



HAL
open science

First discovery of parasite eggs in a vertebrate coprolite of the Late Triassic in Thailand

Thanit Nonsrirach, Serge Morand, Alexis Ribas, Sita Manitkoon, Komsorn
Lauprasert, Julien Claude

► **To cite this version:**

Thanit Nonsrirach, Serge Morand, Alexis Ribas, Sita Manitkoon, Komsorn Lauprasert, et al.. First discovery of parasite eggs in a vertebrate coprolite of the Late Triassic in Thailand. PLoS ONE, 2023, 18 (8), pp.e0287891. 10.1371/journal.pone.0287891 . hal-04787415

HAL Id: hal-04787415

<https://hal.science/hal-04787415v1>

Submitted on 25 Jan 2025

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

RESEARCH ARTICLE

First discovery of parasite eggs in a vertebrate coprolite of the Late Triassic in Thailand

Thanit Nonsrirach^{1*}, Serge Morand^{2,3}, Alexis Ribas^{4,5}, Sita Manitkoon¹, Komsorn Lauprasert⁶, Julien Claude^{7,8}

1 Palaeontological Research and Education Centre, Mahasarakham University, Kantarawichai, Mahasarakham, Thailand, **2** MIVEGEC, CNRS – IRD – Montpellier Université, Montpellier, France, **3** Faculty of Veterinary Technology, Kasetsart University, Bangkok, Thailand, **4** Parasitology Section, Department of Biology, Healthcare and Environment, Faculty of Pharmacy and Food Science, University of Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain, **5** Institut de Recerca de la Biodiversitat (IRBio), Universitat de Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain, **6** Department of Biology, Faculty of Science, Mahasarakham University, Kantarawichai, Mahasarakham, Thailand, **7** Institut des Sciences de l'Évolution de Montpellier (ISEM), Montpellier Université, UMR UM/CNRS/IRD/EPHE, Montpellier, France, **8** Department of Biology, Faculty of Science, Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, Thailand

* thanit.nonsrirach@gmail.com

OPEN ACCESS

Citation: Nonsrirach T, Morand S, Ribas A, Manitkoon S, Lauprasert K, Claude J (2023) First discovery of parasite eggs in a vertebrate coprolite of the Late Triassic in Thailand. PLoS ONE 18(8): e0287891. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0287891>

Editor: Jean-lou Justine, Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, Paris, FRANCE

Received: June 1, 2023

Accepted: June 13, 2023

Published: August 9, 2023

Peer Review History: PLOS recognizes the benefits of transparency in the peer review process; therefore, we enable the publication of all of the content of peer review and author responses alongside final, published articles. The editorial history of this article is available here: <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0287891>

Copyright: © 2023 Nonsrirach et al. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Data Availability Statement: All relevant data are within the paper.

Funding: This research project was financially supported by Mahasarakham University, by the

Abstract

A paleoparasitological investigation of a vertebrate coprolite from the Huai Hin Lat Formation (Upper Triassic) was carried out. Five morphotypes of potential parasite eggs or sporocysts were identified in the coprolite by microscopic analysis using thin section technique. The rounded or oval shape and thick shell of one of the five morphotypes suggests that it belongs to nematode of the order Ascaridida. Systematic assignment of other morphotypes cannot be done in detail but suggests that the host was parasitized by different species of parasites. This is the first record of parasites in terrestrial vertebrate hosts from the Late Triassic in Asia and it provides new information on parasite-host interactions during the Mesozoic era.

Introduction

Paleoparasitology is the investigation of parasites found in paleontological and archaeological sites [1–9]. Although specialized parasites producing traces in hard tissues have sometimes been partly identified [10–16], other parasites have a very poor fossil record because the soft tissues of the host in which they occur are rarely preserved, except in exceptional conditions such as in amber [10, 11]. Another important source of parasite remains are coprolites, i.e., fossilized faecal material, which can shed light on trophic chains [4, 8, 17–19].

Several reports have described parasite eggs in coprolites [3–6, 8, 18]. The assignment of coprolites to a specific host is challenging, but their different shapes can provide systematic information [20, 21]. The insights into parasite-host interactions derived from these discoveries allow a better understanding of palaeo-coevolution and palaeo-ecosystems [6, 17–19].

