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#### Abstract

A new species of the Geophis dubius group is described from the cloud forests in the mountains north of Xalapa, Veracruz. This new species is most similar to G. turbidus and G. Iorancai, from which it differs genetically as well as by a very unique color pattern, morphological characters, and habitat use. The validity of G. fuscus, which was described from central Veracruz, is discussed. With the description of the new species and our assessment of G. fuscus, the number of species in the Geophis dubius group increases to 14 and the number of species of Geophis to 52.


Keywords. Geophis dubius group, Geophis fuscus, Geophis lorancai, Geophis turbidus, montane cloud forest, new species, Sierra de Misantla, Sierra Madre Oriental
Resumen.-Se describe una nueva especie del grupo de Geophis dubius del bosque mesófilo de montaña al norte de Xalapa, Veracruz. Esta nueva especie es mas parecido a G. turbidus y G. Iorancai, de cuales se diferencía geneticamente y por su coloración única, carácteres morfológicas y preferencia de hábitat particular. También disuctimos la valídez de $G$. fuscus, cual también fue descrito del centro de Veracruz. Con la descripción de la nuev especies, y nuestro análisis de G. fuscus, el numero de especies del grupo Geophis dubius se aumenta a 14 y el número de especies de Geophis a 52.
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## Introduction

The genus Geophis Wagler, 1830 is one of the largest genera of Dipsadidae with 50 recognized species (Canseco-Márquezet al. 2016). Downs (1967) recognized seven species groups of Geophis, as the G. chalybeus, G. championi, G. dubius, G. latifrontalis, G. omiltemanus, G. semidoliatus, and G. sieboldi groups, and this study follows that arrangement. While the Geophis dubius group was considered by Downs (1967) to consist of only five species, it has received a great deal of taxonomic interest in recent decades and is currently composed of at least 12 species, with a collective range from along the Atlantic versant from southern Hidalgo to central

Guatemala, and along the Pacific versant from western Oaxaca to El Salvador and Guatemala. Geophis fuscus (Fisher 1886) was described from "Jalapa, Mexico" and later considered synonymous with $G$. dubius by various authors (Boulenger 1894; Bogert and Porter 1966; Downs 1967; Campbell et al. 1983; Nieto-Montes de Oca 2003). Herein, we give more insight to the potential origin and validity of G. fuscus.

The Geophis dubius group is defined by having a head which is indistinct or slightly distinct from the neck; snout long and bluntly pointed; rostral prominent, its visible length is one third or more its distance from the frontal; internasals large, rounded anteriorly; prefrontal short; anterior edge of the frontal sharply angulate;
parietal short; supraocular small, triangular and absent in G. rhodogaster; eye small; postnasal enlarged; loreal short; anterior temporal absent; dorsal scales smooth or keeled and in 17 rows, and scales above the vent with paired apical pits (absent in some species) according to Downs (1967).

Species of the Geophis dubius group are mostly dark dorsally without conspicuous patterns, although several exceptions exist. The most remarkably colored species is G. lorancai, which has black bands on a bright orange background. Herein, we describe a new species of the Geophis dubius group that is unique within the genus in possessing bright crimson red lateral stripes on a slate gray background. The only species we are aware of in Mexico with bright crimson red lateral stripes are Gyalopion quadrangulare (Günther, 1893) and Sonora mutabilis Stickel, 1943; however, both belong to Colubridae, and are white and black banded snakes from the tropical deciduous forests of western Mexico.

## Materials and Methods

The specimens of the new species were compared with specimens of all species of the Geophis dubius group from Central Mexico, as well as the relevant information published in the literature. The specimens examined are listed in Appendix 1.

Scale nomenclature follows Downs (1967) and Savage and Watling (2008). Scale counts were performed with the aid of a dissecting microscope. Measurements were taken with a ruler or digital calipers to the nearest 0.1 mm (Truper, Mexico). Ventrals were counted as suggested by Downs (1967). Bilateral characters were scored on both sides. When the condition of a given character was not identical on both sides, the conditions on the left and right sides are given, in that order, separated by a slash ( $/$ ). In some instances, the conditions on the left and right sides are given in that manner in the tables even when they do not differ. Head length was measured from the tip of the snout to the posterior end of the parietals, and head width was measured at the widest point of the head at the posterior part of the jaw. All scale dimensions were measured at their maximum. To examine dentition characters, the maxilla and ectopterygoid were removed from the skull and cleansed in a dilute solution of Proteinase K at $34^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for approximately one hour. The diagnosis is based on both the specimens examined and the extensive data published on the Geophis dubius group by Canseco-Márquez et al. (2016). Data for $G$. fuscus were taken from the original description (Fischer 1886). Other relevant literature that contributed to the diagnostics includes: Bogert and Porter (1966), Downs (1967), Smith and Holland (1969), Campbell and Murphy (1977), Savage (1981), Campbell et al. (1983), Restrepo and Wright (1987), Smith and Chiszar (1992), Smith and Flores-Villela (1993), Lips and Savage (1994), Smith (1995), Wilson et al. (1998), Pérez-Higareda et
al. (2001), Myers (2003), Nieto-Montes de Oca (2003), Savage and Watling (2008), Townsend (2009), Townsend and Wilson (2006), and Pavón-Vázquez et al. (2011, 2013). Abbreviations used in the text and tables are as follows: snout-vent length (SVL), tail length (TL), total length (TotL), head length (HL), head width (HW), and snout-orbit length (SL).

Molecular analysis. For DNA extraction and PCR amplification, fragments of the mtDNA gene cytochrome $\mathrm{b}(c y t-b)$ were obtained for G. lorancai, G. semidoliatus, and the holotype of the new species (Table 1). The genomic DNA was extracted from liver or muscle tissue with the use of the standard ammonium acetate protocol (Fetzner 1999), and Polymerase Chain Reaction (PCR) was used to amplify the aforementioned fragments with the primers L14919-H15716 and L15845-H16064 (Burbrink et al. 2000). PCR products were purified with polyethylene glycol (Lis 1980). Purified DNA was sequenced by Macrogen Korea (Standard-Seq of Macrogen Inc.). Sequences of $c y t-b$ were obtained from GenBank for G. juarezi, G. carinosus, G. turbidus, and $G$. dubius of the Geophis dubius group; while five samples for the remaining five species groups of Geophis (G. occabus, G. godmani, G. bicolor, G. omiltemanus, and G. latifrontalis), and Rhadinaea flavilata were used as outgroup (Table 1).

