# Macroinvertebrates functional feeding groups as indices of biological assessment in a tropical aquatic ecosystem: implications for ecosystem functioning

Roland Efe UWADIAE

Benthic Ecology Unit, Department of Marine Sciences, University of Lagos, Akoka, Lagos, Nigeria.

Email: eferoland@yahoo.com. Tel: +2347059497190.

Abstract. The composition and abundance of functional feeding groups of the benthic macroinvertebrate communities were investigated along the stretch of Epe lagoon in south-west Nigeria, between September, 2004 and August, 2006. The hypothesis being tested was that functional feeding groups of benthic macroinvertebrates can be used as surrogate for biological assessment. Quantitative benthic samples were collected monthly at 8 sites. Total dissolved solids of the overlying water, total organic, sand and mud contents of sediment were assessed. The amount of dissolved solids recorded in this study ranged between 18 and 15,200mg/L. There was significant difference (P<0.05) in total dissolved solids at the study stations. The total dissolved solids at stations 1 to 3 were similar and significantly lower (P<0.05) than those at stations 4 to 8. The study area was predominantly sandy (range = 54.4 to 93.6%) intermixed with varying proportions of mud (range = 1.01 to 44.6%). A comparatively higher proportion of mud in sediment was recorded in station 3. Total organic content ranged between 1.01 and 10.45%. In terms of relative abundance, collector-filterers and shredders were the predominant groups at most sites. They contributed 77 and 15% respectively to the total benthic macroinvertebrate population. Predators had low abundance in all the study sites and were absent in sites 6 and 8. Correlation between Total organic content and density of collector filterers at the study sites was significant (P < 0.01). Although there was a marked variation in the density of the observed functional feeding groups in the stations used for this study and sequential downstream changes in species composition, most functional feeding groups (apart from predators) were represented down the whole length of the study stretch. The implications of the observed pattern of variation in the density of functional feeding groups, for water quality assessment and ecosystem functioning are discussed. [New York Science Journal 2010;3(8):6-15]. (ISSN: 1554-0200).

Key words: Feeding functional groups, water quality assessment, tropical ecosystem.

## 1. Introduction

Ecological functions can be described by a multitude of general biological traits that reflect the adaptation of species to environmental conditions (Townsend and Hildrew, 1994). Feeding strategies are typical traits reflecting the adaptation of species and they could form part of a unified measure across communities differing in taxonomic composition (Statzner *et al.*, 2004). Functional feeding classification of aquatic organisms enhances the knowledge of trophic dynamics in aquatic systems by simplifying the benthic community into trophic guilds – functional feeding groups (FFGs) (Cummins, 1995).

Feeding measures or trophic dynamics encompass functional feeding groups and provide information on the balance of feeding strategies (food acquisition and morphology) in the benthic assemblage. Many studies (including Vannote *et al.*, 1980) have shown that the pattern of FFG distribution has been related to the environmental gradient in the aquatic system, and this is currently used in some water quality systems, e.g. Index of Trophic completeness (Pavluk *et al.*, 2000). Without relatively stable food dynamics, an imbalance in functional feeding groups will result, reflecting stressed conditions. Trophic metrics are surrogates of complex processes such as trophic interaction, production and food source availability (Merrit *et al.*, 2002).

Macroinvertebrates play fundamental roles in aquatic ecosystems, being consumers at intermediate trophic levels and thus serving as channels by which bottom-up and top-down forces are transmitted (Wallace *et al.*, 1999). Different food sources utilized by macroinvertebrates include: the epilithic layer that grows on the surfaces of substrates (consumed by scrapers); the coarse detritus, composed mainly of leaves falling down

http://www.sciencepub.net/newyork

from riparian vegetation (consumed by shredders); the fine detritus, either deposited on the substrate (consumed by gatherers) or suspended in the water column (consumed by filterers); and finally, live animals (consumed by predators).

The functional composition of macroinvertebrate communities, quantified as the proportions of these different functional feeding groups (FFGs), has important implications for ecosystem functioning (Minshall *et al.*, 1983). Ecological patterns and processes in aquatic ecosystems have been shown to vary at multiple spatial scales, between and within aquatic habitat (Meritt *et al.*, 2002). However, there have been very few attempts of studying how the functional composition of macroinvertebrate communities changes with spatial scale in relation to habitat conditions.

The aim of this study therefore, was to describe the general distribution of FFGs in the study area and determine if the observed pattern of distribution can be used as a basis for biological assessment of the study area.

