# Journal of the Marine Biological Association of the United Kingdom

cambridge.org/mbi

# **Original Article**

**Cite this article:** Kondo Y, Suzuki Y, Ohtsuka S, Nagai H, Tanaka H, Srinui K, Miyake H, Nishikawa J (2020). Differences in the cnidomes and toxicities of the oral arms of two commercially harvested rhizostome jellyfish species in Thailand. *Journal of the Marine Biological Association of the United Kingdom 100, 701–711. https://doi.org/ 10.1017/S002531542000065X* 

Received: 11 March 2020 Revised: 30 June 2020 Accepted: 13 July 2020 First published online: 25 August 2020

#### Key words:

Cnidome; lethality; nematocyst; rhizostome; tubule

Author for correspondence: Yusuke Kondo, E-mail: ykondo@hiroshima-u.ac.jp

 $\ensuremath{\mathbb{C}}$  Marine Biological Association of the United Kingdom 2020



# Differences in the cnidomes and toxicities of the oral arms of two commercially harvested rhizostome jellyfish species in Thailand

# Yusuke Kondo<sup>1</sup> , Yasuko Suzuki<sup>2</sup>, Susumu Ohtsuka<sup>1</sup>, Hiroshi Nagai<sup>2</sup>, Hayato Tanaka<sup>3</sup>, Khwanruan Srinui<sup>4</sup>, Hiroshi Miyake<sup>5</sup> and Jun Nishikawa<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Takehara Station, Setouchi Field Science Center, Graduate School of Integrated Science for Life, Hiroshima University, 5-8-1 Minato-machi, Takehara, Hiroshima, 725-0024, Japan; <sup>2</sup>Department of Ocean Sciences, Tokyo University of Marine Science and Technology, 4-5-7 Konan, Minato-ku, Tokyo, 108-8477, Japan; <sup>3</sup>Tokyo Sea Life Park, 6-2-3 Rinkai-cho, Edogawa-ku, Tokyo, 134-0086, Japan; <sup>4</sup>Institute of Marine Science, Burapha University, Muang, Chon Buri, 20131, Thailand; <sup>5</sup>School of Marine Bioscience, Kitasato University, 1-15-1, Kitasato, Minami-ku, Sagamihara, Kanagawa, 252-0373, Japan and <sup>6</sup>School of Marine Science and Technology, Tokai University, 3-20-1, Orido, Shimizu-ku, Shizuoka, Shizuoka, 424-8610, Japan

### Abstract

In Thailand, two species of rhizostome jellyfish, *Rhopilema hispidum* and *Lobonemoides robustus*, are commercially harvested. The cnidomes, nematocyst size and toxicities were compared between these species. *Rhopilema hispidum* and *L. robustus* each had four types of nematocysts on their oral arms. For *R. hispidum*, these nematocyst types included two types of isorhiza and two types of rhopaloid, while in *L. robustus*, there were three types of isorhiza and one type of rhopaloid. For *R. hispidum*, tubule lengths of the largest nematocyst type (large round isorhiza; mean  $\pm$  SD = 313.8  $\pm$  62.2 µm) were significantly longer than those of *L. robustus* (large ellipsoid rhopaloid; 162.1  $\pm$  38.5 µm). Using the freshwater shrimp, *Palaemon paucidens*, in a bioassay, we determined that the lethal nematocyst concentrations for *R. hispidum* and *L. robustus* were 5705.3  $\pm$  1118.1 and 3408.3  $\pm$  1032.9 unit g<sup>-1</sup> wet weight, respectively, and that these concentrations were significantly higher in the former than in the latter.

### Introduction

Jellyfish are characterized by their possession of nematocysts (Mariscal, 1974; Hessinger & Lenhoff, 1988; Schuchert, 1993; Kass-Simon & Scappaticci, 2002; Marques & Collins, 2004; Technau *et al.*, 2015; Morandini *et al.*, 2016). Nematocysts consist of a capsule and an eversible tubule, and are classified into more than 30 morphological types (Östman, 2000). Nematocysts, which contain various proteinaceous toxins, are used to capture prey, and for defence against enemies, such as medusivorous fish (Ates, 1988; Arai, 1997). When the jelly-fish's tentacles contact a prey organism, the nematocysts discharge their tubules to sting the prey, thus injecting the toxin into the target's tissues (Burke, 2002). Nematocysts are harmful not only to marine organisms, but also to humans; those of some species are highly dangerous and cause serious health problems to beachgoers and fishers worldwide (Purcell *et al.*, 2007). In particular, many fishers suffer stings by jellyfish (Ghosh *et al.*, 1990; Al-Rubiay *et al.*, 2009; Palmieri *et al.*, 2014). They are stung when removing jellyfish from the fishing net during operations (Dong *et al.*, 2014).

Jellyfish fisheries are intensively exploited in the world's oceans (Kingsford et al., 2000; Omori & Nakano, 2001; Omori & Kitamura, 2004; Nishikawa et al., 2008, 2015, 2019; Richardson et al., 2009; Nishida & Nishikawa, 2011; López-Martínez & Álvarez-Tello, 2013; Fujii et al., 2014; Gul et al., 2015; Brotz et al., 2017; Behera et al., 2020). The main target of catch is rhizostome jellyfish, which are used in Chinese cuisine (Kingsford et al., 2000; Omori & Nakano, 2001). According to the fisheries statistics of the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO, 2018), recent annual world jellyfish catches have been more than 500,000 metric tons. China has the highest annual jellyfish catch rate worldwide, followed by the South-east Asian countries, including Thailand, Indonesia, Malaysia and Vietnam (Kingsford et al., 2000; Omori & Nakano, 2001; Nishikawa et al., 2008, 2015, 2019; Nishida & Nishikawa, 2011; FAO, 2018). Worldwide, at least 17 species of rhizostomes have so far been known as main target species: Acromitus hardenbergi Stiasny, 1934; Cassiopea ndrosia Agassiz & Mayer, 1899; Catostylus mosaicus (Quoy & Gaimard, 1824); Catostylus perezi Ranson, 1945; Cephea cephea (Forskål, 1775); Crambione mastigophora Maas, 1903; Crambionella annadalei Rao, 1931; Crambionella helmbiru Nishikawa, Mulyadi & Ohtsuka, 2014; Crambionella orsini (Vanhöffen, 1888); Crambionella stuhlmanni (Chun, 1896); Lobonema smithi Mayer, 1910; Lobonemoides robustus Stiasny, 1920; Nemopilema nomurai Kishinouye, 1922; Rhizostoma pulmo (Macri, 1778); Rhopilema esculentum Kishinouye, 1891; Rhopilema hispidum (Vanhöffen, 1888); Stomolophus meleagris Agassiz, 1860 (Brotz, 2016). Of these, N. nomurai and R.



