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ABSTRACT
The use of parentheses with the authors of scientific names of fish is very often wrong. For instance, *Rutilus rutilus* L. and *Perca fluviatilis* (L.) are wrongly used instead of the correct *Rutilus rutilus* (L.) and *Perca fluviatilis* L., respectively. A review of a CD-ROM bibliographic database showed that up to 89% of papers that included the authority of some fish species, committed this kind of error. Authors, reviewers, and editorial boards are urged to more carefully check these and similar aspects on manuscripts.
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According to the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature (International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, 1985), the authority of scientific names of species must be written between parentheses when the original specific name is now associated to another genus. However, this practice is often forgotten and misuse is very common. For instance, Prejs (1978), Prejs and Jackowska (1978), Hofer (1979), Niederholzer and Hofer (1979), Jelonek (1986), and Jamet et al. (1990) wrongly quote *Rutilus rutilus* L. instead of *Rutilus rutilus* (L.), while Giles et al. (1990) quote *Perca fluviatilis* (L.) instead of *Perca fluviatilis* L. (note errors in *Scardinius erythrophthalmus* (L.) as well). The inclusion of the authors of the name is optional (International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, 1985) and is...
not followed in most biological papers; e.g., among the papers on roach (R. rutilus) abstracted in the CD-ROM Life Sciences Collection 1990-1992 (Cambridge Scientific Abstracts): 28 quoted (in the title or the abstract) the scientific name with the author, 35 quoted the name without the author, and 10 quoted only the common name (i.e., roach). The equivalent figures for perch (P. fluviatilis) were 21, 51, and 8, respectively. The practice of quoting only the common name, probably more limited to articles on physiology or fundamental biology, seems unsuitable, as it complicates the identification of the paper in the database by potentially interested readers.

Unfortunately, the inclusion of the author is very often wrong. A review of a CD-ROM bibliographic database showed an unexpectedly high number of mistakes for recent literature. Of the papers that included the authority, up to 89% were wrong for some fish species (Table 1). Logically, the error of omitting the parentheses was more common than adding them. These statistics urge authors, reviewers, and editorial boards to check these and similar aspects on manuscripts more carefully. A good reference for European fish is Wheeler (1992).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common name</th>
<th>Scientific name</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Number of correct citations</th>
<th>Incorrect author</th>
<th>Number of incorrect citations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European eel</td>
<td>Anguilla angilla</td>
<td>(L.)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>L.</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>goldfish</td>
<td>Carassius auratus</td>
<td>(L.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>L.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>common carp</td>
<td>Cyprinus carpio</td>
<td>L.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>(L.)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perch</td>
<td>Perca fluviatilis</td>
<td>L.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>(L.)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>roach</td>
<td>Rutilus rutilus</td>
<td>(L.)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>L.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trout</td>
<td>Salmo trutta</td>
<td>L.</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>(L.)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Number of papers with correct and incorrect authors for selected fish species in the papers abstracted in the CD-ROM Life Sciences Collection 1990-1992 (Cambridge Scientific Abstracts).
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