The alignment was performed using the Muscle algorithm included in the software MEGA 7 (Kumar et al. 2016; Tamura et al. 2018). The best-fitting substitution models and partitioning schemes were obtained simultaneously using the Bayesian Information Criterion in the software PartitionFinder 2.1.1 (Lanfear 2016). A Bayesian phylogenetic analysis was performed with the software MrBayes 3.2 (Ronquist et al. 2011). The analysis was run for $30,000,000$ generations with the default settings and tree sampling every 3,000 generations. The results were evaluated for convergence and sufficient sampling in Tracer 1.6 (Rambaut et al. 2014), and the combined trees were obtained in each run using LogCombiner 1.8.4 (Drummond et al. 2012). The maximum clade credibility (MCC) tree was annotated in TreeAnnotator 1.8.4 (Drummond et al. 2012) after specifying a burn-in of $25 \%$. Nodes with a Posterior probability ( PP ) $\geq 0.95$ were considered significantly supported (Huelsenbeck and Rannala 2004).

## Results

## Geophis cansecoi sp. nov.

Figs. 1-6.

## urn:Isid:zoobank.org:act:0F7EF314-A7DC-4DC6-B7D8-9B99255A367F

Holotype (Figs. 1-2). MZFZ 4432 (field number, CIG 1161). Adult male, collected at 0.9 km south of Los Capulines, on Misantla-Chiconquiaco Hwy., Municipio
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Table 1. Collection and voucher data for colubrid genetic samples used in this study. Acronyms for herpetological collections follow Sabaj (2019). JAC, CIG, RWB, and ENS are field identifiers for un-catalogued specimens being deposited in the MZFZ, MZFC-HE, and UTA.

| No. | Voucher number | Species | Locality | GenBank accession no. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | JAC 24684 | Geophis bicolor | Mexico: Michoacán | JX398637 |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | MZFZ 4432 | Geophis cansecoi sp. nov. | Mexico: Veracruz: Chiconquiaco | MZ883108 |
| 3 | MZFC-HE 10552 | Geophis carinosus | Mexico: Veracruz: Volcan San Martín | KC917314 |
| 4 | EBUAP 1966: | Geophis dubius | Mexico: Oaxaca: Monte Flor | KC917318 |
| 5 | MZFC-HE 16160 | Geophis dubius | Mexico: Oaxaca: Santa Marí Guienagati | KC917316 |
| 6 | MZFC-HE 27256 | Geophis dubius | Mexico: Oaxaca: San Isidro Buenos Aires | KC917319 |
| 7 | MZFC-HE 27257 | Geophis dubius | Mexico: Oaxaca: San Martín Buenavista | KC917317 |
| 8 | CAS 178126 | Geophis godmani | Costa Rica: Puntarenas: Las Tablas | JQ598932 |
| 9 | MZFC-HE 27525 | Geophis juarezi | Mexico: Oaxaca: Santa Maria Alotepec | KC917315 |
| 10 | RWB 7232 | Geophis latifrontalis | Mexico: Queretaro: San Joaquin | KC917323 |
| 11 | MZFC-HE 28405 | Geophis lorancai | Mexico: Veracruz: Zongolica | MZ883110 |
| 12 | MZFC-HE 28404 | Geophis lorancai | Geophis occabus | Mexico: Guerrero: El Molote |
| 13 | MZFC-HE 25528 | Geophis omiltemanus | Mexico: Guerrero | MZ883109 |
| 14 | ENS 11496 | Geophis semidoliatus | Mexico: Veracruz: Nepopoalco | MZ917323 |
| 15 | CIG 1138 | Geophis turbidus | Mexico: Puebla: Cuetzalan | KC917321 |
| 16 | MZFC-HE 27253 | Mexico: Puebla: Cuetzalan | KC917320 |  |
| 17 | MZFC-HE 27254 | Geophis turbidus | AF471078 |  |
| 18 | CAS 198643 | Rhadinaea flavilata | Lake Ural |  |

de Yecuatla, ( $19.811724^{\circ},-96.824587^{\circ}$, datum WGS84, $1,590 \mathrm{~m}$ asl), Veracruz, Mexico on 5 June 2017 by Christoph I. Grünwald, André J. Grünwald, and Iván T. Ahumada-Carrillo.

Paratypes ( $\boldsymbol{n}=\mathbf{1 4}$, Figs. 3-6). MZFZ 4433 (CIG 01162). Adult, DOR, collected at 1.1 km south of Los Capulines, on Misantla-Chiconquiaco Hwy., Municipio de Yecuatla, $\left(19.810740^{\circ},-96.824874^{\circ}\right.$, datum WGS84, $1,626 \mathrm{~m}$ asl), Veracruz, Mexico, on 6 June 2017 by Christoph I. Grünwald, Iván T. Ahumada-Carrillo, and André J. Grünwald. MZFZ 4434-35 (CIG 01378-79), MZFZ 4436-38 (CIG 01393-95), INIRENA 2811-14 (CIG 01396-99), MZFZ 4448-49 (CIG 01490-91). Adults and juveniles, collected at Los Capulines, on Misantla-Chiconquiaco Hwy., Municipio de Yecuatla, (19.813360 ${ }^{\circ}$, $96.827240^{\circ}$, datum WGS84, $1,570 \mathrm{~m}$ asl), Veracruz, Mexico, on 8 June 2019 by Christoph I. Grünwald, André J. Grünwald, and Carlos E. MontañoRuvalcaba. INIRENA 2815-16 (CIG 01386-87). Adults, collected at 3.7 km S of Los Capulines, on MisantlaChiconquiaco Hwy., Municipio de Chinconquiaco, (19.793370 ${ }^{\circ}$, $-96.822970^{\circ}$, datum WGS84, $1,763 \mathrm{~m}$ asl), Veracruz, Mexico, on 8 June 2019 by Christoph I. Grünwald, André J. Grünwald, and Carlos E. MontañoRuvalcaba.

Diagnosis. A member of the Geophis dubius group, as defined by Downs (1967) and expanded by Wilson and Townsend (2007), and characterized by the following combination of traits: eye relatively small; single supraocular and postocular present on each side (with
one exception, see below); no anterior temporal scale, penultimate supralabial and parietal in contact; second infralabials small, broadly separated from each other; mental scale and anterior chinshields in contact; smooth dorsal scales throughout the body arranged in 17 rows; ventrals 134-142 in females ( $n=7$ ), and 125-131 in males $(n=7)$; subcaudals 28-35 in females $(n=7)$, and 34-37 in males ( $n=7$ ), with ventral + subcaudal totals 163-173 in females $(n=7)$ and 159-165 in males ( $n=7$ ); tail length $11.6-16.3 \%$ of TotL in females, $16.7-19.0 \%$ of TotL in males; dorsal pattern slate gray, with crimson red lateral stripe on each side, usually on first three or four scale rows but occasionally occupying part of the fifth; venter pale cream, except on the ventral surfaces of the head and throat, which are gray; maxillary teeth 6-8.

