Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research

Volume 26, Issue 4, Page 29-37, 2024; Article no.AJFAR.115547
ISSN: 2582-3760

Studies on Seasonal Variation of Zooplankton Population in Elanthakulam, Palayamkottai, Tirunelveli District, India

Ananth Kumar [a*] and Manikandaraja [b]

[a] Department of Biotechnology, Arulmigu Pannirupidi Ayyan College, Vagaikulam, Tirunelveli, Tamil Nadu, India.
[b] Department of Zoology and Research Centre, Aditanar College of Arts and Science, Trichendhur, Tamil Nadu, India.

Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration between both authors. Both authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Article Information

DOI: 10.9734/AJFAR/2024/v26i4754

Open Peer Review History:
This journal follows the Advanced Open Peer Review policy. Identity of the Reviewers, Editor(s) and additional Reviewers, peer review comments, different versions of the manuscript, comments of the editors, etc are available here: https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/115547

Original Research Article

Received: 07/02/2024
Accepted: 11/04/2024
Published: 15/04/2024

ABSTRACT

A study of the zooplankton population in Elanthakulam pond, Tirunelveli District, and the plankton samples were collected during the winter season (August 2017–October 2017). Seasonal changes in the pattern of the zooplankton population have been driven by a combination of abiotic and biotic factors. Hence, the present study was undertaken to assess the zooplankton population in the Elanthakulam pond. The results indicate that 10 species belonging to four genera were recorded during the period of study. Out of 10 species, 4 belonged to rotifers, 3 belonged to caldoserans, 2 belonged to copepods, and one species belonged to Ostracoda. The present study concludes that zooplankton were not at their maximum in the monsoon season because of unfavourable environmental conditions, and they also slightly declined in August and September and increased again in October.

**Corresponding author: Email: ananth2481@gmail.com;*

Keywords: Elanthakulam; cladiceran; moina; daphnia; ostracoda.

1. INTRODUCTION

According to Ali [1], biodiversity can also be defined as the variation found in all living things, including those found in terrestrial, marine, and other aquatic ecosystems, as well as the ecological complexes of which they are a part. Details regarding the evenness, dominance, richness, and variety of species Analysing the ecosystem's biological components is crucial to comprehending harmful environmental changes [2]. Major taxonomic groups are represented in the rich array of zooplankton found in Indian water bodies. Numerous of these types have distinct physiological and environmental assemblages. Any aquatic habitat's population size, composition, and distribution can reveal information about the environmental conditions that are present there.

It is evident that a variety of environmental elements combine to create the right conditions for zooplankton growth in both seasonal and geographical contexts [3]. An essential component of an aquatic ecosystem's relevance and a major player in energy transmission is zooplankton. Because they are highly sensitive to their surroundings, plankton populations' tolerance, abundance, variety, and dominance in the habitat will all shift in response to environmental changes. As a result, plankton population observation could be a trustworthy method for biomonitoring research that evaluates the level of pollution in aquatic environments. The ecosystem and food chain of ponds, lakes, and reservoirs depend heavily on freshwater zooplankton [4]. Zooplankton consume phytoplankton as food. They are in control of consuming millions of tiny algae that would otherwise spread uncontrollably. Different zooplankton species have distinct life histories that are impacted by predation pressure, feeding ecology, and seasonal changes in biotic variables. Primary consumers, which consume phytoplankton, and secondary consumers, which eat other zooplankton, make up the zooplankton community. They offer a direct conduit between upper tropic levels, such fish, and primary producers. During their larval stages, almost all fish rely on zooplankton as their primary food source, and some fish consume it for the entirety of their lives [5]. The freshwater zooplankton population is essential to the food chain's food web because it recycles nutrients and moves organic matter from primary producers like diatoms to secondary consumers like fish. The amount of fish stock is determined in part by zooplankton, and the decline in the *Copepod* population is thought to be the cause of the fishing resources' failure [6,7] The water quality is assessed in terms of domestic, municipal, and industrial contamination using species diversity indices of zooplankton communities [8]. Thus, zooplankton can serve as a sorority indicator. To managing zooplankton populations and maximising system production, research on their variety, density, commonness, and energy levels is currently necessary. When taking into account an aquatic system, planktons show to be quite significant since they can respond instantly to changes in the surrounding environment [9,10]. Many biotic and abiotic elements, including as light, temperature, available nutrients, hydrodynamics, predation, oxygen content, pH, and so forth, affect the growth and development rate of plankton [11]. The trophic level that comes after the phytoplanktons is called the zooplanktons [10] Shanthala et al., (2008). The physicochemical characteristics of the water body have an impact on the zooplankton population, which also varies with the seasons [12,13,]. Unlike physicochemical methods that have led to the detection of one pollutant at a time, the analysis of such indicator organisms, both qualitative and quantitative, has resulted in an assisting option to combine the effects of a number of contaminants. Furthermore, the current state of many water bodies has been ascertained by using indices and other technologies. According to Mahadev et al. (2007), biomonitoring has emerged as a crucial component of studies on water pollution and makes a significant contribution to the field's understanding of water quality assessment. The physicochemical parameters of the environment cause fluctuations in the zooplankton population; in particular, rotifer species are affected by biotic variables (Karuthapandi et al., 2012). The dominance of fish, macroinvertebrates, and water fowl, as well as their feeding preferences, determine the amount and composition of zooplanktons [14]. In a similar vein, Jafari et al. [15] investigated the relationship between the physicochemical conditions of the Haraz River and the variety and compositions of zooplankton. Due to their heterotrophic nature, zooplanktons connect primary producers to higher trophic levels and play a crucial role in the food web. Because there are less opportunities for an individual in a water body to remain in the

