

herbarium or other public collection with a policy of giving bona fide researchers access to deposited material, and that it be scrupulously conserved.” I propose to add a further Recommendation.

(069) Add a new Recommendation 7B to read as follows:

“7B.1. It is strongly recommended that the protologue of the name of a new taxon at the rank of species or below include at least one photograph of the mounted holotype with its label.”

To my mind, adding even the simplest photographs would improve the utility of type material for current and future researchers, not to mention Artificial Intelligence (machine reading, machine learning). It might also help improve the quality of labels.

Acknowledgement

I thank John McNeill for his encouragement and Nicholas Turland for improving my wording.

(070) Proposal to add a new Example after Article 9 Note 6 to illustrate when the term “holotype” cannot be corrected

Adriel Ian Jocou

Departamento de Biología Aplicada, Facultad de Ciencias Agrarias, Universidad Nacional del Comahue, Ruta Nacional N° 151 km 12.5, Cinco Saltos, Río Negro, 8303, Argentina

Address for correspondence: *Adriel Ian Jocou, adrieljocou@gmail.com*

DOI <https://doi.org/10.1002/tax.12469>

First published as part of this issue. See online for details.

Some confusion may arise regarding the application of Art. 9.10 of the *Shenzhen Code* (Turland & al. in *Regnum Veg.* 159. 2018). When the term “holotype” is misused, it can be corrected (to lecto-, neo- or epi-type). For this, the requirements of Art. 7.11 must be met. While Art. 9 Ex. 11 illustrates when the misused term “holotype” can be corrected, there is no Example illustrating when the term cannot be corrected. Although Art. 7.11 is clear, and a typification statement on or after 1 January 2001 must include the phrase “designated here” or an equivalent, adding an Example after Art. 9 Note 6 could be clarifying. Hence, I feel that the following new Example should be included in the *Code*.

(070) Add a new Example after Art. 9 Note 6:

“*Ex. n.* Bohley & al. (in *Syst. Bot.* 42: 138. 2017) cited the specimen *Balansa 2263* (G) as the “type” and “holotype” of *Cypselea*

meziana K. Müll. (in *Bot. Jahrb. Syst.* 42(Beibl. 97): 72. 1908). However, this use of the term holotype cannot be corrected to lectotype because the requirement of Art. 7.11 to include, on or after 1 January 2001, the phrase “designated here” or an equivalent was not met. As a consequence, designation of a lectotype was not achieved until Jocou & Minué (in *Phytotaxa* 461: 69. 2020) wrote “Lectotype (designated here)” selecting a specimen from the same *Balansa* gathering in P.”

Acknowledgement

I thank N.J. Turland for the suggestions that improved this proposal.

(071) Proposal for accountability in designating types based on virtually seen original material

Sneha P. Bramhadande & Mayur D. Nandikar

Naoraji Godrej Centre for Plant Research (NGCPR), 431, Lawkim Campus, Shindewadi, Post Shirwal, Dist. Satara, Maharashtra, 412 801, India

Address for correspondence: *Mayur D. Nandikar, mnandikar@gmail.com*

DOI <https://doi.org/10.1002/tax.12470>

First published as part of this issue. See online for details.

Online databases have provided considerable advantages to many fields of investigation, including plant taxonomy. Despite the positive impacts of digital resources for taxonomists, especially in providing

ease of access to information regarding literature and (potential) type specimens, there can be surprising negative consequences. In recent years there has been a very significant increase in the number of papers