

Comments on “*An annotated catalogue of the mayfly fauna of Turkey (Insecta, Ephemeroptera)*”

[Salur, A., Darilmaz, M.C. and Bauernfeind, E., 2016. “An annotated catalogue of the mayfly fauna of Turkey (Insecta, Ephemeroptera)” ZooKeys 620: 67–118. doi: 10.3897/zookeys.620.9405]

NİLGÜN KAZANCI^{1*} AND GENCER TÜRKMEN¹

¹Hacettepe University, Science Faculty, Biology Department, Hydrobiology Section, Ankara

[*Corresponding Author: Nilgün Kazancı, nilgunkazanci@gmail.com]

ABSTRACT

1. In this study, all data in the annotated catalogue by Salur *et al.* (2016) were reviewed by comparing with the previous Ephemeroptera studies in Turkey.
2. As a result, corrections and additions were made for 122 Ephemeroptera species.
3. It is recommended that the annotated catalogue by Salur *et al.* (2016) has to be used with this paper for future Ephemeroptera studies in Turkey in order to avoid possible scientific confusions, mistakes or incomplete information.

KEY WORDS: Annotated catalogue, bibliography, Ephemeroptera, Turkey.

“Türkiye mayıs sineklerinin açıklamalı kataloğu (Insecta, Ephemeroptera)” üzerine yorumlar

[Salur, A., Darılmaz, M.C. and Bauernfeind, E., 2016. “An annotated catalogue of the mayfly fauna of Turkey (Insecta, Ephemeroptera)” ZooKeys 620: 67–118. doi: 10.3897/zookeys.620.9405]

NİLGÜN KAZANCI* VE GENCER TÜRKMEN¹

¹Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Fen Fakültesi, Bioloji Bölümü, Hidrobioloji Anabilim Dalı, Ankara
[*İletişim: Nilgün Kazancı, nilgunkazanci@gmail.com]

ÖZ

1. Bu çalışmada Salur vd. (2016)’nın açıklamalı kataloğu, Türkiye’de yapılan daha önceki Ephemeroptera çalışmalarıyla karşılaştırılarak yeniden incelenmiştir.
2. Sonuç olarak 122 Ephemeroptera türü hakkında düzeltmeler ve eklemeler yapılmıştır.
3. Bilimsel karışıklıklardan, hatalardan ve eksik bilgilerden sakınmak için, Salur vd. (2016)’nın açıklamalı kataloğunun gelecekteki Ephemeroptera çalışmalarında bu yayınlı birlikte kullanılması önerilmektedir.

ANAHTAR KELİMELER: Açıklamalı katalog, kaynakça, Ephemeroptera, Türkiye.

INTRODUCTION

An annotated catalogue (Salur, A., Darilmaz, M.C. and Bauernfeind, E., 2016. “*An annotated catalogue of the mayfly fauna of Turkey (Insecta, Ephemeroptera)*” ZooKeys 620: 67–118. doi: 10.3897/zookeys.620.9405] was provided by using previous Ephemeroptera studies in Turkey. According to the catalogue, Ephemeroptera fauna of Turkey consisted of 157 taxa, 33 genera and 14 families. In this study, corrections and additions were given for 122 Ephemeroptera species, and one correction was made for the title of the catalogue (in total 208).

MATERIALS AND METHODS

In this study, all previous Ephemeroptera studies were reviewed. For the annotated catalogue, many corrections and additions were given about Ephemeroptera species in Turkey.

The nomenclature and the authors of the species in this study, at the beginning of each paragraph, was given as in the annotated catalogue. The order of the species was given as in the annotated catalogue. Necessary corrections and additions related with the species were given under each species name.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Title:

- Title of the article should scientifically be corrected as “An annotated catalogue of the mayfly (Insecta, Ephemeroptera) of Turkey”.

2. *Ameletus inopinatus* Eaton, 1887:

- Kazancı (2001b) should also have been given again as reference in the part of “listed from Turkey” by Salur *et al.* (2016).

3 *Siphonurus aestivalis* Eaton, 1903:

- Although Salur *et al.* (2016) stated that nomenclature of families was given according to Bauernfeind and Soldan (2012), this species was given as *Siphonurus* (*Siphonurus*) *aestivalis* in Bauernfeind and Soldan (2012).

4. *Siphonurus lacustris* Eaton, 1870:

- Although Salur *et al.* (2016) stated that nomenclature of families was given according to Bauernfeind and Soldan (2012), this species was given as *Siphonurus (Siphonurus) lacustris* in Bauernfeind and Soldan (2012).
- Kazancı (2001b) should also have been given again as reference in the part of “listed from Turkey” by Salur *et al.* (2016).

5. *Siphonurus muchei* Braasch, 1983:

- According to Bauernfeind and Soldan (2012), *Siphonurus aestivalis* and *Siphonurus lacustris* were included in *Siphonurus* subgenus. However, subgenus of *Siphonurus muchei* are not clear yet. The fact that subgenera of *Siphonurus aestivalis* and *Siphonurus lacustris* were not given by Salur *et al.* (2016) may cause scientific difficulties in the use of names. In order to avoid this confusion, all information mentioned above should have been given clearly by Salur *et al.* (2016) according to Bauernfeind and Soldan (2012).
- *Siphonurus muchei* was listed by Kazancı (2001b); however, it was not cited in the part of “listed from Turkey” by Salur *et al.* (2016).

6. *Baetis (Acentrella) inexpectatus* (Tshernova, 1928):

- This species was given as *Pseudocloeon inexpectatum* in Berker (1981), Kazancı (1986a), Tanatmış (1999), Kazancı (2001b), and as *Acentrella inexpectata* in Kazancı and Türkmen (2012). All nomenclature of this species in the previous studies should have been given clearly by Salur *et al.* (2016) to avoid scientific confusion.

7. *Baetis (Acentrella) lapponicus* (Bengtsson, 1912):

- Salur *et al.* (2016) stated that “*Baetis lapponicus* was syntopic with *Baetis sinaicus*” without any citation. Furthermore, doubtful occurrence of *Baetis lapponicus* in Turkey was associated with being syntopic with *Baetis sinaicus* by Salur *et al.* (2016). However, if these two species are syntopic with each other, it is possible that these species can co-exist in the same habitat.
- Salur *et al.* (2016) stated that “re-examination of voucher specimen would be useful” right after stating occurrence in Turkey was doubtful. Bauernfeind and Soldan (2012) clearly gave the larval distinction characteristics of *Baetis lapponicus* and *Baetis sinaicus*. For example, according to Bauernfeind and Soldan (2012), *Baetis lapponicus* has one pair of subapical bristles on tarsal claws and these are absent in *Baetis sinaicus*. The larval specimens of this species recorded from Bolu (Kazancı and Türkmen 2008a, Kazancı and Türkmen 2008b) had one pair of subapical bristles on tarsal claws.

- This species was given as *Baetis lapponicus* in Kazancı (2001b), Kazancı and Türkmen (2008a), Kazancı and Türkmen (2008b), and as *Acentrella lapponica* in Kazancı and Türkmen (2012). All nomenclature of this species in the previous studies should have been given clearly by Salur *et al.* (2016) to avoid scientific confusion.

8. *Baetis (Acentrella) sinaicus* Bogoescu, 1931):

- It was not clear in Salur *et al.* (2016) that if *Baetis lapponicus* and *Baetis sinaicus* were syntopic with each other, why the occurrence of *Baetis lapponicus* was doubtful, while occurrence of *Baetis sinaicus* was not? This fact should have been clarified by Salur *et al.* (2016) to avoid scientific confusion.
- This species was given as *Baetis sinaicus* in Kazancı (1984), Tanatmış (1999), Tanatmış (2000), Kazancı (2001b), Tanatmış (2004a), and as *Acentrella sinaica* in Kazancı and Türkmen (2012). All nomenclature of this species in the previous studies should have been given clearly by Salur *et al.* (2016) to avoid scientific confusion.
- Reference of Kazancı (1984) was not included in the “References”. Citation of Kazancı (1984) was mistakenly given as Kazancı (1985a) in the “annotated catalogue” by Salur *et al.* (2016).

9. *Baetis (Baetis) alpinus* Pictet, 1843):

- This species was given as *Baetis alpinus* in Puthz (1973), Kazancı (1984), Tanatmış (1999), Kazancı (2001b), Kazancı (2009), Kazancı and Türkmen (2012). All nomenclature of this species in the previous studies should have been given clearly by Salur *et al.* (2016) to avoid scientific confusion.
- Reference of Kazancı (1984) was not included in the “References”. Citation of Kazancı (1984) was mistakenly given as Kazancı (1985a) in the “annotated catalogue” by Salur *et al.* (2016).

10. *Baetis (Baetis) buceratus* Eaton, 1870:

- This species was given as *Baetis buceratus* in Kazancı (1985a, actually 1984), Koch (1988), Kazancı *et al.* (1992), Tanatmış (1999), Tanatmış (2000), Kazancı (2001b), Tanatmış (2002), Tanatmış (2004a), Tanatmış (2004b), Narin and Tanatmış (2004), Ertorun and Tanatmış (2004), Tanatmış and Ertorun (2006), Tanatmış (2007), Kazancı and Girgin (2008), Kazancı (2009), Özyurt and Tanatmış (2011), Kazancı and Türkmen (2012), Aydınli (2013), Aydınli and Ertorun (2015). All nomenclature of this species in the previous studies should have been given clearly by Salur *et al.* (2016) to avoid scientific confusion.

- Reference of Kazancı (1984) was not included in the “References”. Citation of Kazancı (1984) was mistakenly given as Kazancı (1985a) in the “annotated catalogue” by Salur *et al.* (2016).

11. *Baetis (Baetis) elazigi* Berker, 1981:

- This species was given as *Baetis elazigi* in Berker (1981), Tanatmış (1999), Kazancı (2001b), Kazancı and Türkmen (2012). All nomenclature of this species in the previous studies should have been given clearly by Salur *et al.* (2016) to avoid scientific confusion.

12. *Baetis (Baetis) fuscatus* (Linnaeus, 1761):

- This species was given as *Baetis fuscatus* in Kazancı (1985a, actually 1984), Tanatmış (1997), Kazancı (1998b), Tanatmış (1999), Tanatmış (2000), Kazancı (2001a), Kazancı (2001b), Tanatmış (2002), Tanatmış (2004a), Tanatmış (2004b), Narin and Tanatmış (2004), Ertorun and Tanatmış (2004), Tanatmış and Ertorun (2006), Tanatmış (2007), Kazancı and Girgin (2008), Kazancı and Türkmen (2008a), Kazancı and Türkmen (2008b), Kazancı and Türkmen (2012), Türkmen and Kazancı (2013), Türkmen and Kazancı (2015), Aydınli and Ertorun (2015). All nomenclature of this species in the previous studies should have been given clearly by Salur *et al.* (2016) to avoid scientific confusion.
- Reference of Kazancı (1984) was not included in the “References”. Citation of Kazancı (1984) was mistakenly given as Kazancı (1985a) in the “annotated catalogue” by Salur *et al.* (2016).

