Hidden diversity of the most basal tapeworms (Cestoda, Gyrocotylidea), the enigmatic parasites of holocephalans (Chimaeriformes)
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Gyrocotylideans are evolutionary ancient parasitic flatworms, and like their hosts—a relict group of holocephalan fishes (Chimaeriformes)—they are considered to be “living fossils” of a vanished past. However, the species diversity, host associations and biogeography of these most basal tapeworms are poorly known. Herein, we provide evidence of a conspicuous contrast between the genetic and morphological data based on an examination of newly collected and properly processed Gyrocotyle specimens (hologenophores) isolated from holocephalans off Taiwan and Argentina. Our molecular data, inferred from three genes (COI, 28S rRNA, 18S rRNA), showed unexpected genetic interrelationships among isolates of the genus Gyrocotyle, because each of the four genotypes from Taiwan clustered with isolates of distinct gyrocotylideans from the North Atlantic. Three genotypes of Gyrocotyle from Taiwan were morphologically almost indistinguishable from each other but represented distinct genetic lineages; a single specimen of Gyrocotyle sp. genotype 4 exhibited a clear genetic and morphological distinctness, though its formal description as a new species would be premature. Additionally, specimens of Gyrocotyle rugosa Diesing, 1850, from the type host Callorhinchus callorynchus from Argentina, provided the first genetic data on the type species of the genus and enabled us to characterise it, which is necessary for future taxonomic studies. The finding of some specimens of Gyrocotyle sp. genotype 3 in Chimaera phantasma, and another one in C. cf. argiloba, together with the putative conspecificity of an unidentified gyrocotylidean from Callorhinchus mili off Australia and G. rugosa from C. callorynchus off Argentina, represent evidence that one gyrocotylidean species may parasitise more than one holocephalan host species. Existing taxonomic problems and conflicts between morphological and molecular data on species of Gyrocotyle can only be resolved if hologenophores from type hosts and localities of nominal taxa are properly characterised genetically and morphologically.

The order Gyrocotylidea Poche, 1926, represents an enigmatic and the most basal extant group of tapeworms, with a unique monozoic body and a posteriorly located funnel-shaped adhesive organ. This relatively small taxon currently has 10 valid species, which are considered strictly host-specific parasites of the spiral intestine of holocephalans (Chimaeriformes), mostly deep-sea dwelling cartilaginous fishes. Gyrocotylideans are distributed worldwide and have been reported from 15 out of the 56 (25%) recognised extant species of holocephalans, with a high prevalence that may reach up to 100%. To the best of our knowledge, each holocephalan that has been examined for endohelminths thus far hosts at least one gyrocotylidean species. This suggests that major parts of gyrocotylidean diversity may be undiscovered. Recently, two new species of Gyrocotyle, from Harriotta...
coast of Japan and was identified as *Gyrocotyle fimbriata* off the coast of the United States of America.  

Results

**Molecular analysis of *Gyrocotyle* spp.** In total, 17 specimens of *Gyrocotyle* sp. from Taiwan were genotyped and four distinct genotypes were identified based on partial sequences of the COI, 28S rRNA and 18S rRNA genes. The pairwise divergence (uncorrected p-value) within the particular genotypes (i.e., intragenotypic divergence) ranged from 0.2 to 0.8% for the COI dataset, whereas the sequences of 28S rDNA were identical (the value was not calculated for 18S rRNA, because a single sequence was obtained for each genotype). The intergenotypic pairwise divergences were 6.1–9.1% for COI, 1.2–3.9% for 28S rRNA, and 0.9–1.2% for 18S rRNA. Considering isolates of *Gyrocotyle rugosa* from *Callorhinchus callorynchus* off Argentina, identical sequences of both COI and 28S rRNA were obtained from two specimens sequenced. The pairwise divergence between them and possibly a conspecific isolate of *Gyrocotyle* sp. from *Callorhinchus milii* Bory de Saint-Vincent off Australia was 0.5% and 0.2% for the 28S rRNA and 18S rRNA genes, respectively.

