Journal of Paleontology

www.cambridge.org/jpa

Articles

Cite this article: Paul C.R.C., and Mao Y. 2026. Geographic bias in the fossil record: tests using Chinese early Paleozoic echinoderms. *Journal of Paleontology*, **100**(3), 615–628
https://doi.org/10.1017/jpa.2026.10280

Received: 08 October 2025 UTC
Revised: 10 July 2026 UTC
Accepted: 21 July 2026 UTC

Corresponding author:
Christopher R. C. Paul;
Email: glcrcp@bristol.ac.uk

Handling Editor:
Bertrand Lefebvre

© The Author(s), 2026. Published by Cambridge University Press on behalf of Paleontological Society. This is an Open Access article, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution licence (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0), which permits unrestricted re-use, distribution and reproduction, provided the original article is properly cited.

JOURNAL OF PALEONTOLOGY
A PUBLICATION OF THE Paleontological SOCIETY

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

Geographic bias in the fossil record: tests using Chinese early Paleozoic echinoderms

Christopher R. C. Paul[1] and Yingyan Mao[2]

[1]School of Earth Sciences, University of Bristol, United Kingdom
[2]Key Laboratory of Economic Stratigraphy and Palaeogeography, Nanjing Institute of Geology and Paleontology, Chinese Academy of Sciences, China

Abstract

The greater diversity of fossils known from North America and Europe, plus the correlation between outcrop area and paleobiodiversity, introduce a potential bias in the fossil record. We develop tests to detect actual bias using recent discoveries of Chinese early Paleozoic fossil echinoderms and the idea that geographic bias can exist only if poorly known parts of the globe contain novel fossils yet unknown to science. Fossil echinoderms had complex skeletons requiring rapid burial, so proportionately more novel forms may be undiscovered. Echinoderm diversity was high in the early Paleozoic, and this time interval includes several Chinese fossil Lagerstätten that enhance the chances of discovering novelties. Chinese fossil echinoderms are categorized as "genuine novelties" or "more of the same." We use taxonomic, phylogenetic, and morphological approaches because some novel echinoderms are undescribed and cannot be used in a taxonomic assessment alone. Results suggest that the known Chinese early Paleozoic echinoderm fauna is predominantly more of the same. Nevertheless, historic discovery curves show that knowledge of Chinese fossil echinoderms is increasing rapidly, so they are still poorly known. If significantly novel echinoderms are rare, as recent discoveries elsewhere suggest, then Chinese fossil echinoderms need further exploration to discover the rarities. Our preliminary results need confirmation. A potential explanation of our results is that modern continents include sedimentary rocks deposited in different provinces during the early Paleozoic, so each may well provide an adequate sample on which to build global diversity curves.

Non-technical Summary

Historically more fossils have been described from the scientifically better explored parts of the globe, North America and Western Europe, than from other continents. If fossils from other continents were as well known, our current perception of the history of life might change, but only if fossils still to be discovered differ significantly from those already known. If the new fossils were the same as the old fossils, there could be no bias. We test this idea using new fossils recently described from China that were previously unknown to Western scientists. We use fossil echinoderms because they require special conditions to be preserved, and hence more fundamentally new forms might remain unknown. We use the early Paleozoic because high-level fossil echinoderm taxonomic diversity was maximal then and because the Chinese early Paleozoic contains several faunas that satisfy the special conditions echinoderms require to be preserved. So there is a greater chance of discovering new types. Our results show that most Chinese fossil echinoderms resemble forms already known from elsewhere, and thus, there is little evidence of bias. One possible explanation is that modern continents include sedimentary rocks deposited in different provinces during the early Paleozoic, so each may well provide an adequate sample on which to build global fossil diversity curves. Nevertheless, the rate at which new Chinese fossil echinoderms are being discovered is increasing rapidly, suggesting that the Chinese fossil record is still poorly known. Many new Chinese fossils remain to be found.

Introduction

Raup (1976a) documented Phanerozoic species diversity using data from the Zoological Record and showed that about 70% of the fossil species were described from Europe, North America, and the USSR (as it then was). In a companion paper, Raup (1976b) demonstrated a correlation, significant at the 1% level, between species diversity and estimated area of outcrop or rock volume throughout the Phanerozoic. Raup concluded that despite the raw numbers of species, there was no compelling evidence for an increase in biodiversity from the Cambrian to the Recent. Combined, Raup's papers suggested that were the fossil record equally well known in all parts of the globe, a different pattern of evolution through the Phanerozoic might be revealed. This can be called the geographic bias hypothesis. Subsequent research has concentrated on further documentation of the correlation between outcrop area and biodiversity and methods to

compensate for the correlation (Sepkoski, 1976; Allison and Briggs, 1993; Alroy et al., 2001; Smith, 2001, 2007; Crampton et al., 2003; Smith and McGowan, 2005, 2007; Tarver et al., 2007; McGowan and Smith, 2008; Vilhena and Smith, 2013; Na et al., 2023). Despite this effort, the geographic bias hypothesis remains more a theoretical concept than a reality. No one has demonstrated that bias exists, but the possibility that it does cannot be dismissed.

The hypothesis of potential geographical bias may be tested using real examples of recent discoveries as well as by theoretical modeling. From a Western perspective, knowledge of Chinese early fossil echinoderms has recently grown significantly and may be used to test the geographical bias hypothesis. The fundamental question is whether newly discovered Chinese early Paleozoic echinoderms are more of the same forms we already know or whether the Chinese fossil record contains previously unknown types of echinoderms. If the Chinese fossil record is predominantly more of the same, very little bias can exist between a fossil record with and one without any Chinese fossils. Alternatively, if the Chinese fossil record contains many types of fossils previously unknown to science, we will be forced to revise our views of the history of life on Earth significantly.

The preceding question can be investigated taxonomically, phylogenetically, and morphologically. A taxonomic approach uses the hierarchy of taxa to evaluate the degree of novelty. Clearly, provided they are correctly identified, species described previously from other parts of the world and subsequently discovered in Chinese rocks have no novelty value whatsoever. A genuinely new species that can be attributed to a previously known genus has less significance than one representing a new order or class of echinoderms. Although there is no generally accepted echinoderm tree of life, a new genus that fits into an accepted lineage is going to be less novel than one whose phylogenetic position is obscure or truly novel. First occurrences of higher-level taxa are more important in evolution than last occurrences. Extending the known range of a well-established lineage into younger rocks would have far less significance than discovering examples that were significantly older than those previously known. So documenting older first occurrences among Chinese early Paleozoic echinoderms is important.

Morphologically, a fundamentally new feature such as a fully developed holomeric stem in pelmatozoan echinoderms will be most significant, but new combinations of morphological features, such as the co-occurrence of spiral ambulacra, a distinct cup, and well-developed stem in *Helicocystis* Smith and Zamora, 2013, would also be seen as a significant morphological novelty.

Finally, the composition of the whole fauna may present novelties or confirm similarities. North American mid-Cambrian echinoderm faunas are dominated by gogiid blastozoans of the family Eocrinidae Jaekel, 1918 (Sprinkle, 1973). So far, Chinese mid-Cambrian echinoderm faunas are dominated by similar forms (*Sinoeocrinus* Zhao et al., 1994; *Guizhoueocrinus* Zhao et al., 2007; *Globoeocrinus* Zhao et al., 2008; *Wudingeocrinus* Luo et al., 2008; *Kunmingeocrinus* Y.L. Zhao et al., 2022) although their taxonomic treatment has been different. North American eocrinids are still largely referred to the single genus *Gogia* Walcott, 1917, whereas Chinese eocrinid genera are mostly monotypic. Nevertheless, the morphological disparity of North American species within the genus *Gogia* is similar to if not greater than that of Chinese examples of the entire family Eocrinidae. Thus, morphological comparisons can be used as a check against different taxonomic practices. The dominance of eocrinids in the mid-Cambrian also suggests the Chinese and non-Chinese fossil records are similar.

Finally, we test the reliability of our preliminary results by using a discovery curve to assess the current state of knowledge of the Chinese echinoderm fossil record. Nevertheless, the principal aim of this paper is to outline approaches to testing for real geographic bias using actual examples. These tests can be applied repeatedly as our knowledge of the global fossil record improves. Equally, they can be applied to other taxonomic groups.

Geological setting

Sources of the Chinese early Paleozoic echinoderms are shown in Figure 1. The exceptionally well-preserved Cambrian echinoderms in China are reported mainly from eight significant faunas of the South China Block, and only a few eocrinoids occurred on the margin of the North China Platform. Five of the Cambrian Series 2 biotas are Burgess Shale-like faunas, including the famous Chengjiang and Guanshan biotas located in eastern Yunnan Province (Shu et al., 2004; Hu et al., 2007; Y.L. Zhao et al., 2022), the Balang Fauna located in Guizhou Province (Zhao et al., 2007), the Huayuan biota in Hunan Province (Zeng et al., 2026), and the Jingshan fossil assemblage in central Hubei Province (Liu et al., 2010). Three of the later Cambrian biotas are also Burgess Shale-like, including the Kaili Biota from eastern Guizhou Province (Zhao et al., 2010), the Fulu biota from the southeastern corner of Yunnan Province (Peng et al., 2020), and the Guole biota located in Guangxi Province (Zhu et al., 2016). The Ordovician and Silurian echinoderms in China are mainly from the South China Block, Sibumasu of southwest Yunnan province, and Tarim Block of northwest Xinjiang (Reed, 1917; Sun, 1936; Regional Geological Team of Xinjiang Geological Bureau et al., 1981; Chen and Yao, 1993). The Ordovician echinoderms of the South China Block were reported from Guizhou, Hubei, and Hunan provinces (Sun, 1936; Li, 1993; Liu et al., 2024), while the Silurian echinoderms of the South China Block were reported from Guizhou, Hubei, and Sichuan provinces (Xu, 1962; Mu and Lin, 1987; Mao et al., 2017).

In general, the early Paleozoic echinoderms in China occur mainly in the South China Block, Sibumasu, and the North China Block. These occurrences and abundant fossils have greatly expanded the paleogeographic distributions of echinoderms.

Materials and methods

We use the fossil record of complete or nearly complete echinoderms from the early Paleozoic. Echinoderms possess complex skeletons that fall apart soon after death. Preservation of articulated echinoderms requires rapid burial soon after (or at) death (Donovan, 1991, and references therein). Thus, the echinoderm fossil record is likely to be less well known than those of major taxa with simpler skeletons, such as gastropods. We concentrate on the early Paleozoic because Konservat Lagerstätten are more common, and known high-level taxonomic diversity of echinoderms reached a peak during that stratigraphic interval. Thus, the possibility of discovering additional novel high-level taxa in a relatively unexplored part of the globe might be increased.

