
Research Article

Clarias Gariepinus Parasites as Bioindicator For Assessing Water Quality in Omi Dam, Kogi State, Nigeria

Olubiyo C. K.^{1*}, Audu P. A.², Adang K. L.³, Alege G.O.⁴, Badaki J. A.⁵, Atawodi J. C.⁶

¹Department of Biological Sciences, Kogi State University Kabba, 261101, Nigeria

^{2,5,6}Department of Zoology, Federal University Lokoja, 260101, Nigeria

³Department of Biology, Federal University Lokoja, 260101, Nigeria

⁴Department of Biotechnology, Federal University Lokoja, 260101, Nigeria

Abstract:

Studies using host-parasite dynamics as bioindicator of effects and accumulators of heavy metals for assessing environmental quality are still scarce, particularly in developing countries. This study aimed at elucidating the possible use of parasites of fish in monitoring and assessing water quality. 102 samples of 18 species of parasites of *Clarias gariepinus* were analyzed for copper, lead, manganese, iron, zinc and cadmium concentrations. Heavy metal concentrations were determined using atomic absorption spectrophotometer. Physico-chemical parameters were measured on sites using Hanna instrument. The nutrients and non-toxic constituents of water were also determined using methods by (American Public Health Association, 1999). The data obtained were analyzed using analysis of variance and significant differences accepted at $p \leq 0.05$. Duncan Multiple range test was used to compare the heavy metal accumulation in the parasites and sample t- test was used to compare the values of physico-chemical parameters, nutrients and non-toxic constituents of the water. The heavy metal concentrations in parasites of *C. gariepinus* were in the order of Lead>Cadmium>Copper>Iron>Magnese>Zinc. Bioindicating capacity of parasites were in the order Nematodes>Cestodes>Protozoan>Trematodes. All physico-chemical parameters of the water (pH, temperature, salinity, turbidity, electrical conductivity, total dissolved solid) except dissolved oxygen were within the permissible level of the WHO (2011) permissible limits. The water nutrients except fluoride were within the permissible limits of WHO (2011). The non-toxic constituents were within permissible limits except NH_4^+ in the control study sites and PO_4^{3-} in both study sites that was not within permissible limits. This study revealed that parasites can be ideal indicators for both effects and accumulation of heavy metals in aquatic environments. Findings from this study demonstrate the need for an ecosystem friendly approach towards sustainable management of dams and rivers. This will curb aquatic pollution which can directly and indirectly affect the structure and composition of fish parasite communities and also lead to a health risk in people consuming aquatic resources contaminated with heavy metals.

Keywords: Bioindicator, heavy metal, Omi dam, *Clarias gariepinus*, Physico-chemical

Introduction

Fish parasite species have been identified as being highly sensitive either in their physiological response to aquatic contaminants or in their ability to accumulate particular toxins in a dose-time dependent manner (Madanire-Moyo *et al.*, 2012; Perez-I-Garcia *et al.*, 2015). Bioindicators are organisms that can integrate and reflect the effects of heavy metals over an extended period of time. Bioindicators are differentially sensitive to environmental stressors and are therefore suitable tools for biomonitoring programmes (Justus *et al.* 2010). An indicator organism should at least have the following characteristics: (1) Taxonomic soundness, (2) low mobility, (3) well-known ecological characteristics, (4) wide distribution, (5) high sensitivity to environmental stressors, (6) numerical abundance, (7) suitability for laboratory experiments and (8) high ability for quantification and standardisation. Historically, the assessment of water quality using bioindicator organisms has been through the use of free-living biota such as fish, macroinvertebrates, and plankton (Ortega-Álvarez and MacGregor-Fors, 2011; Tweedley *et al.*, 2014; Keke *et al.*, 2017). Nevertheless, the use of free-living biota as bioindicators is characterized by several constraints; for example: (1) the sampling processes are sophisticated and require loads of funds;(2) sampling routine requires considerable amounts of samples to make any meaningful inference; (3) the composition of the organisms is affected by seasonal and temporal dynamics; (4) the large-scale heterogeneity in interpreting results occasioned by the use of sophisticated analytic tools and methods (Wright, 2010; Vidal-Martínez and Wunderlich, 2017).

Emphasis is shifting to the use of parasites as both effect indicators and accumulation indicators, given that they respond differently to a variety of pollutants in the environment (Vidal-Martínez *et al.*, 2014; Vidal-Martínez and Wunderlich, 2017; Hassan *et al.*, 2018; Al-Hasawi, 2019; Mehana *et al.*, 2020). Helminth parasites of fish (e.g.trematodes, nematodes, cestodes and

acanthocephalans) have been employed as ideal tools for biomonitoring of heavy metal insults in aquatic ecosystem studies (Bush *et al.*, 2001; Sures, 2003; Hassan *et al.*, 2018; AlHasawi, 2019).