eutrophic zone, where photosynthesis takes place, the abundance of zooplankton is declining [16]. When assessing the temperature, pollution, and nutrient levels of an ecosystem, zooplanktons play a significant role [17]. Evaluating the zooplankton population in the Eanthakulam pond, Tirunelveli District is the aim of the present study.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The plankton sample used in this investigation was collected at Elanthakulam Pond during the winter months of August, September, and October of 2016 (Fig 1a-b). A 25µm-mesh plankton net was swept over surface water, and the plankton it caught was then placed in a different plastic container. To get plankton, around 1 litre of surface water was sieved via a net. Without delay, the zooplankton was preserved in 4% formalin for subsequent microscopic examinations. Post-Clegg [18], Edmondson [19] Hutchinson (1967), Michael [20], Ward and Whipple [21], Pennak [22], APHA [23], and Sridharan [24] planters were identified. Useful indices of species organisation in communities, as described by Odum [25], were also computed when planters were identified.

3. RESULTS

Tables 1 to 5 show the zooplankton that was seen in the Elanthakulam. The tables display that the zooplankton present in the pond belonged to four distinct groups: *Ostracoda, Cladacera, Rotifera*, and *Copepoda*. During the study period, a total of 10 species were reported in the Elanthakulam pond. Four rotifer species in total were identified: *Keretella cochlearis, Brachionus rubens, Brachionus caudatus*, and *Brachionus calyciflorus*. Table 1 lists the different zooplankters that constituted the *Rotifera* group. The table makes it clear that a total of 4 species from 4 genera were found. Of them, three species belong to the genus *Brachionus*, whereas just one species represents genera like *Keretella*. For *Brachionus calyciflorus* and *B.rubens*, the best counts were recorded in February; for *B. caudatus*, the best counts were recorded in January; and for *Keratella*, the best counts were recorded in February.



Fig. 1. Study protocol

Table 2 lists the different zooplankters that represented the *Cladoceran* and *Anostracan* groups. The table makes it clear that a total of 3 species from 2 genera were found. Of these, two species belong to the genus *Moina,* while one species represents genera such as *Daphnia*. *Moina micrura* chose to record her maximum counts in January, while *Daphnia pules* and *Moina brachiata* preferred to record their best counts in February. Table 3 lists the different zooplankton that constitute the copepod group. The table makes it clear that a total of 2 species from 2 genera were found. Of them, one species represented the genus *Diaptamous*, while another species represented genera such as *Mesocyclops hyalinus*. *Mesocyclops hyalinus* favoured January to record their highest counts, while *Diaptamus castor* preferred February. Table 4 showed the zooplankters that constituted the *Ostracod* group. A total of solitary species from solitary genera were noted. One species from the genus *Cypris* was present among them. The best counts of *Cypris Ostracodan* were recorded in January, and there were less of them available during this season.



