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Summary
On the basis of the material examined by the author (with is very incomplete and mostly off old museum skins), the following chewing lice species known to infest Aepypodius bruijnii are here treated or described: Amblycera: Kelerimenon aepypodi Price & Emerson, 1966 sensu lato and Talegalligogus wilhelmi waigeuensis n. ssp.; Ischnocera: Megathellipeurus musesensis n. sp., “Oxylipeurus” aepypodius Clay, 1938, Talegallipeurus tenuis Mey, 1982, Weehalia hakalphila n. sp., and Homocerus sp. These species illustrate the close relationships between their host genera Aepypodius and Talegalla, and suggest that Alectura is more distantly related. An overview is given of the hospitalic distribution of all genera of chewing lice so far known off the Megapodiidae, with special reference to Aepypodius arfakianus and A. bruijnii.
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Zusammenfassung
Introduction

*Aepypodius bruijnii* (Oustalet, 1880), the Bruijn's Brush-turkey, is one of the rarest recent bird species in the world, and was actually rediscovered in the wild only a few years ago (Heij & Post 2001, Mauro 2002). Its epizoic and/or parasitic arthropod fauna remains hardly known. The extreme rarity of this megapode, which occurs in an apparently stable population only on the Indonesian island of Waigeo, off the north-west tip of New Guinea, is directly proportional to the rarity of its ectoparasites. This means that not only the host species, but also its highly specialized parasites face the threat of possible extinction. Among them are various representatives of the chewing lice (Insecta: Amblycera and Ischnocera) found exclusively on the Megapodiidae.

The aim of this paper is principally to document the current state of taxonomic knowledge of the chewing lice species that have been found so far on Bruijn's Brush-turkey. It is based on material obtained from some of the rare museum skins of the species, using the “shaking out” method, as well as on specimens collected off a freshly dead specimen found in October 2002 on Waigeo.

Material and Methods

The material evaluated here comes from at least five of the 24 museum skins in existence worldwide (Heij & Post 2002), which were mostly collected around 1880 and which are now in Europe and North America. Of the six skins investigated, three were from the American Museum of Natural History, New York via C. J. Heij and J. N. J. Post (1999), and three other skins via the author from the Museum für Tierkunde Dresden (1992), from the Senckenberg Museum Frankfurt am Main (1990; this was the only skin with no chewing lice material), and the Zoologisches Museum und Zoologisches Institut of the University of Hamburg (1990).

All chewing lice specimens were permanently mounted in Canada balsam, the great majority of them in the Phthiraptera collection of the Naturhistorisches Museum im Thüringer Landesmuseum Heidecksburg zu Rudolstadt, Germany; Naturhistorisches Museum im Thüringer Landesmuseum Heidecksburg zu Rudolstadt, Germany; Zoologisches Institut und Zoologisches Museum Hamburg, Germany. Material from the following institutions (with abbreviations) was made available for this study:

AMNH American Museum of Natural History, New York, USA;
ISZB Institut für Systematische Zoologie im Museum für Naturkunde, Zentralinstitut der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Germany;
MTKD Museum für Tierkunde Dresden, Senckenberg Naturhistorische Sammlungen, Germany;
NHML The Natural History Museum, London, UK;
NHMRot Natuurmuseum Rotterdam, The Netherlands;
NHMRud Naturhistorisches Museum im Thüringer Landesmuseum Heidecksburg zu Rudolstadt, Germany;
ZIMH Zoologisches Institut und Zoologisches Museum Hamburg, Germany.

Results

Systematics, species accounts

Order Phthiraptera Haeckel, 1896

Suborder Amblycera Kellogg, 1896

Family Menoponidae Mjöberg, 1910 sensu lato

Genus *Kelerimenopon* Conci, 1942

*Kelerimenopon aepypodi* Price & Emerson, 1966

Host: *Aepypodius bruijnii* (Oustalet, 1880).