**Fig. 1.** Dermatitis caused by *Rhopilema hispidum* on 1 July 2013: (A) dermatitis on the backs of a woman's hands; (B) oedema on a man's wrist. Scale bars: A, 3 cm; B, 1 cm.

pulmo have been reported to cause health problems from stings to fishers (Purcell et al., 2007; Mariottini & Pane, 2010). Rhizostome stings are generally reported as mild skin inflammation (Fenner, 1993); however, they can also cause severe health hazards such as erythematous eruption, oedema and burn-like injuries (Figure 1), which have been reported in Acromitus rabanchatu Annandale, 1915, Rhopilema nomadica Galil, Spanier & Ferguson, 1990, R. pulmo, R. hispidum, N. nomurai and S. meleagris (Burnett & Calton, 1985; Galil et al., 1990; Ghosh et al., 1990; Othman et al., 1996; Williamson et al., 1996; Kokelj & Plozzer, 2002; Fenner, 2005; Kawahara et al., 2006; Remigante et al., 2018; present study).

In Thailand, two species are mainly targeted by fisheries: *R. hispidum* and *L. robustus* (Omori & Nakano, 2001; Ohtsuka *et al.*, 2010; Nishida & Nishikawa, 2011; Nishikawa *et al.*, 2019). Both species are distributed in the Gulf of Thailand, while only *L. robustus* appears in the Andaman Sea (Nishikawa *et al.*, 2019). Othman *et al.* (1996) reported that *R. hispidum* nematocysts exhibited toxicity, haemolytic activity and a relaxant effect on phenylephrine-induced smooth muscle contractions in rat aortas. In contrast, *L. robustus* nematocysts have never been analysed toxicologically. This study examined the cnidomes and toxicities



Fig. 2. Sampling sites of jellyfish in Thailand. Open circle and closed circle indicate sampling sites of *Rhopilema hispidum* and *Lobonemoides robustus*, respectively.

of these two species of commercially harvested rhizostome jellyfish in Thailand. The current information on the nematocysts and toxicities of rhizostome jellyfish is insufficient compared with that on other jellyfish (Calder, 1972; Kawahara *et al.*,



**Fig. 3.** Nematocysts of the oral arm of *Rhopilema hispidum* collected from the coastal area of Nathung, Thailand on 4 December 2014: (A) undischarged small ellipsoid isorhiza; (B) undischarged medium round isorhiza; (C) undischarged large round isorhiza; (D) undischarged rhopaloid; (E) discharged small ellipsoid isorhiza; (F) discharged medium round isorhiza; (G) discharged large round isorhiza; (H) discharged rhopaloid. Scale bars: A–D, 5 µm; E–H, 20 µm. Capsule indicated by arrow.

## Table 1. Size of nematocysts in the oral arms of Rhopilema hispidum.

Individual number			No. 1 No. 2								
		BD (cm)	WW (kg)	Sex	BD (cm)	WW (kg)	Sex	BD (cm)	WW (kg)	Sex	
		38.5	4.56	ę	39.0	6.01	ę	57.9	12.64	ę	
Nematocyst type (Number of nematocysts ex	amined)	Min	Max	Mean ± SD	Min	Мах	Mean ± SD	Min	Мах	Mean ± SD	Average
Small ellipsoid isorhiza (N = 10)	Capsule length ( $\mu$ m)	3.5	5.0	$4.1\pm0.4$	3.5	6.1	$4.5\pm0.8$	3.7	5.3	$4.4\pm0.6$	$4.3 \pm 0.6$
	Capsule width (µm)	2.6	3.4	2.9 ± 0.2	2.5	3.5	2.8 ± 0.4	2.1	3.5	$2.9 \pm 0.4$	$2.9 \pm 0.4$
	Tubule length (µm)	26.4	54.8	44.5 ± 8.5	30.1	54.5	45.7 ± 7.7	20.5	77.2	38.1 ± 15.7	42.8±11.3
Medium round isorhiza	Capsule length ( $\mu$ m)	5.4	7.2	$6.3 \pm 0.5$	5.6	6.7	$6.2 \pm 0.3$	5.0	7.6	$6.3 \pm 0.7$	$6.3 \pm 0.5$
(N = 10)	Capsule width (µm)	4.7	6.4	5.8 ± 0.5	5.3	6.3	5.8 ± 0.3	5.0	7.1	5.8 ± 0.7	$5.8 \pm 0.5$
	Tubule length (µm)	50.3	94.4	70.2 ± 12.6	61.5	90.7	74.6 ± 9.1	64.5	95.5	77.5 ± 9.3	74.1 ± 10.5
Large round isorhiza	Capsule length ( $\mu$ m)	12.6	15.1	$13.8 \pm 0.8$	13.3	15.6	$14.8 \pm 0.8$	12.2	15.0	$13.9 \pm 1.0$	$14.1 \pm 1.0$
(N = 10)	Capsule width (µm)	10.4	13.3	12.3 ± 0.8	11.6	15.0	13.2 ± 0.9	11.0	14.9	13.0 ± 1.2	$12.8 \pm 1.0$
	Tubule length (µm)	233.7	329.5	295.7 ± 29.1	249.2	416.9	353.2 ± 60.0	209.8	414.0	292.6 ± 73.7	313.8 ± 62.2
Rhopaloid	Capsule length ( $\mu$ m)	6.0	7.5	$6.9 \pm 0.5$	5.3	6.9	$6.3 \pm 0.5$	6.0	7.1	$6.6 \pm 0.4$	$6.6 \pm 0.5$
(N = 10)	Capsule width (µm)	3.8	4.8	$4.5 \pm 0.4$	4.0	4.8	$4.4 \pm 0.3$	4.3	5.0	4.6 ± 0.2	$4.5 \pm 0.3$
	Tubule length (µm)	55.7	94.7	72.7 ± 13.1	40.7	100.0	67.0 ± 19.1	58.7	96.7	73.1 ± 11.7	70.9 ± 14.7

BD, bell diameter; WW, wet weight.

704



Fig. 4. Nematocyst compositions and proportions from *Rhopilema hispidum* collected from the coastal area of Nathung, Thailand on 4 December 2014.

2006). The purpose of this study is to accumulate basic data to prevent sting injuries caused by jellyfish.

#### **Materials and methods**

### Cnidomes

*Rhopilema hispidum* and *L. robustus* were collected from the coastal areas of Khampuan, Suksamran District, Ranong Province  $(9^{\circ}21'43''-9^{\circ}23'27''N 98^{\circ}22'49''-98^{\circ}23'33''E)$  and Nathung, Muang District, Chumphon Province  $(10^{\circ}29'30''-10^{\circ}29'52''N 99^{\circ}14'42''-99^{\circ}15'32''E)$ , Thailand, on 3 and 4 December 2014, respectively (Figure 2). Each jellyfish was scooped with a 2-mm mesh scoop net with a long handle of ~1.5 m. The bell diameters and wet weights of the captured jellyfish were measured *in situ* 

immediately after collection. The marginal parts of the oral arms from each jellyfish were excised from fresh individuals, using clean scissors for cnidome analysis and toxicity bioassays.