Materials and Methods

Use of Parasites of *Clarias gariepinus* as Biological indicators

Heavy metal Analysis

Wet digestion method

Approximately 0.5 grams of parasites sample was placed in a porcelain crucible and dissolved in 2 ml concentrated nitric acid HNO₃ and heated at 100°C for 6hours. Upon cooling, it was filtered through Whatman No. 42 filter paper into a 50 ml volumetric flask and made to volume with triple distilled water of the sample. A blank solution was also prepared using similar experimental procedure (Haipeng *et al.*, 2019).

Instrumentation

The heavy metal content was determined by employing Atomic Absorption Spectrophotometer (AAS), Analyst 700 Perkin Elmer, USA (Perkin, 1996) with air-acetylene burner for flame. A liquol of the digested solution was aspirated to the instrument for the determination of metals/mineral iron (Fe), Copper (Cu), Lead (Pb), Zinc (Zn), Manganese (Mn) and Cadmium (Cd). Calibration of AAS was done using the working standard prepared from commercially available metal/mineral standard solutions 1000 g/ml. The most appropriate wavelength hallow cathode lamp was selected as given in the instrument user's manual. The measurement was made within linear range of working standard used for calibration (AOAC, 2022).

Water Quality

Water quality parameter from fish sampling site i.e. physico-chemical parameter such as temperature, pH, Electrical Conductivity (S/m), salinity (‰), dissolved oxygen (mg/l), Total Dissolved Solid(mg/l) and Turbidity (NTU) were used.

Determination of the Physico-chemical Parameters of Omi Dam Water

Temperature (°C) , pH, electrical conductivity, turbidity, total dissolved solid and salinity of the water was measured by dipping a Hanna instrument model HI 98129 in water for 1-2 minutes then the reading was recorded (APHA, 1999).

Determination of dissolved oxygen

100 ml of Water sample was poured into a 300 ml Biological Oxygen Demand (BOD) bottle, Two Millilitre (2 ml) of M_nSO₄ and 2ml of alkali –iodide azide reagent and then stoppered with care to exude air bubbles. It was thereafter mixed by inverting the bottles a number of times until a clear supernatant was observed. It was then allowed to settle for 2 minutes after which 2 ml of Concentrated H₂SO₄ was added by allowing the acid run down the neck of the bottle. It was stoppered again by gentle inversion until the solution was complete. Exactly, 100 ml of the prepared solution was transferred into a conical flask, titrated with 0.0125N of Na₂ So₂ O₃.5H₂O solution to a pale straw/yellow colour. Approximately 1 ml of freshly prepared starch was added. Titration was continued by adding thiosulphate until the blue colour disappeared.

$$Do_2 = \frac{100 \times 8 \times n \times v^{-1}}{V}$$

Where V⁻¹ = Volume of thiosulphate used (Titre value)

n = normality of thiosulphate (0.013IN)

v= volume of sample used (200ml)

Determination of chloride

Exactly 100 ml of water sample was transferred into a conical flask, 2-3 drops of Potassium Chromate were added, and content was swirled for few minutes and then titrated against Silver nitrate solution until a dirty reddish precipitate was obtained. Chloride was calculated using Clmg/1 = volume of AgNO₃ x 10 (APHA, 1999).

Determination of fluoride

Approximately 20.0ml of standard solution of NaoH to 100 ml, 10 to 25 ml of Nacl in 100ml beakers, the samples in room temperature, equal volume of buffer added to each beaker. Calibration was set up at 10 meter using standard solution. Standard solution already diluted with the buffer was supplied with meter to avoid stirring before immersing an electrode a direct instrument used for reading (APHA, 1999).

Determination of calcium

Exactly 50 ml of sample was taken into a conical flask with the help of a pipette. 1 ml of NaoH was added to produce pH of 13-14 and 0.2 g muroxide was added as indicator and stirred. It is titrated with 0.1N EDTA solution until a colour change from pink to

purple is observed. The volume of EDTA was recorded as that of the value of Calcium (APHA, 1999).

Determination of magnesium

The values of total hardness and Calcium hardness was determined by Ethylene Diamine Tetra Acetic Acid (EDTA) and Magnesium was calculated (APHA, 1999).

