

Significance and Conservation of Birds of the Genus of Bee-eater (*MEROPS*) in Uzbekistan

Shodiyeva Fotima Ochilovna  , Yangiboyev Elmurod Chorshanbiyevich*  , Kholboev Fakhridin Rohmonkulovich  , Rakhimov Matnazar Shomurodovich  

Department of Zoology, National University of Uzbekistan named after Mirzo Ulugbek, Tashkent, Uzbekistan.

*Corresponding Author.

Received 28/02/2022, Revised 04/02/2023, Accepted 06/02/2023, Published Online First 20/07/2023, Published 01/02/2024



© 2022 The Author(s). Published by College of Science for Women, University of Baghdad.

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Abstract

The purpose of this article is to identify and evaluate the importance of birds of the genus *Merops* (European Bee-eater -*Merops apiaster* and Blue-cheeked Bee-eater -*Merops persicus*) in Uzbekistan, as well as to develop recommendations aimed at solving some problems associated with its conservation. As a result of the study, in the aspect of biocenotic relations, the natural significance of these species was revealed. The economic value is determined and analyzed in beekeeping farms. From the study of the remains of food contained in the stomachs, throats and nests of *M. apiaster*, a preliminary list of the main species of the food spectrum has been compiled. Based on the bioacoustic repellent "Korshun-8", a new, more effective bioacoustic repellent has been developed to repel bee-eaters. To solve some of the problems associated with the conservation of bee-eaters, recommendations have been developed aimed at preventing the illegal extermination of bee-eaters, preserving their nesting colonies, etc.

Keywords: Bees, Biocenotic communications, Bioacoustic repellent, Commensalism, Distress signal, Food residues Predation, Pellet.

Introduction

Usually, an incorrect definition and assessment of the values of an animal species can affect the stability of the population or its continued existence. The same species in different parts of its range has different meanings. Therefore, it is very difficult to characterize a species in terms of its values and take appropriate measures. Based on these complexities, serious problems are created regarding the conservation, use and management of the behavior of the species. In many countries, there is currently a one-sided approach to determining the value of a

species, that is, the value of a species is mainly estimated from an economic point of view¹. Unfortunately, as a result of such an unacceptable approach in Uzbekistan and in some other countries^{2,3}, many birds from the bee-eater genus - *Merops* are destroyed. These are European Bee-eater -*Merops apiaster* and Blue-cheeked Bee-eater - *Merops persicus*).

In Uzbekistan, the significance of the biocenotic relationships of these species has not been sufficiently studied³ The lack of these and other

information, especially about the conservation status, is the main reason for the negative attitude of humans toward hunting these species.

At present, *M. apiaster* is listed in the Red Book of the Republic of Belarus and a number of Red Books of the subjects of the Russian Federation (Bashkortostan, Mari El, Chuvashia, Tatarstan, Udmurtia, Vladimir regions, Altai etc.). *M. persicus* is listed in the Red Books of the Astrakhan region and the Staropol of the Russian Federation⁴. Despite this, in Uzbekistan and in many countries where

Materials and Methods

The materials were collected for the period 2020–2021 in various administrative-territorial entities of the Republic of Uzbekistan (Tashkent, Bukhara, Samarkand, Fergana, Karakalpakstan, Surkhandarya). The field study was carried out in natural landscapes, nesting colonies, beekeeping farms and agrocenoses.

The number of birds was taken into account in stationary areas and fixed routes⁵⁻⁷. At the same time, the length of the route was 1-2 km, the width was 50 meters, in total 168.45 km² were covered. To determine the composition of food, stomachs were collected from shot birds (n=115), from nocturnal and nesting colonies of pellets (n=1020) and food remains from nests (n=48).

Animal species found in food remains were studied in the laboratory of the Department of Zoology of the National University of Uzbekistan. An Eschenbach mobilux led magnifier and MBS-1 binoculars and

Results

At present, in Uzbekistan, the total abundance of *M. persicus* (0.87±0.02 ind/ha) is greater than that of *M. apiaster* (0.45±0.01 ind/ha). This is explained by our own research on the accounting and description of bird distribution areas.

It should be noted that people involved in beekeeping consider these species to be harmful. In their opinion,

beekeeping is developed, this species is destroyed by shooting, as beekeepers consider these species to be the main enemy of bees. This situation dictates that in the future, with the development of beekeeping, the scale of the negative impact of birds of the genus *Merops* may increase.