13. *Baetis (Baetis) lutheri* Müller-Liebenau, 1967:

- In the part of “Comment”, Salur *et al.* (2016) stated that “Subspecific identity of records as *Baetis lutheri* (as above) is not clear”. However, there was not any mention of subspecific identity of *Baetis lutheri* in the previous records in Turkey. The expression of “as above” should have been “as below”. Because, subspecific identity of *Baetis lutheri* was discussed in the part of “*Baetis (Baetis) lutheri georgiensis* Zimmerman, 1981” in below.
- This species was given as *Baetis lutheri* in Kazancı (1985a, actually 1984), Koch (1985), Koch (1988), Kazancı *et al.* (1992), Tanatmış (1999), Tanatmış (2000), Kazancı (2001b), Tanatmış (2002), Tanatmış (2004a), Tanatmış (2004b), Narin and Tanatmış (2004), Ertorun and Tanatmış (2004), Tanatmış and Ertorun (2006), Tanatmış (2007), Kazancı and Girgin (2008), Kazancı and Türkmen (2008a), Kazancı and Türkmen (2008b), Tanatmış and Ertorun (2008), Özyurt and Tanatmış

(2011), Kazancı *et al.* (2012), Kazancı and Türkmen (2012), Aydınlı (2013), Türkmen and Kazancı (2013), Türkmen and Kazancı (2015), Aydınlı and Ertorun (2015), and as *Baetis lutheri* species-group in Kazancı (2009) . All nomenclature of this species in the previous studies should have been given clearly by Salur *et al.* (2016) to avoid scientific confusion.

- Reference of Kazancı (1984) was not included in the “References”. Citation of Kazancı (1984) was mistakenly given as Kazancı (1985a) in the “annotated catalogue” by Salur *et al.* (2016).

14. *Baetis (Baetis) lutheri georgiensis* Zimmermann, 1981:

- Salur *et al.* (2016) stated that larval characters of *Baetis lutheri georgiensis* have not been described so far. However, larval characters of *Baetis lutheri georgiensis* were described by Zimmermann (1981). In addition, Bauernfeind and Soldan (2012: 122) stated that “*Baetis lutheri georgiensis* was described by Zimmermann (1981) (imago not known)”.
- Salur *et al.* (2016) also stated that identification and separation of subspecies *Baetis lutheri lutheri* and *Baetis lutheri georgiensis* in the larval stage remain doubtful at present due to that larval characters of *Baetis lutheri georgiensis* were not known. Thus, this statement is not valid according to the correction above.
- This species was given as *Baetis lutheri georgiensis* in Kazancı (2009), Kazancı and Türkmen (2012). All nomenclature of this species in the previous studies should have been given clearly by Salur *et al.* (2016) to avoid scientific confusion.

15. *Baetis (Baetis) macani* Kimmins, 1957:

- Salur *et al.* (2016) also stated that the occurrence of this species in Turkey was rather unlikely. In addition, Kazancı (2001b) also stated that the previous records of this species from Turkey was doubtful. This information should have been given in the “annotated catalogue” by Salur *et al.* (2016).
- This species was given as *Baetis macani* in Berker (1981), Tanatmış (1999), Kazancı (2001b), Kazancı and Türkmen (2012). All nomenclature of this species in the previous studies should have been given clearly by Salur *et al.* (2016) to avoid scientific confusion.

16. *Baetis (Baetis) melanonyx* (Pictet, 1843):

- This species was given as *Baetis melanonyx* in Koch (1988), Kazancı (2001b), Kazancı and Türkmen (2012). All nomenclature of this species in the previous studies should have been given clearly by Salur *et al.* (2016) to avoid scientific confusion.

17. *Baetis (Baetis) meridionalis* Ikonomov, 1954:

- This species was given as *Baetis meridionalis* in Kazancı (1984), Tanatmış (1999), Tanatmış (2000), Kazancı (2001b), Tanatmış (2002), Kazancı and Türkmen (2012). All nomenclature of this species in the previous studies should have been given clearly by Salur *et al.* (2016) to avoid scientific confusion.
- Reference of Kazancı (1984) was not included in the “References”. Citation of Kazancı (1984) was mistakenly given as Kazancı (1985a) in the “annotated catalogue” by Salur *et al.* (2016).

18. *Baetis (Baetis) pavidus* Grandi, 1951:

- This species was given as *Baetis pavidus* in Berker (1981), Tanatmış (1995), Tanatmış (1999), Tanatmış (2000), Kazancı (2001b), Tanatmış (2002), Kazancı and Türkmen (2008a), Kazancı and Türkmen (2008b), Kazancı *et al.* (2012), Kazancı and Türkmen (2012). All nomenclature of this species in the previous studies should have been given clearly by Salur *et al.* (2016) to avoid scientific confusion.

19. *Baetis (Baetis) nexus* Navás, 1918:

- Reference of Kazancı (1984) was not included in the “References”. Citation of Kazancı (1984) was mistakenly given as Kazancı (1985a) in the “annotated catalogue” by Salur *et al.* (2016).

20. *Baetis (Baetis) samochai* Koch, 1981:

- This species was given as *Baetis samochai* in Koch (1985), Tanatmış (1999), Kazancı (2001b), Kazancı and Türkmen (2012). All nomenclature of this species in the previous studies should have been given clearly by Salur *et al.* (2016) to avoid scientific confusion.

21. *Baetis (Baetis) scambus* Eaton, 1870:

- This species was given as *Baetis scambus* in Kazancı (1984), Kazancı *et al.* (1992), Tanatmış (1995), Tanatmış (1999), Kazancı (2001b), Taşdemir *et al.* (2008), Kazancı and Türkmen (2012). All nomenclature of this species in the previous studies should have been given clearly by Salur *et al.* (2016) to avoid scientific confusion.
- Reference of Kazancı (1984) was not included in the “References”. Citation of Kazancı (1984) was mistakenly given as Kazancı (1985a) in the “annotated catalogue” by Salur *et al.* (2016).

22. *Baetis (Baetis) vardarensis caucasicus* Zimmermann, 1981:

- This species was given as *Baetis vardarensis caucasicus* in Kazancı (2009), Kazancı and Türkmen (2012). All nomenclature of this species in the previous studies should have been given clearly by Salur *et al.* (2016) to avoid scientific confusion.

23. *Baetis (Baetis) vernus* Curtis, 1834:

- This species was given as *Baetis vernus* in Berker (1981), Kazancı (1984), Koch (1985), Tanatmış (1995), Tanatmış (1997), Tanatmış (1999), Tanatmış (2000), Kazancı (2001a), Kazancı (2001b), Tanatmış (2002), Tanatmış (2004a), Tanatmış (2004b), Narin and Tanatmış (2004), Ertorun and Tanatmış (2004), Tanatmış and Ertorun (2006), Tanatmış (2007), Tanatmış and Ertorun (2008), Özyurt and Tanatmış (2011), Kazancı and Türkmen (2012), Aydınli (2013), Aydınli and Ertorun (2015). All nomenclature of this species in the previous studies should have been given clearly by Salur *et al.* (2016) to avoid scientific confusion.
- Citation of Kazancı (2001b) should also have been given again in the part of “listed from Turkey” Salur *et al.* (2016).
- Reference of Kazancı (1984) was not included in the “References”. Citation of Kazancı (1984) was mistakenly given as Kazancı (1985a) in the “annotated catalogue” by Salur *et al.* (2016).

24. *Baetis (Labiobaetis) atrebatinus* Eaton, 1870:

- This species was given as *Labiobaetis atrebatinus* in Aydınli and Ertorun (2015). The nomenclature of this species in the previous study should have been given clearly by Salur *et al.* (2016) to avoid scientific confusion.

25. *Baetis (Labiobaetis) balcanicus* Müller-Liebenau & Soldán, 1981:

- This species was given as *Baetis balcanicus* in Kazancı (1998a), and as *Pseudocloeon balcanicum* in Kazancı and Türkmen (2012). All nomenclature of this species in the previous studies should have been given clearly by Salur *et al.* (2016) to avoid scientific confusion.

26. *Baetis (Labiobaetis) tricolor* Tshernova, 1928:

- Salur *et al.* (2016) described the collecting sites of *Baetis tricolor* (in Kazancı 2009) as “high mountain streams” in Erzincan and Tunceli. However, Kazancı (2009) did not give any information about the stream types of the collecting sites of *Baetis tricolor*. Only the altitudes were given by Kazancı (2009). In addition, the

collecting sites of this species from Erzincan and Tunceli (Kazancı 2009) did not have the characteristics of high mountain streams. Due to the geological structure of Turkey, the altitude classification in Europe may be remarkably different from the classification in Turkey.

- Salur *et al.* (2016) also stated that “Occurrence of potamallic *B. tricolor* in high mountain streams (Erzincan, Tunceli at between 1000–1500 m a.s.l.) is rather doubtful”. However, it should be noted that although the collecting sites of this species (in Kazancı 2009) were in Erzincan and Tunceli, these sites were at high altitude with slow current speed.
- Salur *et al.* (2016) stated that “In the larval stage, usually not separable from *B. calcaratus* Keffermüller, 1972.” right after stating that occurrence in Turkey was rather doubtful. By this statement, it was understood that *Baetis tricolor* was confused with *Baetis calcaratus*. Although Salur *et al.* (2016) stated that habitat information of *Baetis tricolor* was incompatible with the literature (however, it is not), comparing *Baetis tricolor* and *Baetis calcaratus* is trivial. Because, they have similar habitat preferences (Bauernfeind and Soldan 2012).
- This species was given as *Baetis tricolor* in Koch (1985), Koch (1988), Kazancı (1998a), Tanatmış (1999), Tanatmış (2000), Kazancı (2001a), Tanatmış (2002), Kazancı (2009), and as *Labiobaetis tricolor* in Kazancı and Türkmen (2012). All nomenclature of this species in the previous studies should have been given clearly by Salur *et al.* (2016) to avoid scientific confusion.

27. *Baetis (Rhodobaetis) bisri* Thomas & Dia, 1983:

- *Baetis bisri* was recorded for the first time from Hakkari, Turkey by Kazancı (2009). This species was generally confused with *Baetis braaschi* as synonym. In the checklist of Ephemeroptera species of Turkey (Kazancı and Türkmen 2012), *Baetis bisri* was not included in the list and given as *Baetis braaschi*. The nomenclature of this list was prepared based on the list of Barber-James *et al.* (2013) and that list includes *Baetis braaschi*, but not *Baetis bisri*. However, *Baetis bisri* and *Baetis braaschi* were not synonym, and they were completely different species according to Godunko *et al.* (2004, 2015). Godunko *et al.* (2015) also stated that “*B. bisri* record from Hakkari (in Kazancı 2009) was questionable, from our point of the view (on the base of investigation of *Rhodobaetis* material from this region). It should be noted that subsequently this species is not cited in the Turkey mayfly checklist published by Kazancı and Türkmen (2012)”. Salur *et al.* (2016) stated that “occurrence of *B. bisri* in Turkey was not very likely”. Salur *et al.* (2016) also stated that “The record from Hakkari has obviously been

listed subsequently by Kazancı and Türkmen (2012) as *B. braaschi* (see below)”. However, despite the fact that Salur *et al.* (2016) stated occurrence of *Baetis bisri* was doubtful in Hakkari, Turkey, they included *Baetis bisri* in the catalogue with the species and locality record in Kazancı 2009. In addition, Salur *et al.* (2016) used the species and locality record of *Baetis bisri* for *Baetis braaschi*. There is not a previous record of *Baetis braaschi* in Turkey. The main reason of this confusion is that Salur *et al.* (2016) used one species record for two different species (*Baetis bisri* and *Baetis braaschi*).