Calculation

$$\text{Mg Mg/L} = (\text{TH as mg CaCO}_3/\text{L} - \text{Calcium}) \text{Hardness as mg CaCO}_3/\text{L} \times 0.243$$

TH = Total Hardness, Mg CaCO₃/L

Determination of potassium

Photometry flamecell method was used. Instructions of flame photometer was followed for selecting proper photocell wave length, slit width adjustments, fuel gas and air pressure, step for warm up a blank and potassium calibration standard was prepared ranges, 0-100, 10 or 0-1 mgK/L remission at 766.5 nm was measured and calibration curve. Potassium concentration of the sample was determined from the curve calculation

$$\text{MgK/L} = \text{mgK/L from the calibration} \times \text{Dilution}$$

$$\text{Dilution} = \frac{\text{mL sample} + \text{mL distilled water}}{\text{mL Sample}} \quad \text{Determination of sodium}$$

Photometry flamecell method was used. Instructions of flame photometer for selecting proper photocell, wavelength, width adjustment, fuel gas and air pressure, steps for warm up was followed. A blank solution was prepared and Sodium calibration, in any of the ranges 0-100, 0-10, 0-1 mg Na/L. Instrument was set at zero with standard containing sodium emission, calibration curve at 589 nm was measured. Sodium concentration was determined by the sample, diluted sample or from the curve calculations

$$\text{Mg Na/L} = \text{mgNa/L from calibration curve} \times \text{Dilution}$$

Where: Dilution = $\frac{\text{mL sample} + \text{mL distilled water}}{\text{mL sample}}$

Determination of non-toxic constituents of the omi dam water

Non-toxic constituents of the water such as Total Nitrogen (Inorganic Nitrogen), Nitrate, Nitrite, Ammonium and Phosphate were determined using the method of APHA (1999).

Data Analysis

Values are Mean± SD, data were analyzed using one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and Duncan Multiple range test to separate the means and compare the heavy metal parameters. Data were analyzed using independent sample t-test is to compare the parameters of the physico-chemical parameters, nutrients and non-toxic constituents of the study area and control at <0.05 level of significance.

Results

Table 1: Parasites of *Clarias gariepinus* as Biological Indicators

| | Fe | Cu | Cd | Zn | Mn | Pb |
|--|--|--------------------------|--|--|---------------------------|---|
| <i>(Control)Ichthyophthiriu s multifilis</i> | 0.008±0.001 ^a | 0.015±0.007 ^a | 0.115±0.000 ^a | 0.001±0.000 ^a | 0.005±0.001 ^a | 0.025±0.007 ^a |
| <i>Acanthostomum imbutiforme</i> | 0.039±0.016 ^b | 0.298±0.065 ^b | 0.316±0.010 ^c | 0.030±0.010 ^b | 0.041±0.005 ^{bc} | 0.571±0.155 ^{cd} ^e |
| <i>Agamospirura sp.</i> | 0.067±0.018 ^c | 0.300±0.036 ^b | 0.398±0.003 ^c ^d | 0.025±0.003 ^a ^b | 0.064±0.008 ^e | 0.503±0.086 ^{cd} ^e |
| <i>Apophallus muehlingi</i> | 0.052±0.016 ^d | 0.399±0.162 ^b | 0.293±0.003 ^b ^c | 0.030±0.003 ^b | 0.049±0.010 ^d | 0.402±0.049 ^b |
| <i>Bucephalus polymorphus</i> | 0.059±0.022 ^d | 0.263±0.071 ^b | 0.398±0.008 ^d | 0.025±0.008 ^a ^b | 0.058±0.007 ^{de} | 0.447±0.117 ^{bc} |
| <i>Capillaria brevispicula</i> | 0.045±0.006 ^c | 0.360±0.113 ^b | 0.629±0.012 ^{fg} | 0.033±0.012 ^b | 0.044±0.006 ^{bc} | 0.494±0.076 ^{cd} ^e |
| <i>Chloromyxum mucronatum</i> | 0.047±0.001 ^c | 0.375±0.090 ^b | 0.255±0.006 ^a ^b | 0.030±0.006 ^b | 0.045±0.005 ^{bc} | 0.527±0.139 ^{cd} ^e |
| <i>Diphyllobothrium latum larva</i> | 0.046±0.011 ^c | 0.331±0.146 ^b | 0.390±0.009 ^d | 0.030±0.009 ^b | 0.041±0.012 ^{bc} | 0.646±0.304 ^e |
| <i>Eimeria rivirei</i> | 0.040±0.021 ^b ^c | 0.360±0.013 ^b | 0.298±0.007 ^c | 0.029±0.007 ^b | 0.036±0.009 ^b | 0.509±0.098 ^{cd} ^e |