Based on this, consider the definitions and assessment of the importance of birds of the genus *Merops* bee-eaters to be relevant in terms of their conservation and rational use.

guides were used to determine the species belonging to animals⁸⁻¹⁰.

In order to control the behavior of birds by scaring them away from beekeeping farms, the bioacoustic repellent Korshun-8 (manufactured in Ukraine) was tested. For this purpose, it's tested the “*Merops* – distress signal” developed by us, which is adapted to broadcast distress signals of local widespread bird species (*Accipiter nisus*, *Falco naumanni*, *M. apiaster*).

During research, examined 5 museum collections in Uzbekistan and found 196 specimens of these species of datiryushi there at the main end of the XIX th and in the first quarter of the XX th century¹¹. An analysis of these samples shows that *M. apiaster* (110) is larger in abundance than *M. persicus* (86), and in terms of geographical distribution, it is different.

the bee-eaters mainly feed on bees and, at the same time, the economic efficiency of the economy decreases. Our data obtained from the determination of the species composition and number of food objects of *M. apiaster* (Table 1) confirms that these species are useful.

Table 1. Animal species found in the food composition of *M. apiaster* in the reproductive and post-reproductive cycles

№	Species	Reproductive cycle: the number and share of participation of the species in the composition of food		After the reproductive cycle: the number and proportion of the species in the composition of the food	
		Absolute quantity	Share of participation (%)	Absolute quantity	Share of participation (%)
1.	Odonata: <i>Calopteryx splendens</i>	18	1,44	5	0,48
2.	<i>Calopteryx virgo</i>	8	0,64	15	1,45
3.	<i>Lestes dryas</i>	16	1,28	6	0,58
4.	<i>Ischnura elegans</i>	13	1,04	8	0,77
5.	<i>Ischnura forcipata</i>	6	0,48	4	0,38
6.	<i>Gomphus flavipes</i>	9	0,72	13	1,26
7.	<i>Cordulegaster coranatus</i>	20	0,16	12	1,16
8.	<i>Aeschna juncea</i>	35	2,81	20	1,94
9.	<i>Aeschna isoscelis</i>	22	1,77	47	4,57
10.	<i>Anax imperator</i>	50	4,02	35	3,40
11.	<i>Anax partenope</i>	46	3,70	59	5,73
12.	<i>Libellula depressa</i>	31	2,49	26	2,52
13.	<i>Sympetrum flavelonum</i>	19	1,52	30	2,91
14.	<i>Sympetrum vulgatum</i>	42	3,38	21	2,04
15.	<i>Sympetrum pedemontanum</i>	25	2,01	45	4,37
16.	<i>Orthetrum brunneum</i>	31	2,49	19	1,84
17.	Blattodea: <i>Polyphaga saussurei</i>	9	0,72	-	
18.	<i>Blatta jrientalis</i>	5	0,40	-	
19.	Mahtodea <i>Mantis religiosa</i>	7	0,56	12	1,16
20.	Orthoptera:	12	0,96	4	0,38

<i>Tettigonia viridissima</i>					
21.	<i>Melanogryllus desertus</i>	-	-	2	0,19
22.	<i>Gryllus bimaculatus</i>	-	-	10	0,97
23.	<i>Pteronemobius gracilis</i>	-	-	6	0,58
24.	<i>Calliptamus italicus</i>	24	1,93	18	1,75
25.	<i>Calliptamus turanicus</i>	40	3,22	64	6,22
26.	<i>Calliptamus sp.</i>	34	2,73	23	2,23
27.	<i>Locusta migratoria</i>	46	3,70	50	0,48
28.	<i>Doclostaurus maroccanus</i>	48	3,86	21	2,04
29.	Homoptera:	12	0,96	9	0,87
<i>Chloropsalta ochreata</i>					
30.	<i>Melampsalta musiva</i>	8	0,64	-	-
31.	<i>Lepyronia sp.</i>	7	0,56	-	-
32.	Hemiptera:	21	1,69	10	0,97
<i>Eurygaster integriceps</i>					
33.	<i>Aelia sp.</i>	-	-	9	0,87
34.	<i>Dolycoris penicillatus</i>	30	0,24	-	-
35.	<i>Camptopus lateralis</i>	43	3,46	-	-
36.	<i>Reduvius sp.</i>	26	2,09	11	1,07
37.	Coleoptera:	12	0,96	-	-
<i>Calosoma sp.</i>					
38.	<i>Thanatophilus terminatus</i>	19	1,52	-	-
39.	<i>Necrophorus satanas</i>	4	0,32	-	-
40.	<i>Aclypea turkestanica</i>	6	0,48	-	-
41.	<i>Scarabaeus acuticollis</i>	14	1,12	3	0,29
42.	<i>Scarabaeus transcaspicus</i>	5	0,40	6	0,58
43.	<i>Netocia marginicollis</i>	7	0,56	3	0,29
44.	<i>Capnodis sexmaculata</i>	11	0,88	6	0,58
45.	<i>Capnodis tenebricosa</i>	3	0,24	8	0,77
46.	<i>Meligethes aeneus</i>	7	0,56	-	-
47.	<i>Blaps sp.</i>	3	0,24	-	-
48.	<i>Prosodes sp.</i>	2	0,16	-	-