For phylogenetic analysis, amphilinidean, caryophyllidean and spathobothridean taxa were tested as potential outgroups. However, the numerous gaps in alignments caused a considerable loss of signal due to the removal of ambiguously aligned sequence positions. As rooted trees with isolates of none of the three tapeworm orders provided robust support for phylogenetic relationships among the gyrocotylidean taxa, their genetic relationships are herein depicted as an un-rooted network of two concatenated datasets, i.e. 28S rRNA + 18S rRNA genes and COI + 28S rRNA + 18S rRNA genes.

Out of 17 specimens genotyped, only the specimens genetically unique in at least one genetic marker were chosen for the further analysis (for the complete list of the material examined, see Supplementary Table S1). Among the unique isolates, the four genotypes of *Gyrocotyle* off Taiwan did not cluster together but formed separate groups spread among other gyrocotylideans in both analyses (Fig. 1a,b). The individuals of *Gyrocotyle* sp. genotype 1 from *Chimaera phantasma* exhibited the highest genetic similarity with the specimens of *Gyrocotyle urna* from *Chimaera monstrosa* off Norway and an isolate identified as “*Gyrocotyle rugosa*” from *Hydrolagus colliei* in the Gulf of Alaska. Two specimens of *Gyrocotyle* sp. genotype 2 from *Chimaera cf. argiloba* diverged from the lineage with the isolates of *Gyrocotyle discoveryi* Bray, Waeschenbach, Littlewood, Harvolsen & Olson 2020 from *Hydrolagus mirabilis* off Ireland, and the specimens of *Gyrocotyle* sp. genotype 3 from *C. phantasma* and *C. cf. argiloba* grouped with the isolate identified as “*Gyrocotyle urna*” from *Chimaera monstrosa* off Ireland. The specimin of *Gyrocotyle* sp. genotype 4 appeared in the branch with the isolate of *Gyrocotyle confusa* from *Chimaera monstrosa* off Norway, both being closely related to *Gyrocotyle haffii* Bray, Waeschenbach, Littlewood, Harvolsen & Olson 2020 from *Harriotta raleighana* off the North Atlantic and *Gyrocotyle nybelini* from *Chimaera monstrosa* off Norway, which had by far the longest branch in both analyses (Fig. 1a,b). 

Additionally, our specimen of *Gyrocotyle rugosa* off Argentina grouped with the only available isolate from the Southern hemisphere, *Gyrocotyle* sp. from *Callorhinchus milii* off Australia. These two specimens formed a relatively long branch, which was closely related to the group of *Gyrocotyle* sp. genotype 2 off Taiwan + *Gyrocotyle discoveryi* in the 28S rRNA + 18S rRNA gene network (Fig. 1a), though they exhibited a different topology when the COI gene was included (Fig. 1b). Moreover, the addition of the COI data increased the bootstrap support for some nodes when comparing with the dataset of ribosomal genes only. 

**Morphological characterisation of specimens off Taiwan and Argentina.** The specimens of *Gyrocotyle* sp. genotypes 1, 2 and 3 off Taiwan are similar in their general morphology, i.e., they possess heavily pli- cated lateral margins, a wide funnel and a large complex rosette. The copulatory papilla and external and internal seminal vesicles are present, and the male pore opens slightly posterior to the level of the vaginal pore. The ovary
Figure 1. Estimation of genetic interrelationships among the isolates of the genus Gyrocotyle. Maximum likelihood analysis performed on two concatenated datasets of two (28S rRNA + 18S rRNA) (a) and three (COI + 28S rRNA + 18S rRNA), (b) partial genes depicted as unrooted networks. Note the genetic diversity of the four genotypes of Gyrocotyle sp. from Taiwan, each of which clustered with G. urna off Norway + 'G. rugosa' off Alaska, G. discovery off Ireland, ‘G. urna’ off Ireland, and G. confusa off Norway, respectively, rather than together. Also note the cluster of Gyrocotyle sp. genotype 3 specimens isolated from Chimaera phantasma and C. cf. argiloba, respectively, and the close relatedness of Gyrocotyle rugosa from Callorhinchus callorynchus off Argentina with the isolate of Gyrocotyle sp. from Callorhinchus miliii off Australia. Our original isolates are in black, with a micrograph of the morphological voucher; asterisks mark the hologenophores. The ultrafast bootstrap supports over 89% and 94% are shown as open circles and black dots, respectively. The full length of the branches and gene concatenations are in the rectangular box, the identification of isolates in Table 1.
is U-shaped, the uterus coiled, and its distal part forms a well-developed uterine sac containing unembryonated eggs. Two excretory pores open posterolateral to the uterine pore (Figs. 2a–f, 3a–d).