To examine the cnidomes from each jellyfish species, a small piece of the oral arm was cut off with scissors and immersed in vinegar to discharge the nematocysts (Birsa et al., 2010), then subsequently fixed in 5% neutralized formalin/seawater. Approximately 1000 nematocysts per individual were counted and classified by type, capsule size and shape following Östman (2000) under an optical microscope BX53 (Olympus Corporation, Hachioji, Tokyo, Japan). The sizes and tubule lengths of the discharged nematocysts were measured using a microscope digital camera DP21 (Olympus Corporation, Hachioji, Tokyo, Japan) and image-processing software ImageJ, version 1.48 (Wayne Rasband National Institutes of Health, USA). In two species, 10 nematocysts of each type per individual were examined to measure the capsule lengths, widths and tubule lengths. The capsule size of each nematocyst type was compared using a Tukey test and Welch's t-test in R, version 3.0.1 (R Core Team, 2016). The differences in tubule lengths between R. hispidum and L. robustus were also analysed via Welch's t-test in R, version 3.0.1. Capsule volumes were estimated following Purcell (1984) based on capsule length and width from previous and present studies. The correlation between capsule volume and tubule length was determined using Spearman's rank correlation coefficient test in R, version 3.0.1.

## Toxicity

Marginal parts from the oral arms of the two jellyfish species were used in the toxicity bioassays. Oral arm parts were frozen on dry



**Fig. 5.** Nematocysts from the oral arms of *Lobonemoides robustus* collected from the coastal area of Khampuan, Thailand on 3 December 2014: (A) undischarged small ellipsoid isorhiza; (B) undischarged large round isorhiza; (C) undischarged small ellipsoid rhopaloid; (D) undischarged large ellipsoid rhopaloid; (E) discharged small ellipsoid isorhiza; (F) discharged large round isorhiza; (G) discharged small ellipsoid rhopaloid; (H) discharged large ellipsoid rhopaloid. Scale bars: A–D, 5 µm; E–H, 20 µm. Capsule indicated by arrow.

#### Table 2. Size of nematocysts in the oral arm of Lobonemoides robustus.

Individual numbe	r		No. 1			No. 2			No. 3			No. 4		
		BD (cm)	WW (kg)	Sex	BD (cm)	WW (kg)	Sex	BD (cm)	WW (kg)	Sex	BD (cm)	WW (kg)	Sex	
Nematocyst type (Number of nema examined)	atocysts	40.2 Min	7.76 Max	♀ Mean±SD	42.5 Min	7.64 Max	් Mean ± SD	45.8 Min	10.56 Max	ර Mean ± SD	47.9 Min	7.23 Max	♀ Mean±SD	Average
Small ellipsoid isorhiza	Capsule length (μm)	3.1	4.7	4.0 ± 0.5	3.1	5.1	4.1±0.7	3.6	5.2	$4.4 \pm 0.5$	4.7	6.9	$5.5 \pm 0.8$	4.5 ± 0.8
(N = 10)	Capsule width (μm)	2.5	3.9	$2.9\pm0.5$	2.3	3.6	$2.8 \pm 0.4$	2.6	4.0	$3.1\pm0.4$	3.0	4.2	$3.7\pm0.4$	$3.1\pm0.5$
	Tubule length (μm)	28.7	72.1	$47.5 \pm 5.1$	28.0	69.6	45.7 ± 14.2	28.4	90.4	$49.8\pm21.4$	24.4	96.2	64.3 ± 25.8	51.8±20.3
Large round isorhiza	Capsule length (μm)	7.9	9.2	$8.6 \pm 0.4$	8.4	9.4	$8.9\pm0.5$	8.0	10.2	$9.1\pm0.6$	8.6	9.8	$9.3 \pm 0.4$	$9.0\pm0.5$
(N = 10)	Capsule width (μm)	6.7	8.9	$7.8\pm0.7$	7.3	8.8	$8.0\pm0.5$	6.7	9.0	$7.9\pm0.8$	7.5	9.1	$8.1\pm0.5$	8.0±0.6
	Tubule length (μm)	80.7	205.2	$111.7\pm40.8$	111.5	210.2	157.6±33.3	98.8	160.4	$116.5\pm18.9$	100.4	172.6	133.7 ± 24.7	129.9 ± 34.6
Small ellipsoid rhopaloid	Capsule length (μm)	6.2	8.1	7.3 ± 0.5	5.3	7.4	$6.5 \pm 0.7$	6.3	7.1	$6.7\pm0.3$	6.6	7.4	$7.1\pm0.3$	$6.9\pm0.6$
(N = 10)	Capsule width (μm)	4.6	6.3	$5.2 \pm 0.5$	4.4	6.2	$4.9\pm0.5$	4.4	6.0	$5.1\pm0.6$	4.4	5.5	$5.1\pm0.5$	$5.1\pm0.5$
	Tubule length (μm)	53.5	116.1	70.8 ± 17.2	59.7	107.7	77.3 ± 18.8	49.7	98.1	76.2±13.3	52.7	98.3	76.5 ± 11.9	75.2 ± 15.2
Large ellipsoid rhopaloid	Capsule length (μm)	9.0	15.0	$11.1 \pm 1.8$	11.3	15.5	$13.0 \pm 1.5$	9.2	15.1	$11.9 \pm 1.7$	9.7	13.5	$11.9 \pm 1.1$	12.0 ± 1.8
(N = 10)	Capsule width (μm)	7.2	9.5	$8.1 \pm 0.8$	7.7	11.6	9.5±1.3	7.4	11.9	9.3±1.2	7.0	9.6	8.3 ± 1.0	8.8±1.2
	Tubule length (μm)	104.2	175.4	149.5 ± 23.1	134.6	248.7	173.8±34.4	114.0	275.0	164.5 ± 53.2	108.1	198.7	160.6 ± 39.1	162.1 ± 38.5

BD, bell diameter; WW, wet weight.

Journal of the Marine Biological Association of the United Kingdom

706



Fig. 6. Nematocyst compositions and proportions of *Lobonemoides robustus* collected from the coastal area of Khampuan, Thailand on 3 December 2014.

ice in the field, the wet weights were measured, and the arm parts were then lyophilized using a freeze-dryer FreeZone 6 (Labconco Corporation, Kansas City, USA) in the laboratory. The dry weights of the freeze-dried oral arms were recorded using an electronic scale PB602-S (Mettler Toledo International, Inc., Taito City, Tokyo, Japan), then homogenized with a spatula. The oral arm homogenate (mass ~0.10-0.25 g) was then placed in a 2-ml vial together with 1 ml of glass beads (diameter: 0.5 mm). The bottle was then filled with a 0.15 M NaCl 0.01 M phosphate buffer solution at pH 7.0. The bottle was placed in a homogenizer Mini-Beadbeater-1 (Bio Spec Products, Inc., Bartesville, USA) and run through 20 vibration cycles at 4800 rpm for 30 s, then cooled on crushed ice for 60 s. The samples were then moved to microtubes and run through two centrifugation cycles at 62,000 rpm for 30 s, then cooled for 30 s. The supernatant was recovered and diluted 1, 5, 10 and 15 times for R. hispidum and 1, 3, 5 and 7



Fig. 7. Comparison of mean tubule length between *Rhopilema hispidum* and *Lobonemoides robustus*.



Fig. 8. Correlation between capsule volume and tubule length of nematocysts.