49. Lepidoptera sp.	6	0,48	-	-
50. Hymenoptera:	9	0,72	14	1,36
<i>Campsocolia tartata</i>				
51. Scolia maculata	21	1,69	18	1,75
52. Scolia rubida	15	1,20	22	2,14
53. Scolia turkestanica	18	1,44	15	1,45
54. Pompilidae sp.	12	0,96	-	-
55. Ammophila heydeni	17	1,36	11	1,07
56. Psenulus laevis	14	1,12	7	0,68
57. Liris nigra	18	1,44	22	2,14
58. Philanthus triangulum	15	1,20	9	0,87
59. Cerceris sabilosa	10	0,80	13	1,26
60. Cerceris rybyensis	16	1,28	6	0,58
61. Cerceris sp.	15	1,20	15	1,45
62. Apus mellifera	8	0,64	31	3,01
63. Psithyrus sp.	27	2,17	42	4,08
64. Bombus sp.	33	2,65	37	3,59
65. Myrmilla sp.	21	1,69	18	1,75
66. Vespa orientalis	17	1,36	8	0,77
67. Polistes caspica	21	1,69	31	3,01
68. Prionix sp.	9	0,72	15	1,45
69. Formicidae sp.	16	1,28	11	1,07
70. Cataglyphis setipes	19	1,52	6	0,58
71. Diptera:	11	0,88	11	1,07
<i>Muscidae sp.</i>				
72. Asilidae sp.	5	0,40	8	0,77
73. Syrphidae sp.	7	0,56	9	0,87
74. Culicidae sp.	-		4	0,38
75. Simuliidae sp.	-		2	0,19
76. Phlebotomus sp.	5	0,40	3	0,29
77. Skeleton of vertebrates	1	0,08	-	-
Total	1242	100%	1028	100%

Under the conditions of Uzbekistan, bee-eaters are actively involved in biocenotic relationships and play an important role in maintaining the stability of the biocenosis^{12,13}. One of the participation in the biocenotic relationships of bee-eaters is commensal shelter. In the old nests of these birds, found some species of Arthropoda and Chordata (*Bufo viridis*, *Phrynocephalus interscapularis*, *Trapelus*

sanguinolentus, *Cyrtopodion russowi*, *Coliber karelini*, *Eryx miliaris*). These species in such nests are reliably protected from predators and from adverse climatic conditions. Some nests are used for breeding other bird species (*Coracias garrulus*, *Acridotheres tristis*, *Passer indicus*, *Passer montanus*)¹⁴.

Discussion

In Uzbekistan, the reproductive cycle of species of the genus *Merops* occurs mainly in natural landscapes. This period covers from April to August. After the reproductive cycle, the bee-eater leaves the nesting sites, since, during this period, natural landscapes cannot satisfy the food needs of birds. The reason for this is the lack of food resources associated with climatic conditions.

In this regard, after the reproductive cycle, the bee-eater is pumped out into cultural landscapes (agrocenoses, settlements), where many insects are still preserved. They are especially concentrated in large numbers in beekeeping farms. It is during this period (from the beginning of August to the end of September) that bee-eaters feed on bees in local areas and cause some damage to beekeeping farms.

