CONTRIBUTION TO THE KNOWLEDGE OF UROCLEIDOIDES VARIABILIS (MONOGENEA: ANCYROCEPHALIDAE)

Mass fatal infections of Symphysodon discus Hocckel (Cichlidae) with Urocleidoides variabilis Miselle et Kritsak, 1969 were recorded in several aquarium fish breedings in Czechoslovakia in 1982. The parasite was first described from the gills of S. discus from Capitol Aquarium, Sacramento, California (Miselle J. D., Kritsak D. C., Amer. Midl. Nat. 81: 370–388, 1969).

Since the authors gave only some of the metrical data of the hard parts of opisthaptor, namely total length of both pairs of anchors (ventral 0.027–0.030, dorsal 0.026–0.033), width of both bars (ventral 0.032–0.038, dorsal 0.030 to 0.044) and total length of marginal hooks (0.012–0.016), we are presenting the results of our studies of 15 from 22 obtained specimens of this parasite which supplement its original description.

The host preparation and methods concerning preparation, fixation, mounting and measuring of the parasites were employed as given by Ergens and Lom (Caustic agents of parasitic diseases of fishes, Academia, Praha, 84 pp., 1970, in Czech). The figures were drawn with the aid of a camera lucida. The measurements are given in millimeters.

Results: Total length of ventral anchors 0.025 to 0.029; their shaft 0.023–0.026, inner root 0.007–0.010, outer root 0.002 and point 0.005 to 0.007. Connecting bar 0.004–0.005 long and 0.026–0.029 wide. Total length of dorsal anchors 0.026–0.029; their shaft 0.026–0.026, inner root 0.006–0.010, outer root 0.001–0.002 and point 0.006–0.008. Connecting bar 0.003 to 0.004 long and 0.026–0.029 wide. Total length of marginal hooks 0.013–0.013. Copulatory complex consisting of irregularly oval basic portion, membranous supporting portion and thin, curved copulatory tube; length 0.032 to 0.046. Length of vaginal tube 0.028–0.044.

Compared to the specimens of U. variabilis used for the original description, the hard parts of opisthaptor, as well as the copulatory complex in the specimens found in Czechoslovakia are smaller. These differences, however, are not very marked and may be regarded as differences within the range of variability of this species.
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Fig. 1. Hard parts of the opisthaptor (a), vaginal armor (b) and copulatory complex (c) of Uro-

cl eidoides variabilis Miselle et Kritsak, 1969.