Helminth eggs have been described in vertebrate coprolites, including those of Permian sharks [6], cynodonts, dinosaurs [5, 8] and other Mesozoic archosaurs, and Quaternary mammals, e.g., hyena, deer and sloth [22–24]. We report the discovery of parasites, including helminth egg, in a Late Triassic vertebrate coprolite from Northeast Thailand. The coprolite was

IRN paleobiodivASE CNRS, by the Hubert Curien PHC project trophic network evolution of the Mesozoic of Thailand and its impact on biodiversity (2016–2017) and by the French Agence nationale de la recherche (project ANR-11-CEPL-0002 BiodivHealthSEA). The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

Competing interests: The authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

collected by a Thai-French joint paleontological field survey in 2010 during a field work in the Huai Nam Aun outcrop near Nong Yakong village (Khon San District, Chaiyaphum Province, Thailand). The coprolite is preserved in the collections of the Palaeontological Research and Education Centre, Mahasarakham University, Mahasarakham province in Thailand under the catalogue number PRC 021.

The Huai Nam Aun outcrop contains various beds of limestone and mudstone, deposited in brackish water or freshwater and in a low energy depositional environment [25]. The vertebrate fossil remains in the outcrop consist of *Hybodus* teeth, ganoid fish scales, and temnospondyl fragments [25–27]. The Huai Nam Aun outcrop is part of the Huai Hin Lat Formation (Fig 1), which has been dated as Carnian-Norian based on palynomorphs, plant macroremains, conchostracans, and vertebrate remains [28–32]. So far, the vertebrate fossils found in the Huai Hin Lat Formation comprise *Hybodus* sp. [25, 33], ginglymodians [25, 34, 35], lungfishes (possibly *Ferganoceratodus* sp.) [36, 37], temnospondyls (including *Cyclotosaurus* and Plagiosauridae) [25, 27, 38, 39], the primitive stem-turtle *Proganochelys ruchae* [40, 41],




Fig 1. The Huai Nam Aun outcrop in the Huai Hin Lat formation of Thailand [28].

<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0287891.g001>

and phytosaurs [42]. Furthermore, archosauromorph footprints were identified as cf. ichnogenus *Apatopus* sp., and could have been done by a phytosaur [43].

Materials and methods

The studied coprolite was photographed, measured, and classified based on its shape. To search for internal structures and fossil inclusion, the coprolite was hardened by embedding in epoxy resin, and then cut with a diamond saw in longitudinal and transversal sections using a standard thin section method. The coprolite slices were glued to glass slides, and optimal thickness for transmission microscopy was obtained using a grinder with a graded series [6, 44]. All microscopic structures and fossil remains were photographed with a light microscope Nikon ECLIPSE E200, and multiple images taken with different focal distances were combined using a focus stacking technique.

Results

The coprolite has an elongated cylindrical shape, curved on one side, with a rounded end (Fig 2), and is approximately 74 mm in length and 21 mm in diameter. The surface is hard, smooth and grey in colour. Microscopic observations of all slides showed a dark, high-density clay-like material and absence of soft tissue, e.g., folded or spiral traces. Five different morphotypes of organic structures were visible in the coprolite slices.

Morphotype I: ellipsoid in shape with a round to oval sections (Fig 3) and 40 to 60 μm wide and 50 to 70 μm long. They exhibit a hardly discernible and relatively thin shell (1 to 2 μm) and



Fig 2. The vertebrate coprolite with parasites found in the Huai Nam Aun locality (Upper Triassic).

<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0287891.g002>




Fig 3. Parasites of morphotype I, found in the vertebrate coprolite.

<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0287891.g003>

show internal structures that could correspond to dividing cytoplasmic or nuclear material (Fig 3A). The most elongated one (Fig 3D) shows an apical opening (micropyle or operculum).

Morphotype II: spherical in shape (Fig 4) with a diameter of around 80 µm and a thick (3–4 µm) and irregular shell that is interrupted and could present a pore; the surface shows slightly developed wrinkles.

