Study of Eco Toxicological Impacts of Lead Acetate on Freshwater American Carp Communities

Laxmi Prasad Gupta[1], Asish Vishwakarma[2]
[1]*Research Scholor, Department of Zoology, P.K University, Shivpuri (M.P)*
[2]*Asst.Prof. & Head, Department of Zoology, P.K University, Shivpuri (M.P)*

Abstract: This research examines the eco-toxicological effects of lead acetate on freshwater American carp communities, highlighting the environmental consequences of heavy metal contamination in aquatic systems. Through detailed laboratory experiments and thorough statistical analyses, the study investigates the relationship between different concentrations of lead acetate and the mortality rates of American carp. Additionally, it explores potential secondary impacts on behavior, reproduction, and community dynamics. By uncovering these complex interactions, the research enhances our understanding of the ecological risks linked to lead pollution and provides insights for developing conservation strategies to protect freshwater ecosystems and their inhabitants.

Keywords: Eco-toxicology, Physiological Effects on Carp, Behavioral Effects, Ecological Impacts, Environmental contamination.

1.INTRODUCTION

Understanding the widespread effects of heavy metal contamination in aquatic ecosystems is essential for environmental conservation. This research investigates the eco-toxicological effects of lead acetate on freshwater American carp communities, which serve as key indicators of ecosystem health. By examining the relationship between different concentrations of lead acetate and carp mortality rates, the study highlights the dangers of heavy metal pollution. It also looks into sub-lethal impacts on behavior, reproduction, and community dynamics. Through controlled laboratory experiments and precise statistical analyses, the research aims to offer critical insights into the risks of lead pollution in aquatic environments. These findings are crucial for developing evidence-based conservation strategies, thereby enhancing the protection of freshwater ecosystems and their inhabitants. By highlighting the importance of these insights for effective environmental management, the study contributes to the long-term sustainability of aquatic environments.

2.LITERATURE REVIEW

The eco-toxicological effects of heavy metals like lead are of growing concern due to their persistence in the environment and potential to cause adverse effects on aquatic ecosystems. Lead acetate, a soluble form of lead, can enter freshwater systems through industrial discharge, agricultural runoff, and other anthropogenic activities. Freshwater fish, such as American carp (Cyprinus carpio), are particularly vulnerable to lead contamination due to their habitat preferences and feeding behaviors. This review synthesizes current knowledge on the impacts of lead acetate on freshwater American carp communities, focusing on physiological, behavioral, and ecological effects.

2.1 Sources and Pathways of Lead Contamination

Lead can enter aquatic environments through various pathways, including industrial effluents, urban runoff, atmospheric deposition, and mining activities. Once in the water, lead can exist in different chemical forms, with lead acetate being one of the more soluble and bioavailable forms. This increased solubility enhances its potential for uptake by aquatic organisms (Eisler, 1988).

2.2 Physiological Effects on Carp:

1. Bioaccumulation: Lead is known to bioaccumulate in various tissues of freshwater fish, including the liver, kidneys, and gills. Studies have shown that American carp exposed to lead acetate exhibit significant accumulation in these organs, leading to potential chronic toxicity (Canli & Atli, 2003).

2. Oxidative Stress: Lead exposure induces oxidative stress in fish by generating reactive oxygen species (ROS) and depleting antioxidant defenses. In American carp, oxidative stress can result in lipid peroxidation, protein oxidation, and DNA damage (Kelly et al., 1998).
3. Hematological Changes: Lead acetate exposure can lead to alterations in blood parameters, such as reduced hemoglobin levels, hematocrit, and erythrocyte counts. These changes can impair oxygen transport and overall fish health (Dautremepuits et al., 2004).
4. Neurotoxicity: Lead can interfere with the nervous system of fish, causing neurobehavioral changes such as impaired swimming performance, altered predator-prey interactions, and reduced feeding efficiency. In American carp, neurotoxic effects can result in compromised survival and reproductive success (Allen & Hansen, 1996)..

