Taxonomy of five species of cyrtophorids (Protozoa: Ciliophora) including consideration of the phylogeny of two new genera
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INTRODUCTION

The cyrtophorid ciliates usually occur in aquatic habitats, and some of them are ectocommensal or parasitic of aquatic animals (Corliss, 1979; Hofmann, 1987). Cyrtophorids represent one of the most specialized groups in the Ciliophora, which are morphologically characterized by having toothed buccal basket, somatic kineties usually restricted to ventral side and macronuclei heteromerous (Deroux, 1994). Both oral ciliature and somatic kineties are of great morphological diversity, which gives rise to the high species diversity of the cyrtophorids. To date, there are over 40 genera in this group, inclusive of Hypocoma (Kahl, 1931, 1933; Fauré-Fremiet, 1965;
Deroux, 1976a, b, c; Corliss, 1979; Foissner, 1979; Carey, 1991; Song & Wilbert, 2002; Song, 2003; Gong & Song, 2006). Many investigations have been carried out in the last three decades (Dragesco & Dragesco-Kernéis, 1986; Foissner et al., 1991; Petz, Song & Wilbert, 1995; Gong et al., 2002, 2003, 2007, 2008; Gong & Song, 2004a, b; Shao, Song & Gong, 2008; Pan et al., 2011), however, some known cryptophorids still need to be redefined and new taxa have yet to be discovered.

In the past two decades, studies on ciliate biodiversity in China have mainly focused on the coastal waters off the northern seas (Xu & Song, 2006; Sun, Song & Xu, 2007; Chen et al., 2008; Wang et al., 2008; Fan et al., 2010; Jiang et al., 2010a, b; Li et al., 2010c; Miao et al., 2010; Pan et al., 2010a, b). Recently, ciliate faunistic investigations in the coastal habitats off the South China Sea were carried out. These works demonstrated the high diversity in this subtropical area (Liu et al., 2009, 2010; Chen et al., 2010; Jiang & Song, 2010; Li et al., 2010a; Shen et al., 2010). Here we describe two new and three rarely known species, which were collected from the coast off both the northern and southern China seas. Two new genera are suggested.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

Heterohartmannula fangi gen. et sp. nov. was collected on 7 April 2010 from coastal waters off Donghai Island, Zhanjiang (21°14′N, 110°23′E), China (temperature 24 °C, and salinity 27‰).

Aporthotrochilia pulex (Deroux, 1976) gen. et comb. nov. was sampled on 15 December 2009 from coastal waters off Zhanjiang (21°14′N, 110°23′E), China (temperature 24 °C, salinity 25‰, pH 7.4).

Trochilia alveolata sp. nov. was isolated on 7 January 2010 from Clear Water Bay, Hong Kong (22°12′N, 114°17′E), with water temperature 23 °C and salinity 16‰.

Trochochilodon flavus Deroux 1976 was collected on 3 September 2009 from a sandy beach at Qingdao (36°04′ N, 120°23′ E), China. The water temperature was c. 25 °C and salinity was 31‰.

Hypocoma acinetarum Collin, 1907 was sampled on 10 May 2010 from coastal waters off Qingdao, China, using the slide method (Li et al., 2010b). Water temperature was c. 17 °C and salinity was around 30‰.

Living cells were observed at 100–1000× magnifications using bright-field and differential interference contrast microscopy. The counts, measurements, and drawings of stained specimens were performed at 1250× with the aid of a camera lucida. The terminology and systematic scheme are mainly according to Corliss (1979) and Gong et al. (2009a).

Genomic DNA extraction, PCR amplification, and small subunit (SSU) rDNA gene cloning and sequencing were performed according to the method described by Yi et al. (2009).

Other than the SSU rRNA gene sequences of Heterohartmannula fangi and Aporthotrochilia pulex, the sequences used in this study were obtained from the National Center for Biotechnology Information GenBank database and all available SSU rRNA gene sequences of the class Phyllophrygea were included. Pseudomicrothorax dubius and Leptopharynx costatus were selected as the outgroups. Sequences were first aligned with CLUSTAL W implemented in BIOEDIT 7.0 (Hall, 1999) and further modified manually using BIOEDIT. The final alignment of 1462 characters and 35 taxa was used to construct phylogenetic trees.

