International Journal of Applied and Universal Research E- ISSN No: 2395-0269
Volume VII, Issue III, May-June 2020 Available online at: www.ijaur.com

STUDIES OF HELMINTHES PARASITES IN FRESHWATER FISHES OF VINDHYA REGION, REWA (M.P.)

Surya Prakash Saket[1] and Dr. Daya Nand Pandey[2]
1. **Research Scholar, Govt. S.K.N.(P.G.) College, Mauganj**
2. **Professor Govt. S. K. N. (P. G.) College, Mauganj**

ABSTRACT:- The present study deals with the survey of helminth parasites from Vindhya region (M. P.) India, during July 2017 to June 2018 this report summarizes the data of incidence, intensity and density of infection of helminth parasites in freshwater fishes in relation to environmental factors. Fish samples were collected from four main localities i.e. Rewa, region examined for helminth parasites included three classes i.e. Cestode, Trematode and Nematode. During the present study 879 fishes were examined, in which 487 fishes were infected with seven genera of helminth parasites among these four were cestodes, two were trematodes and one was nematode. The present studies are helpful for the status of diversity of helminth parasites from Rewa region.

KEYWORDS:- Survey, Helminth parasites, Freshwater fishes, Environmental factor, Rewa.

INTRODUCTION:-

India is the third largest producer of fish in the world and second in inland Fish production. Fisheries are important for the Indian economy as it provides employment opportunities, is a source of nutritional food and foreign exchange earnings. The total fish production is 6.4 Million Metric Tonnes (mmt) of which 3.4 mmt is inland and 3.0 mmt is marine production but fish farming remains a high risk investment, mainly due to the disease problems caused by parasitic infections. The survey of helminth parasites in freshwater fishes was undertaken to investigate the internal helminth parasitic environment of the host and the environmental factor such as season, temperature, humidity, age of the host.

The common parasites of fishes causing the economic losses includes the helminth parasites like Senga Dollfus (1964), Diphyllobothrium (1758), Lytocestus Cohn, (1908), Spinitectus Fourment, (1883). However, very little is known about the parasitic fauna of fishes of the India in comparison with the information available from other regions of the continent. Fishes are host to many adult helminth parasites and larval forms, the adult of which occur in amphibians, reptiles, birds and mammals as well as predatory fish. The strict dependence of the parasite on its host and the exploitation of the latter by the former provide a useful research model in the field of ecology and evolutionary biology.

Several investigations have studied helminth parasites of freshwater fishes. Through the work of these investigation concerning the survey, population dynamics, host specificity, organ specificity. Therefore one objective of this study was to determine monthly incidence of infection; variation in intensity of infection and the second was to determine variation in parasite fauna with the diet of the host, variation in infection with the habitat type.

MATERIAL AND METHOD:-

The freshwater fishes were collected from different places of Vindhya region during the period of July 2017 to June 2018. Fishes were opened up dorso-ventrally and the internal organs examined. The entire digestive system was removed and placed in a Petri dish with physiological saline. Infection of each group of parasites was treated as follows: collected cestodes and trematode were first relaxed and then fixed in hot 4%formalin and stained using Harris haematoxyline. Stained parasites were washed in distilled water, dehydrated in ascending grades of alcohol, cleared in xylene, mounted in D.P.X. Nematodes were fixed in hot 10% Glycerol and cleared in lacto phenol. Drawings were made using a camera lucida. (Francis Weesner 1964). The identification is made with the help of “Systema Helminthum” by Yamaguti (1961). Population dynamics of helminth parasites were determined by following formulae,-

$$Indcidance\ of\ Infection = \frac{Infected\ host\ X\ 100}{Total\ host\ examined}$$

$$Intensity\ of\ Infection = \frac{No.\ of\ Parasites\ collection\ in\ a\ sample}{No.\ of\ infected\ host}$$

$$Density\ of\ Infection = \frac{No.\ of\ parasites\ collected\ in\ a\ sample}{Total\ host\ examined}$$

$$Index\ of\ Infection = \frac{No.\ of\ host\ infection\ X\ No.of\ parasite\ collected}{Total\ host\ examined}$$

RESULT AND DISCUSSION :-

The survey was carried out with 879 freshwater fishes in which *Mastacembalus armatus* (Lecepede, 1800), *Clarius batrachus* (Linnaeus, 1758), *Wallago attu* (Bleaker, 1857) and *Channa punctatus* (Bloch) from various places of Rewa region. Out of 879 fresh water fishes 487 were infected with helminth parasites in which cestode, trematode and nematode were found in one annual cycle. A total 689 helminth parasites were found during the present investigation. They were belonging with three classes in which total seven genera are found, out of them four from cestode [Senga Dollfus, (1934), Circumoncobothrium Shinde, (1968), Lytocestus Cohn, (1908), Gangesia Woodland, (1924)], two from trematode [Allocreadium Looss, (1900), Orientocreadium, Tubangui, (1931), and one from nematode [Procamallanus Baylis, (1923)].

