-sorting specimens into putative species as full-length barcodes.

Mini-barcodes

Barcodes that are shorter than the full-length barcode are often referred to as

"mini-barcodes". They are obtained with primers that amplify shorter subsets of the

original barcode region and have three key advantages. Firstly, mini-barcodes are

predicted to amplify more readily when the DNA in the sample is degraded. This was

confirmed by several studies comparing amplification success rates for mini- and full-

length barcodes for the same DNA template (Hajibabaei et al. 2006; Meusnier et al.

2008; Hajibabaei and McKenna 2012). This property makes mini-barcodes the

preferred choice for barcoding museum specimens that had been stored under

suboptimal conditions for decades. The ease of amplification is also one of the

reasons why mini-barcodes are the default for metabarcoding projects that rely on

environmental DNA with widely varying DNA quality [e.g., gut content, faeces

(Deagle et al. 2006)].

A second benefit of mini-barcodes is that they can be sequenced at low cost

on short-read sequencing platforms (e.g., Illumina). The maximum amplicon lengths

that such platforms can accommodate is ~450-bp including primer length (using 250-

bp paired-end sequencing libraries), which necessitates the amplification and

sequencing of two overlapping regions to recover the entire 658-bp barcode

(Shokralla et al. 2015b). However, given the additional time and resources required,

it begs the question if there is much to be gained by investing in full-length barcodes.

Full-length barcodes are often automatically assumed to improve performance but

more data does not automatically yield better results. There is often a saturation

point beyond which additional data have little impact on results while increasing

consumable and manpower cost. Occasionally, more data can even be detrimental.

For example, fast-evolving genes or third positions in protein-encoding genes can

worsen the results of phylogenetic analyses addressing the relationships between

old clades. Note that this could also be a concern for barcodes, because sequence

variability changes across the Folmer region of COI (Roe and Sperling 2007;

Pentinsaari et al. 2016). Overall, it is important that one should use empirical data to

determine how long barcodes have to be in order to be informative.

Unfortunately, the performance of mini-barcodes remains insufficiently tested

despite their ubiquitous use in metabarcoding. The existing tests suffer from lack of

scale (the largest study includes 6695 barcodes for 1587 species: Meusnier et al.

2008) or taxonomic scope (usually only 1-2 family-level taxa: e.g. Hajibabaei et al.

2006; Yu and You 2010). Furthermore, the tests yielded conflicting results.

Hajibabaei et al. (2006) found high congruence with the full-length barcode when

species are delimited based on mini-barcodes and Meusnier et al. (2008) find similar

BLAST identification rates for mini-barcodes and full-length barcodes in their *in silico*

tests. However, Yu and You (2010) conceded that mini-barcodes may have worse

accuracy despite having close structural concordance with the full-length barcode. In

addition, Sultana et al. (2018) concluded that the ability to identify species is

compromised when the barcodes are too short (<150-bp), but it remained unclear at

which length/position mini-barcodes stop performing poorly. Furthermore, published

tests of mini-barcodes compare their performance to results obtained with full-length

barcodes. All conflict is then considered evidence for the failure of mini-barcodes,

even though the Folmer region varies in nucleotide variability (Roe and Sperling

2007) and conflict alone does not settle which result is correct. Lastly, the existing

tests of mini-barcodes do not include a sufficiently large number of different mini-

barcodes in order to be able to detect positional and length effects across the 658-bp

barcode region.

Here, we address the lack of scale in previous tests by including 20 empirical

studies covering 5500 species (ca. 30,000 barcodes) and Genbank data for 20,673

species (ca. 98,000 barcodes). We test a large number of different mini-barcodes by

applying a sliding window approach to generate mini-barcodes of different lengths

(100, 200, 300-bp window length, 60-bp intervals) and compare the results to the

performance of nine mini-barcodes with established primers (mini-barcode length: 94

– 407-bp). The taxonomic scope of our study is broad and includes a wide variety of

metazoans ranging from earthworms to butterflies and birds. Lastly, we do not

assume that mOTUs based on full-length barcodes are more accurate than those

obtained with mini-barcodes. Instead, we assess whether mOTUs obtained with

different-length barcodes have different levels of congruence with morphospecies;

i.e. morphology is treated as a constant and we only test whether barcode length

and/or position influence the number of morphospecies that are recovered. All

specimens that are mis-sorted based on morphology (e.g. due to the presence of

cryptic species) will be equally mis-sorted for the full-length barcodes and the mini-

barcodes that are derived from the former via shortening; i.e., misidentified

specimens become noise. What we assess is whether there is an additional loss of

congruence between barcodes and morphology as the barcode length shrinks or

mini-barcodes are in a different position within the Folmer region of COI.

We also compare the performance of different species delimitation methods.

There has been substantial interest in developing algorithms for mOTU estimation,

leading to the emergence of various species delimitation algorithms over the past

decade (e.g. objective clustering: Meier et al. 2006; BPP: Yang and Rannala 2010;

jmOTU: Jones et al. 2011; ABGD: Puillandre et al. 2012; BINs: Ratnasingham and

Hebert 2013; PTP: Zhang et al. 2013; etc.). For the purposes of this study, we

selected three algorithms that represent distance- and tree-based methods: objective

clustering, Automatic Barcode Gap Discovery (ABGD) and Poisson Tree Process

(PTP). Objective clustering utilizes an *a priori* distance threshold to group sequences

into clusters, ABGD groups sequences into clusters based on an initial prior and

recursively uses incremental priors to find stable partitions, while PTP utilizes the

branch lengths on the input phylogeny to delimit species units. Note that PTP is

frequently applied to trees derived from barcode data (e.g. Ermakov et al. 2015; Han

et al. 2016; Hollatz et al. 2016). There are numerous additional techniques for

species delimitation, but most require multiple markers and thus do not scale easily

to millions of specimens.

In addition to species delimitation, we also examine the utility of mini-

barcodes for species identification, which is the original use of DNA barcodes

(Hebert et al. 2003). Species identification with barcodes is particularly valuable for

the detection of specific species and community characterization via metabarcoding

studies (Ficetola et al. 2008; Lim et al. 2016; Morinière et al. 2019). Most of these

studies tend to involve poor quality genetic material (i.e., gut content, faecal matter,

environmental DNA) and hence it would be valuable to know whether short markers

can be reliably used to assign species names to unidentified mini-barcodes. We here

test the performance of the barcodes using "best close match", which considers

those sequences correctly identified when they match conspecific barcodes within a

predefined threshold (Meier et al. 2006).

Materials & Methods

Dataset selection, alignment, excising in silico mini-barcodes

We surveyed the barcoding literature in order to identify 20 recent publications

from 2007 – 2017 that cited the original barcode paper by Hebert et al. (2003) and

met the following criteria: 1) have specimens where the barcoded specimens were

pre-sorted/identified based on morphology and 2) the dataset had at least 500

specimens with *cox1* barcodes >656-bp (Table S1a). In addition, we compiled six

additional datasets based on sequences from GenBank for species-rich metazoan

taxa: Actinopterygii, Arachnida, Coleoptera, Diptera, Hymenoptera and Lepidoptera.

The clade names were used for taxonomy searches in NCBI and all mitochondrial

nucleotide sequences of length 657-1000 bp were downloaded. To these, we added

annotated *cox1* sequences from mitochondrial genomes (mitochondrial sequences

of length 10,000-20,000 bp). Subsequently, we filtered for the *cox1* gene using an

alignment to a reference full-length *cox1* barcode with MAFFT's --add function

(Katoh and Standley 2013), where any non-target sequences are easily identified by

large indels and discarded. We then removed all sequences that were shorter than

657-bp, introduced indels in the multiple sequence alignment, were not identified to

species, or included ambiguous species names. Four of the datasets (Actinopterygii:

21,390 barcodes, Coleoptera: 44,403 barcodes, Diptera: 56,344 barcodes,

Lepidoptera: 198,441 barcodes), were too large for a full evaluation using all species

delimitation methods. We therefore randomly selected 20,000 sequences (=RAND()

in Microsoft Excel) for further analysis. These six datasets comprised 97,758

barcodes for 20,673 morphospecies after subsampling (Table S1b).

The barcode sequences were downloaded from BOLDSystems or NCBI

GenBank and aligned with MAFFT v7 (Katoh and Standley 2013) with a gap opening

penalty of 5.0. Using a custom Python script, we generated three sets of mini-

barcodes along a "sliding window" for the 20 empirical datasets. They were of 100-,

200- and 300-bp lengths. The first iteration begins with the first base pair of the 658-

bp barcode and the shifting windows jump 60-bp at each iteration, generating ten

100-bp windows, eight 200-bp windows and six 300-bp windows. Additionally, we

identified nine mini-barcodes with published primers within the *cox1* Folmer region

(Fig. 1 & Table S2). These mini-barcodes have been repeatedly used in the literature

for a broad range of taxa. The primers for the various mini-barcodes were aligned to

the homologous regions of each dataset with MAFFT v7 --addfragments (Katoh and

Standley 2013) in order to identify the precise position of the mini-barcodes within

the full-length barcode. The mini-barcode subsets from each barcode were then

identified after alignment to full-length barcodes to mark the start and end-point of

the amplicon. Note that most of the published primers are in the 5' region of the full-

length barcode. The nine mini-barcodes with published primers were assessed for

the 20 empirical and for the six GenBank datasets.

