e-ISSN: 2587-1277 http://asujse.aksaray.edu.tr



Aksaray J. Sci. Eng. Volume 7, Issue 2, pp. 67-76.

DergiPark Available online at

An Analysis of Butterfly Diversity in Kozluk District (Batman) and Their Preferences for Habitat and Altitude

Mehmet ASTAN^{1,0}, Erdem SEVEN^{2,*,0}

¹Batman University, Institute of Graduate Studies, Batman, Türkiye ²Batman University, Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Department of Biology, Batman, Türkiye

Keywords Biodiversity, Butterfly, Ecology, Fauna, Lepidoptera

Article information Received: Dec 04, 2022 Revised: Jul 25, 2023 Accepted: Aug 14, 2023 Online: Nov 24, 2023

Abstract

Butterfly species are one of the indicator groups for biodiversity change and habitat monitoring. However, studies on butterfly species' habitat and altitude preferences have rarely been evaluated. A study was carried out on the species diversity of butterfly fauna in different habitats and altitudes from Kozluk district of Batman Province. The survey was conducted in 43 locations between 2020-2021. Evaluations were executed for 1.982 butterfly samples collected from the research area. 103 species are diagnosed in 7 families of butterfly; Argynnidae: 15, Libytheidae: 1, Lycaenidae: 34, Papilionidae: 4, Pieridae: 15, Satyridae: 19, Hesperiidae: 15. Among them, 64 species are newly recorded in Kozluk and 34 species in Batman. The species of Libythea celtis (Laicharting, 1782), together with its family Libytheidae, has been added to the fauna of Batman, and the number of butterfly species in Batman increased from 90 to 124. The altitude and habitat preferences of the specimens in the research area and the number of species in the locations of the families are presented and discussed. The majority of the species are determined in oak forests and riverside biotopes. Gecitalti is the location with the highest number of species. The butterflies are mostly detected between 600-1000 m altitudes with a rate of 72% in the research area. This study is utilizable both to the specification of the distribution areas of the species and to the learning of their ecology.

doi: 10.29002/asujse.1214266

1. Introduction

The first studies on the determination of the Turkish Lepidoptera fauna were carried out by foreign researchers such as Zeller [1], Lederer [2], and Staudinger [3]. Hesselbarth et al. [4] conducted the most thorough study on butterflies in Turkey, and 365 taxa were classified as a result. Turkey is inhabited by 414 species of butterflies, including recently discovered and newly described species [4-10]. Besides, especially after the 2000s, studies have been carried out, mostly by local researchers, to reveal the butterfly fauna of the Southeastern Anatolia Region of Turkey [9, 11-27].

The first research on Papilionoidea and Hesperioidea fauna in Batman Province started in Kozluk district with daily studies. There is not any relevant literature on Kozluk district and its surroundings beyond these studies. Hesselbarth et al. [4] reported Hyponephele lupina (Costa, [1836]) from Kozluk in their study titled "The Butterflies of Turkey". In 2008, Kemal et al. [12] listed 44 butterfly species from the district and presented five of them as new records for the fauna of the province. After that, research in the district led to the listing of 50 butterfly species [17]. According to Turkey's faunistic checklist [8], Kozluk has 66 butterflies. Moreover, Seven [19] added 4 species, and then 15 species [20] to the butterfly fauna of Batman Province. From the region, including Batman, Pontia glauconome (Klug, 1829) received its first record for Turkey [9]. In the West Raman Region of Batman, Seven and Aykal [25] discovered 33 species in total, 5 of which were new records for the province. These results increase the overall number of butterflies in Batman to 90.

In this paper, butterflies' habitat and altitude preferences were interpreted along with species diversity in the area. The research region comprises mainly dense and sparse mountain oak forests and, samples were mostly collected from these habitats. Surveys on the species' habitat and altitude preferences are relatively limited. Butterfly diversity changes in relation to habitats and elevations are an interesting and well-covered topic in ecology, but the effects of aspects have rarely been interpreted. This research condunces to the clarification of the ecological preferences of the species.

