



Thesis  
2574

**ASPECTS OF THE BIOLOGY OF SOME  
MARINE ASCARIDOID NEMATODES**

A thesis presented for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy to the University of Stirling

by

ANGELA M. JONES

Parasitology Laboratory  
Institute of Aquaculture  
University of Stirling  
Stirling FK9 4LA  
October 1994

# BRITISH THESIS SERVICE

**DX186596**

Page Count

1562

Awarding Body: Stirling University

Thesis By : JONES Angela M

We have assigned this thesis the number given at the top of this sheet.

In your notification to ASLIB, please quote this number so that it can be included in their *Index to Theses with Abstracts*.

**THE BRITISH LIBRARY  
DOCUMENT SUPPLY CENTRE**

### DECLARATION

I hereby declare that this thesis has been composed by myself and is the result of my own investigations. It has neither been accepted, nor submitted for any other degrees. All sources of information have been duly acknowledged.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "AM Jones".

**Angela M. Jones**

For Blakey,

My little lady.

Who sat with me every night during  
the writing of this thesis, and  
who gave me so much love.

*Where do nematodes live? Almost anywhere. Nematodes antedated man in their conquest of the whole earth..... As Cobb (1915) so aptly put it, "They occur in arid deserts and at the bottom of lakes and rivers, in the waters of hot springs and in the polar seas where the temperature is constantly below the freezing point of freshwater. They were thawed out alive from Antarctic ice in the Far South by members of the Shackleton Expedition. They occur at enormous depths in Alpine lakes and in the ocean. As parasites of fishes they traverse the seas; as parasites of birds they float across continents and over high mountain ranges." Man, without wings, flies in aeroplanes. Nematodes, without wings, fly in birds, bats, bees, flies, or fleas, or just catch on as these go by and sail with them. ....they need not exert themselves in walking for representatives of the whole animal kingdom act as their common carriers, and even winds may on occasion stoop to lift them and take them to their destination.*

Chitwood and Chitwood (1950)

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Firstly, I would like to extend my appreciation to my supervisors, Dr. Rod Wootten, at the Institute of Aquaculture, Stirling, and Dr. John Smith, at S.O.A.F.D. Marine Laboratory, Aberdeen. Rod deserves special mention for his (mostly!) infinite patience and good humour, especially over the last year when ploughing his way through the vast drafts of thesis which I gave him to read. John must also be acknowledged particularly for his organisation of my bits and pieces of work in Aberdeen, and for being a mine of information with regard to the literature on marine ascaridoids.

All my love, appreciation and undying thanks to all the parasites at the Institute of Aquaculture. I could not have done this Ph.D. without them - they have been there through all the laughter and tears, and in addition to help and support, they have also managed to put up with me and my numerous crises over the last four years! There are several people whom I must thank profusely - James, for his advice on statistics and all things computer-related, and for his constant enthusiasm when I thought the writing of this thesis would never end; Andy Shinn - for being the kindest, smiliest, most helpful man in the whole world, for cheering me up whenever I saw him, and for managing to iron out all the problems which inevitably occurred whenever I touched a computer at the Institute; Jim - for just about everything over the years, from driving me miles around the west coast of Scotland with samples, to driving me mad with frustration at how easily his electron microscopy material sectioned and mine didn't; David - for help with photographs, driving to collect samples, and numerous other bits and pieces; and Will, and Andy and Alison Bell (the latter an honorary parasite) for always being ready and willing to discuss things over lots of alcohol, in addition to being three of the most caring people I know. Thank you also Helen, Eva, Vino, and Obdulio! I would also like to take this opportunity to apologise to everyone for putting up with the smell I created when digesting my fish!

There are two very special ladies at the Institute of Aquaculture who deserve well-earned thanks. Maureen Menzies - for always being there when I needed her, either for practical help or a shoulder to cry on - and Marguerite Kobbs, for her advice, expertise, patience (and sympathy!) in relation to all the electron microscopy work.

