

Lunz, January 2012

Dear Trichopterologist,

Works for the identification of specimens must never be used outside their geographical area. I have pointed this out on several occasions, e.g. in the editor's letter of Braueria 32 (2005). This is a fundamental demand of scientific correctness which, surprisingly, is not yet accepted everywhere.

During my visit in Thailand in spring of 2011, I came across a further contribution to this debate. In the book "Freshwater invertebrates of the Malaysian Region", editors C. M. Yule and Yong Hai Sen (Academy of Sciences Malaysia 2004), there is a chapter on caddis larvae. The keys are adapted from the book by G. B. Wiggins "Larvae of the North American caddisfly genera" (University of Toronto Press 1996) and slightly modified. It is said about Phryganeidae "widespread in lakes, ponds and slow streams" (p.513), about Molannidae "common in lakes, large rivers, spring seeps" (p. 515), about Limnephilidae "occurring in wide range of lentic and lotic habitats" (p. 517) – in a book on Malaysia !! where these families were never found. Included are figures of Ptilostomis, Xiphocentron, Agarodes, Fattigia, Pseudogoera, Apatania arizona, Hydropsyche betteni – which are exclusively American taxa. It is worth mentioning that many good figures and rich information are found in the excellent book by D. Dudgeon "Tropical Asian streams" (Hongkong University Press 1999) – but this book is not even mentioned in the above article.

Back to my rummaging in the University of Chiangmai. I found a report on "Biomonitoring in the lower Mekong Revier" (it is not worth giving the reference) from which I give here a copy of a typical page. Comment: Even Cryptochia and Moselyana are entirely North American taxa. The responsible editors of this report are by no means colleagues from remote countries who have poor access to literature, but are well-known scientists from overseas.

Such kinds of experience make one think, for instance:
1. Why do so many taxonomists struggle life-long with time-consuming detailed studies for careful results, when at the same time people who have access to big projects are free to deliver these kinds of papers ?

2. Why are authors of carefully made papers molested by unpredictable peer-reviewers, when summarising papers which are addressed to a broader audience are printed obviously without any control ?

3. and more sad: Are fellow workers in developing countries not worth an orderly co-operation? Or are faulty copies from anywhere good enough for them ? Is that the macdonaldisation of science ?

4. and even worse: Although politicians are generally not fond of scientists; how long may it take, considering this kind of publications, that they will finally consider any scientists and science useless ?

Nevertheless my best wishes to all of you !



86

Taxon	LNO
Order Trichoptrea	
Peltoperloipsis sp.	0
Micrasema sp.	0
Pseudogoera sp.	0
Polycentropus sp.	0
Neureclipsis sp.	0
Limnephilus sp.	0
Cryptochia sp.	1
Moselyana comosa	0
Pseudostenophylax sp.	1
Hydropsyche bettni	0
Agraylea sp.	0
Fattigia sp.	1
Leptocerus sp.	0
Oecetis sp.	0

ZOBODAT - www.zobodat.at

Zoologisch-Botanische Datenbank/Zoological-Botanical Database

Digitale Literatur/Digital Literature

Zeitschrift/Journal: [Braueria](#)

Jahr/Year: 2012

Band/Volume: [39](#)

Autor(en)/Author(s): Malicky Hans

Artikel/Article: [Dear Trichopterologist 3](#)