A Survey of the Ectoparasites Found on Wild Birds in Northwest Turkey

O. Girisgin¹, A.O. Girisgin², N. Cimenlikaya³, B. Saygin³

10.18805/IJAR.BF-1474

ABSTRACT

Background: Turkey is home to various resident and migratory wild bird species. The aim of the present study was to investigate the ectoparasites found on 188 injured or rescued resident and migratory wild birds from Bursa and surroundings between 2015 and 2019. **Methods:** Sampled birds were examined for different ectoparasites and all of the collected parasites were placed into tubes containing 70% ethyl alcohol. After mounting onto slides or fixing onto a plate, each parasite was identified to species using a light or stereo microscope.

Result: Results revealed that 88 (46.8%) of the examined wild birds were infested with one or two of 3 different species of ectoparasites. The species identified were 38 lice, three ticks and two flies. The lice were highly prevalent (40.4%) species than the flies (2.1%) and ticks (2.1%). The results also first geographically documented the lice and ked fly species as follows, with additional new host records: *Fulicoffula gallinula* and *Pseudomenapon pilosum* in the common moorhens (*Gallinula chloropus*); *Ciconiphilus decimfasciatus* in the grey heron (*Ardea cinerea*); *Saemundssonia clayae* in the Eurasian woodcock (*Scolopax rusticola*); *Ardeicola ixobrychae* in the common little bittern (*Ixobrychus minutus*) and the ked fly as *Ornithophila metallica* in the Eurasian magpies (*Pica pica*) in Turkey. The study results provided valuable data on the ectoparasites living on migratory and resident bird species during their migration throughout northwest Turkey. Further research on the related pathogens that these ectoparasites harbor is in need.

Key words: Ectoparasite, Survey, Wild birds.

INTRODUCTION

Chewing lice and feather mites are common in all birds and can cause damage to their feathers. This affects their thermoregulation and behavior; reduces the nestling survival, mating success and growth; and influences their coloration. Blood-sucking arthropods, such as ticks or parasitic mites, may cause anemia and secondary or vectorborne infections. Infestations of parasites, such as lice, mites, flies, fleas and other biting insects, cause illnesses and may even cause death, especially of nestlings (Clayton and Walther, 1997; Bush and Clayton, 2018).

Turkey spans 779452 km² that contain 7 major geographical regions and 97 important bird ecosystems encompassing 4% of the country's total land. Each of the seven geographical regions have different climates, habitats, flora and fauna and they comprise approximately 460 documented wild bird species, some of which are migrants that summer in Turkey or use it as a flyway route (Anonymous, 2018a). Two of the world's major bird-migration routes pass through Turkey's Bosphorus and Canakkale Straits and the valleys of the Eastern Black Sea. Bursa Province (40°11'N 29°04'E), located along the Marmara Sea, lies along the Bosphorus and Canakkale Straits bird migratory flyway and encompasses four important bird areas (Magnin *et al.*, 2000).

The wild birds found in Turkey may be infested with hundreds of different ectoparasite species. The often found ectoparasites on these birds are the louse or feather mite species (Girisgin *et al.*, 2013; Gurler *et al.*, 2013; Dik *et al.*, 2015, 2017) and are recorded from the central or eastern part of Turkey.

¹Karacabey Vocational School, Bursa Uludag University, Bursa, Turkey. ²Department of Parasitology, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Bursa Uludag University, Bursa, Turkey.

³Institute of Health Sciences, Bursa Uludag University, Bursa, Turkey.

Corresponding Author: A.O. Girisgin, Department of Parasitology, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Bursa Uludag University, Bursa, Turkey. Email: aogirisgin@uludag.edu.tr

How to cite this article: Girisgin, O., Girisgin, A.O., Cimenlikaya, N. and Saygin, B. (2023). A Survey of the Ectoparasites Found on Wild Birds in Northwest Turkey. Indian Journal of Animal Research. 57(8): 1059-1065. doi: 10.18805/IJAR.BF-1474.