Data gathering. We use records from bibliographic databases on the occurrence of early Paleozoic echinoderms to compare known biodiversity in North America and Europe with that of the rest of the world and China in particular. Records from Bassler and Moodey (1943) are used unfiltered to establish the extent of the geographic bias in knowledge of the fossil record by the mid-twentieth century. This establishes a baseline for comparisons with modern knowledge.

https://doi.org/10.1017/jpa.2026.10280 Published online by Cambridge University Press




Figure 1. Map of modern China showing tectonic blocks and distribution of significant lower Paleozoic echinoderm fossil sites. Note the concentration in the South China Block.

From a Western perspective, the past several decades have significantly increased our knowledge of Chinese early echinoderms, including occurrences in several Lagerstätten. Thus, we have a real example on which to test the geographic bias hypothesis. For specific tests, we use Webster's (2014) index of crinoid crowns and parts of crowns and Webster and Webster's (2019) supplement; the supplementary table of all Cambrian echinoderms in Rahman and Zamora (2024); the paleobiology and geobiology databases; and our own compilations of early Paleozoic pelmatozoans post Bassler and Moodey (1943). We have then sought out the original publications to evaluate taxonomic interpretations. Thus, the records we use are based on original publications in which illustrations enable us to assess the identity of the echinoderms. Rarely, we have also used unpublished sources in which the authors have seen photographs of the specimens or personal communications from a trusted source. We have used all these sources to compile a spreadsheet of Chinese early Paleozoic echinoderms that is as reliable as possible. The publications on which our spreadsheet is founded have then been

https://doi.org/10.1017/jpa.2026.10280 Published online by Cambridge University Press

used to assess the relative novelty of recently described and illustrated Chinese echinoderms. The results are presented in tables that distinguish any source without publicly available illustrations.

Our tests are based on the fundamental assumption that geographic bias can affect our interpretation of the history of life on Earth only if currently undiscovered fossils differ fundamentally from those we already know. We then analyze the spreadsheet for degree of novelty among recently discovered Chinese early Paleozoic echinoderms. Our spreadsheet involves single occurrences, but multiple occurrences of the same taxon test the hypothesis of geographic bias equally well. Thus, where we know a fossil has been recorded from different Chinese provinces, this fact has also been recorded.

Taxonomically, species previously described from elsewhere in the world and recently reported from China have no novelty value at all. A new Chinese species is assigned a low novelty value, whereas a new class is assigned the highest value. These categories could be assigned numerical values and an average novelty score calculated. We have not done so because our results do not seem to justify it yet. In addition, we feel this approach needs to be applied to other major taxa before an agreed scoring system could be developed. Nevertheless, we have chosen the family level as a significant boundary. Any new Chinese fossil that can be assigned to a known family is considered as "more of the same"; those assigned to a new family or higher-level taxon are regarded as novel. In a few cases, significantly novel fossil echinoderms have been illustrated but not yet formally described. Using phylogenetic and morphological assessment allows us to include these discoveries.

Phylogenetically, some new genera have been described but not assigned to any higher taxon, except sometimes a class. Nevertheless, if they clearly fit into an already recognized lineage, they merely add detail. These are the equivalent of low-level taxa and assigned a low novelty value. The alternative would be a new fossil that either did not fit into any recognized lineage or perhaps linked two major lineages at an early stage of their differentiation. This would be assigned a high novelty value. Evidence that Chinese specimens are the oldest known examples of families or higher taxa is also considered important.

Finally, any new morphological feature or new combination of morphological features would rate a high novelty value, whereas repetition of combinations of well-known morphological features would be assigned a low score. We need all these approaches because a significant number of echinoderms have been reported but not formally described taxonomically. Applying only a taxonomic test would risk underestimating true novelty.

Discovery curves. Despite these new discoveries, the question remains as to how well known the Chinese early Paleozoic echinoderm fauna is. Bibliographies allow us to build historic discovery curves based on the dates of publication of new taxa. As used here, taxonomic discovery curves avoid the problems of taxonomic refinement and different taxonomic practices (lumpers versus splitters) by selecting the most up-to-date or accurate systematic classification and examining when within each taxon at each taxonomic level the first known example was described. Such discovery curves are all based on the same taxonomy. They can investigate growth of knowledge of stratigraphic or geographic distributions as well as numbers of taxa. If a better taxonomy is adopted, the same process will reassess growth of knowledge under the new taxonomy. Potentially, this approach could be adopted for a phylogeny; however, we are unaware of any such example.

Thus, our discovery curves enable recognition of the rate of growth of knowledge of the echinoderm fossil record, which in turn can be used to assess the completeness of our knowledge of that record (Paul,1980, fig. 3, p. 301, 1982, fig. 2, p. 129, 1998, p. 16 et seq.). We use as our starting point Bassler and Moodey's (1943) bibliography and index of Paleozoic pelmatozoans to establish the geographic bias in search effort (Table 1) as well as knowledge of Chinese early Paleozoic echinoderms by the mid twentieth century (Table 2). Then we have compiled separate files for current knowledge of Chinese Cambrian, Ordovician, and Silurian fossil echinoderms (Tables 3–5). These tables include the earliest date in which Chinese fossil echinoderms became known to science where this differs from the date of formal taxonomic description. From this, we construct a Chinese early Paleozoic echinoderm discovery curve. Finally, Webster's bibliography of echinoderms (Webster, 2014; Webster and Webster, 2019) allows us to estimate the change in effort involved in compiling the known Chinese fossil record over time. Comparison of the Chinese discovery curve with the global effort curve for crinoids enables us to assess how well known the Chinese early Paleozoic echinoderm fauna is.

Table 1. Number of entries for lower Paleozoic pelmatozoan echinoderms in Bassler and Moodey (1943)

Bassler and Moody (1943)	North America	Europe	Rest of world	Total
Silurian	527	315	8	850
Ordovician	412	341	27	780
Cambrian	9	22	0	31
Totals	948	678	35	1,661
Percentage	57.07	40.82	2.11	

Results

Table 1 records the geographic bias in search effort by the mid twentieth century using all records in Bassler and Moodey (1943). Only 2.11% of 1,661 records came from areas outside North America and Europe. These included 28 records from Asia, six from Australia, and one from South America. Table 2 includes all the Chinese early Paleozoic echinoderms recorded by Bassler and Moodey (1943). There are nine identifiable genera and 24 records, all but two of which are Ordovician, and all can be referred to previously known families. The two Silurian genera are crinoids. Up to five species were previously described by Bather (1906) from Myanmar, but only two of them were illustrated by Reed (1917), so the status of the unillustrated taxa cannot be assessed. A sixth, "*Sphaeronites*" *shihtiensis* Reed, 1917, was later recorded from the Karakorums according to Bassler and Moodey (1943, p. 191) and from Thailand (Paul et al., 2019).

Tables 3–5 illustrate the current state (2026) of knowledge of Chinese early Paleozoic echinoderms. Taxonomically, the Chinese Cambrian (Table 3) includes 27 specific records, of which 13 are under open nomenclature or have been figured but not formally described. One species, *Turbanicystis inflatus* Parsley and Zhao, 2010, was assigned to a newly created family, the Turbanicystidae Parsley and Zhao, 2010, but it appears to us to be closely related to *Gogia* sensu lato. Seven taxa are unassigned to a family of which one, the eocrinoid with articulated spines on its thecal plates illustrated by Peng et al. (2020, fig. 4c), could potentially be referred to a new family. No other eocrinoid that we know of has spines on thecal plates although *Arthroacantha* Williams, 1883 is a Devonian

https://doi.org/10.1017/jpa.2026.10280 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 2. Lower Paleozoic echinoderms known from China by 1943

Ordovician		Original name			Modern identification		
Class	Family	Genus	Species	Author		Remarks	Date
Diploporita	Aristocystitidae	*Aristocystis*	*sinica*	(Sun, 1936)	Probably a sphaeronitid	Kweichou	
Diploporita	Aristocystitidae	*Sinocystis*	*loczyi*	Reed, 1917	*Sinocystis loczyi*	Shih-tien	
Diploporita	Aristocystitidae	*Sinocystis*	*yunnanensis*	Reed, 1917	*Sinocystis yunnanensis* probably valid	Shih-tien,	
Diploporita	Aristocystitidae	*Pyrocystis*	*orientalis*	(Reed, 1917)	Probably an aristocystitid	Shih-tien	
Diploporita	Aristocystitidae	*Eucystis*	cf. *E. raripunctata*	Reed, 1917	Probably an aristocystitid	Shih-tien	
Diploporita	Sphaeronitidae	*Sphaeronis*	*lobiferus*	(Reed, 1917)	*Eucystis*? *lobiferus*	Shih-tien	
Diploporita	Sphaeronitidae	*Sphaeronis*	*shihtienensis*	(Reed, 1917)	A sphaeronitid but not *Sphaeronites*	Shih-tien	
Rhombifera	Caryocrinitidae	*Hemicosmites*	*jaekeli*	(Sun, 1936)	Almost certainly a caryocrinitid	Kweichou	
Rhombifera	Caryocrinitidae	*Caryocrinus*	sp.	(Reed, 1917)	*Caryocrinites* sp.	Shih-tien	
Rhombifera	Caryocrinitidae	*Caryocrinus*	cf. *C. turbo*	(Bather, 1906)	*Caryocrinites* cf. *turbo*	Pu-piao,	Reed, **1917**
Rhombifera	Caryocrinitidae	*Hemicosmites*	sp.	(Lóczy, 1899)	*Caryocrinites* sp.	Pu-piao	
Rhombifera	Cheirocrinidae	*Echinoencrinus*	sp.	(Reed, 1917)	*Cheirocystella sp.*	Pu-piao	
Rhombifera	Caryocystitidae	*Caryocystites*	*bicompressa*	(Reed, 1917)	*Heliocrinites bicompressa*	Shih-tien	
Rhombifera	Caryocystitidae	*Heliocrinus*	*fiscella*	(Bather, 1906)	*Lophotocystis fiscella*	Shih-tien, La-mêng	Reed, 1917
Rhombifera	Caryocystitidae	*Heliocrinus*	*qualus*	(Bather, 1906)	*Lophotocystis qualus*	Shih-tien	Reed, 1917
Rhombifera	Caryocystitidae	*Heliocrinus*	cf. *H. balticus*	(Reed, 1917)	*Heliocrinites* cf. *balticus*	Shih-tien	Reed, **1917**
Rhombifera	Caryocystitidae	*Heliocrinus*	*subovalis*	(Reed, 1917)	*Heliocrinites subovalis*	Shih-tien	
Rhombifera	Caryocystitidae	*Heliocrinus*	*kweichouensis*	(Sun, 1936)	*Heliocrinites kweichouensis*	Kweichou	
Rhombifera	Caryocystitidae	*Heliocrinus*?	sp.	(Reed, 1917)	*Heliocrinites* sp.	Pu-piao	
Rhombifera	Echinosphaeritidae	*Echinosphaera*	*asiatica*	(Reed, 1917)	*Echinosphaerites asiaticus*	Shih-tien	
Rhombifera	Echinosphaeritidae	*Echinosphaera*	*sinensis*	(Reed, 1917)	*Echinosphaerites sinensis*	Shih-tien	
Rhombifera	Echinosphaeritidae	*Echinosphaera*	cf. *E. aurantium*	(Reed, 1917)	*Echinosphaerites* sp.	Pu-piao	
Silurian							
Crinoidea	Scyphocrinitidae	*Camarocrinus*	*asiaticus*	(Reed, 1917)	*Scyphocrinites asiaticus*	Shih-tien,	Reed (**1917**)
Crinoidea	Scyphocrinitidae	Crinoidea?	Indet.	Yin and Lu, 1937	*Carolicrinus siniaticus* Haude, 1992	Yunnan	
Total			24		9 genera		

Note: Bold dates indicate no illustration of Chinese specimens exists. Last column refers to date first recorded from China.

crinoid with spines articulating on its cup plates. The Peng et al. (2020) specimen, although unnamed, is clearly a significantly novel Chinese Cambrian echinoderm. In addition, the new genus and species illustrated by Zamora et al. (2013, fig. 2B), here tentatively assigned to the Macrocystellidae, is a member of the lineage leading to dichoporite rhombiferans and closely related to *Jingxieocrinus.* All Chinese Cambrian echinoderms are endemic to China unless *Kailidiscus* is a junior synonym of *Walcottidiscus* Bassler, 1935.

