

DOI: 10.53660/CONJ-714-806

Helminth parasites of *Hoplias malabaricus* (Bloch, 1794) in areas of Brazilian Amazon with different degree of deforestation

Parasitas helmintos de *Hoplias malabaricus* (Bloch, 1794) em áreas da Amazônia Brasileira com diferentes graus de desmatamento

F. Da Silva Lima^{11*}; H. P. S. De MELO²; L. M. A. CAMARGO³; R. M. TAKEMOTO⁴; D. U. O. MENEGUETTI¹; L. R. VIRGILIO¹

RESUMO

Os parasitas são considerados elementos integrantes dos ecossistemas aquáticos e fornecem informações sobre a influência da degradação ambiental na riqueza e distribuição de espécies. Relatar a distribuição das espécies de Helmintos de *Hoplias malabaricus* em regiões da Amazônia com diferentes graus de desmatamento. O estudo foi realizado por meio de bancos de dados online sobre a fauna parasitária de *H. malabaricus* em Estados da Amazônia Legal e dados de amostragem da fauna parasitária de peixes no Acre e sul do Amazonas. A helmintofauna de *H. malabaricus* foi analisada e identificada em laboratório. Índices parasitários e análises estatísticas avaliaram a influência do desmatamento na riqueza e composição de espécies parasitárias. Um total de 42 espécies de parasitas de *H. malabaricus* foram distribuídos em seis estados da Amazônia legal. Nos níveis local (Municípios) e regional (Estados), o tamanho das áreas desmatamento nos ambientes, menor a riqueza de espécies parasitárias. Em conclusão, *H. malabaricus* apresentou uma fauna parasitária rica e bem distribuída por toda a Amazônia. Além disso, os efeitos do desmatamento em algumas regiões foram mais pronunciados em táxons de parasitas heteroxenos do que em monoxenos.

Palavras-chave: Parasitos de peixes; Infracomunidade; Degradação ambiental; Distribuição de espécies.

ABSTRACT

Parasites are considered integral elements in aquatic ecosystems and provide information on the influence of environmental degradation on species richness and distribution. To report the distribution of the Helminth species of *Hoplias malabaricus* in regions of the Amazon with different degrees of deforestation. The study was carried out through online databases about the parasitic fauna of *H. malabaricus* in States of the Legal Amazon and sampling data from the fish parasite fauna in Acre and southern Amazonas. The helminth fauna of *H. malabaricus* was analyzed and identified in the laboratory. Parasite indexes and statistical analyses assessed the influence of deforestation on parasite species richness and composition. A total of 42 species of *H. malabaricus* parasites were distributed in six States of the legal Amazon. At the local (Municipalities) and regional (States) levels, the size of deforestation areas negatively influenced the

^{1,} Universidade Federal do Acre

³ Universidade de São Paulo

⁴ Universidade Estadual de Maringá

^{*} E-mail: fabricial2918s@gmail.com

richness of parasite species, the higher the deforestation rate in the environments, the lower the richness of parasite species. In conclusion, *H. malabaricus* had a rich parasite fauna and well distributed throughout the Amazon. Besides, the effects of deforestation in some regions were more pronounced in taxa of heteroxenous parasites than in monoxenous.

Keywords: Fish parasites; Infracommunity; Environmental degradation; Species distribution.

INTRODUCTION

Evidence suggests that the Amazon rainforest is responsible for maintaining many ecological factors, making it the primary source of diversity for other Neotropical regions (ANTONELLI, ZIZKA, et al., 2018). These forest ecosystems form physical habitats and ecological paths responsible for structuring aquatic communities (SHAW, BIBLE, 1996). They also contribute to the habitat complexity, providing terrestrial resources that control sedimentation and silting in these environments (LO, REED, et al., 2020, TOHAM, TEUGELS, 1999). However, due to the growing demand for resources, mainly fuel and food, the Amazon rainforest has faced continuous pressure in recent decades, leaving its biological structure at risk (KHAN, M A Wadud, BOHANNAN, et al., 2019). One of the main threats is the conversion of forest to pasture, urban, and mining areas, generating impacts considerable on microorganism, plant, and animal communities (BIERREGAARD, GASCON, et al., 2001, COE, COSTA, et al., 2009, RANJAN, PAULA, et al., 2015, RODRIGUES, PELLIZARI, et al., 2013).

Conserved versus degraded environments provide alternative ecological conditions in freshwater habitats, and these environmental filters can determine the distribution of some aquatic organisms, such as specialist and generalist species (CÓRDOVA-TAPIA, HERNÁNDEZ-MARROQUÍN, *et al.*, 2018, ZENI, HOEINGHAUS, *et al.*, 2020). Thus, the present study predicts that the distribution of some species can be influenced by the change in their habitats. More heterogeneous environments will present both generalist and specialist species, while species composition will decrease in degraded environments, making these environments more homogeneous and richer in the most common species.

The interspecific host-parasite relationship is considered to be one of the oldest existing relationships, with the fauna of fish parasites generally harboring several parasite taxa and functional groups with a variety of strategies and life cycles (VAUGHN, TAYLOR, 2000). Parasites are considered essential and integral elements in aquatic ecosystems where they conduct fundamental ecological processes, such as contributing to the system biodiversity, productivity, and structure of the food chain (MARCOGLIESE, D.J., 2004a, POULIN, 1999). A healthy ecosystem, i.e., functional and resilient (COSTANZA, MAGEAU, 1999), is, therefore, a system rich in parasite species (HUDSON, DOBSON, *et al.*, 2006).

The parasite fauna of fish can provide valuable information about the quality, integrity, and health of a system in response to pollutants and other stressors (SURES, NACHEV, et al., 2017). The parasite community composition of fish depends on several factors related to the environment (low water quality, pH changes, availability of dissolved oxygen, variations in temperature, water level, and seasonality effects), to the host (habitat, feeding behavior, physiology, age, and sex), and their biology (heteroxenous, monoxenous, ectoparasite, or endoparasite) (TAKEMOTO, PAVANELLI, et al., 2009). Thus, understanding whether the diversity of parasites is increasing or decreasing is vital for conservation since parasites form a special class of consumers crucial for balancing the ecological factors (LAFFERTY, DOBSON, et al., 2006).

The host species used in this study was *Hoplias malabaricus*. That is a naturally abundant and opportunistic species, occurring in many environments with different degrees of conservation, such as lakes, rivers, and streams. Besides, this species has a non-migratory behavior, even over short geographical distances, which guarantees the isolation between specimens of this species (FARIA, CAVALCANTE-NETO, *et al.*, 2019), allowing the comparison of these parasite communities on a local and regional scale. Its trophic position also allows the occurrence of parasite communities with high species richness and diversity(BAIA, FLORENTINO, *et al.*, 2018, GONÇALVES, OLIVEIRA, *et al.*, 2016, MONIZ, MONIZ, *et al.*, 2021, OLIVEIRA, CORRÊA, *et al.*, 2018). This host species has a well-studied parasite fauna and has been considered the continental neotropical fish with the highest parasite richness (LUQUE, POULIN, 2007, ROSIM, Daniele F., MENDOZA-FRANCO, *et al.*, 2011).

Despite the great diversity of helminth species recorded for *H. malabaricus*, the knowledge about the geographic distribution of its parasites in the Amazon remains incomplete in some places because of its wide distribution in the Neotropical region. Moreover, few studies have evaluated the difference in the distribution, richness and

composition of the helminth fauna between environments with varying degrees of degradation. Thus, research on how anthropic actions affect the diversity and distribution of species will serve as a database for decision making on conservation, monitoring, and management actions in these Amazonian areas. In this sense, the present study aims to report the distribution of Helminth species of *H. malabaricus* in regions of the Amazon with different degrees of deforestation, in addition to analyzing whether there is a difference in the species composition and groups (heteroxenous and monoxenous) of parasites between these environments.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

Study area

The study was carried out in States of the Legal Amazon (Figure 1), which cover about 60% of the Brazilian territory. In addition to the northern Brazilian States (Amazonas, Acre, Amapá, Rondônia, Roraima, Tocantins, and Pará), parts of Mato Grosso and Maranhão are also within the Amazon region. The region is covered by an extensive tropical forest, with transition regions with other biomes, such as the Cerrado and Pantanal (CARVALHO, DOMINGUES, 2016).



Figure 1. Occurrence sites of studies about the parasite fauna of *h. malabaricus* in the Legal Amazon.

Data base

We carried out a literature review using the descriptor on the online databases: Scientific Electronic Library Online, Web of Science, Scopus, Science Direct, Zoological Records, CAB Abstracts Archive, and Google Scholar to evaluate the parasite fauna distribution of *H. malabaricus* in the Legal Amazon region (Table 1). We checked the geographic coordinates on Google Earth, and we generated a geographic distribution map of the parasite groups (Digenea, Monogenea, Nematoda, and Acanthocephala) in the Brazilian Amazon region, using the QGIS software version 3.12.2.

Table 1. Municipalities in the legal Amazon with studies of *H. malabaricus* parasites, categorized according to degrees of deforestation.

Location	Categories	Deforestation level
Buritis - RO	≤25%	Low deforestation
Santa Cruz do Arari - PA		
Rio Branco-AC		
Altamira-PA		
Viseu, Pará		
Terra Alta - PA		
Cruzeiro don Sul AC	26 - 60%	Medium deforestation
Irituia- PA		
Nova Timboteua - PA		
Guajará - AM		
Bragança - PA		
Macapá - AP		
Santana - AP	>60%	High deforestation
Mazagão – AP		
Anajás-Ilha do Marajó- PA		
tangara da serra- MT		
Laranjal do Jari –AP		
Cocalinho – MT		

The data from the northwestern regions of the State of Acre (AC) and the extreme southwesternmost State of Amazonas (AM) were obtained through sampling around the municipalities of Cruzeiro do Sul - AC and Guajará - AM, Brazil (Figure 1). We selected five sub-basins in these regions: (i) Juruá River (7°40'34.1"S 72°39'39.5"W); (ii) Crôa River (7°71'48.30"S 72°53'34.98"W), (iii) Môa River (7°37'18"S 72°47'47"W); (iv) Ipixuna River (7°17'13"S 72°36'49"W); and (v) Gama River (7°37'13"S 72°16'49"W).

Fish sampling

Fish were sampled (SISBIO 59642-2/2019) between August 2019 and May 2020 in each of the sub-basin regions.

We carried out passive fish collections using 12 gillnets of 80 m long and 3.0 m high, distributed in 1.5 cm, 2.5 cm, 3.5 cm, 5.5 cm mash sizes between opposite nodes in areas of rivers, lakes, and streams. The nets were installed in the early afternoon, remaining exposed for 24 hours. Captures were made every 4 hours, in which samples were obtained for the morning, afternoon, and evening periods. We performed active collections with a 25 m long and 2.5 m high trawl, trawled through the banks of lakes, rivers, and streams. A net with 12 m in diameter and 1.8 m height was also used for 24 hour-sampling in the environments, with six throws every four hours in the margin, six in the current, and six in backwater areas.

