

1 ***Carvajal* *Caligus elongatus* and other sea lice of the genus *Caligus* as**
2 **parasites of farmed salmonids: a review**

3
4 Willy Hemmingsen¹, Ken MacKenzie^{2,*}, Kjetil Sagerup³, Mette Remen³, Karin
5 Bloch-Hansen³, Albert K. Dagbjartarson Imsland^{4,5}

6
7 ¹*The Arctic University of Norway, Department of Arctic & Marine Biology, N-9037 Tromsø,*
8 *Norway*

9 ²*University of Aberdeen, School of Biological Sciences (Zoology), Tillydrone Avenue,*
10 *Aberdeen AB24 2TZ, Scotland*

11 ³*Akvaplan-niva, Fram Ctr, NO-9296 Tromsø, Norway*

12 ⁴*Akvaplan-niva, Iceland Off, Akralind 4, IS-201 Kopavogur, Iceland*

13 ⁵*Department of Biological Sciences, University of Bergen, High Technology Centre, 5020*
14 *Bergen, Norway*

15
16 *Corresponding author: k.mackenzie@abdn.ac.uk

17
18 Running page head: *Caligus* species in farmed salmon

19
20 **ABSTRACT**

21 This review was prompted by reports of unusually large numbers of sea lice tentatively
22 identified as *Caligus elongatus* infesting farmed salmon in northern Norway. Following a
23 brief introduction to the sea lice problem in salmonid aquaculture, the review is divided into a
24 further eight sections. The first is a review of existing information on the life cycle and
25 behaviour of *Caligus* spp. The second is a description of the morphology of different stages in
26 the life cycle of *C. elongatus*. The third describes the effects of caligid infestations on
27 salmonid hosts. The fourth reviews information on the geographical distributions and host
28 preferences of the six species of *Caligus* reported from farmed salmonids in different parts of
29 the world: *C. elongatus*, *C. curtus*, *C. clemensi*, *C. rogercresseyi*, *C. teres* and *C. orientalis*.
30 The fifth section describes interactions between farmed and wild fish and the sixth presents
31 information on the genetics of *C. elongatus*. A section reviewing the different methods used
32 to control sea lice infestations follows. The eighth section discusses the predicted effects of
33 climate change and invasive host species on the distribution and occurrence of caligid
34 copepods, and the ninth gives conclusions and recommendations on how to further investigate
35 the infestation that prompted this review. These include the confirmation of the identity of the
36 caligid causing the problem, confirmation of the genotype involved and a study of the vertical
37 distribution in the water column of the infective stages.

38
39 **KEY WORDS:** *Caligus elongatus*; farmed salmon; life cycle; effects; control

1 **1. Introduction**

2
3 The parasitic copepod family Caligidae comprises 30 genera and 509 valid species (Dojiri
4 & Ho 2013; Walter & Boxshall, 2020). Members of two of these genera – *Lepeophtheirus* and
5 *Caligus* - have achieved notoriety by having the greatest economic impact of any group of
6 parasites in salmonid fish mariculture (Costello 2006) and have become collectively known as
7 “sea lice”. Although this notoriety is mainly due to the particularly serious impact of the
8 species *Lepeophtheirus salmonis* (Krøyer, 1837), members of the genus *Caligus* are also
9 implicated. Johnson et al. (2004) estimated that in marine and brackish water fish cultures,
10 61% of copepod infestations are caused by members of the family Caligidae, 40% of which
11 are caused by species of *Caligus* and 14% by species of *Lepeophtheirus*. Costello (2009)
12 estimated that in 2006 the worldwide salmonid farming industry had a total loss of U.S. \$480
13 million due to salmon lice infestations. Controlling salmon lice is one of the biggest
14 challenges in Norwegian salmon farming and cost the aquaculture industry more than NOK 5
15 billion in 2014 (Iversen et al. 2016), corresponding to about 9% of the farms’ income
16 (Abolofia et al. 2017).

17 A major difference between *L. salmonis* and *Caligus* spp. lies in their host specificities: *L.*
18 *salmonis* is essentially a parasite of salmonid fish (Kabata (1979) considered reports from
19 non-salmonid hosts to be unusual and would probably offer no chance for further
20 development and survival of the parasite), whereas many *Caligus* spp. tend to be much less
21 host specific (Kabata 1979; Pike & Wadsworth 1999). Two hundred and sixty-seven valid
22 species of *Caligus* are currently recognized (Walter & Boxshall, 2020). The most common
23 species infecting farmed salmonids are *Caligus elongatus* von Nordmann, 1832 in the North
24 Atlantic, *C. orientalis* Gussev, 1951 and *C. clemensi* Parker & Margolis, 1964 in the North
25 Pacific, and *C. rogercresseyi* (Boxshall & Bravo, 2000) and *C. teres* Wilson, 1905 in Chile
26 (Johnson et al. 2004). Those aspects of the biology and ecology of sea lice of relevance to
27 mariculture were reviewed by Wootten et al. (1982), Pike & Wadsworth (1999), Tully &
28 Nolan (2002), Johnson et al. (2004), Boxaspen (2006), Costello (2006) and Jones & Johnson
29 (2014).

30 The present review was prompted by reports of unusually large numbers of caligid
31 copepods tentatively identified as *C. elongatus* on farmed Atlantic salmon in North Norway
32 (Imstrand et al. 2019a, b). These copepods were readily distinguished from *L. salmonis* by
33 their much smaller size, but specific identification has not been confirmed. This problem has
34 affected salmon farms in north Nordland and Troms counties, but has been particularly severe
35 in Finnmark. The present review has been undertaken prior to a detailed study of the specific
36 identity of these copepods and possible reasons for their recent occurrence in such abundance
37 in North Norway. This situation is unusual because epizootics of *C. elongatus* were
38 previously rare in Norway (Boxaspen 2006), although Øines & Heuch (2007) confirmed that
39 *C. elongatus* was present on salmon in North Norwegian farms. The review aims to collate the
40 existing literature on those aspects of the biology and ecology of *C. elongatus* in particular
41 and other members of the genus *Caligus* in general that we consider to be relevant to this
42 problem.

43 44 45 46 **2. Life cycle and behaviour of *Caligus* spp.**

47

1 Most caligid species were earlier considered to have 10 developmental stages in their life
2 cycle: two free-living planktonic nauplius stages, one free-swimming infective copepodid
3 stage, 4 attached chalimus stages, one or two pre-adult stages and one adult stage (Wootten et
4 al. 1982). It was then discovered that preadult stages were absent in three species of *Caligus* -
5 *C. punctatus* Shiino, 1955, *C. elongatus* and *C. rogercresseyi* (see Kim 1993; Piasecki &
6 MacKinnon 1995; Piasecki 1996; González & Carvajal 2003) and in one species of
7 *Pseudocaligus* (see Ohtsuka et al, 2009). More recent studies have confirmed that the caligid
8 life cycle has only 8 stages: members of the genus *Lepeophtheirus* have only two chalimus
9 and two pre-adult stages, whereas those of the genus *Caligus* have a different life cycle, with
10 four chalimus stages and no pre-adult stage (Hamre et al. 2013; Venmathi Maran et al. 2013)
11 (Fig. 1). The following descriptions of the different developmental stages of *Caligus* spp. are
12 based on those of Hogans & Trudeau (1989a) and Piasecki (1996) for *C. elongatus*.

13 The newly hatched nauplius I stage reflects the short cylindrical shape of the egg, shortly
14 after which it attains the elongated oval shape characteristic of the nauplius stages I and II.
15 Both nauplius stages are slightly less than 0.5 mm in length. They are free-swimming in the
16 plankton and have three pairs of locomotory structures or limbs: antennules, antennae and
17 mandibles. The duration of each naupliar stage lasts for 30-35 h at around 10°C, but is
18 considerably prolonged at lower water temperatures. The next stage is the infective
19 copepodid, which has a more elongated hydrodynamic shape and is slightly longer than the
20 nauplii but still less than 1 mm long. The copepodid has 10 limbs, with poorly developed
21 postantennary processes, maxillules and maxillae, maxillipeds and three pairs of legs added to
22 the antennules, antennae and mandibles of the nauplius. The life span of the copepodid is
23 about 50 h at 13°C. Nauplii and copepodid stages are both positively phototactic, with this
24 ability being much more highly developed in the copepodid. Host location and contact by
25 copepodids of *L. salmonis* were studied by Heuch & Karlsen (1997), who described a burst-
26 swimming response to movements of water currents, such as that caused by movement of a
27 fish within centimetres of the copepodid. Norði et al. (2015) found differences in the spatial
28 distribution of copepods of *L. salmonis* and *C. elongatus* in a strait between two of the Faroe
29 Islands where six salmon farms were located. They considered the differences to be possibly
30 related to different vertical migration patterns between the two species. Copepodids of *L.*
31 *salmonis* are most abundant in the top four metres of the water column (Hevroy et al. 2003;
32 Costello 2006). There have been no studies designed to map the vertical distribution of *C.*
33 *elongatus* copepodids, but the near surface distribution of *L. salmonis* copepodids may not be
34 beneficial for *C. elongatus* because of its wider host range, which includes pelagic and
35 demersal species.

36 On contact with a suitable fish host, the copepodid temporarily attaches to the host skin
37 using the antennae and maxillae. It then extrudes a frontal filament which penetrates the
38 epidermis and anchors into the basement membrane around the scale, after which it moults to
39 the chalimus stage I. The first chalimus stage is slightly longer and wider than the copepodid,
40 but still less than 1 mm long on average. The chalimus II is slightly larger again at 1-2 mm
41 long and has added a fourth leg. The copepod continues to grow with the following two
42 moults into chalimus stages III and IV. By stage III the sexes are distinguishable based on the
43 number of abdominal segments and features of some of the appendages, and a fifth leg has
44 been added. The fourth stage shows pronounced dorsoventral flattening, the cephalothorax
45 has become wider, sexual dimorphism is more obvious and another ventral structure - the
46 sternal furca - makes its first appearance.

47 After the final moult, young adults remain attached by the frontal filament for a short time
48 before breaking free and becoming fully motile. Sexual dimorphism in *C. elongatus* adults is
49 very obvious: males are smaller than females, with a slimmer posterior body region, and there

1 are differences between the sexes in the structure of some of the accessory structures and
2 appendages.

3 The entire generation time of *C. elongatus* is approximately 5 weeks at 10°C. Hogans &
4 Trudeau (1989a) found the optimum temperature for *C. elongatus* to be around 14°C and that
5 there are probably 4 to 8 generations completed annually in the Bay of Fundy. Studies of the
6 epidemiology of *C. elongatus* infections on farmed salmonids show a consistent seasonal
7 pattern which is quite different to that observed for *L. salmonis* (Revie et al. 2002; McKenzie
8 et al. 2004). Wootten et al. (1982) found large numbers of chalimus stages on farmed salmon
9 without any corresponding increase in adult stages thereafter, suggesting that either they
10 failed to develop to maturity or had left the salmon after maturing, possibly to move to wild
11 fish hosts.

12 Most caligids have direct life cycles as described above, without intermediate hosts.
13 However, a study by Hayward et al. (2011) provided evidence of a possible two-host life
14 cycle in some species, with different fish species serving as intermediate and final hosts. The
15 *Caligus* sp. in this scenario - *C. chiastos* — has become a serious pest of ranched tuna
16 *Thunnus maccoyii* in South Australia, but it has never been reported from wild tuna. Adult
17 stages only of *C. chiastos* were found on the ranched tuna, but larval stages were found in
18 abundance on one out of a number of wild fish species examined from the immediate vicinity
19 of the tuna cages. The host of the larval stages – Degen’s leatherjacket *Thamnaconus degeni* –
20 remains heavily infected at a time of year when there are fewer adult forms on tuna,
21 suggesting the close presence of the natural final host. This indicates possible opportunistic
22 behaviour resulting from the parasite coming into close contact with a naïve species – bluefin
23 tuna - which it would not normally encounter. A similar situation occurs with cultured red
24 seabream *Pagrus major* in Japan and Korea, where only adult forms of *Caligus sclerotinosus*
25 are found on the bream, but in this case no possible intermediate host has been identified (Ho
26 et al. 2004; Venmathi Maran et al. 2012). Such opportunistic behaviour is of considerable
27 relevance to pest control management in mariculture, although no ontogenetic host switching
28 of this kind has been reported for any of the *Caligus* species reported from farmed salmonids.

