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**Abstract**

**Background:** *Hymenolepis microstoma* (Dujardin, 1845) Blanchard, 1891, the mouse bile duct tapeworm, is a rodent/beetle-hosted laboratory model that has been used in research and teaching since its domestication in the 1950s. Recent characterization of its genome has prompted us to describe the specific strain that underpins these data, anchoring its identity and bringing the 150+ year-old original description up-to-date.

**Results:** Morphometric and ultrastructural analyses were carried out on laboratory-reared specimens of the ‘Nottingham’ strain of *Hymenolepis microstoma* used for genome characterization. A contemporary description of the species is provided including detailed illustration of adult anatomy and elucidation of its taxonomy and the history of the specific laboratory isolate.

**Conclusions:** Our work acts to anchor the specific strain from which the *H. microstoma* genome has been characterized and provides an anatomical reference for researchers needing to employ a model tapeworm system that enables easy access to all stages of the life cycle. We review its classification, life history and development, and briefly discuss the genome and other model systems being employed at the beginning of a genomic era in cestodology.

---

**Background**

Species of *Hymenolepis* Weinland, 1858 (Platyhelminthes: Cestoda: Cyclophyllidea) have been used as tapeworm models in research and teaching since the 1950s when they were first domesticated in the laboratory of Clark P. Read [1]. Adult parasites of rodents with beetle intermediate hosts, they benefit from easy culture in vivo using natural hosts that are themselves model organisms (e.g. *Mus musculus* L., *Tribolium confusum* Jacquelin du Val). Research on *Hymenolepis*, and especially *H. diminuta* (Rudolphi, 1819), *H. nana* (von Siebold, 1852) and *H. microstoma*, is underpinned by an extensive literature that includes much of our classical knowledge of tapeworm biology [e.g. [2]]. A recently initiated effort sponsored by The Wellcome Trust Sanger Institute to characterize the genome and adult and larval transcriptomes of *H. microstoma* http://www.sanger.ac.uk/sequencing/Hymenolepis/microstoma/ has brought this classical model into the genomic era, greatly advancing its utility for researchers interested in employing a practical tapeworm system that allows access to all life cycle stages. In light of this development, and the fact that laboratory isolates can vary in features of their biology [3], it is desirable to have a description of the exact strain on which the genome is based, and to thus anchor the data to a well-defined entity.

*Hymenolepis microstoma* was first described from the bile ducts of mice in 1845 by Dujardin [4] who placed it in the genus *Taenia* L., 1758, which housed all tapeworms known at that time. In 1891, Blanchard [5] transferred the species to the genus *Hymenolepis* and provided an expanded description of the species. Although Bear and Tenora [6] suggested synonymy between *H. microstoma* and *H. straminea* (Goeze, 1782), species status of *H. microstoma* historically has been widely accepted, and molecular data have shown both species to represent independent, albeit closely related, lineages [7,8]. In contrast, the genus *Hymenolepis* has
itself been overhauled on several occasions and its membership and internal structure remain controversial. For example, whereas Hughes [9,10] accepted the generic assignment *H. microstoma* by Blanchard, Spasskii [11] subdivided the genus and transferred *H. microstoma* to the genus *Rodentolepis* Spasskii, 1954, which he erected to house the rodent-hosted species of *Hymenolepis* with armed rostella. At the same time Spasskii erected the genus *Vampirolepis* Spasskii, 1954, which Schmidt subsequently considered a senior synonym of *Rodentolepis*, thus resulting in the new combination *Vampirolepis microstoma* (Dujardin, 1845) Schmidt, 1986 [12]. The thus resulting in the new combination *Vampirolepis microstoma* (Dujardin, 1845) Schmidt, 1986 [12]. The *Hymenolepis microstoma* [12] represents the most recent formal taxonomic assignment of the species, few investigators have adopted this name, and most reports refer to it as either a member of the genus *Hymenolepis*, or with less frequency, *Rodentolepis*. In our view, a natural circumscription of hymenolepid species will not be attained without the application of molecular data [15].