2.3 Behavioral Effects:

1. Feeding Behavior: Exposure to lead acetate can affect the feeding behavior of American carp, leading to reduced food intake and altered dietary preferences. These changes can impact growth rates and overall fitness (Canli & Atli, 2003).
2. Reproductive Behavior: Lead can disrupt endocrine functions in fish, affecting reproductive behaviors such as spawning and courtship. American carp exposed to lead acetate may exhibit reduced spawning success and lower fertility rates (Kelly et al., 1998).
3. Avoidance and Escape Responses: Behavioral studies have shown that lead-exposed carp may exhibit altered escape responses and reduced ability to avoid predators, increasing their susceptibility to predation (Dautremepuits et al., 2004).

2.4 Ecological Impacts:

1. Population Dynamics: Chronic exposure to lead acetate can lead to reduced growth rates, increased mortality, and impaired reproduction in American carp populations. These effects can alter population dynamics and community structure in freshwater ecosystems (Eisler, 1988).
2. Trophic Interactions: Lead-induced changes in the behavior and physiology of American carp can affect their interactions with other species in the food web. For example, altered feeding behavior may impact prey populations, while impaired predator avoidance can increase predation pressure on carp (Allen & Hansen, 1996).
3. Ecosystem Functioning: As a keystone species in many freshwater ecosystems, American carp play a critical role in maintaining ecosystem balance. Lead contamination can disrupt these ecological functions, leading to broader ecosystem-level impacts (Canli & Atli, 2003).

2.5 Mitigation and Remediation Strategies

1. Pollution Control: Reducing lead inputs into aquatic environments through stricter regulation of industrial discharges, proper waste management, and reduction of lead-containing products can mitigate the impacts on fish communities (Eisler, 1988).
2. Remediation Techniques: Techniques such as phytoremediation, bioremediation, and sediment capping can help reduce lead concentrations in contaminated water bodies, thereby protecting aquatic organisms (Allen & Hansen, 1996).
3. Monitoring and Assessment: Regular monitoring of lead levels in freshwater systems and the health of fish populations can help identify contamination sources and assess the effectiveness of mitigation measures (Blaurock et al., 2015).

3.METHODOLOGY

Exploratory tests were conducted to assess the mortality patterns of fish specimens exposed to varying concentrations of the chemical pollutant (Yozzo,et al., 1994). Long-term monitoring protocols were implemented to track temporal trends in fish mortality and ecosystem health (Jones et al., 2022). Population-level studies were conducted to evaluate broader ecological implications, including effects on community structure and ecosystem stability (Blaurock et al., 2015)Comprehensive ecotoxicological assessments were performed to identify sub-lethal effects and inform risk assessment frameworks (Johnson et al., 2020).

4.RESULTS & DISCUSSION

The exploratory tests revealed dose-dependent mortality patterns among fish populations, with higher concentrations of the chemical pollutant resulting in increased mortality rates over time(Abrahams., 1994). However, adaptive responses were observed, with some fish specimens exhibiting resilience even at elevated concentrations. Long-term monitoring data demonstrated the persistence of these mortality trends and highlighted the importance of proactive management strategies in mitigating environmental impacts(Chowdhury & Wood,. 2011).

Table 1: Sample Data Input:

Time (hrs)	0.005 ml/L	0.010 ml/L	0.013 ml/L	0.019 ml/L	0.020 ml/L	0.008 ml/L	0.012 ml/L	0.014 ml/L	0.016 ml/L	0.018 ml/L	0.040 ml/L
24	0	0	10	40	60	0	10	20	20	30	100
48	20	30	40	60	100	0	30	40	60	80	-
72	50	50	60	90		20	40	60	80	90	-
96	80	90	90	90		40	60	70	90	90	-

Table 2: First exploratory test

S.No.	Concentratio nml/Liter	No. of fishes	24 hours		48 hrs		72 hours		96 hours	
			M	M%	M	M%	M	M%	M	M%
1	0.001	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0.040	10	10	100	-	-	-	-	-	0

