Global Research Trends in Odonata during 2012-2021

Subjects: Zoology

Contributor: José Max Barbosa Oliveira-Junior, Tainã Silva Rocha, Suellen Furtado Vinagre, Jair Costa Miranda-Filho, Cristian Camilo Mendoza-Penagos, Karina Dias-Silva, Leandro Juen, Lenize Batista Calvão

Among the aquatic insect orders, Odonata have stood out because of their high habitat specificity and well-resolved taxonomy. The increase in ecological studies on Odonata may reflect the dynamic characteristics of this order, and its relatively well-defined systematics, especially in the case of adults. Despite the increased number of publications in the the Web of Science (WoS) database, there are still many spatial gaps (e.g., poorly studied regions/countries), and gaps in study focus, such as basic biology (e.g., life cycle, anatomy, physiology, habitat), biogeography, parasitism, competition within and between species, evolutionary and phylogenetic relationships, and Odonata eggs. This demonstrates that some areas are seriously neglected.

Keywords: Anisoptera ; Zygoptera ; dragonflies ; damselflies ; global research ; scientific production

1. Introduction

Aquatic insects have been employed as indicators of environmental quality in various types of freshwater systems worldwide [1]. Among the aquatic insect orders, Odonata have stood out because of their high habitat specificity and well-resolved taxonomy [2][3][4]. Furthermore, compared to aquatic macroinvertebrates, the use of Odonata adults for biomonitoring has several advantages. For instance, most species can be recognized quickly and captured in the field; they are distributed in a wide range of habitats, are sensitive to changes in water quality and ecological conditions of the surrounding environment, and the species assembly is typically large enough for assessments, especially in the tropics [5][6]. In addition, there are some Odonata species with antagonistic interactions, allowing the development of environmental quality indices [7][8].

Equally important, dragonflies arouse both cultural and academic interest [9]. The charisma of these animals, their grand flight maneuvers and vibrant colors attract the attention of many people, which explains the increasing number of partnership networks between researchers and dragonfly lovers [10][11][12], as well as citizen science programs [13][14][15]. Furthermore, because of their rich evolutionary history [16][17] and their ecological [18] and taxonomic particularities [3][4], dragonflies have been the focus of numerous investigations.

Currently, around 6376 species of odonates are known worldwide, with estimations suggesting that between 1000 and 1500 species have yet to be discovered [19][20]. Except for Antarctica, dragonflies are distributed on all continents, with the greatest diversity found in the Tropics (Paleotropics and Neotropics) [19]. Throughout their distribution range, it is possible to find them associated with different lentic (ponds, swamps, marshes, pools, wells) or lotic (rivers, streams, waterfalls, springs) water bodies, where they perform their development, hunting and breeding activities [2].

Odonates have an amphibious life cycle, meaning that part of their life is spent in the water as larvae and the other part is spent in the environment adjacent to the water bodies, as flying adults [2]. Both life stages have unique characteristics, causing them to respond differently to environmental changes. For example, Odonata larvae are more sensitive to changes in water's physical and chemical characteristics [21], whereas adults are more sensitive to changes in riparian vegetation [22]. Therefore, Odonata are widely used as indicators of environmental quality. They respond very well to changes in ecosystems, which can be evaluated using different methods such as: surrogates; taxa/species richness; species composition and the ratio between the suborders based on adult studies conducted at certain localities [23][24][25][26]; the developmental stage [21][27]; multimeric indices [28][29]; fluctuating asymmetry [30]; behavioral diversity [31]; ethodiversity [32]; phylogenetic diversity [33][34]; morphology [25][34] or the taxonomic level used (for establishing cost-benefit monitoring programs), see [27][35].

2. Temporal Trend (Year), Journal Publications and Keywords Cloud

The lowest number of published articles occurred in 2014 (*n* = 244; 8.83%); however, after 2014 there was an increase in the number of publications, with 2019 being the year with the highest number (*n* = 302; 10.93%). The journal with the highest number of published articles on Odonata was *Zootaxa*, with a total of 284 publications (10.27%), followed by the *International Journal of Odonatology* (226 publications; 8.18%), and *Odonatologica* (202 publications; 7.31%). Other important journals (an additional 497 journals) included fewer than 56 articles each. The five most prominent words highlighted in the keywords cloud were 'Odonata' (weight = 1.00), 'dragonfly' (weight = 0.95), 'damselfly' (weight = 0.56), 'species' (weight = 0.53) and 'Zygoptera' (weight = 0.38).

