

An Acad Bras Cienc (2023) 95(1): e20220281 DOI 10.1590/0001-3765202320220281

Anais da Academia Brasileira de Ciências | Annals of the Brazilian Academy of Sciences Printed ISSN 0001-3765 | Online ISSN 1678-2690 www.scielo.br/aabc | www.fb.com/aabcjournal

### **BIOMEDICAL SCIENCES**

### Global distribution patterns of *Caligus* Müller, 1785 (Copepoda: Caligidae) associated to teleost fishes, with physiological and histopathological data and description of treatment strategies

MARCOS TAVARES-DIAS & MARCOS S.B. OLIVEIRA

Abstract: This review surveyed information on Caligus Müller, 1785 to identify global infestation patterns and geographic distribution in teleost fishes, as well as physiological and histopathological data and description of treatment strategies. A total 990 samples of Caligus spp. (N = 212 species) obtained of 233 scientific papers on farmed and wild teleost species from 99 families and 30 orders were used, and the highest number of occurrences was on Carangidae. Caligus spp. was predominantly found in marine environments, and only Caligus lacustris and Caligus epidemicus were found in teleost fish of freshwater environments. There was a high prevalence of Caligus spp. on hosts and infestation occurred predominantly in both the tegument and the gills. Caligus species are distributed across different countries and some particularities were identified and discussed. Caligus elongatus and Caligus bonito bonito had the broadest geographic distribution. Histomorphological and hematological disorders caused by infestation by Caligues spp. were reported and discussed, as well as chemotherapeutic products used for controlling and treating the infestations. Variation in the distribution and geographic patterns of Caligus spp. were little evident in many ecosystems and due to the limited data on the infestation of these sea lice on teleost populations in different regions.

Key words: Caligus, culture, crustacean, ectoparasites, infestation.

### INTRODUCTION

Caligidae Burmeister, 1835 are parasitic copepods that are distributed around the world. This family comprises 31 valid genera and more than 500 species (Öktener et al. 2016, Ho et al. 2016, Oliveira et al. 2020, Hemmingsen et al. 2020, Hamdi et al. 2021a), which predominantly utilize marine and brackish fish as their hosts. In marine and brackish water fish, members of the Caligidae family caused 61.0% of infestations (Hemmingsen et al. 2020). Members of this family occupy a privileged place in the world of parasitism because of their extraordinary adaptive capacity, and are predominantly external parasites, mainly of fishes (Oliveira et al. 2020). The genus *Caligus* Müller, 1785 are sea lice primarily marine, but a few smaller taxa routinely inhabit brackish or fresh water. *Caligus* is most speciose genus of this family, and currently comprises 268 species (Hamdi et al. 2021a, WoRMS 2022). These are copepods, and cause caligidosis in a variety of farmed fish species (Arriagada et al. 2019), as well as infecting economically important wild fish. Morales-Serna et al. (2016) listed 58 species of *Caligus* infesting fish in the Neotropical region.

*Caligus* spp. are globally distributed ectoparasites, and have been considered harmful pathogens for marine fisheries, with major economic consequences in the marine aquaculture industry (Hamre et al. 2011, Araya et al. 2012). Infestations by *Caligus* spp. can cause the mortality in wild fish populations (Chatterji et al. 1982, Hayward et al. 2008, 2009, Abdelkalek et al. 2021) and also result in economic losses due to mortality, reduced growth rate and poor feed conversion ratio among farmed fish populations (Rojas et al. 2018, Arriagada et al. 2019), leading to the use of chemical products to control and treat infestations in the hosts (Bravo et al. 2010, Hamre et al. 2011, Agusti et al. 2016, Arriagada & Marín 2018, Arriagada et al. 2019, 2020).

Caligus spp. feed on the mucus and blood of their host fish and can cause damages to the tegument, increasing the risk of secondary infections, leading to a deterioration in the physical conditions of the host fish population (Bruno & Stone 1990, González et al. 2020). Consequently, it causes the loss of millions of US dollars per year to global aquaculture, making the control of these sea lice economically important and a priority for fish farms (Costello 2009, Araya et al. 2012, Dresdner et al. 2019). Caligus spp. can be vectors and act in the horizontal transmission of the infectious salmon anemia virus among fish (Oelckers et al. 2015, Elgendy et al. 2015, Brookson et al. 2020). Infestations by these ectoparasites can influence the fish recruitment and population growth through direct mortality and potentially through parasite-mediated sublethal effects on host behavior, growth, predation risk, and reproductive success (Brookson et al. 2020).

Some species of *Caligus* are generalist parasites, infecting multiple host fish species in the environment, although this issue still needs to be investigated further. These parasitic crustaceans can also be found in plankton from different aquatic ecosystems (Byrne et al. 2018, Kim et al. 2019, Ohtsuka & Boxshall 2019, Ohtsuka et al. 2020). The life cycle of *Caligus* species has recently been clarified. In general, it undergoes two free-swimming naupliar stages, one infective copepodid stage, four sessile chalimi stages and a reproductive adult stage. However, Caligus epidemicus Hewitt, 1971 have 10 stages of development: two nauplii, one copepodid, six chalimus, and one young adult (Lin et al. 1996). In addition, these phases can vary seasonally (Byrne et al. 2018, Khoa et al. 2019a). Females of these sea lice can produce a varied number of eggs in each egg string pair, depending on species. Once the eggs hatch, a free-swimming larval phase commences that is shared among sea lice and generally consists of two naupliar stages, followed by one infective copepodid stage. The development of sea lice through the various life stages is temperature and salinitydependent for copepodids, if they are to be capable of successful host infestation (González & Carvajal 2003, Byrne et al. 2018). However, since much information on *Caligus* spp. is dispersed and requires further discussion, the aim of this review was to gather information from published research that focuses on the association between Caligus species and teleost fish the around world. Focus was also given to potential harm to fish physiological and histopathological data, and description of treatment strategies.

### MATERIALS AND METHODS

A review on the *Caligus* species in teleost fish was performed by searching the SciELO, ISI, Scopus, Science Direct, Zoological Records, CAB Abstracts, Lilacs, Capes periodicals and Google Scholar databases. Data from 233 scientific papers were subsequently systematized and used. Terms used in searching were *Caligus* and fish, and all articles on the *Caligus* associated to fishes were used. A dataset of *Caligus* species parasitizing fish populations was compiled, using the taxonomic descriptions of species, and surveys on the occurrences of these parasites published between 1898 and 2021. These data comprise surveys on *Caligus* species parasitizing wild and farmed teleost fish distributed throughout the world.

The taxonomy for *Caligus* species was obtained from WoRMS (2022). The taxonomy for each host fish species was obtained from Froese & Pauly (2022), and the sampling unit was the number of individuals parasitized by a Caligus species at a certain location and time. Some of the information used in samples included data on more than one host species. The data were organized in a data frame (extension ".txt") with a list of the following variables: (i) parasite species, (ii) infestation site, (iii) mean prevalence and (iv) mean intensity and (v) mean abundance; along with categorical factors such as: (i) host fish species, (ii) location of sample collection and (iii) family and order of host fish species. In addition, physiological and histopathological data and a description of treatment strategies were also evaluated here (https://github.com/DrTavares/ Supplementary-material).

Geographic distribution maps of *Caligus* species were made using information from the collection sites of the parasites contained in the compiled works. Two maps were made, one taking into account all the parasite species to show locations of occurrence, and one using only species that occur in five or more countries, in order to make the map more readable when superimposing information on it. Coordinates were plotted using Google Earth software and the generated database was exported to Quantum Gis (QGIS) to produce the maps.

### Data analysis

The ecological terms (prevalence, intensity and abundance) used were those recommended by Rohde et al. (1995) and Bush et al. (1997). The prevalence, abundance and intensity data of the parasites were tested for normal distribution and homoscedasticity of variances. As the parameters did not present normal distribution, the Kruskal-Wallis test was used (Zar 2010).

To determine the Caligus-host relationships at species level, a bipartite package (Dormann et al. 2008) was used to construct a bipartite network, in addition to calculating network-level indices (Dormann et al. 2009), such as the c-score, number of compartments and specificity index of the species (SSI) (Dormann 2011). The c-score index measures the co-occurrence rate of species in the network and is an indicator of the degree of specificity of the species that compose it, with values ranging from 0 (high co-occurrence) to 1 (low co-occurrence). Compartments are independent groups of ectoparasites and hosts within the network and are indicators of patterns of specificity. The SSI measures the level of species specificity of parasites, ranging from 0 (low specificity) to 1 (high specificity). Range is the number of fish species with which a species of ectoparasites interacts. Finally, the strength of species is the sum of the participation proportions of a species in all interactions within the network. The volume of connecting bars and lines represents the proportion of interactions performed by each species, and between species, respectively. These analyses were performed using the R software package (R Development Core Team 2017).

### RESULTS

Our search resulted in a total of 990 samples of *Caligus* spp., of which 186 were from farmed fishes and 804 were from wild fishes. In total, 212 species of *Caligus* were found parasitizing 368 teleost fish species, from 99 families and 30 orders. A total of 42 of these species were found in farmed fish and 171 in wild fish. The species richness of *Caligus* spp. and families from host fishes are shown in Table I, which shows higher numbers of occurrences on Carangidae (Figure 1).

### Table I. Richness of Caligus species by taxonomic groups in 368 teleost species.

Host order	Host family	Host species number	Parasite species richness
	Acanthuridae	4	5
	Chaetodontidae	1	1
	Drepaneidae	1	1
	Ephippidae	2	4
Acanthuriformes	Leiognathidae	1	1
	Lobotidae	2	4
	Pomacanthidae	3	3
	Scatophagidae	2	4
	Siganidae	3	5
Acropomatiformes	Lateolabracidae	1	1
Albuliformes	Albulidae	1	1
Atheriniformes	Atherinopsidae	2	5
	Atherinidae	1	1
Aulopiformes	Synodontidae	2	2
Beloniformes	Belonidae	6	9
	Hemiramphidae	2	2
Blenniiformes	Blenniidae	3	2
	Clinidae	2	1
	Tripterygiidae	1	1
Carangiformes	Carangidae	35	35
	Centropomidae	4	5
	Coryphaenidae	3	7
	Echeneidae	1	1
	Latidae	2	9
	Nematistiidae	1	1
	Polynemidae	3	3
	Sphyraenidae	4	6
Centrarchiformes	Girellidae	1	2
	Kyphosidae	4	6
	Scorpididae	1	1
	Terapontidae	1	2
Cichliformes	Cichlidae	3	5
Clupeiformes	Chirocentridae	1	1
	Clupeidae	3	3
	Engraulidae	2	2
Cypriniformes	Leuciscidae	1	1
	Cyprinidae	1	1
Dactylopteriformes	Dactylopteridae	1	1
Gadiformes	Gadidae	8	4
	Merlucciidae	2	3
Gobiesociformes	Gobiesocidae	1	1
Gobiiformes	Gobiidae	4	1
Gonorynchiformes	Chanidae	1	1
Labriformes	Pomacentridae 8		6
Lophiiformes	Lophiidae	1	1
Mugiliformes	Mugilidae	14	20
Mulliformes	Mullidae 5		5
Orectolobiformes	Hemiscylliidae	1	1
Perciformes	Cyclopteridae	1	1
	Eleginopidae	1	5
	Embiotocidae	1	1
	Gasterosteidae	1	1
	Gorroidao	г Б	7
	Jeneidae	J	1