Material examined:


Remarks:

In the absence of additional and better preserved material, the female is provisionally assigned to *K. aepypodi* Price & Emerson, 1966 (type host: *Aepypodius arfaki-anus*), with which it shares the prolongations of the inner ventro-posterior pleural corners on sternites ii-vii pointing posteriorly, the ventral brush of setae on femur III and laterally on sternites iv-vi (the last apparently in very low numbers), and a very similar setae pattern on the ventral terminalia. However it does not possess a frontally pointed head and shows, like *Lorimenopon* Price & Emerson, 1966, a broad, deep preocular notch. In addition it has a pronotal margin with 17 setae and metanotal margin with 22 setae.

Measurements:

TL 1.5, HL 0.36, HW 0.43, HWT 0.58, HI 0.62, PW 0.42, MW 0.52, AW 0.79.
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Genus Talegalligogus Mey, 1982

Talegalligogus wilhelmi waigeuensis n. ssp. (Fig. 1, Table 1)

Type host: Aepypodius bruijnii (Oustalet, 1880).


Diagnosis: Female: I have named this well-preserved ♂ as a new subspecies of "Colpocephalum wilhelmi Price & Beer, 1964" (type host: Aepypodius arfakianus), since only the shape and the structure (e.g. preocular region) of the head (see Figs 1 and 2) and slight differences in the setae pattern of the abdominal tergites deviate from the nominate form, with which it seems to share all other morphological characters. The number of setae in the row on the posterior margin of the tergites, each between the post-spiracular setae, varies per segment between the nominate form (according to a ♀ M. 902.g off the type host in NHMRud collection and the description by Price & Beer 1964: 398 f. of a ♂) and waigeuensis only very slightly, although the latter does possess more macrochaetae there (see Table 1). The number of posterior metanotal setae in wilhelmi is 30, in waigeuensis 28, of which only three on the corners of each side take the form of thick, medium-length macrochaetae.
Suborder Ischnocera KELLOGG, 1896

Family Philopteridae BURMEISTER, 1838 sensu lato

Genus Megathellipeurus MEY & CURIO, 1993

Megathellipeurus mumesensis n. sp. (Figs 3-4, 6, 8, 11-12, Table 2)

Type host: Aepypodius bruijnii (OUSTALET, 1880).

Material examined:
8 ♂, 17 ♀ off three host individuals, especially 1 ♀ (M. 4387. a) off an old skin (no. 3; coll. A. A. Bruijn), in AMNH, Waigeo (no other data), leg. C. J. Heij & J. N. J. Post (12.xi.1999); 4 larvae (M. 3482. b-e), in ZIMH, 31.xii.1909 Waigeo, leg. E. Mey (16.iv.1990); and 8 ♂, 16 ♀ (M. 4614. a-n) off a freshly dead individual conserved in alcohol (no. 1909-01606), in NHMRot, 4.x.2002 Mumes, Waigeo, leg. C. J. Heij & C. Moeliker. Holotype ♂ (M. 4614. b), allotype (M. 4614. j [left]) and 7 ♂, 16 ♀ paratypes in NHMRud.

Diagnosis:
Habitus of male (ventral) and female (dorsal) as in Figs 3 and 4. This species is difficult to separate from M. jonesi MEY, 2000 ["1999"] (type host: Talegalla fuscirostris ssp.). However, since the structure of the male genitalia of M. mumesensis is similar to that of M. jonesi, but the structure of the endosomal part is quite different, it must be assumed that both forms are in fact reproductively isolated from each other and therefore must be given species rank. Otherwise hardly any characters can be discerned that would make a morphostructural differentiation any easier. The simplest method might be to compare the mesometathorax: in mumesensis the anterior corners distinctly project, while in jonesi they bulge only slightly (see Figs 9-12). The clypeal carina appears rather wider in jonesi than in mumesensis, and the preantennal outline of the former is more of a semicircle, in the latter more a semi-oval. The thumb-shaped growth of the male scapus in mumesensis is slightly longer than in jonesi (former 0.057 mm, latter 0.047 mm in length), but as with all these characters this should be verified using a larger series of M. jonesi.

Measurements:
see Table 2.