Species delimitation

Mini-barcodes and full-length barcodes were clustered into putative species

using three species delimitation algorithms: objective clustering (Meier et al. 2006),

ABGD (Puillandre et al. 2012) and PTP (Zhang et al. 2013). For objective clustering,

the mOTUs were clustered at 2 – 4% uncorrected p-distance thresholds (Srivathsan

and Meier 2012) using a Python script which re-implements the objective clustering

of Meier et al. (2006) and allows for batch processing. The p-distance thresholds

selected are the typical distance thresholds used for species delimitation in the

literature (Meier et al. 2006, 2016; Ratnasingham and Hebert 2013). The same

datasets were also clustered with ABGD (Puillandre et al. 2012) using the default

range of priors and with uncorrected p-distances, but the minimum slope parameter

(-X) was reduced in a stepwise manner (1.5, 1.0, 0.5, 0.1) if the algorithm could not

find a partition. We then considered the ABGD clusters at priors P=0.001, P=0.01

and P=0.04. The priors (P) refer to the maximum intraspecific divergence and

function similarly to p-distance thresholds at the first iteration. In the ABGD

algorithm, they are refined by recursive application. Lastly, in order to use PTP, we

generated maximum likelihood (ML) trees in RAxML v.8 (Stamatakis 2014) via rapid

bootstrapping (-f a) under the GTRCAT model. For the 20 empirical datasets, the

best tree generated for each dataset was then used for species delimitation with PTP

(Zhang et al. 2013) under default parameters. For the six much larger clade-based

datasets, we used mPTP (Kapli et al. 2017) with the --single parameter as the

original algorithm took too long to yield results. In order to reduce computational time

for RAxML and PTP, haplotype representatives were used for the six Genbank

dataset instead of the entire dataset. The remaining barcodes with identical

haplotypes were then mapped back into the same mOTU clusters using their

respective haplotypes.

Performance assessment

The performance of mini-barcodes was assessed using morphospecies as an

external arbiter. Species-level congruence was quantified using match ratios

between molecular and morphological groups (Ahrens et al. 2016). The ratio is

defined as $\frac{2 \times N_{match}}{N_1 + N_2} \times 100$, where N_{match} is the number of clusters identical across

both mOTU delimitation methods/thresholds (N_1 & N_2). Consolidated match ratios

are derived by first summing relevant all numerator and denominator values before

calculating the ratio. Incongruence between morphospecies and mOTUs is usually

caused by a few specimens that are assigned to the "incorrect" mOTUs. Conflict at

the specimen-level can thus be quantified as the number of specimens that are in

mOTUs that cause conflict with morphospecies.

In order to test whether barcode length is a significant predictor of

congruence, MANOVA tests were carried out in R (R Core Team 2017) with "match

ratio" (species-level congruence) as the response variable and "dataset" and "mini-

barcode" as categorical explanatory variables. We found that most of the variance in

our study was generated by the variable "dataset" (P < 0.05 in MANOVA tests).

Given that we were interested in the effect of barcode length and position, "dataset"

was subsequently treated as a random effect and "mini-barcode" as the explanatory

variable (categorical) in a linear mixed effects model (R package *lme4*: Bates et al.

2014). The *emmeans* R package (Lenth 2018) was then used to perform pairwise

post-hoc Tukey tests between mini- and full-length barcodes so as to assess

whether either barcode was performing significantly better/worse. To compare the

differences in performance between objective clustering, ABGD and PTP, ANOVA

tests were performed in R. After which, pairwise Tukey tests were used to determine

which species delimitation method was responsible for significant differences. Lastly,

in order to explore the reasons for positional effects, the proportion of conserved

sites for each mini-barcode was obtained using MEGA6 (Tamura et al. 2013).

Match ratios indicate congruence at the species level, but it is also important

to determine how many specimens have been placed into congruent units. Note that

species- and specimen-level congruence are only identical when all mOTUs are

represented by the same number of specimens. However, specimen abundances

are rarely equal across species and hence match ratio is insufficient at

characterizing congruence between mOTUs and morphospecies. It is straightforward

to determine the number of congruent specimens as follows:

(1) Congruence Class I specimens: If $A = B$ then number of congruent specimens is

$Nc_1 = |A|$ OR $|B|$.

Lack of congruence is caused by morphospecies that are split, lumped, or

both split and lumped in the mOTUs. This means that a single mis-sorted specimen

placed into a single, large-sized mOTU leads to all specimens in two mOTUs to be

considered "incongruent" according to the criterion outlined above. Yet, most

specimens are congruent and full congruence could be restored by re-assigning the

mis-sorted specimen after re-examination. It is therefore also desirable to determine

the number of specimens that require re-examination or, conversely, the number of

specimens that would be congruent if one were to remove a few incongruent

specimens. This number of specimens can be estimated by counting congruent

specimens as follows:

(2) Congruence Class II specimens: Specimens that are in split or lumped mOTUs

relative to morphospecies. Here, the largest subset of congruently placed specimens

can be determined as follows. If $A_1 \cup A_2 \cup ... \cup A_x = B$: $Nc_2 = \max(|A_1|, |A_2| ... |A_x|)$

(3) Congruence Class III specimens: This covers specimens in sets of clusters that

are both split and lumped relative to morphospecies. Here, only those specimens are

considered potentially congruent that (1) are in one mOTU and one morphospecies

and (2) combined exceed the number of the other specimens in the set of clusters. In

detail, if $A_1 \cup A_2 \cup ... \cup A_x = B_1 \cup B_2 \cup ... \cup B_y$: $Nc_3 = \max(|A_1 \cap B_1|, |A_2 \cap$

$B_1| ... |A_x \cap B_y|)$ only if $\max(|A_1 \cap B_1|, |A_2 \cap B_1| ... |A_x \cap B_y|) > \frac{1}{2}(|A_1 \cup A_2 ... A_x|)$.

Note that these are approximate (over)estimates because we did not re-cluster

specimens after the removal of the specimens that were causing incongruence in the

original sets of clusters.

Species identification

Using the full-length and mini-barcode sets corresponding to published

primers, we assessed whether the barcodes were yielding conspecific matches

according to "best close match" implemented in SpeciesIdentifier program

(TaxonDNA: Meier et al. 2006). "Best close match" examines one barcode at a time.

It considers it unidentified and then determines whether the best-matching reference

sequence in the dataset is conspecific and within a user-defined distance threshold.

The distance threshold used for all assessments was 2%, which corresponds to the

best match ratio performance results for objective clustering in this study. Sequences

with conspecific matches within 2% are considered correctly identified, while

sequences that match allospecific sequences within 2% are considered incorrectly

identified. Sequences without matches within 2% are considered unidentified and

sequences that have both con- and allo-specific matches within the threshold are

considered to have an ambiguous identification. Mixed effects models were again

used to assess the performance of barcodes of different length. Similarly, pairwise

Tukey tests were used to test for statistical significance with the proportion of correct

matches as the response variable in order to determine whether the full-length

barcode performed significantly better than the mini-barcodes.

Amplification success rates for 313-bp and 658-bp amplicons

We tested amplification success rates for 47-48 specimens (~1mm) from six

Malaise trap samples of different age (2012 and 2018). The same genomic DNA was

used for each specimen for the amplification of the full-length barcode and a mini-

barcode of 313-bp length in two separate PCRs using different tagged primers:

HCO2198 (5'-TAAACTTCAGGGTGACCAAAAAATCA-3') and LCO1490 (5'-

GGTCAACAAATCATAAAGATATTGG-3') (658-bp; Folmer et al. 1994), mlCOlintF

(5'-GGWACWGGWTGAACWGTWTAYCCYCC-3') and jgHCO2198 (5'-

TAIACYTCIGGRTGICCRAARAAYCA-3') (313-bp; Leray et al. 2013). The PCR

reagents used were 5.0µl Taq MasterMix (CW0682; CWBio, Beijing, China), 1.0µl

RNase-free water, 0.5µl bovine serum albumin (1.0 mM), 0.5µl $MgCl_2$, 1.0µl of each

primer and 1.0µl of genomic DNA extract. The PCRs were run at 95°C for 5min, with

35 cycles of 94°C for 1min, 45°C for 2min and 72°C for 1min, and a final extension at

72°C for 5min. PCR amplification success was assessed using a 1% agarose gel,

with the electrophoresis run at 90V for 30min. Band presence was tabulated and chi-

squared performance testing was performed in R (R Core Team 2017).

Results

Evaluation of mini-barcode congruence with morphology

For species delimitation with objective clustering, we found that the 2% p-

distance threshold yielded the highest congruence-levels across the datasets. It was

hence used as the upper-bound estimator for assessing species- and specimen-level

congruence (see supplementary materials for corresponding results for the 3 and 4%

p-distances). For ABGD, average congruence was maximized for the prior P=0.001

and this prior was used in the main analysis (see supplementary material for results

under P=0.01 and P=0.04). PTP does not require *a priori* parameter choices. Overall

consolidated match ratio values range from 68 – 74% for these selected parameters

(Fig. 3), with the 20 empirical datasets generally performing better than the six clade-

based datasets (empirical/clade-based: OC at 2%: 81/72%; ABGD P=0.001: 76/69%;

PTP: 76/66%). Overall match ratios for the other objective clustering and ABGD

parameters tested range from 61 – 74% (Fig. S6).

The MANOVA tests performed on all treatments (species delimitation method

and distance threshold/prior) indicated that the test variable "dataset" was

responsible for much of the observed variance in our measure of congruence

("match ratio"). The choice of mini-barcode or algorithm for generating mOTUs was

of secondary importance (Table S3). After accounting for "dataset", we find that only

mini-barcodes <200-bp perform significantly worse than full-length barcodes (Fig. 2).

This is evident from the large number of significant differences ($p < 0.05$ & $p < 0.001$)

in pairwise post-hoc Tukey tests applied to 100-bp mini- and 657-bp full-length

barcodes. Only short barcodes (<100-bp) have a mean performance that is worse

(<0 match ratio deviation) than the full-length barcode. Conversely, for mini-

barcodes >200-bp, congruence with morphospecies does not differ significantly and

is occasionally superior to what is observed for the full-length barcode. Across all

datasets (20 empirical and 6 clade-based), species delimitation methods, and

clustering parameters (Fig. 3 & S6), the full-length barcode have the highest

congruence values in 49 of the 182 tests, but in 8 of these cases it is a tie and in an

additional 19 some mini-barcodes are within 0.5%. Furthermore, there is no

significant difference between the 200-bp and 300-bp mini-barcodes and the full-

length barcode when objective clustering or PTP are used to estimate mOTUs.

