match the colors in life as published by Ho et al. (1999) who just translated and reproduced data of FEI et al. (1995) on *L. ailaonicum*.

One argument of Ho et al. (1999) concerns the colour of the iris in Leptobrachium. The color of the iris is usually stable in anuran species and has been proven to be a good character for species discrimination (GLAW & VENCES 1997; see also discussion in MATSUI et al. 1999), although often been ignored because it can only be clearly observed when frogs are alive. A major problem in anuran systematics is due to the fact that interspecific variation is often mistaken as intraspecific. Any such systematic analysis is then called to fail [see e. g., morphometric analysis of Rana synkl, esculenta by KAURI (1959), or works on the R. pipiens group, review by DUBOIS 1977]. To understand character distribution, the operational taxonomic unit has to be the population. In all Leptobrachium populations studied in the field, eye coloration seems to be stable or variable to a degree which is only discernable using finer methods, such as spectrographs (DU-BOIS, GROSJEAN, OHLER and NABITHA-BATHA, unpublished data). In more than 50 L. chapaense (BOURRET, 1937) from Ben En (Tanh Hoa Province, Vietnam) observed by our team, the upper iris was light blue in all cases (GROSJEAN, OHLER, unpublished data; DUBOIS & OHLER 1998); the same color was found in the specimens observed in northern Thailand (DUBOIS & OHLER 1998; MATSUI et al. 1999; DUBOIS, OHLER, NABITHABATHA, unpublished data). In all specimens of *L. echinatum* observed on Fan Si Pan the color of the upper iris can most easily be described as lime green. During field work, life color, especially the color of the iris should be noted by researchers in order to provide access to this useful character in systematics.

Morphometric data of the specimens and sexual characters of the males mentioned by Ho et al. (1999) give additional support to the taxonomic conclusions of DUBOIS & OHLER (1998): the range of the number of spines on the upper lip of the five males reported by DUBOIS & OHLER (1998) and Ho et al. (1999) is 50 - 61, and does not overlap the range of 22 - 48 reported from 69 L. ailaonicum from Yunnan by FEI et al. (1995). These data clearly separate L. echinatum and L. ailaonicum. The tadpole description by Ho et al. (1999) is not based on original data, but is a translation of the description of the tadpole of L. ailaonicum by CHEN et al. (1984).

Bufo Laurenti, 1768

DUBOIS & OHLER (1999) proposed a revision of species of the *Bufo melanostictus* group and the *B. stejnegeri* group (both groups sensu INGER 1972). They proposed to include *B. tienhoensis* BOURRET, 1937 in the synonymy of *B. melanostictus* SCHNEIDER, 1799. Based on the comparison of the holotype and topotypical specimens of *Bufo*

Table 3: Measurements and indexes of treefrogs of the Rhacophorus dugritei group (sensu DUBOIS 1987): Rhacophorus duboisi nov. sp., Rh. dugritei (DAVID, 1871), Rh. gongshanensis YANG & SU, 1984, Rh. omeimontis STEINEGER, 1924. SVL - snout-vent lengt, HW - head width, HL - head length, TL - tibia length. Data source: own measurements

Tab. 3: Maße und Indizes von Baumfröschen der Rhacophorus dugritei - Gruppe (sensu DUBOIS 1987): Rhacophorus duboisi nov. sp., Rh. dugritei (DAVID, 1871), Rh. gongshanensis YANG & SU, 1984, Rh. omeimontis STEINEGER, 1924. SVL - Kopf-Rumpflänge, HW - Kopfbreite, HL - Kopflänge, TL - Tibialänge. Datenquelle: eigene Messungen.

Species	Sex	n	SVL	HW/SVL	HL/SVL	TL/SVL
Rh. duboisi	ð	2 2	61.5 - 65.7 71.1 - 74.1	0.314 - 0.338 0.337 - 0.364	0.315 - 0.333 0.320 - 0.333	0.457 - 0.496 0.495 - 0.503
Rh. dugritei	δ Q	2 0	38.0 - 40.8 -	0.358 - 0.385	0.332 - 0.355	0.421 - 0.426 -
Rh. gongshanensis	Ż Ŷ	2 2	64.7 - 68.0 78.0 - 78.7	0.331 - 0.334 0.349 - 0.356	0.331 - 0.335 0.326 - 0.329	0.468 - 0.472 0.515 - 0.515
Rh. omeimontis	₫ 2	15 4	50.4 - 69.6 75.5 - 79.4	0.298 - 0.355 0.319 - 0.359	0.315 - 0.349 0.297 - 0.323	0.488 - 0.491 0.466 - 0.520