- This species was given as *Baetis bisri* in Kazancı (2009), and as *Baetis braaschi* in Kazancı and Türkmen (2012). All nomenclature of this species in the previous studies should have been given clearly by Salur *et al.* (2016) to avoid scientific confusion.

28. *Baetis (Rhodobaetis) braaschi* Zimmermann, 1980:

- In the part of “Distribution in Turkey”, locality record of *Baetis braaschi* was given as “Probably Hakkari (as *B. bisri*; Kazancı 2009)” by Salur *et al.* (2016). However, this record was given clearly and exactly as “Hakkari: Dicle River Basin, 1500 m, 10.7.1986, 3 larvae” for *Baetis bisri* by Kazancı (2009). Moreover, Salur *et al.* (2016) used the same locality record of *Baetis bisri* for *Baetis braaschi*. However, they gave exact locality record for *Baetis bisri* (as in Kazancı 2009). Statement of “Probably Hakkari” is scientifically incorrect and unserious in Salur *et al.* (2016).
- This species was given as *Baetis bisri* in Kazancı (2009), and as *Baetis braaschi* in Kazancı and Türkmen (2012). All nomenclature of this species in the previous studies should have been given clearly by Salur *et al.* (2016) to avoid scientific confusion.

29. *Baetis (Rhodobaetis) gemellus* Eaton, 1885:

- This species was given as *Baetis gemellus* in Kazancı (1984), Kazancı *et al.* (1992), Tanatmış (1999), Kazancı (2001b), Kazancı and Türkmen (2008a), Kazancı and Türkmen (2008b), Kazancı and Türkmen (2012), Türkmen and Kazancı (2013), Türkmen and Kazancı (2015). All nomenclature of this species in the previous studies should have been given clearly by Salur *et al.* (2016) to avoid scientific confusion.
- Reference of Kazancı (1984) was not included in the “References”. Citation of Kazancı (1984) was mistakenly given as Kazancı (1985a) in the “annotated catalogue” by Salur *et al.* (2016).

30. *Baetis (Rhodobaetis) macrospinosus* Koch, 1985:

- This species was given as *Baetis macrospinosus* in Koch (1985), Tanatmış (1999), Kazancı (2001b), Kazancı and Türkmen (2012). All nomenclature of this species in the previous studies should have been given clearly by Salur *et al.* (2016) to avoid scientific confusion.

31. *Baetis (Rhodobaetis) milani* Godunko, Prokopov & Soldán, 2004:

- Godunko *et al.* (2015) stated that “*Baetis milani* was keyed and depicted by Türkmen & Kazancı (2013) in the larval key of the mayflies of the Eastern Black Sea Basin within Turkey. However, confirmation of its occurrence in Western Anatolia is pending”. Salur *et al.* (2016) used the citation of Godunko *et al.* (2015) incorrectly and stated that “distribution in Anatolia needs confirmation”. These two expressions are different from each other and the statement by Salur *et al.* (2016) does not reflect the information given by Godunko *et al.* (2015).
- This species was given as *Baetis milani* in Türkmen and Özkan (2011), Kazancı and Türkmen (2012), Türkmen and Kazancı (2013), Türkmen and Kazancı (2015). All nomenclature of this species in the previous studies should have been given clearly by Salur *et al.* (2016) to avoid scientific confusion.

32. *Baetis (Rhodobaetis) pseudogemellus* Soldán, 1977:

- For the record of *Baetis pseudogemellus* from Turkey, Godunko *et al.* (2015) stated that “it may actually refer to an undescribed species of the subgenus *Rhodobaetis*”. Salur *et al.* (2016) used the citation of Godunko *et al.* (2015) incorrectly and stated that “Occurrence of *B. pseudogemellus* in Turkey is extremely unlikely (Godunko *et al.* 2015: 196)”. These two expressions are different from each other and the statement by Salur *et al.* (2016) does not reflect the information given by Godunko *et al.* (2015). In addition, the citation of the page about *Baetis pseudogemellus* in Godunko *et al.* (2015) is 197, not 196.
- This species was given as *Baetis pseudogemellus* in Kazancı (2009), Kazancı and Türkmen (2012). All nomenclature of this species in the previous studies should have been given clearly by Salur *et al.* (2016) to avoid scientific confusion.

33. *Baetis (Rhodobaetis) rhodani* (Pictet, 1843):

- This species was given as *Baetis rhodani* in Puthz (1972), Berker (1981), Kazancı (1984), Koch (1988), Tanatmış (1995), Tanatmış (1997), Tanatmış (1999), Tanatmış (2000), Kazancı (2001b), Tanatmış (2002), Tanatmış (2004a), Tanatmış (2004b), Narin and Tanatmış (2004), Ertorun and Tanatmış (2004), Tanatmış and Ertorun (2006), Tanatmış (2007), Kazancı and Girgin (2008), Kazancı and

Türkmen (2008a), Kazancı and Türkmen (2008b), Kazancı (2009), Türkmen and Özkan (2011), Özyurt and Tanatmış (2011), Kazancı *et al.* (2012), Kazancı and Türkmen (2012), Türkmen and Kazancı (2013), Aydınli (2013), Türkmen and Kazancı (2015), Aydınli and Ertorun (2015). All nomenclature of this species in the previous studies should have been given clearly by Salur *et al.* (2016) to avoid scientific confusion.

- Reference of Kazancı (1984) was not included in the “References”. Citation of Kazancı (1984) was mistakenly given as Kazancı (1985a) in the “annotated catalogue” by Salur *et al.* (2016).

34. *Baetis (Nigrobaetis) digitatus* Bengtsson, 1912:

- This species was given as *Baetis digitatus* in Kazancı (1984), Tanatmış (1999), Kazancı (2001b), Tanatmış (2004a), Tanatmış (2004b), Tanatmış and Ertorun (2006), Tanatmış (2007), and as *Nigrobaetis digitatus* in Kazancı and Türkmen (2012). All nomenclature of this species in the previous studies should have been given clearly by Salur *et al.* (2016) to avoid scientific confusion.
- Reference of Kazancı (1984) was not included in the “References”. Citation of Kazancı (1984) was mistakenly given as Kazancı (1985a) in the “annotated catalogue” by Salur *et al.* (2016).

35. *Baetis (Nigrobaetis) gracilis* Bogoescu & Tabacaru, 1957:

- This species was given as *Baetis gracilis* in Tanatmış (2000), Kazancı (2001b), Tanatmış (2002), Tanatmış (2004a), and as *Nigrobaetis gracilis* in Kazancı and Türkmen (2012). All nomenclature of this species in the previous studies should have been given clearly by Salur *et al.* (2016) to avoid scientific confusion.
- Citation of Kazancı (2001b) should also have been given again in the part of “listed from Turkey” Salur *et al.* (2016).

36. *Baetis (Nigrobaetis) kars* Thomas & Kazancı, 1989:

- In the part of “Type country and locality”, Salur *et al.* (2016) stated that “Turkey, Kızılsu (the type locality is a stream and is located in the province of Şırnak) (Kazancı and Thomas 1989)”. However, type locality of this species was given clearly and exactly as “Kızılsu Stream, Dicle River, Resor bridge, Siirt-Şırnak road, 11 km to Şırnak, Altitude 1000m, 37°35’N - 42°24’E” by Kazancı and Thomas (1989). These two expressions are completely different from each other and the statement by Salur *et al.* (2016) does not reflect the information given by Kazancı and Thomas (1989). In addition, expression of “the type locality is a stream” by Salur *et al.* (2016) is scientifically incorrect and unserious.

- This species was given as *Baetis kars* in Kazancı and Thomas (1989), Tanatmış (1999), Kazancı (2001b), and as *Nigrobaetis kars* in Kazancı and Türkmen (2012). All nomenclature of this species in the previous studies should have been given clearly by Salur *et al.* (2016) to avoid scientific confusion.

37. *Baetis (Nigrobaetis) muticus* (Linnaeus, 1758):

- This species was given as *Baetis muticus* in Kazancı (1984), Kazancı *et al.* (1992), Tanatmış (1995), Tanatmış (1997), Tanatmış (1999), Tanatmış (2000), Kazancı (2001a), Kazancı (2001b), Tanatmış (2002), Tanatmış (2004a), Tanatmış (2004b), Ertorun and Tanatmış (2004), Tanatmış and Ertorun (2006), Tanatmış (2007), Kazancı and Türkmen (2008a), Kazancı and Türkmen (2008b), Tanatmış and Ertorun (2008), Türkmen and Özkan (2011), and as *Alainites muticus* in Kazancı and Türkmen (2012), Türkmen and Kazancı (2013), Aydınli and Ertorun (2015). All nomenclature of this species in the previous studies should have been given clearly by Salur *et al.* (2016) to avoid scientific confusion.
- Reference of Kazancı (1984) was not included in the “References”. Citation of Kazancı (1984) was mistakenly given as Kazancı (1985a) in the “annotated catalogue” by Salur *et al.* (2016).

38. *Baetis (Nigrobaetis) niger* (Linnaeus, 1761):

- This species was given as *Baetis niger* in Kazancı (1984), Koch (1985), Tanatmış (1999), Kazancı (2001b), and as *Nigrobaetis niger* in Kazancı and Türkmen (2012), Aydınli and Ertorun (2015). All nomenclature of this species in the previous studies should have been given clearly by Salur *et al.* (2016) to avoid scientific confusion.
- Citation of Kazancı (2001b) should also have been given again in the part of “listed from Turkey” Salur *et al.* (2016).
- Reference of Kazancı (1984) was not included in the “References”. Citation of Kazancı (1984) was mistakenly given as Kazancı (1985a) in the “annotated catalogue” by Salur *et al.* (2016).

39. *Centroptilum luteolum* (O.F. Müller, 1776):

- Reference of Kazancı (1984) was not included in the “References”. Citation of Kazancı (1984) was mistakenly given as Kazancı (1985a) in the “annotated catalogue” by Salur *et al.* (2016).
- The author of this species was given as “(O.F. Müller, 1776)”. In scientific nomenclature, use of the abbreviations of the first name of the author is incorrect.

40. *Cloeon dipterum* (Linnaeus, 1761):

- Reference of Kazancı (1984) was not included in the “References”. Citation of Kazancı (1984) was mistakenly given as Kazancı (1985a) in the “annotated catalogue” by Salur *et al.* (2016).

