

## Population Dynamics Of Helminth Parasite *Procamallanus Sp.* In Freshwater Fish *Mastacembelus Armatus* From Latur District (Ms) India

A.V. Pathan \* and M.N Kolpuke \*\*

\*Department of Zoology, Azad college, Ausa- 413520, Maharashtra, India.

\*\*Department of Zoology, Maharashtra Mahavidyalaya, Nilanga -413521, Maharashtra, India.

### Abstract

The present study deals with the Population dynamics of helminth Parasite *Procamallanus sp.* in freshwater fish *Mastacembelus armatus* from Latur District (MS) India. The survey was conducted during, annual cycles 2011 to 2013 from different sampling station to estimate the Population dynamics. For this study 368 freshwater fish *Mastacembelus armatus* selected. Fish samples were collected from different localities of Latur District, Maharashtra State, namely Ausa, Nilanga, Ahemadpur, Deoni, Jalkot, Renapur, Latur, Shirur-Anantpal, Chakur and Udgir.

The population dynamics shows the prevalence, mean intensity, abundance and dominance of the collected cestode *Procamallanus sp.*

**Keywords:** Population dynamics, Freshwater fish, *Mastacembelus armatus*, *Circumoncobothrium sp.*

### Introduction

India is the mega biodiversity country in the world. Fish are the most important inhabitants of the aquatic ecosystem mainly marine and fresh water and provides the human population cheap and easily digestible proteins. In India it is estimated that about 10 million tons of fishes are required to meet the annual demand of fish proteins as compared to an actual annual production of only 3.5 million tons (Shukla and Upadhyay, 1998). The major component of fish is protein. Fish proteins have a high biological value. It also contains variable quantities of calcium, phosphate, fat and other nutrient important for human health and growth. Fish provides the world's prime source of high quality protein, 14-16% of the animal protein consumed worldwide; over one billion people consume fish as their primary source of animal protein.

Recent studies indicate that of 750 species of freshwater fish species found in India, a large number of them are familiar only to the local population. Intestinal parasitic helminths have a serious impact on fish health, productivity, quality and quantity of meat. Fish parasitic populations are known to differ due to variation in the environment and host population (Dogial, 1961). Helminth

parasites of fishes are commonly divided into three main groups; cestodes, nematodes and trematodes. Kennedy, (1975) stated that population investigation can provide data for the prediction of integrated methods to achieve the regulation of numbers of harmful parasites, because it has been stated that a single method of control have little value, where as co-ordinated activities ameliorate the infection.

### Material And Method

#### Examination of fish for collection of parasites:

Examination of intestinal parasites was carried out by using the method described by Hassan *et al.*, (2010). After the separating and counting the population of different helminth parasites from different freshwater fishes the parasites were preserved in separate bottles. Some of these were used for the taxonomic study.

#### Statistical analysis employed for the population dynamics studies of helminth Parasites:

The definitions and formulae of prevalence, mean intensity and relative density given by Margolis *et al.*, (1982) and Index of infection given by Tenoza and Zejda (1974)

### RESULT AND DISCUSSION

#### Infection of *procamallanus sp.* in *Mastacembelus armatus* during 2011-12

Average month wise variations in the Prevalence, Mean Intensity and Relative Density of *Procamallanus sp.* in *Mastacembelus armatus* were as follows:

During observation of population dynamics of *Procamallanus sp.* a total 182 fishes of *Mastacembelus armatus*, out of which 90 males and 92 females were examined. Among them 21 males and 21 females found infected, resulting in maximum 57.14 % prevalence of infection in males and 42.86 % prevalence of infection in females for year 2011-12 (Table 1 and Graph 1).

**Incidence of Infection:**

The maximum prevalence (57.14) in male was recorded in the months of March. Whereas minimum (0) in June, July and September in rest of months between (12.50) to (42.86). The maximum prevalence (42.86) in female was recorded in the months of, April. Whereas minimum (0) in June, in rest of months between (12.50) to (37.50). (Table 1 and Graph 1).