Submitted: 29-11-2021 Accepted: 25-01-2022 Online: 12-03-2022

Even, number of studies have been carried out on tick infestation of the wild birds (Leblebicioglu *et al.*, 2014; Keskin and Erciyas-Yavuz, 2019), but studies on ked flies infestation is rare, except the study of Erdem *et al.* (2019).

Therefore, our study aimed to (a) provide information on the distribution of lice/ticks/flies within the study areas, (b) determine the ectoparasite infestation rates in both migratory and resident bird hosts and (c) create coincidence information on ectoparasite species infesting wild birds mainly in northwest of Turkey.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Study area

The present study was conducted at the Animal Hospital of Bursa Uludag University in Turkey between January 2015 and February 2019. All of the examined animals were either wounded or sick; but none was snared. All of the birds were separated to avoid contamination.

Most of the birds brought to the hospital were from different areas in Bursa Province, which is a forested area located on the northwestern slope of Mount Uludag. The area has a Mediterranean climate and is generally quite humid (mean humidity: 73%) because of its proximity to the Marmara Sea (Anonymous, 2018b). The wild birds brought to the hospital from outside but near to the area were accepted and included in study population. Balikesir and Bilecik from Marmara Region and Bolu and Zonguldak from Black Sea Region (Fig 1) were the other cities from where the birds were taken.

Bird samples

The birds used in the study were identified to species using the guidelines described by Heinzel *et al.* (1995). A total of 188 wild birds belonging to 43 species, 36 genera and 26 families in 17 orders; were included in the study and were examined for ectoparasite infestations.

Birds were examined immediately after arriving. A widespectrum insecticide that containing 0.09% tetramethrin and 0.45% piperonyl butoxide was sprayed between the feathers of the wings, tail and head/neck and over a white piece of paper to collect the ectoparasites; these areas were then examined for any remaining ectoparasites (Clayton and Drown, 2001). In addition, the birds were carefully inspected for ticks, especially on the eye, beak and neck regions, which are possible attaching sites (Clayton and Walther, 1997). The detected ticks were manually collected from the birds using a steel tweezers.

The collected ectoparasites were transferred into plastic tubes containing 70% ethyl alcohol and stored in the laboratory until they were examined under a microscope. The data collected from all of the infested birds for each bird species and the ectoparasites were recorded. The lice were dechitinised in 10% KOH for 24 h, mounted on Canada balsam and identified to species using a light microscope (Nikon Eclipse E600) with the morphological keys of Adam (2004), Adams *et al.* (2005), Clay (1940, 1958, 1962, 1974, 1977), Clayton *et al.* (1996), Clay and Hopkins (1954), Pilgrim (1976), Price (1965), Price and Beer (1963), Price *et al.* (2003), Tendeiro (1973) and Tuff (1970).

After one day immersed in 70% alcohol, the tick and fly species were identified at the species level under a stereomicroscope using the taxonomic keys of Estrada-Pena *et al.* (2004) for adult ticks, Heylen *et al.* (2014) and Walker *et al.* (2005) for immature ticks and Hutson (1984) for ked flies.

Data analysis

The prevalence of ectoparasites was evaluated for both the bird families and bird species and for each ectoparasite if there was at least one type of collected ectoparasites. The mean abundance and intensity levels were determined for each ectoparasitespecies on the avian hosts.

Ethical approval

All applicable international, national and/or institutional guidelines for the care and use of animals were strictly followed. All animal sample collection protocols complied with the current laws of Turkey. Permission to conduct the study protocol and the investigation on the birds was granted by the ethical committee of Bursa Uludag University (No: 2015-06/03) and the Ministry of Forestry and Water Affairs of Turkey on June 29, 2015 (No: 138216).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

During the study, 188 birds of 43 species were examined for ectoparasites. Of these, 71 birds (37.7%) of 21 species



Fig 1: Location and number of the collected wild birds.

