

Profile of Metal Contents of Sewage Contaminated Canal Fishes

V.K. DEWANI, I.A. ANSARI AND M.Y. KHUHAWAR*

*Dr M.A. Kazi Institute of Chemistry
University of Sindh, Jamshoro, Pakistan*

(Received 8th April, 2002, revised 23rd September, 2002)

Summary: The metal contents of ten fish species collected from sewage contaminated Fuleli canal and fresh water (River Indus) were analysed by flame atomic absorption spectrometry after wet acid digestion. The metal contents varied differently in fish communities found in the area under investigation. Iron contents in all the fishes analysed was highest within the range 5.33-40.2 ug/g. The other metals analysed were within the limits manganese 0.11-8.11 ug/g, zinc 2.1-16.2 ug/g, copper 0.38-1.77 ug/g, lead 0.38-2.3 ug/g, nickel 0.25-0.89 ug/g, cobalt upto 0.5 ug/g and cadmium was below the detection limits. Major metals sodium, potassium, calcium and magnesium contents in the fishes were also determined. The potassium was in high concentration upto 4918 ug/g.

Introduction

Fresh water fish is an important component for human consumption. Therefore pollution aspects of fresh water environment with reference to trace metals have been paid much attention due to their toxicity and accumulation in biota [1,2].

Heavy metals may enter into fish body by gills, digestive tract and body surface [3,4]. The gills are considered to be the main site for direct uptake of metal from water [4,5], whereas a minor role is played in uptake of heavy metals in fish by body surface. Food may also be an important source of heavy metal accumulation leading to biomagnification [6,7]. Fish can be an indicator of pollution index [8-10] and the adverse effects of this sort of pollution on human health by use of fish are well known and well documented. In Pakistan by increase in urbanization and industrialization in the country and direct disposal of waste water in natural water system may elevate the contents of trace metals in fresh water fish [11-13].

Fuleli canal takes off from left bank of river Indus and is designed for 386 m³/S. It passes 25 km from the Hyderabad city with a population of about 1.5 million. It receives a major portion of city sewage and industrial effluents. Exact description about Fuleli canal and city sewage added is reported elsewhere [14]. The water quality of river Indus and Fuleli canal including the concentration of metal ion in the water bodies are reported [14-22]. It is therefore the present work examines the metal contents in fishes

collected from municipal sewage contaminated Fuleli canal and fresh water from river Indus.

Results and Discussion

The variation in the concentration of metals in different fishes may be due to biochemical or physiological difference, regardless of the relative position of the organism in aquatic food-chain [23]. The difference in the concentration may be due to the difference in the tendency of the metals to the various molecular groups found within the cells of fish, as well as to the degree of the fish exposure to the metal as influenced by its metabolic character and its position in the food chain [23,3].

The results of analysis for Fe, Mn, Cu, Zn, Ni, Pb, Co & Cd in different fish species (Table-1) are summarized in Table 2. Three to eight samples of each species were analysed.

Iron followed a similar pattern as for water [22] and exhibited many-fold higher level in fish species than other metal ions examined. Averagely highest concentration of iron 33.73 ug/g was found in *Eutropiichthys Vacha* (F6), while the lowest contents of iron 7.10 ug/ml was noted in *Wallago attu* (F1), with over all range for the species analysed 5.33-40.2 ug/g. The recorded levels of iron in the fish of Fuleli canal and river Indus at Kotri barrage were higher than the fresh water fishes found in Jehlum and Satlug rivers of Pakistan reported earlier [24].

*To whom all correspondence should be addressed.