Olubiyo C. K. et al / Clarias Gariepinus Parasites as Bioindicator For Assessing Water Quality in Omi Dam, Kogi State, Nigeria

| | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| <i>Euclinostomum heterostomum</i> | 0.045±0.019 ^c | 0.340±0.081 ^b | 0.334±0.004 ^c | 0.032±0.004 ^b | 0.047±0.014 ^{cd} | 0.454±0.167 ^d |
| <i>Gyrodactylus latus</i> | 0.040±0.011 ^b | 0.397±0.164 ^b | 0.579±0.009 ^f | 0.031±0.009 ^b | 0.053±0.017 ^{de} | 0.517±0.069 ^{cd} |
| <i>Ichthyophthirius multifiliis</i> | 0.036±0.013 ^b | 0.344±0.142 ^b | 0.489±0.009 ^{ef} | 0.027±0.009 ^a | 0.050±0.010 ^d | 0.618±0.132 ^{de} |
| <i>Myxidium oviforme</i> | 0.040±0.012 ^b | 0.383±0.085 ^b | 0.373±0.012 ^c | 0.070±0.012 ^c | 0.044±0.011 ^{bc} | 0.530±0.086 ^{cd} |
| <i>Myxosoma branchialis</i> | 0.063±0.034 ^d | 0.296±0.088 ^b | 0.509±0.008 ^f | 0.024±0.008 ^a | 0.053±0.010 ^d | 0.573±0.085 ^{cd} |
| <i>Philometra intestinalis</i> | 0.047±0.011 ^b | 0.339±0.069 ^b | 0.683±0.004 ^g | 0.024±0.004 ^a | 0.053±0.007 ^{de} | 0.459±0.170 ^d |
| <i>Philometra rischata</i> | 0.054±0.016 ^d | 0.311±0.034 ^b | 0.403±0.006 ^e | 0.029±0.006 ^b | 0.059±0.013 ^{de} | 0.585±0.068 ^{cd} |
| <i>Scolex pleuronectis</i> | 0.052±0.021 ^d | 0.355±0.084 ^b | 0.575±0.012 ^f | 0.025±0.001 ^a | 0.052±0.012 ^{de} | 0.630±0.208 ^{de} |
| <i>Triaenophorus nodulosus</i> larvae | 0.041±0.013 ^b | 0.288±0.089 ^b | 0.436±0.006 ^{ef} | 0.034±0.006 ^b | 0.048±0.011 ^{cd} | 0.635±0.053 ^{de} |
| <i>Trypanosoma cobitis</i> | 0.043±0.019 ^c | 0.340±0.115 ^b | 0.287±0.006 ^b | 0.032±0.006 ^b | 0.045±0.012 ^{bc} | 0.578±0.252 ^{cd} |
| WHO 2011 | 0.3 | 0.05 | 0.003 | 5 | 0.05 | 0.010 |

Means with the same alphabets are not significantly different at p < 0.05

Table 2: Physico-Chemical Parameters of the Water in Omi Dam

| | Sample | Control | p-values | WHO 2011 permissible limits |
|------------------------------|------------|------------|----------|-----------------------------|
| Temperature(°C) | 6.30±0.00 | 6.76±0.01 | 0.000 | 20 |
| Ph | 7.95±0.07 | 7.55±0.07 | 0.030 | 6.5-8.5 |
| Turbidity(NTU) | 9.75±0.35 | 13.00±0.00 | 0.006 | 40 |
| Salinity(‰) | 0.06±0.01 | 0.09±0.00 | 0.018 | 0.6 |
| Electrical Conductivity(S/m) | 0.71±0.01 | 0.92±0.01 | 0.003 | 4 |
| Total Dissolved Solid(mg/L) | 40.25±0.35 | 99.95±0.07 | 0.000 | 600 |
| Dissolved Oxygen(mg/L) | 10.35±0.21 | 8.25±0.07 | 0.006 | 5 |

Table 3: Nutrients of the Water in Omi Dam

| | Sample | Control | p-values | WHO 2011 Permissible limit |
|----------------|------------|-------------|----------|----------------------------|
| Chloride(mg/L) | 7.05±0.14 | 2.98±0.00 | 0.001 | 250 |
| Fluoride(mg/L) | 6.83±0.18 | 2.86±0.00 | 0.000 | 1.5 |
| Na(mg/L) | 2.70±0.14 | 9.20±0.14 | 0.001 | 200 |
| K(mg/L) | 6.80±0.14 | 15.70±0.28 | 0.000 | 200 |
| Mg(mg/L) | 12.35±0.21 | 40.80±0.00 | 0.000 | 50 |
| Ca(mg/L) | 26.55±0.21 | 102.15±0.07 | 0.000 | 100 |

Table 4: Non-toxic Constituents of the Water in Omi Dam

| | Sample | Control | p-values | WHO 2011 permissible limit |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|----------|----------------------------|
| Total Nitrogen(mg/L) | 0.014±0.000 | 0.060±0.005 | 0.006 | 10 |
| NO ₃ ⁻ (mg/L) | 0.024±0.003 | 0.061±0.005 | 0.012 | 10 |
| NO ₂ ⁻ (mg/L) | 0.11±0.01 | 0.17±0.16 | 0.681 | 1.0 |
| NH ₄ ⁺ (mg/L) | 0.31±0.04 | 0.56±0.00 | 0.014 | 0.5 |
| PO ₄ ³⁻ (mg/L) | 6.91±0.10 | 6.38±0.05 | 0.021 | 5.0 |

