1. Oithona minuta T. Scott, 1894

In 1984, I borrowed and examined the type specimens of *O. minuta* T. Scott., 1894, from British Museum (Natural History). The bottle contained seven specimens: three adult females and three immature copepodids closely similar to *O. brevicornis*, and one immature copepodid of another un-identified species of Cyclopoida (see the attached letter-1).

The description of *O. minuta* by T. Scott (1894) agrees with the above adult specimens in the general body shape and the blunt terminal spines of mandible, but differs in presence of two terminal setae on the fifth legs (only one seta in the specimens). There is no mention on the shape of rostrum (sharply pointed in the specimens). These specimens agree with *O. brevicornis* Giesbrecht, 1891, except for the slight differences such as the presence of spinules in the antennule and lack of hair rows in the abdominal somites.

These observations indicate that *O, minuta* T. Scott, 1894, is "not" a member of *Dioithona* but a species closely related to *O. brevicornis* Giesbrecht, 1891.

The species "Dioithona minuta Shuvalov, 1980" listed in WoRMS is not described as new in Shuvalov (1980); instead the respective species is indicated as "Oithona (Dioithona) minuta T. Scott, 1894" (p. 169, fig. 51). However, only one seta is indicated on its fifth leg (fig. 51K) and the rostrum is not pointed, which does not agree with neither Dioithona nor O. brevicornis.

2. Oithona minuta Krichagin, 1977

The original description of *O. minuta* by Krichagin (1977) lacks precision in many respects (e.g. number of setae on appendages), but indicates close resemblance of the species with *O. nana* Giesbrecht, 1981. If the two species are conspecific, *O. minuta* should be treated as the valid name and *O. nana* as a junior synonym. However, detailed comparison of the two species on the basis of the types has not yet been performed. Meanwhile, according to Shuvalov (1980) and Brodsky (1948), *O. minuta* Krichagin is a senior synonym of *O. nana* but should be treated as invalid because the name *O. nana* is much more popular. But Petipa (1970) and Sazhina (1960) used the name *O. minuta* when they studied the Black-Sea copepods.

More recently Gubanova et al. (2014) mentioned: "Oithona minuta was firstly found in the Black Sea by Krichagin (1873). Giesbrecht (1892), having no knowledge of Krichagin's paper, described the same species from the Mediterranean Sea as O. nana. The latter name was used in copepod publications throughout the world. Nevertheless, this species continues to be cited as O. minuta in several publications on the Black Sea zooplankton (Koval, 1984). Sazhina and Kovalev (1971) noted that such nomenclature inconsistency has led to some confusion in taxonomic publications. Moreover, in 1894 the name Oithona (Dioithona) minuta was given by Scott (1894b) to a species with a different morphology and natural habitat than that of O. nana (Shuvalov, 1980). Thus, despite Krichagin (1873) discovered this species, the valid common name for this Black Sea copepod species O. nana (Giesbrecht, 1892) should be accepted and used." [Nishida: Note that "Krichagin (1873) should be (1877) and Giesbrecht (1892) should be (1891).]

I completely agree with this opinion, since the use of *O. minuta* instead of *O. nana* will invite serious confusion in various aspects.

Under this circumstance, based on the Article 23.9.3 of ICZN, it is necessary to propose the Committee to keep the name *O. nana* as valid and treat the name *O. minuta* Krichagin as a *nomen oblitum*.

Actually, in 1985, I examined specimens of *O. minuta* Krichagin from the Black Sea, identified and sent by Dr. Petipa (see the attached letter-2), and confirmed its similarity to *O. nana*, but so far I have been unable to make such a proposal to the Committee, due mainly to my negligence.

These are all what I can tell about the status of *O. minuta* Krichagin, 1977 and *O. minuta* T. Scott, 1894. Please note that all these are still personal observation and not yet published.