ELSEVIER

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

# Parasitology International



journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/parint

## A morphological and molecular study of *Pseudocorynosoma* Aznar, Pérez Ponce de León and Raga 2006 (Acanthocephala: Polymorphidae) from Mexico with the description of a new species and the presence of cox 1 pseudogenes



## Martín García-Varela<sup>a,\*</sup>, Jesús S. Henández-Orts<sup>b</sup>, Carlos D. Pinacho-Pinacho<sup>a,c</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Departamento de Zoología, Instituto de Biología, Universidad Nacional Autonoma de Mexico, Avenida Universidad 3000, Ciudad Universitaria, C.P. 04510, Distrito Federal <sup>b</sup> Instituto de Biología Marina y Pesquera Almirante Storni, Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Técnicas (CONICET), Güemes 1030, 8520, San Antonio Oeste, Río Negro, Argentina <sup>c</sup> Universidad de la Sierra Sur, División de Estudios de Postgrado, Guillermo Rojas Mijangos S/N, C. P. 70800, Ciudad Universitaria, Miahuatlán de Porfirio Díaz, Oaxaca, Mexico

#### ARTICLE INFO

Article history: Received 17 May 2016 Received in revised form 6 September 2016 Accepted 14 November 2016 Available online 16 November 2016

Keywords: Acanthocephala Pseudocorynosoma cox 1 LSU Pseudogenes Phylogeny

#### ABSTRACT

Pseudocorynosoma tepehuanesi n. sp., is described from the intestine of the ruddy duck Oxyura jamaicensis Gmelin, 1789 from single locality from northern Mexico. The new species is mainly distinguished morphologically from the other five described species of Pseudocorynosoma from the Americas (P. constrictum, type species, P. peposacae, P. anatarium, P. enrietti and P. iheringi) associated with waterfowl species by possessing a proboscis with 15 longitudinal rows with 7-8 hooks each, a trunk expanded anteriorly and by having smaller lemniscus. Partial sequences of the mitochondrial gene cytochrome c oxidase subunit I (cox 1) and the large subunit (LSU) of ribosomal DNA including the domains D2 + D3 were used independently to corroborate the morphological distinction between the new species and other two congeneric species (P. constrictum and P. anatarium) from North America. The genetic divergence estimated among the new species and the other two species ranged from 15 to 18% for cox 1 and from 3.2 to 4% for LSU. The cox 1 alignment shows 24 sequences from P. anatarium with abnormalities, which were defined as pseudogenes due the presence of insertions, deletions and premature stop codons. Maximum likelihood and Bayesian inference analyses with each data set showed that the acanthocephalans from ruddy duck represent an independent clade with strong bootstrap support and posterior probabilities. The phylogenetic tree inferred with cox 1 gene placed all the pseudogenes from P. anatarium in single clade suggesting that those genes arose after speciation process within genus Pseudocorynosoma. The morphological evidence, plus the monophyly in both phylogenetic analyses indicate that the acanthocephalans collected from intestine of the ruddy duck from northern Mexico represent a new species.

© 2016 Published by Elsevier Ireland Ltd.

### 1. Introduction

Member of the genus *Pseudocorynosoma* Aznar, Pérez Ponce de León and Raga 2006, are endoparasites that use waterfowl as definitive hosts and amphipods as intermediate hosts to complete their life cycle distributed in the America [1–4]. Morphologically, *Pseudocorynosoma* is distinct from other genera of Polymorphidae Meyer, 1931 by having spines covering the anterior part of the trunk, an ovoid or cylindrical proboscis with slightly swollen region, a truncated cone-shaped neck, 4 to 6 tubular cement glands and spines surrounding genital pore. The eggs of all species have a prominent polar protrusion in the middle fertilization membrane. Based on these morphological features the genus *Pseudocorynosoma* currently comprises five species: *P. constrictum* Van

E-mail address: garciav@ib.unam.mx (M. García-Varela).

Cleave, 1918 (type species), *P. peposacae* Porta, 1914, *P. anatarium* Van Cleave 1945, *P. enrietti* Molfi and Fernandes, 1953 and *P. iheringi* Machado Filho, 1961 [4–6]. In Mexico two species of the genus *Pseudocorynosoma* have been recorded, i.e., *P. constrictum* associate to 5 species of dabbling ducks (*Anas crecca* Linnaeus, 1758, *Anas cyanoptera* Vieillot, 1816, *Anas diazi* Ridgway, 1886, *Anas strepera* Linnaeus, 1758 and *Anas clypeata* Linnaeus, 1758) and 2 species of diving ducks (*Aythya affinis* Eyton, 1838 and *Aythya americana* Eyton, 1838), and *P. anatarium* from a diving duck (*Bucephala albeola* Linnaeus, 1758) [5,7].

As part of an ongoing survey of helminth parasites of waterfowl species in both biogeographical regions of Mexico (Fig. 1), we collected three species of *Pseudocorynosoma*, two of which (*P. constrictum* and *P. anatarium*) have been previously recorded in this country [5,7]. Adult acanthocephalans determined as *Pseudocorynosoma* sp., were collected from intestine of the ruddy duck (*Oxyura jamaicensis* Gmelin, 1789) from Guatimape, Durango in northern Mexico (see locality 4 in Fig. 1).

<sup>\*</sup> Corresponding author at: Departamento de Zoología, Instituto de Biología, UNAM, 04510 México D.F., Mexico.



Fig. 1. Map of Mexico showing sampling sites for the waterfowl species. Localities with a circle were positive for the infection and with a square were negative for the infection with *Pseudocorynosma* spp. Type locality of *Pseudocorynosoma tepehuanesi* n. sp., is indicated by a start. 1. Cienaga de Santa Clara, Sonora; 2. Guerreo Negro, Baja California Sur; 3. La Esperanza, Sonora; 4. Guatimape Durango; 5. Nueva Ideal, Durango; 6. El Huizache, Sinalo; 7. Yuriria Guanajuato; 8. Ixtlahuca, Estado de México; 9. Almoloya del Rio, Estado de México; 10. Tecocomulco, Hidalgo; 11. Tuxtepec, Oaxaca; 12. El Bayo Veracruz; 13. Sontecomapan, Veracruz; 14. Catemaco, Veracruz; 15. Silvictuc, Campeche.

After of a morphological examination, these specimens represent an undescribed species, which is herein described and compared with the other 5 species of the genus. DNA sequences of two genes, the cytochrome oxidase subunit 1 (*cox 1*) of the mitochondrial DNA and the domains D2 and D3 of the Large Subunit (LSU) from nuclear ribosomal DNA were generated from *Pseudocorynosoma* sp., and compared with the other two species previously recorded in Mexico.

## 2. Materials and methods

#### 2.1. Specimen collection and taxonomic identification

A total of 119 specimens from 15 waterfowl species from the genera: Anas (A. clypeata, A. crecca, A. americana Gmelin, 1789, A. acuta Linnaeus, 1758, A. cyanoptera, A. strepera, A. diazi, A. platyrhynchos Linnaeus, 1758 and A. discors Linnaeus, 1758) Aythya (A. affinis, A. americana, A. collaris Donovan, 1809, A. marila Linnaeus, 1761, and A. valisineria Wilson, 1814) Anser (A. caerulescens Linnaeus, 1758 and A. albifrons Scopoli, 1769) Bucephala (B. albeola), Dendrocygna (D. bicolor Vieillot, 1816 and D. autumnalis Linnaeus, 1758), and Oxyura (O. jamaicensis) were collected from 15 localities from both biogeographical regions of Mexico (Fig. 1). Birds were kept on ice and the digestive tract was excised and examined within 2 h after capture. Ducks and geese were identified using 2 field guides [8,9]. Of the 15 definitive hosts species examined only Anas clypeata, A. crecca, A. americana, A. acuta, A. cyanoptera, A. diazi, A. discors, Aythya affinis, A. collaris, B. albeola and O. jamaicensis were infected with Pseudocorynosoma spp. Acanthocephalans were relaxed in distilled water overnight and fixed in 70% ethanol, and stored at 4 °C.

For taxonomic identification, some specimens were stained with Mayer's paracarmine, dehydrated in a graded ethanol series, cleared with methyl salicylate, and mounted on permanent slides with Canada balsam. Illustrations of the specimens were made with the aid of a drawing tube. Measurements are given in micrometers ( $\mu$ m) unless otherwise stated and are presented as the mean, followed in parentheses by the ranges. Measurements of eggs were made from fully developed eggs ones measured in situ through the body wall of female worms.

Adult acanthocephalans of *P. constrictum* (n = 2), *P. anatarium* (n = 2) and *Pseudocorynosoma* sp. (n = 2) were placed individually in 4% formalin and dehydrated through a graded series of ethyl-alcohol and then critical point dried with carbon dioxide. The specimens were mounted on metal stubs with silver paste, coated with gold and examined in a Hitachi Stereoscan Model SU1510 at 10 kV to obtain micrographs of the proboscis, hooks and anterior trunk spines.

Specimens collected in the current study were deposited in the Colección Nacional de Helmintos (CNHE), Instituto de Biología, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de Mexico, Mexico City, Mexico. For comparison, voucher material, deposited in the CNHE and in the Harold. W. Manter Laboratory of Parasitology, Nebraska (HWML) of the following specimens of *Pseudocorynosoma* were examined: *P. constrictum* (CNHE No. 5270, 5881, 6270–6271; HWML No. 34,108, 34,109, 34,714, 34,715, 34,716, 34,717, 34,718) and *P. anatarium* (CNHE No 5271, 10,197).

#### 2.2. Isolation of genomic DNA

Eight specimens of *Pseudocorynosoma* sp., from ruddy duck, seven of *P. anatarium* from bufflehead duck and 15 specimens of *P. constrictum* from waterfowl species were placed individually in tubes and digested overnight at 56C in a solution containing 10 mM Tris–HCl (pH 7.6), 20 mM NaCl, 100 mM Na<sub>2</sub> EDTA (pH 8.0), 1% Sarkosyl, and 0.1 mg/ml proteinase K. Following digestion, DNA was extracted from the supernatant using the DNAzol reagent (Molecular Research Center, Cincinnati, Ohio) according to the manufacturer's instructions.