## 2. Materials and Methods

## 2.1 Description of study Area

This study was carried out in a tropical lagoon (fig. 1) situated between latitudes  $3^{0}50' - 4^{0}10'N$  and longitudes  $5^{0}30' - 5^{0}40'E$ . The lagoon lies within the rainforest belt of southern Nigeria which experiences two major seasons, the rainy season concentrated between May and November, and dry season occurring between December and April. The seasonal rainfall has a bimodal distribution with a major peak in June, and a minor one in September or October each year. The study area is composed of sandy and muddy sediments. Annual rainfall ranged from 6 to 330mm during the study period. Riparian vegetation at the bank of the lagoon consists mainly of grasses and secondary rainforest. Land use in the study area includes agriculture, and human activities in the study stretch include sand mining and artesinal fisheries. Stations 1-5 were covered with thick mat of water hyacinth, a phenomenon that has been linked to pollution in the study area (Nwankwo and Onitiri, 1992). The study area is a rural setting with most of the population concentrated along the bank of the lagoon leading to the dumping of wastes, majorly from domestic sources into the lagoon.



Figure 1. Map Showing Lagos, Epe and Lekki Lagoons as well as the Sampling Stations

http://www.sciencepub.net/newyork

## 2.2 Collection and Processing of Samples

Collection and analysis of water and sediment samples were carried out according to methods used in Uwadiae et al. (2009). Benthic macroinvertebrates were collected from eight sites. Sampling of benthic macroinvertebrates was carried out during the dry and wet seasons. For each study site and sampling occasion, three quantitative samples were taken using van Veen grab. The samples were fixed in 10% formalin solution. In the laboratory, the samples were washed and all macroinvertebrates were sorted under a dissecting microscope. Specimens of macroinvertebrate samples were identified to the lowest possible taxonomic level (mostly family) using the available keys of Edmunds (1978) Yankson and Kendal (2001) and Bouchard (2004). However, previous studies of Dole' dec et al. (2000) and Gayraud et al. (2003) showed that the identification to species level was not necessary for studies on functional diversity and therefore, in this case, I considered the family level as sufficient.

The allocation of each taxon to the FFG depended mainly on the mouthpart morphology (e.g. presence of brushes of scrapers, fine hair fringes of filterers, or dagger-like teeth on the maxillae of predators. Previous FFG allocations from literature were also consulted (Merritt and Cummins, 1996; Graca *et al.*, 2001; Polegatto and Froehlich, 2003; Molina, 2004) and included in the final results.

#### 2.3 Statistical Analysis

I applied cluster analysis in order to determine the FFGs with similar density in the study area. Pearson's correlation test was used to determine the relationship between environmental parameters and density of FFGs at the study sites. Graphical and statistical analyses were performed using Excel and SPSS 10 for windows.

### **3. RESULTS**

### 3.1. Environmental parameters

The results of physico-chemical parameters studied are summarized in Table 1. The amount of dissolved solids (TDS) recorded in this study ranged between 18 and 15,200mg/L. The values were higher in the dry season and was significantly different (P<0.05) at the study stations. The total dissolved solids at stations 1 to 3 were similar and significantly lower (P<0.05) than those at stations 4 to 8.

The study area was predominantly sandy intermixed with varying proportions of mud. The highest value of sand fraction (93.6%) recorded occurred in station 5, while the least (54.4%) fraction of sand was recorded in http://www.sciencepub.net/newyork station 3. The highest amount (44.6%) of mud in sediment was recorded at station 3. A comparatively higher proportion of mud in sediment was recorded in station 3 throughout the period of sampling.

Total organic content (TOC) values ranged between 1.01 and 10.45%. The highest value recorded occurred at station 3 while the least value occurred in stations 4 and 6 respectively. A seasonal pattern in which higher values of TOC were observed in the wet season than in the dry months was evident in the overall values recorded.

#### **3.2. Functional Feeding Groups**

In a total of 17, 444 specimens (density = 174, 440), belonging to 27 taxa (Table 2), aquatic molluscs represented the dominant component of the benthic population and accounted for 98.43% of the total organisms recorded. Annelids constituted 1.16%, while other phyla recorded less than 1% each of the total benthic population. Melaniidae (filter feeders), were the mostly represented molluscs family in the study area, and within this group the most abundant genus was *Pachymelania*.

Four major FFGs were recognized in this study, these include; Predators (P), Shredders (S), collector gatherers (CG), and collector filterers (CF). Analysing the functional composition of the assemblage, it was found that collector filterers were the most abundant FFG (Figure 2) with a total density of 133, 690 accounting for 76.64% of the animals recorded. Shredders ranked second in total density (25, 740) of individuals contributed, and constituted 14.76% of the total population observed. A total density of 14590 was recorded for the collector gatherers, while the predators had a density representation of 420, both groups accounted for 8.36% and 0.24% of the total population respectively.