However, for all mOTU delimitation methods, the variance across datasets declines

as the mini-barcode increases in length (Fig. 2). The results obtained for *in silico*

mini-barcodes are broadly consistent with the performance of mini-barcodes

corresponding to published primers: the mini-barcodes of 94-bp, 130-bp, and 145-bp

lengths tend to perform worse than the longer mini-barcodes (Fig. 3). Congruence at

the species level is similar to congruence at the specimen level (Tables 1 & S8) with

some exceptions such as the performance improvements of short mini-barcodes, for

example, for the "French Guiana earthworms" when grouped with objective

clustering.

The results obtained for the 20 empirical datasets are similar to what is found

for the taxon-specific datasets consisting of sequences from GenBank. There are

small differences in match ratios for barcodes >200-bp and only very short barcodes

perform poorly. In many cases, the full-length barcode does not yield the best

performance compared to the mini-barcodes. An exception is the Coleoptera where

ABGD behaves erratically (Fig. 3). Short barcodes outperform long barcodes under

the lowest prior (P=0.001), but this trend reverses for higher priors.

With regard to specimen-based congruence, we focused on the mini-

barcodes with published primers that are >200-bp. For the 20 empirical datasets,

approximately three quarters of all specimens are in the "Congruence Class I"

(Tables 1 & S8); i.e., their placement is congruent between mOTUs and

morphospecies (Average/Median: OC at 2%: 77/77%; ABGD P=0.001: 74/74%;

PTP: 77/77%). The remaining specimens are placed in mOTUs that are split,

lumped, or split and lumped. The number of specimens that are responsible for

splitting and lumping are classified as Congruence Class II and III specimens (see

Materials and Methods). Overall, fewer than 10% of the specimens fall into these

categories (Table 1: see Class II specimens across species delimitation methods);

i.e., a fairly small number of specimens have to be studied when addressing conflict

between morphospecies and mOTUs. For the six clade-based datasets, there is

generally lower specimen congruence (Class I Average/Median: OC at 2%: 57/57%;

ABGD P=0.001: 53/54%; PTP: 57/57%), although this improves to ca. 75% at Class

II and ca. 80% at Class III. Note that a single mis-identified *D. melanogaster* could

result in all correctly identified specimens of this species to be considered

"incongruent" because they are no longer member of a congruent mOTU.

Species delimitation method

When the performance of the three different clustering methods was

compared, significant differences (p < 0.05 in ANOVA test) were found only for 100-

bp mini-barcodes (Fig. 4). Here, pairwise post-hoc Tukey tests find that objective

clustering performs significantly better than the other delimitation methods (p <

0.001) while ABGD and PTP do not differ significantly (p = 0.88) but behave

erratically for short mini-barcodes (Fig. 2).

Positional effects

Mini-barcodes situated at the 5' end of the full-length barcode perform

somewhat worse than those situated at the middle or at the 3' end (Fig. 2). For

example, the 100-bp mini-barcodes at the 5' end perform poorly for objective

clustering (mini-barcode midpoints at 50, 110 & 170-bp), ABGD (mini-barcode

midpoints at 110 & 170-bp) and PTP (mini-barcode midpoint at 110-bp). This effect

is, however, only statistically significant when the mini-barcodes are very short (100-

bp). This positional effect is observed across all species delimitation techniques.

Note that the 5' end of the full-length barcode appears to contain a large proportion

of conserved sites, particularly around the 170-bp and 230-bp midpoint of the 100-bp

mini-barcode (Fig. 5).

Species identification performance

When comparing the suitability of full-length and mini-barcodes for

identification purposes, we find that full-length barcodes frequently have the highest

number of correct matches (Table 2), but the differences are only statistically

significant for short mini-barcodes <200-bp: 94-bp: p = <0.0001, 130-bp: p =

<0.0001, 145-bp: p = <0.0001, 164-bp: p = 0.0243. All the remaining mini-barcodes:

(189 – 407-bp) have non-significant differences. Note that this is not due to scale

because we are using fairly large datasets here (p = 0.0691 – 0.9996). However, for

many datasets (e.g., Northwest Pacific Molluscs, North American Birds, etc.), the

proportion of ambiguous matches is higher for very short mini-barcodes (94-bp –

164-bp).

Amplification success rates

The 313-bp mini-barcode amplified significantly better than the full-length

barcode (472/570: 82.8% vs. 361/570: 63.3%; chi-squared test: p = <0.001) (Fig.

S9). Overall, the performance differences were greater for samples with overall low

amplification success rates (but see sample 4822).

Discussion

Accelerating species discovery and description are arguably foremost

challenges for the systematics of the 21st century because biodiversity is in steep

decline while systematists are still grappling with establishing the size and

distribution of the biodiversity that needs protection. Specimens for many

undescribed species are already in the world's natural history museums, but the

samples need to be sorted to species-level before they become available for species

identification/description and can be used for large-scale analyses of biodiversity

patterns. Pre-sorting specimens with DNA barcodes is a potentially promising

solution because it is scalable, can be applied to millions of specimens, and much of

the specimen handling can be automated. However, in order for this approach to be

viable, a sufficiently large proportion of the pre-sorted units need to accurately reflect

species boundaries. Furthermore, the methods should be suitable for processing

specimens that only yield degraded DNA. Mini-barcodes appear attractive on

technical grounds because sequencing short amplicons is cheap (Wang et al. 2018:

sequencing cost < 4 cents) and such amplicons have higher PCR amplification rates

especially if the DNA template is degraded. The latter has been repeatedly

discussed in the literature (Hajibabaei et al. 2006; Meusnier et al. 2008; Hajibabaei

and McKenna 2012) and was also confirmed here by comparing identification

success rates for a mini-barcode (313bp) and the full-full length barcode using the

same template (Fig. S9).

However, the use of mini-barcodes for species-level pre-sorting would

nevertheless have to be discouraged if full-length barcodes were to significantly

outperform mini-barcodes with regard to the accuracy of sorting specimens into

species. This is what we tested here and we find that mini-barcodes of moderate

length (>200 bp) perform as well as full-length barcodes.

The main source of variance of congruence: datasets

Overall, we here find that the average congruence between mOTUs and

morphospecies is 80% for all barcodes >200-bp (median: 83%) in the 20 empirical

datasets, with the median being higher (83%) because of a few outlier datasets with

low congruence <65% (OC at 2%; ABGD P=0.001, PTP). Similar variance is also

observed for the six clade-specific GenBank datasets. Both types of datasets were

tested because GenBank data are less likely to be affected by the idiosyncrasies of

individual study designs, but is known to contain misidentified sequences

(Mioduchowska et al. 2018). We overall find that the results are nevertheless similar

(Fig. 3 & S6) although the average congruence between mOTUs and morphospecies

is somewhat lower for GenBank datasets (mean=72%, median=71% for all

barcodes >200-bp across all three species delimitation methods and parameters).

Full-length barcodes only have the highest congruence level in 13 of the 42

treatments, but in 10 of those, the second highest congruence level for a mini-

barcode was only <0.5% lower. Mini-barcodes <200-bp perform poorly with the

possible exception of those for Coleoptera where mini-barcodes <200-bp perform

well under ABGD under two priors (Figs. 3 & S6: P=0.001, P=0.01).

Most studies assessing congruence levels between barcodes and morphology

focus on species-level congruence. However, specimen-level congruence is equally

important because the basic units in a museum collection or ecological surveys are

specimens. The correct placement of specimens into species is thus important for

systematists and biodiversity researchers alike given that the former would like to

see most of the specimens in a collection correctly placed and the latter often need

abundance and biomass information with species-level resolution. We find that for

the 20 empirical datasets, 74-77% (median) of the ca. 30,000 specimens are

assigned to species that are supported by molecular and morphological data even

under the strictest conditions (Table 1). Overall, this is a very high proportion

compared to species-level congruence obtained with species-level sorting by

parataxonomists (Krell 2004).

The remaining ca. 25% of specimens are placed in mOTUs whose boundaries

do not agree with morphospecies. One may initially consider this an unacceptably

high proportion, but it is important to keep in mind that the misplacement of one

specimen (e.g., due to a misidentification or contamination of a PCR product) will

render two mOTUs incongruent; i.e., all specimens in these mOTUs will be

considered incongruent and contribute to the 25% of "incongruently" placed

specimens. Arguably, one may instead want to investigate how many specimens are

causing the conflict. These are the specimens that should be targeted for re-

investigation in reconciliation studies using additional data. The proportion across the

20 datasets in our study is fairly low and ranges from 9-11% (median) depending on

which mOTU delimitation technique is used.

The six GenBank datasets however, have notably lower congruence-levels for

specimens (Class I median: 54-57%), with the Actinopterygii (47-48% median) and

Hymenoptera (45-47% median) having the poorest performance (Table S8). The

overall lower congruence could be caused by the misidentification of a few

specimens belonging to large mOTUs. This is supported by the greater difference

between Class I and Class III for the clade-based datasets as compared to the

empirical ones. Identifications from the empirical datasets are also more likely to be

standardized within the study and consequently have fewer potential conflicts

caused by differing taxon concepts associated with the same name (Franz 2005;

Meier 2017).