Still others at the Institute must be acknowledged - Tom Turnbull, for helping me to discover the mysterious world of histopathology, and also for helping with photographs; Mairi, Debbie, Laura and Jane Brown for always making me laugh as well as advising me on many different matters, and Betty, Sheila and Beatrice, for making my life that little bit easier with regard to all the administration etc. behind the research.

My fondest thanks to Ken MacKenzie (and that infamous Welshman - Dr. Williams!) for making my first research cruise absolutely unforgettable; additional thanks to Ken for collecting samples at sea when I was unable to attend the cruise myself.

I am indebted to both Dr. David Gibson and Eileen at the Natural History Museum, London, in particular for allowing me to come and "steal" some specimens of adult ascaridoids from the parasitic worms collection. Also, I must extend my special "angelic" thanks and affection to David Gibson for always being ready to respond, in such an expert and entertaining way, to my many enquiries and communications.

Finally, but without a doubt most importantly, I would like to thank my husband Mark for putting up with me over the last year, and ask his forgiveness for having to endure the first year of marriage with his wife constantly in the "cupboard under the stairs", and staying up till the early hours nearly every night in order to finish this thesis. In addition to this, in practical terms, I could not have finished this thesis without his help, particularly with computer figures, and in finally putting the last few bits of the thesis together. I can't begin to express how grateful I am to have had his love and support over the last 12 months.



## ABSTRACT

Larval *Anisakis simplex*, *Pseudoterranova decipiens*, *Contracaecum osculatum* and larvae and adults of *Hysterothylacium aduncum* were recovered from specimens of cod, haddock, blue whiting and bull rout; however, only *A.simplex* were retrieved from long rough dab. The epidemiology of infection by these four nematode species was examined both in whole fish, and in individual host tissues and organs. Frequency distributions of nematodes were found to be generally overdispersed in fish. Preliminary investigations revealed no strong evidence to suggest that competitive interactions occurred between ascaridoid nematodes within fish.

Stomach lesions in gadoids were associated with single (partially penetrated) and multiple (throughout stomach wall) worm infections of larval *A.simplex*; such lesions were discrete and raised in appearance. Lesions associated with 1-3 larval *P.decipiens* in an open cavity within the stomach of angler fish were diffuse and not significantly raised. Histological examination of each form of ulcer revealed general similarities in pathology, with infiltration of inflammatory cells being the initial response to the nematode\

Changes in the cephalic morphology of *A.simplex*, *P.decipiens*, *C.osculatum* and *H.aduncum* were examined at different life cycle stages under scanning electron microscopy. Due to their small size, newly hatched third stage larvae of *P.decipiens* were cultured in a bacterial mat prior to fixation for S.E.M., and the external ultrastructure of these larvae is described. The most prominent external feature at this stage is the cephalic boring tooth.

Aspects of the internal ultrastructure of *A.simplex*, *P.decipiens*, *C.osculatum* and *H.aduncum* were examined using transmission electron microscopy. Newly hatched third stage larvae of *P.decipiens* show little differentiation of internal organs. The ultrastructure of sensory amphids in *H.aduncum* and *A.simplex* is consistent with that of a chemoreceptor,

that of the single papilla in **P.deciplens** - a mechanoreceptor. The ultrastructure of the digestive tract, excretory gland and body wall of marine ascaridoids were also examined.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE : GENERAL INTRODUCTION . . . . .	9
1.1 Classification and Taxonomy . . . . .	10
1.2 General Appearance and Identification of Marine Fish Ascaridoids . . . . .	15
1.3 Life Cycles . . . . .	16
1.3.1 Eggs, Hatching and Free Living stage	16
1.3.2 First Invertebrate Hosts . . . . .	19
1.3.3 Fish Transport Hosts . . . . .	21
1.3.4 Final Hosts . . . . .	23
1.4 Geographical Distribution . . . . .	26
1.5 Relevance to Man . . . . .	27
CHAPTER TWO : OCCURRENCE AND DISTRIBUTION OF MARINE ASCARIDOIDS IN FIVE SPECIES OF MARINE TELEOSTS .	31
2.1 INTRODUCTION . . . . .	31
2.1.1 Previous Epidemiological Studies . .	31
2.1.2 Geographical and Temporal Variations in Infection Levels . . . . .	34
2.1.2.1 Geographical Variations . . .	34
2.1.2.2 Temporal Variations . . . . .	36
2.1.3 Length \ Age Relationship to Infection Levels . . . . .	37
2.2 MATERIALS AND METHODS . . . . .	40
2.2.1 Collection of Fish . . . . .	40
2.2.2 Examination of fish . . . . .	41
2.2.3 Identification of nematodes . . . . .	44
2.2.4 Analysis of Data . . . . .	45
2.2.5 Terminology . . . . .	46
2.3 RESULTS . . . . .	47
2.3.1 Epidemiological Data . . . . .	47
2.3.2 Frequency Distributions . . . . .	49
2.3.3 Distribution Of Nematodes Within Fish . . . . .	50
2.3.4 Preliminary Analysis for Competitive Interactions . . . . .	55
2.4 DISCUSSION . . . . .	57