### Table I. Continuation.

Hexagrammidae         1         1           Labridae         16         8           Lethrinidae         3         2           Lutjanidae         19         23           Malacanthidae         1         3           Moronidae         1         9           Moronidae         1         1           Moronidae         1         1           Moronidae         2         1           Moronidae         2         1           Moronidae         2         1           Pinguipedidae         2         1           Piacrephalidae         1         1           Pomacentridae         5         5           Scaridae         4         9           Scaridae         1         1		Haemulidae	11	12
Labridae         16         8           Lettrinidae         3         2           Lutjanidae         19         23           Malacanthidae         1         3           Moronidae         1         9           Nemipteridae         6         3           Nototheniidae         1         1           Odacidae         2         1           Pinguipedidae         2         2           Phatycephalidae         1         1           Pomacentridae         2         1           Pomacentridae         2         1           Sciaenidae         14         7           Sciaenidae         14         7           Sciaenidae         1         1           Scorpaenidae         1         1           Poleuronectiformes		Hexagrammidae	1	1
Lethrinidae         3         2           Lutjanidae         19         23           Malacanthidae         1         3           Moronidae         1         9           Noronidae         6         3           Noronidae         1         1           Noronidae         1         1           Noronidae         1         1           Noronidae         2         1           Noronidae         2         1           Noronidae         2         1           Odacidae         2         1           Pingupedidae         1         1           Pomacentridae         2         1           Pomacentridae         2         1           Priacanthidae         5         5           Scaridae         4         9           Scorpaenidae         1         1           Scorpaenidae         1         1           Scorpaenidae         19         15           Stagnidae         5         6           Paralichthyidae         5         5           Pleuronectiformes         Bothidae         1         1           Pleuronectidae <td></td> <td>Labridae</td> <td>16</td> <td>8</td>		Labridae	16	8
Iutjanidae         19         23           Malacanthidae         1         3           Moronidae         1         9           Nemipteridae         6         3           Nototheniidae         1         1           Odacidae         2         1           Pinguipedidae         2         2           Platycephalidae         1         1           Pomacentridae         2         1           Priacanthidae         5         5           Sciaenidae         14         7           Sciaenidae         1         1           Sciaenidae         19         15           Sciaenidae         19         15           Sciaenidae         19         15           Sciaenidae         1         1           Sciaenidae         19         15           Sciaenidae         1         1           Sciaenidae         1         1           Sciaenidae         1		Lethrinidae	3	2
Malacanthidae         1         3           Moronidae         1         9           Moronidae         1         9           Nemipteridae         6         3           Nototheniidae         1         1           Odacidae         2         1           Pinguipedidae         2         2           Platycephalidae         1         1           Pomacentridae         2         1           Priacanthidae         5         5           Scaridae         4         9           Sciaenidae         14         7           Scorpaenidae         1         1           Sebastidae         1         1           Seranidae         19         15           Sillaginidae         5         6           Pleuronectiformes         Bothidae         1           Pleuronectiformes         Bothidae         1           Soleidae         1         1           Salmoniformes         Salmonidae         9         8           Scombriformes         Salmonidae         1         1           Polynemidae         1         7         1           Salmoniformes		Lutjanidae	19	23
Moronidae19Nemipteridae63Nototheniidae11Odacidae21Pinguipedidae22Platycephalidae11Pomacentridae21Priacanthidae55Scaridae49Sciaenidae11Sebastidae11Sebastidae11Sebastidae11Sebastidae11Sebastidae11Sebastidae11Sebastidae11Sebastidae11Sebastidae11PleuronectiformesBothidae5PleuronectiformesSalmonidae9SalmoniformesSalmonidae9ScombriformesArripidae3Pomatomidae11Pomatomidae11Stormateidae34ScombriformesSalmonidaeSoleidae11Pomatomidae17ScombriformesSalmonidaeStormateidae11Pomatomidae17Scombridae11Pomatomidae11Pomatomidae11Pomatomidae11Pomatomidae11Pomatomidae11Pomatomidae35Stormateidae35		Malacanthidae	1	3
Nemipteridae63Nototheniidae11Odacidae21Odacidae21Pinguipedidae22Platycephalidae11Pomacentridae21Priacanthidae55Scaridae49Sciaenidae11Scorpaenidae11Sebastidae11Sciaenidae1915Sillaginidae56Sillaginidae2937Triglidae86PleuronectiformesBothidae1SalmoniformesSalmonidae9ScombriformesArripidae3ScombriformesArripidae3StimoniformesSalmonidae1Polynemidae11StombriformesSalmonidae9StombriformesArripidae3StombriformesArripidae1StombriformesArripidae1StombriformesArripidae1Stombrifae11Polynemidae11Arripidae34Stombrifae2825Stombrifae11Stombrifae35		Moronidae	1	9
Nototheniidae1Odacidae2Pinguipedidae2Pinguipedidae2Platycephalidae1Pomacentridae2Priacanthidae5Scaridae4Scaridae1Scorpaenidae3PleuronectiformesScorpaenidaeSoleidae5Scorpaenidae1Scorpaenidae1Scorpaenidae1Scorpaenidae1Polynemidae1Polynemidae1Polynemidae1Scorpaenidae1Scorpaenidae1Scorpaenidae1Scorpaenidae1 <td></td> <td>Nemipteridae</td> <td>6</td> <td>3</td>		Nemipteridae	6	3
Odacidae         2         1           Pinguipedidae         2         2           Platycephalidae         1         1           Pomacentridae         2         1           Priacanthidae         5         5           Scaridae         4         9           Scaridae         14         7           Scaridae         14         7           Scorpaenidae         1         1           Scorpaenidae         19         15           Scorpaenidae         19         15           Storpaenidae         29         37           Triglidae         8         6           Pleuronectiformes         Bothidae         1           Paralichthyidae         5         5           Seleidae <td></td> <td>Nototheniidae</td> <td>1</td> <td>1</td>		Nototheniidae	1	1
Pinguipedidae22Platycephalidae11Pomacentridae21Priacanthidae55Scaridae49Sciaenidae147Scorpaenidae11Sebastidae11Sebastidae1915Sillaginidae56PleuronectiformesBothidae1PleuronectiformesBothidae1Scombridae11ScombriformesSoleidae1Sebastidae11PleuronectiformesBothidae1PleuronectiformesSoleidae5ScombriformesSalmonidae9ScombriformesArripidae3ScombriformesSalmonidae1Pomatomidae11Pomatomidae11ScombriformesArripidae1ScombriformesScombridae1Scombridae11Pomatomidae11Scombridae34Scombridae11Scombridae33Scombridae33Scombridae11Scombridae11Scombridae33Stromateidae11Stromateidae35Stromateidae35Stromateidae35Stromateidae35Stromateidae35 <trr><td< td=""><td></td><td>Odacidae</td><td>2</td><td>1</td></td<></trr>		Odacidae	2	1
Platycephalidae1Pomacentridae21Priacanthidae55Scaridae49Scaridae147Scorpaenidae11Scorpaenidae11Scorpaenidae11Scorpaenidae11Scorpaenidae11Scorpaenidae11Scorpaenidae11Scorpaenidae11Scorpaenidae11Scorpaenidae1915Scorpaenidae937Scorpaenidae2937Triglidae86PleuronectiformesBothidae1PleuronectiformesBothidae1Soleidae54SalmoniformesSalmonidae9ScombriformesArripidae3Scombridae11Pomatomidae17Scombridae17Scombridae11Pomatomidae11Stromateidae11Stromateidae11Trichiuridae35		Pinguipedidae	2	2
Pomacentridae21Priacanthidae55Scaridae49Scaridae147Sciaenidae147Scorpaenidae11Scorpaenidae11Sebastidae11Sebastidae1915Sillaginidae56Sillaginidae2937Triglidae86PleuronectiformesBothidae1Pleuronectidae45Soleidae54SalmoniformesSalmonidae9ScombriformesArripidae3Pomatomidae11Pomacentridae11ScombriformesSalmonidae9ScombriformesSalmonidae1Pomatomidae17ScombriformesScombridae1Stomateidae17Scombridae34Stomateidae11Stomateidae11Stomateidae11Stomateidae35Stomateidae11Stomateidae11Stomateidae35Stomateidae35Stomateidae11Stomateidae35Stomateidae35Stomateidae35Stomateidae11Stomateidae35Stomateidae35 <td< td=""><td></td><td>Platycephalidae</td><td>1</td><td>1</td></td<>		Platycephalidae	1	1
Priacanthidae55Image: Constant and any and any and any and any		Pomacentridae	2	1
Scaridae49Image: Scare idae147Image: Scorpaenidae11Image: Scorpaenidae11Image: Scorpaenidae11Image: Scorpaenidae1915Image: Scorpaenidae1915Image: Scorpaenidae1915Image: Scorpaenidae2937Image: Scorpaenidae2937Image: Scorpaenidae2937Image: Scorpaenidae11Image: Scorpaenidae11Image: ScombriformesSalmonidae5Image: Scombridae11Image: Scombridae11Image: Scombridae11Image: Scombridae2825Image: Scombridae11Image: Scombridae11Image: Scombridae35Image: Scombridae35Image: Scombridae11Image: Scombridae11Image: Scombridae35Image: Scombridae35Image: Scombridae35Image: Scombridae11Image: Scombridae35Image: Scombridae35Image: Scombridae35Image: Scombridae35Image: Scombridae35Image: Scombridae35Image: Scombridae35Image: Scombridae35Image: Sco		Priacanthidae	5	5
Sciaenidae147Indestidae11Indestidae11Indestidae11Indestidae1915Indestidae1915Indestidae1915Indestidae2937Indestidae11Indestidae11Indestidae11Indestidae11Indestidae11Indestidae11Indestidae55Indestidae55Indestidae11Indestidae98Indestidae98Indestidae11Indestidae11Indestidae11Indestidae11Indestidae11Indestidae11Indestidae2825Indestidae11Indestidae11Indestidae11Indestidae35Indestidae11Indestidae11Indestidae11Indestidae11Indestidae11Indestidae11Indestidae35Indestidae35Indestidae35Indestidae35Indestidae35 <trr>Indestidae35<trr>I</trr></trr>		Scaridae	4	9
Scorpaenidae11Sebastidae11Serranidae1915Serranidae56Sillaginidae2937Triglidae86PleuronectiformesBothidae1Paralichthyidae55PleuronectiformesSalmonidae9Soleidae98ScombriformesSalmonidae9ScombriformesArripidae1Polynemidae11ScombriformesSalmonidae9ScombriformesArripidae1ScombriformesSalmonidae1Polynemidae17Scombridae2825Stromateidae11Trichiuridae35		Sciaenidae	14	7
Sebastidae11Seranidae1915Sillaginidae56Sillaginidae2937Sparidae2937Triglidae86PleuronectiformesBothidae1Paralichthyidae55Pleuronectidae45Soleidae98SalmoniformesSalmonidae9ScombriformesArripidae1Pomatomidae11Pomatomidae17Scombridae2825Stromateidae11Trichiuridae35		Scorpaenidae	1	1
Serranidae1915Serranidae56Sillaginidae56Sparidae2937Triglidae86PleuronectiformesBothidae1Paralichthyidae55Pleuronectidae45SalmoniformesSalmonidae9ScombriformesArripidae3Polynemidae11Polynemidae11ScombriformesScombridae1Promatomidae17Scombridae2825Stromateidae11Stromateidae35		Sebastidae	1	1
Sillaginidae56Image: Sparidae2937Image: Sparidae2937Image: Sparidae2937Image: Sparidae86PleuronectiformesBothidae1Image: Sparidae11Image: Sparidae55Image: Sparidae45Image: Sparidae45Image: Sparidae98Image: Sparidae34Image: Sparidae11Image: Sparidae11Image: Sparidae17Image: Sparidae2825Image: Sparidae11Image: Sparidae11Image: Sparidae11Image: Sparidae11Image: Sparidae11Image: Sparidae35		Serranidae	19	15
Sparidae2937Image: Constraint of the systemTriglidae86PleuronectiformesBothidae11Image: Constraint of the systemParalichthyidae55Image: Constraint of the systemParalichthyidae45Image: Constraint of the systemSoleidae45Image: Constraint of the systemSoleidae98Image: Constraint of the systemSalmonidae98Image: Constraint of the systemSalmonidae11Image: Constraint of the systemScombridae17Image: Constraint of the systemScombridae11Image: Constraint of the systemScombridae11Image: Constraint of the systemStromateidae11Image: Constraint of the systemStromateidae35		Sillaginidae	5	6
Triglidae86PleuronectiformesBothidae11Paralichthyidae55Pleuronectidae45SalmoniformesSalmonidae98ScombriformesArripidae34Polynemidae111Pomatomidae17Scombridae2825Stromateidae11Trichiuridae35		Sparidae 29		37
PleuronectiformesBothidae11Paralichthyidae55Pleuronectidae45Pleuronectidae45Soleidae54SalmoniformesSalmonidae9ScombriformesArripidae34Polynemidae11Pomatomidae17Scombridae2825Stromateidae11Trichiuridae35		Triglidae	8	6
Paralichthyidae55Pleuronectidae45Pleuronectidae45Soleidae54SalmoniformesSalmonidae9ScombriformesArripidae3Polynemidae11Pomatomidae17Scombridae2825Stromateidae11Trichiuridae35	Pleuronectiformes	Bothidae	1	1
Pleuronectidae45Image: Soleidae54SalmoniformesSalmonidae98ScombriformesArripidae34Image: ScombriformesPolynemidae11Image: Scombridae177Image: Scombridae28251Image: Stromateidae111Image: Stromateidae351		Paralichthyidae	5	5
Soleidae54SalmoniformesSalmonidae98ScombriformesArripidae34Polynemidae111Pomatomidae177Scombridae282525Stromateidae111Trichiuridae355		Pleuronectidae	4	5
SalmoniformesSalmonidae98ScombriformesArripidae34Polynemidae111Pomatomidae17Scombridae2825Stromateidae11Trichiuridae35		Soleidae	5	4
ScombriformesArripidae34Image: Polynemidae11Image: Pomatomidae17Image: Pomatomidae2825Image: Scombridae11Image: Stromateidae11Image: Trichiuridae35	Salmoniformes	Salmonidae	9	8
Polynemidae11Pomatomidae17Scombridae2825Stromateidae11Trichiuridae35	Scombriformes	Arripidae	3	4
Pomatomidae17Scombridae2825Stromateidae11Trichiuridae35		Polynemidae	1	1
Scombridae2825Stromateidae11Trichiuridae35		Pomatomidae	1	7
Stromateidae11Trichiuridae35		Scombridae	28	25
Trichiuridae 3 5		Stromateidae	1	1
		Trichiuridae	3	5
Siluriformes Ariidae 10 8	Siluriformes	Ariidae	10	8
Plotosidae 1 1		Plotosidae	1	1
Syngnathiformes Aulostomidae 1 3	Syngnathiformes	Aulostomidae	1	3
Fistulariidae 1 1		Fistulariidae	1	1
Tetraodontiformes Balistidae 4 5	Tetraodontiformes	Balistidae	4	5
Diodontidae 1 1		Diodontidae	1	1
Monacanthidae 5 6		Monacanthidae	5	6
Ostraciidae 2 3		Ostraciidae	2	3
Tetraodontidae 7 8		Tetraodontidae	7	8
Triacanthidae 2 2		Triacanthidae	2	2
Zeiformes Zeidae 1 1	Zeiformes	Zeidae	1	1