^{*}Corresponding Author: •erdem.seven@batman.edu.tr 000000002-7587-5341



Articles in this journal is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

2. Materials and Methods

Insect nets were used to catch the samples. The collected specimens were put into envelopes made of parchment paper after they were killed in jars containing ethyl acetate. The samples, which were enveloped at each location, were placed in packages with place names and dates. The materials were protected in naphthalene insect boxes. Then, the pinned and softened samples were stretched and dried as standard entomological museum material. Diagnoses were made based on external morphological features. For photographing the materials, the Fujifilm Finepix HS30 EXR camera was used. The specimens are preserved in the collection of the Entomology Laboratory in Batman University. Resources of Alberti [28], Evans [29], Hesselbarth et al. [4], Tolman [30], Tshikolovets [31] and, Wiemers et al. [32] were employed in diagnosis and terminology.

Materials were collected from 43 localities (Fig. 1, Table 1) ranging from approximately 600 m to 1700 m with field studies carried out 56 times between April 2020 and November 2021. The research was carried out in six habitat types: Agricultural land, mountain oak forest, creek edge, sparse oak barren, bush field, and stony areas (Fig. 2, Table 1). Some locations have been studied more intensively. Factors such as vegetation, road and safety conditions of the locations were effective in their studying rates.



Figure 1. Map of Kozluk district and studied locations (Scale: 1/10000, TKGM)



Figure 2. Some studied locations in Kozluk district: **a.** Geyikli, 980 m, 15.04.2021; **b.** Geçitaltı, 1290 m, 28.05.2021; **c.** Alıçlı, 740 m, 15.05.2021; **d.** Yenidoğan, 885 m, 29.08.2021 (Photographs: M. Astan)

Location	Altitude (m)	Date	Coordinates	Habitat
1. Bekirhan	695	26.06.2020	38°10'01"N, 41°18'39"E	Agricultural land
2. Samanyolu	625	03.07.2020	38°06'37"N, 41°13'46"E	Creek edge
Geyikli (Cevizli)	980	03.07.2020, 27.04.2021	38°12'58"N, 41°26'27"E	Mountain oak forest
 Çaygeçit 	660	03.07.2020, 15.04.2021	38°04'18"N, 41°29'18"E	Creek edge
5. Değirmendere	800	14.07.2020	38°12'09"N, 41°28'38"E	Mountain oak forest
6. Tosunpınar	1075	25.07.2020, 25.09.2021	38°13'54"N, 41°28'37"E	Mountain oak forest
7. Armutlu	1225	07.08.2020, 29.07.2021, 07.10.2021	38°15'46"N, 41°28'39"E	Mountain oak forest
8. Geçitaltı	1290	14.08.2020, 28.05.2021, 02.10.2021, 07.10.2021	38°17'01"N, 41°28'57"E	Creek edge
9. İnişli	1200	21.08.2020, 04.09.2021	38°14'18"N, 41°29'50"E	Sparse oak barren
10. Gümüşörgü	1095	21.10.2020, 14.08.2021	38°15'53"N, 41°23'27"E	Mountain oak forest
11. Kumlupınar	615	27.03.2021	38°08'13"N, 41°31'11"E	Creek edge
12. Çayhan	700	07.04.2021	38°09'47"N, 41°36'04"E	Sparse oak barren
13. Taşlık	960	10.04.2021	38°07'30"N, 41°35'05"E	Sparse oak barren
14. Ünsaldı	690	12.04.2021	38°04'42"N, 41°25'03"E	Sparse oak barren
 Yeniçağlar 	645	13.04.2021	38°08'51"N, 41°14'07"E	Stony area
Kavakdibi	760	20.04.2021	38°10'10"N, 41°21'52"E	Sparse oak barren
17. Gündüzlü	870	20.04.2021	38°11'41"N, 41°24'44"E	Bush field
18. Aşağıkıratlı	890	21.04.2020	38°11'44"N, 41°22'42"E	Stony area
Danagözü	965	21.04.2021	38°14'17"N, 41°19'08"E	Stony area
20. Yanıkkaya	1080	21.04.2021, 08.09.2021	38°14'52"N, 41°18'18"E	Stony area
21. Ulaşlı	730	29.04.2021	38°10'45"N, 41°19'20"E	Sparse oak barren
Tuzlagözü	895	15.05.2021	38°10'54"N, 41°34'20"E	Sparse oak barren
23. Kolludere	880	15.05.2021	38°11'37"N, 41°32'58"E	Mountain oak forest
24. Alıçlı	740	15.05.2021	38°12'28"N, 41°31'29"E	Creek edge
25. Konaklı	680	17.05.2021	38°09'16"N, 41°19'27"E	Sparse oak barren
26. Karaoğlak	720	17.05.2021	38°06'31"N, 41°23'16"E	Sparse oak barren
27. Kamışlı	695	17.05.2021	38°06'00"N, 41°21'27"E	Sparse oak barren
28. Yenidoğan	885	10.06.2021, 29.08.2021	38°16'26"N, 41°34'12"E	Mountain oak forest
29. Beşkonak	1390	26.06.2021	38°14'27"N, 41°37'19"E	Mountain oak forest