2.4.1	Comments on General Analysis of Results . . . . .	57
2.4.2	Infection Levels in Fish . . . . .	59
2.4.2.1	Infections in cod ( <u>Gadus morhua</u> ) . . . . .	59
2.4.2.2	Infection of haddock ( <u>Melanogrammus aeglefinus</u> ) . . .	65
2.4.2.3	Infection of Blue Whiting ( <u>Micromesistius poutassou</u> ) . . .	68
2.4.2.4	Infection of Long Rough Dab ( <u>Hippoglossoides platessoides</u> ) .	70
2.4.2.5	Infection in Bull Rout ( <u>Myoxocephalus scorpius</u> ) . . . .	72
2.4.3	Frequency Distribution . . . . .	76
2.4.4	Distribution of Nematodes within Fish . . . . .	77
2.4.4.1	Stomach and Intestine . . . . .	77
2.4.4.2	Body Cavity and Viscera . . . . .	79
2.4.4.2.1	<u>A.simplex</u> . . . . .	79
2.4.4.2.2	<u>P.decipiens</u> . . . . .	80
2.4.4.2.3	<u>C.osculatum</u> . . . . .	81
2.4.4.2.4	<u>H.aduncum</u> . . . . .	81
2.4.4.3	Distribution of <u>A.simplex</u> and <u>P.decipiens</u> between Viscera and Musculature . . . . .	82
2.4.4.4	Musculature . . . . .	84
2.4.4.4.1	Relative Proportions of <u>A.simplex</u> and <u>P.decipiens</u> in the Musculature . . . . .	85
2.4.4.4.2	Distribution between Fillets and Flaps . . . . .	85
2.4.4.4.3	Distribution between Left and Right Fillets . . .	86
2.4.4.5	Comparisons of site distribution of nematodes in cod with the results of Palsson et al. (1985). . . . .	87

2.4.4.6	Reasons for Distribution of Nematodes within Fish . . . . .	88
2.4.5	Competitive Effects . . . . .	92
2.5	CONCLUSIONS . . . . .	96

CHAPTER THREE : THE PATHOLOGY OF FISH STOMACH LESIONS ASSOCIATED WITH LARVAL A.SIMPLEX AND P.DECIPIENS

3.1	INTRODUCTION . . . . .	98
3.1.1	General Pathology of Marine Ascaridoids in Fish . . . . .	98
3.1.2	Stomach Lesions Associated with Marine Nematodes . . . . .	100
3.1.2.1	Birds and Mammals . . . . .	100
3.1.2.2	Fish . . . . .	100
3.2	MATERIALS AND METHODS . . . . .	102
3.2.1	Collection of Ulcers and Normal Stomach Tissue from Fish . . . . .	102
3.2.1.1	Gadoids . . . . .	102
3.2.1.2	<u>Lophius piscatorius</u> . . . . .	102
3.2.2	Gross Morphology . . . . .	103
3.2.3	Assessment of the number of nematodes recovered from large ulcers in gadoids . . . . .	103
3.2.4	Histopathological Examination . . . . .	104
3.2.4.1	Stomach Ulcers from Gadoids . . . . .	104
3.2.4.2	Stomach Ulcers from <u>Lophius piscatorius</u> . . . . .	104
3.2.4.3	Normal Stomach Tissue . . . . .	105
3.3	RESULTS . . . . .	105
3.3.1	Gross Morphology . . . . .	105
3.3.1.1	Gadoids . . . . .	105
3.3.1.2	<u>Lophius piscatorius</u> . . . . .	110
3.3.2	Histopathological Examination . . . . .	111
3.3.2.1	Gadoids . . . . .	111
3.3.2.2	<u>Lophius piscatorius</u> . . . . .	113
3.4	DISCUSSION . . . . .	115
3.4.1	Normal Stomach Tissue . . . . .	115
3.4.2	Gross Morphology of Stomach Lesions . . . . .	115