Fig. 2. Rotifer

Table 1. Rotifer population of elanthakulam pond

S.No	Rotifer	August	September	October
1	*Brachionus calyciflorus*	0	10±2	15±2
2	*Brachionus caudatus*	3±2.3	11.6±3.5	8.3±3.5
3	*Brachionus rubens*	0	4.3±0.5	3±2.5
4	*Keretella cochlearis*	6±2	2.6±1.1	9.6±2

Table 2. Cladoceran and anostracan population of elanthakulam pond

S.No	Cladoceran and Anostracan	August	September	October
1	*Daphnia pulex*	0.5±1.6	5±1.7	9.3±3
2	*Moina brachiata*	8.3±4.7	1±1	10±2
3	*Moina micrura*	2.6±1.1	10.6±5	6±1.7

Table 3. Copepod population of elanthakulam pond

S.No	Copepod	August	September	October
1	*Diaptomus castor*	9.3±3	4±1	12.6±7
2	*Mesocyclops hyalinus*	3.3±1.1	13.3±5.7	8±2

Table 4. Ostracodan population of elanthakulam pond

S.No	Ostracodan	August	September	October
1	*Cypris Ostracodon*	0	2.6±1.5	1.3±0.5

Table 5. Zooplankton Total count of elanthakulam pond

S.No	Zooplankton	August	September	October
1	Rotifera	14	38	56
2	Copepoda	19	26	31
3	Cladocera	19	25	38
4	Ostracoda	0	4	2
	Total	**52**	**93**	**127**



Fig.3. Cladoceran and anostracan

Fig. 4. Ostracoda



a.Cyclops hyalinus *b. Diaptamus castor*

Fig.5. Copepod



Fig. 6. Abundance of different groups of zooplankton during August,September and October in the surface water of Elanthakulam pond

4. DISCUSSION

While being present all year round, rotifers preferred the months of August through October for recording their counts, according to an overall comparison of the population. A detailed examination indicates that, out of this time frame, December to February seems to be the most preferred month because during these months, four of the species that were noted reached their peak counts. According to research, one of the most prevalent rotifer genera found in most India's water bodies is *Brachionus* [26-29]. Therefore, it makes sense that *Brachionus* was the most prevalent genera in this pond during the current investigation as well. It has also been found via numerous researchers' studies that rotifers seem to favor months of the year over others in distinct bodies of water. When it came to their preferences, Michael [30], Chourasia and Adoni [31], Singh et al. [28], Tidame and Shinde [32], Kastooribai [33], and Sivakami (1996) stated that they liked June through August, Jayanthi [34], and Rajasekhar et al. [27] stated that they preferred September and October. The present observation is consistent with these reports. It has been suggested by Tidame and Shinde [32] that rotifers are used as an important aquatic faunal component for biomonitoring, while Bogdan and Gilbert [35] claim that rotifers are the dominant members of the zooplankton in most aquatic systems and that almost all fish feed on tiny rotifers during their early development. Sharma [36] also notes that of the different rotifers that have been identified so far, rotifers belonging to the genus *Brachionus* are more suitable for feeding fish larvae. The most significant soft-bodied metazoans, or

invertebrates, with a brief life cycle among plankton are called rotifers. Table 4 displays the different zooplankters that represented the *Anostracan* and *Cladoceran* groups. A single species represented the genus *Cypris.* The best counts of *Cypris ostracodan* were recorded in January, and there were less of them available during this season. Numerous studies indicate that Chourasia and Adoni [31] said they liked October and April, Khan et al. [37] said they liked summer, and Haque and Khan [38-41] said they liked December, May, and August. According to Rajasekhar et al. [27], they both liked the winter and the rainy season [32]. A vital class of zooplankton, *Cladocerans* are the most beneficial and nutrient-dense group of crustaceans for fish further up the food chain. Cladocera constituted the major group within the Zooplankton. *Daphnia sp., Moina sp., Ceriodaphnia sp.,* and *Bosmina sp.* are the representatives of this group. According to Murugan (1998), this group consumes tiny zooplankton, bacterioplankton, and algae. They are also quite sensitive to pollutants; in fact, they might react even when the concentration of the contaminants is very low [42-44]. Numerous researchers have examined the physicochemical characteristics, biotic components, and seasonal variations in zooplankton population density, composition, and abundance in freshwater bodies [45-47].