Discussion

The findings of this study have revealed the order of heavy metal accumulation Pb>Cd>Cu>Fe>Mn>Zn. Lead (Pb) had the highest

accumulation compared to the other metals. This may be attributed to the source water/river that supplies the dam and the proximity of the dam to a rice mill where expired batteries and tyres are dumped into the river that supplies the dam. Also, higher level of Pb observed in parasites might be attributed to runoff from agricultural lands which contain agrochemical such as fertilizers and pesticides (Banat *et al.*, 1998). The findings in this current study are consistent with the report of previous researchers like Tenora *et al.* (2000); Lohan *et al.* (2001); Abdel-momem (2001); Sures and Reimann (2003); Thielen *et al.* (2004); Eira *et al.* (2009); Jankovska *et al.* (2010) and Shahtat *et al.* (2011) with the similar order of heavy metal accumulation (Pb>Cd>Cu).

The findings by Ogri (2004) and Abraham *et al.* (2015) were not consistent with this study, who reported Fe as most abundant metal and Keke *et al.* (2020)'s work also disagrees with heavy metal accumulation in their study being in this order Fe>Zn>Mn>Cu>Pb. Parasites that recorded the highest accumulation of heavy metal were *Philometra intestinalis* followed by *Diphyllobothrium latum*, *Triaenophorus nodulosus*, *Scolex pleuronectis* and *Capillaria brevispicula*. Bioindicating capacity of these parasites was in this order of Nematodes> Cestodes> Protozoans> Trematodes. Therefore, nematodes are believed to have higher accumulation capacity of heavy metals than the other parasites. The findings of this study are in consonance with the findings of other authors in this order: Acanthocephalan and Nematodes>Cestodes>Trematodes in Nigeria (Ugokwe and Awobode, 2015; Keke *et al.*, 2020), Egypt (El-Lamie and Adel-Mawla, 2018; Al-Hasawi, 2019), Iran and Saudi Arabia (Hassan *et al.*, 2018), South Africa (Erasmus *et al.*, 2020; Pretorius and Avenant-Oldewage, 2021).

Comparing metal accumulations in different helminthic taxa, helminthes utilized their gut for higher metal accumulation capacity because cestodes absorb their nourishment through their tegument and nematode larvae take up their nutrients through two routes; their digestive system and tegument.

To the best of my knowledge, Parasitic protozoans have never been employed as effect or accumulative indicators in any study before now, but were reported in this study suggesting a major breakthrough.

The concentration of iron (Fe) in fish parasites was below the permissible limit recommended by WHO (2011). The concentration of copper (Cu) in this study was less than 0.05 mgkg⁻¹ concentration recommended by WHO (2011) and 2.25 mgkg⁻¹ by WHO (2017). The concentration of cadmium (Cd) was higher than the 0.003 mgkg⁻¹ recommended permissible limit (WHO, 2011). It has been reported that exposure to cadmium enhances hypertension and kidney damage in humans (Yujun *et al.*, 2011). The concentration of zinc (Zn) in this study was lower than the tolerable level of 5.0 mgkg⁻¹ specified by WHO (2011). Manganese (Mn) concentration was found to be below the WHO Permissible limit of 0.50 mg/kg⁻¹. The concentration of Mn in this study appears considerably low, as excessive exposure or intake of it may lead to a condition known as Manganism, a neurodegenerative disorder that causes dopaminegic neuronal death and symptoms similar to Parkinson's disease (Silva *et al.*, 2013).

Lead concentration was higher than the recommended concentration of 0.010 mgkg⁻¹ of WHO (2011).

Also, anthropogenic activities around the dam could lead to lead accumulation above the permissible limit. The study area is an agro-industrial base community. Lead is one of the toxic heavy metals which have no known metabolic use. Lead accumulation in humans could lead to loss of concentration, delusions and hallucinations manifesting as poor memory and irritability mostly in children, mental capability reduction, difficulties in learning, growth reduction, anemia, severe stomach ache, weakness of muscle and brain damage (Izah *et al.*, 2015).

Temperature of Omi dam was within the WHO Permissible limit of 0-20°C. Aquatic organisms have a range of temperature at which optimal growth, general fitness and reproduction occur (Dallas and Day, 2004).

pH of Omi dam was within permissible limit of 6.5-8.5 (WHO, 2011). The pH values obtained in this study were within this range that is 7.55-7.95 which is slightly alkaline. The **pH** measures the concentration of the hydrogen ions (H⁺) and alkalinity by the concentration of hydroxyl, bicarbonate and carbonate ions in the water (Palmer *et al.*, 2004).