#### 2.3. Amplification, cloning and sequencing of DNA

The two genes cox 1 and LSU including the domains D2 + D3 were amplified using the polymerase chain reaction (PCR). A partial fragment of 655 bp of the cytochrome *c* oxidase (cox 1) was amplified with the forward primer (507) 5'-AGTTCTAATCATAA(R)GATAT(Y)GG and reverse primer (588) 5'- TAAACTTCAGGGTGACCAAAAAATCA [10]. A partial fragment of approximately 820 bp that includes the domains D2 + D3 from LSU rDNA were amplified using the forward primer (502) 5'-CAAGTACCGTGAGGGAAAGTTGC 3' and the reverse primer (536) 5'-GTCGATAGGACTCCCTTTG 3' [11]. PCR reactions (25 µl) consisted of 10 mM of each primer, 2.5  $\mu$ l of buffer 10×, 50 mM MgCl<sub>2</sub>, 0. 5 µl of dNTPS mixture (10 mM), 0.125 µl of Tag DNA polymerase (1 U/µl) (Platinum Taq DNA, Invitrogene Corporation, Brazil) and 2 µl of DNA. Thermocycling conditions included denaturation at 94 °C for 3 min, followed by 35 cycles of 94 °C for 1 min, annealing at 40/ 50 °C for 1 min by cox 1 and LSU respectively, and extension at 72 °C for 1 min, followed by a post-amplification incubation at 72 °C for 7 min. Each PCR product was cleaned up and filtered using Millipore columns (Amicon, Billerica, MA). PCR products were cloned by ligation into pGEM-T vector (Promega, Madison, Wisconsin) and used to transform competent Escherichia coli (JM109). Positive clones were identified by blue/white selection, and target insert size was confirmed by PCR of DNA extracts prepared from bacterial (clone) colonies. Liquid cultures for minipreps were grown in Luria broth (Lb) containing 50 µg/ml of ampicillin. Plasmids for DNA sequencing were prepared using commercial miniprep kits (Qiaprep, Qiagen, Valencia, California). Plasmids were

sequenced for both DNA strands using two universal primers. Sequencing reactions were performed using ABI BigDye (PE Applied Biosystems, Boston, Massachusetts) terminator sequencing chemistry, and reaction products were separated and detected using an ABI 310 capillary DNA sequencer. Contigs were assembled and base-calling differences resolved using Codoncode version 5.1.5 (Codoncode Corporation, Dedham, MA). All sequences have been deposited in the Genbank dataset under numbers KX671827-KX671841 for LSU; KX688132-KX688148 for cox 1 and KX688108-KX688131 for the pseudogene.

#### 2.4. Alignments

Sequences of *Pseudocorynosoma* spp., from cox 1 generated in this study were aligned using Clustal program [12] with other sequences of *Polymorphus trochus* Van Cleave, 1945 (JX442196), *Polymorphus minutus* Goeze, 1782 (EF467865), *Profilicollis altmani* Perry, 1942 (DQ089720) and *Profilicollis botulus* Van, Cleave 1916 (EF467862,



Fig. 2. Pseudocorynosoma tepehuanesi n. sp., from Oxyura jamaicensis. A. Adult male, whole worm (holotype), lateral view; B. Male proboscis armature (holotype), lateral view. Missing hooks have been reconstructed with a black shadowed area; C. Male row of hooks (holotype), lateral view; D. Male somatic spines (paratype), lateral view; E. Male genital spines (paratype), lateral view; F. Posterior end of a male showing complete spine armature (paratype), lateral view.

DQ089721) from Polymorphidae that were used as outgroup, due that these species are sister to *Pseudocorynosoma* in a previous phylogenetic analysis [5]. A second alignment was generated with the LSU sequences. This alignment contained 18 sequences of *Pseudocorynosoma* spp., plus other 4 sequences of *P. minutus* (EU267819), *P. altmani* (AY829108) and *P. botulus* (EU267818, AY829109) that were used as outgroup.

### 2.5. Phylogenetic analyses

The cox 1 and LSU alignments were analyzed independently. The akaike information criterion (AlC) was used to assess the fit of nucleotide substitution models for each alignment [13] through use of Modeltest version 3.0 [14]. The GTR model with invariable sites (+1), and rate heterogeneity (+G) [15], was determined to be the best fit for the alignments. Maximum likelihood analyses were conducted using parallel RAxML 7.2.7 [16], using GTR GAMMA for tree inference and the GTRCAT model approximation for bootstrapping, implemented via the CIPRES Science Gateway V. 3.1 [17]. Bayesian analyses were

performed with the program MrBayes version 3.1.2 [18], with the GTR + I + G model. The settings were 2 simultaneous runs with 4 Markov chains and 10 million MCMC generations, sampling every 1000 generations, a heating parameter value of 0.2. The outputs of MrBayes were examined with Tracer Version 1.4 [19] to check for convergence of different parameters, and to determine the approximate number of generations at which log-likelihood values stabilized. A consensus tree was obtained after a conservative burn in of 25% was applied for each data set. Trees were drawn using FigTree version 1.3.1 [20]. The genetic divergence among taxa was estimated using uncorrected "p" distances with the program MEGA version 6 [21].

## 3. Results

## 3.1. Morphological description.

### 3.1.1. Pseudocorynosoma tepehuanesi n. sp. (Figs. 2–3).

General Polymorphidae, with characters of the genus Pseudocorynosoma. Living specimens of orange colour. Sexual



Fig. 3. Pseudocorynosoma tepehuanesi n. sp., from Oxyura jamaicensis. A. Adult female, whole worm (allotype), ventral view; B. Female row of hooks (paratype), lateral view; C. Female reproductive system (paratype), ventral view; D. Egg.

dimorphism evident females larger than males. Proboscis cylindrical armed with 15 longitudinal rows with 7–8 hooks per row; each row with 5–7 large rooted hooks, and 1–3 small basal hooks with small roots (Figs. 2-4) Measurements of hooks are presented in Table 1. Neck cone-shaped; Trunk expanded anteriorly (Figs. 2A, 5A); fore-trunk shorter, hind-trunk elongated posteriorly; spinose, single field, extending along ¾ of fore-trunk in males and females. Genital spines surround genital pore in males. Proboscis receptacle double-walled; ce-phalic ganglion sub-oval at its posterior end; lemnisci digitiform, longer than proboscis receptacle. Genital pore subterminal in both sexes.

*Male* (based on 8 mounted adult specimens, with sperm in the seminal vesicle and 1 for SEM). Trunk 3.8 mm  $(3.4-4.2 \text{ mm}) \times 801$  (534–1.09); maximum width at hind-trunk level. Trunk spines 32 (31–34) × 9 (8–10). Proboscis 355 (315–445) × 140 (123–186). Neck 425 (359–480) × 481 (386–573). Proboscis receptacle 440 (324–590) × 178 (160–201). Lemnisci 856 (493–1.189 mm) × 107 (86–144) (Fig. 2). Testes ovoid, symmetrical, posterior to proboscis receptacle (Fig. 2A). Right testis 560 (489–632) × 301 (133–436). Left testis 556 (416–662) × 359 (247–416). Four tubular cement glands, 1285 (0.946–1.719 mm) × 160 (117–254). Säfftigen's pouch 663 (420–764) × 227 (189–262). Genital spines 20 (16–23) × 9 (8–10). Copulatory bursa 312 (239–433) × 412 (326–532) (Fig. 2A–F).

*Female* (based on 3 gravid mounted specimens and 1 for SEM). Trunk 4.6 mm (3.7–5.1 mm)  $\times$  896 (563–1.080); maximum width at hind-trunk level. Posterior end with distinctive rounded prolongation (Fig. 3 A, C). Trunk spines 34 (33–36) × 8 (8–9). Proboscis 337 (301–365) × 164 (143–178) (Fig. 3A). Neck 396 (302–490) × (336–618). Proboscis receptacle 696 (623–818) × 238 (219–256). Lemnisci 1.037 (805–1.195) × 99 (93–103). Uterine bell short with thick body wall; uterus long; vagina complex with four bulb connected to vagina; gonopore subterminal (Fig. 3C). Mature eggs, containing a fully developed acanthor, fusiform, with polar prolongations in middle fertilization membrane 82 (80–86) × 16 (17–32) (Fig. 3D).

#### 3.1.2. Taxonomic summary

*Type host: Oxyura jamaicensis* Gmelin, 1789 (Aves: Anseriformes: Anatidae) ruddy duck.

*Type locality:* Guatimape, Durango, Mexico (24°49′45″N, 104°53′16″N).

## Site in the host: Intestine.

*Type material*: Holotype CNHE: No. 10,194; allotype CNHE: No. 10,195; paratypes CNHE: No. 10,196.

Prevalence: 100% (9 birds examined).

*Etymology:* the species is named after the Tepehuanes, an indigenous ethnic group inhabiting the northern Mexico, in the state of Durango, where the type locality is located.

#### 3.1.3. Remarks

The new species belongs to the genus *Pseudocorynosoma* based on the distribution of somatic spines in the hind-trunk, and by having



Fig. 4. Pseudocorynosoma anatarium from Bucephala albeola., A. Adult male, whole worm, voucher (CNHE 5721), lateral view; B. Adult female, whole worm, voucher (CNHE 5270), lateral view. Pseudocorynosoma constrictum from Anas clypeata., C. Adult male, whole worm, lateral view; D. Adult female, whole worm, voucher (CNHE 5721), lateral view.

#### Table 1

Comparative metrical data for males and females of species of Pseudocorynosoma. Measurements in micrometers, unless otherwise indicated.

