Zooplankton diversity of SevsakStream (Elazıg-TURKIYE)

ABSTRACT:

The zooplankton and its seasonal distribution of SevsakStream has been investigated in 2021. A total of 31 zooplankton species have been recorded in the stream. Among the zooplankton,19 species identified frombelong to Rotifer,9 species from tоCladocera and 3 species from toCopepoda. In every season, zooplankton species were recorded in various numberabundance. Highest number of taxa were recorded in spring. In this season also, an increase occurred in the individual numbers of species. *Keratellacochlearis*, *Polyarthradolichoptera* and *Cyclops vicinus* were the most recorded species in the stream. As in the other aquatic habitat,rotifera group was determined as the most recorded species in terms of taxa and number of individuals.

Keywords: *Zooplankton, Rotifera, Copepoda, Cladocera, SevsakStream*

1.INTRODUCTION

Rotifera, Cladocera and Copepoda are the largest groups of zooplankton in freshwater environment, which are the main links of the food chain in the aquatic environment. Species diversity and abundance in unit volume provide information about the biological characteristics of reservoirs and ponds. Zooplanktonic organisms constitute the main food source of fish in freshwater sources and they constitute the main food of many pelagic-fed fish species and young periods of demersal-fed fish[1,2].

In addition, zooplankton species are also used to determine water quality, trophic status of the lake and water pollution. With the increasing importance of zooplanktonic organisms, researches studieson Rotifera, Cladocera and Copepoda, which constitute an important part of zooplankton community in our country as well as in the world, have been started. Zooplankton of stagnant waters has great attention by the scientists in Turkey but researches studieson the streams are relatively few. By some of these researchesstudies, the rotifers fauna ofGümüldür Stream [3], diversity of Rotifera in Tigris River[4], the Rrotifers fauna and its seasonal variations of Fırat River [5], the Rrotifers fauna and its seasonal variations of Zıkkım Stream [6], the Rrotifers fauna of Asi River [7], the zooplankton fauna of some rivers in Mediterranean Region [8], the Copepoda and Cladocera fauna of Asi River [9], the Rotifera fauna of Euphrates River basin [10] zooplankton structure of Karaman Stream [11]zooplankton succession of the Asi River [12]were determinedassesed. TIn this researchstudy, we aim to identify the zooplankton fauna and its seasonal composition inofSevsak Stream, where no previous relevant data are available.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

Hazar Lake, which is an important water source, within the borders of Elazig province, 22 km from the city center. It is a tectonic lake. Its average depth is 93 m, its maximum length is 20 km, It has a maximum width of 5.4 km and an altitude of 1248 m.The streams feeding the Hazar

Lake are called "fur streams"together with Sevsak Stream, Zıkkım Stream, Kürk Stream, BehramazStream and Mogal Stream.Sevsak Stream is located in the north east of the lake.The stream born from the high hills is poured into the lake through a channel after passing the state highway. Sevsak Stream is a small stream and can dry out completely in the hot months of some years[13,14,15].Sampling stations in Sevsak Stream is given in Fig 1.

Fig1. The map showing sSampling stations in Sevsak Stream

Zooplankton samples were collected by using Hydro-Bios plankton net (25 cm in diameter, 100 cm inlength, with a 55-µm mesh size) and immediately fixedwith a 4% solution of formalin. Samples were takenfrom stagnant or slow-running, vegetation-rich areas of the stream basin. To identify zooplankton species, various ~~resources~~ indentification guides and literaturewere used [16-22].

Some physicochemical parameters, such as water temperature, electrical conductivity, pH, dissolved oxygen were alsomeasured on-site simultaneously with the sampling time.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

During the study 31 zooplankton species have been recorded in the stream. Among the zooplankton 19 species ~~identified from~~belong to Rotifers, 9 species ~~from~~ toCladocera and 3 species ~~from~~ toCopepoda.The list of the species and their seasonal distribution was given in Table 1.

As shown in the Table 1 in spring in every station the highest number of species were recorded. The highest number of taxa were recorded in the second station of spring period (18 species), the least number of taxa were recorded in the first station of the stream in winter. *K. cochlearis* and *P. dolichoptera* from Rotifera were determined in 10 samplings. *C. retikulata* from Cladocera and *C. vicinus* from Copepoda were recorded the dominant species. *C lacustris*recorded only

Comment [U1]: Mention number of sampling sites and sampling period and fresuency of sampling

Comment [U2]: n

Comment [U3]: need to estimate the abundance

Comment [U4]: Give details of zooplankton analysis and estimation of physico-chemical parameters)

Comment [U5]: Need statistical analysis such as ANOVA and correlation

the last stations. *D. forcipatus, T. tetractis*recorded only in one sampling. In every season zooplankton species have been identified from the stream.