The program MrModeltest v. 2.0 (Nylander, 2004) selected the general time reversible + Proportion Invariant (= 0.2613) + Gamma (= 0.4983) as the best model for both maximum likelihood (ML) and Bayesian inference (BI). A ML tree was constructed with the PhyML v. 2.4.4 program (Guindon & Gascuel, 2003). The reliability of internal branches was assessed using a nonparametric bootstrap method with 1000 replicates. A BI analysis was performed with MrBayes 3.1.2 (Ronquist & Huelsenbeck, 2003) using the Markov chain Monte Carlo algorithm. The program was run for 1 000 000 generations with a sample frequency of 100 generations and the first 2500 trees were discarded as burn-in. The remaining trees were used to calculate posterior probabilities (PP) using a majority rule consensus.

The following uncommon term is used in the present work:

Posterior fragment: In Aporthotrochilia gen. nov., several short kinetics caudally positioned on the right of frontoventral kinetics.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

ORDER: CYRTOPHORIDA FAURE-FREMIET

IN CORLISS, 1956

SUBORDER: DYSTERIINA DEROUX, 1976

FAMILY: HARTMANNULIDAE POCHÉ, 1913

GENUS: HETEROHARTMANNULA GEN. NOV.

Diagnosis: Dorsoventrally flattened Hartmannulidae with a tail-shaped podite; two circimal kinetics distinctly detached, obliquely arranged in a line with fragmented preoral kinety.

Type species: Heterohartmannula fangi sp. nov.
Etymology: The prefix ‘hetero’ indicates that the new genus is different from the well-known genus Hartmannula; feminine gender.

Remarks: The family Hartmannulidae is characterized by: presence of podite, left kineties as a continuous field and macronucleus heteromerous (Deroux, 1976c; Corliss, 1979). The genus Heterohartmannula corresponds well to these features. Thus it belongs to Hartmannulidae.

Compared with other related genera in Hartmannulidae (e.g. Aegyriana, Brookynella, Chlamydonyx, Hartmannula, Orthotrochila, Trochiloides), the oral ciliature of Heterohartmannula gen. nov. is unique: the circumoral kineties are detached and obliquely arranged in a line (vs. closely arranged as equal mark-like), and the preoral kinety is composed of several (e.g. two to four) distinctly detached fragments (vs. single and continuous) (Deroux, 1976c; Song & Wilbert, 2002; Song, 2003; Gong & Song, 2004b, 2006). These differences support the establishment of a new genus.

**Heterohartmannula fangi** sp. nov.

(Figs 1, 2; Table 1)

*Diagnosis:* Marine Heterohartmannula c. 60–90 × 20–30 μm *in vivo*, body oval-shaped in outline; pellicle of cilium-free field covered by densely arranged bacteria; 28–32 ventral kineties, the right-most six of which extend apically; about 19 nematodesmal rods; preoral kinety usually composed of three fragments; about six contractile vacuoles ventrally located; a yellowish pigment spot near the anterior tip of cell; podite subterminally positioned.

*Type deposition:* The holotype slide of protargol-impregnated specimens is deposited in the Laboratory...
of Protozoology, Ocean University of China, China (No. PHB10040701). A paratype slide is in the National History Museum, London, UK (registration number 2010:11:7:2).

Type locality: Coastal waters off Donghai Island, Zhanjiang (21°14′N, 110°23′E), China (temperature 24 °C, salinity 27‰).

Dedication: We dedicate this new species to our respected colleague, Prof. Dr Jingyun Fang, Peking University, China, in recognition of his tremendous contributions to the fields of biodiversity and plant ecology.

