

# **STUDY OF HUMAN-RELATED FACTORS ON THE BIODIVERSITY OF LAGOONS (A CASE STUDY: A COMPARISON BETWEEN SOLOKLI AND SHORMASTS LAGOONS, NORTH OF IRAN)**

*Mahmoud soufi*

*Bahram kiabi*

*Bahram zehzad*

*Hiva*

*nasarzade*

*Borhan riazi*

*Department of environment &Energy sicence and research branch Islamic Azad  
university –Tehran-Iran.m\_soufi\_1980@yahoo.com*

*Department of biological Sciences, , University of Beheshti, , Islamic Republic  
of Iran .B.H.kiabi@gmail.com*

*Prof ,retired ,.Bzehzad@gmail.com*

*Insect Research department of Plant Protection, Iranian Research Institute of  
Plant*

*Protection, Tehran,Iran. h\_naserzadeh@yahoo.com*

*Department of environment &Energy sicence and research branch Islamic Azad  
university –Tehran-Iran.Briazi@PMZ.ir*

## **ABSTRACT**

Lagoons can be regarded as life-giving systems that are irreplaceable. These ecosystems have been always being damaged by human. This study was carried out in during Aug- 2010 between Solokli and Shormast lagoons in the north of Iran in order to assessing degree ofwater pollution via contrasting biodiversity of lagoons. in this study were identified 31 and 16 species macrofauna and species macrophytes in Solokli and Shormast lagoons respectively. the Shannon –Wiener index ( $H= 3.737$  Bit . per ind) caculated for Solokli that was more than value ( $H=2.773$ ) of Shormast and rarefaction statistical method stimated in these areas that showed the values of expected number of species of the Shormast was lower than Solokli lagoon . According to our observations that Shormast lagoon was stressed with physical pollutions of tourism such as infusion of solid garbages and yachting .

## **KEYWORDS**

Solokli; Shormast; Biodiversity; Human effects; Shannon – Winner index ; rarefaction

<https://doi.org/10.15626/Eco-Tech.2010.111>

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Species richness is the simplest way to describe community and regional diversity [1], and this variable  $\pm$  number of species  $\pm$  forms the basis of many ecological models of community structure [2]. Quantifying species richness is important, not only for basic comparisons among sites, but also for addressing the saturation of local communities colonized from regional source pools [3]. Maximizing species richness is often an explicit or implicit goal of conservation studies (May 1988), and current and background rates of species extinction are calibrated against patterns of species richness [4,5]. Therefore, it is important to examine how ecologists have quantified this fundamental measure of biodiversity and to highlight some recurrent pitfalls. Even the most recent reviews of biodiversity assessment [6]. Although species richness is a natural measure biodiversity, it is an elusive quantity to measure properly [7]. Using organisms to assess the health of aquatic environment date back to the nineteenth century [8]. Quantifying species richness is important, not only for basic comparisons among sites, but also for addressing the saturation of local communities colonized from regional source pools [9]. Benthic macroinvertebrate species are differentially sensitive to many biotic and abiotic factors in their environment. Consequently, macroinvertebrate community structure has commonly been used as an indicator of the condition of an aquatic system [10]. In ponds, macroinvertebrates and macrophytes have been chosen as the most practical and effective taxa for quality assessment. plants and animal groups span a complementary range of sensitivities to potential degradation factors. macroinvertebrates are likely to be the best single choice of organisms for assessing overall waterbody quality [11]. Pollution is a semi-nebulous term used to describe changes in the physical, chemical or biological characteristics of water, air or soil, that can effect the health, survival, or activities of living entities [12]. Submerged, floating and emergent macrophytes represent an important mesohabitat. [10]. or functional habitat. [13]. In aquatic ecosystems, a Species richness is a fundamental measurement of community and regional diversity, and it underlies many ecological models and conservation strategies. Ecological coefficients such as relative abundance may be used to provide an estimate of how the community is structured [14,15]. These involve estimating the abundance of individual species, as a function of the total number of individuals gathered in a particular zone or season.

