

HELMINTHOLOGIA, 51, 1: 23-30, 2014

# Monogenoidea on exotic Indian freshwater fishes. 2. Range expansion of *Thaparocleidus caecus* and *T. siamensis* (Dactylogyridae) by introduction of striped catfish *Pangasianodon hypophthalmus* (Pangasiidae)

A. TRIPATHI<sup>1</sup>, S. RAJVANSHI<sup>2</sup>, N. AGRAWAL<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Zoology, Rajiv Gandhi University, Itanagar- 791 112, Arunachal Pradesh, India, E-mail: *tripathi\_amit02@yahoo.co.in*; <sup>2</sup>Department of Zoology, Lucknow University, Lucknow- 226 007, Uttar Pradesh, India;

### Summary

Thaparocleidus caecus and Thaparocleidus siamensis are parasitic monogeneans found on the gills of striped catfish Pangasianodon hypophthalmus (Pangasiidae), a native species of Southeast Asia. We report T. caecus and T. siamensis, for the first time in India, from the gills of aquarium-kept P. hypophthalmus (prevalence 40 % and 80 % respectively). We also report T. siamensis from the gills of pond-cultured P. hypophthalmus (prevalence 100 %); no specimen of T. caecus was observed on pondcultured P. hypophthalmus (prevalence 0 %). Morphometric data of the studied parasites did not differ significantly from previous descriptions of the two species recovered in other geographic locations. Similarly, no consequential variation was found when 28S rDNA of T. siamensis from the present study was compared with that of T. siamensis from Malaysia available on GenBank. The present investigation adds to growing cases of freshwater monogeneans that have been concomitantly introduced worldwide as a result of aquarium and aquaculture trade.

Keywords: Range expansion; Monogenoidea; *Thaparocleidus siamensis*; *Thaparocleidus caecus*; *Pangasianodon hypophthalmus*; India

# Introduction

The Striped catfish *Pangasianodon hypophthalmus* Sauvage, 1878 (Pangasiidae), a native of Mekong, Chao Phraya, and Maeklong basins of Southeast Asia (Roberts & Vidhayanon, 1991), is an excellent candidate for aquaculture and aquarium trade. The fish has been introduced as a source of aquaculture into river basins of many Asian countries (Roberts & Vidthayanon, 1991; Rainboth, 1996; Froese & Pauly, 2012), including India (Singh & Lakra, 2012). In addition, it is exported to 136 countries across all continents (Silva & Phuong, 2011), and its juveniles are available as ornamental fish for the aquarium trade in many countries (Baska *et al.*, 2009). In fact, the farming of *P. hypophthalmus* has achieved such phenomenal growth over the last three decades that it has become a 'global icon of aquaculture development' (Silva & Phuong, 2011) with its production and distribution levels matching that of tilapia, carps and salmon. Despite this increasing socioeconomic importance of *P. hypophthalmus* culture, the parasitic fauna associated with this enterprise is not well studied (Thuy *et al.*, 2010; Silva & Phuong, 2011).

# Material and methods

As part of our continuing effort on cataloguing the monogenean parasites (Platyhelminthes) from exotic Indian freshwater fishes (see Tripathi et al., 2010), we found specimens of Thaparocleidus caecus (Mizelle & Kritsky, 1969) Lim, 1996, and Thaparocleidus siamensis (Lim, 1990) Lim, 1996 from the gills of P. hypophthalmus purchased from the aquarium market of Lucknow (26° 50' N / 80° 56' E) (21.08.2012). Additionally, we found T. siamensis from the gills of P. hypophthalmus collected from the fish farms at Barabanki (26° 55' N / 81° 11' E) (24.07.2011). The prevalence and intensity of infestation of the worms isolated in the present study were recorded (Table 1 and 2). Some parasite specimens were mounted in glycerine and Canada balsam for studying their hard and soft body parts respectively, using the protocol recommended by Kritsky et al. (1986); others were preserved in absolute ethanol for DNA extraction. The mounted parasites were photographed with a digital camera (Olympus photometrics coolsnap) attached to a phase-contrast microscope (Olympus BX51). Based on these photographs, measurements were obtained with the software ProExpress 6.0 (Media Cybernetics, Inc., USA). Voucher specimens have been deposited in the Natural History Museum, London (2013.8.12.1-10, 2013.8.12.11-20).