Description: Cell size about 60–90 × 20–30 μm in vivo, body highly flexible and slightly contractile, usually long oval in outline. Right margin more convex than left, with anterior ‘beak’ projecting to left; usually ventral surface flat and dorsal surface vaulted in midbody (Figs 1A, B, F, 2A–E). Pellicle of cilium-free field conspicuously covered with densely arranged bacteria (Fig. 2F). Podite about 7 μm in length, subterminally positioned. Cytostome slit-like, surrounded by 17–22 straight tooth-tipped nematodesmal rods, extending posteriorly slightly leftwards (Figs 1G, 2H). Cytoplasm colourless or greyish, usually with numerous granules (1–2 μm across), which render the cell more or less opaque. One small patch-like pigment spot positioned at anterior left of cell, usually yellowish to dark yellow in colour (Fig. 2H, arrowhead). About six contractile vacuoles (4 μm in diameter), most of which are longitudinally arranged on ventral side (Figs 1A, 2C). Cilia about 7 μm long. Movement slow, usually crawling on substrate.

Figure 1. Morphology and infraciliature of *Heterohartmannula fangi* gen. et sp. nov. from life (A, B, F) and after protargol impregnation (C–E, G, H). A, ventral view of a typical individual. B, dorsal view. C–E, anterior of different individuals, to show variants of oral kineties. F, lateral view. G, anterior portion to show infraciliature, arrow marks terminal fragment. H, ventral view, arrowhead points to kinetosome-like granules near base of podite. Abbreviations: Co, circumoral kineties; FvK, frontoventral kineties; LK, left kineties; PoK, postoral kineties; Pr, preoral kineties; RK, right kineties. Scale bars = 40 μm (A, G, H), 25 μm (F).
Infraciliature as shown in Figures 1C–E, G, H, 2G, I–L. 28–32 somatic kineties, the right-most six to seven of which extend apically. Ten to 12 right, five to nine postoral, and 11–13 left kineties surrounding the oral area; left and postoral kineties posteriorly shortened progressively from right to left (Figs 1G, H, 2G, L). Terminal fragment (Fig. 1G) consisting of three to eight basal bodies; equatorial fragment not detected. About nine kinetosome-like dots present near the base of podite (arrowhead in Fig. 1H and arrow in Fig. 2L). Macronucleus ellipsoidal, heteromerous, about 18 × 11 μm in size. Micronucleus invisible.

Two circumoral kineties obliquely arranged, the right of which is sometimes divided into two fragments (three of 22 individuals) (Figs 1C–E, 2J–L), and they seldom connect with each other (one of 22 individuals) (Fig. 2G). Preoral kineties usually comprising two to four fragments (Figs 1C–E, 2J–L).

Comparison: Considering general morphology (e.g. cell size and shape, numbers of somatic kineties and contractile vacuoles), *Heterohartmannula fangi* sp. nov. resembles *Hartmannula angustipilosa*. However, it can be separated from the latter by obliquely (vs. in parallel) arranged circumoral kinetics, the number of nematodesmal rods (17–22 vs. ten–11) and the presence of bacteria on the pellicle (vs. absence) (Gong & Song, 2004b; Table 2).

*Hartmannula sinica* Shao et al. 2008 is similar to *Heterohartmannula fangi* sp. nov. in terms of body size, numbers of somatic kineties, and nematodesmal rods (Shao et al., 2008). Nevertheless, *Hartmannula sinica* can be clearly identified by having an alveolar layer on its cell surface (vs. absence in latter) and more contractile vacuoles (c. 15 vs. c. six) (Table 2).

*Heterohartmannula fangi* sp. nov. has the same number of nematodesmal rods as *Hartmannula acrobates* Poche, 1913. However, it differs from the latter by the character of cell surface (partly covered by bacteria vs. by an alveolar layer), and number of somatic kinetics (28–32 vs. 32–37) (Deroux & Dragesco, 1968; Table 2).

Except for differences in oral kinetics, *Hartmannula derouxi* Gong et Song, 2004, differs from...
**Heterohartmannula fangi** sp. nov. mainly by having more somatic kineties (42–53 vs. 28–32), more contractile vacuoles (20–28 vs. c. six), and more nematosomal rods (27–32 vs. 17–22) (Gong & Song, 2004b; Table 2).