The Chinese Ordovician (Table 4) includes 48 taxa in total, including those in Bassler and Moodey (1943). All but one, Cyclocystoid-like organism Fang et al., 2022, can be assigned to known families. The exception differs too much from true cyclocystoids (Kolata et al., 2023, 2025) to be included within that class. Three species were described previously from Myanmar by Bather (1906). Otherwise, these Chinese taxa appear to be endemic.

Finally, the Chinese Silurian (Table 5) includes 43 named species of crinoids, 12 of which were previously reported from elsewhere in the world. The scyphocrinitids were particularly cosmopolitan (Webster, 2014; Webster and Webster, 2019). All crinoid species are named, but two are of uncertain family. Several species have been reported from more than one Chinese province, which increases by 11 the total number of records from China.

In summary, the Chinese early Paleozoic echinoderm fauna includes a total of 118 specific taxa, of which 105 (88.98%) can be referred with reasonable confidence to known families. Fifteen (12.71%) are species first described from elsewhere in the world. The currently known fauna is predominantly more of the same. Alternatively, only three taxa, *Turbanicystis inflatus*, an unnamed spiny eocrinoid, and the cyclocystoid-like organisms from the Liexi fauna, are potentially significantly new in the sense that they have

https://doi.org/10.1017/jpa.2026.10280 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 3. Cambrian echinoderms known from China

	Species	Family	Family date	Series	Stage	Craton	Date
Edrioasteroidea	*Cambroblastus guolensis* Zhu et al., 2014	Astrocystitidae	Bassler, 1935	Furongian	Jiangshanian	South China	2013
Edrioasteroidea	*Kailidiscus chinensis* Zhao et al., 2010	Stromatocystitidae	Bassler, 1936	Miaolingian	Wuliuan	South China	
Edrioasteroidea	*Sprinkleoglobus extenuatus* Y.L. Zhao et al., 2022	Unassigned		2	3	South China	
Eocrinoidea	*Balangicystis rotundus* Parsley and Zhao, 2006	Lyracystidae	Sprinkle and Collins, 2006	2	4	South China	
Eocrinoidea	Gen. and sp. indet. Peng et al., 2020, fig. 4b	Unassigned		Miaolingian	Wuliuan	South China	
Eocrinoidea	Eocrinoidea indet B Huang, 2012	Unassigned		2	4	South China	
Eocrinoidea	*Globoeocrinus globulus* Zhao et al., 2008	Eocrinidae	Jaekel, 1918	Miaolingian	Wuliuan	North China	2007
Eocrinoidea	*Globoeocrinus zhaoyuanlongensis* Yang et al., 2015	Eocrinidae	Jaekel, 1918	2	4	South China	
Eocrinoidea	*Guizhoueocrinus yui* Zhao et al., 2007	Eocrinidae	Jaekel, 1918	2	4	South China	
Eocrinoidea	*Kunmingeocrinus cupuliformis* J. Zhao et al., 2022	Eocrinidae	Jaekel, 1918	2	4	South China	
Eocrinoidea	*Sinoeocrinus lui* Zhao et al., 1994	Eocrinidae	Jaekel, 1918	Miaolingian	Wuliuan	South China	
Eocrinoidea	*Sinoeocrinus* sp. Liu et al., 2010	Eocrinidae	Jaekel, 1918	2	4	South China	
Eocrinoidea	Spiny eocrinoid Peng et al., 2020, fig. 4c	New family?		Miaolingian	Guzhangian	South China	
Eocrinoidea	*Turbanicystis inflatus* Parsley and Zhao, 2010	Turbanicystidae	Parsley and Zhao, 2010	Miaolingian	Wuliuan	South China	
Eocrinoidea	*Vyscystis spinosa* Wang et al., 2024	Lepidocystidae	Durham, 1968	2	4	North China	
Eocrinoidea	*Wudingeocrinus rarus* Hu et al., 2007	Eocrinidae	Jaekel, 1918	2	4	South China	2006
Rhombifera	Possible dibrachicystid Peng et al., 2020, fig. 4f	Dibrachicystidae	Fatka and Szabad, 2014	Miaolingian	Wuliuan	South China	
Rhombifera	New genus and species Zamora et al., 2013	Macrocystellidae?	Bather, 1899	Furongian	Jiangshanian	South China	
Rhombifera	*Jingxieocrinus guoleensis* Chen and Han, 2014	Ridersiidae	Jell et al., 1985	Furongian	Jiangshanian	South China	2013
Soluta	Soluta indet. Zamora et al., 2013	Unassigned		Furongian	Jiangshanian	South China	
Stylophora	Basal mitrocystitid Peng et al., 2020, fig. 4d	Unassigned		Miaolingian	Guzhangian	South China	
Stylophora	Lagynocystid Zamora et al., 2013	Lagynocystidae	Jaekel, 1918	Furongian	Jiangshanian	South China	**2013**
Stylophora	*Flabellicarpus* Peng et al., 2020, fig. 4a, e	Cothurnocystidae		Miaolingian	Guzhangian	South China	
Stylophora	*Drepanocarpos*-like Zamora et al., 2013	Hanusiidae	Cripps, 1991	Furongian	Jiangshanian	South China	
Stylophora	*Phyllocystis* ? *jingxiensis* Han and Chen, 2008	Current research	A cornute	Furongian	Jiangshanian	South China	
Stylophora*	*"Nanocarpus guoleensis* Chen and Han, 2013"	Mitrocystitidae	Ubaghs, 1968	Furongian		South China	
Total	27						

Note: Bold date indicates not illustrated. Date column indicates first record from China if earlier than formal description.
*This taxon is a basal mitrocystitid (Lefebvre and Ausich, 2021, p. 939–940).

been or could be assigned to new families unknown outside China. Even so, *Gogia guntheri* Sprinkle, 1973, from North America is very similar to *Turbanicystis inflatus* from China, and the spiny eocrinoid seems closely related to Eocrinidae. Only the cyclocystoid-like echinoderm (Fang et al., 2022, fig. 2f) appears to be a truly novel early Paleozoic echinoderm from China. The specimens differ too much from true cyclocystoids (Kolata et al., 2023, 2025) to be included within that class. The single photograph does not show enough detail to be sure what it is, but the preservation of apparently soft-tissue peripheral tentacles, but total lack of central plating, is difficult to interpret as a cyclocystoid. We suggest it might be a somasteroid, but it needs thorough description.

Finally, two crinoids, *Eopetalocrinus sinensis* and *Muicrinus dawanensis*, appear to be the only known Ordovician examples of their respective families, the Petalocrinidae and Iocrinidae. In addition, Chinese Petalocrinidae seem to be more diverse both taxonomically and morphologically than those known from elsewhere in the world.

Discussion

Significance of our results. At first sight, our results overwhelmingly suggest that the known Chinese early Paleozoic echinoderm fauna differs little from that already known from elsewhere in the world and therefore there is little evidence of geographic bias. This view is reinforced by the fact that six Silurian species have been reported from more than one province (Table 5). Treated as separate occurrences, these would add another 11 records to our database. In addition, the Geobiodiversity Database (https://geobiodiversity.com) records the genus *Petalocrinus* from six Chinese provinces and *Pisocrinus* from four. Furthermore, we have not identified even one significantly novel taxon at class level, such as the helicoplacoids or ctenocystoids. Nevertheless, our results should be regarded as preliminary for at least three reasons. First, they depend on how well known Chinese echinoderms are. Second, recently discovered new echinoderm classes are rare and not very diverse (see below);

https://doi.org/10.1017/jpa.2026.10280 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 4. Ordovician echinoderms known from China

