Comparison of the Carpal Cleaning Brush in Two Genera of Hydrothermal Vent Shrimp (Crustacea, Decapoda, Bresiliidae)
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ABSTRACT Clusters of specialized serrate setae in patches called “carpal cleaning brushes,” or carpal-propodal brushes, are found on the distal margins of the chelipedal carpus in many species of caridean shrimps and other decapod crustaceans. These brushes, used to clean the antennal flagellum, occur in some bresiliid shrimp species associated with hydrothermal vents in the Pacific and Atlantic oceans, and recently their presence has been proposed as a distinguishing taxonomic character at the genus level. Occurrence of such brushes in shrimp that live near hydrothermal vents is of interest because of the high number of bacteria associated with these vents. These shrimp have the potential to be heavily fouled with bacteria, whereas at the same time preliminary studies suggest that they may depend upon these bacteria at least in part (or possibly exclusively) for food. We employ scanning electron microscopy to examine and describe the general morphology and location of carpal brushes on the chelipeds of all known species in two vent shrimp genera, Rimicaris Williams and Rona and Chorocaris Martin and Hessler. The brush is well developed and clearly delimitated in all known species of Chorocaris, where it consists of a triangular field of serrate setae and a posterior blunt spine that possibly functions as a “stop” to keep the antennal flagellum in place during grooming. Rimicaris exoculata has no recognizable carpal cleaning brush or any serrate setae on the chelipedal carpus and thus appears derived relative to species of Chorocaris with regard to this feature. A newly described species, R. aurantiaca, is somewhat intermediate, having no carpal brush but with two serrate setae and a blunt spine in the region occupied by the brush in species of Chorocaris. Possible implications and comparisons to the genera Alvinocaris and Opapae are discussed briefly.


Cleaning and grooming mechanisms and morphology in caridean shrimps and other decapod crustaceans have been fairly well documented (see reviews in Bauer, '81, '89). Carideans may employ several appendages to clean themselves, but use primarily the third maxillipeds, chelipeds, and the tips of the walking legs to groom the general body surface, gills, embryos, antennae, and antennules. Grooming is a time- and energy-consuming activity that is important to the shrimp's survival. Bauer ('75, '77, '79) has shown that amputation of cleaning appendages sometimes results in extreme fouling of the body and its other appendages; shrimps prevented from grooming their antennules become severely fouled and even suffer loss of olfactory setae. As noted by Bauer ('81, '89), grooming structures also may have value in decapod systematics and phylogeny, although they have been employed for that purpose only rarely. The carpal brush of the cheliped, or carpal-propodal brush if found on the adjoining surfaces of both the carpus...
and propodus, consists of a field of specialized serrate setae that function in cleaning the shrimps' antennal flagellum (Bauer, '75, '78, '81). The flagellum is drawn slowly through the slightly bent cheliped at the carpal-propodal joint, and any fouling materials are removed by the dense array of serrate setae (e.g., Bauer, '78, Fig. 4 for three species of caridean shrimp; Bauer, '89, Fig. 3 for the stenopodid Stenopus hispidus, Fig. 8D–F for the caridean Leander tenuicornis, and Fig. 9D–F for the caridean Heptacarpus pictus).