To this end, Haukisalmi et al. [8] recently used 28S rDNA to analyze phylogenetic relationships among 32 hymenolepid species from rodents, shrews and bats, showing that both *Hymenolepis* and *Rodentolepis* represented paraphyletic assemblages. Although their work assigned *H. microstoma* to a 'Rodentolepis' clade, the lack of resolution and widespread paraphyly of the taxa in their analyses indicate that greater taxonomic representation and more robust data are needed before such nomenclatural circumscriptions can be made reliably. We therefore follow Blanchard [5] in recognizing the mouse bile duct tapeworm as a member of the genus *Hymenolepis*, employing the most common name in usage, whilst appreciating that a more comprehensive understanding of hymenolepid interrelationships is likely to warrant generic reassignment.

Here we provide a description of a ‘Nottingham’ strain of *H. microstoma* based on light and scanning electron microscopy of laboratory-reared specimens from the same culture used to characterize the genome. History of the isolate, dating back to the laboratory of C. P. Read [1], suggests that it represents a model that has been widely employed and disseminated within the parasitological community for over 50 years, making the genome data directly relevant to a significant pre-existing literature on its biology.

**Results**

**Description of Hymenolepis microstoma (Nottingham strain)**

*Hymenolepis microstoma* (Dujardin, 1845) Blanchard, 1891

**Recorded synonyms**

*Taenia microstoma* Dujardin, 1845; *Cercocystis tenebri-onis* Villot, 1882; *Cysticercus tenebrionis* (Villot, 1882) Leuckart, 1886; *Cysticercus taenia-microstomae* Dolly, 1894; *Cysticercoides tenebrionis* (Villot, 1882) Braun, 1898; *Scolex (= Onchoscolex) decipiens* (Diesing, 1853) Joyeux and Kobozieff, 1928; *Rodentolepis microstoma* (Dujardin, 1845) Spasskii, 1954; *Vampirolepis microstoma* (Dujardin, 1845) Schmidt, 1986.

**Common name**

mouse bile duct tapeworm

**Laboratory strain designation**

'Nottingham'

**Laboratory strain history**

2005-present, The Natural History Museum, London (PDO); 1977-2005, University of Nottingham, UK (Prof. Jerzy Behnke); 1964-1977, University of Glasgow, UK (Prof. Adrian Hopkins); before 1964, Texas Rice University, USA (Prof. Clark P. Read).

**Laboratory hosts**

flour beetles (*Tribolium confusum*) and BKW outbred conventional mice (*Mus musculus*).

**Voucher specimens**

20 whole-mounted specimens (BMNH 2010.12.8.1-20), 22 slides of histological sections of adult worms (scolex and neck: BMNH 2010.12.8.21-30; immature strobila: BMNH 2010.12.8.31-36; mature strobila: BMNH 2010.12.8.37-42), and 12 whole and partial specimens prepared for SEM, retained by the corresponding author.

**No. chromosomes**

12 diploid, all acrocentric [16,17]

**Genome size**

~140 Mb (haploid)

**Genome data**

http://www.sanger.ac.uk/resources/downloads/helminths/hymenolepis-microstoma.html