Table-1: Fish Communities Found in Fuleli Canal and River Indus N=Number of Fishes Analysed

S.No.	Fish Community	Common Name	Weight(g)	Length(cm)	Location	n
F1.	Wallago attu	Lanchi	1165-1379	45-56	River Indus	3
F2.	Tenualosa illisha	Palla	155-875	25-38	River Indus	5
F3	Rita rita	Khago	314-623	28-34	River Indus	6
F4	Labeo calbasu	Kalabnas	296-495	26-31	Fuleli canal	8
F5	Cirrhinus-marigala	Morakhi	226-498	24-32	Fuleli canal	5
F6	Eutropiichthys vacha	Jhalee	30-73	12-21	Fuleli canal	12
F7	Macrognaithus aculeate	Bam (Snake like Spiny eell fish)	149-179.6	39-43.5	Fuleli canal	3
F8	Labeodaro	Mori	56-68	17.5-22	Fuleli canal	7
F9	Securicula gora	Sohni	30-49	18-24	Fuleli canal	6
F10	Mystus cavasius	Mali (Cat fish)	22-30	17-23	Fuleli canal	8

Table 2: Transition Metal Ions Present in Fish Muscles of Fuleli Canal and River Indus

Metal Ion ug/g	FISH COMMUNITIES									
	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6	F7	F8	F9	F10
Fe	15.16 (13-17.2)	16.99 (16.1-20.2)	17.9 (14.58-21.7)	28.65 (21-37.2)	13.10 (12.23-14.25)	33.73 (29-40.2)	9.1 (7.8-10.5)	7.10 (5.33-8.9)	9.90 (7.52-13.5)	11.13 (8.6-12.7)
Mn	0.42 (0.37-0.48)	2.42 (1.5-3.47)	7.31 (6.0-8.11)	1.81 (1.2-2.65)	1.47 (1.27-1.87)	2.21 (1.67-2.75)	0.68 (0.52-0.85)	0.83 (0.38-0.53)	1.1 (0.82-1.4)	0.91 (0.48-1.3)
Cu	0.92 (0.85-0.98)	0.69 (0.59-0.81)	0.66 (0.55-0.76)	0.81 (0.63-0.95)	0.65 (0.55-0.80)	1.58 (1.37-1.77)	0.50 (0.46-0.55)	0.45 (0.38-0.53)	0.69 (0.48-0.85)	0.80 (0.66-0.95)
Zn	3.34 (2.85-4.11)	6.97 (6.1-7.85)	4.66 (4.1-5.2)	6.68 (5.74-7.87)	4.82 (3.8-5.67)	13.95 (11.27-16.2)	4.2 (3.53-4.8)	2.95 (2.1-3.8)	3.76 (3.15-4.2)	3.92 (3.3-4.6)
Ni	0.76 (0.7-0.83)	0.39 (0.31-0.44)	0.31 (0.25-0.37)	0.38 (0.29-0.46)	0.48 (0.35-0.59)	0.75 (0.61-0.89)	0.42 (0.38-0.47)	0.43 (0.29-0.53)	0.53 (0.44-0.65)	0.65 (0.53-0.8)
Pb	0.61 (0.54-0.69)	0.56 (0.48-0.70)	0.46 (0.38-0.57)	0.71 (0.60-0.81)	0.60 (0.47-0.73)	1.49 (0.85-1.61)	0.81 (0.67-0.95)	0.75 (0.51-0.95)	1.27 (0.85-1.57)	1.38 (0.85-2.3)
Co	0.16 (0.14-0.18)	0.24 (0.15-0.33)	0.12 (0.08-0.14)	0.22 (0.18-0.27)	0.13 (0.10-0.15)	0.41 (0.31-0.53)	0.13 (0.08-0.19)	0.12 (N.D-0.21)	0.23 (0.13-0.32)	0.21 (0.18-24)
Cd	0.05 (0.04-0.06)	N.D	Traces	Traces	Traces	N.D	0.04 (0.03-0.05)	Traces	Traces	N.D

Mean values; () = Range values N.D = Not detected

This may reflect the importance of environmental conditions controlling the bio-accumulation of iron in fish species, owing to the observation of higher amounts of iron in the water and the sediments at river Indus at Kotri barrage and Fuleli canal [20-25].

Manganese made up its highest concentration (7.31 ug/g) in the muscles of Rita rita (F3) while Wallago attu (F1) showed the minimum presence of manganese (0.42 ug/g). The manganese level fluctuated between 0.11 to 8.1 ug/g (Table II).