Geophis cansecoi is distinct from all species in the G. championi and G. semidoliatus groups, as well as most species in the G. sieboldi group by possessing the dorsal scales arranged in 17 rows (vs. 15 rows), and from the remaining species in the G. sieboldi group by possessing smooth dorsal scales throughout the body (vs. dorsal scales keeled on posterior half of body). Geophis cansecoi differs from all species in the G. omiltemanus and G. chaylybeus groups by a small eye, $10-12 \%$ of head length (vs. $>12 \%$ ); furthermore, from the species in the G. omiltemanus group by lacking an anterior temporal scale, thus either the fourth or fifth supralabial in contact with parietal (vs. fifth supralabial separated from parietal by anterior temporal scale); from some species in the G. chalybeus group (G. dugesii, G. nigrocinctus, and G. tarascae) by possessing dorsal scales arranged in 17 rows (vs. 15 rows) and from the remaining species by


Fig. 1. Holotype of Geophis cansecoi sp. nov. MZFZ 4432 from Los Capulínes, Municipio de Yecuatla, Veracruz, Mexico. (A) Dorsolateral perspective in life. (B) Lateral perspective in life. (C) Ventral perspective in life.
possessing a mental and anterior chinshields in contact (vs. separated by a pair of enlarged first infralabials, which are in contact). Geophis cansecoi can be distinguished from members of the G. latifrontalis group as follows: from G. latifrontalis and G. mutitorques by lacking an anterior temporal scale and possessing the fourth or fifth supralabial in contact with parietal (vs. fifth supralabial separated from parietal by anterior temporal scale); from G. blanchardi and G. latifrontalis by possessing mental and anterior chinshields in contact (vs. separated by a
pair of enlarged first infralabials which are in contact), as well as from all species by its unique color pattern of slate gray ground coloration with two crimson red lateral stripes (vs. variable ground coloration with or without bands and without lateral stripes).

Geophis cansecoi can be distinguished from species within its own Geophis dubius group, as follows: from G. carinosus, G. juarezi, G. rostralis, and sometimes G. turbidus by possessing smooth scales throughout the body (vs. strongly keeled dorsal scales on posterior


Fig. 2. Holotype of Geophis cansecoi sp. nov. MZFZ 4432 from Los Capulínes, Municipio de Yecuatla, Veracruz, Mexico. (A) Dorsal perspective in preservative. (B) Ventral perspective in preservative.
portion of the body or above vent); from G. anocularis, G. duellmani, and G. rhodogaster by usually possessing a supraocular scale (vs. supraocular scale absent); from $G$. anocularis and $G$. duellmani by possessing a postocular scale (vs. postocular scale absent); from G. dubius and G. fuscus (see below) by possessing internasal scales and prefrontal scales that are not fused (vs. fused); from G. carinosus, G. dubius, G. immaculatus, G. juarezi, G. nephodrymus, G. rhodogaster, and sometimes G. turbidus by first infralabial scales that are broadly separated, never in contact (vs. in contact or narrowly separated); from G. carinosus, G. juarezi, and sometimes G. anocularis and G. fulvoguttatus by possessing more than 125 ventral scales in males (vs. less than 125); from G. anocularis and usually from G. carinosus and G. immaculatus by possessing more than 134 ventral scales in females (vs. usually fewer); from G. dubius by possessing fewer than 142 ventral scales in females (vs. more than 144); from G. carinosus, G. duellmani, G. juarezi, G. rhodogaster, and $G$. rostralis by possessing fewer than 38 subcaudal scales in males (vs. 39 or more); from G. nephodrymus and $G$. lorancai by possessing 34 or more subcaudal scales in males (vs. 35 or less); from G. carinosus and G. juarezi by possessing fewer than 35 subcaudal scales in females (vs. 37 or more); from all species in the species group other than $G$. lorancai by possessing fewer maxillary teeth 6-8 (vs. 9 or more); from G. annocularis, G. carinosus, G. duellmani, G. juarezi, G. rhodogaster, and $G$. rostralis by possessing a shorter tail in males, $17-19 \%$ of TotL (vs. more than $19 \%$ of TotL); from G. nephodrymus by possessing a longer tail in males $17-19 \%$ of TotL (vs. less than $17 \%$ of TotL); from $G$. carinosus, G. duellmani, and G. juarezi, by possessing a shorter tail in females, $12-16 \%$ of TotL (vs. more than $16 \%$ of TotL); and from all species in the species group by its unique color pattern of slate gray ground coloration with two crimson red lateral stripes (vs. variable ground coloration with or without bands and without lateral stripes). A comparison of the diagnostic characters of all
species of the G. dubius species group is given in Table 2. Many species of Mexican Geophis are poorly understood, and in many cases photographs of live individuals have not been published. For comparative purposes, we have included photos of closely related species of the Geophis dubius group as well as sympatrically occurring species of Geophis from other species groups (Figs. 7-9).

Description of holotype (Figs. 1-2). MZFZ 4432. Adult male. SVL 227 mm ; TL 47; TotL 274 mm . HL 8.6 mm (from tip to posterior border of parietal); HW 5.1 mm , head slightly ( 1.3 times) distinct from body. Snout long, SL 3.7 mm , with HL 2.3 times SL, rounded from above, obtusely pointed from lateral profile, projecting anteriorly 1.0 mm beyond the lower jaw. Rostral 1.6 times as broad as high ( 2.6 mm wide, 1.6 mm high ), portion visible from above $(1.0 \mathrm{~mm})$ is 0.3 times as long as its distance from frontal $(3.3 \mathrm{~mm}), 1.4$ times as long as common internasal suture $(0.7 \mathrm{~mm})$, with posterior end approximately at level of anterior margin of nostrils; internasals as broad as long (length / width $)=(1.2 \mathrm{~mm} / 1.2 \mathrm{~mm})$, angular anteriorly, in lateral contact with anterior and posterior nasals. Prefrontals in lateral contact with postnasal, loreal, and eye on each side, their length $2.7 \mathrm{~mm}, 73 \%$ of the length of SL, and their common suture 1.7 mm , $63 \%$ of the length of frontal. Frontal wider than long, 3.1 mm wide, 2.7 mm long, 1.2 times as wide as long. Supraocular large, in contact with prefrontal, frontal, parietal, and postocular. Postoculars moderately sized, in contact with supraocular, parietal, and fourth and fifth supralabials. Parietal 3.8 mm long, 2.7 mm wide, 1.4 times as long as wide, length of parietal $44 \%$ of HL , the common suture between parietals $2.4 \mathrm{~mm}, 89 \%$ of frontal length. Nasal divided, postnasal longer than prenasal with combined length of both nasals ( 2.1 mm ) longer than loreal. Loreal 1.6 mm long, 1.1 mm high, longer than high, and reaching orbit. Eye small, $0.9 \mathrm{~mm}, 10 \%$ of HL. Supralabials six on both sides, first in contact with nasals, second and third in contact with loreal, third and fourth


Fig. 3. Diagnostic characters of paratype Geophis cansecoi sp. nov. MZFZ 4436 from Los Capulínes, Municipio de Yecuatla, Veracruz, Mexico. (A) Dorso-lateral perspective in life. (B) Dorsal profile of head in life. (C) Lateral profile of head in life. (D) Ventral profile of head in life. (E) Ventral surface of tail in life.
entering orbit, fifth largest and in contact with parietal and posterior temporal. Anterior temporal absent, one posterior temporal. Four nuchal scales in contact with parietals.