Morphotype III: irregular ellipsoid shape (Fig 5) with a minimum diameter of 80 µm and a maximal diameter of 120 µm with a very thick shell (10 µm) and it shows a segmented or multicellular body within the shell.

Morphotype IV: spherical rounded shape (Fig 6) with a clearly defined shell of 3 to 5 µm, with a reticulated and anastomosed surface ornamentation. This morphotype is 80 to 140 µm in diameter. Within that structure, no clear cellular or nuclear material can be observed and there is no evidence of pore or operculum.

Morphotype V ellipsoid shape (Fig 7) with a very thick shell (7 to 9 µm). It is 60 µm long and 43 µm wide. In this morphotype, a second translucent layer is observable within the shell and is irregular in thickness (2 to 7 µm). There is no evidence of operculum, and the ornamentation of external surface is not properly appreciated.




Fig 4. Parasite of morphotype II, found in the vertebrate coprolite.

<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0287891.g004>




Fig 5. Parasite of morphotype III, found in the vertebrate coprolite.

<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0287891.g005>




Fig 6. Parasites of morphotype IV, found in the vertebrate coprolite.

<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0287891.g006>

Discussion and systematic assessment

The sedimentological conditions of the site where the coprolite was found allowed the preservation of parasites and other organic structures in the coprolite. Microscopic observation of thin sections revealed the highly well-preserved internal structures of the organic structures. This approach had yielded similar results in a study of tapeworm eggs in a shark coprolite [6].

The five observed morphotypes are potentially eggs of parasite. Morphotypes II and IV present some ornamentation on external surfaces. No clearly organized bodies could be defined within these structures. Ornamented surfaces could initially correspond to the sporoderm of fern or moss spores that might have been ingested but not digested by the animal. However, our sections are not showing any fern or moss spore diagnostic features (structures are not triangular or kidney shaped, there is no indication of aperture or sporogenesis scars). The wrinkled surface could correspond to the diagnostic surface of nematode eggs. Using chemical methods may have provided information the external characteristic ornamentation, as in the studies of fossilized *Ascaridida* eggs using chemical methods [3, 5, 8, 45], but they cannot provide important information on internal structures.

Morphotypes I, III and V apparently do not present trace of ornamentation and are likely not plant spores but rather parasite elimination form through the feces of their hosts. A large




Fig 7. Parasite of morphotype V, found in the vertebrate coprolite.

<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0287891.g007>

number of parasite groups carry out these elimination steps (protists and helminths). Morphotype I is relatively small and could potentially correspond to unicellular cyst (i.e., Coccidia). Protist cysts have been found in terrestrial coprolites dating back to the early Cretaceous period [45]. Oocysts of coccidians, such as *Eimeria*, overlap in size range with this morphotype [46, 47]. Morphotype III shows a well-developed shell and organized bodies within the shell. It could be a nematode egg with a developed embryo, but confirmation requires other diagnostic characters.

The ellipsoid shape and thick wall of morphotype V are diagnostic traits of eggs of Ascaridida nematodes [48]. Parasites of this order are commonly found in terrestrial vertebrates such as fishes, amphibians, reptiles, birds, mammal-like reptiles, and mammals [3, 5, 8, 49, 50]. Fossil eggs of nematodes have been ascribed to the genus *Ascarites*. The earliest fossil record of Ascarididae eggs, ascribed to *Ascarites rufferi* is Triassic and comes from a cynodont coprolite from Rio Grande do Sul State in Brazil [5]. Other Mesozoic findings are *Ascarites gerus* and *Ascarites priscus* [45] from Early Cretaceous archosaur coprolites (iguanodontian dinosaur) in Belgium, and Ascaridida eggs discovered in Crocodyliformes coprolites from the Early Cretaceous in Brazil [3]. Morphotype V differs from *Ascarites priscus* by its smoother shell and slightly larger size and by its more homogeneous vitelline layers, it differs also from *Ascarites gerus* and *A rufferi* by its smooth and thicker shell. Other individual eggs must be found and studied using both thin sections and chemical techniques to be able to create a new taxon.