**Genus: Aporthotrochilia gen. nov.**

**Diagnosis:** Dorsoventrally compressed Hartmannulidae with a podite; oral kineties reduced to two fragments; several kinetical fragments positioned on the right posterior of frontoventral kineties; postoral kineties strongly shortened posteriad; terminal fragments consisting of several parallel arranged fragments.

**Type species:** Aporthotrochilia pulex (Deroux, 1976) comb. nov. (basionym: Trichopodiella pulex Deroux, 1976).

**Etymology:** Composite of Greek prefix apo- (derived from) and the generic name Orthotrochilia; feminine gender.

**Comparison:** In general, Aporthotrochilia gen. nov. resembles Orthotrochilia Song, 2003 in oral ciliature and the pattern of postoral kineties. However, the new genus can be distinguished by the presence of several extra kinetal fragments, i.e. the posterior fragments are on right posterior of frontoventral kineties and the higher number of terminal fragments (more than one vs. single) (Song, 2003).

Compared with other closely related genera (e.g. Microxysma, Trochilioides, Chlamydonyx), Aporthotrochilia can be clearly identified by having two perioral kineties (vs. two circumoral and one preoral kineties), several terminal fragments (vs. single), and several extra kinety fragments caudally positioned on right of frontoventral kineties (vs. none) (Deroux, 1976c).

**Aporthotrochilia pulex** (Deroux, 1976) comb. nov. (Fig. 3; Table 3)

**Basionym:** Trichopodiella pulex Deroux, 1976.

**New diagnosis:** Body oval in outline, size in vivo 25–40 × 15–20 μm; a small podite subterminally positioned; two contractile vacuoles situated on right side; one frontoventral kinety and three to five posterior fragments; nine to ten ventral kineties in postoral field; four to five terminal fragments; marine habitat.

**Slide deposition:** One voucher slide with protargol specimens is deposited in the Natural History Museum, London, UK with registration number 2010:11:7:3. Another two slides are deposited in the Laboratory of Protozoology, Ocean University of China (no. PHB09121509).
Redescription: Body size about 25–40 × 15–20 μm in vivo; cells oval shaped with left margin sometimes slightly sigmoidal, both end bluntly rounded. Dorsoventrally flattened, ventral side flat and dorsal side slightly vaulted (Fig. 3A–E, I, N). Cytostome relatively small, subanteriorly positioned, nematodesmal rods hard to detect. Cytoplasm colourless or greyish, with several tiny, greasily shining granules (1–2 μm across) and few food vacuoles (4–5 μm across). Two contractile vacuoles (c. 3 μm in diameter) positioned in anterior and posterior one-third near right margin (Fig. 3F, arrows). Podite inconspicuous, 4 μm long, subterminally positioned (Fig. 3H, arrow). Macronucleus ellipsoid, positioned in body centre, heteromeric. Micronucleus not detected. Cilia about 6 μm long. Movement by slowly gliding on substrate.

Infraciliature as shown in Figure 3G, J, K, L, M, P–T. The short three to five right-most of the ventral kineties, which are anteriorly shortened progressively from left to right and posteriorly positioned, forming posterior fragments (PFs); the longest PF only extending forward to anterior one-third of body length (Fig. 3M, P, R). One frontoventral kinety (FvK) positioned next to PF extending apically. Both FvK and PF terminating posteriorly at the same level, and basal bodies densely arranged at their posterior ends (Fig. 3R, arrowheads). Nine to ten ventral kineties posteriorly positioned, strongly shortened from right to left. Terminal fragments consisting of four to five fragments (Fig. 3G, Q). Equatorial fragment not detected. Perioral kineties positioned anterior to cytostome, consisting of two fragments, both distinctly separated and composed of dikinetids.

Morphogenesis: Only two specimens in middle and late stages of the morphogenetic process have been observed (Fig. 3K, L, S, T). These showed that (1) perioral kineties of opisthe were developed from the oral primordium in midbody, which is generated from sections of postoral kineties; (2) the posterior fragments of both proter and opisthe stem from the parental posterior fragments.