**Intensity of infection**

The maximum mean intensity (6.00) in male was recorded in the months of October. Whereas minimum (0) in June, July, August and September, in rest of months between (2.75) to (4.50). The maximum mean intensity (8.0) in female was recorded in the months of November. Whereas minimum (0) in June, July. In rest of months between (1.00) to (6.00). (Table 1 and Graph 1).

**Density of infection**

The maximum relative density (1.57) in male was recorded in the months of March and May respectively. Whereas minimum (0) in June, July and September, in rest of months between (0.29) to (1.38) (Table 1 and Graph 1). The maximum relative density (1.57) in female was recorded in the months of April. Whereas minimum (0) in June, in rest of months between (0.25) to (1.29) (Table 1 and Graph 1).

**Table-1:** Monthly and gender wise prevalence, mean intensity and relative density of helminth parasites (February 2011 to January 2012)

**Host: *Mastacembelus armatus***


**Genus: *Procamallanus sp***

Month and Year	No. of fish Examined		No. of fish Infected		No. of Parasites collected		Prevalence		Mean Intensity		Relative Density		Locality
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	
Feb. 11	7	8	3	2	9	7	42.8	25	3	3.50	1.29	0.88	Ausa
Mar. 11	7	8	4	3	11	10	57.1	37.5	2.7	3.33	1.57	1.25	Nilanga
Apr. 11	8	7	3	3	11	11	37.5	42.8	3.6	3.67	1.38	1.57	Udgir
May. 11	7	8	3	2	11	12	42.8	25.0	3.6	6.00	1.57	1.50	Deoni
Jun. 11	8	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	Jalkot
Jul. 11	7	8	0	2	0	2	0	25	0	0.00	0.00	0.25	Renapur
Aug. 11	7	8	1	1	2	2	14.2	12.5	0	2.00	0.29	0.25	Latur
Sep. 11	8	7	0	2	0	2	0	28.5	0	1.00	0.00	0.29	Deoni
Oct. 11	8	8	1	2	6	7	12.5	25	6	3.50	0.75	0.88	Chakur
Nov. 11	8	7	2	1	9	8	25	14.2	4.5	8.00	1.13	1.14	Udgir
Dec. 11	7	8	2	1	7	6	28.5	12.5	3.5	6.00	1.00	0.75	Ausa
Jan. 12	8	7	2	2	9	9	25	28.5	4.5	4.50	1.13	1.29	Latur
<b>Total</b>	90	92	21	21	75	76	285.7	276.7	31.5	41.5	10.09	10.04	

**Table 2: Monthly and gender wise prevalence, mean intensity and relative density of helminth parasites (February 2012 to January 2013)**

**Host: *Mastacembelus armatus*  
Genus: *Procamallanus sp.***

Month and Year	No. of fish Examined		No. of fish Infected		No. of Parasites collected		Prevalence		Mean Intensity		Relative Density		Locality
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	
Feb. 12	8	8	4	3	17	15	50.0	37.5	4.2	5.00	2.13	1.88	Ausa
Mar. 12	7	8	3	2	19	17	42.8	25.0	6.3	8.50	2.71	2.13	Nilanga
Apr. 12	8	8	3	2	18	17	37.5	25.0	6	8.50	2.25	2.13	Ausa
May. 12	8	8	3	2	16	15	37.5	25.0	5.3	7.50	2.00	1.88	Deoni
Jun. 12	8	8	1	1	3	3	12.5	12.5	3	3.00	0.38	0.38	Jalkot
Jul. 12	7	8	1	1	4	4	14.2	12.5	0	4.00	0.57	0.50	Renapur
Aug. 12	7	8	1	1	8	6	14.2	12.5	0	6.00	1.14	0.75	Latur
Sep. 12	8	7	1	1	7	8	12.5	14.2	0	8.00	0.88	1.14	Udgir
Oct. 12	8	8	2	1	8	10	25.0	12.5	4.0	10.0	1.00	1.25	Chakur
Nov. 12	8	7	2	1	8	13	25.0	14.2	4.0	13.0	1.00	1.86	Udgir
Dec. 12	7	8	1	1	15	12	14.2	12.5	15	12.0	2.14	1.50	Ausa
Jan.13	8	8	2	1	12	11	25.0	12.5	6	11.0	1.50	1.38	Latur
Total	92	94	24	17	135	131	310.7	216	53.9	96.5	17.7	16.7	