Rotifera was found as the dominant group interms of number of species and individuals The relative density of Rotifera was 61.3%followed by Cladocera29% and Copepoda9.7%.

Comment [U6]: This is not density, number of species

Table 1. The seasonal distribution of zooplankton in Sevsak Stream

	Seasons											
	Winter			Spring			Summer			Autumn		
	Stations											
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
ROTIFERA												
*Asplanchnapriodonta*Gosse, 1850		+		+	+	+		+	+		+	+
*Brachionusangularis*Gosse, 1851					+	+	+		+		+	
*Brachionuscalyciflorus*Pallas, 1766				+				+			+	+
Colurellaobtusa(Gosse, 1886)												
Dicranophorusforcipatus(O.F.Müller, 1786)				+								+
*Euchlanisdilatata*Ehrenberg, 1832					+	+		+	+	+	+	+
Kellicottialongispina(Kellicott, 1879)								+	+			
Keratellacochlearis(Gosse, 1851)	+		+	+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+
Keratellaquadrata(Müller, 1786)					+	+		+	+		+	
Lecane bulla (Gosse, 1886)				+	+							
Lecaneclosterocerca(Schmarda, 1859)	+							+				
Lecaneflexilis(Gosse, 1886)		+			+			+				
Lecaneluna(O.F.Müller, 1776)					+		+					
Lecanelunaris(Ehrenberg, 1832)				+		+						
Lepadellaovalis(O.F.Müller, 1786)				+	+							
Notholcasquamula(O.F.Müller,1786)				+	+			+		+		
PolyarhtradolichopteraIdelson, 1925	+		+		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
*Synchaetaoblonga*Ehrenberg, 1831						+	+					
Trichotriatetractis(Ehrenberg, 1830)					+							
CLADOCERA												
Bosminalongirostris(O.F.Müller, 1785)		+	+		+		+					
Chydorussphaericus(O.F. Müller, 1776)					+							+
Ceriodaphniareticulata(Jurine, 1820)				+	+	+	+	+	+			+
*Coronetallarectangula*Sars, 1862					+		+					+
Cornigeriuslacustris(Spandl1923-1924)			+			+			+			+
*Daphnia longispina*O.F. Müller 1875				+	+	+		+				+
*Diaphanosomalacustris*Korinek, 1981							+	+				
Macrothrixlaticornis (Fischer, 1851)						+					+	
Pleuroxusaduncus(Jurine, 1820)		+						+		+		
COPEPODA												
Acanthopdiaptomusdenticornis(Wierzejski, 1887)		+	+	+						+		
*Cyclops vicinus*Uljanin, 1875	+		+	+	+				+		+	+
Nitokrahibernica(Brady, 1880)						+			+		+	
TOTAL	**4**	**5**	**6**	**11**	**18**	**13**	**9**	**14**	**10**	**6**	**10**	**11**

In the stream pH values were changed between 7.1-7.6, dissolved oxygen 6.9-.2 mg/L, electrical conductivity, 298-345 µS/cmand temperature 5.5.-16 ℃ (Table 2).

Table 2. Some physical and chemical parameter values ofSevsak Stream

Parameters	Winter	Spring	Summer	Autumn

El. Conductivity (µS/cm)	315	298	345	302
pH	7.1	7.3	7.6	7.2
Dissolved oxygen (mg/L)	8.9	9.2	6.9	7.6
Temperature℃	5.5	9	16	12

In recent years, many studies [23-37]showed that rotifers are the dominant ~~species~~ group in running waters. The reason is that rotifers are lessaffected than other groups by the deterioration of water quality and display better adaptation to these conditions[1]. The importance of rotifers increases in comparison tocladocerans when the abundance of the latter is low[38] Furthermore, rotifers are known asan opportunistic species in extreme conditions [39]. Within the last decade, becauseof the degradation of water quality of many wetlands for avariety of reasons (pollution, eutrophication, etc., and the effect of global warming), rotifers have become dominantspecies in many aquatic habitats[40].In line with that finding, this study identified that most ofthe zooplankton species belonged to phylum Rotifera.