There was an increase in the number of publications and the frequencies and trends changed over the time analyzed. Although there are years with low production during the period analyzed, the trend towards an increase in the number of studies on dragonflies is maintained when compared with previous analyses [36] but reaches a plateau after 2017.

Zootaxa, *International Journal of Odonatology* and *Odonatologica*, are the journals with the highest number of papers published on Odonata. All are international, specialized, and peer-reviewed journals, but there are differences between them, which can be used to better interpret the results. *Zootaxa* is a broad scope journal, with a preference for papers in zoology (any animal taxa), mainly focused on the systematic reviews of groups and/or description of new taxa, in a fast, high-quality format. Its wide scope, frequency of publication, and review system have allowed the journal to have a positive impact on the advancement of knowledge of many groups, including Odonata [37]. On the other hand, it was expected that the *International Journal of Odonatology* and *Odonatologica*, specialized journals in Odonatology, would also have many publications. Both accept any type of research related to dragonflies, so their spectrum includes broader fields of research such as ecology, conservation, ethology, and reproduction.

3. Spatial Trend of Publications (Across Countries)

The ten countries with the most publications were the USA (*n* = 346), Brazil (*n* = 272), China (*n* = 204), Germany (*n* = 135), Japan (*n* = 132), Canada (*n* = 122), Sweden (*n* = 121), France (*n* = 110), Mexico (*n* = 103) and India (*n* = 83). Several other countries had >10 publications, indicating the global interest on the Odonata as a target organism for research.

Regarding the countries with the largest number of publications, for the American continents, the USA (first place) and Brazil (second place) remain the countries with the largest number of publications. This reaffirms the importance of the work developed by these two countries, which have a broad tradition of research contributing considerably to the knowledge of Neotropical dragonflies [36]. The case is similar in the African context, where the countries that maintain the highest number of publications are South Africa and Algeria, places where leading odonatologists have been established for many years. Likewise in Europe and Asia, the greater number of publications are in countries with a long history and tradition of Odonata research such as Germany in Europe, or China and Japan in Asia [36].

4. Research Focus

Most studies focused on Odonata ecology (*n* = 717), followed by studies on taxonomy (*n* = 584), behavior (*n* = 576), morphology (*n* = 343) and ecological monitoring (*n* = 207).

The studies show a great diversity of research areas in which dragonflies have been used as research targets. However, it was expected that the largest number of publications would be focused on ecology and biodiversity studies, because many journals publish articles on Odonata that are not specific to taxonomy or phylogeny. Miguel et al. [36] found the same trend worldwide. Moreover, areas such as ecology and behavior are constantly growing, so periodically new metrics, approaches and methodologies are published, generating interest to replicate them in different parts of the world [38][39]. Ecology is the main research focus on the American and African continents. In Asia and Oceania, taxonomy is the main type of study, while in Europe, behavior studies stand out.

Although studies in genetics have increased, there are disadvantages in their replicability, especially in developing countries, because of both financial and equipment limitations [36]. Finally, topics of decreasing scientific interest and funding are associated with fewer publications (e.g., natural history and basic species biology).

The focus of research on each continent is varied and likely related to who lives where. For example, the fact that the Americas contain the largest number of researchers in ecology, behavior and taxonomy is directly related to the establishment and growth of different research groups, mainly in Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, the United States, and

Mexico (e.g., Dragonfly Society of the Americas and Sociedad de Odonatologia Latinoamericana) [36][40][41][42][43]. Asia and Oceania each show the same research patterns, mainly taxonomy, morphology, and ecology. In all three continents, there is a history of taxonomic studies which is maintained today. In Europe, the main research focus is behavior, ecology, and morphology. European odonate biodiversity has been well known for a century, and only after more than 100 years was a new species described there [44]. Africa is the only continent where the main lines of research are also focused on conservation. This is certainly related to the studies developed by several research groups that are focused on conservation, especially in South Africa, such as the research group led by Michael J. Samways and John P. Simaika. M.J. Samways has published extensively on various aspects of Odonata ecology and conservation [45], especially regarding landscape ecology and insect conservation in general [46]. J.P. Simaika has more than a decade of experience working in rivers, lakes, wetlands and artificial ponds in Africa. Their research has led of public conservation policies at the international level [46].

