



DOI: 10.24425/ppr.2021.137148

Spatial distribution, host specificity and genetic diversity of *Onchobothrium antarcticum* in the Southern Ocean

Ilya I. GORDEEV^{1,2,*} (D), Tatyana A. POLYAKOVA³ (D) and Alexander A. VOLKOV⁴ (D)

¹ Department of Pacific Salmons, Russian Federal Research Institute of Fisheries and Oceanography, V. Krasnoselskaya Str. 17, 107140, Moscow, Russia

² Department of Invertebrate Zoology, Faculty of Biology, Lomonosov Moscow State University, Leninskie Gory 1/12, 119234, Moscow, Russia

³ Moscow representative office of A.O. Kovalevsky Institute of Biology of the Southern Seas of RAS, Leninsky Pr. 38/3, 119991, Moscow, Russia

⁴ Department of Molecular Genetics, Russian Federal Research Institute of Fisheries and Oceanography, V. Krasnoselskaya Str. 17, 107140, Moscow, Russia

*corresponding author: gordeev_ilya@bk.ru

Abstract: In this work we summarize the current knowledge on the spatial distribution, host specificity and genetic diversity of *Onchobothrium antarcticum*, an endemic Antarctic cestode. We recorded it in seven fish species, elasmobranchs *Amblyraja georgiana, Bathyraja eatonii*, and *B. maccaini* and teleosts *Antimora rostrata, Chionobathyscus dewitti, Dissostichus mawsoni*, and *Muraenolepis marmorata*, caught in the Ross Sea, the D'Urville Sea, the Mawson Sea, and the Weddell Sea. The infection of *A. rostrata* from the part of its distribution to the south of the Falkland Islands is reported for the first time. We obtained partial 28S rDNA and cox1 sequences of plerocercoids and adults of *O. antarcticum* and analyzed them together with a few previously published sequences. Based on the results of the phylogenetic analysis, we cannot rule out that *O. antarcticum* is in fact a complex of cryptic species.

Keywords: Antarctic, parasite, cestodes, rDNA, polar.



Copyright © 2021. Ilya I. Gordeev, Tatyana A. Polyakova and Alexander A. Volkov. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License (CC BY-NC-ND 3.0 https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/), which permits use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided that the article is properly cited, the use is non-commercial, and no modifications or adaptations are made. www.czasopisma.p



Introduction

The Southern Ocean is one of the most understudied marine areas. Parasitological research of Antarctic deep-water fish is a particularly challenging task due to the difficulty in obtaining research material. An important source of scientific information on this topic is the Scheme of International Scientific Observation (SISO) of the Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources (CCAMLR), which provides opportunities for the scientists to collect samples from deep-water fish: the main fishery targets the toothfish *Dissostichus* spp. and by-catch such as channichthyids, macrourids, and morids (Gordeev and Sokolov 2016).

There are few genetic data on parasites from the Antarctic. An integrated approach involving genetic and morphological methods is the best tool for studying their biodiversity. Using this approach, it is possible to revisit the taxonomic position of cryptic parasitic species, develop phylogenies and obtain new data on species divergence. Most of the parasitological studies in the Antarctic have been made in shallow waters near the northern tip of the Antarctic Peninsula (Zdzitowiecki et al. 1997; Oğuz et al. 2015; Muñoz and Cartes 2020). At present, 21 species of cestodes from seven orders are known from the Antarctic fish (Rocka 2017; Polyakova and Gordeev 2020). There are 15 species of elasmobranchs (five sharks and ten rays) within the Antarctic Convergence Zone (Duhamel et al. 2014; Froese and Pauly 2021). Five of them, four rajids and one shark, are recorded as hosts of twelve cestode species (Wojciechowska 1990a,b; 1991a,b; Wojciechowska et al. 1995; Rocka and Zdzitowiecki 1998; Ivanov and Campbell 2002; Rocka 2003, 2017; Laskowski and Rocka 2014; Polyakova and Gordeev 2020). There are almost no data on the genetic diversity of Antarctic cestodes. Only two species, Onchobothrium antarcticum Wojciechowska, 1990 collected in the Brasfield Straight (Laskowski and Rocka 2014) and Calyptrobothrium sp. from the Ross Sea and the Amundsen Sea (Gordeev and Sokolov 2016), have been examined in this aspect. Host specificity and spatial distribution of O. antarcticum are poorly known. There are only four records of the hosts: Bathyraja maccaini Springer, 1971 in the Weddell Sea (Rocka and Zdzitowiecki 1998), Bathyraja eatonii (Günther, 1876), Notothenia rossii Richardson, 1844 (Laskowski and Rocka 2014), and Antarctic toothfish Dissostichus mawsoni Norman, 1937 (Gordeev and Sokolov 2016).

The aim of this study was to report new hosts and localities of *O. antarcticum* in the Antarctic and to provide new data on its genetic diversity (28S rDNA and cox1).

www.czasopisma.pan.pl

Www.journals.pan.pl

Onchobothrium antarcticum in Antarctic fish

Material and methods

Fish specimens for the parasitological study were caught during commercial fishing for the toothfish, *Dissostichus* spp., in the CCAMLR area of responsibility using bottom longline of various constructions (Petrov *et al.* 2014) in 2010-2011 from FV *Insung* 7 (INSUNG Corp.), in 2011-2012 from FV *Yantar-31* (ORION Ltd.), and in 2012-2013 and 2014-2015 from FV *Yantar-35* (ORION Ltd.). Most specimens were caught in the Ross Sea, where the main fishing grounds are located, while others were caught in the Indian sector of the Antarctic and in the Weddell Sea during "Research Program of the Russian Federation in Subarea 48.5 (Weddell Sea) in season 2012-13" (Fig. 1; Petrov and Gordeev 2015). Twenty-four specimens of teleost and elasmobranch fish belonging to seven species (Table 1) were examined and found infected by *O. antarcticum*. Coordinates and depths of the catching and the characteristics of the examined fish are given in Table 1.



Fig. 1. Spatial distribution of *O. antarcticum* in the Antarctic. Green points – previous records, red – records made in this study.