It was observed that seasonal changes are important factors effecting seasonal distribution of zooplankton~~ic~~groups inSevsak Stream. It is thought that water temperature effects the distribution and amount of zooplankton in the stream. The fact that zooplankton is more abundant in spring and summer supports this data.

There are also zooplankton ~~researches~~ studiescarried out in previous years in other streams flowing into the Hazar Lake, such as the Sevsak Stream. In Kürk Stream *Keratella cochlearis* from Rotifera*Cyclops vicinus* from Copepoda and *Ceriodaphnia reticulata* from Cladocera were took the first places according to frequency of occurence [27].In Behramaz Stream *Kellicottia longispina*, *K. cochlearis* and *C. vicinus* were recorded as dominant species [29].In Hoşrük Stream[41]*Polyarthra dolichoptera* from rotifers has been detected in 10 months and is the most common species among all zooplankton species. *Cyclops vicinus* from Copepoda was the second dominant species observed for 9 months.

A one-year comprehensive zooplankton survey was conducted in Lake Hazar. As a result of the survey, 52 zooplankton species were found in the lake.In Hazar Lake *Brachionus quadridentatus Keratella quadrata* and *Synchaeta verrucosa* has been most recorded Rotifera species. *Cyclops vicinus* from Copepoda was observed every month. *Alona rectangula, Cornigerus lacustris* and *Diaphanosoma lacustris* from Cladocera were the most abundant cladoceran species [42].

The common species in Hazar Lake and the streams flowing into the lake (Kürk, Behramaz Hoşrük Streams*) K. cochlearis, P. dolichoptera* and *C. vicinus* species [27,29,41]. These species have also been recorded in Sevsak Creek. Another common finding is that rotifers are the most common species of all zooplankton in these wetlands. In addition, in these studies, it was reported that the most abundant zooplankton species in terms of the number of species and the number of individuals were in spring and summer. This finding is consistent with the zooplankton distribution of the Sevsak Stream.

*Cornigerius*species are endemic to the Ponto-Caspian, with the exception of *Cornigerius lacustris,*which is endemic to freshwater Lake Hazar in the Euphrates basin[43]. This species was recorded only in the last station next to Hazar Lake. This species living habitat known as Hazar Lake. The fact that the species was found at the last station connected to the lake indicates that this species is not a species belonging to this stream. This species was not recorded in the researches carried out before in the Hoşrük Stream [41] Zıkkım Stream[37] and Behramaz Stream[29] which spills into the lake. In Hazar Lake *C. lacustris* was found every month [42].

The QB/T index shows the rate of the number of *Brachionus* to the number of *Trichocerca*. The Q index is evaluated in three groups for the lake's trophic state, that Q=1 means oligotrophy, Q = 1.0-2.0 means mesotrophy, and Q>2 means eutrophy. In this study, Sevsak Stream was

Comment [U7]: Are these mean values for 3 sites? If so give with standard deviation

Comment [U8]: Use everywhere statting with slowercase letter for all groups

Comment [U9]: Need correlation analysis to explain this scientifically

Comment [U10]: ??

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

determined (2 species of Brachionus, *B. angularis* and *B. calyciflorus* and 1 species of Trichocerca, *T. tetractis*) QB/T 2/1=2. According to this, the Sevsak Stream showed mesotrophic property.

CONCLUSION

The zooplankton species found during the research are important as they are the first record for Sevsak Creek. Hazar Lake has got a blue flag. Sevsak Stream, which is one of the streams pouring into the lake, should be protected in order not to be affected by pollutants and not to pollute the lake.

Comment [U11]: Write based on results eg: polluted or not
Tropic status etc.

