STM JOURNALS

International Journal of
Marine Life

Volume 1, Issue 2, 2024
July—December
DOI (Journal): 10.37591/IJML

https://journals.stmjournals.com/ijml/

Review IJML

Planktonic Organisms as Bio-indicators of Pollution in Aquatic Environments

K.U. Sheethal[1,*], T.S. Annappaswamy[2], M.T. Lakshmipathi[3], Khalasi Binal Rajeshbhai[4], Aitwar Vaijnath Sambayya[5]

Abstract

Planktonic organisms play a pivotal role in aquatic ecosystems, serving as vital bio indicators of pollution levels. This review offers a thorough exploration of their significance in assessing environmental health in aquatic environments. We delve into the diverse array of planktonic taxa, encompassing phytoplankton, zooplankton, and bacterioplankton, and examine their responses to various pollutants such as nutrient enrichment, chemical contaminants, and micro plastics. These organisms exhibit remarkable sensitivity to environmental changes, underscoring their utility in monitoring pollution impacts. By adopting interdisciplinary perspectives, we evaluate the efficacy of planktonic bio indicators in gauging ecosystem health and guiding management strategies. Understanding their reactions to pollutants not only enhances our ability to detect and quantify pollution levels but also provides insights into the broader ecological repercussions on planktonic communities and aquatic ecosystems at large. The review discusses methodological approaches for plankton sampling, data analysis, and interpretation in pollution assessment programs, emphasizing the critical need for standardized protocols and advanced analytical techniques. By synthesizing existing knowledge and pinpointing research gaps, this review aims to deepen our comprehension of how pollution affects planktonic communities. Integration of planktonic bioindicators into holistic approaches for aquatic ecosystem management and conservation is imperative for sustainable environmental stewardship. Future research directions should prioritize refining monitoring techniques, addressing emerging pollutants, assessing the cumulative impacts of multiple stressors on planktonic organisms, and fostering international collaboration to establish global standards for effective environmental monitoring and management strategies. This synthesis underscores the pivotal role of planktonic organisms in bolstering our capacity to safeguard and manage aquatic resources effectively amidst ongoing environmental challenges.

***Author for Correspondence**
K.U. Sheethal
E-mail: sheethal.ku9964@gmail.com

[1,2]Assistant Professor, Department of Aquatic Environment Management, Karnataka Veterinary, Animal and Fisheries Sciences University, College of Fisheries, Mangaluru, Karnataka, India
[3]Professor, Department of Aquatic Environment Management, Karnataka Veterinary, Animal and Fisheries Sciences University, College of Fisheries, Mangaluru, Karnataka, India
[4,5]Student, Department of Aquatic Environment Management, Karnataka Veterinary, Animal and Fisheries Sciences University, College of Fisheries, Mangaluru, Karnataka, India

Received Date: June 03, 2024
Accepted Date: July 10, 2024
Published Date: July 11, 2024

Citation: K.U. Sheethal, T.S. Annappaswamy, M.T. Lakshmipathi, Khalasi Binal Rajeshbhai, Aitwar Vaijnath Sambayya. Planktonic Organisms as Bio-indicators of Pollution in Aquatic Environments. International Journal of Marine Life. 2024; 1(2): 21–26p.

Keywords: Ecosystem, pollution, pesticides, mercury, methyl mercury

INTRODUCTION

Plankton, comprising a diverse array of microscopic organisms, play a vital role in the functioning of aquatic ecosystems worldwide. From the vast expanses of the open ocean to the intricate networks of freshwater lakes and rivers, plankton serve as the foundation of aquatic food webs, fueling productivity and supporting the myriad life forms that depend on them. Planktonic organisms represent a diverse assemblage of microscopic organisms that inhabit aquatic environments, including both marine and freshwater systems. This diverse group encompasses three main categories:

phytoplankton, zooplankton, and bacterioplankton. Phytoplankton, consisting of microscopic algae and photosynthetic bacteria, serve as primary producers, harnessing solar energy to convert inorganic nutrients into organic matter through photosynthesis [12]. Zooplankton, comprising small animals and protozoans, graze on phytoplankton and serve as important links in aquatic food chains, transferring energy from primary producers to higher trophic levels. Bacterioplankton, consisting of diverse bacterial and archaeal taxa, play crucial roles in nutrient cycling, organic matter decomposition, and biogeochemical transformations in aquatic ecosystems [14].