29 Adult caligids are frequently found in marine plankton samples, with 10 named species
30 reported only from the plankton with no known fish hosts. The various hypotheses proposed
31 to explain the presence of caligids in the water column were reviewed by Venmathi Maran et
32 al. (2016). These are: 1) accidental occurrence, 2) behavioural detachment from the host
33 during mate location, 3) host switching, and 4) an ontogenetic strategy as described above.

36 **3. Morphology of *Caligus* spp.**

37
38 The first detailed description of the morphology of an adult caligid copepod was that of
39 *Caligus curtus* Müller, 1785, a common parasite mainly of gadid fish and the type species of
40 its genus (Parker et al. 1968). This study formed the basis for the descriptions of the
41 morphological features common to all adult caligids by Kabata (1979). Here we focus on the
42 features that make the chalimus and adult stages of *Caligus* spp. such successful parasites and
43 serious pathogens; we also highlight the features that serve as the most reliable for specific
44 identification.

45 Schram (2004) compared the distinguishing features of the naupliar and copepodid stages
46 of *C. elongatus* and *L. salmonis*. Basic measurements of the length and width of these stages
47 are of little practical value because they overlap, but Schram described differences in shape,
48 but more importantly in colour, which are of practical use in distinguishing between the two
49 species: larvae of *L. salmonis* are black and brown, whereas those of *C. elongatus* are red.

1 Initial attachment of the infective copepodid to the host is achieved with the help of the
2 antennae and maxillae. By the copepodid stage these have assumed the form of grasping
3 appendages armed with strong claws that provide temporary attachment until the frontal
4 filament is extruded and anchors the parasite securely, after which the copepodid moults into
5 the chalimus I, followed by a further three moults into chalimus stages II, III and IV before
6 reaching the final adult stage (Piasecki & MacKinnon 1995). There are very clear differences
7 between *C. elongatus* and *L. salmonis* in the structure of the frontal filaments: that of *C.*
8 *elongatus* is long and slender, whereas in *L. salmonis* it is short and stout (Pike et al. 1993).

9 The body of an adult caligid consists of four sections or tagmata: the cephalothorax, the
10 fourth leg-bearing somite, genital complex and abdomen. The cephalothorax is formed from
11 the fusion of the cephalon, the maxilliped-bearing somite, and the first, second and third leg-
12 bearing somites (Kabata 1979; Dojiri & Ho 2013). The paired accessory structures on the
13 ventral part of the chalimus IV and adult caligid cephalothorax consist of antennules and
14 antennae, postantennary processes, maxillules, maxillae, maxillipeds and three pairs of
15 swimming legs (Fig. 2). The tenacious grip that adult caligids exert on the body surface of
16 their host fish is due mainly to the convex shape of the dorsal shield or carapace that covers
17 the cephalothorax. This low profile is ideal for attachment to a slippery surface that is often
18 swept by strong water currents. The edge of the shield is sealed by a peripheral flap that acts
19 as a marginal valve when suction is generated, preventing entry of water between the edge of
20 the shield and the host's skin. Almost half of the genera in the family Caligidae, including
21 *Caligus*, additionally possess two antero-lateral subcircular cups called lunules which act as
22 accessory suckers. These are absent in some other caligid genera, including *Lepeophtheirus*,
23 and are thought to have originated as a modification of the marginal membranes of the
24 ancestral frontal plates (Kaji et al. 2012). A ventrally located cuticular structure called the
25 sternal furca (Fig. 2) may also play a role by acting as a brake when the copepod is in danger
26 of slipping backwards, and/or by raising the cephalothorax and so reducing pressure under it,
27 thereby helping to increase the suction force (Kabata & Hewitt 1971; Kabata 1979). Further
28 adhesion is supplied by the antennae and maxillipeds. The terminal hooks of the antennae
29 pierce the epidermis of the host and anchor the parasite to its temporary site of attachment
30 (Kabata 1979). The maxillipeds have a similar role, but were considered by Kabata (1981) to
31 be of minor importance. These features all contribute towards the secure adhesion of an adult
32 caligid to the skin of its host while also permitting it to move across the surface with ease.

33 The mouth in caligid copepods takes the form of a tube or siphon (the oral cone) formed by
34 the overlapping labrum and labium, with associated features including a pair of mandibles
35 (Fig. 3). When not in use it is folded against the ventral surface of the body; for feeding it
36 moves in the anteroposterior plane to a position perpendicular to the copepod body (Kabata
37 1979). Pressing the distal end of the mouth into the skin spreads the marginal membrane to
38 seal the opening, pushes away the labial fold and exposes a divided bar called a strigil which
39 is armed with many fine sharp teeth (Fig. 4). The sawing action of the strigil releases pieces of
40 epidermal tissue which are picked up by the mandibles and transferred into the buccal cavity
41 (Kabata 1974). The musculature associated with the mouth tube in siphonostomatoid
42 copepods was elucidated by Boxshall (1990), who referred to Kabata (1974) but redescribed
43 some of the musculature associated with the oral cone.

44 Figures 5 and 6 show dorsal views of the females and males of the four most common
45 species of *Caligus* infecting farmed salmonids. The first thing that strikes one on looking at
46 these figures is the marked difference in size between *C. curtus* and the three other species.
47 *Caligus curtus* is closer in size to *L. salmonis*, but much larger than the three other species of
48 *Caligus* featured. The other major interspecific difference is the shape of the cephalothorax. It
49 should be noted that the size and shape of the genital complex in female caligids may vary

1 depending on the state of maturity and stage in egg-laying (Parker et al. 1968). In addition, the
2 body size of a parasitic copepod may vary depending on the host species on which it is found
3 (Cressey 1967; Lewis et al. 1969; Cressey & Collette 1970). The shape of the cephalothorax
4 is a more constant feature, but for a confirmatory specific identification it may be necessary to
5 check some finer details such as the structure of certain accessory structures and appendages.

6 7 8 **4. Effects on the host** 9

10 Kabata & Hewitt (1971) concluded that the attachment of caligids and their movements
11 over the host surface contribute little or nothing to the damage resulting from their activities,
12 but that feeding was mainly, or even solely, responsible for the damage caused. The lesions
13 caused may be localised or more extensive, depending on the size of the fish and the number
14 of parasites. Infestations can result in a broad range of clinical signs, ranging from skin
15 irritation to ulcerations, reduced feeding activity, weight loss and mortality (Tørud & Håstein,
16 2008). According to a survey collecting information from fish health personnel in Northern
17 Norway, Iceland and the Faroe Islands, *C. elongatus* represents a welfare challenge for
18 farmed salmon even at light infestation levels when fish are small (Imsland et al. 2019a).
19 Typically, infestations are manifested by the observation of increased jumping activity with
20 subsequent stroke injuries, skin irritation, loss of appetite and secondary infections. The extent
21 of the clinical findings is related to the number of lice on fish and fish size. These findings are
22 also supported by Wootten et al. 1982. The damage caused by heavy infestations of caligids,
23 in particular *L. salmonis*, on farmed salmonids has been well-documented (Johnson et al.
24 2004; Costello 2006), and includes descriptions of extensive areas of skin erosion and
25 haemorrhaging. Hogans & Trudeau (1989a) and Brandal et al. (1976) demonstrated that blood
26 was part of the diet of *C. elongatus* and *L. salmonis*, but according to Costello (2006) it is not
27 an important component. Most studies of the pathological effects of caligid infections on
28 farmed salmonids have been carried out on *L. salmonis*. This is due in large part to the fact
29 that the infection intensities of *L. salmonis* tend to be higher and the effects on the host more
30 severe than is the case with *Caligus* spp. *Lepeophtheirus salmonis* is a specialist parasite of
31 salmonid fishes and is more likely to remain within the confines of a fish farm, whereas many
32 *Caligus* spp., particularly *C. elongatus*, are much less host specific and therefore more likely
33 to move between farmed salmonids and wild hosts of other species.

34 MacKinnon (1993) described the damage caused by the feeding of chalimus stages of *C.*
35 *elongatus*: a hole lined with necrotic cells was excavated in the epidermis down to the
36 basement membrane and in some cases there was evidence of slight hyperplasia around the
37 excavated area. Hogans & Trudeau (1989a) found that adults of *C. elongatus* tended to
38 congregate on the dorsal and lateral surfaces of the head and on the anterior portion of the
39 abdomen between the opercula. The copepods stripped the mucous covering, then fed directly
40 on the skin, musculature and blood. In severe cases they continued to feed through the skin
41 into the subcutaneous musculature, eventually destroying somatic musculature and cartilage.
42 The final cause of death is usually reported as osmoregulatory failure.

43 The distribution of attached and mobile stages of caligids on their hosts is an important
44 factor in relation to the extent of damage caused to the host. Treasurer & Bravo (2011) studied
45 the spatial distribution of chalimus and adult stages of *C. rogercresseyi* and *C. elongatus* on
46 Atlantic salmon and compared their results with those for *L. salmonis*. Adults of both *Caligus*
47 species had a predilection for the abdominal surface of the body, while chalimus stages were
48 more commonly found attached to the fins. These distributions were significantly different to

1 those of *L. salmonis*, adults of which are significantly more common on the back and on the
2 head of young salmon. No chalimi of either *Caligus* species was found on the gills, whereas
3 chalimi of *L. salmonis* do occur on the gills. Treasurer & Bravo (2011) concluded that *L.*
4 *salmonis* represents a more significant threat to salmon than either *Caligus* species due, along
5 with other factors, to their propensity for sensitive areas where the epidermis is thin, such as
6 the head.

7 An additional effect of infection of fish with ectoparasites such as caligids is to allow
8 secondary bacterial or viral infections to infect areas stripped of mucous, or in epidermal
9 tissue lesions. At some Scottish salmonid sea-cage sites in 1980, heavy infestations of *C.*
10 *elongatus* were associated with outbreaks of vibriosis, although it was not clear whether the
11 copepods were attacking fish already debilitated by the disease, or whether the infection was
12 facilitated by the damage done by the copepods (Wootten et al., 1982). However, Nylund et
13 al. (1991) found bacteria in the middle intestinal part of salmon lice. The microsporidian
14 *Desmozoon lepeoptherii*, associated with chronic gill disease in Atlantic salmon, has also
15 been identified in *C. elongatus* (Nylund et al. 2010). The possible role of *L. salmonis* in the
16 transmission of the virus responsible for infectious salmon anaemia (ISA) was confirmed by
17 Nylund et al. (1993). The results of their experiments were inconclusive, but Oelckers et al.
18 (2014) confirmed that *C. rogercresseyi* is capable of transmitting the ISA virus to naïve
19 salmon. The virus did not appear to be capable of replicating in the copepods, but remained
20 viable after 48 hours away from the host from which they acquired the virus, thereby
21 indicating that salmon lice species may also be vectors for other viral and bacterial diseases
22 (Nylund et al. 1994). The probability of *Caligus* spp. being responsible for transmission of
23 microorganisms is greater than for *L. salmonis* because the former parasitize a wider range of
24 fish hosts.

27 **5. Geographical distributions and host preferences of selected *Caligus* spp.**

28
29 In this section we focus on those species of the genus *Caligus* that have been found on
30 cultured salmonids.