A Survey of the	Ectoparasites	Found on	Wild	Birds in	Northwest	Turkey

No.	Hosts	Common name	Common name Chewing lice species		Abundance					
				Ni	М	F	Ν	Т	MI	
	ACCIPITRIFORMES									
	Accipitridae									
24	Buteo buteo	Common buzzard	Craspedorrhynchus platystomus	11	26	73	27	126	11.45	
			Colpocephalum turbinatum	1	-	1	-	1	1.0	
			C. nanum	4	5	17	1	23	5.75	
			Degeeriella fulva	5	8	13	1	22	4.40	
			Laemobothrion maximum	1	-	1	-	1	1.0	
5	Accipiter nisus	Sparrow hawk	Colpocephalum polonum	1	1	3	-	4	4.0	
			Degeeriella nisus	1	3	9	-	12	12.0	
2	Circaetus gallicus	Short-toed snake eagle	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	ANSERIFORMES									
	Anatidae									
1	Cygnus cygnus	Whooper swan	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	APODIFORMES									
	Apodidae									
4	Apus apus	Common swift	Dennyus hirundinis	2	2	2	-	4	2.0	
2	A. melba	Alpine swift	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	CHARADRIIFORMES									
	Laridae									
47	Larus cachinnans	Caspian gull	Saemundssonia lari	20	21	31	18	70	3.5	
			Actornitophilus piceus	2	2	10	8	20	10.0	
1	Chroicocephalus genei	Slender-billed gull	Saemundssonia lari	1	4	1	-	5	5.0	
	, ,	Ũ	Actornitophilus piceus	1	-	1	-	1	1.0	
	Scolopacidae									
2	Scolopax rusticola	Eurasian woodcock	Saemundssonia clayaeª	1	-	1	-	1	1.0	
	COLUMBIFORMES									
	Columbidae									
8	Columba livia	Rock dove	Columbicola columbae	8	27	43	26	96	12.0	
			Campanulotes bidentatus	1	-	1	_	1	1.0	
			Lipeurus caponis	1	2	17	7	26	26.0	
			Goniodes dissimilis	1	-	4	1	5	5.0	
3	Streptopelia senegalensis	Laughing dove	Columbicola bacillus	1	1	1	1	3	3.0	
•	en optopona contogatoriolo	Laagining aovo	C. columbae	1	1	1	-	2	2.0	
			Coloceras chinense	2	2	5	1	8	4.0	
			Cuclotogaster heterographus	1	1	2	-	3	3.0	
	CICONIIFORMES			•	•	2		Ū	0.0	
	Ciconiidae									
11	Ciconia ciconia	White stork	Ardeicola ciconiae	4	13	8	15	36	9.0	
	oleonia eleonia	WINC STOR	Ciconiphilus quadripustulatus	1	19	32	11	62	62.0	
			Colpocephalum zebra	3	6	22	7	35	11.6	
			Neophilopterus incompletus	2	6	4	3	13	6.5	
	CORACIIFORMES		Neophiopleius incompieius	2	0	4	5	15	0.5	
S	Meropidae	Furancan has actor	Marana any marania	2	2	6	F	10	10	
3	Merops apiaster	European bee-eater	Meropoecus meropis Meropoiallo aniastri	3	2 1	6 2	5 1	13	4.3 2.0	
			Meropsiella apiastri Meromononon meronia	2	-			4		
	Ununidae		Meromenopon meropis	1	5	13	9	27	27.0	
4	Upupidae	Francisco birroria								
1	Upupa epops	Eurasian hoopoe	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	PICIFORMES									
	Picidae									
1	Dendrocopos syriacus	Syrian woodpecker	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	

Table 1: Continue...

Table 1: Continue...