Planktonic organisms are highly sensitive to changes in their environment, making them valuable indicators of water quality and ecosystem health. Due to their short generation times and rapid responses to environmental stressors, plankton can serve as early warning indicators of pollution and ecosystem degradation [9]. Various pollutants, including excess nutrients, chemical contaminants, and microplastics, can exert detrimental effects on planktonic communities, disrupting their composition, abundance, and ecological functions (Jansson *et al*., 2010).

We will evaluate the utility of planktonic bioindicators for assessing pollution levels, evaluating ecosystem health, and informing management strategies. Additionally, we will discuss methodological approaches for plankton sampling, data analysis, and interpretation in pollution assessment programs. Finally, we will identify research gaps and future directions for advancing our understanding of the ecological consequences of pollution on planktonic communities and promoting the integration of planktonic bio-indicators into holistic approaches for aquatic ecosystem management and conservation.

PLANKTONIC RESPONSES TO NUTRIENT POLLUTION

Eutrophication Dynamics and Phytoplankton Blooms

Eutrophication, a phenomenon characterized by excessive nutrient inputs, particularly nitrogen and phosphorus, can lead to the proliferation of phytoplankton blooms in aquatic ecosystems. The increased availability of nutrients fuels the growth and reproduction of phytoplankton, leading to rapid increases in their abundance and biomass. These blooms can have significant ecological consequences, including reduced water clarity, oxygen depletion, and alterations in ecosystem structure and function [6].

Phytoplankton blooms are often dominated by certain species, such as diatoms, dinoflagellates, or cyanobacteria, depending on environmental conditions and nutrient availability. Some species of phytoplankton, particularly cyanobacteria, have the ability to fix atmospheric nitrogen, further exacerbating nutrient enrichment in eutrophic waters. Additionally, the rapid growth and senescence of phytoplankton blooms can lead to fluctuations in nutrient concentrations, with potential implications for ecosystem dynamics and biogeochemical cycling [11].

Management strategies for mitigating eutrophication and phytoplankton blooms often focus on reducing nutrient inputs from anthropogenic sources, such as agricultural runoff, wastewater discharges, and urban storm water runoff. These strategies may include nutrient management practices, such as buffer strips, cover crops, and nutrient management plans, as well as the implementation of wastewater treatment technologies and stormwater management measures [1].

Zooplankton Grazing and Trophic Interactions

Zooplanktons play a crucial role in regulating phytoplankton populations through grazing and trophic interactions in aquatic ecosystems. Grazing by zooplankton can exert top-down control on phytoplankton abundance and biomass, thereby influencing the dynamics of phytoplankton blooms and eutrophication processes. Zooplankton feeding preferences, grazing rates, and population dynamics are influenced by various factors, including phytoplankton species composition, nutrient availability, temperature, and predation pressure [4].

Certain species of zooplankton, such as copepods, cladocerans, and rotifers, are voracious grazers of phytoplankton, effectively consuming large quantities of algae and regulating their population growth. However, the effectiveness of zooplankton grazing as a mechanism for controlling phytoplankton blooms can be influenced by factors such as zooplankton abundance, size-selective feeding behavior, and the presence of alternative food sources [7]. Understanding zooplankton grazing dynamics and trophic interactions is essential for predicting and managing phytoplankton blooms and eutrophication in aquatic ecosystems. Integrated approaches that consider both top-down (predation) and bottom-up (nutrient availability) controls on phytoplankton dynamics are necessary for developing effective management strategies for mitigating eutrophication and maintaining ecosystem health.