		P. constrictum					P. anatarium
Species	P. tepehuanesi n. sp.	(Van Cleave, 1	918) P. constrictun	n	P. constrictum		(Van Cleave, 1945)
Reference	This study	Van Cleave (19	918) Schmidt (190	65)	This study		Van Cleave (1945)
a 1							
General			10.00		1.0		
No. longitudinal rows of hooks	15	16	18-20		16		14
No. hooks per row	7–8	10-12	9-10		10		8-9
Male	n = 8				n = 8		
Trunk length (mm)	3.40-4.20 × 0.53-1.01	$2.28 - 4.3 \times 0.5$	5-0.6 $3.0-4.0 \times 0.5$	55-0.7	4.3-6.2 × 9.70-1.36	$(5.6 \times 1.13)$	$4.2-8.6 \times 0.9-1.7$
0 ( )	$(3.8 \times 0.801)$					. ,	
Proboscis	315-445 × 123-186		$410-490 \times 1$	175-182	413-485 × 124-216	3	$550 \times 280 - 290$
110003013	$(355 \times 140)$		110 150 / 1	175 102	$(130 \times 170)$	, ,	550 × 200 250
Apical books longth	$(333 \times 140)$	20 /1	40.50		$(433 \times 173)$ 27 51 (44)		50.92
Middle beeks length	40-45(42)	JU-41 41 47	40-30		37-J1 (44)		33-62
Middle hooks length	31-40 (33)	41-47	45-55		40-53(49)		-
Basal nooks length	19–27 (21)	35-41	40-43		30-33(32)		47-59
Proboscis receptacle	$324-590 \times 160-201 (440 \times 1/8)$		/84-889 × 1	1/6-200	$/91 - 1.250 \times 10/-2.$	$28(1089 \times 163)$	
Leminiscus	$493 - 1.189 \times 86 - 144 \ (856 \times 107)$		1115		$1.332 - 2.069 \times 72 - 9$	90 (1.796 × 77)	
Anterior testis	$489-632 \times 133-436$		$380 \times 200$		513-763 × 215-378	$8(639 \times 294)$	
	(560 × 301)						
Posterior testis	$416-662 \times 247-416$				557-725 × 295-373	$3(673 \times 332)$	
	$(556 \times 359)$						
Cement gland	946-1719 × 117-254				1 120-1 635 × 95-1	$69(1357 \times 128)$	
content grand	$(1.285 \times 160)$				11120 11000 / 00 1	(11557 / 126)	
Cifftigen's neugh	$(1.263 \times 100)$				744 1 022 00 21	1 (070 100)	
Santigen's pouch	$420-764 \times 189-262(663 \times 227)$				/44-1.033 × 99-21	$1(870 \times 108)$	
Females	n = 3				n = 9		
Trunk length (mm)	$3.70-5.1 \times 0.56-1.08 (4.60 \times 0.89)$	3.3  imes 0.8	3.3  imes 0.8		7.3–8.3 × 1.3–1.6 (7	7.6 × 1.5)	
Proboscis	$301-365 \times 143-178$				$422-483 \times 183-190$	$0(445 \times 186)$	
	(337 × 164)						
Apical hooks length	39-45 (42)				30-55 (46)		
Middle hooks length	36-38 (36)				38-45 (42)		
Basal hooks length	23_25 (23)				16-23 (19)		
Proboscis recentacle	$673-818 \times 210-256 (606 \times 238)$				1023(15) $1103_1563 \times 150_1$	222	
Proboscis receptacie	025-818 × 219-250 (090 × 258)				(1 265 × 102)	-223	
	005 4 40				(1.505 × 192)	CC (0 4C0 40 4)	
Leminiscus length mm	805-1.19				$3.102 - 3.809 \times 96 - 1$	$166(3.460 \times 124)$	
	(1.03)						
Egg size	$80-86 \times 17-32 (82 \times 16)$				$67_{70} \times 14_{18}$ (68)	v 15)	$10_{-11} \vee 20_{-23}$
	· · ·				07-70 × 14-10 (00	× 15)	10-11 × 20-25
					07 70 × 14 10 (00	~ 15)	10-11 × 20-25
		Р.	. peposacae	P. iherir	lg	P. enrietti	10-11 × 20-25
Species	P. anatarium	<i>P.</i>	, peposacae Porta, 1914)	P. iherir (Macha	lg Ido Filho, 1961)	<i>P. enrietti</i> (Molfie and Freit	as-Fernandes, 1953)
Species Reference	<i>P. anatarium</i> This study	P. (F	. peposacae Porta, 1914) orta (1914)	P. iherir (Macha Machao	ng Ido Filho, 1961) Io-Filho (1961)	<ul> <li>P. enrietti</li> <li>(Molfie and Freit</li> <li>Molfie and Freita</li> </ul>	as-Fernandes, 1953) s-Fernandes (1953)
Species Reference	P. anatarium This study	P. (F Po	, <i>peposacae</i> Porta, 1914) orta (1914)	P. iherir (Macha Machac	ng Ido Filho, 1961) Ido-Filho (1961)	P. enrietti (Molfie and Freit Molfie and Freita	as-Fernandes, 1953) s-Fernandes (1953)
Species Reference General	P. anatarium This study	P. (F Po	peposacae Porta, 1914) orta (1914)	P. iherir (Macha Machao	ng Ido Filho, 1961) Ido-Filho (1961)	P. enrietti (Molfie and Freit Molfie and Freita	as-Fernandes, 1953) s-Fernandes (1953)
Species Reference <b>General</b> No. longitudinal rows of hooks	P. anatarium This study 14	P. (F Po	. peposacae Porta, 1914) orta (1914) 4–18	P. iherir (Macha Machac 20	g do Filho, 1961) lo-Filho (1961)	P. enrietti (Molfie and Freit Molfie and Freita 20	as-Fernandes, 1953) s-Fernandes (1953)
Species Reference General No. longitudinal rows of hooks No. hooks per row	P. anatarium This study 14 8–9	P. (F Pe	. peposacae Porta, 1914) orta (1914) 4–18 2–14	P. iherir (Macha Machac 20 8	g do Filho, 1961) lo-Filho (1961)	P. enrietti (Molfie and Freit Molfie and Freita 20 8	as-Fernandes, 1953) s-Fernandes (1953)
Species Reference General No. longitudinal rows of hooks No. hooks per row Male	P. anatarium This study 14 8-9 n = 5	<i>P.</i> (F P( 14	. peposacae Porta, 1914) orta (1914) 4–18 2–14	P. iherin (Macha Machac 20 8	g Ido Filho, 1961) Io-Filho (1961)	P. enrietti (Molfie and Freit Molfie and Freita 20 8	as-Fernandes, 1953) s-Fernandes (1953)
Species Reference General No. longitudinal rows of hooks No. hooks per row Male Trunk length (mm)	P. anatarium This study 14 8-9 n = 5 $42-53 \times 0.90-112 (4.8 \times 1.05)$	P. (F Po 14 12	peposacae Porta, 1914) orta (1914) 4-18 2-14	P. iherin (Macha Machac 20 8	g do Filho, 1961) lo-Filho (1961)	<ul> <li>P. enrietti</li> <li>(Molfie and Freit Molfie and Freita</li> </ul>	as-Fernandes, 1953) s-Fernandes (1953)
Species Reference General No. longitudinal rows of hooks No. hooks per row Male Trunk length (mm) Perobacesis	P. anatarium This study 14 8-9 n = 5 $4.2-5.3 \times 0.90-1.12 (4.8 \times 1.05)$ 2711 540 × 145 200	P. (F Po 14 12 5) 8.	. peposacae Porta, 1914) orta (1914) 4–18 2–14 .0–11.0 40, 420	<i>P. iherir</i> (Macha Machac 20 8 5.5-6.5 220, 24	g do Filho, 1961) lo-Filho (1961)	P. enrietti (Molfie and Freit Molfie and Freita 20 8	as-Fernandes, 1953) s-Fernandes (1953)
Species Reference General No. longitudinal rows of hooks No. hooks per row Male Trunk length (mm) Proboscis	P. anatarium This study 14 8-9 n = 5 $4.2-5.3 \times 0.90-1.12$ ( $4.8 \times 1.05$ $371-540 \times 165-200$ ( $440 \times 195$ )	P. (F Pe 14 12 5) 8. 34	. peposacae Porta, 1914) orta (1914) 4–18 2–14 .0–11.0 40–430	P. iherir (Macha Machac 20 8 5.5-6.5 330-34	g do Filho, 1961) lo-Filho (1961)	<ul> <li>P. enrietti</li> <li>(Molfie and Freit</li> <li>Molfie and Freita</li> </ul>	as-Fernandes, 1953) s-Fernandes (1953)
Species Reference General No. longitudinal rows of hooks No. hooks per row Male Trunk length (mm) Proboscis	P. anatarium This study 14 8-9 n = 5 $4.2-5.3 \times 0.90-1.12$ ( $4.8 \times 1.05$ $371-540 \times 165-200$ ( $440 \times 185$ ) ( $440 \times 185$ )	P. (F Pr 14 12 5) 8. 34	peposacae Porta, 1914) orta (1914) 4–18 2–14 .0–11.0 40–430	P. iherir (Macha Machac 20 8 5.5-6.5 330-34	g (do Filho, 1961) Io-Filho (1961)	<ul> <li>P. enrietti</li> <li>(Molfie and Freit Molfie and Freita</li> </ul>	as-Fernandes, 1953) s-Fernandes (1953)
Species Reference General No. longitudinal rows of hooks No. hooks per row Male Trunk length (mm) Proboscis Apical hooks length	P. anatarium This study 14 8-9 n = 5 $4.2-5.3 \times 0.90-1.12 (4.8 \times 1.05)$ $371-540 \times 165-200$ $(440 \times 185)$ 51-53 (52) 51-53 (52)	P. (F Pe 14 12 5) 8. 34 -	peposacae Porta, 1914) orta (1914) 4–18 2–14 .0–11.0 40–430	P. iherir (Macha Machac 20 8 5.5–6.5 330–34 –	g Ido Filho, 1961) Io-Filho (1961)	P. enrietti (Molfie and Freit Molfie and Freita 20 8	as-Fernandes, 1953) s-Fernandes (1953)
Species Reference General No. longitudinal rows of hooks No. hooks per row Male Trunk length (mm) Proboscis Apical hooks length Middle hooks length	P. anatarium This study 14 8-9 n = 5 $4.2-5.3 \times 0.90-1.12 (4.8 \times 1.05)$ $371-540 \times 165-200$ $(440 \times 185)$ 51-53 (52) 48-49 (48)	P. (F Pd 14 12 5) 8. 34 - -	. peposacae Porta, 1914) orta (1914) 4–18 2–14 .0–11.0 40–430	P. iherir (Macha Machac 20 8 5.5–6.5 330–34 – –	g Ido Filho, 1961) Io-Filho (1961)	<ul> <li>P. enrietti</li> <li>(Molfie and Freit</li> <li>Molfie and Freita</li> </ul> 20 8 <ul> <li>-</li> <li>-</li> <li>-</li> </ul>	as-Fernandes, 1953) s-Fernandes (1953)