Conflict between mOTUs and morphospecies can be caused by technical

error or biology. A typical technical factor would be accidental misplacement of

specimens due to lab contamination or error during morphospecies sorting. Indeed,

the literature is replete with cases where mOTUs that were initially in conflict with

morphospecies became congruent once the study of additional morphological

characters let to the revision of morphospecies boundaries (e.g. Smith et al. 2008;

Tan et al. 2010; Baldwin et al. 2011; Ang et al. 2017). But there are also numerous

biological reasons why one should not expect perfect congruence between mOTUs

and species. Lineage sorting, fast speciation, large amounts of intraspecific

variability, and introgression are known to negatively affect the accuracy of DNA

barcodes (Will and Rubinoff 2004; Rubinoff et al. 2006; Meier 2008). It is thus

somewhat heartening that regardless of these issues, the final levels of congruence

between morphospecies and DNA sequences are often quite high in animals (Ball et

al. 2005; Cywinska et al. 2006; Renaud et al. 2012; Landi et al. 2014; Wang et al.

2018). This implies that pre-sorting specimens to species-level units based on

barcodes is worth pursuing for many metazoan clades. This realization led to the

proposal of the "reverse workflow" in Wang et al. (2018) who tested pre-sorting

based on sequences for 4,000 ant specimens. They found that 86 of the 89

molecular operational taxonomic units (mOTUs) were congruent with morphospecies

after reconciliation.

High levels of congruence levels are, however, not a universal observation

across all of life. There are groups with widespread barcode sharing between

species. Within Metazoa this is known for taxa such as Anthozoa (Huang et al. 2008)

and is likely to be the default outside of Metazoa (e.g. Chase and Fay 2009;

Hollingsworth et al. 2011). Indeed, congruence levels between mOTUs and

morphospecies also vary widely in the 20 empirical and 6 Genbank datasets studied

here (Fig. 3). Eighteen of the 26 datasets have congruence levels >75% and are

arguably doing well. With regard to the remaining eight, there are four where the low

levels may be due to the fact that they cover taxa or faunas that are comparatively

poorly known and sorting with morphology may be prone to error (French Guiana

Earthworms, Ecuadorian Chrysomelidae, chironomid midges in the genus

Tanytarsus). For a 5th data set, "Congolese fishes", the authors also mention

identification problems due to the lack of identification tools (Decru et al. 2016).

However, these problems should be lacking for Iberian butterflies where the authors

consider it likely that introgression and cryptic species are responsible for the lack of

congruence (Dincă et al. (2015). Note, however, that these problems do not appear

to affect the remaining Lepidoptera data set for which we observe high levels of

congruence (5 data sets). The picture is similarly confusing for fish (Actinopterygii)

where low congruence is observed for the Genbank dataset while marine fishes are

doing well (3 datasets). Similarly, inconsistent patterns are observed for

Hymenoptera and Arachnida.

We suspect that these inconsistent results are largely due to the lack of

rigorous studies that establish congruence with confidence. Such studies should be

based on datasets with dense taxon and geographic sampling where both

morphological and DNA sequence information is obtained for all specimens.

Subsequently, all specimens that cause conflict should be re-examined in order to

determine the proportion of specimens that were initially misplaced based on

morphology and the proportion that were initially misplaced based on DNA barcodes

(=pre-sorting error). Lastly, one should establish the number of specimens that

cannot be resolved because there is genuine conflict between the data sources.

Such studies are lacking. This also affects the quality of the morphospecies sorting

in the 26 datasets that are analzyed in our study. However, it should not affect our

overall conclusions with regard to the effect of barcode length and position on

congruence levels because morphospecies sorting errors affect both full-length

barcodes and the mini-barcodes that were excised from the former.

But what is gained if all specimens are sorted based on morphology and

barcodes? Using both sources of data would allow for higher quality work based on

the principles of integrative taxonomy (Dayrat 2005; Schlick-Steiner et al. 2010), but

it would not accelerate species discovery. Acceleration can only be achieved if either

a subset of all specimens have to be studied with morphology or the morphological

work requires less time. Both is the case when pre-sorting with barcodes is adopted.

This is shown in Wang et al. (2018) and Srivathsan et al. (2019), who pre-sorted

4000 ant and 7000 phorid specimens, respectively, with barcodes. Checking for

congruence between mOTUs and morpho-species was fast because the specimens

had already been pre-grouped into putative species based on barcodes. In addition,

determining the species limits between putatively closely related species was

simplified because the taxon-specialist could identify closely related

species/populations based on barcode distances. Lastly, for abundant species, only

a subset of the specimens had to be studied with morphology. This subset could be

selected based on genetic, temporal, and geographic gradients (Wang et al. 2018;

Srivathsan et al. 2019); i.e., the highly-skilled specialists could target a small

proportion of specimens for dissection and slide-mounting.

Barcode length and species delimitation methods

We here tested the widespread assumption that mOTUs based on full-length

barcodes are more reliable than those based on mini-barcodes (Burns et al. 2007;

Min and Hickey 2007). If this assumption was confirmed, then the use of mini-

barcodes for pre-sorting would have to be discouraged despite higher amplification

success rates and lower cost. However, we find that the performance of *cox1* mini-

barcodes with a length >200-bp do not differ substantially from the performance of

full-length barcodes. In 19/140 of the empirical and 3/42 of the clade-based dataset

treatments, the full-length barcode outperform all mini-barcodes, after discounting

ties (8/140 and 0/42) and cases where the difference between the next highest

congruence is <0.5% (9/140 and 10/42). Indeed, compared to the dataset effect, the

choice of barcode length is largely secondary. Note that this conclusion is robust

across 26 datasets and holds for different clustering algorithms.

We also find that the choice of species delimitation algorithm matters little for

mini-barcodes longer than 200-bp (Fig. 4). This is fortunate as objective clustering

and ABGD algorithms are less computationally demanding than PTP, which

necessitates the reconstruction of ML trees. However, there are some exceptions.

Firstly, when mini-barcodes are extremely short (~100-bp), ABGD and PTP tend to

underperform relative to objective clustering. PTP's poor performance for 100-bp

mini-barcodes is not surprising given that it relies on tree topologies which cannot be

estimated with confidence based on so little data. ABGD's poor performance is

mostly observed for certain priors (e.g., P=0.04: Fig. S5 & S6). Under these priors,

ABGD tends to lump most of the 100-bp barcodes into one or a few large clusters.

Prior-choice also affects ABGD's performance for full-length barcodes. Overall,

ABGD does not perform well with very high priors (P = 0.04: Fig. S6 vs. P = 0.001:

Fig. 2 & 3) and we conclude that the selection of the best priors and/or clustering

thresholds remains a significant challenge for the study of largely unknown faunas

that lack morphological or other gene information that can be used as an *a posteriori*

criterion for selecting priors/thresholds. In the absence of these data, we would

recommend the use of multiple methods and thresholds in order to distinguish robust

from labile mOTUs that are heavily dependent on threshold- or prior-choices. The

latter mOTUs should be targeted in reconciliation studies utilizing another type of

data. As illustrated earlier, these reconciliation studies can focus on only 10-15% of

all specimens that cause species-level conflict.

Barcode length and species identification

Similar to our tests of species delimitation, we find that mini-barcodes >200-bp

have no significant performance difference when compared with full-length barcodes.

Full-length barcodes have only marginally – albeit statistically non-significantly –

higher identification success rates than mini-barcodes >200-bp (Table 2: 0.00 –

4.15% difference, 0.37% median). This is consistent with the findings of Meusnier et

al. (2008) who reported at least 95% identification success for 250-bp barcodes

while full-length barcodes performed the best (97% success). Overall, our data

suggest that mini-barcodes >200-bp are suitable for species identification. The

poorer performance of shorter mini-barcodes (<200-bp) is largely due to an increase

of ambiguous matches rather than incorrect matches. These mini-barcodes are less

informative which is probably due to their short length and the placement of many

short barcodes in a more conserved part of the Folmer region (see below).

Positional effects

Overall, mini-barcodes at the 3' end of the Folmer region outperform mini-

barcodes at the 5' end. This is consistent across all three species delimitation

methods and was also noticed by Shokralla et al. (2015a) who concluded that mini-

barcodes at the 5' end have worse species resolution for fish species. This positional

effect is apparent when match ratios are compared across a "sliding window" (Fig.

2). The lowest congruence with morphology is observed for 100-bp mini-barcodes

with midpoints at the 50-bp, 110-bp and 170-bp marks. However, this positional

effect is only significant when the barcode lengths are very short (<200-bp). Once

the mini-barcodes are sufficiently long (>200-bp), there is no appreciable difference

in performance, which is not surprising because sampling more nucleotides helps

with buffering against regional changes in nucleotide variability.

These changes in nucleotide variability may have functional reasons related

to the conformation of the Cox1 protein in the mitochondrion membrane. The Folmer

region of Cox1 contains six transmembrane α- helices that are connected by five

loops (Tsukihara et al. 1996; Pentinsaari et al. 2016). Pentinsaari et al. (2016)

compared 292 Cox1 sequences across 26 animal phyla and found high amino acid

variability in helix I and the loop connecting helix I and helix II (corresponding to

position 1-102 of *cox1*), as well as end of helix IV and loop connecting helix IV and V

(corresponding to positions ~448-498)*.* These regions of high variability are distant

from the active sites and thus less likely to affect Cox1 function (Pentinsaari et al.

2016). This may lead to lower selection pressure and thus higher variability in these

areas which could impact the performance of mini-barcodes for species delimitation.

Accelerating biodiversity discovery and description

In our study we test whether species discovery with mini-barcodes is as

accurate as discovery with full-length barcodes. However, the taxonomic impediment

is also caused by the lack of taxonomic capacity for identifying specimens to species

and describing new species. Fortunately, the species discovery step can also help

with species identification because some specimens placed in mOTUs can be

identified via barcode databases. Common species are here more likely to benefit

because they are covered by the databases. This is illustrated by our recent work on

dragon- and damselflies (Odonata), ants (Formicidae), and non-biting midges

(Chironomidae) of Singapore (Baloğlu et al. 2018; Wang et al. 2018; Yeo et al.

2018). These studies document why it is important to distinguish between species-

and specimen-level identification because the results differ widely. For odonates,

BLAST-searches identified more than half of the 95 mOTUs and >75% of the

specimens to species. The corresponding numbers for ants and midges were ca.