-
e
[q]
T_{2}

272

Information about the studied elasmobranch and teleost fish, infected by O. antarcticum

		Host				Catch information		
Species	No	Total length (cm)	Weight (kg)	Location	Date	Latitude	Longitude	Depth (m)
Amblyraja		102	8.16	Ę	18.01.2013	75°45`6S	172°28'1W	1110
georgiana	2	60	2.04	Koss Sca	31.01.2015	75°32`9S	173°22`4W	1268
	3	95	9.76		24.12.2011	77°47`9S	178°18`6W	709
Bathyraja eatonii	4	105	4.85	Ross Sea	24.12.2011	77°47`9S	178°18`6W	709
	5	107	10.46		04.01.2013	73°43`1S	176°38°1E	605
Bathyraja	6	90	8.14		04.01.2013	73°43`1S	176°38°1E	605
maccaini	7	96	8.18	KOSS 2Ca	01.01.2015	77°05`6S	179°36`W	739
	8	63	2.16	Ross Sea	03.01.2013	73°36`2S	176°40°2E	602
Antimora rostrata	6	60	1.54	Weddell Sea	27.02.2013	74°37`1S	28°10`5W	1109
Chionobathyscus	10	37	0.44	Mawson Sea	10.02.2011	64°58`0S	114°07`0E	1450
dewitti	11	38	0.32	Ross Sea (north)	07.12.2014	65°21`2S	178°13`6W	1905
	12	144	51.50	D'Urville Sea	10.01.2011	65°29`0S	139°26`0E	810
	13	132	27.20		21.12.2011	77°38`8S	178°06`3W	689
	14	120	17.60		21.12.2011	77°42`4S	178°03`3W	693
	15	144	45.00		09.01.2012	75°11`3S	174°14`3W	1531
Dissostichus	16	105	16.00		12.01.2012	75°25.3S	174°32°7W	1121
11106447911	17	82	6.30	ROSS 2Ca	04.01.2013	73°43`1S	176°38'1E	605
	18	129	26.00		21.01.2013	75°45°1S	172°42°1W	1071
	19	102	14.00		21.01.2013	75°45°1S	172°42°1W	1071
	20	157	51.00		22.01.2013	75°42`2S	172°58`4W	1089
	21	48	0.57		27.12.2011	75°11`5S	174°54`4W	1463
Muraenolepis	22	54	1.28	Ross Sea	28.01.2015	75°51`S	172°21`2W	898
marmorata	23	46	0.72		31.01.2015	75°32`9S	173°22`4W	1268
	24	55	0.75	Weddell Sea	03.03.2013	74°36`7S	28°28 WQ	1193

www.czasopisma.pan.pl



Ilya I. Gordeev, Tatyana A. Polyakova and Alexander A. Volkov



Species identification of teleosts and elasmobranchs was based on specialized literature (Gon and Heemstra 1990; CCAMLR 2011). All specimens were dissected immediately after capture using standard methods (Bykhovskaja--Pavlovskaja 1985; Klimpel et al. 2019). Specimens for genetic studies were fixed in 96% ethanol and stored at -20 °C. The worms for morphological identification were fixed in 70% ethanol, hydrated, stained with Harris's hematoxylin, differentiated in tap water, destained in ethanol, dehydrated, cleared in methyl salicylate (following Jensen et al. 2011), and finally mounted in Canada balsam. The intensity of infection (Bush et al. 1997) was roughly estimated, visually, without using a stereomicroscope.

DNA extraction, amplification, sequencing, alignment and phylogenetic analysis. — The total DNA was extracted from 96% ethanol-fixed 9 specimens of O. antarcticum using Wizard SV Genomic DNA Purification System (Promega), as recommended by the manufacturer. The nuclear 28S rRNA gene was amplified using the polymerase chain reaction (PCR) with the primers ZX-1 (5'-ACCCGCTGAATTTAAGCATAT-3'), 1500R (5'-GCTATCCTGAGG-GAAACTTCG-3'), LSU 300F (5'-CAAGTACCGTGAGGGAAAGTTG-3'), 1090F (5'-TGAAACACGGACCAAGG-3'), LSU 1200F (5'-CCCGAAA-GATGGTGAACTATGC-3'), ECD2 (5'-CTTGGTCCGTGTTTCAAGACGGG-3'), which were described earlier (Waeschenbach and Littlewood, 2017). The cox1 of the same specimens was amplified using the polymerase chain reaction (PCR) with the primers PBI-cox1F PCR (5'- CATTTTGCTGCCGGTCAR-CAYATGTTYTGRTTTTTGG-3'), PBI-cox1R PCR (5'- CCTTTGTCGA-TACTGCCAAARTAATGCATDGGRAA-3'), which were described by Waeschenbach and Littlewood (2017). The initial PCR was performed in a total volume of 20 µl that contained 0.25 mM of each primer pair, 1 µl DNA in water, $1 \times$ Taq buffer, 1.25 mM dinucleotide triphosphates (dNTPs), 1.5 mM MgCl₂ and 1 unit of Taq polymerase. The amplification was carried out by Eurogen (Moscow) with a 3-min. denaturation hold at 94°C, 40 cycles of 30 s at 94°C, 30 s at 55°C (cox1 - 60°C) and 2 min. (cox1 - 1 min) at 72°C, and a 10-min. extension hold at 72°C. Negative and positive controls were amplified using all primers. The PCR products were directly sequenced using the ABI Big Dye Terminator v.3.1 Cycle Sequencing Kit, as recommended by the manufacturer, with the PCR primers for 28S and with sequencing primers PBI-cox1F seq (5'-CATTTTGCTGCCGGTCA-3'), PBI-cox1R seq (5'-TAATGCATDG-GRAAAAAAC-3') for cox1 (Waeschenbach and Littlewood 2017). The PCR products were analyzed by Eurogen (Moscow).

Alignment and phylogenetic analysis. — Partial sequences used in our study to evaluate the phylogenetic connections of the specimens were assembled using Geneious ver. 10.0.5 software and aligned with sequences retrieved from Genbank (Table 2) using ClustalW DNA weight matrix within MEGA 10.0.5 software alignment explorer (Kumar et al. 2018). Phylogenetic analysis of the nucleotide sequences was performed using maximum likelihood (ML) and

Data on the 28S	rDNA and cox1 sequences and cox1	ences used in the maxi	imum likelihood and Ba	yesian inference phylog	genetic analysis.
E	GenBank	Acc. No.			c c
Iaxon	lsrDNA	cox1	tsoh	Location	Keterence
	MW548862	MW559730			
	MW548863	MW555790			
	MW548955	MW559732	Bathyraja eatonut	Ross Sea	this study
Onchobothrium	MW549040	MW559796			
antarcticum adult	MW548961	MW559566	Bathyraja maccaini* ⁶		
		KF573588			
		KF573596	Bathyraja eatonii	Bransfield Strait	Laskowski and Rocka (2014)
		KF573598	I		
	KF882019				
	KF882020				
	KF882021		I		
Onchobothrium		KF573589		70 FT-27C	Laskowski and Rocka
antarcticum larvae		KF573590	NOTOTNENTA FOSSI	bransheid Strait	(2014)
		KF573591			
		KF573592			
		KF573594			

