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In response to the comment by Fautin & Daly (BZN 68: 204–205), I reiterate that the homonymy in question does not present a problem because Haliplanella Hand, 1956 will disappear in synonymy.

Contrary to the allegation by Fautin & Daly (BZN 68: 204), Hand (1956, pp. 190, 222) was fully aware that he created a genus containing species with or without catch tentacles when he moved the members of the genus Aiptasiomorpha (Aiptasiorphidae), supposedly without catch tentacles, to the genus Diadumene (Diadumenidae), supposedly with catch tentacles. Additionally, catch tentacles ‘may be lacking’ according to Hand’s (1956, p. 222) diagnosis of the monogenic family Diadumenidae and, in his description of Diadumene franciscana, Hand (1956, p. 236) even explicitly stated the absence of catch tentacles. Obviously, the presence or absence of these special tentacles could therefore not play a part in distinguishing between Diadumene, a genus containing species with or without catch tentacles, and Haliplanella, supposedly but not actually without catch tentacles. Hand (1956) thus established the genus Haliplanella and the family Haliplanellidae based on one character: the assumed presence of three types of nematocysts in its acontia. I repeat from den Hartog & Ates (2011, pp. 18–19) that this character is a nonexistent one. Not three, but two types of nematocysts are present in the acontia of Diadumene luciae (Verrill, 1898), ‘amastigophores’ merely being one of several minor categories of p-mastigophores or p-rhabdoids (= penicilli). See also Schmidt (e.g. 1972, p. 8), Manuel (1981, p. 134) and Den Hartog & Ates (2011) for further information.

In his usage of Diadumene, Hand (e.g. in Fautin & Hand, 2007, p. 182) apparently came to realize that not three, but two types of nematocysts are present in the acontia of D. luciae. This may also be obvious from the relevant statement in Fautin et al. (BZN 66: 314), implying that appeal 3493 was being made notwithstanding Hand’s change of opinion to the effect that ‘late in his life’ (cf. BZN 66: 314) he considered Diadumene the valid name rather than Haliplanella. Rodriguez et al. (2012, p. 9) deal the final blow to Haliplanella Hand, 1956 as their genetic research reveals that it ‘nests among species of Diadumene, as predicted by den Hartog (1987) and Manuel (1981/1988)’. Actually, the reference to den Hartog (1987) is wrong as it does not mention Haliplanella. Possibly, they meant den Hartog (1978).

The well-marked fosse and parapet in D. luciae is a very relevant aspect of this matter indeed. Again, there might have been reason to suppress Haliplanella Treadwell, 1943 if the name Haliplanella Hand, 1956 were kept in use as did Manuel (1981/1988). Manuel (1981/1988, p. 134) saw no use for the family Haliplanellidae because he agreed with Schmidt (1972) that amastigophores are merely a subtype of p-mastigophores, leading to the conviction that only two types of nematocysts are present in the acontia of D. luciae. However, Manuel (1981/1988) used the argument of the well-marked fosse and parapet in D. luciae to maintain Haliplanella. That