There was great variations in terms of density distribution of the FFGs at the spatial scales (study sites) (Figure 3 and 4). Greater densities of CF occurred at stations 4 and 9, while that of S were recorded at stations 6 and 5. The population of CF was highest in stations 4 and 6. The highest density of P was recorded in stations 4 and 6, but no predator was recorded in stations 6 and 8 during this study.

The cluster analysis presented in Figure 5 shows clearer separation of the FFGs. Group I is composed of FFGs (S, CF, CG) with relatively higher density representations at the study stations, while group II has only the predators as its component, indicating their relatively low densities at the study stations. The relationship between density of FFGs and environmental parameters (Table 3) using Pearson's correlation test indicates that TOC correlated negatively with the density of all the FFGs except P (r = 0.31). Total dissolve solids affected the density of P negatively (r = -0.37, P > 0.01), but correlated positively with those of S (r = 0.81, P>0.01), CG (R = 0.34, P> 0.01) and CF (r = 0.5, P < 0.01). The percentage of sand in sediment also affected the density of FFGs; the densities of S (r = -0.32, P > 0.01) and CG (r = -0.15, P > 0.01) correlated negatively with the amount of sand in sediment at the study sites, but related positively with densities of P (r = 0.38, P > 0.01) and CF (r = 0.51, P > 0.01).

Table 1: Summary of environmental characteristics of the study stations in Epe lagoon.

Station	GPS Location	TDS (mg	g/L)	Sand (%)		Mud (%)		TOC (%)	
		Max	Min	Max	Min	Max	Min	Max	Min
1	06 <sup>0</sup> 34.729'N 004 <sup>0</sup> 03.710'E	350	70	92.2	79	21	7.8	8.61	2.11
2	06 <sup>0</sup> 34.658'N 003 <sup>0</sup> 58. 719'E	340	80	87.4	61.4	28.6	11.4	8.22	2.10
3	06 <sup>0</sup> 36.564'N 003 <sup>0</sup> 58.799'E	1860	30	89.4	54.4	44.6	9.4	10.45	3.51
4	06 <sup>0</sup> 36.929'N 003 <sup>0</sup> 44.800'E	1270	70	85.4	65.4	27.6	14.6	7.50	1.01
5	06 <sup>0</sup> 36.799'N 003 <sup>0</sup> 42. 568'E	1400	71	93.6	1400	6.5	26	1.02	7.50
6	06°33.592'N 003°30°36.102'E	6852	82	71	73.6	26	7.8	7.50	1.01
7	06 <sup>o</sup> 31.754'N 003 <sup>o</sup> 33.365'E	10932	77	89	65.8	29	11	6.00	1.01
8	06°31.893'N 003°31.912`E	15200	75	92.4	73.5	26.5	7.6	6.30	1.01







Figure 3. Percentages of benthic macroinvertebrate functional feeding groups (FFG) sampled from the study stations.

Table 2. List of taxa and their functional feeding groups in the study area. P = Predator; S = Shredder; CF = Collector - Filterer; CG = Collector - Gatherer.

