

Molecular confirmation of pearl formation in arctic mussels (*Mytilus edulis*) caused by *Gymnophallus bursicola* (Odhner 1900) metacercariae

Research Article

Cite this article: Benito D, Izagirre U, Lekube X, Zaldibar B, Villalba A, De Montaudouin X, Daffe G, Soto M, Diaz de Cerio O (2023). Molecular confirmation of pearl formation in arctic mussels (*Mytilus edulis*) caused by *Gymnophallus bursicola* (Odhner 1900) metacercariae. *Parasitology* **150**, 1015–1021. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0031182023000860>

Received: 29 May 2023

Revised: 21 August 2023

Accepted: 6 September 2023

First published online: 14 September 2023



Keywords:

bivalve molluscs; blue mussel; COI sequence; encapsulation; SSU-rDNA; trematodes

Corresponding author:

Denis Benito;

Email: denis.benito@ehu.eus

Denis Benito^{1,2,3} , Urtzi Izagirre^{1,2,3,4}, Xabier Lekube^{1,2,3,4}, Beñat Zaldibar^{1,2,3}, Antonio Villalba^{3,5,6}, Xavier De Montaudouin⁷ , Guillemine Daffe⁸, Manu Soto^{1,2,3,4} and Oihane Diaz de Cerio^{1,2,3}

¹CBET Research Group, Department of Zoology & Animal Cell Biology, University of the Basque Country (UPV/EHU), Areatza Hiribidea 47, 48620 Plentzia, Basque Country, Spain; ²Faculty of Science & Technology and Research Centre for Experimental Marine Biology and Biotechnology (PiE-UPV/EHU), University of the Basque Country (UPV/EHU), Areatza Hiribidea 47, 48620 Plentzia, Basque Country, Spain; ³Research Centre for Experimental Marine Biology and Biotechnology (PiE-UPV/EHU), University of the Basque Country (UPV/EHU), Areatza Hiribidea 47, 48620 Plentzia, Basque Country, Spain; ⁴Biscay Bay Environmental Biospecimen Bank (BBEBB), University of the Basque Country (UPV/EHU), Areatza Hiribidea 47, 48620 Plentzia, Basque Country, Spain; ⁵Centro de Investigaciones Mariñas (CIMA), Consellería do Mar, Xunta de Galicia, 36620 Vilanova de Arousa, Spain; ⁶Departamento de Ciencias de la Vida, Universidad de Alcalá, 28871 Alcalá de Henares, Spain; ⁷University of Bordeaux, CNRS, Bordeaux INP, EPOC, UMR 5805, 33600 Pessac, France and ⁸University of Bordeaux, CNRS, Observatoire Aquitain des Sciences de l'Univers, UAR 2567 POREA, F-33615 Pessac, France

Abstract

In recent field studies, suspected gymnophallid metacercariae were histologically located in the mantle of mussels from the Norwegian Sea. Mussels from the sites in which that infection was detected also presented abnormally high pearl numbers. It has been previously described that gymnophallid metacercariae could cause pearl formation processes in mussels, as a host reaction to encapsulate these metacercariae. Given the pathological host reaction these parasites elicit, a study was performed to identify gymnophallid metacercariae found in mussels collected from Tromsø at morphological and molecular level and to assess, by the use of molecular tools, the relationship between the parasite and the biological material inside the pearls. As a result, *Gymnophallus bursicola* metacercariae infecting Norwegian *Mytilus edulis* were identified according to morphological characters, along with the first 18S rDNA and COI sequences for this trematode species. In addition, parasite DNA from the core of the pearls was extracted and amplified for the first time, confirming the parasitological origin of these pearls. This procedure could allow identifying different parasitic organisms responsible for the generation of pearls in bivalves.

Introduction

Mytilus spp. are a group of bioindicator species of great importance as they are widely used as sentinel organisms in pollution monitoring programmes to determine the health status of coastal ecosystems (Nasci *et al.*, 2002; Brenner *et al.*, 2014). They also play a key ecological role in rocky shore communities as they provide essential ecological services such as food and habitat to a multitude of other species and their commercial importance is high among aquaculture products (Beyer *et al.*, 2017). Thus, their population dynamics and the different biotic and abiotic factors that explain stock fluctuation are of importance. Among the factors which drive mussel population dynamics, parasitism can play an important role (Thieltges, 2006). Consequently, parasitological studies have been widely performed with the aim of investigating the prevalence and pathology of parasitic infections (Villalba *et al.*, 1997; Özer and Güneydağ, 2015; Vázquez *et al.*, 2020; Benito *et al.*, 2022).

