iNaturalist as a platform for documenting Chilean funga

iNaturalist como plataforma para documentar la funga chilena

Running title — iNaturalist and Chilean funga

Riquelme, Cristian[1,2,*]

[1]Grupo de Estudios Micológicos (GEM), San Nicolás, Punilla, Ñuble, Chile.

[2]Fundación La Fungación, Valdivia, Valdivia, Los Ríos, Chile.

[*]Autor corresponsal: cristian-riquelme@outlook.cl

ORCID Riquelme, Cristian: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1652-571X

ABSTRACT

This study analyzes the impact of iNaturalist on the recording and documentation of fungi in Chile from 2008 to 2024, highlighting its role in integrating citizen science into biodiversity monitoring. This community effort—which currently totals more than 63,000 observations representing 1,245 species—is concentrated in the central and southern regions of the country, mainly in urban areas, where a small group of hyperprolific users generates 44.40% of the records. Since 2020, an increase in the number of observations has been observed, which may be linked to a growing interest in mycology. The use of iNaturalist allows overcoming traditional logistical limitations, expanding the taxonomic, spatial, and temporal coverage of fungal observations, but these advantages are not without biases. In addition, mycology in Chile faces structural challenges, such as funding and training of new specialists. Collaboration between amateurs and professional mycologists is essential to validate the data and extract the potential of this type of tools. This approach complements conventional methods of biodiversity studies and strengthens conservation policies. Although iNaturalist has proven to be an effective tool, more effort and resources are required to address the knowledge gaps of fungal biodiversity. This study reinforces the potential of citizen science as a source of valuable and potentially useful data to address the planetary crisis.

Keywords — Chile; citizen science; Fungi; iNaturalist.

RESUMEN

Este estudio analiza el impacto de iNaturalist en el registro y documentación de hongos en Chile desde 2008 hasta 2024, destacando su rol en la integración de la ciencia ciudadana al monitoreo de biodiversidad. Este esfuerzo comunitario —que actualmente suma más de 63000 observaciones que representan 1245 especies— se concentra en la zona centro y sur del país, principalmente en áreas urbanas, donde un reducido grupo de usuarios hiperprolíficos genera el 44,40 % de los registros. Desde 2020, se ha observado un aumento en el número de observaciones, que puede estar ligado a un creciente interés en la micología. El uso de iNaturalist permite superar las limitaciones logísticas tradicionales, ampliando la cobertura taxonómica, espacial y temporal de las observaciones de hongos, pero estas ventajas no están exentas de sesgos. Además, la micología en Chile enfrenta desafíos estructurales, como el financiamiento y la formación de nuevos especialistas. La colaboración entre aficionados y micólogos profesionales es fundamental para validar los datos y extraer el potencial de este tipo de herramientas. Este enfoque complementa los métodos convencionales de los estudios de biodiversidad y fortalece las políticas de conservación. Aunque iNaturalist ha demostrado ser una herramienta efectiva, se requieren más esfuerzos y recursos para abordar los vacíos de conocimiento de la biodiversidad fúngica. Este estudio

refuerza el potencial de la ciencia ciudadana como fuente de datos valiosos y potencialmente útiles para hacer frente a la crisis planetaria.

Palabras clave — Chile; ciencia ciudadana; Fungi; iNaturalist.

INTRODUCTION

Citizen or community science

Before the—relatively recent—professionalization of science, many of the observations about the natural world depended on people without formal scientific training (Miller-Rushing *et al*., 2012; Vetter, 2011). The—apparently recent—phenomenon of citizen science stands out as a valuable source of data and has a scientific and social impact worthy of being considered. (Bonney *et al*., 2014). Multiple attempts have been made to provide a definition of citizen science—also referred to as community science (Lin Hunter *et al*., 2023)—without yet reaching an interdisciplinary consensus (Auerbach *et al*., 2019). To address this, Heigl *et al*. (2019) propose a catalog of criteria—based on the ten principles of the European Citizen Science Association (2015)—to assess the quality of a citizen science project, covering seven areas of evaluation: (1) what is not citizen science, (2) scientific standards (3) collaboration, (4) open access to scientific research, (5) communication, (6) ethics, and (7) data management.

The scientific endeavor benefits from the propensity of people to record and document the natural world (Bonney, 2021). The inclusion of the community in the scientific research process can greatly contribute to monitoring biodiversity and environmental conditions, reinforcing their connection with nature (Peter *et al*., 2021). On the other hand, gathering new data while managing existing data efficiently is pivotal to fully understand emerging patterns and driving agents involved in biological and environmental phenomena. Primary data such as taxonomic identification, timestamps, and geographic coordinates are indispensable, and secondary data, often recorded unintentionally, are crucial to understanding biodiversity dynamics (Pernat *et al*., 2024).

Community efforts aimed at gathering quality scientific data currently take place on a global scale (de Sherbinin *et al*., 2021; Chandler *et al*., 2017) and provide the opportunity to engage young volunteers (Aristeidou *et al*., 2021a, 2021b). Successful examples include the eBird platform (https://ebird.org/home), a global network of birders that advocates (a) reaching a balance between quantity and quality of data (b) facilitating access and use of data, and (c) encouraging diversity of collaborators in every aspect of the project (Sullivan *et al*., 2009, 2014). Other relevant initiatives include monitoring the advance of the invasive alien species *Harmonia axyridis* (Coleoptera, Coccinelidae) at national, continental, and global scales (de Groot *et al*., 2024; Grez *et al*., 2022; Hiller & Haelewaters, 2019), GLOBE Mosquito Habitat Mapper (https://observer.globe.gov/do-globe-observer/mosquito-habitats) that contributes to mosquito-borne disease risk modeling (Low *et al*., 2021), and *Científicos de la Basura* (https://cientificosdelabasura.ucn.cl/) that seeks to record data on anthropogenic waste on beaches and rivers (Thiel *et al*., 2023).

Citizen science in South America

Currently, studies whose data source comes from citizen science initiatives tend to increase in number and scope, even in developing countries (Follet & Strezov, 2015; Ortega-Alvarez & Casas, 2022; Requier *et al*., 2020). In South America specifically, there have been studies on bird ecology in Argentina (Schaaf *et al*., 2024), community-based environmental data gathering in Bolivia (Maillard *et al*., 2024), analysis of observations on terrestrial gastropods in Brazil (Rosa *et al*., 2022), taxonomic novelties on fungi in Colombia (Franco-Molano *et al*., 2024) and Ecuador (Vandegrift *et al*., 2023), the monitoring of the advance of invasive species in Paraguay and Uruguay (Goossen-Lebrón *et al*., 2023; Grattarola *et al*., 2024), bird mating patterns and nesting habits in Peru (Díaz *et al*., 2024), the use of local knowledge for decision-making on climate change adaptation measures in Suriname (Smith *et al*., 2024), and a surveillance program for insect vectors of Chagas disease in Venezuela (Delgado-Noguera *et al*., 2022). While in Chile citizen science have contributed, for instance, to amphibian conservation (Vidal *et al*., 2024), to documenting biotic interactions in gastropods (Barahona-Segovia *et al*., 2024a) and multi-taxa pollinators (Barahona-Segovia *et al*., 2023, 2024b; Fontúrbel *et al*., 2024), and to cetacean monitoring (Garcia-Cegarra *et al*., 2021).