### **Figure 1.** Network of interactions between species of *Caligus* and families of host teleosts.

In the network of interaction that relates parasites with host families, the co-occurrence rate of the ectoparasites was low at a network level (c-score = 0.88) (Figure 1), indicating that Caliaus species do not share the same host families, and have a certain specificity for host families. In relation to the interaction between parasites and host families, at the parasite species level, most parasite species were recorded in only one host family in the network (Figure 1). Caligus elongatus Nordmann, 1832 was most widely distributed (Figure 1), registered in 19 host families and participating in 32.8% of the network interactions (range = 19.0, species strength = 10.6), followed by C. epidemicus, which featured in 31.3 % of the network interactions (range = 17, strength of species = 6.2). Carangidae was the most parasitized host family, featuring in 22.1% of network interactions (range = 38.0, family strength = 28.3), followed by the Labridae family, which was involved in 15.2% of the network interactions (range = 18.0, strength of species = 10.3). Most species exhibited high species specificity index values (SSI) in relation to host families. In contrast, the least specialist species were C. elongatus (SSI = 0.30), followed by C. epidemicus (SSI = 0.36).

While there was a predominance of samples collected in a marine environment (Figure 2), *Caligus lacustris* Steenstrup & Lütken, 1861 and *C. epidemicus* infest hosts from a freshwater environment. The prevalence (n = 309), intensity (n = 197) and abundance (n =186) data of *Caligus* species in the host fish analyzed are shown in Figure 3. A high prevalence of *Caligus* spp. was found in both farmed and wild fish and a higher intensity was found in farmed fish species. Infestation sites by *Caligus* spp. occurred predominantly in the tegument and gills of host



Figure 2. Number of samples on host teleost according to environment of collection.

fish, but other organs were also infested (Figure 4).

*Caligus centrodonti* (Baird, 185) infested only species of Labridae; Caligus lalandei Barnard, 1948 infested only species of Carangidae; Caligus clemensi Parker & Margolis, 1964 infested species of Gasterosteidae, Salmonidae, Clupeidae, Hexagrammidae and Gadidae; Caligus absens Ho, Lin & Chen, 2000 infested species of Priacanthidae, Latidae and Cichlidae; Caligus asperimanus Pearse, 1951 infested species of Lutjanidae, Haemulidae and Sparidae; Caligus biaculeatus Brian, 1914 infested species of Aulostomidae, Scaridae, Labridae, Acanthuridae and Malacanthidae; Caligus bonito bonito Wilson, 1905 infested species of Coryphaenidae, Scombridae, Arripidae, Mugilidae, Carangidae, Coryphaenidae, Pomatomidae and Lutjanidae; Caligus chiastos Lin & Ho, 2003 infested species of Scombridae, Lutjanidae, Sparidae, Sillaginidae, Pomacentridae, Tetraodontidae and Latidae; Caligus coryphaenae (Steenstrup & Lütken, 1861) infested species of Scombridae, Carangidae, Coryphaenidae and Pomatomidae; Caligus diaphanous Nordmann, 1832 infested species of Triglidae, Sparidae, Pleuronectidae and Lutjanidae; C. elongatus infested species of Mullidae, Salmonidae, Gadidae, Labridae, Moronidae, Carangidae, Pleuronectidae,

Lophiidae, Cyclopteridae, Triglidae, Clupeidae, Mugilidae, Gobiidae, Monacanthidae, Belonidae, Sciaenidae and Soleidae; C. epidemicus infested species of Sparidae, Mugilidae, Pomacentridae, Gerreidae, Girellidae, Kyphosidae, Tetraodontidae, Lutjanidae, Synodontidae, Sillaginidae, Latidae, Cichlidae, Serranidae, Siganidae and Scatophagidae; Caligus haemulonis infested species of Ephippidae, Ariidae, Sparidae, Sciaenidae, Monacanthidae, Haemulidae and Ephippidae; Caligus laticaudus (Shiino, 1960) infested species of Carangidae, Kyphosidae, Chaetodontidae, Labridae, Sparidae, Haemulidae, Lutjanidae, Mugilidae and Polynemidae; Caligus lichiae Brian, 1906 infested species of Carangidae and Sphyraenidae; Caligus longipedis Bassett-Smith, 1898 infested species of Arripidae, Acanthuridae, Carangidae, Haemulidae, Ostraciidae, Pomacanthidae, Scaridae, Serranidae, Paralichthyidae, Gerreidae and Moronidae; Caligus mortis Kensley, 1970 infested species of Clinidae, Blenniidae, Gobiesocidae, Mugilidae and Sparidae; Caligus mutabilis Wilson, 1905 infested species of Carangidae, Scombridae, Ephippidae, Serranidae, Gerreidae, Haemulidae, Sciaenidae, Mugilidae, Centropomidae, Balistidae and Ephippidae; Caligus pageti Russell, 1925 infested species of Mugilidae and Moronidae; Caligus pagrosomi Yamaguti, 1939 infested species of Ariidae, Latidae, Lobotidae, Lutjanidae, Sciaenidae and Carangidae; Caligus pelamydis Krøyer, 1863 infested species of Scombridae, Carangidae, Lateolabracidae and Pomatomidae; Caligus pomacentrus Cressey, 1991 infested species of Pomacentridae, Haemulidae, Aulostomidae, Bothidae, Malacanthidae and Scaridae; Caligus praetextus Bere, 1936 infested species of Sciaenidae, Centropomidae, Diodontidae, Sparidae, Gerreidae, Echeneidae, Lutjanidae, Synodontidae, Tetraodontidae, Mugilidae, Ephippidae, Merlucciidae, Haemulidae,



Figure 3. Quantitative descriptors of infestation for *Caligus* species in samples of teleost species (Box plots represent medians, percentile ranges (25-75%), minimummaximum and outlier values).

Scombridae, Lutjanidae and Ariidae; Caligus productus Dana, 1852-1853 infested species of Coryphaenidae, Sparidae, Carangidae, Serranidae, Balistidae, Sphyraenidae, Scombridae, Lutjanidae and Centropomidae; *Caligus quadratus* Shiino, 1954 infested species of Coryphaenidae, Scombridae, Siganidae and Serranidae; Caligus robustus Bassett-Smith, 1898 infested species of Carangidae, Lutjanidae, Scombridae and Latidae; Caligus rogercresseyi Boxshall & Bravo, 2000 infested species of Salmonidae, Eleginopidae, Atherinopsidae and Paralichthyidae; *Caligus rotundigenitalis* Yü, 1933 infested species of Atherinidae, Leiognathidae, Mullidae, Scatophagidae, Terapontidae, Drepaneidae, Mugilidae, Latidae, Lutjanidae, Carangidae, Serranidae, Lobotidae and Cichlidae; Caligus rufimaculatus Wilson, 1905 infested species of Carangidae, Haemulidae, Pomatomidae, Lutjanidae, Mugilidae and Centropomidae; Caligus schlegeli

Ho & Lin, 2003 infested species of Sparidae, Mugilidae, Scatophagidae, Terapontidae, Carangidae, Siganidae, Girellidae, Nemipteridae and Sillaginidae; Caligus spinosus Yamaguti, 1939 infested only species of Carangidae and Sphyraenidae; Caligus suffuscus Wilson, 1913 infested species of Acanthuridae, Labridae, Ostraciidae, Malacanthidae, Scaridae and Balistidae and Caligus teres Wilson, 1905 infested species of Salmonidae, Eleginopidae and Merlucciidae and Caligus xystercus Cressey, 1991 infested species of Haemulidae, Aulostomidae, Sparidae, Lutjanidae, Pomacanthidae and Priacanthidae. However, for the mostly of Caligus species the host records collected from a number of different localities clearly does not allow any conclusion on host specificity.

Although diverse species of *Caligus* are distributed across continents and countries (Figures 5-6), some particularities were found. For example, there is a lack of studies on *Caligus* 



spp. for the coast of Africa, with the exception of a few records for South Africa. These records were particularly scarce from the seas of tropical West Africa. In the interaction network that relates parasites to countries of occurrence, the cooccurrence rate of *Caligus* spp. was low at network level (c-score = 0.82), indicating the species are geographically restricted. Furthermore, most Caligus species have been recorded in one or two countries. Caligus elongatus had the widest geographic distribution (Figure 7), participating in 31.0% of the network interactions (range = 14.0, species strength = 6.74), followed by C. bonito bonito, which participated in 31.6% of network interactions (range = 11.0, strength of species = 1.0). Vietnam had the highest recorded occurrence of Caligus species, featuring in 32.71% of network interactions (range = 48.0, country strength = 31.1), followed by Greece. which featured in 28.3% of network interactions (range = 34.0, country strength = 14.4) (Figure 7).

Regarding to distribution by continents, for Europe are described 24 species of *Caligus*, for Africa 26 species, for Asia 81 species, for Oceania 49 species, for Central America 14 species, for South America 30 species and for North America 39 species (Figure 5-6). For the Asiatic continent are known the higher number of *Caligus* species, indicating therefore that these parasites are better studied.

The histopathological disorders caused by *Caligus* spp. infestation in the gills and skin of different fish species are shown in Table II. The hematological, biochemical, and immunological effects of *Caligus* spp. on different fish species are shown in Table III.

A variety of chemotherapeutic products has been used to effectively control and treat infestation by *Caligus* spp. (Table IV).

### DISCUSSION

## Global distribution pattern of host-parasite interaction

During the last decade, interest has increased in ecological studies of host-parasite interactions, which provide important information about the distribution of parasites in host fishes. Taxa of the ectoparasites *Caligus* spp. are widely distributed in oceans around the world, infesting both wild and farmed teleost fishes of commercial and biological importance. How the dynamics of *Caligus* species vary among wild fish species has not been fully established, and the same is true for the role of these species in the host-parasite system, as they can serve as a natural reservoir host population



Figure 5. Geographical distribution of Caligus species on the continents of terrestrial globe.

for these copepods. It has been cited that the prevalence of C. clemensi on wild juvenile salmon correlated positively with the presence of the Atlantic salmon Salmo salar Linnaeus. 1758 in fish farms from British Columbia, Canada (Brookson et al. 2020). In addition, studies have indicated differences in the specialization of C. clemensi in Oncorhynchus gorbuscha Walbaum, 1792, Oncorhynchus keta Walbaum, 1792 and Oncorhynchus nerka Walbaum, 1792, which may arise via the initial infestation process, the survival of attached parasites, or parasiteinduced host mortality (Brookson et al. 2020). In experimental trials, C. elongatus was transferred between wild Pollachius virens Linnaeus, 1758 and S. salar salmon farmed in net cages, and from salmon to salmon. Both moribund S. salar and *P. virens* appeared to attract more lice than healthy fishes (Bruno & Stone 1990).

In the present study, there was a predominance of infestation by *Caligus* spp. in 24.8% of the host families, comprising Carangidae (10.6%), Sparidae (7.6%) and Scombridae (6.6%) species. The Carangidae family consists of 30 genera and 147 species, while the Sparidae family consists of 38 genera and 158 species of teleost fishes, and the Scombridae family consists of 15 genera and 54 species (Froese & Pauly 2022). These results may therefore reflect a greater number of studies on Caligus spp. in these teleost fish taxa and may also reflect local priorities for parasitological research into these hosts. Despite studies on the presence of Caligus species in teleost fish, global distribution patterns in teleost fish in different



Figure 6. Geographical distribution of Caligus species that occurred in five or more countries of terrestrial globe.

aquatic ecosystems around the world have not thus far been studied.

Analysis of the Caligus-host interactions is an important way to evaluate the local adaptation of these ectoparasites with heterogeneous distribution in hosts, as infestation rates vary between host teleost populations. We detected the following global patterns within Caligushost interactions: (a) a prevalence ranging from low to high, with abundance and intensity ranging from low to moderate; (b) association with other ectoparasites infracommunities, mainly Lepeophtheirus salmonis Krøyer, 1837; (c) typically aggregated distribution patterns; (d) occasionally positive correlations of prevalence and intensity with the body size of host fish at the infracommunity level; (e) 4.2% of parasite species are shared among farmed and wild

teleost fish and (g) ectoparasites infect mostly the gills and tegument of hosts. Therefore, findings from the present study shows in the gills and tegument have been the sites most frequently infected by *Caligus* species when searching for the parasite-host systems, as they are selective in their choice of attachment site. We can therefore suggest that these parasites seem to have a certain microhabitat specificity in hosts.