Table 1. Location data and habitat types

Astan, M. & Seven, E. (2023). Aksaray University Journal of Science and Engineering. 7:2, 67-76.

Location	Altitude (m)	Date	Coordinates	Habitat
30. Akçakışla	1100 29.06.2021 38°15'47"		38°15'47"N, 41°36'33"E	Mountain oak forest
31. Yazılı	815	08.07.2021, 22.08.2021	38°15'08"N, 41°32'43"E	Mountain oak forest
32. Akçalı	1720	13.07.2021	38°18'41"N, 41°35'18"E	Mountain oak forest
 Kayadibi 	1400	07.08.2021	38°15'54"N, 41°26'26"E	Mountain oak forest
34. Yukarıkıratlı	1300	08.09.2021	38°13'11"N, 41°23'18"E	Mountain oak forest
35. Dereköy	1280	12.09.2021	38°13'32"N, 41°22'36"E	Mountain oak forest
36. Yedibölük	1280	16.10.2021	38°14'08"N, 41°22'50"E	Mountain oak forest
37. Bölükkonak	1100	24.10.2021	38°13'21"N, 41°25'06"E	Mountain oak forest
38. Duygulu	615	03.11.2021	38°03'54"N, 41°19'53"E	Sparse oak barren
39. Yankılı	690	07.11.2021	38°06'20"N, 41°27'11"E	Sparse oak barren
40. Yapaklı	645	07.11.2021	38°05'52"N, 41°29'15"E	Creek edge
41. Oyuktaş	610	13.11.2021	38°02'49"N, 41°29'52"E	Bush field
42. Arıkaya	675	13.11.2021	38°04'12"N, 41°32'14"E	Sparse oak barren
43. Örensu	600	18.11.2021	38°01'38"N, 41°27'18"E	Sparse oak barren

3. Results and Discussion

In this paper, 103 species were found in 7 families from Kozluk district. The overall number of these species in Batman Province has increased from 90 to 124 as a result of the registration of 34 new species. *Libythea celtis*, which is represented by a single species in Libytheidae family in Turkey, is newly discovered in the province (Table 2, 3).

Family	Known species in Batman	•		The total number for Batman
Argynnidae	15	15	6	21
Libytheidae	-	1	1	1
Lycaenidae	29	34	9	38
Papilionidae	2	4	2	4
Pieridae	12	15	5	17
Satyridae	18	19	4	22
Hesperiidae	14	15	7	21
Total	90	103	34	124

Table 2. Comparison of the number of butterfly species in the families

Lycaenidae, with 34 species, has the greatest number of species in the research region. Satyridae family, which contains 19 species, is the next. Hesperiidae, Pieridae, and Argynnidae have 15, Papilionidae has 4, and Libytheidae has 1 species (Fig. 3).