Table 2

274



Ilya I. Gordeev, Tatyana A. Polyakova and Alexander A. Volkov



E	GenBank	Acc. No.			Ę
laxon	lsrDNA	cox1	ПOSI	госацоп	Kelerence
		KF573595			
		KF573597			Laskowski and Rocka
		KF573599	Notothenia rossu	Bransneid Strait	(2014)
		KF573600			
Onchobothrium	MW555776	MW559598	Dissostichus		
antarcticum larvae	MW548985	MW559785	mawsoni* ^{17,20}		
	MW555788	MW560078	Chionobathyscus dewitti* ¹¹	Ross Sea	this study
	MW549053	MW559601	Muraenolepis		
	MW549201		marmorata* ^{22,23}		
<i>Onchobothrium</i> sp. larva		KF573593	Notothenia rossii	Bransfield Strait	Laskowski and Rocka (2014)
Onchobothrium sp. adult	MW566787	MW560094	Bathyraja sexoculata	off Simushir Island	this study
Acanthobothrium rodmani	FJ843596		Himantura sp.	Australia	Fyler <i>et al.</i> (2009)
Acanthobothrium romanowi	FJ843598		Himantura sp.	Australia	Fyler <i>et al.</i> (2009)
Acanthobothrium parviuncinatum	EF095264		Urobatis maculatus	Mexico	Waeschenbach <i>et al.</i> (2007)
Uncibilocularis okei	KF685777		Pastinachus atrus	Australia	Caira et al. (2014)