Remarks: Deroux (1976c) described a species under the name of *Trichopodiella pulex* with its infraciliature (Fig. 3O) in detail: one frontoventral kinety, 11 postoral kineties and three or four posterior fragments; the postoral kineties strongly shortened. However, he did not note whether the podite is present. Our isolate corresponds very well to the original report in terms of infraciliature, except for the only difference in the number of postoral kineties (ten vs. 11), which is, however, considered minor. Therefore, our isolate should represent a population of *Trichopodiella pulex*.

However, during our study, we found this organism was quite different from other *Trichopodiella* spp. by: the presence of podite (vs. absence), four to five terminal fragments (vs. single), three to five distinct posterior fragments (vs. none) and two perioral kineties (vs. single) (Fauré-Fremiet, 1957; Deroux & Dragesco, 1968; Deroux, 1976c; Gong et al., 2008). Therefore, we concluded that this small species should represent a distinct genus, and assigned it to the new genus *Aporthotrochilia* as *Aporthotrochilia pulex* (Deroux, 1976) gen. et comb. nov.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>CV</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Body length</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body width</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of SK</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of FvK</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of PF</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of TF</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Ma</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width of Ma</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All measurements in μm. CV, coefficient of variation (%); FvK, frontoventral kineties; Ma, macronucleus; Max., maximum; Mean, arithmetic mean; Min., minimum; N, number of specimens; PF, posterior fragments; SD, standard deviation; SK, somatic kineties; TF, terminal fragments.
a conspicuous alveolar layer; four right somatic kineties, the right-most two of which extend dorsoapically; two left frontal kineties which extend to about one-third of body length; podite caudally positioned.

Type deposition: The holotype, as a protargol-impregnated slide, has been deposited in the Laboratory of Protozoology, Ocean University of China (No. PHB10010703). A paratype slide is in the National History Museum, London, UK, with the registration number 2010:11:7:1.

Type locality: Coastal waters off Clear Water Bay, Hong Kong (22°12′N, 114°117′E), water temperature 23 °C and salinity 16‰.

Etymology: The name refers to the feature of having distinct alveoli.

Description: Cell size about 55–45 × 15–20 μm in vivo, bilaterally flattened about 1:2. From side view, body elongated or oval in outline; left side flattened and right side vaulted with about five or six ridges. Anterior margin rounded and posterior slightly tapering (Fig. 4A–C, F, K–M). Pellicle of cillum-free field conspicuously covered with a thick alveolar layer that is composed of multiple vacuoles and detectable under 200 × magnification (Fig. 4F, L). Podite slender, about 8 μm long, caudally positioned. Cytoplasm colourless or greyish, usually with many tiny shining granules (1–2 μm across) and one or two ingested diatoms,
which render the cell more or less opaque. Cytostome in anterior quarter of cell. Cytopharynx diagonally orientated, about 20 mm long, and extending to about posterior fifth of cell, supported by two nematodesmal rods (Fig. 4E). Contractile vacuole not detected. Macronucleus ellipsoidal, size about 23 × 13 mm in vivo, centrally positioned, characteristically hetero-omerous. Micronucleus not detected. Cilia 8 mm long in vivo. Movement always slow, by crawling on substrate.

Infraciliature as shown in Figure 4D, G, H, J, N. Four right kineties, the two right-most of which are almost equal in length (c. 147 kinetosomes) and both extend anteriorly and bend to dorsal side; the other two kineties shortened at both ends from right to left (Fig. 4D, J, N). At midbody about five closely spaced, very short left kineties. Two relatively long left frontal kineties, composed of 30–43 kinetosomes, positioned at the left side of cytostome, extending to about one-third of body length. One straight terminal fragment comprising three kinetosomes. Equatorial fragment consisting of about three kinetosomes.

Oral ciliature typical of the genus Trochilia (Fig. 4D, G, N): two parallel circumoral kineties and one short preoral kinety, all of which are composed of dikinetids.