Class	Species	Family	Stage	Province	Date
Asteroidea	*Protopalaeaster*? *sinensis* Zhang and Han, 1991	Hudsonasteridae Schuchert, 1914		Zhejiang	
Crinoidea	*Eopetalocrinus sinensis* Li, 1993	Petalocrinidae Weller and Davidson, 1896	Darriwilian		
Crinoidea	*Muicrinus dawanensis* Lin et al., 2018	Iocrinidae Moore and Laudon, 1943	Floian–Dapingian	Hubei	
Crinoidea	*Pseudaristocystis yunnanensis* Sun, 1948	Scyphocrinitidae Jaekel, 1918		Yunnan	
Unassigned	Cyclocystoid-like organism Fang et al., 2022		Floian	Hunan	
Rhombifera	*Caryocrinites jaekeli* (Sun, 1936)	Caryocrinitidae Bernard, 1895		Yunnan	
Rhombifera	*Caryocrinites ludianensis* Chen and Yao, 1993	Caryocrinitidae Bernard, 1895		Yunnan	
Rhombifera	*Caryocrinites turbo* (Bather, 1906)	Caryocrinitidae Bernard, 1895		Yunnan	**1917**
Rhombifera	*Caryocrinites* sp. Lóczy, 1899	Caryocrinitidae Bernard, 1895		Yunnan	
Rhombifera	*Caryocrinites* sp. Li et al., 2023, fig. 2e, f	Caryocrinitidae Bernard, 1895	Floian	Guiyang	
Rhombifera	cf. *Fusicystis* sp. Lee and Zhang, 2022	possibly Echinoencrinitidae Bather, 1899		Mongolia	**2022**
Rhombifera	Hemicosmitoid plates Paul et al., 2016	Caryocrinitidae Bernard, 1895	Floian	Guizhou	2014
Rhombifera	*Paracaryocrinites subglobosus* Chen and Yao, 1993	Caryocrinitidae Bernard, 1895		Yunnan	
Rhombifera	*Polycosmites* sp. Paul et al., 2016	Caryocrinitidae Bernard, 1895	Floian	Guizhou	2014
Rhombifera	*Polycosmites* sp., Li et al., 2023	Caryocrinitidae Bernard, 1895	Floian	Guiyang	
Rhombifera	"*Cheirocrinus*" *penniger* Mao et al., 2021, non Eichwald	Cheirocrinidae Jaekel, 1899			
Rhombifera	"*Cheirocrinus*" sp. Paul et al., 2016	Cheirocrinidae Jaekel, 1899	Floian	Guizhou	2014
Rhombifera	*Cheirocystella* sp. (Reed, 1917)	Cheirocrinidae Jaekel, 1899		Yunnan	
Rhombifera	*Cheirocystella* sp. (Xia et al., 1990)	Cheirocrinidae Jaekel, 1899		Hunan	
Rhombifera	*Cheirocystis liexiensis* Liu et al., 2024	Cheirocrinidae Jaekel, 1899	Floian	Hunan	2022
Rhombifera	*Macrocystella* sp. Li et al., 2023, fig. 4f	Macrocystellidae Bather, 1899		Guiyang	
Rhombifera	*Pleurocystites bassleri* Sun, 1948	A glyptocystitoid, but not *Pleurocystites*		Yunnan	
Diploporita	*Aristocystites sinicus* (Sun, 1936)	Aristocystitidae Neumayr, 1889?	Darriwilian	Yunnan	
Diploporita	*Pyrocystis orientalis* Reed, 1917	Aristocystitidae Neumayr, 1889?		Yunnan	
Diploporita	*Sinocystis loczyi* Reed, 1917	Aristocystitidae Neumayr, 1889		Yunnan	
Diploporita	*Sinocystis yunnanensis* Reed, 1917	Aristocystitidae Neumayr, 1889		Yunnan	
Diploporita	*Sinocystis shaanxiensis* Xia et al., 1990	Aristocystitidae Neumayr, 1889		Hunan	
Diploporita	*Sinocystis* sp. Wang et al., 2022	Aristocystitidae Neumayr, 1889	Darriwilian	Yangtze	**2022**
Diploporita	*Eucystis*? *jenhochiaoensis* (Sun, 1948)	Sphaeronitidae Neumayr, 1889		Yunnan	
Diploporita	*Eucystis*? *lobiferus* Reed, 1917	Sphaeronitidae Neumayr, 1889		Yunnan	
Diploporita	*Eucystis* cf. *E. raripunctata* Reed, 1917, non Angelin, 1878	Aristocystitidae Neumayr, 1889		Yunnan	
Diploporita	*Eucystis* sp. unpublished	Sphaeronitidae Neumayr, 1889	Katian	Yunnan	2024
Diploporita	*Haplosphaeronis*? *jenhochiaoensis* (Sun, 1948)	Sphaeronitidae Neumayr, 1889		Yunnan	
Diploporita	*Sphaeronis shihtienensis* Reed, 1917	Sphaeronitidae Neumayr, 1889		Yunnan	
Rhombifera	*Caryocystites cylindratus* Chen and Yao, 1993	Caryocystitidae Jaekel, 1918		Yunnan	
Rhombifera	*Heliocrinites* cf. *H. balticus* (Reed, 1917)	Caryocystitidae Jaekel, 1918		Yunnan	**1917**
Rhombifera	*Heliocrinites bicompressa* (Reed, 1917)	Caryocystitidae Jaekel, 1918		Yunnan	
Rhombifera	*Heliocrinites kweichouensis* (Sun, 1936)	Caryocystitidae Jaekel, 1918		Yunnan	
Rhombifera	*Heliocrinites subovalis* (Reed, 1917)	Caryocystitidae Jaekel, 1918		Yunnan	
Rhombifera	*Heliocrinites szetui* Sun, 1948	Caryocystitidae Jaekel, 1918		Yunnan	
Rhombifera	*Lophotocystis fiscella* (Bather, 1906)	Caryocystitidae Jaekel, 1918		Yunnan	1917
Rhombifera	*Lophotocystis qualus* (Bather, 1906)	Caryocystitidae Jaekel, 1918		Yunnan	1917

(*Continued*)

https://doi.org/10.1017/jpa.2026.10280 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 4. (*Continued*)

Class	Species	Family	Stage	Province	Date
Rhombifera	*Echinosphaerites asiaticus* (Reed, 1917)	Echinosphaeritidae Neumayr, 1889		Yunnan	
Rhombifera	*Echinosphaerites* cf. *E. aurantium* Reed, 1917, non Gyllenhaal, 1772	Echinosphaeritidae Neumayr, 1889		Yunnan	
Rhombifera	*Echinosphaerites sinensis* (Reed, 1917)	Echinosphaeritidae Neumayr, 1889		Yunnan	
Rhombifera	*Echinosphaerites* sp. Wang et al., 2022	Echinosphaeritidae Neumayr, 1889	Darriwilian–Sandbian	Yangtze	**2022**
Ophiuroidea	Undescribed ophiuroids (B. Lefebvre, personal communication, 2026)		Hirnantian	Guizhou	**2026**
Stylophora	Undescribed mitrates (B. Lefebvre, personal communication, 2026)	Anomalocystitidae Bassler, 1938	Hirnantian	Guizhou	**2026**
Total	48				

Note: Bold date indicates no Chinese specimens were illustrated. "*Cheirocrinus*" is in quotes because the specimens can be attributed only to the family Cheirocrinidae, not the genus *Cheirocrinus*. Rhombifera listed before and after Diploporita represent dichoporite and fistuliporite Rhombifera, respectively.

if randomly discovered they are likely to be the last taxa discovered. Finally, application of the test to other fossil groups might produce different results. We next consider how well known the Chinese echinoderm fossil record is.

Discovery curves. Chinese fossil echinoderms are just as much subject to "the law of diminishing returns" as are fossils from anywhere else. Experience shows that when searching for fossils, the common ones are soon discovered, but it takes increasing effort to add new species to the list of fossils found. If significantly new types of fossils were rare, only after thorough searches could we become confident that they were truly absent because the common fossils would be found first. Equally, the common Chinese fossils are more likely to have been common elsewhere and therefore already known. As used here, discovery curves (Fig. 2) provide a means of assessing how complete our knowledge of the local fossil record is (Paul, 1982, p. 102). In this context, discovery curves plot increasing taxonomic knowledge against search effort. Common examples are plots of number of species against number of specimens, or against area searched, or against time spent searching, all collectively called "effort." So, if one plots the rate of discovery of taxa at various taxonomic levels, one can compare the shape of the resulting curve with a standard discovery curve (Fig. 2). The early part of the curve rises steeply and implies there is a lot more still to be discovered; the last part of the curve is nearly horizontal and implies that most of the fossil biota has been found. Paul (1980, fig. 67, p. 207, 1982, fig. 13, p. 103) compared global discovery curves for species, genera, and families of cystoids (Diploporita and Rhombifera) from 1772 to 1975. This showed that whereas both genuinely new species and genera were still being discovered at a rapid rate, the curve for families had flattened significantly since 1900 (Fig. 3). In 2026, the number of families is still 25, but genera have increased from 110 to 132. Raup (1972, p. 1067) discussed the theoretical basis for this relationship between lower- and higher-level taxa.

In this context, counting the number of families, genera, or species is not adequate. Some may be synonyms, others homonyms, and in the case of families and genera, many will result from refined taxonomy. For example, the first two blastozoans known to science were described under the generic name *Echinus* by Gyllenhaal (1772). Subsequently, one was recognized as the fistuliporite rhombiferan genus *Echinosphaerites* Wahlenberg, 1818 and the other as the diploporite *Sphaeronites* Hisinger, 1828. Each is now recognized as the type genus of its respective family, the Echinosphaeritidae Neumayr, 1889 and Sphaeronitidae Neumayr, 1889. The difficulties that changes in taxonomy introduce can be overcome by assigning all taxa to the best modern classification and then finding when the first species within any higher taxon was described. So, the first known fistuliporite and echinosphaeritid was *Echinosphaerites aurantium* (Gyllenhaal, 1772). The subclass Fistuliporita, family Echinosphaeritidae, and genus *Echinosphaerites* all date from 1772. Equally, the class Diploporita, family Sphaeronitidae, and genus *Sphaeronites* all date from 1772. Even this approach may not truly reflect when a taxon first became known to science. According to Regnéll (1945, p. 1) and Kesling (1968, p. S152), both *Echinosphaerites aurantium* and *Sphaeronites pomum* were mentioned by Linnaeus (1745) but were regarded as "crystal apples" and so thought to belong in the mineral kingdom. It could be argued that they were known to science from 1745. Kesling (1968, p. S152–S159) discussed numerous previous classifications of cystoids (a taxon no longer recognized), but whichever classification is chosen, *E. aurantium* and *S. pomum* date from 1772. Similarly, however many or few species one may assign to the two genera, *E. aurantium* and *S. pomum* were still the first species described. Taxonomic synonymies allow the date of publication to be established and thus for historic discovery curves to be constructed easily.

Effort curves. A related phenomenon is the effort involved in finding and describing fossils. This too can be analyzed historically, and typically such curves show an increase in effort through time. Webster (2014, appendix 1) provided a compilation of the number of publications dealing with Paleozoic crinoids annually from 1758 to 2012. Webster and Webster (2019) enable us to extend that to 2018 (Fig. 4). Although these will not all have been taxonomic papers, they give a sense of the growth in study of Paleozoic crinoids. Progress was very slow until the mid-nineteenth century then increased rapidly until the mid-twentieth century and even more rapidly since. The first period represents the era of gentleman scientists of independent means; the second represents the growth of practical state geological surveys and museums; the final part represents the increase in global wealth and geology departments in universities, all fueled by the dramatic increase of the global population. Nevertheless, if the rate of discovery declines despite the very significant recent increase in search effort, then we must be getting to know the fossil record quite well. Tarver et al. (2007, fig. 3, p. 180) present estimates for worker effort on trilobites (papers per year and number of authors per decade recorded in

https://doi.org/10.1017/jpa.2026.10280 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 5. Silurian echinoderms known from China

