

**Report of epibiont diatom *P. pacificum* on the cyclopoid copepod *D. affinis* from the southwestern shelf waters of India (eastern Arabian Sea)**

**Amrita Bhaumik<sup>1\*</sup>, Veronica Fernandes<sup>1</sup>, Haimanti Biswas<sup>1,2</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>CSIR-National Institute of Oceanography, Biological Oceanography Division Dona Paula, Goa-403004, India.

<sup>2</sup> Academy of Scientific and Innovative Research (AcSIR), Ghaziabad- 201002

Amrita Bhaumik: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0575-7726>

\*Corresponding author's email id: amrita8016@gmail.com

**Abstract**

*Pseudohimantidium pacificum*, an epizoic diatom has been reported from different parts of the global oceans, however, has not been reported from the shelf waters of India. This symbiotic association of *P. pacificum* with a specific copepod species (*Ditrichocorycaeus affinis*) was repeatedly noticed from the shelf waters of the Arabian Sea during the winter monsoon from three locations in the South East Arabian Sea. Our study suggests towards host specificity of *P. pacificum* and additionally reveals their preference towards male hosts which is consistent with the earlier reports from other regions. Most importantly, this report extends the range of geographic distribution of the epibiont and this is the third report on this epibiont from the Indian Ocean region. It also suggests that epibiosis in marine zooplankton is much frequent phenomenon that has the potential to play an important role in the marine zooplankton population dynamics.

**Keywords :**Epibiont; *P. pacificum*; Zooplankton; Copepod; Epibiosis; Arabian Sea

## 1. Introduction

Marine microorganisms such as bacteria, ciliate, diatoms, *etc.* show a strong affinity towards attachment. Among other microorganisms, the association of some diatoms on the exoskeletons of chitinous zooplankton is rather common in the marine environment (Ohtsuka et al. 2004). Zooplankton provide suitable sites to the diatoms for attachment, growth, and colonization (Walkusz and Rolbiecki 2007). These epibionts benefit through enhanced photosynthesis due to vertical migration of hosts during the daytime, relief from particle-feeding predators, as well as utilization of nutrients released from the host's body and/or from captured prey (Hiromi et al. 1985). In turn, they increase the buoyancy of hosts, thus, lessening the required energy for swimming (Klevenhusen 1933). Additionally, zooplankton could be benefitted via fresh oxygen supply during intensive bloom (Chiavelli et al. 1993). Diatoms are typically host-specific while associating with zooplankton such as copepods (Hiromi et al. 1985; Prasad et al. 1989; Totti et al. 2011). *P. pacificum* is one of the most abundant epibionts (Simonsen 1974; Navarro 1982; Skovgaard and Saiz 2006) which is principally found in Corycaeidae family (Russell and Norris 1971; Hiromi et al. 1985). Giesbrecht (1892) first reported the association between *Corycaeus elongatus* and *P. pacificum*, collected from the Adriatic Sea. Attachment sites of *P. pacificum* vary between male and female copepods. A higher abundance of the diatoms is generally observed on the second antennae, genital and anal segments of males, and the carapace as well as thoracic segments of females (Russell and Norris 1971).

Although quite a few studies had been carried out about the attachment of diatoms on zooplankton from temperate waters, hardly any information is available from tropical and subtropical waters. Reports on the association between *P. pacificum* on *Corycaeus* sp. had mostly been recorded from the United States (Motoda 1963; Russell and Norris 1971; Gibson 1978, 1979; Gárate-Lizárraga and Muñetón-Gómez 2009; Tiffany 2011; Fernandes and Calixto-Feres 2012; Sunesen et al. 2015; Gárate-Lizárraga et al. 2018), Indonesia (Früchtl 1924), Korea (Lee et al. 1993), Spain (Alf Skovgaard and EnricSaiz 2006). Whereas, only a handful of reports are available from India to date (Sahu et al. 2015; Padmakumar et al. 2015). Besides, those studies mostly encompassed offshore of the Bay of Bengal and Northern Arabian Sea, respectively. As yet, no information is available from the shelf waters of the Arabian Sea. The information will help us to generate baseline information about the association between *P. pacificum* and *D. affinis*. from the west coast of India.