Parasites may influence the composition, structure and dynamics of their hosts' populations in an important way affecting marine coastal ecosystems (Mouritsen and Poulin, 2010; Thieltges *et al.*, 2013; Feis *et al.*, 2015; Galaktionov *et al.*, 2015; Thieltges *et al.*, 2018; Stout *et al.*, 2022). Among parasites, trematodes are especially prevalent in coastal ecosystems. In particular, trematode parasites using molluscs as first intermediate hosts are common in boreal and Arctic intertidal ecosystems (Galaktionov, 1996). Typically, the cercariae are emitted by the first intermediate host and infect the second intermediate hosts (various invertebrates or fishes) in which they settle as metacercariae. The metacercariae develops into egg-producing adults after being ingested by the final hosts, which are vertebrates and, in some species, marine birds (Galaktionov *et al.*, 2015). The high concentrations of both predators and prey, which act as hosts at different life stages and are common in the intertidal and upper subtidal zones, are conducive to the occurrence of parasites with complex life cycles (Galaktionov *et al.*, 2015). Among trematode parasites infecting bivalves, those in the Digenea subclass are the most common, including members of the Gymnophallidae (Cremonte *et al.*, 2015; Magalhães *et al.*,

© The Author(s), 2023. Published by Cambridge University Press. This is an Open Access article, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives licence (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided that no alterations are made and the original article is properly cited. The written permission of Cambridge University Press must be obtained prior to any commercial use and/or adaptation of the article.

2020; Puljas and Burazin, 2022; Marchiori *et al.*, 2023). The final host of Gymnophallidae parasites are coastal birds, mostly charadriiforms and anseriform species. While bivalves are the first intermediate hosts, bivalves, gastropods, polychaetes and brachiopods act as second intermediate hosts (Cremonte *et al.*, 2015; Marchiori *et al.*, 2023).

Infection by gymnophallids in molluscan hosts has a wide array of pathogenic effects which also depend on the parasitic stage (sporocysts or metacercariae). In the second intermediate host, metacercariae can initiate the formation of pearls, causing one of the greatest commercial damage in mussels (Stunkard and Uzmann, 1958; Gosling, 2015; Marchiori *et al.*, 2023). Pearl formation is a defence mechanism by mussel mantle which is activated by exogenous organic (e.g. parasite) and inorganic materials and that ends isolating this material through conchiolin encapsulation. The host reaction to the trematodes larval stage infection leads to the death of the parasite by the calcification of its body in the pearl centre (Marchiori *et al.*, 2023). Different metacercariae infections are associated with changes in mantle tissue due to degenerative and inflammatory processes, including compression and displacement of gonads with consequent decrease in reproductive potential and pearl formation (Gosling, 2015).

In early autumn 2016 and late summer 2017, alleged gymnophallid metacercariae were observed together with pearls in the mantle of mussels collected in Iceland and Tromsø (Benito *et al.*, 2022). The aim of the present study was to identify the trematode species corresponding to metacercariae found in mussels collected from Tromsø at morphological and molecular levels, and analyse the relationship between the gymnophallid parasite and the biological material encapsulated inside the pearls. For that purpose, morphological analysis of the metacercariae were carried out by histology and DNA analysis was performed on isolated metacercariae and pearl powder.

Material and methods

Host sampling, dissection and parasite dissection

Mussels (*Mytilus edulis*) were collected from a rocky beach (69.642089 N, 18.94639 E) and a harbour (69.654177 N, 18.968459 E) in Tromsø, Norway, on 20/10/2016. Individuals ranged 2–4.5 cm in shell length and were collected from the lower first metre of the intertidal zone. Mussels were transported to the laboratory at ambient temperature. Mussels used for histological analysis were dissected and a transverse section from each one, including mantle, gills and digestive gland tissues, was fixed in formalin. The rest of the histological procedure was carried out as indicated in Benito *et al.* (2022). Frozen mussels and paraffin blocks were stored in the Biscay Bay Environmental

Biospecimen Bank. In this particular case, a paraffin block corresponding to a mussel that presented heavy metacercarial infection was selected and serial consecutive sections (5 µm thick) were performed, getting serial sections of 2 different metacercariae, named A and B ('A' metacercariae: coronal sections and 'B' metacercariae: sagittal sections).

