Importance of artificial water bodies in maintaining a balanced food web and freshwater biodiversity in an urban park
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Abstract

The survey was performed from May 2020 and May 2022 in lake and Pakhibitan’s pond. Both are the main carrier of the freshwater life in Ecopark. Pakhibitan’s pond is very small in size in compare to the lake but quite undisturbed. During the study period, a total of 27 species of fishes belonging to 6 orders, 12 families were recorded also as per IUCN out of 27 species, 24 are Least Concern (LC), 1 species is in Vulnerable (VU), 1 species is in Not Evaluated (NE) and 1 species is in Data Deficient (DD) category. A total of 4 species of phylum Mollusca belonging to 3 orders, 4 families were recorded also, all are Least Concern. The lake and Pakhibitan's pond region help to preserve the freshwater ecology. Both contributed to the development of a food web and the flourishing of all ecological organisms.
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1. Introduction

Freshwater ecosystems provide a diverse range of goods and ecological services for human well-being, including drinking water, sanitation, and irrigation (Green et al., 2015; Harrison et al., 2010) \[1, 2\]. Furthermore, while occupying less than 1% of the Earth's surface, freshwater ecosystems are incredibly rich, supporting approximately 10% of all known living species and one-third of vertebrates (Strayer and Dudgeon, 2010; Winemiller, 2018) \[3, 4\]. Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (2005) \[5\] state that freshwater biodiversity dropped by 55% from 1970 to 2002, while terrestrial and marine biodiversity declined by 32% each. Given the gap in the taxonomic database on freshwater biodiversity, one has to infer that the true figure for continental waters was much greater (Balian et al., 2008) \[6\]. So, urban lakes and ponds have become important part of any city as well as the country. Since they provide a habitat for aquatic species (Chester & Robson, 2013) \[7\], support with sustainable water management (Novotny, 2008) \[8\], and provide essential blue space for wildlife and humans, urban ponds and lakes have a high scientific and sociological value (White et al., 2010; Higgins et al., 2019) \[9, 10\]. Urban freshwater ecosystems are a complex mosaic of ecosystems that have been influenced by anthropogenic concerns such as residential development, habitat degradation, water pollution, flow regime disruption, ineffective management approaches, and species invasion (Hassall, 2014) \[11\].

In this study, we give a comprehensive case study of the ecological state, biodiversity, and community dynamics of urban waterbodies in Ecopark (Kolkata, West Bengal, India). The principal purposes are to (i) present a foodweb perspective on the biodiversity and community structure of macrofauna, and (ii) determine if indicators based on trophic status, biodiversity, and community structure of foodweb components (avifauna, ichthyofauna, herpetofauna, odonates and aquatic macroinvertebrates) are useful tools for assessing the ecological status of urban water bodies.
2. Materials and Methods

2.1 Study area

The survey was performed from May 2020 and May 2022 in lake and Pakhibitan’s pond by using direct observation method. The study areas are in an urban park called Ecopark (Fig 1), located in Kolkata. Lake and Pakhibitan’s pond are the main carrier of the freshwater life in Ecopark. The area of the lake is 104 acres which is approx one fourth of the 480 acres in Ecopark where the pond in Pakhibitan is very small in size in compare to the lake but quite undisturbed.

Fig 1: Map of the study site

For photography of the species Nikon Coolpix P900 and P600 were used. For identification of the fishes, mollusks and crabs were done with the help of these guidebook “Classification and Identification of Freshwater Fishes” (Hiware et al., 2020) [12] and “The Mollusks: A Guide to Their Study, Collection, and Preservation” (Sturm et al., 2006) [13] respectively.