Table 3.	Types,	capsule sizes,	volumes	and	tubule	lengths	of	f scyphomedusae nematocysts.	
----------	--------	----------------	---------	-----	--------	---------	----	------------------------------	--

https://doi.org/10.1017/S002531542000065X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Jellyfish	Nematocsyt type	Length (µm)	Width (µm)	Volume (µm <sup>3</sup> )	Tubule length (μm)	Reference
Aurelia aurita	Atrichous isorhiza	-	-	-	44.7 ± 30.2	Kitatani <i>et al.</i> (2015)
	Heterotrichous microbasic eurytele	-	-	-	51.2 ± 32.0	
	Unidentified nematocyst	-	-	-	34.1 ± 6.97	
Crysaora pacifica	Atrichous isorhiza	-	-	-	92.0 ± 42.5	Kitatani <i>et al</i> . (2015)
	Heterotrichous microbasic eurytele	-	-	-	133.3 ± 71.1	
	Unidentified nematocyst	-	-	-	87.9 ± 41.4	
Cyanea capillata	Basitrichous isorhiza	5.4 ± 0.84	$3.55 \pm 0.2$	35.8*	220-470	Heeger <i>et al</i> . (1992)
	Holotrichous isorhiza	11.62 ± 1.21	$9.41\pm0.72$	539.9*	< 850	
	Heterotrichous microbasic eurytele	$10.35 \pm 0.96$	$7.21 \pm 0.53$	282.7*	< 500	
Lobonemoides robustus	Small ellipsoid isorhiza	$4.5 \pm 0.8$	3.1 ± 0.5	21.9*	51.8 ± 20.3	Present study
	Large round isorhiza	9.0 ± 0.5	8.0 ± 0.6	301.6*	129.9 ± 34.6	
	Small ellipsoid rhopaloid	$6.9 \pm 0.6$	5.1 ± 0.5	94.0*	75.2 ± 15.2	
	Large ellipsoid rhopaloid	$12.0 \pm 1.8$	8.8 ± 1.2	486.6*	162.1 ± 38.5	
Rhopilema esculentum	a-isorhiza	4.9	3.2	26.3*	75	Chen & Ding (1981)
	o-isorhiza	9.9	7.9	323.5*	200	
	e-isorhiza	10.5	4.9	132.0*	150	
	Eurytele	10.1	7.5	297.5*	140	
Rhopilema hispidum	Small ellipsoid isorhiza	4.3 ± 0.6	$2.9 \pm 0.4$	18.9*	42.8 ± 11.3	Present study
	Medium round isorhiza	6.3 ± 0.5	5.8 ± 0.5	111.0*	74.1 ± 10.5	
	Large round isorhiza	$14.1 \pm 1.0$	$12.8\pm1.0$	1209.6*	313.8 ± 62.2	
	Rhopaloid	$6.6 \pm 0.5$	$4.5 \pm 0.3$	70.0*	$70.9 \pm 14.7$	
Rhopilema nomadica	Small holotrichous isorhiza	$5.57 \pm 0.56$	$5.11 \pm 0.38$	51.34 ± 14.95	68.86 ± 16.31	Avian <i>et al</i> . (1995)
	Large holotrichous isorhiza	$12.55 \pm 0.97$	$10.82\pm0.95$	906.09 ± 207.63	$247.25 \pm 50.31$	
	Heterotrichous microbasic eurytele	8.46 ± 1.20	$6.26 \pm 1.16$	$248.99 \pm 97.00$	134.28 ± 37.34	
Pelagia noctiluca	Heterotrichous microbasic eurytele	$12.88\pm0.9$	$8.90 \pm 0.77$	$541.28 \pm 110.97$	570.05	Avian <i>et al</i> . (1991)
	Heterotrichous isorhiza	$14.32 \pm 1.40$	$7.48 \pm 0.67$	423.84 ± 89.26	190.02	
	Holotrichous O-isorhiza	$20.82 \pm 1.94$	$18.87 \pm 1.91$	3987.25 ± 1110.81	470.51	
	Atrichous a-isorhiza	$5.03 \pm 0.39$	$3.00 \pm 0.27$	23.93 ± 5.23	123.38	
Periphylla periphylla	Holotrichous isorhiza	11.3-15.6	7.3-9.8	516.4*	> 260	Jarms <i>et al</i> . (2002)
	Small holotrichous isorhiza	7.9	6.1	153.9*	> 260	
	Round heterotrichous microbasic eurytele	17.6-21.8	13-15	2021.7*	> 420	
	Long ellipsoid heterotrichous microbasic eurytele	16-62	13-16	4293.4*	> 700	
	Giant ellipsoid heterotrichous microbasic eurytele	38-100	24-27	23492.4*	800-1160	
	Short ellipsoid heterotrichous microbasic eurytele	21.8-25.8	16.3-18.5	3772.9*	> 560	

\*, Volumes estimated following Purcell (1984) based on capsule length and width.



Fig. 9. Comparison of lethal activity between *Rhopilema hispidum* and *Lobonemoides* robustus. Asterisk indicates significant difference (Welch's t-test, P < 0.05).

times for *L. robustus* with a 0.15 M NaCl 0.01 M phosphate buffer solution at pH 7.0. For the lethality assay, the diluted solution was injected into the abdomens of three individual freshwater shrimp *Palaemon paucidens* De Haan, 1844 per each diluted concentration extracted from one individual jellyfish. The injection volume was calculated as  $0.2 \mu$ l per 0.5 g of shrimp wet weight. Lethality (one unit) was defined as the minimum amount of venom that killed the tested shrimp within 4 h. The dilution ratio at which the shrimp died within 4 h was 5, 5, 10 times for *R. hispidum* and 3, 3, 3, 5 times for *L. robustus*, respectively. The shrimps injected with saline were used as a negative control to confirm that the shrimp did not die within 4 h. The lethality per gram of wet weight of the oral arm was formulated as follows:

Lethality per oral arm wet weight (unit  $g^{-1}$  wet weight) = lethality (unit)/homogenized oral arm (g) × [wet weight of fresh oral arm (g)/dry weight of freeze-dried oral arm (g)].

Differences in the toxicities between *R. hispidum* and *L. robustus* were tested via Welch's *t*-test in R, version 3.0.1.