31 32 *5.1. C. elongatus*

33
34 This species was earlier thought to have a cosmopolitan distribution, having been reported
35 from most regions of the world, often under its incorrect name of *Caligus rapax* (see Kabata,
36 1979). Parker (1969) cited reports from the South Atlantic and South Australia, but Hayward
37 et al. (2008) considered that earlier records from Australia and New Zealand were probably of
38 *Caligus chiastos* Lin & Ho, 2003. *Caligus elongatus* appears to be most abundant in the North
39 Atlantic and may be restricted to this region. It has a very low host specificity and has been
40 reported from >80 fish species and one cetacean (Kabata, 1979; Øines et al. 2006; Ólafsdóttir
41 & Shinn, 2013; Agusti-Ridaura et al. 2019). The only region where *C. elongatus* has been
42 reported as being more abundant than *L. salmonis* on farmed Atlantic salmon is the Bay of
43 Fundy in the Northwest Atlantic (Hogans & Trudeau, 1989a, b). One can only speculate on
44 the reasons for this, but it may be that the copepods on different sides of the North Atlantic
45 are different genotypes of *C. elongatus*. Prior to this the only report of *C. elongatus* on farmed
46 salmonids in eastern Canada had been that of Sutterlin et al. (1976) on cultured brook trout
47 *Salvelinus fontinalis* and rainbow trout *Oncorhynchus mykiss*.

48 Several publications identify lumpfish *Cyclopterus lumpus* as a favoured host for *C.*
49 *elongatus*. Boxshall (1974) found chalimus larvae occurring commonly on the skin and fins of
50 all 11 of the lumpfish he examined from the North Sea. Lumpfish were the preferred host for

1 two genotypes of *C. elongatus* in experimental studies carried out by Øines et al. (2006), with
2 one genotype also favouring cod *Gadus morhua* in one experiment. Heuch et al. (2007) found
3 lumpfish to be the most heavily infected of 52 wild fish species examined for *C. elongatus* off
4 the south-east coast of Norway, followed by tub gurnard *Chelidonichthys lucerna*, pollack
5 *Pollachius pollachius* and sea trout *Salmo trutta*. Herring *Clupea harengus* and saithe
6 *Pollachius virens* were other favoured hosts. Heavy infestations of North Sea herring with *C.*
7 *elongatus* were reported by MacKenzie & Morrison (1989). A survey of the occurrence of *C.*
8 *elongatus* on 6,334 individuals of 35 species of wild fishes caught in inshore waters off Maine
9 in the northwest Atlantic found 10 species to be infected. Only one lumpfish was examined,
10 but it had by far the highest median intensity of 22. Of the other infected species, three-spined
11 stickleback *Gasterosteus aculeatus* was the most heavily infected at 12.3% prevalence
12 (Jensen et al., 2016). *Caligus elongatus* also occurs commonly on wild Atlantic salmon *Salmo*
13 *salar*, although levels of infection on returning wild salmon caught in the Northeast Atlantic
14 were found to be much lower than those of *L. salmonis* (see Berland 1993; Jacobsen & Gaard
15 1997; Copley et al. 2005). Amongst farmed salmonids, arctic charr *Salvelinus alpinus* are
16 more susceptible than Atlantic salmon to *C. elongatus* (Mustafa et al. 2005).

17 18 5.2. *C. curtus*

19
20 This is the type species of the genus *Caligus*. Its natural range is the Arctic-Boreal Atlantic
21 and contiguous waters. It is predominantly a parasite of gadid fishes, but has also been
22 reported from a variety of other fish, including elasmobranchs (Parker et al. 1968). It is one of
23 only two species of *Caligus* reported from off the north coast of Norway, the other being *C.*
24 *elongatus* (see Karasev 2003). It is not considered to be a serious pathogen of farmed
25 salmonids: Hogans & Trudeau (1989a) found that it accounted for only 0.7% of all the sea
26 lice collected from farmed salmon in the Bay of Fundy, despite the common occurrence of its
27 gadid hosts around the salmon cages.

28 29 5.3. *C. clemensi*

30
31 This species is native to the Northeast Pacific where it infests a wide range of mainly
32 pelagic fishes (Parker & Margolis, 1964). Jones & Johnson (2014) listed 13 fish species as
33 reported hosts for *C. clemensi*, including Atlantic salmon and 6 species of the genus
34 *Oncorhynchus*. Apart from *Oncorhynchus* spp., its main natural hosts appear to be Pacific
35 herring *Clupea pallasii*, three-spined stickleback, and Alaska pollock *Theragra*
36 *chalcogrammus* (see Parker & Margolis 1964; Arai 1969; Margolis et al. 1975; Arthur & Arai
37 1980; Margolis & Kabata 1988).

38 39 5.4. *C. rogercresseyi*

40
41 This species is native to the southeast Pacific where it occurs along the coast of Chile and
42 southern Argentina (Bravo et al. 2006), and possibly the coast of Peru (Conroy 2001; Bravo et
43 al 2011). It parasitizes a wide range of wild fish, but its most favoured host appears to be the
44 rock cod or robalo *Eleginus maclovinus*, which occurs commonly around salmonid cages,
45 along with the Chilean silverside *Odontesthes regia*, which has also been reported as a host
46 (Carvajal et al. 1998). Salmonid farming began in Chile in the early 1980s, but *C.*
47 *rogercresseyi* was not reported from these fish until 1992, when heavy caligid infestations
48 were recorded on coho salmon *Oncorhynchus kisutch*, rainbow trout and Atlantic salmon by
49 Gonzalez & Carvajal (1994) and Carvajal et al. (1998). These authors identified the copepod
50 responsible as *Caligus flexispina* Lewis, 1964, but Boxshall & Bravo (2000) confirmed that it

1 was a hitherto undescribed species which they named *C. rogercresseyi*. It is now the dominant
2 species of *Caligus* affecting farmed salmonids in Chile, the most susceptible species being
3 rainbow trout and Atlantic salmon (Mancilla-Schulz et al. 2018).

4 5 5.5. *C. teres*

6
7 Like *C. rogercresseyi*, this species is native to the southeast Pacific, where it has been
8 reported from fish of a variety of taxonomic groups. It was first described by Wilson (1905)
9 from the chimaera *Callorhynchus callorhynchus* and an unidentified ray off the coast of
10 Chile, and has since been reported from the Peruvian hake *Merluccius gayi peruanus* and the
11 silverside *Odontesthes* sp. (see Fernández et al. 1986). It was the first native caligid to transfer
12 to farmed salmonids in Chile in the early 1980s, when it was found infesting coho salmon
13 (Reyes & Bravo 1983). When the culture of rainbow trout in Chile began in 1987, they were
14 found to be highly susceptible to *C. teres* (see Bravo 2003). It is not considered to be as great
15 a threat as *C. rogercresseyi* to Chilean salmonid farming.

16 17 5.6. *C. orientalis*

18
19 This species is distributed in the northwest Pacific Ocean off Russia, Japan and China. It is
20 unusual amongst caligids in that it has been reported from a wide range of both marine and
21 freshwater fishes. Heavy infections of cultured rainbow trout in brackish water in Japan were
22 reported by Urawa & Kato (1991), but no further similar cases have been reported since and
23 this copepod was not considered to be important for marine rainbow trout culture in Japan by
24 Nagasawa (2015).

25 26 6. Interactions between wild and farmed fish

27
28 Large aggregations of wild fish are attracted to fish farms, one of the main reasons being
29 the attraction of waste fish feed (Uglem et al. 2014). The extent and scale of both the
30 attraction and repulsion of fish farms for wild organisms, and the reasons for it, were
31 reviewed by Callier et al. (2018). Some of the wild fish species attracted to fish farms are
32 natural hosts for *C. elongatus* and could be an important source of infection for the farmed
33 fish. Saithe are the most abundant wild fish species reported as congregating around salmonid
34 cages in Norway (Uglem et al. 2009). Because they are predominantly pelagic feeders, saithe
35 are consistently found in higher concentrations immediately beside and beneath farm cages
36 (Dempster et al. 2010). Dempster et al. (2009) found that saithe, cod and haddock
37 *Melanogrammus aeglefinus* dominated the farm-associated wild fish assemblages around
38 salmon farms in coastal Norway. These three species, plus mackerel *Scomber scombrus*, were
39 significantly more abundant at farm than at control locations. Somdal & Schram (1992) found
40 *C. elongatus* on only two out of 454 mackerel caught in the Northeast Atlantic, which
41 suggests it is probably not a favoured host. Because lumpfish are commonly used as cleaner
42 fish in salmon aquaculture, Mitamura et al. (2012) examined their movements in a north
43 Norwegian fjord during their spawning season to assess their potential to act as vectors for
44 transmission of parasites to farmed salmon. They found that wild lumpfish are not attracted to
45 salmon farms in the same way as some other species. Other species commonly found around
46 salmon farms included two-spotted goby *Gobiusculus flavescens* and poor cod *Trisopterus*
47 *minutus* (see Carss 1990; Dempster et al. 2010). The latter species was listed among the hosts
48 for *C. elongatus* by Kabata (1979).

49 50 7. Genetics

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

Genetic analyses of mitochondrial COI from samples of *C. elongatus* indicated two distinct clades, possibly revealing two closely related species (Øines & Heuch 2005). The different genotypes did not appear to be associated with sample site or host species. A later study (Øines et al. 2006) revealed that the two genotypes varied slightly in their host preferences, lice from wild lumpfish being all of genotype 1, while those from wild saithe were mainly of genotype 2. Adult *C. elongatus* from both original host species presented experimentally to lumpfish, sea trout, cod, Atlantic salmon and plaice *Pleuronectes platessa* showed a distinct preference for lumpfish and cod. In addition, the genotype 1 of *C. elongatus* was over-represented in wild fish samples collected during spring and genotype 2 gradually increased in samples collected in autumn (Øines & Heuch 2007). However, the study also showed that farmed salmon from Northern Norway (Finnmark), the Faroe Islands, Canada and Scotland had 100% of genotype 1, although samples were collected throughout the year (Øines & Heuch 2007). The differences between the two genotypes were investigated in more detail by Øines & Schram (2008), using two mitochondrial and one nuclear genetic markers, backed up by a morphological analysis of a selected group of characters. The mitochondrial genes indicated genetic distances between the two genotypes within the lower range previously reported for other crustacean species, but the nuclear 18S sequences showed no detectable difference. Two of the three selected morphological characters supported the division based on the molecular results. The authors were unable to draw any firm conclusion regarding the species status of the two genotypes, although their results did suggest the possibility of two sibling species. The *Caligus* species closest to *C. elongatus* in the molecular analysis were *C. gurnardi* and *C. belones*, which are also similar morphologically.

8. Control of sea lice

Since salmonid culture began in the 1960s, a great deal of time and effort has been expended in finding ways to control caligid infestations. In his review of the different methods used, Costello (1993) divided them into three categories: chemical, physical and biological. We discuss them below under the same headings.

8.1. Chemical methods

The first efforts to control *L. salmonis* on farmed salmonids in Norway used formalin and acetic acid baths with limited success (Hastein & Bergsjø 1976). Since these early days many chemicals, mostly insecticides, have been used against sea lice. At present, the most commonly used substances belong to five groups of compounds: orally administered avermectins (emamectin benzoate) and benzoyl ureas (diflubenzuron and teflubenzuron), or bath treatments, using organophosphates (azamthipos), pyrethroids (deltametrin and cypermethrin) and disinfectants (hydrogen peroxide; reviewed by Aaen et al. 2015). Some have been used in combination for greater effect.

Wootton et al. (1982) found that the effects of chemotherapy using Dichlorvos were similar on *C. elongatus* and *L. salmonis* on Scottish salmonid farms, but Landsberg et al. (1991) found a freshwater dip to be more effective than copper, formalin and trichlorfon treatments

1 against *C. elongatus* on red drum *Sciaenops ocellatus* held in seawater ponds. Freshwater dips
2 are not considered to be entirely effective, however, especially against older stages of sea lice
3 (Stone et al. 2002; Wright et al. 2016). Bron et al. (1993a) found treatment with dichlorvos to
4 be more effective against *C. elongatus* than against *L. salmonis*.