## 2 MATERIAL AND METHODS

### 2.1 Study Area

The investigations were carried out in two lagoons; Solokli ((36° 29' 64" N - 55° 46' 22" E) and Shormast (36° 51' 51" N- 53° 2' 49" E), situated in the north of Iran. The Shormast lagoon is (2.5/ha) with maximum depth of (4 m) and situated in county Savad Kouh in Mazandaran province. This Lagoon is infested with effects of human and is subjected to various anthropogenic interferences. The main macrophyte found in the water body is *Alnus glutinosa*. Golestan National Park is a mountainous area that which located in end of eastern north forests. this Park in between countrys Gonbad-Kavus and Bujnourd, The Solokli is located in northwest of the Golestan National Park (GNP) on Byli Kuoh mountain and North of Ghorghon cliffs in adjacent Zav and Totli Tamak villages with (2.7/ha) area and maximum depth of (110 cm).

We used different stages in this present study, first we selected areas sampling in tow water body (Solokli & Shormast) randomly. then recorded being aquatic plant in each lagoon. Second, we used quadrat method for attaining specimens, in this method was sampled with

hand net (30×30cm – 200 µm mesh size ), in during each sampling approximately 2 minute for sampling . the specimens caught in the net and brushed from surface, were fixed with %75 alcohol solution . in the lab, macrofauna were identified and count ed the 10× magnification binocular microscope.

Dataset analysis were calculated by ecological methodology software and to assessing the biodiversity index used from Shannon-wiener index, also compaired community samples in both sites by rarefaction statistical method for meaningful standardization and dataset and processes in are expressed by transfer function:

Equation of rarefaction statistical method ; (Sanders, 1968).

1)

Equation of Shannon- winer index; ( Shannon-winner, 1949 ).

$$E(\hat{S}_n) = \sum_{i=1}^s \left[ 1 - \frac{\binom{N - N_i}{n}}{\binom{N}{n}} \right]$$

$$(2) \quad H' = \sum_{i=1}^s (p_i)(\log_2 p_i)$$

### 3 RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The results of the study showed that during the entire study period, 48 species were founded in two waterbody The fauna of in both water body was composed of twelve Benthic order ; Coleoptera, Hemiptera, Diptera, Odonana, Ephemeroptera, Gastropoda, Bivalvia, Arachnidea, Hirudinea, Crustacea, Cypriniformes, Salientia, among these, Diptera dominated 39/60% of the fauna in Sulukli lagoon and Hemiptera 35.68% of the fauna Shormast, respectively. a total number of 980 individuals were sampled, in the Sulukli coleopterans, belonging to 8 species from 3 family, and on contrary the Shormast only one species was collected. Abundance analysis calculated for the two Place showed that were most abundant species (Culex ; 34.11% in Shormast and 23.44% in Sulukli).

the Number of Odonata , Hemiptera, Arachnidea, Bivalvia, Coleoptera families in Sulukli were more than Shormast .in the present investigation we estimated species diversity index Shannon- Winner and ultimately we compaired dataset with Rarefaction statistical methods in each site, that were given in ( table2).the Rarefaction compairing showed that expected number of species for Sulukli ;SD= 1.715, Var = 2.942, 12.028 > 8.503 SD = 1.337, Var = 1.788 were more than Shormast and also the calculated Shannon –Winner were ; 3.737bit/ indiv > 2.773 in respectively.

No study was previously carried out heretofore. the bed of the Sulukli covered with organic matter and many of submerged and floated aquatic macrophytes such as *Shoenoplectus lacustris.*, *Carex Pseudocyperus.**Eleocharis palustris.* *Utricularia neglecta* *Ceratophyllum submersum*, *Callitriche palustris*, *Elatine hydropripe* .*Batrachium tricophyllum*, *Ranunculus sceleratus*. *Ranunculus Lingua* , *Salix cf.capra.**Alnus glutinosa.* *Lemna minor.* , *Lemna trisulca.* , *Spirodella polyrhiza*, *Marsillea quadrifolia**L.Poa golestanensis*, and also the macrophytes were founded in Shormast lagoon as;., *Carex sp.*, *Lythrum salicaria.*,., *Sambacus ebulus*.

The Shormast bed constitutes small sized gravel (Mean diameter = 11.5 mm) and fine sand at the base. Aquatic flora is restricted to *Alnus glutinosa.* and *Lythrum salicaria.*, poorly inhabiting the lagoon, but There are some trees on the stream margins, which macrofauna can be most probably found among their free roots in water, as well as inside the decaying leaves trapped in them.