## 2. Material and methods

Zooplankton samples were collected onboard *RV Sindhu Sadhana* (SSD-068), during December 2019 from three locations (*i.e.* St 1- 11.002°N, 75.1159°E, St 2- 14°N, 73.33°E, and St 3-

16.0028°N, 72.6179°E) along the southwestern shelf water of India (eastern Arabian Sea) (Figure 1). Zooplankton samples were collected with the help of a multi-plankton net (Multinet, Hydro-bios, Kiel, Germany; mouth area of 0.25 m<sup>2</sup> and mesh size of 200 µm) operated through the mechanical winch covering the upper 200 m water depth by vertical hauls of plankton net and immediately after collection, preserved with 10% formaldehyde in a clean plastic bottle till further analysis. Microscopic analysis was carried out with the help of a stereo zoom microscope (make-Nikon; Model-SMZ-18) as well as an inverted microscope (Make-Nikon; Model-Eclipse Ti2). Photomicrographs, measurements of diatom (n=50), and copepod were obtained by using a compound microscope (Make-Nikon; Model-Eclipse Ci). The copepod (*D. affinis* McMurrich 1916) was identified using the identification keys by Y.S. Kang et al. (1990) and Radhika R. et al. (2020). Whilst, the terminology and systematic position of diatom (*P. pacificum* Hustedt and Krasske 1941) followed Krasske (1941), Simonsen (1970), Gibson (1978, 1979), Hiromi et al. (1985), Rivera et al. (1986), Round et al. (1990), Lee et al. (1993), Garate-Lizárraga and Muñeton-Gomez (2009).

### 3. Results and discussion

The stalked epizoic diatoms which were found attached to the surface of the copepod (*Ditrichocorycaeus affinis*) were morphologically identical with *Pseudohimantidium pacificum*, hence, identified as the same.

#### 3.1. Taxonomic classification and a brief description of the diatom

Hustedt and Krasske (1941) first described the diatom species *P. pacificum* from the Chilean waters, on the eastern coast of the South-West Pacific.

Classification of the diatom:

**Empire:** Eukaryota (Chatton 1925)

**Kingdom:** Chromista (Cavalier-Smith 1981)

**Phylum:** Bacillariophyta (Karsten 1928)

**Subphylum:** Bacillariophytina (Medlin and Kaczmarska 2004)

**Class:** Bacillariophyceae (Haeckel 1878)

**Subclass:** Fragilariophycidae (Round 1990)

**Order:** Protoraphidales (Round 1990)

**Family:** Protoraphidaceae (Simonsen 1970)

**Genus:** *Pseudohimantidium* (Hustedt and Krasske 1941)

**Species:** *P. pacificum* (Hustedt and Krasske 1941)

*Hormophora rogallii* (Jurilj 1957), *Hormophora zavodnikia* (Jurilj 1957), *P. pacificum* var. *minor* (Voigt 1958), *P. adriaticum* (Voigt 1958), and *Sameioneis carinaes* (Russell and Norris 1971) are considered to be synonymous with *P. pacificum* (Simonsen 1974).

### 3.2 Diatom cell morphology

*P. pacificum* can be easily identified regarding the valve shape, presence of axial area, as well as occurrence of a row of labiate processes on both ends of the valve (Rivera et al. 1986; Sunesen et al. 2015). Earlier, Simonsen (1970), Hasle (1973), and Gibson (1979) had precisely described the general morphology of the valves of *P. pacificum*. The frustules were curved in girdle view (Figure 2). Several numbers of the diatom were found to be attached with the copepod through mucilage stalks. Usually, the diatom secretes watery and sticky mucilage (mucopolysaccharides) which becomes the stalk and attaches with the copepod (Russell and Norris 1970). In our present study, most stalks were branched (Figure 2), having more than one frustules attached with it, while, few were branchless. The stalks emerged from the frustules through a series of fissures present at the apices (Gibson 1979).

Measuring the apical and the transapical length of the diatom is another simple way to verify their identification. The length of the apical axis varied from 30-35  $\mu\text{m}$  and these values are in good agreement with the earlier reported values (Voigt 1958; Simonsen 1970; Russell and Norris 1971; Gibson 1978; Lee et al. 1993; Padmakumar et al. 2015). However, according to Voigt (1970), Belyaeva (1973), and Rivera (1986), the apical axis length could reach  $>100 \mu\text{m}$ . The transapical axis of the diatom ranged from 9-12  $\mu\text{m}$ . The transapical axis length was also in agreement with the studies reported by Husted and Krasske (1941), Navarro (1982), Lee et al. (1993), and Fernandes and Calixto-Feres (2012). Table 1 represents a summary based on the previously published report on the cell length of *P. pacificum*.