3. Result

During the study period, a total of 27 species of fishes belonging to 6 orders, 12 families were recorded (Table 1). In this study, as per IUCN (2022) [14] out of 27 species, 24 are Least Concern (LC), 1 species is in Vulnerable (VU), 1 species is in Not Evaluated (NE) and 1 species is in Data Deficient (DD) category (Table-1). Order Cypriniformes was most dominant (13 species), followed by Perciformes (8 species), Osteoglossiformes (2 species), Siluriformes (2 species), Cyprinodontiformes (1 species), Synbranchiformes (1 species) (Table-2, Figure-2). Cyprinidae is the most abundant family, contributing 44.82% of the ichthyofauna of the Ecopark. The family Channidae is second most abundant with 10.34% of the total species (Table-3, Figure-3).

Table 1: Checklist of observed fish species with order, family and IUCN status

| Sl No. | Local Name | Scientific Name                        | Order: Cypriniformes | Family: Cyprinidae |
|--------|------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------|
| 1      | Rui        | Labeo rohita (Hamilton, 1822)         | Cypriniformes        | Labeo rohita     |
| 2      | Katla      | Catla catla (Hamilton, 1822)          | Cypriniformes        | Catla catla      |
| 3      | Mrigal     | Cirrhinus mrigala (Hamilton, 1822)    | Cypriniformes        | Cirrhinus mrigala|
| 4      | Bata       | Labeo bata (Hamilton, 1822)           | Cypriniformes        | Labeo bata       |
| 5      | Bata       | Cirrhinus reba (Hamilton, 1822)       | Cypriniformes        | Cirrhinus reba    |
| 6      | Kalbose    | Labeo calbasu (Hamilton, 1822)        | Cypriniformes        | Labeo calbasu    |
| 7      | Sarpunti   | Puntius sarana (Hamilton, 1822)       | Cypriniformes        | Puntius sarana   |
| 8      | Tipunti    | Puntius ticto (Hamilton, 1822)        | Cypriniformes        | Puntius ticto    |
| 9      | Punti      | Puntius sophore (Hamilton, 1822)      | Cypriniformes        | Puntius sophore   |
| 10     | Silver Karp| Hypophthalmichthys nobilis (Richardson, 1845) | Cypriniformes | Hypophthalmichthys nobilis |
| 11     | Grass Karp | Ctenopharyngodon idella (Valenciennes, 1844) | Cypriniformes | Ctenopharyngodon idella |
IUCN (International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources) Red list: LC: Least Concern, VU: Vulnerable, NE: Not Evaluated, DD: Data Deficient

Table 2: Name of the order and number of species and % of abundance

| Sl No. | Order               | Number of species | % of species abundance |
|--------|---------------------|-------------------|------------------------|
| 1      | Cypriniformes       | 13                | 44.82                  |
| 2      | Cyprinodontiformes  | 1                 | 3.44                   |
| 3      | Osteoglossiformes   | 2                 | 6.89                   |
| 4      | Perciformes         | 8                 | 27.58                  |
| 5      | Siluriformes        | 2                 | 6.89                   |
| 6      | Synbranchiformes    | 1                 | 3.44                   |

Fig 2: Relationship among order and species abundance
Table 3: Name of the family and number of species and % of abundance

| Sl No. | Family       | Number of species | % of species abundance |
|--------|--------------|-------------------|------------------------|
| 1      | Cyprinidae   | 1                 | 44.82                  |
| 2      | Poeciliidae  | 1                 | 3.44                   |
| 3      | Notopteridae | 2                 | 6.89                   |
| 4      | Ambassidae   | 1                 | 3.44                   |
| 5      | Anabantidae  | 1                 | 3.44                   |
| 6      | Channidae    | 3                 | 10.34                  |
| 7      | Cichlidae    | 2                 | 6.89                   |
| 8      | Osphronemidae| 1                 | 3.44                   |
| 9      | Claridae     | 1                 | 3.44                   |
| 10     | Heteropneustidae | 1 | 3.44               |
| 11     | Synbranchidae| 1                 | 3.44                   |

Fig 3: Relationship among family and species abundance

A total of 4 species of phylum Mollusca belonging to 3 orders, 4 families were recorded (Table 4). In this study, as per IUCN (2022) [14], all are Least Concern (LC) category (Table-4). Order Architaenioglossa was most dominant (2 species), followed by Stylommatophora (1 species), Unionida (1 species) (Table-4).