#### Result

#### Cnidomes

*Rhopilema hispidum* cnidomes were composed of four nematocyst types: small ellipsoid isorhizas (Figure 3A, E), medium round isorhizas (Figure 3B, F), large round isorhizas (Figure 3C, G) and rhopaloids (Figure 3D, H) (Table 1). The average capsule dimensions were  $4.3 \pm 0.6$  (length)  $\times 2.9 \pm 0.4$  (width)  $\mu$ m (N = 30) for small ellipsoid isorhizas,  $6.3 \pm 0.5 \times 5.8 \pm 0.5 \,\mu\text{m}$  (N = 30) for medium round isorhizas,  $14.1 \pm 1.0 \times 12.8 \pm 1.0 \,\mu\text{m}$  (N = 30) for large round isorhizas, and  $6.6 \pm 0.5 \times 4.5 \pm 0.3 \,\mu\text{m}$  (N = 30) for rhopaloids (Figure 3A-H, Table 1). All three isorhiza capsule dimensions are significantly different (Tukey's test, P < 0.05). Tubule lengths were  $42.8 \pm 11.3 \,\mu\text{m}$  (N = 30) for small ellipsoid isorhizas,  $74.1 \pm 10.5 \,\mu\text{m}$  (N = 30) for medium round isorhizas,  $313.8 \pm 62.2 \,\mu m$  (N = 30) for large round isorhizas, and  $70.9 \pm 14.7 \,\mu\text{m}$  (N = 30) for rhopaloids (Table 1). The rhopaloids and medium round isorhizas were the major components of R. hispidum nematocysts, constituting 55.2-60.5% and 28.6-30.9%, respectively, irrespective of bell diameter (Figure 4). The small ellipsoid and large round isorhizas were less prevalent and comprised only 8.0-13.4% and 0.8-0.9% of the cnidomes, respectively (Figure 4).

Lobonemoides robustus cnidomes were also composed of four nematocyst types, but their compositions differed from those of *R*.

hispidum: small ellipsoid isorhizas (Figure 5A, E), large round isorhizas (Figure 5B, F), small ellipsoid rhopaloids (Figure 5C, G) and large ellipsoid rhopaloids (Figure 5D, H) (Table 2). The average capsule dimensions were  $4.5 \pm 0.8$  (length)  $\times 3.1 \pm 0.5$  (width)  $\mu$ m (N = 40) for small ellipsoid isorhizas,  $9.0 \pm 0.5 \times 8.0 \pm 0.6 \mu m$  (N = 40)for large round isorhizas,  $6.9 \pm 0.6 \times 5.1 \pm 0.5 \,\mu\text{m}$  (N = 40) for small ellipsoid rhopaloids and  $12.0 \pm 1.8 \times 8.8 \pm 1.2 \,\mu\text{m}$  (N = 40) for large ellipsoid rhopaloids (Figure 5A-H, Table 2). There was a significant difference between the capsule dimensions of the two isorhizas (Welch's t-test, P > 0.05). The two rhopaloids are also significantly different (Welch's *t*-test, P > 0.05). The tubule lengths were  $51.8 \pm 20.3 \,\mu\text{m}$  (N = 40) for small ellipsoid isorhizas,  $129.9 \pm$ 34.6  $\mu$ m (N = 40) for large round isorhizas, 75.2 ± 15.2  $\mu$ m (N = 40) for small ellipsoid rhopaloids and  $162.1 \pm 38.5 \,\mu\text{m}$  (N = 40) for large ellipsoid rhopaloids (Table 2). The small ellipsoid rhopaloids were the most dominant nematocysts in L. robustus, constituting over 70% of the cnidome, irrespective of bell diameter (Figure 6). The small ellipsoid isorhizas and large round isorhizas comprised 6.3-12.8% and 5.9-17.0% of the total cnidome, respectively (Figure 6). The large ellipsoid rhopaloids comprised <1% of the nematocysts in the cnidome (Figure 6).

The tubule lengths of the most dominant nematocyst types did not differ significantly between *R. hispidum* (rhopaloids) and *L. robustus* (small ellipsoid rhopaloids) (Welch's *t*-test, P > 0.05) (Figure 7, Tables 1 and 2). However, tubule lengths of the large round isorhizas in *R. hispidum* were significantly longer than those of the large ellipsoid rhopaloids in *L. robustus* (Welch's *t*-test, P < 0.05) (Figure 7, Tables 1 and 2).

The capsule volume and tubule length of several scyphozoans were significantly positively correlated (Spearman's rank correlation coefficient test, P < 0.05, r = 0.82) (Figure 8, Table 3). The following equation was obtained from the relationship between capsule volume (*x*) and tubule length (*y*):  $y = 174.14 \times 10^{-1E-04x}$ .

## Toxicity

In *R. hispidum*, the lethality per wet weight (g) of the oral arms ranged from 5020.0–6995.6 unit  $g^{-1}$  wet weight (mean ± SD = 5705.3 ± 1118.1 unit  $g^{-1}$  wet weight, N = 3). In *L. robustus*, the lethal activity ranged from 2871.5–4956.6 unit  $g^{-1}$  wet weight (3408.3 ± 1032.9 unit  $g^{-1}$  wet weight, N = 4) (Figure 9). The lethal activity of *R. hispidum* was significantly greater than that of *L. robustus* (Welch's *t*-test, *P* < 0.05).

#### Discussion

Scyphozoans, including rhizostomes, have fewer nematocyst types than do anthozoans and hydrozoans (Kubota, 1985; Purcell & Mills, 1988). In many scyphozoans, isorhizas and rhopaloids are the main components (Arai, 1997). Rhopilema hispidum and L. robustus cnidomes were also composed of isorhizas and rhopaloids. Rhopilema hispidum had three isorhiza types and one rhopaloid type, while L. robustus had two of each type. Othman et al. (1996) observed three nematocyst types (atrichous isorhizas, holotrichous isorhizas and heterotrichous microbasic euryteles) in R. hispidum tentacles. This differed from the nematocyst composition of the oral arm, suggesting that R. hispidum cnidomes vary among body parts. Previous studies have reported that rhizostome jellyfish have between two and five nematocyst types (Table 4). Mastigophores are rare (Table 4). Cnidomes from five species of the genus Rhopilema have been reported: Rhopilema verrilli (Fewkes, 1887) (Calder, 1972); R. esculentum (Chen & Ding, 1981); R. hispidum (Othman et al., 1996; present study); R. nomadica (Avian et al., 1995). Previous and present studies have revealed that cnidomes of the genus Rhopilema

Table 4. Capsule size of Rhizostomeae sp	ecies nematocysts.
--	--------------------