For parasite dissection, whole mussels were deep frozen (−80°C) and stored until dissection. After thawing the mussels ($n = 15$), mantle tissue was dissected out and placed between 2 glass plates, which were used to apply pressure on the tissue in order to locate the parasites under the stereomicroscope (Nikon SMZ800). Once located, metacercariae and pearls (pearls were retrieved from the mussels before using the glass plates in order to avoid breaking them) were carefully isolated with the aid of fine forceps and brushes. Parasites for molecular identification were deep frozen again, and the metacercariae for morphological identification ($n = 13$) were measured at the microscope (Olympus BX61) with attached camera (Olympus DP74) using the Olympus CellSens Entry 2.2 software. After removing the remaining soft tissues of the hosts, pearls were air dried and stored in Eppendorf tubes at room temperature until processing.

DNA extraction and PCR amplification

Pearls were individually grounded in an agate hand mortar and the fine powder was collected and placed into Eppendorf tubes. To avoid cross-contamination, all the tools used to grind the pearls were cleaned with bleach diluted to 10%. DNA extraction of the pearls was carried out using the DNeasy blood and tissue kit (Qiagen, Germany), and DNA was eluted in RNase-free water.

For parasite DNA extraction, Trizol (Invitrogen, California, USA) method was used following manufacturer's instructions. DNA was dissolved in RNase-free water. Conventional PCR was performed in SimplyAmp Applied Biosystems (AB, Waltham, Massachusetts, USA) thermocycler using NZYTECH 2X Green Taq polymerase master mix with 0.1 µM concentrations of Fw and Rv primers of 18S rDNA, COI and ITS genes (Table 1). PCR final reaction volume was 25 µL, being 2 µL of DNA template. Briefly, the reaction was as follows: Taq polymerase activating temperature step of 95°C for 2 min, followed by denaturation step at 94°C for 30 s, an annealing temperature of T_m (Table 1) for 30 s, ending with an elongation step of 72°C for 30 s. These 3 steps were repeated 35 times. The reaction ended at 72°C for 7 min, and kept at 4°C until electrophoresis was performed. In the case of pearl powder extract samples, mentioned PCR was repeated on top of the PCR product (volume used as template in the second PCR, 1 µL). All conventional PCR reactions were performed with a non-template control containing water as template. All amplicons were visualized in 2% agarose gels stained

Table 1. List of primers used for PCR amplification in *Mytilus edulis* pearls and parasite samples

Trematoda primers	Tm	Obtained sequence	Reference
18SFw: AGCTCGTAGTTGGATCTGGGTC	60	OP965542 (pearl) OP965543; OP965544 (parasite)	
18SRv: CACGGATCGTCAGTTGGCATCGTTTA			
Bb18S Rv: ACTGGAGGGCAAGTCTGGTGC	58	QQ378338 (pearl) OP965545 (parasite)	Magalhães <i>et al.</i> (2020)
Bb18S FW: CAGCTTTGCAACCATACTTCCC			
BbITS_Fw: GACCGAACTTGATCATTTAGAGG		-	
BbITS_rv: CTTAAGTTACGCGGGTAATCACG		-	
Tremcois2Fw: TGTTYTTTAGKTCTGKAC	50	OP965638 (parasite) QQ376662–QQ376666 (pearl)	
Tremcois2Rv: AATGCATMGGRAAAAACA			

Primers melting temperature (Tm), obtained and published sequences, and references for used primers are indicated. No reference means primers designed by the authors.




Figure 1. (A) Micrograph of the general view of a metacercariae isolated from mantle tissue. (B) Schematic drawing of *Gymnophallus bursicola* metacercariae from Stunkard and Uzmann (1958). OS, oral sucker; EV, excretory vesicle; DC, digestive caeca; VS, ventral sucker.

with real safe. Samples positive for PCR results were sequenced, for both strands, using Sanger procedures in the Sequencing and Genotyping Unit of the SGIker of the University of the Basque Country (UPV/EHU).