41. *Cloeon simile* Eaton, 1870:

- Reference of Kazancı (1984) was not included in the “References”. Citation of Kazancı (1984) was mistakenly given as Kazancı (1985a) in the “annotated catalogue” by Salur *et al.* (2016).

42. *Procloeon bifidum* (Bengtsson, 1912):

- Although Salur *et al.* (2016) stated that nomenclature of families was given according to Bauernfeind and Soldan (2012), this species was given as *Procloeon (Procloeon) bifidum* in Bauernfeind and Soldan (2012).
- Reference of Kazancı (1984) was not included in the “References”. Citation of Kazancı (1984) was mistakenly given as Kazancı (1985a) in the “annotated catalogue” by Salur *et al.* (2016).

43. *Procloeon nana* (Bogoescu, 1951):

- Although Salur *et al.* (2016) stated that nomenclature of families was given according to Bauernfeind and Soldan (2012), this species was given as *Procloeon (Pseudocentroptilum) nana* in Bauernfeind and Soldan (2012).
- This species was given as *Centroptilum nanum* in Tanatmış (1999), Kazancı (2001b). All nomenclature of this species in the previous studies should have been given clearly by Salur *et al.* (2016) to avoid scientific confusion.
- Reference of Kazancı (1984) was not included in the “References”. Citation of Kazancı (1984) was mistakenly given as Kazancı (1985a) in the “annotated catalogue” by Salur *et al.* (2016).

44. *Procloeon pennulatum* (Eaton, 1870):

- Although Salur *et al.* (2016) stated that nomenclature of families was given according to Bauernfeind and Soldan (2012), this species was given as *Procloeon (Pseudocentroptilum) pennulatum* in Bauernfeind and Soldan (2012).
- This species was given as *Centroptilum pennulatum* in Tanatmış (1997), Kazancı (2001a), and as *Pseudocentroptilum pennulatum* in Tanatmış (1999), Tanatmış (2000), Kazancı (2001b), Tanatmış (2002), Tanatmış (2004a), Tanatmış (2007), Özyurt and Tanatmış (2011). All nomenclature of this species in the previous studies should have been given clearly by Salur *et al.* (2016) to avoid scientific confusion.

- This species was given as *Centroptilum pennulatum* in “the abstract in English” and in the text, and as *Pseudocentroptilum pennulatum* in “the abstract in Turkish” by Tanatmış and Ertorun (2006). However, Salur *et al.* (2016) did not mention this confusion in the “annotated catalogue” and they gave this species record as *Procloeon pennulatum*.
- Citation of Kazancı (2001b) should also have been given again in the part of “listed from Turkey” Salur *et al.* (2016).
- Reference of Kazancı (1984) was not included in the “References”. Citation of Kazancı (1984) was mistakenly given as Kazancı (1985a) in the “annotated catalogue” by Salur *et al.* (2016).

45. *Procloeon pulchrum* (Eaton, 1885):

- Although Salur *et al.* (2016) stated that nomenclature of families was given according to Bauernfeind and Soldan (2012), this species was given as *Procloeon (Pseudocentroptilum) pulchrum* in Bauernfeind and Soldan (2012).
- This species was given as *Centroptilum pulchrum* in Tanatmış (1999), Ertorun and Tanatmış (2004), Tanatmış and Ertorun (2008), Kazancı (2001b). All nomenclature of this species in the previous studies should have been given clearly by Salur *et al.* (2016) to avoid scientific confusion.
- Reference of Kazancı (1984) was not included in the “References”. Citation of Kazancı (1984) was mistakenly given as Kazancı (1985a) in the “annotated catalogue” by Salur *et al.* (2016).

46. *Pseudocentroptiloides shadini* (Kazlauskas, 1964):

- This species was given as *Centroptilum shadini* in Kazancı (2001b). The nomenclature of this species in the previous study should have been given clearly by Salur *et al.* (2016) to avoid scientific confusion.
- Kazancı (2001b) should also have been given again as reference in the part of “listed from Turkey” by Salur *et al.* (2016).

47. *Isonychia ignota* Walker, 1853:

- Kazancı (2001b) should also have been given again as reference in the part of “listed from Turkey” by Salur *et al.* (2016).

48. *Oligoneuriella pallida* (Hagen, 1855):

- This species was given as *Oligoneuriella mikulskii* in Tanatmış (1999), Kazancı (2001b). All nomenclature of this species in the previous studies should have been given clearly by Salur *et al.* (2016) to avoid scientific confusion.

49. *Oligoneuriella rhenana* (Imhoff, 1852):

- Kazancı (2001b) should also have been given again as reference in the part of “listed from Turkey” by Salur *et al.* (2016).

50. *Oligoneuriella tsxhomelidzei* Sowa & Zosidze, 1973:

- Salur *et al.* (2016) stated that this species was given as *Oligoneuriella baskale* by Kazancı (2009). However, this species was given as *Oligoneuriella tsxhomelidzei* by Kazancı (2009).
- *Oligoneuriella tsxhomelidzei* was listed by Tanatmış (1999) as *Oligoneuriella baskale* and *Oligoneuriella zanga*; however, it was not cited in the part of “listed from Turkey” by Salur *et al.* (2016).
- This species was given as *Oligoneuriella baskale* and *Oligoneuriella zanga* in Kazancı (2001b). The nomenclature of this species in the previous study should have been given clearly by Salur *et al.* (2016) to avoid scientific confusion.

51. *Ecdyonurus bimaculatus* Tanatmış & Haybach, 2010:

- Salur *et al.* (2016) used sub-generic nomenclature for all *Ecdyonurus* species in the annotated catalogue, but they did not give the sub-generic status of *Ecdyonurus bimaculatus*. However, Bauernfeind and Soldan (2012: 252) stated that *Ecdyonurus bimaculatus* was considered *incertae sedis*, which indicates that specific taxonomic level of this species is still uncertain. In order to avoid this confusion, this situation should have been explained clearly by Salur *et al.* (2016) according to Bauernfeind and Soldan (2012).

52. *Ecdyonurus (Ecdyonurus) aurantiacus* (Burmeister, 1839):

- This species was given as *Ecdyonurus aurantiacus* in Kazancı (2009), Kazancı and Türkmen (2012). All nomenclature of this species in the previous studies should have been given clearly by Salur *et al.* (2016) to avoid scientific confusion.

53. *Ecdyonurus (Ecdyonurus) autumnalis* Braasch, 1980:

- This species was given as *Ecdyonurus autumnalis* in Tanatmış (1999), Kazancı (2001a), Kazancı (2001b), Kazancı and Türkmen (2012). All nomenclature of this species in the previous studies should have been given clearly by Salur *et al.* (2016) to avoid scientific confusion.
- Kazancı (2001b) should also have been given again as reference in the part of “listed from Turkey” by Salur *et al.* (2016).

54. *Ecdyonurus (Ecdyonurus) dispar* (Curtis, 1834):

- This species was given as *Ecdyonurus dispar* in Kazancı (2001b), Tanatmış (2002), Tanatmış (2004a), Tanatmış (2004b), Tanatmış and Ertorun (2006), Kazancı (2009), Kazancı and Türkmen (2012), Aydınli and Ertorun (2015), and as *Ecdyonurus fluminum* in Tanatmış (1999). All nomenclature of this species in the previous studies should have been given clearly by Salur *et al.* (2016) to avoid scientific confusion.
- Kazancı (2001b) should also have been given again as reference in the part of “listed from Turkey” by Salur *et al.* (2016).

55. *Ecdyonurus (Ecdyonurus) macani* Thomas & Sowa, 1970:

- Salur *et al.* stated that “occurrence of *Ecdyonurus macani* in Turkey is probably doubtful” without any reason or reference.
- This species was given as *Ecdyonurus macani* in Türkmen and Kazancı (2013), Türkmen and Kazancı (2015). All nomenclature of this species in the previous studies should have been given clearly by Salur *et al.* (2016) to avoid scientific confusion.

56. *Ecdyonurus (Ecdyonurus) ornatipennis* Tshernova, 1938:

- This species was given as *Ecdyonurus ornatipennis* in Braasch (1981), Kazancı and Braasch (1988), Tanatmış (1999), Kazancı (2001b), Kazancı and Türkmen (2012). All nomenclature of this species in the previous studies should have been given clearly by Salur *et al.* (2016) to avoid scientific confusion.

57. *Ecdyonurus (Ecdyonurus) russevi* Braasch & Soldán, 1985:

- This species was given as *Ecdyonurus russevi* in Kazancı (2001b), Kazancı and Türkmen (2012). All nomenclature of this species in the previous studies should have been given clearly by Salur *et al.* (2016) to avoid scientific confusion.
- Kazancı (2001b) should also have been given again as reference in the part of “listed from Turkey” by Salur *et al.* (2016).

58. *Ecdyonurus (Ecdyonurus) submontanus* Landa, 1969:

- Salur *et al.* (2016) stated that “occurrence of *Ecdyonurus submontanus* in Turkey is rather questionable” without any reason or reference. However, Bauernfeind and Soldan (2012) stated that this species is considered to represent a Pontomediterranean faunistic element (Haybach 1998, Haybach and Jacob 2010). Turkey is situated in Pontomediterranean region. Therefore, expression of “rather questionable” is in conflict with the references above.

- This species was given as *Ecdyonurus submontanus* in Kazancı (2009), Kazancı and Türkmen (2012). All nomenclature of this species in the previous studies should have been given clearly by Salur *et al.* (2016) to avoid scientific confusion.

59. *Ecdyonurus (Ecdyonurus) starmachi* Sowa, 1971:

- This species was given as *Ecdyonurus starmachi* in Kazancı and Türkmen (2008a), Kazancı and Türkmen (2008b), Kazancı and Türkmen (2012), Türkmen and Kazancı (2013), Türkmen and Kazancı (2015). All nomenclature of this species in the previous studies should have been given clearly by Salur *et al.* (2016) to avoid scientific confusion.

60. *Ecdyonurus (Ecdyonurus) venosus* (Fabricius, 1775):

- Salur *et al.* (2016) stated that “occurrence of *Ecdyonurus venosus* in Turkey rather questionable” without any reason or reference. However, Bauernfeind and Soldan (2012) stated that this species is considered to represent a Holomediterranean faunistic element (Haybach 1998, Haybach and Jacob 2010). Turkey is situated in Holomediterranean region. Therefore, expression of “rather questionable” is in conflict with the references above.
- This species was given as *Ecdyonurus venosus* in Tanatmış (1995), Tanatmış, (1997), Tanatmış (1999), Tanatmış (2000), Kazancı (2001b), Kazancı and Girgin (2008), Kazancı and Türkmen (2008a), Kazancı and Türkmen (2008b), Kazancı (2009), Kazancı and Türkmen (2012). All nomenclature of this species in the previous studies should have been given clearly by Salur *et al.* (2016) to avoid scientific confusion.
- Kazancı (2001b) should also have been given again as reference in the part of “listed from Turkey” by Salur *et al.* (2016).