Species Reference General No. longitudinal rows of hooks No. hooks per row Male Trunk length (mm) Proboscis Apical hooks length Middle hooks length Basal hooks length	P. anatarium This study 14 8-9 n = 5 $4.2-5.3 \times 0.90-1.12 (4.8 \times 1.05)$ $371-540 \times 165-200$ $(440 \times 185)$ 51-53 (52) 48-49 (48) 41-45 (42)	P. (F Pe 14 12 5) 8. 34 - - -	. peposacae Porta, 1914) orta (1914) 4–18 2–14 .0–11.0 40–430	P. iherir (Macha Machac 20 8 5.5–6.5 330–34 – – –	g Ido Filho, 1961) Io-Filho (1961)	P. enrietti (Molfie and Freit Molfie and Freita 20 8	as-Fernandes, 1953) s-Fernandes (1953)
Species Reference General No. longitudinal rows of hooks No. hooks per row Male Trunk length (mm) Proboscis Apical hooks length Middle hooks length Basal hooks length Proboscis receptacle	P. anatarium This study 14 8-9 n = 5 $4.2-5.3 \times 0.90-1.12$ ( $4.8 \times 1.05$ $371-540 \times 165-200$ ( $440 \times 185$ ) 51-53 ( $52$ ) 48-49 ( $48$ ) 41-45 ( $42$ ) $950-1.365 \times 148-192$ ( $1.131 \times 128$ )	P. (F Pe 14 12 5) 8. 34 - - - - - 172)	. peposacae Porta, 1914) orta (1914) 4–18 2–14 .0–11.0 40–430	P. iherir (Macha Machac 20 8 5.5–6.5 330–34 – – –	g do Filho, 1961) lo-Filho (1961)	<ul> <li>P. enrietti</li> <li>(Molfie and Freita</li> <li>Molfie and Freita</li> </ul> 20 8 - <ul> <li>-</li> <li>-</li> <li>-</li> <li>-</li> <li>-</li> <li>-</li> <li>-</li> </ul>	as-Fernandes, 1953) s-Fernandes (1953)
Species Reference General No. longitudinal rows of hooks No. hooks per row Male Trunk length (mm) Proboscis Apical hooks length Middle hooks length Basal hooks length Proboscis receptacle Leminiscus	P. anatarium This study 14 8-9 n = 5 $4.2-5.3 \times 0.90-1.12 (4.8 \times 1.05)$ $371-540 \times 165-200$ $(440 \times 185)$ 51-53 (52) 48-49 (48) 41-45 (42) $950-1.365 \times 148-192 (1.131 \times 1.249-1.457 \times 103-116)$	P. (F Pe 12 12 12 5) 8. 34 - - - 172)	. peposacae Porta, 1914) orta (1914) 4-18 2-14 .0-11.0 40-430	P. iherir (Macha Machac 20 8 5.5–6.5 330–34 - - - 1662–1	ag Ido Filho, 1961) Io-Filho (1961) 00	<ul> <li>P. enrietti</li> <li>(Molfie and Freit Molfie and Freita</li> </ul> 20 8 <ul> <li>-</li> <li>-</li> <li>-</li> <li>-</li> </ul>	as-Fernandes, 1953) s-Fernandes (1953)
Species Reference General No. longitudinal rows of hooks No. hooks per row Male Trunk length (mm) Proboscis Apical hooks length Middle hooks length Basal hooks length Proboscis receptacle Leminiscus	P. anatarium This study 14 8-9 n = 5 $4.2-5.3 \times 0.90-1.12 (4.8 \times 1.05)$ $371-540 \times 165-200$ $(440 \times 185)$ 51-53 (52) 48-49 (48) 41-45 (42) $950-1.365 \times 148-192 (1.131 \times 1.249-1.457 \times 103-116)$ $(1.368 \times 108)$	P. (F Pd 14 12 5) 8. 34 - - - - 172)	. peposacae Porta, 1914) orta (1914) 4–18 2–14 .0–11.0 40–430	P. iherir (Macha Machac 20 8 5.5–6.5 330–34 - - - 1662–1	10 / 10 × 14 10 (00 10 / 10 × 14 10 (00 10 / 10 / 10 / 10 / 10 10 / 10 / 10 / 10 / 10 10 / 10 / 10 / 10 / 10 10 / 10 / 10 / 10 / 10 / 10 10 / 10 / 10 / 10 / 10 / 10 / 10 10 / 10 / 10 / 10 / 10 / 10 / 10 / 10 /	<ul> <li>P. enrietti</li> <li>(Molfie and Freit</li> <li>Molfie and Freita</li> </ul> 20 8 <ul> <li>-</li> <li>-</li> <li>-</li> <li>-</li> <li>-</li> <li>-</li> <li>-</li> <li>-</li> </ul>	as-Fernandes, 1953) s-Fernandes (1953)
Species Reference General No. longitudinal rows of hooks No. hooks per row Male Trunk length (mm) Proboscis Apical hooks length Middle hooks length Basal hooks length Proboscis receptacle Leminiscus Anterior testis	P. anatarium This study 14 8-9 n = 5 $4.2-5.3 \times 0.90-1.12 (4.8 \times 1.05)$ $371-540 \times 165-200$ $(440 \times 185)$ 51-53 (52) 48-49 (48) 41-45 (42) $950-1.365 \times 148-192 (1.131 \times 1.249-1.457 \times 103-116)$ $(1.368 \times 108)$ $616-864 \times 333-399 (772 \times 36)$	P. (F Po 14 12 5) 8. 34 - - - 172) 7)	. peposacae Porta, 1914) orta (1914) 4–18 2–14 .0–11.0 40–430	P. iherir (Macha Machac 20 8 5.5–6.5 330–34 - - - 1662–1 603 × 3	10 / 10 × 14 10 (00 10 / 10 × 1961) 10 - Filho (1961) 10 - 719 × 123 1335	<ul> <li>P. enrietti</li> <li>(Molfie and Freita</li> <li>20</li> <li>8</li> <li>-</li> <li>-</li></ul>	as-Fernandes, 1953) s-Fernandes (1953)
Species Reference General No. longitudinal rows of hooks No. hooks per row Male Trunk length (mm) Proboscis Apical hooks length Middle hooks length Basal hooks length Proboscis receptacle Leminiscus Anterior testis Posterior testis	P. anatarium This study 14 8-9 n = 5 $4.2-5.3 \times 0.90-1.12$ ( $4.8 \times 1.05$ $371-540 \times 165-200$ ( $440 \times 185$ ) 51-53 ( $52$ ) 48-49 ( $48$ ) 41-45 ( $42$ ) $950-1.365 \times 148-192$ ( $1.131 \times 1.249-1.457 \times 103-116$ ( $1.368 \times 108$ ) $616-864 \times 333-399$ ( $772 \times 36^{\circ}$ ) $551-954 \times 267-372$	P. (F Pr 14 12 5) 8. 34 - - - 172) 7)	. peposacae Porta, 1914) orta (1914) 4-18 2-14 .0-11.0 40-430	P. iherir (Macha Machac 20 8 5.5–6.5 330–34 - - - 1662–1 603 × 3 536 × 3	ng do Filho, 1961) lo-Filho (1961) 0 719 × 123	<ul> <li>P. enrietti</li> <li>(Molfie and Freit</li> <li>Molfie and Freita</li> </ul> 20 8 <ul> <li>-</li> <li>-</li> <li>-</li> <li>-</li> <li>-</li> </ul>	as-Fernandes, 1953) s-Fernandes (1953)
Species Reference General No. longitudinal rows of hooks No. hooks per row Male Trunk length (mm) Proboscis Apical hooks length Middle hooks length Basal hooks length Proboscis receptacle Leminiscus Anterior testis Posterior testis	P. anatarium This study 14 8-9 n = 5 $4.2-5.3 \times 0.90-1.12 (4.8 \times 1.05)$ $371-540 \times 165-200$ $(440 \times 185)$ 51-53 (52) 48-49 (48) 41-45 (42) $950-1.365 \times 148-192 (1.131 \times 1.249-1.457 \times 103-116)$ $(1.368 \times 108)$ $616-864 \times 333-399 (772 \times 367)$ $561-954 \times 267-372$ $(728 \times 211)$	P. (F Pe 12 12 5) 8. 32 - - 172) 7)	. peposacae Porta, 1914) orta (1914) 4-18 2-14 .0-11.0 40-430	P. iherir (Macha Machac 20 8 5.5–6.5 330–34 - - - 1662–1 603 × 3 536 × 3	ng ng rib x 14 16 (66 ng no Filho, 1961) no Filho (1961) no no 719 × 123 335 301	<ul> <li>P. enrietti</li> <li>(Molfie and Freit</li> <li>Molfie and Freita</li> </ul> 20 8 <ul> <li>-</li> <li>-</li> <li>-</li> <li>-</li> <li>-</li> </ul>	as-Fernandes, 1953) s-Fernandes (1953)
Species Reference General No. longitudinal rows of hooks No. hooks per row Male Trunk length (mm) Proboscis Apical hooks length Middle hooks length Basal hooks length Proboscis receptacle Leminiscus Anterior testis Posterior testis	P. anatarium This study 14 8-9 n = 5 $4.2-5.3 \times 0.90-1.12 (4.8 \times 1.05)$ $371-540 \times 165-200$ $(440 \times 185)$ 51-53 (52) 48-49 (48) 41-45 (42) $950-1.365 \times 148-192 (1.131 \times 1.249-1.457 \times 103-116)$ $(1.368 \times 108)$ $616-864 \times 333-399 (772 \times 367)$ $561-954 \times 267-372$ $(738 \times 311)$ 1.124 - 126 - 127 - 150	P. (F Pd 14 12 5) 8. 34 - - - 172) 7)	. peposacae Porta, 1914) orta (1914) 4–18 2–14 .0–11.0 40–430	P. iherir (Macha Machac 20 8 5.5–6.5 330–34 - - 1662–1 603 × 3 536 × 3	10 / 10 × 14 10 (00 10 / 10 × 1961) 10 - Filho (1961) 0 719 × 123 335 301	<ul> <li>P. enrietti</li> <li>(Molfie and Freit</li> <li>Molfie and Freita</li> </ul> 20 8 <ul> <li>-</li> <li>-</li> <li>-</li> <li>-</li> <li>-</li> <li>-</li> </ul>	as-Fernandes, 1953) s-Fernandes (1953)
Species Reference General No. longitudinal rows of hooks No. hooks per row Male Trunk length (mm) Proboscis Apical hooks length Middle hooks length Basal hooks length Proboscis receptacle Leminiscus Anterior testis Posterior testis Cement gland	P. anatarium This study 14 8-9 n = 5 $4.2-5.3 \times 0.90-1.12 (4.8 \times 1.05)$ $371-540 \times 165-200$ $(440 \times 185)$ 51-53 (52) 48-49 (48) 41-45 (42) $950-1.365 \times 148-192 (1.131 \times 1.249-1.457 \times 103-116)$ $(1.368 \times 108)$ $616-864 \times 333-399 (772 \times 36)$ $561-954 \times 267-372$ $(738 \times 311)$ $1.174-1.364 \times 127-150$	P. (F Pd 14 12 5) 8. 34 - - - 172) 7)	. peposacae Porta, 1914) orta (1914) 4–18 2–14 .0–11.0 40–430	P. iherir (Macha Machac 20 8 5.5–6.5 330–34 - - - 1662–1 603 × 3 536 × 3	10 / 10 × 14 10 (00 10 / 10 × 1961) 10 - Filho (1961) 10 / 1961) 10 / 1961) 10 / 1961) 10 / 1961) 10 / 1961) 10 / 10 / 10 / 10 / 10 / 10 / 10 / 10 /	<ul> <li>P. enrietti</li> <li>(Molfie and Freit</li> <li>Molfie and Freita</li> <li>20</li> <li>8</li> <li>-</li> <li>-</li> <li>-</li> <li>-</li> <li>-</li> <li>-</li> </ul>	as-Fernandes, 1953) s-Fernandes (1953)