Parasitism is a factor that may influence the fish recruitment and population growth via direct mortality and potentially through parasite mediated sublethal effects on host behavior, growth, predation risk, and reproductive success (Brookson et al. 2020). In teleost fish samples analyzed around the world, we found a moderate to high prevalence, low abundance

Table II. Histopathological alteration caused by infes	tation of Caligus spp. in different teleost species.
--	--

Fish species	Parasite species	Organs	Tissue alterations	References
Mugil cephalus	Caligus curtus	Skin	Focal desquamation of the most superficial layer of the epidermis. Areas of vacuolar degeneration with multiple bulla formations were noticed in the skin of most examined cases. Ulcerated areas displayed edema which overdistended the scale pockets. The dermis showed congested blood vessels as well as infiltration, with numerous leukocytes, mainly lymphocytes and macrophages, together with melanomacrophage cells. Numerous melanin- carrying cells were seen in the tunica compacta. The underlying muscles showed sarcoplasmolysis, myophagia, and migration of sarcolemmal nuclei, especially in the ulcerated areas.	Easa & El-Wafa (1995)
Mugil cephalus	Caligus curtus	Skin	The skin of fish showed hyperplasia of club cells of the epidermis, congested and hemorrhagic dermis with excessive aggregation of round cells, melanomacrophage cell and edema of the dermis	El-Atta & El- Ekiaby (2012)
Salmo salar	Caligus elongatus	Skin	Chalimus larvae were anchored to the host scales by a frontal filament that penetrates through the epidermis and anchors into the basement membrane around the scale. Larval stages remain in one place feeding on the mucus and epidermal cells. The tissue surrounding the third- and fourth stage chalimus larvae showed no tissue changes due to the presence of the filament or any evidence of damage caused by the initial attachment by the second antennae of the copepodid. The feeding of the larvae resulted in excavation of a hole in the epidermis of fish, down to the basement membrane, with detachment of the epidermal layer from the basement membrane in the area surrounding the hole in the majority of samples examined. Necrotic cells line the hole formed by the larva, and some samples of chalimus IV larvae showed evidence of slight hyperplasia around the excavated area.	Mackinnon (1993)
Dicentrarchus labrax	Caligus minimus	Skin	Ulceration of the epidermis with marked inflammatory, mainly mononuclear cellular infiltration of the dermis as a result of the attachment and feeding activity of the parasites. The attachment was achieved by means of second pair of the antennae which were inserted into the host epidermal tissue. A marked reactive epidermal hyperplasia was observed at those areas as well as at the periphery of ulcerated lesions. Many epidermal cells around the damaged area showed signs of necrosis, the vacuolar degeneration of basal cells was prominent and epidermis was also characterized by diffuse areas of spongiosis. In many cases, increased fibroplasia and spongiosis was noticed within dermal collagenous connective tissue	Ragias et al. (2004)
Oncorhynchus mykiss	Caligus rogercresseyi	Skin	Analyses revealed differences between the epidermis of the control and infected fish. In particular, attachment sites were characterized by varying degrees of epithelium erosion and disorganization, no epidermal hyperplasia was observed. Lesions extended into the underlying dermis, showing hyperplasia, inflammation of the stratum compactum connective tissue, disorganization of collagen fiber arrangement, and an increased number of melanophores. Furthermore, an increased quantity of goblet cells was interspersed between epithelial cells. The ultra-structural analysis of the skin from infected fish also showed collagen fiber disruption and an evident increase in subdermal melanophores.	Rojas et al. (2018)

### Table II. Continuation.

Acanthopagrus australis	Caligus epidemicus	Skin	Copepodids eroded the epidermis and usually attached their frontal filament to the basement membrane on the inter-ray region of fins, as well as the fin rays or scales. The most extensive tissue response was associated with the redundant frontal filament, and was characterized by infiltrating macrophages, multinucleated giant cells, and epidermal and fibroblast proliferation.	Roubal (1994)
Dicentrarchu labrax	Caligus clemensi	Gills	Partial or complete sloughing of their lamellar epithelium which results in denuded filaments. Sometimes hyperplastic secondary lamellar epithelium in the adjacent area which led to fusion of the filaments were encountered thickened filaments by numerous inflammatory cells and edema beside dilated capillaries were observed. Fragments from the parasite were detected between primary filaments with ulceration and distortion of the adjacent filaments. Sometimes, heavy parasitic infestation with atrophy, distortion and blunting of the gill filaments could be seen. The base of primary filaments was covered by sheath from hyperplastic lamellar epithelium. The gill arch contained congested blood vessels beside edema, hemorrhage and inflammatory cells infiltration mainly eosinophil, granular cells in their necrotic muscles.	Abdelkalek et al. (2021)
Mugil cephalus	Caligus curtus	Gills	Parasites induced severe congestion of brachial blood vessels, telangiectasia, and also sloughing of secondary lamellae and desquamation of secondary lamellar epithelium	El-Atta & El- Ekiaby (2012)
Mugil cephalus	Caligus sp.	Gills	Many branchial lesions showed severe inflammatory reactions to advanced degenerative and hyperplastic changes. The inflammatory changes were mainly observed in gill arch and congestion of lamellar blood vessels and adhesion of most gill filaments and lamellae	El-Deen et al. (2012)
Dicentrarchus labrax	Caligus elongatus	Gills	Variety of circulatory, degenerative and proliferative changes evident in tissues of infected fish. Severe congestion of lamellar blood vessels was common among pathological findings. Diffuse hyperplasia at the base of the secondary lamellae as well as lamellar fusion was frequently denoted. Increase in the activity of goblet cells was characteristic. In some other cases, gill arch demonstrated edema, hemorrhages together with some eosinophilic granular cell aggregations	Elgendy et al. (2015)
Oncorhynchus mykiss	Caligus rogercresseyi	Gills	The secondary lamellae showed evidence of hyperplasia, base and tip thickening, and complete or partial lamellar fusion. The gills presented ordered organization, with numerous parallel threadlike secondary lamellae arranged at nearly right angles to the primary lamellae. Moreover, at the primary lamellae of the infected fish, the connective tissue showed an increased quantity of MCs/EGCs, macrophages, and lymphocytes). Increase in mucus-secreting or goblet cells in the epithelium of secondary lamellae and the distal tip of the gill filaments	Rojas et al. (2018)

and low to moderate intensity of *Caligus* species, in contrast to farmed fish, which had higher abundance and intensity. The prevalence, intensity and abundance of different species in the *Caligus* infracommunities sampled of the present study are clearly unequal. Therefore,

we detected variation in the infestation rates of *Caligus* species in the host fishes, which may reflect the fluctuations in the environmental conditions and factors related to host fish (González et al. 2000, Gargan et al. 2016, Bravo et al. 2017, 2021, González-Gómez et al. 2020). Caligus spp. ectoparasites are widely distributed in seas around the world and infest wild and farmed fish of commercial importance. Large aggregations of wild fish are attracted to fish farms, attracted by fish feed waste. Some of the wild fish species attracted in this way are natural hosts for *Caligus* spp. and could be an important source of infestation for farmed fish (Hemmingsen et al. 2020). Infestations and diseases caused by Caligus species have become a constant problem in farmed fish production, where high densities in fish farming, and within each farm, increase the frequency of contact between fish (Bravo 2003, Bravo et al. 2010). These infestations are a problem for the viability of the global salmon industry, and may be a major constraint to biological sustainability as well as the main factor limiting the future growth of fish aquaculture.

Many fish parasites are generalists, infecting multiple host species, which can lead to apparent competition (indirect competition via shared natural enemies), among fish host populations. Generalist parasites can persist even when the abundance of a focal host species is low, by infesting a reservoir host species, leading to spillover and spillback dynamics that are important for the management of farmed and wild fish populations (Brookson et al. 2020). Caligus bonito bonito and C. coryphaenae are cosmopolitan in distribution. These caligid species are not host specific and are thus found on a variety of host fish. Hogans & Trudeau (1989) cited that C. elongatus has infected more than 80 species of marine fish around the world. *Caligus rogercresseyi* has a low host specificity as they have been identified on several species of wild fish commonly present around salmon farms (Carvajal et al. 1998), and similar findings were observed in this study. Morales-Serna et al. (2013) reported that Caligus serratus Shiino 1965

has low host specificity, as it infects at least 13 fish species.

### Global geographic distribution of *Caligus* spp.

In fish assemblages, regional patterns of Caligus spp. may provide insights for the creation of global distribution maps. For fish from the Carangidae Rafinesque, 1815 family, which are globally distributed, 80 species of Caligus were listed by Özak et al. (2019). For scombrid hosts, Morales-Serna et al. (2017) listed 26 species of Caligus, while 33 species of Caligus have been listed for fish from the Mediterranean (Özak et al. 2012). Six species of Caligus were reported parasitizing tunas Auxis spp., Euthynnus affinis Cantor 1849, Katsuwonus pelamis Linnaeus 1758, and Thunnus spp. in Japan (Nagasawa et al. 2018). Recently, it was reported that fish from Turkey had been infested by 20 species of Caligus (Özak 2020), and these ectoparasites have been cited in marine fish from South Korea, China, Japan, Philippines and Taiwan (Ho et al. 2016). Hamdi et al. (2021a) listed 12 species of Caligus infecting 12 host fishes from the Tunisia coast, and thirteen species of *Caligus* were listed infecting 18 species of marine fish from Portugal (Hamdi et al. 2021b).

The establishment of global geographic distribution patterns of *Caligus* species is one of the main current goals of fish parasitology (Hamdi et al. 2021a, b). Hence, efforts to characterize these parasite species in host fishes may be crucial for monitoring and mitigating threats of disease in fishery and aquaculture. Despite the diversity of global fish fauna, there is little knowledge about the distribution of *Caligus* species across biomes distributed worldwide. Host specificity was not an important factor in the geographic distribution of *Caligus* spp. in seas around the world, since the distribution of these ectoparasites do not reflect that of the host fish species.

Fish species	Parasite species	Alterations	References
Salmo salar	Caligus rogercresseyi	Increase in plasma glucose and decrease in osmolality in 1day post infestation, with decrease in glucose and increase in osmolality in 16day post infestation, and decrease in triglycerides levels	González et al. (2015)
Salmo salar	Caligus rogercresseyi	Decrease in plasma glucose, pCO <sub>2</sub> and hematocrit, and increase in hemoglobin and lymphocytes	González et al. (2016a)
Salmo salar	Caligus rogercresseyi	Increase in plasma cortisol levels, and decrease in plasma level of glucose and triglycerides	González et al. (2016b)
Salmo salar	Caligus rogercresseyi	Increase in plasma cortisol and glucose levels	González et al. (2020)
Thunnus maccoyii	Caligus chiastos	Increase in plasma cortisol and glucose levels	Hayward et al. (2010)
Netuma bilineata	Calugus sp.	Decrease in hematocrit, hemoglobin and total erythrocytes	Jori & Mohamad (2008)
Eleginops maclovinus	Caligus rogercresseyi	Decrease in hematocrit, total erythrocytes and monocytes, and increase in hemoglobin, MCV, MCHC, leukocytes and lymphocytes	Peña-Rehbein et al. (2013)
Salmo salar	Caligus rogercresseyi	Decrease in plasma glucose and plasma total α-amino acids levels	Vargas-Chacoff et al. (2016)
Oncorhynchus kisutch	Caligus rogercresseyi	Increase in plasma glucose, triglycerides and total protein levels, and decrease in plasma total α-amino acids levels	Vargas-Chacoff et al. (2016)
Salmo salar	Caligus rogercresseyi	Increase in plasm a lactate dehydrogenase levels	Vargas-Chacoff et al. (2017)
Oncorhynchus kisutch	Caligus rogercresseyi	Increase in plasm a lactate dehydrogenase levels	Vargas-Chacoff et al. (2017)

Table III. Hematological, biochemical, and immunological effects of Caligus spp. for different teleost spe	cies.
--	-------

In the present study, an important factor related to the geographic distribution of *Caligus* species in sea ecosystems around the world was observed. These ectoparasites are widely distributed in the seas of many countries, particularly *C. elongatus and C. bonito bonito*. However, Vietnam had a highest occurrence of *Caligus* species, which may be due to a greater sampling efforts. This high occurrence of *Caligus* spp. may also be due to the fact that parasite species richness is greater in the tropics than at higher latitudes, with species richness of ectoparasites increasing at a greater rate towards the equator than that of host species (Rohde 2005). Studies on *Caligus* spp. for the coast of tropical West Africa were scarce and this is a region where we would expect to find a rich fauna as in other tropical oceans.