5 According to a survey performed in Northern Norway, Iceland and the Faroe Islands, oral
6 administration of emamectin benzoate is currently the preferred and most effective chemical
7 treatment against *C. elongatus* (Imsland et al. 2019a). Infestation is inhibited for up to 55 days
8 after treatment (Stone et al. 2000), and there are no signs of *C. elongatus* developing drug
9 resistance at this point (Agusti-Ridaura et al. 2019). Oral administration of benzoyl urea
10 compounds against *C. elongatus* was only reported at the Faroe Islands and with mixed
11 reports of its efficiency (Imsland et al. 2019a). These compounds inhibit moulting through
12 inhibition of chitin synthesis, and will therefore only be effective in removal of chalimus
13 stages (Campbell et al. 2006). For protection of non-target species, the use of benzoyl ureas
14 has been banned or restricted in several salmon-producing countries (e.g. Canada, Iceland,
15 Norway).

16 The bath treatments commonly used against *L. salmonis* or *C. rogercresseyi* also appear to
17 be effective against *C. elongatus* (Agusti-Ridaura et al. 2019). However, pyrethroids are
18 aimed at chalimus stages (Treasurer & Wadsworth 2004) and hydrogen peroxide against adult
19 stages (MacKinnon 1997). This may be challenging in periods of high infestation rates, during
20 which all stages of *C. elongatus* appear on the fish. Furthermore, the effect may be short-term,
21 due to rapid re-infestation after treatment (Imsland et al. 2019a and references therein).

22 Although effective, these chemicals all carry environmental risks, can affect fish health and
23 can impact negatively on the public image of aquaculture. They also carry the risk of reduced
24 sensitivity and resistance to chemical treatments on the part of the parasites. Efforts have
25 therefore been made to replace them with more environmentally friendly methods (Jackson et
26 al. 2017; Bui et al. 2019), such as those described below.

27 28 8.2. Physical methods

29
30 These include methods involving modifications to the design and structure of farm cages or
31 additions of filtration and sieving devices. The use of plankton nets or tarpaulin skirts around
32 salmon cages has proved effective in reducing sea lice infestations on the farmed fish (Stien et
33 al. 2018; Grøntvedt et al. 2018), although they may not completely prevent entry of copepodid
34 stages. Increasing the depth of the nets also increases their efficiency. A recent development
35 is the use of “snorkel” sea cages. These are cages with a net roof that hold the salmon deep in
36 the water column but allow them access to the surface via an enclosed tarpaulin tube called a
37 snorkel. This gives the salmon the opportunity to refill their open swim bladders by gulping
38 air at the surface so that they can maintain their buoyancy in deeper water. This system was
39 tested by Stien et al. (2016), Oppedal et al. (2017) and Geitung et al. (2019) and was found to
40 significantly reduce loads of *L. salmonis* on farmed salmon. Oppedal et al. (2017) tested five
41 different systems with net roofs set at 0, 4, 8, 12 and 16 metres and found that *L. salmonis*
42 infestation decreased exponentially with depth: infestation levels in shallow snorkels (0 and
43 4m) were consistently 4 to 10 times higher than those in deep snorkels (12 and 16m). Geitung
44 et al. (2019) found that barrier cages reduced newly settled lice on salmon by 75% compared
45 to standard cages.

46 These plankton nets/tarpaulin skirts and snorkels are designed to keep farmed fish away
47 from the near-surface layers favoured by infective stages of *L. salmonis*. While the use of

1 plankton nets of the mesh size used in these situations may be effective in controlling *L.*
2 *salmonis* infestations (Grøntvedt et al., 2018), they may not be as effective a barrier against
3 the copepodids of smaller caligid species such as *C. elongatus*, although this remains to be
4 investigated. There is also evidence that copepodids of *C. elongatus* may occur at greater
5 depths than those of *L. salmonis* (see Nordi et al. (2015).

6 In an effort to reduce the numbers of sea lice re-entering the marine environment via
7 harvest water outflow, O'Donohoe & McDermott (2014) used a system consisting of two
8 sieves of different sizes. They reported a reduction in sea lice numbers of 89.5%, thus
9 considerably reducing the risk of re-infestation.

11 8.3. Biological methods

13 These methods include the use of cleaner fish (Imsland et al., 2014, 2018), fallowing
14 (Overton et al., 2019), vaccination (Carpio et al., 2011), selective breeding (Robledo et al.,
15 2019) and fish behaviour (Frenzl et al., 2014).

16 The cleaner fish selected for lice control on salmon farms in the northern hemisphere are
17 wrasse (Labridae) and lumpfish. Wrasse are efficient cleaners but have the major
18 disadvantage that they tend to become inactive in winter (Powell et al. 2017). Lumpfish, on
19 the other hand, continue to feed at low temperatures and are thus the obvious candidate for
20 use in salmon farms in colder regions such as northern Norway (Imsland et al., 2014, 2018).
21 Lumpfish are generally effective in reducing numbers of *L. salmonis* on farmed salmon
22 (Bolton-Warberg, 2017; Imsland et al., 2018), and have also been found to reduce the
23 numbers of *C. elongatus* (Imsland et al. unpublished data). However, their use may come with
24 a considerable risk attached, as lumpfish have been shown to be a favoured host of *C.*
25 *elongatus* (see section 4 above). Another disadvantage of lumpfish as cleaners is that they are
26 opportunistic feeders and may be less effective when other food sources such as zooplankton
27 or salmon pellets are readily available (Imsland et al. 2015; Eliassen et al. 2018).

28 Fallowing is a method of controlling disease, including sea lice infestations, in aquaculture
29 (Overton et al., 2019). In this method, sites are emptied of fish and not restocked for a period
30 of time. Its effectiveness is linked to the persistence of the pathogen in the water with a
31 reduced biomass of suitable hosts and the length of the fallowing period (Werkman et al.
32 2011). While fallowing is an effective method of controlling *L. salmonis* infestations, it has
33 been found to have no observable effect on *C. elongatus* (see Bron et al. 1993b; Treasurer
34 1998; Revie et al. 2002), because the latter will persist around the fallowed site on its
35 numerous natural wild hosts. The Norwegian lice surveillance programme requires each farm
36 to develop a general plan for prevention and treatment of salmon lice (Torrissen et al. 2013,
37 Overton et al., 2019). All farms are required to annually re-evaluate and update their lice
38 management plans, and also provide details to the Norwegian Food Safety Authority
39 (Torrissen et al. 2013)

40 Raynard et al. (2002) reviewed efforts to develop a vaccine against sea lice, but it remains
41 elusive (Bui et al. 2019). To date the only reported successive trial is from Chile with *Caligus*
42 *rogercresseyi* (see Carpio et al., 2011), where up to 75% reduction in infestation of adult
43 female lice was achieved in the vaccinated groups.

44 Selective breeding for disease resistance is a long-established practice in terrestrial farming,
45 but is still in the exploration phase in aquaculture, although studies of genomics and selective
46 breeding of parasite-resistant salmon is increasing (Bui et al. 2019). Gharbi et al. (2015)

1 combined experimental trials and diagnostics to provide a practical protocol for quantifying
2 resistance to *L. salmonis* in Atlantic salmon. Their model predicted that substantially fewer
3 chemical treatments would be needed to control infestations in selected populations and that
4 chemical treatment could be unnecessary after 10 generations of selection. Experimental
5 exposures of different wild populations and families of farmed Atlantic salmon have
6 demonstrated the considerable potential of selective breeding for increasing resistance to
7 infestation with *L. salmonis* (see Gjerde et al. 2011; Lush et al. 2019) and *C. rogercresseyi*
8 (see Llorente et al. 2012). The only similar experiments carried out with *C. elongatus* are
9 those of Mustafa & MacKinnon (1999) and Glover et al. (2005). Mustafa & MacKinnon
10 (1999) exposed lice-free farmed Atlantic salmon of 73 full-sibling families to salmon already
11 infested with *C. elongatus*. The amount of variation in infestation levels they found between
12 families indicated moderate genetic-based variability and suggested that resistance to
13 infestation with *C. elongatus* may be heritable. Glover et al. (2005) measured the variations in
14 abundance of both *L. salmonis* and *C. elongatus* between 30 full-sibling families of farmed
15 Atlantic salmon. The differences in abundance between families were statistically significant
16 for *L. salmonis*, but not for *C. elongatus*. The authors considered that this difference may have
17 been a consequence of the low prevalence of *C. elongatus* on the fish when they were
18 sampled.

19 Bui et al. (2019) proposed that natural host behaviour patterns could be harnessed to control
20 parasitic infections, with particular reference to Atlantic salmon and sea lice. The reasoning
21 behind this approach is that because wild salmon have co-evolved with *L. salmonis*, so certain
22 behaviour patterns they use to avoid infestation in the wild should be retained in farmed
23 salmon. To use these behavioural patterns to reduce sea lice infestations, fish farmers must
24 draw on existing knowledge of wild salmon behaviour and also observe the behaviour of
25 farmed salmon. Recognising the farmed salmon as a species with an evolutionary history and
26 taking advantage of their naturally developed responses to parasites by modifying aquaculture
27 systems accordingly will facilitate management of the health and welfare of farmed fish. This
28 approach combined with selective breeding could signal the future direction of salmonid
29 farming.

30

31

32 **9. Predicted effects of climate change and invasions**

33

34 Trying to predict the effects of climate change on any organism is a difficult task.
35 Predictions are made on the assumption that current changes will continue into the future,
36 which is by no means certain. What is certain is that climate change affects parasites in two
37 ways: through direct effects on the parasite itself, and through indirect effects on other hosts
38 in its life cycle. The probable effects of climate change on aquatic parasites were reviewed by
39 Marcogliese (2001, 2008) and Löhmus & Björklund (2015). Here we discuss the effects that
40 are most likely to affect parasitic copepods, and caligids in particular.

41 The two effects of climate change most likely to affect caligid copepods are increasing
42 acidification and temperatures in the sea. As atmospheric carbon dioxide continues to
43 increase, more of it is being absorbed by both oceanic and freshwater systems, leading to
44 changes in water chemistry and a continuous reduction in pH, with potentially serious
45 consequences for many aquatic organisms. If current trends continue, it is predicted that many
46 marine organisms, particularly pteropods and crustaceans, will have difficulty maintaining
47 their external calcium carbonate exoskeletons (Orr et al. 2005). However, studies on the

1 probable effects of increasing water temperature on free-living marine copepods indicate an
2 antagonistic effect of increased warming and acidification. The impacts of future climate
3 change on community structure, diversity, distribution and phenology of 14 different species
4 of free-living marine copepods in the North Atlantic were evaluated by Villarino et al. (2015).
5 Their projections indicated poleward shifts, earlier seasonal peaks and changes in biodiversity
6 spatial patterns, but with important range variations between species. Other studies indicated
7 that higher temperatures reduced energy status and decreased copepodid and nauplii
8 abundance, but also that acidification partially counteracted some observed effects of
9 increased temperature, while adding to others (Garzke et al. 2016; Pedersen & Hanssen 2017).
10 Similar changes may be expected for parasitic copepods such as caligids. The optimum
11 temperature for *C. elongatus* was found to be around 14°C (Hogans & Trudeau 1989a) so, as
12 temperatures increase, earlier seasonal peaks and more annual generations may be expected
13 for northern parts of its distribution such as northern Norway. Other effects are more difficult
14 to predict because of the above-mentioned antagonistic effects of temperature and
15 acidification. A recent study (Thompson et al. 2019) of the effects of increased acidification
16 on growth and metabolic rates on the early planktonic stages of *L. salmonis* indicated that
17 these stages have mechanisms to compensate for increased concentration of $p\text{CO}_2$ and that
18 populations will be tolerant of projected future ocean acidification scenarios.