4.2.7	Examination of Specimens . . . . .	157
4.3	RESULTS . . . . .	157
4.3.1	Early Third Stage Larvae of <u>Pseudoterranova decipiens</u> . . . . .	158
4.3.2	Cephalic Regions of Third Stage Larvae from Fish . . . . .	159
4.3.2.1	<u>Pseudoterranova decipiens</u> . . . . .	159
4.3.2.2	<u>Anisakis simplex</u> . . . . .	159
4.3.2.3	<u>Contracaecum osculatum</u> . . . . .	161
4.3.3	Cephalic Regions of Fourth Stage Larvae . . . . .	162
4.3.3.1	<u>Contracaecum osculatum</u> . . . . .	162
4.3.3.2	<u>Hysterothylacium aduncum</u> . . . . .	163
4.3.4	Cephalic Region of Adults . . . . .	164
4.3.4.1	<u>Pseudoterranova decipiens</u> . . . . .	164
4.3.4.2	<u>Anisakis simplex</u> . . . . .	166
4.3.4.3	<u>Contracaecum osculatum</u> . . . . .	167
4.3.4.4	<u>Hysterothylacium aduncum</u> . . . . .	169
4.3.5	Internal Structure . . . . .	170
4.4	DISCUSSION . . . . .	172
4.4.1	Early third stage larvae of <u>Pseudoterranova decipiens</u> . . . . .	172
4.4.1.1	Body, Cuticular and Caudal Structure . . . . .	172
4.4.1.2	Boring Tooth and Cephalic Structure . . . . .	174
4.4.1.3	Growth and development within third larval stage . . . . .	178
4.4.2	Cephalic Region of Third Stage Larvae from Fish . . . . .	180
4.4.2.1	General Cephalic Structure . . . . .	180
4.4.2.2	Mouth Opening, Boring Tooth and Excretory Pore . . . . .	185
4.4.2.3	Cephalic Sense Organs . . . . .	188
4.4.3	Cephalic Region of Fourth Stage Larvae and Adults . . . . .	192
4.4.3.1	Development of Cephalic	

Regions . . . . .	192
4.4.3.2 General Cephalic Structure .	196
4.4.3.3 Structure of the Anterior Lip Margins . . . . .	199
4.4.3.4 Structure of Lips in Relation to Feeding. . . . .	201
4.4.3.5 Denticles . . . . .	202
4.4.3.6 Interlabia . . . . .	206
4.4.3.7 Cephalic Sense Organs . . . .	209
4.4.3.7.1 Development of Sense Organs . . . . .	209
4.4.3.7.2 Double Papillae . . .	210
4.4.3.7.3 Single Papillae and Amphids . . . . .	213
4.4.3.7.4 Role of Sense Organs	215
4.4.4 Internal Ultrastructure . . . . .	217
4.5 CONCLUSIONS . . . . .	218