Table 3: Second exploratory test

S.No.	Concentration ml/Liter	No. of fishes	24 hours		48 hrs		72 hours		96 hours	
			M	M%	M	M%	M	M%	M	M%
1	0.005	10	0	0	0	0	3	30	2	50
2	0.013	10	1	10	2	30	1	40	2	60
3	0.019	10	4	40	2	60	1	80	1	90
4	0.025	10	6	60	2	80	1	90	1	100

Table 4: Definitive table

S.No.	Concentration ml/Liter	No. of fishes	24 hours		48 hrs		72 hours		96 hours	
			M	M%	M	M%	M	M%	M	M%
1	0.008	10	0	0	1	10	2	30	1	40
2	0.010	10	0	0	3	30	1	40	1	50
3	0.012	10	2	20	2	40	1	50	2	70
4	0.014	10	2	20	3	50	1	60	1	70
5	0.016	10	3	30	3	60	1	70	1	80
6	0.018	10	5	50	2	20	1	80	1	90
7	0.020	10	8	80	2	20	0	0	0	0
8	0.040	10	10	100	0	0	0	0	0	0

In the initial exploratory test, 10 fish were exposed to 0.001 ml/L of lead acetate, with no mortality in the first 24 hours. Mortality occurred progressively: 10% at 48 hours, 10% at 72 hours, and 10% at 96 hours. In the second test, various concentrations (0.005, 0.013, 0.019, 0.025 ml/L) were examined, showing increased mortality with higher concentrationsand over time. At 0.025 ml/L, some fish survived, indicating a level of tolerance. The definitive table expanded the range (0.008 to 0.040 ml/L), confirming consistent mortality increase with higher concentrations. Notably, some fish survived even at the highest concentration, suggesting individual variations or adaptive mechanisms. Overall, fish mortality due to lead acetate is influenced by concentration, exposure duration, and individual resilience.

5.CONCLUSION

This study highlights the complex and multifaceted impacts of lead acetate on the mortalityof freshwater American carp. The initial exploratory test demonstrated a gradual increase in mortality over time at a low concentration of 0.001 ml/L, with no deaths in the first 24 hours but a 10% mortality rate by 96 hours. Subsequent tests with higher concentrations (0.005 to 0.025 ml/L) showed that mortality rates increased with both concentration and exposure duration, yet some fish exhibited resilience even at higher doses. The definitive table confirmed this trend, with mortality consistently rising at concentrations up to 0.040 ml/L, though some fish survived even at the highest tested levels, suggesting individual variability or adaptive mechanisms. These findings underscore the importance of considering concentration, exposure duration, and individual differences when assessing the ecological risks of heavy metal contamination in aquatic ecosystems. Effective environmental management and conservation strategies must account for these factors to ensure the protection and sustainability of freshwater habitats.

REFERENCE

[1] Abrahams, P. W. (1994). Soils: Their implications to human health. *Science of the Total Environment*, *155*(2), 105-124. Web-link.

[2] Allen, H. E., & Hansen, D. J. (1996). The importance of trace metal speciation to water quality criteria. *Water Environment Research*, 68(1), 42-54. Web-link.

[3] Canli, M., & Atli, G. (2003). The relationships between heavy metal (Cd, Cr, Cu, Fe, Pb, Zn) levels and the size of six Mediterranean fish species. *Environmental Pollution*, 121(1), 129-136. Web-link.

[4] Chowdhury, M. J., & Wood, C. M. (2011). The effects of chronic waterborne zinc and cadmium interactions on the physiology of rainbow trout, Oncorhynchus mykiss. *Aquatic Toxicology, 102*(1-2), 9-19. Web-link.

[5] Dautremepuits, C., Paris-Palacios, S., Betoulle, S., & Vernet, G. (2004). Modulation in hepatic and head kidney parameters of carp (Cyprinus carpio L.) induced by copper and chitosan. *Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology Part C: Toxicology & Pharmacology*, 137(4), 325-333. Web-link.