Subclass	Species	Family	Series/Stage	Province	Date
Camerata	*Camarocrinus* cf. *C. subornatus* (Waagen and Jahn, 1899)	Scyphocrinitidae Jaekel, 1918	Pridolian	Yunnan	
	Carolicrinus shidianensis Chen and Yao, 1993	Scyphocrinitidae Jaekel, 1918	Pridolian	Yunnan	
	Carolicrinus siniaticus Haude, 1992	Scyphocrinitidae Jaekel, 1918	Pridolian	Yunnan	**1937**
	Marhoumacrinus pyburnensis Springer, 1917	Scyphocrinitidae Jaekel, 1918	Telychian	Yunnan	
	Neoarchaeocrinus shiquianmensis Wang, 1995	Rhodocrinitidae Roemer, 1855	Llandovery	Guizhou	
	Scyphocrinites duanjiapoensis Chen and Yao, 1990	Scyphocrinitidae Jaekel, 1918	Telychian	Yunnan	
	Scyphocrinites elegans Zenker, 1833	Scyphocrinitidae Jaekel, 1918	Telychian	Yunnan	
	Scyphocrinites mutabilis Springer, 1917	Scyphocrinitidae Jaekel, 1918	Telychian	Yunnan	
	Scyphocrinites stellatus (Hall, 1879)	Scyphocrinitidae Jaekel, 1918	Telychian	Yunnan	
Cladida	*Caelocrinus stellifer* Xu, 1962	Euspirocrinidae Ulrich, 1925	Wenlock	Szuchuan	
	Dazhucrinus guizhouensis Mu and Wu, 1974	Uncertain	Wenlock	Kweichou	
	Dazhucrinus shanxiensis Mu and Wu, 1974	Uncertain	Wenlock	Shensi	
	Petalocrinus chiai Mu, 1949	Petalocrinidae Weller and Davidson, 1896	Aeronian	Kweichou, Wuchuan, Guizhou, Shihchien	
	Petalocrinus eximius Mu and Wu, 1974	Petalocrinidae Weller and Davidson, 1896	Aeronian	Kweichou, Guizhou	
	Petalocrinus guizhouensis Mu and Lin, 1987	Petalocrinidae Weller and Davidson, 1896	Aeronian	Guizhou	
	Petalocrinus inferior Bather, 1898	Petalocrinidae Weller and Davidson, 1896	Aeronian	Kweichou, Guizhou, Sichuan, Hubei	1949
	Petalocrinus inflatus Mu, 1949	Petalocrinidae Weller and Davidson, 1896	Aeronian	Kweichou, Guizhou	
	Petalocrinus involucrus Mu and Wu, 1974	Petalocrinidae Weller and Davidson, 1896	Aeronian	Kweichou, Guizhou, Sichuan	
	Petalocrinus latus Mu and Lin, 1987	Petalocrinidae Weller and Davidson, 1896	Aeronian	Guizhou	
	Petalocrinus magnus Mu and Lin, 1987	Petalocrinidae Weller and Davidson, 1896	Aeronian	Guizhou	
	Petalocrinus sinensis Mu and Wu, 1974	Petalocrinidae Weller and Davidson, 1896	Aeronian	Hupei, Guizhou, Sichuan	
	Petalocrinus stenopetalus Mao et al., 2017	Petalocrinidae Weller and Davidson, 1896	Aeronian	Guizhou	
	Petalocrinus tenuis Mu and Lin, 1987	Petalocrinidae Weller and Davidson, 1896	Aeronian	Guizhou	
	Petalocrinus validus Mu and Wu, 1974	Petalocrinidae Weller and Davidson, 1896	Aeronian	Kweichou	
	Sinopetalocrinus involutus Mu and Lin, 1987	Petalocrinidae Weller and Davidson, 1896	Aeronian	Guizhou	
	Sinopetalocrinus robustus Mu and Lin, 1987	Petalocrinidae Weller and Davidson, 1896	Aeronian	Guizhou	
	Sinopetalocrinus shiquianensis Mu and Lin, 1987	Petalocrinidae Weller and Davidson, 1896	Aeronian	Guizhou	
	Spirocrinus abnormis Mu and Lin, 1987	Petalocrinidae Weller and Davidson, 1896	Aeronian	Guizhou	
	Spirocrinus circularis Mao et al., 2017	Petalocrinidae Weller and Davidson, 1896	Aeronian	Guizhou	
	Spirocrinus dextrosus Mao et al., 2017	Petalocrinidae Weller and Davidson, 1896	Aeronian	Guizhou	
	Spirocrinus longus Mu and Wu, 1974	Petalocrinidae Weller and Davidson, 1896	Aeronian	Guizhou	
	Spirocrinus multiramus Mu and Lin, 1987	Petalocrinidae Weller and Davidson, 1896	Aeronian	Guizhou	
	Spirocrinus pauciramus Mu and Lin, 1987	Petalocrinidae Weller and Davidson, 1896	Aeronian	Guizhou	
	Spirocrinus typicus Mu and Wu, 1974	Petalocrinidae Weller and Davidson, 1896	Aeronian	Guizhou	
	Spirocrinus uniformis Mu and Lin 1987	Petalocrinidae Weller and Davidson, 1896	Aeronian	Guizhou	
Disparida	*Parapisocrinus ollula* (Angelin, 1878)	Pisocrinidae Angelin, 1878	Telychian		1996
	Parapisocrinus pateriformis (Wang, 1996)	Pisocrinidae Angelin, 1878	Telychian		
	Parapisocrinus sphaericus (Rowley, 1904)	Pisocrinidae Angelin, 1878	Telychian		1996
	Pisocrinus bohemicus Bouška, 1956	Pisocrinidae Angelin, 1878	Telychian		1996
	Pisocrinus brevis Wang, 1996	Pisocrinidae Angelin, 1878	Telychian		

(*Continued*)

https://doi.org/10.1017/jpa.2026.10280 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 5. (*Continued*)

Subclass	Species	Family	Series/Stage	Province	Date
	Pisocrinus kosovensis Bouška, 1956	Pisocrinidae Angelin, 1878	Telychian		1996
	Pisocrinus pilula de Koninck, 1858	Pisocrinidae Angelin, 1878	Telychian		1996
	*Pisocrinus pilula yin*i Mu, 1954	Pisocrinidae Angelin, 1878	Wenlock	Szechuan	1954
Total	43				

Note: They are all crinoids. Bold date = no illustration of Chinese examples.




Figure 2. Generalized discovery curve. N = number of specimens; % = percentage of total biota known. In this case, even at 100 specimens, > 20% of the biota would be unknown but there would be no point in collecting beyond 600 as all the species would have been found. Redrawn from Paul (1982, fig. 2).




Figure 3. Historic discovery curves for F = families (leftmost scale), G = genera (left scale), S = species (right scale) of Rhombifera and Diploporita from 1772 to 1975. Note that most of the families were known by 1900, but both genera and species were still increasing rapidly after 1950. Redrawn from Paul (1982, fig. 13, p. 103).

the ISI Web of Science, https://clarivate.com), showing a dramatic increase after World War II. Tarver et al. (2007, fig. 4, p. 180) also illustrate discovery curves for trilobite families and genera plotted against this worker effort. The generic curve is linear and almost entirely reflects effort, whereas the familial curve flattens out about halfway through the plot, despite the increase in effort. It would seem the trilobite fossil record is quite well known, at least at family level.

An historic discovery curve of Chinese early Paleozoic echinoderms (Fig. 5) may be compared with global cystoid discovery




Figure 4. Cumulative number of publications (N) on Paleozoic crinoids from 1758 to 2018. Data from Webster (2014, appendix 1; Webster and Webster, 2019, supplement 1). Note the slow start followed by an exponential increase, especially since 1850.

(Fig. 3) and global Paleozoic crinoid effort (Fig. 4) curves. Clearly, the Chinese discovery curve is concave-up and more like the global crinoid effort curve (Fig. 4) but only to the early part of the global cystoid species discovery curve (Fig. 3). At present, it would be wise to conclude that although there is very little evidence for geographic bias in the fossil record using the Chinese early Paleozoic echinoderm discovery curve, it is early still, and the situation may change in the future.

Finally, we use class-level taxa as the ultimate example of significant new discoveries. Paleozoic echinoderms are well known for having several classes that are very distinct morphologically but very small (low biodiversity) and relatively rare. If yet unknown Chinese new classes of echinoderms were similarly rare, statistically they would be the last to be discovered. It is premature to take our results at face value.

Other tests

We chose to use a real example to illustrate a potential test of the geographic bias hypothesis. Other approaches are equally valid. It is not necessary to wait until another area of the globe yields significant numbers of new echinoderms or other fossils. One might, for

https://doi.org/10.1017/jpa.2026.10280 Published online by Cambridge University Press




Figure 5. Cumulative rate of discovery of Chinese lower Paleozoic echinoderm species. Note the curve starts at the very end of the nineteenth century and resembles an effort curve rather than a discovery curve. There are many more Chinese lower Paleozoic echinoderms still to be found. N = number of species; Date = time of first description.

Table 6. Currently known geographic occurrence of a random sample of 294 Paleozoic crinoid genera

Province	Crinoid genera	%	Exclusive to	%
North America	200	68.03	131	44.56
Europe	120	40.82	51	17.35
Elsewhere	75	25.51	32	10.88
Total	294			
1 province	190	64.63		
2 provinces	59	20.07		
3+ provinces	21	7.14		

Note: Data from Webster and Webster (2019). See text for further explanation.

example, degrade our existing knowledge by deleting the North American or European fossil record and comparing the resulting loss of information. To test this, we used a randomly chosen subsample of Webster and Webster's (2019) crinoid data (all generic names beginning with A, B, and C). We assigned their occurrences to North America, Europe, and 'Elsewhere' (Table 6). As expected, most of the genera (68%) occur in North America, many (41%) in Europe, and the smallest proportion (25.5%) in the rest of the world. Nearly two-thirds (65%) occur in only one province, 20% in two provinces, and 7% in three or more provinces. If the North American fauna were unknown, just under half of the crinoid genera in the sample (44.56%) would be unknown. Loss of the European fauna would reduce known crinoid genera by 17.35%, and if the record were confined to just North America and Europe, only 10.88% of crinoid genera would be unknown. Another, perhaps more significant, effect of loss of the North American fauna would be that all Tremadocian (lowest Ordovician) crinoid genera would be unknown except for *Aethocrinus* Ubaghs, 1969, which is known from southern France and Morocco (Lefebvre et al., 2016), and an undescribed genus from the USA and France.

Webster and Webster (2019) list eight named Tremadocian crinoid genera, attributed to subclasses Aethocrinea, Disparida, Cladida, Camerata, and Hybocrinida, plus the order Protocrinoida, which is not assigned to a subclass. Thus, Tremadocian crinoids were already very diverse. All but one of the new genera were assigned to new families. Western North America appears to have been the cradle of the Crinoidea.

Another approach might be to consider where in the world recent new class-level discoveries have been made. For example, since the mid-twentieth century, *Camptostroma* Ruedemann, 1933, *Helicoplacus* Durham and Caster, 1963, *Ctenocystis* Robison and Sprinkle, 1969, and *Helicocystis* Smith and Zamora, 2013 have been discovered or reinterpreted as echinoderms. All are significant new "class-level" discoveries only one of which, *Helicocystis*, came from outside North America. They also illustrate the previously mentioned point about rarity. *Camptostroma* and *Helicocystis* are still known from a single species. Helicoplacoids comprise three monotypic genera (Wilbur, 2006). Only ctenocystoids are moderately diverse. Currently, seven genera and about 16 species are recognized although some taxa are still under open nomenclature. In addition, ctenocystoids have since been recorded from Europe (Fatka and Kordule, 1985), Australia (Jell et al., 1985), and Africa (Smith et al., 2013), but the other taxa are still confined to the continent from which they were originally described.