Some of the most conspicuous faunal components of the hydrothermal vent fields of the Mid-Atlantic Ridge are the large numbers of caridean shrimps in the genera Rimicaris, Chorocaris, and (to a lesser degree) Alvinocaris. The occurrence of carpal brushes in shrimp inhabiting vent fields is of particular interest. Most known hydrothermal vent sites are characterized by the presence of high numbers of chemosynthetic bacteria. Indeed, these bacteria support, either directly or indirectly, the unusual communities of life found at these vents (e.g., Grassle, '86; Tunnicliffe, '91; Casanova et al., '93; Wirsen et al., '93; Van Dover, '95). Yet there is also the possibility that bacterial fouling poses a larger problem for vent species than it would for species in other marine habitats; indeed, vent shrimp are known to harbor large numbers of bacteria on various parts of the appendages and body surface (Casanova et al., '93). Although descriptions of the chelipeds of these shrimp usually contain some illustrations and/or verbal accounts of the carpal cleaning brush, these have never been examined in any detail. Recently, Martin et al. ('97) use the presence of the carpal brush to distinguish between two genera of bresiliid shrimps from hydrothermal vents, Rimicaris (as modified by Martin et al., '97) and Chorocaris, which together contain five species to date. The present study is a comparison of the details of the carpal cleaning brush in these two most prevalent shrimp genera of the Mid-Atlantic Ridge hydrothermal vent fields, using shrimp from these sites and also species of Chorocaris from vent sites in the western Pacific.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Shrimp were collected by various researchers on expeditions to the Mariana Back-Arc Basin Spreading Center in the Pacific (see Hessler et al., '88; Hessler and Martin, '89; Martin and Hessler, '90) and to the TAG, Lucky Strike, and Snake Pit hydrothermal vent sites of the Mid-Atlantic Ridge (see Seagonza, '92; Van Dover, '95; Nuckley et al., '96, and individual species treatments below). Abbreviations used in measurements are CL for carapace length, CW for carapace width, and TL for total length; the abbreviation LACM indicates the catalog number in the crustacea collections at the natural history museum of Los Angeles County. Drawings were made with the use of a Wild M5APO dissecting stereoscope and a Nikon Labophot compound binocular microscope. Preparation for scanning electron microscopy involved hydration to pure water, brief sonication in a Bransonic Model 1200 ultrasonicator with minute amounts of a commercial surfactant (Branson GP Formulated Cleaning Concentrate) added to distilled water as the sonication fluid, dehydration through a graded ethanol series, drying via hexamethyldisilazane (HMDS) (Nation, '83), and sputter coating with gold prior to examination with a Cambridge 360 Stereoscan at an accelerating voltage of 10kV at the Center for Electron Microscopy and Microanalysis on the University of Southern California campus. Materials used are described below.

Genus Chorocaris (Martin and Hessler, '90)

Chorocaris chacei (Williams and Rona, '86).
Two chelipeds from same specimen, CL = 19.0 mm, CW = 11.1, TL = ~57.6 mm, collected 2 June 1993, Lucky Strike hydrothermal vent, Mid-Atlantic Ridge, DSRV Alvin Dive 2607 (donated by S. Chamberlain, Syracuse University).

Chorocaris vandoverae (Martin and Hessler, '90). Two chelipeds from same specimen, CL = 19.0 mm, CW = 11.1, TL = ~57.6 mm, collected 2 June 1993, Lucky Strike hydrothermal vent, Mid-Atlantic Ridge, DSRV Alvin Dive 2607 (donated by S. Chamberlain, Syracuse University).

Chorocaris fortunata (Martin and Christiansen, '95). Two chelipeds removed from same individual, Paratype, LACM 87-272.1, claws removed only (body remains with other paratypes) from individual measuring CL = 8.9 mm, CW = 4.6 mm, TL = 25.1 mm, collected 26 April 1987, Snail Pit, Burke Vent Field, Mariana Back-Arc Spreading Center, 3660 m, DSRV Alvin Dive 1835.

Chorocaris fortunata (Martin and Christiansen, '95). Two chelipeds removed from same individual, Paratype, LACM 95-45.3, claws removed only (body remains with other paratypes) from individual measuring CL = 7.3 mm, CW = 3.2 mm, TL = ~22.6 mm, collected 2 June 1993, Lucky Strike hydrothermal vent, Site 3, 1624 m, DSRV Alvin Dive 2607.

Genus Rimicaris (Williams and Rona, '86).
**RESULTS**

Genus *Chorocaris*

*Chorocaris chacei* (Figs. 1a,b, 2a,b)

The carpus of the *Chorocaris chacei* cheliped bears a well-developed, triangular field of serrate setae, with one apex of the triangle directed proximally such that the widest part of the field is adjacent to the rounded posterior "heel" of the inflated chelipedal "hand" (propodus) (Fig. 1a, b). Setae on the periphery of the brush are slightly shorter than those located more centrally. Each seta arises from a well-defined, circular socket (see also description of *C. vandoverae* below, and Figs. 1c, e, 2d). Each seta is proximally cylindrical, becoming distally flattened, and is serrate along two borders on the distal half to two-thirds of the setal shaft (shown in Fig. 1d for *C. vandoverae*). Each setule arises from a poorly developed "socket" on the setal shaft (i.e., with crescent-shape indentations on either side of the setule, but without a continuous circular socket), and the setules are themselves minutely serrulate as well. The tip of the seta is distinct from the main setal shaft, with shorter setules that are not serrulate and that form a slightly spatulate tip directed toward the chelipedal propodus (as shown in Fig. 1c,d for *C. vandoverae*).