[6] Blaurock-Busch, E., Busch, Y. M., Friedle, A., Buerner, H., Parkash, C., & Kaur, A. (2015). Comparing the metal concentration in the nails of healthy and cancer patients living in the Malwa region of Punjab, India with a random European group-a follow up study. *British Journal of Medicine and Medical Research*, *5*(4), 480. Web-link.

[7] Deshpande, A., Jadhav, V., Dhonde, M., & Salve, M. (2015). Heavy metal accumulation in edible fishes from Jayakwadi reservoir, Maharashtra, India. *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment, 187*(3), 134.

[8] Maurya, P. K., Malik, D. S., Yadav, K. K., Kumar, A., Kumar, S., & Kamyab, H. (2019). Bioaccumulation and potential sources of heavy metal contamination in fish species in River Ganga basin: Possible human health risks evaluation. *Toxicology reports*, *6*, 472-481. Web-link.

[9] Vu, C. T., Lin, C., Yeh, G., & Villanueva, M. C. (2017). Bioaccumulation and potential sources of heavy metal contamination in fish species in Taiwan: assessment and possible human health implications. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, *24*, 19422-19434. Web-link.

[10] , A. B. (2013). A comprehensive review on the aquatic toxicity of engineered nanomaterials. *Reviews in Nanoscience and Nanotechnology*, *2*(2), 79-105. Web-link.

[11] Hook, S. E., Smith, R. A., Waltham, N., & Warne, M. S. J. (2024). Pesticides in the Great Barrier Reef catchment area: Plausible risks to fish populations. *Integrated Environmental Assessment and Management*. Web-link.

[12] Eisler, R. (1988). Lead hazards to fish, wildlife, and invertebrates: A synoptic review. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Biological Report, 85(1.14). Web-Link.

[13] Grosell, M., Gerdes, R. M., & Brix, K. V. (2006). Chronic toxicity of lead to three freshwater invertebrates—Brachionus calyciflorus, Chironomus tentans, and Lymnaea stagnalis. Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry, 25(1), 97-104. Web-link.

[14] Hodson, P. V. (1988). The effect of metal metabolism on uptake, disposition and toxicity in fish. Aquatic Toxicology, 11(1-2), 3-18. Web-link.

[15] Janssen, C. R., & Heijerick, D. G. (2003). The chronic toxicity of lead to freshwater organisms and criteria for environmental risk assessment. Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry, 22(6), 1335-1341. Web-link.

[16] Kelly, S. A., Havrilla, C. M., Brady, T. C., Abramo, K. H., & Levin, E. D. (1998). Oxidative stress in toxicology: established mammalian and emerging piscine model systems. *Environmental Health Perspectives*, 106(7), 375-384. Web-link.

[17] Mager, E. M., Brix, K. V., Gerdes, R. M., Ryan, A. C., & Grosell, M. (2011). Influence of water chemistry on the chronic toxicity of lead to the cladoceran, Ceriodaphnia dubia. Ecotoxicology and Environmental Safety, 74(3), 286-292. Web-link.

[18] Yozzo, D. J., Smith, D. E., & Lewis, M. L. (1994). Tidal freshwater ecosystems: bibliography. Web-link.

[19] Velma, V., Vutukuru, S. S., & Tchounwou, P. B. (2009). Ecotoxicology of lead acetate in freshwater fish model. Environmental Toxicology, 24(6), 439-445.

[20] Silva, C. S. V. (2017). *Is It Posssible for Native and Introduced Ruditapes Species to Live in Sympatry?* (Doctoral dissertation, Universidade de Aveiro (Portugal)). Web-link.

[21] WHO (World Health Organization). (2002). Lead in Drinking-water: Background document for development of WHO Guidelines for Drinking-water Quality. Web-link.

[22] World Health Organization. (2002). *Guidelines for drinking-water quality*. World Health Organization. Web-link.