*Table 1. The Following taxa have been recognized in during Ast-2010.*

Taxa	Number of indiv.Solokli	Number of indivi.Shormast	Ralative frequeny	Ralative frequeny
<i>Corixia punctata</i> (Illiger). Family- Gerridae	59	74	0.08	0.29
<i>Gerris thoricus</i> (Schummel) Family- Notonectidae	19	1	0.02	0.003
<i>Notonecta gluca</i> Family-Nabidae	91	16	0.12	0.06
<i>Nabis sp.</i> Family- Pleoidae	1	-	0.001	-
<i>Plea minutissima</i>	74	-	0.1	-

*continuation of Table 1. The Following taxa have been recognized in during August-2010.*

Taxa	Number of indiv.Solokli	Number of indivi.Shormast	Ralative frequency	Ralative frequency
<i>Order-</i>				
<i>Hirudinea</i>				
<i>Family-</i>				
<i>Hirudidae</i>	7	-	0.009	-
<i>Hirudo sp.</i>				
<i>Family-</i>				
<i>Glossiphonidae</i>	4	10	0.005	0.03
<i>Helobdella</i>				
<i>stagnalisL.</i>	-	1	-	0.003
<i>Plecobdella</i>				
<i>costata</i>				
<i>Family-</i>				
<i>Erpobdellidae</i>	7	-	0.009	-
<i>Erpobdella sp.</i>				
<i>Order- Diptera</i>	23	14	0.03	0.05
<i>Family-</i>				
<i>Chironomidae</i>				
<i>Chironomus</i>				
<i>sp.</i>	170	87	0.23	0.34
<i>Family-</i>				
<i>Culicidae</i>	1	-	0.001	-
<i>Culex sp.</i>				
<i>Family-</i>				
<i>Stratiomidae</i>				
<i>Stratiomys sp.</i>				

*cintinuance of Table1.The Following taxa have been recognized in during Agust-2010.*

Taxa	Number of indiv.Solokl i	Number of indivi.Shormast	Ralative frequeny	Ralative frequeny
Order-Odonata				
Coenagrionidae				
<i>Ischnura elegans</i> (Schmidt).	4	2	0.005	0.007
Libellulidae				
<i>Libellula</i>	4	-	0.005	-
<i>depressa</i> L.	4	-	0.005	-
<i>Sympetrum</i> sp.				
Family-				
Aeshnidae	2	1	0.002	0.003
<i>Anax</i> <i>imperator</i> Leach.				
Order-				
Ephemeroptera	25	16	0.03	0.06
Family-Beatidae				
<i>Beatis</i> sp.				
Order-				
Arachnidea				

*cintinuance of Table1.The Following taxa have been recognized in during Agust-2010.*

Taxa	Number of indiv.Solokli	Number of indivi.Shormast	Ralative frequeny	Ralative frequeny
Argyronetidae				
<i>Argyroneta</i>	2	-	0.002	-
<i>aquatic</i>				
OrderGastropo da				
<i>Planorbis</i>	76	10	0.1	0.03
<i>planorbis</i>	-	11	-	0.04
<i>Physa sp.</i>				
Order-Bivalvia				
<i>Psidium</i>	56	-	0.077	-
<i>casertanum</i>				
Order Crustacea				
Potamidae	-	2	-	0.007
<i>Potamon</i>				
<i>ibericum</i>				
Order-				
Cypriniformes				
Family-				
Cyprinidae	-	7	-	0.02
<i>Cyprinus caprio</i>				
Order-Salientia	24	1	0.03	0.003
Family-Ranidae				
<i>Rana ridibunda</i>				
Σ of species				
	725	255	0.924	0.946

Table 2. dataset estimated for two way Shannon -Winner & Rarefation method , Exp=Expected , Num spe= Number of species ,Var = Variance, SD= Standard deviation, bpr/ ind= bit per individual

indices	Solokli	Shormast
Shannon-winner (H) bpr/ind	3.737	2.773
Exp – Num of spe	12.028	8.503
Var :	2.942	1.788
S.D	1.715	1.337




Figure1. relative frequency (%) of individual macrofauna taxa in both site (Sulukli & Shormast).



