Study of the functional morphology of mouthparts of parasitic isopods of marine fishes
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1. Introduction

Parasites have received considerable scientific attention because they cause serious damage to fishery resources. Isopods associate with many species of commercially important fishes around the world and cause significant economic losses to fisheries by killing, stunting, or damaging these fishes[1-3]. The relationship of diet with the functional morphology of mouth parts have been studied for many crustaceans. In general, macrophyth has been associated with both mouth parts and foregut[4]. Considerable interest in functional morphology of crustacean mouthparts and foreguts has, however, been generated by systematists who are attempting to determine evolutionary relationships and develop meaningful taxonomic systems[5].

In most animals the structure of their mouth parts reflects the type of diet utilized. This was found to be true for isopods by Jones et al[6]. Mouthparts of the free-living isopod Jaera nordmanni described by the researchers[7]. Made a detailed SEM study on the gnathiid isopod Paragnathia formica[8]. Described three genera within the cirolanid family (Metacirloanis, Neocirolanis, and Anopsilana) and three other new genera (Nataolana, Poliolana and Cartetolana)[9]. Studied the morphology of the body appendages of the gnathiid isopod Bythognathia yucatanensis[10]. Examined the unusual endoparasitic isopod Tiurinio texopolliaum, from the majid crab Tiurinia sp. and directed special attention to the description of the antennules, antennae and pereopods related to parasitic adaptation[11]. Keable et al. described a new species of the cirolanid isopod Dolicholana, and redescribed Dolicholana porcellana with special reference to their mouthparts and setal types[12]. He revealed the difference between the molar median surfaces of Dolicholana elongata and Natatolana.
corpulenta by scanning electron micrographs. Investigated the oniscoid isopod Pentoniscus and described a new species with details of its mouthparts, pereiopods and pleopods.\[13\]. The mouthparts of the cirolanid isopod Ceratolana papuae, and the prominent horns formed by its rostrum and frontal lamina as a diagnostic feature of that species.\[14\]. At present, there is no accurate study on the mouth parts and diet analysis of parasitic isopods. Hence the present attempt was to examine the structure of the mouthparts and relate it to their function in the feeding process.

2. Materials and methods

The specimens were collected from marine fishes of Parangipettai (11° 29' N; 79° 46' E). The heads were removed with a sharp razor blade to avoid any discharge that may conceal surface details. Mouthparts were removed using techniques described by Barnard.\[15\]. Mouthparts were placed in glycerin on glass slides under cover slips.

Foreguts were dissected out of 73 specimens. Heads were gently pulled away from the body of the animals with forceps. The foregut and midgut remained attached to the head. To soften muscle attached to the foregut, the head was soaked in a solution of 10% potassium hydroxide overnight. The foreguts were then separated from the surrounding tissue and placed on a drop of glycerin on a microscope slide. The food contents were estimated by the frequency of occurrence method and the volumetric methods as suggested by Williams.\[16\]. Specimens were observed with a dissection and compound microscopes.

3. Results

3.1. Feeding structures

3.1.1. Cymothoa indica

The mouth appendages were strongly modified for the parasitic habit. The maxillipeds were reduced to small palps of two or three articles, the distal being manifestly smaller than the proximal and the basis of the maxilliped was often enlarged into a flattened plate; The first maxillae (=maxillules) are reduced to slender, unarticulated styles, which lay adjacent to one another in such a manner as to facilitate transfer of the host’s blood toward the mouth. The second maxillae was small, bilobed appendages. All these appendages bear strong, recurved, terminal or sub terminal spines that serve to hold the buccal region strongly affixed to the flesh of the host fish. The teeth of the maxillae may assist the mandible in rasping the host’s flesh. The first maxillae bear four terminal spines. The mandibles had lost the lacinia mobilis, setal row, molar process, and the incisor region is modified into a sharp, blade-like cutting process presumably capable of slicing through the host’s epidermis. The labrum was lamellar and well developed, aiding in preventing loss of the host’s blood from the mouth region because there specificity on preference only in the buccal cavity (Figures 1 and 2).

Figure 1. Mouth parts of Cymothoa indica.

Figure 2. Sphyraena jello on Cymothoa indica.

3.1.2. Mothocya renardi

The first segmented of mandibular palp expanded, third segment with three setae at apex. Incisor process of mandible acute. Maxilla 1 with one large straight spine and three smaller recurved apical spines. Distal lobes of maxilla two each with one recurved spine and distal segment of maxilliped palp with three stout recurved spines, apex of second segment was with stout triangular spine (Figure 3). All these appendages were highly modified to hold the gill chamber of host fish strongly (Figure 4).

Figure 3. Mouth parts of Mothocya renardi.
3.1.3. *Lobothorax typus*

Articles of mandibular palp all distinct, article 3 with 3 apical setae. Maxillule slender, styli form, with four terminal robust setae. Maxilla broad, endopod and lateral lobes each with two robust setae. Maxilliped composed of 3 articles and obscurely segmented basal articles; palp article 3 rounded, with 4 robust setae (Figure 5). *Lobothorax typus* was collected only from the buccal region of *Trichiurs lepturus* (Figure 6).

