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INTRODUCTION

*Lepeophtheirus kareii* was first discovered in Japan attached as an ectoparasite to the flatfishes *Kareius bicoloratus* (Basilewsky) and *Limanda yokohamae* Günther (Yamaguti, 1936). It has since been collected from the fishes *Limanda punctatissima* (Steindachner), *Hypoptychus dybowskii* Steindachner, *Liopsetta obscura* (Herzenstein) (Gussev, 1951), *Lepidotrigla microptera* Günther and *Platycthyrs bicoloratus* (= *Kareius b.*) (Shen, 1958). In March 1972 this copepod was discovered in the Eastern Pacific at Bodega Bay, California, U.S.A., attached to the blind side of the starry flounder, *Platichthys stellatus* (Pallas). Over 100 fishes were examined during April and May 1972 and all were infected. This report redescribes the species and makes new observations on the development of the larva.

*Lepeophtheirus kareii* Yamaguti, 1936 (fig. 1, 2; pl. 1 figs. a, b)

REDESCRIPTION

Material and methods. — Parasites were gently removed from the host and returned alive to the laboratory where they were maintained in aerated Stendor dishes containing unfiltered seawater refrigerated at 15° C. Drawings were made with the aid of a camera lucida and measurements with an ocular micrometer.

Although the original description by Yamaguti and the redescription by Gussev are excellent, five deviations from their descriptions were noted: 1) the "additional 8 small hairs", described on, "the front edge of the basal article of antenna 1" (Gussev, 1951) could not be found; 2) there are two small, plumose spines near the front edge of the basal article of antenna 1. The spine most distal is hooked; 3) the broad-based spine drawn by Gussev on the proximal edge of the hook-like terminal article of antenna 2 was not present; 4) the dimple-like structure drawn by Gussev at the base of both the male and female furca was not present; 5) swimming leg 1 of the female is different from swimming leg 1 of the male. In the female, the middle article is much wider, relative to its own length, than in the male. Yamaguti (1936) and Gussev (1951) did not note these differences.
Fig. 1. *Lepeophtbeirus karei* Yamaguti, 1936, female. a, antenna 1; b, antenna 2; c, maxillary hook; d, mandible; e, maxilla 2; f, maxilliped 1; g, maxilliped 2; h, furca; i, leg 1; j, leg 4; k, legs 5 and 6.