20% and 10% at mOTU-level, and 9% and 40% at the specimen-level; i.e., despite

low mOTU identification success for midges, a fairly large number of specimens

could be identified because very common species were already represented in a

barcode database.

In addition, mOTUs are also useful for understanding biodiversity patterns

because they can be readily compared across studies and borders (Ratnasingham

and Hebert 2013). In contrast, a new species identified based on morphology usually

remains unavailable to the scientific community until the descriptions are published

unless associated molecular information is also present. This is a very significant

difference because a large amount of downstream biodiversity analysis can be

carried out based on newly discovered species regardless of whether they are were

discovered with morphological or molecular means. However, cross-study

comparisons are only straightforward for mOTUs because sequences are readily

shared and compared. This allows for the study of species richness and abundances

before taxa are described. Even studies covering different time periods can be

carried out, which is increasingly important in the 21st century.

Conclusions

We here illustrate that mini-barcodes are as reliable for pre-sorting specimens

into putative species as full-length barcodes. Mini-barcodes are also suitable for

identifying unidentified barcodes to species based on barcode reference databases.

We would thus argue that mini-barcodes should be preferred over full-length

barcodes because (1) they can be obtained more readily for specimens that only

contain degraded DNA (Hajibabaei et al. 2006) and (2) are much more cost-

effective. In particular, we recommend the use of mini-barcodes >200-bp at the 3'

end of the Folmer region. It is encouraging that such mini-barcodes perform well

across a large range of metazoan taxa. These conclusions are based on three

species delimitation algorithms (objective clustering, ABGD and PTP) which, overall,

have no appreciable effect on the performance of barcodes. If the DNA of the

specimens is so degraded that very short mini-barcodes have to be obtained, we

advise against the use of PTP and ABGD (especially with high priors) in order to

reduce the likelihood that morphospecies are lumped.

Funding

This work was supported by a Ministry of Education grant on biodiversity discovery

(R-154-000-A22-112).

Acknowledgements

We would like to acknowledge Athira Adom and Jonathan Ho for data processing,

Lee Wan Ting for performing the molecular work and Emily Hartop and Wendy Wang

for commenting on the manuscript.

References

Ahrens D., Fujisawa T., Krammer H.-J., Eberle J., Fabrizi S., Vogler A.P. 2016.
Rarity and incomplete sampling in DNA-based species delimitation. Syst. Biol.
65:478–494.

Ang Y., Meier R., Su K.F.-Y., Rajaratnam G. 2017. Hidden in the urban parks of New
York City: Themira lohmanus, a new species of Sepsidae described based on
morphology, DNA sequences, mating behavior, and reproductive isolation
(Sepsidae, Diptera). ZooKeys. 698:95–111.

Baldwin C., Castillo C., Weigt L., Victor B. 2011. Seven new species within western
Atlantic Starksia atlantica, S. lepicoelia, and S. sluiteri (Teleostei,
Labrisomidae), with comments on congruence of DNA barcodes and species.
ZooKeys. 79:21–72.

Ball S.L., Hebert P.D.N., Burian S.K., Webb J.M. 2005. Biological identifications of
mayflies (Ephemeroptera) using DNA barcodes. J. North Am. Benthol. Soc.
24:508–524.

Baloğlu B., Clews E., Meier R. 2018. NGS barcoding reveals high resistance of a
hyperdiverse chironomid (Diptera) swamp fauna against invasion from
adjacent freshwater reservoirs. Front. Zool. 15:31.

Bar-On Y.M., Phillips R., Milo R. 2018. The biomass distribution on Earth. Proc. Natl.
Acad. Sci. 115:6506–6511.

Bates D., Mächler M., Bolker B., Walker S. 2014. Fitting linear mixed-effects models
using *lme4*. ArXiv14065823 Stat.

Bi K., Linderoth T., Vanderpool D., Good J.M., Nielsen R., Moritz C. 2013. Unlocking
the vault: next-generation museum population genomics. Mol. Ecol. 22:6018–
6032.

Bickel D.J. 1999. What museum collections reveal about species accumulation,
richness, and rarity: an example from the Diptera. The other. 99:174–181.

Blaimer B.B., Lloyd M.W., Guillory W.X., Brady S.G. 2016. Sequence capture and
phylogenetic utility of genomic ultraconserved elements obtained from pinned
insect specimens. PLoS ONE. 11:e0161531.

Burns J.M., Janzen D.H., Merhdad Hajibabai, Winnie Hallwachs, Paul D. N. Hebert.
2007. DNA barcodes of closely related (but morphologically and ecologically
distinct) species of skipper butterflies (Hesperiidae) can differ by only one to
three nucleotides. J. Lepidopterists' Soc. 61:138–153.

Cafaro P. 2015. Three ways to think about the sixth mass extinction. Biol. Conserv.
192:387–393.

Ceballos G., Ehrlich P.R., Barnosky A.D., García A., Pringle R.M., Palmer T.M.
2015. Accelerated modern human–induced species losses: Entering the sixth
mass extinction. Sci. Adv. 1:e1400253.

Chase M.W., Fay M.F. 2009. Barcoding of plants and fungi. Science. 325:682–683.

Cooper A. 1994. DNA from museum specimens. In: Herrmann B., Hummel S.,
editors. Ancient DNA: Recovery and Analysis of Genetic Material from
Paleontological, Archaeological, Museum, Medical, and Forensic Specimens.
New York, NY: Springer New York. p. 149–165.

Cywinska A., Hunter F.F., Hebert P.D.N. 2006. Identifying Canadian mosquito
species through DNA barcodes. Med. Vet. Entomol. 20:413–424.

Dayrat B. 2005. Towards integrative taxonomy. Biol. J. Linn. Soc. 85:407–415.

Deagle B.E., Eveson J.P., Jarman S.N. 2006. Quantification of damage in DNA
recovered from highly degraded samples – a case study on DNA in faeces.
Front. Zool. 3:11.

Decru E., Moelants T., De Gelas K., Vreven E., Verheyen E., Snoeks J. 2016.
Taxonomic challenges in freshwater fishes: a mismatch between morphology

and DNA barcoding in fish of the north-eastern part of the Congo basin. Mol.
Ecol. Resour. 16:342–352.

Dincă V., Montagud S., Talavera G., Hernández-Roldán J., Munguira M.L., García-
Barros E., Hebert P.D.N., Vila R. 2015. DNA barcode reference library for
Iberian butterflies enables a continental-scale preview of potential cryptic
diversity. Sci. Rep. 5:12395.

Ermakov O.A., Simonov E., Surin V.L., Titov S.V., Brandler O.V., Ivanova N.V.,
Borisenko A.V. 2015. Implications of hybridization, NUMTs, and overlooked
diversity for DNA barcoding of Eurasian ground squirrels. PLoS ONE.
10:e0117201.

Fagan-Jeffries E.P., Cooper S.J.B., Bertozzi T., Bradford T.M., Austin A.D. 2018.
DNA barcoding of microgastrine parasitoid wasps (Hymenoptera: Braconidae)
using high-throughput methods more than doubles the number of species
known for Australia. Mol. Ecol. Resour. 18:1132–1143.

Ficetola G.F., Miaud C., Pompanon F., Taberlet P. 2008. Species detection using
environmental DNA from water samples. Biol. Lett. 4:423–425.

Folmer O., Black M., Hoeh W., Lutz R., Vrijenhoek R. 1994. DNA primers for
amplification of mitochondrial cytochrome c oxidase subunit I from diverse
metazoan invertebrates. Mol. Mar. Biol. Biotechnol. 3:294–299.

Franz N.M. 2005. On the lack of good scientific reasons for the growing
phylogeny/classification gap. Cladistics. 21:495–500.

Guschanski K., Krause J., Sawyer S., Valente L.M., Bailey S., Finstermeier K., Sabin
R., Gilissen E., Sonet G., Nagy Z.T., Lenglet G., Mayer F., Savolainen V.
2013. Next-generation museomics disentangles one of the largest primate
radiations. Syst. Biol. 62:539–554.

Hajibabaei M., McKenna C. 2012. DNA Mini-barcodes. In: Kress W.J., Erickson D.L.,
editors. DNA Barcodes. Totowa, NJ: Humana Press. p. 339–353.

Hajibabaei M., Smith M.A., Janzen D.H., Rodriguez J.J., Whitfield J.B., Hebert
P.D.N. 2006. A minimalist barcode can identify a specimen whose DNA is
degraded. Mol. Ecol. Notes. 6:959–964.

Han T., Lee W., Lee S., Park I.G., Park H. 2016. Reassessment of species diversity
of the subfamily Denticollinae (Coleoptera: Elateridae) through DNA
barcoding. PLoS ONE. 11:e0148602.

Hebert P.D.N., Braukmann T.W.A., Prosser S.W.J., Ratnasingham S., deWaard
J.R., Ivanova N.V., Janzen D.H., Hallwachs W., Naik S., Sones J.E.,
Zakharov E.V. 2018. A Sequel to Sanger: amplicon sequencing that scales.
BMC Genomics. 19:219.

Hebert P.D.N., Cywinska A., Ball S.L., deWaard J.R. 2003. Biological identifications
through DNA barcodes. Proc. R. Soc. Lond. B Biol. Sci. 270:313–321.

Hollatz C., Leite B.R., Lobo J., Froufe H., Egas C., Costa F.O. 2016. Priming of a DNA metabarcoding approach for species identification and inventory in marine macrobenthic communities. Genome. 60:260–271.

Hollingsworth P.M., Graham S.W., Little D.P. 2011. Choosing and using a plant DNA barcode. PLoS ONE. 6:e19254.

Huang D., Meier R., Todd P.A., Chou L.M. 2008. Slow mitochondrial COI sequence evolution at the base of the Metazoan tree and its implications for DNA barcoding. J. Mol. Evol. 66:167–174.