# Histomorphological and hematological alterations caused by *Caligus* spp.

Histopathology is an excellent tool for evaluating the effects of parasites on host fish tissues (Easa & El-Wafa 1995, Rojas et al. 2018).

## **Table IV.** Management strategies with chemotherapeutic products to control and treatment of infestation by *Caligus* spp. in different teleost species.

Parasite species	Products Concentrations Resu		Results	References	
Caligus rogercresseyi	Cypermethrin	15 µg/L	High efficacy	Agusti et al. (2016)	
Caligus rogercresseyi	Cypermethrin	0.4 mg/L	High efficacy	González-Gómez et al. (2019)	
Caligus rogercresseyi	Cypermethrin	15 ppb	Inefficacy	Marín et al. (2015)	
Caligus elongatus	Cypermethrin	5 µg/L	High efficacy	Treasurer & Wadsworth (2004)	
Caligus rogercresseyi	Deltamethrin	3 µg/L	High efficacy	Agusti et al. (2016)	
Caligus rogercresseyi	Deltamethrin	0.003 mg/L	Moderate efficacy	Bravo et al. (2013)	
Caligus rogercresseyi	Deltamethrin	2 µg/L	High efficacy	Bravo et al. (2014b)	
Caligus rogercresseyi	Deltamethrin	0.08 mg/L	High efficacy	González-Gómez et al. (2019)	
Caligus_rotundigenitalis	Deltamethrin	12.5 mg/L	High efficacy	Solanki et al. (2016)	
Caligus rogercresseyi	Azamethiphos	100 µg/L	High efficacy	Agusti et al. (2016)	
Caligus rogercresseyi	Azamethiphos	0.9 mg/L	High efficacy	González-Gómez et al. (2019)	
Caligus rogercresseyi	Azamethiphos	100 mg/m <sup>3</sup>	High efficacy	Jimenez et al. (2018)	
Caligus elongatus	Azamethiphos	0.2 mg/L	High efficacy	Roth et al. (1996)	
Caligus elongatus	Ivermectin	0.2 mg/kg	High efficacy	Palmer et al. (1987)	
Caligus teres	Neguvon	0.25 mg/L	High efficacy	Reyes & Bravo (1983)	
Caligus rogercresseyi	Emamectin benzoate	50 µg/kg	High efficacy	Agusti et al. (2016)	
Caligus rogercresseyi	Emamectin benzoate	50-100 µg/kg	Inefficacy	Bravo et al. (2012)	
Caligus rogercresseyi	Emamectin benzoate	70 µg/kg	Inefficacy	Bravo et al. (2013)	
Caligus curtus	Emamectin benzoate	50 µg/kg	High efficacy	Hamre et al. (2011)	
Caligus clemensi	Emamectin benzoate	-	High efficacy	Byrne et al. (2018)	
Caligus elongatus	Emamectin benzoate	50 µg/kg	High efficacy	Stone et al. (2000)	
Caligus rogercresseyi	Hydrogen peroxide	1.5 g/L	Inefficacy	Bravo et al. (2010)	
Caligus rogercresseyi	Hydrogen peroxide	2.0 g/L	High efficacy	Chávez-Mardones et al. (2017)	
Caligus rogercresseyi	Hydrogen peroxide	825 mg/L	High efficacy	Marín et al. (2018)	
Caligus elongatus	Hydrogen peroxide	15.0-20.0 mg/L	High efficacy	El- Deen et al. (2013)	
Caligus rogercresseyi	Hydrogen peroxide	1200 mg/L	High efficacy	Valenzuela-Muñoz et al. (2020)	
Caligus rogercresseyi	Freshwater	-	Inefficacy	Bravo et al. (2015b)	
Caligus curtus	Freshwater	-	High efficacy	El-Atta & El-Ekiaby (2012)	
Caligus sp.	Freshwater	-	High efficacy	El-Deen et al. (2012)	
Caligus elongatus	Freshwater	-	High efficacy	El-Deen et al. (2013)	
Caligus elongatus	Freshwater	-	High efficacy	Landsberg et al. (1991)	
Caligus orientalis	Freshwater	-	Inefficacy	Urawa & Kato (1991)	
Caligus curtus	Malathion	0.02 mg/L	High efficacy	Easa & El-Wafa (1995)	
Caligus elongatus	Malathion	0.15-0.20 mg/L	High efficacy	El-Deen et al. (2013)	
Caligus sp.	Trichlorfon	20.0-30.0 mg/L	High efficacy	El-Deen et al. (2012)	
Caligus elongatus	Trichlorfon	20.0-30.0 mg/L	High efficacy	El-Deen et al. (2013)	
Caligus elongatus	Trichlorfon	0.25 mg/L	Inefficacy	Landsberg et al. (1991)	
Caligus elongatus	Formalin	250 mg/L	Inefficacy	Landsberg et al. (1991)	
Caligus platytarsis	Formalin	0.02%	High efficacy	Chatterji et al. (1982)	
Caligus elongatus	Potassium permanganate	5.0-10.0 mg/L	High efficacy	El-Deen et al. (2013)	
Caligus sp.	Potassium permanganate	5.0-10.0 mg/L	High efficacy	El-Deen et al. (2012)	
Caligus elongatus	Copper	150 mg/L	Inefficacy	Landsberg et al. (1991)	

Fish gills and skin have therefore been used as biomarkers in the evaluation of the health of fish infested by Caligus species in both laboratory and field studies. Fish gills and skin have multiple functions and thus respond to Caligus spp. infestations (Table II). These sea lice are ectoparasitic copepods that feed on the mucus, epidermal tissue and blood of hosts (Bruno & Stone 1990, González et al. 2020), with sublethal effects, such as stress, appetite loss, and immune system depression, as well as lethal effects in heavily infected fish (Rojas et al. 2018). The attachment of *Caligus* and their movements over the host surface contribute little or nothing to the damage from their activities, with their feeding mainly, or even solely, responsible for the damage caused. The lesions caused may be localized or extensive, depending on the size of the fish and the number of parasites. Infestations can result in a broad range of clinical signs (Hemmingsen et al. 2020).

Clinic signals such as lesions, erosions, ulcerations, and dark discoloration, especially at the tegument of Mugil cephalus Linnaeus, 1758 infested by C. curtus have been reported (Easa & El-Wafa 1995). Mugil cephalus infested by C. curtus rubbed themselves on solid substrates and presented excessive mucus. Opaque skin, frayed fins, hemorrhagic spots scattered on every part of the body especially the perianal, caudal and pectoral regions were observed. In severe cases, mechanical damage of the skin, erosion, ulceration, gasping for air and accumulation around the water inlet were observed (El-Atta & El-Ekiaby 2012). Dicentrarchus labrax Linnaeus, 1758 infested by C. minimus presented distress, surface swimming, excessive mucus production, sluggish movement, emaciation and rubbing of the body against hard objects. Opercula exhibited bulging from the gulping of atmospheric air (surface breathing). The gills of host fish had a marbling (mosaic) appearance (areas of congestion and paleness), while excessive mucous secretion and paleness was seen in the gills of some fishes. The gills exhibited areas of thickened mucus, petechial hemorrhages, protruding gill tips with grayish coloration and necrosis (Eissa et al. 2016). The clinical signs in *M. cephalus* infested by *Caligus* sp. were a loss of appetite, debilitation, with extensive mucous, rubbing against the plastic silk coating of the ponds, nervous behavior and respiratory manifestations. In addition, extensive focal brown spots on the skin and fins, and redness around the mouth were observed (El-Deen et al. 2012). Therefore, the clinic signals caused by Caligus spp. depend on the parasite and host species, and on the degree of infestation.

Blood parameters have been considered an important way to measure the health status of fish populations. In fish, physiological changes caused by sea lice are effective indicators welfare; however, in practice routine monitoring on fish farms is difficult to implement (González et al. 2020). Hematological and biochemical variables have been used for clinical diagnoses related to the physiology of fish and to determine the effects of stressors such as *Caligus* spp. infestations (Table III).

In *S. salar* infested by *C. rogercresseyi* no evidence of the upregulation of genes related to heme-biosynthesis was demonstrated, suggesting that parasitic feeding by parasites on fish skin does not cause microcytic anemia (Valenzuela-Muñoz & Gallardo-Escárate 2017). Results indicate that host tissue damage caused by *C. rogercresseyi* liberates molecules recognized by tlr22a2, thus activating the host immune response. In addition, the abundance of tlr13 in infested fish, the increased expression of this receptor in the skin, and the phylogenetic similarity of tlr22 and tlr13, suggest the possible role of tlr13 in the immune response to ectoparasites (Valenzuela-Muñoz et al. 2016). In *S. salar* and *Oncorhynchus kisutch* Walbaum, 1792, infestation by *C. rogercresseyi* caused an increase in levels of lactate dehydrogenase in muscles, and a decrease in the liver (Vargas-Chacoff et al. 2017).

## Control and treatment strategies of *Caligus* species in teleosts

Aquaculture is the most consistently expanding industry in the world, and provides many products for human consumption, mainly fish species. However, diseases are a major constraint to fish aquaculture, affecting farmed fish systems, among which are those caused by Caligus spp. Thus, the management of diseases is a major challenge for the fish aquaculture industry, with current methods for controlling ectoparasites such as *Caligus* spp. mostly reactionary and reliant on chemical treatments. Antiparasitic control and treatment using chemotherapeutants are required for infested fish as they limit economic losses in fish farms. These antiparasitic interventions primarily rely on the treatment of infestation through baths or oral drug administration and usually focus on killing juvenile and adult parasites.

Studies suggests that the unit production costs of S. salar in Chile increased by an average of US\$ 1.45/kg when treatments against Caligus spp. were included. However, such treatment costs are compensated by higher harvesting levels, with unit production costs unchanging in comparison with the situation without treatment (Dresdner et al. 2019). The treatment of feed with emamectin benzoate reduced infestation by C. rogercresseyi when applied for more than 14 days, but repeated use over time reduces sensitivity to the treatment (Bravo et al. 2014a). A study in S. salar demonstrated genetic variation in resistance to C. rogercresseyi, indicating that its selection at the sessile stage allows a reduction in the parasite load at the adult stage

by modulating the reproductive cycle of the parasites (Lhorente et al. 2012).

The use of chemotherapeutants treatments to remove Caligus spp. is potentially harmful to these crustaceans, but there is strong evidence that the extensive use of these treatments results in the development of resistance. A study of salmonids reported a significant reduction in azamethiphos efficacy against C. rogercresseyi (Arriagada et al. 2020). The evaluation of cypermethrin, deltamethrin or deltamethrin was associated with lower juvenile, mobile adult, and gravid female C. rogercresseyi levels after treatment, when compared with an untreated pen. However, the three chemotherapeutants appeared to be less effective at reducing the number of juvenile sea lice compared to the mobile stages of farmed fish (Arriagada et al. 2014), in contrast to this parasite in native teleosts (González-Gómez et al. 2019). In S. salar and Oncorhynchus mykiss Walbaum, 1792 farms in the south of Chile, the immobilizing 50% effective concentration (EC<sub>50</sub>) of *C. rogercresseyi* varied from 0.06 to 0.2 mg/L (Bravo et al. 2008). The EC<sub>50</sub> values of deltamethrin for C. rogercresseyi ranged from 0.14 to 0.24 g/L (Helgesen et al. 2014), while the  $EC_{50}$  of hydrogen peroxide was 709.8 mg/L for 100% immobilization of C. rogercresseyi (Marín et al. 2018). Differences in the 50% immobilizing concentration ( $EC_{50}$ ) of C. rogercresseyi of azamethiphos, deltamethrin and emamectin benzoate for females and males have been reported, as females have higher values (Agusti et al. 2016). However, Agusti-Ridaura et al. (2018) reported the gene of enzyme acetylcholinesterase was probably involved in resistance to azamethiphos organophosphate. Caligus elongatus from a fish farm in Norway had lower immobilization rates at the highest hydrogen peroxide concentration than wild fish, which might be due to a loss of sensitivity, in contrast to azamethiphos, deltamethrin and

emamectin benzoate, which showed resistance (Agusti-Ridaura et al. 2018). Prolonging treatmenttime with azamethiphos in *C. rogercresseyi* appears to contribute to treatment success, reducing the number of treatments required throughout a production cycle, and reducing the risk of *S. salar* developing resistance to this drug (Jimenez et al. 2018). Studies by Valenzuela-Muñoz et al. (2014) have identified a relationship between Cr-Pgp expression and the detoxifying gene Cr-P540, suggesting the role of Cr-Pgp in pyrethroid metabolism for exposure to *C. rogercresseyi*.