The cylindrical and curved shape of the coprolite and the absence of prey remains are typical of the Crurotarsi, especially crocodile-like animals [3, 20, 51, 52]. Crocodiles are not known in Huai Hin Lat but abundant vertebrate assemblages have been discovered in several outcrops of the Huai Hin Lat Formation including actinopterygian fishes [25, 34, 35], lungfish [36, 37],

temnospondyls [25, 27, 38, 39], turtles [40, 41], and phytosaurs [42]. The studied coprolite was therefore likely produced by a crocodile-like reptile, possibly a phytosaur, a reptile that evolved convergently with crocodylians, and whose tooth and bone remains have been found in the same formation [25, 42, 43].

The discovery of at least six parasites with at least five different morphotypes in a single coprolite suggests that multi-parasite infection was common had already diversified by the late Triassic. The presence of the Ascaridida eggs and the evidence for multi-infection found in the coprolite can presumably be explained by the predatory habits of the host, which would have been parasitized by feeding on parasitized fishes, amphibians, or other reptiles [3, 4, 18].

Conclusion

Parasites of several species, including Ascaridida eggs were found in a coprolite probably produced by a crocodile-like reptile and possibly a phytosaur. This is therefore the first discovery of Ascaridida eggs and evidence of multi-infection in a host assignable to the Crurotarsi from the Late Triassic of Asia.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank all staff of the Palaeontological Research and Education Centre (PRC) of Mahasarakham University who took part in the fieldwork.

Author Contributions

Conceptualization: Thanit Nonsrirach, Serge Morand, Alexis Ribas, Julien Claude.

Data curation: Komsorn Lauprasert.

Formal analysis: Thanit Nonsrirach, Serge Morand, Sita Manitkoon, Julien Claude.

Funding acquisition: Sita Manitkoon, Julien Claude.

Investigation: Thanit Nonsrirach, Komsorn Lauprasert.

Methodology: Thanit Nonsrirach, Alexis Ribas, Komsorn Lauprasert.

Resources: Komsorn Lauprasert.

Supervision: Serge Morand, Julien Claude.

Visualization: Thanit Nonsrirach.

Writing – original draft: Thanit Nonsrirach, Sita Manitkoon.

Writing – review & editing: Serge Morand, Alexis Ribas, Julien Claude.

References

1. Anastasiou E, Mitchell PD. Simplifying the process of extracting intestinal parasite eggs from archaeological sediment samples: A comparative study of the efficacy of widely-used disaggregation techniques. *Int J Paleopathol.* 2013; 3: 204–207. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpp.2013.04.004> PMID: 29539457
2. Beltrame MO, Fugassa MH, Barberena R, Sauthier DE Udrizar, Sardella NH. New record of anoplocephalid eggs (Cestoda: Anoplocephalidae) collected from rodent coprolites from archaeological and paleontological sites of Patagonia, Argentina. *Parasitol Int.* 2013; 62: 431–434. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.parint.2013.04.004> PMID: 23602736
3. Cardia DFF, Bertini RJ, Camossi LG, Letizio LA. The first record of ascaridoidea eggs discovered in crocodyliformes hosts from the upper cretaceous of Brazil. *Rev Bras Paleontol.* 2018; 21: 238–244. <https://doi.org/10.4072/RBP.2018.3.04>