CHAPTER FIVE : TRANSMISSION ELECTRON MICROSCOPY OBSERVATIONS  
OF INTERNAL ULTRASTRUCTURE . . . . . 221

5.1 INTRODUCTION . . . . .	221
5.1.1 Cephalic Sense Organs . . . . .	223
5.1.1.1 Amphids . . . . .	224
5.1.1.2 Papillae . . . . .	225
5.1.2. Digestive System . . . . .	225
5.1.2.1 Oesophageal Region . . . .	226
5.1.2.2 Intestinal Region . . . . .	227
5.1.2.3 Rectal Area . . . . .	228
5.1.3 Excretory System . . . . .	229
5.1.4 Body wall . . . . .	230
5.2 MATERIALS AND METHODS . . . . .	231
5.2.1 Conventional TEM Processing . . . .	231
5.2.2 Microwave method of fixation . . . .	232
5.2.3 Early third stage larvae of <u>Pseudoterranova decipiens</u> . . . . .	234
5.2.3.1 Agar Jelly Method . . . . .	234
5.2.4 Third Stage Larvae From Fish, Fourth	

	Stage Larvae and Adults . . . . .	235
	5.2.4.1 Structure of the Cephalic End . . . . .	235
	5.2.4.2 Structure of the Digestive System . . . . .	237
	5.2.5 Cutting of Blocks . . . . .	238
	5.2.6 Staining of Sections . . . . .	239
	5.2.7 Examination of Specimens . . . . .	240
5.3	RESULTS . . . . .	240
	5.3.1 Early third stage larvae of <u>Pseudoterranova decipiens</u> . . . . .	240
	5.3.2 Cephalic Sense Organs . . . . .	241
	5.3.2.1 Amphids . . . . .	241
	5.3.2.2 Papillae . . . . .	243
	5.3.3 Digestive System . . . . .	244
	5.3.3.1 Preventriculus . . . . .	244
	5.3.3.2 Ventriculus . . . . .	245
	5.3.3.3 Ventricular Appendix . . . . .	247
	5.3.3.4 Intestinal Caecum . . . . .	247
	5.3.3.5 Intestine . . . . .	248
	5.3.4 Excretory gland . . . . .	251
	5.3.5 Body Wall . . . . .	253
5.4	DISCUSSION . . . . .	254
	5.4.1 Early third stage larvae of <u>Pseudoterranova decipiens</u> . . . . .	254
	5.4.2 Cephalic Sense Organs . . . . .	258
	5.4.2.1 Ultrastructure of Amphids . . . . .	259
	5.4.2.2 Ultrastructure of Papillae . . . . .	262
	5.4.2.3 Function of Cephalic Sense Organs . . . . .	263
	5.4.3 Digestive System . . . . .	264
	5.4.3.1 Preventriculus . . . . .	265
	5.4.3.2 Ventriculus . . . . .	266
	5.4.3.3 Ventricular Appendix . . . . .	268
	5.4.3.4 Intestinal Caecum . . . . .	269
	5.4.3.5 Intestine . . . . .	270
	5.4.3.6 Feeding and Energy Stores . . . . .	273
	5.4.4 Excretory System . . . . .	275



3.4.2.1	Gastro-Intestinal Lesions in Non-Fish Hosts . . . . .	118
3.4.2.2	Comparisons of fish lesions with the gross morphology of gastro-intestinal lesions reported from other hosts. . . . .	119
3.4.3	Histopathology of Stomach Lesions .	121
3.4.4	Possible Causes of Stomach Ulcers .	128
3.4.4.1	Resistance and Immunity . . .	128
3.4.4.2	Mass Attack, Attraction and Clustering Behaviour . . . . .	131
3.4.4.3	Re-infection . . . . .	134
3.4.5	Fate of Nematode Larvae in Stomach Lesions . . . . .	136
3.4.6	Possible Adverse Effects of Stomach Ulcers in Fish . . . . .	137
3.4.7	CONCLUSIONS . . . . .	138

CHAPTER FOUR : SCANNING ELECTRON MICROSCOPY

	OBSERVATIONS OF THE CEPHALIC REGIONS OF MARINE ASCARIDOIDS . . . . .	140
4.1	INTRODUCTION . . . . .	140
4.1.1	Scanning Electron Microscopy of Marine Ascaridoids . . . . .	142
4.1.2	General Cephalic Morphology . . . .	143
4.1.3	Cephalic Sense Organs . . . . .	145
4.2	MATERIALS AND METHODS . . . . .	148
4.2.1	Conventional SEM Processing . . . .	148
4.2.2	Culturing of Early Third Stage Larvae of <u>Pseudoterranova decipiens</u> . . . . .	150
4.2.3	Fixation of Early Third Stage Larvae of <u>Pseudoterranova decipiens</u> . . . . .	152
4.2.4	Collection and Fixation of Third Stage Larvae from Fish . . . . .	154
4.2.5	Collection and Fixation of Fourth Stage Larvae . . . . .	155
4.2.6	Collection and Fixation of Adults .	156