XODISTDNACOLHORLOGADODREFERENCESeriorestusKF68573 \odot (KF68573Potamotrygon castexiPenuCaira et al. (2014)seridadeKF685764 \rightarrow (KF685764 \rightarrow (KF685764 \rightarrow (KF685764Caira et al. (2014)seridadeKF685733 \rightarrow (KF685733 \rightarrow (Mistelus cartis \rightarrow USACaira et al. (2014)siliatumKF685733 \rightarrow (KF685733 \rightarrow (KF685733 \rightarrow (KF685733 \rightarrow (KF685733 \rightarrow (KF685733solutiumKF685733 \rightarrow (YF685898 \rightarrow (KF685712 \rightarrow (KF685712 \rightarrow (KF685712 \rightarrow (KF685712 \rightarrow (KF685712solutiumKF685772 \rightarrow (YF685898 \rightarrow (KF685712 \rightarrow (KF685712 \rightarrow (KF685712 \rightarrow (KF685712 \rightarrow (YF697)solutiumKF685772 \rightarrow (YF685898 \rightarrow (KF685712 \rightarrow (KF685712 \rightarrow (KF685712 \rightarrow (YF697)solutiumKF685772 \rightarrow (YF68898 \rightarrow (YF68898 \rightarrow (YF688988 \rightarrow (YF698988solutiumKF685772 \rightarrow (YF6889898 \rightarrow (YF68989898 \rightarrow (YF6989898solutiumKF685772 \rightarrow (YF68898988 \rightarrow (YF689898988 \rightarrow (YF698989888solutiumKF685772 \rightarrow (YF688989888 \rightarrow (YF688989888 \rightarrow (YF6898989888solutiumKF685772 \rightarrow (YF6889898989888 \rightarrow (YF68898989888 \rightarrow (YF68898988888888888888888888888888888888	E	GenBank	Acc. No.		•	c F
nocestus aldaeKF68573Equanotrygon castexiPeruCaira et al. (2014)aldaeKF685764 \rightarrow <		lsrDNA	cox1	HOST	Location	Keterence
s shavaeKF685764 \rightarrow Memipristis elongataAustraliaCaira et al. (2014)rium cf.KF68573 \rightarrow Mustelus canisUSACaira et al. (2014)hriumKF68573 \rightarrow Mustelus canisUSACaira et al. (2014)hriumKF685772 \rightarrow Mustelus \rightarrow MustraliaCaira et al. (2014)hriumKF685772 \rightarrow Mustelus \rightarrow MustraliaCaira et al. (2014)hriumKF685772 \rightarrow Mustelus \rightarrow MustraliaCaira et al. (2014)hriumEF095261 \rightarrow MN061843Sander vitreus \rightarrow USAScholz et al. (2019)hriu \rightarrow Mustelus \rightarrow MN061845 \rightarrow MusterusUSAScholz et al. (2019)hria \rightarrow MN061845 \rightarrow MN061845 \rightarrow MusterusUSAScholz et al. (2019)hris \rightarrow Mn061845 \rightarrow Mn061845 \rightarrow MusterusUSAScholz et al. (2019)hris \rightarrow MN061845 \rightarrow Mn061845 \rightarrow MusterusUSAScholz et al. (2019)hris \rightarrow Mn061845 \rightarrow Mn061845 \rightarrow MusterusUSAScholz et al. (2019)hris \rightarrow Mn061845 \rightarrow Mn061845 \rightarrow MusterusUSAScholz et al. (2019)hris \rightarrow Mn061845 \rightarrow Mn061845 \rightarrow MusterusMusterusMusterushris \rightarrow Mn061845	onocestus raldae	KF685773		Potamotrygon castexi	Peru	Caira <i>et al.</i> (2014)
rium cf. atumKF685753Mustelus canisUSACaira et al. 2014 $atum$ KF685898 $muse$ $muse$ $mose$ $mose$ $mose$ $mose$ $hrium$ KF685808 $mose$ $mose$ $mose$ $mose$ $mose$ $mose$ $mose$ $hrium$ KF685772 $mose$ $mose$ $mose$ $mose$ $mose$ $mose$ $mose$ $hrium$ KF685772 $mose$ $mose$ $mose$ $mose$ $mose$ $mose$ $mose$ $hrium$ KF685772 $mose$ $mose$ $mose$ $mose$ $mose$ $mose$ $mose$ $hrium$ KF685772 $mose$ $mose$ $mose$ $mose$ $mose$ $mose$ $mose$ $hrium$ KF685772 $mose$ $mose$ $mose$ $mose$ $mose$ $mose$ $mose$ $hrium$ KF685772 $mose$ $mose$ $mose$ $mose$ $mose$ $mose$ $mose$ $mose$ $hrium$ KF685772 $mose$ $mose$ $mose$ $mose$ $mosemosemosemosehriumKF685772mosemosemosemosemosemosemosemosehriumEf095261mose$	os shawae	KF685764		Hemipristis elongata	Australia	Caira <i>et al.</i> (2014)
hriumKF68598et al. (2014) $atum$ KF685772Prionace glaucaUSACaira et al. (2014) $hrium$ KF685772Negaprion acutidensAustraliaCaira et al. (2014) $phalus$ EF095261 $Anguilla$ anguillaUKWaeschenbach et al. (2007) $phalus$ EF095261 $Anguilla$ anguillaUKWaeschenbach et al. (2019) $phalus$ EF095261 $MN061843$ Sander vitreusCanadaScholz et al. (2019) $phalus$ MN061852Sander vitreusUSAScholz et al. (2019) $phalus$ MN061849Perca flavescensUSAScholz et al. (2019) $hris pinguis$ MN061849Esox luciusUSAScholz et al. (2019) $hris pinguisMN061849Esox luciusUSAScholz et al. (2019)hris pinguisMN061849Esox luciusMOSAScholz et al. (2019)hris pinguisMN061849Esox luciusMOSAScholz et al. (2019)hris pinguisMN061849Esox luciusMOSAScholz et al. (2019)hris pinguisMNMNMNMN$	trium cf. latum	KF685753		Mustelus canis	USA	Caira <i>et al.</i> 2014
hriumKF685772Negaprion acutidensAustraliaCaira et al. (2014)orumorum $EF095261$ $Anguila$ anguila UK Vaeschenbach et al. (2007)phalus $EF095261$ $Anguila$ anguila UK $Vaeschenbach et al. (2007)$ phalus $MN061843$ $Sander virreus$ $Canada$ $Scholz et al. (2019)$ phalus $MN061845$ $Sander virreus$ USA $Scholz et al. (2019)$ phalus $MN061845$ $Sander virreus$ USA $Scholz et al. (2019)$ phalus $MN061845$ $Perca flavescens$ USA $Scholz et al. (2019)$ us pinguis $MN061849$ $Perca flavescens$ USA $Scholz et al. (2019)$ us pinguis $MN061849$ $Esox luctus$ USA $Scholz et al. (2019)$ us pinguis $MN061849$ $Esox luctus$ USA $Scholz et al. (2019)$ us pinguis $MN061849$ $Esox luctus$ USA $Scholz et al. (2019)$ us pinguis $MN061849$ $Esox luctus$ USA $Scholz et al. (2019)$ us pinguis $MN061849$ $Esox luctus$ USA $Scholz et al. (2019)$ us pinguis $MN061849$ $Esox luctus$ USA $Scholz et al. (2019)$ us pinguis $MN061849$ $Relis catus$ MSA $Relis et al. (2014)$ us pinguis $MN061849$ $Relis catus$ MSA $Relis et al. (2014)$ us pinguis $MN061849$ $Relis catus$ $MR061849$ $Relis catusus pinguisMN061849Relis catusMR061849$	thrium latum	KF685898		Prionace glauca	USA	Caira <i>et al.</i> (2014)
<i>phalus</i> EF095261 <i>Anguilla anguilla</i> UKWaeschenbach <i>et al.phalus</i> MN061843 <i>Sander vitreus</i> CanadaScholz <i>et al.</i> (2019) <i>pralus</i> MN061852 <i>Sander vitreus</i> USAScholz <i>et al.</i> (2019) <i>phalus</i> MN061852 <i>Sander vitreus</i> USAScholz <i>et al.</i> (2019) <i>phalus</i> MN061845 <i>Perca flavescens</i> USAScholz <i>et al.</i> (2019) <i>uls pearsei</i> MN061849 <i>Esox lucius</i> USAScholz <i>et al.</i> (2019) <i>us pinguis</i> USA <i>USA</i> Scholz <i>et al.</i> (2019) <i>us pinguis</i> MN061849 <i>Esox lucius</i> USAScholz <i>et al.</i> (2019) <i>us pinguis</i> MN061849 <i>Esox lucius</i> USAScholz <i>et al.</i> (2019) <i>va spinguis</i> MN061849 <i>Esox lucius</i> MOSAScholz <i>et al.</i> (2019) <i>va spinguis</i> MN061849 <i>Esox lucius</i> MOSAScholz <i>et al.</i> (2019) <i>va spinguis</i> MN061849 <i>AlabosMOSA</i> Scholz <i>et al.</i> (2014) <i>va spinguis</i> MN061849 <i>AlabosMOSAAlabosAl</i>	thrium orum	KF685772		Negaprion acutidens	Australia	Caira <i>et al</i> . (2014)
phalusMN061843Sander vitreusCanadaScholz et al. (2019) $ercae$ MN061852Sander vitreusUSAScholz et al. (2019) $phalus$ MN061845Perca flavescensUSAScholz et al. (2019) $hs pearsei$ MN061849Perca flavescensUSAScholz et al. (2019) $hs pinguis$ MN061849Fesor flavescensUSAScholz et al. (2019) $hs pinguis$ USAVISAScholz et al. (2019) $era sp.$ USAVISAScholz et al. (2019) $era sp.$ USAVISAScholz et al. (2014) $rocutae$ MSD05201.1Crocuta crocutaAfricaTerefe et al. (2014)	sphalus sphalus	EF095261		Anguilla anguilla	UK	Waeschenbach <i>et al.</i> (2007)
phalusMN061852Sander vitreusUSAScholz et al. (2019) $ollis$ $mN061845$ $Perca flavescens$ USA Scholz et al. (2019) $lus pearsei$ $mN061849$ $Esox lucius$ USA Scholz et al. (2019) $lus pinguis$ $mN061849$ $Esox lucius$ USA Scholz et al. (2019) $era sp.$ $LC008533$ $Felis catus$ $Fals catus$ $France$ $Lavikainen et al. (2014)$ $rocutae$ $modelMB05201.1Crocuta crocutaAfricaTerefe et al. (2014)$	sphalus ercae		MN061843	Sander vitreus	Canada	Scholz et al. (2019)
lus pearseiMN061845Perca flavescensUSAScholz et al. (2019) lus pinguisMN061849Esox luciusUSAScholz et al. (2010) era sp.LC008533Felis catusFranceLavikainen et al. (2011) $rocutae$ MB905201.1Crocuta crocutaAfricaTerefe et al. (2014)	sphalus collis		MN061852	Sander vitreus	USA	Scholz et al. (2019)
lus pinguisMN061849 $Esox lucius$ USAScholz <i>et al.</i> (2019) $era sp.$ LC008533 $Felis catus$ FranceLavikainen <i>et al.</i> (2014) $rocutae$ MB905201.1Crocuta crocutaAfricaTerefe <i>et al.</i> (2014)	ilus pearsei		MN061845	Perca flavescens	NSA	Scholz et al. (2019)
era sp.LC008533Felis catusFranceLavikainen et al. (201trocutaeAB905201.1Crocuta crocutaAfricaTerefe et al. (2014)	lus pinguis		MN061849	Esox lucius	NSA	Scholz et al. (2019)
rocutae AB905201.1 Crocuta crocuta Africa Africa I Terefe et al. (2014)	<i>era</i> sp.		LC008533	Felis catus	France	Lavikainen et al. (2016)
	rocutae		AB905201.1	Crocuta crocuta	Africa	Terefe et al. (2014)

(*) the number(s) after correspond the host number in Table 1 (consistently).