The captured 216 specimens of *H. malabaricus* were measured, weighed, and necropsied. Some individuals, after biometrics, were fixed in 10% formalin and taken to the laboratory, where they were deposited in the Ichthyological Collection of the Federal University of Acre. We had a permit from the Brazilian Institute for the Environment and Renewable Natural Resources (No. 59642-2 / 2019).

Parasite analysis

The fish taken to the laboratory were subjected to parasite analysis. First, the tegument was scraped using microscope slides to check for the presence of ectoparasites. The individuals were then anesthetized with eugenol solution, collecting monogenoids on the fish external surface and fins. They were washed with 0.65% physiological saline (NaCl) and then examined under a stereomicroscope. The eyes were removed and placed in Petri dishes in the same solution to be examined, and the gills were removed and placed in a flask for fixation and analysis of Monogenoidea.

Digenea and Nematoda were collected through a longitudinal incision using a scalpel, from the anus towards the head, to expose the visceral cavity contents. Internal organs were carefully removed and separated individually in Petri dishes containing 0.65% physiological saline. Once separated, the organs were examined and parasites fixed. Monogenoidea parasites found were mounted in Hoyer's medium between the slide and coverslip, stained with Langeron's hydrochloric carmine, and mounted on a slide and

coverslip in Canadian balsam. Nematoda was clarified and mounted on semi-permanent slides in Phenol.

Helminth identification was performed according to (KRITSKY, THATCHER, *et al.*, 1980, 1986, YAMAGUTI, Satyu, 1968) and (COHEN, JUSTO, *et al.*, 2013) for Monogenoidea; (YAMAGUTI, S., 1971) for Digenea; and (ASSIS, FERREIRA, *et al.*, 2019) for Nematoda, besides specialized literature.

Description of deforestation dataset

Deforestation increase data were obtained for six States (Acre, Amazona, Para, Amapá, Rondônia, and Mato Grosso) and 18 municipalities belonging to the legal Amazon between 2008 and 2019, through the Terrabrasilis INPE database (MORAVEC, 1998) (Figure 2). These regions were chosen because they had studies focusing on the helminth fauna of *H. malabaricus*. The rate of deforestation increase was based on data from the Project for Deforestation Monitoring in the Legal Amazon by Satellite (PRODES) that covers vegetation in areas of any size, including less than 6.25 hectares. This approach showed that the total area deforested in 2019 in the Amazon was 10,896 km2. Calculated since 2008, the increase tends to be slightly higher than the official deforestation rate. However, the increase allows monitoring of deforestation evolution in municipalities, conservation units, and indigenous lands, filters that cannot be adopted in the annual rate calculation. For the entire length of the Brazilian Legal Amazon (ALB), the PRODES system, used by Terrabrasilis, inventories the primary forest loss through satellite images. PRODES aims to estimate the annual deforestation rate through primary forest clear-cutting in ALB.

Thus, these data on cumulate deforestation increase in each of the 18 municipalities were correlated with species richness and used to assess the degree of deforestation, correlating them with fish parasite composition. Moreover, we used these data to generate the distribution map of parasite species in the legal Amazon, using the QGIS software version 3.12.2.

From the PRODES data, municipalities were categorized into groups according to the deforestation rate. The variables used were constructed using the ratio between the cumulative deforested area and municipality area. Areas with rates <25% were considered low, between 26% and 50% medium, and <50% high (Table 1). These groups were

created to assess the similarity in parasite composition among areas with different degrees of deforestation in the Amazon.

Data analysis

Prevalence, mean abundance, mean intensity, and parasite richness data were evaluated according to (BUSH, LAFFERTY, *et al.*, 1997) for field and literature data. The parasites were divided into two groups (marked 'm' and 'h' in tables 1 and 2) regarding the reproduction mode: (i) Monoxenous (m, the life cycle of a single host); and (ii) Heteroxenous (h, the life cycle of multiple hosts).

The variation in parasite composition was expressed by the multivariate homogeneity of group dispersions (ANDERSON, ELLINGSEN, *et al.*, 2006). This method proposes that the variation of a group of sample units in a given area can be measured as mean distance (or dissimilarity) from a single sample to a centroid group. This method is calculated in the main coordinates space (PCoA – Principal Coordinates Analysis), evaluating the distances between sample units and their respective centroids. Greater distances from the centroid express higher variability. The areas used for the analysis were divided into categories of high, medium, and low deforestation. PCoA axes were generated based on the similarity calculated for presence and absence data of parasites, in the regions of the Legal Amazon, in a Sorensen similarity matrix. PERMANOVA (Permutational Multivariate Analysis of Variance) was used with the Sørensen index to test any differences in species composition, using the municipalities (environments with different degrees of deforestation: low, medium, and high). The significance was obtained using a Monte Carlo method with 999 permutations.

RESULTS

We found a total of 42 parasite species of *H. malabaricus*, distributed in six states of the legal Amazon, 15 in the State of Amapá, 14 in Acre, 12 in Pará, 12 in Amazonas, ten in Mato Grosso, and one in Rondônia (Figure 2). The groups with the broadest distribution in the Amazon were Nematoda, Digenea, and Monogenea (Figure 1). We found only two species of Acanthocephalus, *Gorytocephalus spectabilis* in Amapá and *Quadrigyrus* spp. in Acre.



Figure 2. Area of cumulative deforestation increase (km^2) in the States of the Legal Amazon.

Pará was the State with the highest richness of monoxenous ectoparasites (Richness-S:7), and Amapá had the highest richness of heteroxenous endoparasites (S = 12) (Figure 3).

Nematoda was the parasite group with the greatest distribution in the Amazon, with high richness in Acre (S = 7; Prevalence = 80%; Mean abundance = 0.20; Mean intensity = 1.9), Amapá (S = 5; P = 100%; AM = 5.9; IM = 5.9), and Mato Grosso (S = 5; P = 29%; AM = 0.29; IM = 1). Therefore, the larvae of *Contracaecum* and *Eustrongylides* were the taxa with the greatest distribution among the states. However, *Cystidicoloides* sp. was restricted to Amapá, *Paracapillaria* (P) *piscicola*, *Porrocaecum* spp. to Mato Grosso, and *Nilonema* sp. and *Procamallanus* (S.) *neocaballeroi* restricted to Acre (Figure 3, Table 2 and 3).



Figure 3. Distribution of Nematoda parasites of *H. malabaricus* in areas with different deforestation degrees in the Legal Amazon. A - Eastern Amazon Region; B - Western Amazon Region; C - Region of Rondônia and Amazon of Mato Grosso.

Table 2. Parasite fauna of *H. malabaricus* distributed in the Legal Amazon. Dig-Digenea; Nem-Nematoda; Mon-Monogenea; Acant- Acantocephala; Cest- Cestoda. N- Number of fish individuals; P- Prevalence; IM- Mean intensity; AM- Mean Abundance; TNP- Total parasites per fish; SI- Infestation Site; h- Heteroxenous; and m- Monoxenous. Mes-Mesentery; Br– Gills; Ms - Muscle; Fig- Liver; Est - Stomach; Ov - Ovary; Bo - Mouth; Nar - Nostril.

Species	Ν	P (%)	MI	MA	TNP	Group	SI	Group	Location	Reference
<i>Clinostomum marginatum</i> Braun, 1899 (larvae)	30	83.3	25.8	21.5	645	Dig.	Mest	Н	AP	(OLIVEIRA, CORRÊA, <i>et al.</i> ,
Pseudoproleptus sp. (larvae)	30	96.7	13.3	12.9	388	Nem.	Mest	Н	AP	2018)
Contracaecum sp. (larvae)	30	90.0	5.5	4.8	143	Nem.	Mest	Н	AP	
Gorytocephalus spectabilis Machado, 1959	30	23.3	8.4	1.4	35	Acant.	Mest	Н	AP	
Constrictoanchoratus ptilonophallus	-	-	-	-	35	Mon.	Br.	М	PA	