3.1.4. *Nerocilia phaeopleura*

Maxilla I slender with two small apical stylets, bilobed and inner lobe very small, bud like outer lobe squarish apical margin of outer lobe flate serrated and with a stout postero-lateral spine. Mandibles broad triangular with broad, maxilliped 3 segmented, basal segment very long, middle nearly circular and apical acutely bent laterally with three unequal spines (Figure 7). All these appendages are highly modified to hold the body surface and tearing the body muscles of host fish strongly.

3.1.5. *Nerocilia sundaica*

Maxilla slender with two small apical stylets, bilobed and inner lobe were very small. Outer lobe squarish, apical margin was flate serrated and with a stout postero-lateral spine. Mandibles broad triangular with broad, maxilliped 3 segmented, basal segment very long, middle nearly circular and apical acutely bent laterally with unequal spines (Figure 8).

3.1.6. *Ryukyua circularis*

Maxilla I slender with five apical stylets. Maxilla II with serrated margins but without spines. Palp stout distinctly 3 segmented narrow and distally terminal finger shaped (Figure 9). All these appendages are highly modified to hold the branchial chamber of host fish strongly.
3.1.7. Joryma brachysoma

Maxilla I slender with five apical stylets. Maxilla II bilobed, outer lobe large and inner lobe small, both with serrated margins but without spines. Incisor process of mandible is chispel-shaped, guarded by a cap. Palp stout, distinctly 3 segmented. Maxillipeds indistinctly 3 segmented, terminal finger shaped segment bears three stout apical spines. Incisor region is modified into a sharp, blade-like cutting process presumably capable of slicing through the host’s epidermis. The labrum was lamellar and well developed, aiding in preventing loss of the host’s blood from the buccal field (Figure 10).

3.1.8. Joryma hilsae

Maxilla slender with five apical stylets and serrated margins but without spines. Palp stout distinctly 3 segmented narrow and distally terminal finger shaped (Figure 11). All these appendages are highly modified to hold the branchial chamber of host fish strongly.

3.2. Diet analysis

A total of 73 stomachs was analysed (19 males/54 females). Comparison of the total number of stomachs analysed is shown in Figures 12 and 13, the gut contents of C. indica and J. brachysoma consisted of frequency 90% to 95% and volumetric 85%–93% of blood. The diet of M. renardi, R. circularis and J. hilsae were mainly composed frequency 80%–90% and volumetric 70%–81% of mucus and similarly the stomach contents of N. phaeopleura and N. sundaica were dominated by body muscles frequency 75%–83% and volumetric 80%–82%, because they were attached only the outer surface of the body[16].

4. Discussion

Parasitic isopods exploit different habitats and can consume different foods of their hosts. However, there are also largely free living isopods with a few groups being symbionts on Limpets and on chitons[17,18]. Consequently, isopods have different life styles. This is reflected in the structure of their mouthparts. Generally, crustaceans as a lower arthropod group than insects have the mouth lobes (upper and lower lips) more or less developed or even modified when compared to those of insects. The latter are more potentially developed and highly modified to perform definite functions and have received much attention in research due to their economic importance.

In the present study, isopods like C. indica and J.
Metacirolana moortgati, the incisor region is modified into a sharp, blade–like cutting process presumably capable of slicing through the host’s epidermis. The labrum is lamellated and well developed, aiding in preventing loss of the host’s blood from the buccal field. The mouth parts of M. renaudi, R. circularis and J. hilsae are structurally somewhat similar to one another. The mandibular palp is expanded with three setae at apex. Incisor process of mandible is acute. Maxilla with large staright spine and recurved apical spines. All these appendages are highly modified to hold the gill chamber of host fish strongly. Similarly the mouth parts of N. phaeopleura and N. sundaeica are also morphologically somewhat similar. Mandibles of these species are triangular and broad, maxilliped 3 segmented, basal segments very long, middle nearly circular and apical acutely bent laterally with unequal spines and are highly modified for anchorage to the body surface. In addition, the diet found in their gut contents indicating their parasitic habit that involves detection, attachment, manipulation and processing of host items before parasitism. Detection of the host may be visual and the mandibles are well equipped for handling the host or large food items. The mandibular mediol cuticular surface is elaborated into different forms of hard denticles as a pronounced cutting tooth, molars, and canines for shredding and masticating food; hooked mandibles, for perhaps tightly gripping the host fish, serrated movable plates for sawing hard bits of their hosts and then crushing them between opposite grinding molar surfaces, like stones if needed. The shredded and ground food is pushed into the mouth by perhaps, the stout setae of mobiles aided by the long maxillulary robust setae as well. In C. indica and J. brachysoma, the labrum was lamellated and well developed, aiding in preventing loss of the host’s blood from the buccal field.