### 3.3 Host specificity

The interaction between epibiotic diatoms with marine copepods is usually host-specific. Some epibiotic diatoms are facultative epibionts (Gaiser and Bachmann 1994), while, others cannot grow without host copepods (Russell and Norris 1971). *P. pacificum* is an obligate epibiont that cannot survive without a host (Padmakumar et al. 2015). According to the previous findings, the presence of *P. pacificum* can mostly be observed on the copepods belonging to order Cyclopoida (*Corycaeus* sp., *Farronula gracilis*), while, a few reports suggested their association with Harpacticoida (*Euterpina acutiformis*) from a wide range of marine areas (Gibson 1978, 1979; Prasad et al. 1989). *P. pacificum*

was only found attached to the surface of the Cyclopoida (*Ditrichocoryca eusaffinis*) irrespective of the presence of other zooplankton orders from the study locations. Our findings are in agreement with the previous studies carried out from the waters of the Brazilian coastline (Fernandes and Calixto-Feres 2012), Bay of Bengal (Sahu et al. 2015), and Gulf of California (Gárate-Lizárraga et al. 2018).

### **3.4 Preference between the male and female hosts**

Association of *P. pacificum* was predominantly found on the male *D. affinis*, confirmed by the presence of spermatophore except for fewer cases with the female host. Of note, the diatoms were mostly attached to the dorsal surface of the exoskeleton while few could be found on the antennae. Significantly higher abundances of the diatoms on the male copepods were probably due to the male carapace being more hydrophobic, with a rougher exterior that provides a suitable surface for attachment. Also, toxic compounds associated with the female, carrying eggs, could act as a limiting factor for epibiosis (Totti et al. 2011).

### **3.5 Distribution**

The association between the diatom and the copepod has been reported throughout the world (Table 2), however, only two reports are available from Indian waters to date (Sahu et al. 2015; Padmakumar et al. 2015). In accordance with the previous studies, our study confirms extended biogeographic distribution of *P. pacificum*, attached with *D. affinis*, from the shelf waters of the Arabian Sea.

## **4. Conclusion**

While our study included analysis of samples from both shelf and offshore waters, this epibiosis was only observed in the shelf waters. This is the third report on this epibiont from the Indian Ocean region. The apical and transapical length of the diatom is consistent with the available literature. We suggest that *P. pacificum* is primarily a host-specific epibiont. Interestingly, the male copepods were favoured over the female for the attachment. However, before commenting further on the preferences between male over the female, it is of much importance to accumulate detailed information about the ecology on both of the species. In contrast to previous conjectures, epibiosis could be more frequent, especially from the shelf waters of India. As the cruise was conducted during the winter monsoon season (December), thus, further study is required to understand the effect of different seasons on the epibiosis. Nevertheless, the present study provided much-needed information to generate baseline information about the epibiosis between *P. pacificum* and *D. affinis*. from Indian waters.

## 5. Acknowledgment

The authors are grateful to the Director of CSIR-NIO, Goa, India for providing the necessary research facilities. We are thankful to all the participants and ship cell members of SSD068 *RV Sindhu Sadhana* cruise for their help during onboard sampling. We appreciate Dr. Mandar Nanajkar for his help and support. The work was done under the project MLP 1802 of CSIR-NIO, Goa. NIO contribution number is XXXX.

## Conflict of interests

The authors declare no conflict of interest, financially or otherwise.