$ \begin{array}{c} Urocleidoides brasiliensis 6 & Mon. Br. m PA & RODRIGUES, et al., 2018) \\ Luque, 2011 \\ Urocleidoides cuiabai 4 & Mon. Br. m PA \\ Rosim.Mendoza-Franco and \\ Luque, 2011 \\ Urocleidoides bubophaltus 8 & Mon. Br. m PA \\ Urocleidoides bubophaltus 8 & Mon. Br. m PA \\ Urocleidoides bubophaltus 8 & Mon. Br. m PA \\ Urocleidoides bubophaltus 2 & Mon. Br. m PA \\ Urocleidoides bubophaltus 2 & Mon. Br. m PA \\ Urocleidoides bubophaltus 2 & Mon. Br. m PA \\ Urocleidoides bubophaltus 2 & Mon. Br. m PA \\ Urocleidoides bubophaltus 2 & Mon. Br. m PA \\ Urocleidoides bubophaltus 2 & Mon. Br. m PA \\ Urocleidoides bubophaltus 2 & Mon. Br. m PA \\ Urocleidoides bubophaltus 2 & Mon. Br. m PA \\ Urocleidoides bubophaltus 2 & Mon. Br. m PA \\ Urocleidoides bubophaltus 2 & Mon. Br. m PA \\ Urocleidoides bubophaltus 2 & Mon. Br. m PA \\ Urocleidoides bubophaltus 2 & Mon. Br. m PA \\ Urocleidoides bubophaltus 2 & Mon. Br. m PA \\ Urocleidoides bubophaltus 2 & Mon. Br. m PA \\ Urocleidoides bubophaltus 2 & Mon. Br. m PA \\ Urocleidoides bubophaltus$	Constrictoanchoratus lemmyi	-	-	-	-	6	Mon.	Br.	m	PA	(FERREIRA,
Rosim, Mendoza-Franco and Luque, 2011 $al., 2018$) $al., 2018$) Urocleidoides cutabai $ 4$ Mon. Br. m PA Rosim, Mendoza-Franco and Luque, 2011 $ 8$ Mon. Br. m PA Urocleidoides $ 2$ Mon. Br. m PA Urocleidoides $ 2$ Mon. Br. m PA (JEMENTF, etc.) Insolutionaris surfaces $ 2$ Mon. Br. m PA (JEMENTF, etc.) MONIZ, etc., al. Isystem 0 9.56 5.4 $ 25$ Nem. Br h AC 2021 <	Urocleidoides brasiliensis	-	-	-	-	6	Mon.	Br.	m	PA	RODRIGUES, et
Laque, 2011 Uncoleidoides cuiabai 4 Mon. Br. m PA Rosim, Mendoza-Franco and Laque, 2011 Urcoleidoides bulbophallus 8 Mon. Br. m PA Urcoleidoides bulbophallus 2 Mon. Br. m PA Urcoleidoides cremitus Kritsky, 2 Mon. Br. m PA Urcoleidoides cuiabai Constraints Franco and Laque 2011 Clinostomum dimorphum 104 0.96 2 0.02 Dig. Mest h PA (BENIGNO, M. N.R., 1899 Lityoelinostonum dimorphum 104 0.96 2 0.02 Dig. Ms h PA (CLEMENTE, et al., 2012) Contracaceum sp. 9 56 5.4 - 27 Nem. Fig.; h AC (MONIZ, et al., 2012) Contracaceum sp. 9 56 5.4 - 25 Nem. Br h AC 2021) Eastrongylides sp. 9 56 5.4 - 25 Nem. Ms h RO (MENEGUETTI, Sortau, 2014) Eastrongylides sp. 9 56 5.4 - 20 Nem h AP (BEAL, 2014) Eastrongylides sp. 9 56 5.4 - 20 Nem h AP (MENEGUETTI, 2014) Procamallamus 67 20 Nem h AP Frocamallamus 67 20 Nem h AP Procamallamus 9 67 20 Nem h AP Urcoleidoiglostomum sp. 67 20 Nem h AP Dendrorchis neivai Travassos, 67 20 Nem h AP Dendrorchis neivai Travassos, 77 20 Nem h AP Dist 20 Nem h AP Dist	Rosim, Mendoza-Franco and										al., 2018)
$ \begin{array}{c} Irrectendates cuadati & - & - & - & 4 \\ Mon. Br. m PA \\ Iaque, 2011 \\ Urocleidoides bublophallus & - & - & - & 8 \\ Urocleidoides bublophallus & - & - & - & 8 \\ Urocleidoides bublophallus & - & - & - & 2 \\ Urocleidoides cremitus Kritsky, & - & - & - & 2 \\ Urocleidoides membro sorbens Braun, 104 30.7 \\ Issop & 1.84 \\ Urocleidoides arbon braun 104 30.7 \\ Issop & 1.84 \\ Urocleidoides num dimorphum 104 0.96 2 0.02 \\ Urocleidoides sorbens Braun, 104 30.7 \\ Issop & 1.84 \\ Urocleidoides sorbens Braun, 104 0.96 2 0.02 \\ Urocleidoides sorbens Braun, 104 0.96 2 0.02 \\ Urocleidoides sorbens Braun, 104 0.96 5 \\ Urocleidoides sorbens Braun, 104 0.96 2 0.02 \\ Urocleidoides sorbens Braun, 189 \\ Urocleidoides soremintus Kritsky, 3 07$	Luque, 2011							D		DA	
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Urocleidoides cuiabai Posim Mondoza Eronoo and	-	-	-	-	4	Mon.	Br.	m	PA	
$ \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 $	Luque 2011										
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Urocleidoides bulbophallus	-	-	-	-	8	Mon.	Br.	m	PA	
Thatcher, and Boeger, 1986 Urocleidoides PA malabaricus/Rosim, Mendoza- Franco and Luque 2011 Climostomumorphis sorbens Braun, 104 30.7 1.84 0.57 - Dig. Mest h PA (BENIGNO, M. N. R. 1899 Dissing, 1850 O 2 0.02 Dig. Ms h PA CLEMENTE, et al. (2012) Contracaecum sp. 9 56 5.4 - 27 Nem. Fig.; h AC QUDNIZ, et al., 2012) Contracaecum sp. 9 56 5.4 - 25 Nem. Br h AC 2021) Eustrongylides sp. 9 56 5.4 - 25 Nem. Br h AC 2021) Listrongylides sp. 9 56 5.4 - 25 Nem. Br h AC 2021) Procamallanus 100 10.47 FLORENTHO, restrict and solution of the all solut	Urocleidoides eremitus Kritsky,	-	-	-	-	2	Mon.	Br.	m	PA	
$ \begin{array}{ccccccc} Urocleidoides & - & - & - & 2 & Mon. & Br. & m & PA \\ malabaricus/Rosim, Mendoza-Franco and Luque 2011 \\ Clinostomatopsis sorbens Braun, & 104 & 30.7 & 1.84 & 0.57 & - & Dig. & Mest & h & PA & (BENIGNO, M. N.R., R.) \\ 1899 \\ lthyoclinostomum dimorphum & 104 & 0.96 & 2 & 0.02 & Dig. & Ms & h & PA & CLEMENTE, et al., 2012) \\ Contracaecum sp. & 9 & 56 & 5.4 & - & 27 & Nem. & Fig.; & h & AC & (MONIZ, et al., 2012) \\ Contracaecum sp. & 9 & 56 & 5.4 & - & 25 & Nem. & Br & h & AC & 2021) \\ Eastrongylides sp. & 9 & 56 & 5.4 & - & 25 & Nem. & Br & h & AC & 2021) \\ Eastrongylides sp. & 9 & 56 & 5.4 & - & 25 & Nem. & Br & h & AC & 2021) \\ Procamallanus & 67 & - & - & 20 & Nem. & - & h & AP & (BAIA, FLORENTINO, et al., 2014) \\ Soprocephalus spectabilis & 67 & - & - & 20 & Nem. & - & h & AP \\ Procamallanus & 67 & - & - & 20 & Nem. & - & h & AP \\ Procamallanus & 67 & - & - & 20 & Nem. & - & h & AP \\ Procamallanus & 67 & - & - & 20 & Nem. & - & h & AP \\ Procamallanus & 67 & - & - & 20 & Nem. & - & h & AP \\ Procamallanus & 67 & - & - & 20 & Nem. & - & h & AP \\ Procamallanus & 67 & - & - & 20 & Nem. & - & h & AP \\ Procamallanus & 67 & - & - & 20 & Nem. & - & h & AP \\ Procamallanus & 67 & - & - & 20 & Nem. & - & h & AP \\ Procamallanus & 67 & - & - & 20 & Nem. & - & h & AP \\ Procamallanus & 67 & - & - & 20 & Nem. & - & h & AP \\ Dracleidoides eremitus Kritsky, & 67 & - & - & 20 & Nem. & - & h & AP \\ Urocleidoides eremitus Kritsky, & 67 & - & - & 20 & Nem. & - & h & AP \\ Urocleidoides eremitus Kritsky, & 397.0 & - & 28.2 & - & Mon. & Br & m & AP \\ Urocleidoides eremitus Kritsky, & 33 & 97.0 & - & 28.2 & - & Mon. & Br & m & AP \\ Urocleidoides eremitus Kritsky, & 33 & 2.4 & - & 3.9 & - & Dig. & Br, & h & AP \\ Dracherochis neival Travassos, & 13 & 2.4 & - & 3.9 & - & Dig. & Br, & h & AP \\ Mathedo, 1926 & & & & & & & & & & \\ Dendrorchis neival Travassos, & 13 & 2.4 & - & 3.9 & - & Dig. & Br, & h & AP \\ Dracherochis neival Travassos, & 13 & 0.6 & - & Nem. & Est & h & AP \\ Contracaecum sp. & 33 & 32.4 & - & 3.9 & - & Dig. &$	Thatcher, and Boeger, 1986										
	Urocleidoides	-	-	-	-	2	Mon.	Br.	m	PA	
$ \begin{array}{c} \mbox{France and Luque 2011} \\ \mbox{Climostomatops is sorbens Braun, 104} 30.7 1.84 0.57 - Dig. Mest h PA (BENIGNO, M. N. R., 1899) \\ \mbox{Ithyoclinostomum dimorphum 104} 0.96 2 0.02 Dig. Ms h PA (LEMENTE, et al., 2012) \\ Contracaecum sp. 9 56 5.4 - 27 Nem. Fig.: h AC (MONIZ, et al., 2012) \\ \mbox{Custrongylides sp. 9 56 5.4 - 25 Ncm. Br h AC 2021) \\ \mbox{Eustrongylides sp. 9 56 5.4 - 25 Ncm. Br h AC 2021) \\ \mbox{Eustrongylides sp. 9 56 5.4 - 25 Ncm. Br h AC 2021) \\ \mbox{Eustrongylides sp. 30 93.3 1.47 - 44 Nem. Ms h RO (MENEGUETTI, SOARES, et al., 2014) \\ \mbox{Fractandlanus 6 7 20 Nem h AP (BAIA, FLORENTINO, et al., 2018) \\ \mbox{Artigas & Pereira, 1928 Gorveceptabulas spectabilis 67 20 Nem h AP (BAIA, FLORENTINO, et al., 2018) \\ \mbox{Artigas & Preira, 1928 Gorveceptabulas spectabilis 67 20 Nem h AP (Procamdlanus sp. 67 20 Nem h AP (Procamdlanus sp. 67 20 Nem h AP (DENTINO, et al., 2018) \\ \mbox{Procamaltanus sp. 67 20 Nem h AP (DENTINO, et al., 2018) \\ \mbox{Procamaltanus sp. 67 20 Nem h AP (DENTINO, et al., 2018) \\ \mbox{Procamaltanus sp. 67 20 Nem h AP (DENTINO, et al., 2018) \\ \mbox{Procamaltanus sp. 67 20 Nem h AP (DENTINO, et al., 2018) \\ \mbox{Procamaltanus sp. 67 20 Nem h AP (DENTINO, et al., 2018) \\ \mbox{Procamaltanus sp. 67 20 Nem h AP (DENTINO, et al., 2018) \\ \mbox{Procamaltanus sp. 67 20 Nem h AP (DENTINO, et al., 2016) \\ \mbox{Procamaltanus sp. 67 20 Nem h AP (DENTINO, et al., 2016) \\ \mbox{Procamaltanus sp. 67 20 Nem h AP (DENTINO, et al., 2016) \\ \mbox{Procamaltanus sp. 67 20 Nem h AP (DENTINO, et al., 2016) \\ \mbox{Procamaltanus sp. 67 20 Nem h AP (DENTINO, et al., 2016) \\ \mbox{Procamaltanus sp. 67 20 Nem h AP (DENTINO, et al., 2016) \\ \mbox{Procamaltanus sp. 67 20 Nem h AP (DENTINO, et al., 2016) \\ \mbox{Procamaltanus sp. 67 20 Nem h AP (DENTINO, et al., 2016) \\ \mbox{Procamaltanus sp. 67 20 Nem.$	malabaricusiRosim, Mendoza-										
	Franco and Luque 2011	104	20.7	101	0.57		Dia	Magt	h	DA	(DENICNO M
Introduction Introduction <thintroduction< th=""> Introduction <th< td=""><td>1899</td><td>104</td><td>50.7</td><td>1.04</td><td>0.37</td><td>-</td><td>Dig.</td><td>Mest</td><td>п</td><td>PA</td><td>(DENIGNO, M. N R</td></th<></thintroduction<>	1899	104	50.7	1.04	0.37	-	Dig.	Mest	п	PA	(DENIGNO, M. N R
Dising, 1850 $al., 2012$ Contracaecum sp. 9 56 5.4 - 27 Nem. Fig.; h Ms AC (MONIZ, et al., 2012) Eustrongylides sp. 9 56 5.4 - 25 Nem. Br h AC 2021) Eustrongylides sp. 30 93.3 1.47 - 44 Nem. Br h AC 2021) Procanallanus for an and pointus 7 - - 20 Nem. - h AP (BAIA, FLORENTINO, et al., 2018) Artigas & Pereira, 1928 Gorytocephalus spectabilis 67 - - 20 Aem. - h AP (BAIA, FLORENTINO, et al., 2018) Artigas & Pereira, 1928 Gorytocephalus spectabilis 67 - - 20 Mem. - h AP Posthodiplostomum sp 67 - - 20 Dig. - h AP Dendrorchis neivai Travassos, 67 - - 20 Mon. - m AP Contracaecum sp.<	Ithyoclinostomum dimorphum	104	0.96	2	0.02		Dig.	Ms	h	PA	CLEMENTE, <i>et</i>
Contracaecum sp. 9 56 5.4 - 27 Nem. Fig.; h Ms AC Ms (MONIZ, MONIZ, et al., MONIZ, et al., 201) Eustrongylides sp. 9 56 5.4 - 25 Nem. Br h AC MONIZ, et al., 2021) Eustrongylides sp. 30 93.3 1.47 - 44 Nem. Ms h AC AC 2021) Procamallanus inopinatus incorandllanus) inopinatus Travassos, 67 - - 20 Nem. - h AP AP (BAIA, FLORENTINO, et al., 2018) Artigas & Pereira, 1928 Gorytocephalus spectabilis 67 - - 20 Acant. - h AP Posthodiplostomum sp 67 - - 20 Dig. - h AP Procamallanus sp. 67 - - 20 Nem. - h AP Contracecum sp. 67 - - 20 Nem. - h AP Urocleidoides eremitus Kritsky, Thatcher, and Boeger, 1986 67 -	Diesing, 1850						C				al., 2012)
Eustrongylides sp.9565.4-25Nem.BrhAC2021)Eustrongylides sp.3093.31.47-44Nem.MshRO(MENEGUETTI, SOARES, et al., 2014)Procamallanusinopinatus6720NemhAP(BAIA, FLORENTINO, et al., 2018)Artigas & Pereira, 19286720AcanthAP(BAIA, FLORENTINO, et al., 2018)Gorytocephalus spectabilis6720DighAPPosthodiplostomum sp6720NemhAPProcamallanus sp.6720NemhAP192620NemhAPUrocleidoides eremitus Kritsky, 19266720NemhAPUrocleidoides eremitus Kritsky, 19263397.0-28.2-Mon.BrmAPoLIVEIRA, etUrocleidoides eremitus Kritsky, 19263332.4-3.9-Dig.Br, int., esthAP192620NemhAP192620NemhAP1926Dig.Br, int., ov<	Contracaecum sp.	9	56	5.4	-	27	Nem.	Fig.;	h	AC	(MONIZ,