An apparent loss in the sensitivity of C. rogercresseyi to emamectin benzoate due to the exclusive use of this chemotherapeutic to control this sea lice for long periods was reported by Bravo et al. (2008). Oral treatment with emamectin benzoate reduced C rogercressevi juveniles but did not reduce the abundance of gravid females in S. salar (Mancilla-Schulz et al. 2019). However, studies in O. mykiss suggest that treatment against C. rogercresseyi using emamectin benzoate is regulated by the transcriptional expression of proteins involved in the metabolism, distribution and elimination of endobiotics and xenobiotics, such as hormones and drugs, and could even affect the pharmacokinetics of emamectin benzoate in the same treatment (Cárcamo et al. 2011). The extensive use of chemotherapeutics in the aquaculture industry has negatively impacted the sensitivity of Caligus species to delousing effects with these chemotherapeutants.

Studies have indicated that the abundance of adult *C. rogercresseyi* on fish farms that synchronized treatments with neighbors within 5 km was lower than the abundance on nonsynchronized fish farms, 4 to 11 weeks after the procedure. These findings suggest the treatment synchronization effect was distance dependent and greater when neighboring farms up to 5 km away took part in the procedure (Arriagada & Marín 2018). Troncoso et al. (2011) demonstrated that feeding of *S. salar* with polyunsaturated aldehydes 2-trans, 4-trans decadenial (A3) has a potentially antiparasitic effect against *C. rogercresseyi*.

Adding 1.5 g/L of hydrogen peroxide to *S. salar* baths had an effectiveness of 100% against male *C. rogercresseyi* and 98.3% in females, compared with an effectiveness of only 55.6% against chalimus, which recovered from the treatment and were available to infest new hosts (Bravo et al. 2010). Meanwhile, 24 h baths with 0.000.4 and 0.002 mg/L of azamethiphos, 0.0002 and 0.001 mg/L of deltamethrin, 0.1 mg/L and 0.5 mg/L of emamectin benzoate, and 42 mg/L and 336 mg/L of hydrogen peroxide, negatively affected the fecundity rate of *C. rogercresseyi* (Bravo et al. 2015a).

Although effective, chemotherapeutants all involve environmental risks, can affect fish health and can negatively affect the public image of aquaculture. They also carry the risk of reduced sensitivity and resistance to chemical treatments on the part of the parasites. Efforts have therefore been made to replace them with more environmentally friendly methods. Oil of Azadirachta indica A. Juss used against Caligus spp. exhibited a median lethal concentration (LC<sub>50-96h</sub>) of 2.0 mg/L, and *in vivo* assays indicated that 10.0 mg/L resulted in 100% antiparasitic efficacy within 96 h of exposure (Khoa et al. 2019b). Some fish species are not particularly selective in their food choices and will readily ingest both adult and larval Caligus spp. Alternatively, biological methods using cleaner fish, such as lumpfish Cyclopterus lumpus Linnaeus 1758 have been used for grazing on Caligus spp., reducing the parasitic infestations (Imsland et al. 2020).

Although varieties of chemotherapeutants are used to control the abundance of *Caligus* 

spp. on fish, some have not demonstrated the desired effectiveness. Despite the difficulties indicated above, however, the effective control and treatment of these sea lice may be achieved with the integrated management of a combination of measures.

### CONCLUSIONS

The identification of the global distribution patterns of Caligus species improved our knowledge on the dynamics of these ectoparasites in different ecosystems around the world. This knowledge can lead to a more precise mapping of the zoogeographical patterns of these parasites in host teleost from endemic regions and geographic hotspots, allowing the parasite species to be estimated and improving the understanding of infestation patterns in host fish with a wide geographic distribution, in addition to determining the global geographical range limits of *Caligus* spp. Biogeographical patterns of Caligus spp. diversity may also be useful for determining how host-parasite interactions can influence speciation. The results of the present study provide several relevant insights into the distribution patterns of these parasites in host fish and across the major oceans of the world, and it represents the most extensive survey of species of *Caligus* in host teleost in such waters. Nevertheless, the variation in the distribution and geographic patterns of Caligus spp. were little evident in many ecosystems and due to the limited data on the infestation of these sea lice on teleost populations in seas in different regions. Since regions with significant deficits in sampling to describe the occurrence of Caligus species in host teleost were identified, the understanding of the distribution of these parasite species requires greater sampling in all countries, especially in regions where none was carried out.

### Acknowledgments

Tavares-Dias, M was supported by a research fellowship from the Conselho Nacional de Pesquisa e Desenvolvimento Tecnológico (CNPq, Brazil) (Grant 303013/2015-0). The authors are thanks to the Coordination Office for Improvement of Higher-Education Personnel (Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior, CAPES, Brazil) for granting a doctoral scholarship to Oliveira, MSB.

### REFERENCES

ABDELKALEK N, MAGED RAE, ALI H & SATOUR N. 2021. Identification of *Caligus* parasites infesting *Morone labrax* and its impact on fish health status and pathological alteration. MVMJ 22: 7-12. 10.35943/mvmj.2021.56334.1023.

AGUSTI C, BRAVO S, CONTRERAS G, BAKKE MJ, HELGESEN KO, WINKLER C, SILVA MT, MENDOZA J & HORSBER TE. 2016. Sensitivity assessment of *Caligus rogercresseyi* to antilouse chemicals in relation to treatment efficacy in Chilean salmonid farms. Aquaculture 458: 195-205.

AGUSTI-RIDAURA C, DONDRUP M, HORSBERG TE, LEONG JS, KOOP BF, BRAVO S, MENDOZA J & KAUR K. 2018. *Caligus rogercresseyi* acetylcholinesterase types and variants: a potential marker for organophosphate resistance. Parasites Vectors 11: 570. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13071-018-3151-7.

ARAYA A, MANCILLA M, LHORENTE JP, NEIRA R & GALLARDO JA. 2012. Experimental challenges of Atlantic salmon *Salmo salar* with incremental levels of copepodids of sea louse *Caligus rogercresseyi:* effects on infestation and early development. Aquacul Res 43: 1904-1908. https://doi. org/10.1111/j.1365-2109.2011.02991.x.

ARRIAGADA GA & MARÍN SL. 2018. Evaluating the spatial range of the effect of synchronized antiparasitic treatments on the abundance of sea lice *Caligus rogercresseyi* (Boxshall & Bravo, 2000) in Chile. Aquacul Res 49: 816-831. doi: 10.1111/are.13513.

ARRIAGADA GA, STRYHN H, CAMPISTÓ JL, REES EE, SANCHEZ J, IBARRA R, MEDINA M & ST-HILARE S. 2014. Evaluation of the performance of pyrethroids on different life stages of *Caligus rogercresseyi* in southern Chile. Aquaculture 426-427: 231-237. http://dx.doi.org/ 10.1016/j. aquaculture.2014.02.007.

ARRIAGADA G, FIGUEROA J, MARÍN SL, ARRIAGADA AM, LARA M & GALLARDO-ESCÁRATE C. 2020. First report of the

ARRIAGADA G, VALENZUELA-MUÑOZ V, ARRIAGADA AM, NÚÑEZ-ACUÑA P, BROSSARD M, MONTECINO K, LARA M, GALLARDO A & GALLARDO-ESCÁRATE C. 2019. First report of the sea louse *Caligus rogercresseyi* found in farmed Atlantic salmon in the Magallanes region, Chile. Aquaculture 512: 734386. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aquaculture.2019.734386.

BRAVO S. 2003. Sea lice in Chilean salmon farms. Bull Eur Ass Fish Pathol 23: 197-200.

BRAVO S, ERRANZ F & SILVA MT. 2021. Comparison under controlled conditions of the life cycle of *Lepeophtheirus mugiloidis* and *Caligus rogercresseyi*, parasites of the Patagonian blenny *Eleginops maclovinus*. Aquacul Res 52: 4198-4204. doi: 10.1111/are.15258.

BRAVO S, HURTADO CF & SILVA MT. 2017. Coinfection of *Caligus lalandei* and *Benedenia seriolae* on the yellowtail kingfish *Seriola lalandi* farmed in a net cage in northern Chile. Lat Am J Aquat Res 45(4): 852-857. doi: 10.3856/vol45-issue4-fulltext-24.

BRAVO S, NUÑEZ M & SILVA MT. 2013. Efficacy of the treatments used for the control of *Caligus rogercresseyi* infecting Atlantic salmon, *Salmo salar* L., in a new fish-farming location in Region XI, Chile. J Fish Dis 36: 221-228. doi:10.1111/jfd.12023.

BRAVO S, POZO V & SILVA MT. 2015b. Evaluación de la efectividad del tratamiento con agua dulce para el control del piojo de mar *Caligus rogercresseyi* Boxshall & Bravo, 2000. Lat Am J Aquat Res 43(2): 322-328.

BRAVO S, SEPULVEDA M, SILVA MT & COSTELLO MJ. 2014b. Efficacy of deltamethrin in the control of *Caligus rogercresseyi* (Boxshall and Bravo) using bath treatment. Aquaculture 432: 175-180. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j. aquaculture.2014.05.018.

BRAVO S, SEVATDAL S & HORSBERG T. 2008 Sensitivity assessment of *Caligus rogercresseyi* to emamectin benzoate in Chile. Aquaculture 282: 7-12. doi:10.1016/j. aquaculture.2008. 06.011.

BRAVO S, SILVA MT, AGUSTI C, SAMBRA K & HORSBERG TE. 2015a. The effect of chemotherapeutic drugs used to control sea lice on the hatching viability of egg strings from *Caligus rogercresseyi*. Aquaculture 443: 77-83. http:// dx.doi.org/10.1016/j. aquaculture. 2015.03.011.

BRAVO S, SILVA MT & MONTI G. 2012. Efficacy of emamectin benzoate in the control of *Caligus rogercresseyi* on farmed Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar* L.) in Chile from 2006 to 2007. Aquaculture 364-365: 61-66. http://dx.doi. org/10.1016/j. aquaculture.2012.07.036.

BRAVO S, SILVA MT & TREASURER J. 2014a. Factors affecting the abundance of *Caligus rogercresseyi* (Boxshall and Bravo) on farmed salmonids in Chile in the period 2006–2007. Aquaculture 434: 456-461. http://dx.doi. org/10.1016/j.aquaculture.2014.09.009.

BRAVO S, TREASURER J, SEPULVEDA M & LAGOS C. 2010. Effectiveness of hydrogen peroxide in the control of *Caligus rogercresseyi* in Chile and implications for sea louse management. Aquaculture 303: 22-27. doi:10.1016/j. aquaculture.2010.03.007.

BROOKSON CB, KRKOŠEK M, HUNT BPV, JOHNSON BT, ROGERS LA & GODWIN SC. 2020. Differential infestation of juvenile Pacific salmon by parasitic sea lice in British Columbia, Canada. Can J Fish Aquat Sci 77: 1960-1968. dx.doi.org/ 10.1139/cjfas-2020-0160.

BRUNO DW & STONE J. 1990. The role of saithe, *Pollachius virens* L., as a host for the sea lice, *Lepeoptheirus salmonis* Kroyer and *Caligus elongatus* Nordmann. Aquaculture 89: 201-207.

BUSH A, LAFFERTY K, LOTZ JM & SHOSTAK W. 1997. Parasitology meets ecology on its own term: Margolis et al. revisited. J Parasitol 83: 575-583. https://doi.org/ 10.2307/3284227.

BYRNE AA, PEARCE CM, CROSS SF, JONES SRM, ROBINSON SMC, HUTCHINSON MJ, MILLER MR, HADDAD CA & JOHSON DL. 2018. Planktonic and parasitic stages of sea lice (*Lepeophtheirus salmonis* and *Caligus clemensi*) at a commercial Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*) farm in British Columbia, Canada. Aquaculture 486: 130-138. https://doi. org /10.1016/j.aquaculture.2017.12.009.

CÁRCAMO JG, AGUILAR MN, BARRIENTOS CA, CARREÑO CF, QUEZEDA CA, BUSTOS C, MANRÍQUEZ RA, AVENDAÑO-HERRERA R & YAÑEZ AJ. 2011. Effect of emamectin benzoate on transcriptional expression of cytochromes P450 and the multidrug transporters (Pgp and MRP1) in rainbow trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*) and the sea lice *Caligus rogercresseyi*. Aquaculture 321: 207-215.

CARVAJAL J, GONZÁLEZ L & GEORGE-NASCIMENTO M. 1998. Native sea lice (Copepoda: Caligidae) infestation of salmonids reared in netpen systems in southern Chile. Aquaculture 166: 241-246.

CHATTERJI A, INGOLE BS & PARULEKAR AH. 1982. Effectiveness of formaldehyde in *Caligus* infection of laboratory reared grey mullet, *Mugil cephalus* (L). Indian J Marine Sci 11: 344-346.

CHÁVEZ-MARDONES J, ASENCIO G, LATUZ S & GALLARDO-ESCÁRATE C. 2017. Hydrogen peroxide modulates antioxidant system

#### MARCOS TAVARES-DIAS & MARCOS S.B. OLIVEIRA

transcription, evidencing sex-dependent responses in *Caligus rogercresseyi*. Aquac Res 48: 969-978 doi:10.1111/ are.12939.