Possible explanations

If novelty is an essential quality for geographic bias to exist, then bias is more likely to occur during periods of high endemicity in shallow continental seas. Despite deliberately choosing taxa and a stratigraphical interval that might be expected to increase the chances of discovering novelties, our results suggest the Chinese early Paleozoic echinoderm fauna is largely more of the same. One possible explanation of our results, especially in relation to early Paleozoic fossils, is plate tectonics. The parts of the global landmass that currently make up Europe and China, for example, were not always in the same geographic position; nor were they homogeneous regions. Waters et al. (2008, fig.16.1) divided modern China into at least seven named regions, one of which was labeled "composite" and all of which presumably had separate geologic histories. What is now China was part of at least three distinct provinces, just as early Paleozoic rocks in Europe include parts of North America, Baltica, Avalonia, and Gondwanaland. It seems likely that the better-explored parts of the world may well have sampled an adequate set of both latitudinal environments and longitudinally wide basins to provide a reasonable sample of early Paleozoic life, thus overcoming the effects of endemism.

By coincidence, the first paper published by one of us (Paul, 1965) apparently recorded an enormous increase in paleogeographic range of comarocystitid paracrinoids, a small taxon of early echinoderms with very distinctive thecal plates. Previously, all comarocystitids had been found in rocks then thought to be of Middle Ordovician age from the Midwest of North America. The new specimens came from the Upper Ordovician of Girvan, Scotland. At the time, this appeared to be an increase in geographic range of several thousand kilometers, but that was before plate tectonics had been proposed, let alone accepted. Now, we know that all of Scotland north of the Southern Uplands was part of North America in the Ordovician. In addition, the American occurrences are now regarded as of early Late Ordovician age, so the increase in

https://doi.org/10.1017/jpa.2026.10280 Published online by Cambridge University Press

stratigraphic range has also been reduced. The tiny island of Britain contains early Paleozoic rocks from at least two major provinces. How much more diverse were the early Paleozoic faunas of Western Europe or North America?

Conclusion

The disproportionate number of fossils found in the scientifically better-explored parts of the globe (North America and Europe) may introduce a bias in the known fossil record. Recent increases in knowledge of the Chinese early Paleozoic echinoderm fauna have been used in a preliminary test of the geographic bias hypothesis. The basic approach designates newly discovered Chinese echinoderms as genuine novelties or more of the same. This test can be applied taxonomically, phylogenetically, or morphologically. Our preliminary results suggest that the Chinese early Paleozoic echinoderm fauna is predominantly more of the same. A potential explanation of our results is that areas such as Europe and China are composed of several different early Paleozoic provinces, and each alone may provide an adequate sample on which to build global diversity curves. This suggestion will be tested by future discoveries. Nevertheless, historic discovery curves show that the rate of new Chinese fossil echinoderm discoveries is rising sharply and therefore that the Chinese early Paleozoic echinoderm fauna is still relatively poorly known.

Acknowledgments. Comments from an anonymous reviewer, E. Nardin, Geosciences Environnement Toulouse, France, and M. Nohejlová, Czech Geological Survey, plus the editor, B. Lefebvre, greatly improved the original draft of the manuscript, not only by drawing our attention to additional records, but in sharing details of current research. Y.M. was financially supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant number 42202019).

Competing interests. The authors declare none.

References

Allison, P.A., and Briggs, D.E.G., 1993, Paleolatitudinal sampling bias, Phanerozoic species diversity, and the end-Permian extinction: *Geology*, **v. 21**, p. 65–68.

Alroy, J., Marshall, C.R., Bambach, R.K., Bezusko, K., Foote, M., et al., 2001, Effects of sampling standardization on estimates of Phanerozoic marine diversification: *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, **v. 98**, p. 6261–6266.

Angelin, N.P., 1878, Iconographia crinoideorum in stratis Sueciae Siluricis fossilium: *Holmiae, Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences*, **32** p.

Bassler, R.S., 1935, The classification of the Edrioasteroidea: *Smithsonian Miscellaneous Collections*, **v. 93**, part 8, p. 1–11.

Bassler, R.S., 1936, New species of American Edrioasteroidea: *Smithsonian Miscellaneous Collections*, **v. 95**, part 6, p. 1–33.

Bassler, R.S., 1938, Pelmatozoa Palaeozoica, *in* Quenstedt, W., ed., *Fossilium Catalogus, part 1, Animalia, part 83*: Gravenhage, W. Junk's, p. 1–194.

Bassler, R.S., and Moodey, M.W., 1943, Bibliography and faunal index of Paleozoic pelmatozoan echinoderms: *Geological Society of America Special Paper*, **v. 45**, 733 p.

Bather, F.A., 1898, *Petalocrinus* (Weller and Davidson): *Quarterly Journal of the Geological Society of London*, **v. 54**, p. 401–441.

Bather, F.A., 1899, A phylogenetic classification of the Pelmatozoa: *Report of the British Association for the Advancement of Science*, **v. 68**, p. 916–923.

Bather, F.A., 1906, Ordovician Cystidea from Burma, *in* Reed, F.R.C., ed., The lower Palaeozoic fossils of the northern Shan States, Burma: *Memoirs of the Geological Survey of India, Palaeontologia Indica*, new series, 2, **v. 3**, p. 6–40.

Bernard, F., 1893–1895, *Eléments de Paléontologie*: Paris, J.-B. Ballière et Fils, 1168 p.

Bouška, J., 1956, [Pisocrinidae Angelin from the Silurian and Devonian of Bohemia (Crinoidea)]: *Rozpravy Ústredniho Ústavu Geologického*, **v. 20**, p. 97–138. [in Czech with English summary]

Chen, G.Y., and Han, N.R., 2013, [New materials of Stylophora from the upper Cambrian of the Jingxi area, Guangxi, South China]: *Acta Palaeontologica Sinica*, **v. 52**, p. 288–293. [in Chinese with English abstract]

Chen, G.Y., and Han, N.R., 2014, [A new eocrinoid from the upper Cambrian of Guangxi, South China]: *Acta Palaeontologica Sinica*, **v. 53**, p. 290–301. [in Chinese with English summary]

Chen, Z., and Yao, J., 1990, First discovery of *Scyphocrinites* in China: *Acta Palaeontologica Sinica*, **v. 29**, p. 228–236.

Chen, Z., and Yao, J., 1993, [*Palaeozoic Echinoderm Fossils of Western Yunnan, China*]: Beijing, Geological Publishing House, 102 p. [in Chinese]

Crampton, J.S., Beu, A.G., Cooper, R.A., Jones, C.M., Marshall, B., and Maxwell, P.A., 2003, Estimating the rock volume bias in paleobiodiversity studies: *Science*, **v. 301**, p. 358–360.

Cripps, A.P., 1991, A cladistic analysis of the cornutes (stem chordates): *Zoological Journal of the Linnean Society*, **v. 102**, p. 333–366.

de Koninck, L.G., 1858, Sur quelques Crinoides paleozoiques nouveaux de l'Angleterre et de l'Ecosse: *Bulletin de l'Academie Royal des Sciences, des Lettres et des Beaux-Arts de Belgique*, series 2, **v. 4**, p. 93–108.

Donovan, S.K., 1991, The taphonomy of echinoderms: calcareous multielement skeletons in the marine environment, *in* Donovan, S.K., ed., *The Processes of Fossilization*: London, Bellhaven Press, p. 241–269.

Durham, J.W., 1968, Lepidocystoids, *in* Moore, R.C., ed., *Treatise on Invertebrate Paleontology*, Part S, Echinodermata 1: Lawrence, Kansas, Geological Society of America and University of Kansas Press, p. S631–S364.

Durham, J.W., and Caster, K.E., 1963, Helicoplacoidea: a new class of echinoderms: *Science*, **v. 140**, p. 820–822.

Fang, X., Mao, Y., Liu, Q., Yuan, W., Chen, Z., et al., 2022, The Liexi fauna: a new Lagerstätte from the Lower Ordovician of South China: *Proceedings of the Royal Society B*, **v. 289**, p. 1–8.

Fatka, O., and Kordule, V., 1985, *Etoctenocystis bohemica* gen. et. sp. nov., new ctenocystoid from Czechoslovakia (Echinodermata, middle Cambrian): *Věstnik Ústredniho Ústavu geologického*, **v. 60**, p. 225–230.

Fatka, O., and Szabad, M., 2014, Family Dibrachicystidae (Echinodermata: Rhombifera) from the "middle" Cambrian of the Barrandian area, Czech Republic: *Paläontologisches Zeitschrift*, **v. 88**, p. 159–166.

Gyllenhaal, J.A., 1772, Beskrifning På de så kallade Crystall-äplen och kalkbollar, såsom petreficerade. Djur af Echini genus, eller dessnärmaste slägtingar: *Konglich Svenska Vetenskaps Akademie, Handlingar*, **v. 33**, p. 239–261.

Hall, J., 1879, The fauna of the Niagara Group, in central Indiana. *Twenty-eighth Annual Report of the New York State Museum of Natural History*: Albany, Weed Parsons and Co., p. 99–199.

Han, N.R., and Chen, G.Y., 2008, New Stylophorans (Echinodermata) from the upper Cambrian of Guangxi, South China: *Chinese Science Bulletin*, **v. 51**, p. 181–186.

Haude, R., 1992, Scyphocriniden, die Bojen-Seelilien im hohen Silur-tiefen Devon: *Paleontographica, Abteilung A, Palaeozoologie und Stratigraphie*, **v. 222**, p. 141–187.

Hisinger, W., 1828, *Antecknings i physik och geognosie under resor uti Sverige och Norige*, Volume **4**: Upsala, Palmblad, p. 183–191.

Hu, S.X., Luo, H.L., Hou, S.G., and Erdtmann, B.D., 2007, Eocrinoid echinoderms from the lower Cambrian Guanshan Fauna in Wuding, Yunnan, China: *Chinese Science Bulletin*, **v. 52**, p. 717–719.

Huang, S.Y., 2012, Eocrinoids from the Cambrian Mantou Formation of Dalian, Liaoning: *Chinese Science Bulletin*, **v. 57**, p. 3855–3857.

Jaekel, O., 1899, *Stammesgeschichte der Pelmatozoen. 1. Thecoidea und Cystoidea*: Berlin, Julius Springer, 442 p.

Jaekel, O., 1918, Phylogenie und System der Pelmatozoen: *Paläontologisches Zeitschrift*, **v. 3**, p. 1–128.

Jell, P.A., Burrett, C.F., and Banks, M.R., 1985, Cambrian and Ordovician echinoderms from eastern Australia: *Alcheringa*, **v. 9**, p. 183–208.

Kesling, R.V., 1968, Cystoids, *in* Moore, R.C., ed., *Treatise on Invertebrate Paleontology*, Part S, Echinodermata 1: Lawrence, Kansas, Geological Society of America and University of Kansas Press, p. S85–S267.