Species Reference General No. longitudinal rows of hooks No. hooks per row Male Trunk length (mm) Proboscis Apical hooks length Middle hooks length Basal hooks length Proboscis receptacle Leminiscus Anterior testis Posterior testis Cement gland	P. anatarium This study 14 8-9 n = 5 $4.2-5.3 \times 0.90-1.12$ ( $4.8 \times 1.05$ $371-540 \times 165-200$ ( $440 \times 185$ ) 51-53 ( $52$ ) 48-49 ( $48$ ) 41-45 ( $42$ ) $950-1.365 \times 148-192$ ( $1.131 \times 1.249-1.457 \times 103-116$ ( $1.368 \times 108$ ) $616-864 \times 333-399$ ( $772 \times 36^{\circ}$ $561-954 \times 267-372$ ( $738 \times 311$ ) $1.174-1.364 \times 127-150$ ( $1.278 \times 139$ )	P. (F Pr 14 12 5) 8. 34 - - 172) 7)	. peposacae Porta, 1914) orta (1914) 4-18 2-14 .0-11.0 40-430	P. iherir (Macha Machac 20 8 5.5–6.5 330–34 - - 1662–1 603 × 3 536 × 3	ng do Filho, 1961) lo-Filho (1961) 0 719 × 123 335 301	<ul> <li>P. enrietti</li> <li>(Molfie and Freita</li> <li>Molfie and Freita</li> <li>20</li> <li>8</li> <li>-</li> <li>-&lt;</li></ul>	as-Fernandes, 1953) s-Fernandes (1953)
Species Reference General No. longitudinal rows of hooks No. hooks per row Male Trunk length (mm) Proboscis Apical hooks length Middle hooks length Basal hooks length Proboscis receptacle Leminiscus Anterior testis Posterior testis Cement gland Säfftigen's pouch	P. anatarium This study 14 8-9 n = 5 $4.2-5.3 \times 0.90-1.12 (4.8 \times 1.05)$ $371-540 \times 165-200$ $(440 \times 185)$ 51-53 (52) 48-49 (48) 41-45 (42) $950-1.365 \times 148-192 (1.131 \times 1.249-1.457 \times 103-116)$ $(1.368 \times 108)$ $616-864 \times 233-399 (772 \times 36)$ $561-954 \times 267-372$ $(738 \times 311)$ $1.174-1.364 \times 127-150$ $(1.278 \times 139)$ $471-724 \times 104-213 (596 \times 163)$	P. (F Pe 14 12 5) 8. 34 - - 172) 7) 8)	. peposacae Porta, 1914) orta (1914) 4–18 2–14 .0–11.0 40–430	P. iherir (Macha Machac 20 8 5.5–6.5 330–34 - - - 1662–1 603 × 3 536 × 3	ng ng ldo Filho, 1961) lo-Filho (1961) 00 719 × 123 335 301	<ul> <li>P. enrietti</li> <li>(Molfie and Freit</li> <li>Molfie and Freita</li> </ul> 20 8 <ul> <li>-</li> <li>-</li> <li>-</li> <li>-</li> <li>-</li> </ul>	as-Fernandes, 1953) s-Fernandes (1953)
Species Reference General No. longitudinal rows of hooks No. hooks per row Male Trunk length (mm) Proboscis Apical hooks length Basal hooks length Basal hooks length Proboscis receptacle Leminiscus Anterior testis Posterior testis Cement gland Säfftigen's pouch Females	P. anatarium This study 14 8-9 n = 5 $4.2-5.3 \times 0.90-1.12 (4.8 \times 1.05)$ $371-540 \times 165-200$ $(440 \times 185)$ 51-53 (52) 48-49 (48) 41-45 (42) $950-1.365 \times 148-192 (1.131 \times 1.249-1.457 \times 103-116)$ $(1.368 \times 108)$ $616-864 \times 333-399 (772 \times 367)$ $561-954 \times 267-372$ $(738 \times 131)$ $1.174-1.364 \times 127-150$ $(1.278 \times 139)$ $471-724 \times 104-213 (596 \times 166)$ n = 7	P. (F Pe 14 12 5) 8. 34 - - - 172) 7) 8)	. peposacae Porta, 1914) orta (1914) 4-18 2-14 .0-11.0 40-430	P. iherir (Macha Machac 20 8 5.5–6.5 330–34 - - 1662–1 603 × 3 536 × 3	10 / 10 × 14 10 (00 10 / 10 × 1961) 10 - Filho (1961) 00 719 × 123 335 301	<ul> <li>P. enrietti</li> <li>(Molfie and Freit</li> <li>Molfie and Freita</li> </ul> 20 8 <ul> <li>-</li> <li>-</li> <li>-</li> <li>-</li> <li>-</li> </ul>	as-Fernandes, 1953) s-Fernandes (1953)
Species Reference General No. longitudinal rows of hooks No. hooks per row Male Trunk length (mm) Proboscis Apical hooks length Middle hooks length Basal hooks length Basal hooks length Proboscis receptacle Leminiscus Anterior testis Posterior testis Cement gland Säfftigen's pouch Females Trunk length (mm)	P. anatarium This study 14 8-9 n = 5 $4.2-5.3 \times 0.90-1.12 (4.8 \times 1.05)$ $371-540 \times 165-200$ $(440 \times 185)$ 51-53 (52) 48-49 (48) 41-45 (42) $950-1.365 \times 148-192 (1.131 \times 1.249-1.457 \times 103-116)$ $(1.368 \times 108)$ $616-864 \times 333-399 (772 \times 367)$ $561-954 \times 267-372$ $(738 \times 311)$ $1.174-1.364 \times 127-150$ $(1.278 \times 139)$ $471-724 \times 104-213 (596 \times 163)$ n = 7 $4.8-6.9 \times 1.03-1.82 (6.2 \times 1.64)$	P. (F Pd 14 12 5) 8. 34 - - - 172) 7) 7) 8)	n peposacae Porta, 1914) orta (1914) 4–18 2–14 .0–11.0 40–430	P. iherir (Macha Machac 20 8 5.5–6.5 330–34 - - - 1662–1 603 × 3 536 × 3	19 76 × 14 16 (66 19 10-Filho (1961) 10-Filho (1961) 0 719 × 123 335 301	<ul> <li>P. enrietti</li> <li>(Molfie and Freit</li> <li>Molfie and Freita</li> </ul> 20 8 <ul> <li>-</li> <li>-</li> <li>-</li> <li>-</li> <li>-</li> </ul>	as-Fernandes, 1953) s-Fernandes (1953)
Species Reference General No. longitudinal rows of hooks No. hooks per row Male Trunk length (mm) Proboscis Apical hooks length Middle hooks length Basal hooks length Proboscis receptacle Leminiscus Anterior testis Posterior testis Cement gland Säfftigen's pouch Females Trunk length (mm) Proboscis	P. anatarium This study 14 8-9 n = 5 $4.2-5.3 \times 0.90-1.12$ ( $4.8 \times 1.05$ $371-540 \times 165-200$ ( $440 \times 185$ ) 51-53 ( $52$ ) 48-49 ( $48$ ) 41-45 ( $42$ ) $950-1.365 \times 148-192$ ( $1.131 \times 1.249-1.457 \times 103-116$ ( $1.368 \times 108$ ) $616-864 \times 333-399$ ( $772 \times 36^{\circ}$ $561-954 \times 267-372$ ( $738 \times 311$ ) $1.174-1.364 \times 127-150$ ( $1.278 \times 139$ ) $471-724 \times 104-213$ ( $596 \times 16i$ n = 7 $4.8-6.9 \times 1.03-1.82$ ( $6.2 \times 1.64$ $372-466 \times 165-180$ ( $433 \times 177$ )	P. (F Pr 14 12 5) 8. 34 - - 172) 7) 7) 8)	. peposacae Porta, 1914) orta (1914) 4-18 2-14 .0-11.0 40-430	P. iherir (Macha Machac 20 8 5.5–6.5 330–34 - - 1662–1 603 × 3 536 × 3	ng do Filho, 1961) lo-Filho (1961) 0 719 × 123 335 301	<ul> <li>P. enrietti</li> <li>(Molfie and Freita</li> <li>20</li> <li>8</li> <li>-</li> <li>-</li> <li>-</li> <li>-</li> <li>-</li> <li>-</li> <li>-</li> </ul>	as-Fernandes, 1953) s-Fernandes (1953)
Species Reference General No. longitudinal rows of hooks No. hooks per row Male Trunk length (mm) Proboscis Apical hooks length Middle hooks length Basal hooks length Proboscis receptacle Leminiscus Anterior testis Posterior testis Cement gland Säfftigen's pouch Females Trunk length (mm) Proboscis Apical hooks length	P. anatarium This study 14 8-9 n = 5 $4.2-5.3 \times 0.90-1.12$ ( $4.8 \times 1.05$ $371-540 \times 165-200$ ( $440 \times 185$ ) 51-53 ( $52$ ) 48-49 ( $48$ ) 41-45 ( $42$ ) $950-1.365 \times 148-192$ ( $1.131 \times 1.249-1.457 \times 103-116$ ( $1.368 \times 108$ ) $616-864 \times 333-399$ ( $772 \times 36^{\circ}$ $561-954 \times 267-372$ ( $738 \times 311$ ) $1.174-1.364 \times 127-150$ ( $1.278 \times 139$ ) $471-724 \times 104-213$ ( $596 \times 164$ ) n = 7 $4.8-6.9 \times 1.03-1.82$ ( $6.2 \times 1.64$ $372-466 \times 165-180$ ( $433 \times 172$ ) 55-62 ( $57$ )	P. (F Pr 14 12 5) 8. 34 - - 172) 7) 8) 2)	. peposacae Porta, 1914) orta (1914) 4–18 2–14 .0–11.0 40–430	P. iherir (Macha Machac 20 8 5.5–6.5 330–34 - - - 1662–1 603 × 3 536 × 3	ng Ido Filho, 1961) Io-Filho (1961) 00 719 × 123 335 301	<ul> <li>P. enrietti</li> <li>(Molfie and Freit</li> <li>Molfie and Freita</li> <li>20</li> <li>8</li> <li>-</li> <li>-<!--</td--><td>as-Fernandes, 1953) s-Fernandes (1953)</td></li></ul>	as-Fernandes, 1953) s-Fernandes (1953)