Jones M., Ghoorah A., Blaxter M. 2011. jMOTU and Taxonerator: Turning DNA barcode sequences into annotated operational taxonomic units. PLoS ONE. 6:e19259.

Kapli P., Lutteropp S., Zhang J., Kobert K., Pavlidis P., Stamatakis A., Flouri T. 2017. Multi-rate Poisson Tree Processes for single-locus species delimitation under Maximum Likelihood and Markov Chain Monte Carlo. Bioinformatics.:btx025.

Katoh K., Standley D.M. 2013. MAFFT multiple sequence alignment software version 7: Improvements in performance and usability. Mol. Biol. Evol. 30:772–780.

Kemp C. 2015. The billions of specimens in natural-history museums are becoming more useful for tracking Earth's shrinking biodiversity. But the collections also face grave threats. Nat. News. 518:292–294.

Krell F.-T. 2004. Parataxonomy vs. taxonomy in biodiversity studies – pitfalls and applicability of 'morphospecies' sorting. Biodivers. Conserv. 13:795–812.

Landi M., Dimech M., Arculeo M., Biondo G., Martins R., Carneiro M., Carvalho G.R., Brutto S.L., Costa F.O. 2014. DNA Barcoding for species assignment: The case of mediterranean marine fishes. PLoS ONE. 9:e106135.

Lenth R. 2018. Emmeans: Estimated marginal means. Aka Least-Sq. Means R.

Leray M., Yang J.Y., Meyer C.P., Mills S.C., Agudelo N., Ranwez V., Boehm J.T., Machida R.J. 2013. A new versatile primer set targeting a short fragment of the mitochondrial COI region for metabarcoding metazoan diversity: application for characterizing coral reef fish gut contents. Front. Zool. 10:34.

Lim N.K.M., Tay Y.C., Srivathsan A., Tan J.W.T., Kwik J.T.B., Baloğlu B., Meier R., Yeo D.C.J. 2016. Next-generation freshwater bioassessment: eDNA metabarcoding with a conserved metazoan primer reveals species-rich and reservoir-specific communities. R. Soc. Open Sci. 3:160635.

Lister A.M., Stephen J. Brooks, Phillip B. Fenberg, Adrian G. Glover, Karen E. James, Kenneth G. Johnson, Ellinor Michel, Beth Okamura, Mark Spencer, John R. Stewart, Jonathan A. Todd, Eugenia Valsami-Jones, Jeremy Young. 2011. Natural history collections as sources of long-term datasets. Trends Ecol. Evol. 26:153–154.

Meier R. 2008. DNA sequences in taxonomy, opportunities and challenges. New
Taxon.:65–127.

Meier R. 2017. Citation of taxonomic publications: the why, when, what and what
not: Species citations. Syst. Entomol. 42:301–304.

Meier R., Shiyang K., Vaidya G., Ng P.K.L. 2006. DNA barcoding and taxonomy in
Diptera: A tale of high intraspecific variability and low identification success.
Syst. Biol. 55:715–728.

Meier R., Wong W., Srivathsan A., Foo M. 2016. $1 DNA barcodes for reconstructing
complex phenomes and finding rare species in specimen-rich samples.
Cladistics. 32:100–110.

Meusnier I., Singer G.A., Landry J.-F., Hickey D.A., Hebert P.D., Hajibabaei M. 2008.
A universal DNA mini-barcode for biodiversity analysis. BMC Genomics.
9:214.

Min X.J., Hickey D.A. 2007. Assessing the effect of varying sequence length on DNA
barcoding of fungi. Mol. Ecol. Notes. 7:365–373.

Mioduchowska M., Czyż M.J., Gołdyn B., Kur J., Sell J. 2018. Instances of erroneous
DNA barcoding of metazoan invertebrates: Are universal cox1 gene primers
too "universal"? PLOS ONE. 13:e0199609.

Morinière J., Balke M., Doczkal D., Geiger M.F., Hardulak L.A., Haszprunar G.,
Hausmann A., Hendrich L., Regalado L., Rulik B., Schmidt S., Wägele J.,
Hebert P.D.N. 2019. A DNA barcode library for 5,200 German flies and
midges (Insecta: Diptera) and its implications for metabarcoding-based
biomonitoring. Mol. Ecol. Resour. 19:900–928.

Pentinsaari M., Salmela H., Mutanen M., Roslin T. 2016. Molecular evolution of a
widely-adopted taxonomic marker (COI) across the animal tree of life. Sci.
Rep. 6:35275.

Puillandre N., Lambert A., Brouillet S., Achaz G. 2012. ABGD, Automatic Barcode
Gap Discovery for primary species delimitation. Mol. Ecol. 21:1864–1877.

Ratnasingham S., Hebert P.D.N. 2013. A DNA-based registry for all animal species:
the Barcode Index Number (BIN) system. PLoS ONE. 8:e66213.

Renaud A.K., Savage J., Adamowicz S.J. 2012. DNA barcoding of Northern Nearctic
Muscidae (Diptera) reveals high correspondence between morphological and
molecular species limits. BMC Ecol. 12:24.

Riedel A., Daawia D., Balke M. 2010. Deep *cox1* divergence and hyperdiversity of
Trigonopterus weevils in a New Guinea mountain range (Coleoptera,
Curculionidae). Zool. Scr. 39:63–74.

Roe A.D., Sperling F.A.H. 2007. Patterns of evolution of mitochondrial cytochrome c
oxidase I and II DNA and implications for DNA barcoding. Mol. Phylogenet.
Evol. 44:325–345.

Roskov Y., Abucay L., Orrell T., Nicolson D., Bailly N., Kirk P.M., Bourgoin T.,
DeWalt R.E., Decock W., De Wever A. 2018. Species 2000 & ITIS Catalogue
of Life. 2017, Annual Checklist. Digital resource at www. catalogueoflife.
org/annual-checklist/2017. Species 2000: Naturalis, Leiden, the Netherlands.
ISSN 2405-884X. .

Rubinoff D., Cameron S., Will K. 2006. A genomic perspective on the shortcomings
of mitochondrial DNA for "Barcoding" identification. J. Hered. 97:581–594.

Sánchez-Bayo F., Wyckhuys K.A.G. 2019. Worldwide decline of the entomofauna: A
review of its drivers. Biol. Conserv. 232:8–27.

Schlick-Steiner B.C., Steiner F.M., Seifert B., Stauffer C., Christian E., Crozier R.H.
2010. Integrative Taxonomy: A Multisource Approach to Exploring
Biodiversity. Annu. Rev. Entomol. 55:421–438.

Shokralla S., Hellberg R.S., Handy S.M., King I., Hajibabaei M. 2015a. A DNA mini-
barcoding system for authentication of processed fish products. Sci. Rep.
5:15894.

Shokralla S., Porter T.M., Gibson J.F., Dobosz R., Janzen D.H., Hallwachs W.,
Golding G.B., Hajibabaei M. 2015b. Massively parallel multiplex DNA
sequencing for specimen identification using an Illumina MiSeq platform. Sci.
Rep. 5:9687.

Smith M.A., Rodriguez J.J., Whitfield J.B., Deans A.R., Janzen D.H., Hallwachs W.,
Hebert P.D.N. 2008. Extreme diversity of tropical parasitoid wasps exposed
by iterative integration of natural history, DNA barcoding, morphology, and
collections. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. 105:12359–12364.

Srivathsan A., Baloğlu B., Wang W., Tan W.X., Bertrand D., Ng A.H.Q., Boey E.J.H.,
Koh J.J.Y., Nagarajan N., Meier R. 2018. A MinION™-based pipeline for fast
and cost-effective DNA barcoding. Mol. Ecol. Resour. 18:1035–1049.

Srivathsan A., Hartop E., Puniamoorthy J., Lee W.T., Kutty S.N., Kurina O., Meier R.
2019. 1D MinION sequencing for large-scale species discovery: 7000 scuttle
flies (Diptera: Phoridae) from one site in Kibale National Park (Uganda)
revealed to belong to >650 species. bioRxiv.:622365.

Srivathsan A., Meier R. 2012. On the inappropriate use of Kimura-2-parameter (K2P)
divergences in the DNA-barcoding literature. Cladistics. 28:190–194.

Stamatakis A. 2014. RAxML version 8: a tool for phylogenetic analysis and post-
analysis of large phylogenies. Bioinformatics. 30:1312–1313.

Stork N.E. 2018. How many species of insects and other terrestrial arthropods are
there on Earth? Annu. Rev. Entomol. 63:31–45.

Stork N.E., McBroom J., Gely C., Hamilton A.J. 2015. New approaches narrow
global species estimates for beetles, insects, and terrestrial arthropods. Proc.
Natl. Acad. Sci. 112:7519–7523.

Sultana S., Ali Md.E., Hossain M.A.M., Asing, Naquiah N., Zaidul I.S.M. 2018.
Universal mini COI barcode for the identification of fish species in processed
products. Food Res. Int. 105:19–28.

Tamura K., Stecher G., Peterson D., Filipski A., Kumar S. 2013. MEGA6: molecular
evolutionary genetics analysis version 6.0. Mol. Biol. Evol. 30:2725–2729.

Tan D.S.H., Ang Y., Lim G.S., Ismail M.R.B., Meier R. 2010. From 'cryptic species' to
integrative taxonomy: an iterative process involving DNA sequences,
morphology, and behaviour leads to the resurrection of *Sepsis pyrrhosoma*
(Sepsidae: Diptera). Zool. Scr. 39:51–61.

Taylor H.R., Harris W.E. 2012. An emergent science on the brink of irrelevance: a
review of the past 8 years of DNA barcoding. Mol. Ecol. Resour. 12:377–388.

