

1                   **DISTRIBUTION OF ECOSYSTEM HEALTH INDICATORS FOR**  
2                   **BIOMONITORING OF OIL POLLUTION IN THE WESTERN NIGER DELTA,**  
3                   **NIGERIA**

4  
5    **ABSTRACT**

6    As a result of the limitations of physical and chemical methods for monitoring pollution,  
7    interest on the more reliable biological monitoring intensified over the past four decades.  
8    Soil microarthropods, specifically the free-living mites (Cryptostigmata, Mesostigmata,  
9    Prostigmata) and Collembolans were used as monitor (ability to withstand pollutants) and  
10   indicator (sensitive to pollutants) species in the Eastern Niger Delta. Study was undertaken  
11   in the Western Niger Delta (Delta State) across three eco-vegetational zone (freshwater  
12   swamp forest, Mangrove swamp forest, Lowland rainforest) in the area to determine if these  
13   ecosystem health indicators were widely distributed in these zones. Collections were made  
14   during the rainy season over a 4-month period. A modified Berlese-Tullgren funnel was  
15   used for extraction of microarthropods. Free-living mites: Cryptostigmata (Oribatida) –  
16   *Archogozettes magnus*, *Opiida sp.*, *Annecticarus sp.*, *Bicyrthermania negeriana*, *Cephalida*  
17   *sp.*, *Schelorbates sp.*, *Galumnida sp.*, Mesostigmata (Gamasida) - *Asca sp.*, *Trichuropodida*  
18   and Collembolan – *Paronella sp.*, were widely distributed across the eco-vegetational  
19   zones. **Oribatids were dominant across eco-vegetational zones.** These mesofauna contained  
20   the full complement of monitor and indicator species. It is therefore possible to use these  
21   mesofauna for biomonitoring of oil pollution across the Niger Delta (eastern and western  
22   sectors), Nigeria.

23   Key Words: Pollutants, Ecosystem Health Indicators, Mites, Collembolans, Biomonitoring,  
24   Niger Delta, Nigeria.

25   **INTRODUCTION**

26   The effective dose of a pollutant in an individual, determined by physical or chemical  
27   methods may be much lower than the result obtained. The total concentration may be raised  
28   by high levels of surface contamination or the binding of pollutant to inert sites. Thus the  
29   biological significance of the concentration in the individual may be overestimated. In  
30   contrast, biological monitoring assesses the significance of a pollutant for an organism in its  
31   habitat and other individuals in the community. Monitor and indicator species are used to

32 measure pollutant impact (Martin and Coughtrey, 1982). Monitor species have the ability to  
33 withstand pollutants and they are used to assess the scale and distribution of the pollutant.  
34 In contrast, indicator species are sensitive to the pollutant and their presence or absence  
35 indicates a significant level of contamination.

36 Mites of the suborder Oribatida, also called “beetle” or “moss” mites are the world’s most  
37 numerous arthropods living in the soil (Seastedt, 1984). There are several thousand species,  
38 yet the fauna of much of the tropics is still unknown. They are the most abundant group of  
39 microarthropods in most forested, grassland and desert ecosystem (Seastedt, 1984). Mites  
40 and other microarthropods (Including Collembolans), part of the mesofauna play a crucial  
41 role in the context of soil biodiversity, decomposition and mineralization processes  
42 (Seastedt, 1984; Tiann *et al.*, 1998). Among the microarthropods, the feeders (mycophages)  
43 are dominant Collembolans free-living astigmatid mites and most oribatids  
44 (Cryptostigmmites) have well-developed mouthparts, capable of fragmenting organic matter,  
45 while feeding on the microflora adhering to detritus. Fragmentation and communitation are  
46 important to the decomposition and mineralization processes by creating new surface area  
47 for microbial colonization (Fountain and Hopkin, 2005). The decomposer community  
48 received greater interest within soil ecology in the past six decades (Bardgett, 2002). The  
49 free-living mites (Cryptostigmata, Mesostigmata, Prostigmata) and Collembolans have been  
50 used as monitor and indicator species to determine ecosystem health in Rivers State,  
51 Eastern Niger-Delta (Gbarakoro *et al.*, 2010; Okiwelu *et al.*, 2011a & b; Gbarakoro *et al.*,  
52 2011).

53 This study was undertaken to produce baseline data on the species composition of mites and  
54 Collembolans in relatively undisturbed habitats in mangrove swamp forest, freshwater  
55 swamp forest, lowland rainforest in Delta State, Western Niger Delta, Nigeria. If they are  
56 distributed across these zones, they can be used for biomonitoring of oil pollution across the  
57 Niger Delta.

## 58 MATERIALS AND METHODS

59 The mangrove swamp forest is located on the bank of the Isaba River, Warri North Local  
60 Government Area (LGA) and the freshwater swamp forest, at Merogun, Warri South LGA,  
61 Delta State. Collections were made from two sites in each of in each of the LGAs. At Isaba  
62 in Warri North LGA, collections were made from the mangrove forest and in lowland  
63 rainforest approximately 200m away. In Warri South LGA, at Merogun, collections were

64 from the freshwater swamp forest and approximately 200km away, in farm bush located in  
65 lowland rainforest.