However, these three genotypes can be distinguished from each other by the unique combination of morphological traits (Supplementary Table S2). Specimens of *Gyrocotyle* sp. genotype 1 possess a large acetabulum and a rosette of the same width or wider than the maximum body width. The acetabular spines are less numerous, and the dorsal body spines are small and distributed mostly on the posterior half of the body, whereas ventral spines are few and restricted to near the rosette. The testicular field reaches one-fourth of the uterus length, the ejaculatory duct is straight, and the uterine sac is middle-sized (Fig. 2a,b).

**Figure 2.** Whole mounts of *Gyrocotyle* spp. off Taiwan and Argentina. Morphological vouchers of *Gyrocotyle* sp. genotype 1 ex *Chimaera phantasma* (a), specimen TW212-1*; (b), specimen TW13-1, *Gyrocotyle* sp. genotype 2 ex *Chimaera cf. argiloba* (c), specimen TW138*; (d), specimen TW139*, *Gyrocotyle* sp. genotype 3 ex C. cf. *argiloba* (e), specimen TW215* and *C. phantasma* (f), specimen TW10-1, *Gyrocotyle* sp. genotype 4 ex C. cf. *argiloba* (g), specimen TW141*, all from Taiwan; and *Gyrocotyle rugosa* ex *Callorhinchus callorhinchus* Argentina (h), specimen AR89*. Field numbers with asterisks above indicate the hologenophores. ac acetabulum, do dorsal opening, ep excretory pore, gn genital notch, mg male gonopore, ov ovary, rs receptaculum seminis, te testes, us uterine sac, ut uterus, va vagina.
Gyrocotyle sp. genotype 2 is characterised by a large acetabulum and the rosette is not wider than the maximum body width. The acetabular spines are numerous and the body spines are small, with dorsal spines distributed on the posterior half of the body and near the lateral margins towards the acetabulum, whereas the ventral body spines are restricted to near the rosette; anterolateral spines (posterior to the acetabular spines) are also present. The testicular field reaches one-half of the uterus, the ejaculatory duct is coiled, and the uterine sac is middle-sized (Fig. 2c,d).

Gyrocotyle sp. genotype 3 possesses a small acetabulum and the rosette is not wider than the maximum body width. The acetabular spines are less numerous, body spines are large and distributed over the whole body surface. They are more numerous on the dorsal than on the ventral side, and their density is highest on the funnel, decreasing towards the acetabulum. The testicular field reaches one fourth of the uterus, the ejaculatory duct is straight, and the uterine sac is large (Fig. 2e,f).

The single specimen of *Gyrocotyle* sp. genotype 4 markedly differs from the specimens of all the genotypes described above by its lateral margins with few deep folds, numerous acetabular spines, a relatively narrow funnel and rosette, and the ovary being far from both the dorsal opening and the posterior body margin (Fig. 2g).

*Gyrocotyle rugosa* from *Callorhinchus callorynchus* off Argentina is typified by possessing an elongated body with crenulate lateral margins, a small rosette, a weakly developed uterine sac, a branched uterus, a V-shaped ovary and embryonated intrauterine eggs (Fig. 2h).