The turbidity of Omi dam was within permissible limit of 40 NTU (WHO, 2011), while that of the control (study site) was above the permissible limit (FEPA, 2004). Increase in turbidity has been associated with a loss of fish body condition and vision and leading to a decrease in ability to capture food. (Gray *et al.*, 2011).

The salinity of Omi dam was 0.06‰ and control study site was 0.09‰. Salinity is a term used to refer to the saltiness of the water (Dallas and Day, 2004). The electrical conductivity of the dam was within permissible limit of WHO (2011). Electrical conductivity is the ability of water to conduct an electrical current. The total dissolved solids of Omi dam were within the permissible limit (WHO, 2011). The TDS concentrations that are too high or too low may limit growth and may lead to the death of aquatic organisms (Dallas and Day, 2004).

Dissolved oxygen of Omi dam was above permissible limit of (WHO) 2011. These values exceeded permissible limit of 5.00 mgℓ⁻¹. According to Palmer *et al.* (2004), an increase in water temperature decreases oxygen solubility which may increase the toxicity of certain chemicals to aquatic life. The DO concentrations recorded in this study would not adversely affect the functioning and survival of biological communities because DO concentration value was below 5 mgℓ⁻¹ recorded during this study period.

The values for chloride were less than permissible limit of 250 mgℓ⁻¹, Fluoride was above the permissible limit of 1.5 mgℓ⁻¹ (WHO, 2011). Sodium was within permissible limit for sodium in aquatic ecosystem (WHO, 2011). The concentration of potassium in Omi dam was within the permissible limit (WHO, 2011). Magnesium was within permissible limit (WHO, 2011). The concentration of Calcium in Omi dam study site was within permissible limit of <100 mgℓ⁻¹ and above permissible limit in control study site (WHO, 2011). Calcium is a vital element for all living organisms (Dallas and Day, 2004).

Total Nitrogen was within permissible limit of (WHO) 2011. Ammonium in Omi dam was within permissible limit and control

study site was above permissible limit of 0.5 mg ℓ^{-1} (WHO, 2011). Ammonium concentrations recorded in the control study site was high and may thus result in mortalities of aquatic organisms. The high concentration of ammonium could be attributed to agricultural runoffs from farmlands. However, no mortalities of fish were recorded during the sampling period.

Nitrate was within the permissible limit of 10 mg ℓ^{-1} (WHO, 2011). Nitrite was within the permissible limit of 0.1 mg ℓ^{-1} (WHO, 2011). Phosphates in Omi dam and Control study site respectively found to exceed permissible limit of 5.0 mg ℓ^{-1} (WHO, 2011). Phosphate is a crucial nutrient for living organisms and exists in water bodies in both dissolved and particulate forms.

