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**Abstract:** Comments and corrections are made to the paper by Schmidt and Noyes (2003) on egg parasitoids of *Agrianome spinicollis* (Macleay)(Coleoptera: Cerambycidae) in the *Australian Journal of Entomology* (2003). This paper has ignored the published works of the present author and his associates and in so doing has provided incorrect and misleading information. These failings are pointed out here for the first time and the relevant literature cited.

**Introduction & Comments**

Schmidt & Noyes (2003) published a paper wherein they stated that “Larvae of *A. spinicollis* have been recorded from about 20 host plants representing 12 plant families, showing that it is one of the most polyphagous species of Australian Cerambycidae (Hawkeswood & Dauber 1991)”. This statement is in fact erroneous and misleading in its first part. They failed to quote the 4 other papers of mine and those of my coauthors (viz. Hawkeswood, 1992, 2002, 2003a; Hawkeswood, Turner & Wells, 1997), which have dealt extensively with the food plants and general biology of this cerambycid. Up until the appearance of the Schmidt and Noyes (2003) paper, the number of recorded larval host plant species of *A. spinicollis* stood at 28 and not 20 as listed by Schmidt and Noyes (2003). Their record of “pecans” thus brings the total of recorded (published) hosts to 29 (see below). However, the Schmidt and Noyes (2003) paper displays another example of sloppiness in that it also does not provide the scientific name, family or authority for this plant species, which is *Carya illinoinensis* (Wangenh.) K. Koch. (Juglandaceae). This genus, species and family have not been recorded previously as a host for *A. spinicollis*.

The 29 recorded larval hosts are as follows: *Howea forsteriana* (Areaceae), *Schinus areira* (Anacardiaceae), *Bauhinia forficata*, *Delonix regia* (Caesalpiniaiceae), *Casuarina* sp. (Casuarinaceae), *Flindersia schottiana* (Flindersiaceae), *Acacia maidenii*, *Acacia* sp. (Mimosaceae), *Ficus macrophylla*, *F. watkinsiana*, *Ficus* sp. (Moraceae), *Angophora floribunda*, *Eucalyptus acmenioides*, *E. moluccana*, *E. saligna* (Myrtaceae), *Grevillea robusta* (Proteaceae), *Citrus sinensis* (Rutaceae), *Malus pumila* (Rosaceae), *Populus deltoides*, *P. nigra*, *Populus* sp., *Salix babylonica*, *Salix* sp. (Salicaceae), *Solanum mauritianum* (Solanaceae), *Brachychiton populneus* (Sterculiaceae) (Hawkeswood et al., 1997 and references cited therein); *Eucalyptus umbra*, *Melaleuca quinquenervia* (Myrtaceae)(Hawkeswood, 2002); *Hibiscus tiliaeus* (Malvaceae) (Hawkeswood, 2003a); *Carya illinoinensis* (Juglandaceae)(Schmidt & Noyes, 2003).

**Final comments**

It should be noted that I have never been asked to be a referee for the *Australian Journal of Entomology*. If I had been so asked, I am certain that I could have improved the Schmidt & Noyes (2003) paper, as well as many others in that journal (and in other CSIRO publications) which have appeared without acknowledging the works of others. This unethical practice seems
to be occurring a lot lately in this country both in Australian journals of entomology and botany and in natural science books. This serious problem of unethical behaviour has been commented in the literature recently by Hawkeswood (2003b,c, 2004) & Dunn (2004). It was about time that Australian biology cleaned up its act and became more professional because, at the present time, many sectors are appearing incompetent, corrupt and scientifically and morally unethical.
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Postscript

It should be noted that the Email address given in the Schmidt & Noyes (2003) paper as the address to whom correspondence should be submitted, is not valid, as Emails sent to that address were returned as “undelivered”.