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## Introduction

In this paper we describe for the first time the life-cycle of Acotyledon paradoxa Oudemans, 1903 . This species was known, so far, only from the hypopial stage and a protomympl. The discovery of the adults allows us to precise the systematic position of the genus Acotyledon and to throw light on this difficult group of Acaridae.

All our material was found by the junior author in a nest of a screech owl, ()tus asio, in Syracuse, New York, U.S.A. It includes numerous hypopi, protonymphs, tritonymphs and adults of both sexes. One of our protonymphs contained a completely developed hypopus identical with the other free hypopi.

## Review of the literature

Oudemans (1903) erected the genus Acotyledon for a new species, $A$. paradoxa, represented only by a single hypopus collected on a bat from Russia. This hypopus is characterized by the vestigial aspect of the suctorial plate bearing only one pair of, small suckers and no conoids.

Zachvatkin (1937) in his first sturly on Tyroglyphidae did not mention the genus Acotyledon, but in 19+1, after having discovered new specimens of hypolv as wel as protonymphs of the species of Oudenans, he synonymized with . Acotyledon the gencra l:berhardia Oudemans (1924), Cosmoglyphus


Fig. I. Acotylcdon paradoxa Oudemans. Female, ventrally (specimen from uest of Otus asio).

Oudemans (1932) and Myrmoglyphus Vitzthum (1935). He recognized, however, that this new complex comprised two sharply different morphological types of hypopi, one of the Acotyledon type with poorly developed suckers, the other of the Cosmoglyphus type with a normally developed suctorial plate. He included in the genus Acotyledon twelve palearctic and four tropical species.

Nesbitt ( 1945 ), in his revision of the family Acaridae based on adults, did not mention the genus Acotyledon, but he conserved the genus Eberhardia and placed the taxon Cosmoglyphus as a subgenus of the latter.

Baker and Wharton (1952) synonymized Acotyledon with Eberhardia.
Samsinak (1957) at first considered Cosmoglyphus a subgenus of Acotyledon. In 1960 he showed that the name Eberhardia Oudemans (1942) is homonymous with Eberhardia Angel (1920) (see Neave, S.A., Nomenclator Zoologicus, 1939). He did not mention the genus Cosmoglyphus, but in the same paper he described a new hypopus, Acotyledon solenopsidis, which is morphologically very close to the hypopus of Cosmoglyphus krameri, the type species of Cosmoglyphus. One may therefore suppose that this author considered Cosmoglyphus a synonym of Acotyledon. Moreover he accepted the opinion of Zachvatkin (1941) considering Myrmoglyphus Vitzthum a synonym of Acotyledon and he synonymized Caloglyphus with Sancassania Oudemans, 1916.

Hughes (1961) did not mention the genus Cosmoglyphus and incorporated Acotyledon, Ebcrhardia and Myrmoglyphus into the genus Caloglyphus lierlese (1923).

In 1966, Samsinak reestablished the genus Cosmoglyphus which he redefined as follows.

Adults: Cuticle whitish or dirty yellowish, shiny. Dorsum: A propodosomal shield is present. The $v e$ are short, simple, situated along the lateral margins of propodosomal shield approximately at same distance from $v i$ and $s c x$; the sci$i$ are significantly shorter than sce; the $s c x$ are always thickened, long and distinctly barbulated. Grandjean's organ is rodlike. Orifice of oil-gland is situated between $l_{2}$ and $l_{3}$. Venter: Vulva is between coxae IV. Copulatory suckers are present in male. Epimera I are fused in a Y, other epimera are free. Anal setae: 6 pairs in female, 3 pairs in male. Penis narrow, slightly curved. Chaetotaxy of legs: Tarsi I-II with never more than one foliate seta in male; without foliate setae in female. Claws simple; at base of claws there are 5 small spines; a slightly stronger additional spine is present dorsally near apex of tarsus I-III. The two ventral setae of tarsi are spinelike. Solenidiotaxy: $w$, of tarsi I-II are club-shaped apically; $w 2$ is basal and flankerl with a simple seta, as long as $w i ; w 3$ is long and apical; phi I-II are
as long as tarsi. The setae of tibiae [-] I are small, spinelike; sigma 2 of genu I is twice shorter than sigma $I$. Male with two oval suckers on tarsi TV.

