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I write as a conservation-oriented herpetologist who has had some field encounters in Thailand with the species *Hemidactylus garnotii* Duméril & Bibron, 1836.

It is my pleasure to support the application made by Prof. Smith, Kluge, Bauer and Chuszar to conserve the specific name of *Hemidactylus garnotii* in the face of the senior synonymy of *H. peruviamus* Wiegmann, 1835. My reasons for this are two-fold:

1. The name *H. garnotii* is well established and universally employed in publications dealing with the taxonomy of this species and its allies (see, for example, Smith, 1935; Taylor, 1963; Ota & Hikida, 1989; Ota, Hikida & Lue, 1989; Ota, Lau & Bogad, 1995; Ota, Matsui, Chan-ard & Nabhitabhata, 1996). Few, if any, authors include *H. peruviamus* even as a tentative synonym. I could not find any reference to the latter in my Asia-dominated library.

2. The *Hemidactylus* taxon in question was originally a species of tropical eastern Asia, a region to which its close relatives remain restricted (see papers by Ota et al.). It has subsequently been introduced outside its natural range by human means, its establishment in new locales doubtless facilitated by its parthenogenetic reproduction. For an essentially Asian species to be named 'peruviamus' may not be nomenclaturally incorrect but it is highly misleading; I hope that it will be kept in mind as an additional factor in favour of the suppression of *peruviamus* on grounds of stability.
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