19 One of the results of current climate warming is expansion of host geographical ranges,
20 with the result that species that have evolved in isolation may be brought into close contact.
21 These host species carry their established parasites with them and expose them to new
22 potential hosts, providing them with opportunities to expand their host range. Many invasive
23 species have been introduced accidentally, while others have been introduced deliberately.
24 The opening of the sea passage along the north coast of Siberia will inevitably lead to more
25 introductions of North Pacific species into the northeast Atlantic and possibly beyond (Chan
26 et al. 2018). One invasive species of relevance to this review is the pink salmon *O. gorbuscha*,
27 which was introduced to rivers in the Kola Peninsula in northwest Russia in the period 1956-
28 1959 and began to appear in Norwegian rivers from 1960 (Berg 1977; Mo et al. 2018). This
29 salmonid is a known host of *C. clemensi* (see Parker & Margolis 1964). The only report of
30 parasites in invasive pink salmon is that of Grozdilova (1974) from the White Sea, and *C.*
31 *clemensi* was not found in this study. Another common host of *C. clemensi* is the Pacific
32 herring, which also occurs in the White Sea along with Atlantic herring (Froese & Pauly
33 2019). Although there appears to be no report of *C. clemensi* parasitizing this particular
34 population of Pacific herring, its close proximity to the Barents Sea and other parts of the
35 northeast Atlantic, combined with the current trend of climate change, may provide an
36 opportunity for *C. clemensi* to colonise this region in the future, with possibly serious
37 consequences for salmonid culture.

38

39

40 **10. Conclusions and recommendations**

41

42 This review was prompted by reports of large numbers of sea lice identified as *C. elongatus*
43 infesting farmed salmon in northern Norway. The salmon louse *L. salmonis* is usually the
44 most numerous species of sea louse on salmon farms in the North Atlantic, including southern
45 and western Norway, so the occurrence of such large numbers of *C. elongatus* is very
46 unusual. Northern Norway has lower sea temperatures than regions further south, but the
47 optimum temperature for *C. elongatus* is reported as being 14°C (Hogans & Trudeau 1989a),
48 and there are fewer generations produced per year at temperatures lower than this. The

1 occurrence of such large numbers of *C. elongatus* in northern Norway thus contradicts the
2 published information.

3 Assuming that the identification of the culprit as *C. elongatus* is correct, one possible
4 explanation is that this infestation is caused by a different genotype of *C. elongatus* with a
5 greater tolerance of cold temperatures. This hypothesis is given some credibility by the study
6 of Øines & Schram (2008), who identified two genotypes of *C. elongatus* which were
7 different enough to suggest the possibility of them being considered as sibling species. The
8 dominance of *C. elongatus* over *L. salmonis* reported by Hogans & Trudeau (1989a, b) on
9 farmed salmon in the northwest Atlantic may also be explained by the presence there of
10 another genotype of *C. elongatus*. More research is needed into the genetics of *C. elongatus* in
11 different parts of its wide geographical distribution.

12 Another possibility is that the copepods infesting the fish in these northern farms are not all
13 *C. elongatus*, but a mix of this and another species. If we consider those species that are
14 known to cause problems in salmonid farming, the most obvious candidates for the other
15 species are *C. curtus* and *C. clemensi*. The former is not regarded as a serious pathogen of
16 farmed salmonids and is easily recognized by its much greater size than other species of
17 *Caligus* reported from farmed salmonids, although it is comparable in size to *L. salmonis*.
18 *Caligus clemensi* has not been reported from the North Atlantic but, as discussed earlier in
19 this review, one of its natural hosts is the invasive Pacific pink salmon, which is now caught
20 on a regular basis in Norwegian rivers (Mo et al. 2018). Another of its natural hosts is the
21 Pacific herring, which has a long-established resident population in the White Sea (Froese &
22 Pauly 2019). An extension of the range of *C. clemensi* into north Norway is thus a distinct
23 possibility. A less likely possibility, but still one to consider, is an infestation by another
24 species of *Caligus* hitherto unreported from farmed salmonids.

25 The design of plankton nets/tarpaulin skirts and snorkels is aimed at keeping farmed fish
26 away from the near-surface layers favoured by infective stages of *L. salmonis*. They may not
27 be as effective against those of *C. elongatus*, which are found over a greater depth range.
28 Fallowing is not effective against *C. elongatus*.

29 Our recommendations are therefore as follows.

- 30 • Confirm the identity (or identities) of the caligids causing this problem by having a
31 large number of parasites examined by expert parasitologists.
- 32 • If *C. elongatus* is confirmed as the culprit, have a sample sequenced and compared
33 with existing sequences for the two genotypes reported previously.
- 34 • If another species of caligid is present, further action will depend on its specific
35 identity, distribution and host preferences.
- 36 • Determine which wild, including introduced, fish species present in the vicinity of the
37 affected farms may be serving as reservoir hosts.
- 38 • Carry out a study of the distribution in the water column of copepodids of *C.*
39 *elongatus* or whatever species is identified as causing the problem. This information
40 will be necessary for the development of appropriate control measures.

43 **Acknowledgements.**

44 Funding for this study was supported by the Fishery and Aquaculture Industry Research
45 Fund FHF (project 901539. The authors thank Elisabeth Ann Myklebust, Cermaq, Finnmark
46 for providing helpful comments on the study.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

References

- Aaen, S.M., Helgesen, K.O., Bakke, M.J., Kaur, K., Horsberg, T.E., 2015. Drug resistance in sea lice: a threat to salmonid aquaculture. *Trends Parasitol.* 31, 72-81.
- Abolofia, J., Asche, F., Wilen, J.E., 2017. The cost of lice: quantifying the impacts of parasitic sea lice on farmed salmon. *Mar. Res. Econom.* 32, 329-349.
- Agusti-Ridaura, C., Hamre, L.A., Espedal, P.G., Øines, Ø., Horsberg, T.E., Kaur, K., 2019. First report on sensitivity of *Caligus elongatus* towards anti-lice chemicals and identification of mitochondrial cytochrome C oxidase I genotypes. *Aquaculture* 507, 190-195.
- Anon., 1991. Onion research. *Scottish Fish Farmer* No. 34 August.
- Arai, H., 1969. Preliminary report on the parasites of certain marine fishes of British Columbia. *J. Fish. Res. Board Can.* 26, 2319-2337.
- Arthur, J.R., Ara, H., 1980. Studies on the parasites of Pacific herring (*Clupea harengus pallasii* Valenciennes): survey results. *Can. J. Zool.* 58, 64-70.
- Berg, M., 1977. Pink salmon, *Oncorhynchus gorbuscha* (Walbaum) in Norway. *Rep. Inst. Freshw. Res., Drottningholm* 56, 12-17.
- Berland, B., 1993. Salmon lice on wild salmon (*Salmo salar* L.) in western Norway. In: Boxshall, G.A., Defaye, D. (Eds.), *Pathogens of Wild and Farmed Fish: Sea Lice*. Ellis Horwood, Chichester, UK, pp. 179-187.
- Bolton-Warberg, M., 2017. An overview of cleaner fish use in Ireland. *J. Fish Dis.* 41, 935-939.
- Boxaspen, K., 2006. A review of the biology and genetics of sea lice. *ICES J. Mar. Sci.* 63, 1304-1316.
- Boxshall, G., 1974. Infections with parasitic copepods in North Sea marine fishes. *J. Mar. Biol. Ass. UK* 54, 355-372.
- Boxshall, G.A., 1990. The skeletomusculature of siphonostomatoid copepods, with an analysis of adaptive radiation in structure of the oral cone. *Phil. Trans. Roy. Soc. Lond. Ser. B* 328, 167-212.
- Boxshall, G., Bravo, S., 2000. On the identity of the common *Caligus* (Copepoda: Siphonostomatoida: Caligidae) from salmonid netpen systems in southern Chile. *Contrib. Zool.* 69, 137-146.
- Brandal, O., Egidius, E., Romslo, I., 1976. Host blood: a major food component for the parasitic copepod *Lepeophtheirus salmonis* Krøyeri (sic) 1838 (Crustacea: Caligidae). *Norw. J. Zool.* 24, 341-343.
- Bravo, S., 2003. Sea lice in Chilean salmon farms. *Bull. Eur. Ass. Fish Pathol.* 23, 197-200.
- Bravo, S., Boxshall, G.A., Conroy, G., 2011. New cultured host and a significant expansion of the known geographical range of the sea louse *Caligus rogercresseyi*. *Bull. Eur. Ass. Fish Pathol.* 31, 156-160.
- Bravo, S., Perroni, E., Torres, E., Silva, M.T., 2006. Report of *Caligus rogercresseyi* in the anadromous brown trout (*Salmo trutta*) in the Rio Gallegos Estuary, Argentina. *Bull. Eur. Ass. Fish Pathol.* 26, 186-191.
- Bron, J.E., Sommerville, C., Wootten, R., Rae, G.H., 1993a. Influence of treatment with dichlorvos on the epidemiology of *Lepeophtheirus salmonis* (Krøyer, 1837) and *Caligus elongatus* Nordmann, 1832 on Scottish salmon farms. In: Boxshall, G.A. and Defaye, D. (Eds.), *Pathogens of Wild and Farmed Fish: Sea Lice*. Ellis Horwood, Chichester, UK, pp. 263-274.
-

- 1 Bron, J.E., Sommerville, C., Wootten, R., Rae, G.H., 1993b. Fallowing of marine Atlantic
2 salmon, *Salmo salar* L., farms as a method for the control of sea lice. J. Fish Dis. 16,
3 487-493.
- 4 Bui, S., Oppedal, F., Sievers, M., Dempster, T., 2019. Behaviour in the toolbox to outsmart
5 parasites and improve fish welfare in aquaculture. Rev. Aquac. 11, 169-186.
- 6 Callier, M.D., Byron, C.A., Bengston, D.A., Cranford, P.J., Cross, S.F., Focken, U., Jansen,
7 H.M., Kamermans, P., Kiessling, A., Landry, T., O'Beirn, F., Petersson, E., Rheault,
8 R.B., Strand, Ø., Sundell, K., Sväsand, T., Wikfors, G.H., McKindsey, C.W., 2018.
9 Attraction and repulsion of mobile wild organisms to finfish and shellfish aquaculture:
10 a review. Rev. Aquac. 10, 924-949.
- 11 Campbell, P.J., Hammell, K.L., Dohoo, I.R., Ritchie, G., 2006. Historical control clinical trial
12 to assess the effectiveness of teflubenzuron for treating sea lice on Atlantic salmon.
13 Dis. Aquat. Org. 70, 109-114.
- 14 Carpio, Y., Basabe, L., Acosta, J., Rodriguez, A., Mendoza, A., Lisperger, A., Zamorano, E.,
15 González, M., Rivas, M., Contreras, S., Haussmann, D., Figureoa, J., Osorio, V.N.,
16 Ascenio, G., Mancilla, J., Ritchie, G., Borroto, C., Estrada, M.P., 2011. Novel gene
17 isolated from *Caligus rogercresseyi*: A promising target for vaccine development
18 against sea lice. Vaccine 29, 2810-2820.
- 19 Carss, D.N., 1990. Concentrations of wild and escaped fishes immediately adjacent to fish
20 farm cages. Aquaculture 90, 29-40.
- 21 Carvajal, J., Gonzalez, L., George-Nascimento, M., 1998. Native sea lice (Copepoda:
22 Caligidae) infestation of salmonids reared in netpen systems in southern Chile.
23 Aquaculture 166, 41-246.
- 24 Chan, F.T., Stanislawczyk, K., Sneekes, A.C., Dvoretzky, A., Gollasch, S., Minchin, D.,
25 David, M., Jelmert, A., Albretsen, J., Bailey, S.A., 2018. Climate change opens new
26 frontiers for marine species in the Arctic: Current trends and future invasion risks.
27 Global Change Biol. 2018, 1-14.
- 28 Conroy, G., 2001. Diseases found in tilapia culture in Latin America. Global Aquac.
29 Advocate 4, 52-55.
- 30 González, L., Carvajal, J., 2003. Life cycle of *Caligus rogercresseyi*, (Copepoda: Caligidae)
31 parasite of Chilean reared salmonids. Aquaculture 220, 101-117.
- 32 Copley, I., Tierney, T.D., Kane, F., Naughton, O., Kennedy, S., O'Donohoe, P., Jackson, D.,
33 McGrath, D., 2005. Sea lice, *Lepeophtheirus salmonis* and *Caligus elongatus*, levels
34 on salmon returning to the west coast of Ireland, 2003. J. Mar. Biol. Ass. UK 85, 87-
35 92.
- 36 Costello, M.J., 1993. Review of methods to control sea lice (Caligidae: Crustacea) infestations
37 on salmon (*Salmo salar*) farms. In: Boxshall G.A., Defaye, D. (Eds.), Pathogens of
38 Wild and Farmed Fish: Sea Lice. Ellis Horwood, Chichester, UK, pp. 219- 252.
- 39 Costello, M.J., 2006. Ecology of sea lice parasitic on farmed and wild fish. Trends Parasitol.
40 22, 475-483.
- 41 Costello, M.J., 2009. The global economic cost of sea lice to the salmonid farming industry. J.
42 Fish Dis. 32, 115-118.
- 43 Cressey, R.F., 1967. Genus *Gloiopotes* and a new species with notes on host specificity and
44 intraspecific variation (Copepoda: Caligoida). Proc. US Nat. Mus. 122, 1-22.
- 45 Cressey, R.F., Collette, B.B., 1970. Copepods and needlefishes: a study in host-parasite
46 relationships. Fish. Bull. 68, 347-432.
- 47 Dempster, T., Sanchez-Jerez, P., Uglem, I., Bjørn, P.-A., 2010. Species-specific patterns of
48 aggregation of wild fish around fish farms. Est. Coast. Shelf Sci. 86, 271-275.