**Molecular identification of Chimaera spp. off Taiwan.** The analysis of the hosts’ COI gene distinguished two host genotypes (Fig. 4). The first genotype clustered within the *Chimaera phantasma* clade, whereas the second one nested with the isolates of *Chimaera argiloba* Last, White & Pogonoski off Australia, Indonesia and New Caledonia. Although the identification of the second Taiwanese genotype as *Chimaera cl. argiloba* is provisional due to its distinct geographical origin, it is evident that we examined two different host species from the East China Sea.
Almost 50 years ago, Simmons called gyrocotylideans a “century-old enigma” and this status still persists despite the advent of more advanced identification methods. The poor understanding of the group (e.g., the complete life cycle of none of the species is known) is linked with the scarcity of available data and the biological peculiarities of these tapeworms and their holocephalan hosts. In particular, most of the host species are rarely available deep-sea dwellers, which often could not be examined fresh or were frozen with their parasites prior to examination. If isolated alive, gyrocotylideans exhibit an unusual morphological variability due to the contraction of their large bodies and as a result of different fixative procedures which were tested to ensure their relaxation (e.g.). Despite these issues, several comprehensive studies have been conducted, e.g., which provided deep insight into the biology, ecology and taxonomy of these enigmatic tapeworms. Nevertheless, the poor quality of the specimens studied and the use of different, not always appropriate, methods of parasite fixation, unintentionally affected the quality of morphological descriptions of most gyrocotylidean species, which prevented the establishing of clear morphological borders to delimit individual species. As a result, the informative value of morphological traits used for species delimitation should be re-assessed, based on the simultaneous use of molecular data, i.e., the use of hologenophores to match morphology and molecular data. Existing problems with species delimitation and morphological variability even led to complete omission of morphological characterisation of two new species described just recently.

Herein, the genotyping of the Gyrocotyle spp. specimens acquired in Taiwan revealed four distinct genotypes, each one more related to the North Atlantic isolates identified as “Gyrocotyle urna” off Ireland (the isolate is genetically diverse from G. urna off Norway), “G. rugosa” off Alaska (probably misidentified, see below), G. discoveryi off Ireland and G. confusa off Norway, respectively, than to each other. In addition to casting doubts on the restriction of gyrocotylideans to individual oceans, our data also question the proclaimed strict host specificity, because specimens of Gyrocotyle sp. genotype 3 were found in two hosts species, which are not the closest relatives to one another—Chimaera phantasma and C. cf. argiloba (Fig. 4). Broader host specificity was also reported for G. fimbriata, which was found in Hydrolagus colliei and Chimaera phantasma, and for G. rugosa, recorded in Callorhinchus callorynchus and C. milii. Gyrocotyle urna was also found in several holocephalans, including Chimaera monstrosoa, Callorhinchus callorynchus, Hydrolagus ogilbyi Waite and H. colliei. In contrast, Bandoni & Brooks revised the host spectrum of this parasite, considering C. monstrosoa as the only host of G. urna.

The suitability of the molecular markers employed for this group also requires attention, because a considerable amount of phylogenetic information was also lost in the un-rooted dataset due to treatment of the numerous gaps in the 28S rRNA alignment. The involvement of partial COI gene sequences seemed to be informative for estimating gyrocotylidean phylogeny, because we obtained a no-gap COI alignment and improved support for some nodes in the three-gene network. The suitability of this marker requires assessment employing further
taxa, because except for our isolates off Taiwan and Argentina, only a single sequence of the COI gene (i.e., that of G. urna off Norway; GenBank acc. no. JQ268546) is currently available.

A single specimen of Gyrocytyle sp. genotype 4 was conspicuously different morphologically from the remaining ones by having few folds on the lateral margins, many acetabular spines, a narrow funnel and a small rosette. However, its formal description as a new species would be premature, because only a single specimen was found. Morphological differences among the specimens of the other genotypes were not so obvious, even though a careful examination of the hologenophores allowed us to find several morphological traits that were characteristic for particular genotypes (see “Results” section). Among them, the number of acetabular spines and the distribution of the body spines and their size may be potentially useful for species differentiation, especially because the body contraction can hardly affect them. Since body contraction cannot be absolutely excluded even when live specimens are properly fixed, its effect could be overcome to some degree by an evaluation of ratios related to the main body dimensions (e.g., length of uterine sac/total body length) rather than comparison of total measurements of internal structures.

The specimens off Taiwan most probably represent several new species, but we decided not to describe them formally as new taxa, mainly because of the shortage of comparative data. In addition to these specimens, two hologenophores of Gyrocytyle rugosa off Argentina were examined, which made it possible to characterise the type species of the genus. The host of G. rugosa described by Diesing was questionable until Callorchynchus antarcticus (= C. callorynchus—see) off New Zealand was finally established as its currently accepted type host. Gyrocytyle rugosa was found in coastal waters of South America, South Africa and New Zealand as a parasite of C. callorynchus and C. milit, suggesting its broader host specificity. Our specimens from C. callorynchus off Argentina were identified as G. rugosa based on crenulated (i.e., without any folds) lateral margins, a tiny uterine sac, a branched uterus and embryonated eggs in the uterine sac; the latter two traits are unique to this species.