Citizen science and fungi

Fungi play essential ecological roles in the conservation of the biosphere (Cao *et al*., 2021; Gonçalves *et al*., 2021). To date, 155,869 species of fungi have been described (Bánki *et al*., 2024), although the number of existing species is estimated to surpass 2,500,000 (Niskanen *et al*., 2023). In Chile, although there is no consensus regarding the number of species occurring in the territory, the most up-to-date data indicate that there are 1,600 species of macrofungi—of which 240 correspond to aphyllophoroid fungi—and 1,416 species of lichenized and lichenicolous fungi (Riquelme & Rajchenberg, 2021; Riquelme *et al*., 2022; Sandoval-Leiva *et al*., 2023; Vargas-Castillo & Sandoval-Leiva, 2020). While these numbers are substantial, it is possible to get even closer to the actual number of existing species by actively involving the community in the data gathering process (Haelewaters *et al*., 2024b). Studies using citizen science data, meanwhile, rely on open and efficient access to information, where the online databases Index Fungorum (Index Fungorum Partnership, 2024), MycoBank (Robert *et al*., 2013), and MyCoPortal (Miller & Bates, 2017; MyCoPortal, 2024), stand out along with the iNaturalist (https://www.inaturalist.org/home; iNaturalist Network, 2024), Mushroom Observer (https://mushroomobserver.org; Mushroom Observer, Inc., 2024), CitSci (https://citsci.org; CitSci.org, 2024), Guardians of Earth (https://www.guardiansofearth.io; Guardians of Earth, 2024), Observation.org (https://observation.org; Observation International and local partners, 2024), and SPOTTERON (https://www.spotteron.net; SPOTTERON GmbH, 2024) platforms. Some relevant citizen science projects focused on the study of fungi include Mind.Funga (https://mindfunga.ufsc.br; Chaves *et al*., 2024), Danish Fungal Atlas (https://svampe.databasen.org; Heilmann-Clausen *et al*., 2021), Fungimap (https://fungimap.org.au; Fungimap Inc, 2024), FunDiS (https://www.fundis.org; Fungal Diversity Survey, Inc., 2024; Sheehan *et al*., 2021), Lost and Found Fungi Project (https://fungi.myspecies.info/content/lost-and-found-fungi-project; Fungi of Great Britain and Ireland, 2014), Meetnet Paddenstoelen (https://www.mycologen.nl/onderzoek/meetnet; Nationale Databank Flora en Fauna [NDFF], 2024) y HongosAR (https://hongos.ar/; Fundación Hongos de Argentina para la Sustentabilidad [FHAS], 2024). Examples of the contributions on fungi from citizen science data can be found in countries such as Australia (Irga *et al*., 2018, 2020), Canada (Bazzicalupo *et al*., 2022), Chile (Riquelme *et al*., 2022), Denmark (Heilmann-Clausen *et al*., 2016, 2019, 2021), Ecuador (Vandegrift *et al*., 2023), Estonia (Copoț *et* *al*., 2024), United States (Shumskaya *et al*., 2023), Finland (Ruotsalainen *et al*., 2023), Greece (Polemis *et al*., 2023), Czech Republic (Koukol *et al*., 2020), and South Africa (Gryzenhout, 2015). Much of the data used in these studies converge in the Global Biodiversity Information Facility or GBIF (GBIF.org, 2024) under the Darwin Core standard (Biodiversity Information Standards [TDWG], 2024).

iNaturalist network

iNaturalist is an online citizen science platform for recording and documenting biodiversity data (iNaturalist Network, 2024). It consists of a global network of users who voluntarily share their observations of biota through photographs and audio recordings, along with metadata such as timestamp and geolocation. It is also possible to introduce additional information—or secondary data—which may include ecological interactions, DNA sequence accession numbers, and voucher specimen codes. As of November 23, 2024, 8,350,896 iNaturalist users have contributed 243,346,228 observations, of which 13,880,320—equivalent to 23,770 species—are fungi. Observations that achieve a consensus of ⅔ of the species-level identification agreements or Community ID qualify to achieve Research Grade (https://help.inaturalist.org/en/support/solutions/articles/151000194901-how-do-identifications-work-) and are subsequently added into GBIF (GBIF.org, 2024). In addition, the global iNaturalist network converges in national-scale nodes associated with various governmental and non-governmental organizations. The iNaturalist node for Chile, called iNaturalistCL, brings together local naturalists, amateurs, and biodiversity professionals, in collaboration with the Ministerio de Medio Ambiente (https://inaturalist.mma.gob.cl/home).

Rationale

It is well known that citizen science—together with its assumptions, methods and products—can be considered a source of reliable biological data. However, its potential value is not easy to predict or quantify. So far, the impact of such initiatives at the local level is still not known. Involving the community in biodiversity studies can enhance biological data collection and processing, supporting improved conservation decisions and climate adaptation strategies. In this context, the records of iNaturalist fungal observations made in Chile since its implementation in 2008 until November 21, 2024, were analyzed. This paper provides an overview of the role of the iNaturalist platform in recording and documenting data on fungi in Chile, while addressing some aspects of the number of observations, user behavior, and the spatiotemporal distribution of observations.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Data sources

The datasets were obtained from iNaturalist (https://www.inaturalist.org/observations/export) using the Export Observations option. The following parameters were entered in the Create a Query section: quality_grade=any&identifications=any&iconic_taxa[]=Fungi&place_id=7182&verifiable=true&spam=false) mientras que en Choose columns: Columns id, uuid, observed_on_string, observed_on, time_observed_at, time_zone, user_id, user_login, user_name, created_at, updated_at, quality_grade, license, url, image_url, sound_url, tag_list, description, num_identification_agreements, num_identification_disagreements, captive_cultivated, oauth_application_id, place_guess, latitude, longitude, positional_accuracy, private_place_guess, private_latitude, private_longitude, public_positional_accuracy, geoprivacy, taxon_geoprivacy, coordinates_obscured, positioning_method, positioning_device, place_town_name, place_county_name, place_state_name, place_country_name, place_admin1_name, place_admin2_name, species_guess, scientific_name, common_name, iconic_taxon_name, taxon_id, taxon_kingdom_name, taxon_phylum_name, taxon_subphylum_name, taxon_superclass_name, taxon_class_name, taxon_subclass_name, taxon_superorder_name, taxon_order_name, taxon_suborder_name, taxon_superfamily_name, taxon_family_name, taxon_subfamily_name, taxon_supertribe_name, taxon_tribe_name, taxon_subtribe_name, taxon_genus_name, taxon_genushybrid_name, taxon_species_name, taxon_hybrid_name, taxon_subspecies_name, taxon_variety_name, taxon_form_name, field:animated+observation, field:count+of+individuals+observed, field:cultivated, field:genbank+accession+number, field:herbarium+catalog+number, field:host, field:original+collector%2F+observer, field:personal+herbarium+id, field:pollinates, field:predating, field:predator+species. Alternatively, in each of the subcategories Basic, Geo, Taxon, Taxon Extras, and Observation Fields it is possible to select the All option. Finally, it is necessary to click on Create Export, to obtain a .csv or Comma-Separated Values file for direct download or via e-mail.

Data analysis

One of the best-known tools for analyzing data sets is R, a programming language and environment for computation and graphical visualization of data (R Core Team, 2021).

The versions of R that were used were R v4.1.2 (R Core Team, 2021) and R v.4.4.2 (R Core Team, 2024). Additionally, the R packages employed are listed: ggplot2 (Wickham, 2016), ggspatial (Dunnington, 2023), gridExtra (Auguié, 2017), iNEXT (Chao *et al*., 2014; Hsieh *et al*., 2016, 2024), rgeoboundaries (Runfola *et al*., 2020; Dicko, 2024), sf (Pebesma, 2018), terra (Hijmans, 2022b), and tidyverse (Wickham *et al*., 2019).

Data availability

The original datasets and the R script to run the analyses are available in the Zenodo repository (European Organization for Nuclear Research & OpenAIRE, 2013; Riquelme, 2024c): https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14223732.

RESULTS

There are more than 63,000 observations of fungi in the iNaturalistCL

The iNaturalist node in Chile, also called iNaturalistCL, accumulates 63,174 observations of fungi—1,245 species—of which 14,376 (22.76%) are Research Grade. The interpolation rarefaction curve based on samples and projected with a 95% confidence interval, estimates a growth in the number of species observed as the number of observations increases (Figure 1A).

About 100 users have contributed 30,000 observations of fungi

Regarding user behavior, the data indicate that the weight of the identification proposal falls mainly on the observer and that the user community generally agrees with this proposal (Figure 1B). Also, there are 103 users (2.10%) with 100 or more observations of fungi. These hyperprolific users—following the term proposed by Prylutskyi and

Kapets (2024)—have contributed 28,077 records, accounting for 44.40% of the 63,174 observations recorded by November 21, 2024.

Observations of fungi are concentrated between Valparaíso and Los Lagos

Since its implementation, the iNaturalistCL platform shows an upward trend in the number of fungal observations, with a marked increase after 2020 (Figure 1C). In addition, observations of fungi are concentrated in central and southern Chile, between the regions of Valparaíso and Los Lagos. Also, it can be observed that the density of observations is higher in more populated localities (Figure 1D).

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Overview

In Chile, the iNaturalist platform accumulated 63,174 observations of fungi as of November 21, 2024, of which 44.40% were recorded by 103 users who can be considered hyperprolific. An important pattern that emerged from the data was that a large part of the observations of fungi were made in central and southern Chile, concentrating in the most densely populated areas. The results also indicate that if sampling efforts are maintained it would be possible to find a greater number of species (Figure 1A). On the other hand, the interest shown by the community in contributing data on fungi, particularly since 2020, as opposed to the low number of identification disagreements—and even more so the high number of identification agreements— may indicate a limited understanding of the community about the species of fungi inhabiting the territory. Considering this information, it is important to address some aspects related to the possible implications of citizen science in mycological studies at the local level.

iNaturalist as a platform for documenting Chilean funga

In comparison with other South American countries (Riquelme, 2024b; https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14269923), Chile ranks seventh out of 12 in terms of population; however, in terms of number of observations and number of users it ranks fourth, after Brazil, Colombia, and Ecuador, respectively. In terms of observations of fungi per user, Chile is in second place, only behind Guyana. Similarly, in the observers per capita parameter, Chile is in second place after Ecuador. Another parameter, the percentage of iNaturalist users with respect to the total population of each country, places Ecuador in the lead, followed by Bolivia, Chile, Uruguay, and Colombia. This preliminary balance—without pretending to be exhaustive and leaving aside multiple factors that could well explain this situation— reveals a growing interest in this platform within the community. It also indicates a tendency among users to document fungi in Chile.