AnnelidaCGCapitellidaeCGLumbrineridaePNereidaeSLumbriculidaeCGNaididaeCGEchinodermataPNemertinaCGOtonemeridaePCucumariidaeCGArthropodaCGGammaridaeCGCorophidaeCFPenaeidaeCFOcypodidaeCFSesarmidaeCFClibanaridaeCFChironomidaePChord ataPBrachiostomidaeCFBaetoidaeCGMolluscaCFNeritidaeCFPotamididaeCFPotamididaeCFPotamididaeCFPotamididaeCFPotamididaeCFPotamididaeCFPotamididaeCFPotamididaeCFPotamididaeCFPotamididaeCFPotamididaeCFPotamididaeCFPotamididaeCFPotamididaeCFPotamididaeCFAvcidaeCFAloididaeCFAloididaeCFPotamididaeCFPotamididaeCFPotamididaeCFPotamididaeCFPotamididaeCFPotamididaeCFPotamididaeCFPotamididaeCFPotamididaeCFPotamididaeCFPotamididae	Taxa		FFG
CapitellidaeCGLumbrineridaePNereidaeSLumbriculidaeCGNaididaeCGEchinodermataPOtonemeridaePCucumariidaeCGArthropodaCGGammaridaeCGGomphidaeCFPenaeidaeCFOcypodidaeCFClibanaridaeCFChironomidaePCorophidaeCFChironomidaePChironomidaeCFBrachiostomidaeCFBaetoidaeCGMolluscaCFNeritidaeCFPotamididaeCFPotamididaeCFPotamididaeCGTenthredinidaeCGMolluscaCFNeritidaeCFPotamididaeCFPo	Annelida		
LumbrineridaePNereidaeSLumbriculidaeCGNaididaeCGEchinodermataCGNemertinaPOtonemeridaePCucumariidaeCGArthropodaCGGammaridaeCGCorophidaeCFPenaeidaeCFOcypodidaeCFClibanaridaeCFChironomidaePChord ataPBranchiostomidaeCFPateoidaeCGMolluscaPNeritidaeCFNeritidaeCFPotamididaeCFPotamididaeCFPateoidaeCGTenthredinidaeCFPotamididaeCFPotamididaeCFPotamididaeCFPotamididaeCFPotamididaeCFPotamididaeCFPotamididaeCFPotamididaeCFPotamididaeCFPotamididaeCFPotamididaeCFPotamididaeCFPotamididaeCFAvcidaeCFAloididaeCFPotamididaeCFPotamididaeCFPotamididaeCFPotamididaeCFPotamididaeCFPotamididaeCFPotamididaeCFPotamididaeCFPotamididaeCFPotamididaeCFPotamididaeCFPotamididae<	Capitellidae		CG
NereidaeSLumbriculidaeCGNaididaeCGEchinodermataCGNemertinaPOtonemeridaePCucumariidaeCGArthropodaCGGammaridaeCGCorophidaeCFPenaeidaeCFOcypodidaeCFSesarmidaeCFClibanaridaeCFChironomidaePGomphidaeCFChironomidaePBrachiostomidaeCFBaetoidaeCGMolluscaCFNeritidaeCFPotamididaeCFPotamididaeCFPotamididaeCFPotamididaeCGCorrelinidaeCFPotamididaeCFPotam	Lumbrineridae	Р	
LumbriculidaeCGNaididaeCGNaididaeCGEchinodermataCGNemertinaPOtonemeridaePQueumariidaeCGArthropodaCGGammaridaeCGCorophidaeCFPenaeidaeCFOcypodidaeCFSesarmidaeCFClibanaridaeCFChironomidaePGomphidaeCFChironomidaePBrachiostomidaeCFBaetoidaeCGMolluscaCFNeritidaeCFPotamididaeCFPotamididaeCFPotamididaeCFPotamididaeCGCorrelinidaeCFPotamididaeCFPotamididaeCFPotamididaeCFPotamididaeCFPotamididaeCFPotamididaeCFPotamididaeCFAvcidaeCFOstreidaeCFAloididaeCFDirelinidaeCFAloididaeCFCorrelinidaeCFCorrelinidaeCFCorrelinidaeCFCorrelinidaeCFOstreidaeCFAloididaeCFCorrelinidaeCFCorrelinidaeCFCorrelinidaeCFCorrelinidaeCFCorrelinidaeCFCorrelinidaeCFCorrelinidaeCFCorreli	Nereidae		S
NaididaeCGEchinodermataPNemertinaPOtonemeridaePCucumariidaeCGArthropodaCGGammaridaeCGGammaridaeCFPenaeidaeCFOcypodidaeCFSesarmidaeCFClibanaridaeCFChironomidaePChord ataPBranchiostomidaeCFBaetoidaeCGMolluscaPNeritidaeCGMolluscaCFPotamididaeCGTellinidaeCFAvcidaeCFOstreidaeCFAloididaeCF	Lumbriculidae		CG
NemertinaOtonemeridaePCucumariidaeCGArthropodaCGGammaridaeCGCorophidaeCFPenaeidaeCFOcypodidaeCFSesarmidaeCFClibanaridaeCFClibanaridaeCFChironomidaePGomphidaeCFPatentidaeCFChironomidaeCFBaetoidaeCGTenthredinidaeCGMolluscaCFNeritidaeSMelaniidaeCFPotamididaeCGTellinidaeCFAvcidaeCFOstreidaeCFAloididaeCF	Naididae <b>Echinodermata</b>		CG
OtonemeridaePCucumariidaeCGArthropodaCGGammaridaeCGCorophidaeCFPenaeidaeCFOcypodidaeCFSesarmidaeCFClibanaridaeCFClibanaridaeCFChironomidaePGomphidaeCFPhotomidaeCFBactoidaeCGTenthredinidaeCGMolluscaCFNeritidaeSMelaniidaeCFPotamididaeCGTellinidaeCFAvcidaeCFOstreidaeCFAloididaeCF	Nemertina		