**Graph 1:** Showing monthly fluctuation of *Procamallanus sp.* in the population of *Mastacembelus* (February 2011 to January 2012)

**Infection of *Procamallanus sp.* in *Mastacembelus armatus* during 2012-13**

Average month wise variations in the Prevalence, Mean Intensity and Relative Density of *Procamallanus sp.* in *Mastacembelus armatus* were as follows:

During observation of population dynamics of *Procamallanus sp.*, a total 186 fishes of *Mastacembelus armatus*, out of which 92 males and 94 females were examined. Among them 24 males and 27 females found infected, resulting in 50 % prevalence of infection in males and 37.50

prevalence of infection in females for year 2012-13 (Table 2, Graph 2).

**Incidence of Infection:**

The maximum prevalence (50) in male was recorded in the months of February. Whereas minimum (12.50) in July and September. In rest of months between (14.29) to (42.86). The maximum prevalence (37.50) in female was recorded in the months of, February. Whereas minimum (12.50) in June, July, August, October, and December. In rest of months between (14.29) to (25.00) (Table 2, Graph 2).


**Intensity of infection**

The maximum mean intensity (15.00) in male was recorded in the months of December. Whereas minimum (0) in July, August and September. In rest of months between (3.00) to (6.33); (. The maximum mean intensity (13.0) in female was recorded in the months of November. Whereas minimum (3.00) in June. In rest of months between (4.00) to (12.00). (Table 2, Graph 2).

**Density of infection**

The maximum relative density (2.71 and 2.25) in male was recorded in the months of March and April respectively. Whereas minimum (0.38 and 0.57) in June and July respectively. In rest of

months between (0.88) to (2.13). The maximum relative density (2.13) in female was recorded in the months of March and April. Whereas minimum (0.38) in June. In rest of months between (0.50) to (1.88). (Table 2, Graph 2).



**Graph 2.** Monthly fluctuation of *Procamallanus* sp. in the population of *Mastacembelus armatus* (February 2012 to January 2013).

### Discussion

During the course of taxonomical investigations on helminth parasites of economically important fish hosts available throughout the year were periodically observed made to evaluate population dynamics of these fish helminth parasites. A complete record of the basic data comprising the number of host specimens examined, number of host specimens infected and the number of parasites found was maintained for two annual cycles and is included in this work from February 2011 to January 2013.

The parasite prevalence, intensity and density depend on many factors like parasite and its life cycle, host and its feeding habits and the physical factors of water body where the fish inhabit. It also depends upon the presence of intermediate host such as piscivorous birds for the spread of cestodes infection (Zaidi and Khan, 1976).

Feeding activity of the host also is one of the reasons for the seasonal fluctuations of infections; the fishes were infected with large number of parasites in late winter to end of summer months, because the environmental conditions are favourable in such months. The waters are warm at

that time the zooplankton fauna may be rich, this probably corresponds to the peak in the feeding activity of the fish together with the richness in the intermediate host fauna may be the crustaceans, smaller mollusks and fish resulting in high infections. The variation in prevalence and intensity may be due to host migration, change of feeding habits, availability of infective stages of parasites, and intermediate hosts (Bashirullah and Hafizuddin, 2007).