Zinc is an essential trace element that is presumably homostatically controlled [26]. Toxicity of zinc on fish increases synergistic with copper and nickel [27]. The toxicity of zinc also increases with decrease in dissolved oxygen. Zinc with high mean concentration was observed with a value of 13.95 ug/g in Eutropiichthys Vacha (F-6) like iron, while other fish species also contained significant concentration > 2 ug/g of zinc with over all concentration range within 2.1-16.2 ug/g. The observed concentration of zinc was next to iron and followed a similar trend as reported in fish species examined in Satluj and Jehlum rivers [24].

The copper concentration in all the fishes analysed (F1-F10) was observed in the range of 0.38-1.77 ug/g with maximum average again in Eutropiichthys Vacha (F6) as 1.58 ug/g. The lowest copper concentration of 0.45 ug/g was estimated in Labeo daro (F8).

The fishes analysed for lead contains indicated concentrations below 1 ug/g except Eutropiichthys vacha (F6), Securicula gora (F9) and Mystus Cavasius (F10). The average lead contents in F6, F9, F10 were 1.49, 1.27 and 1.38 ug/g respectively, owing to the occurrence of these community in proximity, where lead batteries are washed and burnt, with high concentration of lead in water [20].

The nickel contributed 0.76 ug/g as the maximum average concentration in Wallago attu (F1), while the lowest average concentration of 0.31 ug/g was estimated in Rita rita (F3) with overall variation in the range 0.2 to 0.89 ug/g.

The cobalt concentrations in the fishes were observed below 0.25 ug/g except F-6, which

Table 3: Major Metal Ions Present in Fish Muscles of Fuleli Canal and River Indus

Metal Ion ug/g	FISH COMMUNITIES									
	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6	F7	F8	F9	F10
Na	395.5 (364-427)	258.5 (196-327)	286 (257-320)	418 (372-490)	296.6 (270-327)	540 (430-695)	325 (280-370)	215 (169-275)	282 (222-329)	329 (248-397)
K	3785 (3527-4044)	2560 (2395-2836)	143.6 (107.6-187)	784 (707-880)	258 (245-317)	4918.7 (4625-5102)	121 (94-148)	269 (177-350)	784 (679-890)	695 (588-778)
Ca	9.61 (7.95-11.3)	14.70 (13.8-17.3)	26.20 (22-31)	1.90 (1.41-2.6)	1.98 (1.35-2.63)	27.10 (23.2-31.6)	2.43 (1.8-3.1)	5.67 (2.82-8.7)	8.83 (5.7-11.5)	6.23 (3.5-8.81)
Mg	4.35 (3.48-5.22)	2.80 (2.2-3.75)	1.90 (1.61-2.3)	5.15 (4.13-5.7)	4.38 (3.55-5.2)	13.20 (10.5-15.22)	5.70 (3.8-7.7)	9.23 (5.5-12.8)	12.10 (8.1-14.5)	10.63 (7.6-12.8)

Mean values

() = Range values (Lowest - Highest)

contained 0.41 ug/g cobalt. The over all variation was upto 0.53 ug/g.

The cadmium is reported as toxic for aquatic life but in present work cadmium was present only as trace and below the detection limits of FAAS. The results of major metal ions Na, K, Ca and Mg are summarized in Table 3. The average sodium contents in the fishes was higher than 200 ug/g with highest content of 540 ug/g present in *Eutropiichthys Vacha* (F6) and lowest of 215 ug/g in *Labeo daro* (F8). The over all variation of sodium contents was between 169-695 ug/g.

The potassium was the most dominant with the maximum average value of 4919 ug/g in F6, while the lowest of 121 ug/g in *Macrognathus aculeata* (F7). The potassium values in the fishes examined varied between 94-5102 ug/g. It did not show any correlation with its concentration in the water, because the potassium was observed lowest among the major metal ions [20], may be because of selective bioaccumulation of metal by the fish species.

The calcium and magnesium concentrations in the fishes were observed lower than sodium and potassium. The calcium exhibited its maximum level 27.1 ug/g in F6 and the lowest contents of 1.98 ug/g in *Labeo calbasu* (F4) and *Cirrhinus marigala* (F5).

Similarly F6 also indicated maximum value of 13.2 ug/g magnesium and lowest contents of 2.0 ug/g was estimated in *Rita rita* (F3).