Bioedit was used to visualize sequencing quality of the Sanger files. Forward and reverse Fasta sequences of the same sequence were clustered together, primer section trimmed and consensus sequences built using IUPAC nomenclature for undetermined bases. Consensus sequences were used to search for sequence similarities in NCBI GenBank using BlastN (database of 30/11/2022).

Results

Morphological description of the metacercariae

Body oval or pyriform (Figs 1A, B and 2A) presenting a spiny tegument (Fig. 2B). Metacercariae displayed a subterminal and muscular oral sucker, similar in size to the ventral sucker. Well-developed muscular pharynx. Digestive caeca reached the posterior third part of body, where the ventral sucker was located. Inconspicuous genital pore (Fig. 3A), pars prostatica (Fig. 3C) and genital atrium were only found in histological samples (Fig. 3B). Excretory vesicle Y-shaped reaching pharyngeal level. Morphometric data are presented in Table 2 as mean value (\pm standard deviation): metacercariae length 669.54 (\pm 66.01) μ m, metacercariae width 380.88 (\pm 43.13) μ m, oral sucker dimensions 121.11 (\pm 13.09) \times 110.23 (\pm 11.92) μ m and ventral sucker dimensions 123.02 (\pm 22.29) \times 112.23 (\pm 15.37) μ m. More detailed morphometric data are shown in Table 2.

Metacercariae and pearl prevalence

Multiple metacercariae and pearls were found in 62.5% of the dissected mussels ($n = 16$). The size of the pearls ranged from roughly the same size as the metacercariae (300–700 μ m) up to 2980 \times 2400 μ m. Remarkably, a dead metacercaria surrounded by host haemocytes and chitin deposits was observed too in a histological section (Fig. 4A). While dissecting, some pearls were seen attached to the nacreous layer of the inner side of mussel valves (Fig. 4B).

Pearl DNA extraction

DNA was successfully extracted from the powder of the 16 pearls tested, with an average concentration of 80.74 $\text{ng } \mu\text{L}^{-1} \pm 34.38$. The 260/280 DNA quality ratio measured spectrophotometrically ranged from 1.56 to 1.89.

PCR amplification of 18S rDNA

Both pearl powder and parasites positively amplified 18S rDNA using primers from Magalhães *et al.* (2020). Five sequences were obtained, 2 in the pearl extract (ID: OP965542 and OQ378338) and the rest in isolated parasites (ID: OP965543; OP965544 and OP965545) being each one of 514, 596, 540, 450 and 504 bp in length, respectively. It is worth mentioning that out of all tested pearls, 14 were positive for 18S rDNA amplicons, however, only 2 were sequenced with homology related to parasitic microorganism; the others corresponded to *M. edulis* 18S




Figure 2. Histological micrographs (haematoxylin and eosin) of a metacercariae encapsulated in mantle tissue. (A) General view of the 'A' metacercariae (arrow-head). (B) Detailed view of the spiny tegument (arrow) of the 'B' metacercariae.




Figure 3. Histological micrographs (haematoxylin and eosin) in which genital traits of metacercariae can be visualized. (A, B) Serial sections of the 'B' metacercariae in which the genital pore and genital atrium can be distinguished. (C) A section of the 'A' metacercariae in which the pars prostatica can be appreciated. VS, ventral sucker; DC, digestive caeca; GA, genital atrium. Asterisk: genital pore; arrow: pars prostatica; arrowhead: prostatic cells.

rDNA sequence. BlastN results of OP965542 and OQ378338 showed strong similarity with digenean trematodes, particularly with the genus *Gymnophallus*. Detailed information of the identity percentages of 18S rDNA sequences is given in Table 3.

The 3 sequences from parasites were 100% identical, being different in length. The 18S rDNA sequences obtained from the pearl extract, overall, had lower Sanger sequencing quality, and contained 5 undetermined bases. Nonetheless, pearl sequences were identical to the parasite ones (Table 3).