Just proximal to the triangular field of serrate setae is a stout, simple spine arising from a socket (Figs. 1b, e, Fig. 2a white arrow). This spine appears to mark the posterior terminus of the carpal cleaning brush and possibly functions as a "stop" to keep the antennal flagellum in place as it is pulled along the carpal cleaning brush during bouts of grooming. A "stop" on the carpal brush may be needed because of the absence of any propodal brush, which in other shrimp "are usually somewhat more setose and may be the principal scraping or rasping structure" (Bauer, '89, p. 54).

*Chorocaris vandoverae* (Figs. 1c–e, 2c,d)

Features exactly as for *Chorocaris chacei*, but with one significant difference. In *Chorocaris vandoverae* there is a pair of serrate setae on the opposing surface of the chelipedal propodus (Fig. 2c, black arrow in Fig. 2d), much as is seen in previous descriptions of some non-vent caridean shrimp (e.g., Bauer, '75, '78). There is also a row of shorter, nonserrate setae along the medial border of the brush region (not actually part of the brush). It is possible that this row is present also in *C. chacei*, but the specimens of *C. chacei*, we examined were more heavily fouled (Fig. 2a, b), and this area was obscured. In the specimens of *C. vandoverae* examined by us, accidental loss of setae (by oversonicating) allowed us to count the actual number of setae in the field; there were ~46 on the left cheliped (Fig. 2d) and 49 on the right (not figured).

The stout, simple spine at the proximal terminus of the carpal brush occurs in the same area (Fig. 1e, 2c white arrow) as described for *Chorocaris chacei*.

*Chorocaris fortunata* (Fig. 2e,f)

Chelipeds are similar to those of both *Chorocaris chacei* and *Chorocaris vandoverae*, but with the entire field of setae slightly depressed, arising from a recessed area of cuticle (Fig. 2e, f). Details of the individual setae (i.e., socket, shaft, setules, tip) are as described for *C. chacei* and *C. vandoverae* above. There are additional differences in the nature of the cheliped that do not involve the cleaning brush, but that may be important in terms of grooming. Although not mentioned or illustrated in the original description by Martin and Christiansen ('95), the outer surface of the chelipedal fingers bear long, curved, gently sweeping setae that are minutely serrulate and comblike along almost the entire length of the seta. The fingers of the cheliped are themselves minutely pectinate, as is the case for all other known vent-inhabiting bresiliid species, but this pectination is in some ways obscured by the setal rows (Fig. 2e). The bases of these setae typically are covered by...
Fig. 1. Schematic view of the cheliped and the carpal cleaning brush in vent-inhabiting shrimp. The figure is somewhat artificial in that (a) and (b) are based on Chorocaris chacei, whereas (c), (d) and (e) are scanning electron micrographs of the carpal brush of C. vandoverae. (a) carapace and pereiopods of C. chacei, lateral view, with third maxilliped, cheliped (first pereiopod), second pereiopod, and third pereiopod labeled. (b) chela and part of the carpus of C. chace showing location of carpal cleaning brush. (c and d) scanning electron micrographs of the cleaning setae. (e) The blunt spine (s) that marks the posterior terminus of the carpal cleaning brush, (a) is redrawn from Segonzac et al. ('93). Scale bars = 50 um for (c) and (e); 20 um for (d).

dense accumulations of small rod-shape bacteria. Although not part of the carpal brush, these long comblike setae almost certainly play some role in scraping, but whether for grooming or for feeding purposes is not known.

The stout, simple spine at the proximal terminus of the carpal brush occurs in the same area (Fig. 2e white arrow) as described above for both Chorocaris chacei and Chorocaris vandoverae.

Genus Rimicaris

Rimicaris exoculata (Fig. 3a,b)

The carpus, which is longer relative to the chela than in species of Chorocaris, lacks a
Fig. 2. Scanning electron micrographs of the three distal articles of the cheliped (a, c, e) and higher magnifications of the carpal cleaning brush (b, d, f) in species of Chorocaris. (a, b) Chorocaris chacei, Lucky Strike hydrothermal vent site, Mid-Atlantic Ridge. (c, d) Chorocaris vandoverae, Mariana Back-Arc Basin, western Pacific. (e, f) Chorocaris fortunata, Lucky Strike vent site, Mid-Atlantic Ridge. Thin white arrows in (a), (c), and (e) indicate extent of carpal cleaning brush. Thick white arrows on (a), (c), and (e) point to posterior terminal spine at proximal end of carpal brush. Black arrow in (d) indicates serrate setae of the propodus. Scale bars = 1.0 mm for (a and c), 0.5 mm for (e), 200 um for (b and d), 100 um for (f).

field of serrate setae. No individual serrate setae were found on any area of the carpus or the propodus (Fig. 3a, b). No stout, simple spine was found on the carpus. In this regard our findings agree with those of Van Dover et al. ('78).