The relevance of taxonomy and biological collections

Recently, there has been renewed interest in recording and documenting fungi at the local level (Figure 1C), but this interest has not turned into peer-reviewed scientific publications. In the last five years, only 10 articles reported new species of fungi for Chile (Riquelme, 2024a; https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14275186; https://www.webofscience.com/wos/woscc/summary/b8566cee-40df-42e8-b02e-db843ebc7599-0131a50439/date-ascending/1). This can be explained by factors such as the scarcity of research and development funding, which in Chile reached 0.36% of gross domestic product (GDP) in 2021, roughly one-seventh of the average figure for countries belonging to the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development

(OECD) which was 2.72% in the same year (https://data-viewer.oecd.org/?chartId=74051c6c-7933-4bf5-b3b7-c63ce901d061), and the lack of specialists in fungal taxonomy. Moreover, mycology can be considered as a discipline that does not enjoy the same status as zoology, botany or microbiology (Rambold *et al*., 2013) but emulates the same weaknesses of the other disciplines in terms of promoting—and thus allocating resources to—the training of new taxonomists (Löbl *et al*., 2023; Pearson *et al*., 2011).

Natural history collections—and in particular biological collections—are fundamental resources, not only for taxonomy, but for multiple areas of basic and applied research, but their continuity is far from assured (Antonelli *et al*., 2024; Funk, 2018). Meanwhile, biological collections of fungi, called fungaria—plural of fungarium—undergo low taxonomic and geographic coverage—restricted mostly to the northern hemisphere—or limited access to specimen data (Andrew et al., 2019; Paton et al., 2020; Pearce et al., 2020). One way to increase access to specimen data is proposed by Eberling and Isaac (2018) where they use the iNaturalist platform for the purpose of enhancing the value of specimens in biological collections and facilitating access to associated information.

Recently, D'Elía (2024) exposed the current state of biological collections in Chile, emphasizing three aspects that require more attention, such as (a) the scarce funding that affects infrastructure and personnel, (b) the lack of guarantee of the perpetuity of the collections, and (c) the low growth of their holdings. Another worrying aspect is the almost null representation of fungi in biological collections in Chile (Ortiz *et al*., 2023). A particular example of a local biological collection of fungi whose data are open access is VALD-F (Riquelme, 2024d). Addressing this Linnean, Wallacean—and Scottian—deficit is an urgent and challenging task (Antonelli *et al*., 2024).

Fungal conservation policies

As of November 27, 2024, the number of species of fungi globally assessed according to their conservation status is 763—an increase of 27.80% over the number reported by Mueller *et al*., (2022)—with 183 species in the Vulnerable (VU), 106 Endangered (EN) and 37 Critically Endangered (CR) categories, that is, 42.72% of the fungal species assessed are considered to be threatened with extinction (The Global Fungal Red List Initiative, 2024).

During the last decade, the recommendation of the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) to include the assessment of fungi and lichens in Chilean environmental policy was included in Ley N.° 20417 (Ley N.° 20417/2010), which amends Ley N.° 19300 (Ley N.° 19300/1994). In line with Decreto Supremo N.° 40/2012, fungi must be considered in environmental impact assessment. In addition, Decreto Supremo N.° 29/2012 or rules for the classification of species according to conservation status establishes the procedure for assessing the risk of extinction of native species of fungi in Chile using the IUCN criteria. To date, 19 species classification processes have been conducted. In the eleventh classification process, during 2014, 21 species of fungi were included for the first time (Ministerio del Medio Ambiente [MMA], 2024). Currently, 137 species of fungi have been evaluated and around 28% are threatened with extinction.

Other ways to conserve fungal species have emerged over time. Citizen science and the incorporation of new DNA sequencing technologies emerge as advantageous options compared to traditional conservation measures (Cazabonne *et al*., 2022; Haelewaters *et al*., 2024b; Lofgren & Stajich, 2021; May *et al*., 2019; Niskanen *et al*., 2023; Srivathsan *et al*., 2021). Contributions from the amateur mycology community have increased the volume and flow of biological data on fungi (Bazzicalupo *et al*., 2022; de Lange *et al*., 2022; Haelewaters *et al*., 2024a; Heilmann-Clausen *et al*., 2019; Irga *et al*., 2018, 2020). Furthermore, the use of environmental DNA has the potential to improve mushroom conservation measures (Copoț *et al*., 2024; Geml *et al*., 2014; Frøslev *et al*., 2019).

Possible limitations of citizen science for the study of funga

Photographs can be considered a valuable source of data in the study of biodiversity (Miralles *et al*., 2020; Phang *et al*., 2022). Also, some observations on citizen science platforms have turned out to be the very first photographs of living specimens ever recorded (Mesaglio *et al*., 2021). Even, data from observations as photographs or geolocation have enabled, respectively, to implement machine learning systems and modelling species distributions (Geurts *et al*., 2023b; Hao *et al*., 2020). However, one of the limitations of using this type of data is that they often have errors and biases that need to be addressed. Although the usefulness of machine learning models for identification from images is self-evident (Chaves *et al*., 2024; Koch *et al*., 2022, 2023; Picek *et al*., 2022; Rahman *et al*., 2022; van Horn *et al*., 2018), in some cases they have been shown to be not reliable enough to accurately distinguish between species (Hodgson *et al*., 2023; Munzi *et al*., 2023).

Open repositories of geo-referenced biological data, developed from citizen science records and digitized specimen information from biological collections, often have quality issues, potentially incompatible with large-scale fungal diversity and biogeography studies (Hao *et al*., 2021; McMullin & Allen, 2022). As for diversity data, these data sources exhibit a taxonomic bias towards charismatic or more well-known species (Cazabonne *et al*., 2024; Di Cecco *et al*., 2021; Haelewaters *et al*., 2024b; Martínez-Sagarra *et al*., 2022; Pernat *et al*., 2024) that is even reproduced in machine learning models (Koch *et al*., 2023) along with a spatial and temporal bias (Geldmann *et al*., 2016; Stallman *et al*., 2024), often associated with access and proximity to trails, or the date of occurrence of some massive biodiversity recording event, also known as BioBlitz (Dimson & Gillespie, 2023; Geurts *et al*., 2023a, 2023b).

While data retrieved from iNaturalist can be considered complementary to those obtained by conventional means—in aspects such as taxonomic diversity and expanded geographic coverage—identifications that reach Research Grade within the platform should be treated as only tentative (Hochmair *et al*., 2020) and still require analysis of specimens to confirm their taxonomic identity (Nachman *et al*., 2023).

Moreover, the data generated in citizen science studies offer the opportunity to obtain information that is often neglected (Mesaglio & Callaghan, 2021). Studies with sampling in the same region over time allow capturing relevant information on the fungal diversity of the territory, such as recording in detail the phenology of sporocarp production (Boddy *et al*., 2014; Stallman *et al*., 2024; Stallman & Robinson, 2022), determining the type of associated vegetation (Heilmann-Clausen *et al*., 2016) or documenting episodes of trophic interactions such as mycophagy (Barahona-Segovia *et al*., 2024a). To facilitate the analysis of this type of data it is recommended to adopt the guidelines of the Darwin Core standard (Marques *et al*., 2024).

Conclusions

In summary, this study aligns with the challenges set by Callaghan *et al*. (2020): (a) sampling historically overlooked organisms, (b) estimating species abundance in space and time, and (c) exploiting the potential of secondary data in ecology and conservation. Particularly, for the case of fungi, Halme et al. (2012) propose strategies for recording and documenting fungi, from fungal forays and specimen collection to the extensive use of environmental DNA to monitor fungi in an area, even in the absence of sporocarps, aiming at efficient data management. Fungal blindness—paraphrasing Wandersee and Schussler (1999)—must be avoided at all costs.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author would like to express his gratitude to the iNaturalist community, particularly the iNaturalist Chile node, who have contributed in a disinterested manner to a—constantly evolving—public biodiversity database.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The author declares to be user since 2016 and curator since 2018 of the iNaturalist network (https://www.inaturalist.org/people/cristianriquelme).