COSTELLO MJ. 2009. The global economic cost of sea lice to the salmonid farming industry. J Fish Dis 32: 115-118. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2761.2008.01011.x.

DORMANN CF. 2011. How to be a specialist? Quantifying specialisation in pollination networks. Network Biol 1: 1-20.

DORMANN CF, FRUEND J, BLUETHGEN N & GRUBER B. 2009. Indices, graphs and null models: analyzing bipartite ecological networks. Open Ecol J 2: 7-24.

DORMANN CF, GRUBER B & FRUEND J. 2008. Introducing the bipartite Package: analysing ecological networks. R News Vol 8/2: 8-11.

DRESDNER J, CHÁVEZ C, QUIROGA M, JIMÉNEZ D, ARTACHO P & TELLO A. 2019. Impact of *Caligus* treatments on unit costs of heterogeneous salmon farms in Chile. Aquac Econ Manag 23: 1-27 doi: 10.1080/13657305.2018.1449271.

EASA MES & EL-WAFA AA. 1995. Pathological studies on an epidemic of *Caligus curtus* (Copepoda) among captive *Mugil* and *Sparus* in Egypt with reference to malathion control. J Appl Aquacul 5: 25-29. doi:10.1300/ J028v05n02\_02.

EISSA IAM, DERWA HIM, MAATHER ML & EL-RAZIKY EA. 2016. Studies on crustacean diseases of seabass and white grouper fishes in Port Said Governorate. SCVMJ 21: 143-158.

EL-ATTA MEA & EL-EKIABY WT. 2012. Prevalence of bacterial infection associated with *Caligus* infestation in cultured *Mugil cephalus* with trial to control. Abbassa Int J Aqua 5: 415-440.

EL-DEEN AIEN, MAHMOUD E & HASSAN HM. 2013. Field Studies of Caligus parasitic Infections among cultured seabass (*Dicentrarchus labrax*) and Mullet (*Mugil cephalus*) in marine fish farms with emphasis on treatment trials. Global Vet 11(5): 511-520. doi:10.5829/idosi. gv.2013.11.5.76168.

EL-DEEN NAE, ABDEL HOK, SHALABY SI & ZAKI MS. 2012. Field studies on *Caligus* disease among cultured *Mugil cephalus* in brackish water fish farms. Life Sci J 9: 733-737.

ELGENDY MY, ABDELSALAM M, MOUSTAFA M, KENAWY AM & SEIDA A. 2015. *Caligus elongatus* and *Photobacterium damselae* subsp *piscicida* concomitant infections affecting broodstock European seabass, *Dicentrarchus labrax*, with special reference to histopathological responses. J Aquac Res Development 6: 346. doi:10.4172/2155-9546.1000346. FROESE R & PAULY D. 2022. FishBase. Version (02/2022) [online]. USA: FishBase; 2021 [cited 2022 January 15]. Available from: www.fishbase.org.

GARGAN P, KARLSBAKK E, COYNE J, DAVIES C & ROCHE W. 2016. Sea lice (*Lepeophtheirus salmonis* and *Caligus elongatus*) infestation levels on sea trout (*Salmo trutta* L.) around the Irish Sea, an area without salmon aquaculture. ICES J Marine Sci 73(9): 2395-2407. doi:10.1093/icesjms/fsw044.

GONZÁLEZ-GÓMEZ MP, OVALLE L, MENANTEAU M, SPINETTO C, OYARZÚN R, RIVAS M & OYARZO C. 2019. Susceptibility of *Caligus rogercresseyi* collected from the native fish species *Eleginops maclovinus* (Cuvier) to antiparasitics applied by immersion. J Fish Dis 42: 1143-1149. https:// doi.org/10.1111/jfd.13020.

GONZÁLEZ-GÓMEZ MP, OVALLE L, SPINETTO C, OYARZON C, OYARZÚN R, MENANTEAU M, ÁLVAREZ D, RIVAS M & OLMOS P. 2020. Experimental transmission of *Caligus rogercresseyi* between two different fish species. Dis Aquatic Org 141: 127-138. https://doi.org/10.3354/dao03513.

GONZÁLEZ L & CARVAJAL J. 2003. Life cycle of *Caligus rogercresseyi*, (Copepoda: Caligidae) parasite of Chilean reared salmonids. Aquaculture 220: 101-117.

GONZÁLEZ L, CARVAJAL J & GEORGE-NASCIMENTO M. 2000. Differential infectivity of *Caligus flexispina* (Copepoda, Caligidae) in three farmed salmonids in Chile. Aquaculture 183: 13-23.

GONZÁLEZ MP, MARÍN SL, MANCILLA M, CAÑON-JONES H & VARGAS-CHACOFF L. 2020. Fin erosion of *Salmo salar* (Linnaeus 1758) Infested with the parasite *Caligus rogercresseyi* (Boxshall & Bravo 2000). Animals 10: 1166. doi:10.3390/ani10071166.

GONZÁLEZ MP, MARÍN SL & VARGAS-CHACOFF L. 2015. Effects of *Caligus rogercresseyi* (Boxshall and Bravo, 2000) infestation on physiological response of host *Salmo salar* (Linnaeus 1758): establishing physiological thresholds. Aquaculture 438: 47-54. http://dx.doi.org/ 10.1016/j.aquaculture.2014.12.039.

GONZÁLEZ MP, MUÑOZ JLP, VALERIO V & VARGAS-CHACOFF L. 2016a. Effects of the ectoparasite *Caligus rogercresseyi* on *Salmo salar* blood parameters under farm conditions. Aquaculture 457: 29-34. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j. aquaculture.2016.01.027.

GONZÁLEZ MP, VARGAS-CHACOFF L & MARÍN SL. 2016b. Stress response of *Salmo salar* (Linnaeus 1758) when heavily infested by *Caligus rogercresseyi* (Boxshall & Bravo 2000) copepodid. Fish Physiol Biochem 42: 263-274. doi: 10.1007/s10695-015-0134-x. HAMDI I, BENMANSOUR B, ZOUARI-TLIG S, KAMANLI SA, ÖZAK AA & BOXSHALL GA. 2021a. *Caligus tunisiensis* n. sp. (Copepoda: Caligidae) parasitic on the painted comber *Serranus scriba* (L.) (Perciformes: Serranidae) from the Mediterranean Sea, off the Tunisian Coast. Syst Parasitol 98: 57-71. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11230-020-09959.

HAMDI I, HERMIDA M & KAMANLI AS. 2021b. Caligus madeirensis sp. nov. (Copepoda: Caligidae) parasitic on pompano, *Trachinotus ovatus* (Linnaeus, 1758), from eastern Atlantic waters, Surrounding the Madeira Archipelago, Portugal. Acta Parasitol 66: 361-376. https:// doi. org/10.1007/s11686-020-00290-3.

HAMRE LA, LUNESTAD BT, HANNISDAL R & SAMUELSEN OB. 2011. An evaluation of the duration of efficacy of emamectin benzoate in the control of *Caligus curtus* Müller infestations in Atlantic cod, *Gadus morhua* L. J Fish Dis 34: 453-457. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2761.2011.01256.x.

HAYWARD CJ, AIKEN HM & NOWAK BF. 2008. An epizootic of *Caligus chiastos* on farmed southern bluefin tuna *Thunnus maccoyii* off South Australia. Dis Aquat Org 79: 57-63. doi:10.3354/dao01890.

HAYWARD CJ, BOTT NJ & NOWAK BF. 2009. Seasonal epizootics of sea lice, *Caligus* spp., on southern bluefin tuna, *Thunnus maccoyii* (Castelnau), in a long-term farming trial. J Fish Dis 32: 101-106. doi:10.1111 /j.1365-2761.2008.01010.

HAYWARD CJ, ELLIS D, FOOTEC D, WILKINSON RJ, CROSBIE PBB, BOTT NJ & NOWAK BF. 2010. Concurrent epizootic hyperinfections of sea lice (predominantly *Caligus chiastos*) and blood flukes (*Cardicola forsteri*) in ranched southern bluefin tuna. Vet Parasitol 173: 107-115. doi:10.1016/j.vetpar.2010.06.007.

HELGESEN KO, BRAVO S & SEVATDAL S. 2014. Deltamethrin resistance in the sea louse *Caligus rogercresseyi* (Boxhall and Bravo) in Chile: bioassay results and usage data for antiparasitic agents with references to Norwegian conditions. J Fish Dis 37: 877-890. doi:10.1111/jfd.12223.

HEMMINGSEN W, MACKENZIE K, SAGERUP K, REMEN M, BLOCH-HANSEN K & IMSLAND AKD. 2020. *Caligus elongatus* and other sea lice of the genus *Caligus* as parasites of farmed salmonids: a review. Aquaculture 522: 735160. https://doi. org/10.1016/j.aquaculture.2020.735160.

HO JS, LIN CL & LIU WC. 2016. High diversity of *Caligus* species (Copepoda: Siphonostomatoida: Caligidae) in Taiwanese waters. Zootaxa 4174: 114-121. http://doi. org/10.11646/zootaxa.4174.1.8.

HOGANS WE & TRUDEAU DJ. 1989. Caligus elongatus (Copepoda: Caligoida) from Atlantic salmon (Salmo

*salar*) cultured in marine waters of the Lower Bay of Fundy. Can J Zool 67: 1080-1082.

IMSLAND AK, REMEN M, BLOCH-HANSEN K, SAGERUP K, MATHISEN R, MYKLEBUST E & REYNOLDS P. 2020. Possible use of lumpfish to control *Caligus elongatus* infestation on farmed Atlantic salmon: a mini review. J Ocean Univ China 19: 1133-1139. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11802-020-4466-5.

JIMENEZ DF, IBARRA R, ARTACHO P, PRIMUS AE & TELLO A. 2018. Prolonging Azamethiphos bath increases the effectiveness of field treatments against *Caligus rogercresseyi* in Atlantic salmon in Chile (*Salmo salar*). Aquaculture 493: 186-191. https://doi.org/10.1016/j. aquaculture.2018.04.034.

JORI MM & MOHAMAD ET. 2008. The effect of *Hamatopeduncularia* sp. and *Caligus* sp. on some blood parameters of *Arius bilineatus* (Val., 1840). Mar Meso 23: 269-277.

KHOA TND, MAZELAN S, MUDA S & SHAHAROM-HARRISON F. 2019a. The life cycle of *Caligus minimus* on seabass (*Lates calcarifer*) from floating cage culture. Thalassas: Inter J Marine Sci 35: 77-85. https://doi.org/10.1007/ s41208-018-0088-8.

KHOA TND, MAZELAN S, MUDA S & SHAHAROM-HARRISON F. 2019b. Use of neem oil (*Azadirachta indica*) to control caligid copepod infestation on Asian seabass (*Lates calcarifer*). Aquac Res 50: 1885-1892. https://doi. org/10.1111/are.14074.

KIM IH, SUÁREZ-MORALES E & MÁRQUEZ-ROJAS B. 2019. Caligid copepods (Copepoda: Siphonostomatoida: Caligidae) as zooplankters off the Venezuelan coast, western Caribbean Sea. Thalassas: Inter J Marine Sci 35: 607-618. https://doi.org/10.1007/s41208-019-00130-w.

LANDSBERG JH, VERMEER GK & RICHARDS SA. 1991. Control of the parasitic copepod *Caligus elongatus* on pond-reared red drum. J Aquat Anim Health 3: 206-209. doi: 10.1577/1548-8667(1991)003<0206:COTPCC>2.3.CO;2.

LHORENTE JP, GALLARDO JA, VILLANUEVA B, ARAYA AM, TORREALBA DA, TOLEDO XE & NEIRA R. 2012. Quantitative genetic basis for resistance to *Caligus rogercresseyi* sea lice in a breeding population of Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*). Aquaculture 324-325: 55-59. doi:10.1016/j. aquaculture.2011.10.046.

LIN CL, HO JS & CHEN SN. 1996. Developmental stages of *Caligus epidemicus* Hewitt, a copepod parasite of tilapia cultured in brackish water. J Nat Hist 30(5): 661-684. doi:10.1080/00222939600770371.

### MARCOS TAVARES-DIAS & MARCOS S.B. OLIVEIRA

MACKINNON BM. 1993. Host response of Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*) to infection by sea lice (*Caligus elongatus*). Can Fish Aquat Sci 50: 789-792.

MANCILLA-SCHULZ J, MARÍN SL & MOLINET C. 2019. Dynamics of *Caligus rogercresseyi* (Boxshall & Bravo, 2000) in farmed Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*) in southern Chile: are we controlling sea lice? J Fish Dis 42: 357-369. https:// doi. org/10.1111/jfd.12931.

MARÍN SL, GONZÁLEZ MP, MADARIAGA ST, MANCILLA M & MANCILLA J. 2018. Response of *Caligus rogercresseyi* (Boxshall & Bravo, 2000) to treatment with hydrogen peroxide: recovery of parasites, fish infestation and egg viability under experimental conditions. J Fish Dis 41: 861-873. https://doi.org/10.1111/jfd.12691.