Jellyfish	Nematocyst type	Capsule length ( $\mu m$ )	Capsule width ( $\mu$ m)	Reference
Cassiopea andromeda	a-isorhiza	4.15-8.29	2.68-4.88	Heins <i>et al.</i> (2015)
	O-isorhiza	5.37-9.02	4.88-8.54	
	Rhopaloid	5.97-17.80	4.52-15.85	
	Lemon-shaped microbasic birhopaloid	4.63-9.27	2.93-5.85	
Catostylus mosaicus	Oval-shaped holotrichous isorhiza	3.9-4.8	2.9–3.4	Peach & Pitt (2005)
	Pear-shaped holotrichous isorhiza	5.8-8.7	2.4–3.0	
	Rhopaloid	7.1–9.3	4.9-6.6	
	Birhopaloid	14.0-15.9	9.5-10.2	
Lobonemoides robstus	Small ellipsoid isorhiza	3.1-6.9	2.3-4.2	Present study
	Large round isorhiza	7.9–10.2	6.7–9.1	
	Small ellipsoid rhopaloid	5.3-8.1	4.4-6.3	
	Large ellipsoid rhopaloid	9.0-15.5	7.0–11.9	
Nemopilema nomurai	Holotrichous anisorhiza	25.0-30.0	24.0-26.0	Kubota <i>et al</i> . (2006)
	Microbasic mastigophore	17.0-22.0	11.0-14.0	
	Large atrichous isorhiza	13.7-15.8	3.74-4.15	
	Small atrichous isorhiza	8.47-10.8	5.40-7.06	
Phyllorhiza punctata	Round holotrichous isorhiza	5.6-5.8	4.9	Peach & Pitt (2005)
	Oval holotrichous isorhiza	5.1–5.7	3.4–3.8	
	Medium rhopaloid	7.2–7.7	4.7–5.5	
	Large rhopaloid	12.5–14.7	8.4-10.9	
	Birhopaloid	13.5–14.6	10.0-10.5	
Rhizostoma octopus	Atrichous haploneme	3.5-6.5	2.3–5.3	Holst <i>et al</i> . (2007)
	Heterotrichous microbasic eurytele	5.8-10.2	4.1-7.8	
Rhizostoma plumo	Heterotrichous microbasic eurytele	5.9-8.0	3.5-6.0	Avian <i>et al</i> . (1991)
	Holotrichous isorhiza	3.0-4.0	2.0-2.5	
	Atrichous a-isorhiza	3.0–3.5	2.0-3.0	
	Atrichous α-isorhiza	3.3-4.0	1.1-1.4	
Rhopilema esculentum	a-isorhiza	2.9–7.5	2.0-5.0	Chen & Ding (1981)
	o-anisorhiza	5.9-15.0	3.9–12.5	
	e-anisorhiza	4.5-12.8	2.5-6.7	
	Eurytele	4.4-16.0	2.9-11.5	
Rhopilema hispidum	Small ellipsoid isorhiza	3.5-6.1	2.1-3.5	Present study
	Medium round isorhiza	5.0-7.6	4.7–5.0	
	Large round isorhiza	12.2-13.3	10.4–15.0	
	Rhopaloid	5.3-7.5	3.8–5.0	
Rhopilema nomadica	Small holotrichous isorhiza	4.20-8.50	2.90-5.56	Avian <i>et al</i> . (1995)
	Large holotrichous isorhiza	10.50-18.30	10.10-16.80	
	Heterotrichous microbasic eurytele	6.10-12.70	4.10-10.50	
Rhopilema verrilli	a-atrichous isorhiza	5.3-6.9	3.3-4.5	Calder (1972)
	Holotrichous haploneme (isorhiza or anisorhiza)	6.9-8.9	5.4-7.4	
	Microbasic heterotrichous eurytele	7.6–10.1	5.0-7.1	
Stomolophus meleagris	a-isorhiza	3.8-4.8	2.4–31.	Calder (1983)
	Small eurytele	6.4-10.1	4.5-6.5	
	Medium-large eurytele	10.5-12.6	7.3–9.0	
	Large eurytele	13.2–17.8	8.0-10.3	

mainly consist of isorhizas and rhopaloids (Table 4). The cnidome of *L. robustus* was first recorded in the rhizostome family, Lobonemidae. They have two nematocyst types, isorhizas and rhopaloids (present study). In both jellyfish species examined in this study, small nematocysts of >10  $\mu$ m in capsule length dominated the oral arms cnidome, while relatively large nematocysts were rare. Similar cnidomes were found in other rhizostomes, such as *S. meleagris* (Calder, 1983), *R. nomadica* (Avian *et al.*, 1995), *C. mosaicus* and *Phyllorhiza punctata* von Lendenfeld, 1884 (Peach & Pitt, 2005).

The types and tubule lengths of scyphozoan nematocysts were compiled from previous studies (Table 3). The purple jellyfish, Pelagia noctiluca (Forsskål, 1775), is a highly venomous species, with nematocysts containing tubules longer than 400 μm (Avian et al., 1991; Mariottini et al., 2008). The lion's mane jellyfish, Cyanea capillata (Linnaeus, 1758), which occasionally causes serious damage to humans, has nematocysts with tubule lengths that reach  $\sim 850 \,\mu\text{m}$  (Heeger et al., 1992). Kitatani et al. (2015) clarified that nematocyst tubule length is directly correlated with pain in humans; stings from longer tubules exert more severe pain. The average longest tubules in R. hispidum (313.8 µm) and L. robustus (162.1 µm) were longer than those in the harmful Japanese sea nettle, Chrysaora pacifica (Goette, 1886) (133.3 µm) (Yasuda et al., 2003; Kitatani et al., 2015; present study). Therefore, these two species of edible jellyfish can potentially cause damage in humans. Our results showed that the tubule lengths of the large round isorhizas in R. hispidum were significantly longer than those of the large ellipsoid rhopaloids of L. robustus, suggesting that R. hispidum is more harmful than L. robustus. Our lethality bioassay also showed that the toxicity of the former was approximately twice that of the latter. Rhopilema hispidum has longer tubules than do other Rhopilema species (Chen & Ding, 1981; Avian et al., 1995; present study) (see Table 3). Othman et al. (1996), Williamson et al. (1996) and Kawahara et al. (2006) reported that R. hispidum caused considerable damage to human skin. In fact, when one of the authors and one of the aquarium staff were stung by R. hispidum in Thailand on 1 July 2013, dermatitis and oedema occurred on their hands (Figure 1). In contrast, L. robustus has not been observed to cause such severe damage since we first studied it in 2009. The nematocyst volume and tubule length were significantly positively correlated (Figure 8, Table 3). The tubule is helically coiled in the capsule before discharge (Avian et al., 1991, 1995; Östman, 2000). Purcell (1984) suggested that large-volume capsules could accommodate longer tubules and could more effectively penetrate and capture prey animals. Jellyfish with large capsules and long tubules are highly likely to be dangerous species.

This study revealed the cnidomes and toxicities of two commercially harvested rhizostome jellyfish in Thailand. Rhopilema hispidum causes more severe symptoms because its toxicity is stronger than that of L. robustus. Fortunately, no fatal stings by rhizostomes have been reported in Thai waters (Fenner et al., 2010). Stings from rhizostomes such as Catostylus, Lobonema and Phyllorhiza are usually relatively mild (Halstead, 1965; Williamson et al., 1996; Marsh & Slack-Smith, 2010); however, the sting of N. nomurai has been reported to be fatal in the worst cases (Williamson et al., 1996; Dong et al., 2010; Kim et al., 2018). Further research is needed, as toxicity varies by jellyfish species. This study is the first report to investigate the toxicity and cnidome of L. robustus, but the rhizostome toxicity information is insufficient. Understanding cnidome biology, toxins and jellyfish behaviour is important in preventing stings to fishers and beachgoers.

**Acknowledgements.** We thank the members of Enoshima Aquarium for providing us with the pictures. We would like to express our sincere thanks to Prof. Shuhei Nishida for encouragement throughout this study.

**Financial support.** This study was partially supported by grants from the Japan Society of Promotion of Science (JSPS), KAKEN (grant numbers 20380110, 25304031, 26304030 and 18K05688), and the Core to Core Program (B. Asia-Africa Science Platforms).