Comparison and remarks: The genus Trochilia Dujardin, 1841, is characterized by a combination of the following features: (1) lateral compressed but no ventral grooves; (2) two nematodesmal rods; (3) left field kineties divided into left kineties and left frontal kineties, the latter group always composed of two rows (Heuss & Wilbert, 1973; Deroux, 1976c; Gong, Warren & Song, 2009b).

Amongst Trochilia species that have been described using modern methods, three species are similar to Trochilia alveolata sp. nov., Trochilia minuta (Roux, 1899) Kahl 1931; Trochilia petrani Dragesco, 1966, and Trochilia sigmoides Dujardin, 1841.

Trochilia petrani (Fig. 5F) resembles T. alveolata sp. nov. in terms of cell size, but it can be distinguished by the absence of both the alveolar layer and the ridges on right side (vs. present in latter) (Dragesco, 1966).

Table 4. Morphometric characteristics of Trochilia alveolata sp. nov. (upper line) and Hypocoma acinetarum (lower line) from protargol-impregnated specimens

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>CV</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Body length</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body width</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of right kineties</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of left kineties</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of FvK</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of basal bodies in FvK</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>147.7</td>
<td>11.78</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of basal bodies in TF</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of basal bodies in EF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>68.7</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of basal bodies in Lf</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of macronucleus</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width of macronucleus</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All measurements in μm. Abbreviations: CV, coefficient of variation (%); EF, equatorial fragment; FvK, frontoventral kineties; Lf, left frontal kineties; Max, maximum; Mean, arithmetic mean; Min, minimum; N, number of specimens; SD, standard deviation; TF, terminal fragment.

Trochilia minuta and T. sigmoides are similar to the new species in terms of the presence of ridges on the right side. However, T. minuta (Fig. 5D) can be separated from T. alveolata sp. nov. by having relatively shorter left frontal kineties (containing c. six kinetosomes vs. 30–43 kinetosomes) and the absence of alveolar layer (vs. present in latter) (Foissner, 1979). Compared with the new species, T. sigmoides (Fig. 5A, B) is smaller (20–28 vs. 45–55 μm in length), oval in body outline (vs. elliptical) and has no alveolar layer (vs. present), and hence can be identified (Gong et al., 2009b).
Trochilia marina Mereschkowski, 1881, and T. salina Entz, 1879, whose infraciliatures are not known, are also similar to T. alveolata sp. nov. in cell shape and marine habitat. The former (Fig. 5E) is characterized by smaller size (c. 33 vs. 45–55 μm in length) and the absence of alveolar layer (vs. present in latter). The latter (Fig. 5C) can be identified from T. alveolata sp. nov. by smaller size (c. 20 vs. 45–55 μm in length) and the absence of ridges on the right side (vs. present) (Kahl, 1931).

**SUBORDER: DYSTERIINA DEROUX, 1976**

**FAMILY: PLESIOTRICHOPIDAE DEROUX, 1976**

**GENUS:** TROCHOCHILODON DEROUX, 1976

Deroux (1976b) reported Trochochilodon with detailed infraciliature of the type species Trochochilodon flavus but no live information. The genus Trochochilodon, in our opinion, has not been clearly defined yet. Based on the data available, an improved diagnosis of the genus is supplied here.

**Improved diagnosis for genus Trochochilodon:** Dors-ventrally compressed plesiotrichopids; right kineties clearly separated from left kineties in posterior region of cell; left kineties posteriorly shortened from right to left; oral ciliature consisting of two circumoral kineties only; no podite.

**TROCHOCHILODON FLAVUS** DEROUX, 1976 [NOM. CORRECT. AESCHT, 2001 (pro T. FLAVUM)]

(Fig. 6, TABLE 1)

Based on current careful observations of both morphology and infraciliature, we supply here an improved diagnosis and a detailed description.

**Improved diagnosis:** Marine Trochochilodon, size 40–60 × 20–30 μm in vivo, cell oval in outline; nine ventral kineties, including five right and four left kineties; three right-most kineties extending apically; about 12 nematodesmal rods; cortical granules.
sparsely arranged in lines in the dorsal pellicle; two contractile vacuoles, diagonally positioned.