- 1 Dempster, T., Uglem, I., Sanchez-Jerez, P., Fernandez-Jover, D., Bayle-Sempere, J., Nilsen,
2 R., Bjørn, P.A., 2009. Coastal salmon farms attract large and persistent aggregations
3 of wild fish: an ecosystem effect. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* 385, 1-14.
- 4 Dojiri, M., Ho, J.-S., 2013. Systematics of the Caligidae, copepods parasitic on marine fishes.
5 *Crustac. Monogr.* 18:i-xiii, 1-448.
- 6 Eliassen, K., Danielsen, E., Johanessen, Á., Joensen, L.L., Patturson, E., 2018. The cleaning
7 efficacy of lumpfish (*Cyclopterus lumpus* L.) in Faroese salmon (*Salmo salar* L.)
8 farming pens in relation to lumpfish size and seasonality. *Aquaculture* 488, 61-65.
- 9 Fernández, J., Villalba, C., Alviña, A., 1986. Parásitos del pejegallo *Callorhynchus*
10 *callorhynchus* (L.) en Chile: Aspectos biológicos y sistemáticos. *Biol. Pesq.* (15), 63-
11 73.
- 12 Frenzl, B., Stien, L.H., Cockerill, D., Oppedal, F., Richards, R., Shinn, A., Bron, J.E.,
13 Migaud, H., 2014. Manipulation of farmed Atlantic salmon swimming behaviour
14 through the adjustment of lighting and feeding regimes as a tool for salmon lice
15 control. *Aquaculture* 424-42, 183-188.
- 16 Froese, R., Pauly, D., 2019. Fishbase, World Wide Web electronic publication.
17 www.fishbase.org.
- 18 Garzke, J., Hansen, T., Ismar, S.M.H., Sommer, U., 2016. Combined effects of ocean
19 warming and acidification on copepod abundance, body size and fatty acid content.
20 *PLoS ONE* 11(5), e015952.
- 21 Geitung, L., Oppedal, F., Stien, L.H., Dempster, T., Karlsbakk, E., Nola, V., Wright, D.W.,
22 2019. Snorkel sea-cage technology decreases salmon louse infestation by 75% in a
23 full-cycle commercial test. *Int. J. Parasitol.* 49, 843-846.
- 24 Gharbi, K., Matthews, L., Bron, J., Roberts, R., Tinch, A., Stear, M., 2105. The control of sea
25 lice in Atlantic salmon by selective breeding. *J. Roy. Soc. Interface* 12, 20150574, 8
26 pp
- 27 Gjerde, B., Ødegård, J., Thorland, I., 2011. Estimates of genetic variation in the susceptibility
28 of Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*) to the salmon louse *Lepeophtheirus salmonis*.
29 *Aquaculture* 314, 66-72.
- 30 Glover, K.A., Aasmundstad, T., Nilsen, F., Storset, A., Skaala, Ø., 2005. Variation of Atlantic
31 salmon families (*Salmo salar* L.) in susceptibility to the sea lice *Lepeophtheirus*
32 *salmonis* and *Caligus elongatus*. *Aquaculture* 245, 19-30.
- 33 González, L., Carvajal, J., 1994. Parasitos en los cultivos marinos de salmónidos en el sur de
34 Chile. *Invest. Pesq. (Chile)* 38, 87-96.
- 35 González, L., Carvajal, J., 2003. Life cycle of *Caligus rogercresseyi*, (Copepoda: Caligidae)
36 parasite of Chilean reared salmonids. *Aquaculture* 220, 101-117.
- 37 Grøntvedt, R.N., Kristoffersen, A.B., Jansen, P.A., 2018. Reduced exposure of farmed salmon
38 to salmon louse (*Lepeophtheirus salmonis* L.) infestation by use of plankton nets:
39 Estimating the shielding effect. *Aquaculture* 495, 865-872.
- 40 Grozdilova, T.A., 1974. Parasite fauna of the gorbusha *Oncorhynchus gorbusha* of the
41 White Sea. *Parazitologiya* 8, 293-298 (In Russian).
- 42 Hamre, L.A., Eichner, C., Caipang, C.M.A., Dalvin, S.T., Bron, J.E., Nilsen, F., Boxshall, G.,
43 Skern-Mauritsen, R., 2013. The salmon louse *Lepeophtheirus salmonis* (Copepoda:
44 Caligidae) life cycle has only two chalimus stages. *PLoS ONE* 8, e73539, 9 pp.
- 45 Hastein, T., Bergsjø, T., 1976. The salmon lice *Lepeophtheirus salmonis* as the cause of
46 disease in farmed salmonids. *Riv. Ital. Piscic. Ittiopatol.* A.11, 3-4.
- 47 Hayward, C.J., Aiken, H.M., Nowak, B.F., 2008. An epizootic of *Caligus chiastos* on farmed
48 southern bluefin tuna *Thunnus maccoyii* off South Australia. *Dis. Aq. Org.* 79, 57-63.
-

- 1 Hayward, C.J., Svane, I., Lachimpadi, S.K., Itoh, N., Bott, N.J., Nowak, B.F., 2011. Sea lice
2 infections of wild fishes near ranched southern bluefin tuna (*Thunnus maccoyi*) in
3 South Australia. *Aquaculture* 320, 178-182.
- 4 Heuch, P.A., Øines, Ø., Knutsen, J.A., Schram, T.A., 2007. Infection of wild fishes by the
5 parasitic copepod *Caligus elongatus* on the south east coast of Norway. *Dis. Aquat.*
6 *Org.* 77, 149-158.
- 7 Heuch, P.A., Karlsen, H.E., 1997. Detection of infrasonic oscillations by copepodids of
8 *Lepeophtheirus salmonis* (Copepoda: Caligidae). *J. Plankton Res.* 19, 735- 747.
- 9 Hevrøy, E.M., Boxaspen, K., Oppedal, F., Taranger, G.L., Holm, J.C., 2003. The effect of
10 artificial light treatment and depth on the infestation of the sea louse *Lepeophtheirus*
11 *salmonis* on Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar* L.) culture. *Aquaculture* 220, 1-14.
- 12 Ho, J.S., Gómez, S., Ogawa, K., Aritai, M., 2004. Two species of parasitic copepods
13 (Caligidae) new to Japan. *Syst. Parasitol.* 57, 19-34.
- 14 Hogans, W.E., Trudeau, D.J., 1989a. Preliminary studies on the biology of sea lice *Caligus*
15 *elongatus*, *Caligus curtus* and *Lepeophtheirus salmonis* (Copepoda: Caligoida),
16 parasitic on cage-cultured salmonids in the lower Bay of Fundy. *Can. Tech. Rep. Fish.*
17 *Aquat. Sci.* 1715, iv + 14 pp.
- 18 Hogans, W.E., Trudeau, D.J., 1989b. *Caligus elongatus* (Copepoda: Caligoida) from Atlantic
19 salmon (*Salmo salar*) cultured in marine waters of the Lower Bay of Fundy. *Can. J.*
20 *Zool.* 67, 1080-1082.
- 21 Imsland, A.K.D., Hanssen, A., Nytrø, A.V., Reynolds, P., Jonassen, T.M., Hangstad, T.A.,
22 Elvegård, T.A., Urskog, T.C., Mikalsen, B., 2018. It works! Lumpfish can
23 significantly lower sea lice infestation in large-scale salmon farming. *Biol. Open* 7,
24 bio036.301.doi:10.1242/bio.036.301.
- 25 Imsland, A.K., Remen, M., Sagerup, K., Bloch-Hansen, K., Hemmingsen, W., Myklebust,
26 E.A., Mathisen, R., Reynolds, P., Seljestokken, B., 2019a. Kan vi bruke rognkjeks mot
27 skottelus? *Norsk fiskeoppdrett* 36-41. Norsk fiskeoppdrett AS, Bergen, Norway.
- 28 Imsland, A.K., Reynolds, P., Eliassen, G., Hangstad, T.A., Foss, A., Vikingstad, E., Elvegård,
29 T.A., 2014. The use of lumpfish (*Cyclopterus lumpus* L.) to control sea lice
30 (*Lepeophtheirus salmonis* Krøyer) infestations in intensively farmed Atlantic salmon
31 (*Salmo salar* L.). *Aquaculture* 425-426, 18-23.
- 32 Imsland, A.K., Reynolds, P., Eliassen, G., Hangstad, T.A., Nytrø, A.V., Foss, A., Vikingstad,
33 E., Elvegård, T.A., 2015. Feeding preferences of lumpfish (*Cyclopterus lumpus* L.)
34 maintained in open-net pens with Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar* L.). *Aquaculture* 436,
35 47- 51.
- 36 Imsland, A.K.D., Sagerup, K., Remen, M., Bloch-Hansen, K., Hemmingsen, W., Myklebust,
37 E.A., 2019b. Kunnskaps- og erfaringskartlegging av skottelus (KEKS). Url:
38 <https://www.fhf.no/prosjekter/prosjektbasen/901539/>
- 39 Iversen, A. et al., 2016. The cost impact of lice in Norwegian salmon farming – Presentation
40 at “Zero LICE”, Day zero of the NASF 2016, Bergen, Norway, March 1, 2016.
41 <http://www.seafoodinnovation.no/page/65/Zero> Lice 01/03/2016.
- 42 Jackson, D., Moberg, O., Stenevik Djupeväg, E.M., Kane, F., Hareide, H., 2017. The drivers
43 of sea lice management policies and how best to integrate them into a risk
44 management strategy: An ecosystem approach to sea lice management. *J. Fish Dis.* 41,
45 927-933.
- 46 Jacobsen, J.A., Gaard, E., 1997. Open-ocean infestation by salmon lice (*Lepeophtheirus*
47 *salmonis*): comparison of wild and escaped farmed Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar* L.).
48 *ICES J. Mar. Sci.* 54, 1113-1119.
- 49 Jensen, A.J., Zydlewski, G.B., Barker, S., Pietrack, M., 2012. Sea lice infestations of a wild
50 fish assemblage in the Northwest Atlantic Ocean. *Trans. Am. Fish. Soc.* 145, 7-16.