Tsukihara T., Aoyama H., Yamashita E., Tomizaki T., Yamaguchi H., Shinzawa-Itoh
K., Nakashima R., Yaono R., Yoshikawa S. 1996. The whole structure of the
13-subunit oxidized cytochrome c oxidase at 2.8 Å. Science. 272:1136–1144.

Valan M., Makonyi K., Maki A., Vondráček D., Ronquist F. 2019. Automated
taxonomic identification of insects with expert-level accuracy using effective
feature transfer from convolutional networks. Syst. Biol. 0:1–20.

Wang W.Y., Srivathsan A., Foo M., Yamane S.K., Meier R. 2018. Sorting specimen-
rich invertebrate samples with cost-effective NGS barcodes: Validating a
reverse workflow for specimen processing. Mol. Ecol. Resour. 18:490–501.

Will K.W., Rubinoff D. 2004. Myth of the molecule: DNA barcodes for species cannot
replace morphology for identification and classification. Cladistics. 20:47–55.

Yang C., Tan S., Meng G., Bourne D.G., O'Brien P.A., Xu J., Liao S., Chen A., Chen
X., Liu S. 2018. Access COI barcode efficiently using high throughput Single-
End 400 bp sequencing. .

Yang Z., Rannala B. 2010. Bayesian species delimitation using multilocus sequence
data. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. 107:9264–9269.

Yeates D.K., Zwick A., Mikheyev A.S. 2016. Museums are biobanks: unlocking the
genetic potential of the three billion specimens in the world's biological
collections. Curr. Opin. Insect Sci. 18:83–88.

Yeo D., Puniamoorthy J., Ngiam R.W.J., Meier R. 2018. Towards holomorphology in
entomology: rapid and cost-effective adult-larva matching using NGS
barcodes: Life-history stage matching with NGS barcodes. Syst. Entomol.
43:678–691.

Yu H.J., You Z.H. 2010. Comparison of DNA truncated barcodes and full-barcodes
for species identification. Int. Conf. Intell. Comput.:108–114.

Zhang J., Kapli P., Pavlidis P., Stamatakis A. 2013. A general species delimitation
method with applications to phylogenetic placements. Bioinformatics.
29:2869–2876.

Figure Captions

Table 1. Proportion of specimens congruent between morphospecies and mOTU clusters (20 empirical datasets/6 clade-based datasets) under the three stringency classes. Values in brackets represent an upper bound estimate of number of specimens causing conflict.

Table 2. Proportion of correct/incorrect/ambiguous/unidentified specimens in the "best close match" analysis.

Figure 1. Positions of the mini-barcodes with established primers assessed in this study.

Figure 2. Performance of mini-barcodes along a sliding window (100-bp, 200-bp, 300-bp). Mini-barcode position is indicated on the x-axis and congruence with morphology on the y-axis. mOTUs were obtained with Objective Clustering (2%), ABGD P=0.001 prior), and PTP. Each line represents one data set while the boxplots summarise the values across datasets. Significant deviations from the results obtained with full-length barcodes are indicated with color-coded asterisks (* = $p < 0.05$; ** = $p < 0.001$; red = poorer and green = higher congruence with morphology).

Figure 3. Match ratios across three different species delimitation methods. Mini-barcodes (columns) are sorted by primer length while the 20 empirical datasets (rows) are sorted by average match ratio. The six clade-specific datasets from GenBank are grouped below. Match ratios above average are coloured green, while those below average are in pink. The highest match ratio values are indicated with white text.

Figure 4. Comparison of species delimitation methods for full-length and mini-barcodes generated by "sliding windows" (100-bp, 200-bp, 300-bp).

1044   **Figure 5.** Proportion of conserved sites along the full-length barcode (sliding

1045   windows of 100-bp, 200-bp, 300-bp).

Table 1. Proportion of specimens congruent between morphospecies and mOTU clusters (20 empirical datasets/6 clade-based datasets) under the three stringency classes. Values in brackets represent an upper bound estimate of number of specimens causing conflict.

Objective clustering, 2% p-distance							
Length	**295**	**307**	**313**	**407**	**657**	**Average**	**Median**
Midpoint	**405**	**154**	**502**	**455**	**329**		
Class I	77/57% (7475/41367)	76/56% (7511/42052)	77/57% (7275/40857)	77/57% (7246/40849)	77/58% (7118/40327)	77/57% (7325/41090)	77/57% (7372/40941)
Class II	90/75% (3283/23846)	90/75% (3333/24794)	90/75% (3131/23554)	90/76% (3078/23304)	90/76% (3006/23349)	90/75% (3166/23769)	90/76% (3112/23469)
Class III	91/82% (3021/17875)	91/81% (2954/18981)	91/82% (2822/17666)	91/82% (2813/17511)	91/82% (2759/17509)	91/82% (2874/17908)	91/82% (2862/17745)
ABGD, P=0.001							
Length	**295**	**307**	**313**	**407**	**657**	**Average**	**Median**
Midpoint	**405**	**154**	**502**	**455**	**329**		
Class I	75/55% (7916/42576)	76/55% (7685/42403)	75/55% (8169/42787)	73/53% (8583/45131)	69/47% (9833/49848)	74/53% (8437/44549)	74/54% (8126/43386)
Class II	89/75% (3305/24555)	89/75% (3442/24541)	89/75% (3336/24267)	89/74% (3526/25153)	88/72% (3901/26691)	89/74% (3502/25041)	89/74% (3382/24625)
Class III	91/81% (2981/18303)	91/81% (2906/18509)	90/81% (2984/18352)	90/80% (3041/18978)	89/78% (3482/20860)	90/80% (3079/19000)	91/81% (2927/18494)
PTP							
Length	**295**	**307**	**313**	**407**	**657**	**Average**	**Median**
Midpoint	**405**	**154**	**502**	**455**	**329**		
Class I	76/57% (7643/40692)	76/56% (7744/42608)	77/57% (7369/41588)	78/57% (7130/41056)	78/58% (7207/40234)	77/57% (7419/41236)	77/57% (7318/40839)
Class II	89/75% (3322/23946)	89/75% (3549/24598)	90/75% (3230/23857)	90/76% (3109/23583)	90/76% (3127/22912)	90/75% (3267/23779)	90/76% (3198/23659)
Class III	90/81% (3091/18208)	90/81% (3334/19189)	91/82% (2926/18179)	91/81% (2813/18968)	91/82% (2859/17317)	91/81% (3005/18372)	91/81% (2937/18193)

Table 2. Proportion of correct/incorrect/ambiguous/unidentified specimens in the "best close match" analysis.

Dataset	Published Primers									
	94	**130**	**145**	**164**	**189**	**295**	**307**	**313**	**407**	**657**
Great Barrier Reef Fish	85/1/0/15	83/1/3/13	83/1/2/14	85/0/0/14	86/1/0/13	86/0/0/14	85/1/0/14	86/0/0/14	86/0/0/14	86/0/0/14
South China Sea Fish	93/0/1/6	91/1/3/6	91/1/3/6	93/0/1/6	93/0/1/6	94/0/0/6	93/0/1/6	93/1/1/6	94/1/0/6	94/0/0/6
North Sea Molluscs	90/0/0/10	91/0/0/9	92/0/0/8	92/0/0/8	92/0/0/8	92/0/0/8	92/0/0/8	91/0/0/9	91/0/0/9	92/0/0/8
Canadian Echinoderms	95/0/0/5	95/0/0/4	95/0/0/5	96/0/0/4	96/0/0/4	95/0/0/5	96/0/0/4	95/0/0/5	96/0/0/4	96/0/0/4
Ecuadorian Geometridae	84/0/0/15	85/1/0/13	85/0/0/14	85/0/0/14	85/0/0/14	86/0/0/14	86/0/0/14	86/0/0/14	86/0/0/14	86/0/0/14
German Aranea & Opiliones	88/0/5/7	89/0/5/5	89/0/5/6	90/1/4/5	90/0/4/5	92/0/2/6	91/1/3/5	92/0/2/5	92/1/2/5	93/1/2/5
European Marine Fish	92/0/7/1	91/0/7/1	92/0/6/2	96/0/3/1	96/0/3/1	97/0/1/1	97/0/1/1	96/0/2/1	97/0/1/1	98/0/1/1
South American Butterflies	89/0/4/7	91/1/2/6	92/0/1/6	92/0/1/6	93/0/0/6	93/0/0/6	94/0/0/6	94/0/0/6	94/0/0/6	94/0/0/6
German EPT	92/0/1/7	93/0/1/5	94/0/1/6	94/0/0/6	94/0/0/6	93/0/0/6	94/0/0/5	94/0/0/6	94/0/0/6	94/0/0/6
Northwest Pacific Molluscs	69/2/15/14	75/2/10/13	74/2/10/13	73/2/12/12	73/2/12/12	77/2/8/12	77/2/9/12	76/3/9/12	77/3/8/12	78/4/6/12
Amazonian Moths	62/2/1/36	63/3/1/34	63/3/1/34	62/2/1/35	63/2/1/35	63/1/1/35	63/2/1/34	63/1/1/35	63/1/1/35	63/2/1/34
North American Birds	77/1/11/11	72/2/15/10	73/2/15/11	81/2/7/10	80/1/9/10	83/2/5/11	81/2/6/11	84/2/3/10	85/2/3/10	85/2/2/11
French Guianan Earthworms	96/0/0/4	97/0/0/3	97/0/0/3	96/0/0/4	96/0/0/4	97/0/0/3	97/0/0/3	97/0/0/3	97/0/0/3	96/0/0/4
Pakistani Lepidoptera	88/1/3/8	90/1/1/8	90/1/1/8	91/1/1/8	91/1/0/8	91/0/0/8	91/0/0/8	91/0/0/8	91/0/0/8	91/0/0/8
Tanytarsus	81/1/5/12	83/2/5/11	82/2/5/12	86/2/2/11	85/2/3/10	83/2/3/12	86/2/3/9	85/2/2/10	86/2/1/11	87/2/1/11
North European Tachinidae	64/2/14/19	65/3/16/17	65/3/15/17	66/3/13/18	65/3/15/17	67/3/11/18	68/3/12/17	68/3/10/18	69/3/10/18	71/4/8/17
Congolese Fish	80/1/10/9	78/1/11/9	79/1/11/10	84/2/6/7	86/2/5/7	85/2/5/8	86/2/4/8	86/3/4/7	86/3/4/7	88/3/2/7
North American Pyraustinae	93/1/4/3	94/1/4/1	96/1/2/1	96/1/1/2	97/0/0/2	97/0/0/3	98/1/0/2	97/0/0/3	97/0/0/2	98/2/0/2
Ecuadorian Chrysomelidae	74/0/1/25	76/0/1/23	76/0/1/23	76/0/1/23	76/0/1/24	75/0/1/24	76/0/1/23	75/0/1/24	75/0/1/24	75/0/1/24
Iberian Butterflies	77/0/22/1	85/0/15/0	86/0/13/0	87/0/12/0	89/0/10/0	93/0/6/0	94/1/5/0	94/0/5/0	96/0/4/0	97/1/3/0

1052

1053　**Figure 1.** Positions of the mini-barcodes with established primers assessed in this

1054　study.