61. *Ecdyonurus (Helvetoraeticus) helveticus* Eaton, 1883:

- Salur *et al.* (2016) stated that “occurrence of alpine taxon *Ecdyonurus helveticus* in Turkey rather doubtful” without any reason or reference. According to Bauernfeind and Soldan (2012), larvae of this species inhabit epi- and meta-rhithralic section of alpine rivers. The collecting sites of larval *Ecdyonurus helveticus* in Giresun and Rize (Türkmen and Kazancı 2015) and in Eastern Black Sea Region (Türkmen and Kazancı 2013) were situated at epirhithron and metarhithron zones of the streams.
- In addition, Bauernfeind and Soldan (2012) stated that this species is supposed to represent an Adriaticomediterranean or Pontomediterranean faunistic element (Haybach 1998). Turkey is situated in Pontomediterranean region. Therefore, expression of “rather questionable” is in conflict with the references above.

- This species was given as *Ecdyonurus helveticus* in Kazancı (2001b), Tanatmış (2004a), Tanatmış (2007), Kazancı and Türkmen (2012), Türkmen and Kazancı (2013), Türkmen and Kazancı (2015), Aydınlı and Ertorun (2015). All nomenclature of this species in the previous studies should have been given clearly by Salur *et al.* (2016) to avoid scientific confusion.
- Kazancı (2001b) should also have been given again as reference in the part of “listed from Turkey” by Salur *et al.* (2016).

62. *Ecdyonurus (Helvetoraeticus) picteti* (Meyer-Dür, 1864):

- Salur *et al.* (2016) stated that “occurrence of alpine taxon *Ecdyonurus picteti* in Turkey is rather doubtful” without any reason or reference. According to Bauernfeind and Soldan (2012), larvae of this species inhabit epi- and meta-rhithralic section of alpine rivers. The collecting sites of larval *E. picteti* in Giresun and Rize (Türkmen and Kazancı 2015) and in Eastern Black Sea Region (Türkmen and Kazancı 2013) were situated at epi-rhithron and meta-rhithron zones of the streams.
- This species was given as *Ecdyonurus picteti* in Türkmen and Kazancı (2013), Türkmen and Kazancı (2015). All nomenclature of this species in the previous studies should have been given clearly by Salur *et al.* (2016) to avoid scientific confusion.

63. *Electrogena antaltensis* (Braasch & Kazancı in Kazancı & Braasch, 1986):

- Kazancı (2001b) should also have been given again as reference in the part of “listed from Turkey” by Salur *et al.* (2016).

64. *Electrogena hakkarica* (Kazancı, 1986b):

- Kazancı (2001b) should also have been given again as reference in the part of “listed from Turkey” by Salur *et al.* (2016).
- The author of this species was incorrectly given as “(Kazancı, 1986b)” by Salur *et al.* (2016). In scientific nomenclature, use of letter in the year is incorrect. It should be given as *Electrogena hakkarica* (Kazancı, 1986).

65. *Electrogena lateralis* (Curtis, 1834):

- This species was given as *Ecdyonurus lateralis* in Tanatmış (1995). The nomenclature of this species in the previous study should have been given clearly by Salur *et al.* (2016) to avoid scientific confusion.
- Kazancı (2001b) should also have been given again as reference in the part of “listed from Turkey” by Salur *et al.* (2016).

- Reference of Kazancı (1984) was not included in the “References”. Citation of Kazancı (1984) was mistakenly given as Kazancı (1985a) in the “annotated catalogue” by Salur *et al.* (2016).

66. *Electrogena quadrilineata* (Landa, 1969):

- Salur *et al.* (2016) stated that “*Electrogena quadrilineata* has so far been recorded from a few localities in Central Europe and occurrence in Turkey rather questionable” without any reason or reference. However, Bauernfeind and Soldan (2012) stated that distribution of this species was “probably East-Central European” and for east, up to Bulgaria.

67. *Afronurus kugleri* Demoulin, 1973:

- This species was given as *Electrogena kugleri* in Kazancı and Türkmen (2012). The nomenclature of this species in the previous study should have been given clearly by Salur *et al.* (2016) to avoid scientific confusion.

68. *Afronurus madli* Kazancı, 1992:

- This species was given as *Electrogena madli* in Kazancı and Türkmen (2012). The nomenclature of this species in the previous study should have been given clearly by Salur *et al.* (2016) to avoid scientific confusion.

69. *Epeorus (Caucasiron) alpestris* (Braasch, 1979):

- This species was given as *Iron alpestris* in Tanatmış (1999), Kazancı (2001b), and as *Epeorus alpestris* in Kazancı and Türkmen (2012). All nomenclature of this species in the previous studies should have been given clearly by Salur *et al.* (2016) to avoid scientific confusion.

70. *Epeorus (Caucasiron) caucasicus* (Tshernova, 1938):

- This species was given as *Epeorus caucasicus* in Tanatmış (1999), Kazancı and Türkmen (2012), Türkmen and Kazancı (2013), Türkmen and Kazancı (2015), as *Iron caucasicus* in Kazancı (2001b), and as *Cinygma caucasica* in Kazancı (2009). All nomenclature of this species in the previous studies should have been given clearly by Salur *et al.* (2016) to avoid scientific confusion.
- In the part of “Distribution of Turkey”, Salur *et al.* (2016) noted that this species was given from Artvin, Erzincan and Erzurum by Kazancı (1986a). However, this species was not given in Kazancı (1986a) at all.

71. *Epeorus (Caucasiron) fuscus* (Sinitshenkova, 1976):

- This species was given as *Iron fuscus* in Kazancı (2009). The nomenclature of this species in the previous study should have been given clearly by Salur *et al.* (2016) to avoid scientific confusion.

72. *Epeorus (Caucasiron) longimaculatus* (Braasch, 1980):

- This species was given as *Iron longimaculatus* in Tanatmış (1999), Kazancı (2001b), and as *Epeorus longimaculatus* in Kazancı and Türkmen (2012). All nomenclature of this species in the previous studies should have been given clearly by Salur *et al.* (2016) to avoid scientific confusion.

73. *Epeorus (Caucasiron) magnus* (Braasch, 1978):

- This species was given as *Epeorus magnus* in Kazancı and Türkmen (2012). The nomenclature of this species in the previous study should have been given clearly by Salur *et al.* (2016) to avoid scientific confusion.

74. *Epeorus (Caucasiron) nigripilosus* (Sinitshenkova, 1976):

- This species was given as *Iron nigripilosus* in Kazancı (2009), and as *Epeorus nigripilosus* in Kazancı and Türkmen (2012). All nomenclature of this species in the previous studies should have been given clearly by Salur *et al.* (2016) to avoid scientific confusion.

75. *Epeorus (Caucasiron) znojkoii* (Tshernova, 1938 [sub *Iron znojkoii*]):

- This species was given as *Epeorus znojkoii* in Türkmen and Kazancı (2013), Türkmen and Kazancı (2015). All nomenclature of this species in the previous studies should have been given clearly by Salur *et al.* (2016) to avoid scientific confusion.

76. *Epeorus (Epeorus) assimilis* Eaton, 1885:

- There is not a previous record of *Epeorus assimilis* in Turkey. All records of the species were given as *Epeorus sylvicola* in Turkey. *Epeorus assimilis* and *Epeorus sylvicola* are frequently considered as synonym. However, these species are completely different species (Thomas *et al.* 1999, Bauernfeind and Soldan 2012, Barber-James *et al.* 2013). In Salur *et al.* (2016), it was not clear whether these species were considered as synonym, or as separate species. If considered as separate species, it should have been clearly explained by Salur *et al.* (2016) why all previous records of *Epeorus sylvicola* were given as *Epeorus assimilis*. This uncertainty causes a scientific confusion.

- Moreover, if this species was considered as synonym of *Epeorus sylvicola* by Salur *et al.* (2016), *Epeorus sylvicola* (Pictet 1865) should have been included in the “annotated catalogue” instead of *Epeorus assimilis* (Eaton 1885) according to the priority rule.
- This species was given as *Epeorus sylvicola* in Tanatmış (1999), Kazancı (2001b), Kazancı and Türkmen (2012), Türkmen and Kazancı (2013). All nomenclature of this species in the previous studies should have been given clearly by Salur *et al.* (2016) to avoid scientific confusion.
- Kazancı (2001b) should also have been given again as reference in the part of “listed from Turkey” by Salur *et al.* (2016).

77. *Epeorus (Epeorus) zaitzevi* Tshernova, 1981:

- This species was given as *Epeorus zaitzevi* in Tanatmış (1999), Kazancı (2001b), and as *Epeorus zaitzevi* in Kazancı (2009), Kazancı and Türkmen (2012), Türkmen and Kazancı (2013), Türkmen and Kazancı (2015). All nomenclature of this species in the previous studies should have been given clearly by Salur *et al.* (2016) to avoid scientific confusion.

78. *Epeorus (Ironopsis) alpicola* (Eaton, 1871):

- This species was given as *Epeorus alpicola* in Tanatmış (1995), Tanatmış (1999), Tanatmış (2000), Kazancı (2001b), Tanatmış (2002), Ertorun and Tanatmış (2004), Kazancı and Türkmen (2012), Türkmen and Kazancı (2013), Türkmen and Kazancı (2015). All nomenclature of this species in the previous studies should have been given clearly by Salur *et al.* (2016) to avoid scientific confusion.

79. *Rhithrogena amseli* (Demoulin, 1964) [sub *Epeiron*]:

- Salur *et al.* (2016) stated that “occurrence of this species in Turkey was rather questionable” without any reason or reference.

80. *Rhithrogena anatolica* Kazancı, 1985b:

- Kazancı (2001b) should also have been given again as reference in the part of “listed from Turkey” by Salur *et al.* (2016).
- The author of this species was incorrectly given as “Kazancı, 1985b” by Salur *et al.* (2016). In scientific nomenclature, use of letter in the year is incorrect. It should be given as *Rhithrogena anatolica* Kazancı, 1985.

81. *Rhithrogena beskidensis* Alba-Tercedor & Sowa, 1987:

- Salur *et al.* (2016) stated that “So far considered to represent rather a west Palaearctic taxon, distribution on the Balkans and in Turkey probably questionable (Bauernfeind and Soldan 2012: 336)”. However, Bauernfeind and Soldan (2012: 336) did not give any information about distribution of this species in Turkey.

82. *Rhithrogena germanica* Eaton, 1885:

- Salur *et al.* (2016) stated that “Larvae are very difficult to separate from several representatives of the *R. semicolorata* species-group and occurrence in Turkey probably doubtful (Bauernfeind and Soldan 2012: 344)”. However, Bauernfeind and Soldan (2012: 345, not 344) did not give any information about distribution of this species in Turkey.

83. *Rhithrogena iridina kownackorum* Sowa & Zimmermann, 1975:

- Although Türkmen and Kazancı (2015) did not specify sub-specific nomenclature for *Rhithrogena iridina*, Salur *et al.* (2016) claimed that this species was *Rhithrogena iridina kownackorum*.