References

1. Abd El-Monem, S (2001). Fish parasites as biological indicators of pollution with heavy metals” Ph.D. Thesis, Fac.of Sci.Cairo Univ., Egypt. 237pp.
2. Abraham, J.T., Oloko, G.O. & Ikpeme, E.M (2015). Parasite of crayfish (*P. clarki*) and lobster (*Macrobrachium vollenhovenic*) as indicator of metallic pollutions in Great Kwa River, Nigeria. *Global Journal of Agricultural Sciences* 14:27-36.
3. Al-Hasawi, Z. M. (2019). Environmental Parasitology: intestinal helminth parasites of the siganid fish *Siganus rivulatus* as bioindicators for trace metal pollution in the Red Sea. *Parasite* 26(12):1-11. March 2019.
4. APHA, (American Public Health Association), (1999). Standard Method for Examination of Water and Waste Water. American Public Health Association, 1-8pp.
5. Banat, I.M., Hassan, E.S., El-Shahawi, M.S. & Abu-Hilal, A.H (1998). Postgulf-War Assessment of Nutrients, Heavy Metal Ions, Hydrocarbons and Bacterial Pollution Levels in the United Arab Emirates Coastal Waters. *Environmental International*, 24(2):109-116.
6. Bush, A.O., Fernandez, J.C., Esch, G.W. & Seed, J.R, Parasitism, the Diversity and Ecology of Animal Parasites. Cambridge University Press. 566pp. 2001.
7. Dallas, H.F. & Day, J.A, The Effect of Water Quality Variables on Riverine Ecosystems: a Review. Water Research Commission Report No TT 224/04. 222pp. 2004.
8. Eira, C., Torres, J., Miquel, J., Vaqueiro, J., Soares, A. & Vingada, J. (2008). Trace element concentrations in *Proteocephalus macrocephalus* (Cestoda) and *Anguillicola crassus* (Nematoda) in comparison to their fish host, *Anguilla anguilla* in Ria de Aveiro, Portugal”. *Science of the Total Environment* 407(2):991-998.
9. El-lamie, M.M. & Abdel-Mawla, H.I. (2018). Investigation of Acanthocephalan parasites in some marine fishes as a bio-indicator for heavy metals pollution. *Egyptian Journal of Aquatic Science* 8:13-30.
10. Erasmus, J.H., Wepener, V., Nachev, M., Zimmermann, S., Malherbe, W., Sures, B. & Smit, N.J. (2020).The role of fish helminth parasites in monitoring metal pollution in aquatic ecosystems: a case study in the world’s most productive platinum mining region. *Parasitology Research* 119:2783-2798.
11. FEPA (2004). National Environmental Standards: Water Quality. 153pp.
12. Gray, S.M., Sabbah, S. & Hawryshyn, C.W. (2011). Experimentally increased Turbidity causes behavioral shift in Lake Malawi Cichlids. *Ecology of Freshwater Fish* 20(1):529-536.
13. Haipeng, M., Xilin, Z., Liang, B., Zhonghua, S., Qingqing, H. & Di, L, (2019). Chongqing Academy of Metrology and Quality Inspection, China. *Earth and Environmental Science* 5:20-24.
14. Hassan, A., Moharram, S. & El Helaly, H. (2018). Role of parasitic helminths in bioremediating some heavy metal accumulation in the tissues of *Lethrinus mahsena*”. *Turkish Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Science* 435-443.
15. Izah, S.C., Chakrabarty, N. & Srivastav, A.L. (2015). A Review on Heavy Metal Concentration in Potable Water Sources in Nigeria: Human Health Effects and Mitigating Measures. *Exposure and Health*, 8:285-304.
16. Jankovská, I., Miholová, D., Bejcek, V., Vadlejš J., Sulc, M., Szaková, J. & Langrová, I. (2010). Influence of Parasitism on Trace element contents in tissues of Red Fox (*Vulpes vulpes*) and its parasite Mesocestoidea spp. (Cestoda) and *Toxocara leonina* (Nematoda). *Arch Environ Contam Toxicol*, 58:469-477.
17. Justus, B.G., Petersen, J.C., Femmer, S.R., Davis, J.V. & Wallace, J.E. (2010). A comparison of algal, macroinvertebrate, and fish assemblage indices for assessing low-level nutrient enrichment in wadeable Ozark streams. *Ecological Indicators*, 10:627-638.
18. Keke, U.N., Arimoro, F.O., Auta, Y.I. & Ayanwale, A.V. (2017). Temporal and spatial variability in Macroinvertebrate community structure in relation to environmental variables in Gbako River. Niger State, Nigeria. *Tropical Ecology*, 58:229-240.
19. Keke, U.N., Mgbemena, A.S., Arimoro, F.O. & Omalu, I.C. (2020). Biomonitoring of effects and accumulations of heavy metals insults using some helminth parasites of fish as bio-indicators in an Afrotropical stream”. *Frontier in Environmental Science* 8:155.
20. Lohan, C.M., Statham, P.J. & Peck, L. (2001). Trace metals in the Antarctic soft-shelled *Laternula elliptica*: implications for metal pollution from Antarctic research stations. *Polar Biology* 24:808-817.
21. Madanire-Moyo, G.N., Luus-Powel, W.J. & Olivier, P.A. (2012). Diversity of metazoan parasites of the Mozambique tilapia, *Oreochromis mossambicus* (Peters, 1852), as indicators of pollution in the Limpopo and Olifants River systems. *Onderstepoort Journal of Veterinary Research* 79: 362-369.

