

Feeding Patterns and Strategies of Ephemeroptera, Plecoptera and Trichoptera in Relation to Seasonality, Landscape Elements and Mesohabitats**Thambiratnam SIVARUBAN^{1*}**, **Sivaruban BARATHY²**, **Pandiarajan SRINIVASAN¹**, **Rajasekaran ISACK¹**¹PG& Research department of Zoology, The American College, Madurai-625002, India²Department of Zoology, Fatima College, Madurai-625001, India*Corresponding author: rooban2002@yahoo.com**Research Article**

Received 28 May 2020; Accepted 06 August 2020; Release date 01 December 2020.

How to Cite: Sivaruban, T., Barathy, S., Srinivasan, P., & Isack, R. (2020). Feeding patterns and strategies of Ephemeroptera, Plecoptera and Trichoptera in relation to seasonality, landscape elements and mesohabitats. *Acta Aquatica Turcica*, 16(4), 558-570 <https://doi.org/10.22392/actaquatr.744336>**Abstract**

We inspected functional feeding groups in relationship with seasonality, stream order, Land Landscape Elements (LSE), and mesohabitat of Ephemeroptera, Plecoptera, and Trichoptera (EPT) based on gut content analysis and mouthparts in 27 streams of the Western Ghats and the Eastern Ghats. From the study, a total of 14,168 specimens were collected and identified. The composition of trophic categories showed a slight variation among the different seasons with the dominance of collectors. The results of the abundance of functional feeding groups of EPT across stream orders additionally showed the predominance of collectors and predators in-stream orders 1 and 2. Collectors and filter feeders dominate in-stream orders 3 and 4. By examining the LSE elements, it is found that collectors were higher in the streams flowing through areca nut and low in the streams flowing through natural vegetation. The distributions of functional feeding groups within the orders were also analyzed. Mesohabitat results showed scrapers were found to be predominant in riffles whereas collectors, predators, shredders, and filter feeders overwhelm in runs. ANOVA results showed that only mesohabitat was found to be significant. The results of the present study did not broadly concur with the predictions of the River Continuum Concept (RCC) because of the lack of thickly canopied headwater stream sites and the limitation of our study to only EPT taxa.

Keywords: Mesohabitat, EPT, land landscape elements, macroinvertebrates, seasons**Mevsimsellik, Peyzaj Elemanları ve Mezohabitatlara Göre Ephemeroptera, Plecoptera ve Trichoptera Beslenme Modelleri ve Stratejileri**

Batı Ghats ve Doğu Ghats'ın 27 deresindeki Fonksiyonel beslenme grupları, bağırsak içeriği analizine ve ağız kısımlarına dayanarak, mevsimsellik, akarsu düzeni, peyzaj elementleri (LSE) Ephemeroptera, Plecoptera ve Trichoptera mezohabitat (EPT) ile ilişkili olarak incelenmiştir. Çalışmadan toplam 14.168 örnek toplandı ve tanımlandı. Trofik kategorilerin bileşimi, toplayıcıların baskınlığı ile farklı mevsimler arasında hafif bir farklılık gösterdi. Akarsu düzenine göre EPT'nin fonksiyonel besleme gruplarının bolluğunun sonuçları, akarsu düzeni 1 ve 2'de toplayıcıların ve avcılarının, 3 ve 4'de toplayıcılar ve filtre besleyicilerin baskın olduğunu gösterdi. LSE elementleri incelendiğinde, toplayıcıların areka cevzinden akan derelerde yüksek, doğal bitki örtüsü içinden akan akarsularda ise düşük olduğu görülmüştür. Fonksiyonel besleme gruplarının akarsu düzeni içindeki dağılımları da analiz edilmiştir. Mezohabitat sonuçları, kazıyıcıların çukurlardaki suda baskın olduğunu, toplayıcıların, yırtıcıların, öğütücülerin ve filtre besleyicilerin akan derelerde olduğunu gösterdi. ANOVA sonuçları, sadece mezohabitatın istatistikî açıdan anlamlı olduğunu gösterdi. Bu çalışmanın sonuçları, çalışmamızın sadece EPT taksonları ile sınırlı olması ve kalın bir şekilde örtülü su akışı alanlarının bulunmaması nedeniyle, Nehir Sürekliliği Konseptinin (RCC) tahminleriyle genel olarak uyuşmamaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Mesohabitat, EPT, peyzaj elemanları, makro omurgasızlar, mevsimler**INTRODUCTION**

The streams and other freshwater habitats mirror the physical and organic processes happening in the specific environment (Allan, 2004). Aquatic insects form assemblages that vary with their geographical location, according to historical biogeographical and ecological processes. Trophic categorization of aquatic insects is generally controlled by the species adaptation and taxonomical variations. The structure and functions of an aquatic habitat are maintained by the material cycling and energy flow. In turn, a significant position of such material cycling and energy flow involves the

processing of various forms of organic matter by freshwater invertebrates, especially insects. The functional feeding group of aquatic insects can be classified into several functional feeding groups (FFGs) based on the trophic dynamics and mouthparts modification. Assessment of the mouthparts and adornment structures in the front legs is an initial phase in allocating an FFG. These are the parts utilized by the organisms to catch, control, and devour food resources (Merritt *et al.*, 2008). Sharp and pointed teeth are attributes of predators and shredders. Mouthparts that look like plates or flat structures are a sign of a scraper. Collectors and filterers normally have an enormous number of hairs and setae or fan-like structures.