84. *Rhithrogena loyolae* Navás, 1922:

- Salur *et al.* (2016) stated that “So far considered to represent a west-central Palaearctic taxon, distribution on the Balkans and in Turkey probably questionable (Bauernfeind and Soldan 2012: 368)”. However, Bauernfeind and Soldan (2012: 368) did not give any information about distribution of this species in Turkey.
- Reference of Kazancı (1984) was not included in the “References”. Citation of Kazancı (1984) was mistakenly given as Kazancı (1985a) in the “annotated catalogue” by Salur *et al.* (2016).

85. *Rhithrogena puytoraci* Sowa & Degrange, 1987:

- Salur *et al.* (2016) stated that “So far considered to represent rather a central Palaearctic taxon, distribution in Turkey probably questionable (Bauernfeind and Soldan 2012: 378)”. However, Bauernfeind and Soldan (2012: 378) did not give any information about distribution of this species in Turkey.

86. *Rhithrogena semicolorata* (Curtis, 1834):

- Reference of Kazancı (1984) was not included in the “References”. Citation of Kazancı (1984) was mistakenly given as Kazancı (1985a) in the “annotated catalogue” by Salur *et al.* (2016).

87. *Rhithrogena tibialis* (Ulmer, 1920):

- Salur *et al.* (2016) noted that Tshernova and Belov (1982) gave *Rhithrogena tibialis* record from Bursa. However, Tshernova and Belov (1982) did not give species record of *Rhithrogena tibialis* from Bursa. They transferred *Cinygma tibiale* to *Epeorus (Epeorus) tibialis* as comb. nov. by using Ulmer’s description (Ulmer 1920).
- This species was given as *Epeorus (Epeorus) tibialis* in Tshernova and Belov (1982). The nomenclature of this species in the previous study should have been given clearly by Salur *et al.* (2016) to avoid scientific confusion.

88. *Rhithrogena zelinkai* Sowa & Soldán, 1984:

- Salur *et al.* (2016) stated that “So far considered to represent a central Palaearctic taxon, distribution in Turkey is probably questionable (Bauernfeind and Soldan 2012: 378)”. However, Bauernfeind and Soldan (2012: 369, not 378) did not give any information about distribution of this species in Turkey.

89. *Rhithrogena znojkoii* (Tshernova, 1938) [sub *Ecdyonurus* ? *znojkoii*]:

- *Rhithrogena znojkoii* was listed by Tanatmış (1999); however, it was not cited in the part of “listed from Turkey” by Salur *et al.* (2016).
- Reference of Kazancı (1984) was not included in the “References”. Citation of Kazancı (1984) was mistakenly given as Kazancı (1985a) in the “annotated catalogue” by Salur *et al.* (2016).

90. *Heptagenia (Dacnogenia) coerulans* Rostock, 1878:

- This species was given as *Heptagenia coerulans* in Kazancı (1986a), Koch (1988), Tanatmış (2000), Kazancı (2001a), Kazancı (2001b), Tanatmış (2002) Kazancı (2009), and as *Dacnogenia coerulans coerulans* in Kazancı and Türkmen (2012). All nomenclature of this species in the previous studies should have been given clearly by Salur *et al.* (2016) to avoid scientific confusion.

91. *Heptagenia (Dacnogenia) coerulans micracantha* Kluge, 1989:

- This species was given as *Heptagenia coerulans* in Tanatmış (2004a). However, it is not clear that why this species was given as *Heptagenia (Dacnogenia) coerulans micracantha* by Salur *et al.* (2016). This fact should have been explained by Salur *et al.* (2016) to avoid scientific confusion.
- This species was given as *Dacnogenia coerulans micracantha* in Kazancı and Türkmen (2012). The nomenclature of this species in the previous study should have been given clearly by Salur *et al.* (2016) to avoid scientific confusion.

92. *Heptagenia (Heptagenia) longicauda* (Stephens, 1836):

- This species was given as *Heptagenia longicauda* in Kazancı (1986a), Tanatmış (1999), Tanatmış (2000), Kazancı (2001b), Tanatmış (2002), Tanatmış (2004a), Narin and Tanatmış (2004), Ertorun and Tanatmış (2004), Kazancı and Türkmen (2012). All nomenclature of this species in the previous studies should have been given clearly by Salur *et al.* (2016) to avoid scientific confusion.
- Kazancı (2001b) should also have been given again as reference in the part of “listed from Turkey” by Salur *et al.* (2016).

93. *Heptagenia (Heptagenia) perflava* Brodsky, 1930:

- This species was given as *Heptagenia perflava* in Kazancı (2009), Kazancı and Türkmen (2012). All nomenclature of this species in the previous studies should have been given clearly by Salur *et al.* (2016) to avoid scientific confusion.

94. *Heptagenia (Heptagenia) sulphurea* (O.F. Müller, 1776):

- This species was given as *Heptagenia sulphurea* in Tanatmış (1995), Tanatmış (1999), Kazancı (2001b), Kazancı and Türkmen (2012). All nomenclature of this species in the previous studies should have been given clearly by Salur *et al.* (2016) to avoid scientific confusion.
- Kazancı (2001b) should also have been given again as reference in the part of “listed from Turkey” by Salur *et al.* (2016).
- The author of this species was incorrectly given as “(O.F. Müller, 1776)”. In scientific nomenclature, use of the abbreviations of the first name of the author is incorrect. It should be given as *Heptagenia (Heptagenia) sulphurea* (Müller, 1776).

95. *Choroterpes (Choroterpes) picteti* Eaton, 1871:

- This species was given as *Choroterpes picteti* in Kazancı (1985a, actually 1984), Koch (1985), Tanatmış (1997), Tanatmış (1999), Tanatmış (2000), Kazancı (2001b), Tanatmış (2002), Tanatmış (2004a), Tanatmış (2004b), Tanatmış and Ertorun (2006), Tanatmış (2007), Kazancı and Girgin (2008), Kazancı and Türkmen (2012). All nomenclature of this species in the previous studies should have been given clearly by Salur *et al.* (2016) to avoid scientific confusion.
- Reference of Kazancı (1984) was not included in the “References”. Citation of Kazancı (1984) was mistakenly given as Kazancı (1985a) in the “annotated catalogue” by Salur *et al.* (2016).

96. *Choroterpes (Euthralus) balcanica* (Ikonomov, 1961):

- This species was given as *Choroterpes (Euthralus) balcanicus* in Kazancı (2001b), and as *Euthralus balcanicus* in Kazancı and Türkmen (2012). All nomenclature of this species in the previous studies should have been given clearly by Salur *et al.* (2016) to avoid scientific confusion.
- Kazancı (2001b) should also have been given again as reference in the part of “listed from Turkey” by Salur *et al.* (2016).

97. *Paraleptophlebia submarginata* (Stephens, 1836):

- Kazancı (2001b) should also have been given again as reference in the part of “listed from Turkey” by Salur *et al.* (2016).

98. *Paraleptophlebia wernerii* Ulmer, 1920:

- Kazancı (2001b) should also have been given again as reference in the part of “listed from Turkey” by Salur *et al.* (2016).

99. *Habroleptoides caucasica* Tshernova, 1931:

- Kazancı (2001b) should also have been given again as reference in the part of “listed from Turkey” by Salur *et al.* (2016).

100. *Habroleptoides confusa* Sartori & Jacob, 1986:

- This species was given as *Habroleptoides modesta* in Tanatmış (1997), Tanatmış (1999), Tanatmış (2000), Kazancı (2001b), Tanatmış (2004a), Tanatmış and Ertorun (2006), Tanatmış (2007), Tanatmış and Ertorun (2008), Özyurt and Tanatmış (2011), Kazancı and Türkmen (2012), Türkmen and Kazancı (2013), Türkmen and Kazancı (2015). All nomenclature of this species in the previous studies should have been given clearly by Salur *et al.* (2016) to avoid scientific confusion.
- Salur *et al.* (2016) noted that this species was given as *Habroleptoides confuse* in Tanatmış (2002). However, this species was given as *Habroleptoides confusa* in Tanatmış (2002).
- Salur *et al.* (2016) noted that this species was given as *Habroleptoides confuse* in Türkmen and Kazancı (2015). However, this species was given as *Habroleptoides modesta* in Türkmen and Kazancı (2015).
- Reference of Kazancı (1984) was not included in the “References”. Citation of Kazancı (1984) was mistakenly given as Kazancı (1985a) in the “annotated catalogue” by Salur *et al.* (2016).

101. *Habroleptoides kavron* Kazancı & Türkmen, 2011:

- Salur *et al.* (2016) stated that “Imagines very similar to *Habroleptoides confusa* Sartori and Jacob, 1986 and other related taxa, hardly separable without doubt”. However, Kazancı and Türkmen (2011) compared *Habroleptoides kavron* with *Habroleptoides confusa* and clearly specified some distinctive diagnostic characters of *H. kavron* from *H. confusa*.
- In the part of “Type country and locality”, Salur *et al.* (2016) stated that “Turkey The stream that is inflowing Büyük Deniz Lake (the type locality is located in the Kaçkar Mountains, Upper Kavron Highland, the province of Rize) (Kazancı and Türkmen 2011)”. However, type locality of this species was given clearly and exactly as “TURKEY - Eastern Black Sea Region - Rize - Upper Kavron Highland - the stream inflowing Büyük Deniz Lake - Kaçkar Mountains, 40 51 58.45N, 41 09 42.75E, 2950m, 23.VII.1994” by Kazancı and Türkmen (2011). Salur *et al.* (2016) recorded the type locality of the species with missing information from the original paper by Kazancı and Türkmen (2011).

102. *Habrophlebia fusca* (Curtis, 1834):

- Reference of Kazancı (1984) was not included in the “References”. Citation of Kazancı (1984) was mistakenly given as Kazancı (1985a) in the “annotated catalogue” by Salur *et al.* (2016).

103. *Habrophlebia lauta* Eaton, 1884:

- Reference of Kazancı (1984) was not included in the “References”. Citation of Kazancı (1984) was mistakenly given as Kazancı (1985a) in the “annotated catalogue” by Salur *et al.* (2016).

104. *Ephemera danica* Müller, 1764:

- Kazancı (2001b) should also have been given again as reference in the part of “listed from Turkey” by Salur *et al.* (2016).
- Reference of Kazancı (1984) was not included in the “References”. Citation of Kazancı (1984) was mistakenly given as Kazancı (1985a) in the “annotated catalogue” by Salur *et al.* (2016).

105. *Ephemera glaucops* Pictet, 1843:

- Kazancı (2001b) should also have been given again as reference in the part of “listed from Turkey” by Salur *et al.* (2016).

106. *Ephemera lineata* Eaton, 1870:

- Kazancı (2001b) should also have been given again as reference in the part of “listed from Turkey” by Salur *et al.* (2016).

107. *Ephemera vulgata* Linnaeus, 1758:

- Kazancı (2001b) should also have been given again as reference in the part of “listed from Turkey” by Salur *et al.* (2016).
- Reference of Kazancı (1984) was not included in the “References”. Citation of Kazancı (1984) was mistakenly given as Kazancı (1985a) in the “annotated catalogue” by Salur *et al.* (2016).