5. Study Habitat Types

The highest number of published articles on Odonata were conducted in the field, i.e., in streams (*n* = 668), ponds (*n* = 437), rivers (*n* = 318), and lakes (*n* = 278), but many were also part of laboratory experiments (*n* = 364) or involved fossilized material (*n* = 125). Markedly fewer studies have been conducted in pools (*n* = 42), reservoirs (*n* = 20), mesocosms (*n* = 10), and plants (*n* = 3).

Because of the strong relationship between dragonflies and aquatic environments, it is reasonable that research on Odonata focused on some of these environments. Most of the research has been conducted in lotic environments, such as rivers and streams, systems that are under constant anthropogenic threats [47]. The type of impact, as well as the degree of intensity, affects the complex dynamics of functioning and interconnection in this habitat, generating serious effects on their health as well as on the biodiversity that inhabits them [48]. Because of this, numerous environmental laws across the world stress the evaluation and monitoring of lotic bodies as a priority [1][49].

6. Suborder, Life Stage and Taxonomic Resolution Most Used in Studies

Of the total articles on Odonata, 982 involved the Zygoptera, 946 Anisoptera and 15 the Anisozygoptera. Another 756 studies were focused on both main suborders, i.e., Anisoptera and Zygoptera. Most studies (*n* = 1662) were focused only on adults, 714 only on the nymphs, 160 on adults and nymphs, and 40 on nymphs and eggs. It is noteworthy that several articles focused on more than one life stage. Most articles (*n* = 2381) used species-level taxonomy.

Most studies focused on Odonata, including the suborders Anisoptera and Zygoptera in their analyses. Numerous studies included both suborders to compare the responses among their species [23][50]. When a single suborder was analyzed, the Zygoptera and Anisoptera were used with similar frequencies. Thus, there was no clear pattern or preference for a specific suborder. One reason for this tendency is the well resolved taxonomy in both suborders [51], because a resolved taxonomy is the basis for asking different questions in areas such as evolution, systematics, or ecology.

Adults or larvae were the stages most commonly used in research. Presumably, this is because adult Odonata are visible in the field, their collection requires only an insect net, excellent taxonomic keys for most species are available and easily accessible, and the adults can be identified to the species level [3][4][9]. This is partially true for larvae, the second stage with the most publications, particularly in regions with a long tradition in larval dragonfly research [52]. On the other hand, in regions where this tradition is more recent, there are fewer larval studies [36]. Furthermore, only the larvae of 1/3 of the Odonata species are described [53] and larvae detection and transportation from the field to the laboratory is more complex [36]. Research studies on both adults and larvae are numerous, which is especially useful when one may want to compare responses between the two phases to provide a more comprehensive analysis [27]. There has also been research on three or more phases, presumably when one wants to evaluate ontogenetic development, for which the collection of eggs and the development of larvae are needed [54]. This also applies in the case of larvae and exuviae and larvae and adults, where the association of the different stages is important for taxonomic description [55].

Despite not being an official life stage, research on exuviae shows great potential for tracing the route of environmental contaminants [56] or for adults that are difficult to find or capture [57]. Exuviae also provide proof of life cycle completion at particular habitats [56]. However, exuvia research requires investing much field time, considerable care in transportation and storage of such fragile specimens, and identification problems similar to those with larvae. Incidentally, the results reinforce the evidence that shows how different life stages in Odonata are useful for evaluating different research questions. Finally, it is not surprising that fossil studies are numerous in Odonata because there are many odonate fossil records, which provide the basis for studies of evolutionary relationships within the order [58].

Species is the taxonomic level most often used in most studies, but genus, family, and order are used as well. Identification to species is important because it facilitates more accurate information about a particular taxon. However, this requires more time, taxonomic expertise, and financial resources, which is a disadvantage for projects that need an immediate response or are underfunded [59]. Therefore, there is much discussion in the literature regarding the preferable taxonomic level for studies. For example, Jansen et al. [60] point out that it is challenging to classify organisms into higher-level taxonomic groups, such as families, because many family-specific features may not be distinguishable.