Figure 3. Species number in the families

The study area includes mostly mountain oak forests and sparse oak biotopes (see Table 1). Therefore, the majority of the species were collected from *Quercus* spp. forests and streamside habitats. Argynnidae family was generally identified from mountainous and creekside sites. Specimens of *Libythea celtis* were detected in oak habitats and collected from altitudes between 1250-1800 m a.s.l. Members of Lycaenidae were mostly determined in mountainy, creek edge, and stony habitats. The captured butterflies in the family of Papilionidae were commonly found in natural and bush fields and, specimens were caught at 600-900 m a.s.l. Pieridae samples were diagnosed from mountain oak forests, creek edges, and sparse oak biotopes. The vertical distribution scale of the species in this family is high. Individuals belonging to Satyridae family were gathered from mountainous areas, streamside, and sparse oak barren. Hesperiidae specimens were largely caught in mountainous regions and near streams (Table 3).

Table 3. Species list and their habitat and altitude preferences (1: Agricultural land, 2: Mountain oak forest, 3: Creek
edge, 4: Sparse oak barren, 5: Bush field, 6: Stony area, *: new records for Batman)

Family		Species	1	2	3	4	5	6	Altitude (m)
	1.	Argynnis niobe*							1250-1500
	2.	A. pandora							850-1750
	3.	A. paphia*							800-900
	4.	Issoria lathonia* (Fig. 4a)							750-1300
	5.	Limenitis reducta							800-1500
	6.	Melitaea collina*							750-850
lae	7.	M. ornata*							800-900
Argynnidae	8.	M. persea							750-850
	9.	M. phoebe							750-850
	10.	M. syriaca							800-900
₹	11.	Nymphalis xanthomelas							800-900
	12.	Polygonia c-album*							800-1000
	13.	P. egea							1000-1100
	14.	Vanessa atalanta							600-1100
	15.	Vanessa cardui							600-1400
Libytheidae	16.	Libythea celtis*							1250-1800
	17.	Celastrina argiolus							600-1100
	18.	Cigaritis uighurica							1250-1500
	19.	Cupido osiris*							600-700
	20.	Glaucopsyche alexis							750-900
	20.	G. lessei							700-800
	21.	Lampides boeticus							700-1700
	23.	Lycaena alciphron							800-900
	23. 24.	L. asabinus*							900-1700
	24.	L. kefersteinii							700-1400
	25. 26.	L. kurdistanica							900-1400
	20.	L. phlaeas							800-1300
	27. 28.	L. tityrus							800-1300
	28.	Plebejus carmon							800-1300
	30.	Polyommatus alcedo*							800-1000
dae	31.	P. amandus							1300-1500
	32.	P. agestis							600-1700
cac	33.	P. bellargus							800-1100
Lycaenidae	33. 34.	P. bellis*							700-900
	35.								800-1000
	35. 36.	P. demavendi P. daphnis*							800-1000
	30. 37.	P. aapnnis* P. icarus							800-1700
	37. 38.	P. icarus P. isauricus*							700-900
		P. isauricus* P. loewii							
	39. 40.								700-1100
		P. poseidon*							600-1100
	41.	P. thersites							800-1000
	42.	Pseudophilotes vicrama							1300-1500
	43.	Satyrium abdominalis							800-1300
	44.	S. marcidum							700-900
	45.	S. spini*							1300-1500
	46.	S. zabni							1100-1300
	47.	Tarucus balkanicus							800-1500

Aksaray J. Sci. Eng. 7:2 (2023) 67-76.