During the present investigation the high rate of infection of cestode and trematode found as compare to nematode parasites. The values for the incidence, intensity, density of infection in Table no.1 whereas the Table no. 2 shows influence of season on parasitic infection of helminth parasites from freshwater fishes. The incidence of infection of cestode and trematode was highest in summer season (41.55%, 23.91%) respectively, while cestode low in winter season (27.95%) and trematode moderate in winter season (9.44%) and but in cestode moderate in rainy season (40.14%,) while trematode least in rainy season (07.06%) but nematode parasites incidence of infection was highest in winter season (13.66%) while moderate in summer season (08.64%) and least in rainy season (0.40%). Regarding the parasitic diversity and population study cestode and trematode indicates abundance population as compare to nematode parasites. This may be due to, development of parasites requires high temperature, low humidity and less rainfall which is the best environment for the growth of parasites except nematode parasites. The valuable information pertaining to the influence of seasons on the helminth parasites was contributed by several workers like Tornqust (1931) who described about the systematic method of occurrence of certain fish parasites Camallanus lacustus that the infective stages invade the host during summer, the growth and maturation takes place during autumn and winter release of their infective progeny occurs during summer.

Survey of seasonal infection of fish infected with Caryophyllids has been done in other countries by different workers Hanley, Anderson (1976), Karnaev (1960) in carps, Progestrom and Haluorson (1968) in B.rutilius. They observed high infection in summer. Kennedy (1976) and Homes (1976) observed the factors such as distribution and environment of the host the diet and mode of feeding, often play important role to limit a parasite to a particular host species, as well as high prevalence occur in particular season.

During summer season the manifestation of cestode parasite was highest because of temperature which helps to hatching eggs of parasites and enhances the rate of parasites while as rainy relatively shows very low infection of the parasites. The L. Szidat (1956) he state that “parasites are influenced by the same conditions of specific differentiation and phylogenetic development as free living animals. The only difference is that the they are influenced by the wide external environment surrounding the host, but only by the host itself acting as the environment. The latter produces stimuli which promote further development”(Szidat 1956). This statement is radical contradiction to the following statement by V.A. Dogel (1947), “parasites are also connected by many strong links to the external environment surrounding the host itself”. The second thesis of Soviet parasitology is the study of all parasites inhabiting the host organism, in which they form a certain aggregation, the parasite fauna. V.A. Dogel (1935, 1936, 1947, and 1948) defines the problem confronting ecological parasitology as the study of the dependence of the parasite fauna as a whole on the changes in the external conditions surrounding the host and on changes in the physiological state of the host itself i.e. the environment of the order. This line of study

has proved to be extremely fruitful. The infections of *Lytocestus sp*. are observed in only *Clarius batrachus* and *Senga* sp, Circumoncobothrium sp. and Allocreadium are heavily found in *Mastacembelus armatus.* The infection of *Senga sp, Orientocreadium sp*. in *Channa punctatus* and while *Gangesia sp, Procamallanus sp*. is found in *Wallago attu*, because of the host specificity. Morphological, physiological and ecological factors play important role in the host specificity. *Senga sp, Circumoncobothrium sp. Gangesia sp. Procamallanus sp*. were specifically recovered from intestine *M. armatus* and *W. attu* while *Allocreadium sp*. were recovered from lung only *M. armatus. Lytocestus* are recovered from stomach of *C. batrachus* and *Orientocreadium sp*. were recovered from stomach and intestine of *C. punctatus* This suggests that the worms are site specific and probably derive certain nutrients from the organs. This needs further investigation to establish the reasons for organ specificity.

The subject of organ specificity among fish parasites has been reported by various researches for example, William and Jones (1994) reported that host and organ specificity is determined by ecological requirements of the hosts and the parasites. Hosts when they share the same environment and have, for example, similar feeding requirements are likely to harbor parasites which are closely related taxonomically. Another interesting observation during this study was variation in parasitic infection with sampling stations. Although *Mastacembalus armatus* was more infected than the other fish hosts, the intensity of infection of this fish with different parasites varied from one station to another. At Rewa Districts the fish was heavily infected with the cestode and nematode while the other parasites occurred in low numbers or absent. Noteworthy is the fact that all *Clarius batrachus* and *Channa punctatus* from Rewa Districts did not harbor any nematodes. The above variations can be attributed to changes in physico-chemical parameters or variation in food habits of the host. Among the *Wallago attu* those from Rewa Districts were observed to be more heavily infected by the nematode. Moller and Anders (1986) concluded that fish from more polluted water tend to harbour more helminth parasites than those from less polluted waters. Polanski (1961a) reported that the main factors determining the variety of parasite fauna as well as the intensity and incidence of infection can be summarized as follows: The diet of the host, lifespan of the host, the mobility of the host throughout its life including the variety of habitats it encounters, its population density and the size attained, large hosts provide more habitats suitable for parasites than do small ones. During this study, *Mastacembalus armatus* which was the most heavily infected was observed to feed mainly on a particular type of zooplankton and other small fishes. Some of these parasites cause diseases to fish, affecting their health and reproduction, making them fall easy prey to predators and some infect man. In fish farming, parasites may lead to epidemics and mortalities, resulting in economic losses (Khalil & Polling, 1997).