4. Cardia DFF, Bertini RJ, Camossi LG, Letizio LA. First record of Acanthocephala parasites eggs in coprolites preliminary assigned to Crocodyliformes from the Adamantina Formation (Bauru Group, Upper Cretaceous), São Paulo, Brazil. *An Acad Bras Cienc.* 2019; 91 Suppl. 2: e20170848. <https://doi.org/10.1590/0001-3765201920170848> PMID: 31090797
5. Silva PAD, Borba VH, Dutra JMF, Leles D, Da-Rosa AAS, Ferreira LF, et al. A new ascarid species in cynodont coprolite dated of 240 million years. *An Acad Bras Cienc.* 2014; 86: 265–270. <https://doi.org/10.1590/0001-3765201320130036> PMID: 24519010
6. Dentzien-Dias PC, Poinar G, de Figueiredo AEQ, Pacheco ACL, Horn BLD, Schultz CL. Tapeworm eggs in a 270 million-year-old shark coprolite. *PLoS One.* 2013; 8: 8–11. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0055007> PMID: 23383033
7. Dittmar K, Steyn M. Paleoparasitological analysis of coprolites from K2, an Iron Age archaeological site in South Africa: the first finding of *Dicrocoelium* sp. eggs. *J Parasitol.* 2004; 90: 171–173. <https://doi.org/10.1645/GE-3224RN> PMID: 15040686
8. Hugot J-P, Gardner SL, Borba V, Araujo P, Leles D, Stock Da-Rosa AA, et al. Discovery of a 240 million year old nematode parasite egg in a cynodont coprolite sheds light on the early origin of pinworms in vertebrates. *Parasit Vectors.* 2014; 7: 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13071-014-0486-6> PMID: 25495824
9. Beltrame MO, Fugassa MH, Sardella NH, Civalero MT, Aschero C. Raptor pellets as zooarchaeological material for paleoparasitological studies in Patagonia. *J Archaeol Sci.* 2011; 38: 1511–1515. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jas.2011.02.016>
10. Poinar G, Buckley R. Nematode (Nematoda: Mermithidae) and hairworm (Nematomorpha: Chordodiidae) parasites in Early Cretaceous amber. *J Invertebr Pathol.* 2006; 93: 36–41. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jip.2006.04.006> PMID: 16737709
11. Poinar GO, Currie DC. Mermithid nematode (Nematoda: Mermithidae) parasites of a fossil black fly (Diptera: Simuliidae) in Baltic amber. *Nematology.* 2020; 22: 655–658. <https://doi.org/10.1163/15685411-00003328>
12. Balinski A, Sun Y, Dzik J. Traces of marine nematodes from 470 million years old Early Ordovician rocks in China. *Nematology.* 2013; 15: 567–574. <https://doi.org/10.1163/15685411-00002702>
13. Brachaniec T, Niedźwiedzki R, Surmik D, Krzykowski T, Szopa K, Gorzelak P, et al. Coprolites of marine vertebrate predators from the Lower Triassic of southern Poland. *Palaeogeogr Palaeoclimatol Palaeoecol.* 2015; 435: 118–126.
14. Klompmaker AA, Boxshall GA. Fossil crustaceans as parasites and hosts. *Adv Parasitol.* 2015; 90: 233–289. <https://doi.org/10.1016/bs.apar.2015.06.001> PMID: 26597069
15. Littlewood DTJ, Donovan SK. Feature: Fossil parasites: a case of identity. *Geol Today.* 2003; 19: 136–142. <https://doi.org/10.1046/J.1365-2451.2003.00406.X>
16. Lukševics E, Lebedev O, Mark-Kurik E, Karatajūtė-Talimaa V. The earliest evidence of host–parasite interactions in vertebrates. *Acta Zool.* 2009; 90: 335–343. <https://doi.org/10.1111/J.1463-6395.2008.00362.X>
17. De Baets K, Littlewood DTJ. *Fossil Parasites.* Academic Press; 2015.
18. Barrios-de Pedro S, Osuna A, Buscalioni AD. Helminth eggs from Early Cretaceous faeces. *Sci Reports* 2020 101. 2020; 10: 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-75757-4> PMID: 33127992
19. Leung TLF. Fossils of parasites: what can the fossil record tell us about the evolution of parasitism? *Biol Rev.* 2017; 92: 410–430. <https://doi.org/10.1111/brv.12238> PMID: 26538112
20. Dentzien-Dias P, Carrillo-Briceño JD, Francischini H, Sánchez R. Paleoeological and taphonomical aspects of the Late Miocene vertebrate coprolites (Urumaco Formation) of Venezuela. *Palaeogeogr Palaeoclimatol Palaeoecol.* 2018; 490: 590–603. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.PALAEO.2017.11.048>
21. Hunt AP, Lucas SG. Descriptive terminology of coprolites and recent feces. *Vertebr Coprolites New Mex Museum Nat Hist Sci Bull.* 2012; 57: 153–160.
22. Ferreira LF, Araújo A, Duarte AN, Araujo A. Nematode larvae in fossilized animal coprolites from Lower and Middle Pleistocene sites, Central Italy. *J Parasitol.* 1993; 79: 440–442. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3283583> PMID: 8501604
23. Ferreira LF, Araújo A, Confalonieri U, Chame M, Ribeiro B. *Eimeria* oocysts in deer coprolites dated from 9,000 years BP. *Mem Inst Oswaldo Cruz.* 1992; 87: 105–106. <https://doi.org/10.1590/s0074-02761992000500021>
24. Schmidt GD, Duszynski DW, Martin PS. Parasites of the extinct Shasta ground sloth, *Nothrotheriops shastensis*, in Rampart Cave, Arizona. *J Parasitol.* 1992; 78: 811–816. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3283310>
25. Laojumpon C, Deesri U, Khamha S, Wattanapitaksakul A, Lauprasert K, Suteethorn S, et al. New vertebrate-bearing localities in the Triassic of Thailand. *J Sci Technol MSU.* 2014; 4: 335–343.