-	10	Asian, M. & Seven, E. (2025). Aksaray University	
	48.	Tomares callimachus*	600-700
	49.	Turanana endymion	800-1000
	50.	Zizeeria karsandra	600-800
lae	51.	Archon apollinaris*	600-700
Papilionidae	52.	Iphiclides podalirius*	800-900
piliq	53.	Papilio machaon	700-800
Pa	54.	Zerynthia deyrollei (Fig. 4b)	600-900
	55.	Anthocharis cardamines	700-1000
	56.	Aporia crataegi	1200-1500
	57.	Colias alfacariensis*	800-1300
	58.	<i>C. crocea</i> (Fig. 4c)	600-1500
	59.	Colotis fausta (Fig. 4d)	600-700
	60.	Euchloe ausonia	600-800
Pieridae	61.	Gonepteryx farinosa	1200-1500
, ini	62.	Pieris brassicae*	800-1500
Pie	63.	P. ergane	600-1500
	64.	P. mannii	600-1100
	65.	P. persis*	800-1500
	66.	P. pseudorapae*	600-1500
	67.	P. rapae*	600-1500
	68.	Pontia chloridice	700-1800
	69.	P. edusa	700-1500
	70.	Brintesia circe (Fig. 4e)	800-1800
	71.	Chazara briseis*	1200-1300
	72.	Coenonympha pamphilus	700-1800
	73.	C. saadi	700-1000
	74.	Hipparchia parisatis*	1000-1200
	75.	H. syriaca	1000-1200
	76.	Hyponephele lupina	1100-1500
9	77.	H. lycaon	1100-1400
da	78.	H. wagneri	1100-1200
ÿri	79.	Kirinia roxelana	800-1800
Satyridae	80.	Lasiommata maera*	1300-1800
0 1	81.	L. megera	800-900
	82.	Maniola jurtina	700-1800
	83.	M. telmessia	1300-1500
	84.	Melanargia grumi	800-1500
	85.	M. syriaca*	800-1500
	86.	Pararge aegeria (Fig. 4f)	800-1800
	87.	Pseudochazara anthelea	1100-1200
	88.	P. pelopea	1100-1800
	89.	Carcharodus alceae	700-1500
	90.	C. lavatherae	1100-1500
	91.	C. orientalis	1300-1500
	92.	Erynnis marloyi	1100-1200
	93.	Muschampia nomas	1300-1500
ae	94.	M. poggei	600-1800
üd	95.	M. proteides*	1100-1500
er	96.	M. tersa*	1100-1300
Hesperiidae	97.	M. tessellum*	1300-1500
Ĥ	98.	Pyrgus armoricanus*	1100-1300
	99.	P. serratulae*	700-1500
	100.	Spialia orbifer	700-800
	101.	S. phlomidis*	700-800
	1011		
	102. 103.	Thymelicus lineolus*	1100-1500

Field studies in Kozluk district were carried out at 43 locations (see Table 1). Of these, Geçitaltı (Site: 8) is the habitat with the highest number of species. The number of studies and plant diversity are thought to be the reasons for the identified species diversity in this location. Moreover, Kayadibi (Site: 33), Yenidogan (Site: 28), Yazılı (Site: 31), and Tosunpınar (Site: 6) are rich in species diversity. Although Kayadibi was studied once, it attracted attention with the detection of a very high number of species (Table 4).

The butterflies are mostly found (at a rate of 72%) between 600-1000 m a.s.l. in the research area (Table 5). The considerable plant diversity between these meters can be used to explain this condition. The ecosystems between these altitudes typically consist of valleys and stream sides. There is a minor decrease in the number of species between 1000-

1400 meters, and there is a decrease in the number of species beyond 1400 meters. This condition is believed to be the result of less research and longer working hours in high-altitude settings. It turns out that whereas Argynnidae, Lycaenidae, Papilionidae, and Pieridae species are mostly seen at 600-1000 m a.s.l., Hesperiidae, Libytheidae, and Satyridae families are diagnosed at 1000-1400 m a.s.l.

