



Contributions to the knowledge of the Quediina (Coleoptera, Staphylinidae, Staphylinini) of China. Part 32. Genus *Quedius* Stephens, 1829. Subgenus *Distichalius* Casey, 1915. Section 3

ALEŠ SMETANA

Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada, Central Experimental Farm, K. W. Neatby Bldg., Ottawa, ON K1A 0C6, Canada.

E-mail: ales.smetana@agr.gc.ca

The purpose of this paper is the need to correct mistakes appearing in a paper by Zheng, Wang and Liu (Zheng *et al.* 2008), and to offer a few considerations concerning the peer reviewing of scientific papers.

The corrections may be summarized as follows: 1. *Quedius (Distichalius) wangi* Zheng, Wang & Liu, 2008, *Quedius (Distichalius) xian* Zheng, Wang & Liu, 2008 and *Quedius (Distichalius) wolong* Zheng, Wang & Liu, 2008 are removed from the *kashmirensis* species group and assigned tentatively to *annectens* species group. The *kashmirensis* species group is not represented by any species in the territory of mainland China. 2. The mainland China record of *Quedius (Distichalius) lin* Smetana, 1995 from Jinfo Shan, Chonqing, is based on misidentification and is to be disregarded. *Quedius lin* remains to be known only from the two mountain ranges Hsuehsan and Yushan in Taiwan.

Additional comment: *Quedius xian* Zheng, Wang & Liu, 2008 is quite similar to *Q. daedalus* Smetana, 2008 and may even be conspecific.

The paper by Zheng, Wang and Liu (Zheng *et al.* 2008), mentioned above, deals with some Chinese species of the subgenus *Distichalius* Casey, 1915 of the genus *Quedius* Stephens, 1829. There are some mistakes in this paper that need correction, mistakes that were pointed out by myself already in October 2006, when I was asked by the Editor of Acta Zootaxonomica Sinica to review a paper by Zheng Fa-ke and Wang Zhen-ji of the same title and basically the same content. During the reviewing process several problems were encountered. I pointed out these and suggested how they should be corrected. When returning the manuscript with the review to the Editor, I asked the Editor to resend the manuscript to me for final review. After that I was never contacted by the Editor, nor by the authors and I assumed that the paper was withdrawn. The mistakes to be corrected are as follows:

1. The three new species in the original manuscript, as well as in the published paper, were declared to belong to the *kashmirensis* species group. I explained in my review that the *kashmirensis* species group contains only one Himalayan species, a species that is characterized, among other characters, by the evenly distributed punctuation of the elytra. The authors referred in this context to my 1988 paper (Smetana 1988). In that paper I used only the different punctuation of the elytra to characterize the group, because it was sufficient for the purpose of that particular revision and it reflected the concept of the subgenus *Distichalius* at that time. I also explained that the three new species definitely do not belong to the *kashmirensis* species group and that they may represent a lineage within the *annectens* species group. Since the authors ignored this comment and proceeded to publish the three new species as members of the *kashmirensis* species group, the following corrections are to be made: *Quedius (Distichalius) wangi* Zheng, Wang & Liu, 2008: 667, *Quedius (Distichalius) xian* Zheng, Wang & Liu, 2008: 669 and *Quedius (Distichalius) wolong* Zheng, Wang & Liu, 2008: 670 are to be removed from the *kashmirensis* species group and assigned tentatively into *annectens* species group. The *kashmirensis* species group is not represented by any species in the territory of mainland China; the only member of this species group remains *Quedius (Distichalius) kashmirensis* Cameron, 1944, occurring in India (Kashmir and Uttarakhand) and Nepal.

2. The authors of the originally reviewed manuscript, as well as of the published paper, recorded *Quedius (Distichalius) lin* Smetana, 1995 from Jinfo Shan, Chonqing in mainland China. I pointed out that *Q. lin* was described from specimens collected in two mountain ranges in Taiwan (Hsuehsan and Yushan), that all specimens were taken in high altitude mountain habitats (3350m to 3720m) and that all are markedly brachypterous, obviously not capable of flight, and therefore that the occurrence of *Q. lin* in Jinfo Shan in Chonqing is as good as impossible. Despite this explanation, the authors again proceeded to record *Q. lin* from mainland China, from Jinfo Shan in Chonqing (Zheng *et al.* 2008: 672). The occurrence of *Q. lin* in Jinfo Shan, based on the above data, is quite impossible and the record should