108. *Ephoron virgo* (Olivier, 1791):

- Kazancı (2001b) should also have been given again as reference in the part of “listed from Turkey” by Salur *et al.* (2016).
- Reference of Kazancı (1984) was not included in the “References”. Citation of Kazancı (1984) was mistakenly given as Kazancı (1985a) in the “annotated catalogue” by Salur *et al.* (2016).

109. *Potamanthus luteus* (Linné, 1767):

- Kazancı (2001b) should also have been given again as reference in the part of “listed from Turkey” by Salur *et al.* (2016).
- Reference of Kazancı (1984) was not included in the “References”. Citation of Kazancı (1984) was mistakenly given as Kazancı (1985a) in the “annotated catalogue” by Salur *et al.* (2016).

110. *Ephemerella mucronata* (Bengtsson, 1909):

- Kazancı (2001b) should also have been given again as reference in the part of “listed from Turkey” by Salur *et al.* (2016).

111. *Ephemerella notata* Eaton, 1887:

- Kazancı (2001b) should also have been given again as reference in the part of “listed from Turkey” by Salur *et al.* (2016).

112. *Ephemerella ignita* (Poda, 1761):

- This species was given as *Serratella ignita* in Tanatmış (2004a), Tanatmış (2007), Özyurt and Tanatmış (2011), Kazancı and Türkmen (2012), Türkmen and Kazancı (2013), Türkmen and Kazancı (2015), Aydınli and Ertorun (2015).

All nomenclature of this species in the previous studies should have been given clearly by Salur *et al.* (2016) to avoid scientific confusion.

- Reference of Kazancı (1984) was not included in the “References”. Citation of Kazancı (1984) was mistakenly given as Kazancı (1985a) in the “annotated catalogue” by Salur *et al.* (2016).

113. *Ephemerella mesoleuca* (Brauer, 1857):

- This species was given as *Serratella mesoleuca* in Tanatmış (2004a), and as *Teloganopsis mesoleuca* in Kazancı and Türkmen (2012). All nomenclature of this species in the previous studies should have been given clearly by Salur *et al.* (2016) to avoid scientific confusion.

114. *Drunella karia* Kazancı, 1990:

- This species was given as *Serratella karia* in Kazancı and Türkmen (2012). The nomenclature of this species in the previous study should have been given clearly by Salur *et al.* (2016) to avoid scientific confusion.

115. *Drunella euphratica* Kazancı, 1987:

- This species was given as *Quatica euphratica* in Kazancı and Türkmen (2012). The nomenclature of this species in the previous study should have been given clearly by Salur *et al.* (2016) to avoid scientific confusion.

116. *Torleya major* (Klapálek, 1905):

- This species was given as *Ephemerella major* in Kazancı (1985a, actually 1984), Tanatmış (1999), Kazancı (2001b), Kazancı and Girgin (2008), Kazancı and Türkmen (2008b). All nomenclature of this species in the previous studies should have been given clearly by Salur *et al.* (2016) to avoid scientific confusion.
- Kazancı (2001b) should also have been given again as reference in the part of “listed from Turkey” by Salur *et al.* (2016).
- Reference of Kazancı (1984) was not included in the “References”. Citation of Kazancı (1984) was mistakenly given as Kazancı (1985a) in the “annotated catalogue” by Salur *et al.* (2016).

117. *Brachycercus harrisellus* Curtis, 1834:

- This species was given as *Brachycercus harrisella* in Tanatmış (2002), Kazancı and Türkmen (2012). All nomenclature of this species in the previous studies should have been given clearly by Salur *et al.* (2016) to avoid scientific confusion.

118. *Caenis horaria* (Linnaeus, 1758):

- Kazancı (2001b) should also have been given again as reference in the part of “listed from Turkey” by Salur *et al.* (2016).

119. *Caenis luctuosa* (Burmeister, 1839):

- Kazancı (2001b) should also have been given again as reference in the part of “listed from Turkey” by Salur *et al.* (2016).

120. *Caenis macrura* Stephens, 1836:

- Kazancı (2001b) should also have been given again as reference in the part of “listed from Turkey” by Salur *et al.* (2016).

121. *Caenis robusta* Eaton, 1884:

- *Caenis robusta* was listed by Kazancı (2001b); however, it was not cited in the part of “listed from Turkey” by Salur *et al.* (2016).

122. *Prosopistoma orhanelicum* Dalkiran, 2009:

- In the part of “Type country and locality”, Salur *et al.* (2016) stated that “Turkey, Deliballılar site (Deliballılar is located in the district of Orhaneli in Orhaneli stream, the province of Bursa) (Dalkiran 2009)”. However, type locality of this species was given clearly and exactly as “northwestern Turkey, Bursa province, Orhaneli district, Orhaneli stream, Deliballılar site (39°55’56” N, 28°58’21” E), 01.XI.2001. 345 m a.s.l” by Dalkiran (2009). Salur *et al.* (2016) reported the type locality of the species with missing information from the original paper by Dalkiran (2009).

123. *Prosopistoma pennigerum* (O.F. Müller, 1785):

- This species was given as *Prosopistoma foliaceum* in Tanatmış (1999), Kazancı (2001b). All nomenclature of this species in the previous studies should have been given clearly by Salur *et al.* (2016) to avoid scientific confusion.
- The author of this species was incorrectly given as “(O.F. Müller, 1785)”. In scientific nomenclature, use of the abbreviations of the first name of the author is incorrect. It should be given as *Prosopistoma pennigerum* (Müller, 1785).

CONCLUSION

Confusions, mistakes and incomplete information, which needed to be corrected and added, are summarized as follows;

- Salur *et al.* (2016) stated that nomenclature of families was given according to Bauernfeind and Soldan (2012). However, the nomenclature of many species were not given according to Bauernfeind and Soldan (2012) (for example, see *Siphonurus aestivalis*, *Procloeon nana*).
- Many species that were included in the previous Ephemeroptera lists from Turkey were not given by Salur *et al.* (2016) in the part of “listed from Turkey” of the related species (for example, see *Siphonurus muchei*, *Caenis robusta*, *Rhithrogena znojkoii*).
- The nomenclature of many species in the previous Ephemeroptera studies were not given by Salur *et al.* (2016) (for example, see *Baetis (Acentrella) inexpectatus*, *Procloeon pennulatum*, *Oligoneuriella tsxhomelidzei*).
- There were some misinterpretations about the occurrence of some species in Turkey in Salur *et al.* (2016), due to not consulting to the experts who have been studying Ephemeroptera for many years in Turkey (for example, see *Baetis (Acentrella) lapponicus*, *Baetis (Labiobaetis) tricolor*).
- Some geographical information was misinterpreted by Salur *et al.* (2016) (for example, see *Baetis (Labiobaetis) tricolor*).
- Single species record was used for two different species by Salur *et al.* (2016) (for example, see *Baetis (Rhodobaetis) bisri*, *Baetis (Rhodobaetis) braaschi*).
- Type localities of some species in the original papers were given incorrectly (for example, see *Baetis (Nigrobaetis) kars*, *Baetis (Rhodobaetis) braaschi*) or with missing information (for example, see *Habroleptoides kavron*, *Prosopistoma orhanelicum*) by Salur *et al.* (2016).
- Some information in the original papers were misinterpreted by Salur *et al.* (2016) (for example, see *Baetis (Rhodobaetis) milani*, *Baetis (Rhodobaetis) pseudogemellus*).
- Some species names given in the previous studies were given as different species names by Salur *et al.* (2016) (for example, see *Oligoneuriella tsxhomelidzei*, *Habroleptoides modesta*).
- Some species which were not included in the original paper were recorded by Salur *et al.* (2016) as if it was given in the original paper (for example, see *Epeorus (Caucasiron) caucasicus*).

- Although distributional information of some species in Turkey were not given by Bauernfeind and Soldan (2012), Salur *et al.* (2016) reported the information as if it was given in the Bauernfeind and Soldan (2012) (for example, see *Rhithrogena beskidensis*, *Rhithrogena germanica*, *Rhithrogena loyolaeva*).
- According to the scientific nomenclature, the authors of some species were written incorrectly by Salur *et al.* (For example, see *Centroptilum luteolum*, *Rhithrogena anatolica*)
- The aim of an annotated catalogue is to gather information from previous studies and to ensure that they can be reached easily. Considering that the publication of Salur *et al.* (2016) is an annotated catalogue, it is necessary to use cited information correctly.

As a result, it is recommended that the annotated catalogue by Salur *et al.* (2016) has to be used with this article for future Ephemeroptera studies in order to avoid possible scientific confusions, mistakes or incomplete information.

REFERENCES

- Aydınlı, C., 2013. Sultansuyu Çayı'nın (Malatya) Ephemeroptera (Insecta) Limnofaunası. *Anadolu University Journal of Science and Technology-C* 3: 9–14.
- Aydınlı, C. and Ertorun, N., 2015. Species records of Ephemeroptera (Insecta) nymphs in the Gediz River basin with a new record for the Turkish fauna: *Labiobaetis atrebatinus* Eaton, 1870. *Turkish Journal of Zoology* 39: 587–595. doi: 10.3906/zoo-1402-64
- Barber-James, H., Sartori, M., Gattolliat, J.L. and Webb, J., 2013. World checklist of freshwater Ephemeroptera species. World Wide Web electronic publication. Available from: <http://fada.biodiversity.be/group/show/35> [cited 2015 Sep 15]
- Bauernfeind, E. and Soldan, T., 2012. *The Mayflies of Europe (Ephemeroptera)*. Apollo Books, Leiden, 781 pp.
- Berker, F., 1981. Keban Barajı ve Keban'a dökülen nehirler ile Elazığ bölgesinin Ephemeroptera (Insecta) Limnofaunasının (Larvalarının) Saptanması ve Sistemik İncelenmesi. *Fırat University Medical Journal of Health Sciences* 6: 124–139.
- Braasch, D., 1981. Eintagsfliegen aus Anatolien und Iran (Ephemeroptera, Insecta). *Faunistische Abhandlungen Staatliches Museum für Tierkunde in Dresden* 8: 75–79.