REFERENCES

1. Kolisko R, Plankton Rotifers Biology and Taxonomy. E. Schweizerbart'scheVerlagsbuchhandlung (Nageleu. Obermiller), 1974, Stuttgart,Germany.
2. Wetzel RG, Limnology. W. B. Sauders Company, Philadelphia,1975, 743 p.
3. Ustaoğlu MR, Balık S, Aygen C, Özdemir D,Rotifera fauna of Gümüldür Stream (İzmir). E.Ü. Su Ürünleri Fakültesi, Su Ürünleri Dergisi 1996,13 (1-2): 163-169, Turkish.
4. Bekleyen A, Gokot B, Varol M, Thirty-four new records and the diversity of the Rotifera in the Turkish part of the Tigris River watershed, with remarks on biogeographically interesting taxa. Sci Res Essays. 2011, 6(30):6270-6284. doi: 10.5897/SRE11.355
5. Saler (Emiroğlu) S, Şen B, Şen D, The seasonal variations of rotifers of Kömürhan region of River Fırat. Su Ürünleri Sempozyumu, 2000, Sinop, 385-396.
6. Saler (Emiroğlu) S, Şen, B. Rotifers of Zıkkım Stream which flows into Hazar Lake and their seasonal variations. XI. Ulusal Su Ürünleri Sempozyumu, 2001,1: 261-271
7. Bozkurt A, Göksu MZL, Sarıhan E, Taşdemir M,Rotifera fauna of Asi River (Hatay, Türkiye). Ege University Journal of Fisheries & Aquatic Sciences 2002, 19, (1-2): 63-67
8. Bozkurt A, Preliminary observation on the zooplankton fauna of some rivers in Mediterranean Region. Turk J Aqua Life. 2004, 2(3):65-70,Turkish.
9. Göksu MZL, Bozkurt A, Taşdemir M, Sarıhan E, Copepoda and Cladocera (Crustacea) fauna of Asi River (Hatay, Türkiye). Ege J Fish Aqua Sci. 2005, 22(1-2):17-19,Turkish.
10. Akbulut (Emir) N, Yıldız K, The Rotifera fauna of Euphrates of River Basin (Turkey). Hacettepe Journal Biology and Chemistry,2005, 34: 93-105.
11. Altındağ A, Buyurgan Ö, Kaya M, Özdemir E, Dirican S, A survey on some physico-chemical parameters and zooplankton structure in Karaman Stream, Antalya, Turkey. J Anim Vet Adv. 2009, 8(9):1710-1716.
12. Bozkurt A, Güven SE, Zooplankton succession of the Asi River (Hatay-Turkey). J FisheriesSciences.com. 2010, 4(4):337-353,Turkish.
13. Özmen H, Külahçı F, Çukurovalı A, Doğru M. Concentrations of heavy metal and radioactivity in surface water and sediment of Hazar Lake (Elazığ, Turkey). Chemosphere,2004, 55(3) : 401 - 408
14. KoçerMAT, Water quality and phytoplankton distribution in the open water of Lake Hazar, Fırat University,Institute of Science and Technology, PhD Thesis,2008, 357p, Turkish.
15. Rashid RF, Saler S, Çoban MZ. Water Quality of a Tectonic Lake:Hazar Lake.Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research,2022,16(5):35-44
16. Koste W, RadertiereMitteleeuropas. 2. Berlin, Germany:Tafelband,1978.
17. Edmonson WT, Freshwater Biology. 2nd edition. New York, NY, USA: John Wiley and Sons Inc.; London: Chapman andHall Limited,1959.
18. Harding JP, Smith WA, A Key to the British FreshwaterCyclopoid and Calanoid Copepods. 2nd edition. Ambleside,UK: Freshwater Biological Association,1974.
19. Nogrady T, Pourriot R, Notommatidae andScaridiidae, Guides to the Identification of the Microinvertebrates of the Continental Waters ofthe World 8, Dumont, H.J.F. (ed.), SPB Academi Publishing, 1995,3: 248.