Table 4: Checklist of observed Mollusca with order, family and IUCN status

| Sl No. | Local Name               | Scientific Name                      | IUCN Status |
|--------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------|
| 1      | Channeled Apple snail    | Pomacea canaliculata (Lamarck, 1819) | LC          |
| 2      | Common banded Pond Snail | Filepseudina bengalensis (Lamarck, 1822) | LC          |
| 3      | African Giant Snail      | Lissachatina fulica (Férussac, 1821) | NE          |
| 4      | Freshwater mussel        | Lamellidens marginalis (Lamarck, 1819) | LC          |

IUCN (International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources) Red list: LC: Least Concern, NE: Not Evaluated
Only 2 types of freshwater crabs were recorded both are Least Concern (LC), one is Sartoriana spinigera (Wood-Mason, 1871) and other is Varuna litterata Fabricius (1798).

4. Discussion

27 species of fish, 4 species of the phylum Mollusca, and 2 varieties of freshwater crabs were identified during this survey. The freshwater ecosystem, which includes fish, molluscs, and crabs, is crucial to preserving because it contains valuable resources for food, recreation and ornament. People occupy the “beel” local name of the large water body, region for agricultural purposes as population density rises, ‘putting massive pressure on the wetlands, which are then converted to croplands. It is obvious that a significant fish population was constructed over a portion of the East Calcutta wetland. Making a large body of water in Ecopark and Pakhibitan’s pond aided in the preservation of a healthy freshwater ecology, as well as allowing many cormorants to perch in the lake’s boating area and many migratory birds to rest on occasion. In addition to helping to shape aquatic bottom environments, mollusks play a crucial role in ecosystem engineering by providing a variety of other taxa with habitat, protection, and food (Fortunato, 2015) [15]. Additionally, because they are important calcareous organisms with a rich fossil record, they can shed light on significant past climate and oceanic changes, which will help us better understand anticipated future changes (Fortunato, 2015) [15]. Crabs also serve a part in cleaning the bottom by consuming decomposing plant and animal debris.

Out of 171 bird species belonging to 57 families were recorded in Ecopark (Chatterjee et al., 2022) [16], family Anatidae, Podicipedidae, Ardeidae, Phalacrocoracidae,
Rallidae, Jacanidae, Rostratulidae, Scolopacidae, Alcedinidae and some species of family Motacillidae mostly depend on freshwater as they forage near the pond or take fish in their diet. Also rest of the bird species are also depend on the freshwater indirectly as they quench their thirst or forage other species found near freshwater.

In previous paper we had mentioned that, 26 species of herpetofauna including 21 species of class Reptilia and 5 species of class Amphibia were observed in Ecopark, where class Reptilia, 9 snake species, 3 types of monitor lizard, 2 types of turtle, 1 pond Terrapin and in class Amphibia 1 Common Asian Toad and 4 types of toad were depended on freshwater (Roy et al., 2022) [17]. Herpetofauna is crucial in preserving freshwater ecosystems because Amphibians spend a portion of their lives in freshwater and are eaten by snakes. Terrapins and turtles act as scavengers in the ecosystem, eating aquatic vegetation and so limiting its growth and contributing to the health of water body. Monitor lizards are likely to spend the majority of their lives near water. Pakhibitan's pond region is a spectacularly quiet spot for herpetofauna to live due to the lack of human disturbance. Also in previous paper, 34 species of Odonates were recorded (Samanta et al., 2022) [18] in Ecopark. As Odonates lay eggs in the water and their larva live in the water. Water is important for their lives to live and the larvae are also a food source of freshwater fish. As well as Macrobrachium sp. and mosquito larvae are live in water and become food source for freshwater fish.