Rimicaris aurantiaca (Fig. 3c,d)

There is no true "carpal cleaning brush" as is seen in any of the species of Chorocaris. However, two setae, details of which are almost exactly as described above for Chorocaris species, are borne on the distal border of the carpus (Fig. 3c, d). These appear shorter and are perhaps less spatulate on the tip than the setae described for Chorocaris, although this may be a size-related difference only. A stout, simple spine (Fig. 3c, d, white arrow) arising from a circular socket, exactly as is found in Chorocaris species,
occurs proximal to this pair of setae, with only smooth unarmed cuticle in between. The row of simple, nonserrate setae just medial to the carpal brush described above for *C. vandoverae* also is present (along an oblique line from upper left to lower right in Fig. 3d because of different orientation of cheliped).

**DISCUSSION**

**Carpal cleaning brush in hydrothermal vent shrimp**

The presence and nature of the carpal brush differs between species of *Chorocaris* and *Rimicaris*, supporting placement by Martin et al. ('97) of the recently described *R. aurantiaca* in the genus *Rimicaris*. However, this difference is not as great, nor is it as clear-cut, as we had earlier believed (Martin et al., '97). Although *R. aurantiaca* lacks a true carpal cleaning brush in the traditional sense of that term (e.g., Bauer, '81), the presence of the two serrate setae and the stout posterior spine are highly suggestive of a condition not far derived from what is seen in species of *Chorocaris*. Indeed, the presence of the blunt posterior spine would argue for uniting them, as this has not been described in other bresiliid species (vent or nonvent) to date. Martin et al. ('97) commented on the fact that *Rimicaris aurantiaca* “in many ways bridges the morphological gap between the genera *Rimicaris* and *Chorocaris,*” and Segonzac et al. ('93, p. 563, addendum) had noted earlier the “occurrence at the Snake Pit [hydrothermal vent field] of a new species with features intermediate between *Rimicaris exoculata* and *Chorocaris chacei*” (from the English translation). This morphologically intermediate position of *R. aurantiaca* is further evidenced in the present work. We can easily envision a transformation series from a “normal” caridean shrimp, possessing typical frontal compound eyes, a carpal-propodal cleaning brush, and a well-developed rostrum,
through *Chorocaris*, with its reduced rostrum, carpal (but not carpal-propodal) brush, and frontal optical array, to finally *Rimicaris*, species of which lack a brush altogether, have lost the rostrum (except in *R. aurantiaca*), and have a bizarre dorsally oriented optical complex (see Van Dover et al., '89; O'Neil et al., '95; Nuckley et al., '96; Kuenzler et al., '97).

The other two genera of bresiliid shrimp have species with eyestalks that appear more "typical" (although the function is completely different from that described for surface-dwelling shrimp, at least in *Alvinocaris*; see Wharton et al., '97), well-developed rostrums, and well-developed carpal cleaning brushes. We base this comparison on the descriptions and illustrations of Williams and Chace ('82), Williams ('88), and Segonzac et al. ('93) for species of *Alvinocaris*, and of Williams and Dobbs ('95) for *Opappaele*, a fourth genus of vent-inhabiting Bresiliidae that to date consists of a single species, *O. loihi*, found on the Loihi Seamount off Hawaii (Williams and Dobbs, '95). Although these authors do not always refer to the carpal cleaning brush as such, it is usually mentioned. Williams and Chace ('82, p. 143) mention the "heavily setose" surface between the lateral and mesial ridges of the chelipedal carpus of *Alvinocaris lusca*, and Williams and Dobbs ('95, p. 231) refer to the carpus of *O. loihi* as having a "patch of setae," which is almost undoubtedly a carpal cleaning brush based on its location (their Fig. 2c). The carpal brush is clearly illustrated for all three species of *Alvinocaris* described by Williams ('88), and in one of the scanning electron micrographs in that work (Williams, '88, p. 276, Fig. 7f) the carpal brush can be seen at lower right, where it appears to originate in a depressed region similar to that described above for *Chorocaris fortunata*. Thus, *Alvinocaris* and *Opappaele* are less derived than are species of either *Chorocaris* and *Rimicaris* based on the above characters (rostrum, eyes, carpal brush). Because SEM has been used only sparingly in descriptions of vent shrimp (e.g., Williams, '88; Van Dover et al., '88; Martin et al., '97), details of the carpal brush, such as the nature of the individual setae and the presence or absence of the stout spine at the posterior terminus of the field, are unknown.