Bayesian (BI) methods. Phylogenetic trees made with the use of ML and BI were reconstructed using MEGA 10.0.5 (Kumar et al. 2018) and MrBayes v. 3.6.2 software (Ronquist and Huelsenbeck 2003), respectively. Pairwise distances were calculated using MEGA 10.0.5. Best nucleotide substitution model for the dataset was estimated using jModelTest version 0.1.1 software (Posada 2008). In both methods, the general time-reversible model GTR+G+I was used based on the Aikake Information Criteria (AIC). A Bayesian algorithm was performed using the Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) option. The burnin values were 2,500,000 for the 'sump' and the 'sumt' options. The robustness of the phylogenetic relationship was estimated using bootstrap analysis with 1000 replications (Felsenstein 1985) for ML and with posterior probabilities for BI (Ronquist and Huelsenbeck 2003). The choice of outgroups generally followed the current phylogeny of cestodes by Caira and Jensen (2017). The obtained sequences of O. antarcticum were submitted to GenBank, with accession numbers given in Table 2. Besides the sequences from GenBank and the newly obtained 16 sequences of O. antarcticum specimens from the Ross Sea, we involved in the analysis a sequence of *Onchobothrium* sp. collected from *Bathyraia sexoculata* Misawa, Orlov, Orlova, Gordeev et Ishihara, 2020 caught off Simushir Island in the northwestern Pacific (see Gordeev and Polyakova 2020; Misawa et al. 2020).

Results

Intestines and pyloric caeca of Dissostichus mawsoni, Chionobathyscus dewitti Andriashev et Neyelov, 1978, Antimora rostrata (Günther, 1878), and Muraenolepis marmorata, Günther, 1880 were infected with plerocercoids of O. antarcticum. Spiral intestines of Amblyraja georgiana (Norman, 1938), Bathyraja maccaini, and Bathyraja eatonii were infected with adults of O. antarcticum.

Exact values of infection indices were not determined. We can only give a rough estimation of the intensity of infection. It did not exceed several tens of worms in most fish, but could reach two hundreds of worms and more in large rays. The infection with cestodes was mainly represented by small plerocercoids with bilocular bothridia of an unknown species. The larvae of O. antarcticum, which could be easily distinguished by a larger size and trilocular bothridia, were less common. To note, the examined teleost fishes did not seem to be more heavily infected than those examined in our previous study, where about a hundred plerocercoids per one specimen of *D. mawsoni* were found (Gordeev and Sokolov 2016).

Our data show that in the Ross Sea this species occurs not only in the shelf area but also in intrashelf depressions and in submarine elevations in the northern part of the sea (Fig. 1). This is the first record of this tapeworm in the Indian sector of the Antarctic.





Phylogenetic analysis based on 28S gene (Fig. 2) showed that *Onchobothrium* formed a highly supported clade, separated from the other representatives of Onchoproteocephalidea included in the analysis. It also revealed that only three of our sequences were identical with the sequences of *O. antarcticum* obtained by Laskowski and Rocka (2014), which formed subclade B. The rest of our specimens fell into subclade A, which was distinguished by one nucleotide substitution (A/T) in both ML and BI analyses. *Onchobothrium* sp. ex *Bathyraja sexoculata* was different in two loci and was clearly separated from *O. antarcticum* on the tree (Fig. 2).

The cox1 analyses of all currently available sequences (GenBank) revealed similar results. Despite a high diversity of the cox1 gene in this species, the topology of the *Onchobothrium* clade was similar to that on the 28S tree. The same isolates that formed subclade A in Fig. 2 fell into clade A on the cox1 tree. Moreover, specimens of the subclade B clustered with the sequences of *O. antarcticum* obtained by Laskowski and Rocka (2014) in the clade B (Fig. 3). Only MW549201 stands out because we failed to obtain cox1 of this specimen (see Table 2). Pairwise distances between the members of Clade A and Clade B varied from 5 to 7%.



Fig. 2. Phylogenetic position of *Onchobothrium antarcticum* and *Onchobothrium* sp., based on the analysis of 28S rRNA gene partial sequences (1459 bp). Nodal numbers are posterior probability values for bootstrap values for ML/BI. Sequences obtained during this study are in bold.



Fig. 3. Phylogenetic position of Onchobothrium antarcticum and Onchobothrium sp., based on the analysis of cox1 gene partial sequences (544 bp). Nodal numbers are posterior probability values for bootstrap values for ML/BI. Sequences obtained during this study are in bold.

Discussion

The topology of 28S and cox1 trees suggests that the parasite specimens examined in our study could belong to two closely related species of Onchobothrium. Unfortunately, this issue cannot be fully elucidated because sequences of larvae and adults mostly grouped into different clades. On the 28S tree (Fig. 2) all sequences of larvae, obtained by Laskowski and Rocka (2014), grouped into subclade B while all adult sequences obtained in our study grouped into another subclade (A). On the cox1 tree (Fig. 3), three sequences of adults, obtained by Laskowski and Rocka (2014) (KF573588, KF573596, KF573598), showed a well-supported close relation only to the larval sequences in clade B, while four sequences of adults from our study (MW559730, MW555790, MW559796, MW559566) clustered in clade A (Fig. 3).

We do not draw any taxonomic conclusions based on the values of genetic differentiation obtained in this study, given a smooth topology of the Onchobothrium clade on the 28S tree, the absence of proven differences in host specificity, site of infection or geographical range (see Table 1, Fig. 1) and the lack of molecular data for other six valid Onchobothrium spp. (Caira and Jensen 2017). A careful comparison of the morphology of gravid proglottids of



our specimens with the original description (Wojciechowska 1990a) should be performed in the future in order to ascertain whether our specimens of Clade A belong to a closely related undescribed species.

Onchobothrium sp. from B. sexoculata collected by us in the northwestern Pacific (MW566787) falls within the Onchobothrium clade in Fig. 2. However, it is separated from all the other members of this clade sequenced in this study with a high support and has unique morphological features. Therefore, we conclude that it is probably a new species to describe in the future.

All intermediate and final hosts of O. antarcticum are relatively common in the Antarctic and partly the Subantarctic waters (Fig. 1), thus we assume that the spatial distribution of this cestode in the Antarctic is circumpolar. This is typical of many members of the Antarctic marine ecosystem, which is known for its homogeneity (Eastman 1993; Mugue et al. 2014; Gordeev 2015). At the same time, studies of migration of the Antarctic toothfish have shown that after leaving the shelf, where their larvae develop, and after the transition from the target feeding on plankton to feeding on fish and molluscs, they almost do not migrate any more (Hanchet et al. 2015). Parasites obviously move with their hosts, but taking into account that all fish specimens in this study were caught at a wide range of depths, from 602 m on the shelf to 1905 m, it appears that the current system, including the Antarctic Circumpolar Current, is conducive to the successful dispersal of coracidia and planktonic crustaceans, which act as the first intermediate hosts of cestodes (Marcogliese 1995). The host specificity of O. antarcticum seems to be very low both at the level of the definitive and the intermediate host, since it was found in the spiral values of all studied elasmobranchs and four common teleosts from various taxa.