Species Reference General No. longitudinal rows of hooks No. hooks per row Male Trunk length (mm) Proboscis Apical hooks length Basal hooks length Basal hooks length Proboscis receptacle Leminiscus Anterior testis Posterior testis Cement gland Säfftigen's pouch Females Trunk length (mm) Proboscis Apical hooks length Middle hooks length	P. anatarium This study 14 8-9 n = 5 $4.2-5.3 \times 0.90-1.12 (4.8 \times 1.05)$ $371-540 \times 165-200$ $(440 \times 185)$ 51-53 (52) 48-49 (48) 41-45 (42) $950-1.365 \times 148-192 (1.131 \times 1.249-1.457 \times 103-116)$ $(1.368 \times 108)$ $616-864 \times 333-399 (772 \times 367)$ $561-954 \times 267-372$ $(738 \times 311)$ $1.174-1.364 \times 127-150$ $(1.278 \times 139)$ $471-724 \times 104-213 (596 \times 166)$ n = 7 $4.8-6.9 \times 1.03-1.82 (6.2 \times 1.64)$ $372-466 \times 165-180 (433 \times 177)$ 55-62 (57) 53-60 (56)	P. (F Pe 14 12 5) 8. 34 - - 172) 7) 7) 8) 2)	. peposacae Porta, 1914) orta (1914) 4-18 2-14 .0-11.0 40-430	P. iherir (Macha Machac 20 8 5.5–6.5 330–34 - - 1662–1 603 × 3 536 × 3	<sup>1</sup> / <sub>1</sub>	<ul> <li>P. enrietti</li> <li>(Molfie and Freit</li> <li>Molfie and Freita</li> </ul> 20 8 - <ul> <li>-</li> <li>-</li> <li>-</li> <li>-</li> </ul>	as-Fernandes, 1953) s-Fernandes (1953)
Species Reference General No. longitudinal rows of hooks No. hooks per row Male Trunk length (mm) Proboscis Apical hooks length Middle hooks length Basal hooks length Proboscis receptacle Leminiscus Anterior testis Posterior testis Cement gland Säfftigen's pouch Females Trunk length (mm) Proboscis Apical hooks length Middle hooks length Middle hooks length	P. anatarium This study 14 8-9 n = 5 $4.2-5.3 \times 0.90-1.12 (4.8 \times 1.05)$ $371-540 \times 165-200$ $(440 \times 185)$ 51-53 (52) 48-49 (48) 41-45 (42) $950-1.365 \times 148-192 (1.131 \times 1.249-1.457 \times 103-116)$ $(1.368 \times 108)$ $616-864 \times 333-399 (772 \times 367)$ $561-954 \times 267-372$ $(738 \times 311)$ $1.174-1.364 \times 127-150$ $(1.278 \times 139)$ $471-724 \times 104-213 (596 \times 163)$ n = 7 $4.8-6.9 \times 1.03-1.82 (6.2 \times 1.64)$ $372-466 \times 165-180 (433 \times 177)$ 55-62 (57) 53-60 (56) 40-44 (41)	P. (F Pd 14 12 5) 8. 34 - - - 172) 7) 7) 8) 2)	n peposacae Porta, 1914) orta (1914) 4-18 2-14 .0-11.0 40-430	P. iherir (Macha Machac 20 8 5.5–6.5 330–34 - - 1662–1 603 × 3 536 × 3	10 / 10 × 14 10 (00 10 / 10 × 1961) 10 - Filho (1961) 0 719 × 123 335 301	<ul> <li>P. enrietti</li> <li>(Molfie and Freit</li> <li>Molfie and Freita</li> </ul> 20 8 <ul> <li>-</li> <li>-</li> <li>-</li> <li>-</li> <li>-</li> </ul>	as-Fernandes, 1953) s-Fernandes (1953)
Species Reference General No. longitudinal rows of hooks No. hooks per row Male Trunk length (mm) Proboscis Apical hooks length Middle hooks length Basal hooks length Proboscis receptacle Leminiscus Anterior testis Posterior testis Cement gland Säfftigen's pouch Females Trunk length (mm) Proboscis Apical hooks length Basal hooks length Basal hooks length Basal hooks length	P. anatarium This study 14 8-9 n = 5 $4.2-5.3 \times 0.90-1.12$ ( $4.8 \times 1.05$ $371-540 \times 165-200$ ( $440 \times 185$ ) 51-53 ( $52$ ) 48-49 ( $48$ ) 41-45 ( $42$ ) $950-1.365 \times 148-192$ ( $1.131 \times 1.249-1.457 \times 103-116$ ( $1.368 \times 108$ ) $616-864 \times 333-399$ ( $772 \times 36^{\circ}$ $561-954 \times 267-372$ ( $738 \times 311$ ) $1.174-1.364 \times 127-150$ ( $1.278 \times 139$ ) $471-724 \times 104-213$ ( $596 \times 166$ ) n = 7 $4.8-6.9 \times 1.03-1.82$ ( $6.2 \times 1.64$ $372-466 \times 165-180$ ( $433 \times 177$ ) 55-62 ( $57$ ) 53-60 ( $56$ ) 40-44 ( $41$ ) $806-1151 \times 157-242$ ( $068 \times 28$ )	P. (F Pr 14 12 5) 8. 34 - - 172) 7) 7) 8) 2)	. peposacae Porta, 1914) orta (1914) 4-18 2-14 .0-11.0 40-430	P. iherir (Macha Machaa 20 8 5.5–6.5 330–34 - - 1662–1 603 × 3 536 × 3	ng ldo Filho, 1961) lo-Filho (1961) 0 719 × 123 335 301	<ul> <li>P. enrietti</li> <li>(Molfie and Freit</li> <li>Molfie and Freita</li> <li>20</li> <li>8</li> <li>-</li> <li>-<!--</td--><td>as-Fernandes, 1953) s-Fernandes (1953)</td></li></ul>	as-Fernandes, 1953) s-Fernandes (1953)
Species Reference General No. longitudinal rows of hooks No. hooks per row Male Trunk length (mm) Proboscis Apical hooks length Middle hooks length Basal hooks length Proboscis receptacle Leminiscus Anterior testis Posterior testis Cement gland Säfftigen's pouch Females Trunk length (mm) Proboscis Apical hooks length Middle hooks length Middle hooks length Basal hooks length Basal hooks length Proboscis receptacle Lominiccus	P. anatarium This study 14 8-9 n = 5 $4.2-5.3 \times 0.90-1.12$ ( $4.8 \times 1.05$ $371-540 \times 165-200$ ( $440 \times 185$ ) 51-53 ( $52$ ) 48-49 ( $48$ ) 41-45 ( $42$ ) $950-1.365 \times 148-192$ ( $1.131 \times 1.249-1.457 \times 103-116$ ( $1.368 \times 108$ ) $616-864 \times 333-399$ ( $772 \times 36^{\circ}$ $561-954 \times 267-372$ ( $738 \times 311$ ) $1.174-1.364 \times 127-150$ ( $1.278 \times 139$ ) $471-724 \times 104-213$ ( $596 \times 164$ ) n = 7 $4.8-6.9 \times 1.03-1.82$ ( $6.2 \times 1.64$ $372-466 \times 165-180$ ( $433 \times 172$ ) 55-62 ( $57$ ) 53-60 ( $56$ ) 40-44 ( $41$ ) $806-1.151 \times 157-243$ ( $968 \times 2$ $1.200 \times 1557 \times 102$ )	P. (F Pr 14 12 5) 8. 34 - - 172) 7) 7) 8) 2) 04)	. peposacae Porta, 1914) orta (1914) 4-18 2-14 .0-11.0 40-430	P. iherir (Macha Machaa 20 8 5.5–6.5 330–34 - - 1662–1 603 × 3 536 × 3	ng ng ldo Filho, 1961) lo-Filho (1961) 00 719 × 123 335 301	<ul> <li>P. enrietti (Molfie and Freit Molfie and Freita</li> <li>20</li> <li>8</li> <li></li> </ul>	as-Fernandes, 1953) s-Fernandes (1953)
Species Reference General No. longitudinal rows of hooks No. hooks per row Male Trunk length (mm) Proboscis Apical hooks length Middle hooks length Basal hooks length Proboscis receptacle Leminiscus Anterior testis Posterior testis Cement gland Säfftigen's pouch Females Trunk length (mm) Proboscis Apical hooks length Middle hooks length Middle hooks length Basal hooks length Proboscis receptacle Leminiscus	P. anatarium This study 14 8-9 n = 5 $4.2-5.3 \times 0.90-1.12$ ( $4.8 \times 1.05$ $371-540 \times 165-200$ ( $440 \times 185$ ) 51-53 ( $52$ ) 48-49 ( $48$ ) 41-45 ( $42$ ) $950-1.365 \times 148-192$ ( $1.131 \times 1.249-1.457 \times 103-116$ ( $1.368 \times 108$ ) $616-864 \times 333-399$ ( $772 \times 367$ ) $561-954 \times 267-372$ ( $738 \times 311$ ) $1.174-1.364 \times 127-150$ ( $1.278 \times 139$ ) $471-724 \times 104-213$ ( $596 \times 164$ ) n = 7 $4.8-6.9 \times 1.03-1.82$ ( $6.2 \times 1.64$ ) $372-466 \times 165-180$ ( $433 \times 177$ ) 55-62 ( $57$ ) 53-60 ( $56$ ) 40-44 ( $41$ ) $806-1.151 \times 157-243$ ( $968 \times 2$ $1.349-1.557 \times 103-116$ ( $1268 \times 108$ )	P. (F Pe 12 12 12 12 5) 8. 32 - - 172) 7) 7) 8) 2) 04)	. peposacae Porta, 1914) orta (1914) 4-18 2-14 .0-11.0 40-430	P. iherir (Macha Machac 20 8 5.5–6.5 330–34 - - 1662–1 603 × 3 536 × 3	<ul> <li>37 70 × 14 10 (00</li> <li>10 Filho, 1961)</li> <li>10 -Filho (1961)</li> <li>10</li> <li>10</li> <li>10</li> <li>11 10 (00</li> <li>12 1</li></ul>	<ul> <li>P. enrietti (Molfie and Freit Molfie and Freita</li> <li>20 8</li> <li></li> <li>-</li> </ul>	as-Fernandes, 1953) s-Fernandes (1953)
Species Reference General No. longitudinal rows of hooks No. hooks per row Male Trunk length (mm) Proboscis Apical hooks length Middle hooks length Basal hooks length Proboscis receptacle Leminiscus Anterior testis Posterior testis Cement gland Säfftigen's pouch Females Trunk length (mm) Proboscis Apical hooks length Basal hooks length Middle hooks length Middle hooks length Basal hooks length Proboscis receptacle Leminiscus	P. anatarium This study 14 8-9 n = 5 4.2-5.3 × 0.90-1.12 (4.8 × 1.05 371-540 × 165-200 (440 × 185) 51-53 (52) 48-49 (48) 41-45 (42) 950-1.365 × 148-192 (1.131 × 1.249-1.457 × 103-116 (1.368 × 108) 616-864 × 333-399 (772 × 36' 561-954 × 267-372 (738 × 311) 1.174-1.364 × 127-150 (1.278 × 139) 471-724 × 104-213 (596 × 164' n = 7 4.8-6.9 × 1.03-1.82 (6.2 × 1.64' 372-466 × 165-180 (433 × 17') 55-62 (57) 53-60 (56) 40-44 (41) 806-1.151 × 157-243 (968 × 2 1.349-1.557 × 103-116 (1.368 × 108)	P. (F Pe 12 12 12 12 12 12 172) 7) 8) 2) 04)	1 00 15 15 15	P. iherir (Macha Machac 20 8 5.5–6.5 330–34 - - 1662–1 603 × 3 536 × 3	10 / 10 × 14 10 (00 10 / 10 × 1961) 10 - Filho (1961) 00 719 × 123 335 301	<ul> <li>P. enrietti (Molfie and Freit Molfie and Freita</li> <li>20</li> <li>8</li> <li>-</li> <li< td=""><td>as-Fernandes, 1953) s-Fernandes (1953)</td></li<></ul>	as-Fernandes, 1953) s-Fernandes (1953)