1055

Figure 2. Performance of mini-barcodes along a sliding window (100-bp, 200-bp,

300-bp). Mini-barcode position is indicated on the x-axis and congruence with

morphology on the y-axis. mOTUs were obtained with Objective Clustering (2%),

ABGD P=0.001 prior), and PTP. Each line represents one data set while the boxplots

summarise the values across datasets. Significant deviations from the results

obtained with full-length barcodes are indicated with color-coded asterisks (* = p <

0.05; ** = p < 0.001; red = poorer and green = higher congruence with morphology).

Objective clustering 2%

	94	130	145	164	189	295	307	313	407	657	Average
Length / Midpoint	257	65	73	243	213	405	154	502	455	329	
20 Empirical Datasets											
Ecuadorian Geometridae	94	95	96	98	98	99	99	99	99	99	98
Great Barrier Reef Fish	94	91	92	95	95	97	94	97	97	97	95
Pakistani Lepidoptera	88	87	90	91	91	95	93	95	95	97	92
South China Sea Fish	92	86	88	94	94	94	94	94	94	95	92
South American Butterflies	83	89	88	90	90	92	93	92	93	93	90
Amazonian Moths	87	88	89	90	91	91	90	91	91	91	90
European Marine Fish	81	74	84	92	90	97	93	94	97	97	90
Canadian Echinoderms	81	89	85	91	88	91	91	91	94	95	90
North Sea Molluscs	77	85	84	90	90	89	92	84	85	87	86
German EPT	78	85	84	85	84	83	85	83	83	84	83
North European Tachinidae	81	81	82	81	83	83	83	83	83	84	82
North American Birds	84	77	77	82	81	85	82	84	85	85	82
German Aranea & Opiliones	69	77	76	79	78	80	82	82	80	81	78
Northwest Pacific Molluscs	72	74	73	77	77	78	77	77	78	78	76
North American Pyraustinae	61	56	64	69	77	74	75	74	77	84	71
Congolese Fish	63	61	60	68	70	72	66	70	71	70	67
French Guianan Earthworms	52	74	74	54	63	65	65	65	65	60	64
Iberian Butterflies	51	55	56	59	63	61	62	63	61	65	60
Ecuadorian Chrysomelidae	54	54	55	55	56	55	55	55	55	55	55
Tanytarsus	47	51	49	57	57	58	59	55	56	57	55
Consolidated:	77	78	79	82	82	83	83	83	83	84	81
6 Clade-based Datasets											
Coleoptera	76	78	78	80	80	80	81	80	80	81	79
Lepidoptera	72	73	74	77	78	80	79	80	81	81	78
Diptera	72	74	74	76	76	77	78	76	77	77	76
Arachnida	63	66	65	65	66	68	68	67	67	67	66
Actinopterygii	64	60	61	65	65	66	64	66	66	66	64
Hymenoptera	60	63	63	63	63	65	65	65	64	64	64
Consolidated:	69	70	70	72	73	74	73	73	73	74	72
Overall Consolidated:	70	72	72	74	75	76	75	75	75	76	74

ABGD P=0.001

	94	130	145	164	189	295	307	313	407	657	Average
Length / Midpoint	257	65	73	243	213	405	154	502	455	329	
20 Empirical Datasets											
North Sea Molluscs	94	90	92	94	94	89	90	89	86	80	90
South China Sea Fish	92	78	83	89	93	94	92	93	91	90	89
Great Barrier Reef Fish	79	75	79	90	89	97	92	95	95	94	88
Canadian Echinoderms	87	78	76	91	91	87	91	95	92	89	88
Pakistani Lepidoptera	61	67	75	84	89	95	91	95	96	94	85
German EPT	85	84	85	86	87	83	85	84	78	67	82
Ecuadorian Geometridae	48	58	57	96	70	99	99	99	99	97	82
South American Butterflies	60	70	77	84	84	89	91	91	91	81	82
European Marine Fish	80	72	72	85	86	83	84	80	78	69	79
North American Birds	61	67	73	74	76	81	83	83	84	87	77
Amazonian Moths	72	43	42	88	75	87	90	90	91	89	77
North European Tachinidae	71	60	66	77	80	77	84	82	82	84	76
French Guianan Earthworms	78	89	93	81	81	73	80	70	59	55	76
Northwest Pacific Molluscs	76	75	75	77	77	76	77	76	76	63	75
German Aranea & Opiliones	76	18	79	85	82	71	74	73	65	52	67
Congolese Fish	68	44	55	67	71	70	63	67	71	65	64
Tanytarsus	67	71	71	61	62	50	56	48	47	45	58
North American Pyraustinae	25	29	41	67	76	70	74	67	58	59	57
Ecuadorian Chrysomelidae	55	55	54	56	56	57	57	55	57	58	56
Iberian Butterflies	26	36	42	53	57	60	65	59	55	52	50
Consolidated:	69	63	71	80	79	80	82	81	79	74	76
6 Clade-based Datasets											
Coleoptera	77	80	80	81	82	77	79	76	73	67	77
Diptera	69	73	74	76	77	73	75	72	69	63	72
Lepidoptera	42	54	62	74	77	79	78	79	77	71	69
Arachnida	71	71	71	69	68	66	64	64	64	57	67
Actinopterygii	59	54	55	64	64	66	66	65	65	64	62
Hymenoptera	62	64	65	64	65	62	63	62	59	55	62
Consolidated:	63	66	68	72	73	71	72	71	69	64	69
Overall Consolidated:	65	65	68	74	74	73	74	73	71	66	70

PTP

	94	130	145	164	189	295	307	313	407	657	Average
Length / Midpoint	257	65	73	243	213	405	154	502	455	329	
20 Empirical Datasets											
Great Barrier Reef Fish	89	85	87	91	91	95	90	95	96	96	91
Pakistani Lepidoptera	95	83	82	87	90	95	95	95	95	94	91
Ecuadorian Geometridae	14	89	91	94	97	98	97	96	99	98	87
North Sea Molluscs	78	71	82	94	96	86	92	86	93	93	87
South China Sea Fish	86	75	77	87	88	92	89	89	92	92	87
Canadian Echinoderms	75	71	78	83	90	89	90	87	91	89	84
German EPT	82	80	81	81	83	79	83	82	79	80	81
North European Tachinidae	77	70	73	82	80	84	83	83	82	85	80
Amazonian Moths	32	88	38	89	88	91	89	91	90	90	79
German Aranea & Opiliones	72	73	77	77	79	82	80	77	81	79	78
North American Birds	72	67	66	77	78	81	82	81	85	85	77
French Guianan Earthworms	71	83	69	85	80	81	62	78	75	69	75
European Marine Fish	71	60	61	71	78	80	74	79	79	80	73
Northwest Pacific Molluscs	72	67	68	75	74	72	74	76	77	78	73
Congolese Fish	57	44	50	67	69	68	64	68	71	69	63
Tanytarsus	51	58	64	61	58	68	63	64	66	63	62
North American Pyraustinae	45	58	54	56	49	58	71	80	76	58	61
Ecuadorian Chrysomelidae	55	57	55	56	55	55	54	55	55	55	55
Iberian Butterflies	32	47	48	47	48	59	58	61	58	54	51
South American Butterflies	0	0	0	0	0	89	90	93	91	91	45
Consolidated:	63	68	66	74	75	81	81	82	82	82	76
6 Clade-based Datasets											
Coleoptera	74	73	73	78	78	81	81	80	81	80	78
Arachnida	69	70	70	70	69	70	68	68	68	66	69
Diptera	37	71	69	55	71	76	76	75	75	75	68
Lepidoptera	39	65	41	64	33	79	78	77	79	78	63
Hymenoptera	44	63	63	62	64	66	66	65	65	65	62
Actinopterygii	22	49	51	61	61	64	61	64	65	65	56
Consolidated:	45	64	59	65	61	73	72	72	72	72	66
Overall Consolidated:	50	65	61	67	64	75	74	74	75	74	68

Figure 3. Match ratios across three different species delimitation methods. Mini-barcodes (columns) are sorted by primer length while the 20 empirical datasets (rows) are sorted by average match ratio. The six clade-specific datasets from GenBank are grouped below. Match ratios above average are coloured green, while those below average are in pink. The highest match ratio values are indicated with white text.

1068

1069 **Figure 4.** Comparison of species delimitation methods for full-length and mini-

1070 barcodes generated by "sliding windows" (100-bp, 200-bp, 300-bp).

1071

1072 **Figure 5.** Proportion of conserved sites along the full-length barcode (sliding

1073 windows of 100-bp, 200-bp, 300-bp).

1074