Although most Odonata papers in the WoS database use the species level of taxonomic resolution, Mendoza-Penagos et al. [35] demonstrated that the family level provides an effective tool odonate for biomonitoring of tropical streams by providing ecologically meaningful information. Future studies should evaluate the costs and benefits of diagnosing impacts by comparing multiple taxonomic levels against a common disturbance gradient [61][62].

References

1. Bonada, N.; Prat, N.; Resh, V.H.; Statzner, B. Developments in aquatic insect biomonitoring: A comparative analysis of recent approaches. Annu. Rev. Entomol. 2006, 51, 495–523.
2. Corbet, P.S. Dragonflies: Behaviour and Ecology of Odonata, 1st ed.; Harley Books: Colchester, UK, 1999; 850p.
3. Garrison, R.W.; Ellenrieder, N.V.; Louton, J.A. Dragonfly genera of the New World: An Illustrated and Annotated Key to the Anisoptera; The Johns Hopkins University Press: Baltimore, MA, USA, 2006; 490p.
4. Garrison, R.W.; Von Ellenrieder, N.; Louton, J.A. Damselfly genera of the New World: An Illustrated and Annotated Key to the Zygoptera; Johns Hopkins University Press: Baltimore, MA, USA, 2010; 490p.
5. Samways, M.J.; Steytler, N.S. Dragonfly (Odonata) distribution patterns in urban and forest landscapes, and recommendations for riparian management. Biol. Conserv. 1996, 78, 279–288.
6. Chovanec, A.; Waringer, J. Ecological integrity of river–floodplain systems—Assessment by dragonfly surveys (Insecta: Odonata). Regul. Rivers Res. Manag. 2001, 17, 493–507.
7. Oliveira-Junior, J.M.B.; Juen, L. The Zygoptera/Anisoptera Ratio (Insecta: Odonata): A New Tool for Habitat Alterations Assessment in Amazonian Streams. Neotropic. Entomol. 2019, 48, 552–560.
8. Batista, J.D.; Ferreira, V.R.S.; Cabette, H.S.R.; De Castro, L.A.; De Marco, P.; Juen, L. Sampling efficiency of a protocol to measure Odonata diversity in tropical streams. PLoS ONE 2021, 16, e0248216.
9. May, M.L. Odonata: Who they are and what they have done for us lately: Classification and ecosystem services of dragonflies. Insects 2019, 10, 62.
10. Sociedad de Odonatología Latinoamericana. Available online: https://www.odonatasol.org/ (accessed on 8 February 2022).
11. Dragonfly Society of the Americas. Available online: https://www.dragonflysocietyamericas.org/ (accessed on 8 February 2022).
12. Worldwide Dragonfly Association. Available online: https://worlddragonfly.org/ (accessed on 8 February 2022).
13. Ožana, S.; Burda, M.; Hykel, M.; Malina, M.; Prášek, M.; Bárta, D.; Dolný, A. Dragonfly Hunter CZ: Mobile application for biological species recognition in citizen science. PLoS ONE 2019, 14, e0210370.
14. Patten, M.A.; Hjalmarson, E.A.; Smith-Patten, B.D.; Bried, J.T. Breeding thresholds in opportunistic Odonata records. Ecol. Indic. 2019, 106, 105460.
15. Bried, J.; Ries, L.; Smith, B.; Patten, M.; Abbott, J.; Ball-Damerow, J.; Cannings, R.; Cordero-Rivera, A.; Córdoba-Aguilar, A.; De Marco, P.; et al. Towards global volunteer monitoring of odonate abun-dance. BioScience 2020, 70, 914–923.
16. Carle, F.L.; Kjer, K.M.; May, M.L. Evolution of Odonata, with special reference to Coenagrionoidea (Zygoptera). Arthropod Syst. Phylogeny 2008, 66, 37–44.
17. Felker, A.S. New Damselflies of the Family Kennedyidae (Odonata: Protozygoptera) from the Upper Permian of the Vologda Region. Paleontol. J. 2021, 55, 396–404.
18. Córdoba-Aguilar, A. Dragonflies and Damselflies, Model Organisms for Ecological and Evolutionary Research, 1st ed.; Oxford University Press: Oxford, UK, 2008; 290p.
19. Kalkman, V.J.; Clausnitzer, V.; Dijkstra, K.-D.B.; Orr, A.G.; Paulson, D.R.; van Tol, J. Global diversity of dragonflies (Odonata) in freshwater. Hydrobiologia 2008, 595, 351–363.