**Description**

(based on 14–16 day old *in vivo* laboratory-reared specimens: 20 whole-mounted, 2 sectioned, and 12 specimens prepared for SEM; Figures. 1–2; all measurements are given as length × width in μm except where noted): worms anapolytic, weakly craspedote, 4.7 (2.5-8.1) cm long, with 659 (291-1,087) total segments (Figure 1A); scolex 138 (116-157) × 232 (204-284) with four muscular suckers 102 (79-129) × 96 (76-113) (Figure 1B). Rostellum 38 (26-52) × 71 (51-75) with an irregular surface lacking microtriches (Figures. 2A, B), armed with 25 (22-26) hooks, retractable into contractile rostellar pouch 104 (83-139) × 101 (79-140) (Figure 1B). Hooks cricetoid; α = 13.9, β = 12.3, γ = 6, γ' = 4.4 (Figure 1C). Width at level of neck 175 (94-225). Immature segments 62 (38-83) × 404 (437-463), mature segments 117 (70-167) × 729 (360-887), gravid terminal segments 164...
Figure 1 Illustrations of adult *Hymenolepis microstoma* (Nottingham strain). A. Whole worm. B. Hook showing measurement vectors. C. Egg. D. Scolex. E. Mature proglottide. F. Cross section of mature proglottide. Abbreviations: b, blade; c, cirrus; cs, cirrus sac; doc, dorsal osmoregulatory canal; eb, embryophore; eh, embryonic hooks; es, eggshell; esv, external seminal vesicle; g, guard; h, handle; isv, internal seminal vesicle; nc, nerve cord; o, ovary; oc, oncosphere; pf, polar filaments; r, rostellum; rp, rostellar bulb; s, shell; sr, seminal receptacle; t, testis; u, uterus; va, vagina; voc, ventral osmoregulatory canal. Scale bars: A = 1 mm; B = 10 μm; C = 50 μm; D-F = 100 μm.
Figure 2 Scanning electron micrographs of adult *Hymenolepis microstoma* (Nottingham strain). A. Scolex and rostellum. B. Rostellar hooks. C. Microtriches on the scolex. D. Internal view of gravid strobila. E. Seminal receptacle with spermatozoa surrounded by eggs. F. Three-day old transforming oncosphere showing larval hooks (arrows and insets). Scale bars: A = 50 μm; B = 5 μm; C = 2 μm; D = 100 μm; E-F = 20 μm (insets = 2 μm).
and voles (*Microtus Schrank*) [9,12,24]. Infections in rats is controversial: whereas Joyeux and Kobozieff [25] reported successful infection of laboratory rats, Dvorak *et al.* [20] found rats to be refractory to *H. microstoma*, and Litchford [24] showed that rats became refractory with age. Similarly, although infections can be established in golden hamsters (*Mesocricetus Nehring*), they result in underdeveloped worms and cause severe pathology to the host [20,24]. Dvorak *et al.* [20] demonstrated that mice could not be infected via eggs, as is the case with *H. nana* (ie. auto-infection) [26]. However, in congenitally athymic mice, Andreassen *et al.* [27] found that autoinfection was possible, showing that oncospheres penetrated the intestinal tissues and developed into cysticercoids that subsequently excysted and developed normally in the bile duct and duodenum, in a manner similar to the direct cycle of *H. nana*. Autoinfection of BALB/c mice was also implied by the detection of stage-specific antigens [28].

The life history of *H. microstoma* (Figure 3) has been described in detail previously [20,25,29] and is typical of other hymenolepid species, save its unusual location in the bile duct of the mammalian host. In brief, eggs containing patent oncospheres are expelled with faeces into the environment and may be ingested by either the adult or larval stage of an appropriate beetle host (e.g. *Tribolium confusum*, *T. castaneum*, *Tenebrio molitor*, and *Oryzaephilus surinamensis*). Oncospheral larvae (~20 μm; Figure 1D; Figure 2F) are released from their thin shells (Figure 2E; n.b. appearing as a ‘hymen’ via light microscopy and the eponym of the genus) through the action of the host mouthparts, and after ingestion use their three pairs of hooks and proteolytic secretions [30] to enter the haemocoel. There they undergo a complete metamorphosis, reconstituting their bodies into cysticercoid larvae [31] in approximately seven days, the phases of which have been documented by both Voge [32] and Goodchild and Stullken [33]. Upon infection of the definitive host, the combination of pepsin and HCl in the stomach act to dissolve the larval membranes, and juvenile worms are then activated in the duodenum in response to trypsin and bile salts. de Rycke [22] described adult growth and organogenesis in *Mus musculus* (summarized in Table 1): in the first three days the juveniles move anteriorly in the upper 20% of the small intestine and duodenum before establishing permanently in the bile duct, where they commence strobilation. Within approximately 14 days terminal segments are gravid and most of their strobila extends outside of the bile duct and into the duodenum. Thus the entire life cycle, from egg to gravid adult, can be completed in the laboratory in only three weeks. Although the germinal (‘neck’) region of tapeworms has the potential for ‘immortality’ as demonstrated in *H. diminuta* by
Read [34], infections of *H. microstoma* in mice persist for an average of six months, whereas those in the intermediate host can remain infective for the life of the beetle (> one year).

