

## COMMENTS ON: The Ostracoda (Crustacea) Fauna of Lakes Erikli, Hamam, Mert, Pedina and Saka (İğneada, Kırklareli, Turkey)

Okan KÜLKÖYLÜOĞLU, Erdoğan USTA, M. Tekin BABAÇ

Abant İzzet Baysal University, Department of Biology, Hydrobiology Program, Gölköy, 14280, Bolu - TURKEY  
e-mail: okank@ibu.edu.tr

Received: 30.05.2002

In his paper (Tr. J Zool, 25(4): 343-355), Altınışalı (1) proposed that three ostracod species (*Pseudocandona* [=Candona] *hartwigi*, *Ilyocypris monstrifica*, *Limnocythere stationis*) were new records for the Ostracoda fauna of Turkey. (The square brackets are ours.)

We have three comments concerning this paper.

First, the author mistakenly proposed that these three species were new records for Turkey. The same three species had previously been documented in a PhD dissertation by Özüluğ (2), which was accepted by both the Scientific Institute of İstanbul University and a dissertation committee in February 2000. Therefore, the reports on this dissertation should have priority over Altınışalı (1).

Second, the sample collection period in Özüluğ (2) was from 28.06.1996 to 18.08.1999. Samples were taken from the Thrace region (Trakya Bölgesi) at 108 stations. However, Altınışalı (1) stated (page 344) that "...samples were collected from 20 stations in the summer (July 12), autumn (September 6), winter (February 22) and spring (May 10) 1999". Therefore, this again shows the priority of Özüluğ (2).

Third, these arguments above are also supported by the date Altınışalı's paper was received by the journal editor (21.04.2000, page 343), two months later than Özüluğ's dissertation, which was accepted in February 2000.

Finally, scientific ethics are as important as the scientific method itself. Scientists should not only be unbiased in their work to prevent methodological errors such as pseudoreplication (3), but they must also be responsible for proper and accurate reporting of their results. Science (especially experimental science) should be done carefully, and the results should not be sent for publication without adequate research and knowledge of other similar work. We are hopefully optimistic that the dissertation of Özüluğ (2) was not known by Altınışalı, despite the fact that both work at the same department.

In conclusion, all these support our earlier arguments that the results in Altınışalı's (1) paper about the three ostracod species proposed as new records from Turkey should not be accepted because the same three species from the same study area had already been identified in Özüluğ (2), which has priority.

### References

1. Altınışalı, S. The Ostracoda (Crustacea) Fauna of Lakes Erikli, Hamam, Mert, Pedina and Saka (İğneada, Kırklareli, Turkey). Turk. J. Zool. 25(4): 343-355, 2001.
2. Özüluğ, O. Trakya Bölgesi Ostrakod (Crustacea) faunası. Doktora Tezi. (Şubat 2000). 70 pages. İstanbul Üniversitesi Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü. İstanbul, 2000.
3. Hurlbert, S.H. Pseudoreplication and the design of ecological field experiments. Ecological Monographs, 54(2):187-211, 1984.