Chlorpyrifos and Dichlorvos in Combined Exposure Reveals Antagonistic Interaction to Freshwater Fish Mrigal, *Cirrhinus Mrigala*

Prabesh Singh Kunwar (✉ prabeshkunwar@yahoo.com)

Tribhuvan University Central Department of Zoology <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3949-8355>

Bhawani Sapkota

Tribhuvan University

Samikshya Badu

Tribhuvan University

Kusum Parajuli

Tribhuvan University

Amit Sinha

University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff

Gudrun De Boeck

University of Antwerp: Universiteit Antwerpen

Kumar Sapkota

Tribhuvan University

Research Article

Keywords: Additive index, Fish behavior, Growth, Organophosphate, Pesticide mixture

Posted Date: November 8th, 2021

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-896260/v2>

License: © ⓘ This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

[Read Full License](#)

Version of Record: A version of this preprint was published at Ecotoxicology on March 17th, 2022. See the published version at <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10646-022-02534-6>.

Abstract

Toxicity imposed by organophosphate pesticides to the freshwater cultivable fish species mrigal (*Cirrhinus mrigala*) was assessed under laboratory conditions. Healthy juveniles were exposed to chlorpyrifos, dichlorvos, and their equitoxic mixture in geometric series. Median lethal concentrations of chlorpyrifos were found to be 0.906 (0.689–1.179), 0.527 (0.433–0.633), 0.435 (0.366–0.517) and 0.380 (0.319–0.450) mg/L and dichlorvos were found to be 38.432 (33.625–47.866), 22.477 (19.047–26.646), 12.442 (9.619–14.196) and 11.367 (9.496–13.536) mg/L after 24 h, 48 h, 72 h and 96 h of exposure respectively. Surprisingly, the joint toxicity of these organophosphates in the binary mixture was less than additive during most of the exposure periods. Behavioral changes exhibited by pesticide exposed fish were elevated opercular beatings, loss of equilibrium, loss of schooling behavior, aggregating at corners of the test chamber, slight color changes, surplus mucus secretion, and sudden and rapid body movements before death. Such behavioral studies can be applied as a non-invasive bio-monitoring tool for water quality assessment for fish growth and development. Despite the same mode of action of both pesticides, the antagonistic action in the binary mixture is an interesting outcome of this research that requires further investigation for a lucid understanding of the joint toxicity mechanism of such pesticides.

Introduction

Toxicity is the level to which any substance or mixture of substances can impair organisms. Pesticides are toxic compounds and their toxicity depends on chemical concentration, target organisms, exposure environment, and exposure period. Median lethal concentration (LC_{50}) is the most common way of reporting toxicity of any substance at which fifty percent of the exposed organisms are killed within the given time period. Sabra and Mehana (2015) have classified pesticides as minimal, slight, moderate, high, extreme and super-toxic compounds based on their LC_{50} values. There are a number of studies that estimated median lethal concentration (LC_{50}) of chlorpyrifos (Bhatnagar et al. 2017), dichlorvos (Velmurugan et al. 2009; Srivastava et al. 2012), carbaryl, carbofuran, profenfos and triazophos (Mahboob et al. 2015), endosulfan (Ilyas and Javed 2013) and malathion (Rauf 2015) in mrigal (*Cirrhinus mrigala*).

Pesticides are one of the most potentially harmful chemicals, therefore increasing pesticide application is a serious threat to human health and biodiversity. Chlorpyrifos is a broad-spectrum organophosphate pesticide. It is extensively used for pest control throughout the world for agriculture and domestic purposes (Ali et al. 2009). Dichlorvos is another commonly used organophosphate pesticide in developing countries (Ural and Çalta 2005). It is one of the main chemical agents used in bath treatment against fish ectoparasites (Varó et al. 2007). A small fraction of the applied pesticide reaches the target pests and the majority of it is released into the environment (Tišler et al. 2009). During the rainy season, the pesticides from agricultural fields are flushed away and drained into the water systems (rivers, lakes, reservoirs, ponds) that alter physic-chemical parameters of water and ultimately affect the performance of aquatic organisms inhabiting there. Since the final destination of all applied pesticides is the water bodies, organisms thriving there are always threatened by the mixture of various pesticides which can be

more hazardous than single pesticide exposure. Laetz et al. (2009) also reported that pesticide mixtures can be much more toxic compared to single pesticide exposure.

Pesticides can be fatal to fish; but fortunately, their concentrations in natural waters generally remain at a lower level that does not incite fish mortality. However, they are still able to cause adverse effects to organisms. These effects can be retarded growth, reproductive failure, poor swimming performance, becoming prone to predation, and so on. Such sub-lethal effects are generally ignored and receive less attention since no direct mortality is observed, but these effects ultimately determine the overall success of any species and their population. Behavioral change is one of the sub-lethal effects which is an important indicator of water pollution and stress (Chebbi and David 2010; Kesharwani et al. 2018). In recent studies, behavioral observations are gaining popularity because these are noticed even at low chemical concentrations and are also a non-invasive method.

The global fisheries sector is threatened by aquatic pollution and pesticides are one of the serious sources of pollution. In this context, we selected mrigal as a model organism to evaluate the toxicity of pesticides. This is an important aquaculture candidate species in Nepal which is successfully cultivated under single stocking and multiple harvesting techniques. This farming technique, locally called Chhadi farming, is gaining popularity in Nepal (Mishra and Kunwar 2014; Kunwar and Adhikari 2016 and 2017; Adhikari et al. 2018). Chlorpyrifos and dichlorvos were selected for a toxicity assessment because they are commonly used in many countries (Sun et al. 2015) and their traces were detected in nature, fish and fisheries products (Kafle et al. 2015; Singh et al. 2015; Akoto et al. 2016; Zahran et al. 2018; Nag et al. 2020).