#### 4 CONCLUSIONS

in order to provide baseline information for future monitoring of impacts and to analyse which are the most important physical factors affecting diversity, high species diversity indicates that such community has their resources more finely distributed among individuals of many species [16]. Diversity index can also be used to measure environmental stress [17]. Consequently, the ordering of communities may differ when ranked by species richness vs. species density [18].

species diversity (Shannon winner) and rarefaction were compared (suitable 2) it was noted that these were maximum in Sulukli and minimum in Shormast, The fauna of both reservoirs was most composed of followed benthic groups, (Coleoptera, Hemiptera, Hirudinea, Diptera, Odonata, Ephemeroptera, Bivalvia, Gastropoda, Crustacea, Cypriniformes, Salientia), among which, Cypriniformes (Cyprinidae=2.74%), (Bivalvia & Arachnidea = 0), (Hemiptera = 35.68%), (Diptera = 39.60), superlative frequency of the fauna in Shormast lagoon. in contrast the orders of (Gastropoda = 10.48%), (Coleoptera = 9.51%), (Hemiptera = 33.51%), (Ephemeroptera = 3.44%), (Odonata = 1.93%), (Crustacea & Cypriniformes = 0) were maximum of relative frequency in Sulukli wetland, the most represented species belong to the Dytiscidae family (eight species) and Hemiptera (five species). In the whole collection of Shormast specimens were represented by the Hemiptera and Diptera family (see Figure 1).

The number of submerged and emergent plant species in Sulukli with (12 family) that showed have a higher diversity from Shormast (4 family), and also we observed rarity species (*Poa golestanensis*) that described by Akhiani & Scholz, 1998.

The invasion of exotic species is another pervasive and damaging impact on freshwater systems that is generally induced by humans [19]. the species of *Cyprinus caprio* within the Shormast is as an exotic species that introduced by human intentionally.

Aquatic macrophytes play an important role in the structure and function of aquatic ecosystems by altering water movement regimes (flow and wave impact condition) providing shelter and refuge, serving as a food source, and altering water and sediment quality [20]. they provide a structurally complex environment over spatial scales ranging from millimeters (e.g; foliage structure of macrophytes: Dibble et al; 2006) to hundreds of meters (e.g; distance between weed beds in a lake; [21]. This environmental heterogeneity can increase numbers and types of niches, and can uncouple interacting predators and prey [22]. In addition to their important role in maintaining aquatic biodiversity, diverse macrophyte communities also contribute to the maintenance of aquatic ecosystem functioning [23].

According to our observations the Shormast lagoon was stressed with physical pollutions of tourism such as infusion of solid garbages and yachting. In fact, this lagoon, particularly degraded and heavily impacted during summer months, probably attracted, through nonremoval of trash, rubbish, a great number of species that generally did not occur within Shormast lagoon. this activities were reasons for elimination of floating or emergent macrophytes. So it may be concluded that, the water body under investigation was under stress and perturbed. In the present sites (Shormast) were used for washing automobiles and hence were more polluted and perturbed. our results that showed many of coleopteran and hemipteran species diversity such as (Dytiscidae, Hydrophilidae, Pleoidea, Notonectidae, Nabidae), were lowest in the Shormast, also in contrast these families within Sulukli were most abundance and striking. of living insect species it is estimated that about 50% are herbivores mostly associated with vascular plant [24]. All the typical water beetle families are included here. ecologically, they are mostly true water beetles like predaceous diving beetles (Dytiscidae), water scavenger beetles (Hydrophilidae). any environmental influence (Water pollution, power plant, drought) effecting the truly aquatic species will

have more or less the same effect on the shore beetle although they hardly get into contact with water activity [25].

one of the reasons lack some species of Odonata order in Shormast, that it is because the absence of submerged or floating macrophytes. This sheltered groups, which possibly use the vegetable as a support, or refuge, as it is the case of the nymphs of Odonata and of the larvae of Ceratopogonidae and Tanyptodinae. The small contribution of the shredders is in agreement with other studies [26]. Macrophytes constitute a major component of fresh water biodiversity ecosystem functioning, and species richness [27,28].

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to thank Dr .Jamali, and Philippe Ponel Institut Méditerranéen d'Ecologie et de Paléoécologie, Pavillon Villemin -Aix-en-Provence Cedex 04, France for identification some specimens, and also Special thanks to A.Qashqai , Dr,B .Eslami, University of Ghaemshahr for dedicate lab facilities, Grateful thanks go to Dr , H.Akhani University of Tehran-Iran for identifying some aquatic macrophytes.