	PELECANIFORMES								
	Ardeidae								
4	Ixobrychus minutus	Common little bittern	Ardeicola ixobrychaeª	1	-	3	3	6	6.0
1	Ardea cinerea	Grey heron	Ciconiphilus decimfasciatusª	1	4	13	5	22	22.0
1	A. alba	Great white egret	Comatomenapon elongatum	1	2	2	-	4	4.0
	FALCONIFORMES								
~	Falconidae		5						4.0
3	Falco tinnunculus	Common kestrel	Degeeriella spp.	1	-	-	1	1	1.0
1	F. eleonorae	Eleonora's falcon	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	GRUIFORMES								
2	Rallidae	Common moorbon		4	4	4		2	2.0
2	Gallinula chloropus chloropus	Common moorhen	Fulicoffula gallinulaª	1 1	1	1 1	-	2 1	2.0 1.0
	PASSERIFORMES		Pseudomenapon pilosumª	I	-	I	-	I	1.0
	Corvidae								
12		Eurosian magnio	Menacanthus eurysternus	1		1	-	1	1.0
	Pica pica Corvus monedula	Eurasian magpie Western jackdaw	พิธาลิงิลาแทนร์ ธนารรเยาที่นร์	1	-		-	I	1.0
4 3	Corvus monedula C. corone	Western jackdaw Carrion crow	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
3 3	C. cornix	Hooded crow	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	C. frugilegus	Rook	- Myrsidea isostoma	2	3	- 3	-	- 7	- 3.5
2	C. Il ugliegus	NOOK	Brueelia tasniemae	1	-	1	-	, 1	1.0
2	Garrulus glandarius	Eurasian jay	-	-	-	-	-		-
2	Turdidae	Eurasian jay	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
3	Turdus merula	Eurasian blackbird	Menacanthus eurysternus ^b	1	3	6	-	9	9.0
Ũ			Brueelia jacobi	1	1	2	_	3	3.0
	Motacilidae			•	•	-		Ū	0.0
1	Anthus trivialis	Tree pipit	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Passeridae								
7	Passer domesticus	House sparrow	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Regulidae	•							
1	Regulus regulus	Goldcrest	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Sylvidae								
1	Sylvia atricapilla	Eurasian blackcap	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Sturnidae								
3	Sturnus vulgaris	Common starling	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Hirundinidae								
1	Hirundo rustica	Barn swallow	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	PHOENICOPTERIFORMES								
	Phoenicopteridae								
2	Phoenicopterus ruber	American flamingo	Colpocephalum heterosoma	2	1	1	1	3	1.5
			Trinoton femoratum	2	-	2	-	2	1.0
			<i>Anaticola</i> sp.°	1	-	-	2	2	2.0
	STRIGIFORMES								
	Strigidae								
4	Athene noctua	Little owl	Strigiphilus cursitans	2	8	14	7	29	14.5
2	Strix aluco	Tawny owl	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1	Asio otus	Long-eared owl	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1	Bubo bubo	Eurasian eagle-owl	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Tytonidae								
6	Tyto alba	Barn owl	Colpocephalum spp.º	1	-	1	-	1	1.0

Table 1: Continue...

Table 1: Continue								
CAPRIMULGIFORMES								
Caprimulgidae								
2 Caprimulgus europaeus	European nightjar	-	-	-		-	-	-
Total			104	182	375	74	631	

No: Number of birds examined, Ni: Number of birds infested, M: Male, F: Female, N: Nymph, T: Total, MI: Mean intensity. *Considered for number of infested birds only.

^aNew geographic record for Turkey. ^bNew host record for Turkey. ^cUnspecified because of unsuccessful preparation.

Table 2: Distribution of tick species according to their avian hosts.