**Description based on Qingdao population:** Cell size c. 45–55 × 25–30 μm *in vivo*, body shape usually oval or slightly kidney-like with both ends broadly rounded (Fig. 6A, F–I). Cell dorsoventrally flattened, ventral surface flat, and dorsal side slightly vaulted. Pellicle somewhat rough, some cortical granules (c. 1 μm across) arranged in curved lines on cilia-free area (Fig. 6C, L, N). Cytoplasm colourless and hyaline, with different sized granules (1–6 μm in diameter) and food vacuoles (4–5 μm across). Cytostome inconspicuous, positioned in anterior one-sixth of body length; cytopharynx diagonally orientated, supported by 12 nematodesmal rods. Two contractile vacuoles,

---

**Figure 6.** Morphology and infraciliature of *Trochochilodon flavus* from life (A, C, F–I, L, N) and after protargol impregnation (B, D, E, J, K, M, O). A, ventral view of a typical individual. B, ventral view, showing infraciliature, from Deroux (1976b). C, dorsal view, showing cortical granules. D, ventral view, arrow points to the gap between right and left kineties. E, dorsal view, arrowhead indicates the extra basal body in left margin. F, G, ventral views of different individuals. H, I, to show contractile vacuoles (arrowheads) and food vacuoles (arrows in H). J, ventral view, arrowhead marks the gap between right and left kineties. K, ventral view, arrow refers to equatorial fragment, arrowhead shows circumoral kineties. L, dorsal view, arrow shows terminal cilia. M, anterior of dorsal side, arrowhead points to terminal fragment. N, ventral view. O, ventral view of an individual in a late stage of morphogenesis. Abbreviations: Co, circumoral kineties; CvP, contractile vacuole pore; EF, equatorial fragment; FvK, frontoventral kineties; TF, terminal fragment. Scale bars = 25 μm.
about 3 \( \mu \)m in diameter, diagonally positioned (Fig. 6A, H, I). Macronucleus heteromerous and ellipsoidal, about 15 \( \times \) 10 \( \mu \)m \textit{in vivo}, obliquely positioned in midbody. Micronuclei not detected. Cilia about 12 \( \mu \)m long \textit{in vivo}. Movement usually by gliding on substrate.

Infraciliature as shown in Figure 6D, E, J, K, M, O. A total of nine somatic kineties, which are divided into five right and four left kineties by a conspicuous gap in posterior region (arrow in Fig. 6D and arrowhead in Fig. 6J); the right-most three kineties extending apically and bending to left margin; the middle three kineties arranged in postoral region; the posterior ends of left kineties shortened progressively from right to left. Terminal fragment comprising five basal bodies (Fig. 6M, arrowhead); equatorial fragment consisted of five to 22 basal bodies (Fig. 6D, K). Usually one or two basal bodies (arrowhead in Fig. 6E) recognized in left margin, positioned in anterior one-sixth of body length. After protargol impregnation, two contractile vacuole pores visible (Fig. 6D).

Oral kineties composed of two short, parallel arranged circumoral kineties. Outer circumoral kinety slightly longer than the inner one (Fig. 6D, K).

Remarks: \textit{Trochochilodon flavus} was originally described by Deroux (1976b) with detailed infraciliature (Fig. 6B) but no live characters. Considering that the infraciliature of our population is the same as the original, we confirm that our form is \textit{T. flavus}.

**SUBORDER: HYPOCOMATINA DEROUX, 1976**

**FAMILY: HYPOCOMIDAE BUTSCHLI, 1889**

**GENUS: HYPOCOMA GRUBER, 1884**

**HYPOCOMA ACINETARUM COLLIN, 1907**

(Fig. 7, Table 4)

Deroux (1974) revealed the infraciliature and morphogenesis of \textit{Hypocoma acinetarum}, and recently
Improved diagnosis: Marine Hypocoma, cell size in vivo 30–60 × 15–30 μm; oval-shaped in outline; 17–20 ventral kineties consisting of nine to 13 right and six to eight left kineties; about four contractile vacuoles arranged in a longitudinal row on left side of cell; one macronucleus, C-shaped.