- 1 Johnson, S.C., Treasurer, J.W., Bravo, S., Nagasawa, K., Kabata, Z., 2004. A review of the
2 impact of parasitic copepods on marine aquaculture. *Zool. Stud.* 43, 229-243.
- 3 Jones, S., Johnson, S., 2014. Biology of sea lice, *L. salmonis* and *Caligus* spp., in western and
4 eastern Canada. *Can. Sci. Adv. Secret Res. Doc.* 19: i-v, 1-18.
- 5 Kabata, Z., 1974. Mouth and mode of feeding of Caligidae (Copepoda), parasites of fishes, as
6 determined by light and scanning electron microscopy. *J. Fish. Res. Board Can.* 31,
7 1583-1588.
- 8 Kabata, Z., 1979. Parasitic Copepoda of British Fishes. The Ray Society, London, 468 pp.
- 9 Kabata, Z., 1981. Copepoda (Crustacea) parasitic on fishes: problems and perspectives. *Adv.*
10 *Parasitol.* 19, 1-71.
- 11 Kabata, Z., Hewitt, G.C., 1971. Locomotory mechanisms in Caligidae (Crustacea: Copepoda).
12 *J. Fish. Res. Board Can.* 28, 1143-1151.
- 13 Kaji, T., Venmathi Maran, B.A., Kondoh, Y., Ohtsuka, S., Boxshall, G.A., Tsukagoshi, A.,
14 2012. The lunule of caligid copepods: an evolutionary novel structure. *Evol. Devol.*
15 14, 465-475.
- 16 Karasev, A.B., 2003. The catalogue of parasites of the Barents Sea fishes. PINRO Press,
17 Murmansk, 150 pp.
- 18 Kim, I.H., 1993. Developmental stages of *Caligus punctatus* Shiino, 1955 (Copepoda;
19 Caligidae). In: Boxshall G.A., Defaye, D. (Eds.), *Pathogens of wild and farmed fish:*
20 *sea lice.* Ellis Horwood, Chichester, UK, pp 16-29.
- 21 Landsberg, J.H., Vermeer, G.K., Richards, S.A., Perry, N., 1991. Control of the parasitic
22 copepod *Caligus elongatus* on pond-reared red drum. *J. Aquat. Anim. Health* 3, 206-
23 209.
- 24 Lewis, A.G., Dean, J., Gilfillan III, E., 1969. Taxonomy and host associations of some
25 parasitic copepods (Crustacea) from pelagic teleost fishes. *Pac. Sci.* 23, 414-437.
- 26 Llorente, J.P., Gallardo, J.A., Villanueva, B., Araya, A.M., Torrealba, D.A., Toledo, X.E.,
27 Neira, R., 2012. Quantitative genetic basis for resistance to *Caligus rogercresseyi* sea
28 lice in a breeding population of Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*). *Aquaculture* 324-325,
29 55-59.
- 30 Löhmus, M., Björklund, M., 2015. Climate change: what will it do to fish-parasite
31 interactions? *Biol. J. Linn. Soc.* 116, 397-411.
- 32 Lush, L., Marshall, K., Eaves, A., Salvo, F., Murray, H.M., Hamoutene, D., 2019.
33 Susceptibility of farmed and two origins of wild Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*) to
34 experimental infestations with sea lice (*Lepeophtheirus salmonis*). *Aquaculture* 503,
35 602-608.
- 36 MacKenzie, K., Morrison, J.A., 1989. An unusually heavy infestation of herring (*Clupea*
37 *harengus* L.) with the parasitic copepod *Caligus elongatus* Nordmann, 1832. *Bull.*
38 *Eur. Ass. Fish Pathol.* 9, 12-13.
- 39 MacKinnon, B.M., 1993. Host response of Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*) to infection by sea
40 lice (*Caligus elongatus*). *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* 30, 789-792.
- 41 MacKinnon, B.M., 1997. The importance of host stress in sea lice infestations. Report of the
42 Workshop on the interactions between salmon lice and salmonids. Edinburgh, 11.-15.
43 November 1996.
- 44 Mancilla-Schulz, J., Marín, S.L., Molinet, C., 2018. Dynamics of *Caligus rogercresseyi*
45 (Boxshall and Bravo, 2000) in farmed Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*) in southern
46 Chile: Are we controlling sea lice? *J. Fish Dis.* 42, 357-369.
- 47 Marcogliese, D.J., 2001. Implications of climate change for parasitism of animals in the
48 aquatic environment. *Can. J. Zool.* 79, 1331-1352.
- 49 Marcogliese, D.J., 2008. The impact of climate change on the parasites and infectious
50 diseases of aquatic animals. *Rev. Sci. Tech. – Office Int. Epizooties* 27, 467-484.
-

- 1 Margolis, L., Kabata, Z., 1988 (Eds.). Guide to the Parasites of Fishes of Canada. Part II –
2 Crustacea. Can. Spec. Publ. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 101, 184 pp.
- 3 Margolis, L., Kabata, Z., Parker, R.R., 1975. Catalogue and synopsis of *Caligus*, a genus of
4 Copepoda (Crustacea) parasitic on fishes. Bull. Fish. Res. Board Can. No. 192, vi and
5 117 pp.
- 6 McKenzie, E., Gettinby, G., McCart, K., Revie, C.W., 2004. Time-series models of sea lice
7 *Caligus elongatus* (Nordmann) abundance on Atlantic salmon *Salmo salar* L. in Loch
8 Sunart, Scotland. Aquaculture Res. 35, 764-772.
- 9 Mitamura, H., Thorstad, E.B., Uglem, I., Bjørn, P.A., Økland, F., Næsje, T.F., Dempster, T.,
10 Arai, N., 2012. Movements of lump sucker females in a northern Norwegian fjord
11 during the spawning season. Env. Biol. Fish. 93, 475-481.
- 12 Mo, T.A., Thorstad, E.B., Sandlund, O.T., Berntsen, H.H., Fiske, P., Uglem, I., 2018. The
13 pink salmon invasion: a Norwegian perspective. J. Fish Biol. 93, 5-7.
- 14 Mustafa, A., MacKinnon, B.M., 1999. Genetic variation in susceptibility of Atlantic salmon
15 to the sea louse *Caligus elongatus* Nordmann, 1832. Can. J. Zool. 77, 1332-1335.
- 16 Mustafa, A., MacKinnon, B.M., Piasecki, W., 2005. Interspecific differences between
17 Atlantic salmon and arctic charr in susceptibility to infection with larval and adult
18 *Caligus elongatus*: effect of skin mucus protein profiles and epidermal histological
19 differences. Acta Ichthyol. Piscat. 35, 7-13.
- 20 Nagasawa, K., 2015. Parasitic copepods of marine fish cultured in Japan: a review. J. Nat.
21 Hist. 49, 2891-2903.
- 22 Nordi, G.A., Simonsen, K., Danielsen, E., Eliassen, K., Mols-Mortensen, A., Christiansen,
23 D.H., Steingrund, P., Galbraith, M., Patursson, Ø., 2015. Abundance and distribution
24 of planktonic *Lepeophtheirus salmonis* and *Caligus elongatus* in a fish-farming region
25 in the Faroe Islands. Aquac. Environ. Inter. 7, 15-27.
- 26 Nylund, A., Bjørknes, B., Wallace, C., 1991. *Lepeophtheirus salmonis* - a possible vector in
27 the spread of diseases on salmonids. Bull. Eur. Ass. Fish Pathol. 11, 213-216.
- 28 Nylund, A., Hovland, T., Hodneland, K., Nilsen, F., Lovik, P., 1994. Mechanisms for
29 transmission of infectious salmon anaemia (ISA). Dis. Aquat. Org. 19, 95-100.
- 30 Nylund, A., Wallace, C., Hovland, T., 1993. The possible role of *Lepeophtheirus salmonis*
31 (Krøyer) in the transmission of infectious salmon anaemia. In: Boxshall G.A., Defaye
32 D. (Eds.), Pathogens of Wild and Farmed Fish: Sea Lice. Ellis Horwood, Chichester,
33 UK, pp. 367-373.
- 34 Nylund, S., Nylund, A., Watanabe, K., Arnesen, C.E., Karlsbakk, E., 2010.
35 *Paranucleospora theridion* n. gen., n. sp (Microsporidia, Enterocytozoonidae) with a
36 Life Cycle in the Salmon Louse (*Lepeophtheirus salmonis*, Copepoda) and Atlantic
37 Salmon (*Salmo salar*). J. Eukaryot. Microbiol. 57, 95-114.
- 38 O'Donohoe, P., McDermott, T., 2014. Reducing sea lice infestation risk from harvest water at
39 a salmon farm site in Ireland using a bespoke sieving and filtration system. Aquac.
40 Eng. 60, 73-76.
- 41 Oelckers, K., Vike, S., Duesund, H., Gonzalez, J., Wadsworth, S., Nylund, A., 2014. *Caligus*
42 *rogercresseyi* as a potential vector for transmission of Infectious Salmon Anaemia
43 (ISA) virus in Chile. Aquaculture 420-421, 126-132.
- 44 Ohtsuka, S., Takami, I., Venmathi Maran, B.A., Ogawa, K., Shimono, T., Fujita, Y.,
45 Asakawa, M., Boxshall, G.A., 2009. Developmental stages and growth of
46 *Pseudocaligus fugu* Yamaguti, 1936 (Copepoda: Siphonomostomatoida: Caligidae)
47 host-specific to puffer. J. nat. Hist. 43, 1779-1804.
- 48 Øines, Ø., Heuch, P.A., 2005. Identification of sea louse species of the genus *Caligus* using
49 mtDNA. J. Mar. Biol. Ass. UK 85, 73-79.

- 1 Øines, Ø., Heuch, P.A., 2007. *Caligus elongatus* Nordmann genotypes on wild and farmed
2 fish. J. Fish Dis. 30, 81-91.
- 3 Øines, Ø., Schram, T., 2008. Intra- or inter-specific difference in genotypes of *Caligus*
4 *elongatus* Nordmann 1832? Acta Parasitol. 53, 93-105.
- 5 Øines, Ø., Simonsen, J.H., Knutsen, J.A., Heuch, P.A., 2006. Host preference of adult *Caligus*
6 *elongatus* Nordmann in the laboratory and its implications for Atlantic cod
7 aquaculture. J. Fish Dis. 29, 167-174.
- 8 Ólafsdóttir, D., Shinn, A.P., 2013. Epibiotic macrofauna on common minke whales,
9 *Balaenoptera acutorostrata* Lacépède, 1804, in Icelandic waters. Parasit. Vectors 6
10 (105), 10 pp.
- 11 Oppedal, F., Samsing, F., Dempster, T., Wright, D.W., Bui, S., Stien, L.H., 2017. Sea lice
12 infestation levels decrease with deeper ‘snorkel’ barriers in Atlantic salmon sea cages.
13 Pest Manage. Sci. 73, 1935-1943.
- 14 Orr, J.C., Fabry, V.J., Aumont, O., Bopp, L., Doney, S.C., Feely, R.A., Gnanadesikan, A.,
15 Gruber, N., Ishida, A., Joos, F., Key, R.M., Lindsay, K., Maier-Reimer, E., Matear, R.,
16 Monfray, P., Mouchet, A., Najjar, R.G., Plattner, G.K., Rodgers, K.B., Sabine, C.L.,
17 Sarmiento, J.L., Schlitzer, R., Slater, R.D., Totterdell, I.J., Weirig, M.F., Yamanaka,
18 Y., Yool, A., 2005. Anthropogenic ocean acidification over the twenty-first century
19 and its impact on calcifying organisms. Nature 437(7059), 681-686.
- 20 Overton, K., Dempster, T., Oppedal, F., Kristiansen, T., Gismervik, K., Stien, L.H., 2019.
21 Salmon lice treatments and salmon mortality in Norwegian aquaculture: a review.
22 Rev. Aquac. 11, 1398-1417.
- 23 Parker, R.R., 1969. Validity of the binomen *Caligus elongatus* for a common parasitic
24 copepod formerly misidentified with *Caligus rapax*. J. Fish. Res. Board Can. 26,
25 1013-1035.
- 26 Parker, R.R., Kabata, Z., Margolis, L., Dean, M.D., 1968. A review and description of
27 *Caligus curtus* Müller, 1785 (Caligidae: Copepoda), type species of its genus. J. Fish.
28 Res. Board Can. 25, 1923-1969.
- 29 Parker, R.R., Margolis, L., 1964. A new species of parasitic copepod, *Caligus clemensi* sp.
30 nov. (Caligoida: Caligidae), from pelagic fishes in the coastal waters of British
31 Columbia. J. Fish. Res. Board Can. 21, 873-889.
- 32 Pedersen, A.P., Hanssen, A.E., 2017. Ocean acidification ameliorates harmful effects of
33 warming in primary consumer. Ecol. Evol. 8, 396-404.
- 34 Piasecki, W., 1996. The developmental stages of *Caligus elongatus* von Nordmann, 1832
35 (Copepoda: Caligidae). Can. J. Zool. 74, 1459-1478.
- 36 Piasecki, W., MacKinnon, B.M., 1995. Life cycle of the sea louse *Caligus elongatus* von
37 Nordmann, 1832 (Copepoda, Siphonostomatoida, Caligidae). Can. J. Zool. 73, 74-82.
- 38 Pike, A.W., Mackenzie, K., Rowand, A., 1993. Ultrastructure of the frontal filament in
39 chalimus larvae of *Caligus elongatus* and *Lepeophtheirus salmonis* from Atlantic
40 salmon, *Salmo salar*. In: Boxshall G.A., Defaye, D. (Eds.), Pathogens of Wild and
41 Farmed Fish: Sea Lice. Ellis Horwood, Chichester, UK, pp. 99-113.
- 42 Pike, A.W., Wadsworth, S.L., 1999. Sealice on Salmonids: Their Biology and Control. Adv.
43 Parasitol. 44, 233-337.
- 44 Powell, A., Treasurer, J.W., Pooley, C.L., Keay, A.J., Lloyd, R., Imsland, A.K., de Leaniz,
45 C.G., 2017. Use of lumpfish for sea lice control in salmon farming: challenges and
46 opportunities. Rev. Aquac. 10, 683-702
- 47 Raynard, R.S., Bricknell, I.R., Billingsley, P.F., Nisbet, A.J., Vigneau, A., Sommerville, C.
48 2002. Pest Manage. Sci. 58, 569-575.
-

