

Methodological issues affecting the study of fish parasites. III. Effect of fish preservation method

Yuriy Kvach*, Markéta Ondračková, Michal Janáč, Pavel Jurajda

*Corresponding author: yuriy.kvach@gmail.com

Diseases of Aquatic Organisms 127: 213–224 (2018)

Table S1. Significance (P) and F-statistics (Chi for precision tests) for paired comparisons between four fish preservation methods. Note that the Benjamini-Hochberg procedure was later applied in order to control for false discovery rate in multiple comparisons (resulting significance is shown in Figures 2-4).

parameter comparison	P						F (Chi in precision)					
	Live vs Frozen	Live vs Formalin	Live vs Ethanol	Frozen vs Formalin	Frozen vs Ethanol	Formalin vs Ethanol	Live vs Frozen	Live vs Formalin	Live vs Ethanol	Frozen vs Formalin	Frozen vs Ethanol	Formalin vs Ethanol
<i>R. amarus</i>												
<i>Bucephalus</i> sp.	0.773	0.003	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.084	9.769	50.072	15.752	101.549	16.276
<i>Holostephanus</i> sp.	0.045	0.000	0.000	0.007	0.001	0.302	4.193	16.002	18.916	7.934	11.850	1.084
<i>Metorchis xanthosomus</i>	0.779	0.003	0.000	0.006	0.000	0.199	0.080	9.529	17.173	8.304	16.086	1.686
Hyalin cysts	0.154	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.090	2.083	16.506	22.705	15.046	26.001	2.969
Soft cysts	0.917	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	1.000	0.011	13.228	13.228	11.554	11.554	0.000
<i>P. fluviatilis</i>												
<i>Bunodera</i> sp.	0.005	0.354	0.001	0.031	0.828	0.009	8.664	0.870	11.712	4.904	0.048	7.401
<i>Dermocystidium</i> sp.	0.030	0.008	0.448	0.353	0.054	0.008	4.952	7.640	0.583	0.877	3.856	7.538
<i>Proteocephalus</i> sp. pl	0.287	0.380	0.006	0.856	0.076	0.054	1.153	0.781	8.026	0.033	3.270	3.869
<i>Proteocephalus cernua</i>	0.060	0.001	0.001	0.004	0.004	1.000	3.678	12.247	12.247	8.934	8.934	0.000
<i>Ergasilus sieboldi</i>	0.395	0.603	0.456	0.221	0.174	0.742	0.734	0.273	0.563	1.532	1.891	0.109
<i>Acanthocephalus</i> sp.	0.964	0.739	0.421	0.660	0.216	0.109	0.002	0.112	0.657	0.196	1.564	2.650
<i>Argulus foliaceus</i>	0.287	0.717	0.047	0.456	0.302	0.082	1.152	0.132	4.097	0.564	1.084	3.127
<i>Ancyrocephalus percae</i>	0.014	0.088	0.000	0.302	0.101	0.004	6.391	2.999	16.004	1.084	2.773	8.934
species richness												
<i>R. amarus</i>	0.257	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	1.312	24.765	57.266	25.176	56.546	25.171
<i>P. fluviatilis</i>	0.016	0.008	0.000	0.848	0.229	0.097	6.097	7.400	19.666	0.037	1.476	2.844
species composition												
<i>R. amarus</i> - Jaccard	0.140	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	1.826	10.840	33.772	8.283	41.956	45.847
<i>R. amarus</i> - Bray-Curtis	0.474	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.865	16.561	35.559	18.910	44.262	31.065
<i>P. fluviatilis</i> - Jaccard	0.001	0.039	0.002	0.093	0.422	0.048	4.128	2.141	4.390	1.768	0.994	2.512
<i>P. fluviatilis</i> - Bray-Curtis	0.002	0.084	0.003	0.140	0.287	0.036	3.401	1.786	3.238	1.689	1.175	2.526
precision												
<i>Acanthocephalus</i> sp.	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.201	0.600	0.107	22.180	31.841	12.991	1.634	0.275	2.602
<i>Bunodera</i> sp.	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.010	0.003	30.617	196.183	68.672	37.982	6.617	9.038
<i>Holostephanus</i> sp.	0.224	0.631	0.260	0.952	0.391	0.410	1.479	0.231	1.268	0.004	0.736	0.680