Muraenolepis marmorata from the Ross Sea was examined for the presence of helminths (Gordeev and Sokolov 2017), but only the larvae of Diphyllobothriidae and genus *Calyptrobothrium* were found. It is likely that the larvae of O. antarcticum were found in the intestines of this gadid fish in the Ob Bank, the Lena Bank, and in the waters near Kerguelen Island by other authors, listed in Gordeev and Sokolov (2017). However, we cannot be certain about it because authors only identified parasites to a high taxonomic level and provided no morphological descriptions.

Blue hake, Antimora rostrata is distributed almost worldwide, inhabiting all ocean waters except the North Pacific, where the congener, the Pacific flatnose Antimora microlepis Bean, 1890, occurs. From the previous studies on its infection recorded, mostly in the North Atlantic (Gordeev et al. 2017, 2019), A. rostrata harbors few or no specialist parasites and is usually involved in the cycles of the local parasite fauna. The only record on its infection by digenean Elytrophalloides oatesi (Leiper et Atkinson, 1914) in the Subantarctic was made by Gaevskaya and Rodjuk (1988) in the Falkland Islands area. Thus, in this study, we made the first record of helminths of A. rostrata from the high latitudes of the Antarctic.

Among all teleost hosts, only D. mawsoni could successively serve as the second intermediate host, the paratenic host, and a dead-end host of O. antarcticum. After feeding on plankton for some time, it proceeds to feeding on fish and squids. The Antarctic toothfish grows to a length of more than two meters and is one of the highest-order predators. After reaching one meter in length, it can hardly fall prey to rays, even large ones, and can only be consumed by killer whales and other large marine mammals (Yukhov 1982). In our previous study focused on the Antarctic toothfish (Gordeev and Sokolov 2016), the maximum intensity of infection by O. antarcticum reached 108 worms and 471 plerocercoids with bilocular bothridia per host, which means that the plerocercoids of O. antarcticum probably pass through the food chain and accumulate in the intestines of high-order predators.

Chionobathyscus dewitti (Channichthyidae) is a rarely studied deep-water demersal fish. It has been noted as the host of the digenean Neolepidapedon trematomi Prudhoe et Bray, 1973 (Sokolov and Gordeev 2013). Here we reported for the first time its infection with cestodes. Cestode species identification is difficult because no molecular data on cestode larvae from the Antarctic waters are available. A recent detailed study of five channichthyid species in the northwest Antarctic Peninsula area (Kuhn et al. 2018) contains some data on cestode larvae but all of them were identified as "Diphyllobothriidea indet." or "Tetraphyllidae indet.", and comparison is thus impossible.

The taxonomy of Antarctic rays needs revision. Most researchers identifying ray species within the framework of the CCAMLR Scheme of International Scientific Observation (SISO) rely on the methodology presented in the Scientific Observer's Manual (CCAMLR 2011) that base on Gon and Heemstra (1990) and Fischer and Hureau (1985). New genetic data (Smith et al. 2008; Stehmann et al. 2021) show that B. eatonii caught at the continental shelf (Ross Sea) and the Antarctic slope is distinct from *B. eatonii* from the Kerguelen Plateau (type locality). This means that the rays from the Ross Sea, including the host rays in our study, identified by Smith et al. (2008) as Bathyraja cf. eatonii, could belong to another species. The exact distribution of the examined host species is described in different ways in the literature. McCain's skate Bathyraja maccaini appears to have a circum-Antarctic distribution according to Duhamel et al. (2014), but according to Last et al. (2016) it inhabits only the waters around the tip of the Antarctic Peninsula and off Kerguelen Island. Antarctic starry skate Amblyraja georgiana according to Duhamel et al. (2014) inhabits the Ross Sea, Amundsen Sea, Bellingshausen Sea, Cooperation Sea and the South Shetland Islands, whereas Last et al. (2016) report it occurs mostly off South America and adjacent waters of Pacific and Atlantic sectors of the Antarctic. Unfortunately, although rays are persistent by-catch in longline fisheries for toothfish, the data on their actual distribution obtained by the observers are rarely compiled and made available to the scientific community. To sum up, we are confident about the definition of all the host fish species examined in our study, except that of *B. eatonii*.





Conclusion

In this study we discovered five new hosts of *O. antarcticum* and added several new geographical records and suggest its circumpolar distribution. Phylogenetic analysis based on 28S and cox1 genes partial sequences suggests that this species could be a complex of cryptic species. This issue requires a thorough morphological study. Helminth infection of *Antimora rostrata* from the Antarctic was recorded for the first time.

Acknowledgements. — The authors are grateful to the crews of fishing vessels Yantar-31, Yantar-35 (ORION Ltd, Khabarovsk), Insung 7 (INSUNG Corp., Korea) and Alexey Finogenov (Southern Research Institute of Marine Fisheries and Oceanography, Odessa, Ukraine), Alexander Terentiev, Alexander Zaytsev (Department "Kerch" of the Azovo-Chernomorsky branch of the Russian Federal Research Institute of Fisheries and Oceanography, Kerch) for help in the sampling and Dr. Sergey Sokolov (IPEE RAS, Moscow, Russia) for valuable advice. We thank Natalia Lentsman (Department of Ichthyology and Hydrobiology, St. Petersburg State University) for the linguistic correction of the manuscript. The work was partly carried out within the framework of the state assignment, A.O. Kovalevsky Institute of Biology of the Southern Seas of RAS (AAAA-A19-119100290162-0). We thank two anonymous Reviewers whose comments helped to improve this manuscript.

References

- BUSH A.O., LAFFERTY K.D., LOTZ J.M. and SHOSTAK A.W. 1997. Parasitology meets ecology on its own terms: Margolis et al. revisited. *The Journal of Parasitology* 83: 575–583.
- BYHOVSKAJA-PAVLOVSKAJA I.E. 1985. *Parazity ryb. (Parasites of fishes.)* Nauka, Leningrad (in Russian).
- CAIRA J.N. and JENSEN K. 2017. Planetary biodiversity inventory (2008–2017): Tapeworms from vertebrate bowels of the earth. Natural History Museum, University of Kansas, Lawrence.
- CAIRA J.N., JENSEN K., WAESCHENBACH A., OLSON P.D. and LITTLEWOOD D.T.J. 2014. Orders out of chaos molecular phylogenetics reveals the complexity of shark and stingray tapeworm relationships. International Journal for Parasitology 44: 55–73.
- CCAMLR (Commission for the Conservation of Marine Living Recourses). 2011. Scientific Observers Manual (observation guidelines and reference materials). CCAMLR, Hobart. Tasmania.
- DUHAMEL G., HULLEY P.-A., CAUSSE R., KOUBBI P., VACCHI M., PRUVOST P., VIGETTA S., IRISSON J.-O., MORMEDE S., BELCHIER M., DETTAI A., DETRICH H.W., GUTT J., JONES C.D., KOCK K.-H., LOPEZ ABELLAN L.J. and VAN DE PUTTE A. 2014. Chapter 7. Biogeographic patterns of fish. *In*: C. De Broyer, P. Koubbi and H.J. Griffiths, B. Raymond, C. d' Udekem d'Acoz *et al.* (eds). *Biogeographic Atlas of the Southern Ocean*. Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research, Cambridge: 328–362.
- EASTMAN J.T. 1993. Antarctic Fish Biology: Evolution in a Unique Environment. Academic Press, San Diego.
- FELSENSTEIN J. 1985. Confidence limits on phylogenies: an approach using bootstrap. *Evolution* 39: 783–791.