20. Suhling, F.; Sahlén, G.; Gorb, S.; Kalkman, V.J.; Dijkstra, K.D.B.; van Tol, J. Order Odonata. In Thorp and Covich's Freshwater Invertebrates: Ecology and General Biology, 5th ed.; Thorp, J.H., Covich, A.P., Eds.; Academic Press: Cambridge, MA, USA, 2015; pp. 893–932.
21. Mendes, T.P.; Luiza-Andrade, A.; Cabette, H.S.R.; Juen, L. How does environmental variation affect the distribution of dragonfly larvae (Odonata) in the Amazon-Cerrado transition zone in Central Brazil? Neotropic. Entomol. 2018, 47, 37–45.
22. Carvalho, F.G.; Pinto, N.S.; Oliveira Junior, J.M.B.; Juen, L. Effects of marginal vegetation removal on Odonata communities. Acta Limnol. Bras. 2013, 25, 10–18.
23. Oliveira-Junior, J.M.B.; Dias-Silva, K.; Teodósio, M.A.; Juen, L. The Response of Neotropical Dragonflies (Insecta: Odonata) to Local and Regional Abiotic Factors in Small Streams of the Amazon. Insects 2019, 10, 446.
24. Oliveira-Junior, J.M.B.; Juen, L. Structuring of dragonfly communities (Insecta: Odonata) in eastern Amazon: Effects of envi-ronmental and spatial factors in preserved and altered streams. Insects 2019, 10, 322.
25. Oliveira-Junior, J.M.B.; Teodósio, M.A.; Juen, L. Patterns of co-occurrence and body size in dragonflies and damselflies (Insecta: Odonata) in preserved and altered Amazonian streams. Austral Entomol. 2021, 60, 436–450.
26. Oliveira-Junior, J.M.B.; De Marco, P.; Dias-Silva, K.; Leitão, R.P.; Leal, C.G.; Pompeu, P.S.; Gardner, T.A.; Hughes, T.A.; Juen, L. Effects of human disturbance and riparian conditions on Odonata (Insecta) assemblages in eastern Amazon basin streams. Limnologica 2017, 66, 31–39.
27. Valente-Neto, F.; Roque, F.O.; Rodrigues, M.E.; Juen, L.; Swan, C. Toward a practical use of Neotropical odonates as bioindicators: Testing congruence across taxonomic resolution and life stages. Ecol. Indic. 2016, 61, 952–959.
28. Miguel, T.B.; Oliveira-Junior, J.M.B.; Ligeiro, R.; Juen, L. Odonata (Insecta) as a tool for the biomonitoring of environmental quality. Ecol. Indic. 2017, 81, 555–566.
29. Valente-Neto, F.; Rodrigues, M.E.; Roque, F.O. Selecting indicators based on biodiversity surrogacy and environmental response in a riverine network: Bringing operationality to biomonitoring. Ecol. Indic. 2018, 94, 198–206.
30. Pinto, N.S.; Juen, L.; Cabette, H.S.R.; De Marco, P. Fluctuating Asymmetry and Wing Size of Argia tinctipennis Selys (Zygoptera: Coenagrionidae) in Relation to Riparian Forest Preservation Status. Neotropic. Entomol. 2012, 41, 178–185.
31. Resende, B.O.; Ferreira, V.R.S.; Brasil, L.S.; Calvão, L.B.; Mendes, T.P.; Carvalho, F.G.; Mendoza-Penagos, C.C.; Bastos, R.C.; Brito, J.S.; Oliveira-Junior, J.M.B.; et al. Impact of environmental changes on the behavioral diversity of the Odonata (Insecta) in the Amazon. Sci. Rep. 2021, 11, 9742.
32. Guillermo-Ferreira, R.; Juen, L. Odonate ethodiversity as a bioindicator of anthropogenic impact. Int. J. Odonatol. 2021, 24, 149–157.
33. Geraldo de Carvalho, F.; Duarte, L.; Nakamura, G.; Dubal dos Santos Seger, G.; Juen, L. Changes of Phylogenetic and Taxonomic Diversity of Odonata (Insecta) in Response to Land Use in Amazonia. Forests 2021, 12, 1061.
34. Bastos, R.C.; Brasil, L.S.; Oliveira-Junior, J.M.B.; Geraldo Carvalho, F.; Lennox, G.D.; Barlow, J.; Juen, L. Morphological and phylogenetic factors structure the distribution of damselfly and dragonfly species (Odonata) along an environmental gradient in Amazonian streams. Ecol. Indic. 2021, 122, 107257.
35. Mendoza-Penagos, C.C.; Calvão, L.B.; Juen, L. A new biomonitoring method using taxonomic families as substitutes for the suborders of the Odonata (Insecta) in Amazonian streams. Ecol. Indic. 2021, 124, 107388.
36. Miguel, T.B.; Calvão, L.B.; Vital, M.V.C.; Juen, L. A scientometric study of the order Odonata with special attention to Brazil. Int. J. Odonatol. 2017, 20, 27–42.
37. Zhang, Z.Q. Contributions of Zootaxa to biodiversity discovery: An overview of the first twenty years. Zootaxa 2021, 4979, 6–16.
38. Bybee, S.; Córdoba-Aguilar, A.; Duryea, M.C.; Futahashi, R.; Hansson, B.; Lorenzo-Carballa, M.O.; Schilder, R.; Stoks, R.; Suvorov, A.; Svensson, E.I.; et al. Odonata (dragonflies and damsel-flies) as a bridge between ecology and evolutionary genomics. Front. Zool. 2016, 13, 46.
39. Cordero-Rivera, A. Behavioral diversity (ethodiversity): A neglected level in the study of biodiversity. Front. Ecol. Evol. 2017, 5, 7.
40. Palacino-Rodríguez, F. Two decades of progress in over one hundred years of study: Present status of Odonata research in Colombia. Odonatologica 2016, 45, 327–334.
41. Lozano, F.; del Palacio, A.; Ramos, L.; Muzón, J. The Odonata of Argentina: State of knowledge and updated checklist. Int. J. Odonatol. 2020, 23, 113–153.