#### REFERENCES

- [1]Magurran, A.E;1988. Ecological Diversity and its Measurement.Princeton University Press, Princeton, U.S.A.
- [2]Macarthur, R.H. & Wilson, E.O;1967. The Theory of Island Biogeography.Princeton University Press, Princeton, U.S.A
- [3] Cornell, H.V;1999. Unsaturation and regional influences on species richness in ecological communities: a review of the evidence. *Ecoscience*, 6, 303-315.
- [4] Simberloff, D; 1970. Taxonomic diversity of island biotas. *Evolution*, 24, 23- 47.
- [5] Simberloff, D;1972. Properties of the rarefaction diversity measurement. *Am. Naturalist*, 106, 414- 418
- [6] Lawton, J.H., Bignell, D.E. & Bolton, B. (1998). Biodiversity inventories, indicator taxa, and effects of habitat modification in tropical forest. *Nature*, 391, 72-76.
- [7] May, R.M;1988. How many species on earth *Science*, 241,1441-1449.
- [8] Angermeier, P.L.& Karr,J.R; 1994.biological diversity integrity vs. biological diversity as policy divertives, *Bioscience* 44. 690-697.
- [9] May, R.M;1988. How many species on earth *Science*, 241,1441-1449.
- [10] Armitage, P. D., Pardo, I. & Brown, A. (1995): Temporal constancy of faunal assemblages in mesohabitats. . Application to management? . *Arch. Hydrobiol.* 133 (3): 367.387.
- [11] Palmer, M.W; 1990. The estimation of species richness by extrapolation. *Ecology*, 71, 1195-1198.
- [12] Miller, T.E; 1994. Direct and indirect interactions in an early old-field plant community *Am. Naturalist*, 143, 1007-1025.
- [13] Harper, D. M,1995; River bottom habitats: biological reality and practical value in

- river management Folia Fac. Sci. Nat. Univ. Masarykianae Brunensis, Biologia 91, 35.45.
- [14] Bigot, L., & Bodot, P,1973; Contribution a` l'e´tude biocoenotique de la garrigue a` Quercus coccifera. II— Composition biotique du peuplement des inverte´bre´ s. Vie et Milieu 23, 229-249.
- [15] Bigot, L., Picard, J., & Roman, M. L. (1982). Contribution a` l'e´tude des peuplements des inverte´bre´ s des milieux extreˆmes. (1) La plage et les dunes vives de l'Espiguette (Grau-du-Roi, Gard). Ecologia Mediterranea 8, 3–29.
- [16] Smith, R.L;1977. Elements of ecology and field biology. Harper and Row. New York. p. 447.
- [17] Mason, C.F; 1981. Biology of freshwater pollution. Longman Scientific and Technical. p. 250 .
- [18] James, F.C. & Wamer, N.O. (1982). Relationships between temperate forest bird communities and vegetation structure. Ecology,63, 159-171.
- [19] Lodge,D.M; Kershner,M.W; and Aloi, J;1994. Effectes of an omnivorous crayfish (orconectes rusticus) on a freshwater littoral food web .Ecology,75,1265-81.
- [20] Chambers, p. A; & E.E.prepas; 1994.Nutrient dynamics in riverbeds: the impact of sewage effluent and aquatic macrophytes . water research28:453- 464.
- [21] Dibble.E,D;K.J.Killgore & S. L.Harrel, 1996. Assessment of fish- plant interactions . in Miranda L.E. & D. R. De vries (eds), Multidimensional approaches to reservoir fisheries management. American fisheries society , symposium 16 ,Bethesda, Maryland:357-372.
- [22] Harrel, S.L;& E. D. Dibble; 2001. Foraging efficiency of juvenile bluegill ( *Lpomis macrlichirus* ) among different vegetated habitats . Environment biology of Fishes 62: 44-53.
- [23] Englhardt, K.A. M. & M . E. Ritchie, 2001. Effects of macrophyte species richness on wetland ecosystem functioning and services . Nature 411:687- 689.
- [24] Strong,D,R;Lawton,J.H. and south wood , R; 1984. insect on plants community patterns and mechanisms , Blackwell, Oxford.
- [25] Jach,M . A. & E.R.Easton; 1998. Water beetles of macao ( coleopteran ) . Wien: 43-50.
- [26] Glowacka, I., Soszka, G. J. & Soszka, H., 1976. Invertebrates associated with macrophytes.in E.Pieczynska (ed.), Selected problems of lake littoral ecology.Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego,Warszawskiego, Warszawa, 238 p.
- [27] Hutchinson ,G.E;1975. A.treatise on limnology . 111.limnological botany.john wily.New york
- [28] Strixino, G., Trivinho-Strixino, S. & ALVES, G. R.,1997, Macroinvertebrados bentônicos de lagoas marginais da planície de inundação do Rio Mogi-Guaçu(Estação Ecológica de Jataí). An. VIII Sem. Reg. Ecol. V.,I: 33-42.