Mental 1.2 times as broad as long (1.4 mm broad, 1.2
mm long), rounded anteriorly, in posterior contact with both anterior chinshields. Infralabials five left / six right, first through third in contact with anterior chinshields, and third and fourth in contact with posterior chinshields. Anterior chinshields irregular, left chinshield 2.4 mm
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Table 2. Key to comparative characters of the Geophis dubius species group.

|  | G. cansecoi sp. nov. | G. turbidus | G. Iorancai | G. dubius | G. fuscus | G. rostralis | G. carinosus | G. juarezi | G. duellmani | G. anocularis | G. fulvoguttatus | G. immaculatus | G. nephodrymus | G. rhodogaster |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Extent of dorsal scale keeling | Smooth | Smooth or keeled on posterior one-fourth of body | Smooth | Smooth with keels barely visible above vent | Smooth | Keeled above vent | Strongly keeled on posterior two-thirds of body | Strongly keeled on posterior one-half to two-thirds of body | Smooth | Smooth or weakly keeled above vent | Smooth | Smooth | Smooth | Smooth |
| Supraoculars | Present | Present | Present | Present | Present | Present | Present | Present | Absent | Absent | Present | Present | Present | Absent |
| Postoculars | Present | Present | Present | Present | Present | Present | Present | Present | Absent | Absent | Present | Present | Present | Present |
| Prefrontals and internasals fused or not fused | Not fused | Not fused | Not fused | Fused | Fused | Not fused | Not fused | Not fused | Not fused | Not fused | Not fused | Not fused | Not fused | Not fused |
| Loreal length (as length/ height) | 1.5 | 1.3 | 1.5 | Varied | 2.0 | ? | Long and narrow | 1.1-2.0 | 1.5 | 2.0-2.5 | 1.4-1.7 | 1.5 | 1.1-2.0 | 1.4-1.8 |
| First gular single or paired | Single | Usually single | Usually single or none | Paired | Single | ? | Single | Single | ? | Single or paired | ? | Single | Single | ? |
| $1^{\text {st }}$ pair of infralabials | Separated | In contact or narrowly separated | Separated | In contact or narrowly separated | In contact | Broadly separated | In contact | In contact | Broadly separated | Broadly separated | Separated | In contact | In contact or narrowly separated | In contact |
| Subcaudal coloration | Red with some light gray crossbands and darker gray on tip | Banded white and brown | Reddish or orange with darker gray on tip | Brown | Cream, yellowish | White or pale cream with mottled with dark | Brown with traces of white anteriorly | Cream with reddish brown crossbands, turning to reddish brown | White anteriorly then dark brown | Pink suffused with dark brown | - | Dark gray | Dark gray | - |
| Ventrals ( $0^{\text {a }}$ ) | 125-131 | 125-139 | 125-130 | 131-149 | 142 | 126-132 | 116-123 | 114 | 126-133 | 122-126 | 135-137 | 129 | 122-138 | 131-138 |
| Ventrals ( P $^{\text {) }}$ | 134-142 | 129-140 | 130 | 137-151 | - | - | 125-136 | 118-124 | 134-138 | 123-132 | 145-147 | 130-134 | 128-138 | 136-147 |
| Subcaudals <br> ( ${ }^{3}$ ) | 34-37 | 34-39 | 33-35 | 36-50 | 49 | 39-43 | 45-49 | 55 | 40-43 | 35-39 | 34-36 | 32 | 22-31 | 39-46 |
| Subcaudals $\text { ( } \mathrm{P} \text { ) }$ | 28-35 | 26-31 | 25 | 31-41 | - | - | 37-43 | 49 | 32-36 | 29-35 | 24-35 | 27-29 | 24-32 | 29-35 |
| Maxillary teeth | 6-8 | 9 | 7 | 10-12 | ? | 11 | 10-13 | 11-13 | 10-12 | 09-11 | 10 | 12 | 11 | 14-17 |
| Tail length / total length ratio ( ${ }^{\prime}$ ) | 0.17-0.19 | 0.14-0.18 | 0.15-0.18 | 0.17-0.21 | 0.16 | 0.20-0.21 | 0.23-0.24 | 0.25 | 0.20-0.21 | 0.21-0.22 | 0.16-0.18 | 0.17 | 0.12-0.165 | 0.22 |

A new Geophis species from Veracruz, Mexico

|  | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \begin{array}{l} \text { G. cansecoi } \\ \text { sp. nov. } \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | G. turbidus | G. lorancai | G. dubius | G. fuscus | G. rostralis | G. carinosus | G. juarezi | G. duellmani | G. anocularis | G. fulvogutatus | G. immaculatus | G. nephodrymus | G. rhodogaster |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tail length / total length ratio ( ( ) | 0.12-0.16 | 0.12-0.13 | - | - | - | 0.15 | 0.18-0.195 | 0.22 | 0.17 | 0.155 | 0.11 | 0.14 | 0.12-0.15 | 0.135-0.17 |
| Dorsal coloration pattern | Dark slate gray dorsal coloration with red lateral stripes | Grayishbrown, unmarked, one juvenile with a pink collar | Dark gray crossbands on a red or orange background | Brownish or slate gray, unmarked | Brownish or slate gray, unmarked | Gray (?), unmarked | Dark brownish or slate gray, unmarked | Dark brown | $\begin{gathered} \text { Dark saddles } \\ \text { on a red } \\ \text { or white } \\ \text { background } \end{gathered}$ | Dark slate gray | Red orange middorsal spots on a dark grayish brown background, darker posteriorly | Brownish | Gray background, <br> ranging from unpatterned to extensively marked with bands, laterally offset partial bands, and lateral blotches that range from pale grayish cream to brick red | Grayish to reddish brown |
| Ventral coloration | White with reddish outlines | Pale Cream | Reddish or orange | White | Cream, yellowish | Unmarked, white or pale cream | Cream with brown anterior borders | Cream, <br> with narrow <br> crossbands | Unmarked, red or white | Pink | Whitish, lateral edges mottled with dark pigment | White with brown on anterior and lateral edges of ventrals | Cream, yellowish with brown outlines | Reddish orange or yellow |
| Geographic distribution | Sierra Madre Oriental, west-central Veracruz | Sierra Madre Oriental, east-central Hidalgo and northern Puebla, Mexico | Sierra de <br> Zongolica, <br> west- <br> central <br> Veracruz, <br> and <br> Sierra de <br> Quimixtlán, <br> east-central <br> Puebla, <br> Mexico | Central Oaxaca, Mexico | Veracruz <br> Xalapa, Veracruz? | Sierra Madre del Sur, southern Oaxaca, Mexico | Northern <br> Chiapas and southern Veracruz, Mexico to western Guatemala | Sierra de Juárez and Sierra Mixe, northern Оахаса, Mexico | Sierra de Juárez, northern Оахаса, Mexico | Sierra Mixe, eastern Oaxaca, Mexico | Northwestern El Salvador to southwestern Honduras | Southeastern Chiapas, Mexico and southwestern Guatemala | Sierra de Omoa, northwestern Honduras | Eastern Chiapas, Mexico through southern Guatemala to southwestern Honduras and northwestern El Salvador |
| Habitat | Cloud forest | $\begin{gathered} \text { Cloud forest } \\ \text { and pine } \\ \text { forest } \end{gathered}$ | Cloud forest |  | Unknown | Humid pine-oak forest | Cloud forest, pine-oak forest, and wet forest | Wet forest and cloud forest ecotone | Cloud forest | Cloud forest | Cloud forest | Cloud forest and wet forest | Cloud forest | Humid pineoak forest |