Table 1. Prevalence and intensity of *T. caecus* and *T. siamensis* infestation on aquarium-kept *P. hypophthalmus* 

T. caecus	T. siamensis
40 % (4/10)	80 % (8/10)
30 +	200 +
	<i>T. caecus</i> 40 % (4/10) 30 +

DNA was extracted from the individual specimen of T. siamensis (query species) using the Qiagen's Dneasy blood and tissue Kit (Qiagen, Germany). The extracted DNA (10 µl) was used as a template in a PCR reaction to amplify the partial 28S rDNA, using forward (5'-ACCCGCTGAATTTAAGCAT-3') and reverse (5'-CTCTTCAGAGTACTTTTCAAC-3') primers. The reaction volume was 25 µl, containing 2 µl polymerase chain reaction (PCR) buffer (10X), 0.5 µl dNTPs (10 mM), 0.5 µl forward primer (19.6 nMol.), 0.5 µl reverse primer (31.9 nMol.), 0.5 µl Taq polymerase (5 Units), 1 µl MgCl2 (25 mM), 5 µl genomic DNA and 15 µl miliQ water. PCR conditions were 95 °C for 4 min (initial denaturation), followed by 35 cycles of 95 °C for 1 min (denaturation), 55 °C for 45 sec (annealing), 72 °C for 1 min (extension) and 72 °C for 10 min (final extension). An aliquote (10 µl) from the amplicon was electrophoresed in a 1.5 % agarose gels in TAE buffer, stained with ethidium bromide, and visualized under UV illuminator. The remaining amplicons were sequenced with the same primers using 3730/ABI-3730XL-1409-023 automated sequencer (Xcelris Labs Limited, India).

Sequencing products were subjected to BLAST (Basic Local Alignment Search Tool) for homology search. Aligned sequences of 28S rDNA of *T. siamensis* from the present study and that of Malaysia (available on GenBank under accession number AF218123.1) were compared using the SDSC (San Diego Supercomputer Center) work bench, and multiple sequence alignments were made by ClustalW (Thompson *et al.* 1994). Texshade (colour coded

Table 2. Prevalence and intensity of *T. caecus* and *T. siamensis* infestation on pond-cultured *P. hypophthalmus* 

	T. caecus	T. siamensis
Prevalence	0 % (0/4)	100 % (4/4)
Intensity	0	250 +

plots) of aligned sequences was used for conserved, nonconserved and identical sequences. Sequences were deposited in GeneBank under the accession number JX947852.

### **Results and discussion**

#### Taxonomy

Thaparocleidus caecus was originally described as Ancvlodiscoides caecus Mizelle and Kritsky, 1969 from an unidentified aquarium fish collected in United States (Mizelle & Kritsky, 1969). Gussev (1978), however, transferred the species to Silurodiscoides Gussev, 1976 as Silurodiscoides caecus (Mizelle & Kritsky 1969) n. comb. Lim (1990) redescribed S. caecus based on new material and also described the new species, S. siamensis, both from Pangasianodon hypophthalmus pond cultured in Malaysia. Subsequently, Lim (1996) considered Silurodiscoides Gussev. 1976. a junior subjective synonym of Thaparocleidus Jain, 1952, based on the law of priority. Accordingly, the scientific names of S. caecus and S. siamensis were changed to T. caecus (Mizelle & Kritsky, 1969) Lim, 1996 and T. siamensis (Lim, 1990) Lim, 1996 respectively. We compared our specimens of *T. caecus* and *T. siamensis* from India with the respective redesrciption and description by Lim (1990), which we considered detailed and the most adequate representation of the two species. The general morphology and measurements of male and female reproductive organs, and haptoral parts of our specimens (Figs. 1 and 2) are consistent with the details provided by Lim (1990), and the diagnostic features of Thaparocleidus



Fig. 1. Copulatory complex and vagina (a) and haptoral sclerites (b) of *Thaparocleidus siamensis* (Lim, 1990) Lim, 1996. Scale bar = 50 µm.