COI primers also amplified both, parasite and pearl DNA extract. The consensus sequence for parasite (ID: OP965638;

259 bp in length) was most similar to *G. choledochus* (MN547969.1) with an identity 85% and $1e^{-73}$ e-value, followed by *Renicola buchanani* (KF512572) with an 84% of identity and $5e^{-66}$ e-value. In the case of the pearls, PCR cycles were increased. Out of the 16 pearls, 7 were positive to COI. However, only 5 were uploaded in NCBI for similarity searching due to sequence quality issues (ID: OQ376662–OQ376666; length range: 330–386 bp). Blast homology results of pearl's COI amplicon displayed lowest similarity e-values with species different from the parasite amplified COI: *Plagiorchis* sp (MW520081; $2e^{-93}$); *R. buchanani* (KF512572), $3e^{-90}$ and *Neogplagioporus elongates* (LC196193)

Table 2. Morphometrics of the metacercariae analysed in the present work compared to morphometrics of *Gymnophallus bursicola* collected from *Mytilus edulis* in Massachusetts described by Stunkard and Uzzmann (1958), *Parvatrema* sp. metacercariae collected from *Mytilus galloprovincialis* in the Adriatic sea in 2 different studies (Puljas and Burazin, 2022; Marchiori et al., 2023)

		Present study	Stunkard and Uzzmann (1958)	Puljas and Burazin (2022)	Marchiori et al. (2023)
Body	Length (μm)	531.3–764.0 (669.5 \pm 66.0)	400.0–600.0	251.9–269.1 (259.9 \pm 4.6)	231.1 \pm 16.7
	Width (μm)	308.0–460.9 (380.9 \pm 43.1)	200.0–300.0	138.3–165.1 (154.4 \pm 5.6)	167.6 \pm 25.1
Oral sucker (OS)	Length (μm)	93.2–140.0 (121.1 \pm 13.1)	88.0*	57.2–67.0 (63.3 \pm 2.6)	65.6 \pm 5.7
	Width (μm)	90.6–127.4 (110.2 \pm 11.9)		53.2–64.0 (58.2 \pm 3.0)	80.7 \pm 9.2
Ventral sucker (VS)	Length (μm)	82.8–153.9 (123.0 \pm 22.2)		20.4–31.1 (26.1 \pm 2.3)	35.9 \pm 3.2
	Width (μm)	85.6–142.4 (112.2 \pm 15.34)		18.2–29.1 (23.2 \pm 2.7)	33.8 \pm 3.1
OS/VS		1:1		2.47:1	2.1:1

Data from the present study and Puljas and Burazin (2022) are presented as range (mean \pm s.d.), data from Stunkard and Uzzmann (1958) are presented as range, data from Marchiori et al. (2023) are presented as mean \pm s.d. Asterisk indicates that the measurement was done on a fixed individual.




Figure 4. (A) Histological micrograph (haematoxylin and eosin) in which a dead metacercariae (arrowhead) can be seen surrounded by layers of haemocytes (arrows) and chitin (asterisk). (B) Photograph of 2 pearls embedded in the nacreous layer (NL) of a mussel shell.

Table 3. Identity percentage (%) comparison among the 18S rDNA sequences from the present work and the top 4 most similar species: *G. choledochus* (MN544854); *M. minutus* (MN879355); *G. seoi* (JQ955636.1); *G. deliciosus* (OM699016.1)

	Pearl 1 OQ378338	Pearl 2 OP965542	Parasite 1 OP965543	Parasite 2 OP965544	Parasite 3 OP965545	<i>G. choledochus</i> (MN544854)	<i>M. minutus</i> (MN879355)	<i>G. seoi</i> (JQ955636)
<i>OP965542</i>	93.58							
<i>OP965543</i>	97.82	95.24						
<i>OP965544</i>	97.77	94.88	100					
<i>OP965545</i>	98.14	95.52	100	100				
<i>MN544854</i>	95.39	92.77	96.01	96.43	96.49			
<i>MN879355</i>	94.56	92.34	95.20	95.51	95.56	95.18		
<i>JQ955636</i>	93.08	90.61	93.80	96.18	94.37	94	94.05	
<i>OM699016</i>	92.65	90.37	93.76	–	94.07	96.93*	92.66	93.68

Bold numbers indicate values higher than 97% of identity. Asterisk: highest identity percentage among *Gymnophallus* species.

$4e^{-89}$. However, the highest identity of percentage 83.21% was with *Gymnophallus choledochus* (MN547969) that was the fourth hit of the blastN with an e-value of $9e^{-71}$. Regarding ITS primers, they did not amplify either the parasite or the pearl materials.

Discussion

The aims of the present study were (1) to identify the parasite infecting mussel mantle in Tromsø as metacercariae, and (2) to decipher whether the pearls observed in the mantle of blue mussels (*M. edulis*) were produced by the parasitic infection that was causing histopathological alterations. Molecular and histological procedures confirmed causation of pearl formation and the presence of digenean parasites.