CucumariidaeCGArthropodaCGGammaridaeCGCorophidaeCFPenaeidaeCFOcypodidaeCFSesarmidaeCFClibanaridaeCFClibanaridaePComphidaePComplidaeCFPatronomidaePBactoidaeCGMolluscaCGNeritidaeCGMelaniidaeCFPotamididaeCGComplidaeCGComplidaeCGComplidaeCGComplidaeCGComplidaeCGComplidaeCGComplidaeCGComplidaeCGComplidaeCGCompliaeCFActicaeCFOstreidaeCFAloididaeCFAloididaeCF	Otonemeridae		Р
GammaridaeCGCorophidaeCFPenacidaeCFOcypodidaeCFSesarmidaeCFClibanaridaeCFChironomidaePGomphidaePChordataCFBatetoidaeCGTenthredinidaeCGMolluscaCFNeritidaeCFPotamididaeCGTellinidaeCFOstreidaeCFAvcidaeCFOstreidaeCFAloididaeCF	Cucumariidae Arthropoda		CG
Corophidae CF Penaeidae CF Ocypodidae CF Sesarmidae CF Clibanaridae CF Chironomidae P Gomphidae P Gomphidae CF Branchiostomidae CF Branchiostomidae CF Tenthredinidae CG Mollusca S Melaniidae CG Mollusca CF Potamididae CF Potamididae CF Potamididae CF Avcidae CF Avcidae CF	Gammaridae		CG
Penaeidae CF Ocypodidae CF Sesarmidae CF Clibanaridae CF Chironomidae P Gomphidae P Gomphidae CF Branchiostomidae CF Baatoidae CG Tenthredinidae CG Mollusca S Melaniidae CG Melaniidae CF Potamididae CF Potamididae CF Avcidae CF Avcidae CF	Corophidae		CF
Ocypodidae CF   Sesarmidae CF   Clibanaridae CF   Clibanaridae CF   Chironomidae P   Gomphidae P   Chordrata P   Branchiostomidae CF   Branchiostomidae CG   Mollusca CG   Melaniidae CF   Potamididae CG   Tenthredinidae CF   Potamididae CF   Potamididae CF   Potamididae CF   Potamididae CF   Potamididae CF   Ostreidae CF   Aloididae CF	Penaeidae		CF
Sesarmidae CF Clibanaridae CF Chironomidae P Gomphidae P Chordiata Disclutionation Batetoidae CF Batetoidae CG Mollusca Neritidae S Melaniidae CF Potamididae CF Potamididae CF Avcidae CF Avcidae CF Aloididae CF	Ocypodidae		CF
Clibanaridae CF Chironomidae P Gomphidae P Chordiala Branchiostomidae CF P Branchiostomidae CG Tenthredinidae CG Mollusca S Melaniidae CF Potamididae CF Potamididae CF Avcidae CF Avcidae CF Aloididae CF	Sesarmidae		CF
Chironomidae P   Gomphidae P   Chordiata P   Branchiostomidae CF   Branchiostomidae CG   Mollusca CG   Melaniidae CF   Potamididae CG   Melaniidae CF   Potamididae CF   Potamididae CF   Potamididae CF   Potamididae CF   Avcidae CF   Ostreidae CF   Aloididae CF	Clibanaridae		CF
Gomphidae P   Chordiata CF   Branchistomidae CF   Branchistomidae CG   Tenthredinidae CG   Mollusca S   Melaniidae CF   Potamididae CF   Potamididae CF   Potamididae CF   Potamididae CF   Potamididae CF   Ostreidae CF   Aloididae CF	Chironomidae		Р
LiterationPBranchiostomidaeCFBaetoidaeCGTenthredinidaeCGMolluscaNeritidaeNeritidaeCFPotamididaeCGTellinidaeCFAvcidaeCFOstreidaeCFAloididaeCF	Gomphidae		Р
Baetoidae CG   Tenthredinidae CG   Mollusca S   Neritidae CF   Potamididae CG   Tellinidae CF   Avcidae CF   Ostreidae CF   Aloididae CF	Libellulidae Branchiostomidae	CF	Р
Tenthredinidae CG Mollusca Neritidae S Melaniidae CF Potamididae CG Tellinidae CF Avcidae CF Ostreidae CF Aloididae CF	Baetoidae	01	CG
MolluscaNeritidaeSMelaniidaeCFPotamididaeCGTellinidaeCFAvcidaeCFOstreidaeCFAloididaeCF	Tenthredinidae	CG	
NeritidaeSMelaniidaeCFPotamididaeCGTellinidaeCFAvcidaeCFOstreidaeCFAloididaeCF	Mollusca		
MelaniidaeCFPotamididaeCGTellinidaeCFAvcidaeCFOstreidaeCFAloididaeCF	Neritidae		S
PotamididaeCGTellinidaeCFAvcidaeCFOstreidaeCFAloididaeCF	Melaniidae		CF
TellinidaeCFAvcidaeCFOstreidaeCFAloididaeCF	Potamididae		CG
AvcidaeCFOstreidaeCFAloididaeCF	Tellinidae		CF
Ostreidae CF Aloididae CF	Avcidae		CF
Aloididae CF	Ostreidae		CF
	Aloididae		CF
Porifera	Porifera		
Chalinidae CF	Chalinidae		CF