The aquatic production is directed by various intricate and dynamic biotic and abiotic factors, such as spatial and temporal variations in the overall productivities of environments (Chan *et al.*, 2007) coupled by trophic trade (Wesner, 2010), predator-prey life history attributes (Baxter *et al.*, 2005), highlights of the riparian ecotone, for example, limit penetrability (Cadenasso *et al.*, 2003) and microhabitat multifaceted nature (Bates *et al.*, 2007).

Aquatic insects are influenced by biotic and abiotic factors. Most examinations and calculated models relating to stream food networks have concentrated on the amount of every food web part and the development of vitality and materials from allochthonous and autochthonous food sources to benthic macroinvertebrates (Vannote *et al.*, 1980). Benthic macroinvertebrates normally track the changes in the environment and they show dietary shift as a component of resource accessibility (Haapala *et al.*, 2001). Hydromorphological changes are decided to be one of the most serious human-produced impacts influencing the uprightness of lotic ecosystems. The most well-known modifications are channel fixing and expulsion of riparian vegetation (Naiman and Décamps, 1997; Ward, 1998). A decrease of riparian vegetation can increment sunlight in the riparian zone and this leads to shifting of the changes in the functional feeding groups of the particular habitat. The effects of changes in land use and the expulsion of riparian vegetation on stream environments are well studied and understood (Allan and Castillo, 2007). Anthropogenic changes can bring about diminished diversity and distributions in aquatic insects and compel the appropriation of sensitive species.

Material cycles and energy flows of freshwater ecosystems are strongly influenced by the riparian zone, stream hydrology, and physicochemical parameters of water and substrate characteristics of streams. Ecological patterns and processes in aquatic ecosystems have been shown to vary at multiple spatial scales, between and within an aquatic habitat. Scrapers and collector-gatherers are abundant in the upper lotic habitat. Filter feeders are numerous in lower lotic habitats (Vilenica *et al.*, 2018). Habitat and microhabitat distribution of trophic categories of insects of Western Ghats have been studied by Burton and Sivaramakrishnan (1993) and Subramanian and Sivaramakrishnan (2005).

This work intends to contemplate the trophic relationship of Ephemeroptera, Plecoptera, and Trichoptera in both the Western and the Eastern Ghats of Southern India. It also addresses the comparisons of trophic classifications with different seasons, landscape elements, and mesohabitats.

MATERIALS and METHODS

Study area

The study was carried out in 27 streams of the Western and the Eastern Ghats. The details of the study area were given in Table 1. Each site was selected after assessing the habitat heterogeneity, canopy cover, and riparian taxa.

Sampling

All the streams in 27 sites are classified into four orders, three seasons, six landscape elements, and seven mesohabitats. The method of sampling was followed by kick net sampling (Burton and Sivaramakrishnan, 1993) and Surber sampling. The individuals were assigned to five functional feeding groups, namely predators, shredders, scrapers, collectors, and filter feeders (Merritt and Cummins, 1984) depending on their gut contents analysis and by the study of mouthparts morphology.

Analysis of Data

An Analysis of Variance (One way-ANOVA) was performed by PAST software (Hammer *et al.*, 2001).

Classification of Stream orders

Twenty-seven sites were classified into 4 Stream orders. They are Stream order I, II, III, and IV. The stream orders were classified based on Strahler (1957).

Table 1. Characteristic features of sampling sites

No	Sites	Abbreviation	Altitude (m)	Latitude and Longitude	Stream order
1	Kumbakkarai	Kumb	400	10°18' N 77°53' E	Third
2	Sothuparai stream	Soth	282	10°13' N 77°46' E	Fourth
3	Suruli	Suru	450	09°65' N 77°30' E	First
4	Kurangani falls	Kura	650	11°04' N 77°50' E	Second
5	Gadana Nathi	Gada	360	08°48' N 77°19' E	Third
6	Iluppaiair	Ilup	125	08°46' N 77°17' E	Second
7	Ramanadi	Rama	310	08°47' N 77°23' E	Second
8	Chittar	Chit	200	09°38' N 77°36' E	Third
9	Ayyanar falls	Ayya	115	08°42' N 77°07' E	Second
10	Karuppar	Karu	253	08°29' N 77°03' E	First
11	Mundar	Mund	155	08°30' N 77°07' E	Third
12	Mothiramalai	Moyh	139	08°18' N 77°29' E	Second
13	Kumbar	Kumr	211	08°29' N 77°01' E	Second
14	Illanguruparai	Illa	197	08°29' N 77°11' E	Second
15	Kalikesam falls	Kali	280	08°39' N 77°39' E	Third
16	Kaippillai thodu-Kallar	Kaip	48	08°71' N 77°12' E	Third
17	Golden valley-Kallar	Gold	176	08°72' N 77°12' E	Second
18	Kallar	Kall	165	08°70' N 77°10' E	Third
19	Aranakuzhi – Kallar	Aran	240	08°50' N 77°35' E	Second
20	Panivadi – Kallar	Pani	300	08°33' N 77°19' E	Second
21	Meenmutti	Meen	610	08°71' N 77°14' E	Third
22	Downstream- Kallar Odamundurair odai-	Down	155	08°42' N 77°14' E	Fourth
23	Karanthamalai	Odam	470	10°30' N 78°17' E	Second
24	Ayyan odai-Karanthamalai	Aayn	390	10°35' N 78°20' E	First
25	Sirumalai	Siru	550	10°24' N 77°95' E	Third
26	Bison vally- Alagar malai	Biso	425	10°30' N 78°20' E	First
27	Periaaruvi- Alagar malai	Peri	500	10°50' N 78°30' E	Second