Lustrongylides sp. 9 56 5.4 - 25 Nem. Br h AC 2021) Eustrongylides sp. 30 93.3 1.47 - 44 Nem. Ms h RC 2021) SOARES, et al., (pirocamallanus) inopinatus 67 - - 20 Nem. - h AP (BAIA, (BCNTINO, et al., 2018) Artigas & Pereira, 1928 67 - - 20 Acant. - h AP (BAIA, (BCNTINO, et al., 2018) Artigas & Pereira, 1928 67 - - 20 Acant. - h AP Posthodiplostomum sp 67 - - 20 Nem. - h AP Procamallanus sp. 67 - - 20 Nem. - h AP Urocleidoides eremitus Kritsky, 67 - - 20 Nem. - h AP Urocleidoides eremitus Kritsky, 67 - - 20 Nem. - h AP Urocleidoides e	E U	0				~-	N 7	Ms			MONIZ, $et al.$,
Eastrongylides sp.3093.3 1.47 $-$ 44Nem.MshRO(MENEGUETT, SOARES, et al., 2014)Procamallanusinopinatus67 $ -$ 20Nem. $-$ hAP(BAIA, FLORENTINO, et al., 2018)Artigas & Pereira, 192867 $ -$ 20Acant. $-$ hAPGorytocephalus spectabilis67 $ -$ 20Dig. $-$ hAPPosthodiplostomum sp67 $ -$ 20Nem. $-$ hAPProcamallanus sp.67 $ -$ 20Nem. $-$ hAPUrocleidoides eremitus Kritsky, torcaecum sp.67 $ -$ 20Non. $-$ mAPUrocleidoides eremitus Kritsky, torcaecum sp.3330.3 $-$ 1.3Dig.Br, nt.hAPal., 2016)Int., Posthodiplostomum marginatum3330.3 $-$ 1.3Dig.Br, nt.hAPInt.1899No.Gena	<i>Eustrongylides</i> sp.	9	56	5.4	-	25	Nem.	Br	h	AC	2021)
SOARES, et al., 2014)Procamallanusinopinatus(Spirocamallanus) inopinatusTravassos,Artigas & Pereira, 1928Gorytocephalus spectabilis67Gorytocephalus spectabilis67Posthodiplostomum sp676720DighAPPosthodiplostomum sp6720Nem.Postnodiplostomum sp6720Nem.Postnodiplostomum sp6720Nem.Postnodiplostomum sp6720Nem.Postnodiplostomum sp6720Nem.Procamallanus Kritsky,6720Nem.NemNatcher, and Boeger, 1986Contracaecum sp.6720Nem20Nem20Nem20Nem20Nem20Nem20Nem20Nem20Nem20Nem20Nem20Nem. <t< td=""><td><i>Eustrongylides</i> sp.</td><td>30</td><td>93.3</td><td>1.47</td><td>-</td><td>44</td><td>Nem.</td><td>Ms</td><td>h</td><td>RO</td><td>(MENEGUETTI,</td></t<>	<i>Eustrongylides</i> sp.	30	93.3	1.47	-	44	Nem.	Ms	h	RO	(MENEGUETTI,
Procamallanus6720NemhAP(BAIA, FLORENTINO, et al., 2018)Travassos, Artigas & Pereira, 1928 Gorytoce/phalus spectabilis6720AcanthAPMachado, 1959 Posthodiplostomum sp6720DighAPProcamallanus sp.6720DighAPProcamallanus sp.6720DighAPProcamallanus sp.6720DighAP1926Urocleidoides eremitus Kritsky, Contracaecum sp.6720MonmAPUrocleidoides eremitus Kritsky, 											SUARES, et al., 2014
ContracteringContractionContractionContractionContractionTravassos, Travassos, Artigas & Pereira, 1928 Gorytocephalus spectabilis6720AcanthAPMachado, 1959 Posthodiplostomum sp6720DighAPProcamallanus sp.6720NemhAPProcamallanus sp.6720NemhAPDendrorchis neivai Travassos, 19266720MonmAPUrocleidoides eremitus Kritsky, Thatcher, and Boeger, 1986 Contracaecum sp.6720NemhAPUrocleidoides eremitus Kritsky, Thatcher, and Boeger, 1986 Contracaecum sp.6720NemhAPUrocleidoides eremitus Kritsky, Thatcher, and Boeger, 1986 Contracaecum sp.3330.3-1.3-Dig.Br, int., EsthAPIlonstomum marginatum 19263330.3-1.3-Dig.Br, int., ov.APIlonstomum sp.3332.4-3.9-Dig.Br, int., ov.APGenarchella genarchella Travassos, 1928 Cystidicoloides sp.331.6-0.6-Nem.Est. Est.APContracaecum sp.3369.7-11.2-Nem.Est.AP <t< td=""><td>Procamallanus</td><td>67</td><td>-</td><td>_</td><td>_</td><td>20</td><td>Nem</td><td>-</td><td>h</td><td>AP</td><td>(BAIA</td></t<>	Procamallanus	67	-	_	_	20	Nem	-	h	AP	(BAIA
Travassos, $et al., 2018$) Artigas & Pereira, 1928 67 - - 20 Acant. - h AP Gorytocephalus spectabilis 67 - - 20 Acant. - h AP Machado, 1959 67 - - 20 Dig. - h AP Posthodiplostomum sp 67 - - 20 Nem. - h AP Procamallanus sp. 67 - - 20 Nem. - h AP Procamallanus sp. 67 - - 20 Nem. - h AP Urocleidoides eremitus Kritsky, 67 - - 20 Nem. - h AP Urocleidoides eremitus Kritsky, 33 97.0 - 28.2 - Mon. Br M AP al., 2016) Intacher, and Boeger, 1986 - 16.8 - Dig. Br, h AP al., 2016) int. Braun, 1899 - 16.8	(Spirocamallanus) inopinatus	01									FLORENTINO,
Artigas & Pereira, 1928 Gorytocephalus spectabilis 67 - - 20 Acant. - h AP Machado, 1959 67 - - 20 Dig. - h AP Procamallanus sp. 67 - - 20 Nem. - h AP Dendrorchis neivai Travassos, 67 - - 20 Nem. - h AP Urocleidoides eremitus Kritsky, 67 - - 20 Nem. - h AP Urocleidoides eremitus Kritsky, 67 - - 20 Nem. - h AP Urocleidoides eremitus Kritsky, 67 - - 20 Nem. - h AP Urocleidoides eremitus Kritsky, 33 97.0 - 28.2 - Mon. Br m AP oll/VES, OLIVEIRA, et Clinostomum marginatum 33 30.3 - 1.3 - Dig. Br, h AP 1926 -	Travassos,										et al., 2018)
Gorytocephalus spectabilis 67 20AcanthAPMachado, 1959Posthodiplostomum sp 67 20DighAPProcamallanus sp. 67 20NemhAPDendrorchis neivai Travassos, 67 20NemhAPUrocleidoides eremitus Kritsky, 67 20MonmAPUrocleidoides eremitus Kritsky, 67 20NemhAPUrocleidoides eremitus Kritsky, 33 97.0 - 28.2 -Mon.BrmAPOLIVEIRA, etUrocleidoides eremitus Kritsky, 33 97.0 - 28.2 -Mon.BrmAPdencyclubelica, etUrocleidoides eremitus Kritsky, 33 97.0 - 28.2 -Mon.BrmAPdencyclubelica, etUrocleidoides eremitus Kritsky, 33 30.3 - 1.3 -Dig.Br,hAP $al., 2016$)int.,Braun, 1899	Artigas & Pereira, 1928										
Machado, 1959Posthodiplostomum sp 67 $ 20$ Dig. $ h$ AP Procamallanus sp. 67 $ 20$ Nem. $ h$ AP Dendrorchis neivai Travassos, 67 $ 20$ Nem. $ h$ AP Urocleidoides eremitus Kritsky, 67 $ 20$ Mon. $ m$ AP Urocleidoides eremitus Kritsky, 67 $ 20$ Nem. $ h$ AP Urocleidoides eremitus Kritsky, 67 $ 20$ Nem. $ h$ AP Urocleidoides eremitus Kritsky, 33 97.0 $ 28.2$ $-$ Mon. Br M AP Urocleidoides eremitus Kritsky, 33 97.0 $ 28.2$ $-$ Mon. Br M AP Urocleidoides eremitus Kritsky, 33 30.3 $ 1.3$ $ Dig.$ Br , h AP Urocleidoides eremitus Kritsky, 33 30.3 $ 1.3$ $ Dig.$ Br , h AP Urocleidoides eremitus Kritsky, 33 30.3 $ 1.3$ $ Dig.$ Br , h AP Urocleidoides eremitus Kritsky, 33 30.3 $ 1.3$ $ Dig.$ Br , h AP Braun, 1899 M M M M M M M M M <	Gorytocephalus spectabilis	67	-	-	-	20	Acant.	-	h	AP	
Posthodiplostomum sp 67 $ 20$ Dig. $ n$ AP Procamallanus sp. 67 $ 20$ Nem. $ h$ AP Dendrorchis neivai Travassos, 67 $ 20$ Dig. $ h$ AP 1926 $Urocleidoides eremitus Kritsky,67 20Mon. mAPUrocleidoides eremitus Kritsky,67 20Nem. hAPUrocleidoides eremitus Kritsky,3397.0 28.2-Mon.BrmAPUrocleidoides eremitus Kritsky,3397.0 28.2-Mon.BrmAPUrocleidoides eremitus Kritsky,3397.0 28.2-Mon.BrmAPUrocleidoides eremitus Kritsky,3397.0 28.2-Mon.BrmAPUrocleidoides eremitus Kritsky,3330.3 1.3-Dig.Br,hAPUrocleidoides eremitus Kritsky,3329.4 16.8-Dig.Br,hAP1926 16.8-Dig.Br,hAP1926 3332.4 3.9-Dig.Br,hAP1926-$	Machado, 1959	(7				20	Dia		1	۸D	
Procumulantis sp.6720NemnAPDendrorchis neivai Travassos,6720DighAP1926Urocleidoides eremitus Kritsky,6720MonmAPUrocleidoides eremitus Kritsky,6720NemhAPUrocleidoides eremitus Kritsky,3397.0-28.2-Mon.BrmAP(GONÇALVES, OLIVEIRA, etUrocleidoides eremitus Kritsky,3330.3-1.3-Dig.Br, int.,hAPal., 2016)Braun, 18993330.3-1.6.8-Dig.Br, int.,hAPDendrorchis neivai Travassos,3329.4-16.8-Dig.Br, int.,hAP19263332.4-3.9-Dig.Br, int.,hAP19260.6-Dig.Br, int.,hAP19260.6-Dig.Br, int.,hAP19260.6-Nem.Est.hAP19260.6-Nem.Est.hAP19260.9Br, Est.hAPEst.hAP19260.6	Posinoaipiosiomum sp	07 67	-	-	-	20	Dig.	-	11		
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Procamatianus sp.	07	-	-	-	20	Nem.	-	n 1.	AP	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	<i>Denarorchis netvai</i> Travassos,	67	-	-	-	20	Dig.	-	n	AP	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Urocleidoides eremitus Kritsky.	67	-	_	_	20	Mon.	_	m	AP	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Thatcher, and Boeger, 1986	01									
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Contracaecum sp.	67	-	-	-	20	Nem.	-	h	AP	
Thatcher, and Boeger, 1986OLIVEIRA, etClinostomum marginatum33 30.3 - 1.3 -Dig.Br, int.,hAP $al., 2016$)Braun, 1899-16.8-Dig.EsthAPDendrorchis neivai Travassos, 19263329.4-16.8-Dig.EsthAPPosthodiplostomum sp.3332.4-3.9-Dig.Br, int.,hAPGenarchella genarchella Travassos, 19283332.4-29.6-Dig.Br, Est.hAPCystidicoloides sp.331.6-0.6-Nem.EsthAPContracaecum sp.3369.7-11.2-Nem.Est., hAP	Urocleidoides eremitus Kritsky,	33	97.0	-	28.2	-	Mon.	Br	m	AP	(GONÇALVES,
Clinostomum marginatum33 30.3 $ 1.3$ $-$ Dig.Br,hAP $al., 2016$)Braun, 1899 33 29.4 $ 16.8$ $-$ Dig.EsthAPDendrorchis neivai Travassos, 33 29.4 $ 16.8$ $-$ Dig.EsthAP1926 33 32.4 $ 3.9$ $-$ Dig.Br,hAPPosthodiplostomum sp. 33 32.4 $ 3.9$ $-$ Dig.Br,hAPGenarchella genarchella 33 32.4 $ 29.6$ $-$ Dig.Br,hAPTravassos, 1928 $ 33$ 1.6 $ 0.6$ $-$ Nem.EsthAPContracaecum sp. 33 69.7 $ 11.2$ $-$ Nem.Est.,hAP	Thatcher, and Boeger, 1986										OLIVEIRA, et
Braun, 1899Int., EstDendrorchis neivai Travassos,33 29.4 - 16.8 -Dig.EsthAP1926102633 32.4 - 3.9 -Dig.Br, int.hAPPosthodiplostomum sp.33 32.4 - 3.9 -Dig.Br, int.hAPGenarchella genarchella33 32.4 - 29.6 -Dig.Br, Est.hAPCystidicoloides sp.33 1.6 - 0.6 -Nem.EsthAPContracaecum sp.33 69.7 - 11.2 -Nem.Est., hAP	Clinostomum marginatum	33	30.3	-	1.3	-	Dig.	Br,	h	AP	al., 2016)
Dendrorchis neivai Travassos, 19263329.4-16.8-Dig.Est nthAP intPosthodiplostomum sp.3332.4- 3.9 -Dig.Br, nt.,hAPGenarchella genarchella Travassos, 192833 32.4 - 29.6 -Dig.Br, Est.hAPCystidicoloides sp.33 1.6 - 0.6 -Nem.EsthAPContracaecum sp.33 69.7 - 11.2 -Nem.Est., hAP	Braun, 1899							int., Ect			
Definition of the formula function of the formula formula function of the formula formula formula formula for the formula for	Dendrorchis neivai Travassos	33	29.4	_	16.8	_	Dig	Est Fst	h	ΔP	
Posthodiplostomum sp.33 32.4 - 3.9 -Dig.Br, int., ov.hAPGenarchella genarchella Travassos, 192833 32.4 - 29.6 -Dig.Br, Est.hAPCystidicoloides sp.33 1.6 - 0.6 -Nem.Est.hAPContracaecum sp.33 69.7 - 11.2 -Nem.Est., Int.hAP	1926	55	27.4		10.0		Dig.	int	11	7 11	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Posthodiplostomum sp.	33	32.4	-	3.9	-	Dig.	Br,	h	AP	
Genarchella genarchella33 32.4 - 29.6 -Dig.Br, Est.hAPTravassos, 192833 1.6 - 0.6 -Nem.Est.hAPCystidicoloides sp.33 1.6 - 0.6 -Nem.Est.hAPContracaecum sp.33 69.7 - 11.2 -Nem.Est.,hAP							-	int.,			
Genarchella genarchella3332.4-29.6-Dig.Br,hAPTravassos, 19280.6-Nem.EstCystidicoloides sp.331.6-0.6-Nem.EsthAPContracaecum sp.3369.7-11.2-Nem.Est.,hAPInt11.2-Nem.Est.,hAP	~		·					ov.	-	. –	
Iravassos, 1928 Est.Cystidicoloides sp.331.6-0.6-Nem.Est.hAPContracaecum sp.3369.7-11.2-Nem.Est.,hAPInt.	Genarchella genarchella	33	32.4	-	29.6	-	Dig.	Br,	h	AP	
Contracaecum sp. $33 69.7 - 11.2 - \text{Nem. Est., h AP}$ Int.	Travassos, 1928 Cystidicoloidas sp	33	16		0.6		Nem	ESI. Est	h	٨D	
$\frac{1}{112} = 112 = 112 = 112$ Int.	Contracaecum sp.	22	60 7	-	11.2	-	Nom	Est	n h		
1111.	Communecum sp.	55	07.1	-	11.4	-		Int	11	Aſ	