Kolata, D.R., Frank, T., Haplan, A., and Guensburg, T.E., 2023, New specimens of *Cyclocystoides scammophoris* (Echinodermata) from the Upper

https://doi.org/10.1017/jpa.2026.10280 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Ordovician rocks of the American midcontinent with implications for cyclocystoid functional morphology: *Journal of Paleontology*, **v. 97**, p. 639–651.

Kolata, D.R., Mooi, R., Guensburg, T.E., and Koniecki, J.M., 2025, Cyclocystoids (Echinodermata) from the Upper Ordovician (early Katian) Kirkfield and Verulam formations of Ontario, Canada: implication for cyclocystoid skeletal homologies, anatomy, functional morphology, life mode, and systematics: *Journal of Paleontology*, p. 1–29 https://doi.org/10.1017/jpa.2025.10116.

Lee, D.C., and Zhang, X.L., 2022, A new glyptocystitid rhombiferan from Upper Ordovician of Inner Mongolia, China: *From Gondwana to Laurasia, 6th International Palaeontological Congress, Khon Kaen, Thailand, Abstract Book*, p. 340.

Lefebvre, B., and Ausich, W.I., 2021, New Siluro-Devonian anomalocystitids (Echinodermata, Stylophora) from Bolivia and Canada, and a reevaluation of skeletal homologies in mitrates: *Paleontological Journal*, **v. 55**, p. 932–965.

Lefebvre, B., Allaire, N., Guensburg, T.E., Hunter, A.W., Kouraïss, K., et al., 2016, Palaeoecological aspects of the diversification of echinoderms in the Lower Ordovician of central Anti-Atlas, Morocco: *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology*, **v. 460**, p. 97–121.

Li, L., 1993, [Discovery of *Eopetalocrinus* (gen. nov.) in Lower Ordovician Dawan Formation at Liujiachang, Songzi, Hubei and its significance]: *Oil and Gas Geology*, **v. 14**, p. 272–277. [in Chinese with English summary]

Li, L., Lan, T., and Wang, Y., 2023, [Diversity and paleogeographic distribution of hemicosmitoid and glyptocystitoid in Ordovician Meitan Formation of Guiyang]: *Journal of Jilin University (Earth Science Edition)*, **v. 53**, p. 1380–1390. [in Chinese with English abstract]

Lin, J.P., Ausich, W.I., Balinski, A., Bergström, S.M., and Sun, Y., 2018, The oldest iocrinid crinoids from the Early/Middle Ordovician of China: possible paleogeographic implications: *Journal of Asian Earth Sciences*, **v. 151**, p. 324–333.

Linnaeus, C., 1745, *Öländska och Gothländska Resa pa Riksens Högloflige Ständers befallning förrättad Åhr 1741*: Stockholm, Gottfried Kiesewetter, 344 p.

Liu, Q., Hu, S.X., Zhang, Z., Cuevas-Castell, J.M., Gong, Y.M., and Tao, J.L., 2010, [A new Burgess Shale-type biota from the upper Shilongdong Formation, lower Cambrian of central Hubei, South China]: *Acta Palaeontologica Sinica*, **v. 49**, p. 389–397. [in Chinese with English abstract]

Liu, Q., Paul, C.R.C., Mao, Y., Li, Y., Fang, X., and Huang, D., 2024, *Cheirocystis liexiensis*, a new rhombiferan blastozoan (Echinodermata) from Lower Ordovician of South China Block: *Palaeoworld*, **v. 33**, p. 1505–1514.

Lóczy, O., 1899, *Wissenschaftliche Ergebnisse der Reise des Grafen Széchenyi in Ostasien 1877–1880, Zweiter Band: Die Bearbeitung des gesammelten Materials; Nach dem im Jahre 1896 erscheinenen ungarischen Original*: Wien, Hölzel, 523 p.

Luo, H.L., Fu, X.P., Hu, S.X., Li, Y., Hou, S.G., Liu, X.Y., Chen, L.Z., Li, F.J., Pang, J.Y., and Liu, Q., 2008, [*Early Cambrian Malong Fauna and Guanshan Fauna from Eastern Yunnan China*]: Kunming, Yunnan Science and Technology Press, 134 p. [in Chinese with English summary]

Mao, Y., Ausich, W.I., Li, Y., Lin, J.P., and Lin, C.H., 2017. New taxa and phyletic evolution of the Aeronian (Llandovery, Silurian) Petalocrinidae (Echinodermata, Crinoidea) in Guizhou, South China Block: *Journal of Paleontology*, **v. 91**, p. 477–492.

Mao, Y., Fang, X., Yu, S.Y., Song, Y.Y., and Li, Y., 2021, [First record of *Cheirocrinus penniger* (Eichwald, 1842) (Cystoidea) from the Ordovician Miaopo Formation in western Hubei, China]: *Acta Paleontologica Sinica*, **v. 60**, p. 215–223. [in Chinese with English abstract]

McGowan, A.J., and Smith, A.B., 2008, Are global Phanerozoic marine diversity curves truly global? A study of the relationship between regional rock records and global phanerozoic marine diversity: *Paleobiology*, **v. 34**, p. 80–103.

Moore, R.C., and Laudon, L.J., 1943, Evolution and classification of Paleozoic crinoids: *Geological Society of America Special Paper*, **v. 46**, p. 1–153.

Mu, E.Z., 1949, *Petalocrinus* from the Shihniulan Limestone of Wuchuan: *Bulletin of the Geological Society of China*, **v. 29**, p. 93–96.

Mu, E.Z., (A.T.), 1954, [On the occurrence of *Pisocrinus* in China]: *Acta Palaeontologica Sinica*, **v. 2**, p. 323–332. [in Chinese with English abstract]

Mu, E.Z., and Lin, C.H., 1987, [Petalocrinidae from the Silurian of Shiqian District, Guizhou]: *Bulletin of Nanjing Institute of Geology and Paleontology*, **v. 12**, p. 1–30 [in Chinese]

Mu, E.Z., and Wu, Y.R., 1974, Petalocrinidae from the Silurian of Shiqian District, Guizhou, *in* **Nanjing Institute of Geology and Palaeontology, Academica Sinica**, ed., *A Handbook of the Stratigraphy and Paleontology in Southwest China*: Beijing, Science Press, p. 208–210.

Na, L., Li, Q., Krause, C., Zhu, M., and Kiessling, W., 2023, Revisiting the Phanerozoic rock–diversity relationship: *Geological Magazine*, **v. 160**, p. 1853–1862.

Neumayr, M., 1889, *Die Stämme des Thierreiches. 1. Wirbellose Thiere*: Vienna and Prague, Tempsky, 603 pp.

Parsley, R.L., and Zhao, Y.L., 2006, Long stalked eocrinoids in the basal middle Cambrian Kaili biota, Taijiang County, Guizhou Province, China: *Journal of Paleontology*, **v. 80**, p. 1058–1071.

Parsley, R.L., and Zhao, Y.L., 2010, A new turban-shaped gogiid eocrinoid from the Kaili Formation (Kaili Biota), Balang, Jianhe County, Guizhou Province, China: *Journal of Paleontology*, **v. 84**, p. 549–553.

Paul, C.R.C., 1965, On the occurrence of *Comarocystites* or *Sinclairocystis* (Paracrinoidea: Comarocystitidae) in the Starfish Bed, Threave Glen, Girvan: *Geological Magazine*, **v. 102**, p. 474–477.

Paul, C.R.C., 1980, *The Natural History of Fossils*: London, Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 292 p.

Paul, C.R.C., 1982, The adequacy of the fossil record, *in* Joysey, K.A., and Friday, A.E., eds., *Problems of Phylogenetic Reconstruction*, Systematics Association Special Volume **21**: London, Academic Press, p. 75–117.

Paul, C.R.C., 1998, Adequacy, completeness and the fossil record, *in* S. K. Donovan, S.K., and Paul, C.R.C., eds., *The Completeness and Adequacy of the Fossil Record*: Chichester, Wiley, p. 1–22.

Paul, C.R.C., Donovan, S.K., Muir, L.A., Botting, J.P., Lin, J.-P., and Zhang, Y., 2016, Primitive Ordovician (Floian) echinoderms from Sandu, Guizhou Province, South China, and their significance: *Geological Journal*, **v. 51**, p. 143–156.

Paul, C.R.C., Boucot, A.J., Donovan, S.K., Zhan, R.B., and Tansathien, W., 2019, Primitive stalked echinoderms from the Middle Ordovician (Darriwilian) of Bang Song Tho, Kanchanaburi, western Thailand: *Geological Magazine*, **v. 156**, p. 147–171.

Peng, S.C., Yang, X.F., Liu, Y., Zhu, X.J., Sun, H.J., Zamora, S., Mao, Y.Y., and Zhang, Y.C., 2020, Fulu biota, a new exceptionally-preserved Cambrian fossil assemblage from the Longha Formation in southeastern Yunnan: *Palaeoworld*, **v. 29**, p. 453–461.

Rahman, I.A., and Zamora, S., 2024, Origin and early evolution of echinoderms: *Annual Review of Earth and Planetary Science*, **v. 52**, p. 295–320.

Raup, D.M., 1972, Taxonomic diversity during the Phanerozoic: *Science*, **v. 177**, p. 1065–1071.

Raup, D.M., 1976a, Species diversity in the Phanerozoic: a tabulation: *Paleobiology*, **v. 2**, p. 279–288.

Raup, D.M., 1976b, Species diversity in the Phanerozoic: an interpretation: *Paleobiology*, **v. 2**, p. 289–297.

Reed, F.R.C., 1917, Ordovician and Silurian fossils from Yun-nan: *Geological Survey of India, Memoirs, Palaeontographica Indica*, new series, **v. 6**, p. 1–69.

Regional Geological Team of Xinjiang Geological Bureau, **Geoscience Institute of Xinjiang Geological Bureau**, and **Geological Survey of Xinjiang Petroleum Bureau**, 1981, [*Fossil Atlas of Northwest China, Volume of the Xinjiang Uygur Autonomous Region (I), Late Protozoic–Early Paleozoic Part*]: Beijing, Geological Publishing House, p. 1–308. [in Chinese]

Regnéll, G., 1945, Non-crinoid Pelmatozoa from the Paleozoic of Sweden: *Lunds Geologisk-Mineralogiska Institutionen, Meddelanden*, **v. 108**, p. 1–255.

Robison, R.A., and Sprinkle, J., 1969, Ctenocystoidea a new class of echinoderms: *Science*, **v. 166**, p. 1512–1514.

Roemer, C.F., 1855, Echinoderms, *in* Bronn, H.G., ed., *Lethaea Geognostica* (third edition), Volume **2**: Stuttgart, E. Schweitzerbart, p. 210–291.

Rowley, R.R., 1904, The Echinodermata of the Missouri Silurian and a new brachiopod: *American Geologist*, **v. 34**, p. 269–282.