5. Conclusion

Overexploitation, flow alteration, habitat degradation, invasion by foreign species, pollution, including the worldwide issue of eutrophication (Harrison et al., 1999; Dudgeon et al., 2006) [19 20], are all interconnected threats to fish biodiversity. Farmers also use various chemical fertilisers to increase crop production, which leads to eutrophication and lowers the level of dissolved oxygen in water bodies, harming the diversity of fish at the same time (Rathore et al., 2016; Savci, 2012) [21 22]. For Ecopark, the lake is properly maintained to catch fish, and it has occasionally been revealed that fish were caught illegally. While Pakhibitan's pond region attracts few people, the number of cases in this case is low. Fish is particularly important for the ecology since it provides food for many water birds such as cormorants, consumes a lot of mosquito larvae, and occasionally controls the growth of aquatic plants. The generally drab-colored and uninteresting freshwater species known as 'Mollusks,' which face the most significant threats and demand the most public concern and action, are in critical need of supporters.

Pakhibitan is designed for the birds' hideout and lake is also the place for many water birds' roosting site. Water birds and other bird species can be found near both Pakhibitan’s pond and lake in their various activities, proving that freshwater plays an important role in bird’s life and also helps to balance and maintain the freshwater ecology. Freshwater crab conservation will be mostly dependent on keeping big enough natural forest areas to sustain the good water quality of the original streams. As a result, more nature reserves and national parks, as well as cautious planning and development, are required (Balian et al., 2008) [6]. The relevance of the freshwater environment for amphibian population survival is crucial, and further research on the unique requirements of frogs in their aquatic, primarily larval phase is required to design integrated conservation strategies (Balian et al., 2008) [6].

Monitor lizards are also extremely rare in any natural setting. Pakhibitan’s pond is an amazing safe haven for monitor lizards, which may be found in numerous places. Turtles are extremely sensitive to environmental changes and are among the first vertebrates to disappear when a habitat is lost. Another issue is increased collection for food, ostensibly for medicinal reasons, and for the pet trade (Balian et al., 2008) [6]. Turtles are not found naturally in any nearby pond because they were artificially introduced into the pond. They are extremely beneficial to the freshwater habitat. Most freshwater snake species are non-venomous as they play a vital role in the freshwater ecology by devouring other species and thus. Odonates have minimal economic worth, but they are used as food and as magical or medicinal resources on a local scale, and they may influence disease vector populations to an unknown level (Balian et al., 2008) [6]. The number of Odonates is decreasing as more ponds are destroyed to make way for multistory buildings. The scavenger Macrobrachium sp. not only consumes algae and other debris, but also acts as a predator to sustain the food web as a component of freshwater ecology. The Ecopark protects the habitat while also offering a shelter for wildlife.

As explained previously, the lake and Pakhibitan's pond region help to preserve the freshwater ecology. As the population grows, open spaces such as ponds are being destroyed. Both contributed to the development of a food web and the flourishing of all ecological organisms.

6. Acknowledgements

We appreciate the help and encouragement we got from the West Bengal Housing Infrastructure Development Corporation (WBHIDCO), especially Mr. Debasis Sen. We also want to express our gratitude to all of the Nature-Mates Nature Club members for their unwavering support and leadership. For their ongoing support, our friends, family, and teachers deserve our gratitude as well.