_

Procamallanus (S.) inopinatus Travassos, Artigas & Pereira 1928	33	32.4	-	1.0	-	Nem.	Est., Int.	h	AP	
Gorytocephalus spectabilisMachado, 1959	33	20.6	-	0.8	-	Acant.	Est., Int.	h	AP	
Nomimoscolex matogrossensisRego &	33	21.2	-	0.7	-	Cest.	Int.	h	AP	
Pavanelli, 1990 Urocleidoides aimarai Moreira, Scholz and Luque 2015	-	-	-	-	12	Mon.	Br	h	AP	(MOREIRA,
Urocleidoides xinguensis Moreira, Scholz & Luque, 2015	-	-	-	-	6	Mon.	Br	m	AP	2015)
Urocleidoides eremitus Kritsky, Thatcher, and Boeger, 1986	-	-	-	-	13	Mon.	Br	m	AM	(KRITSKY, THATCHER, <i>et</i>
Urocleidoides cuiabai Rosim,Mendoza-Franco and Luque, 2011	-	-	-	-	10	Mon.	Br	m	MT	<i>al.</i> , 1986) (ROSIM, Daniele F., MENDOZA- FRANCO, <i>et al.</i> , 2011)
Contracaecum sp	104	95.19	8.49	8.01	-	Nem.	Mest.	h	PA	(BENIGNO,
Eustrongylides sp.	104	3.9	3.41	-	-	Nem.	Ms	h	PA	Raimundo
Procamallanus sp.	104	53.84	-	-	-	Nem.	Mest	h	PA	Nonato Moraes, CLEMENTE, <i>et</i> <i>al.</i> , 2012)
Urocleidoides eremitus Kritsky, Thatcher, and Boeger, 1986	33	97.0	29.1	28.1	931	Mon.	Br	m	AP	(ALCÂNTARA, TAVARES-
Contracaecum sp	33	51.5	8.1	4.2	138	Nem.	Int.	h	AP	DIAS, 2015)
Procamallanus (S.) inopinatus Travassos, Artigas & Pereira, 1928	33	9.1	1.3	0.1	4	Nem.	Est.	h	AP	
Clinostomum marginatum Braun, 1899	33	24.2	4.3	1.0	34	Dig.	Br;Int	h	AP	
Nomimoscolex matogrossensis Rego & Pavanelli, 1990	33	21.2	3.1	0.7	22	Cest.	Int.	h	AP	
Urocleidoides eremitus Kritsky, Thatcher, and Boeger, 1986	17	24		0.6		Mon.	Br	m	MT	(ROSIM, D. F., 2010)
Sphincterodiplostomum borjanensis	17	24		0.1		Dig.	Olho	h	MT	
musculosum Dubois, 1936	17	12		0.01		Dig. Dig	Nar	n h	MT	
Tytoacipitys sp	17	12		0.1		Dig.	Bo.	11	1011	
<i>Paracapillaria</i> (Paracapillaria) <i>piscicola</i> Travassos, Artigas & Pereira. 1928	17	18		0.1		Nem.	Est.	h	MT	
Paraseuratum soaresi Fábio, 1983	17	41		0.2		Nem.	Int.	h	MT	
Contracaecum (larvae) spp.	17	59		0.4		Nem.	Int., Mest	h	MT	
Eustrongylides ignotus Jäegerskiold, 1909	17	6		0.01		Nem.	Ms	h	MT	
Porrocaecum (larvae) sp.	17	76		0.9		Nem.	Bn, Int.	h	MT	

