

Short Research Article

PRELIMINARY STUDIES ON THE INVERTEBRATE MICROFAUNA ASSOCIATED WITH A TERRESTRIAL MOSS, *HYOPHILA SP.* IN URBAN AREAS OF CHENNAI, TAMIL NADU.

ABSTRACT

Bryophytes provides microhabitat, optimal temperature condition, and acts as nutrient source for invertebrate micro fauna. In the present study, the invertebrate micro fauna associated with a terrestrial moss, *Hyophila* sp. was examined. This preliminary study was conducted for a period of six months from october to march and the invertebrate microfauna was recorded for two different seasons (october-december and january – march).

KEY WORDS

Terrestrial moss, *Hyophila* sp., invertebrate microfauna, bdelloid rotifers, , nematodes, eggs.

1. INTRODUCTION

Bryophytes are tiny, autotrophic, non –vascular cryptogams, which are ubiquitous in distribution [1]. They are referred to as “Amphibians of the Plant Kingdom” due to their dual lives on both water and land [2]. In the light of evolution, bryophytes are the first terrestrial plants placed between algae and vascular plants [3, 4].

The world of bryophytes echoes with life, creating a habitat unlike any other [5]. They provide food as they sequester fairly a good amount of micro and macronutrients, shelter, camouflage and nesting material for variety of animal groups such as microscopic invertebrates, eggs to larger worms and insects [6]. Mosses protect invertebrates from climatic oscillations and gives insulation against rapid temperature and humidity changes by creating spaces filled with air inside their tissue structure [7]. However, only limited information is available on the same.

Most of the terrestrial mosses can adapt and survive in varying degree of available moisture. They can dry almost as rapidly as the environment and resume normal metabolic activity upon supply of moisture [8]. Many aquatic invertebrates living in association with the mosses are capable of undergoing anhydrobiosis, an adaptation to survive desiccation and remoistening. Protozoans, nematodes, tardigrades, and rotifers are the dominant aquatic moss-dwelling invertebrate groups, and all require free water for activity [1] but all are capable of anhydrobiosis to tolerate periodic drought [9, 10, 11].

Comment [IC1]: Writing scientific names must follow the rules of nomenclature

Comment [IC2]: The results, conclusions, and implications have not been clearly stated.

Comment [IC3]: The references used are not up to date
up to date

Comment [IC4]: The references used are not up to date
up to date

Comment [IC5]: The references used are not up to date
up to date

Comment [IC6]: The references used are not up to date
up to date

Comment [IC7]: The references used are not up to date
up to date

The invertebrate bryofauna can also be classified into micro fauna which includes microscopic organisms such as protozoans, rotifers and some nematode worms and meso/macro fauna that includes other larger nematode worms, annelids, insect larvae, insects and molluscs. As mosses occupy a fairly significant part of the food web, the association between moss and micro fauna living amidst them play an important role in majority of the ecosystems. In fact, studies have shown micro fauna present in the mosses regulates bacterial populations [12], plays a significant role in nutrient mineralization and plant growth [13]. Even among the limited literature available, most of the studies are on micro fauna associated with moss that dwells in natural systems, such as forests, river banks, mountains etc [1, 14]. With rapid urbanization throughout the globe, there are almost no studies that are available on the micro fauna associated with mosses dwelling in urban areas (man-made structures).

Therefore, it is necessary that a deeper understanding on the diversity and distribution of bryophyte micro fauna in urban areas is a prerequisite for the use of these organisms in environmental monitoring. The objective of the present study was to perform an initial analysis and compare the invertebrate micro fauna during two different seasons (October to December and January to March) associated with an urban dwelling, terrestrial moss, namely *Hyophila* sp.

Comment [IC8]: The references used are not up to date
up to date

Comment [IC9]: The references used are not up to date
up to date

Comment [IC10]: The references used are not up to date
up to date

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

Hyophila sp. was collected from two different urban parks in Chennai, Tamil Nadu, India from the period of October 2022 to March 2023. These mosses were found growing mostly on man-made structures, such as side walk ways and stone benches. The moss samples were carefully scrapped from these areas using a scalpel and the collected samples were sealed in polyethylene bags and taken to the laboratory for further analysis. All the moss samples collected were in their sporophytic stage. After bringing them to the laboratory, the soil and other debris attached to the moss samples were removed manually under a dissection microscope (Figure 1). The moisture content was analysed by checking their wet weight and dry weight difference.

Micro fauna were analyzed from the collected moss samples following the procedure of Merrifield *et al.* [15]. 2-3 g of collected moss samples were immersed in distilled water for 24 hours in a Petri dish. Each of these samples were agitated vigorously for at least 30 seconds and were squeezed by hand for about 30 times. Then the sample was placed on a strainer and the residual water was collected. A monolayer of 100 µl of this residual sample (1 cm × 1 cm) was made on a slide and a coverslip was placed to restrict the movement of the animals present. The slide was then observed under bright field optics of a Magnus binocular microscope at 40X and live animals were analyzed to check the different groups of microscopic fauna present in the sample. The animals were also enumerated and the relative percentage of different groups of

Comment [IC11]: The references used are not up to date
up to date

these microscopic organisms were calculated. In addition, the different groups of invertebrate microfauna were compared between wet and dry season.