Etymology:
Named for the village of Mumes in the south of the eastern half of the island of Waigeo, where in October 2002 the freshly dead Bruijn’s Brush-turkey, which apparently only harbored this single chewing louse species, came into the prudent hands of Dr. C. J. Heij.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>males</th>
<th></th>
<th>females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VW</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>holo-type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL</td>
<td>2.41–2.66</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HL</td>
<td>0.63–0.67</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HW</td>
<td>0.40–0.45</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HWT</td>
<td>0.40–0.43</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>1.50–1.58</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW</td>
<td>0.33–0.37</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MW</td>
<td>0.41–0.52</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AW</td>
<td>0.46–0.55</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Measurements (in mm) and head index of Megathellipeurus mumesensis n. sp. VW - variation width, x - arithmetic means. Males n = 8, females n = 17; * n = 16.

Genus Oxylipeurus MJÖBERG, 1910

"Oxylipeurus" aepypodius CLAY, 1938
(Figs 13-14)

Host: Aepypodius bruijnii (OUSTALET, 1880).

Material examined:
1 ♂ (without head; M. 3844. a) off an old skin (C 8228) from Laglaize, Waigeo, in MTKD, leg. E. Mey (30.x.1992).

Diagnosis:
Despite its missing head, the only available male specimen can almost certainly be identified as O. aepypodius CLAY, 1938 (type host: Aepypodius arfakianus), since there are hardly any visible differences, even in the form of the genitalia. The shape of the genital apparatus shows very slight but constant differences (see Figs 13 and 14), but it is unknown if they are determined perhaps by the preparation or by variation; if they exist in natura then these distinguishing characters would point to at least a subspecific differentiation. However these points can only be clarified by having a wider range of authenticated material to work on.

Measurements:
PW 0.20, MW 0.30, AW 0.40.

Remarks:
Allied to these problems is the still open question of the generic classification of "Oxylipeurus aepypodius CLAY, 1938" and "Lipeurus ischnocephalus TASCHENBERG, 1882" (type host: Alectura lathami), which here remain in Oxylipeurus, although with reservations. Both species are easily separable (e.g., by head shape, clearer in males than females, and by male genitalia), but they also share some synapomorphies, such as the characteristic suite of macrochaetae frontally on the clypeal carina in males.
Fig. 3: *Megatheliurus mumesensis* n. sp., male, ventral view. – Scale 1 mm.
Fig. 4: Megathellipeurus mumesensis n. sp., female, dorsal view. – Scale 1 mm.
and their unique genital region structure. These characters indicate an independent development that should find its expression in nomenclature. A close relationship to Talegallipeurus is unmistakable, and if it was to be confirmed that Talegallipeurus spp. and "O." aepypodius or ischnocephalus exist synhospitalically, then more than just a separation at the subgenus level would be called for (see v. Kéler 1958, MEY 1990).

Figs 5-8: Megathellipeurus spp., males: 5. shape of head of M. jonesi. – 6. dito M. mumesenis sp. n. – 7. Genitalia (terminalia part only) of M. jonesi. – 8. dito M. mumesenis sp. n. – Scale 0.1 mm.


Figs 13-14: Male genitalia of "Oxylipeurus" aepypodius 13. ex Aepypodius arfakianus. – 14. ex A. bruijnii. – Scale 0.1 mm.

Genus Talegallipeurus MEY, 1982

Talegallipeurus tenuis MEY, 1982

Host: Aepypodius bruijnii (Oustalet, 1880).

Material examined:
1 ♀ (M. 4387. b) off an old skin (no. 3; coll. Bruijn ex coll. W. Rothschild, Tring) from Waigeo (no other data), in AMNH, leg. C. J. Heij & H. Post (12.xi.1999).

Remarks:
The ♀ in question, lacking antennae, legs, and part of the terminalia, cannot be separated morphologically from T. tenuis MEY, 1982 (type host: Talegalla jobiensis longicauda). It must remain open whether it belongs to another form.

Measurements (mm):
TL 2.44, HL 0.57, HW 0.27, HWT 0.30, HI 1.90, PW 0.21, MW 0.27, AW 0.39.
Family Goniodidae MJÖBERG, 1910

Genus Weehalia MEY, 1997

Weehalia hakalphila n. sp.  
(Figs 15, 19, Table 3)

Type host: Aepypodius bruijnii (OUSTALET, 1880).