7. Reference

1. Green PA, Vorosmarty CJ, Harrison I, Farrell T, Saenz L, Fekete BM. Freshwater ecosystem services supporting humans: Pivoting from water crisis to water solutions. Global Environ. Chang. 2015;34:108-118.
2. Harrison PA, Vandewalle M, Sykes MT, Berry PM, Bugter R, et al. Identifying and prioritising services in European terrestrial and freshwater ecosystems. Biodivers. Conserv. 2010;19(10):2791–2821.
3. Strayer DL, Dudgeon D. Freshwater biodiversity conservation: recent progress and future challenges. J. North Am. Benthol. Soc. 2010;29:344–358.
4. Winemiller KO. Trends in biodiversity: freshwater. Encyclopedia Anthropocene. 2018;3:151–161.
5. Millennium Ecosystem Assessment. Island Press, Washington, DC; c2005.
6. EV Balian CL. Freshwater Animal Diversity Assessment. Springer Dordrecht; c2008.
7. Chester ET, BJ Robson. Anthropogenic refuges for freshwater biodiversity: their ecological characteristics and management. Biological Conservation. 2013;166:64-75.
8. Novotny V. Sustainable urban water management. In: Feyen J, et al. (Ed), EC International Conference on ‘Water and Urban Development Paradigms: towards an Integration of Engineering, Design and Management

~ 32 ~
9. White M, A Smith, K Humphryes, S Pahl, D Snelling, M Depledge. Blue space: the importance of water for preference, affect and restrictiveness ratings of natural and built scenes. Journal of Environmental Psychology. 2010;30:482-493.
10. Higgins SL, F Thomas, B Goldsmith, SJ Brooks, C Hassall, J Harlow, et al. Urban freshwaters, biodiversity, and human health and wellbeing: setting an interdisciplinary research agenda. WIREs Water. 2019;6:e1339.
11. Hassall C. The ecology and biodiversity of urban ponds. Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews Water. 2014;1:187-206.
12. Hiware CJ. Classification and Identification of Freshwater Fishes. Daya Publishing House; c2020
13. Sturm CF, Mayhew R, Bales B. The Mollusks: A Guide to Their Study, Collection, and Preservation. Edn 1, Universal Publishers, Los Angeles and Pittsburgh; c2006. p. 251-326.
14. IUCN. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. Version 2022-1. https://www.iucnredlist.org. Accessed on [14 October 2022]; c2022.
15. Fortunato H. Mollusks: Tools in Environmental and Climate Research. American Malacological Bulletin. 2015;33(2):310-324. https://doi.org/10.4003/006.033.0208
16. Chatterjee L, Samanta T, Sinha S, Besra S, Roy AB. Analysis of avifaunal diversity, richness, status and food guild in Ecopark, West Bengal, India. Species. 23(72):441-451.
17. Roy AB, Chatterjee L, Samanta T, Sinha S, Besra S. The significance of Ecopark, an urban park in Kolkata, West Bengal, in terms of the refuge of Herpetofauna. Journal of Entomology and Zoology Studies 2022;10(5):110-114
18. Samanta T, Chatterjee L, Roy AB, Sinha S, Besra S. Importance of Ecopark, Kolkata in the context of sustainability, compare to Rajarhat grassland, as a habitat for Odonata (Dragonflies and Damselflies) diversity. World News of Natural Sciences. 2022;44:165-175.
19. Harrison IJ, Staissnly MLJ. The quiet crisis: A preliminary listing of freshwater fishes of the World that are either extinct or “missing in action”. In MacPhee, R. D. E. (ed.), Extinctions in Near Time: Causes, Contexts, and Consequences. Plenum Press, New York and London; c1999. p. 271–331.
20. Dudgeon D, Arthington AH, Gessner MO, Kawabata ZI, Knowler DJ, Le’veque C, et al. Freshwater biodiversity: Importance, threats, status and conservation challenges. Biological Reviews. 2006;81:163-182.
21. Rathore SS, Chandravanshi P, Chandravanshi A, Jaiswal K. Eutrophication: Impacts of Excess Nutrient Inputs on Aquatic Ecosystem. IOSR J of Agri. and Vetert. Sci. 2016;9(10):89-96.
22. Savci S. An Agricultural Pollutant: Chemical Fertilizer. Int. J of Environ. Sci. And Dev. 2012;3(1):7780.