## References

1. Chiavelli, D. A., Mills, E. L., & Threlkeld, S. T. (1993). Host preference, seasonality, and community interactions of zooplankton epibionts. *Limnology and Oceanography*, 38(3), 574-583.
2. Fernandes, L. F., & Calixto-Feres, M. (2012). Morphology and distribution of two epizoic diatoms (Bacillariophyta) in Brazil. *Acta Botanica Brasilica*, 26(4), 836-841.
3. Früchtl, F. (1924). *Die Cladoceren-und Copepoden-Fauna des Aru-Archipels: MitBeiträgen zur Kenntnis der strukturellen Anomalien indo-pazifischer Plankton-Copepoden* (Vol. 2, No. 2). W. Junk.
4. Gaiser, E. E., & Bachmann, R. W. (1994). Seasonality, substrate preference and attachment sites of epizoic diatoms on cladoceran zooplankton. *Journal of plankton research*, 16(1), 53-68.
5. Gárate-Lizárraga, I., & Muñetón-Gómez, MDS (2009). First record of the diatom epibiont *Pseudohimantidium pacificum* and other symbiotic associations in the Gulf of California. *Actabotánica mexicana* , (88), 31-45.
6. Gibson, R. A. (1978). *Pseudohimantidium pacificum*, AN EPIZOIC DIATOM NEW TO THE FLORIDA CURRENT (WESTERN NORTH ATLANTIC OCEAN) 1, 2. *Journal of Phycology*, 14(3), 371-373.
7. Gibson, R. A. (1979). *Protoraphisatlantica* sp. nov., a new marine epizoic diatom. *Bacillaria*, 2, 109-126.
8. Giesbrecht, W. (1892). *Systematik und Faunistik der pelagischen Copepoden des Golfes von Neapel und der angrenzenden Meeres-Abschnitte* (Vol. 19). R. Friedlander &sohn.
9. Gonzalez, H., & Vergara, L. (1984). Ecological interaction between the epizoic diatom *Pseudohimantidium pacificum* Hust. and Krasske and copepods of genus *Corycaeus*. *Revista de Biología Marina*, 20(1), 77-90.
10. Hasle, G. R. (1973). Some marine plankton genera of the diatom family Thalassiosiraceae. *Nova Hedwigia, Beih*, 45, 1-49.

11. Hiromi, J., Kadota, S., & Takano, H. (1985). Diatom infestation of marine copepods. *Bulletin of Tokai Regional Fisheries Research Laboratory (Japan)*.
12. Jurilj, A. (1957). Epibiontska flora naplanktonskimcopepodima-Novi rod dijatomeja u Jadranskom moru. *Acta Botanica Croatica*, 16(1), 93-104.
13. KANG, Y. S., HUH, S. H., & LEE, S. S. (1990). Taxonomy and distribution of Corycaeidae (Copepoda: Cyclopoida) in the Korean waters in summer. *한국해양학회지*, 25(2), 49-61.
14. Klevenhusen, W., Defant, A., Meyer, K., & Ramner, W. (1933). Die Bevölkerung des Südatlantischen Ozeans mit Coryaceen. de Gruyter.
15. LEE, J. H., LEE, J. Y., & KIM, M. O. (1993). The fine structure of the marine epizoic pennate diatom *Pseudohimantidium pacificum* in Korean coastal waters. *한국해양학회지*, 28(3), 202-211.
16. Lizárraga, I. G., & Esqueda-Escárcega, G. M. (2018). *Ditrichocorycaeus anglicus* (Copepoda; Poecilostomatoida), new basibiont of *Pseudohimantidium pacificum* (Bacillariophyceae) in Bahía de La Paz, Gulf of California. *CICIMAR Océánides*, 33(1), 63-67.
17. Motoda, S. (1963). *Corycaeus* and *Farranula* (Copepoda, Cyclopoida) in Hawaiian waters.
18. Navarro, J. N. (1982). A survey of the marine diatoms of Puerto Rico. IV. Suborder Araphidineae: Families Diatomaceae and Protoraphidaceae. *Botanica Marina*, 25(6), 247-264.
19. Ohtsuka, S., Hanamura, Y., Nagasawa, K., Horiguchi, T., & Suzaki, T. (2004). First record of the occurrence of an ellobiopsid *Thalassomyces marsupii* Kane on a new host of hyperiid amphipod in Japanese waters. *Plankton Biology and Ecology*, 51(2), 110-112.
20. Padmakumar, K. B., Thomas, L. C., Vijayan, A., & Sanjeevan, V. N. (2015). First report of epizoic diatom *Pseudohimantidium pacificum* on copepod *Corycaeus affinis* from North Eastern Arabian Sea.
21. Prasad, A. K. S. K., Livingston, R. J., & Ray, G. L. (1989). The marine epizoic diatom *Falculahyalina* from Choctawhatchee Bay, the Northeastern Gulf of Mexico: Frustule morphology and ecology. *Diatom Research*, 4(1), 119-129.
22. Radhika, R., & Nandan, S. B. (2020). Morpho-taxonomy of Corycaeid Cyclopoids from Lakshadweep Sea, South Eastern Arabian Sea—A Part of the Indian Ocean. In *Dynamics of the Earth System: Evolution, Processes and Interactions* (pp. 141-191). Springer, Cham.
23. Rivera, P. S., González, H. E., & Barrales, H. L. (1986). Cingulum and valve morphology of *Pseudohimantidium* Hustedt & Krasske (Bacillariophyceae). *Phycologia*, 25(1), 19-27.
24. Ross, R., Cox, E. J., Karayeva, N. I., Mann, D. G., Paddock, T. B. B., Simonsen, R., & Sims, P. A. (1979). An amended terminology for the siliceous components of the diatom cell.
25. Russell, D. J., & Norris, R. E. (1971). Ecology and taxonomy of an epizooic diatom.