C. bovina the incisors of each mandible have three sclerotized cusps instead of four as is the case in Metacirolana moortgati[9]. It is also worthy to notice that Hale et al. and Jones et al. used the form of mandibles as a systematic basis for separating or comparing the different genera such as Neocirologna and Cirolana[19,6]. The mandibles and maxillipeds of post molt and gravid females of some isopods (e.g. Paracerceis) may lose their setae as they stop feeding during this period[20]. Considering the first maxillae, it is found that its inner endite in Cirolana bovina has three robust pappose setae as opposed to three plumose ones in Metacirolana moortgati and four plumose setae in Sphaeroma serratum. In addition, the outer endite of the maxillae is heavily chitinized and denticulated in Metacirolana[21] and in Sphaeroma serratum[22]. This is reminiscent of the branchiopod phyllopodia used in filter–feeding process. The maxillipedal palp of Sphaeroma serratum carries typical filter setae with packed soft setules, while its maxillipedral plumose setae are more numerous with dense setules[23]. In contrast, the maxillipedal plumose setae of C. bovina are few and ventral and may be used as a secondary filtering net applied to the primary maxillary one for controlling the mesh size. C. bovina has three maxillipedal hooks, two are distal and longer than the third. These have been examined in some marine isopods and found to be restricted to females. For instance, found one coupling maxillipedal hook in the sphaeromatid Dynamene bidentata[23]. The cuticular surface of Crustacea, like that of other arthropods, shows a wide variety of microstructures as displayed by scanning electron microscopy. The most complex structures are the setae, where as some cuticular structures are only ornamental and others are sensory[23].

The mouthparts of C. bovina provides a background for further studies of their ultrastructural features and feeding mechanisms. Moreover, the highly differentiated structure of the mandibles may be used in the construction phylogenies within the isopods, as the morphology of the mouthparts has been the basis of amphipod systematics since the time of Boeck[24]. The present observations reveal a great diversity of morphology of mouth parts that may be species–specific. The possible functions of the mouthparts, especially in feeding are discussed in light of their structure. In this respect, the mouth parts are heavily modified with respected to their feeding behavior. In the light of the hypothesis that the structures of the mouthparts are related to diet, it seems obvious that parasitic isopods are mainly carnivorous and feeding on host tissues.
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Comments

Background

Isopods associate with many species of commercially important fishes around the world and cause significant economic losses to fisheries by killing, stunting, or damaging these fishes. The mouth appendages are strongly modified for the parasitic habit. The labrum of C. indica is lamellated and well developed, aiding in preventing loss of the host’s blood from the mouth region because there specificity on preference only in the buccal cavity. All these appendages Joryma hilsae are highly modified to hold the body surface and tearing the body muscles of host fish strongly.

Research frontiers

To carry out a comparative study of the mouthparts and the diet of eight isopod fish parasites. The mouthparts consist of a labrum, paragnaths, paired mandibles, maxillules, maxillae and maxillipeds. The labrum and the paragnaths are the least developed but peculiarly the mandibles are asymmetrical, large, stout and highly modified. The analysis of gut contents indicated that C. indica and J. brachysoma
diet consisted of 90% to 95% of animal blood. The diet of *Mothoca renardi*, *Ryukyuana circularis* and *J. hilsae* were mainly composed of mucus (80%–90%).

**Related reports**

In contrast, the maxillipedal plumose setae of *C. borina* are few and ventral and may be used as a secondary filtering net applied to the primary maxillary one for controlling the mesh size. *C. borina* has three maxillipedal hooks, two are distal and longer than the third. These have been examined in some marine isopods and found to be restricted to females. For instance, found one coupling maxillipedal hook in the sphaeromatid *Dynamene bidentata*. The cuticular surface of Crustacea, like that of other arthropods, shows a wide variety of microstructures as displayed by scanning electron microscopy. The most complex structures are the setae, where as some cuticular structures are only ornamental and others are sensory.

**Innovations & breakthroughs**

The innovative outcome of this paper to examine the structure of the mouthparts and relate it to their function in the feeding process.

**Applications**

Comparison of the total number of stomachs analysed the gut contents of *C. indica* and *J. brachysoma* consisted of 90% to 95% (frequency %) and 85%-93% (volumetric %) of blood. The diet of *M. renardi*, *R. circularis* and *J. hilsae* were mainly composed 80%-90% (frequency %) and 70%-81% (volumetric %) of mucus and similarly the stomach contents of *N. phaeopleura* and *N. sundaica* were dominated by body muscles 75%-83% (frequency %) and 80%-82% (volumetric %) because they were attached only the outer surface of the body.

**Peer review**

The paper is essentially sound, and I agree with the functional morphology made by the authors with the parasitic isopods. The author included more information on distinguishing the species from its congeners. It has got value information about cymothoids. I read this article with curiosity, it contributes scientific data in this field.
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