Figure 1 : Photomicrograph of *Hyophilasp.* under dissection microscope

3. RESULTS

Figure 1 shows the photomicrograph of the moss, *Hyophila*. The moisture content of the moss, *Hyophila* sp. showed considerable difference between the wet and the dry season. The moisture content was 58 % during the wet season compared to 36 % during drier months.

The invertebrate micro fauna were analyzed and compared from the moss sample, *Hyophilasp.* It is to be noted that there was not much difference between the micro fauna collected from two of the sample sites. In general, protozoans, rotifers, nematodes, eggs or cysts and certain larvae were observed in the samples collected from the period of October to March (Figure 2). At least 3 different species of rotifers, a single type of protozoan and 2 different species of nematodes were observed. However, there was a significant difference in the occurrence of these organisms with different seasons (Figure 3). During monsoon period, there was a high population of active, moving animals. The invertebrate life during the wet season was highly vibrant with metabolically active animals. However, very few cysts, eggs and larvae were observed during this period and the relative abundance showed rotifers (~ 65 %) being the most dominant group followed by ciliates and nematodes.

During the post monsoon period/dry season, we were still able to identify rotifers, ciliates and nematodes. However, there was a substantial population of eggs, cysts and also some insect larvae. The microscopic life during the dry season was more stagnant with a very few metabolically active animals. The number of cysts and eggs in dry sample were much higher when compared to active live animals. It was pertinent to note that we were not able to observe any occurrence of tardigrade species in any of our samples.




Figure 2: Photomicrographs of various microfauna associated with the terrestrial moss *Hyophilasp*.




Figure 3: Comparison of invertebrate micro fauna between 2 different seasons.

Each Bar Represents relative percentage \pm SE.

4. DISCUSSION

Bryophytes are primitive plants which are under rated for their ecological role. Not many studies are available on these non-vascular plants. Mosses, one of most abundant and ubiquitous bryophytes found in various natural and man-made habitats often go underappreciated and overlooked. They contribute in nutrient cycling, maintenance of food web, work as bio monitorsetc [15]. In addition, they also play an important role in sustaining the lives of number of micro, meso and macro fauna by providing safe nesting site, optimal temperature conditions and act as rich nutrient source [7, 16]. Studies on moss micro fauna is not very common, and whatever studies that are available are on moss associated fauna in natural habitats, such as forest floor, mountains etc[1, 14]. However, almost no significant studies are reported on fauna associated with moss dwelling on man-made structures

In the present study moss growing in urban parks of Chennai was chosen and the taxonomic identity was found to be *Hyophilasp*. This moss is a type of acrocarpous (pinnate) moss that belongs to the family of Pottiaceae, and are commonly distributed throughout tropical and subtropical regions of the world [17]. It can be found at various natural habitats such as deserts, humid soil, wet rocks, and stream banks of waterfalls and is also found on manmade concrete structures in urban habitats [18, 19].

A variety of invertebrates ranging from small protozoans to larger insects and molluscs inhabits the different groups of moss. Mosses attract invertebrates, primarily due to their water absorption and retention capacity [20]. During dry weather conditions they can completely dry out and stay in a quiescent state till the arrival of favorable conditions[21]. In our study, the number of invertebrate micro faunal species were analysed during 2 different seasons. During

Comment [IC12]: The references used are not up to date up to date

Comment [IC13]: The references used are not up to date up to date

Comment [IC14]: The references used are not up to date up to date

Comment [IC15]: The references used are not up to date up to date

both the seasons we were able to observe rotifers, ciliates, nematodes and miscellaneous eggs of various organisms which is similar to previous reports [15]. However, there were also occurrence of many other protozoans[22] and tardigrades in previous studies [15, 22, 23]. In our study, we could not observe a single occurrence of tardigrades in any of the samples collected from October-march. During the wet/monsoon period, high number of active animals were observed, which includes ciliates, rotifers and nematodes. Atleast two different types of bdelloid rotifer species were identified, and formed the dominant group among the analysed bryofauna. Very few number of eggs and larvae were seen during this season. However, in dry season the samples had relatively higher percentage of eggs, fertilized/cleaving eggs, morula and larvae when compared to metabolically active animals. This could be possibly due to the drier conditions, when the metabolic activity of the animals were low.

This initial study suggests that the invertebrate communities in mosses are vital component of the ecosystem. Very few studies are available in India that shows the association between the invertebrate organisms and moss species. Therefore, the extent of interaction between invertebrates and mosses needs further investigation to determine whether the bryofauna is just a reflection of the litter fauna of the area in which the mosses are living, or they form integral part of the moss needs further investigation.