66 Studies were conducted over a 4-month period, June-September, during the rainy season. At  
67 each location, an area 30.00cmx30.00cm was delineated. Each delineated area was divided  
68 into 4 sub-plots and collections made monthly in rotation from each sub-plot. Collections  
69 were made at 08.00-09.00hrs from litter and depths of 0.50cm, 5.0-10.0cm, 10.0-15.0cm;  
70 15.0-20.0 cm, 20-25cm and 25-30cm. Samples were placed in labeled transparent bags. A  
71 modified Berlese-Tullgren funnel was used to extract the microarthropod species were  
72 identified to family levels by keys and illustrations provided by Badejo (1994) and type  
73 specimens in the Entomology and Pest Management Laboratory, University of Port  
74 Harcourt.

## 75 RESULTS

76 In the mangrove swamp forest, six species of Cryptostigmata (Oribatida) were collected:  
77 *Archogozettes magnus*, *Annecticarus sp.*, *Bicyrthermania negeriana*, *Cephalida sp.*,  
78 *Scheloribates sp.*, *Galumnida sp.*; a species of Mesostigmata (*Gamasida*) *Asca sp.* and a  
79 species of Collembola, *Paronella sp.* (Table 1). In the freshwater swamp forest, 4  
80 Cryptostigmata (*Oribatida*) species - *Opiida sp.*, *Galumnida sp.*, *Cephalid sp.*,  
81 *Scheloribates*, 1 Mesostigmata (*Gamasida sp.*) were collected (Table 2).

82 In lowland rain forest - Warri North LGA (1), 4 species of Cryptostigmata (*Oribatida*) -  
83 *Archogozettes magnus*, *Galumnida sp.*, *Cephalid sp.*, *Scheloribates sp.*; 2 species of  
84 Mesostigmata (*Gamasida*), *Asca sp.* and *Uropodida sp.* and 1 species of Collembola -  
85 *Paronella sp.* were collected (Table 3). In lowland rainforest of Warri South LGA, 4  
86 Cryptostigmata (*Oribatida*) - 4 species *Scheloribates sp.*, *Galumnida sp.*, *Cephalida sp.*,  
87 *Opiida sp.*; 2 Mesostigmata (*Gamasida*) - *Asca sp.*, *Uropopida sp.*, and 1 Collembola *sp.*-  
88 *Paronella sp.* were collected (Table 3). **Oribatids were dominant across eco-vegetational**  
89 **zones. Lowland rainforest yielded the highest number of soil microarthropods (Table 4).**

## 90 DISCUSSION

91 In the lowland rainforest, the species composition of mites and Collembolans was more  
92 limited than that of Okiwelu *et al.* (2011) from undisturbed habitat in lowland rainforest of  
93 eastern Niger Delta. This was probably due to the significantly reduced period for  
94 collection. The absence of any Prostigmata *sp.* was also probably due to the limited

95 collection period. However, both monitor species of Cryptostigmata (*Galumnida sp.*;  
96 *Scheloribates sp.*) and indicator species of Cryptostigmata (*Cephalides sp.*, *Archeogozettes*  
97 *magnus*, *Oppia sp.*) and Mesostigmata (*Asca sp.*, *Trachyllropodida sp.*, *Uropodida sp.*)  
98 were encountered. The Collembolan monitor sp. (*Paronella sp.*) was encountered.

99 In the mangrove swamp forest, there were six spp. that consisted of both monitor spp.  
100 (*Bichrthermannia nigeriana*, *Scheloribates sp.*, *Galumnida sp.*) and indicator spp.  
101 Cryptostimata - (*Archeogozettes magnus.*, *Cephalida sp.*) and Mesostigmata - (*Asca sp.*). The  
102 Collembolan monitor species - *Paronella sp.* was also identified. In the freshwater swamp  
103 forest, there were 2 monitor spp. - Mesostigmata (*Galumnida sp.*, *Scheloribates sp.*) and 3  
104 indicator species – (*Oppia sp.*, *Cephalida sp.*) and Mesostigmata (*Asca sp.*). In lowland  
105 rainforest, 2 monitor species- Mesostigmata (*Galumnida sp.*, *Scheloribates sp.*) and 1  
106 indicator species - Mesostigmata (*Asca sp.*) were identified. The Collembolan monitor  
107 species - *Paronella* was also identified.

108 In a series of studies in lowland rainforest, Rivers State, eastern Niger Delta (*Gbarakoro et*  
109 *al.*, 2010, 2011; *Okiwelu et al.*, 2011 a & b), it was established that a full complement of  
110 soil microarthropods of monitor and indicator species was adequate for bio-monitoring to  
111 assess ecosystem health. Monitor species are used to assess the scale and distribution of the  
112 pollutants while indicator species are sensitive to the pollutant and their presence or absence  
113 indicates a significant level of contamination. The mangrove, freshwater swamp forests and  
114 lowland rainforests of the western Niger Delta also have these complements of soil  
115 microarthropods. Oil pollution biomonitoring with soil microarthropods is therefore feasible  
116 across all eco-vegetational zones in the Niger Delta and it is thus recommended.