282

www.czasopisma.pan.pl

Onchobothrium antarcticum in Antarctic fish

- FISCHER W. and HUREAU J.C. (eds). 1985. FAO Species Identification Sheets for Fishery Purposes. Southern Ocean (CCAMLR Convention Area Fishing Areas 48, 58 and 88), Vols. I and II. Prepared and published with the support of the Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources. FAO, Rome.
- FROESE R. and PAULY D. 2021. FishBase. World Wide Web electronic publication. www.fishbase. org, version (02/2021).
- FYLER C.A., CAIRA J.N. and JENSEN K. 2009. Five new species of *Acanthobothrium* (Cestoda: Tetraphyllidea) from an unusual species of *Himantura* (Rajiformes: Dasyatidae) from northern Australia. *Folia Parasitologica* 56: 107.
- GAEVSKAYA A.V. and RODJUK G.N. 1988. New and rare Trematoda species from deep-sea fishes of the South-West Atlantic. *Vestnik Zoologii* 5: 11–15 (in Russian).
- GON O. and HEEMSTRA P.C. 1990. Fishes of the Southern Ocean. J.L.B. Smith Institute of Ichthyology, Grahamstown.
- GORDEEV I.I. 2015. Prevalence, geographical distribution and host specificity of parasitic copepode *Lophoura szidati* Stadler, 1978 (Copepoda: Sphyriidae) on grenadiers (*Macrourus* spp.) in the Antarctic. *Invertebrate Zoology* 12: 207–212.
- GORDEEV I.I. and POLYAKOVA T.A. 2020. Helminths and the stomach contentment of *Bathyraja* sp. (Rajiformes: Arhynchobatidae) in the Simushir Island area (Pacific Ocean). *Journal of Asia-Pacific Biodiversity* 13: 306–309.
- GORDEEV I.I. and SOKOLOV S.G. 2016. Parasites of the Antarctic toothfish *Dissostichus mawsoni* Norman, 1937 (Perciformes, Nototheniidae) in the Pacific sector of the Antarctic. *Polar Research* 35: 29364.
- GORDEEV I.I. and SOKOLOV S.G. 2017. Helminths and the feeding habits of the marbled moray cod *Muraenolepis marmorata* Günther, 1880 (Gadiformes, Muraenolepididae) in the Ross Sea (Southern Ocean). *Polar Biology* 40: 1311–1318.
- GORDEEV I.I., SOKOLOV S.G. and ORLOV A.M. 2017. Macroparasites of blue hake Antimora rostrata and Pacific flatnose Antimora microlepis (Gadiformes, Moridae): Current State of Exploration. Proceedings of Kazan University. Natural Sciences Series 159: 468–479 (in Russian).
- GORDEEV I.I., SOKOLOV S.G., DIAZ R., MORALES X. and ORLOV A.M. 2019. Parasites of the blue hake *Antimora rostrata* and slender codling *Halargyreus johnsonii* (Gadiformes: Moridae) in the northwestern Atlantic. *Acta Parasitologica* 64: 489–500.
- HANCHET S., DUNN A., PARKER S., HORN P., STEVENS D. and MORMEDE S. 2015. The Antarctic toothfish (*Dissostichus mawsoni*): biology, ecology, and life history in the Ross Sea region. *Hydrobiologia* 761: 397–414.
- IVANOV V.A. and CAMPBELL R.A. 2002. Notomegarhynchus navonae n. gen. and n. sp. (Eucestoda: Teteraphyllidea), from skates (Rajidae: Arhynchobatinae) in the southern hemisphere. Journal of Parasitology 88: 340–349.
- JENSEN K., NIKOLOV P. and CAIRA J.N. 2011. A new genus and two new species of Anteroporidae (Cestoda: Lecanicephalidea) from the darkspotted numbfish, *Narcine maculata* (Torpediniformes: Narcinidae), off Malaysian Borneo. *Folia Parasitologica* 58: 95–107.
- KLIMPEL S., KUHN T., MÜNSTER J., DÖRGE D.D., KLAPPER R. and KOCHMANN J. 2019. *Parasites* of marine fish and cephalopods. Springer International Publishing, New York.
- KUHN T., ZIZKA V.M., MÜNSTER J., KLAPPER R., MATTIUCCI S., KOCHMANN J. and KLIMPEL S. 2018. Lighten up the dark: metazoan parasites as indicators for the ecology of Antarctic crocodile icefish (Channichthyidae) from the north-west Antarctic Peninsula. *PeerJ* 6: e4638.
- KUMAR S., STECHER G., LI M., KNYAZ C. and TAMURA K. 2018. MEGA X: Molecular evolutionary genetics analysis across computing platforms. *Molecular Biology and Evolution* 35: 1547–1549.