22. Mehana, E. E., Khafaga, A. F., Elblehi, S. S., Abd El-Hack, M. E., Naiel, M. A. & Bin-Jumah, M. (2020). Biomonitoring of heavy metal pollution using acanthocephalans parasite in ecosystem: an updated overview. *Animals* 10:811.
23. Official Methods of Analysis of Association of Analytical Chemist International (2022). The Official Method of Analysis. 22nd Edition. 771pp.
24. Ogrı, O.R. (2004).The Distribution of Heavy metals and Hydrocarbon in water /sediment and biota from Great Kwa River Estuary, South Eastern Nigeria. An unpublished PhD Theses. University of Calabar, Nigeria. 230pp.
25. Ortega-Álvarez, R. & MacGregor-Fors, I. (2011). Distinguishing the file: a review of knowledge on urban ornithology in Latin America". *Landscape Urban Planning*, 101(1):1-10.
26. Palmer, T., Berold, R. & Muller, N. (2004). Environmental Water Quality in Waterresources Management". WRC Report No. TT 217/04.
27. Perez-I-Garcia, D., Constenla, M., Padros, F., Soler-Membrives, A., Sole, M. & Carrasson, M. (2015). Parasite communities of the deep-sea fish *Alepocephalus rostratus* Risso, 1820 in the Balearic Sea (NW Mediterranean) along the slope and relationships with enzymatic biomarkers and health indicators. *Deep Sea Research Part I: Oceanography Research Papers* 99:65-74.
28. Perkin, E. (1996). Analytical Methods for Atomic Absorption Spectroscopy". USA: The Perkin Elmer Corporation.
29. Pretorius, M. & Avenant-Oldewage, A. (2021). Parasites as biological indicators: the impact of environmental quality on the infections of *Lamproglana clariae* (Crustacea) on *Clarias gariepinus* along the Vaal River, South Africa. *Biological Trace Element Research* 1:11.
30. Rajappa, B., Manjappa, S. & Puttaiah, E. T. (2010). Monitoring of Heavy metal in groundwater of Hakinaka TaluK, India. *Contemporary Engineering Sciences*, 3(4):183-190.
31. Ramdane, Z., Trilles, J.P., Mahe, K. & Amara, R. (2013). Metazoan ectoparasites of two teleost fish, *Boops boops* (L.) and *Mullus barbatus barbatus* L. from Algerian coast: diversity, parasitological index and impact of parasitism. *Cybium*, 37(1-2):59-66.
32. Rosenberg, D.M. & Resh, V.H. (1993). *Freshwater Biomonitoring and Benthic Micro Invertebrates*" Chapman and Hall: Pp 1-488.
33. Shahat, M.A., Amer, O.S.O., AbdAllah, A.T., Abdelsater, N. & Moustafa, M.A. (2011). The distribution of certain heavy metals between intestinal parasites and their fish hosts in the River Nile at Assuit Province, Egypt". *The Egyptian Journal of Hospital Medicine*, 43:241-257.
34. Silva, A., Daiana, Luiz, P., Robson, A. & Michael, (2013). Chapter 7. Manganese in Health and Disease". In Astrid Sigel (eds.). *Interrelations between Essential Metal Ions in Life Sciences*. 13. Springer. Pp.199-227.
35. Sures, B. (2003). Accumulation of Heavy Metals by Intestinal Helminthes in Fish: an Overview and Perspective". *Parasitology* 126:53-60. 2003.
36. Sures, B. & Reinmann, N. (2003). Analysis of Trace Metals in the Antarctic Host – Parasite System *Notothenia corciiceps* and *Aspersentismegarhychus* (Acanthocephalan) caught at King George Island, South Shetland Islands". *Polar Biology* 26:680-686.
37. Tenora, F., Baruš, V., Kráčmar, S. & Dvořáček, J. (2000). Concentrations of some heavy metals in *Ligula intestinalis* plerocercoids (Cestoda) and *Philometra ovata* (Nematoda) compared to some of their hosts (Osteichthyes)". *Helminthologia* 37(1):15-18.
38. Thielen, F., Zimmermann, S., Baska, F., Taraschewski, H. & Sures, B. (2004). The Intestinal Parasite *Pomphorhynchus laevis* (Acanthocephala) from *Barbell* as a Bioindicator for Metal Pollution in Danube River near Budapest. Hungary". *Environmental Pollution* 129:421-429.
39. Tweedley, J. R., Warwick, R. M., Clarke, K. R. & Potter, I. C. (2014).Family-levelAMBII valid for use in the north-eastern Atlantic but not for assessing the health of microtidal Australian estuaries". *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science* 141:85-96.
40. Ugokwe, C.U. & Awobode, H.O (2015). Heavy Metals in organs and endoparasites of, *Oreochromis niloticus*, Sediment and Water from River Ogun, Ogun State, Nigeria. *IOSR Journal of Environmental Science, Toxicology and Food Technology* 9:101-109.
41. Vidal-Martínez, V. M., Pal, P., Aguirre-Macedo, M. L., May Tec, A. L. & Lewis, J. W. (2014). Temporal variation in the dispersion patterns of metazoan parasites of a coastal fish species from the Gulf of Mexico". *Journal of Helminthology* 88:112-122.
42. Vidal-Martínez, V. M. & Wunderlich, A. C. (2017). Parasites as bioindicators of environmental degradation in Latin America: a meta-analysis. *Journal of Helminthology* 91: 165-173.
43. WHO (2011). Guidelines for Drinking Water Quality. 4thEdition, World Health Organization. Geneva. 564pp.
44. WHO (2017). Guidelines for Drinking Water Quality". 4thEdition, Volume 1: Incorporating 1st and 2nd Addenda. World Health Organization. Geneva. 631pp.
45. Wright, J. (2010). Biomonitoring with Aquatic Benthic Macroinvertebrates in Southern Costa Rica in Support of Community Based Watershed Monitoring". M.Sc. thesis, York University, Toronto, ON.105pp.
46. Yujun, Q.I., Penj, F. & Liepeng, A. (2011). Composition of Theoretical Solution and Ultimate Span Length between FRP Cables and Steel Cables". *Civil Construction and Environmental Engineering*, 33(4):52-58.