#### References

- Al-Rubiay KK, Al-Musaoi HA, Alrubaiy L and Al-Freje MG (2009) Skin and systemic manifestations of jellyfish stings in Iraqi fishermen. *Libyan Journal* of Medicine 4, 96–99.
- Arai MN (1997) A Functional Biology of Scyphozoa. London: Chapman & Hall.
- Ates R (1988) Medusivorous fishes: a review. Zoologische Mededeelingen 62, 29-42.
- Avian M, Del Negro P and Rottini Sandrini L (1991) A comparative analysis of nematocysts in *Pelagia noctiuca* and *Rhizostoma pulmo* from the North Adriatic Sea. *Hydrobiologia* 216/217, 615–621.
- Avian M, Spanier E and Galil B (1995) Nematocysts of *Rhopilema nomadica* (Scyphozoa: Rhizostomeae), and immigrant jellyfish in the eastern Mediterranean. *Journal of Morphology* 224, 221–231.
- Behera PR, Raju SS, Jishnudev MA, Ghosh S and Saravanan R (2020) Emerging jellyfish fisheries along Central South East coast of India. Ocean and Coastal Management 191, 105183.
- Birsa LM, Verity PG and Lee RF (2010) Evaluation of the effects of various chemicals on discharge of and pain caused by jellyfish nematocysts. *Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology Part C: Toxicology and Pharmacology* 151, 426–430.
- Brotz L (2016) Jellyfish fisheries: a global assessment. In Pauly D and Zeller D (eds), Global Atlas of Marine Fisheries: A Critical Appraisal of Catches and Ecosystem Impacts. Washington, DC: Island Press, pp. 110–124.
- Brotz L, Schiariti A, López-Martínez J, Álvarez-Tello J, Peggy Hsieh YH, Jones RP, Quiñones J, Dong Z, Morandini AC, Preciado M, Laaz E and Mianzanet H (2017) Jellyfish fisheries in the Americas: origin, state of the art, and perspectives on new fishing grounds. *Reviews in Fish Biology and Fisheries* 27, 1–29.
- Burke WA (2002) Cnidarians and human skin. Dermatologic Therapy 15, 18–25.
- Burnett JW and Calton GJ (1985) Recurrent eruption following a solitary envenomation by the cnidarian *Stomolophous meleagris*. *Toxicon* 23, 1010–1014.
- **Calder DR** (1972) Nematocysts of the medusa stage of *Rhopilema verrilli* (Scyphozoa, Rhizostomeae). *Transactions of the American Microscopical Society* **91**, 213–216.
- Calder DR (1983) Nematocysts of stages in the life cycle of Stomolophus meleagris, with keys to scyphistomae and ephyrae of some western Atlantic Scyphozoa. Canadian Journal of Zoology 61, 1185–1192.
- Chen J and Ding G (1981) On the nematocysts of the various stages of development of *Rhopilema esculenta* Kishinouye (Cnidaria, Scyphozoa). *Acta Zoologica Sinica* 27, 310–316. [In Chinese with English abstract].
- Dong Z, Liu D and Keesing JK (2010) Jellyfish blooms in China: dominant species, causes and consequences. Marine Pollution Bulletin 60, 954–963.
- FAO (2018) FishStatJ software for fishery statistical time series. Available at http://www.fao.org/fishery/statistics/software/fishstatj/en (Accessed 18 October 2018).
- Fenner PJ (1993) 63rd Annual Report 1992–93. Newstead: Surf Life Saving Queensland.
- Fenner PJ (2005) Venomous jellyfish of the world. South Pacific Underwater Medicine Society Journal 35, 131–138.
- Fenner PJ, Lippmann J and Gershwin LA (2010) Fatal and nonfatal severe jellyfish stings in Thai waters. *Journal of Travel Medicine* 17, 133–138.
- Fujii N, Kondo Y, Okada S, Ohtsuka S, Urata M, Adati A, Kato M, Yamaguchi S, Nakaguchi K, Muranaka S, Yoshino K and Tsutsumi H (2014) Estimation of biomass of the rhizostome jellyfish *Rhopilema esculen*tum Kishinouye in Ariake Sea in summer and fall of 2012. Bulletin of the Plankton Society of Japan 61, 23–31. [In Japanese with English abstract].
- Galil BS, Spanier E and Ferguson WW (1990) The Scyphomedusae of the Mediterranean coast of Israel, including two Lessepsian migrants new to the Mediterranean. *Zoologische Mededelingen* 64, 95–105.

- Ghosh TK, Gomes A and Nag Chaudhuri AK (1990) Pharmacological actions of tentacle extract of the jellyfish, *Acromitus rabanchatu*, occurring in the Bay of Bengal. *Indian Journal of Experimental Biology* **28**, 39–42.
- Gul S, Jahangir S and Schiariti A (2015) Jellyfish fishery in Pakistan. *Plankton and Benthos Research*, **10**, 220–224.
- Halstead BW (1965) Poisonous and Venomous Marine Animals of the World. London: Darwin Press.
- Heeger T, Möller H and Mrowietz U (1992) Protection of human skin against jellyfish (*Cyanea capillata*) stings. *Marine Biology* **113**, 669–678.
- Heins A, Glatzel T and Holst S (2015) Revised descriptions of the nematocysts and the asexual reproduction modes of the scyphozoan jellyfish *Cassiopea andromeda* (Forskål, 1775). *Zoomorphology* **134**, 351–366.
- Hessinger DA and Lenhoff HM (1988) The Biology of Nematocysts. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Holst S, Sötje I, Tiemann H and Jarms G (2007) Life cycle of the rhizostome jellyfish *Rhizostoma octopus* (L.) (Scyphozoa, Rhizostomeae), with studies on cnidocysts and statoliths. *Marine Biology* 151, 1695–1710.
- Jarms G, Tiemann H and Båmstedt U (2002) Development and biology of Periphylla periphylla (Scyphozoa: Coronatae) in a Norwegian fjord. Marine Biology 141, 647–657.
- Kass-Simon G and Scappaticci Jr AA (2002) The behavioral and developmental physiology of nematocysts. *Canadian Journal of Zoology* 80, 1772–1794.
- Kawahara M, Uye S, Burnett J and Mianzan H (2006) Stings of edible jellyfish (*Rhopilema hispidum*, *Rhopilema esculentum* and *Nemopilema nomurai*) in Japanese waters. *Toxicon* 48, 713–716.
- Kim JH, Han SB and Durey A (2018) Fatal pulmonary edema in a child after jellyfish stings in Korea. Wilderness and Environmental Medicine 29, 527–530.
- Kingsford MJ, Pitt KA and Gillanders BM (2000) Management of jellyfish fisheries, with special reference to the order Rhizostomeae. *Oceanograply* and Marine Biology: An Annual Review 38, 85–156.
- Kitatani R, Yamada M, Kamio M and Nagai H (2015) Length is associated with pain: jellyfish with painful sting have longer nematocyst tubules than harmless jellyfish. *PLoS ONE* **10**, e0135015.
- Kokelj F and Plozzer C (2002) Irritant contact dermatitis from the jellyfish *Rhizostoma pulmo. Contact Dermatitis* **46**, 179–180.
- Kubota S (1985) Hydrozoan various lifestyles and species. *Iden* **39**, 52–61. [In Japanese].
- Kubota S, Kawamura M and Ueno S (2006) First occurrence of a mature medusa of *Nemopilema nomurai* (Cnidaria, Scyphozoa, Rhizostomae) in Tanabe Bay, Wakayama prefecture, Japan. *Nankiseibutsu* 48, 57–59. [In Japanese and English abstract].
- Li R, Yu H, Xue W, Yue Y, Liu S, Xing R and Li P (2014) Jellyfish venomics and venom gland transcriptomics analysis of *Stomolophus meleagris* to reveal the toxins associated with sting. *Journal of Proteomics* **106**, 17–29.
- López-Martínez J and Álvarez-Tello J (2013) The jellyfish fishery in Mexico. Agricultural Sciences 4, 57–61.
- Lucas CH, Gelcich S and Uye S (2014) Living with jellyfish: management and adaptation strategies. In Pitt KA and Lucas CH (eds), *Jellyfish Blooms*. Heidelberg: Springer Netherlands, pp. 129–150.
- Mariottini GL and Pane L (2010) Mediterranean jellyfish venoms: a review on Scyphomedusae. *Marine Drugs* 8, 1122–1152.
- Mariottini GL, Giacco E and Pane L (2008) The mauve stinger *Pelagia* noctiluca (Forsskål, 1775). Distribution, ecology, toxicity and epidemiology of stings: A review. *Marine Drugs* 6, 496–513.
- Mariscal RN (1974) Nematocysts. In Muscatine L and Lenhoff HM (eds), Coelenterate Biology: Reviews and new Perspectives. New York, NY: Academic Press, pp. 129–178.
- Marques AC and Collins AG (2004) Cladistic analysis of Medusozoa and cnidarian evolution. *Invertebrate Biology* 123, 23–42.
- Marsh LM and Slack-Smith SM (2010) Field Guide to Sea Stingers and Other Venomous and Poisonous Marine Invertebrates of Western Australia. Western Australia: Western Australian Museum.
- Morandini AC, Custódio MR and Marques AC (2016) Phylum Porifera and Cnidaria. In Gopalakrishnakone P, Haddad Jr V, Kem WR, Tubaro A and Kim E (eds), *Marine and Freshwater Toxins*. Dordrecht: Springer, pp. 287–316.