Contracaecum (larvae) sp.	3	100	5	5	15	Nem.	Mest.	h	AP	(SIDNEY,
<i>Eustrongylides</i> (larvae) sp.	3	100	8	8	24	Nem.	Ms	h	AP	OLIVEIRA, et
										al., 2020)

Table 3 Parameters of *Hoplias malabaricus* parasite species collected in Acre and Amazonas regions. P- Prevalence; IM- Mean intensity; AM- Mean Abundance; TNP-Total parasites per fish; SI- Infestation Site. PF - Parasitized fish; Int-Intestine; Bn-Gills; Bi-Bile.

			Acre Amazonas									
Parasite species	SI	Group	PF	P(%)	MI	TNP	MA	PF	P(%)	MI	TNP	MA
ACANTHOCEPHALA												
Quadrigyrus sp.	Int.	h	1	1.1	2.0	2	0.02	-	-	-	-	-
DIGENEA												
Austrodiplostomum sp.	Int.	h	-	-	-	-	-	7	8.6	9.9	69	0.57
Ithyoclinostomum dimorphum	Int.	h	5	5.3	1.4	7	0.07	-	-	-	-	-
Posthodiplostomum sp	Br	h	-	-	-	-	-	2	7.7	5.5	11	0.09
Prosthenhystera obesa	Bi	h	3	3.2	1.0	3	0.03	-	-	-	-	-
NEMATODA												
Contracaecum sp.	Int.	h	2	2.1	5.0	10	0.11	25	36.8	9.75	50	0.41
Eustrongylides sp.	Int.	h	1	1.1	2.0	2	0.02	-	-	-	-	
Nematoda sp.	Int.	h	3	3.2	1.7	5	0.05	2	7.7	1.5	3	0.02
Nilonema sp.	Int.	h	1	1.1	1.0	1	0.01	-	-	-	-	-
Paraseuratum soaresi sp	Int.	h	1	1.1	1.0	1	0.01	-	-	-	-	-
Procamallanus (S.) inopinatus	Int.	h	-	-	-	-		1	1.2	1	1	0.01
Procamallanus(S.)neocaballeroi	Int.	h	1	1.1	2.0	2	0.02	-	-	-	-	-
Pseudoproleptus sp.	Int.	h	1	1.1	1.0	1	0.01	1	1.2	1	1	0.01
MONOGENEA												
Urocleidoides Sp.	Br	m	-	-	-	-	-	1	0.0	1	4	0.01
<i>Urocleidoides eremitus</i> Kritsky, Thatcher, and Boeger, 1986	Br	m	5	0.05	1	8	0.24	2	0.0	1	5	0.04
Urocleidoides cuiabaiRosim, Mendoza-Franco & Lugue, 2011	Br	m	15	0.16	1	18	0.53	1	0.0	1	4	0.01
Anacanthorus scapanus Van Every & Kristky, 1992	Br	m	1	0.01	1	1	0.03	1	0.0	1	5	0.01
Notozothecium sp.	Br	m	5	0.05	1	11	0.32	-	-	-	-	-
<i>Monogenea</i> sp.	Br	m	2	0.02	1	3	0.09	2	0.0	1	2	0.02
Vancleaveus janauacaensis Kritsky, Thatcher & Boeger, 1986	Br	m		-	-	-	-	1	0.0	1	2	0.02
	Ν			9	95				1	21		

Digeneans, on the other hand, showed the greatest richness in Amapá (S = 4; P = 97%; AM = 5.42; IM = 5.54) followed by Acre (S = 3; P = 3%; AM = 0.15; IM = 5), and Mato Grosso (S = 3; P = 17%; AM = 0.17; IM = 1). *Ithyoclinostomum dimorphum*, *Clinostomum marginatum*, and *Posthodiplostomum* spp. were common in more than one region, the rest of the Digenea fauna had a restricted distribution to a certain area (Figure 4, Table 2 and 3).



Figure 4. Distribution of Digenea parasites of *H. malabaricus* in areas with different deforestation degrees in the Legal Amazon. A - Eastern Amazon Region; B - Western Amazon Region; C – Amazon Region of Mato Grosso.

Monogenea fauna showed the greatest richness in Pará (S=7; P= 100%; AM=2.1; IM=2.1) and in Amazonas (S=7; P=28%; AM=0.39; IM=1.37). *Urocleidoides* species showed a wide distribution in the Amazon region. However, some monogeneans, such as *Constrictoanchoratus*, were restricted to the State of Pará (Figure 5, Table 2 and 3).



Figure 5 Distribution of Monogenea parasites of *H. malabaricus* in areas with different deforestation degrees in the Legal Amazon. A - Eastern Amazon Region; B - Western Amazon Region; C – Amazon Region of Mato Grosso.

There was a difference in the parasite species composition of *H. malabaricus* (PERMANOVA: Pseudo-F = 2.75; p = 0.04) between deforestation degrees. The first two PCoA axes explained 63.57% of the total variability (Figure 6). The difference occurred between medium and high deforestation areas (p = 0.02) and between low and high deforestation areas (p = 0.04).



Figure 6. Principal component analysis for parasite species composition in areas with different deforestation degrees (high, medium, and low).

DISCUSSION

The present study showed a high species distribution of *Hoplias malabaricus* helminth parasites in the legal Amazon environments. Some species had a more restricted distribution, while others showed a broader distribution. These results were expected since *H. malabaricus* is widely distributed in the Amazon (DAGOSTA, PINNA, 2019). Besides, its parasite fauna is one of the most studied and with many parasites (BAIA, FLORENTINO, *et al.*, 2018, GONÇALVES, OLIVEIRA, *et al.*, 2016, LUQUE, POULIN, 2007, OLIVEIRA, CORRÊA, *et al.*, 2018).

However, the present study showed a reduction in the composition of some parasite taxa in areas impacted by deforestation. For example, the Pará region showed a high rate of deforestation, a reduction of heteroxenous parasites, and an increase in the occurrence of monoxenous ectoparasite species. The Amapá region, on the other hand, showed a lower rate of deforestation that may have favored heteroxenous endoparasites. This reduction and change in the parasite fauna may be reflecting the quality of the environment (TIMI, POULIN, 2020). Regions, such as the State of Pará, have been suffering from mining, urbanization, and agricultural activities, some of the main factors influencing deforestation (HAHN, GANGNON, *et al.*, 2014, SIQUEIRA-GAY, YANAI,

et al., 2020, SONTER, HERRERA, *et al.*, 2017). These activities release into the aquatic environment several types of effluents that can reduce the fauna of intermediate hosts, negatively influencing heteroxenous parasites (PÉREZ-DEL OLMO, RAGA, *et al.*, 2007, SURES, NACHEV, *et al.*, 2017). For monoxenous parasite communities, such as monogeneans, changes in the population level depend on the concentration and type of pollutant to which they are being exposed. (SKINNER, 1982) showed that fish infection by monogenetic parasites increased with high concentrations of nutrients. Some authors have indicated infections caused by Dactylogyridae in their hosts in environments exposed to effluents due to the impairment of fish's immune system(BAGGE, VALTONEN, 1996, KHAN, R. A., KICENIUK, 1988). Moreover, some studies indicated that some pollutants stimulate high mucus production in the host, creating a suitable environment for parasites (MARCOGLIESE, D. J., 2005, MARCOGLIESE, D.J., 2004b). Thus, monoxenous parasites show susceptibility to degradation different from heteroxenous, as observed by (PÉREZ-DEL OLMO, RAGA, *et al.*, 2007).

However, the Amazon region of Mato Grosso, which is the second state with the highest rate of deforestation increase (TERRABRASILIS, INPE, 2020), showed a more heterogeneous fauna than that of monoxenous. This fact may be associated with local characteristics of the area's ecotone between Amazon and Pantanal biomes. According to (DA SILVA, Carolina Joana, SILVA SOUSA, *et al.*, 2015), these ecotones can be particularly rich and share flora and fauna species. They also induce species exchange processes, being a crucial area for biological conservation at the regional level.

The present study also indicated that sites in the Legal Amazon with low and medium rates of deforestation showed a different and more varied fauna in species composition than areas with a high deforestation rate. Deforestation can influence the species composition of many organisms, such as phytoplankton, benthic insects, zooplankton, and birds (BURTON, ULRICH, 1994, PATOINE, PINEL-ALLOUL, *et al.*, 2000, RASK, ARVOLA, *et al.*, 1993). It can change food webs, and consequently, fish parasite composition since some parasites are often dependent on trophic interactions for transmission (MARCOGLIESE; CONE, 1997). In this sense, disturbed systems may have communities with less species variability than host-parasite systems in conserved environments (MARCOGLIESE, 2001).

Some parasite species showed restricted distribution in more conserved regions of the Amazon, such as Cystidicoloides sp. and *Dendrorchis neivai* in Amapá, *Nilonema* sp.

and *Prosthenhystera obesa* in Acre, and *Paracapillaria (P) piscicola* and digeneans of genus Sphincterodiplostomum in the ecotone of the Amazon region of Mato Grosso. According to (SILVA, *et al.*, 2005), areas with high environmental complexity, such as the Amazon, are home to species more restricted to some environments due to mosaics of distinct endemism areas separated by large rivers, each with its evolutionary relationships and biotic associations. Thus, the high ecological heterogeneity in forested environments provides many available niches, favoring species coexistence. This heterogeneity stabilizes the environment over time and may allow specializations and adaptations of some species because of the relative constancy of resources (TEDESCO, DOYLE, *et al.*, 2010).