42. González-Soriano, E.; Novelo-Gutiérrez, R. Biodiversidad de Odonata en MéxicoBiodiversity of Odonata in Mexico. Rev. Mex. Biodivers. 2014, 85, 243–251.

43. White, E.L.; Hunt, P.D.; Schlesinger, M.D.; Corser, J.D.; deMaynadier, P.G. A Conservation Status Assessment of Odonata for the Northeastern United States; New York Natural Heritage Program: Albany, NY, USA, 2014; Available online: https://rcngrants.org/sites/default/files/final_reports/RCN%202011-3%20final%20report.pdf (accessed on 11 November 2022).

44. López-Estrada, E.K.; Barona Fernández, J.; Cardo- Maeso, N.; Teruel Montejano, S.; Díaz-Martínez, C. Onychogomphus cazuma sp. nov. from Spain: Molecular and morphological evidence supports the discovery of a new European dragonfly species (Odonata: Gomphidae). Odonatatologica 2021, 49, 125–154.

45. Bried, J.T.; Samways, M.J. A review of odonatology in freshwater applied ecology and conservation science. Freshw. Sci. 2015, 34, 1023–1031.

46. Samways, M.J.; Barton, P.S.; Birkhofer, K.; Chichorro, F.; Deacon, C.; Fartmann, T.; Fukushima, C.S.; Gaigher, R.; Habel, J.C.; Hallmann, C.A.; et al. Solutions for humanity on how to conserve insects. Biol. Conserv. 2020, 242, 108427.

47. Leal, C.G.; Lennox, G.D.; Ferraz, S.B.; Ferreira, J.; Gardner, T.A.; Thomson, J.R.; Berenguer, E.; Lees, A.C.; Hughes, R.M.; Nally, R.M.; et al. Integrated terrestrial-freshwater planning doubles conservation of tropical aquatic species. Science 2020, 370, 6512.