5.4.4.1	Structure of Excretory System	275
5.4.4.2	Function of Excretory System	278
5.4.5	Body Wall . . . . .	282
5.5	CONCLUSIONS . . . . .	284
CHAPTER SIX : SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE WORK . . . . .		287
REFERENCES . . . . .		292
APPENDIX 1 . . . . .		329

## CHAPTER ONE : GENERAL INTRODUCTION

Seventeen families of nematodes occur in fish, and at least 650 species of adult nematodes have been recorded, generally occurring in the intestine. Additional species occur at the larval stage in fish (Möller and Anders 1986). Ascaridoid nematodes parasitise all major vertebrate groups, although they are scarce in amphibians (Gibson 1983). The superfamily Ascaridoidea is large, and is divided into several families and subfamilies, including the Anisakidae, which are mainly found as adults in piscivorous vertebrates, such as mammals, birds and fish (Myers 1970) and the Raphidascaridae. Nematodes parasitic in marine fish are extremely common, and although the number of species reported is not large, the number of specimens -especially of larval nematodes - found in individual fish may be very large (Berland 1961). The larval stages of certain ascaridoid genera occur commonly in the flesh and viscera of marine fish (eg. Myers 1970) and have assumed economic and medical significance. Four species of ascaridoid nematodes commonly infect marine teleosts in British waters -**Anisakis simplex**, (Rudolphi, 1809) Dujardin, 1845; **Pseudoterranova decipiens** (Krabbe, 1878); **Contracaecum osculatum** (Rudolphi, 1802), all anisakines, found as third stage larvae, and **Hysterothylacium aduncum** (Rudolphi, 1802) Deardorff and Overstreet, 1981 - a raphidascarine, found as third stage larvae in the viscera, and as adults in the intestinal tract. **Anisakis** sp. is one of the most widespread parasites of marine teleost fish (MacKenzie 1979), being found in a variety of species (eg. Smith and Wootten 1984b). **P.decipiens** have also been reported from a variety of marine teleosts (eg. Smith and Wootten 1984a), and heavy infections of **P.decipiens** have been reported particularly from the fillets of cod and other fish species (eg. McClelland et al. 1983a,b), with Young (1972) stating that cod are the major fish host for **P.decipiens** in the Atlantic. **Contracaecum** sp. and **H.aduncum** also occur in a number of marine fish species (eg. Smith and Wootten 1984c;

Berland 1961, 1991). All of these parasites are found in a wide range of fish species and thus do not appear to be host specific. Lick (1991) found 78% of 41 fish species from the outer Elbe estuary to be infected with nematodes of a number of species including **A.simplex**, **P.decipiens**, **C.osculatum** and **H.aduncum**.

### 1.1 Classification and Taxonomy

The taxonomic histories of **Anisakis**, **Pseudoterranova**, **Contracaecum** and **Hysterothylacium** are confusing, and ascaridoid nematodes in general appear to be inadequately characterised with regard to nomenclature. The morphology of the excretory system in nematodes is considered to be of taxonomic significance (Gibson 1983, Sprent 1983), and Hartwich (1974) formulated a classification for nematodes of the superfamily Ascaridoidea, based on features of the excretory system. Hartwich recognised five families - one of which was the Anisakidae - which contains most of the ascaridoids parasitic in fish. Hartwich distinguished the subfamily Raphidascaridinae (containing **Hysterothylacium**) from Anisakinae (containing **Anisakis**, **Pseudoterranova** and **Contracaecum**) by virtue of the non ribbon-like excretory system of the former, with an excretory pore near the nerve ring. The excretory system of Anisakinae is ribbon-like, and the excretory pore is found at the level of the lips. Sprent (1983) considered that there may be no justification for the family Anisakidae, as Hartwich's system of classification contained defects with regard to the oesophago-intestinal junction, and Sprent suggested that the family Ascarididae comprised five sub-families, including Anisakinae (containing the genera **Anisakis** and **Pseudoterranova**) and Contracaecinae (containing **Contracaecum**). However, Gibson (1983), in the same treatise, also reviewed the systematics of ascaridoid nematodes, and retained the family Anisakidae containing only the subfamilies Anisakinae and Raphidascaridinae.

