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Abstract. According to Article 9.2 of International Code of Nomenclature for algae, fungi, and plants (ICN, Shenzhen Code, 2018), the errors of collection number in the protologues of 14 names of Chinese plants were corrected, including Bauhinia bohniana (Fabaceae), Bauhinia dioscoreifolia (Fabaceae), Brassaiopsis glomerulata var. brevipedicellata (Araliaceae), Deutzia coriacea (Saxifragaceae), Fissistigma capitatum (Annonaceae), Gymnadenia monophylla (Orchidaceae), Hibiscus venustus var. integrilobus (Malvaceae), Hibiscus wangiensis (Malvaceae), Hydrangea fulvescens (Hydrangeaceae), Ilex chuniana (Aquifoliaceae), Ilex corallina Franch. var. macrocarpa (Aquifoliaceae), Lonicera montigena (Caprifoliaceae), Morinda hupehensis (Rubiaceae), Neonauclea tsaiana (Rubiaceae). The holotypes of the 14 names are deposited in the Harvard University Herbaria.
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The Harvard University Herbaria include six integrated herbaria: the Herbarium of the Arnold Arboretum (A); Economic Herbarium of Oakes Ames (ECON); Oakes Ames Orchid Herbarium (AMES); Farlow Herbarium (FH); Gray Herbarium (GH); and the New England Botanical Club Herbarium (NEBC). The current collections contain more than five million specimens and over 100 thousand type specimens of vascular plants. Of special interest are more than 10,000 type specimens of Chinese plants.

With the support of the National Plant Specimen Resource Center Project (NPSRC) and the Chinese Virtual Herbarium (CVH) project, we undertook a review from 2018 to 2021 of the Chinese type specimens in the Harvard University Herbaria. During our review we discovered some errors in the citation of collection numbers that need to be corrected. This paper presents the numbers incorrectly cited in the protologues and gives their correct citation. Another paper, “Correction of date errors in the protologues of eighteen taxon names from China,” was recently published in this journal (Lin et al., 2021).

We reviewed the literature and examined all the electronic images of type specimens of Chinese plants from A and AMES; following ICN Art. 9.2 “If a designation of holotype made in the protologue of the name of a taxon is later found to contain errors (e.g. in locality, date, collector, collection number, herbarium code, specimen identifier, or citation of an illustration), these errors are to be corrected provided that the intent of the original author(s) is not changed” (Turland et al., 2018).

We herewith correct the collection errors in the protologues of 14 names of taxa described from China. The 14 names are arranged alphabetically by the genus wherein they are currently placed. This is followed by a brief discussion. Images of the specimens at A and AMES are linked to the barcodes cited in the following text.


The name Bauhinia bohniana L. Chen (Chen, 1938) was validly published with the type designated as Rock “2905” in A. However, the specimen in A annotated “Bauhinia bohniana spec. nov., det. Luetta Chen, March 1938,” “Type,” and matching all other details of the protologue bears the collection number J. F. Rock 3905. Therefore, the original type citation is erroneous and is to be corrected.


The name Bauhinia dioscoreifolia L. Chen (Chen, 1939) was validly published with the type designated as S. K. Lau “27552” in A. However, the specimen in A annotated “Bauhinia dioscoreifolia sp. nov.,” “Type,” and matching all other details of the protologue bears the collection number S. K. Lau 27552. Therefore, the original type citation is erroneous and is to be corrected.

3. Brassaiopsis glomerulata (Bl.) Regel var. brevipedicellata H. L. Li (Araliaceae), Sargentia 2: 59. 1942. TYPE: China. Yunnan Province: Gongshan Hsien [Xian], Kiukiang Valley, alt. 1600 m, 21 November 1938, T. T. Yu 21056 (Holotype: A [00094876]).

The name Brassaiopsis glomerulata (Bl.) Regel var. brevipedicellata H. L. Li (Li, 1942) was validly published with the holotype designated as T. T. Yu “20156” in A. However, the specimen in A annotated “Brassaiopsis glomerulata var. brevipedicellata var. nov.” and matching all other details of the protologue bears the collection collection numbers incorrectly cited in the protologue.
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number T. T. Yu 21056. Therefore, the original type citation is erroneous and is to be corrected.