4. CONCLUSION

Based on the present studies, zooplankton did not reach its peak during the monsoon season because of adverse climatic conditions. Furthermore, it shows a slight decline in August and September and an increase in October.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors would like to express their gratitude to their advisor, Dr. Haniffa, for his steadfast support, perseverance, ambition, and depth of knowledge. They also thank the Principals of Aditanar College of Arts and Science in Tiruchendur and Arulmigu Pannirupidi Ayyan College of Arts and Science in Tirunelveli for their encouragement and support.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Ali SS. Fresh water Fisheries Biology, 1st Ed. Naseem Book Depot, Hyderabad; 1999.
2. Krishnamoorthy K, Subramanian P. Organisation of commercially supporting metroplankton in Palk Bay and Gulf of Mannar biosphere reserve areas, Southeast of India. Indian Journal of Marine Sciences. 1999;28:211-215.
3. Shah JA, Pandit AK. Relation between physico–chemical limnology and crustacean community in Wular Lake of Kashmir Himalaya. Pakistan Journal of Biological Sciences. 2013;16(19):976-983.
4. Manickam N, Saravana Bhavan P, Santhanam P, Muralisankar T, Srinivasan V, Radhakrishnan S, Vijayadevan K, Chitrarasu P, Jawahar Ali A. Seasonal Variations of Zooplankton Diversity in a Perennial Reservoir at Thoppaiyar, Dharmapuri District, South India. Austin Journal of Aquaculture and Marine Biology. 2014;1(1):1-7.
5. Madin LP, Horgan EF, Steinberg DK. Zooplankton at the Bermuda Atlantic Time-series Study (BATS) station: diel, seasonal and interannual variation in biomass, 1994-1998. Deep Sea Research. 2001;48:2063-2082.
6. Stottrup JG. The elusive copepods: Their production and suitability in marine aquaculture. Aquaculture Research. 2000;31:703-711.
7. Tiwari LR, Nair VR. Contribution of zooplankton to the fishery of Dharamtar creek, adjoining Bombay harbour. Journal of the Indian Fisheries Association. 1991;21:15-19.
8. Acharjee B, Dutta A, Chaudhury M, Pathak B. Phytoplankton species diversity indices in dighali beel, Assam. India Environmental Ecology. 1995;13(3):660-662.
9. Thakur R, Jindal U, Singh UB, Ahuwalia AS. Plankton diversity and water quality assessment of three freshwater lakes of Mandi (Himachal Pradesh, India) with special reference to planktonic indicators. Environmental Monitoring and Assessment. 2013;185:8355-8373.
10. Malik N, Biswas AK, Raju CB. Plankton as an Indicator of Heavy Metal Pollution in a Freshwater Reservoir of Madhya Pradesh, India. Bulletin of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology.

2013;90:725-729.
11. Dhar J, Baghel RS, Sharma AK. Role of instant nutrient replenishment on plankton dynamics with diffusion in a closed system: A pattern formation. Applied Mathematics and Computation. 2012;218:8925-8936.
12. Hulyal SB, Kaliwal BB. Water quality assessment of Alamatti Reservoir of Bijapur (Karnataka State, India) with special reference to zooplankton. Environmental Monitoring and Assessment. 2008;139:299-306.
13. Kudari AV, Kanamadi RD. Impact of changed trophic status on the zooplankton composition in six water bodies of Dharwad district, Karnataka state (South India). Environmental Monitoring and Assessment. 2008;144:301-313.
14. Russell J, Shiel A, Justin F, Costelloe BT, Julian RW, Reid AC, Hudson AP, Powling J. Zooplankton diversity and assemblage in Aride zone river of lake Eyre Basin, Australia. Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research. 2006;57:49-60.
15. Jafari N, Nabavi S, Akhavan M. Ecological investigation of zooplankton abundance in the river Haraz, Northeast Iran: impact of environmental variables. Archives of Biological Sciences. 2011;63(3):785-798.
16. Dhembare AJ. Diversity and its indices in zooplankton with physicochemical properties of Mula Dam Water Ahmednagar, Maharashtra India. European Journal of Experimental Biology. 2011;1(4):98-103.
17. Purushothama R, Sayeswara HA, Goudar MA, Harishkumar K. Physicochemical profile and zooplankton community composition in Brahmana Kalasi Tank, Sagar, Karnataka, India. Ecoscan. 2011;5(3):99-103.
18. Clegg J. The Observers Book of Pond Life. Frederick Warne and Co. Ltd., London. 1956.
19. Edmondson WT. Freshwater Biology. 2nd ed. John Wiley and Sons Inc., New York. 1959.
20. Michael RG. A guide to the study of freshwater organisms. J. Madurai Kamaraj University, India (Suppl.). 1973.
21. Ward HB, Whipple GC. Fresh-Water Biology. John Wiley & Sons; New York. 1963.
22. Pennak RW. Freshwater invertebrates of the United States. 2nd ed. John Wiley and Sons, New York. 1978.
23. American Public Health Association (APHA). Standard methods for the examination of water and wastewater. American Public Health Association, Washington, USA. 1989.
24. Sridharan VT. Phytoplankton and algae studies. Techniques of plankton methodology. Prepared for Training workshop on Integrated Environmental Research programme on Kaveri River. 1989.
25. Odum EP. Fundamentals of ecology. W.B. Saunders Co., Philadelphia, London, Toronto; 1971.
26. Sreenivasan A. Limnological studies and primary production in temple lake ecosystem. Hydrobiologia. 1974;48:117-125.
27. Rajasekhar M, Vijayakumar K, Paerveen Z. Seasonal variations in Zooplankton Community in Freshwater reservoir, Gulbarga District, Karnataka, South India. International Journal of Systems Biology. 2010;2:6-11.
28. Singh RK, Pandey MK, Kumari R, Ranjam P. Study on the diversity and seasonal variation of zooplankton in Mahendra Nath Pond, Siwan, Bihar. International Journal of Pharmaceutical and Biological Archives. 2012;3:867-890.
29. Srivastava SK. Monthly variations in the occurrence of zooplankton in a freshwater body, Ramgarh Lake, Gorakhpur, UP. International Journal of Applied Biosciences. 2013;1:23-27.
30. Michael RG. Seasonal trends in Physico-chemical factors and plankton of a freshwater fish lake and their role in fish culture. Hydrobiologia. 1969;33:144-161.
31. Chourasia SK, Adoni AD. Zooplankton dynamics of a shallow eutrophic lake. Bulletin of the Botanical Society of Sugar. 1985;32:30-39.
32. Tidame SK, Shinde SS. Studies on seasonal variations in physico-chemical parameters of the temple pond, Nashik District (MS), India. International Multidisciplinary Research Journal. 2012;2:29-32.
33. Kastooribai RS. A comparative study of two tropical lentic systems in the context of aquaculture. Ph.D. Thesis, University of Madras, India. 1991.
34. Jayanthi M. A comprehensive study of three contrasting lentic systems in the context of aquaculture. Ph.D. Thesis,