26. Sahu G, Panigrahi S, Mohanty AK, Achary MS, Samantara MK, Bramha SN, Satpathy KK, Dovgal IV. (2015). New record of an epizoic diatom, *Pseudohimantidium pacificum* on two species of copepods from the Indian Ocean.
27. Simonsen, R. (1974). THE DIATOM PLANKTON OF THE INDIAN OCEAN EXPEDITION OF R/V!! METEOR"1964-1965.
28. Skovgaard, A., & Saiz, E. (2006). Seasonal occurrence and role of protistan parasites in coastal marine zooplankton. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 327, 37-49.
29. Sunesen, I., Romero, S. M., Toubes, E., & Sar, E. A. (2015). Morphology and distribution of three araphid diatoms (Fragilariophyceae, Bacillariophyta) from marine coastal waters of Argentina.
30. Tiffany, M. A. (2011). Epizoic and epiphytic diatoms. In *The diatom world* (pp. 195-209). Springer, Dordrecht.
31. Totti, C., Romagnoli, T., De Stefano, M., & Bavestrello, G. (2010). The diversity of epizoic diatoms. In *All flesh is grass* (pp. 323-343). Springer, Dordrecht.
32. Voigt, M. (1958). Notes on some Diatoms belonging to the genus *Pseudohimantidium*. *Life and Environment*, 53-57.
33. Walkusz, W., & Rolbiecki, L. (2007). Epibionts (Paracineteta) and parasites (Ellobiopsis) on copepods from Spitsbergen (Kongsfjorden area). *Oceanologia*, 49(3).

### **Caption and Legends**

Figure 1. Map of sampling locations.

Figure 2. A: Light micrographs of the *P. pacificum* cells on the exoskeleton of *D. affinis*. The arrows point the diatom cells (Scale bar: 100µm). B: Magnified view of the diatom colony (Scale bar: 50 µm).






Figure 1.



Figure 2.

Table 1. Measurements of *P. pacificum* based on available literature and the present study.

Apical length (µm)	Transapical length (µm)	Reference
44-78	9-11	Husted and Krasske, 1941
31-35	7.5	Voigt,1958
85-106	8-10	Voigt,1970
31-102,85-113	8-12,8-11	Simonsen,1970
28-70	9-15	Russell and Norris,1971
40-112	8-12	Belyaeva,1973
70-108	8-13	Belyaeva,1973
32-53	7-15	Gibson,1978
38-49	9-13	Navarro,1982
38-105 (70-90)	9.8-19 (12-14)	Rivera,1986
34-76	9-14	Lee et al.,1993
39-46	9-13	Fernandes and Calixto-Feres ,2012
38-44	10-14	Sahu et al.,2015
42-47	8.5-10.5	Sunesen et al.,2015
32-51	7-14	Padmakumar et al.,2015
28-70	10-17	Gárate-Lizárraga et al., 2018
30-35	9-12	<b>Present study</b>

Table 2. Worldwide records of different copepod species colonized by the diatom *P. pacificum*.