REFERENCES

Andrew, C., Halvorsen, R., Heegaard, E., Kuyper, T. W., Heilmann-Clausen, J., Krisai-Greilhuber, I., Bässler, C., Egli, S., Gange, A. C., Høiland, K., Kirk, P. M., Senn-Irlet, B., Boddy, L., Büntgen, U., & Kauserud, H. (2018). Continental-scale macrofungal assemblage patterns correlate with climate, soil carbon and nitrogen deposition. *Journal of Biogeography*, *45*(8), 1942–1953. https://doi.org/10.1111/jbi.13374

Antonelli, A., Teisher, J. K., Smith, R. J., Ainsworth, A. M., Furci, G., Gaya, E., Gonçalves, S. C., Hawksworth, D. L., Larridon, I., Sessa, E. B., Simões, A. R. G., Suz, L. M., Acedo, C., Aghayeva, D. N., Agorini, A. A., Al Harthy, L. S., Bacon, K. L., Chávez-Hernández, M. G., Colli-Silva, M., … Williams, C. (2024). The 2030 Declaration on Scientific Plant and Fungal Collecting. *Plants, People, Planet*, ppp3.10569. https://doi.org/10.1002/ppp3.10569

Aristeidou, M., Herodotou, C., Ballard, H. L., Higgins, L., Johnson, R. F., Miller, A. E., Young, A., & Robinson, L. D. (2021a). How do young community and citizen science volunteers support scientific research on biodiversity? The case of iNaturalist. *Diversity*, *13*(7), 318. https://doi.org/10.3390/d13070318

Aristeidou, M., Herodotou, C., Ballard, H. L., Young, A., Miller, A. E., Higgins, L., & Johnson, R. F. (2021b). Exploring the participation of young citizen scientists in scientific research: The case of iNaturalist. *PLOS ONE*, *16*(1). https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0245682

Auerbach, J., Barthelmess, E. L., Cavalier, D., Cooper, C. B., Fenyk, H., Haklay, M., Hulbert, J. M., Kyba, C. C. M., Larson, L. R., Lewandowski, E., & Shanley, L. (2019). The problem with delineating narrow criteria for citizen science. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *116*(31), 15336–15337. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1909278116

Auguié, B. (2017). *gridExtra: Miscellaneous functions for “grid” graphics* (Version v.2.3) [Computer software]. https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=gridExtra

Bánki, O., Roskov, Y., Döring, M., Ower, G., Hernández Robles, D. R., Plata Corredor, C. A., Stjernegaard Jeppesen, T., Örn, A., Pape, T., Hobern, D., Garnett, S., Little, H., DeWalt, R. E., Ma, K., Miller, J., Orrell, T., Aalbu, R., Abbott, J., Aedo, C., … World Flora Online. (2024, November). *Catalogue of Life* (Versions 2024-11-18). Catalogue of Life. https://doi.org/10.48580/dgjy9

Barahona-Segovia, R. M., Durán-Sanzana, V., & Murúa, M. (2023). This flower is our bed: Long-term citizen science reveals that hummingbird flies use flowers with certain shapes as sleeping places. *Arthropod-Plant Interactions*, *17*(1), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11829-022-09936-7

Barahona-Segovia, R. M., Gallardo-Pillancari, E., Orrego, G., & Osorio, F. (2024a). Mycophagy and feeding on other native land snails by the black snail *Macrocyclis peruvianus* (Gastropoda, Macrocyclidae). *Austral Ecology*, *49*(2), e13491. https://doi.org/10.1111/aec.13491

Barahona-Segovia, R. M., Mulieri, P. R., González, C. R., Osorio Zúñiga, F., & Pañinao-Monsálvez, L. (2024b). On the distribution and habitat use of the sub-Antarctic fly *Hyadesimyia clausa* Bigot (Diptera, Tachinidae) according to citizen science. *Ecology and Evolution*, *14*(3), e11169. https://doi.org/10.1002/ece3.11169

Bazzicalupo, A., Gonçalves, S. C., Hébert, R., Jakob, S., Justo, A., Kernaghan, G., Lebeuf, R., Malloch, B., Thorn, R. G., & Walker, A. K. (2022). Macrofungal conservation in Canada and target species for assessment: A starting point. *Facets*, *7*, 448–463. https://doi.org/10.1139/facets-2021-0180

Biodiversity Information Standards [TDWG]. (2024). *Darwin Core*. https://dwc.tdwg.org/

Boddy, L., Büntgen, U., Egli, S., Gange, A. C., Heegaard, E., Kirk, P. M., Mohammad, A., & Kauserud, H. (2014). Climate variation effects on fungal fruiting. *Fungal Ecology*, *10*, 20–33. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.funeco.2013.10.006

Bonney, R. (2021). Expanding the impact of citizen science. *BioScience*, *71*(5), 448–451. https://doi.org/10.1093/biosci/biab041

Bonney, R., Shirk, J. L., Phillips, T. B., Wiggins, A., Ballard, H. L., Miller-Rushing, A. J., & Parrish, J. K. (2014). Next steps for citizen science. *Science*, *343*(6178), 1436–1437. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1251554

Callaghan, C. T., Poore, A. G. B., Mesaglio, T., Moles, A. T., Nakagawa, S., Roberts, C., Rowley, J. J. L., Vergés, A., Wilshire, J. H., & Cornwell, W. K. (2020). Three frontiers for the future of biodiversity research using citizen science data. *BioScience*, biaa133. https://doi.org/10.1093/biosci/biaa131

Cao, Y., Wu, G., & Yu, D. (2021). Include macrofungi in biodiversity targets. *Science*, *372*(6547), 1160–1160. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abj5479

Cazabonne, J., Bartrop, L., Dierickx, G., Gafforov, Y., Hofmann, T. A., Martin, T. E., Piepenbring, M., Rivas-Ferreiro, M., & Haelewaters, D. (2022). Molecular-based diversity studies and field surveys are not mutually exclusive: On the importance of integrated methodologies in mycological research. *Frontiers in Fungal Biology*, *3*, 860777. https://doi.org/10.3389/ffunb.2022.860777

Cazabonne, J., Walker, A. K., Lesven, J., & Haelewaters, D. (2024). Singleton-based species names and fungal rarity: Does the number really matter? *IMA Fungus*, *15*(1), 7. https://doi.org/10.1186/s43008-023-00137-2

Chandler, M., See, L., Copas, K., Bonde, A. M. Z., López, B. C., Danielsen, F., Legind, J. K., Masinde, S., Miller-Rushing, A. J., Newman, G., Rosemartin, A., & Turak, E. (2017). Contribution of citizen science towards international biodiversity monitoring. *Biological Conservation*, *213*, 280–294. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2016.09.004

Chao, A., Gotelli, N. J., Hsieh, T. C., Sander, E. L., Ma, K. H., Colwell, R. K., & Ellison, A. M. (2014). Rarefaction and extrapolation with Hill numbers: A framework for sampling and estimation in species diversity studies. *Ecological Monographs*, *84*(1), 45–67. https://doi.org/10.1890/13-0133.1

Chaves, T., Santos Xavier, J., Gonçalves Dos Santos, A., Martins-Cunha, K., Karstedt, F., Kossmann, T., Sourell, S., Leopoldo, E., Fortuna Ferreira, M. N., Farias, R., Titton, M., Alves-Silva, G., Bittencourt, F., Bortolini, D., Gumboski, E. L., Von Wangenheim, A., Góes-Neto, A., & Drechsler-Santos, E. R. (2024). Innovative infrastructure to access Brazilian fungal diversity using deep learning. *PeerJ*, *12*, e17686. https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.17686

CitSci.org. (2024). *CitSci.org: An online database of citizen science observations*. https://citsci.org/

Copoț, O., Lõhmus, A., Abarenkov, K., Tedersoo, L., & Runnel, K. (2024). Contribution of environmental DNA toward fungal Red Listing. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment*, *22*(9), e2791. https://doi.org/10.1002/fee.2791

Decreto Supremo N.° 29/2012. Aprueba Reglamento para la Clasificación de Especies Silvestres según Estado de Conservación. Ministerio del Medio Ambiente, Chile. *Diario Oficial*, 27 de abril de 2012. https://bcn.cl/2k6w2

Decreto Supremo N.° 40/2012. Reglamento del Sistema de Evaluación de Impacto Ambiental. Ministerio del Medio Ambiente, Chile. *Diario Oficial*, 12 de agosto de 2013. https://bcn.cl/2f8a8

de Groot, M. D., Christou, M., Pan, J. Y., Adriaens, T., Maes, D., Martinou, A. F., Roy, H. E., Verbeken, A., & Haelewaters, D. (2024). Beetlehangers.org: Harmonizing host–parasite records of *Harmonia axyridis* and *Hesperomyces harmoniae*. *Arthropod-Plant Interactions*, *18*(4), 665–679. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11829-023-10037-2

de Lange, O., Youngflesh, C., Ibarra, A., Perez, R., & Kaplan, M. (2022). Broadening participation: 21st century opportunities for amateurs in biology research. *Integrative and Comparative Biology*, *61*(6), 2294–2305. https://doi.org/10.1093/icb/icab180