Bharathidasan University, Tiruchirappalli, India. 1994.
35. Bogdan KG, Gilbert JJ. Body size and food size in freshwater zooplankton. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America. 1984;81:6427-6431.
36. Sharma SSS. Rotifers and aquaculture. Environmental Ecology. 1991;9:414-428.
37. Khan AA, Ali M, Haque N. Population ecology of zooplankton in a polluted lake at Aligarh. Proceedings of the National Symposium on Environmental Biology of Coastal Ecosystem. 1986;475.
38. Haque N, Khan AA. Temporal and spatial distribution of cladoceran population in a freshwater lake at Aligarh. Journal of Freshwater Biology. 1997;6:225-229.
39. Thirupathaiah M, Sammatha CH, Sammaiah CH. Diversity of zooplankton in freshwater lake of Kamalapur, Karimnagar District (A.P) India. Ecoscan. 2011;5(1-2):85-87.
40. Patel V, Shukla SN, Patel VK. Studies on the diversity of zooplankton and their seasonal variation in Govindgarh lake at Rewa (M.P), India. Indian Journal of Applied Research. 2013;3(11):544-546.
41. Chakrapani BK, Krishna MB, Srinivasa TS. A Report on the water quality, plankton and bird populations of the lakes in and around Bangalore and Maddur, Karnataka, India. Department of Ecology and Environment, Government of Karnataka. 1996.
42. Dhanapathi MVSSS. Taxonomic notes on rotifers from India. IAAB Publications, Hyderabad. 2000.
43. Goldman CR, Horne AJ. Limnology. McGraw-Hill International Book Co., New Delhi. 1983.
44. Karuthapandi M, Rao DV, Xavier Innocent B, Deepa J. Zooplankton diversity and trophic status of Safilguda tank, Hyderabad. International Journal of Advanced Life Sciences. 2013;6(1):44-50.
45. Karuthapandi M, Rao DV, Xavier Innocent B. Zooplankton composition and diversity of Umdasager, Hyderabad. International Journal of Life Sciences Education Research. 2013;1(1):21-26.
46. Maruthanayagam C, Sasikumar M, Senthilkumar C. Studies on zooplankton population in Thirukkulam pond during summer and rainy seasons. Nature Environment and Pollution Technology. 2003;2:13-19.
47. Sukumaran PK, Das AK. Plankton abundance in relation to physicochemical features in a peninsular man-made lake. Environmental Ecology. 2002;20:873-879.

Peer-review history:
The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:
https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/115547