Fig. 4. Diagnostic characters of paratype Geophis cansecoi sp. nov. MZFZ 4437 from Los Capulínes, Municipio de Yecuatla, Veracruz, Mexico. (A) Dorso-lateral perspective in life. (B) Dorsal profile of head in life. (C) Lateral profile of head in life. (D) Ventral profile of head in life. (E) Ventral surface of tail in life.
long and 1.0 mm wide ( 2.4 times as long as wide) and right anterior chinshield 2.1 mm long and 1.0 mm wide ( 2.1 times as long as wide). Left posterior chinshield 1.4 mm long and 1.0 mm wide ( 1.4 times as long as wide) and right posterior chinshield 1.7 mm long and 1.1 mm wide ( 1.5 times as long as wide). Three midgular scales. Infralabials and scales in chin region smooth. Dorsal scales in 17-17-17 rows, smooth throughout body; no evident apical pits. Ventrals 125 ; cloacal plate single; subcaudal scales paired, 34 on both sides.

Coloration in life (Fig. 1). Dorsal coloration of head and mid-dorsal region of body and tail slate gray, with one crimson red lateral stripe on each side. The red lateral stripe restricted to scale rows 1 and half of 2 at one head length behind the neck, then expanding to cover scale rows 1-3 and lower portions of 4 at mid-body, and continuing to cover scale rows $1-3$ and lower portions of 4 above vent. Dorsal coloration of tail slate gray, and red lateral stripe continues on scale 1 and half of 2 (with some speckling on 3 ) on anterior half of tail, and then


Fig. 5. Diagnostic characters of paratype Geophis cansecoi sp. nov. INIRENA 2814 from Los Capulínes, Municipio de Yecuatla, Veracruz, Mexico. (A) Dorso-lateral perspective in life. (B) Dorsal profile of head in life. (C) Lateral profile of head in life. (D) Ventral profile of head in life. (E) Ventral surface of tail in life.


Fig. 6. Paratypes of Geophis cansecoi sp. nov. in life. (A-B) MZFZ 4435; (C-D) INIRENA 2812; (E) INIRENA 2814; (F) MZFZ 4434; all from the vicinity of Los Capulínes, Municipio de Yecuatla, Veracruz, Mexico.
remnants of red lateral stripes continue on scale 1 and parts of 2 on posterior half of the tail, with the tail tip slate gray. The ventral coloration in life of the head and neck is dark gray on the mental and anterior chinshields and infralabials, light gray on the posterior chinshields, gulars, and first 15 ventral scales, fading after the ninth ventral. The ventral coloration on the body is white/pale cream. The ventral scales are outlined in pink, which represents the remnants of the red lateral stripe which fades out on the ventrals. The pink ventral scale outlines intensify in color towards the posterior portion of body
and become wider, enclosing the pale cream coloration present on the ventral scales; and the last three ventral scales, as well as the cloacal plate, are crimson red. Subcaudals are crimson red, barely outlined in white/ cream on anterior three-fourths of tail and then outlined in slate gray on posterior eight subcaudal pairs. Tail tip is slate gray above and below.

Coloration in preservative (Fig. 2). General coloration bicolor. Dorsal surfaces of head, body, and tail predominately dark gray; ventral surfaces of body and tail predominately pale cream, with dark gray stippling