Delgado-Noguera, L. A., Hernández-Pereira, C. E., Ramírez, J. D., Hernández, C., Velasquez-Ortíz, N., Clavijo, J., Ayala, J. M., Forero-Peña, D., Marquez, M., Suarez, M. J., Traviezo-Valles, L., Escalona, M. A., Perez-Garcia, L., Carpio, I. M., Sordillo, E. M., Grillet, M. E., Llewellyn, M. S., Gabaldón, J. C., & Paniz Mondolfi, A. E. (2022). Tele-entomology and tele-parasitology: A citizen science-based approach for surveillance and control of Chagas disease in Venezuela. *Parasite Epidemiology and Control*, *19*, e00273. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.parepi.2022.e00273

D'Elía, G. (2024). Las colecciones biológicas de Chile deben potenciarse. *Anales del Instituto de la Patagonia*. https://doi.org/10.22352/AIP202452002

Di Cecco, G., Barve, V., Belitz, M. W., Stucky, B. J., Guralnick, R. P., & Hurlbert, A. H. (2021). Observing the observers: How participants contribute data to iNaturalist and implications for biodiversity science. *BioScience*. https://doi.org/10.1093/biosci/biab093

Díaz, A., Amanqui, E., Saravia-Llaja, K. G., Mandujano Collantes, J. R., Jiménez, M., Zárate-Gómez, R., & Condo, F. (2024). Breeding records of 325 bird species from Peru over 21 years based on citizen science data. *Ecological Research*, *39*(5), 789–799. https://doi.org/10.1111/1440-1703.12496

Dicko, A. (2024). *rgeoboundaries: geoBoundaries client* (Version v.1.3) [Computer software]. https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=rgeoboundaries

Dimson, M., & Gillespie, T. W. (2023). Who, where, when: Observer behavior influences spatial and temporal patterns of iNaturalist participation. *Applied Geography*, *153*, 102916. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apgeog.2023.102916

Dunnington, D. (2023). *ggspatial: Spatial Data Framework for ggplot2* (Version v.1.1.9) [Computer software]. https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=ggspatial

European Citizen Science Association [ECSA]. (2015). *Ten principles of citizen science*. http://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/XPR2N

European Organization for Nuclear Research & OpenAIRE. (2013). *Zenodo: Research. Shared.* https://www.zenodo.org/

Follett, R., & Strezov, V. (2015). An analysis of citizen science based research: Usage and publication patterns. *PLOS ONE*, *10*(11), e0143687. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0143687

Fontúrbel, F. E., García, J. P. A., Celis-Diez, J. L., Murúa, M. M., Vieli, L., & Díaz-Forestier, J. (2024). Engaging citizens to monitor pollinators through a nationwide BioBlitz: Lessons learned and challenges remaining after four years. *Biological Conservation*, *300*, 110868. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2024.110868

Franco-Molano, A. E., Baroni, T. J., & Van De Peppel, L. J. J. (2024). *Arthromyces pulverulentus* sp. nov. (Basidiomycota, Agaricales, Lyophyllaceae), a new insect associated conidia-producing species from the cloud forests of Colombia. *Phytotaxa*, *662*(3), 271–278. https://doi.org/10.11646/phytotaxa.662.3.6

Frøslev, T. G., Kjøller, R., Bruun, H. H., Ejrnæs, R., Hansen, A. J., Læssøe, T., & Heilmann-Clausen, J. (2019). Man against machine: Do fungal fruitbodies and eDNA give similar biodiversity assessments across broad environmental gradients? *Biological Conservation*, *233*, 201–212. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2019.02.038

Fundación Hongos de Argentina para la Sustentabilidad [FHAS]. (2024). *HongosAR*. https://hongos.ar/

Fungal Diversity Survey, Inc. (2024). *Fungal Diversity Survey*. https://www.fundis.org/

Fungi of Great Britain and Ireland. (2014). *The Lost and Found Fungi Project*. https://fungi.myspecies.info/content/lost-and-found-fungi-project

Fungimap Inc. (2024). *Fungimap*. https://fungimap.org.au/

Funk, V. A. (2018). Collections-based science in the 21st Century. *Journal of Systematics and Evolution*, *56*(3), 175–193. https://doi.org/10.1111/jse.12315

Garcia-Cegarra, A. M., Toro, F., & Gonzalez-Borasca, V. (2021). Citizen science as a tool to assess cetacean diversity in the Atacama Desert coast. *Ocean & Coastal Management*, *213*, 105858. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2021.105858

GBIF.org. (2024). *Global Biodiversity Information Facility*. https://www.gbif.org/

Geldmann, J., Heilmann-Clausen, J., Holm, T. E., Levinsky, I., Markussen, B., Olsen, K., Rahbek, C., & Tøttrup, A. P. (2016). What determines spatial bias in citizen science? Exploring four recording schemes with different proficiency requirements. *Diversity and Distributions*, *22*(11), 1139–1149. https://doi.org/10.1111/ddi.12477

Geml, J., Gravendeel, B., Van Der Gaag, K. J., Neilen, M., Lammers, Y., Raes, N., Semenova, T. A., De Knijff, P., & Noordeloos, M. E. (2014). The contribution of DNA metabarcoding to fungal conservation: Diversity assessment, habitat partitioning and mapping red-listed fungi in protected coastal *Salix repens* communities in the netherlands. *PLOS ONE*, *9*(6), e99852. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0099852

Geurts, E. M., Reynolds, J. D., & Starzomski, B. M. (2023a). Not all who wander are lost: Trail bias in community science. *PLOS ONE*, *18*(6), e0287150. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0287150

Geurts, E. M., Reynolds, J. D., & Starzomski, B. M. (2023b). Turning observations into biodiversity data: Broadscale spatial biases in community science. *Ecosphere*, *14*(6), e4582. https://doi.org/10.1002/ecs2.4582

Gonçalves, S. C., Haelewaters, D., Furci, G., & Mueller, G. M. (2021). Include all fungi in biodiversity goals. *Science*, *373*(6553), 403–403. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abk1312

Goossen-Lebrón, T., Garcete-Barrett, B., Martínez, N., & Espínola, V. (2023). New records and distribution of the tiger fly *Eristalinus* (*Eristalodes*) *taeniops* (Wiedemann, 1818) (Diptera: Syrphidae) in Paraguay. *Revista Chilena de Entomología*, *49*(2), 331–336. https://doi.org/10.35249/rche.49.2.23.14

Grattarola, F., Rodríguez-Tricot, L., Zarucki, M., & Laufer, G. (2024). Status of the invasion of *Carpobrotus edulis* in Uruguay based on citizen science records. *Biological Invasions*, *26*(4), 935–942. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10530-023-03242-w

Grez, A. A., Zaviezo, T., Orellana, I., Pino, L., Roy, H. E., Torres, F., & Rebolledo, C. (2022). Citizen science and phytosanitary surveillance systems are complementary tools to follow the invasion of *Harmonia axyridis*. *Neotropical Entomology*, *52*(1), 46–56. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13744-022-01014-0

Gryzenhout, M. (2015). The need to engage with citizen scientists to study the rich fungal biodiversity in South Africa. *IMA Fungus*, *6*(2), A58–A64. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03449355

Guardians of Earth. (2024). *Guardians of Earth*. https://www.guardiansofearth.io/

Haelewaters, D., Matthews, T. J., Wayman, J. P., Cazabonne, J., Heyman, F., Quandt, C. A., & Martin, T. E. (2024a). Biological knowledge shortfalls impede conservation efforts in poorly studied taxa—A case study of

Laboulbeniomycetes. *Journal of Biogeography*, *51*(1), 29–39. https://doi.org/10.1111/jbi.14725

Haelewaters, D., Quandt, C. A., Bartrop, L., Cazabonne, J., Crockatt, M. E., Cunha, S. P., de Lange, R., Dominici, L., Douglas, B., Drechsler-Santos, E. R., Heilmann-Clausen, J., Irga, P. J., Jakob, S., Lofgren, L., Martin, T. E., Muchane, M. N., Stallman, J. K., Verbeken, A., Walker, A. K., & Gonçalves, S. C. (2024b). The power of citizen science to advance fungal conservation. *Conservation Letters*, e13013. https://doi.org/10.1111/conl.13013

Halme, P., Heilmann-Clausen, J., Rämä, T., Kosonen, T., & Kunttu, P. (2012). Monitoring fungal biodiversity – towards an integrated approach. *Fungal Ecology*, *5*(6), 750–758. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.funeco.2012.05.005

Hao, T., Elith, J., Guillera-Arroita, G., Lahoz-Monfort, J. J., & May, T. W. (2021). Enhancing repository fungal data for biogeographic analyses. *Fungal Ecology*, *53*, 101097. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.funeco.2021.101097

Hao, T., Guillera-Arroita, G., May, T. W., Lahoz-Monfort, J. J., & Elith, J. (2020). Using species distribution models for Fungi. *Fungal Biology Reviews*, *34*(2), 74–88. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fbr.2020.01.002

Heberling, J. M., & Isaac, B. L. (2018). iNaturalist as a tool to expand the research value of museum specimens. *Applications in Plant Sciences*, *6*(11), e01193. https://doi.org/10.1002/aps3.1193