Host species	Location	Author(s)
<i>Agetus limbatus</i> (Brady, 1883) (= <i>Corycaeus limbatus</i> )	Adriatic sea	Giesbrecht, 1892
<i>Corycaeus crassiusculus</i> (Dana, 1849) (= <i>Corycaeus elongatus</i> )	Gulf of Naples	Giesbrecht, 1892
<i>Corycaeus obtusus</i> (Dana, 1849)	Adriatic sea	Steuer, 1910
<i>Ditrichocorycaeus brehmi</i> (Steuer, 1910) (= <i>Corycaeus brehmi</i> )		
<i>Farranula rostrata</i> (Claus, 1863) (= <i>Corycaeus rostratus</i> )		
<i>Farranula gibbula</i> (Giesbrecht, 1891)	Aru Islands, Indonesia	Früchtl, 1924
<i>Corycaeus spiciosus</i> (Dana, 1849)	South Atlantic Ocean	Klevenhusen, 1933
<i>Agetus flaccus</i> (Giesbrecht, 1891) (= <i>Corycaeus flaccus</i> )		
<i>Urocorycaeus lautus</i> (Dana, 1849) (= <i>Corycaeus lautus</i> )		
<i>Corycaeus crassiusculus</i> (Dana, 1849)	Hawaiian water	Motoda, 1963
<i>Ditrichocorycaeus affinis</i> (McMurrich, 1916)	Northern part of Puget Sound, Washington	Russell and Norris, 1971
<i>Corycaeus spiciosus</i> (Dana, 1849)	Western North Atlantic Ocean	Gibson, 1978
<i>Farranula gracilis</i> (Dana, 1849) (= <i>Corycaeus gracilis</i> )		
<i>Corycaeus</i> ( <i>Ditrichocorycaeus</i> ) <i>subulatus</i> (Herrick, 1887) (= <i>Corycaeus subulatus</i> )		
<i>Onychocorycaeus giesbrechti</i> (Dahl F., 1894) (= <i>Corycaeus giesbrechti</i> )		
<i>Corycaeus speciosus</i> (Dana, 1849)	Ft. Pierce Inlet, Florida	Gibson, 1978; 1979
<i>Euterpina acutifrons</i> (Dana, 1847)		
<i>Corycaeus</i> ( <i>Ditrichocorycaeus</i> ) <i>subulatus</i> (Herrick, 1887)		
<i>Corycaeus</i> sp.	Southern Pacific Ocean	Rivera et al., 1986

<i>Ditrichocorycaeus affinis</i> (McMurrich,1916)	Korean coastal waters	Lee et al.,1993
<i>Corycaeus</i> sp.	Barcelona, Spain	Alf Skovgaard and Enric Saiz, 2006
<i>Farranula gibbula</i> (Giesbrecht, 1891)	The Bay of La Paz, Gulf of California	Gárate-Lizárraga and Muñetón-Gómez, 2009
<i>Euterpina acutifrons</i> (Dana, 1847)	Mission Bay, California,	Tiffany, 2011
<i>Euterpina acutifrons</i> (Dana, 1847)	Brazilian coastline	Fernandes and Calixto-Feres ,2012
<i>Ditrichocorycaeus amazonicus</i> (Dahl F., 1894) (=Corycaeus <i>amazonicus</i> )		
<i>Euterpina acutifrons</i> (Dana, 1847)	coastal waters of Argentina	Sunesen et al., 2015
<i>Euterpina acutifrons</i> (Dana, 1847)	Bay of Bengal, India	Sahu et al., 2015
<i>Corycaeus</i> sp. (Dana, 1849)		
<i>Ditrichocorycaeus affinis</i> (McMurrich,1916)	North Eastern Arabian Sea, India	Padmakumar et al., 2015
<i>Ditrichocorycaeus anglicus</i> (Lubbock, 1857)	Bahía de La Paz, Gulf of California	Gárate-Lizárraga et al., 2018
<i>Oithona nana</i> (Giesbrecht, 1893)	Sao Paulo State, Brazil	Fernando Gomez et al., 2018
<i>Onychocorycaeus giesbrechti</i> (Dahl F., 1894) (=Corycaeus <i>giesbrechti</i> )		
<i>Ditrichocorycaeus affinis</i> (McMurrich,1916)		<b>Present study</b>
	Coastal waters of Arabian Sea, India	