Figure 4. Density of the different functional feeding groups in the study area. N = 8.

Table 3. Relationships between density of functional feeding groups (FFGs) and environmental parameters at the study stations (Pearson's correlation test). \* Statistically Significant p<0.01.

	Р	S	CG	CF
TOC	0.31	-0.79	-0.58	-0.96
TDS	-0.37	0.81	0.34	0.50*
Sand	0.38	-0.32	-0.15	0.51

Dendrogram using Average Linkage (Between Groups)

Rescaled Distance Cluster Combine

C A S E Label	Num	0 +	5 +	10	15	20	25 +
S CF CG P	2 4 3 1	۵۵۵۵۵۵۵ ۵÷ ۵۵۵۵۵۵۵ ۵۵۵۵۵۵۵	0000 000000 00000000000000000000000000	56666666	රරරරරර රරරරරර	රරරරරර රරරරරරර රරරරරර	මරරරරරරරරරරර ර රරරරරරරරරරරරරර

Figure 5. Cluster analysis of FFGs based on density at the study station

## 4. Discussion

This is the first major study in Epe lagoon and about one of the formost in south-west Nigeria examining benthos functional structure as a bioassessment tool. In terms of functional feeding group's distribution, the benthic community showed few changes across the study stretch, collectors (filterers) being the dominant functional group in all the study sites.

The representation of collector filterers all the study sites of the lagoon indicates the importance of seston transport in the water column (Minshall et al. 1992; Palmer et al. 1993b). As all the sites were open and a great part of the lagoon basin drains cultivated land and secondary forests, particulate organic matter tends to be high providing enough filterable materials. This study indicates a positive and significant relationship between density of filterers and the TDS in the water column. The significance of fine detritus as food resources for macroinvertebrates has been highlighted by Tomanova et al. (2006) in other lotic ecosystems. The fact that the collector filterers (Melaniidae) were abundant in most of the sites responded to a significant habitat complexity that possibly enhanced organic matter retentions and availability of suspended organic matter. The poor representation of collector-filterers at station 3 could be related with the discontinuities in seston supply and poor water circulation in the muddy sediment (Uwadiae, 2009).

Nature of sediment is an important factor in shaping benthic communities, both in structural and functional composition. Sediments with high percentage of sand fractions have well distributed interstitial spaces which favour oxygenation of sediment. Aquatic areas with sandy sediments are likely to be associated with high water current or velocity which influences water oxygenation and also plays a key role in the feeding process of some groups, such as filterers. Filterers feed on suspended fine particulate organic matter, which is transported by the current, and thus these organisms usually select areas of fast current, which provides more organic matter in a shorter period of time (Bus *et al.*, 2002).

Moreover, it is well established that micro-flow dynamics play a key role in the small-scale distribution of benthic communities (Merritt *et al.*, 2002; Minshal *et al.*, 1992). Considering the substratum composition, our results agree with previous findings in temperate streams where mud

was reported as a poor substrate, probably for its anoxic condition resulting from the decomposition of high organic matter load. The hydrogen sulphide released during organic matter decomposition in muddy sediment is poisonous to macrobenthic invertebrates and limits the number and diversity of functional feeding groups. The clogging of the filtering devices of most benthic invertebrates by mud has also been observed (Hart and Robinson, 1990).

The relatively high numbers of collector gatherers, collector filterers and shredders in our samples underscores the roles of these groups organic matter processing in an environment like Epe lagoon. supports an emergent hypothesis about This allochtonous coarse particulate organic matter processing in tropics: in tropical lotic systems, the decomposition of plant material in fine particulate organic matter is operated either by macroconsumers or by enhanced microbial activity (Graca et al., 2001; Dobson et al., 2003). The number of predators recorded in this study was low, they were completely absent in stations 6 and 8. This is expected since specialized feeders are more sensitive and thought to be well represented in healthy streams. Generalists, such as collectors-filterers which were well represented in this study, have a broader range of acceptable food materials than specialists (Meritt et al., 2002) and thus are more tolerant to pollution that might alter availability of certain food. Their wide spread distribution in the study stretch indicates the perturbed status of the study area.