Common nome	Tick encodes	Abundance						
Common name	Tick species	Ni	М	F	L	Ν	Т	MI
White stork	Rhipicephalus sanguineusª	2	-	-	-	2	2	1.0
Rook	Haemaphysalis punctataª	1	1	-	-	-	1	1.0
Little owl	Ixodes ricinusª	I	- 1	-	1	- 2	1 4	1.0
		White stork <i>Rhipicephalus sanguineus</i> ª Rook <i>Haemaphysalis punctata</i> ª	Ni White stork Rhipicephalus sanguineus ^a 2 Rook Haemaphysalis punctata ^a 1	Ni M White stork Rhipicephalus sanguineus ^a 2 - Rook Haemaphysalis punctata ^a 1 1 Little owl Ixodes ricinus ^a 1 -	Common name Tick species Ni M F White stork Rhipicephalus sanguineusa 2 - - Rook Haemaphysalis punctataa 1 1 - Little owl Ixodes ricinusa 1 - -	Common name Tick species Ni M F L White stork Rhipicephalus sanguineus ^a 2 - - - Rook Haemaphysalis punctata ^a 1 1 - - Little owl Ixodes ricinus ^a 1 - - 1	Common name Tick species Ni M F L N White stork Rhipicephalus sanguineus ^a 2 - - - 2 Rook Haemaphysalis punctata ^a 1 1 - - - Little owl Ixodes ricinus ^a 1 - - 1 -	Common name Tick species Ni M F L N T White stork Rhipicephalus sanguineus ^a 2 - - - 2 2 Rook Haemaphysalis punctata ^a 1 1 - - 1 Little owl Ixodes ricinus ^a 1 - - 1 - 1

No: Number of birds examined, Ni: Number of birds infested, M: Male, F: Female, L: Larvae, N: Nymph, T: Total, MI: Mean intensity. *Considered for number of infested birds only. *New host record for Turkey.

Table 3: Distribution of fly species according to their avian hosts.

Hosts	0	-	Abundance					
	Common name	Fly species	Ni	М	F	Т	MI	
COLUMBIFORMES								
Columbidae								
Columba livia	Rock dove	Pseudolynchia canariensis	3	-	3	3	1.0	
PASSERIFORMES								
Corvidae								
Pica pica	Eurasian magpie	Ornithophila metallicaª	1	1	-	1	1.0	
Total			4	1	3	4		

No: Number of birds examined, Ni: Number of birds infested, M: Male, F: Female, T: Total, MI: Mean intensity.

*Considered for number of infested birds only. aNew geographic record for Turkey. bNew host record for Turkey.

were migrant and 117 birds (62.2%) of 22 species were resident. A total of 631 lice, four ticks and four flies were collected from 88 birds of 27 species, which corresponds to 46.8% of all birds examined. These birds were infested with at least one ectoparasite with a mean intensity of 8.3, 1.3 and 1.0 per bird for louse, tick and fly species, respectively.

Species-wise, 41 louse species, three tick species and two ked fly species were identified, with the louse species being more prevalent (40.4%) than the fly (2.1%) and tick (2.1%) species. The voucher specimens of lice, ticks and flies were deposited at the Department of Parasitology, Bursa Uludag University, Turkey.

The species of the ectoparasite identified in this study according to parasite orders were presented in Table 1 to 3.

Among the lice species, *Ciconiphilus quadripustulatus* had the highest mean intensity (62.0). Table 1 shows the ecto parasite-free birds together with infested birds.

Although some of the samples found in the study are similar to those previously made in the area, the new geographic records of lice samples were *Fulicoffula gallinula*, *Ciconiphilus decimfasciatus*, *Ardeicola ixobrychae* and *Saemundssonia clayae*. The new geographic record for the ked fly sample was *Ornithophila metallica*. In addition, there are new host records for Turkey: the louse species *Pseudomenapon pilosum* on common moorhens; the tick species *Rhipicephalus sanguineus* sensu lato, *Haemaphysalis punctata* and *Ixodes ricinus* on white storks, rooks and little owls, respectively and the ked fly species *Ornithophilus metallica* on Eurasian magpies. Individually considering the migration status of infested birds, the ectoparasite infestation rate was higher in the residents (52/88; 59.09%) than in the migrants (36/88; 40.90%).