Ruedemann, R., 1933, *Camptostroma*, a lower Cambrian floating hydrozoan: *Proceedings of the United States National Museum*, **v. 82**, p. 1–8.

Schuchert, C., 1914, Fossilium Catalogus 1, Animalia *pars 3*, Stelleroidea palaeozoica: Berlin, W. Junk, 53 p.

Sepkoski, J.J., Jr., 1976, Species diversity in the Phanerozoic: species-area effects: *Paleobiology*, **v. 2**, p. 298–303.

https://doi.org/10.1017/jpa.2026.10280 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Shu, D.G., Conway Morris, S., Han., J., Zhang, Z.F., and Liu, J.N., 2004, Ancestral echinoderms from the Chengjiang deposits of China: *Nature*, **v. 430**, p. 422–428.

Smith, A.B., 2001, Large scale heterogeneity of the fossil record: implications for Phanerozoic biodiversity studies: *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B*, **v. 356**, p. 351–367.

Smith, A.B., 2007, Phanerozoic marine diversity: problems and prospects: *Journal of the Geological Society of London*, **v. 164**, p. 731–745.

Smith, A.B., and McGowan, A.J., 2005, Cyclicity in the fossil record mirrors rock outcrop area: *Biology Letters*, **v. 2**, p. 1–3.

Smith, A.B., and McGowan, A.J., 2007, The shape of the marine paleodiversity curve using the Phanerozoic rock record of western Europe: *Palaeontology*, **v. 50**, p. 765–774.

Smith, A.B., and Zamora, S., 2013, Cambrian spiral-plated echinoderms from Gondwana reveal the earliest pentaradial body plan: *Proceedings of the Royal Society B*, **v. 280**, p. 1–6, https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2013.1197.

Smith, A.B., Zamora, S., and Alvaró, J.J., 2013, The oldest echinoderm faunas from Gondwana show that echinoderm body plan diversification was rapid: *Nature Communications*, **v. 4**, n. 1385, https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms2391.

Springer, F., 1917, On the crinoid genus *Scyphocrinites* and its bulbous root *Camarocrinus*: *Smithsonian Institution Publication* 2440, 75 p.

Sprinkle, J., 1973, Morphology and evolution of blastozoan echinoderms: *Museum of Comparative Zoology, Harvard University, Special Publication*, 284 p.

Sprinkle, J., and Collins, D., 2006, New eocrinoids from the Burgess Shale, southern British Columbia, and the Spence Shale, northern Utah, USA: *Canadian Journal of Earth Sciences*, **v. 43**, p. 303–322.

Sun, Y.C., 1936, On the occurrence of *Aristocystis* faunas in China: *Bulletin of the Geological Society of China*, **v. 15**, p. 477–488.

Sun, Y.C., 1948, On the early occurrence of some Ordovician and Silurian cystoids from western Yunnan and its significance: *China Palaeontological Society, Palaeontological Novitates*, **v. 1**, p. 1–9.

Tarver, J.E., Braddy, S.J., and Benton, M.J., 2007, The effects of sampling bias on Paleozoic faunas and implications for macroevolutionary studies: *Palaeontology*, **v. 50**, p. 177–184.

Ubaghs, G., 1968, Stylophora, *in* Moore, R.C., ed., *Treatise on Invertebrate Paleontology*, Part S, Echinodermata 1: Lawrence, Kansas, Geological Society of America and University of Kansas Press, p. S495–S565.

Ubaghs, G., 1969, *Aethocrinus moorei* Ubaghs, N. Gen., N. Sp., le plus ancient crinoide dicyclique connu: *University of Kansas, Paleontological Contributions*, paper 38, p. 1–25.

Ulrich, E.O., 1925, New classification of the "Heterocrinidae," *in* Foerste, A.F., ed., Upper Ordovician faunas of Ontario and Quebec: *Canada Geological Survey Memoir*, **v. 138**, p. 82–106.

Vilhena, D.A., and Smith, A.B., 2013, Spatial bias in the marine fossil record: *PLoS One*, **v. 8**, n. e74470.

Waagen, W., and Jahn, J.J., 1899, Classe des Echinodermes, pt. 2, Famille des Crinoides, *in* Barrande, J., ed., *Systême Silurien du Centre de la Bohême*, Volume 7: Prague, Rivnác, 216 p.

Wahlenberg, G., 1818, Om svenska jordena bildning: *Svenska Tidskrift Vetenskaps Konst.*, **v. 1**, p. 1–77.

Walcott, C.D., 1917, Cambrian geology and paleontology IV, fauna of the Mount Whyte Formation: *Smithsonian Miscellaneous Collections*, **v. 67**, p. 61–114.

Wang, D.Z., Nohejlova, M., Sun, Z.X., Zeng, H., Lefebvre, B., Yang, X.L., and Zhao, F.C., 2024, First report of lepidocystid echinoderm in the Cambrian of North China: evolutionary and palaeobiogeographic implications: *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology*, **v. 644**, n. 112194.

Wang, G.X., Ling, Y., Gong, F.Y., Wu, R.C., Cui, Y.N., Zhang, Y.C., Wei, X., Luan, X.C., and Zhan, R.B., 2022, [Revised Darriwilian–Sandbian (Ordovician) stratigraphy and paleogeography of the southwestern Yangtze Platform, South China]: *Journal of Stratigraphy*, **v. 46**, p. 118–137. [in Chinese with English abstract]

Wang, Y., 1995, On discovery of *Neoarchaeocrinus* in China: *Acta Palaeontologica Sinica*, **v. 34**, p. 344–349.

Wang, Y., 1996, Silurian pisocrinids from southwest China: *Acta Palaeontologica Sinica*, **v. 35**, p. 702–713.

Waters, J.A., Marcus, S.A., Maples, C.G., Lane, N.G., Hou, H., Liao, Z., Wang, J., and Liu, L., 2008, Overview of Paleozoic stemmed echinoderms from China, *in* Ausich, W.I., and Webster, G.D., eds., *Echinoderm Paleobiology*: Bloomington, Indiana University Press, p. 346–367.

Webster, G.D., 2014, Bibliography and Index of Paleozoic Crinoids, Coronates, and Hemistreptocrinoids, 1758–2012: https://crinoids.azurewebsites.net (accessed Aug 2026).

Webster, G.D., and Webster, D.W., 2019, Bibliography and Index of Paleozoic Crinoids, 2013–2018 Supplement 1: https://crinoids.azurewebsites.net (accessed Aug 2026).

Weller, S., and Davidson, A.D., 1896, *Petalocrinus mirabilis* (n. sp.) and a new American fauna: *Journal of Geology*, **v. 4**, p. 166–173.

Wilbur, B.C., 2006, Reduction in the number of early Cambrian helicoplacoid species: *Palaeoworld*, **v. 15**, p. 283–293.

Williams, H.S., 1883, On a crinoid with movable spines (*Arthroacantha ithacensis*): *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, **v. 21**, p. 81–88.

Xia, S.F., Zhiu, X.P., and Sun, H.B., 1990, Two fossil cystoids from Lower Ordovician of Nan-Zheng, Shaanxi and Taoyuan, Hunan: *Acta Paleontologica Sinica*, **v. 29**, p. 467–471.

Xu, Y., 1962, [*Caelocrinus* - a new Wenlock crinoid genus from Sichuan]: *Acta Palaeontologica Sinica*, **v. 10**, p. 45–53. [in Chinese]

Yang, Z.C., Lin, J.P., Zhang, Y.P., Wu, Y.S., and Meng, X.Y., 2015, A new eocrinoid fauna (Cambrian Series 2) from Guizhou Province, South China: *Palaeoworld*, **v. 24**, p. 430–437.

Yin, T.H., and Lu, C.H., 1937, On the Ordovician and Silurian beds of Shihtien, western Yunnan: *Bulletin of the Geological Survey of China*, **v. 16**, p. 41–56.

Zamora, S., Zhu, X., and Lefebvre, B., 2013, A new Furongian (Cambrian) echinoderm-Lagerstätte from the Sandu Formation (South China): *Cahiers Biologie Marine*, **v. 54**, p. 565–569.

Zeng, H., Liu, Q., Zhao, F., Luo, C., Wang, D., et al., 2026, A Cambrian soft-bodied biota after the first Phanerozoic mass extinction: *Nature*, **v. 651**, p. 679–687.

Zenker, J.C., 1833, *Beiträge zur Naturgeschichte der Urwelt. Organische Reste (Petrefacten) aus der Altenburger Braunkohlen-formation, dem Blankenburger Quadersandstein, jenaischen bunten Sandstein und böhmischen Übergangsgebirge*: Jena, Friedrich Mauke, 67 p.

Zhang, J.L., and Han, N.R., 1991, Discovery of Stelleroidea from the Upper Ordovician in China: *Geological Review*, **v. 37**, p. 368–372.

Zhao, J., Rahman, I.A., Zamora, S., Chen, A., and Cong, P., 2022, The first edrioasteroid echinoderm from the lower Cambrian Chengjiang biota of Yunnan Province, China: *Papers in Palaeontology*, **v. 8**, n. e1465.

Zhao, Y.L., Huang, Y.Z., and Gong, X.Y., 1994, [Echinoderm fossils of Kaili Fauna from Taijiang, Guizhou]: *Acta Palaeontologica Sinica*, **v. 33**, p. 305–324. [in Chinese with English abstract]

Zhao, Y.L., Parsley, R.L., and Peng, J., 2007, Early Cambrian eocrinoids from Guizhou Province, China: *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology*, **v. 254**, p. 317–327.

Zhao, Y.L., Parsley, R.L., and Peng, J., 2008, Basal middle Cambrian short-stalked eocrinoids from the Kaili Biota, Taijiang County, Guizhou Province, China: *Journal of Paleontology*, **v. 82**, p. 369–376.

Zhao, Y.L., Sumrall, C.D., Parsley, R.L., and Peng, J., 2010, *Kailidiscus*, a new plesiomorphic edrioasteroid from the basal middle Cambrian Kaili Biota of Guizhou Province, China: *Journal of Paleontology*, **v. 84**, p. 668–680.

Zhao, Y.L., Guo, J., Selden, P.A., Cong, P.Y., and Li, Y.J., 2022, A new eocrinoid from the Guanshan Biota (Cambrian Series 2, Stage 4), with implication of the development of different attachment modes in early Cambrian: *Palaeoworld*, **v. 31**, p. 185–193.

Zhu, X.-J., Zamora, S., and Lefebvre, B., 2014, Morphology and palaeoecology of a new edrioblastoid from the Furongian of China: *Acta Palaeontologica Polonica*, **v. 59**, p. 921–926.

Zhu, X.J., Peng, S.C., Zamora, S., Lefebvre, B., and Chen, G.Y., 2016, Furongian (upper Cambrian) Guole Konservat-Lagerstätte from South China: *Acta Geologica Sinica*, **v. 90**, p. 30–37.

https://doi.org/10.1017/jpa.2026.10280 Published online by Cambridge University Press