Heigl, F., Kieslinger, B., Paul, K. T., Uhlik, J., & Dörler, D. (2019). Toward an international definition of citizen science. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *116*(17), 8089–8092. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1903393116

Heilmann-Clausen, J., Bruun, H. H., Ejrnæs, R., Frøslev, T. G., Læssøe, T., & Petersen, J. H. (2019). How citizen science boosted primary knowledge on fungal biodiversity in Denmark. *Biological Conservation*, *237*, 366–372. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2019.07.008

Heilmann-Clausen, J., Frøslev, T., Petersen, J., Læssøe, T., & Jeppesen, T. (2021). Experiences from the Danish Fungal Atlas: Linking mushrooming, nature conservation and primary biodiversity research. *Biodiversity Information Science and Standards*, *5*, e75265. https://doi.org/10.3897/biss.5.75265

Heilmann-Clausen, J., Maruyama, P. K., Bruun, H. H., Dimitrov, D., Læssøe, T., Frøslev, T. G., & Dalsgaard, B. (2016). Citizen science data reveal ecological, historical and evolutionary factors shaping interactions between woody hosts and wood-inhabiting fungi. *New Phytologist*, *212*(4), 1072–1082. https://doi.org/10.1111/nph.14194

Hijmans, R. J. (2022). *terra: Spatial Data Analysis* (Version v.1.6-17) [Computer software]. https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=terra

Hiller, T., & Haelewaters, D. (2019). A case of silent invasion: Citizen science confirms the presence of *Harmonia axyridis* (Coleoptera, Coccinellidae) in Central America. *PLOS ONE*, *14*(7), e0220082. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0220082

Hochmair, H. H., Scheffrahn, R. H., Basille, M., & Boone, M. (2020). Evaluating the data quality of iNaturalist termite records. *PLOS ONE*, *15*(5), e0226534. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0226534

Hodgson, S. E., McKenzie, C., May, T. W., & Greene, S. L. (2023). A comparison of the accuracy of mushroom identification applications using digital photographs. *Clinical Toxicology*, *61*(3), 166–172. https://doi.org/10.1080/15563650.2022.2162917

Hsieh, T. C., Ma, K. H., & Chao, A. (2016). iNEXT: An R package for rarefaction and extrapolation of species diversity (Hill numbers). *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, *7*(12), 1451–1456. https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.12613

Hsieh, T. C., Ma, K. H., & Chao, A. (2024). *iNEXT: iNterpolation and EXTrapolation for species diversity* (Version v.3.0.1) [Computer software]. https://cran.r-project.org/package=iNEXT

iNaturalist Network. (2024). *iNaturalist*. https://www.inaturalist.org/

Index Fungorum Partnership. (2024). *Index Fungorum*. http://www.indexfungorum.org/names/Names.asp

Irga, P. J., Barker, K., & Torpy, F. R. (2018). Conservation mycology in Australia and the potential role of citizen science. *Conservation Biology*, *32*(5), 1031–1037. https://doi.org/10.1111/cobi.13121

Irga, P. J., Dominici, L., & Torpy, F. R. (2020). The mycological social network a way forward for conservation of fungal biodiversity. *Environmental Conservation*, *47*(4), 243–250. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0376892920000363

Koch, W., Hogeweg, L., Nilsen, E. B., & Finstad, A. G. (2022). Maximizing citizen scientists' contribution to automated species recognition. *Scientific Reports*, *12*(1), 7648. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-022-11257-x

Koch, W., Hogeweg, L., Nilsen, E. B., O'Hara, R. B., & Finstad, A. G. (2023). Recognizability bias in citizen science photographs. *Royal Society Open Science*, *10*(2), 221063. https://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.221063

Koukol, O., Halasů, V., Janošík, L., Mlčoch, P., Polhorský, A., Šandová, M., & Zíbarová, L. (2020). Citizen science facilitates phylogenetic placement of old species of non-lichenised Pezizomycotina based on newly collected material. *Czech Mycology*, *72*(2), 263–280. https://doi.org/10.33585/cmy.72207

Krah, F.-S., Büntgen, U., Schaefer, H., Müller, J., Andrew, C., Boddy, L., Diez, J., Egli, S., Freckleton, R., Gange, A. C., Halvorsen, R., Heegaard, E., Heideroth, A., Heibl, C., Heilmann-Clausen, J., Høiland, K., Kar, R., Kauserud, H., Kirk, P. M., … Bässler, C. (2019). European mushroom assemblages are darker in cold climates. *Nature Communications*, *10*(1), 2890. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-019-10767-z

Ley N.° 19300/1994. Aprueba ley sobre bases generales del medio ambiente. Ministerio Secretaría General de la Presidencia, Chile. *Diario Oficial*, 9 de marzo de 1994. https://bcn.cl/2f707

Ley N.° 20417/2010. Crea el ministerio, el servicio de evaluación ambiental y la superintendencia del medio ambiente. Ministerio Secretaría General de la Presidencia, Chile. *Diario Oficial*, 26 de enero de 2010. https://bcn.cl/2fade

Lin Hunter, D. E., Newman, G. J., & Balgopal, M. M. (2023). What's in a name? The paradox of citizen science and community science. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment*, *21*(5), 244–250. https://doi.org/10.1002/fee.2635

Löbl, I., Klausnitzer, B., Hartmann, M., & Krell, F.-T. (2023). The silent extinction of species and taxonomists—An appeal to science policymakers and legislators. *Diversity*, *15*(10), 1053. https://doi.org/10.3390/d15101053

Lofgren, L. A., & Stajich, J. E. (2021). Fungal biodiversity and conservation mycology in light of new technology, big data, and changing attitudes. *Current Biology*, *31*(19), R1312–R1325. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2021.06.083

Low, R., Boger, R., Nelson, P., & Kimura, M. (2021). GLOBE Mosquito Habitat Mapper Citizen Science Data 2017–2020. *GeoHealth*, *5*(10), e2021GH000436. https://doi.org/10.1029/2021GH000436

Maillard, O., Michme, G., Azurduy, H., & Vides-Almonacid, R. (2024). Citizen science for environmental monitoring in the eastern region of Bolivia. *Sustainability*, *16*(6), 2333. https://doi.org/10.3390/su16062333

Marín, C., Rubio, J., & Godoy, R. (2022). Chilean blind spots in soil biodiversity and ecosystem function research. *Austral Ecology*, *47*(7), 1372–1381. https://doi.org/10.1111/aec.13232

Marques, N., Soares, C. D. D. M., Casali, D. D. M., Guimarães, E., Fava, F., Abreu, J. M. D. S., Moras, L., Silva, L. G. D., Matias, R., Assis, R. L. D., Fraga, R., Almeida, S., Lopes, V., Oliveira, V., Missagia, R., Carvalho, E., Carneiro, N., Alves, R., Souza-Filho, P., … Tavares, V. D. C. (2024). Retrieving biodiversity data from multiple sources: Making secondary data standardised and accessible. *Biodiversity Data Journal*, *12*, e133775. https://doi.org/10.3897/BDJ.12.e133775

Martínez-Sagarra, G., Castilla, F., & Pando, F. (2022). Seven hundred projects in iNaturalist Spain: Performance and lessons learned. *Sustainability*, *14*(17), 11093. https://doi.org/10.3390/su141711093

May, T. W., Cooper, J. A., Dahlberg, A., Furci, G., Minter, D. W., Mueller, G. M., Pouliot, A., & Yang, Z. (2019). Recognition of the discipline of conservation mycology. *Conservation Biology*, *33*(3), 733–736. https://doi.org/10.1111/cobi.13228

McMullin, R. T., & Allen, J. L. (2022). An assessment of data accuracy and best practice recommendations for observations of lichens and other taxonomically difficult taxa on iNaturalist. *Botany*, *100*(6), 491–497. https://doi.org/10.1139/cjb-2021-0160

Mesaglio, T., & Callaghan, C. T. (2021). An overview of the history, current contributions and future outlook of iNaturalist in Australia. *Wildlife Research*, *48*(4), 289–303. https://doi.org/10.1071/WR20154

Mesaglio, T., Soh, A., Kurniawidjaja, S., & Sexton, C. (2021). 'First Known Photographs of Living Specimens': The power of iNaturalist for recording rare tropical butterflies. *Journal of Insect Conservation*, *25*(5–6), 905–911. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10841-021-00350-7

Ministerio del Medio Ambiente [MMA]. (2024). Clasificación de especies – Clasificación según estado de conservación. https://clasificacionespecies.mma.gob.cl/

Miller, A. N., & Bates, S. T. (2017). The Mycology Collections Portal (MyCoPortal). *IMA Fungus*, *8*(2), A65–A66. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03449464

Miller-Rushing, A., Primack, R., & Bonney, R. (2012). The history of public participation in ecological research. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment*, *10*(6), 285–290. https://doi.org/10.1890/110278