- 1 Revie, C.W., Gettinby, G., Treasurer, J.W., Rae, G.H., 2002. The epidemiology of the sea
2 lice, *Caligus elongatus* Nordmann, in marine aquaculture of Atlantic salmon, *Salmo*
3 *salar* L., in Scotland. J. Fish Dis. 25, 391-399.
- 4 Reyes, X., Bravo, S., 1983. Salmón coho *Oncorhynchus kisutch*, cultivado en Puerto Montt,
5 Chile, nuevo huésped para el copépodo *Caligus teres* (Caligidae). Invest. Mar.,
6 Valparaiso 11, 55-57.
- 7 Robledo, D., Gutierrez, A.P., Barria, A., Lhorente, J.P., Houston, R.D., Yanez, J.M., 2019.
8 Discovery and functional annotation of quantitative trait loci affecting resistance to sea
9 lice in Atlantic salmon. Front. Gen. 10, article no. 56, DOI: 10.3389/fgene.2019.00056
- 10 Schram, T., 2004. Practical identification of pelagic sea lice larvae. J. Mar. Biol. Ass. UK 84,
11 103-110.
- 12 Somdal, O., Schram, T.A., 1992. Ectoparasites on northeast Atlantic mackerel (*Scomber*
13 *scombrus* L.) from western and North Sea stocks. Sarsia 77, 19-31.
- 14 Stien, L.H., Dempster, T., Bui, S., Glaropoulos, A., Fosseidengen, J.E., Wright, D.W.,
15 Oppedal, F., 2016. ‘Snorkel’ sea lice barrier technology reduces sea lice loads on
16 harvest- sized Atlantic salmon with minimal welfare impacts. Aquaculture 458, 29-37.
- 17 Stien, L.H., Lind, M.B., Oppedal, F., Wright, D.W., Seternes, T., 2018. Skirts on salmon
18 production cages reduced salmon lice infestations without affecting fish welfare.
19 Aquaculture 490, 281-287.
- 20 Stone, J., Sutherland, I.H., Sommerville, C., Richards, R.H., Varma, K.J., 2000. Field
21 trials to evaluate the efficacy of emamectin benzoate in the control of sea lice,
22 *Lepeophtheirus salmonis* (Krøyer) and *Caligus elongatus* Nordmann, infestations in
23 Atlantic salmon *Salmo salar* L. Aquaculture 186, 205-219.
- 24 Stone, J., Boyd, S., Sommerville, C., Rae, G.H., 2002. An evaluation of freshwater bath
25 treatments for the control of sea lice, *Lepeophtheirus salmonis* (Krøyer), infections in
26 Atlantic salmon, *Salmo salar* L. J. Fish Dis. 25, 371-373.
- 27 Sutterlin, A.M., Harmon, P., Blanchard, H., 1976. The culture of brook trout in salt water.
28 Fish. Mar. Serv. Res. Dev. Dir. Tech. Rep. No. 636.
- 29 Thompson, C.R.S., Fields, D.M., Bjelland, R.M., Chan, V.B.S., Durif, C.M.F., Mount, A.,
30 Runge, J.A., Shema, S.D., Skiftesvik, A.B., Browman, H.I., 2019. The planktonic
31 stages of the salmon louse (*Lepeophtheirus salmonis*) are tolerant of end-of-century
32 $p\text{CO}_2$ concentrations. PeerJ, DOI 10.7717/peerj.7810.
- 33 Torrissen, O., Jones, S., Asche, F., Guttormsen, A., Skilbrei, O.T., Nilsen, F., Horsberg, T.E.,
34 Jackson, D., 2013. Salmon lice – impact on wild salmonids and salmon aquaculture. J.
35 Fish Dis. 36, 171–194.
- 36 Treasurer, J.W., 1998. Sea lice management methods in Scotland. Caligus Newsletter 5, 8-12.
- 37 Treasurer, J.W., Bravo, S., 2011. The spatial distribution patterns of *Caligus rogercressyi* and
38 *C. elongatus* in Atlantic salmon hosts (*Salmo salar*). Aquaculture 320, 54-158.
- 39 Treasurer, J.W., Wadsworth, S.L., 2004. Interspecific comparison of experimental and natural
40 routes of *Lepeophtheirus salmonis* and *Caligus elongatus* challenge and consequences
41 for distribution of chalimus on salmonids and therapeutic screening. Aquac. Res. 35,
42 773-783.
- 43 Tørud, B., Håstein, T., 2008. Skin lesions in fish: causes and solutions. Acta Vet. Scand.
44 50(Suppl 1), S7.
- 45 Tully, O., Nolan, D.T., 2002. A review of the population biology and host-parasite
46 interactions of the sea louse *Lepeophtheirus salmonis* (Copepoda: Caligidae).
47 Parasitology 124, S165-182.
- 48 Uglem, I., Dempster, T., Bjørn, P.-A., Sanchez-Jerez, P., Økland, F., 2009. High connectivity
49 of salmon farms revealed by aggregation, residence and repeated movements of wild
50 fish among farms. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 384, 251-260.

- 1 Uglem, I., Karlsen, Ø., Sanchez-Jerez, P., Sæther, B.-S., 2014. Impacts of wild fishes attracted
2 to open-cage salmonid farms in Norway. *Aquac. Environ. Inter.* 6, 91-103.
- 3 Urawa, S., Kato, T., 1991. Heavy infections of *Caligus orientalis* (Copepoda: Caligidae) on
4 caged rainbow trout *Oncorhynchus mykiss* in brackish water. *Gyobyo Kenkyu* 26,
5 161-162.
- 6 Venmathi Maran, B.A., Oh, S.-Y., Soh, H.Y., Choi, H.J., Myoung, J.-G., 2012. *Caligus*
7 *sclerotinosus* (Copepoda: Caligidae), a serious pest of cultured red seabream *Pagrus*
8 *major* (Sparidae) in Korea. *Vet. Parasitol.* 188, 355-361.
- 9 Venmathi Maran, B.A., Moon, S.Y., Ohtsuka, S., Oh, S.-Y., Soh, H.Y., Myoung, J.-G.,
10 Iglukowska, A., Boxshall, G.A., 2013. The caligid life cycle: new evidence from
11 *Lepeophtheirus elegans* reconciles the cycles of *Caligus* and *Lepeophtheirus*
12 (Copepoda: Caligidae). *Parasite* 20, 1-22.
- 13 Venmathi Maran, B.A., Suárez-Morales, E., Ohtsuka, S., Soh, H.Y., Hwang, U.W., 2016. On
14 the occurrence of caligids (Copepoda: Siphonostomatoida) in the marine plankton: a
15 review and checklist. *Zootaxa* 4174(1), 437-447.
- 16 Villarino, E., Chust, G., Licandro, P., Butenschön, M., Ibaibarriaga, L., Larrañaga, A.,
17 Irigoien, X., 2015. Modelling the future biogeography of North Atlantic zooplankton
18 communities in response to climate change. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* 531, 121-142.
- 19 Walter, T.C., Boxshall, G., 2020. World of Copepods database. Caligidae Burmeister, 1835.
20 Accessed through: World Register of Marine Species at:
21 <http://www.marinespecies.org/aphia.php?p=taxdetails&id=135566> on 2020-01-19.
- 22 Werkman, M., Green, D.M., Murray, A.G., Turnbull, J.F., 2011. The effectiveness of
23 fallowing strategies in disease control in salmon aquaculture assessed with an SIS
24 model. *Prev. Vet. Med.* 98, 64-73.
- 25 Wilson, C.B., 1905. North American parasitic copepods belonging to the family Caligidae. Pt.
26 1. The Caliginae. *Proc. US Natl. Mus.* 28, 479-672.
- 27 Wootten, R., Smith, J.W., Needham, E.A., 1982. Aspects of the biology of the parasitic
28 copepods *Lepeophtheirus salmonis* and *Caligus elongatus* on farmed salmonids, and
29 their treatment. *Proc. Roy Soc. Edinb.* 81B, 185-197.
- 30 Wright, D.W., Oppedal, F., Dempster, T., 2016. Early-stage sea lice recruits on Atlantic
31 salmon are freshwater sensitive. *J. Fish Dis.* 39, 1179-1186.

32
33

34 **Figure legends**

35

36 Figure 1. Life cycle stages of *Caligus elongatus*: 1 = nauplius I, 2 = nauplius II, 3 =
37 copepodid, 4 = anterior of copepodid with frontal filament extended, 5 = chalimus I, 6 =
38 chalimus II, 7 = chalimus III, 8 = chalimus IV, 9 = young adult male. Scale bars: 1-5 = 100
39 µm; 6-7 = 200 µm; 8-9 = 500 µm. (Modified from Hogans & Trudeau 1989a).

40

41 Figure 2. Ventral surface of caligid cephalothorax showing appendages: ant1 = antennule,
42 ant2 = antenna, apr = apron of third leg, fp = frontal plate, lun = lunule, mmb = marginal
43 membrane, mt = mouth tube, mx1 = maxillule, mx2 = maxilla, mxp = maxilliped, pan =
44 postantennal process, sf = sternal furca, th1 = th3 = first to third legs, vel = velum (after
45 Margolis & Kabata 1988, with terminology updated).

46

47 Figure 3. Mouth cone of *Caligus curtus* (after Kabata 1974).

48

49 Figure 4. Diagrammatic face-on view of caligid mouth (after Kabata 1974).

50

1 Figure 5. Comparison of dorsal views of females of the four most common *Caligus* spp.
2 infecting farmed salmonids. Scale bars = 1 mm. (after Parker & Margolis 1964, Kabata 1979,
3 Hogans & Trudeau 1989, Boxshall & Bravo, 2000).

4

5 Figure 6. Comparison of dorsal views of males of the four most common *Caligus* spp.
6 infecting farmed salmonids. Scale bars = 1 mm. (after Parker & Margolis 1964, Kabata 1979,
7 Hogans & Trudeau 1989, Boxshall & Bravo, 2000).

8