MARÍN SL, MARTIN R & LEWIS R. 2015. Effects of *Caligus rogercresseyi* (Boxshall & Bravo 2000) chalimus stage condition (dead, moribund, live) on the estimates of Cypermethrin BETAMAX® efficacy. Aquac Res 46(Suppl. 1): 30-36 doi:10.1111/are.12460.

MORALES-SERNA FN, HERNÁNDEZ-INDA ZL, GÓMEZ S & PÉREZ-PONCE DE LEÓN G. 2013. Redescription of *Caligus serratus* Shiino, 1965 (Copepoda: Caligidae) parasitic on eleven fish species from Chamela Bay in the Mexican Pacific. Acta Parasitol 58: 367-375. doi:10.2478/s11686-013-0150-x.

MORALES-SERNA FN, MEDINA-GUERRERO RM & FAJER-AVILA EJ. 2016. Sea lice (Copepoda: Caligidae) parasitic on fishes reported from the Neotropical region. Neotrop Biodivers 2: 141-150. doi: 10.1080/23766808.2016.1236313.

MORALES-SERNA FN, OCEGUERA-FIGUEROA A & TANG D. 2017. *Caligus fajerae* n. sp. (Copepoda: Caligidae) parasitic on the Pacific sierra *Scomberomurus sierra* Jordan & Starks (Actinopterygii: Scombridae) in the Pacific Ocean off Mexico. Syst Parasitol 94: 927-939. doi:10.1007/ s11230-017-9752-2.

NAGASAWA K, ASHIDA H & SATO T. 2018. Caligid copepods parasitic on yellowfin tuna, *Thunnus albacares*, and bigeye tuna, *Thunnus obesus*, in the western North Pacific Ocean off central Japan, with a list of parasitic copepods of tunas (*Auxis* spp., *Euthynnus affinis*, *Katsuwonus pelamis*, and *Thunnus* spp.) in Japan (1894– 2018). Nature Kagoshima 45: 37-42.

OELCKERS K, VIKE S, DUESUND H, GONZÁLEZ J, NYLUND A & YANY G. 2015. *Caligus rogercresseyi*: posible vector en la transmisión horizontal del virus de la anemia infecciosa del salmón (ISAv). Lat Am J Aquat Res 43: 380-387. doi:10.3856/vol43-issue2-fulltext-15.

OHTSUKA S & BOXSHALL GA. 2019. Two new species of the genus *Caligus* (Crustacea, Copepoda, Siphonostomatoida)

from the Sea of Japan, with a note on the establishment of a new species group. ZooKeys 893: 91-113. doi: 10.3897/ zookeys.893.46923.

OHTSUKA S, NAWATA M, NISHIDA Y, NITTA M, HIRANO K, ADACHI K, KONDO Y, MARAN BAV & SUÁREZ-MORALES E. 2020. Discovery of the fish host of the 'planktonic' caligid *Caligus undulatus* Shen & Li, 1959 (Crustacea: Copepoda: Siphonostomatoida). Biodivers Data J 8: e5227. doi:10.3897/BDJ.8.e52271.

ÖKTENER A, ALAŞ A & TÜRKER-ÇAKIR D. 2016. First record of *Caligus diaphanus* Nordmann, 1832 from Turkish marine habitats. Bol Inst Pesca 42: 203-208. doi:10.5007/1678-2305.2016v42n1p203.

OLIVEIRA BL, FERNANDES LFL, ROCHA GM, MALANSKI ACGS & PASCHOAL F. 2020. Occurrence of *Caligus asperimanus* Pearse, 1951 (Copepoda: Caligidae) parasitic *Lutjanus* spp. (Perciformes: Lutjanidae) in the western South Atlantic. Braz J Vet Parasitol 29(2): e018219. https://doi. org/10.1590/S1984-29612020001.

ÖZAK AA. 2020. Sea lice (Copepoda: Caligidae) of Turkey, with the discovery of *Caligus quadratus* Shiino, 1954 in the Mediterranean Sea and the re-description of a rare caligid copepod, *Caligus scribae* Essafi, Cabral & Raibaut, 1984. Syst Parasitol 97: 779-808. https://doi.org/10.1007/ s11230-020-09953-1.

ÖZAK AA, DEMIRKALE I & YANAR A. 2012. First record of two species of parasitic copepods on immigrant pufferfishes (Tetraodontiformes: Tetraodontidae) caught in the eastern Mediterranean Sea. Turkish J Fish Aqua Sci 12: 675-681. doi:10.4194/1303-2712-v12\_3\_16.

ÖZAK AA, SAKARYA Y, YANAR A, ÖZBILEN U & BOXSHALL GA. 2019. The re-discovery of *Caligus lichiae* Brian, 1906 (Copepoda: Caligidae) parasitic on two carangid fishes in the Mediterranean Sea, and the recognition of *Caligus aesopus* Wilson C. B., 1921 as a junior subjective synonym. Syst Parasitol 96: 207-232. https://doi.org/10.1007/ s11230-019-09841-3.

PALMER R, RODGER H, DRINAN E, DWYER C & SMITH PR. 1987. Preliminary trials on the ivermectin efficacy of against parasitic copepods of Atlantic salmon. Bull Eur Ass Fish Pathol 7(2): 47-54.

PEÑA-REHBEIN P, RUIZ K, ORTLOFF A, PIZARRO MI & NAVARRETE C. 2013. Hematological changes in *Eleginops maclovinus* during an experimental *Caligus rogercresseyi* infestation. Rev Bras Parasitol Vet 22: 402-406. https:// doi.org/10.1590/S1984-29612013000300014.

R DEVELOPMENT CORE TEAM. 2017. R: a language and environment for statistical computing. Vienna: R

### MARCOS TAVARES-DIAS & MARCOS S.B. OLIVEIRA

Foundation for statistical computing. [cited 2022 Mar 10]. Available from: http://www.R-project.org.

RAGIAS V, TONTIS D & ATHANASSOPOULOU F. 2004. Incidence of an intense *Caligus minimus* Otto 1821, *C. pageti* Russel, 1925, *C. mugilis* Brian, 1935 and *C. apodus* Brian, 1924 infection in lagoon cultured sea bass (*Dicentrarchus labrax* L.) in Greece. Aquaculture 242: 727-733.

REYES XP & BRAVO S. 1983. Nota sobre una copepodosis en salmones de cultivo. Invest Mar Valparaíso 1: 55-57.

ROHDE K. 2005. Marine parasitology. 1<sup>th</sup> ed, Australia, CSIRO Publishing, 565 p.

ROHDE K, HAYWARD C & HEAP M. 1995. Aspects of the ecology of metazoan ectoparasites of marine fishes. Int J Parasitol 25: 945-970. https://doi.org/10.1016/0020-7519(95)00015-T.

ROJAS V, SÁNCHEZ D, GALLARDO JA & MERCADO L. 2018. Histopathological changes induced by *Caligus rogercresseyi* in rainbow trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*). Lat Am J Aquat Res 46: 843-848. doi:10.3856/ vol46-issue4-fulltext-23.

ROTH M, RICHARDS RH, DOBSON DP & RAE GH. 1996. Field trials on the efficacy of the organophosphorus compound azamethiphos for the control of sea lice (Copepoda: Caligidael infestations of farmed Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*). Aquaculture 140: 217-239.

ROUBAL FR. 1994. Histopathology caused by *Caligus epidemicus* Hewitt (Copepoda: Caligidae) on captive *Acanthopagrus australis* (Gunther) (Pisces: Sparidae). J Fish Dis 17: 631-640.

SOLANKI HG, PATIL PK, VANZA JG, PATEL P, SETHI S & GOPAL C. 2016. Sea lice, *Caligus rotundigenitalis* infestations and its management in pond cultured pearlspot, *Etroplus suratensis* in Gujarat: a case study. J Parasit Dis 40: 565-567. doi:10.1007/s12639-014-0539-y.

STONE J, SUTHERLAND IH, SOMMERVILLE C, RICHARDS RH & VARMA KJ. 2000. Field trials to evaluate the efficacy of emamectin benzoate in the control of sea lice, *Lepeophtheirus salmonis* (Kroyer) and *Caligus elongatus* Nordmann, infestations in Atlantic salmon *Salmo salar* L. Aquaculture 186: 205-219.

TREASURER JW & WADSWORTH SL. 2004. Interspecific comparison of experimental and natural routes of *Lepeophtheirus salmonis* and *Caligus elongatus* challenge and consequences for distribution of chalimus on salmonids and therapeutant screening. Aquacul Res 35: 773-783. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2109.2004.01100.x.

TRONCOSO J, GONZÁLEZ J, PINO J, RUOHONEN K, EL-MOWAFI A, GONZÁLEZ J, YANY G, SAAVEDRA J & CÓDOVA A. 2011. Effect of polyunsatured aldehyde (A3) as an antiparasitary

ingredient of *Caligus rogercresseyi* in the feed of Atlantic salmon, *Salmo salar*. Lat Am J Aquat Res 39: 439-448. doi:10.3856/vol39-issue3-fulltext.

URAWA S & KATO T. 1991. Heavy Infections of *Caligus orientalis* (Copepoda: Caligidae) on caged rainbow trout *Oncorhynchus* mykiss in Brackish Water. Gyobyo Keokyug 26(3): 161-162.

VALENZUELA-MUÑOZ V, BOLTAÑA S & GALLARDO-ESCÁRATE C. 2016. Comparative immunity of *Salmo salar* and *Oncorhynchus kisutch* during infestation with the sea louse *Caligus rogercresseyi*: an enrichment transcriptome analysis. Fish Shellfish Immunol 59: 276e287. http:// dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.fsi.2016.10.046.

VALENZUELA-MUÑOZ V & GALLARDO-ESCÁRATE C. 2017. Iron metabolism modulation in Atlantic salmon infested with the sea lice *Lepeophtheirus salmonis* and *Caligus rogercresseyi*: a matter of nutritional immunity? Fish Shellfish Immunol 60: 97e102. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j. fsi.2016.11.045.

VALENZUELA-MUÑOZ V, GALLARDO-ESCÁRATE A, SÁEZ-VERA C, GARCÉS F, BONFATTI J & GALLARDO-ESCÁRATE C. 2020. More than bubbles: *In vivo* assessment and transcriptome modulation of *Caligus rogercresseyi* and Atlantic salmon exposed to hydrogen peroxide (Paramove<sup>\*</sup>). Aquaculture 522: 735170. https://doi.org/10.1016/j. aquaculture.2020.735170.

VALENZUELA-MUÑOZV, NUÑES-ACUNÑAG&GALLARDO-ESCÁRATE C. 2014. Molecular characterization and transcription analysis of P-Glycoprotein gene from the salmon louse *Caligus rogercresseyi*. J Aquac Res Development 5(3): 1-7. http://dx.doi.org/10.4172/2155-9546.1000236.

VARGAS-CHACOFF L ET AL. 2016. Atlantic salmon (Salmo salar) and Coho salmon (Oncorhynchus kisutch) display differential metabolic changes in response to infestation by the ectoparasite Caligus rogercresseyi. Aquaculture 464: 469-479. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j. aquaculture.2016.07.029.

VARGAS-CHACOFF L ET AL. 2017. Ectoparasite *Caligus rogercresseyi* modifies the lactate response in Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*) and Coho salmon (*Oncorhynchus kisutch*). Vet Parasitol 243: 6-11. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j. vetpar.2017.05.031.

WORMS. 2022. World Register of marine species at http:// www.marinespecies.org. (Accessed February 10, 2022).

ZAR JH. 2010. Biostatistical analysis.  $\mathbf{5}^{th}$  ed, Upper Saddle River (NJ), Prentice Hall, 944 p.

### How to cite

TAVARES-DIAS M & OLIVEIRA MSB. 2023. Global distribution patterns of *Caligus* Müller, 1785 (Copepoda: Caligidae) associated to teleost fishes, with physiological and histopathological data and description of treatment strategies. An Acad Bras Cienc 95: e20220281. DOI 10.1590/0001-3765202320220281.

Manuscript received on April 18, 2022; accepted for publication on July 20, 2022

### MARCOS TAVARES-DIAS<sup>1,2</sup>

https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8376-1846

### MARCOS S.B. OLIVEIRA<sup>2</sup>

https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4421-9608

<sup>1</sup>Embrapa Amapá, Rodovia Josmar Chaves Pinto, 2600, Universidade, 68903-419 Macapá, AP, Brazil

<sup>2</sup>Universidade Federal do Amapá (UNIFAP), Programa de Pós-Graduação em Biodiversidade Tropical (PPGBio), Rodovia Josmar Chaves Pinto, s/n, Universidade, 68903-419 Macapá, AP, Brazil

Correspondence to: **Marcos Tavares-Dias** *E-mail: marcos.tavares@embrapa.br* 

### **Author contributions**

Marcos Tavares-Dias: Conception, elaboration and redaction. Marcos Sidney Brito: Confection of Maps and statistical analyses.

CC BY