26. Laojumpon C, Matkhammee T, Wathanapitaksakul A, Suteethorn V, Suteethorn S, Lauprasert K, et al. Preliminary report on coprolites from the Late Triassic of Thailand. *Vertebr Coprolites New Mex Museum Nat Hist Sci Bull.* 2012; 57: 207–213.
27. Nonsrirach T, Manitkoon S, Lauprasert K. First occurrence of brachyopid temnospondyls in Southeast Asia and review of the Mesozoic amphibians from Thailand. *Foss Rec.* 2021; 24: 33–47. <https://doi.org/10.5194/fr-24-33-2021>
28. Buffetaut E, Suteethorn V. The biogeographical significance of the Mesozoic vertebrates from Thailand. *Biogeogr Geol Evol SE Asia.* 1998; 83–90.
29. Department of Mineral Resources. *The Geology of Thailand.* 1st ed. Bangkok, Thailand: Department of Mineral Resources, Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment; 2014.
30. Kobayashi T. Upper Triassic estheriids in Thailand and the conchostracan development in Asia in the Mesozoic Era. *Geol Palaeontol Southeast Asia.* 1975; 16: 57–90. Available: <https://ci.nii.ac.jp/naid/10007415985/>
31. Racey A, Love M., Canham A., Goodall JGS. Stratigraphy and reservoir potential of the Mesozoic Khorat Group, NE Thailand. *Pet Geol.* 1996; 5–40. Available: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1747-5457.1996.tb00511.x>
32. Racey A, Goodall JGS. Palynology and stratigraphy of the Mesozoic Khorat Group red bed sequences from Thailand. *Geol Soc London, Spec Publ.* 2009; 315: 69–83. <https://doi.org/10.1144/SP315.6>
33. Manitkoon S, Deesri U, Lauprasert K, Warapeang P, Nonsrirach T, Nilpanapan A, et al. Fossil assemblage from the Khok Pha Suam locality of northeastern, Thailand: an overview of vertebrate diversity from the Early Cretaceous Khok Kruat Formation (Aptian-Albian). *Foss Rec* 25(1) 83–98. 2022; 25: 83–98. <https://doi.org/10.3897/FR.25.83081>
34. Martin M. The actinopterygian scales and teeth (PISCES) from the continental; Upper Triassic of Thailand, their paleogeographical significance. *Mémoires la Société géologique Fr.* 1984; 101–105.
35. Deesri U, Lauprasert K, Varavudh S, Wongko K, Cavin L. A new species of the ginglymodian fish *Isanichthys* (Actinopterygii, Holostei) from the Late Jurassic Phu Kradung Formation, northeastern Thailand. *Acta Palaeontol Pol.* 2014; 59: 313–331. <https://doi.org/10.4202/app.2012.0013>
36. Cavin L, Deesri U, Suteethorn V. The Jurassic and Cretaceous bony fish record (Actinopterygii, Dipnoi) from Thailand. Geological Society Special Publication. Geological Society of London; 2009. pp. 125–139. <https://doi.org/10.1144/SP315.10>
37. Deesri U, Wongko K, Cavin L. Taxic diversity and ecology of Mesozoic bony fish assemblages from the Khorat Group, NE Thailand. *Res Knowl.* 2017; 3: 18–22.
38. Ingavat R, Janvier P. *Cyclotosaurus* cf. *posthumus* Fraas (Capitosauridae, Stereospondyli) from the Huai Hin Lat Formation (Upper Triassic), Northeastern Thailand: with a note on capitosaurid biogeography. *Geobios.* 1981; 14: 711–725.
39. Suteethorn V, Janvier P, Morales M. Evidence for a plagiosauroid amphibian in the Upper Triassic Huai Hin Lat Formation of Thailand. *J Southeast Asian Earth Sci.* 1988; 2: 185–187.
40. Broin de France. *Proganochelys rucha* n. sp., chélonien du Trias supérieur de Thaïlande. *Stud Geol Salamanticensia, Stud Palaeocheloniologica.* 1984; 1: 87–97. Available: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/285363434>
41. Tong H, Claude J, Buffetaut E, Suteethorn V, Naksri W, Chitsing S. Fossil turtles of Thailand: an updated review. In *Papers from the 2005 Heyuan International dinosaur symposium.* Beijing: Geological Publishing House; 2006. pp. 183–194.
42. Buffetaut E, Ingavat R. Phytosaur remains (Reptilia, Thecodontia) from the Upper Triassic of North-Eastern Thailand. *Geobios.* 1982; 15: 7–17. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0016-6995\(82\)80054-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0016-6995(82)80054-5)
43. Kozu, Shohei. *Dinosaur Footprints from the Khorat Group, Northeastern Thailand.* University of Tsukuba. 2017.
44. Chin K. The paleobiological implications of herbivorous dinosaur coprolites from the Upper Cretaceous Two Medicine Formation of Montana: why eat wood? *Palaios.* 2007; 22: 554–566. <https://doi.org/10.2110/palo.2006.p06-087r>
45. Poinar G, Boucot AJ. Evidence of intestinal parasites of dinosaurs. *Parasitology.* 2006; 133: 245. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0031182006000138> PMID: 16623965
46. Yang R, Brice B, Ryan U. Morphological and molecular characterization of *Eimeria purpureicephali* n. sp. (Apicomplexa: Eimeriidae) in a red-capped parrot (*Purpureicephalus spurius*, Kuhl, 1820) in Western Australia. *Int J Parasitol Parasites Wildl.* 2016; 5: 34–39. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.IJPPAW.2016.01.003> PMID: 26977403
47. Fugassa MH, Sardella NH, Taglioretti V, Reinhard KJ, Araújo A. Eimeriid Oocysts from Archaeological Samples in Patagonia, Argentina. *J Parasitol.* 2008; 94: 1418–1420. <https://doi.org/10.1645/GE-1537.1> PMID: 18576839