- Nishida S and Nishikawa J (2011) Biodiversity of marine zooplankton in Southeast Asia (Project-3: Plankton Group). In Nishida S, Fortes MD and Miyazaki N (eds), Coastal Marine Science in Southeast Asia —Synthesis Report of the Core University Program of the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science: Coastal Marine Science (2001–2010). Tokyo: Terra Scientific Publishing Company, pp. 59–71.
- Nishikawa J, Thu NT, Ha TM and Thu PT (2008) Jellyfish fisheries in northern Vietnam. *Plankton and Benthos Research* **3**, 227–234.
- Nishikawa J, Ohtsuka S, Mulyadi N, Mujiono N, Lindsay DJ, Miyamoto H and Nishida S (2015) A new species of the commercially harvested jellyfish *Crambionella* (Scyphozoa) from central Java, Indonesia with remarks on the fisheries. *Journal of the Marine Biological Association of the United Kingdom* **95**, 471–481.
- Nishikawa J, Srinui K, Ohtsuka S, Kondo Y, Miyake H, Lindsay D and Iida A (2019) Jellyfish fisheries in Thailand. *Aquabiology* 41, 13–18. [In Japanese with English abstract].
- Ohtsuka S, Kondo Y, Sakai Y, Shimazu T, Shimomura M, Komai T, Yanagi K, Fujita T, Nishikawa J, Miyake H, Venmathi-Maran BA, Go A, Nagaguchi K, Yamaguchi S, Dechsakulwatana C, Srinui K, Putchakarn S, Mulyadi M, Mujiono N, Md F and Yusoff FM (2010) *In-situ* observations of symbionts on medusae occurring in Japan, Thailand, Indonesia and Malaysia. *Bulletin of the Hiroshima University Museum* 2, 9–18.
- Omori M and Kitamura M (2004) Taxonomic review of three Japanese species of edible jellyfish (Scyphozoa: Rhizostomeae). *Plankton Biology and Ecology* **51**, 36–51.
- **Omori M and Nakano E** (2001) Jellyfish fisheries in Southeast Asia. *Hydrobiologia* **451**, 19–26.
- Östman CA (2000) Guideline to nematocyst nomenclature and classification, and some notes on the systematic value of nematocysts. *Scientia Marina* 64, 31–46.
- Othman I, Fathilah AR, Mohd Saad J, Mohd Yusof M, Mustaffa MR and Azila N (1996) Studies of the venomous coelenterate: *Rhopilema hispidum*. *Journal of Natural Toxins* 5, 361–375.
- Palmieri MG, Barausse A, Luisetti T and Turner K (2014) Jellyfish blooms in the Northern Adriatic Sea: fishermen's perceptions and economic impacts on fisheries. *Fisheries Research* 155, 51–58.
- Peach MB and Pitt KA (2005) Morphology of the nematocysts of the medusa of two scyphozoans, *Catostylus mosaicus* and *Phyllorhiza punctata* (Rhizostomeae): implications for capture of prey. *Invertebrate Biology* 124, 98–108.
- Purcell JE (1984) The functions of nematocysts in prey capture by epipelagic siphonophores (Coelenterata, Hydrozoa). *Biological Bulletin* 166, 310–327.
- Purcell JE and Mills CE (1988) The correlation between nematocysts types and diets in pelagic hydrozoa. In Hessinger DA and Lenhoff HM (eds), *The Biology of Nematocysts*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press, pp. 463–485.
- Purcell JE, Uye S and Lo WT (2007) Anthropogenic causes of jellyfish blooms and their direct consequences for humans: a review. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 350, 153–174.
- R Core Team (2016). R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. Vienna: R Foundation for Computing. Available at: https:// www.R-project.org/.
- Remigante A, Costa R, Morabito R, Spada GL, Marino A and Dossena S (2018) Impact of scyphozoan venoms on human health and current first aid options for stings. *Toxins* **10**, 133.
- Richardson AJ, Bakun A, Hays GC and Gibbons MJ (2009) The jellyfish joyride: causes, consequences and management responses to a more gelatinous future. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 24, 312–322.
- Schuchert P (1993) Phylogenetic analysis of the Cnidaria. Zeitschrift für Zoologische Systematik und Evolutionsforschung 31, 161–173.
- Technau U, Genikhovich G and Kraus JEM (2015) Cnidaria. In Wanninger A (ed.), Evolutionary Developmental Biology of Invertebrates. 1: Introduction, Non-Bilateria, Acoelomorpha, Xenoturbellida, Chaetognatha. Vienna: Springer, pp. 115–163.
- Williamson JA, Fenner PJ, Burnett JW and Rifkin JF (1996) Venomous and Poisonous Marine Animals: Medical and Biological Handbook. Sydney: University of New South Wales Press.
- Yasuda T, Ueno S and Adachi A (2003) Marine UFO medusa. Tokyo: Kouseisya. [In Japanese].