Genetically, it clustered with an unspecified isolate of Gyrocytyle from C. milit off Australia, and these specimens seem to be conspecific.

In contrast, an isolate from Hydrologus colliei off Alaska identified as G. rugosa (GenBank acc. nos. AF286925 and AF124455) was apparently misidentified, because (i) it was found in an unrelated definitive host (H. colliei belongs to the family Chimaeridae, whereas the type host to the family Callorhinchidae), (ii) its distant geographic origin (the type locality of G. rugosa is unclear, but it is definitely in the Southern hemisphere), and (iii) its genetic divergence from our isolate of G. rugosa from the type host off Argentina. The isolate from H. colliei may represent Gyrocytyle fimbriata or G. parvispinosa, which have been reported from this host off the Pacific coast of North America, but its identification was not possible because morphological vouchers were not available to the present authors.

Gyrocytyleans were generally considered to be oioxenous, i.e. strictly specific parasites sensu Euzet and Combes, with each gyrocytylean species parasitising a single holocephalan species. Although several species were reported from two or more hosts species, these findings are usually considered as misidentifications due to the unclear taxonomy of the order. Moreover, some holocephalans, such as Ch. monstrosa, H. milit, H. affinis, and Ca. callorynchus, were often found to harbour two or more gyrocytylean species, one common and the other rare. Our findings of Gyrocytyle sp. genotypes 1 and 3 in Ch. phantasma and Gyrocytyle sp. genotypes 2, 3 and 4 in Ch. cf. argiloba suggested stenoxenous host specificity (i.e., the occurrence in a few closely related hosts) of gyrocytyleans, because the specimens of genotype 3 were found in both species of Chimaera. The obvious genetic similarity of our G. rugosa specimen from Ch. callorynchus and the isolate of Gyrocytyle sp. from C. milit also questions the strict specificity of this group, but morphological vouchers of the latter, which are necessary for the confirmation of their conspecificity, are not available.

Our genetic analyses provided insight into the interrelationships among the gyrocytyleans, even though the absence of a suitable outgroup did not enable us to broadly assess the possible evolutionary scenario of this earliest evolving group of tapeworms. Moreover, genetic data on only half of the nominal species of Gyrocytyle are available, not considering the possibility of misidentifications of previously sequenced specimens, for which hologenophores are not available. However, some clues of host-parasite coevolution can be inferred from the network. The mutual genetic distance of species/genotypes from the same host species suggests multiple colonisation events rather than co-speciation with their hosts within the order. It seems that G. phantasma might have been colonised by Gyrocytyle sp. genotype 1 or genotype 3, because these two genotypes are not the closest relatives in our analyses. The same pattern is obvious for C. cf. argiloba parasitised by Gyrocytyle sp. genotype 2, 3 and 4, and also for C. monstrosa, which harbours G. urna, G. confusa and G. nybelini. Indeed, Colin et al. considered these species from C. monstrosa to be conspecific, but our genetic data support the validity of three separate and genetically distinct species. Moreover, G. nybelini formed by far the most distant lineage among all isolates, which may suggest the validity of the genus Gyrocytoides Furhmann, 1931.

Genetic divergence of congeneric tapeworms from the same host species was also observed in several elasmobranch/teleost-cestode assemblages, e.g., Acanthobothrium spp. (Onchoproteocephalidae) and the mamburarr whipray Urogymnus acanthobothrium Last, White & Kyne; Echeneibothrium spp. (Rhinebothriidae) and the yellownose skate Dipturus chilenensis (Guichenot); and Pseudoendorchis spp. (Onchoproteocephalidae) and the catfish Pimelodus maculatus Lacepède.

The aim of this paper was to provide new insight into the phylogenetic relationships within the enigmatic order Gyrocytoidae, but, in particular, to demonstrate the lack of geographical patterns in the distribution of most of its species and the limited suitability of current morphological characteristics for species circumscription. Herein, we have outlined a methodology (fixation of live specimens with hot fixative and the exclusive use of hologenophores) that should be used in future taxonomic, ecological and biogeographical studies of gyrocytyleans in order to reliably circumscribe their actual species diversity and to unravel associations with their hosts, a relic group of marine vertebrates. Gyrocytyleans represent one of the key groups of parasitic
flatworms (Neodermata) in terms of a better understanding of their evolutionary history and the switch of free-living flatworms to parasitism.