The simple mathematical ratio between the concentrations of metals in muscles: liver and Gills (M:L:G) was estimated. The ratio was highly variable over the range of the metal and fish species studied. Iron and manganese were higher in quantities in gill except F7. The liver is a significant organ in toxicological processes and is also detoxification

centre [28]. The copper concentration was mostly higher in liver than much muscles except F1 and F3. The nickel contents was higher in the liver of F2 and F7. The nickel contents were observed higher in liver and gills than muscles. Zinc and lead concentrations were also higher in gills except F7. The higher concentrations of metal in gills may be due to uptake mechanism of metals from water by gills.

The results indicate that iron was the dominant element in fish muscles followed by the zinc. Among the major metals potassium was the dominant. The total metal concentration exhibited the following decreasing sequence:

Fe > Zn > Mn > Cu > Pb > Ni > Co > Cd; K > Na > Ca > Mg

The trends did not obey exactly a similar pattern as for relevant water. The present work therefore do not reflect the absolute correlation in concentration of the metal and environment. Therefore the levels of the metal ions in fish may not be the total indicator of the ambient pollution [29,30]. The biological impact of heavy metals may be based on the actual concentrations in the particular species.

Experimental

The fish samples were collected from river Indus, upstream of Kotri barrage through the Fuleli canal upto Behar colony, the limits the Fuleli canal left the Hyderabad city during the years 96-97.

Ten different fish species were collected, three (F1-F3) from river Indus and seven from different locations from Fuleli canal (F4-F10) Table-1.

The fishes were sampled thrice from Fuleli canal and river Indus. The fishes were captured with a net of mesh size 2-4 cm. The fish communities collected were brought to the laboratory and were

identified. In all 63 fish samples were obtained and analysed. The fishes were weighed and their fork lengths were measured (Table-I). Samples of fish tissue were dissected from muscles, liver and gills using stainless steel implements and frozen in sample tube (-20°C) till analysis.

Triplicate sub samples (5-50 g) were taken from the mass of fish tissue (muscle, liver and gills). The samples were placed separately in digestion flasks and were treated with 50 ml of hydrochloric acid (36%) and nitric acid (65%) (1:1). The contents were digested until most of the mass dissolved. The contents were then heated gently to near dryness. The residue was dissolved in 5 ml nitric acid (0.5 M) and was diluted to 25 ml with double distilled water. The solution was run on Varian Spectr AA-20 atomic absorption spectrophotometer equipped with standard burner head at the conditions recommended by the manufacturer. Copper, nickel, iron, cobalt, lead, manganate, cadmium and zinc were analysed using analytical line at 324.7, 232.0, 248.3, 240.7, 217.0, 279.5 and 213.9 nm respectively. The analysis was carried out in triplicate with integration time 3 sec. and delay time 3 sec. The amounts were evaluated from the calibration graphs obtained from respective standards.

Conclusions

The work reports major and minor metal contents in 10 fish species found at river Indus and Fuleli canal. The variation of a metal content among the species was large may be because of different mechanisms for bio-accumulation. However the average values for the metal contents for the fishes studied indicated potassium as highest and cadmium as the lowest.