Bacterioplankton Community Shifts and Biogeochemical Cycling

Bacterioplankton, comprising diverse assemblages of bacteria and archaea, play critical roles in biogeochemical cycling and nutrient transformations in aquatic ecosystems. In eutrophic environments, shifts in bacterioplankton community composition and metabolic activity can occur in response to changes in nutrient availability, phytoplankton biomass, and organic matter inputs. The decomposition of organic matter, including phytoplankton-derived detritus, by bacterioplankton drives key biogeochemical processes, such as carbon and nutrient cycling, in aquatic ecosystems [3]. Bacterioplankton are responsible for the remineralization of organic carbon and nutrients, releasing inorganic forms (e.g., CO_2, ammonia, phosphate) that are readily available for uptake by phytoplankton and other primary producers. Eutrophication-induced shifts in bacterioplankton community composition and activity can have cascading effects on ecosystem functioning and water quality. Changes in bacterial diversity, metabolic pathways, and functional traits may alter the efficiency of organic matter decomposition, nutrient cycling rates, and the production of greenhouse gases (e.g., CO2, methane) in eutrophic waters. Integrated approaches that consider the interactions between phytoplankton, zooplankton, and bacterioplankton are essential for developing holistic management strategies that address the complex drivers of eutrophication and promote ecosystem resilience and sustainability.

PLANKTONIC RESPONSES TO CHEMICAL CONTAMINANTS

Organic Pollutants: Pesticides, PCBs, and PAHs

Organic pollutants, including pesticides, polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), are ubiquitous contaminants in aquatic environments, originating from agricultural, industrial, and urban sources. These compounds can enter aquatic ecosystems through runoff, atmospheric deposition, and direct discharges, posing risks to planktonic organisms and ecosystem health [2].

Pesticides, such as herbicides, insecticides, and fungicides, are commonly used in agriculture to control pests and enhance crop yields. However, pesticide residues can contaminate surface waters and exert toxic effects on planktonic organisms, including phytoplankton, zooplankton, and bacterioplankton. Some pesticides may interfere with photosynthesis, respiration, and cellular metabolism in phytoplankton, leading to reduced growth rates and photosynthetic efficiency. Zooplankton may be directly exposed to pesticides through ingestion or dermal contact, resulting in mortality, reproductive impairment, and altered population dynamics.

PCBs and PAHs are persistent organic pollutants that can accumulate in aquatic ecosystems and biomagnify through food webs, posing long-term risks to planktonic organisms and higher trophic levels. These compounds are highly lipophilic and can bioaccumulate in plankton tissues, potentially reaching toxic concentrations in organisms at higher trophic levels. PCBs and PAHs have been associated with developmental abnormalities, reproductive impairments, and immune system dysfunction in planktonic organisms, with implications for ecosystem structure and function. Mitigating the impacts of organic pollutants on planktonic communities requires integrated approaches that address pollution prevention, remediation, and monitoring. Best management practices, such as reducing pesticide use, implementing buffer zones, and promoting sustainable agricultural practices, can help minimize contaminant inputs into aquatic ecosystems. Additionally, advanced treatment technologies, such as activated carbon filtration and phytoremediation, may be employed to remove organic pollutants from contaminated waters and sediments.

Heavy Metals: Mercury, Lead, and Cadmium

Heavy metals, including mercury (Hg), lead (Pb), and cadmium (Cd), are toxic contaminants that can accumulate in aquatic ecosystems and biomagnify through food chains, posing risks to planktonic organisms and human health. These metals are released into the environment through natural processes, such as weathering and volcanic activity, as well as anthropogenic activities, including mining, industrial emissions, and waste disposal.