20. Segers H,The Lecanidae (Monogononta). Ghent, Belgium:Ghent University,1995.
21. Smet WH, Proalidae (Monogonanta), Guides to the Identification of the Microinvertebrates of the Continental Waters of the World 9 (Co. Ed: Dumont, H.J.F.), SPB Academic Publishing, 1996, 4, 102.
22. Smirnov NN,Cladocera: the Chydorinae and Sayciinae(Chydoridae) of the World. Guides to the identification of the of the Continental Waters of the World, Vol. 11. Amsterdam, the Netherlands: SPB Academic Publishing,1996.
23. Özbay H, Altındağ A. Zooplankton abundance in the River Kars, Northeast Turkey: Impact of environmental variables. Afr. J. Biotechnol.,2009,8(21):5814-5818.
24. Saler S, Zooplankton of Munzur River (Tunceli-Turkey). J Anim Vet Adv., 2011,10(2):192-194.
25. Saler S, İpek Alış, N, Zooplankton composition of Tohma Stream (Malatya - Turkey). Journal of Aquaculture Enginering and Fisheries Research,2016, 2: 1, 30-35
26. Saler S, Eroğlu M, Haykır H, Zooplankton of Peri Stream (Tunceli-Türkiye). e-Journal of New World Sciences Academy, Ecological Life Sciences,2010,6(2):14-20,Turkish.
27. Saler S, İpek N, Arslan S, Zooplankton of Kürk Stream (Elazığ-Turkey). Journal of Fisheries Sciences.com,2011,5(3):219-255.
28. Saler S, Bulut H, Birici N, Tepe R, Alpaslan K, Zooplankton of Karasu (Erzincan). Eğirdir Su Ürün Fak Derg., 2015, 11(1):10-16, Turkish.
29. Saler S, Çelik S, Yüce S, Zooplankton of Behramaz Stream (Elazığ). Ecology 2017 11-13 May, Kayseri . 2017,397 p,Turkish.
30. Güher H, The investigation of zooplanktonic organisms (Rotifera, Copepoda, Cladocera) of Meriç River (Turkey). J Anim Vet Adv.,2012,11(24):4673-4677.
31. Gaygusuz Ö, Dorak Z, Species composition and diversity of the zooplankton fauna of Darlık Stream (İstanbul-Turkey) and its tributaries. J FisheriesSciences. Com, 2013, 7(4):329-343. doi: 10.3153/jfscom.2013037
32. Saler S, Haykır H, Zooplankton composition of Pülümür Stream (Tunceli-Turkey). J Anim Vet Adv.,2011, 10(11):1401-1403.
33. İpek N, Saler S, Zooplankton of Görgüşan Stream and Geban Stream (Elazığ-Turkey). J FisheriesSciences.com, 2012, 6(2):155-163. Turkish.
34. İpek N, Saler S, Zooplankton community structure of Ohi Stream (Elazığ-Turkey). J FisheriesSciences.com, 2013. 7(1):83-88
35. Bulut H, Saler S, Zooplankton variation of Murat River (Elazığ-within the borders Palu district). Turk J Agrie-Food Sci Tech., 2014, 2(1):13-17,Turkish.
36. Bulut H, Saler S, Effect of physicochemical parameters on zooplankton at a freshwater body of Euphrates Basin (Elazıg-Turkey). Cellular and Molecular Biology, 2019, 65 (1), 8-13.
37. Bulut H, SalerS, Zooplankton of Zıkkım Stream (Elazıg). 6th Asia Pasific International Modern Sciences Congress,2021, 1:352-35
38. Wallace RL, Snell TW, Ricci C, Nogrady T,Rotiferabiology,ecology and systematics. In: Segers H, Dumont HJ, editors.Guides to the Identiication of the Microinvertebrates of theContinental Waters of the World. 2nd edition. Ghent, Belgium:Kenobi Productions; Leiden, the Netherlands: BackhuysAcademic Publishing BV.2006.
39. Gannon JE, Stremberger RS, Zooplankton (Especially Crustaceans and Rotifers) as indicators of water quality transactions of the American Microscopical Society , 1978, 97, 1: 16-35
40. Gürbüzer P, Buyurgan Ö, Tekatlı Ç, Altındağ A, Species diversity and community structure of zooplankton in three different types of water body within the Sakarya River Basin, Turkey. Turk J Zool.,2017, 41: 848-859.
41. Saler S, Yüce S, Çelik, B., Bulut, H. Zooplankton of Hoşrük Stream (Elazığ-Türkiye). Türk Tarım – Gıda Bilim ve Teknoloji Dergisi, 2018,6(5): 607-612, Turkish.
42.Çelik B, Saler S, Karakaya G, Yüce S, Özbey N, Şeker T,Evaluation of zooplankton of HazarLake (Elazığ) by means of geographıc ınformatıon system.Ecological Life Sciences, 2022,17 (1), 24-35, Turkish.
43. Dumont H J, Vierstraete A, Akbulut N, Cornigerius lacustris of Lake Hazar, Turkey, a synonym of Cornigerius maeoticus (Pengo) of the Ponto-Caspian (Cladocera: Onychopoda). Plazi.org taxonomic

treatments database. Checklist dataset, 2019. https://doi.org/10.11646/zootaxa.4619.1.9 accessed via GBIF.org on 2022-07-04