Fig. 2. Copulatory complex (a) and haptoral sclerites (b) of *Thaparocleidus caecus* (Mizelle & Kritsky, 1969) Lim, 1996. Scale bar = 50 µm.

(Lim *et al.*, 2001). Additionally, we have shown the morphology of the vagina to be inverted cone shaped in *T. siamensis* which Lim (1990) missed (Fig. 1). The morphometric data for *T. caecus* and *T. siamensis* examined are presented in Table 3 and Table 4 and compared with data reported by other authors. Molecular analysis also demonstrated that the specimens of *T. siamensis* from India, and those in Malaysia differ by only five bases (Figs. 3 and 4). In other words, the specimens of *T. siamensis* from India and those in Malaysia have 99.3 % similarity (MVIEW Multiple Alignment Display) and are thus similar species.

#### Range expansion

Mizelle and Kritsky (1969) described *T. caecus* from an unidentified aquarium fish imported into the United States from Thailand. Subsequently, Lim (1990) redescribed *T. caecus* from *P. hypophthalmus* (imported from Thailand and cultured) in Malaysia. Lim (1990) also described *T. siamensis* on the same host. Lerssutthichawal *et al.* (1999) recorded *T. caecus* from three host fishes: *Pangasius conchophilus*, *Pangasius larnaudii* and *P. hypophthalmus*, and *T. siamensis* from *P. hypophthalmus* cultured in Thailand. Pariselle *et al.* (2002) recorded *T. caecus* from both *P. hypophthalmus* and *Pangasius djambal* and *T. siamensis* 

Parameters measured	Present study	Lim (1990)	Mizelle & Kritsky (1969)
Body			
Total body length	1038 (680 - 1230)	833 (333 - 1000)	904 (768 - 1055)
Total body width	167 (120 – 200)	149 (124 – 183)	176 (140 – 251)
Pharynx diameter	48 (36 - 60)	_	81 (68 – 95)*
Haptor length	125 (80 - 150)	_	115 (96 – 137)
Haptor width	110 (77 – 150)	_	144 (111 – 179)
Male reproductive organs			
Testis length	113 (36 – 150)	_	_
Testis width	63 (30 - 80)	_	_
Copulatory tube length	60 (48 - 70)	62 (60 - 64)	66 (61 – 71)
Accessory piece length	43 (34 – 53)	41 (40 – 44)	49 (40 – 54)
Female reproductive organs			
Ovary length	141 (60 – 120)	_	_
Ovary width	67 (40 - 100)	_	_
Haptoral parts			
Dorsal anchor length	39 (37 – 41)	43 (40 – 44)	46 (45 – 48)
Dorsal anchor recurved point les	ngth $11(10-13)$	12 (12 – 14)	_
Dorsal anchor patch length	6 (4 – 7)	8 (7 – 9)	_
Ventral anchor length	17 (16 – 19)	20 (19 – 21)	21 (20 – 22)
Ventral anchor recurved point le	ength $6(5-7)$	8 (8 - 10)	-
Dorsal bar length	42 (29 – 44)	44 (44 – 52)	32 (29 – 34)
Ventral bar length	25 (21 – 27)	25 (22 - 26)	50 (44 - 59)
Hooks length	14 (14 – 15)	11 (10 – 12)	12 (11 – 19)
Egg			
Egg length (with filament)	77 (56 – 91)	_	_
Egg width	41 (33 – 50)	_	_

Table 3. Morphometric data (presented in µm as means followed by ranges in parentheses) of *Thaparocleidus caecus* from *Pangasianodon hypophthalmus* in India (present study), Malaysia (Lim 1990), and USA (Mizelle & Kritsky 1969)