The purpose of this study was to estimate the present status of parasite incidence in this region and to provide parasitologic and epidemiologic information.

.

Table no. 1. Month wise parasite infection in fish of Vindhya region

Months	Name of Parasite	No. of host examined	Total no. of host infected
July 2017	Cestode	47	32
	Trematode		
	Nematode		
August 2017	Cestode	46	17
	Trematode		
	Nematode		
September 2017	Cestode	61	11
	Trematode		
	Nematode		

October 2017	Cestode	72	07
	Trematode		
	Nematode		
November 2017	Cestode	78	34
	Trematode		
	Nematode		
December 2017	Cestode	76	58
	Trematode		
	Nematode		
January 2018	Cestode	88	46
	Trematode		
	Nematode		
February 2018	Cestode	84	52
	Trematode		
	Nematode		
March 2018	Cestode	82	59
	Trematode		
	Nematode		
April 2018	Cestode	88	56
	Trematode		
	Nematode		
May 2018	Cestode	85	69
	Trematode		
	Nematode		
June 2018	Cestode	72	46
	Trematode		
	Nematode		
	Total	889	487

Table 2-Influence of seasons on parasitic infection Genera

Genera	Seasons	Incidence %	Intensity %	Density %	Index of infection
Cestode	Rainy	40.14	01.15	0.44	11.99
	Winter	27.95	01.13		10.06
	Summer	41.55	01.51	0.62	20.35
Trematode	Rainy	07.06	0.91	0.26	0.47
	Winter	09.44	01.13	0.12	01.36
	Summer	23.91	01.34	0.27	05.72
Nematode	Rainy	0.40	0.5	0.007	0.007
	Winter	13.66	01.82	0.23	03.23
	Summer	08.64	01.39	0.10	01.48

CONCLUSION:-

The one year study has shown that fresh water fishes from the Vindhya region harbor a wide range of parasites especially the helminth parasites. The study has established that the *Mastacembalus armatus* fish is one of the most heavily infected fish species as compare to *Clarius batrachus, Wallago attu and Channa punctatus*. This study thus highlights on the details of therefore is, the only one that has given some details on the endoparasitic organisms infecting freshwater fish species along the Vindhya region. However, the above study can only be complete if it covers a whole season to

investigate the following: Seasonal variation in incidence of infection, variation in intensity of infection, variation in parasite fauna with the diet of the host, variation in infection with the habitat type.

REFERENCES:-

1. Anderson R.M. (1976) Parasitology (72) 281-395.
2. Anderson R.M. and May R. M. (1979) Nature 280: 361-367.
3. Baylis H.A. (1923) Parasitology, 15, 137- 138.
4. Cohn (1908) Bakt. Parasitenk (46) 134-39.
5. Dollfus R.PH (1934) Bull. Sac. Zool. France 69; 476-490.
6. Dogiel V.A. (1985) Parasitology of fishes. Leningrand university press, Olivear and Boyed, Edinburgh and London. 1-348
7. Esch G.W. (1977) Regulation of parasite population. Academic press, INC, New York 253.
8. Kanaev A.I. (1956) Avaforcefert mosrybutavz, 137-144
9. Kennedy C.R. (1976) Ecological aspects of parasitology North Holland publishing company Amsterdam 1- 474.
10. Khalil L. F. and Polling K. (1997) Checklist of the Helminth Parasites of African Freshwater Fishes. Uni. of the North Department of Zoology. Republic of South Africa 184
11. Moller H. And Anders K. (1986) Kiel: Moller 365.
12. Shinde G.B. (1968) Rivi Di Para (1912): 111-114.
13. Shinde Laxmikant et. al (2009) Ecological study of endoparasites in alimentary canal from Gallus (M.S.) India. Decca c.science
14. Thomas J.D. (1964) J. Animal Ecology, 33:83-85 [15]
15. Tubangii M. A. (1931) Philipp. J. Sci. 44: 417 – 424.
16. Williams D.D. (1978a) Lowa State J. Res. 53(4): 305-310
17. Williams H, Jones A. (1994) Parasitic worms of fish, Taylor and Francis, Bristol, UK 593.
18. Woodland WNF. (1924) Parasit (16): 441- 451.
19. Yamaguti S. (1958) Systema Helminthum Vol. I The digenic Trematodes of vertebrates. Int. Sci. Pub. New York 1575.
20. Yamaguti S. (1961): Systema Helminthium, vol. II .Cestode of vertebrates, Interscience publishers INC, New York and London, 1-860.
21. Yamaguti S. (1961) Systema Helminthum the nematode of vertebrates. Inter science publishers .INC. New York. And London. Vol. III, Part I and II.