Among other (nonvent) bresiliids, it is unclear whether a carpal brush exists. If the carpal brush as described here does not exist in other bresiliids, then its presence in vent species might support Christoffersen's ('86) recognition of the family Alvinocarididae (see also Segonzac et al., '93). We are not aware of any descriptions or illustrations of the carpal cleaning brush in other bresiliids, but our assumption is that it has been overlooked or not recognized as a cleaning brush. Wicksten ('89), e.g., describes the carpus of *Encantada spinoculata*, a species that is morphologically close to the *Bresilia-Alvinocaris-Rimicaris-Chorocaris* group of bresiliids (Williams and Rona, '86; Wicksten, '89), as having a "tuft of setae at [the] articulation with [the] chela," and this may be a carpal brush. In addition, Forest and Cals ('77) illustrated what is probably a carpal-propodal brush in their description of a second species of *Bresilia*, *B. corsicana* (Forest and Cals, '77, p. 557, Fig. 13), describing the carpus (p. 556) as having "une rangee antéroventrale de soies raides, plumeuses." It would be interesting to compare the details of the carpal brush setae and spines in species of all genera currently treated as bresiliids to see if this character helps resolve the issue of whether the vent-inhabiting bresiliids should be recognized as a separate family, the Alvinocarididae, as proposed by Christoffersen ('86, '91), or retained in the Bresiliidae (e.g., see Chace, '92; Holthuis '93; see also discussions in Segonzac et al., '93; Williams and Dobbs, '95; Martin and Christiansen, '95).

**Need for a carpal cleaning brush in vent shrimp**

The propensity for hard surfaces in marine environments to become fouled rather quickly would argue for the need for cleaning mechanisms in all marine decapod Crustacea (Bauer, '75, '89). At hydrothermal vents, the potential for fouling would seem even greater than in other marine habitats, because these shrimp live near, and apparently feed on, enormous populations of microbes (Van Dover et al., '88; Gebruk et al., '93; Segonzac et al., '93; Casanova et al., '93). Furthermore, the antennal flagellum is clearly of vital importance to vent-inhabiting shrimp. Renninger et al. ('95) have shown that species of *Rimicaris* can detect, and are attracted to, sulfides, specifically N$_2$S, and that this geochemical sensory ability allows them to locate vent sites. Renninger et al. ('95) also demonstrated that it is the antennal and antennal sensory setae that serve...
as the detectors. The need to keep these appendages fouled is therefore obvious and critical (see also Bauer, '89, section 6.1). The absence of a carpal brush in species of *Rimicaris* is thus somewhat puzzling. It may be that *Rimicaris* relies on other appendages to clean its antennal flagellum. Many carideans use the third maxillipeds for this purpose, and in fact Bauer ('77, p. 261) called grooming with these appendages "a characteristic behavior of caridean shrimp and other decapods," and later (Bauer, '79, p. 70) noted that "the P1-C1 carpal brushes are not essential to antennal grooming and that their function is easily supplied by the third maxillipeds." Of the 15 caridean families surveyed by Bauer ('78), a survey that did not include the Bresiliidae, 13 had a carpal-propodal brush. Alpheids and atyids apparently employ the third maxilliped alone for this task. Of course, the chelipeds in these two families (Alpheidae, Atyidae) are rather highly specialized, which does not appear to be the case for the vent-inhabiting bresiliids. Better stated, if the vent shrimp chelipeds are more specialized than those of non-vent bresiliids, it is not yet known for what purpose(s). One interpretation of having a carpal brush in *Chorocaris* alone is that either the cheliped of *Rimicaris* is in some way more specialized than it is in species of *Chorocaris*, or at least is used in other ways, and/or that *Rimicaris* employs other appendages to clean the antennal flagella. If *Rimicaris* species use the third maxilliped to groom the antennal flagellum, it would seem well suited for the task, as it bears, in both species, rows of variously armed spines and setae (see especially Figs. 5a, b of *R. auran-tiaca* in Martin et al., '97). Comparison of the details of the third maxilliped in species of *Rimicaris* and *Chorocaris* and also in the other vent-inhabiting bresiliids would seem a worthwhile endeavor.
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