1 Iypopi: dorsum strongly convex, with anterior margin sinuous and curved backwards in its median part. Suctorial plate widely distant from posterior margin of the body (more than the width of the plate). Genu and tibia I with powerful spines. Setae of basal part of tarsus T relatively long. Genu IV


Figs 2-3. Acoty/edon paradora Oudemans. 2, female, dorsum; , 3 , male, venter (specimens from nest of Othes asio).
distinctly longer than femur IV. The hypopi of all the known species are very close to each other and very difficult to separate.

Samsinak inclutles in the genus Cosmoglyphus seven species represented by the adults.

Hughes (1976) incorporated Acotyledon and Cosmoglyphus into the genus Caloglyphus, considering the latter a valid genus, distinct from Sancassania.

## Acotyledon Oudemans, 1903

We give here a definition of this genus based on the adults and the hypopi of Acotyledon paradoxa.

Adults: Cuticle whitish and shiny, becoming yellowish in older specimens. Sejugal furrow well developed. Propodosoma with a large punctate shield. Oil gland orifice much closer to $l z$ than to $l 3$ setae. The $v i$ are shortly barbed in their apical half. The $v e$, short and thin, are situated on lateral borders of the shield and closer to $s-c x$ than to $r i$. The $s-c x$ are thin, long and with a few very short barbs. All the other dorsal setae are bare. The sci are much thinner and shorter than sce. Setae $d_{I}, d_{2}, l_{I}, l_{2}$ and $l_{4}$ thin and much shorter than the $d_{3}, d_{4}, d_{5}, l_{3}, l_{5}$ and $h$. Epimera I fused in a Y , other epimera free. Vulva situated at level of coxae IV. A very small, poorly sclerotized epigynium is present. Genital suckers well developed. Anus ventral, relatively far in front of posterior margin of body. Female with 6 pairs of thin slightly unequal anal setae, male with only 3 pairs of setae. Tarsus IV of male with 2 suckers dividing the tarsus in 3 equal parts. Grandjean's organ rodlike with small denticles. I eg chaetotaxy: In female: Apex of tarsi I with 6 small spines and 2 unec $u a l$ simple setae, the middle of this tarsus bears 4 simple setae, the base I simple seta. Tarsi III with apically 6 small spines and 2 long fine setae and medially 2 simple setae. Tarsus IV as tarsus III, but one of the merlian setae is a spine. Tibiae I-II with 2 thin non barbed setae, tibiae III-IV each with I thin seta. Genua I-IV with 2-2-I-O thin setae. The legs do not bear any foliate seta. Male: as in the female except for tarsus IV, which bears apically 5 small apical spines and one apical simple seta, and medially one simple seta and one spinelike seta. Solenidiotaxy: wi of tarsi I-II rather thick aud bulbous apically; $w_{2}$ thin and more basal than $w i$; wi 3 apical, rather short. Tibiae I: phi of leg I-II longer than the tarsi. Genua I with 2 subequal rather long sigma.

Hypopus: Cuticle poorly sclcrotized. Dursum slightly convex. The margins of the botly are not membrancous. Anterior borly tapering anteriorly into a small cone with rounded apex. Sejugal furrow well developed. Venter: epimera I fused in Y , epimera II frec. lepimera IIS and IV poorly sclerotized,
fused at their apex, the two coxal fields III separated in the midline. Suctorial plate apparently large, bearing only the anterior pair of suckers. The posterior pair is represented by two very small pores situated beneath the cuticle. The conoids are completely lacking. Palposoma short. Legs short, rather thick ending into a rather strong and sessile claw. Chaetotaxy of body: the $v e$ are present; the $s-c x$ are long. Other dorsal setae rather short. Ventrally the $c x I, c x I I I$ and $g m$ are absent, some of them may be represented by very small pores. Leg chaetotaxy: Tarsus I with 5 foliate setae, 2 thin simple