48. Maurelli MP, Alves LC, Aggarwal CS, Cociancic P, Levecke B, Cools P, et al. *Ascaris lumbricoides* eggs or artefacts? A diagnostic conundrum. *Parasitology*. 2021; 148: 1554–1559. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0031182021001256> PMID: 34250886
49. Bouchet F, Araújo A, Harter S, Chaves SM, Duarte AN, Monnier JL, et al. *Toxocara canis* (Werner, 1782) eggs in the Pleistocene site of Menez-Dregan, France (300,000–500,000 years before present). *Mem Inst Oswaldo Cruz*. 2003; 98: 137–139. Available: http://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?pid=S0074-02762003000900020&script=sci_arttext
50. Sprent JFA. Ascaridoid nematodes of amphibians and reptiles: *Orneoascaris*. *Ann Parasitol Hum Comp*. 1985; 60: 33–55. <https://doi.org/10.1051/parasite/198560133>
51. Lucas SG, Spielmann JA, Hunt AP, Emry RJ. Crocodylian coprolites from the Eocene of the Zaysan Basin, Kazakstan. *Vertebr Coprolites New Mex Museum Nat Hist Sci Bull*. 2012; 57: 319–324.
52. Milàn J. Crocodylian scatology—a look into morphology, internal architecture, inter- and intraspecific variation and prey remains in extant crocodylian feces. *Vertebr Coprolites New Mex Museum Nat Hist Sci Bull*. 2012; 57: 65–71.