Miralles, A., Bruy, T., Wolcott, K., Scherz, M. D., Begerow, D., Beszteri, B., Bonkowski, M., Felden, J., Gemeinholzer, B., Glaw, F., Glöckner, F. O., Hawlitschek, O., Kostadinov, I., Nattkemper, T. W., Printzen, C., Renz, J., Rybalka, N., Stadler, M., Weibulat, T., … Vences, M. (2020). Repositories for taxonomic data: Where we are and what is missing. *Systematic Biology*, *69*(6), 1231–1253. https://doi.org/10.1093/sysbio/syaa026

Mueller, G., Cunha, K. M., May, T., Allen, J. L., Westrip, J. R. S., C. Canteiro, D. H. Costa-Rezende, E. R. Drechsler-Santos, Aída M. Vasco-Palacios, A. Ainsworth, Genivaldo Alves-Silva, F. Bungartz, Amanda Chandler, Susana C. Gonçalves, I. Krisai-Greilhuber, R. Iršėnaitė, J. Jordal, Thiago Kosmann, J. Lendemer, … A. Dahlberg. (2022). What do the first 597 global fungal Red List assessments tell us about the threat status of Fungi? *Diversity*, *14*(9), 736. https://doi.org/10.3390/d14090736

Munzi, S., Isocrono, D., & Ravera, S. (2023). Can we trust iNaturalist in lichenology? Evaluating the effectiveness and reliability of artificial intelligence in lichen identification. *The Lichenologist*, *55*(5), 193–201. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0024282923000403

Mushroom Observer, Inc. (2024). *Mushroom Observer*. https://mushroomobserver.org/

MyCoPortal. (2024). *The Mycology Collections Portal (MyCoPortal)*. https://www.mycoportal.org/portal/index.php

Nationale Databank Flora en Fauna [NDFF]. (2024). *NDFF Verspreidingsatlas*. https://www.verspreidingsatlas.nl/

Niskanen, T., Lücking, R., Dahlberg, A., Gaya, E., Suz, L. M., Mikryukov, V., Liimatainen, K., Druzhinina, I., Westrip, J. R. S., Mueller, G. M., Martins-Cunha, K., Kirk, P., Tedersoo, L., & Antonelli, A. (2023). Pushing the frontiers of biodiversity research: Unveiling the global diversity, distribution, and conservation of fungi. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, *48*(1), annurev-environ-112621-090937. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-environ-112621-090937

Nordén, J., Abrego, N., Boddy, L., Bässler, C., Dahlberg, A., Halme, P., Hällfors, M., Maurice, S., Menkis, A., Miettinen, O., Mäkipää, R., Ovaskainen, O., Penttilä, R., Saine, S., Snäll, T., & Junninen, K. (2020). Ten principles for conservation translocations of threatened wood-inhabiting fungi. *Fungal Ecology*, *44*, 100919. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.funeco.2020.100919

Observation International and local partners. (2024). *Observation.org*. https://observation.org/

Ortega-Álvarez, R., & Casas, A. (2022). Public participation in biodiversity research across Latin America: Dissecting an emerging topic in the Neotropics. *Environmental Science & Policy*, *137*, 143–151. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2022.08.016

Ortiz, J. C., Pizarro-Araya, J., Parra, L. E., Marticorena, A., & Jerez, V. (2023). Catálogo de las colecciones biológicas de Chile. *Gayana*, *87*(2), 179–196. https://doi.org/10.4067/S0717-65382023000200179

Paton, A., Antonelli, A., Carine, M., Forzza, R. C., Davies, N., Demissew, S., Dröge, G., Fulcher, T., Grall, A., Holstein, N., Jones, M., Liu, U., Miller, J., Moat, J., Nicolson, N., Ryan, M., Sharrock, S., Smith, D., Thiers, B., … Dickie, J. (2020). Plant and fungal collections: Current status, future perspectives. *PLANTS, PEOPLE, PLANET*, *2*(5), 499–514. https://doi.org/10.1002/ppp3.10141

Pearson, D. L., Hamilton, A. L., & Erwin, T. L. (2011). Recovery plan for the endangered taxonomy profession. *BioScience*, *61*(1), 58–63. https://doi.org/10.1525/bio.2011.61.1.11

Pebesma, E. (2018). Simple features for R: Standardized support for spatial vector data. *The R Journal*, *10*(1), 439. https://doi.org/10.32614/RJ-2018-009

Pernat, N., Canavan, S., Golivets, M., Hillaert, J., Itescu, Y., Jarić, I., Mann, H. M. R., Pipek, P., Preda, C., Richardson, D. M., Teixeira, H., Vaz, A. S., & Groom, Q. (2024). Overcoming biodiversity blindness: Secondary data in primary citizen science observations. *Ecological Solutions and Evidence*, *5*(1), e12295. https://doi.org/10.1002/2688-8319.12295

Peter, M., Diekötter, T., Höffler, T., & Kremer, K. (2021). Biodiversity citizen science: Outcomes for the participating citizens. *People and Nature*, *3*(2), 294–311. https://doi.org/10.1002/pan3.10193

Phang, A., Atkins, H., & Wilkie, P. (2022). The effectiveness and limitations of digital images for taxonomic research. *TAXON*, *71*(5), 1063–1076. https://doi.org/10.1002/tax.12767

Picek, L., Šulc, M., Matas, J., Heilmann-Clausen, J., Jeppesen, T. S., & Lind, E. (2022). Automatic fungi recognition: Deep learning meets mycology. *Sensors*, *22*(2), 633. https://doi.org/10.3390/s22020633

Polemis, E., Fryssouli, V., Konstantinidis, G., Kottis, L., Sofronis, D., Kaounas, V., Koutrotsios, G., & Zervakis, G. I. (2023). Mycological research and citizen science: Morphological features and DNA sequencing reveal seven new species records for the Greek mycobiota. *Plant Biosystems - An International Journal Dealing with All Aspects of Plant Biology*, *157*(3), 640–657. https://doi.org/10.1080/11263504.2023.2176944

Prylutskyi, O., & Kapets, N. (2024). State-of-the-art of iNaturalist as a source of data on Ukrainian fungi. *Citizen Science: Theory and Practice*, *9*(1), 25. https://doi.org/10.5334/cstp.717

R Core Team. (2021). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing* (Version v4.1.2) [Computer software]. R Foundation for Statistical Computing. https://www.R-project.org/

Rahman, H., Faruq, Md. O., Abdul Hai, T. B., Rahman, W., Hossain, M. M., Hasan, M., Islam, S., Moinuddin, Md., Islam, Md. T., & Azad, M. M. (2022). IoT enabled mushroom farm automation with Machine Learning to classify toxic mushrooms in Bangladesh. *Journal of Agriculture and Food Research*, *7*, 100267. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jafr.2021.100267

Rambold, G., Stadler, M., & Begerow, D. (2013). Mycology should be recognized as a field in biology at eye level with other major disciplines – a memorandum.

Mycological Progress, *12*(3), 455–463. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11557-013-0902-x

Requier, F., Andersson, G. K., Oddi, F. J., & Garibaldi, L. A. (2020). Citizen science in developing countries: How to improve volunteer participation. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment*, *18*(2), 101–108. https://doi.org/10.1002/fee.2150

Riquelme, C. (2024a). *Búsqueda en Web of Science sobre especies nuevas de hongos descritas en Chile en los últimos cinco años (2020–2024)* [Dataset]. Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14275186

Riquelme, C. (2024b). *Datos de observaciones de hongos en iNaturalist restringido a los países de Sudamérica* [Dataset]. Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14269923

Riquelme, C. (2024c). *iNaturalist como plataforma para documentar la funga chilena* [Dataset]. Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14223732

Riquelme, C. (2024d). *VALD-F* [Dataset]. Universidad Austral de Chile. https://doi.org/10.15468/P45MEM

Riquelme, C., Cabrera-Pardo, J. R., Valdés-Reyes, C., Gallardo-Pillancari, E., Rehbein, A., & Silva-Reyes, P. (2022). Nuevos registros para la funga afiloforoide (Basidiomycota, Agaricomycotina) de Chile. *Lilloa*, *59*(Suplemento), 137–154. https://doi.org/10.30550/j.lil/2022.59.S/2022.08.07

Riquelme, C., & Rajchenberg, M. (2021). Aphyllophoroid fungi (Basidiomycota) of Chile: An annotated checklist. *Mycotaxon*, *136*(3), 691–691. https://doi.org/10.5248/136.691

Robert, V., Vu, D., Amor, A. B. H., van de Wiele, N., Brouwer, C., Jabas, B., Szoke, S., Dridi, A., Triki, M., Ben Daoud, S., Chouchen, O., Vaas, L. A. I., de Cock, A., Stalpers, J. A., Stalpers, D., Verkley, G. J. M., Groenewald, M., dos Santos, F. B., Stegehuis, G. J., … Crous, P. W. (2013). MycoBank gearing up for new horizons. *IMA Fungus*, *4*(2), 371–379. https://doi.org/10.5598/imafungus.2013.04.02.16