Material and methods

Fifteen individuals of *Chimaera* spp. (Chimaeridae) from the fish market in Yilan City, northern Taiwan, and several individuals of *Callorhinchus callorynchus* (Callorhinchidae) off Mar del Plata, Argentina, were examined from 2004 to 2019. Their morphological identification followed Ebert et al.37; isolation of their genomic DNA and amplification of partial mitochondrial *cytochrome c oxidase subunit 1* (*COI*) genes were performed according to Holmes et al.38. Purification of the amplicons, sequencing method and processing of raw sequence data were same as for the parasites (see below). Live tapeworms isolated from the spiral valve of the above-mentioned holocephalans (prevalence 100%) were processed using standard helminthological techniques (see39); specimens were fixed with almost boiling water and

| Species           | Coll. nos | Host                      | Locality                   | Acc. no. 18S | Acc. no. 28S | Acc. no. COI | References |
|-------------------|-----------|---------------------------|----------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|------------|
| *Gyrocotyle urna* | Gurn1     | *Chimaera monstrosa*      | Unknown, Norway             | –            | –            | AI228799     | 40         |
| *Gyrocotyle urna* | Gurn2     | *Chimaera monstrosa*      | Fjord near Bergen, Norway   | AI228782     | AF286924     | –            | 17         |
| *Gyrocotyle urna* | Gurn3     | *Chimaera monstrosa*      | Fjord near Bergen, Norway   | –            | –            | AJ157178     | 19,20      |
| *Gyrocotyle urna* | Gurn4     | *Chimaera monstrosa*      | Coast of Finnmark, Norway   | –            | –            | MN657012     | 8          |
| *Gyrocotyle urna* | Gurn5     | *Chimaera monstrosa*      | Coast of Troms, Norway      | MN655884     | MN657013     | –            | 8          |
| *Gyrocotyle urna* | Gurn6     | *Chimaera monstrosa*      | Unknown fjord, Norway       | MN655883     | MN657015     | –            | 8          |
| *Gyrocotyle urna* | Gurn´     | *Chimaera monstrosa*      | Goban Spur, Ireland         | MN655882     | MN657010     | –            | 8          |
| *Gyrocotyle confusa* | Gcon | *Chimaera monstrosa*      | Coast of Finnmark, Norway   | –            | –            | MN657014     | 8          |
| *Gyrocotyle nybelini* | Gnyb | *Chimaera monstrosa*      | Coast of Finnmark, Norway   | MN655885     | MN657016     | –            | 8          |
| *Gyrocotyle discoveryi* | Gdis1 | *Hydrolagus mirabilis*     | Goban Spur, Ireland         | MN655879     | MN657003     | –            | 8          |
| *Gyrocotyle discoveryi* | Gdis2 | *Hydrolagus mirabilis*     | Porcupine Bight, Ireland    | MN655881     | MN657007     | –            | 8          |
| *Gyrocotyle haffii* | Ghaf     | *Harriotta rai-leghana*    | Goban Spur, Ireland         | MN655880     | MN657006     | –            | 8          |
| *Gyrocotyle rugosa* | Grug     | *Hydrolagus collei*       | Gulf of Alaska, USA         | AF124455     | AF286925     | –            | 50         |
| *Gyrocotyle sp.* | Gsp       | *Callorhinchus millii*     | Tasman Sea, Australia       | EU343741     | EU343735     | –            | 50         |
| *Gyrocotyle sp.* gen. 1 | TW212-1 | *Chimaera phantasma*       | East China Sea, Taiwan      | MWS87254     | MWS87259     | MWS81648     | This study |
| *Gyrocotyle sp.* gen. 1 | TW14-3 | *Chimaera phantasma*       | East China Sea, Taiwan      | MWS87260     | MWS81649     | This study   |
| *Gyrocotyle sp.* gen. 2 | TW138 | *Chimaera cf. argiloba*    | East China Sea, Taiwan      | MWS87255     | MWS87261     | MWS81650     | This study |
| *Gyrocotyle sp.* gen. 2 | TW139 | *Chimaera cf. argiloba*    | East China Sea, Taiwan      | MWS87262     | MWS81651     | This study   |
| *Gyrocotyle sp.* gen. 3 | TW10-2 | *Chimaera phantasma*       | East China Sea, Taiwan      | MWS87263     | MWS81652     | This study   |
| *Gyrocotyle sp.* gen. 3 | TW140 | *Chimaera cf. argiloba*    | East China Sea, Taiwan      | MWS87264     | MWS81653     | This study   |
| *Gyrocotyle sp.* gen. 3 | TW215 | *Chimaera phantasma*       | East China Sea, Taiwan      | MWS87256     | MWS87266     | MWS81654     | This study |
| *Gyrocotyle sp.* gen. 4 | TW141 | *Chimaera cf. argiloba*    | East China Sea, Taiwan      | MWS87257     | MWS87265     | MWS81655     | This study |
| *Gyrocotyle rugosa* | AR84     | *Callorhinchus callorynchus* | Coast near Mar del Plata, Argentina | MWS87258 | MWS87267 | MWS81656 | This study |
| *Chimaera phantasma* | TW12h    | –                          | East China Sea, Taiwan      | –            | –            | MWS81646     | This study |
| *Chimaera cf. argiloba* | TW14h  | –                          | East China Sea, Taiwan      | –            | –            | MWS81647     | This study |