- Dalkiran, N., 2009. A new species of *Prosopistoma* Latreille, 1833 (Ephemeroptera: Prosopistomatidae) from northwestern Turkey. *Aquatic Insects* 31: 119–131. doi: 10.1080/01650420802642414
- Ertorun, N. and Tanatmış, M., 2004. Karasu Çayı (Sinop)' nın Ephemeroptera (Insecta) Limnofaunası. *Anadolu Üniversitesi Bilim ve Teknoloji Dergisi* 5: 107–114.
- Godunko, R.J., Prokopov, G.A., Kluge, N. and Novikova, E.A., 2004. Mayflies of the Crimean Peninsula. II. *Baetis braaschi* Zimmermann, 1980 (= *B. stipposus* Kluge, 1982 syn. n.) (Ephemeroptera: Baetidae). *Acta Zoologica Cracoviensia* 47: 155–166. doi: 10.3409/173491504783995807
- Godunko, R.J., Palatov, D.M. and Martynov, A.V., 2015. Mayflies of the Caucasus Mountains. III. A new representative of the subgenus *Rhodobaetis* Jacob, 2003 (Baetidae: *Baetis*) from the South-Western Caucasus. *Zootaxa* 3948: 182–202. doi: 10.11646/zootaxa.3948.2.2
- Haybach, A., 1998. Die Eintagsfliegen (Insecta: Ephemeroptera) von Rheinland Pfalz. Zoogeographie, Faunistic, Ökologie, Taxonomie und Nomenklatur. Unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Familie Heptageniidae und unter Einbeziehung der übrigen aus Deutschland bekannten Arten. Dissertation Johannes-Gutenberg-Universität Mainz, 417pp.
- Haybach, A. and Jacob, U., 2010. Zoogeographische Analyse der deutschen Eintagsfliegenfauna (Insecta: Ephemeroptera). *Lauternbornia* 71: 79-91.
- Kazancı, N., 1984. New Ephemeroptera (Insecta) records from Turkey. *Aquatic Insects* 6: 253–258. [1984, publ. 1985]
- Kazancı, N., 1986a. New Ephemeroptera records from Turkey. *Zoology in the Middle East* 1: 141–143. doi: 10.1080/09397140.1986.10637539
- Kazancı, N., 1986b. A new Ephemeroptera (Heptageniidae) species from Anatolia. *Turkish Journal of Biology* 10: 391–393.
- Kazancı, N., 1998a. Additional Ephemeroptera (Insecta) Records from Turkey and their Zoogeography. *Proceeding of the 6th European Congress of Entomology*. 1998 Aug 23–29; Ceske Budejovice, Czech Republic, 418–419.
- Kazancı, N., 1998b. Burdur Gölü ve Acıgöl'ün Limnolojisi, Çevre Kalitesi ve Biyolojik Çeşitliliği. *Türkiye İçsuları Araştırmaları Dizisi III*, Ankara.
- Kazancı, N., 2001a. Gümüşhane, Erzurum, Erzincan, Artvin, Kars İlleri Ephemeroptera Faunası Üzerine Ön Çalışma. *Türkiye İç Suları Araştırmaları Dizisi V* (Ed. Nilgün Kazancı). İmaj Yayınevi, Ankara.
- Kazancı, N., 2001b. Türkiye Ephemeroptera (Insecta) Faunası. *Türkiye İç Suları Araştırma Dizisi IX*, İmaj Yayınevi, Ankara.
- Kazancı, N., 2009. Ephemeroptera (Insecta) Fauna of Turkey: Records from Eastern Anatolia (Turkey). *Review of Hydrobiology* 2: 187–195.

- Kazancı, N. and Braasch, D., 1988. On some new Heptageniide (Ephemeroptera) from Anatolia. Faunistische Abhandlungen Staatliches Museum für Tierkunde in Dresden 15: 131–135.
- Kazancı, N. and Girgin, S., 2008. Ephemeroptera, Odonata, Plecoptera (Insecta) fauna of Ankara Stream (Turkey). Review of Hydrobiology 1: 37–44.
- Kazancı, N. and Thomas, A.G.B., 1989. Complements et corrections a la faune des Ephemeropteres du Proche-Orient: 2. *Baetis kars* n. sp. de Turquie. Mittheilungen der Schweizer Entomologischen Gesellschaft 62: 323–327.
- Kazancı, N. and Türkmen, G., 2008a. Research on Ephemeroptera (Insecta) fauna of Yedigöller National Park (Bolu, Turkey): water quality and reference habitat indicators. Review of Hydrobiology 1: 53–72.
- Kazancı, N. and Türkmen, G., 2008b. Ephemeroptera (Insecta) Türlerinin Bir Koruma Alanındaki Akarsuların Habitat Özelliklerini ve Koruma Alanı Sınırlarını Belirlemede İndikatör Olarak Kullanılması. Ege Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences 25: 325–331.
- Kazancı, N. and Türkmen, G., 2011. *Habroleptoides kavron* sp. n., a new species (Ephemeroptera, Leptophlebiidae) from Eastern Black Sea Region (Turkey) with ecological notes. Review of Hydrobiology 4: 63–72.
- Kazancı, N. and Türkmen, G., 2012. The checklist of Ephemeroptera (Insecta) species of Turkey. Review of Hydrobiology 5: 143–156.
- Kazancı, N. and Türkmen, G., 2015. The swarm of *Ephoron virgo* (Olivier, 1791) (Ephemeroptera: Polymitarcyidae) in Kura River (Turkey). Review of Hydrobiology 8: 63–50.
- Kazancı, N., İzbirak, A., Çağlar, S.S. and Gökçe, D., 1992. Köyceğiz-Dalyan Özel Çevre Koruma Bölgesi Sucul Ekosisteminin Hidrobiyolojik Yönden İncelenmesi. Özyurt Matbaası, Ankara.
- Kazancı, N., Türkmen, G. and Bolat, H.A., 2012. Habitat characteristics of endangered species *Marthamea vitripennis* (Burmeister 1839) (Insecta, Plecoptera). Review of Hydrobiology 5:1–18.
- Koch, S., 1985. Eintagsfliegen aus der Türkei und Beschreibung einer neuen Baetis-Art: *B. macrospinosus* n. sp. (Insecta: Ephemeroptera: Baetidae). Senckenbergiana biologica 66: 105–110.
- Koch, S., 1988. Mayflies of the northern Levant (Insecta: Ephemeroptera). Zoology in the Middle East 2: 89–112. doi: 10.1080/09397140.1988.10637565
- Narin, N.O. and Tanatmış, M., 2004. Gönen (Balıkesir) ve Biga (Çanakkale) Çayları'nın Ephemeroptera (Insecta) Limnofaunası. Balıkesir Üniversitesi Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü 6: 16–25.

- Özyurt, I. and Tanatmış, M., 2011. Akşehir (Konya-Afyon) ve Eber (Afyon) gölleri havzalarının Ephemeroptera (Insecta) limnofaunası. Afyon Kocatepe University Journal of Sciences and Engineering 8: 29–39.
- Puthz, V., 1972. Einige Ephemeropteren (Insecta) aus der Türkei gesammelt von W. Wittmer (Basel). Mittheilungen der Schweizer Entomologischen Gesellschaft 45: 35–36.
- Puthz, V., 1973. Ephemeropteren aus den östlichen Mittelmeerländern. Fragmenta Entomologica 9: 15–19.
- Salur, A., Darılmaz, M.C. and Bauernfeind, E., 2016. An annotated catalogue of the mayfly fauna of Turkey (Insecta, Ephemeroptera). ZooKeys 620: 67–118. doi: 10.3897/zookeys.620.9405
- Tanatmış, M., 1995. Sakarya Nehir Sistemi Ephemeroptera Limnofaunası'nın belirlenmesi üzerine araştırmalar. Türkiye Entomoloji Dergisi 19: 287–298.
- Tanatmış, M., 1997. On the Ephemeroptera Fauna (Insecta) of Thrace. Zoology in the Middle East 15: 95–106. doi: 10.1080/09397140.1997.10637744
- Tanatmış, M., 1999. Genel ve Türkiye Zoocoğrafyası. Meteksan, Ankara. Türkiye Ephemeroptera türleri ve yayılışları, 739–747.
- Tanatmış, M., 2000. Susurluk (Simav) Çayı ve Manyas Gölü Havzası'nın Ephemeroptera (Insecta) Faunası. Türkiye Entomoloji Dergisi 24: 55–67.
- Tanatmış, M., 2002. The Ephemeroptera (Insecta) fauna of Lake Ulubat basin. Turkish Journal of Zoology 26: 53–61.
- Tanatmış, M., 2004a. Filyos (Yenice) Irmağı Havzası'nın Ephemeroptera (Insecta) faunası. Türkiye Entomoloji Dergisi 28: 229–240.
- Tanatmış, M., 2004b. Gökırmak Nehir Havzası (Kastamonu) ile Cide (Kastamonu) – Ayancık (Sinop) arası sahil bölgesinin Ephemeroptera (Insecta) faunası. Türkiye Entomoloji Dergisi 28: 45–56.
- Tanatmış, M., 2007. Efteni (Melen) Gölü Havzası İle Melenagzı (Düzce) – Zonguldak Arası Sahil Bölgesinin Ephemeroptera (Insecta) Faunası. Anadolu University Journal of Science and Technology 8: 111–119.
- Tanatmış, M. and Ertorun, N. 2006. Bartın Çayı (Bartın) Havzası'nın Ephemeroptera (Insecta) Limnofaunası. Ege Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences 23: 145–148.
- Tanatmış, M. and Ertorun, N., 2008. Kabalı Çayı (Sinop) Havzası'nın Ephemeroptera (Insecta) Limnofaunası. Turkish Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences 2: 329–331.
- Taşdemir, A., Ustaoglu, M., Balık, S. and Sarı, H.M., 2008. Batı Karadeniz Bölgesindeki (Türkiye) Bazı Göllerin Diptera ve Ephemeroptera Faunası. Journal of Fisheries Sciences 2: 252–260.

- Thomas, A., Marie, V. and Brulin, M., 1999. Corrections à la faune des Éphémères d'Europe occidentale: 2. *Epeorus assimilis* Eaton, 1885 est une espèce valide, distincte d'*E. sylvicolus* (Pictet, 1865) [Ephemeroptera, Heptageniidae]. *Ephemera* 1: 85–91.
- Tshernova, O.A. and Belov, V.V., 1982. Systematic position and synonymy of *Cinygma tibiale* Ulmer, 1920 (Ephemeroptera, Heptageniidae). *Entomologische Mitteilungen aus dem Zoologischen Museum Hamburg* 7: 193-194.
- Türkmen, G. and Kazancı, N., 2013. The key to the Ephemeroptera (Insecta) larvae in running waters of the Eastern Black Sea Basin (Turkey) with the new records. *Review of Hydrobiology* 6: 31–55.
- Türkmen, G. and Kazancı, N., 2015. Additional records of Ephemeroptera (Insecta) species from the Eastern Part of Black Sea Region (Turkey). *Review of Hydrobiology* 8: 33–50.
- Türkmen, G. and Özkan, N., 2011. Larval Ephemeroptera records from Marmara Island and Kapıdağ Peninsula (North-Western Turkey) with new record of *Baetis milani* Godunko, Prokopov and Soldán 2004. *Review of Hydrobiology* 4: 99–113.
- Ulmer, G., 1920. Neue Ephemeropteren. *Archiv für Naturgeschichte Abteilung A* 85: 1–80.
- Zimmermann, W., 1981. Beitrag zur Kenntnis der Gattung *Baetis* Leach, 1815 (Insecta: Ephemeroptera) im Kaukasus und in Transkaukasien (USSR). *Entomologische Nachrichten und Berichte* 25,7/8: 97-112.