48. Calvão, L.B.; Nogueira, D.S.; Montag, L.F.A.; Lopes, M.A.; Juen, L. Are Odonata communities impacted by conventional or reduced impact logging? For. Ecol. Manag. 2016, 382, 143–150.

49. Buss, D.F.; Carlisle, D.; Chon, T.S.; Culp, J.; Harding, J.S.; Keizer-Vlek, H.E.; Robinson, W.A.; Strachan, S.; Thirion, C.; Hughes, R.M. Stream biomonitoring using macroinvertebrates around the globe: A comparison of large-scale programs. Environ. Monit. Assess. 2015, 187, 4132.

50. Oliveira-Junior, J.M.B.; Shimano, Y.; Gardner, T.A.; Hughes, R.M.; De Marco, P.; Juen, L. Neotropical dragonflies (Insecta: Odonata) as indicators of ecological condition of small streams in the eastern Amazon. Austral Ecol. 2015, 40, 733–744.

51. Bybee, S.M.; Kalkman, V.J.; Erickson, R.J.; Frandsen, P.B.; Breinholt, J.W.; Suvorov, A.; Dijkstra, K.D.B.; Cordero-Rivera, A.; Skevington, J.H.; Abbott, J.C.; et al. Phylogeny and classification of Odonata using targeted genomics. Mol. Phylogenet. Evol. 2021, 160, 107115.

52. Tennessen, K.J. Dragonfly Nymphs of North America: An Identification Guide, 1st ed.; Springer: New York, NY, USA, 2019; 620p.

53. Hamada, N.; Nessimian, J.L.; Querino, R.B. Insetos Aquáticos na Amazônia Brasileira: Taxonomia, Biologia e Ecologia, 1st ed.; Editora do INPA: Manaus, AM, Brasil, 2014; 724p.

54. Schenk, K.; Söndgerath, D. Influence of egg size differences within egg clutches on larval parameters in nine libellulid species (Odonata). Ecol. Entomol. 2005, 30, 456–463.

55. Paul, S.; Kakkassery, F.K. Taxonomic and diversity studies on odonate nymphs by using their exuviae. J. Entomol. Zool. Stud. 2013, 1, 47–53.

56. Simon, E.; Tóthmérész, B.; Kis, O.; Jakab, T.; Éva Szalay, P.; Vincze, A.; Baranyai, E.; Harangi, S.; Miskolczi, M.; Dévai, G. Environmental-Friendly Contamination Assessment of Habitats Based on the Trace Element Content of Dragonfly Exuviae. Water 2019, 11, 2200.

57. Silva-Méndez, G.; Riso, S.; Lorenzo-Carballa, M.O.; Cordero-Rivera, A. Sampling larvae, exuviae or adults of Odonata for ecological studies: A test of methods in permanent rivers in the Iberian Peninsula. Odonatologica 2022, 51, 63–81.

58. Rehn, A.C. Phylogenetic analysis of higher-level relationships of Odonata. Syst. Entomol. 2003, 28, 181–240.

59. Vianna, D.M.; De Marco, P. Higher-taxon and cross-taxon surrogates for odonate biodiversity in Brazil. Nat. ConServação 2012, 10, 34–39.

60. Jansen, J.; Hill, N.A.; Dunstan, P.K.; Eléaume, M.P.; Johnson, C.R. Taxonomic Resolution, Functional Traits, and the Influence of Species Groupings on Mapping Antarctic Seafloor Biodiversity. Front. Ecol. Evol. 2018, 6, 81.

61. Whitter, T.R.; Van Sickle, J. Macroinvertebrate tolerance values and an assemblage tolerance index (ATI) for western USA streams and rivers. J. N. Am. Benthol. Soc. 2010, 29, 852–866.

62. Valente-Neto, F.; Martinez, B.T.; Ferreira, A.; Neto, F.S.; de Souza, F.L.; Souza, R.P.; Escarpinati, S.C.; Hughes, R.M.; Roque, F.O. Incorporating costs, thresholds and spatial extents for selecting stream bioindicators in an ecotone between two Brazilian biodiversity hotspots. Ecol. Indic. 2021, 127, 107761.