Contracaecum sp., *Eustrongylides* sp., and *Clinostomum marginatum* showed a more generalist distribution among the States of the Legal Amazon. These parasites were considered, according to the literature, organisms of wide distribution throughout South America and with low host specificity, occurring several fish species (GHOLAMI, MOBEDI, *et al.*, 2011, MORAVEC, 1998, PINHEIRO, FURTADO, *et al.*, 2019). Such generalist characteristics can assist in the adaptation of these taxa in disturbed areas. That is alarming because these parasites have a zoonotic potential and can be accidentally (through ingestion of poorly processed fish meat) transmitted to humans. Besides, some studies report that zoonotic parasites may increase with environmental degradation (HOBERG, COOK, *et al.*, 2017, KLIMPEL, PALM, 2011).

The wide distribution of genus *Urocleidoides* in the Amazonian states reported in this study may be associated with the fact that *H. malabaricus* is a generalist species with many adaptive characteristics. These characteristics allow *Urocleidoides* species to occur in both forested and degraded environments since they may have developed strategies that help them in this parasite-host relationship. Thus, as it is a group that develops in a single host, consequently, it may have adapted to the physiology of this fish species, managing to survive in distinct environments (KEARN, 1986).

Finally, the present study also contributed to registering new parasitic associations in *H. malabaricus* in the western Amazon region. For example, *Nilonema* spp. that was recorded parasitizing *Arapaima gigas* in the central Amazon (SANTOS, MALTA, 2014)[69] and Peru (MATHEWS, ISMIÑO, *et al.*, 2014), and *Procamallanus* (S.) *neocaballeroi* found parasitizing *Serrasalmus marginatus* in southern Brazil (CASALI, TAKEMOTO, 2016). New reports and distribution of fish parasites in the Amazon are expected because, in addition to presenting a high heterogeneity of aquatic environments, it is endowed with a high fish diversity with approximately 2257 species described (including 1248 endemic) (JÉZÉQUEL, TEDESCO, *et al.*, 2019), being an environment conducive to housing a large fauna of parasites.

In conclusion, *H. malabaricus* showed a rich fauna of parasites with 43 parasitic associations registered in the Brazilian Amazon. As expected, there was a difference in the composition of parasite species among Amazonian regions, with groups of generalist parasites distributed throughout the region and organisms more restricted to certain locations.

Finally, the present study contributes with new reports of host and distribution for some parasite species, indicating that the Amazon has a great diversity of species. That can be alarming because, if deforestation continues to advance, many species will disappear before registered. Besides, in this scenario, more adapted species can dominate, such as some monogenous species that proliferate and influence fish health, leading to fish loss and even diseases to humans, such as those caused by helminths with zoonotic potential.

REFERÊNCIAS

ALCÂNTARA, N.M.; TAVARES-DIAS, M. Structure of the parasites communities in two Erythrinidae fish from Amazon River system (Brazil). **Revista Brasileira de Parasitologia Veterinária** 24: 183-190, 2015.

ANDERSON, M.J.; ELLINGSEN, K.E.; MCARDLE, B.H. Multivariate dispersion as a measure of beta diversity. **Ecology letters** *9*(6) :683-693, 2006.

ANTONELLI, A.; ZIZKA, A.; CARVALHO, F.A.; SCHARN, R..; BACON, C.D.; SILVESTRO, D.; CONDAMINE, F.L. Amazonia is the primary source of Neotropical biodiversity. **Proceeding of the National Academy** 115: 6034-6039, 2018.

ASSIS, F.G.; FERREIRA, L.F.; VINHAS, K.R.; MAURANO, L.; ALMEIDA, L.; CARVALHO, C.A.; CAMARGO, C. TerraBrasilis: A Spatial Data Analytics Infrastructure for Large-Scale Thematic Mapping. **International Journal of Geo-Information** 8: 513, 2019.

BAGGE, A.M.; VALTONEN, E.T. Experimental study on the influence of paper and pulp mill effluent on the gill parasite communities of roach (*Rutilus rutilus*). **Parasitology** 112: 499-508, 1996.

BAIA, R.R.J.; FLORENTINO, A.C.; SILVA, L.M.A.; TAVARES-DIAS, M. Patterns of the parasite communities in a fish assemblage of a river in the Brazilian Amazon region. **Acta parasitology** 63: 304-316, 2018.

BIERREGAARD, R.O.; GASCON, C.; LOVEJOY, T.E.; MESQUITA, R. Lessons from Amazonia: the ecology and conservation of a fragmented forest. Yale: **Yale University Press**. 2001.

BURTON, T.M.; ULRICH, K.E. The effects of whole-tree harvest on insects associated with leaf packs in small streams in New Hampshire. **Internationale Vereiningung fur Theoretische Angewandte Limnologie: Verhandlungen** *25:*1483-1491, 1994.

BUSH, A.O.; LAFFERTY, K.D.; LOTZ, J.M.; SHOSTAK, A.W. Parasitology meets ecology on its own terms: Margolis et al. revisited. **The Journal of parasitology** 575-583, 1997.

CARVALHO, T.S.; DOMINGUES, E.P. Projeção de um cenário econômico e de desmatamento para a Amazônia Legal brasileira entre 2006 e 2030. **Nova economia** 26: 585-621, 2016.

CASALI, G.P.; TAKEMOTO, R.M. Endoparasitic fauna of *Serrasalmus* spp. (Characidae: Serrasalminae) in a neotropical floodplain. Acta Scientiarum Biological Sciences 38: 105-112, 2016.

COE, M.T.; COSTA, M.H.; SOARES-FILHO, B.S. A influência do desmatamento histórico e potencial futuro no fluxo dos rios Amazonas e processos de superfície terrestre e feedbacks atmosféricos. **Journal of Hydrology** *369*: 165-174, 2009.

COHEN, S.C.; JUSTO, M.C.; KOHN A. South American Monogenoidea parasites of fishes, amphibians and reptiles. Rio Janeiro: **Instituto Oswaldo Cruz FIOCRUZ**. 2013.

CÓRDOVA-TAPIA, F.; HERNÁNDEZ-MARROQUÍN, V.; ZAMBRANO L. The role of environmental filtering in the functional structure of fish communities in tropical wetlands. **Ecology of Freshwater fish** 27: 522-532, 2018.

COSTANZA, R.; MAGEAU M. What is a healthy ecosystem?. Aquatic Ecology 33: 105-115, 1999.

DA SILVA, C.J.; SOUSA, K.N.S.; IKEDA-CASTRILLON, S.K.; LOPES, C.R.A.S.; DA SILVA NUNES, J.R.; CARNIELLO, M.A.; JONGMAN R.H. Biodiversity and its drivers and pressures of change in the wetlands of the Upper Paraguay–Guaporé Ecotone, Mato Grosso (Brazil). Land Use Policy, *47* : 163-178, 2015.

DAGOSTA, F.C.; DE PINNA, M. The fishes of the Amazon: distribution and biogeographical patterns, with a comprehensive list of species. **Bulletin of the American Museum of Natural History** 431: 1-163, 2019.

FARIA, M.D.R.; CAVALCANTE-NETO, A.; ALLAMAN, I.B.; GOMES, A.D.O.; MOREIRA, R.G.; HALLERMAN, E.M.; HILSDORF A.W.S. The potential of *Hoplias malabaricus* (Characiformes: Erythrinidae), a Neotropical carnivore, for aquaculture. **Aquaculture and Fisheries** *4*: 89-97, 2019.

FERREIRA, K.D.C.; RODRIGUES, A.R.O.; CUNHAL J.M; DOMINGUES, M.V. 2018. *Dactylogyrids* (Platyhelminthes, Monogenoidea) from the gills of *Hoplias malabaricus* (Characiformes: Erythrinidae) from coastal rivers of the Oriental Amazon

Basin: species of *Urocleidoides* and *Constrictoanchoratus* n. gen. Journal of Helminthology 92: 353, 2018.

GHOLAMI, Z.; MOBEDI, I.; ESMAEILI, H.R.; KIA, E.B. Occurrence of *Clinostomum complanatum* in *Aphanius dispar* (Actinoptrygii: Cyprinodontidae) collected from Mehran River, Hormuzgan Province, South of Iran. **Asian Pacific Journal of Tropical Biomedicine** *1*(3) : 189-192, 2011.

GONÇALVES, R.A.; OLIVEIRA, M.S.B.; NEVES, L.R.; TAVARES-DIAS, M. Seasonal pattern in parasite infracommunities of *Hoplerythrinus unitaeniatus* and *Hoplias malabaricus* (Actinopterygii: Erythrinidae) from the Brazilian Amazon. Acta Parasitology *61*: 119-129, 2016.

HAHN, M.B.; GANGNON, R.E.; BARCELLOS, C.; ASNER, G.P; PATZ, J.A Influence of deforestation, logging, and fire on malaria in the Brazilian Amazon. **PloS one** *9*: e85725, 2014.

HOBERG, E.P.; COOK, J.A.; AGOSTA, S.J.; BOEGER, W.; GALBREATH, K.E.; LAAKSONEN, S.; BROOKS, D.R. Sistemas árticos no Quaternário: colisão ecológica, mosaicos faunísticos e as consequências de um clima instável. **Journal of helmintology** 91: 409–421, 2017.

HUDSON, P.J.; DOBSON, A.P.; LAFFERTY, K.D. Is a healthy ecosystem one that is rich in parasites?. **Trends in Ecology & Evolution** *21*: 381-385, 2006.

JÉZÉQUEL, C.; TEDESCO, P.A.; MALDONADO-OCAMPO, J.A.; PRADA-PEDREROS, S.; ORTEGA, H.; HILDALGO, M.; MARTENS, K.; DE WEVER, A.; ZUANON, J.; TORRENTE-VILARA, G.; SOUSA, L.M. Metadata description of the AMAZON FISH database. **Freshw. Metadata** *J*. 43:1-9, 2019.

KEARN, G.C. The eggs of monogeneans. Advances in Parasitology 25:175-273, 1986.

KHAN, M.W.; BOHANNAN, B.J.; NÜSSLEIN, K.; TIEDJE, J.M.; TRINGE, S.G.; PARLADE, E.; RODRIGUES, J.L. Deforestation impacts network co-occurrence patterns of microbial communities in Amazon soils. **FEMS Microbiology Ecology** *95:* fiy230, 2019.

KHAN, RA.; KICENIUK, J.W. Effect of petroleum aromatic hydrocarbons on monogeneids parasitizing Atlantic cod, Gadus morhua L. **Bulletin of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology** 41: 94-100, 1988.

KLIMPEL, S; PALM, H.W. Anisakid nematode (Ascaridoidea) life cycles and distribution: increasing zoonotic potential in the time of climate change? In **Progess in Parasitology** Berlin: Springer. 2011.

KRITSKY, D.C.; THATCHER, V.E.; BOEGER, W.A. Neotropical monogenea. 8. revision of Urocleidoides (Dactylogyridae, Ancyrocephalinae). **Proceedings of the Helminthological Society of Washington** 53: 1-37, 1986.