Site	Arg	Lib	Lyc	Рар	Pie	Sat	Hes	Total
1	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	3
2			5		2		1	3 8
3	3	-	-	-	1	5	-	9
4	1	-	5	2	4	-	-	12
5	-	-	9	-	4	1	1	15 27
6	1	-	12	-	7	5	2	27
7	-	-	4	-	7	3	2	16 47
8	4	1	16	-	8	9	9	47
9	1	1	11	-	6	1	4	24 21 5 8
10	2	-	7	-	7	5	-	21
11	1	-	1	-	3	-	-	5
12	-	-	2	-	2	3	1	8
13	-	-	4	-	1	2	-	7
14	1	-	2	2	2	-	-	7
15	1	-	2 2	-	2	-	-	5
16	2	-	2	1	4	-	-	9
17	-	-	5	-	4	-	-	5 9 9 9
18	2	-	1	1	5	-	-	9
19	-	-	6	-	2	-	- 4	8 20
20	1	-	9	-	6	-		20
21 22	1 3	-	2 3	1	4 2	-	2	10
22		-		-		-		10
23 24	1	-	2 5	- 1	1 3	- 3	- 1	4 13
24 25	4	-	-	1	3	1	1	13
25 26	4	-	3	1	1	1	1	6
20 27	1	-	1	-	4	-	- 1	7
28	4	-	11	- 1	6	8	-	30
20 29	2		4	-	6	4	- 1	17
30	-	_	4	_	3	1	1	17 9
31	5	-	8	-	6	6	1	26
32	1	1	4	-	3	7	-	16
33	3	-	10	-	8	3	6	30
34	2	-	5	-	3	2	1	30 13
35	1	-	6	-	2	2	3	14
36	1	-	4	-	3	3	1	12
37	2	-	2	-	3	1	2	10
38	2	-	1	1	4	-	-	10 8
39	-	-	-	1	3	-	-	4
40	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	4 2
41	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	2
42	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	2 4 5
43	-	-	1	-	4	-	-	5

Table 4.	e species number of families in locations (Arg: Argynnidae, Lib: Libytheidae, Lyc: Lycaenidae, Pa	ap:
	apilionidae, Pie: Pieridae, Sat: Satyridae, Hes: Hesperiidae, for sites see Table 1)	

 Table 5. Numerical distribution of species depending on the altitude (Arg: Argynnidae, Lib: Libytheidae, Lyc: Lycaenidae, Pap: Papilionidae, Pie: Pieridae, Sat: Satyridae, Hes: Hesperiidae)

Altitude (m)	Arg	Lib	Lyc	Pap	Pie	Sat	Hes	Total
600-1000	13 (% 12,6)	- (% 0)	30 (% 29,1)	4 (% 3,8)	12 (% 11,6)	9 (% 8,7)	6 (% 5,8)	74 (% 71,6)
1000-1400	6 (% 5,8)	1 (% 0,9)	21 (% 20,3)	- (% 0)	11 (% 10,6)	16 (% 15,5)	13 (% 12,6)	68 (% 65,7)
1400-1800	3 (% 2,9)	1 (% 0,9)	9 (% 8,7)	- (% 0)	9 (% 8,7)	11 (% 10,6)	10 (% 9,7)	43 (% 41,5)

The research region's fauna was not represented well in earlier studies. The number of butterflies in Kozluk and the province as a whole was far from being accurately given by the data collected through daily studies and for specific species. That is why a thorough program has been used to study the topic. It is believed that the Papilionoidea and Hesperioidea superfamilies will contribute to the fauna of Batman Province and the Turkish fauna in this regard. The study's findings are crucial for comprehending the richness of butterflies in Batman Province. In addition to these, it will help determine the habitat and altitude preferences of species as well as the areas where the species are found.