\*Width of pharynx

from P. hypophthalmus (imported from Thailand and cultured) in Indonesia. They also described T. vietnamensis on P. hypophthalmus and Pangasius bocourti. Das et al. (2006) recorded T. siamensis from P. hypophthalmus (imported from Thailand and cultured) in Bangladesh. Thuy & Buchmann (2008) recorded both T. siamensis and T. caecus from P. hypophthalmus cultured in Vietnam. Wiecaszek et al. (2009) recorded T. caecus from an aquarium escapee pangasiid (either P. hypophthalmus or the hybrid of P. hypophthalmus with some unknown ornamental fish, presumably imported from Thailand) in Poland. Baska et al. (2009) recorded 'Thaparocleidus monogeneans' from P. hypophthalmus fry (imported from Thailand to pet fish shops) in Hungary and Russia; although parasites could not be identified to species level, given the high level of monogenean host specificity, and their coevolution with their host, they were possibly either T. siamensis or T. caecus or even both.

In India, Rastogi et al. (2008) were apparently the first to record a monogenean parasite from aquarium-kept Puntius sutchii (now Pangasianodon hypophthalmus). However, these authors completely misidentified the parasite species for the formerly described Silurodiscoides vistulensis (Siwak 1932) Gusev 1973 (now Thaparoclidus vistulensis (Siwak 1932) Lim 1996). The copulatory organ, as illustrated by Rastogi et al. (2008), in particular, is not even close to that of T. vistulensis. Indeed, the monogenean illustrated by Rastogi et al. (2008) corresponds more to T. siamensis than T. vistulensis, to which this article is a testimony. Singh & Lakra (2012) also noted 'gill fluke infection' in all P. hypophthalmus farms in India, but neither the generic nor the specific identity of these parasites was established. Thus, ours is the first published account of T. siamensis and T. caecus from India, which also represents

Tsiamensis Query_sp.	GAAAGAGATTAG GGCATGTGAGCAGAAAACTGACCATGGCTTCTCTTAGTAACGGCGAGTGAAAAGAGATTAG **********
Tsiamensis Query_sp.	CCCATCACCGAAGCCCATCCGCTCATGTGGATAAGGCCATGTGGTGTTCAGTCATTGACC CCCATCACCGAAGCCCATCCGCTCATGTGGATAAGGCCATGTGGTGTTCAGTCATTGACC ***********************************
Tsiamensis Query_sp.	TGGGGACAGTTGTTTACTCGAAGTCCAACTCCGATTTTGGCTTTGGATTTGTTCCGTAGA TGGGGACAGTTGTTTACTCGAAGTCCAACTCCGATTTTGGCTTTGGATTTGTTCCGTAGA **********************************
Tsiamensis Query_sp.	GGGTGAAAGGCCCGTACGARTAAACACTTACGGTATCAAGCTGTTTCCTAATGGTCAGTG GGGTGAAAGGCCCGTACGAGTAAACACTTACGGTATCAAGCTGTTTCCTAATGGTCAGTG ***********************************
Tsiamensis Query_sp.	ACATGGAGTCGGATTGCTTGAGAATGCAGTCCAAAGTGGGTGG
Tsiamensis Query_sp.	TAGATACTGGCACGAGTCTCG TAAATACTGGCACGAGTCCGATAGTAGACAAGTACCGCGAGGGAAAGTTGAAAAGTACTC ** ********
Tsiamensis Query_sp.	TGAAGAGAGAGTAAATAGTACGTGGATACCC

Fig. 3. ClustalW alignment

a range extension of these two species to South Asia. The extent of global distribution of these two parasite species also exemplifies the potential of exotic fish to concomitantly introduce their monogeneans into areas outside of their natural range (see Tripathi, 2013 for discussion). *Disease risk implications* 

The pathological implications of these monogeneans are not well studied. Nonetheless, the sporadic mortality of P.