Thus, in Uzbekistan, depending on the change in trophic relationships, the habitat, abundance and practical significance of these species change. This is evidenced by the indicators of the food spectrum of *M. apiaster*. If, in the reproductive cycle in the food composition, the share of *Apis mellifera* is 0,64%, then after the reproductive cycle it is 3,04%.

Usually pellets accumulate around and inside the nests of the bee-eater and in the places of their roosting. In these pellets, found some species and their larvae (*Lasius niger*, *Monomorium pharaonis*, *Dermestidae*). Surely these pellets are food resources for them. The relationship of commensal species obtaining nutrients and locomotion ensures the formation and stability of the food chain in biocenosis.

The trophic relationships of bee-eaters in biocenosis are very diverse and complex. Bee-eaters, when stalking, ambushing and in other behaviors while hunting for insects, will demonstrate the behavior

characteristic of predatory animals. It should be noted that the insect also reacts to the sounds of the bee-eater and exhibits the behavior characteristic of the victims. In turn, bee-eaters and their chicks and eggs also become prey of some species (*Vulpes vulpes*, *Canis aureus*, *Falco naumanni*, *Circus aeruginosus*, *Varanus griseus*, *Coluber karelini* and *Coluber ravergieri*). In 2020, in one of the nesting colonies located in an old quarry in the Bukhara region, *Varanus griseus* was found swallowing an adult *M. persicus*. As a result, bee-eater predation is involved in regulating the number of insects, causing some damage to beekeeping, and predatory animals are involved in regulating the number of bee-eaters.

It should be said that in many countries, including Uzbekistan, *M. persicus* and *M. apiaster* are considered the main pest of beekeeping farms and therefore they are scared away or destroyed using different methods (shooting, catching with nets, destroying nests). Sometimes various optical and acoustic devices are used to scare away birds. According to our observations and the results of the survey, it was revealed that only in the Bukhara region for 2016-2018. Approximately 10000 individuals of *M. persicus* have been shot, more than any other illegally shot species⁴. Although, both species are listed in the Red Books. Such an attitude towards species of the genus *Merops* and a one-sided assessment of their importance require further development of appropriate measures to control their behavior and protect these species from illegal destruction. Currently, in many countries, different repellents are used to control the behavior of birds¹². When testing the bioacoustic repellent "Korshun-8", the expected result was not obtained. This can be explained by the population individuality of the sound signals that species perceive and respond to.

Based on this repellent developed by us, the bioacoustic repellent “*Merops* – distress signal” is

more effective in controlling the behavior of bee-eaters.

Conclusion

It is fact that *M. apiaster* and *M. persicus* have a positive value in nature and in human economic activity. Especially, in the biocenoses of the arid zone of Uzbekistan, where many factors (lack of

nesting sites and food resources, harsh climatic conditions, etc.) are at a critical level, it is necessary to take appropriate measures to prevent illegal hunting and destroy the nesting sites of these species.

Acknowledgment

The authors would like to thank all the participants of this study for their help and cooperation.

Authors' Declaration

- Conflicts of Interest: None.
- We hereby confirm that all the Figures and Tables in the manuscript are ours. Furthermore, any Figures and images, that are not ours, have been

- included with the necessary permission for republication, which is attached to the manuscript.
- Ethical Clearance: The project was approved by the local ethical committee in University of National University of Uzbekistan.

Authors' Contribution Statement

Sh. F.O.: She did the conception, and design of paper, Also she did the acquisition and analysis of the data. Y.E.Ch. The paper was my idea. Also, the relationship of bird species with other animals,

especially reptiles, given in the article, was the results of my research. Kh. F. R. and R. M. Sh: they did analysis, interpretation, revision and proofreading.