Rosa, R. M., Cavallari, D. C., & Salvador, R. B. (2022). iNaturalist as a tool in the study of tropical molluscs. *PLOS ONE*, *17*(5), e0268048. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0268048

Runfola, D., Anderson, A., Baier, H., Crittenden, M., Dowker, E., Fuhrig, S., Goodman, S., Grimsley, G., Layko, R., Melville, G., Mulder, M., Oberman, R., Panganiban, J., Peck, A., Seitz, L., Shea, S., Slevin, H., Youngerman, R., & Hobbs, L. (2020). geoBoundaries: A global database of political administrative boundaries. *PLOS ONE*, *15*(4), e0231866. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0231866

Ruotsalainen, A. L., Kekki, T., Ohenoja, E., & Von Bonsdorff, T. (2023). Increase in Sarcosoma globosum observations reveals new fungal observation culture. *Fungal Ecology*, *65*, 101282. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.funeco.2023.101282

Sandoval-Leiva, P. A., Calle Valencia, A. E., Pérez Orellana, D. C., & Riquelme, C. (2023). *Lista sistemática de macrohongos presentes en Chile* [Dataset]. Ministerio del Medio Ambiente de Chile. https://doi.org/10.15468/D7XN8P

Sheehan, B., Stevenson, R., & Schwartz, J. (2021). Crowdsourcing Fungal Biodiversity: Approaches and standards used by an all-volunteer community science project.

Biodiversity Information Science and Standards, *5*, e74225. https://doi.org/10.3897/biss.5.74225

Shumskaya, M., Filippova, N., Lorentzen, L., Blue, S., Andrew, C., & Lorusso, N. S. (2023). Citizen science helps in the study of fungal diversity in New Jersey. *Scientific Data*, *10*(1), 10. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41597-022-01916-z

Smith, G., Chowenga, M., & Karsters, J. (2024). Local knowledge matters: Understanding the decision-making processes of communities under climate change in Suriname. *Frontiers in Climate*, *5*, 1294271. https://doi.org/10.3389/fclim.2023.1294271

SPOTTERON GmbH. (2024). *SPOTTERON Citizen Science Platform*. https://www.spotteron.net/

Srivathsan, A., Lee, L., Katoh, K., Hartop, E., Kutty, S. N., Wong, J., Yeo, D., & Meier, R. (2021). ONTbarcoder and MinION barcodes aid biodiversity discovery and identification by everyone, for everyone. *BMC Biology*, *19*(1), 217. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12915-021-01141-x

Stallman, J. K., Haelewaters, D., Koch Bach, R. A., Brann, M., Fatemi, S., Gomez-Zapata, P., Husbands, D. R., Jumbam, B., Kaishian, P. J., Moffitt, A., & Catherine Aime, M. (2024). The contribution of tropical long-term studies to mycology. *IMA Fungus*, *15*(1), 35. https://doi.org/10.1186/s43008-024-00166-5

Stallman, J. K., & Robinson, K. (2022). Importance of seasonal variation in Hawaiian mushroom (Agaricomycetes) basidiomata production for biodiversity discovery and conservation. *Frontiers in Fungal Biology*, *3*, 869689. https://doi.org/10.3389/ffunb.2022.869689

Sullivan, B. L., Aycrigg, J. L., Barry, J. H., Bonney, R. E., Bruns, N., Cooper, C. B., Damoulas, T., Dhondt, A. A., Dietterich, T., Farnsworth, A., Fink, D., Fitzpatrick, J. W., Fredericks, T., Gerbracht, J., Gomes, C., Hochachka, W. M., Iliff, M. J., Lagoze, C., La Sorte, F. A., … Kelling, S. (2014). The eBird enterprise: An integrated approach to development and application of citizen science. *Biological Conservation*, *169*, 31–40. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2013.11.003

Sullivan, B. L., Wood, C. L., Iliff, M. J., Bonney, R. E., Fink, D., & Kelling, S. (2009). eBird: A citizen-based bird observation network in the biological sciences. *Biological Conservation*, *142*(10), 2282–2292. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2009.05.006

The Global Fungal Red List Initiative. (2024). *The Global Fungal Red List Initiative*. https://redlist.info/en/iucn/welcome

Thiel, M., Baeza Álvarez, J., Diaz, M., De Veer, D., Dittmann, S., Guevara-Torrejón, V., Ahumada, G. H., Honorato-Zimmer, D., Kiessling, T., Leyton Muñoz, A., López-Xalín, N., Nuñez, P., Sepúlveda, J. M., & Vásquez, N. (2023). Communication strategies in an international school citizen science program investigating marine litter. *Frontiers in Environmental Science*, *11*, 1270413. https://doi.org/10.3389/fenvs.2023.1270413

Vandegrift, R., Newman, D. S., Dentinger, B. T. M., Batallas-Molina, R., Dueñas, N., Flores, J., Goyes, P., Jenkinson, T. S., McAlpine, J., Navas, D., Policha, T., Thomas, D. C., & Roy, B. A. (2023). Richer than Gold: The fungal biodiversity of Reserva Los Cedros, a threatened Andean cloud forest. *Botanical Studies*, *64*(1), 17. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40529-023-00390-z van Horn, G., Mac Aodha, O., Song, Y., Cui, Y., Sun, C., Shepard, A., Adam, H., Perona, P., & Belongie, S. (2018). The iNaturalist species classification and detection dataset. *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*.

Vargas-Castillo, R., & Sandoval-Leiva, P. (2020). *Lista sistemática de los hongos liquenizados y liquenícolas presentes en Chile* [Dataset]. https://doi.org/10.15468/JXYNX2

Vetter, J. (2011). Introduction: Lay participation in the history of scientific observation. *Science in Context*, *24*(2), 127–141. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0269889711000032

Vidal, M. A., Henríquez, N., Torres-Díaz, C., Collado, G., & Acuña-Rodríguez, I. S. (2024). Identifying strategies for effective biodiversity preservation and species status of Chilean amphibians. *Biology*, *13*(3), 169. https://doi.org/10.3390/biology13030169

Wandersee, J. H., & Schussler, E. E. (1999). Preventing plant blindness. *The American Biology Teacher*, *61*(2), 82–86. https://doi.org/10.2307/4450624

Wickham, H., Averick, M., Bryan, J., Chang, W., McGowan, L., François, R., Grolemund, G., Hayes, A., Henry, L., Hester, J., Kuhn, M., Pedersen, T., Miller, E., Bache, S., Müller, K., Ooms, J., Robinson, D., Seidel, D., Spinu, V., … Yutani, H. (2019). Welcome to the Tidyverse. *Journal of Open Source Software*, *4*(43), 1686. https://doi.org/10.21105/joss.01686

Wickham, H. (with Sievert, C.). (2016). *ggplot2: Elegant graphics for data analysis* (2nd ed.). Springer international publishing.

FIGURES



Figure 1. Analysis of Chilean fungal data from iNaturalist. A) Rarefaction curve relating the cumulative number of observations to the number of species. The solid line indicates the rarefaction of the data, while the dotted line corresponds to a projection, with a 95% confidence interval. B) Graph of identification activity relating the number of observations to identification agreements and disagreements. C) Accumulation curve of fungal observations since the launch of the platform. D) Map of the density of fungal

observations per cell as of November 21, 2024. Each cell represents an area of 1,000 km^2.

Figura 1. Análisis de datos sobre la funga chilena en iNaturalist. A) Curva de rarefacción que relaciona la cantidad acumulada de observaciones con el número de especies. La línea sólida señala la rarefacción de los datos, mientras que la línea punteada corresponde a una proyección, con un intervalo de confianza del 95 %. B) Gráfico de actividad de identificación que relaciona el número de observaciones con acuerdos y desacuerdos de identificación. C) Curva de acumulación de observaciones de hongos desde el lanzamiento de la plataforma. D) Mapa de la densidad de observaciones de hongos por celda al 21 de noviembre de 2024. Cada celda representa una superficie de 1000 km^2.

RESUMEN GRÁFICO



ABSTRACT

The impact of iNaturalist on the recording of Chilean funga was explored, integrating citizen science into biodiversity monitoring. Although such an approach broadens the taxonomic, spatial and temporal coverage of the group, it is not without biases. Collaboration between amateurs and professionals is key to validate data and strengthen conservation policies.

RESUMEN

Fue explorado el impacto de iNaturalist en el registro de los hongos de Chile, integrando la ciencia ciudadana al monitoreo de biodiversidad. Aunque dicho enfoque amplía la cobertura taxonómica, espacial y temporal del grupo, no está exento de sesgos. La colaboración entre aficionados y profesionales es clave para la validación de datos y el fortalecemiento de las políticas de conservación.