Digs. f-5. Acotyden paradora ()udemans. Hymons, venter and dorsme (specimen from nest of Ofus asia).
setae and 2 spines. Tarsus II as tarsus I but the big basal spine is replaced by a submedian thin seta. Tarsi III with 7 foliate and I simple setae. Tarsi IV with 6 foliate setac, I spine and i simple seta. Tibiae I-IV with 2-2-I-I setae. Tarsi I with a long $w$ I parabasal, a short $w 2$ more basal than $w i$ and


Figs. 6-13. Acotyledon paradoxa Oudemans. 6-9, female, leg I (6-7), tarsi IlI (8) and IV (9) ; 10, male, tarsus IV; II-I3, hypopus, leg IV (iI), leg III (12), leg I (13) (N.B.: All specimeus from the nest of Othe asio).
situated close to a spine. The $w_{3}$ is shorter than $w_{1}$ and situated slightly closer to the apex than to the base of tarsus.

Type species: Acotyledon paradoxa Oudemans, 1903.
Other species of Acotyledon: We think that four other species should be incorporated in this genus: Tyroglyphus ayilis Canestrini (i888), Ebcrhardia (Cosmoglyphus) pedispinifer Neshitt (1944), Eberhardia (Cosmoglyphus) rhizoglyphoides Zachvatkin (1937) and Acotyledon sokolovi Zachvatkin (1941). The last two species differ from A. paradoxa mainly by the narrow shape and the different structure of the suctorial plate in the hypopi which bears 2 pairs of suckers (instead of one) and 4 small conoids placed on a transverse straight line (absent in A. paradoxa).

The hypopi of $A$. agilis and $A$. pedispinifer are unknown. The adults of A. agilis resemble closely those of $A$. sokolovi. The adults of $A$. pedispinifer differ from $A$. paradoxa only by slight characters such as the slightly larger size of the body, the more unequal length of the anal setae in the female and the different length and shape of some setae of legs.

The exact position of Eberhardia michaeli (Oudemans, 1924) ( $=$ Rhizoglyphus agilis Michael, 1903), the type of the genus Eberhardia, is not clear. In that species there are two types of males (both homeo- and heteronorphic) and the hypopus does not correspond exactly with that of Acotyledon. It seems, however, more close to the latter than to Cosmoglyphus or Sancassania ( = Caloglyphus). The drawing of Türk \& Tïrk (1957) does not correspond with the original figure of Michael (1903). A re-examination of the types (holotype or syntypes) of $E$. michaeli is necessary before a definite status can be assigned to that species.

Acotyledon paradoxa Oudemans, 1903 (figs. 1-16)
Female (figs. 1, 2, 6-9): Our largest female specimen (ovigerous) is $590 \mu$ long (idiosoma) and $320 \mu$ wide. In four other specimens these measurements are: $510 \mu \times 290 \mu ; 460 \mu \times 280 \mu ; 420 \mu \times 230 \mu ; 400 \mu \times 210 \mu$. Setae $d_{1}, d_{2}, l_{1}$ and $l_{2}$ are $27 \mu$ to $33 \mu$ long. The $d_{4}$ and $d_{5}$ are longer ( $150 \mu$ ) than the $d_{3}(120 \mu)$. The $l_{3}, l_{4}$ and $l_{5}$ are 150,45 and $150 \mu$ long, respectively. The anal setae are slightly unequal. Copulatory pore ventral, close to posterior border of body; there is a very small and flat papilla.

Male (figs. 3, Io): All the males are homeomorphic. Measurements of 3 specimens (length of idiosoma $\times$ width): $459 \mu \times 258 \mu, 445 \mu \times 24^{\circ} \mu$ and $375 \mu \times 220 \mu$. The genital sclerite is a little more posterior than the vulva in the female. It is triangular in shape. The penis is short and slightly
curved. Leg chaetotaxy: as in the female, there are no foliate setae on tarsi I-IV.
'Tritonymph: Idiosoma $340 \mu$ long and $175 \mu$ wide.
Protonymph: Idiosoma $245 \mu$ to $300 \mu$ long and $140 \mu$ to $170 \mu$ wide.
Larva: Idiosoma $196 \mu \mathrm{long}$ and $117 \mu$ wide.
Hypopus: The holotype is actually $216 \mu$ long and $150 \mu$ wide. It is in a rather poor condition and we give here drawings of some of its principal organs (figs. 14-16).