**The Hymenolepis genome**

Through collaboration with The Wellcome Trust Sanger Institute, a draft genome of *H. microstoma* derived from the cultures described herein is now publically available: http://www.sanger.ac.uk/resources/downloads/helminths/hymenolepis-microstoma.html. The latest assembly (October 2010) includes more than 40× coverage of the estimated 140 Mb haploid genome and is based on data produced by a combination of Roche 454 and Illumina Solexa next-generation sequencing technologies. Gene annotation is presently being conducted using a combination of RNA-Seq [35] and automated gene prediction tools, revealing intron-exon structures and other aspects of their genomic organization, and additional tools are being used to characterize non-coding regions (M. Zarowiecki and M. Berriman, pers. comm.).

*Hymenolepis microstoma* is one of four tapeworm species to have complete genomes characterized: a reference genome of *Echinococcus multilocularis* Leukart, 1863 and draft genome of *E. granulosus* (Batsch, 1786) have been produced by the Sanger Institute (available from http://www.sanger.ac.uk/resources/downloads/helminths/) in collaboration with Profs. Klaus Brehm and Cecelia Fernandez, respectively, and a consortium in Mexico are currently working to characterize the genome of *Taenia solium* L., 1758 [36]. These data herald the beginning of the genomic era in cestodology and are already accelerating advances in our understanding of tapeworm biology and infection. At present the only published platyhelminth genome is that of the human blood fluke, *Schistosoma mansoni* Sambon, 1907 [37]. However, genome data for *Schistosoma* Weinland, 1858 and *Echinococcus* Rudolphi, 1801, as well as the free-living flatworm

---

**Table 1 Growth of *Hymenolepis microstoma* in *Mus musculus* (summarized from de Rycke [22])**

| Days p.i. | Avg. length (mm) | Development and position in gut |
|----------|------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1-2      | 0.25-0.50        | no external segmentation or genital anlagen; worms localized in the first 10-20 cm of the intestine |
| 3        | 1.58             | some internal segmentation; appearance of genital anlagen; worms localized in the first 10 cm of the intestine |
| 4-5      | 3.40-3.85        | external segmentation and male & female genital anlagen discernable; worms localized in the bile duct |
| 6        | 5.85             | testes in few segments |
| 7        | 9.15             | testes mature |
| 8        | 13.50            | early-mature to mature proglottides |
| 9-10     | 17-20.50         | all proglottides mature |
| 11       | 27               | disappearance of female glands; few pre-oncospheres |
| 12       | 36               | pre-oncospheres, no hooks |
| 13       | 46.5             | semi-gravid proglottides |
| 14       | 62.5             | near gravid proglottides |
| 15-16    | 94-129           | gravid proglottides |

---

**Figure 3** Life cycle of *Hymenolepis microstoma* (mouse bile duct tapeworm)
models *Schmidtea mediterranea* Benazzi, Baguna, Balles-
ter, Puccinelli and Del Papa, 1975 [38] and *Macrostomum lignon* Ladurner, Scharer, Salvenmoser and Rieger, 2005 (http://www.macgenome.org/), have been available for some time and full reports on the characteristics of all of these genomes, including that of *H. microstoma*, are expected soon.

**Model systems in the genomic era of cestodology**

Of the three *Hymenolepis* species that have been employed in laboratory research, most literature con-
cerns the rat tapeworm *H. diminuta*, followed by the medically important dwarf tapeworm, *H. nana*, and finally by the mouse bile duct tapeworm, *H. microstoma*. As a model for research in the genomic age, however, *H. microstoma* has advantages over both of these alternative systems. For example, compared to *H. diminuta*, it is both smaller and mouse-hosted, enabling smaller, and thus less expensive, assay sizes (e.g. for RNAi), as well as less expensive animal costs, whereas the mouse-hosted *H. nana* is both a human pathogen (albeit controversy persists regarding the conspecficity of human and mouse strains) and capable of infecting other laboratory animals through faecal contamination via its direct life cycle [26]. Moreover, whereas *H. nana* survives only weeks in the mouse host [39], *H. microstoma* persist for ~6 months and thus require less frequent passage. Although the smaller size of *H. nana* would be preferable for assays, on balance *H. microstoma* provides the best practical solution for contemporary research programmes that wish to employ a tapeworm model providing easy access to all stages of their life cycle at minimal expense and risk to human and animal health.