Comment [A16]: Give a more detailed explanation regarding this sentence

5. REFERENCES

- 1) Budke, J. M., Bernard, E. C., Gray, D. J., Huttunen, S., Piechulla, B., & Trigiano, R. N. (2018). Introduction to the Special Issue on Bryophytes. *Critical Reviews in Plant Sciences*, 37(2–3), 102–112. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07352689.2018.148239>
- 2) Rao, G.M., & Dora, S.V. (2019). Some ecological studies on distribution of bryophytes and its applications in Visakhapatnam district, Eastern Ghats of India.
- 3) Gerson, U. (1982). Bryophytes and Invertebrates. In: Smith, A.J.E. (eds) *Bryophyte Ecology*. Springer, Dordrecht. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-009-5891-3_9.
- 4) Buck W.R., Shaw A.J., Goffinet B. (2008). Morphology, anatomy, and classification of the Bryophyta. In: Shaw AJ, ed. *Bryophyte Biology*. Cambridge University Press: 55-138.
- 5) Ramazzotti, G. (1972). Il Phylum Tardigrada. *Mem Ist Ital Idrobiol* 28:1–732
- 6) Glime, J.M., "Chapter 1 - Introduction" (2017). *Bryophyte Ecology Volume 1: Physiological Ecology*. 13. <https://digitalcommons.mtu.edu/bryophyte-ecology1/13>
- 7) Gerson, U. (1969). Moss-Arthropod Associations. *Bryologist*. 72. 10.2307/3241388.
- 8) Anderson, L.E., & Richardson, D.H. (1982). The Biology of Mosses. *The Bryologist*, 85, 274.
- 9) Gilbert, J. J. (1974). Dormancy in Rotifers. *Transactions of the American Microscopical Society*, 93(4), 490–513. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3225154>
- 10) Nicholas, W.L. (1975). The biology of free-living nematodes.

Comment [IC17]: The references used are not up to date

Comment [IC18]: The references used are not up to date

Comment [IC19]: The references used are not up to date

Comment [IC20]: The references used are not up to date

Comment [IC21]: The references used are not up to date

- 11) Wright, J.C. (1991). The significance of four xeric parameters in the ecology of terrestrial Tardigrada. *Journal of Zoology*, 224, 59-77.
- 12) Gilbert, D., Amblard, C., Bourdier, G. *et al.* (1998). The Microbial Loop at the Surface of a Peatland: Structure, Function, and Impact of Nutrient Input. *MicrobEcol* 35, 83–93. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s002489900062>.
- 13) Foissner, W. (1999). Soil protozoa as bioindicators: pros and cons, methods, diversity, representative examples. *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment*, 74: 95–112.
- 14) Longton R.E. (1988). The polar regions. In: *Biology of Polar Bryophytes and Lichens*. Studies in Polar Research. Cambridge University Press :1-31.
- 15) Merrifield, K., & Ingham, R. E. (1998). Nematodes and Other Aquatic Invertebrates in *Eurhynchiumoreganum* from Mary's Peak, Oregon Coast Range. *The Bryologist*, 101(4), 505–511. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3244525>.
- 16) Kinchin, I.M. (1994). *The biology of tardigrades*. xi, 186p. London: Portland Press.
- 17) Reese, W.D., Zander, R.H., & Eckel, P.M. (1994). Genera of the Pottiaceae: Mosses of Harsh Environments. *The Bryologist*, 97, 216.
- 18) Buck, W.R., & Eddy, A. (1991). A Handbook of Malesian Mosses. Volume 2. Leucobryaceae to Buxbaumiaceae. *The Bryologist*, 94, 132.
- 19) Deora, V., & Deora, G.S. (2017). Morphotaxonomical studies on some mosses of Indian Thar desert. *Annals of Plant Sciences*, 6, 1893-1897.
- 20) Božanić, B. (2011). Thesis on “Terrestrial mosses as living environment for invertebrates”.
- 21) Kinchin, I.M. (1990). The moss fauna 3: Arthropods. *Journal of Biological Education*, 24, 93-99.
- 22) Šatkauskienė, I. & Vosyliute, R. (2010). Microfauna of Moss (Bryophyta: Bryopsida) from Four regions of Lithuania. *Acta ZoologicaLituonica* 20(3):225-231.
- 23) Schuster, R.K., & Greven, H. (2007). A long-term study of population dynamics of tardigrades in the moss *Rhytidiadelphussquarrosus* (Hedw.) Warnst. *Journal of Limnology*, 66, 141-151.

Comment [IC22]: The references used are not up to date

Comment [IC23]: The references used are not up to date

Comment [IC24]: The references used are not up to date

Comment [IC25]: The references used are not up to date

Comment [IC26]: The references used are not up to date

Comment [IC27]: The references used are not up to date

Comment [IC28]: The references used are not up to date