cylindrical proboscis, a cone-shaped neck, four tubular cement glands and eggs with a prominent polar prolongation in the middle fertilization membrane [1,4]. *Pseudocorynosoma tepehuanesi* n. sp. can be morphologically distinguished from the other five species from the Americas by having a trunk expanded anteriorly and a proboscis cylindrical, armed with 15 longitudinal rows with 7–8 hooks each vs 16–20 longitudinal rows with 10–12 hooks each in *P. constrictum* (Figs. 4, 5), 14–18 longitudinal rows with 12–14 hooks each in *P. peposacae*, 14 longitudinal rows with 8–9 hooks each in *P. anatarium* and 20 longitudinal rows with 8 hooks each in *P. enrietti* 

and *P. iheringi* [1,22,23] (see Table 1). The new species also differs from *P. constrictum* and *P. anatarium* by having smaller lemniscus (Figs. 3–4). The female of *P. tepehuanesi* n. sp. differs from the other five species, by having a small protuberance on the posterior extremity of the body (Figs. 2–4).

#### 3.1.4. Alignments and phylogenetic analyses

A total of 62 sequences for cox 1 gene from the three species of Pseudocorynosoma (P. constrictum, P. anatarium and tepehuanesi n. sp.) were aligned with other sequences of Polymorphus trochus, P. minutus, Profilicollis altmani and P. botulus from Polymorphidae, conforming a data set of 673 sites. The alignment of these sequences revels 24 sequences belonging P. anatarium with abnormalities, which were defined as pseudogenes by the presence of insertions, deletions and premature stop codons. The length of these pseudogenes ranged from 643 bp to 656 bp, whereas the other 33 functional genes of cox 1 of Pseudocorynosoma spp., had a length of 655 bp. The genetic divergences among 24 types of pseudogenes range from 8 to 12%, whereas the genetic distances within P. constrictum, ranged from 0. 09 to 3%, P. anatarium from 0. 03 to 1.5% and P. tepehuanesi n. sp., ranged from 0 to 0.3%. Finally the genetic divergence among the new species and the other two congeneric species ranged from 15 to 18%. Phylogenetic analysis of this data set with ML and IB supported the monophyly of Pseudocorynosoma. This tree was composed of 4 main clades. The first clade contained 15 specimens of P. constrictum recovered from the intestine of ducks of the genera Anas and Aythya (localities 1, 4-6, 8-10 in Fig. 1). The second clade includes 8 specimens of P. tepehuanesi n. sp., recovered from single locality (locality 4 in Fig. 1). The third clade was composed of 10 specimens of P. anatarium recovered from bufflehead duck from three localities (localities 1, 2, 4 in Fig. 1). Finally the fourth clade was composed by pseudogenes of *P. anatarium*. The phylogenetic relationships among taxa received strong bootstrap support and Bayesian posterior probability values (Fig. 6).

The sequences of *P. tepehuanesi* n. sp., from LSU, were aligned with the same species of *Pseudocorynosoma* and with sequences of *P. minutus*, *Profilicollis altmani* and *P. botulus* available in the GenBank data set, conforming a data set of 811 sites. The genetic divergence among the three species of *Pseudocorynosoma* (*P. constrictum*, *P. anatarium* and *P. tepehuanesi* n. sp.), ranged from 3.2 to 4%. Phylogenetic analysis of LSU data set with ML and IB methods supported the monophyly of the three sub clades of *Pseudocorynosoma* representing the three species and the nodes among the branches received strong bootstrap support and Bayesian posterior probability values (Fig. 7).

#### 4. Discussion

The phylogenetic trees obtained with LSU yielded three major clades, each one represents the three species of Pseudocorynosoma, which received high bootstrap and posterior probability values (Fig. 7). The phylogenetic tree inferred with cox 1 dataset yielded three clades, representing the three species of Pseudocorynosoma, and within of the clade of *P. anatarium* a sub-clade was conformed only with pseudogenes (Fig. 6). The genetic divergence among the pseudogenes ranged from 8 to 12%, these values are higher than those recorded between pseudogenes of Acanthocephalus Koelreuter, 1771, which had a divergence of 7% [24]. In contrast the genetic divergence found in cox 1 pseudogenes among individual of Pomphorhynchus laevis Müller 1776 from Sava river in Croatia ranged from 0 to 20.1% [25]. The presence of pseudogenes only in P. anatarium indicates that they arose after speciation process on the genus Pseudocorynosoma. Benesh et al. [24]. detected cox 1 pseudogenes in two species of the genus Acanthocephalus Koelreuter 1771 no related each other (A. lucii Müller, 1776 and A. dirus Van Cleave, 1931), indicating that the pseudogenes arose before these species diverged.

The nuclear mitochondrial pseudogenes exhibited a high degree of similarity with the mitochondrial DNA (numts). The presence of those



**Fig. 5.** Scanning electron micrographs of proboscis and trunk of adult male of *Pseudocorynosoma tepehuanesi* n. sp. (A–B), *Pseudocorynosoma constrictum* (C–D), *Pseudocorynosoma anatarium* (E–F). Scale bars: b, d, F, 1.0 mm; a, c, e, 200 µm.

genes is due two mechanisms 1) continual horizontal transfer from the mitochondria to the nucleus, 2) duplication within the nuclear genome after a transfer event [26,27]. The mitochondrial cox 1 pseudogenes were coamplified from total DNA by using conserved universal cox 1 primers [10] those pseudogenes have been found in the genomes of a diverse range of metazoan species. The cox 1 gene is a fragment that has been used successfully for the identification and delimitation of metazoan species, turning it into the core fragment for DNA barcoding [28–31]. However, the existence of cox 1 numts poses a serious challenge to DNA barcoding and may overestimate the diversity of the species on the ecosystems. To avoid the numts is necessary made a carefully examination of the sequences with the aim of detected insertions, deletions and premature stop codons [31].

Currently, *Pseudocorynosoma* contains five described species plus the new species from the Americas. During the migration of waterfowl species in North America four flyways have been proposed [32]. In the current study, waterfowl species from three flyways (Pacific, Central and Atlantic) were collected. Interestingly waterfowl from two flyways (Pacific and Central) were infected with acanthocephalans. The type species of the genus i.e., *P. constrictum* has been previously recorded in the four flyways in 20 waterfowl species and it is considered as one



Fig. 6. Maximum likelihood tree and consensus Bayesian Inference trees inferred with cox 1 data set; numbers near internal nodes show ML bootstrap clade frequencies and posterior probabilities (BI).

generalist parasite, abundant and widely distributed in the Neartic region [1,7,33–36]. In contrast, *P. anatarium* was described from an undetermined duck in the state of Texas in the United States of North America [1]. Recently *P. anatarium* has been found on the Pacific and Central flyways from Mexico in the bufflehead duck (*Bucephala albeola*). The new species *P. tepehuanesi* n. sp., was recorder in the ruddy duck (*Oxyura jamaicensis*) a diving duck from single locality (see Fig. 1) of the Central flyway from Mexico. Species of *Pseudocorynosoma* apparently show some level of host-specificity, i.e., *P. constrictum*, has been found in waterfowl species from the genera *Anas* and *Aythya*, whereas *P.*  *anatarium* and *P. tepehuanesi* n. sp., were only found in the genera *Bucephala* and *Oxyura* respectively.