According to the morphological and anatomical characters, including the taxonomic key proposed by Cremonte *et al.* (2015), detected metacercariae were identified as likely members of the genus *Gymnophallus*. This idea reinforced by morphometric data and by comparison with the schematic drawings published by Stunkard and Uzmann (1958) of *Gymnophallus bursicola*. Moreover, Galaktionov *et al.* (2015) indicated that *G. bursicola* is the only species of the *Gymnophallus* genus present in European mussels. Presently, there is compelling evidence suggesting that the metacercariae found in blue mussels (*M. edulis*) collected from Tromsø belong to the *G. bursicola* species. Nevertheless, there are anatomical traits defined in the bibliography that could not be assessed with absolute certainty (i.e. the identification of genital traits). This uncertainty could be due to the non-optimal condition of the specimens as they were thawed

for testing. In addition, analysed metacercariae were almost 3 times larger than the ones described in the recent bibliography, which could have hindered the observation of the inner organs by light microscopy. Lastly, according to the descriptions of Stunkard and Uzmann (1958), the metacercariae analysed in the present study might be a very immature asexual stage of *G. bursicola*, and consequently they would present underdeveloped genital systems important for accurate identification.

Morphological studies need to be coupled with molecular tools to safely develop quick and precise diagnostics. The approach used herein has allowed morphological discrimination of a parasite species, and confirming its presence based on molecular evidence. Although no *G. bursicola* sequence was available in NCBI, consequently, the morphological identification could not be molecularly linked to an existing sequence.

The infection prevalence reported in the present study is coherent with data reported by Galaktionov *et al.* (2015), which ranged from 46.7% to 51.6% in Tromsø, but went up to 83.9% in Iceland. The prevalence data reported by Benito *et al.* (2022) in histological samples of mussels collected in the same sampling sites as in the present study were lower (15.79–31.58%) than that reported in the present study. This decrease might indicate an underestimation of parasite prevalence and infection intensity when using only histological techniques. The results of the present study together with the histopathological analysis performed in previous studies (Benito *et al.*, 2022), and the negative effects described in Mediterranean mussel populations caused by *Gymnophallid* trematodes (Puljas and Burazin, 2022) make this family a subject of great parasitological interest.

Previous studies indicated Gymnophallid trematodes as possible inducers of pearl formation in mussels (Ituarte *et al.*, 2005; Marchiori *et al.*, 2023). The formation of the pearls is the result of the response of the host to any tissue-invading foreign bodies in an attempt to encapsulate them when they cannot be phagocytized. The encapsulating haemocytes release cytotoxic products to destroy the parasite and create a multicellular chitinous capsule that adheres and encloses the pathogen (Lauckner, 1983; De Vico and Carella, 2012; Gao *et al.*, 2015; Marchiori *et al.*, 2023). The mucous layer surrounding the parasite, as seen under the microscope (Fig. 4A), constitutes a matrix for the deposition of calcareous material (Marchiori *et al.*, 2023). In addition, in the present study, pearls were found embedded in the nacreous layer of the shell of infected mussels (Fig. 4B), which indicates that pearls end up trapped in the mineral matrix while the CaCO₃ is being deposited on the shell surface during the growth and thickening processes of the shell. Overall, the described defence system that includes cytotoxic action and organic and inorganic encapsulation of the parasites can be an important stress source for *Mytilus* species, which makes it a key pathological phenomenon that should be taken into account for the assessment of the health status of wild and cultured mussels.

In the Norwegian coast, high prevalence of pearls in mussels was reported in 2018 (Bråte *et al.*, 2018), with some mussels including more than 360 pearls per individual. Bråte *et al.* (2018) found no correlation between the occurrence of microplastics and pearls. Although they hypothesized that the presence of parasites is an aetiological factor for pearl formation, they did not present any evidence. Thus, as suggested by Benito *et al.* (2022), it seems clear that the importance of parasitological studies for the health status assessment of mussels is critical. Co-occurrence of pearl formation and Gymnophallidae infection has been recently observed in Mediterranean mussels (Puljas and Burazin, 2022; Marchiori *et al.*, 2023). Furthermore, when comparing the morphometric and anatomical characteristics with the cited Mediterranean studies, it is clear that the metacercariae infecting Mediterranean mussels and Northern Atlantic mussels (the ones in the present study) belong to different species. These facts make the presence of pearls in *Mytilus* spp. and their aetiology a significant research subject, at least, at European level.