References

1. Ravkin ES, Chelintsev NG. Methodical recommendations for integrated route counting of birds. 1st ed. Moskva: VNII Priroda, 1990. 33 p
2. Shodieva F, Kholboev F. Reproduction ecology of the genus *Merops* in Uzbekistan. Int Multidiscip Res J. 2022; (12); 67-73. <https://doi.org/10.5958/2249-7137.2022.00623.1>
3. Kholboev FR. Fauna, population and ecology of birds in towns of Kyzylkum region. Int J Res publ . 2021; 1(69) 564-575. <https://doi.org/10.47119/IJRP100691120211675>
4. Shodieva FO, Kholboev FR. Distribution, ecology and significance of the genus beeter (*Merops*) in Uzbekistan. Int J Res publ. 2021; 209-214. <https://doi.org/10.47119/IJRP100841920212237>
5. Casas-Criville A, Valera F. The European bee-eater (*Merops apiaster*) as an ecosystem engineer in arid environments. J Arid Environ. 6(2): 2005; 227-238. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaridenv.2004.03.012>
6. Ryabov VM, Ashikhmina TY. Faunistic characteristics and monitoring of vertebrates on the territory of the State Nature Reserve “Bylina”. Theor App Eco. 2021; 1: 79-84. <https://doi.org/10.25750/1995-4301-2021-1-079-084>
7. Whittaker RH. Evolution and Measurement of Species Diversity. Taxon. 1972; 213-251. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1218190>
8. Plavilshikov NN. Insect identifier. 1st ed. St University. Tashkent. 1994; 542p.
9. Schweizer M., Aye R., Roth T. Birds of Central Asia. Almaty. 1st ed. 2007; 554p.
10. Shodieva F. Current status of birds of the genus of beam (*Merops*) in Uzbekistan. Web Sci J. 2022; (6): 745-750. <https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/MA9N2>
11. Kholboev FR, Shodieva FO, Mirkhonova ZP. Hunting animals of the Bukhara region and issues of their rational use. Int J Res publ. 2021; 556-564. <https://doi.org/10.47119/IJRP100691120211673>
12. Yangiboyev ECh, Rakhimov MSh. Ecology and fauna of the species belonging to the families elapidae and viperidae of Kashkadarya region. Universum J. 2022; 1(91): 84-86. <https://doi.org/10.32743/UniChem.2022.91.1.12860>

13. Roitberg ES, Bulakhova Nina A, Kuranova Valentina N, Eplanova Galina V, Zinenko Oleksandr I, Arribas Oscar, et.al. Variation in body size and sexual size dimorphism in the most widely ranging lizard: testing the effects of reproductive mode and climate. *Eco Evo.* 01.2020; 10(11): 4531-4561.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/ece3.6077>
14. Hui C, McGeoch MA. Zeta diversity as a concept and metric that unifies incidence-based biodiversity pattern. *Am Nat.* 2014; 184 (5): 684–694.
<https://doi.org/10.1086/678125>

أهمية والحفاظ على طيور من جنس اكلة النحل (ميروبس) في أوزبكستان

شوديفا فوتيما أو شيلوفنا، يانجيبوف المرود تشورشانيبيفيتش، خوليوف فخرالدين رومونكولوفيتش، راخيموف ماتنازار شومورودوفيتش

قسم علم الحيوان، جامعة أوزبكستان الوطنية سميت باسم ميرزو أولوغبيك، طشقند، أوزبكستان.

الخلاصة

الغرض من هذه المقالة هو تحديد وتقييم أهمية الطيور من جنس الميروبس (آكل النحل الأوروبي - آكل النحلة الميروبس والنحل الأزرق الخدين - آكل النحلة الميروبس) في أوزبكستان، بالإضافة إلى وضع توصيات تهدف إلى حل بعض المشاكل المرتبطة بحفظها. نتيجة للدراسة، في جانب العلاقات الحيوية الحيوية، تم الكشف عن الأهمية الطبيعية لهذه الأنواع. يتم تحديد القيمة الاقتصادية وتحليلها في مزارع تربية النحل. من دراسة بقايا الطعام الموجود في المعدة والحلق وأعشاش *M. apiaster*، تم تجميع قائمة أولية للأنواع الرئيسية من الطيف الغذائي. استنادًا إلى طارد الحشرات الصوتي الحيوي "Korshun-8"، تم تطوير طارد حيوي صوتي جديد وأكثر فاعلية لصد آكلات النحل. لحل بعض المشاكل المرتبطة بالحفاظ على آكلي النحل، تم وضع توصيات تهدف إلى منع الإبادة غير القانونية لمن يأكلون النحل، والحفاظ على مستعمراتهم العشوائية، وما إلى ذلك.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الاتصالات الحيوية، طارد الصوت الحيوي، إشارة الاستغاثة، التعايش، الافتراس، النحل، الحبيبات، بقايا الطعام.