During present study more prevalence is found during summer season followed by winter and low in rainy season. Jadhav and Shinde (1976) explained the development of parasites should be needed high temperature, low rainfall and sufficient moisture. Hence, the high prevalence occurs in summer followed by other season.

### Conclusion

The two year survey (2011 to 2013) has shown that fresh water fishes from the Latur district shows wide range of freshwater fishes. After the analysis of data the present study can be concluded that the high infection of helminth parasites (incidence, intensity, density and index of infection) were occurred in summer seasons followed by winter and low in monsoon season. This type of results indicated that environmental factors and feeding habitant are influencing the seasonally of parasitic infection either directly or indirectly. Observing the prevalence of *Procamallanus* sp. in the target host fish (*Mastacembelus armatus*) in this study, shows that the intermediate in this case, copepods, are present in the habitat. This is due to the abundant vegetation which gives rise to a more extensive habitat for the copepods therefore; fish are more exposed to greater concentrations of *Procamallanus* sp.

The helminth fauna of fish may depend on various environmental factors such as geographical location of the habitat, season of the year, physico-chemical characters of the water. The infection of helminth parasites may also be related to the availability of their intermediate host, life cycles of the parasites and feeding habits of the fish host. Individual parasite species may have widely differing effects on different host species.

It is indeed important to acquire knowledge on different fish pathogens, their biology and life cycle in order to recognize fish diseases and for their control. The results obtained from current research will give preliminary knowledge of population dynamics of parasitic fauna of fishes from Latur District, Maharashtra, India which was till date less explored. At the same time it will help the scientific community and also pisci-culturists to know about the parasite species found to be infected in different fish hosts.

### Acknowledgments

The author thankful to Head, Dept of Zoology, D.B.F. Dayanand College of Arts and Science, Solapur (M.S) India for providing laboratory advances and library Facilities.

### References

1. **Bashirullah, A.K. and Hafizuddin, A.K.M. (2007).** Seasonal distribution and population structure of *P. fusiformis* (Digenea: Bucephalidae) in *E. vacha* in Kapti lake, Bangladesh. *Saber, Universidad de Oriente, Venezuela*, 19 (2):137:14
2. **Dogial, V.A. (1961).** Ecology of the parasites of freshwater fishes. In: *Parasitology of fishes* (Eds. Dogial, V.A., Petrushevski, G.K. and Polyanski, Yu.I.) pp.1-47. Oliver and Byod, London.
3. **Hassan, A.A, Akinsanya, B and Adegaju, W.A. (2010).** Impacts Of Helminth Parasites on *Clarias gariepinus* And *Synodontis clarias* From Lekki Lagoon, Lagos, Nigeria. Report and Opinion, 2010; 2 (11)
4. **Jadhav, B.V. and Shinde, G.B. (1976).** New species of genus *Circumoncobothrium* Shinde, 1968 (Cestoda: *Pseudophyllidea carus*, 1863) from afreshwater fish Aurangabad, India. *J. Indian Bio. Asso.* 2: 163-166.
5. **Kennedy, C. R. (1975).** Dispersion of parasites within a Host-Parasite System in: *Ecological animal parasitology*, Kennedy, C.R. (Ed.). Blackwell Scientific Publication, Oxford London.
6. **Margolis, L., Esch, G. W., Holmes, J. C., Kuris, A. M. and Schad, G. A. (1982).** The use of ecological terms in parasitology (Report of and adhoc committee of the American Society of Parasitologists). *J. Parasitol.* 68:131-133.
7. **Shukla, G.S. and Upadhyay, V.B. (1998).** A textbook of economic zoology. Rastogi Publications, India. 205 p.
8. **Tenoza, F. Zejda, J. (1974).** The helminth synyster of *Clethrionomys glareolus* in a low land forest and its change. *Acta. Sci. Nat. Brno.* 8 (6):1-48.

ISSN 2349-638X

www.aiirjournal.com