Table 4. Morphometric data (presented in µm as means followed by ranges in parentheses) of *Thaparocleidus siamensis* from *Pangasianodon hypophthalmus* in India (present study) and Malaysia (Lim 1990)

Parameters measured	Present study	Lim (1990)
Body		
Total body length	822 (695 – 1139)	-
Total body width	140 (90 - 170)	_
Pharynx diameter	40 (30 - 50)	_
Haptor length	118 (90 – 175))	_
Haptor width	93 (70 – 145)	_
Male reproductive organs		
Testis length	131 (90 - 180)	_
Testis width	64 (45 – 95)	_
Copulatory tube length	96 (90 - 97)	97 (90 - 100)
Accessory piece length	129 (121 – 138)	120 (110 - 134)
Female reproductive organs		
Ovary length	124 (90 – 188)	_
Ovary width	65 (50 - 85)	_
Vagina length	37 (20 – 50)	_
Haptoral parts		
Dorsal anchor length	60 (58 - 64)	64 (60 - 70)
Dorsal anchor recurved point length	30 (27 – 35)	33 (28 - 38)
Dorsal anchor patch length	30 (24 – 35)	30 (24 – 36)
Ventral anchor length	19 (15 – 21)	23 (22 – 24)
Ventral anchor recurved point length	12 (9 – 15)	13 (12 – 14)
Dorsal bar length	38 (31 – 40)	40 (36 – 44)
Ventral bar length	28 (25 - 32)	28 (24 - 30)
Hooks length	12 (12 – 13)	14 (13 – 15)
Egg		
Egg length (with filament)	237 (147 - 385)	_
Egg width	25 (19 – 30)	_



Fig. 4. Texshade showing colour coded plots for conserved sequence (light blue colour), all match sequence (blue colour) and similar sequence (purple colour) and non-match sequence (white colour)

hypophthalmus due to *T. siamensis* and *T. caecus* infestation has been documented in Vietnam (Thuy & Buchmann, 2008). In India, Singh and Lakra (2012), who were not aware of taxonomic status of monogeneans from *P. hypophthalmus*, also reported, "gill fluke infection common in all *P. hypophthalmus* farms with infection rate varying from 60 - 90 % and highest mortality during the first week after stocking". Indeed, the intensities of infestation by *T. siamensis* in the present study reached higher than 200 parasites per aquarium-kept fish and 250 parasites per pond-cultured fish, which makes it difficult to envisage that such a high parasitic burden would not exert a strongly adverse effect on the host survival. Further studies are required to estimate their pathogenicity accurately.

An additional disease risk involved, especially in Indian conditions where the culture sites of *P. hypophthalmus* are very close to open water (Singh & Lakra, 2012), is the spread and colonisation of *P. hypophthalmus* and associated monogeneans to sympatric wild fish. The fish was

previously known to have established a small population of it in the lake Kinneret, Israel as an aquarium escapee (Snovsky & Golani, 2012) and is thus capable of establishing elsewhere, including India. Should the escapee *P. hypophthalmus* establish its population in Indian waters, it can trickle across state boundaries and disseminate its monogeneans to further new localities for a combination of two reasons: 1) *P. hypophthalmus* is highly potamodromous and can cover distances of over several hundred kilometres (FAO 2013), and 2) India has one of the largest networks of rivers in the world (Rao, 1975).

Wiecaszek *et al.* (2009) contended that *T. caecus*, because of its very narrow host-specificity, poses no threat to the native ichthyofauna of Europe. However, a thorough examination of the literature reveals that *T. caecus* can actually exploit a range of pangasiid hosts (Table 3). Evidently, *T. caecus* is a generalist parasite with wide host specificity, and thus most likely to represent a natural threat to native fish biodiversity of importing countries.

Table 5. Fish species reported as hosts of Thaparocleidus caecus

Host fish	Reference
Pangasiidae	
Pangasianodon hypophthalmus	Lim (1990); Lerssutthichawal <i>et al.</i> (1999); Pariselle <i>et al.</i> (2002); Thuy & Buchmann (2008); Wiecaszek <i>et al.</i> (2009); Baska <i>et al.</i> (2009); Present study
Pangasius conchophilus	Lerssutthichawal et al. (1999)
Pangasius larnaudii	Lerssutthichawal et al. (1999)
Pangasius djambal	Pariselle et al. (2002)

Considering continuing worldwide introductions/exports of *P. hypophthalmus* for aquarium and/or aquaculture purposes, we anticipate further range expansion for these parasites. It seems only relevant and essential that parasitologists consider the potential impact of parasites onto the economically important *P. hypophthalmus* farming.