Table 1. List of isolates with GenBank accession numbers of 18S rRNA, 28S rRNA and *cytochrome c oxidase subunit 1* (*COI*) genes of *Gyrocotyle* spp. and *COI* gene of *Chimaera* spp. used in genetic analyses.
then placed in 70% non-denatured ethanol. This approach allowed the isolation of DNA from a small piece of the parasite tissue, whereas the rest of the body was used for morphological observations as a hologenophore (see[28]). Additionally, paragenophores (an individual putatively conspecific with a hologenophore) were included in our analyses, because also mixed infections, i.e., two different parasite species (genotypes in our case) in a single host individual were recorded. The vouchers were deposited in the Helminthological collection of the Institute of Parasitology, Biology Centre of the Czech Academy of Sciences, České Budějovice, Czech Republic (IPCAS.C.869–872).

Isolation of genomic DNA and amplification of two nuclear genes (18S rRNA and 28S rRNA) followed Olson et al[40]. The partial COI gene was amplified by newly designed GcotCO1F (5'-ACTTCTACATCAGCGTT ATGGG-3') and GcotCO1R1 (5'-AGCATAGTTATACAGGC-3') primers (courtesy of H. Hansen, Norwegian Veterinary Institute, Oslo, Norway); PCR was initiated by denaturation at 95 °C for 5 min, followed by 35 cycles of 95 °C for 1 min, 50 °C for 1 min, and 72 °C for 90 s, and terminated at 72 °C for 5 min. The amplicons were enzymatically purified[41] and Sanger sequenced using PCR primers; nuclear genes were also sequenced using internal primers[42]. Contiguous sequences were aligned and inspected for ambiguous bases using Geneious[43].

In total, 26 original sequences of gyrocotylideans and Chimaera spp. were submitted to the GenBank database (accession numbers in Table 1).

Phylogenetic analyses were computed based on two concatenated datasets of our original sequences and those available from GenBank. The sequences of three genes were separately aligned by E-INS-I (18S rRNA and 28S rRNA) and L-INS-I (COI) algorithms in MAFFT ver.7.388[44]; the alignments were inspected by eye in Geneious and doubtful positions were removed. Substitution models for 18S rRNA (GTR + F + I), 28S rRNA (TVM + F + I + G4) and COI (TIM3 + F + I, HKY + F, and K3Pu + F + G4) for the 1st, 2nd, and 3rd codon positions, respectively) gene alignments were estimated under AICc criterion with an implemented test of model violation in ModelFinder using IQ-Tree ver. 2.0.47. IQ-Tree was also employed in the construction of phylogenetic trees under the Maximum Likelihood method with ultrafast bootstrapping (1000 replicates)[48]. These methods were also applied for host molecular identification employing TIM3e + G4, F81 + F, and TIM2 + F + G4 substitution models for the 1st, 2nd, and 3rd COI codon positions, respectively.
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