References

1. G. Mance, pollution threat of heavy metals in aquatic environment, Elsevier, London (1987).
2. C.F. Mason, biology of fresh water pollution 2nd ed. Longman Scientific and Technical Essex (1991).
3. R. Dallinger, F. Prosi, H. Senger, H. Back, *Oecologia*, **73**, 91 (1987).
4. N. Pourange, *Environ. Monitor Assess*, **35**, 207 (1995).
5. D.G. Thomas, A. Cryer, J. Solbe, L. G. De, J.A. Kay, *Comp. Biochem. Physiol.* **76**, 241 (1983).
6. R. Dallinger, H. Kautzky, *Oecologia*, **67**, 82 (1985).
7. T. Braunbeck, W. Hanke, H. Segner, Fish Ecotoxicology and Ecophysiology, VCH Verlagsgesellschaft MbH, D-6940 Weinheim, Germany (1993).
8. K.S. Badsha, C.R. Goldspink, *J. Fish Biol.* **21**, 251 (1982).
9. A. Johnson, D. Norton, B. Take, S. Swiss, *Bull. Environ. Contam. Toxicol.* **45**, 703 (1990).
10. A. Efrin, G. Gallindo, G.F. Munos, A. S. Florer, *Bull. Environ. Contam. toxicol.* **41**, 210 (1988).
11. M. Ashraf Tarique Jaleel, M. Jaffar, *Fish Res.* **12**, 355 (1991).
12. M. Ashraf, M. Jaffer, Tarique Jaleel, *Toxicol. Environ. Chem.* **35**, 1 (1992).
13. Tarique Jaleel, M. Jaffer, M. Ashraf, *Toxicol. Environ. Chem.* **33**, 133 (1991).
14. V.K. Dewani, I.A. Ansari, M.Y. Khuhawar, *J. Sci. Sindh*, **2**, 45 (1994).
15. R. Arain, M.Y. Khuhawar, Carbon Transport in Indus river. Preliminary results, In transport of Carbon and Minerals in Major World Rivers, part I, (Ed. E.T. Degens), Mitt. Geol. Paleont. Inst. Univ. Hamberg SCOPE/UNEP Sonderbd. **52**: 449 (1982).
16. R. Arain, Carbon and mineral Transport in Indus river, 1982-83, In transport of Carbon and Minerals in Major World Rivers, part III, (Ed. E.T. Degens, S. Kempe, R. herrera), Mitt. Geol. Paleont. Inst. Univ. Hamberg SCOPE/UNEP Sonderbd. **55**, 487 (1985).
17. R. Arain, Persisting trends in carbon and mineral transport monitoring of Indus river, In Transport of Carbon and Minerals in Major World Rivers, part IV, (Ed. E.T. Degens, S. Kempe, G. Wei-Bin), Mitt. Geol. Paleont. Inst. Univ. Hamberg SCOPE/UNEP Sonderbd. **64**, 417 (1987).
18. R. Arain, carbon and mineral transport by Indus river, An overview after five years (1981-85) of monitoring of river discharge to Arabian sea. In Transport of Carbon and Minerals in Major World Rivers, part V, (Ed. E.T. Degens, S. Kempe, S.A. Naidu), Mitt. Geol. Paleont. Inst. Univ. Hamberg SCOPE/UNEP Sonderbd. **66**, 93 (1988).
19. V. K. Dewani, I.A. Ansari, M.Y. Khuhawar *J. Chem. Soc. Pak.* **19**, 267 (1997).
20. I.A. Ansari V.K. Dewani, M.Y. Khuhawar, *J. Chem. Soc. Pak.* **21**, 359 (1999)
21. V.K. Dewani, I.A. Ansari M.Y. Khuhawar, *J. Chem. Soc. Pak.* **22**, 104 (2000)
22. V.K. Dewani, I.A. Ansari M.Y. Khuhawar, *Pak. J. Sci. Ind. Res.*

23. E.A. Laws, Aquatic pollution, A Wiley-Interscience publications, John Wiley & Sons, Inc. New York, pp 304 (1981).
24. J. Tarique, M. Ashraf, M. Jaffer, *Toxicol. Environ. Chem.* **40**, 169 (1994).
25. V.K. Dewani, Pollution study of pre and post mixing of Hyderabad sewage on water and sediment quality of Fuleli canal, Ph.D thesis, University of Sindh (2000).
26. J.R. Giesy, J.C. Wiener, *Trans. Am. Fish Soc.* **106**, 393 (1977).
27. V.V. Metelev, A.I. Karaev, N.G. Dzasokhova, Water Toxicology, American Publishing Co. Pvt. Ltd. New Dehli (1983).
28. G.A. McFariani, W.G. Franzin, *Can. J. Fish Aquat. Sci.* **37**, 157 (1980).
29. P.A. Amundsen, F.J. Staldink, A.A. Lukw. N.A. Kashutin, O.A. Popova, Y.S. Reshetnikov, *Sci. total Environment*, **201**, 211 (1997).
30. R.W. Prally, J.R. Morris, *Water Air, Soil Pollut.* **27**, 341 (1986).