| Specimen | $\begin{gathered} \text { MZFZ } \\ 4432 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { MZFZ } \\ 4434 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { MZFZ } \\ 4435 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { INIRENA } \\ 2815 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { INIRENA } \\ 2816 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { MZFZ } \\ 4436 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { MZFZ } \\ 4437 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { MZFZ } \\ 4438 \end{gathered}$ | INIRENA 2811 | $\begin{gathered} \text { INIRENA } \\ 2812 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { INIRENA } \\ 2813 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { INIRENA } \\ 2814 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { MZFZ } \\ 4448 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { MZFZ } \\ 4449 \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sex | Male | Female | Male | Female | Female | Male | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |
| TotL (mm) | 274 | 294 | 187 | 302 | 239 | 174 | 182 | 264 | 169 | 199 | 198 | 311 | 180 | 158 |
| SVL (mm) | 227 | 254 | 153 | 262 | 200 | 141 | 159 | 229 | 140 | 169 | 165 | 275 | 148 | 136 |
| TL (mm) | 47 | 40 | 34 | 40 | 39 | 33 | 33 | 35 | 29 | 30 | 33 | 36 | 32 | 22 |
| EL (mm) | 0.9 | 0.8 | 0.75 | 0.9 | 7.1 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 1 | 0.6 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.7 |
| HL (mm) | 8.6 | 8 | 7.3 | 7.8 | 0.7 | 6.4 | 6.9 | 8.2 | 6.3 | 6.7 | 6.9 | 8.3 | 6.5 | 6.3 |
| EL/HL | 0.105 | 0.100 | 0.103 | 0.115 | 10.143 | 0.109 | 0.116 | 0.122 | 0.095 | 0.119 | 0.116 | 0.096 | 0.123 | 0.111 |
| TL/TotL | 0.172 | 0.136 | 0.182 | 0.132 | 0.163 | 0.190 | 0.181 | 0.133 | 0.172 | 0.151 | 0.167 | 0.116 | 0.178 | 0.139 |
| TL/SVL | 0.207 | 0.157 | 0.222 | 0.153 | 0.195 | 0.234 | 0.208 | 0.153 | 0.207 | 0.178 | 0.200 | 0.131 | 0.216 | 0.162 |
| Dorsal scale rows | 17 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 17 |
| Ventrals | 125 | 141 | 126 | 142 | 136 | 126 | 131 | 138 | 129 | 134 | 130 | 135 | 127 | 135 |
| Subcaudals | 34 | 32 | 37 | 31 | 35 | 36 | 34 | 28 | 35 | 29 | 35 | 30 | 37 | 28 |
| Total scales | 159 | 173 | 163 | 173 | 171 | 162 | 165 | 166 | 164 | 163 | 165 | 165 | 164 | 163 |
| Extent of dorsal keeling | Smooth | Smooth | Smooth | Smooth | Smooth | Smooth | Smooth | Smooth | Smooth | Smooth | Smooth | Smooth | Smooth | Smooth |
| Maxillary teeth | 7 and 6 | 6 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Prefrontals and internasals fused or not fused | Not fused | Not fused | Not fused | Not fused | Not fused | Not fused | Not fused | Not fused | Not fused | Not fused | Not fused | Not fused | Not fused | Not fused |
| Supralabials | 6L/6R | 6L/6R | 6L/6R | $6 \mathrm{~L} / 6 \mathrm{R}$ | $6 \mathrm{~L} / 6 \mathrm{R}$ | 6L/5R | $6 \mathrm{~L} / 5 \mathrm{R}$ | $6 \mathrm{~L} / 6 \mathrm{R}$ | 6L/ 6 R | $6 \mathrm{~L} / 6 \mathrm{R}$ | 6L/6R | 6L / 6R | 6L/6R | 6L/6R |
| Midgulars | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 and 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 |
| Infralabials | $5 \mathrm{~L} / 6 \mathrm{R}$ | 6L/6R | 6L / 6 R | $6 \mathrm{~L} / 6 \mathrm{R}$ | $6 \mathrm{~L} / 6 \mathrm{R}$ | 6L / 6 R | $6 \mathrm{~L} / 6 \mathrm{R}$ | $6 \mathrm{~L} / 6 \mathrm{R}$ | $6 \mathrm{~L} / 6 \mathrm{R}$ | $6 \mathrm{~L} / 6 \mathrm{R}$ | $6 \mathrm{~L} / 6 \mathrm{R}$ | $6 \mathrm{~L} / 6 \mathrm{R}$ | $6 \mathrm{~L} / 6 \mathrm{R}$ | 6L/6R |
| Mental in contact with chinshields | In contact | In contact | In contact | In contact | In contact | In contact | In contact | In contact | In contact | In contact | In contact | In contact | In contact | In contact |
| Postocular | 1 and 1 | 1 and 1 | 1 and 1 | 1 and 1 | 1 and 1 | 1 and 1 | 1 and 1 | 1 and 1 | 1 and 1 | 1 and 1 | 1 and 1 | 1 and 1 | 1 and 1 | 1 and 1 |
| Supraocular | 1 and 1 | 1 and 1 | 1 and 1 | 1 and 1 | 1 and 1 | 1 and 1 | 1 and 1 | 1 and 1 | 1 and 0 | 1 and 1 | 1 and 1 | 1 and 1 | 1 and 1 | 1 and 1 |
| Anterior temporal | Absent | Absent | Absent | Absent | Absent | Absent | Absent | Absent | Absent | Absent | Absent | Absent | Absent | Absent |
| Prefontal contacting parietal | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | Barely on one side due to lack of supraocular | No | No | No | No | No |
| Number of sides to frontal | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| $1^{\text {st }}$ pairs | Broadly Separated | Broadly separated | Broadly separated | Broadly separated | Broadly separated | Broadly separated | Broadly separated | Broadly separated | Broadly separated | Broadly separated | Broadly separated | Broadly separated | Broadly separated | Broadly separated |



Fig. 7. Comparative photos of sympatric or nearly sympatric species of Geophis living in close proximity of Geophis cansecoi $\mathbf{s p}$. nov. (A) Dorsal perspective of juvenile Geophis turbidus from vicinity of El Damo, Municipio de Tenango de Doria, Hidalgo. Photo by L. Fernández-Badillo. (B) Dorsal perspective of juvenile Geophis turbidus from vicinity of La Viejita, Municipio de Tenango de Doria, Hidalgo (CIB 04451). Photo by R. Cruz-Elizalde. (C) Dorsal perspective of Geophis semidoliatus from the vicinity of La Joya, Municipio de Tezonapa, Veracruz. UTA 52611. Photo by J.A. Campbell. (D) Ventral perspective of Geophis semidoliatus from the vicinity of La Joya, Municipio de Tezonapa, Veracruz. UTA 52611. Photo by J.A. Campbell. (E) Dorsal perspective of Geophis mutitorques from the vicinity of Chiconquiaco, Veracruz. CIG 1156. (F) Ventral perspective of Geophis mutitorques from the vicinity of Chiconquiaco, Veracruz. CIG 1156.
on subcaudals, increasing towards tip of tail. Lateral surfaces of body pale cream on first and lower portions of second scale rows on anterior third of body, increasing to first, second, third, and very bottom of fourth scale rows on latter two-thirds of body. Light lateral stripe on latter two-thirds of body variable but with slight amounts of light salmon, remnants of the red lateral stripe in life.

Variation. Morphological variations observed on 13 specimens are as follows: MZFZ 4436-37 has only five
supralabials on the right side (supralabials 3 and 4 are fused or partially fused). Four midgulars in MZFZ 4434 and MZFZ 4449, and irregularly split in INIRENA 2816, where it can be understood to represent either three or four midgulars between the posterior chinshields and first ventral. Supraocular absent on the right side of the head in INIRENA 2811. Meristic variation is given in Table 3.

Color in life. An adult female paratype had the following coloration. Dorsal coloration of head and mid-dorsal region of body and tail slate gray, with one


Fig. 8. Comparative photos of similar species of the Geophis dubius group from southern Mexico. (A) Dorsal perspective of Geophis dubius from the vicinity of Santa María Tlahuitoltepec, Oaxaca. CIG 00723. (B) Ventral perspective of Geophis dubius from the vicinity of Santa María Tlahuitoltepec, Oaxaca. CIG 00723. (C) Dorsal perspective of Geophis dubius from the vicinity of La Cumbre, Municipio de Santa Catarina Ixtepejí, Oaxaca. UTA 38826 (JAC 17793). Photo by J.A. Campbell. (D) Ventral perspective of Geophis dubius from the vicinity of La Cumbre, Municipio de Santa Catarina Ixtepejí, Oaxaca. UTA 38826 (JAC 17793). Photo by J.A. Campbell. (E) Dorsal perspective of Geophis anocularis from vicinity of Totontepec, Municipio de Totontepec Villa de Morelos, Oaxaca. CIG 00725. (F) Ventral perspective of Geophis anocularis from vicinity of Totontepec Villa de Morelos, Oaxaca. CIG 00725.
crimson red lateral stripe on each side. The red lateral stripe restricted to scale rows 1 and 2 at one headlength behind the neck, then expanding to cover scale rows $1-4$ and lower portions of 5 at midbody, and continuing to cover scale rows $1-4$ and lower portions of 5 above vent. Dorsal coloration of tail slate gray, and lateral
stripe dissipates on anterior one-fourth of tail; however, remnants of red lateral stripes continue to outline some of the lower dorsal scales on the tail onto the anterior three-fourths of the tail. The ventral coloration in life dark gray on the mental and anterior portions of the chinshields, light gray on the remaining gulars and first