The name *Deutzia coriacea* Rehd. (Rehder, 1911) was validly published with the type designated as *E. H. Wilson “4481”* in A. However, the specimen in A annotated “*Deutzia coriacea* Rehd., n. sp.” and matching all other details of the protologue bears the collection number *E. H. Wilson 4487*. Therefore, the original type citation is erroneous and is to be corrected.

5. **Fissistigma capitatum** Merr. ex H. L. Li (Annonaceae), J. Arnold Arbor. 26(1): 60. 1945. TYPE: China. Guangxi [Zhuangzu Zizhiqu: Chen-pien (=Napo Hsien [Xian]), alt. 5].

The name *Fissistigma capitatum* Merr. ex H. L. Li (Li, 1945) was validly published with the type designated as *S. P. Ko 56073*. Therefore, the original type citation is erroneous and is to be corrected.


The name *Gymnadenia monophylla* Ames & Schltr. (Ames & Schltr., 1919) was validly published with the type designated as *E. H. Wilson “4723”* in AMES. However, the specimen in AMES annotated “*Gymnadenia monophylla* Ames & Schltr. n. sp.,” “Type,” and matching all other details of the protologue bears the collection number *E. H. Wilson 4722*. Therefore, the original type citation is erroneous and is to be corrected.


The name *Hibiscus venustus* Bl. var. *integrilobus* S.Y. Hu (Hu, 1955) was validly published with the type designated as *E. H. Wilson “11055”* in A. However, the specimen in A annotated “*Hibiscus venustus var. integrilobus* v. n.,” “Type,” and matching all other details of the protologue bears the collection number *E. H. Wilson 11053*. Therefore, the original type citation is erroneous and is to be corrected.


The name *Hibiscus wangkanianus* S.Y. Hu (Hu, 1955) was validly published with the type designated as *C. W. Wang “80945”* in A. The specimen in A annotated “*Hibiscus wangkanianus* sp. n.,” “Type,” and matching all other details of the protologue bears the collection number C. W. Wang 80943. Therefore, the original type citation is erroneous and is to be corrected.


The name *Hydrangea fulvescens* Rehd. (Rehder, 1911) was validly published with the type designated as *E. H. Wilson “1393”* in A. However, the specimen in A annotated “*Hydrangea fulvescens* Rehd. n. sp.,” “Type,” and matching all other details of the protologue bears the collection number *E. H. Wilson 1373*. Therefore, the original type citation is erroneous and is to be corrected.


The name *Ilex chuniana* S. Y. Hu (Hu, 1951) was validly published with the type designated as *C. Wang “33904”* in A. However, the specimen in A annotated “*Ilex chuniana* sp. nov.,” “Type,” and matching all other details of the protologue bears the collection number C. Wang 35904. Therefore, the original type citation is erroneous and is to be corrected.


The name *Ilex corallina* Franch. var. *macrocarpa* S. Y. Hu (Hu, 1950) was validly published with the type designated as *H. C. Chow “155”* in A. However, the specimen in A annotated “*Ilex corallina* Franch. var. *macrocarpa* var. nov.,” “Type,” and matching all other details of the protologue bears the collection number H. C. Chow 1556. Therefore, the original type citation is erroneous and is to be corrected.


The name *Lonicera montigena* Rehd. (Rehder, 1911) was validly published with the type designated as *E. H. Wilson “375 c”* in A. However, the specimen in A annotated “*Lonicera montigena* Rehd. sp. n.,” “Type,” and matching all other details of the protologue bears the collection number *E. H. Wilson 3754 c*. Therefore, the original type citation is erroneous and is to be corrected.

The name *Morinda hupehensis* S. Y. Hu (Hu, 1951) was validly published with the type designated as *H. C. Chou “1818”* in A. However, the specimen in A annotated “*Morinda hupehensis* S. Y. Hu,” “Holotype,” and matching all other details of the protologue bears the collection number *H. C. Chou 1815*. Therefore, the original type citation is erroneous and is to be corrected.


The name *Neonauclea tsaiana* S. Q. Zou (Zou, 1988) was validly published with the holotype designated as *C. W. Wang “39373”* in A. However, the specimen in A annotated “*Neonauclea tsaiana* S. Q. Zou,” “Type,” and matching all other details of the protologue bears the collection number *C. W. Wang 79373*. Therefore, the original type citation is erroneous and is to be corrected.