Several researchers throughout the world have studied ectoparasitic infestations in wild birds (Ilieva, 2005; Lyakhova and Kotti, 2011); however, most of these studies from Turkey were on lice (Girisgin *et al.*, 2013; Dik *et al.*, 2017). One of the reasons for this is that lice infestation is common on birds than other ectoparasitic infestation (Bush and Clayton, 2018). In contrast to previous studies, the present study includes all ectoparasites (except feather mites) obtained from both migratory and resident wild birds in Bursa and surroundings, Turkey.

Rehabilitation of wild birds, especially in endangered species requires expertise and special care (Debnath et al., 2018; Aslan et al., 2018). Ectoparasites are great menace to poultry production causing threat to growth, reproduction, behavior, or long-term survival (Clayton and Walther, 1997; Bush and Clayton, 2018). The dynamics of ectoparasite infestations on birds are complicated due to migration or residence, combined with other factors, such as seasonal influences and contact with each other. However, migratory birds may also face additional risks due to perilous journey. In our study, a higher ectoparasite infestation rate was determined on resident birds (59.09%). A previous study in Turkey showed a higher infestation rate on migratory birds (Girisgin et al., 2013). Variation in rate of infestation in different type of birds could be difference in sample size, behaviors, or local conditions of birds (Bush and Clayton, 2018).

Although the ked fly infestation rate was low (2.1%), ked flies (Hippoboscidae) can feed on the host's blood and cause anemia (Hutson, 1984). Most of the fly species found in this study were similar to those recorded on domestic pigeons in Turkey (Erdem *et al.*, 2019; reviewed in Tezcan, 2020). In addition to the wild pigeons, a less common ked fly species (*O. metallica*) was detected on a Eurasian magpie, which is the first geographic record in Turkey.

Similar to ked infestation, low tick infestation rate (2.1%) was detected in the present study, which is consistent with that of the other studies conducted in Turkey ranging from 0.5% to 4.36% (Leblebicioglu *et al.*, 2014; Keskin and Erciyas-Yavuz, 2019). Nevertheless, our low numbers of ticks can, all or partially, be from accidental infestation. In addition, most of the detected ticks were larvae and nymphs, similar to those seen in previous studies in Turkey.

CONCLUSION

The avifauna of an environment plays a critical role in the ecosystem and is involved in the transmission of some zoonotic diseases (Smith *et al.*, 2020); therefore, their ectoparasites may play a role as vectors for spreading diseases. Results revealed numerous species of ectoparasites (lice, ticks and keds) on wild birds in Turkey being heavy infestation on resident birds than migratory.

Although these species can be possible vectors, additional research is needed to confirm the related pathogens that they harbor.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Authors thank Prof. Dr. Bilal Dik for his kindly guiding to identify some lice species and advising and thank Prof. Dr. Levent Aydın for his kindly teaching to identify tick species.

Conflict of interest: None.