Mercury is a particularly concerning heavy metal due to its neurotoxicity and ability to bioaccumulate in aquatic organisms. Methyl mercury, the organic form of mercury, can be produced by microbial methylation in sediments and water columns, leading to its accumulation in planktonic organisms, particularly at higher trophic levels. Methyl mercury exposure can impair neurological development, reproductive success, and immune function in planktonic organisms, with cascading effects on ecosystem structure and function. Lead and cadmium are also toxic metals that can adversely affect planktonic organisms in aquatic ecosystems. Lead can interfere with enzymatic processes, cellular function, and membrane integrity in planktonic organisms, leading to metabolic disruptions and physiological impairments. Cadmium is a known carcinogen and reproductive toxicant, with deleterious effects on growth, development, and survival in planktonic organisms.

Controlling the inputs of heavy metals into aquatic ecosystems requires source reduction, pollution prevention, and remediation measures. Efforts to mitigate mercury contamination may include regulating industrial emissions, implementing pollution control technologies, and reducing mercury use in consumer products. Similarly, lead and cadmium pollution can be addressed through pollution abatement strategies, such as phytoremediation, soil amendments, and contaminated site cleanup [10].

Plankton community composition and diversity metrics serve as valuable indicators of pollution impacts in aquatic ecosystems. Taxonomic diversity indices and species richness metrics quantify the richness and evenness of plankton species, reflecting changes in community structure and ecosystem health in response to pollution stressors. Functional diversity and trait- based approaches provide insights into the ecological roles and adaptive strategies of planktonic organisms, considering functional traits related to feeding strategies, reproductive modes, and tolerance to pollution [8]. Molecular techniques, including DNA sequencing, PCR, and metagenomics, offer powerful tools for assessing planktonic communities and their responses to pollution, enabling the identification of key taxa and functional genes involved in pollutant degradation, nutrient cycling, and ecosystem resilience. Integrating these approaches enhances our understanding of pollution impacts on plankton communities and informs management strategies for mitigating pollution effects and preserving aquatic ecosystem health.

Integrating Planktonic Bio-indicators into Pollution Monitoring Programs

Several case studies demonstrate the effectiveness of integrating planktonic bio-indicators into pollution monitoring programs. For instance, in the Baltic Sea, plankton community composition changes have been linked to nutrient pollution, guiding management strategies to mitigate eutrophication. Similarly, in freshwater ecosystems, phytoplankton responses to chemical contaminants have informed regulatory decisions to improve water quality. These case studies highlight the utility of planktonic bio-indicators for assessing pollution impacts and guiding management actions in diverse aquatic environments [13].

Despite their effectiveness, planktonic bio-indicators face several challenges and limitations in pollution monitoring programs. Taxonomic identification can be time-consuming and require specialized expertise, limiting the scalability and applicability of plankton-based assessments. Additionally, plankton communities exhibit natural variability, making it challenging to distinguish between natural fluctuations and pollution-induced changes. Furthermore, plankton responses to pollution can be influenced by multiple stressors, such as climate change and habitat alteration, complicating interpretation and management efforts [5].

Future research should focus on addressing key challenges and advancing the integration of planktonic bio-indicators into pollution monitoring programs. Developing rapid and cost- effective molecular techniques for plankton identification can enhance the scalability and efficiency of plankton-based assessments. Additionally, incorporating multi-stressor approaches into monitoring programs can improve our understanding of complex interactions between pollution and other environmental factors. Long-term monitoring efforts are needed to track trends in plankton communities and assess the effectiveness of management interventions over time. Furthermore, interdisciplinary collaborations between researchers, policymakers, and stakeholders are essential for integrating planktonic bio-indicators into holistic approaches for aquatic ecosystem management and conservation. By addressing these research priorities, we can enhance the effectiveness of plankton-based pollution assessments and promote sustainable management of aquatic environments.