Fig. 9. Comparative photos of similar species of the Geophis dubius group from southern Mexico and Guatemala. (A) Dorsal perspective of Geophis lorancai from the vicinity of Zongolica, Veracruz. ITSZ 025. (B) Ventral perspective of Geophis lorancai from the vicinity of Zongolica, Veracruz. MZFC ITSZ 025. (C) Dorsal perspective of Geophis nasalis from the vicinity of Quetzaltenango, Guatemala. UTA 20800. (D) Ventral perspective of Geophis nasalis from the vicinity of Quetzaltenango, Guatemala. UTA 20800. (E) Dorsal perspective of Geophis rhodogaster from vicinity of Guatemala, Guatemala. UTA28347. (F) Ventral perspective of Geophis rhodogaster from the Department of Quetzaltenango, Guatemala (UTA 22752). Photos by M.A. de la Torre Loranca $(A-B)$ and J.A. Campbell $(C-F)$.
seven ventral scales, and then off white/pale cream on the remaining ventral scales of the anterior one-third of the body, changing to off white/pale cream with orange outline on sides and borders on the remaining two-thirds of body. Dorsal coloration of anterior half of tail red with slate gray outlines on sides and borders, posterior half of tail slate gray.

Two juvenile paratypes, a male and a female, had a dorsal coloration of head and mid-dorsal region of body and tail dark gray, with one crimson red lateral stripe
present on each side. The red lateral stripe was confined to scale rows 1 and 2 at one head length behind the neck, expanding to scale rows $1-3$ and the very bottom edge of 4 at mid-body, and reducing to scale rows $1-3$ above vent. Dorsal coloration of tail dark gray with red lateral stripes fading out on anterior one-fourth of the tail. Ventral coloration in life dark gray on the mental and anterior portions of the chinshields, then light gray on the gulars and first two ventral scales, changing to cream/off white on the remaining ventrals. Ventrals on the latter one-third


Fig. 10. Type locality of Geophis cansecoi sp. nov. at Los Capulínes, Municipio de Yecuatla, Veracruz. (A) Exact location where type specimen was collected. (B) General photo of type locality. (C) Decomposing log in clearing in cloud forest where several of the type specimens were collected.


Fig. 11. Bayesian phylogenetic inference of several members of the Geophis dubius group based on the mitochondrial loci 16 S rRNA. Black circles represent nodes with a posterior support of 1 . All nodes with support of less than 0.5 are collapsed. (A) Geophis occabus, (B) G. turbidus, (C) G. dubius, (D) G. lorancai, (E) G. cansecoi, (F) G. semmidoliatus. Photos by Christoph I. Grünwald (A, C, E, F), Raciel Cruz-Elizalde (B), and Miguel A. de la Torre-Loranca (D).


Fig. 12. Map showing the type localities and distribution of the Geophis dubius group members in southern Mexico and adjacent Guatemala. Circles represent localities and triangles represent known type localities. Type localities which are not known or not exact are not shown.
of the body on the male outlined in red. Subcaudals of the tail red with dark gray outlines, turning completely dark gray toward the tip of the tail.

Dentition. An adult female paratype (MZFZ 4434) had six teeth visible and two spaces, which probably represented missing teeth. The anterior maxillary tooth was opposite the first supralabial. The holotype appears to have 6-8 maxillary teeth visible; however, we did not remove the jaw.

Distribution, habitat, and ecology. This species appears to be restricted to the immediate vicinity of the type locality in the Sierra de Misantla portion of the Sierra Madre Oriental of Veracruz, Mexico (Fig. 10). It has been collected between $1,550-1,763 \mathrm{~m}$ asl in mesic cloud forest. Specimens were found beneath a variety of decomposing logs, trash, and rocks, and also crossing the road at night. All specimens were collected in the month of June.

Etymology. The specific epithet honors to Luis CansecoMárquez, a Mexican herpetologist who has dedicated a portion of his career to the study of snakes of the genus Geophis.

Relationships of Geophis cansecoi. The final sequence alignment consisted of $1,055 \mathrm{bp}$. The partitions and models that best fit the data were GTR +G for the first and second codon positions, and GTR+G+I for the third codon position. The phylogenetic hypotheses support the morphological data, which places G. cansecoi in the Geophis dubius group and supports the genetic distinctiveness of this species from other congeners in Mexico and northern Central America (Fig. 11). In the Maximum Credibility Tree, the sequence of Geophis from this population forms a strongly supported clade ( $\mathrm{Pp}=1.0$ ) with other species currently placed in the Geophis dubius group (G. carinosus, G. dubius, G. lorancai, G. juarezi, and G. turbidus). Furthermore, our results suggest that Geophis cansecoi forms a strongly supported clade $(\mathrm{Pp}=0.97)$ with its sister group, which includes G. carinosus, G. dubius, G. lorancai, and G. juarezi. Geophis turbidus appears to form the sister taxon to all the remaining haplotypes of the Geophis dubius group.

## Discussion

On the validity of G. fuscus Fischer, 1886. Geophis fuscus was described by Fischer (1886) based on a specimen collected by Mr. Kienast from "Jalapa"


Fig. 13. Holotype of Geophis fuscus (BMNH 1946.1.6.48) from "Jalapa," Mexico. (A) Dorsal perspective in preservative. (B) Ventral perspective in preservative. Photos by Jeff Streicher.
(=Xalapa?), Mexico (Fig. 12). Generally, it has been assumed that this specimen originated from near Xalapa, Veracruz. Fischer (1886) recognized G. fuscus as being closely related to $G$. dubius since the internasal scales were fused with the prefrontals. He distinguished $G$. fuscus from G. dubius, however, by having a longer loreal scale, possessing a first pair of infralabials in contact with each other, and having a single gular scale as opposed to a pair of midgular scales as in G. dubius. For the coloration, he described the ventral coloration of both the body and tail as unmarked pure yellow, as opposed to that of G. dubius, which he described as having a ventral coloration peppered with brown (Fischer 1886). Bogert and Porter (1966) considered G. fuscus conspecific with G. dubius. They proposed that since there are numerous towns in Mexico with the name Jalapa, including several in Oaxaca, and the specimen might have come from Oaxaca. However, the collector was M. Kienast-Zolly of Zurich, Switzerland, a Swiss diplomat who lived for many years on Pico de Orizaba, Veracruz, and made various botanical collections, specifically of orchids, in the immediate vicinity of his residence (Boyle 2019).