#### Acknowledgements

To Monisha Banerjee (Lucknow University, India) for helping with the molecular analysis; and University Grant Commission, India [39-603/2010 (SR)] and Department of Science and Technology, India [SR/SO/AS-56/2011] for providing financial assistance to Amit Tripathi.

### References

BASKA, F., VORONIN, V. N., ESZTERBAUER, E., MULLER, L., MARTON, S., MOLNAR, K. (2009): Occurrence of two myxosporean species, *Myxobolus hakyi* sp. n. and *Ho-ferellus pulvinatus* sp. n., in *Pangasianodon hypophthal-mus* fry imported from Thailand to Europe as ornamental fish. *Parasitol. Res.*, 105 (5): 1391 – 1398. DOI: 10.1007/s00436-009-1567-x.

DAS, A. K., CHANDRA, K. J., GHOSH, P. K., BISWAS, S. R. (2006): Parasitic monogenea of three exotic fish species to Bangladesh waters. *Indian J. Anim. Sci.*, 76 (2): 168 – 173 FAO. 2010 – 2013. Cultured aquatic species information programme. *Pangasius hypophthalmus*. Cultured aquatic species information programme. Text by GRIFFITHS, D., VAN KHANH, P., TRONG, T. Q. In: *FAO Fisheries and Aquaculture Department* (online). Rome. Updated 14 January 2012, retrieved April 9, 2013

FROESE R., PAULY D. (2007): *Fish base*. Retrieved November 2, 2012 from www.fishbase.org

GUSEV, A. V. (1978): Monogenoidea of freshwater fishes. Principles of systematics, analysis of world fauna and its evolution. *Parasitol. Sbor.*, 38: 96 – 198. [In Russian.]

KRITSKY, D. C., THATCHER, V. E., BOEGER, W. A. (1986): Neotropical Monogenea. 8. Revision of *Urocleidoides* (Dactylogyridae, Ancyrocephalinae). *Proc. Helminthol. Soc. Wash.*, 53 (1): 1 – 37

LERSSUTTHICHAWAL, T., LIM, S. L. H., CHINABUT S. (1999): Monogeneans from the pangasiid fishes of Thailand. *AAHRI Newsletter*, 8 (1): 1-5

LIM, S. L. H. (1990): *Silurodiscoides* Gussev, 1961 (Monogenea: Ancyrocephalidae) from *Pangasius sutchi* Fowler, 1931 (Pangasiidae) cultured in Peninsular Malaysia. *Raffles Bull. Zool.*, 38 (1): 55 – 63

LIM, S. L. H. (1996): *Thaparocleidus* Jain, 1952, the senior synonym of *Silurodiscoides* Gussev, 1976 (Monogenea: Ancylodiscoidinae). *Syst. Parasitol.*, 35 (3): 207 – 215. DOI: 10.1007/BF00009640

LIM, L. H. S., TIMOFEEVA, T. A., GIBSON, D. I. (2001): Dactylogyridean monogeneans of the siluriform fishes of the Old World. *Syst. Parasitol.*, 50(3), 159 – 197. DOI: 10.1023/A:1012237801974

MIZELLE, J. D., KRITSKY D. C. (1969): Studies on Mono-

genetic Trematodes. XXXIX. Exotic species of Monopisthocotylea with the proposal of *Archidiplectanum* gen. n. and *Longihaptor* gen. n. *Am. Midl. Nat.*, 81: 370 – 386

PARISELLE, A., LIM, L. H. S., LAMBERT, A. (2002): Monogeneans from Pangasiidae (Siluriformes in Southeast Asia: III. Five new species of *Thaparocleidus* Jain, 1952 (Ancylodiscoididae) from *Pangasius bocourti*, *P. djambal* and *P. hypophthalmus*. *Parasite*, 9: 207 – 217

RAO, K. L. (1975): *India's water wealth: its assessment, uses and projections*. New Delhi, India, Orient Longman, 255 pp.