## 117 CONCLUSION

118 The full complement of soil micro-arthropod ecosystem health indicators (monitor and  
119 indicator species) were widely distributed across the major eco-vegetational zones  
120 (Lowland rainforest, Mangrove swamp forest, Freshwater Swamp forest) of the western  
121 Niger Delta. They had been found extensively distributed in the eastern Niger Delta.  
122 Consequently, their use for biomonitoring of oil pollution in the Niger Delta is feasible and  
123 advisable.

124

125

126

127  
128

Table 1. Species of microarthropods from Mangrove Swamp Forest

Vegetation type	Mites		Collembola
	Oribatida	Gamasida	
Mangrove Swamp Forest	<i>Archezogettes magnus</i> <i>Annecticarus sp.</i> <i>Bicyrthermannia nigeriana</i> <i>Cephalida sp.</i> <i>Galumnida sp.</i> <i>Scheloribates sp.</i>	<i>Asca sp.</i>	<i>Paronella sp.</i>

129  
130  
131  
132

Table 2. Species of microarthropods from Freshwater Swamp Forest

Habitat type	Mites		Collembola
	Oribatida	Gamasida	
Freshwater Swamp Forest	<i>Cephalida sp.</i> <i>Galumnida sp.</i> <i>Oppia sp.</i> <i>Scheloribates sp.</i>	<i>Ascidae sp.</i>	

133  
134  
135  
136

Table 3. Species of microarthropods from Lowland Rainforest

Vegetation type	Mites		Collembola
	Oribatida	Gamasida	
Lowland Rainforest - Warri North LGA	<i>Archezogettes magnus</i> <i>Cephalida sp.</i> <i>Galumnida sp.</i> <i>Scheloribates sp.</i>	<i>Asca sp.</i>	<i>Paronella sp.</i>
Lowland Rainforest (Farm bush) - Warri South LGA	<i>Cephalida sp.</i> <i>Galumnida sp.</i> <i>Oppia sp.</i> <i>Scheloribates sp.</i>	<i>Asca sp.</i> <i>Uropodidae sp.</i>	<i>Paronella sp.</i>

137  
138  
139  
140

Table 4. Mite and Collembolan abundance across eco-vegetational zones

Order	Sub-Order	Mangrove forest	Freshwater swamp forest	Lowland rainforest
Acarina	Oribatida	42	11	77
	Gamasida	6	3	15
Collembolan		2	0	9

141 REFERENCES

1421. Gbarakoro T.N., Okiwelu S.N., Badejo M.A., Umeozor O.C. 2010. Soil microarthropods in  
143 a secondary rainforest in Rivers State, Nigeria -I- Seasonal variations in species richness,  
144 vertical distribution and density in an undisturbed habitat. *Scientia Africana* 9:48-54.
1452. Bardgett R.D. 2002. Causes and consequences of biological diversity in soil. *Zoology* 105:  
146 367-374.
1473. Fountain M.T., Hopkins S.P. 2005. *Folsornia candida* (Collembolan): a standard soil  
148 arthropod. *Annual Review of Entomology* 50:201-222.
1494. Seastedt T.R. 1984. The role of microarthropods in decomposition and mineralization  
150 processes. *Annual Review of Entomology* 29:25-46.
1515. Tian G., Adejuyigbe C.O., Adeoye G.O., Kang B.T. 1998. Role of soil microarthropods in  
152 leaf decomposition and N release under various land-use practices in the humid tropics.  
153 *Pedobiologia Jena* 42:33-42.
1546. Okiwelu S.N., Gbarakoro T.N., Badejo M.A. 2011a. Soil microarthropods in a secondary  
155 rainforest, Rivers State: Ecosystem health indicators of oil pollution. *Journal of Ecology*  
156 and Natural Environment 3:29-32.
1577. Gbarakoro T.N., Okiwelu S.N., Umeozor O.C., Badejo M.A. 2011. Soil microarthropods in  
158 a secondary rainforest -III- partial recovery after an oil spill. *International Journal of*  
159 *Ecosystem* 1: 1-4.
1608. Badejo M.A. 1996. Measuring the diversity of soil microarthropods and microfauna in an  
161 area of conservation of biodiversity. *In* Biosphere resources for diversity conservation and  
162 sustainable development in Anglophone Africa (BRAAF), Assessment and monitoring  
163 techniques in Nigeria, Abeokuta, Nigeria, 120pp.
1649. Okiwelu S.N., Gbarakoro T.N., Umeozor O.C., Badejo M.A. 2011b. Soil microarthropods  
165 in a secondary rainforest, Rivers State, Nigeria -IV- the impact of oil pollution on their  
166 distribution. *Resources and Environment* 1:1-4
16710. Martin M.H., Coughtrey P.J. 1982. Biological monitoring of heavy metal pollution.  
168 *Pollution monitoring series Ad.* (Mellanby K., ed.). Applied Sciences Publishers Ltd.  
169 London 475pp.

170

171