Thus, a central Veracruz origin of the type specimen of G. fuscus is more likely. Downs (1967) included the type specimen of G. fuscus in his definition of G. dubius, as he did specimens of G. rostralis, G. chalybeus, and $G$. anocularis. The confusion of these related taxa as one species by Downs (1967) renders his definition of $G$. dubius inaccurate. Furthermore, Downs (1967) ignored several of the diagnostic characters Fischer (1886) listed in his description of G. fuscus, such as the first pair of infralabials being in broad contact, the 49 subcaudal scales, and the brown subcaudal coloration.

The snakes of the Geophis dubius group are very habitat specific, and often partition mountain ranges amongst species by habitat and rainfall. A few examples of this pattern between closely related species can be seen in northern Puebla, where G. turbidus inhabits humid pine-oak woodland and pine forest, whereas an undescribed Geophis sp. (Canseco-Márquez, Pers. Comm.) inhabits cloud forest; in the Sierra Juárez of Oaxaca where G. dubius inhabits moist pine-oak and pine woodland, whereas G. duellmani inhabits cloud forest; and in the Sierra Mixe, Oaxaca where G. dubius inhabits
moist pine-oak and pine woodland while G. anocularis inhabits cloud forest (Pavón-Vázquez et al. 2013; Canseco-Márquez et al. 2016; Canseco-Márquez, Pers. Comm.). In the portion of Sierra Madre Oriental roughly between Xalapa, Veracruz, and the Oaxacan border, the only member of the Geophis dubius group that has been reported is the recently described G. lorancai, which is restricted to cloud forest at intermediate elevations (Canseco-Márquez et al. 2016). Whether any species of the Geophis dubius group inhabits the moist pine-oak and pine woodland in this region remains unknown but should be considered likely.

We propose that the dismissal of the suggestion by Bogert and Porter (1966) of a central Veracruz origin of the type of G. fuscus was unwarranted. Taking into consideration the presently known diversity of the Geophis dubius group in the Sierra Madre Oriental, the geographical distance between central Veracruz and the closest known specimens of G. dubius in Oaxaca (Sierra Mazateca) (Fig. 12), and evidence that relatively minor morphological differences are generally indicative of significant genetic divergence (Pavón-Vázquez et al. 2013), we consider G. fuscus as valid.

Geophis cansecoi can be readily distinguished from G. fuscus as follows (character states of G. fuscus in parenthesis): internasals and prefrontals separate (vs. fused); second infralabials broadly separated (vs. in broad contact); TL/TotL ratio in males $0.17-0.19$ (vs. 0.16 ); ventral scales in males 125-131 (vs. 142); subcaudal scales in males 34-36 (vs. 49) (Fig. 13B).

Conservation of Geophis cansecoi. Despite collection localities in two different municipalities, all known individuals of this species originate from a radius of about 2.5 km from the type locality, which happens to be located near the boundary of Yecuatla and Chiconquiaco municipalities. Extensive collection efforts and the revision of DOR specimens above and below the type locality failed to locate any additional specimens of this species. We suspect that this species, while locally abundant, might have an extremely restricted range. Geophis cansecoi might be endemic to a narrow band of extremely mesic cloud forest on the northern slopes of the Sierra de Misantla, which we understand to be the eastern-most extension of the Mexican Trans-Volcanic Belt in Veracruz running east-west between the cities of Misantla and Xalapa then dropping off into the Atlantic Coastal Plain. This extremely small distribution, coupled with moderate habitat modification at the type locality, should merit the highest level of conservation attention possible.
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Appendix 1. List of Geophis specimens examined in this study. Museum acronyms follow Sabaj (2019), except ITSZ $=$ Instituto Tecnológico Superior de Zongolica in Zongolica, Mexico, INIRENA = Instituto de Investigaciones sobre los Recursos Naturales (INIRENA) of the Universidad Michoacana de San Nicolás de Hidalgo (UMSNH) in Morelia, Mexico, and MZFZ = Museo de Zoología, Facultad de Estudios Superiores Zaragoza, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de Mexico. JAC, CIG, RWB, and ENS are field identifiers for un-catalogued specimens being deposited in the MZFZ, MZFC-HE, and UTA.

Geophis anocularis (9 specimens): MEXICO: Oaxaca: CIG 00725-729, CIG 00797, MZFC-HE 11591, MZFC-HE 16178, MZFC-HE 16180.

Geophis bicolor (1 specimen): MEXICO: Michoacán: JAC 24684.
Geophis carinosus (1 specimen): MEXICO: Veracruz: MZFC-HE 10552.
Geophis cansecoi sp. nov. (15 specimens): MEXICO: Veracruz: MZFZ 4432-38, 4448-49, INIRENA 2811-16.
Geophis dubius (12 specimens): MEXICO: Oaxaca: CIG 00723-724, CNAR 6732, EBUAP 1966, MZFC-HE 13887, MZFC-HE 16160, MZFC-HE 16193, MZFC-HE 16547, MZFC-HE 27255-258.
Geophis duellmani (4 specimens): MEXICO: Oaxaca: MZFC-HE 4525-527, MZFC-HE 5081.
Geophis fuscus (1 specimen): MEXICO: Veracruz: BMNH 1946.1.6.48.
Geophis godmani (1 specimen): COSTA RICA: Puntarenas: CAS 178126.
Geophis immaculatus (5 specimens): MEXICO: Chiapas: CIG 00786-787, CIG 01228, MZFC-HE 7259-260.
Geophis juarezi (2 specimens): MEXICO: Oaxaca: MZFC-HE 2236, MZFC-HE 27525.
Geophis latifrontalis (1 specimen): RWB 7232.
Geophis lorancai (8 specimens): MEXICO: Puebla: MZFC-HE 28404; Veracruz: ITSZ 025, ITSZ 071, ITSZ 217, MZFC-HE 28401-403, MZFC-HE 28405.

Geophis occabus (1 specimen): MEXICO: Guerrero: MZFC-HE 25528.
Geophis omiltemanus (1 specimen): MEXICO: Guerrero: ENS 11496.
Geophis rhodogaster (4 specimens): MEXICO: Chiapas: CIG 00130, SMR 1831, SMR 1847, SMR 1873.
Geophis semidoliatus (2 specimens): MEXICO: Veracruz: CIG 01138, CIG 01375.
Geophis turbidus (8 specimens): MEXICO: Puebla: CNAR 6886-889, CNAR 8233, KU 39642, MZFC-HE 27253254.