RAINBOTH, W. J. (1996): *Fishes of the Cambodian Mekong*. Food and Agriculture Organization of the U.N. Rome, 265 pp.

RASTOGI, P., MISHRA, D., RASTOGI, R., SHARMA, V., SINGH, H. S. (2008): On a New Species of Genus *Silurodiscoides* (Achmerow, 1964) Gussev, 1973 with redescription, copulation biology and Neuroanatomy of *S. vistulensis* (New Combination) from Meerut (UP), India. *Asian J. Exp. Biol. Sci.*, 22 (3): 329 – 342

ROBERTS, T. R., VIDTHAYANON, C. (1991): Systematics revision of the Asian Catfish family Pangasiidae, with biological observation and description of three new species. *Proc. Acad. Nat. Sci. Philadelphia*, 143: 97 – 144

SILVA, S. S. D., PHUONG, N. T. (2011): Striped catfish farming in the Mekong Delta, Vietnam: a tumultuous path to a global success. *Rev. Aquac.*, 3 (2): 45 - 73. DOI: 10.1111/i.1753-5131.2011.01046.x

SINGH, A. K., LAKRA, W. S. (2012): Culture of *Pan-gasianodon hypophthalmus* into India: Impacts and present scenario. *Pak. J. Biol. Sci.*, 15 (1): 19 – 26. DOI: 10.3923/pjbs.2012.19.26

SNOVSKY, G., GOLANI, D. (2012): The occurrence of an aquarium escapee, *Pangasius hypophthalmus* (Sauvage, 1878), (Osteichthys, Siluriformes, Pangasiidae) in Lake Kinneret (Sea of Galilee), Israel. *Bioinvasions Rec.*, 1 (2): 101 – 103. DOI: 10.3391/bir.2012.1.2.03

THOMPSON, J. D., HIGGINS, D. G., GIBSON, T. J. (1994): ClustalW: improving the sensitivity of progressive multiple sequence alignment through sequence weighting, position-specific gap penalties and weight matrix choice. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, 22 (22): 4673 – 4680. DOI: 10.1093/nar/22.22.4673

THUY, D. T., BUCHMANN, K. (2008): Infections with gill parasitic monogeneans *Thaparocleidus siamensis* and *T. caecus* in cultured Catfish *Pangasius hypophthalmus* in Southern Vietnam. *Bull. Eur. Assoc. Fish Pathol.*, 28 (1): 10-15

THUY, D.T., KANIA, P., BUCHMANN, K. (2010): Infection status of zoonotic trematode metacercariae in Sutchi catfish (*Pangasianodon hypophthalmus*) in Vietnam: Associations with season, management and host age. *Aquaculture*, 302 (1): 19 – 25. DOI: 10.1016/j.aquaculture.2010.02.002

TRIPATHI, A., AGRAWAL, N., SRIVASTAVA, N. (2010): Monogenoidea on exotic Indian freshwater fishes. 1. A new geographical record of *Sciadicleithrum iphthimum* Kritsky, Thatcher, and Boeger, 1989 (Dactylogyridae) with the first description of its egg. *Comp. Parasitol.*, 77 (1): 83 – 86. DOI: 10.1654/4382.1

TRIPATHI, A. (2013): The invasive potential of parasitic monogenoids (platyhelminthes) via the aquarium fish trade: an appraisal with special reference to India. *Reviews in Aquaculture* 5: 1 - 15. DOI: 10.1111/raq.12035

WIĘCASZEK, B., KESZKA, S., SOBECKA, E., BOEGER, W. A. (2009): Asian pangasiids- an emerging problem for European inland waters? systematic and parasitological aspects. *Acta Ichthyologica Et Piscatoria*, 39 (2): 131 – 138. DOI: 10.3750/AIP2009.39.2.08

RECEIVED JULY 12, 2013

ACCEPTED JANUARY 7, 2014