Redescription: Body in vivo c. 35–60 × 15–30 μm. Cell usually oval-shaped in outline, with right margin convex and left margin straight or slightly concave (Fig. 7A–E, J). A depressed region positioned in posterior of ventral side (Fig. 7I, arrow). Cytoplasm colourless or greyish, containing several granules (3–5 μm across). Usually four contractile vacuoles, about 3–4 μm in diameter, longitudinally arranged on left (Fig. 7B, arrowheads). Cytoplasm simply and inconspicuous, positioned near the anterior end of cell, no distinct nematodesmal rods detected. Macronucleus C-shaped, centrally positioned (Fig. 7E, arrow). Cilia on ventral side about 7 μm long, and on dorsal terminal fragment about 12 μm long. Movement by swimming moderately fast.

Infraciliature as shown in Figure 7F–H, K, L. Sixteen to 19 somatic kineties consisting of nine to 13 right and six to eight left kineties, forming sutures at both anterior and posterior ends. Left kineties straight, and right kineties slightly curved to left at both ends. Anterior ends of all kineties surrounding the cytostome. The right-most and left-most kineties converge in caudal region. About three or four middle kineties interrupted in posterior part, their posterior ends positioned in the depressed area and forming a naked region (Fig. 7K, arrowhead). Equatorial fragment composed of 17–40 basal bodies. Terminal fragment consisting of nine to 16 basal bodies (Fig. 7L, arrowhead). Oral kineties not observed.

Remarks: Collin (1907) first reported Hypocoma acinetarum with a general morphological description. The morphometric data of our form correspond well with the original report in terms of cell shape and size, number of contractile vacuoles, and shape of macronucleus. Thus it is confirmed that our isolate is Hypocoma acinetarum.

Deroux (1974) first revealed the infraciliature of Hypocoma acinetarum. Differently from the present population, his form has slightly more kineties (20 vs. 16–19).

Hu et al. (2003) also reported a Chinese population without information on the contractile vacuoles. Compared with their population, our isolate is a little larger in size (35–60 × 15–30 vs. 30–50 × 20–25 μm) and has fewer kineties (16–19 vs. 17–20).

Phylogeny of two new genera (Fig. 8)

Deposition of sequences

The new SSU rDNA sequences have been deposited in the GenBank database with the following accession numbers: HQ605947 (Aporothrochilia pulex gen. et comb. nov.) and HQ605946 (Heterohartmannula fangi gen. et. sp. nov.).

Phylogenetic analyses

Phylogenetic trees by ML and BI strongly support the monophyly of Subkinetalia, Phyllophryngea, Suctoria, Synhymeniida and the genus Oysteria. The topology shown in Figure 8 indicates Heterohartmannula fangi gen. et sp. nov. clustering with Hartmannula spp., then forming a sister clade to Trichopodiella faurei. Furthermore, Aporothrochilia pulex gen. et comb. nov. occupies the basal position of the chonotrichid–cyrtophorid clade with moderate values (ML/BI, 75/1.00).

Discussion based on phylogenetic trees

In previous studies (Snoeyenbos-West et al., 2004; Li & Song, 2006; Gong et al., 2008, 2009a), Phyllophryngea and Suctoria have been considered as monophyletic, which is also strongly supported by our research. Heterohartmannula fangi gen. et sp. nov. is placed closer to Hartmannula than to Trichopodiella, which corresponds well to morphological comparisons that both Heterohartmannula and Hartmannula have distinct podites but Trichopodiella does not.

It is striking that Aporothrochilia pulex gen. et comb. nov. locates at the base of the Cyrtophoria-Chonotrichia group in the molecular trees. This result disagrees with the morphological taxonomy in which A. pulex belongs to Hartmannulidae and hence would have been expected to cluster with Trichopodiella, Heterohartmannula, and Hartmannula. We have double-checked the macronucleus of A. pulex, and confirm that it is juxtaposed heteromeros (vs. centrally heteromeros in Chilodonellina). What morphological character makes the phylogenetic position of A. pulex so special, and in which family (possibly new?) it should be classified, remain open questions for further discussion.
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