REFERENCES

- Adam, C. (2004). Some morphological aspects of the species Meropoecus meropis (Denny, 1842) (Phthiraptera: Ischnocera). Travaux du Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle «Grigore Antipa». 17: 129-137.
- Adams, R.J., Price, R.D., Clayton, D.H. (2005). Taxonomic revision of old world members of the feather louse genus *Columbicola* (Phthiraptera: Ischnocera), including descriptions of eight new species. Journal of Natural History. 39: 3545-3618.
- Anonymous, (2018a). Trakus: Turkey's Anonymous Birds. Website http://www.trakus.org (accessed 28 December 2018).
- Anonymous, (2018b). Turkish State Meteorological Service: Meteorological Data in Bursa 1926-2017. Website https:/ /www.mgm.gov.tr/veridegerlendirme/il-ve-ilceler-istatistik. aspx?m=BURSA (accessed 28 December, 2018).
- Aslan, L., Adizel, Ö., Sancak, T. (2018). Treatment and rehabilitation of wild birds and mammals. Indian Journal of Animal Research. 52(4): 623-627.
- Bush, S.E. and Clayton, D.H. (2018). Anti-parasite Behaviour of Birds. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B. 373(1751): 20170196.
- Clay, T. (1940). Genera and species of Mallophaga occurring on Gallinaceous hosts. Part II. *Goniodes*. Zoological Society of London. 110(Ser B): 1-119.
- Clay, T. (1958). Revisions of Mallophaga genera. *Degeeriella* from Falconiformes. Bulletin of British Museum (Natural History) Entomology. 7(4): 123-207.
- Clay, T. (1962). A key to the species of *Actornithophilus* Ferris with notes and descriptions of new species. Bulletin of British Museum (Natural History) Entomology. 11: 189-244.
- Clay, T. (1974). The Phthiraptera (Insecta) parasitic on flamingoes (Phoenicopteridae: Aves). Journal of Zoology London. 172: 483-490.
- Clay, T. (1977). The *Strigiphilus cursitans* group (Phthiraptera: Insecta). Records of Queen Victoria Museum Launceston. 56: 1-4.
- Clay, T. and Hopkins, G.H.E. (1954). The early literature on Mallophaga. Bulletin of British Museum (Natural History) Entomology. 3: 221-266.
- Clayton, D.H. and Drown, D.M. (2001). Critical evaluation of five methods for quantifying chewing lice (Insecta: Phthiraptera). Journal of Parasitology. 87(6): 1291-1301.
- Clayton, D.H. and Walther, B.A. (1997). Collection and Quantification of Arthropod Parasites of Birds. In: Post-Parasite Evolution: General Principles and Avian Models. [Clayton, D.H. and Moore, J. (eds)]. Oxford University Press, Oxford. pp. 419-440.

- Clayton, D.H., Price, R.D., Page, R.D.M. (1996). Revision of *Dennyus* (*Collodennyus*) lice (Phthiraptera: Menoponidae) from swiftlets, with descriptions of new taxa and a comparison of host-parasite relationships. Systematic Entomology. 21: 179-204.
- Debnath, S., Biswas, S., Panigrahi, K. (2018). Present status and diversity of avian fauna in Purbasthali bird sanctuary, West Bengal, India. Agricultural Science Digest. 38(2): 95-102.
- Dik, B., Erciyas-Yavuz, K., Per, E. (2017). Chewing lice (Phthiraptera: Amblycera, Ischnocera) on birds in the Kızılırmak delta, Turkey. Revue de Médecine Vétérinaire. 1(1): 53-62.
- Dik, B., Per, E., Erciyas-Yavuz, K., Yamaç, E. (2015). Chewing lice (Phthiraptera: Amblycera, Ischnocera) species found on birds in Turkey, with new records and a new host association. Turkish Journal of Zoology. 39: 790-798.
- Erdem, I., Zerek, A., Yaman, M. (2019). The first record *Pseudolynchia canariensis* (Diptera: Hippoboscidae) in an Eurasian eagle owl (*Bubo bubo* Linnaeus, 1758) in Turkey. Kafkas Universitesi Veteriner Fakültesi Dergisi. 25(6): 887-888.
- Estrada-Pena, A., Bouattour, A., Camicas, J., Walker, A. (2004). Ticks of Domestic Animals in the Mediterranean Region: A Guide to Identification of Species. University of Zaragoza Press, Zaragoza. pp. 131.
- Girisgin, A.O., Dik, B., Girisgin, O. (2013). Chewing lice (Phthiraptera) species of wild birds in northwestern Turkey with a new host record. International Journal of Parasitology: Parasites and Wildlife. 2: 217-221.
- Gurler, A.T., Mironov, S.V., Erciyes-Yavuz, K. (2013). Avian Feather Mites (Acari: Astigmata) of Samsun, Turkey. Acarologia. 53(1): 17-23.
- Heinzel, H., Fitter, R., Parslow, J. (1995). Pocket Guide to Birds of Britain and Europe with North Africa and the Middle East. Harper Collins Publishers Ltd, UK. pp. 384.
- Heylen, D., De Coninck, E., Jansen, F., Madder, M. (2014). Differential diagnosis of three common *lxodes* spp. ticks infesting song birds of Western Europe: *lxodes arboricola*, *I. frontalis* and *I. ricinus*. Ticks and Tick-borne Diseases. 5(6): 693-700.
- Hutson, A.M. (1984). Keds, Flat-flies and Bat-flies. Diptera, Hippoboscidae and Nycteribiidae. Handbooks for the Identification of British Insects. 10(7): 1-40.
- Ilieva, M.N. (2005). New data on chewing lice (Insecta: Phthiraptera) from wild birds in Bulgaria. Acta Zoologica Bulgarica. 57: 37-48.