Acknowledgments

This study was produced from the MSc thesis of the first author. The project BTUBAP-2021-YL-011 of Batman University's Scientific Research Projects Unit provided funding for this survey. We would like to thank Batman General Directorate of Land Registry and Cadastre (TKGM) for supplying the Kozluk district map.



Figure 4. Stretched some butterfly species with upperside (left) and underside (right) (Photographs: E. Seven)

References

- [1] Zeller, P.C. (1847). Verzeichniss der vom Prof. Loew in der Türkei und in Asien gesammelten Lepidoptera, Isis von Oken, 1, 3-39.
- [2] Lederer, J. (1865). *Excursion Lepidopteroloqiue en Anatolie*, Annales de la Société Entomologique de Belgique, 9, 49-81.
- [3] Staudinger, O. (1881). Lepidopterenfauna Kleinasien's, Horae Societatis Entomologicae Rossicae, 16, 65-135.
- [4] Hesselbarth, G., Van Oorschot, H., Wagener, S. (1995). Die Tagfalter der Türkei unter Berücksichtigung der angrenzenden Länder, Verlag Goecke & Evers, Bochum. Band 3, 1-848.
- [5] Kemal, M., Koçak, A.Ö. (2013). Notes on the subgenus Polyommatus (Neolysandra) Koçak in East Turkey, with descriptions of new taxa (Lycaenidae, Lepidoptera), Miscellaneous Paper, 160, 5-6.
- [6] Seven, S. (2014). A new species of blue from Turkey, Neolycaena soezen Seven, sp. n. (Lepidoptera: Lycaenidae), SHILAP Revista de lepidopterología, 42(166), 311-317.
- [7] Carbonell, F. (2015). Un nouvel Agrodiaetus de Turquie (Lepidoptera, Lycaenidae), Bulletin de la Société entomologique de France 120(4) 463-464. DOI: 10.3406/bsef.2015.2287
- [8] Koçak, A.Ö., Kemal, M. (2018). A synonymous and distributional list of the species of the Lepidoptera of Turkey, Centre for Entomological Studies, Memoirs, 8, 1-487.
- [9] John, E., Başbay, O., Seven, E., Kaymaz, N. (2020). Pontia glauconome Klug, 1829 (Lepidoptera: Pieridae, Pierinae) in south-eastern Turkey: confirmation of breeding populations, with notes on the biology of early stages and on a species of the larval parasitoid Hyposoter Förster, 1869 (Hymenoptera: Ichneumonidae, Campopleginae), Entomologist's Gazette, 71(1), 27-44. DOI: 10.31184/G00138894.711.1722
- [10] Çalışkan, S., Hasbenli, A. (2022). The first record of endangered Lycaena helle ([Denis & Schiffermuller], 1775) for Turkey (Lepidoptera: Lycaenidae), SHILAP Revista de Lepidopterologia, 50(197), 51-55. DOI: 10.57065/shilap.185
- [11] Akın, K. (2008). Studies on the fauna and ecology of Papilionoidea and Hesperioidea (Lepidoptera) in Ceylanpınar district (Şanlıurfa). Msc Thesis, Yüzüncü Yıl University, Turkey. pp. 1-107.
- [12] Kemal, M., Koçak, A.Ö., Akın, K. (2008). Butterflies of Batman Province (East Turkey) (Lepidoptera), Cesa News, 17, 1-7.
- [13] Kemal, M., Aydın, M. (2008). List of the Lepidoptera of Diyarbakır Province (East Turkey), Cesa News, 15, 1-6.
- [14] Kemal, M., Seven, E. (2008). Spring aspect of the diurnal Lepidoptera fauna of Şirvan District (Siirt Province) (South East Turkey), Cesa News, 10, 1-14.
- [15] Kemal, M., Koçak, A.Ö. (2006). List of the butterflies of Urfa Province (South Turkey) (Lepidoptera, Papilionoidea, *Hesperioidea*), Miscellaneous Paper, 94, 3-8.
- [16] Kemal, M., Koçak, A.Ö. (2006). List of the butterflies of Mardin Province (South Turkey) (Lepidoptera, Papilionoidea, Hesperioidea), Miscellaneous Paper, 96, 1-7.
- [17] Kemal, M., Koçak, A.Ö. (2008). Second attempt for determining the Lepidoptera fauna of Kozluk with notes on some other insects of the District (Batman Prov., East Turkey)-II, Cesa News, 23, 1-4.
- [18] Seven, E. (2010). Studies on the fauna and ecology of Papilionoidea and Hesperioidea (Lepidoptera) in Şirvan district (Siirt), Priamus (Supplement), 20, 1-118.
- [19] Seven, E. (2016). *New Records for the Lepidoptera Fauna of Batman Province*, International Ecology Adnan Aldemir Symposium, 16-19 May, Kars, Turkey, pp. 36-37.
- [20] Seven, E. (2019). First comprehensive faunistic list on the Lepidoptera species of Batman Province (Southeastern *Turkey*), Munis Entomology & Zoology, 14(2), 439-447.

