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I fully support the proposed conservation of the genus-group names *Trichiotinus* Casey, 1915 and *Stegopterus* Burmeister & Schaum, 1840 because their senior synonyms *Tetrophthalmus* Kirby, 1827 and *Trichinus* Kirby, 1827 have not or only once been used as valid names in more than 150 years. The last usage of *Tetrophthalmus* as a valid name, I am aware of, was that of MacLeay (1838, p. 15).

Hoffmann (1935, p. 152), in a comprehensive revision of the genus *Trichiotinus*, explicitly decided not to use the older synonym *Trichinus* to avoid ‘considerable confusion’. He also listed 12 additional references using the name *Trichiotinus* covering the years 1920–1934. In none of his 85 references for the species *T. piger*, 11 for *T. rufobrunneus* (Casey) and 20 for *T. texanus* covering the years 1833–1934 had the genus name *Trichinus* been used. I found three additional recent references documenting the current use of *Trichiotinus*: Pascarella et al. (2001, p. 561), Sikes (2003, p. 12), and Cook (2004, p. 87).

The name *Trichius sutularis*, type species of the subgenus *Tetrophthalmus* Kirby, 1827 should be placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology. Although it was introduced as a manuscript name and qualified as an ‘undescribed species’, this specific name is probably available by indication under Article 12.2.6, but the species has never been described and the name has never been used as valid.
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