

SCAMIT CODE: None

Date examined: 16 June 1999
Vouchered by: Dean Pasko

SYNONYMY: *Photis* ? *conchicola*

LITERATURE: See Page 2

DIAGNOSTIC CHARACTERS:

General:

Eye lobe poorly produced, blunt

Antennae short, setae moderately long

Male:

Coxae moderately setose (≤ 15 setae along ventral margin, typically 10-12)

Gnathopod 1, article 2 broad ($L:W \leq 2.0$), posterior margin convex

Gnathopod 1, article 5 shorter than article 6, posterior margin narrow and lobate (approx. one-third the length of anterior margin)

Gnathopod 1, palm concave, defining corner quadrate and slightly produced; coxa 1 ventral margin flat.

Gnathopod 2, robust, transverse (defining process extending to level of dactylar hinge); defining tooth displaced medially; palmar tooth tapered; dactyl thick, with blunt median tooth.

Gnathopod 2, article 2 broad, antero-distally produced, with stridulating ridge.

Female:

Coxae moderately setose.

Gnathopod 1, palm flat, nearly simple, defining corner poorly defined (little change of angle, no defining spine), the hind margin straight; article 5 subequal to 6, posterior margin approx. one-half anterior margin; article 2 narrow, unproduced.

Gnathopod 2, palm weakly stepped (or strongly excavate); article 2 unproduced.

Coloration: unknown, white in alcohol



Figure 1. *Photis* sp SD9, male gnathopod 1.



Figure 2. *Photis* sp SD9, male gnathopod 2

RELATED SPECIES:

Male *Photis parvidons* Conlan 1983 differs from *Photis* sp SD9 in that coxae 1 and 2 are distinctly shorter than coxae 3 & 4 (not subequal); gnathopod 1, article 5 is subequal to article 6, the posterior margin is approx 1/2 the anterior margin, article 6 is narrow and the defining corner is rounded; gnathopod 2, article 2 is less stout (according to the illustration in Conlan 1983), and the defining tooth of article 6 is not displaced medially. Females differ in the concave or sinuous palm of gnathopod 1 and the concave palm of gnathopod 2 (i.e., not stepped or excavate).

Male *P. conchicola* have coxae 1 & 2 distinctly shorter than 3 & 4, gnathopod 1 palm is convex or flat, and the dactyl of gnathopod 2 does not possess a tooth. Female *P. conchicola* appear to be more similar to *Photis* sp SD9, but differ because coxae 1 & 2 are much shorter than 3 & 4, the coxae are more densely setose, and gnathopod 2, article 2 possesses a strong antero-distal process.

LITERATURE:

Barnard, J.L. 1962. Benthic marine Amphipoda of southern California: Families Aoridae, Photidae, Ischyroceridae, Corophiidae, Podoceridae. *Pacific Naturalist*, 3: 1-72.

Conlan, K.E. 1983. The amphipod superfamily Corophioidea in the northeastern Pacific region. 3. Family Isaeidae: Systematics and distributional ecology. *Publications in Natural Sciences*, No. 4. 1-75.

DISTRIBUTION: La Jolla, CA.

HABITAT: Intertidal among *Phyllospadix* rhizomes



Figure 3. *Photis* sp SD9, female gnathopod 1



Figure 4. *Photis* sp SD9, female gnathopod 2