Material:
1♂ (M. 4387. b) off an old skin (no. 1; coll. Bruijn, ex coll. W. Rothschild, Tring) from Waigeo (no other data), in AMNH, leg. C. J. Heij & H. Post (12.i.1999). Holotype in NHMRud.

Diagnosis:
Male: very similar to W. fissus (RUDOW, 1869), but definitely smaller (see Table 3). The temporal corners are clearly swollen in fissus, in hakalphila almost straight, which, coupled with size, makes for a striking difference in the shape of the head (Figs 15-16). The solenoidal genital apparatus, along the entire length of the abdomen, is clearly constricted in its lower third in fissus, where there is a grip-like endosclerite, but this is not the case in hakalphila sp. n. (see Figs 17-19). Current illustrations of W. fissus genitalia (CLAY 1940, MEY 1997b) show them with a partially erect preputial sac; here it is shown in a relaxed state (Figs 17-18).

Measurements: see Table 3.

Female: Unknown.

Remarks:
In addition to a large Weehalia series off Alectura lathami (= type host of “Goniodes fissus RUDOW”), CLAY (1940: 112) examined 6♂, 7♀ ex Aepypodius arfakianus and 12♂, 13♀ “from skins of Aepypodius bruijnii (OUSTALET) from Waigou”, all of which she placed in fissus without comment. At least 1♂, 2♀ (prep. BM 3069) of W. fissus ex Alectura l. lathami from New South Wales, and also 3♂, 2♀, 1 larva (prep. MEINERTZHAGEN 11001) of the same species ex A. lathami from Queensland, were made available to me. On this basis it is impossible to determine whether the body measurements and setae numbers given by CLAY (1940: 111) are actually derived from the total material off the three host species mentioned above, or only from a part of it. Two Weehalia ♀ ex Aepypodius arfakianus that I examined are distinctly smaller than a fissus ♀, and definitely not conspecific with it, but are probably very close to hakalphila.

Etymology:
Derived from Hakal, the usual name for Bruijn’s Bush-turkey used on Waigeo (Lupintol) (after JONES et al. 1995; gender feminine), and the Greek phil = loving.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>W. hakahphi lla</th>
<th>W. fissus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>males</strong></td>
<td><strong>females</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>holotype</td>
<td>C 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HL</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HW</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HWT</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MW</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AW</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Measurements (mm) and head index of Weehalia hakalphila n. sp. (♂, holotype), W. fissus (♂ & ♀) and Weehalia sp. ♀ ex Aepypodius arfakianus. C 1 – 3 = slides BM 3069. (C 2, female designed as homotype by T. CLAY) and M 1 – 3 = slides R. MEINERTZHAGEN 11001, all ex coll. NHML. Me = slides E. MEY. * = immature specimen.

DOI: 10.21248/contrib.entomol.63.2.313-323
Genus Homocerus Kéler, 1940 [.,1939”]

Homocerus sp.

**Type host:** Aepypodius bruijni (Oustalet, 1880).

**Material examined:**
2 ♂ and 1 ♀ off two specimens, namely 1 ♂, 1 ♀ (M. 3844.b-c) off skin C 8228 in MTKD, Laglaize, Waigeu, leg. E. Mey (20.11.1992), and 1 ♂ (M. 4386.) off an old skin (no. 2; coll. Bruijn ex coll. W. Rothschild, Tring) from Waigeu (no other data) in AMNH, leg. C. J. Heij & H. Post (12.xi.1999).

**Remarks:** The specimens studied are very close to, but not conspecific with, Homocerus arfakianus (Tendeiro, 1983), since there are visible differences in the shape of the unpaired terminalia sclerites in both sexes. Neither can they be assigned to H. aepypodius (Tendeiro, 1983). Tendeiro (1983: 118) described the species from a male and a female that came from the collection of K. C. Emerson, and for which there is no further information on their provenance than “Aepypodius bruijni” and “île Waigeu”. In my opinion, the original description and illustrations (Planche III, Photo 1-2 in Tendeiro, 1983) of *H. aepypodius* fit very well to *H. curtiprothorax* Mey, 1982 (type host: Talegalla jobinensis longicauda). In *H. arfakianus* and Homocerus sp. ex Aepypodius bruijni, as in the species of Homocerus usually paired thoracic pleural sternites II and III are fused in a plate. Also the tergites IX+X and VIII on male anal conus are different in shape from those of *H. curtiprothorax*. Therefore, the supposition is not groundless that in Tendeiros’ description the host provenance on which *aepypodius* is based, is mistaken, and that in actual fact *curtiprothorax* is perhaps synonymous with *aepypodius*. The problem will doubtless be finally resolved in the course of the intended revision on the basis of type specimens comparisons of the genus Homocerus. For the actual publication date of Homocerus see Mey (2009: 185).