The three species of *Pseudocorynosoma* from North America, *P. constrictum, P. anatarium* and *P. tepehuanesi* n. sp., were found in the same locality in Durango (locality 4, in Fig. 1). The other three species of *Psuedocorynosoma* from South America also occur in sympatry and show certain level of host-specificity, i.e., *P. peposacae* was recorded in the rosy-billed pochard (*Netta peposaca* Vieillot, 1816); *P. iheringi* in the Brazilian duck (*Amazonetta brasiliensis* Gmelin, 1789) and finally *P. enrietti* was recorded in the white-cheeked pintail (*Anas bahamensis* 



Fig. 7. Maximum likelihood tree and consensus Bayesian Inference trees inferred with LSU data set; numbers near internal nodes show ML bootstrap clade frequencies and posterior probabilities (BI).

Linnaeus, 1758) and Brazilian duck [23]. Therefore, the other three species of *Pseudocorynosoma* from South America are essential to understand the phylogenetic relationships among the six species of the genus *Pseudocorynosoma* and their relationships host-parasite.

## 5. Conclusions

*Pseudocorynosoma tepehuanesi* is the sixth species of the genus associated with waterfowl from northern Mexico. Morphologically, the new species is distinguished from the other five congeneric species described from Americas by possessing a proboscis with 15 longitudinal rows with 7–8 hooks each, a trunk expanded anteriorly and by having smaller lemniscus. These morphological distinctions were demonstrated with 2 phylogenetic analyses inferred with molecular data. We detected cox 1 pseudogenes only in *P. anatarium* suggesting that those genes arose after speciation process within genus *Pseudocorynosoma*.

#### Acknowledgments

This research was supported by grants from the Programa de Apoyo a Proyectos de Investigación e Inovación Tecnológica (PAPIIT-UNAM) IN206716, and the Consejo Nacional de Ciencia y Tecnología (CONACYT) 179048. CDPP thanks the support of the Programa de Posgrado en Ciencias Biológicas, UNAM and CONACYT for granting a scholarship to complete his PhD program. We thank Berenit Mendoza Garfias for her help obtaining the scanning electron microphotographs.

#### References

- H.J. Van Cleave, The acanthocephalan genus Corynosoma I. The species found in water birds of North America, J. Parasitol. 25 (1945) 332–340.
- [2] J.S. Keithly, Life History of Corynosoma constrictum Van CleavePh.D. Thesis Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa, 1968 (203 p.).
- [3] L.M. Duclos, B.J. Danner, B. Nickol, Virulence of Corynosoma constrictum (Acanthocephala: Polymorphidae) in Hyalella azteca (Amphipoda) throughout parasite ontogeny, J. Parasitol. 92 (2006) 749–755.

- [4] F.J. Aznar, G.P.P. de Leon, J.A. Raga, Status of *Corynosoma* (Acanthocephala: Polymorphidae) based on anatomical, ecological and phylogenetic evidence, with the erection of *Pseudocorynosoma* n. Gen, J. Parasitol. 92 (2006) 548–564.
- [5] M. García-Varela, G. Pérez-Ponce de León, F.J. Aznar, S.A. Nadler, Phylogenetic relationship among genera of Polymorphidae (Acanthocephala), inferred from nuclear and mitochondrial gene sequences, Mol. Phylogenet. Evol. 68 (2014) 176–184.
- [6] O.M. Amin, Classification of the Acanthocephala, Folia Parasitol. 60 (2013) 273–305.
   [7] L. García-Prieto, M. García-Varela, B. Mendoza-Garfias, G. Pérez-Ponce de León, Checklist of the Acanthocephala in wildlife vertebrates of Mexico, Zootaxa 2419 (2010) 1–50.
- [8] S.N.G. Howell, S. Webb, A Guide to the Birds of México and Northern Central America, Oxford University Press, New York, 1995 (851 p.).
- [9] American Ornithologists' Union (AOU), Check-list of North American, Birds, 7 th ed., 1998 (Washington, D.C.).
- [10] O. Folmer, M. Black, W. Hoeh, R. Lutz, R. Vrijenhoek, DNA primers for the amplification of mitochondrial cytochrome *c* oxidase subunit I from diverse metazoan invertebrates, Mol. Mar. Biol. Biotechnol. 3 (1994) 294–299.
- [11] M. García-Varela, S.A. Nadler, Phylogenetic relationships of palaeacanthocephala (Acanthocephala) inferred from SSU and LSU rDNA gene sequences, J. Parasitol. 91 (2005) 1401–1409.
- [12] J.D. Thompson, H.G. Higgins, T.J. Gibson, CLUSTAL W: Improving the sensitivity of progressive multiple sequence alignment through sequence weighting, position specific gap penalties and weight matrix choice, Nucleic Acids Res. 22 (1994) 4673–4680.
- [13] F. Rodríguez, J.F. Oliver, A. Marin, J.R. Medina, The general stochastic model of nucleotide substitution, J. Theor. Biol. 817-818 (1990).
- [14] D. Posada, K.A. Crandall, Modeltest: testing the model of DNA substitution, Bioinformatics 9 (1998) 817–818.
- [15] Z. Yang, Estimating the patterns of nucleotide substitution, J. Mol. Evol. 39 (1994) 105–111.
- [16] W. Pfeiffer, A. Stamatakis, Hybrid mpi/pthreads parallelization of the raxml phylogenetics code, International Symposium on Parallel & Distributed Processing, Workshops and Phd Forum (IPDPSW) IEEE, IEEE, New York, USA 2010, pp. 1–8.
- [17] M.A. Miller, W. Pfeiffer, T. Schwartz, Creating the CIPRES Science Gateway for inference of large phylogenetic trees, Proceedings of the Gateway Computing Environments Workshop (GCE) 2010, pp. 1–8 (New Orleans).
- [18] J.P. Huelsenbeck, F. Ronquist, MrBayes: Bayesian inference of phylogeny, Bioinformatics 17 (2001) 754–755.
- [19] A. Rambaut, A.J. Drummond, Tracer v1.4 2003–2007, MCMC Trace Analysis Package, 2007 (http://tree.bio.ed.ac.uk/software/tracer/).
- [20] A. Rambaut, Tree Figure Drawing Tool Version 1.4.0, Institute of Evolutionary Biology, University of Edinburgh, 2006.
- [21] K. Tamura, G. Stecher, D. Peterson, A. Filipski, S. Kumar, MEGA6: molecular evolutionary genetics analysis version 6.0, Mol. Biol. Evol. 30 (2013) 2725–2729.

- [22] H.J. Van Cleave, The Acanthocephala of North America birds, Trans. Am. Microsc. Soc. 37 (1918) 19–48.
- [23] E.M. McDonald, Key to Acanthocephala Report in Waterfowl, U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 1998 173.
- [24] D. Benesh, P.T. Hasu, L.R. Suomalainen, E.T. Valtonen, M. Tiirola, Reliability of mitochondrial DNA in an acanthocephalan: the problem of pseudogenes, Int. J. Parasitol. 36 (2006) 247–254.
- [25] I. Vardić Smrzlić, D. Valić, D. Kapetanović, V. Filipović Marijić, E. Gjurčević, E. Teskeredžić, *Pomphorhynchus laevis* (Acanthocephala) from the Sava River basin: new insights into strain formation, mtDNA-like sequences and dynamics of infection, Parasitol. Int. 64 (2015) 243–250.
- [26] E. Hazkani-Covo, R. Sorek, D. Graur, Evolutionary dynamics of large Numts in the human genome: rarity of independent insertions and abundance of post-insertion duplications, J. Mol. Ecol. 56 (2003) 169–174.
- [27] D. Bensasson, M.W. Feldman, D.A. Petrov, Rates of DNA duplication and mitochondrial DNA insertion in the human genome, J. Mol. Evol. 57 (2003) 343–354.
- [28] A. Obwaller, R. Schneider, J. Walochnik, B. Gollackner, A. Deutz, K. Janitschke, H. Aspock, H. Auer, *Echinococcus granulosus* strain differentiation based on sequences heterogeneity in mitochondrial gene of cytochrome c oxidase-1 and NADH dehy-drogenase-1, Parasitology 128 (2004) 569–575.
- [29] S. Derycke, J. Vanaverbeke, A. Rigaux, T. Backeljau, T. Moend, Exploring the use of cytochrome oxidase c subunit I (COI) for DNA barcoding of free-living marine nematodes, PLoS One 5 (2010), e13716.
- [30] J.V. López, N. Yuhki, R. Masuda, W. Modi, S. O'Brien, Numt, a recent transfer and tandem amplification of mitochondrial DNA to the nuclear genome of the domestic cat, J. Mol. Evol. 39 (1994) 174–190.
- [31] H. Song, J.E. Buhay, M.F. Whiting, K.A. Crandall, Many species in one: DNA barcoding overestimates the number of species when nuclear mitochondrial pseudogenes are coamplified, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. 105 (2008) 13486–13491.
- [32] P.A. Johnsgard, Waterfowl of North America, Revised ed. University of Nebraska Press Lincoln, 2010.
- [33] V.I. Petrochenko, Acanthocephala of Domestic and Wild Animals, vol. II, Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR, Vsesoyuznoe Obshchestvo Gel'mintologov, Moscow, Russia, Moscow, 1958.
- [34] H.N. Buscher, Dynamics of the intestine helminth fauna in three species of ducks, J. Wildl. Manag. 29 (1965) 772–781.
- [35] J.D. Farias, A.G. Canaris, Gastrointestinal helminths of the Mexican duck, Anas platyrhynchus diazi, from north central México and Southwestern USA, J. Wildl. Dis. 22 (1986) 51–54.
- [36] L.F. Mayberry, A.G. Canaris, J.R. Bristol, S.L. Gardner, Bibliography of Parasites and Vertebrate Hosts in Arizona, New Mexico and Texas (1893–1984), 2000.