Understanding community structure and ecosystem functioning and their determinants is one of the main objectives of ecology. The variation of the different FFGs at different sampling stations can be explained by their mode of search for their food resources, together with the environmental variability at these sites. For example, the occurrence of the four FFGs observed in this study at station 3 was low. This can be related to the inability of the animals to carry out active search for food resources (leaf patches, deposited fine detritus patches, and prey items, respectively) due to the muddy nature of the substrate. In the search for food, these animals are constantly moving, and the distances traveled depend on how sparse are their food sources distributed (Covich, 1988; Merritt et al., 2002). When food sources are more heterogeneous, individuals can travel long distances until they find a suitable patch (Graca et al., 2001).

The present study illustrates that studies at multiple spatial scales are also essential for relating patterns and processes, given that the functional composition of macroinvertebrate communities is directly related to aquatic processes. The relative abundances of the different FFGs are major characteristics of macroinvertebrate communities with important implications at ecosystem level (Ramírez and Pringle, 1998), and thus directly relate community structure with ecosystem functioning. Results recorded in this study corroborates the River Continuum Concept (RCC) which predicts that community functional composition changes with habitat size, with shredders and gatherers being dominant in low-size forested streams, scrapers and gatherers in medium-sized streams, and gatherers and filterers in larger streams (Vannote et al., 1980) (as observed in Epe lagoon).

Royer and Minshall (2003) showed that leaf processing and supply of food materials is scaledependent and that factors controlling processing rates largely depend on the spatial scale of study. They presented a hierarchical framework relating constraints on leaf processing to specific spatial scales, which allowed the development of scalespecific predictions of how environmental changes could affect leaf processing. It would be desirable to develop similar multi-scale frameworks to study the different ecosystem processes, and the distribution patterns of the organisms involved in those processes, in order to understand the relationships (Mathuriau and Chauvet, 2002).

The relative flexibility in trophic levels could reduce niche overlap among and within species and therefore, decrease the inter- and intra-specific competition (Callisto et al., 2001). Moreover, in unpredictably disturbed aquatic systems the supply and persistence of a particular food item is very variable. Hence the ability to exploit changing resources may potentially maintain population stability against natural fluctuations (Hart and Robinson, 1990). Indeed, the generalist feeding habit in the tropics is not surprising because it is considered as common strategy among lotic macroinvertebrates (Mihuc, 1997). Probably, this diet flexibility might contribute to an increase in the survival ability, and may have facilitated the spatial colonization of generalist feeders in the study area.

The use of surrogate measures for ecosystem attributes shows promise as indicated in this and other studies (Palmer, *et al.*, 1993a, 1993b; Merritt *et al.*, 2002; Tomanova *et al.*, 2006). Selected

ecosystem attributes can be the most sensitive measures of the state of ecosystems. Using various macroinvertebrate functional-group ratios as surrogates for these attributes can provide critical data with much less effort.

## References

- Bouchard RW.Jr. Guide to aquatic macroinvertebrates of the Upper Midwest. Water Resources Center, University of Minnesota, St. Paul, MN. 2004. 208pp.
- Buss DF, Baptista DF, Silveira MP, Nessimian JL, Dorville LFM. Influence of water chemistry and environmental degradation on macroinvertebrate assemblages in a river basin in south-east Brazil. Hydrobiologia. 2002. 481: 125–136.
- Callisto M, Moreno CE, Barbosa FAR.. Habitat diversity and benthic functional trophic groups at Serra do Cipo, southeast Brazil. Revista Brasileira de Biologia. 2001. 61: 259–266.
- Covich AP. Geographical and historical comparisons of neotropical streams: biotic diversity and detrital processing in highly variable habitats. Journal of the North American Benthological Society. 1988. **7**: 361–386.
- Dobson M, Mathooko JM, Ndegwa FK, M'Erimba C.. Leaf litter processing rates in a Kenyan highland stream, the Njoro River. Hydrobiologia. 2003. 519: 207–210.
- Dole' dec S, Olivier JM, Statzner B. Accurate description of the abundance of taxa and their biological traits in stream invertebrate communities: effects of taxonomic and spatial resolution. Archiv fu"r Hydrobiologie. 2000. 148: 25–43.
- Edmunds J.Sea shells and molluscs found on West African Coasts and Estuaries. Ghana University Press, Accra. 1978. 146pp.