The present study confirms that the pearls are formed by the encapsulation of gymnophallid metacercariae. In previous studies, pearl (host) DNA had been only extracted to determine the origin of cultivable pearls (Meyer *et al.*, 2013). The positive amplification of the parasitic DNA encapsulated inside the pearls reported in the present study, as far as the authors are aware, is a novel achievement.

In conclusion, the present study combines morphological, histological and molecular approaches for the characterization of *G. bursicola* metacercariae infecting Norwegian *M. edulis*, allowing the authors to undoubtedly report the first 18S rDNA and COI sequences for the mentioned species. In addition, parasite DNA from the core of the pearls was extracted and amplified for the first time, which confirmed the parasitological origin of these pearls and allows the possibility of identifying different parasitic organisms that cause the generation of pearls in bivalves.

Data availability statement. The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author, [D.B.], upon reasonable request.

Acknowledgements. SGiker technical support (University of the Basque Country) is greatly acknowledged. Thanks are also due to Perrine Geraudie from Akvaplan-Niva for her tremendous support.

Author contributions. Denis Benito, Urtzi Izagirre, Xabier Lekube, Beñat Zaldibar, Manu Soto and Oihane Diaz de Cerio conceived and designed the study. Denis Benito, Oihane Diaz de Cerio, Xavier De Montaudouin and

Guillemine Daffe conducted data gathering. Denis Benito, Urtzi Izagirre, Xabier Lekube, Beñat Zaldibar, Antonio Villalba, Xavier De Montaudouin, Guillemine Daffe, Manu Soto and Oihane Diaz de Cerio wrote and revised the article.

Financial support. This study was funded by the Basque Government (grant to consolidated research groups IT1302-19) and EU GRACE Project (grant agreement number 679266).

Competing interests. None.

Ethical standards. Not applicable.

References

- Benito D, Paleček D, Lekube X, Izagirre U, Marigómez I, Zaldibar B and Soto M (2022) Variability and distribution of parasites, pathologies and their effect on wild mussels (*Mytilus* sp) in different environments along a wide latitudinal span in the Northern Atlantic and Arctic Oceans. *Marine Environmental Research* **176**, 105585.
- Beyer J, Green NW, Brooks S, Allan IJ, Ruus A, Gomes T, Bråte ILN and Schøyen M (2017) Blue mussels (*Mytilus edulis* spp.) as sentinel organisms in coastal pollution monitoring: a review. *Marine Environmental Research* **130**, 338–365.
- Bråte ILN, Buenaventura NT and Lusher A (2018) Occurrence of pearls in mussels (*Mytilus* spp.) from the Norwegian coast. *NIVA-rapport*, 7308.
- Brenner M, Broeg K, Frickenhaus S, Buck BH and Koehler A (2014) Multi-biomarker approach using the blue mussel (*Mytilus edulis* L.) to assess the quality of marine environments: season and habitat-related impacts. *Marine Environmental Research* **95**, 13–27.
- Cremonte F, Gilardoni C, Pina S, Rodrigues P and Ituarte C (2015) Revision of the family Gymnophallidae Odhner, 1905 (Digenea) based on morphological and molecular data. *Parasitology International* **64**, 202–210.
- De Vico G and Carella F (2012) Morphological features of the inflammatory response in molluscs. *Research in Veterinary Science* **93**, 1109–1115.
- Feis ME, Thielges DW, Olsen JL, de Montaudouin X, Jensen KT, Bazairi H, Culloty SC and Lutikhuisen PC (2015) The most vagile host as the main determinant of population connectivity in marine macroparasites. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* **520**, 85–99.
- Galaktionov KV (1996) Life cycles and distribution of seabird helminths in arctic and sub-arctic regions. *Bulletin of the Scandinavian Society for Parasitology* **6**, 31–49.
- Galaktionov KV, Bustnes JO, Bårdsen BJ, Wilson JG, Nikolaev KE, Sukhotin AA, Skirnisson K, Saville DH, Ivanov MV and Regel KV (2015) Factors influencing the distribution of trematode larvae in blue mussels *Mytilus edulis* in the North Atlantic and Arctic Oceans. *Marine Biology* **162**, 193–206.
- Gao P, Liao Z, Wang XX, Bao LF, Fan MH, Li XM, Wu CW and Xia SW (2015) Layer-by-layer proteomic analysis of *Mytilus galloprovincialis* shell. *PLoS ONE* **10**, e0133913.
- Gosling E (2015) *Marine Bivalve Molluscs*. New Jersey, USA: John Wiley & Sons.
- Ituarte C, Cremonte F and Zelaya DG (2005) Parasite-mediated shell alterations in recent and Holocene sub-Antarctic bivalves: the parasite as modeler of host reaction. *Invertebrate Biology* **124**, 220–229.
- Lauckner G (1983) Diseases of Mollusca: Bivalvia. In Kinne O (ed.), *Diseases of Marine Animals*, Vol. 2. Hamburg: Biologische Anstalt Helgoland, pp. 477–961.
- Magalhães L, Daffe G, Freitas R and de Montaudouin X (2020) *Monorchis parvus* and *Gymnophallus choledochus*: two trematode species infecting cockles as first and second intermediate host. *Parasitology* **147**, 643–658.
- Marchiori E, Quaglio F, Franzo G, Brocca G, Aleksi S, Cerchier P, Cassini R and Marcer F (2023) Pearl formation associated with gymnophallid metacercariae in *Mytilus galloprovincialis* from the Northwestern Adriatic coast: preliminary observations. *Journal of Invertebrate Pathology* **196**, 107854.
- Meyer JB, Cartier LE, Pinto-Figueroa EA, Krzemnicki MS, Hänni HA and McDonald BA (2013) DNA fingerprinting of pearls to determine their origins. *PLoS ONE* **8**, e75606.
- Mouritsen KN and Poulin R (2010) Parasitism as a determinant of community structure on intertidal flats. *Marine Biology* **157**, 201–213.