However, the currently accepted classification for the four species of ascaridoid nematodes examined during the present study is as follows (D.I.Gibson pers.comm.):-

Class Nematoda

Subclass Secernentea

Order Ascaridida

Superfamily Ascaridoidea

Family Anisakidae

Subfamily           Anisakinae                           Raphidascaridinae

Genus                **Anisakis**                               **Hysterothylacium**

**Pseudoterranova**

**Contracaecum**

Difficulties may arise when identifying or assigning the larval stages to genera, and much of the literature is in a state of confusion with regard to larvae in fish (eg. Templeman **et al.** 1957; Berland 1961; Myers 1975). Identification is often based on tenuous morphological grounds, and this, along with a lack of knowledge on the life histories, is further complicated by the fact that few of the characteristics used to identify adults are present in the larval stages (Hurst 1984a).

Nematodes of the genus **Anisakis** have been described under a vast number of names - many of which have now been shown to be incorrect (see Davey 1971, Smith and Wootten 1978a, and references therein). Grainger (1959) had reared larvae to the pre-adult stage and positively identified them as belonging to the genus **Anisakis**. Van Theil **et al.** (1960) identified **Anisakis** as **Eustoma rotundatum**, but subsequently (Van Theil 1966) corrected this to **A.marina**, and proposed that all **Anisakis** species belonged to this taxon. However, several authors including Khalil (1969) and Davey (1971) rejected this proposal. Davey (1971) examined taxonomic characters of various members of the genus **Anisakis** and concluded that there are only three valid distinguishable

species, of which **A.simplex** is one (with several synonyms, including **A.marina**), the others being **A.typica** and **A.physeteris**, and four **species inquirendae**. **A.simplex** is the most common species of this genus (Munger 1983). Berland (1961) identified two types of **Anisakis** larvae which he designated types I and II - probably belonging to separate species. Positive specific identification of **Anisakis** larvae from fish was made by, amongst others, Pippy and Van Banning (1975), Grabda (1976b), Hurst (1984a) and Carvajal **et al.** (1981) who reared third stage larvae type I, from the North Sea, Baltic Sea, New Zealand waters and Chilean waters respectively, into adults of **A.simplex**.

The confusion with regard to **Pseudoterranova decipiens** occurs at the generic level. The scientific name has undergone a number of changes over the last 50 years. Originally called **Ascaris**, then **Porrocaecum** and **Terranova** (see Myers 1959, Gibson 1983 and references therein), Myers (1959) created the genus **Phocanema** to include **Porrocaecum decipiens** and **Terranova decipiens**, with **Phocanema decipiens** being the only species. The genus **Pseudoterranova** was initially erected by Mozgovoi (in Skrjabin **et al.** 1951, see Gibson 1983), however Hartwich (1974) did not include **Pseudoterranova** in his key as he considered it to be incompletely described. Gibson (1983) reviewed the taxonomic confusion surrounding the genus **Phocanema**, and stated that current criteria for distinguishing **Phocanema** and **Pseudoterranova**, as distinct from **Terranova**, were weak or defunct. Authorities on nematode systematics agree that the generic name **Porrocaecum** should no longer be used, but opinions vary as to the use of **Terranova** or **Phocanema** (Margolis 1977). Gibson (1983) concluded that **Pseudoterranova** must be recognised as the oldest name with **Phocanema** as its' synonym. **Terranova** larvae type A, from Japanese waters are synonymous with **P.decipiens** (Ishikura 1990).

Baylis (1937) listed synonyms of **C.osculatum**. Berland (1963) subsequently suggested that **Contracaecum** sp. be termed