- Keskin, A. and Erciyas-Yavuz, K. (2019). Ticks (Acari: Ixodidae) parasitizing Passerine birds in Turkey with new records and new tick-host associations. Journal of Medical Entomology. 56(1): 156-161.
- Leblebicioglu, H., Eroglu, C., Erciyas-Yavuz, K., Hokelek, M., Acici, M., Yilmaz, H. (2014). Role of migratory birds in spreading Crimean-Congo hemorrhagic fever, Turkey. Emerging Infectious Diseases. 20(8): 1331-1334.
- Lyakhova, O.M. and Kotti, B.C. (2011). Chewing lice (Mallophaga: Insecta) of birds in the Central Ciscaucasia. Entomology Review. 91: 367-376.
- Magnin, G., Eken, G., Yarar, M. (2000). Turkey. In: Important Bird Areas in Europe: Priority Sites for Conservation 2: Southern Europe. [Heath, M.F., Evans, M.I. (Eds.)].Cambridge, UK: Birdlife International (Birdlife Conservation Series No.8), pp. 651-655.
- Pilgrim, R.I.C. (1976). Mallophaga on the rock pigeon (*Columba livia*) in New Zealand, with a key to their identification. New Zealand Entomology. 6: 160-164.
- Price, R.D. (1965). A review of *Comatomenapon* with descriptions of two new species (Mallophaga: Menoponidae). Pan-Pacific Entomology. 41(2): 80-85.
- Price, R.D. and Beer, J.R. (1963). Species of *Colpocephalum* (Mallophaga: Menoponidae) parasitic upon the Falconiformes. Canadian Entomology. 95: 731-763.
- Price, R.D., Hellenthal, R.A., Palma, R.L., Johnson, K.P., Clayton, D.H. (2003). The Chewing Lice: World Checklist and Biological Overview. USA: Illinois Natural History Survey Special Publication. 24. pp. 501.
- Smith, O.M., Snyder, W.E., Owen, J.P. (2020). Are we over estimating risk of enteric pathogen spillover from wild birds to humans? Biology Reviews. 95(3): 652-679.
- Tendeiro, J. (1973). Estudos Sobre os Goniodideos (Mallophaga, Ischnocera) dos Columbiformes. XIV. Género Coloceras Taschenberg, 1882. Revista de la Facultad de Ciências Veterinarias. 6: 199-524. (In Spanish).
- Tezcan, S. (2020). Analysis of the insect fauna of Turkey and suggestions for future studies. Munis Entomology and Zoology. 15(2): 690-710.
- Tuff, D.W. (1970). A new species of Ardeicola (Mallophaga: Philopteridae) from Thailand. Annual of Entomology Society of America. 63(4): 945-946.
- Walker, J.B., Keirans, J.E., Horak, I.G. (2005). The Genus *Rhipicephalus* (Acari, Ixodidae): A Guide to the Brown Ticks of the World. New York: Cambridge University Press. pp. 656.