- Nasci C, Nesto N, Monteduro RA and Da Ros L (2002) Field application of biochemical markers and a physiological index in the mussel, *Mytilus galloprovincialis*: transplantation and biomonitoring studies in the lagoon of Venice (NE Italy). *Marine Environmental Research* **54**, 811–816.
- Özer A and Güneydağ S (2015) Seasonality and host–parasite interrelationship of *Mytilus galloprovincialis* parasites in Turkish Black Sea coasts. *Journal of the Marine Biological Association of the United Kingdom* **95**, 1591–1599.
- Puljas S and Burazin J (2022) Infection of *Mytilus galloprovincialis* by the Trematode *Parvatrema* sp. (Digenea: Gymnophallidae) in the Middle Adriatic Sea, Croatia. *Thalassas: An International Journal of Marine Sciences* **38**, 745–752.
- Stout L, Garenne A and de Montaudouin X (2022) Marine trematode parasites as indicators of environmental changes. *Ecological Indicators* **141**, 109089.
- Stunkard HW and Uzmans JR (1958) Studies on digenetic trematodes of the genera *Gymnophallus* and *Parvatrema*. *The Biological Bulletin* **115**, 276–302.
- Thieltges DW (2006) Effect of infection by metacercarial trematode *Renicola roscovita* on growth in intertidal blue mussel *Mytilus edulis*. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* **319**, 129–134.
- Thieltges DW, Mouritsen KN and Poulin R (2018) Ecology of parasites in mudflat ecosystems. In Beninger PG (ed.), *Mudflat Ecology. Aquatic Ecology Series*, vol. 7. Cham: Springer, pp. 213–242. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-99194-8_9
- Thieltges DW, Engelsma MY, Wendling CC and Wegner KM (2013) Parasites in the Wadden Sea food web. *Journal of Sea Research* **82**, 122–133.
- Vázquez N, Frizzera A and Cremonte F (2020) Diseases and parasites of wild and cultivated mussels along the Patagonian coast of Argentina, southwest Atlantic Ocean. *Diseases of Aquatic Organisms* **139**, 139–152.
- Villalba A, Mourelle SG, Carballal MJ and Lopez C (1997) Symbionts and diseases of farmed mussels *Mytilus galloprovincialis* throughout the culture process in the Rias of Galicia (NW Spain). *Diseases of Aquatic Organisms* **31**, 127–139.