KRITSKY, D.C.; THATCHER, V.E.; KAYTON, R.J. Five new species from South America with the proposal of *Tereancistrum* gen. n. and *Trinibaculum* gen. n.(Dactylogyridae: Ancyrocephalinae). Acta Amazonica 10: 411-417, 1980.

LAFFERTY, K.D.; DOBSON, A.P.; KURIS, A.M. Parasites dominate food web links. **Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences** 103: 11211-11216, 2006.

LO, M.; REED, J.; CASTELLO, L.; STEEL, E.A.; FRIMPONG, E.A.; ICKOWITZ, A. The Influence of Forests on Freshwater Fish in the Tropics: A Systematic Review. **BioScience** *70*:404-414, 2020.

LUQUE, J.L.; POULIN, R. Metazoan parasite species richness in neotropical fishes: hotspots and the geography of biodiversity. **Parasitology** 134: 865, 2007.

MARCOGLIESE, D.J. Implications of climate change for parasitism of animals in the aquatic environment. **Canadian Journal of Zoology** *79*: 1331-1352, 2001.

MARCOGLIESE, D.J. Parasites: small players with crucial roles in the ecological theater. **EcoHealth** 1(2): 151-164, 2004.

MARCOGLIESE, D.J. Parasites of the superorganism: are they indicators of ecosystem health?. **International Journal for Parasitology** *35*: 705-716, 2005.

MARCOGLIESE, D.J.; CONE, D.K. Parasite communities as indicators of ecosystem stress. **Parassitologia** 39: 227, 1997.

MATHEWS, P.; MALHEIROS, A.F. High Infection of *Nilonema Senticosum* In Mature *Arapaima Gigas* Cultivated In The Peruvian Amazon [infección Elevada De *Nilonema Senticosum* En Adultos De *Arapaima Gigas* Cultivados En La Amazonía Peruana]. **Revista de Investigaciones Veterinarias del Peru** 25: 414-418, 2014.

MENEGUETTI, D.U.D.O.; LARAY, M.P.D.O.; CAMARGO, L.M.A. Primeiro relato de larvas de *Eustrongylides* sp. (Nematoda: Dioctophymatidae) em *Hoplias malabaricus* (Characiformes: Erythrinidae) no Estado de Rondônia, Amazônia Ocidental, Brasil. **Revista Pan-Amazônica de Saúde** 4: 55-58, 2013.

MONIZ, N.B.; MONIZ, A.P.C.; SALDANHA, R.F.; DE AQUINO, J.M.; MAGGI, L.E.; VIEIRA, L.J.S.; DE ARAÚJO SANTOS, F.G. Estudo ictioparasitológico de espécies de ambientes lacustres artificiais da bacia hidrográfica do Igarapé Quinoá, Senador Guiomard, Acre, Brazil. **South American Journal of Basic Education, Technical and Technological** *6*(2): 311-324, 2019.

MORAVEC, F. Nematodes of freshwater fishes of the Neotropical Region. Academia: Publishing **House of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic**, 1998.

MOREIRA, J.; SCHOLZ, T.; LUQUE, J.L. First data on the parasites of *Hoplias aimara* (Characiformes): description of two new species of gill monogeneans (Dactylogyridae). Acta Parasitologica *60*: 254-260, 2015.

OLIVEIRA, M.S.B.; CORRÊA, L.L.; FERREIRA, D.O.; TAVARES-DIAS, M. Larvas de nematoides de potencial zoonótico infectando peixes carnívoros do baixo Rio Jari, no Norte do Brasil. **Biota Amazonica** 9: 50-52, 2020.

OLIVEIRA, M.S.B.; CORRÊA, L.L.; PRESTES, L.; NEVES, L.R.; BRASILIENSE, A.R.P.; FERREIRA, D.O.; TAVARES-DIAS, M. Comparison of the endoparasite fauna of *Hoplias malabaricus* and *Hoplerythrinus unitaeniatus* (Erythrinidae), sympatric hosts in the eastern Amazon region (Brazil). **Helminthologia** *55*: 157-165, 2018.

PATOINE, A.; PINEL-ALLOUL, B.; PREPAS, E.E.; CARIGNAN, R. Do logging and forest fires influence zooplankton biomass in Canadian Boreal Shield lakes?. **Canadian Journal of Fisheries Aquatic Sciences** *57*: 155-164, 2000.

PÉREZ-DEL OLMO, A.; RAGA, J.A.; KOSTADINOVA, A.; FERNÁNDEZ, M. Parasite communities in Boops boops (L.) (Sparidae) after the Prestige oil-spill: Detectable alterations. **Marine Pollution Bulletin** *54*: 266-276, 2007.

PINHEIRO, R.H.D.S.; FURTADO, A.P.; SANTOS, J.N.D.; GIESE, E.G. *Contracaecum* larvae: morphological and morphometric retrospective analysis, biogeography and zoonotic risk in the amazon. **Revista Brasileira de Parasitologia Veterinária** 28:12-32, 2019.

POULIN, R. The functional importance of parasites in animal communities: many roles at many levels?. **International Journal for Parasitology** *29:* 903-914, 1999.

RANJAN, K.; PAULA, F.S.; MUELLER, R.C.; JESUS, E.D.C.; CENCIANI, K.; BOHANNAN, B.J.; RODRIGUES, J.L. Forest-to-pasture conversion increases the diversity of the phylum Verrucomicrobia in Amazon rainforest soils. **Frontiers in Microbiology** 6: 779, 2015.

RASK, M.; ARVOLA, L.; SALONEN, K. Effects of catchment deforestation and burning on the limnologyy of a small forest lake in southern Finland. **Internationale Vereinigung für theoretische und angewandte Limnologie: Verhandlungen** 25: 525-8, 1993.

RODRIGUES, J.L.; PELLIZARI, V.H.; MUELLER, R.; BAEK, K.; JESUS, E.D.C.; PAULA, F.S.; TIEDJE, J.M. Conversion of the Amazon rainforest to agriculture results in biotic homogenization of soil bacterial communities. **Proceedings of National Academy of Sciences** *110*: 988-993, 2013.

ROSIM, D.F. Biodiversidade das comunidades parasitárias em populações de *Hoplias malabaricus* (Bloch, 1794) (Characiformes, Erythrinidae) provenientes de quatro regiões hidrográficas do Brasil. Doutorado (Ciências veterinárias) – **Universidade Federal Rural do Rio de janeiro, Rio de Janeiro**, 2010.

ROSIM, D.F.; MENDOZA-FRANCO, E.F.; LUQUE, J.L. New and previously described species of *Urocleidoides* (Monogenoidea: Dactylogyridae) infecting the gills and nasal cavities of *Hoplias malabaricus* (Characiformes: Erythrinidae) from Brazil. **Journal of Parasitology** 97: 406-417, 2011.

SANTOS, A.K.S.D.; MALTA, J.C.D.O. A fauna de protozoa, acanthocephala, nematoda e crustacea parasitas do *Arapaima Gigas* (SchInz, 1822) (Osteichthyes: Arapaimatidae) criados em cativeiro na Amazônia central. **Revista igapó – Revista de Educação Ciência e Tecnologia do IFAM** 4:1, 2014.

SHAW, D.C.; BIBLE K. An Overview of Forest Canopy Ecosystem Functions with Reference to Urban and Riparian Systems. **Northwest Scienc** 70: 1-6, 1996.

SILVA, D.S.; LUCOTTE, M.; ROULET, M.; POIRIER, H.; MERGLER, D.; SANTOS, E.O.; CROSSA, M. Trophic structure and bioaccumulation of mercury in fish of three natural lakes of the Brazilian Amazon. **Water Air Soil Pollution** 165:77-94, 2005.

SIQUEIRA-GAY, J.; YANAI, A.M.; LESSMANN, J.; PESSÔA, A.C.M.B; ORJA, D.; CANOVA, M.; BORGES, R.C. Pathways to positive scenarios for the Amazon forest in Pará state, Brazil. **Biota Neotropica** 20:1-21, 2020.

SKINNER, R.H. The interrelation of water quality, gill parasites, and gill pathology of some fishes from south Biscayne Bay, Florida. **Fishery Bulletin**, v. 80, n. 2, p. 269-280, 1982.

SONTER, L.J.; HERRERA, D.; BARRETT, D.J.; GALFORD, G.L.; MORAN, C.J.; SOARES-FILHO, B.S. Mining drives extensive deforestation in the Brazilian Amazon. **Nature Communications** 8: 1-7, 2017.

SURES, B.; NACHEV, M.; SELBACH, C.; MARCOGLIESE, D.J., Parasite responses to pollution: what we know and where we go in 'Environmental Parasitology'. **Parasites & vectors** 10: 65, 2017.

TAKEMOTO, R.M.; PAVANELLI, G.C.; LIZAMA, M.A.P.; LACERDA, A.C.F.; YAMADA, F.H.; MOREIRA, L.H.A.; BELLAY, S. Diversity of parasites of fish from the Upper Paraná River floodplain. **Brazilian Journal of Biology** 69: 691-705, 2009.

TEDESCO, S.; DOYLE, H.; BLASCO, J.; REDMOND, G.; SHEEHAN, D. Oxidative stress and toxicity of gold nanoparticles in Mytilus edulis. **Aquatic Toxicology** 100: 178-186, 2010.

TERRABRASILIS; INPE. TerraBrasilis. PRODES (Desmatamento). Retrieved from <u>http://terrabrasilis.dpi.inpe.br/en/home-page/</u>. 2020.

TIMI, J.T.; POULIN, R. Why ignoring parasites in fish ecology is a mistake. **International Journal for Parasitology** 50: 755-761, 2020.

TOHAM, A.K.; TEUGELS, G.G. First data on an Index of Biotic Integrity (IBI) based on fish assemblages for the assessment of the impact of deforestation in a tropical West African river system. **Hydrobiologia** 397: 29-38, 1999.

VAUGHN, C.C.; TAYLOR, C.M. Macroecology of a host-parasite relationship. **Ecography** 23: 11-20, 2000.

YAMAGUTI, S. Monogenetic trematodes of Hawaiian fishes. Honolulu : **University of Hawaii Press.** 262: 287, 1968.

YAMAGUTI, S. Synopsis of digenetic trematodes of vertebrates. **Keigaku Publishing Co. Tokio**, v.1, 1074p, 1971.

ZENI, J.O.; HOEINGHAUS, D.J.; ROA-FUENTES, C.A.; CASATTI, L. Stochastic species loss and dispersal limitation drive patterns of spatial and temporal beta diversity of fish assemblages in tropical agroecosystem streams. **Hydrobiologia** 1: 1-15, 2020

Recebido em: 03/02/2022 Aprovado em: 05/03/2022 Publicado em: 07/03/2022