- [21] Aydın, M. (2012). Studies on the fauna and ecology of Papilionoidea and Hesperioidea (Lepidoptera) of the Valley Sarim (Kulp, Diyarbakir), Msc Thesis, Yüzüncü Yıl University, Turkey. pp. 1-87.
- [22] Koçak, A.Ö., Kemal, M. (2007). Synonymical and distributional List of the species of Şırnak Province (South East Turkey) (Lepidoptera), Miscellaneous Paper, 127, 1-8.
- [23] Koçak, A.Ö., Kemal, M. (2017). Some vernal Lepidoptera SE Turkey faunistical results of a short trip made in 2017 with some taxonomic and bionomic notes, Cesa News, 133, 1-16.
- [24] Seven, E., Yıldız, C. (2018). On the Butterflies of Savur District (Mardin Province, Southeastern Turkey), Sakarya University Journal of Science, 22(6), 1907-1916. DOI: 10.16984/saufenbilder.392685
- [25] Seven, E., Aykal, A. (2019). A Faunistic Investigation on Butterflies (Lepidoptera: Rhopalocera) of Batı Raman Region in Batman Province, Turkey, International Engineering and Science Symposium, 20-22 June, Siirt, Turkey, pp. 8-13.
- [26] Genç, V., Seven, E., Kaymaz, N. (2021). Determination of Butterflies' Potential in Tourism Diversification Based on a Route-Planning Case Study in Botan Valley National Park, Turkey, Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Issues, 3(2), 104-123. DOI: 10.51525/johti.997125
- [27] Akbaba, E., Akın, K. (2022). Papilionoidea and Hesperioidea Fauna of Hizan District (Bitlis), Journal of Agriculture and Nature, 25(5), 1028-1035. DOI: 10.18016/ksutarimdoga.vi.928366
- [28] Alberti, B. (1955). Zur Kenntnis der Gattung Carcharodus Hbn., mit einer Betrachtung zum Art, und Gattungsbegriff, Zeitschrift für Lepidopterologie, 3, 105-142.
- [29] Evans, W.H. (1949). A Catalogue of the Hesperiidae from Europe, Asia and Australia in the British Museum, Natural History, London.
- [30] Tolman, T. (1997). Butterflies of Britain and Europe, Harper Collins Publishers, London.
- [31] Tshikolovets, V.V. (2011). Butterflies of Europe and the Mediterranean Area, Pardubice, Tshikolovets Publications.
- [32] Wiemers, M., Balletto, E., Dincă, V., Fric, Z.F., Lamas, G., Lukhtanov, V., Munguira, M.L., van Swaay, C.A.M., Vila, R., Vliegenthart, A., Wahlberg, N., Verovnik, R. (2018). An Updated Checklist of the European Butterflies (Lepidoptera, Papilionoidea), ZooKeys, 81, 9-45. DOI: 10.3897/zookeys.811.28712