CONCLUSION

Planktonic organisms serve as invaluable bio-indicators of pollution in aquatic ecosystems, reflecting changes in water quality and ecosystem health. Through this review, we have synthesized key findings and insights regarding the responses of planktonic communities to different types of pollution, including nutrient enrichment, chemical contaminants, and microplastics. The role of plankton diversity metrics, functional traits, and molecular techniques in assessing pollution impacts and guiding management strategies has been discussed. Plankton- based pollution assessments have significant implications for pollution management and conservation efforts, informing targeted actions to reduce pollutant inputs, restore ecosystem health, and promote sustainable management practices. Future research should focus on addressing key knowledge gaps and advancing methodologies for plankton-based pollution assessments, including long-term monitoring efforts, interdisciplinary collaborations, and investigations into the interactions between pollution stressors and other environmental factors. By prioritizing the protection and restoration of planktonic communities, we can preserve the biodiversity, productivity, and resilience of aquatic ecosystems for future generations.

REFERENCES

1. A.M. Edwards and J. Brendley, 1999. Zooplankton mortality and the dynamical behaviour of plankton population model, Bull. Math. Biol. 61:303.
2. Arrhenius, A., Gršnvall, F., Scholze, M., Backhaus, T., Blanck, H., 2004. Predictability of the mixture toxicity of 12 similarly acting congener inhibitors of photosystem II in marine periphyton and epipsammon communities. Aquat. Toxicol. 68, 351–367.
3. Church, M.J, Hutchins, D.A and Ducklow, H.W, 2000. Limitation of bacterial growth by dissolved organic matter and iron in the Southern Ocean. Appl Environ Microbiol. 66:455–466.
4. Dhooge, A., Govaerts, W. and Kuznetsov, Y.A., 2003. MATCONT: a MATLAB package for numerical bifurcation analysis of ODEs. ACM Transactions on Mathematical Software 29, 141–164.
5. Holt E.A. and Miller S.W. 2010. Bio-indicators: using organisms to measure environmental impacts. Nature. 3(10):8–13.
6. Karl E. Havens. 2003. Phosphorusalgal bloom relationships in large lakes of South Florida: implications for establishing nutrient Criteria, Lake Reservoir Manage. 19 (3), 222–228.
7. Ramchandra T.V., Rishiram R and Karthik B. 2006. Zooplanktons as bioindicators: hydro biological investigation in selected Bangalore lakes. Technical report 115.
8. Rodgher, S., Espindola, E. L., Simões, F. C., and Tonietto, A. E, 2012. Cadmium and Chromium

Toxicity to Pseudokirchneriella subcapitata and Microcystis aeruginosa. Brazilian Archieves of Biology and Technology 55(1): 161-169.
9. Salmaso N., 2005. Effects of climatic fluctuations and vertical mixing on the interannual trophic variability of Lake Garda, Italy. Limnology and Oceanography., 50(2):553-565.
10. Sbihi, K., Cherifi, O., El Gharmali, A., Oudra, B., and Aziz, F., 2012. Accumulation and Toxicological Effects of Cadmium, Copper and Zinc on the Growth and Photosynthesis of the Freshwater Diatom Planothidium lanceolatum (Brébisson) Lange-Bertalot: A Laboratory Study. Journal of Material and Environmental Science 3(3): 497-506.
11. Sommer U and Lengfellner K., 2008. Climate change and the timing, magnitude, and composition of the phytoplankton spring bloom. Global Change Biology. 14(6):1199- 1208.
12. Stanley J, and Preetha G., 2016 Pesticide toxicity to fishes: exposure, toxicity and risk assessment methodologies. In Pesticide Toxicity to Non-target Organisms. Springer, Dordrecht, 411-497.
13. Thakur R K, Jindal R, Singh U.B. and Ahluwalia AS. 2013. Plankton diversity and water quality assessment of three freshwater lakes of Mandi (Himachal Pradesh, India) with special reference to planktonic indicators. Environ Monit Assess. 185(10):8355–8373. doi: 10.1007/s10661-013-3178-3
14. Xu F.L, Tao S, Dawson R.W., Li P.G. and Cao J., 2001 Lake ecosystem health assessment: indicators and methods. Water Research.35(13):3157- 3167.