Completion of the *H. microstoma* life cycle in *vitro* from egg to gravid adult was demonstrated in the 1960s and 70s by De Rycke and Berntzen [40], Evans [41,42] and Seidel [43,44], but to our knowledge no report of research employing these techniques has been published subsequently. Our initial attempts to follow these protocols for the cultivation of adult worms resulted in only limited growth (3× increase in length) without the onset segmentation (unpub. data). However, as many of the reported media used by previous authors are no longer available, more work is needed to develop contemporary protocols for *in vitro* culture. Among the most advanced *in vitro* systems available for tapeworm research today has been developed by Brehm and colleagues for *Echinococcus* [45-48], the genus on which most of our understanding of tapeworm molecular biology is based [49]. Development of an axenic culture system of the hydatid stage of *E. multilocularis* has allowed them to introduce transgenic and functional genomic techni-
ques (e.g. RNAi) to cestodology, and their system is currently being used to pioneer research on stem-cells and developmental biology in parasitic flatworms [45,50]. Although not yet supported by genome characterization, another currently employed *in vitro* system is that of *Mesocestoides Vaillant, 1863* [e.g. [51]] which are readily maintained in the larval tetrahydridal stage [31] and can increase their numbers in culture via asexual fission [52]. Adult worms have also been grown *in vitro* and induced to strobilate through the addition of bile salts [53]. However, as with species of *Echinococcus* and *Taenia*, in *vivo* development of strobilar stages of *Mesocestoides* is pro-
hibited by the legalities and expense of maintaining large vertebrate hosts in the laboratory. Rodent hosted *Hyme-
nolepis* species therefore remain the most convenient sys-
tems for research on the biology of adult tapeworms, and for this reason we have been developing *H. microstoma* as a model to study the development and evolution of tapeworm segmentation [54].

Although the basic framework of cestode evolution has been revealed by previous molecular studies [55-58] and the interrelationships of select groups are now well resolved [59-61], there has yet to be a comprehensive molecular phylogenetic study of the largest and most important group of tapeworms with regard to human and animal health, the Cyclophyllidea. All of the tape-
worm species for which genomes have been characterized thus far belong to this order and thus it is especially important that we elucidate the relative phylo-
genetic positions of the 350+ described genera [14]. Such knowledge will provide an evolutionary underpin-
ning for comparative genomic studies within the group and allow us to identify the sister lineages whose gen-
omes share the closest evolutionary histories to the spe-
cies for which full genome data are now available.

**Methods**

A seed culture of *Hymenolepis microstoma* infected beetles was obtained from Nottingham University in 2005 courtesy of Prof. Jerzy Behnke and subsequently main-
tained *in vivo* at the Natural History Museum (London) using flour beetles (*Tribolium confusum*) and BKW outbred conventional mice (full protocols can found at http://www.olsonlab.com; please contact the correspond-
ing author to enquire about seed cultures). Gravid, 14-16 day old specimens were removed from the bile ducts and duodenum of mice and quickly swirled in near-boiling 0.85% saline for ~4 secs to fully extend the worms prior to fixation in cold 4% paraformaldehyde overnight at -4 C. Whole-mounted specimens were dehydrated in a graded ethanol series, stained using Gill’s haematoxylin or left unstained, cleared in beach-
wood creosote and mounted in Canada balsam. Sections were prepared by paraffin embedding using standard histological techniques and stained with Mayer’s Hae-
malum [62]. Measurements and illustrations were made
under differential interference contrast on a Leica DM5000B compound microscope equipped with a camera lucida and digital documentation system. Specimens used for SEM were dehydrated as above, critically-point dried, sputter-coated with gold/palladium and viewed on a JEOL XL30 scanning electron microscope. Internal structures were imaged by SEM by cutting worms crudely using a razor blade.
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