- LASKOWSKI Z. and ROCKA A. 2014. Molecular identification of larvae of *Onchobothrium antarcticum* (Cestoda: Tetraphyllidea) from marbled rockcod, *Notothenia rossii*, in Admiralty Bay (King George Island, Antarctica). *Acta Parasitologica* 59: 767–772.
- LAST P., NAYLOR G., SÉRET B., WHITE W., DE CARVALHO M. and STEHMANN M. 2016. *Rays of the World*. CSIRO Publishing, Clayton.
- LAVIKAINEN A., IWAKI T., HAUKISALMI V., KONYAEV S., CASIRAGHI M., DOKUCHAEV N., GALIMBERTI A., HALAJIAN A., HENTTONEN H., ICHIKAWA-SEKI M., ITAGAKI T., KRIVOPALOV A., MERI S., MORAND S., NÄREAHO A., OLSSON G., RIBAS A., TEREFE Y. and NAKAO M. 2016. Reappraisal of *Hydatigera taeniaeformis* (Batsch, 1786) (Cestoda: Taeniidae) sensu lato with description of *Hydatigera kamiyai* n. sp. *International Journal for Parasitology* 46: 361–374.
- MARCOGLIESE D.J. 1995. The role of zooplankton in the transmission of helminth parasites to fish. *Reviews in Fish Biology and Fisheries* 5: 336–371.
- MISAWA R., ORLOV A.M., ORLOVA S.YU., GORDEEV I.I., ISHIHARA H., HAMATSU T., UEDA Y., FUJIWARA K., ENDO H. and KAI Y. 2020. *Bathyraja (Arctoraja) sexoculata*, a new softnose skate (Rajiformes: Arhynchobatidae) from Simushir Island, Kuril Islands (western North Pacific), with comments on geographical variation within *Bathyraja (Arctoraja) smirnovi*. *Zootaxa* 4861: 515–543.
- MUGUE N.S., PETROV A.F., ZELENINA D.A., GORDEEV I.I. and SERGEEV A.A. 2014. Low genetic diversity and temporal stability in the Antarctic toothfish (*Dissostichus mawsoni*) from nearcontinental seas of Antarctica. *CCAMLR Science* 21: 1–10.
- MUNOZ G. and CARTES F.D. 2020. Endoparasitic diversity from the Southern Ocean: is it really low in Antarctic fish? *Journal of Helminthology* 94: E180.
- OĞUZ M.C., TEPE Y., BELK M.C., HECKMANN R.A., ASLAN B., GÜRGEN M., BRAY R.A. and AKGÜL Ü. 2015. Metazoan parasites of Antarctic fishes. *Türkiye Parazitoloji Derneği* 39: 174–178.
- PETROV A.F., SHUST K.V., PIYANOVA S.V., URYUPOVA E.F., GORDEEV I.I., SYTOV A.M. and DEMINA N.S. 2014. Guidelines for collection and processing of fishery and biological data on aquatic bioresources of the Antarctica to the Russian scientific observers in the CCAMLR area. VNIRO, Moscow (in Russian).
- PETROV A.F. and GORDEEV I.I. 2015. Distribution and biological characteristics of Antarctic toothfish *Dissostichus mawsoni* in the Weddell Sea. *Journal of Ichthyology* 55: 210–216.
- POLYAKOVA T.A. and GORDEEV I.I. 2020. Cestodes of Antarctic and Subantarctic fish: History and prospects of research. *Marine Biological Journal* 5: 79–93.
- POSADA D. 2008. jModelTest: phylogenetic model averaging. *Molecular Biology and Evolution* 25: 1253–1256.
- ROCKA A. 2003. Cestodes of the Antarctic fishes. Polish Polar Research 24: 261–276.
- ROCKA A. 2017. Cestodes and Nematodes of Antarctic Fishes and Birds. *In:* S. Klimpel, T. Kuhn, H. Mehlhorn (eds) *Biodiversity and Evolution of Parasitic Life in the Southern Ocean*. Parasitology Research Monographs, vol 9. Springer, Cham: 77–107.
- ROCKA A. and ZDZITOWIECKI K. 1998. Cestodes in fishes of the Weddell Sea. *Acta Parasitologica* 43: 64–70.
- RONQUIST F. and HUELSENBECK J.P. 2003. MrBayes 3: Bayesian phylogenetic inference under mixed models. *Bioinformatic* 19: 1572–1574.
- SCHOLZ T., CHOUDHURY A., UHROVÁ L. and BRABEC J. 2019. The *Proteocephalus* speciesaggregate in freshwater centrarchid and percid fishes of the Nearctic region (North America). *Journal of Parasitology* 105: 798–812.
- SMITH P.J., STEINKE D., MCVEAGH S.M., STEWART A.L., STRUTHERS C.D. and ROBERTS C.D. 2008. Molecular analysis of Southern Ocean skates (*Bathyraja*) reveals a new species of Antarctic skate. *Journal of Fish Biology* 73: 1170–1182.
- SOKOLOV S.G. and GORDEEV I.I. 2013. New data on trematodes (Plathelminthes, Trematoda) of fishes in the Ross Sea (Antarctic). *Invertebrate Zoology* 10: 255–267.

284

www.czasopisma.pan.pl

Onchobothrium antarcticum in Antarctic fish

- STEHMANN M.F., WEIGMANN S. and NAYLOR G.J. 2021. First complete description of the darkmouth skate Raja arctowskii Dollo, 1904 from Antarctic waters, assigned to the genus Bathyraja (Elasmobranchii, Rajiformes, Arhynchobatidae). Marine Biodiversity 51: 1-27.
- TEREFE Y., HAILEMARIAM Z., MENKIR S., NAKAO M., LAVIKAINEN A., HAUKISALMI V., IWAKI T., OKAMOTO M. and ITO A. 2014. Phylogenetic characterisation of *Taenia* tapeworms in spotted hyenas and reconsideration of the "Out of Africa" hypothesis of Taenia in humans. International Journal for Parasitology 44: 533-541.
- WAESCHENBACH A., WEBSTER B.L., BRAY R.A. and LITTLEWOOD D.T.J. 2007. Added resolution among ordinal level relationships of tapeworms (Platyhelminthes: Cestoda) with complete small and large subunit nuclear ribosomal RNA genes. Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution 45: 311-325.
- WAESCHENBACH A. and LITTLEWOOD D.T.J. 2017. A molecular framework for the Cestoda. In: J.N. Caira and K. Jensen (eds), Planetary Biodiversity Inventory (2008-2017): Tapeworms from the vertebrate bowels of the Earth. Natural History Museum: Lawrence: 431-451.
- WOJCIECHOWSKA A. 1990a. Onchobothrium antarcticum sp. n. (Tetraphyllidea) from Bathyraja eatonii (Günther, 1876) and a plerocercoid from Notothenioidea (South Shetlands, Antarctic). Acta Parasitologica Polonica 35: 113–117.
- WOJCIECHOWSKA A. 1990b. Pseudanthobothrium shetlandicum sp. n. and P. notogeorgianum sp. n. (Tetraphyllidea) from rays in the regions of the South Shetlands and South Georgia (Antarctic). Acta Parasitologica Polonica 35: 181-186.
- WOJCIECHOWSKA A. 1991a. New species of the genus Phyllobothrium (Cestoda, Tetraphyllidea) from Antarctic batoid fishes. Acta Parasitologica Polonica 36: 63-68.
- WOJCIECHOWSKA A. 1991b. Some tetraphyllidean and diphyllidean cestodes from Antarctic batoid fishes. Acta Parasitologica Polonica 36: 69-74.
- WOJCIECHOWSKA A., PISANO E. and ZDZITOWIECKI K. 1995. Cestodes in fishes at the Heard Island (Subantarctic). Polish Polar Research 16: 205-212.
- YUKHOV V.L. 1982. Antarctic toothfish. Nauka, Moscow (in Russian).
- ZDZITOWIECKI K., WHITE M.G. and ROCKA A. 1997. Digenean, monogenean and cestode infection of inshore fish at the South Orkney Islands. Acta Parasitologica 42: 18-22.

Received 22 March 2021 Accepted 5 June 2021