**Measurements:**
In this order of two males (prep. M. 3844.b, 4386.) and one female (prep. 3844.c): TL 1.05, 1.06, 1.30; HL 0.37, 0.39, 0.43; HW 0.34, 0.34, 0.42; HWT 0.51, 0.51, 0.60; HI 0.73, 0.76, 0.72; PW 0.25, 0.25, 0.27; MW 0.39, 0.39, 0.42; AW 0.61, 0.63, 0.73.

**Discussion**

The fact that *Aepypodius bruijni*, from an ornithological point of view, is obviously a good species in its own right when compared with *A. arfakianus* and Talegalla spp. is however not adequately expressed in its chewing lice (referring to the 7 species discussed here). This means that representatives at least of the genera Talegalligogus, “Oxylipeurus”, and Talegallepeurus have not yet attained species level in the course of their isolated development from each other on their hosts (5 recent species with altogether 10 subspecies, after Jones et al. 1995), which probably had its beginnings in a common ancestral form of *Aepypodius* and *Talegalla*. From a pthirapterological standpoint, this host group, today confined to New Guinea, is most likely closest to the Australian *Alectura* within the Megapodidae (Mey 1999). *Weehalia* appears to give us a strong support in this direction. We can however state that *Alectura* on the one hand, and *Aepypodius* and *Talegalla* on the other hand, harbor no conspecific chewing lice.

The infestation of Bruijn’s Brush-turkey and Wattled Brush-turkey as reflected in the list of all chewing lice genera recorded on the megapodes is presented in Table 4. This overview makes one thing above all clear: the large gaps remaining in our knowledge, here especially where the Amblycera are concerned. However, with the help of parasitophyletic deduction, it also enables us to see the emerging contours of an internal systematic arrangement of the megapodes and their differentiation from other galliform families.

What is noteworthy is the fact that only one species of chewing louse (*Megathellipeurus mumesensis* n. sp., with larvae and adults in large numbers) was retrieved from the recently collected freshly dead Bruijn’s Brush-turkey, while
on each of three out of five old skins from the end of the 19th and beginning of the 20th century two species (single specimens) were recorded (see Table 5). One of these old skins harbored no chewing lice, and on each of two others one species was found. Whether these findings result from the collecting method, or reflect actual qualitative individual infestation, cannot be decided here. Whatever the case, we can surely expect further new chewing lice species from Bruijn’s Brush-turkey.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alectura</th>
<th>Aepypodius</th>
<th>Talegalla</th>
<th>Leipoa</th>
<th>Macrocephalon</th>
<th>Eulipoa</th>
<th>Megapodius</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>arfakianus</td>
<td>bruijimii</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amblycera</td>
<td>Menoponidae</td>
<td>sensu lato</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amyrsidea</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelerimenopon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megacolpocephalum</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colpocephalum sensu lato</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talegalligogus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ischnocera</td>
<td>Philopteridae</td>
<td>sensu lato</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degeeriella complex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megapodiella</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lipeurus complex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lipecuroïdes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megatheliipeurus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maleulipeurus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxylipeurus complex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxylipeurus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talegallipeurus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>„Oxylipeurus“</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goniodidae</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leipoëlla</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megatheliella</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maleophilus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maleoicus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euligoniodes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homocerus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weelahia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lobicrotaphus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goniocotes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Distribution of the Phthiraptera (suborder Amblycera and Ischnocera) on the Megapodiidae according to genera, with special reference to Aepypodius spp. (as of August 2010). 0 = lacking or not yet recorded; 1 = recorded; (1) = generic status questionable; ? = report questionable.
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