

RETRACTION

of Research Article “Integrative phylogenomics positions sponges at the root of the animal tree”

On 13 November 2025, *Science* published the Research Article “Integrative phylogenomics positions sponges at the root of the animal tree” by Jacob L. Steenwyk and Nicole King (1). The authors alerted us that errors in the analysis pipeline had affected the results to an extent that they are no longer reliable. Two aspects of the data analysis introduced artifacts. First, an imbalance between the number of sponges and ctenophores in the dataset biased one of the scoring metrics, thereby influencing the outcomes. Second, part of the analysis involved collapsing internal nodes, which was not properly accommodated by the software used. The authors thank Casey W. Dunn and colleagues for bringing this to their attention, as detailed in an eLetter and in Steenwyk and King’s eLetter Response, both available at <https://www.science.org/doi/10.1126/science.adw9456#elettersSection>. Given these issues, both authors have requested a Retraction. *Science* is therefore retracting the Research Article.

H. Holden Thorp, Editor-in-Chief, *Science*

REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. J. L. Steenwyk, N. King, *Science* **390**, 751 (2025).

10.1126/science.aef5589

Ineffective marine protected areas in Azores

The Azores islands, an autonomous region of Portugal, are a volcanic archipelago in deep waters, located above large seamounts in the Atlantic Ocean (1). The islands are considered a biodiversity hotspot of endemic corals; hydrothermal vent ecosystems; and many species of fishes, whales, dolphins, sharks, and rays (2). Beginning on 1 January, the Azores government increased its marine protected areas



Marine protected areas in Portugal’s Azores islands do not adequately protect shallow coastal ecosystems.

(MPAs) by 30% in an effort to meet the European Union conservation target ahead of schedule (3). However, the newly established MPAs will not protect the Azores’ fisheries or vulnerable coastal ecosystems.

Most of the Azores’ MPAs are in deep waters, and none adequately protects shallow coastal ecosystems, where most fishing biomass is concentrated (4, 5). Moreover, only about half of the recently designated MPAs, which are in seas where fishers target highly mobile, pelagic fish species, such as tuna (6), are classified as no-take zones. This decision—to increase MPAs but to cover only deep-sea areas and not fully prohibit fishing—sidelines decades of local marine science (4, 7, 8). Meanwhile, weak enforcement of land-use planning and pollution regulations on the islands continues to threaten coastal water quality (9, 10).

Other countries have also presented a bold conservation image to the international community but have failed to support their claims with the underlying protected area design. For example, the UK’s Chagos Archipelago and Pitcairn islands, France’s New Caledonia, and the US’s Pacific Remote Islands all remain inadequately protected (11). Worldwide, political and economic interests, short electoral cycles, and corporatism often override evidence-based conservation measures (12).

Effective biodiversity protection of the marine ecosystems of the Azores and elsewhere, including appropriately designed MPAs, requires governance structures grounded in science, transparent management, and meaningful participation of stakeholders (2). Rather than being driven by political considerations and narrow economic interests, MPAs should be established in geographic areas where protection would demonstrably benefit biodiversity and support long-term ecological and socioeconomic resilience.

João Pedro Barreiros^{1,2}, Alfonso Aguilar-Perera³, Antônio Batista Anderson⁴, Luís M. D. Barcelos^{1,2}, Luciano B. Beheregaray⁵, Edgardo Díaz-Ferguson⁶

¹Azorean Biodiversity Group, Centre for Ecology, Evolution and Environmental Changes, University of the Azores, Angra do Heroísmo, Portugal. ²School of Agrarian and Environmental Sciences, University of the Azores, Angra do Heroísmo, Portugal. ³Departamento de Biología Marina, Universidad Autónoma de Yucatán, Mérida, Yucatán, Mexico. ⁴Benthic Ecology Laboratory, Department of Oceanography, Federal University of Espírito Santo, Vitória, Espírito Santo, Brazil. ⁵Molecular Ecology Lab, Flinders University, Adelaide, SA, Australia. ⁶Estación Científica Coiba (Coiba Asociación de Interés Público), Ciudad del Saber, Clayton, Panama City, Panama. Email: alfaguilar@gmail.com

REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. E. A. Lima *et al.*, *Geoheritage* **10**, 659 (2018).
2. N. Campaña-Llovet, A. E. Bates, A. Colaço, *Divers. Distrib.* **31**, e70059 (2025).
3. Decreto Legislativo Regional n.º 11/2025/A (2025); <https://diariodarepublica.pt/dr/detalhe/decreto-legislativo-regional/11-2025-908074087> [in Portuguese].
4. C. K. Pham *et al.*, *ICES J. Mar. Sci.* **70**, 564 (2013).
5. S. Mana’oakamai Johnson, A. O. Villagomez, *Front. Mar. Sci.* **9**, 1012815 (2022).
6. P. M. Silva, C. Pita, J. L. Costa, C. M. Teixeira, *Front. Sustain. Food Syst.* **9**, 1577917 (2025).
7. R. C. Abecasis *et al.*, *Front. Mar. Sci.* **2**, 104 (2015).
8. P. Afonso *et al.*, *Front. Mar. Sci.* **6**, 826 (2020).
9. J. V. Cruz, D. Pacheco, R. Cymbron, S. Mendes, *Environ. Earth Sci.* **61**, 173 (2010).
10. C. M. R. Almeida, T. Azevedo, L. Guimarães, J. Coast. Conserv. **28**, 42 (2024).
11. P. Leenhardt *et al.*, *Ocean Coast. Manag.* **85**, 112 (2013).
12. S. Berdej, J. Silver, D. Armitage, *Soc. Nat. Resour.* **32**, 1258 (2019).

10.1126/science.aed7607

Halt illegal cyber tiger trade in Asia

Tigers (*Panthera tigris*), one of the iconic big cats in Asia, are listed as Endangered on the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN)’s Red List of Threatened Species (1). As a result of habitat loss, human-felid conflicts, and poaching, the population of mature wild tigers declined from about 100,000 in 1900 to an estimated 3140 in 2021 (1). Asian governments have implemented measures to halt the illegal tiger trade, but as traditional markets have shut down, online trafficking has proliferated. To protect