- Gayraud S, Statzner B, Bady P, Haybachp A, Scholl F, Usseglio-Polatera P, and Bacchi M. Invertebrate traits for the biomonitoring of large European rivers: an initial assessment of alternative metrics. Freshwater Biology. 2003. 48: 1–20.
- Graca MAS, Cressa C, Gessner MO, Feio MJ, Callies KJ, Barrios C. Food quality, feeding preferences, survival and growth of shredders from temperate and tropical streams. Freshwater Biology. 2001. 46: 947–957.
- Hart CW, Fuller SH. Pollution Ecology of Estuarine Invertebrates. Academic Press Inc. London, Ltd. 1979. 406pp
- Hart DD, Robinson CT. Resource limitation in a stream community: phosphorus enrichment effects on periphyton and grazers. Ecology. 1990. 71: 1494–1502.
- Mathuriau C, Chauvet E. Breakdown of leaf litter in a neotropical stream. Journal of the North America Benthological Society. 2002. 21: 384–396.
- Merritt RW, Cummins KW. An introduction to the aquatic insects of North America. Kendall Hunt Publishing Co.1996. 862 pp.
- Merritt RW, Cummins KW, Berg MB, Novak JA, Higgins MJ, Wessel KJ, Lessard JL. Development and application of a macroinvertebrate functional-group approach in the bioassessment of remnant river oxbows in southwest Florida. Journal of the North American Benthological Society. 2002. 21(2):290– 310
- Mihuc TB. The functional trophic role of lotic primary consumers: generalist versus specialist strategies. Freshwater Biology. 1997. 37: 455–462.
- Minshall GW, Petersen RC, Bott TL, Cushing CE, Cummins KW, Vannote RL, Sedell JR. Stream ecosystem dynamics of the Salmon River, Idaho: an 8th-order system.

Journal of the North American Benthological Society. 1992. 11:111–137.

- Nwankwo DI, Onitiri AO. Periphyton (Aufuschs) community on submerged aquatic macrophytes in Epe lagoon, Nigeria. J. Agric. Sci. Tech. 1992. 3: 153 – 141.
- Palmer C, O'Keeffe J, Palmer A, Dunne T, Radloff S. Macroinvertebrate functional feeding groups in the middle and lower reaches of the Buffalo River Eastern Cape, South Africa. I. Dietary variability. Freshwater Biology. 1993a. 29: 441–453.
- Palmer C, O'Keeffe J, Palmer A. Macroinvertebrate functional feeding groups in the middle and lower reaches of the Buffalo River Eastern Cape, South Africa. II. Functional morphology and behaviour. Freshwater Biology. 1993b. 29: 455–462.
- Pavluk TI, de Bij Vaate A, Leslie HA. Development of an index of trophic completeness for benthic macroinvertebrate communities in flowing waters. Hydrobiologia. 2000. 427: 135–141.
- Polegatto CM, Froehlich CG. Feeding strategies in Ataloplebiinae (Ephemeroptera: Leptophlebiidae), with considerations on scraping and filtering. In Gaino, E. (ed.), Research Update on Ephemeroptera and Plecoptera. University of Perugia, Perugia. 2003. 55–61.
- Statzner B, Dole´ dec S, Hugueny B. Biological trait composition of European stream invertebrate communities: assessing the effects of various trait filter types. Ecography. 2004. 27: 470–488.
- Tomanova S, Goitia E, Helesic J. Trophic levels and functional feeding groups of macroinvertebrates in neotropical streams. Hydrobiologia. 2006. 556: 251–26
- Townsend CR, Hildrew AG. Species traits in relation to habitat templet for river systems. Freshwater Biology.1994. 31:265–275.
- Uwadiae RE. An ecological study on the macrobenthic invertebrate community of Epe

http://www.sciencepub.net/newyork

14

lagoon, Lagos. Ph.D Thesis University of Lagos. 2009; 253pp.

Vannote RL, Minshall GW, Cummins KW, Sedeli JR, Cushing CE. The river continuum concept. Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences. 1980. 37: 130–137.

08/04/2010

- Wallace JB, Eggert SL, Meyer JL, Webster JR. 1999). Effects of resource limitation on a detrital-based ecosystem. Ecological Monographs. 1999. 69: 409–442.
- Yankson K, Kendall M. A Student's guide to the seashore of West Africa. Marine Biodiversity Capacity Building in the West African Sub-region. Darwin Initiative Report 1, Ref. 162/7/451. 2001. 305pp.