In the hypopi collected in the nest of Otus asio the size varies from $213 \mu$ $\times 14^{1} \mu$ (the smallest) to $270 \mu \times 165 \mu$ (the largest), with all the intermediate sizes. The length and width of the setae or spines and of the palposoma may also vary slightly according to the specimen (figs. 4, 5, II-I3).


Figs. 14-16. Acotyledon paradoxa Oudemans. Holotype hypopus. Palposoma (i4), part of leg I (15), suctorial plate and genital slit (16).

## Systematic position of the genus Acotyledon

The genus Cosmoglyphus Oudemans, 1932 (type species Tyroglyphus krameri Berlese, $\mathbf{1 8 8 1}=$ syn. Eberhardia (Cosmoglyphus) redikorzevi Zachvatkin, 1937) differs from the genus Acotyledon mainly by the structure of the hypopi. The borders of the body in the hypopi are flattened, membraneous and very wide, the anterior margin is truncate, more or less concave and with a median "rostrum-like" projection; the suctorial plate is far remote from the posterior border of the body, it is wider than long and bears 2 pairs of well developed suckers; the genua IV are elongate and distinctly longer than the femora IV; the tibiae and genua I-II bear long and strong spines; the epinera III and IV are not fused; the anterior coxal shields are separated
from posterior ones by a convex furrow originating at the bases of epimera III. In the adult of Cosmoglyphus the $s-c x$ setae are thick and distinctly barbulated, the ventral seta of tibiae (I-IV) are spinous as well as the two ventral setae of tarsi.

The genus Sancassania Oudemans, 1916, type species: Sancassania chelone Oudemans, 1916 (syn. Caloglyphus Berlese, 1923, type species: Tyroglyphus berlesei Michael, 1903) is distinguished from Acotyledon by the following characters: the size of the body in adults and hypopi is distinctly greater. In the hypopi the suctorial plate is larger and relatively wider and bears two pairs of larger suckers and two pairs of conoids, the latter being not situated on a transverse line, also the palposoma is relatively longer. The adults differ by the spinous aspect of the ventral setae of tibiae I-IV and of some median setae of the tarsi and by the constant presence of $1-3$ foliate setae on the apices of tarsi I-II and sometimes of tarsi III-IV.

## Habitat of Acotyledon paradoxa

1. The holotype hypopus was collected from a bat in U.S.S.R. (Prof. Wagner, Aug. 1898).
2. Zachvatkin (1941) found hypopi and protonymphs of that species in wheat and granaries in Irkoutsk (U.S.S.R.).
3. Numerous specimens have been collected by the junior author from the nest of Otus asio, from Syracuse, N.Y., U.S.A. (i2.iii.1976) (2000 hypopi, 277 females, 221 males, 696 tritonymphs, 547 protonymphs, 5 larvae). Most ovigerous females contained I-2 eggs, some contained up to 7 eggs. Many additional specimens have also been found in a nest of a great horned owl, Bubo virginianus, in West Monroe, N.Y. (26.vii.1977) and in a nest box used by Otus asio and red squirrels, Tamiasciurus hudsonicus, in Jamesville, N.Y. (24.vi.1976).
4. Hypopi (29 in number) were collected from I 3 different nests of Peromyscus sp. in Patuxent Wildlife Refuge, U.S.A. (Coll. R.O. Drummond) (Nests nos: 2, 3, 4, 6, 11, 12, 14, 18, 20, 22, 23, 25 and 26; dates of collections from December 1954 until March 1955). These hypopi were sent for study to us by Prof. D. Johnston.
5. Several hypopi found in a nest of Peromyscus leucopus in U.S.A. were sent to us by Mr. G. S. Ide.

Türk and Türk (1957) recorded hypopi of $A$. paradoxa from the nest of a squirrel in Erlangen (Germany). These hypopi, however, are markedly larger than the holotype or those from U.S.A. and they have better formed suckers. They probably do not belong to $A$. paradoxa.
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