Classification of Landscape Types

Twenty-seven sites were classified into 6 Land Landscape Element (LSE) types. They are Evergreen (EVG), Semi-evergreen (SEVG), Forestry plantation (FORP), Areca nut (ARE), Scrub (SCRUB), and Dry deciduous forest (DRY). The landscapes were classified according to Nagendra and Gadgil (1998) and Ghate *et al.* (1998).

Seasonality classification

All the samples collected during February to May, June to September, October to January are grouped as summer, south-west monsoon, and north-east monsoon collections respectively.

Mesohabitat Descriptions

Based on flow speed, depth, and substrate mesohabitat has been evolved by Vadas and Orth (1998), which were then characterized to EPT insects according to habitat associations in temperate streams (Ferro and Sites, 2007). Seven meso habitats were identified in the study and they were riffle, run, leaf pack, pool, no flowing, bank, and silt/mud.

RESULTS and DISCUSSION

From the study, a total of 14,168 specimens were collected and identified. In the present investigation, twenty seven species of Ephemeroptera belonging to six families, two species of Plecoptera belonging to one family, and 20 genera of Trichoptera belonging to 12 families were identified. Plenitude of Plecoptera was limited only to two species; this may be due to the that the stoneflies ordinarily endure only in the cool headwaters as they are cold-water specialists and also due to the absence of rocky substrates in the 27 streams.

To characterize the functional feeding groups of EPT in different seasons, streams flowing through various stream orders, LSE types, and mesohabitats were examined utilizing the proportional abundance and log abundance in this study. The functional feeding groups of EPT taxa in 27 streams

of the Western and the Eastern Ghats showed in Table 2. The composition of trophic categories indicates slight changes across various seasons (Figure 1). Different species of EPT insects present in six LSE types of the Western and the Eastern Ghats were presented in table 3. The proportional abundance of collectors is high in the stream moving through areca nut (ARE) and low in streams flowing through natural vegetation (Forested area). The scrapers were higher in streams flowing through the semi-evergreen area (57.9 %). The predators were at a high rate (17 %) and shredders were at a low rate (8.4 %) in streams coursing through scrub forests. The shredders were in high percentage in streams flowing through evergreen and semi-evergreen forests. The filter feeders were in high percentage in streams flowing through the dry deciduous forest (23.5 %). Only the influence of mesohabitats between groups and within groups was found to be significant based on ANOVA results. Statistically, P-value for functional feeding groups of EPT is significant ($P=0.0004$) between and within the mesohabitats (Table 4). On all stream orders (Figure 2) collectors were more dominant when compared to other groups and shredders were of low rate (Table 5). Moreover, the distribution of functional feeding groups within the orders shows that Ephemeroptera generally prevailed by collectors followed by scrapers whereas in the order Plecoptera, they were predator transcendent because they were mostly predaceous, so it accounts for only one type of functional feeding group. Trichoptera, which were enriched with all the five functional feeding groups, in which the filter feeder was dominant among them and scrapers were least present feeding group (Figure 5).

However, in the present study, level of shredders was low (6 to 10 %) and this might be because of the low degrees of leaf litter in the streams. Stout (1989) recommended that shredders are hindered in tropical stations by the higher extent of poisonous dense tannins in the leaves of the tropical plants. Abdul and Che Salmah (2019) reported that the abundance of predators increments step by step in streams with a high measure of prey. Predators like stoneflies and some trichopterans can survive in cool headwaters. This might be ascribed to the slow decrease in predators in our study. The results of the present study agree with the results of other studies that have suggested that predictions of the River Continuum Concept do not apply strictly to streams from the tropics (Winterbourn et al., 1981).

The present study shows that the diversity and community structure of EPT insects change with riparian land-use patterns (Table 6). Taxa such as *Hydropsyche* sp., *Macronema* sp., *Tenuibaetis frequentus*, *Baetis ordinatus*, *Labiobaetis germinatus*, *Centroptella similis*, *Isca purpurea*, *Choroterpes alagarensis*, *Choroterpes nambiyarensis*, *Choroterpes nandini*, *Choroterpes petersi*, *Neoperla* sp were tolerant to disturbance inhabit streams flowing through human-influenced riparian land-use types.