Individual effects of chlorpyrifos and dichlorvos on mrigal had already been documented but their joint toxic effect on this species is still lacking. Pesticides in a mixture can interact with each other (additive or competitive) to modulate the overall resultant toxicity effect, therefore water quality assessment based on single pesticide toxicity can be misleading. Wang et al. (2015) had also highlighted that single pesticide risk assessments are more likely to underestimate the impacts of these pesticides to aquatic organisms. Therefore, the present study was designed with the aim to elucidate lethal toxicity as well as behavioral manifestation of mrigal in response to chlorpyrifos and dichlorvos not only individually but also in combination. The results obtained from this study are expected to enrich the existing knowledge on joint pesticide toxicity.

Materials And Methods

Fish Acclimatization

Mrigal hatchlings (one week after hatching) were purchased from Fish Pure-line Breed Conservation and Promotion Centre, Bhairahawa, Rupandehi, Nepal and transported in oxygen-packed polythene bags to Central Fisheries Promotion and Conservation Centre (CFPCC) Balaju, Kathmandu, Nepal. Hatchlings were grown in an earthen pond for two months until they reached finger size. Healthy fingerlings with

uniform size (exact weight provided below) were transferred to a 350-L indoor glass aquarium of CFPCC for acclimatization. The aquarium was fitted with a water filter and aeration system. Fish were regularly fed ad libitum with commercial pellet feed having 32% protein (Sreema feed Pvt. Ltd., India). Uneaten food and fecal matter were removed with the help of a scoop net and siphon. Everyday approximately half of the aquarium water was exchanged with freshwater to maintain optimum water quality. Water pumps, air stones, pipes and filters were cleaned twice a week. Water temperature, pH, dissolved oxygen and total ammonia ranged between 23.97–24.62 °C, 7.68–7.85, 5.80–6.74 mg/L and 0.20–0.23 mg/L, respectively. Fish were acclimatized for 15 days before using them for the lethal toxicity experiment.

Pesticides Selection

Two pesticides-chlorpyrifos and dichlorvos were selected for the present toxicity experiment. These are commonly applied organophosphate insecticides in crops for pest control. Dichlorvos (G-VAN-80%) Greenriver Industry Co., Ltd., ShenZhen, China and chlorpyrifos (Dursban-20%) Dow AgroSciences Pvt. Ltd., India were the commercial- grade pesticides used in this study.

Lethal Toxicity Test

Lethal toxicity tests were conducted in triplicates as per the standard guidelines (OECD 1992) in semi-static conditions. Well cleaned glass aquaria (35-L capacity) with 25-L water volume were used for the test. The average weight of the fish used in this experiment was 5.52 ± 0.91 g (mean $\pm$ SD). Feeding was ceased 24 hours prior to the exposure experiments to avoid any interference of waste with pesticides. Stock solutions were freshly prepared in distilled water and calculated amounts of the solution were added in the aquaria to obtain five different pesticide concentrations in geometric series (chlorpyrifos: 0.25, 0.5, 1.0, 2.0 and 4.0 mg/L; dichlorvos: 4.0, 8.0, 16.0, 32.0 and 64.0 mg/L). Exposed fish were regularly monitored and dead fish were immediately removed from the aquaria; no fish died in the control. Mortality was recorded after 24 h, 48 h, 72 h and 96 h of exposure. The mortality data obtained from chlorpyrifos and dichlorvos treatments were analyzed to estimate lethal concentrations (24 h to 96 h- LC_{10-90}) of both pesticides by using a log probit analysis program.

After estimation of individual pesticide toxicity, their joint toxicity was assessed. For this, five geometric series of pesticides mixtures were prepared by adding both pesticides in equitoxic concentration i.e. 12.5%, 25%, 50%, 100% and 200% 96 h- LC_{50} of chlorpyrifos and dichlorvos. Fish mortality was recorded as described above. As before, no fish mortality was observed in the control. Similar to individual pesticides, 24 h to 96 h- LC_{10} to LC_{90} of the mixture pesticide toxicity was also calculated; where LC_{10} and LC_{90} indicate pesticide concentrations required to kill 10% and 90% of the fish population, respectively.

Joint Toxicity Assessment

The joint toxicity of pesticide was assessed by the additive index (AI). This was calculated according to Marking (1985).

$$AI = (1/S) - 1 \text{ for } S \leq 1 \text{ and,}$$

$$AI = 1 - S \text{ for } S > 1$$

where, AI represents additive index and S represents the sum of biological activity

$$S = (A_m/A_i) + (B_m/B_i)$$

where, A and B represent two different pesticides, 'm' represents LC₅₀ of pesticides in mixture, 'i' represents LC₅₀ of individual pesticides.

AI values equal, greater or less than zero indicates additive, synergistic or antagonistic action of the pesticide mixture respectively.

Fish Behavior

Fish exposed to chlorpyrifos, dichlorvos and mixture pesticides in geometric series (doses mentioned above) for lethal toxicity assessment were carefully observed during the whole experimental period and their behavior like body movements, operculum movements, color change, swimming pattern, schooling behavior, mucus secretion was recorded. Although the behavior study was started with five concentrations of each pesticide, data from all treatments could not be presented due to fish mortality in higher pesticide concentrations.

Data Presentation and Analysis

The average weight, standard deviation and mortality percentage of fish were calculated in Microsoft Excel. The diagrams were also prepared in Microsoft Excel. The lethal concentrations (24 h, 48 h, 72 h and 96 h LC₁₀ to LC₉₀) of individual and mixture pesticides were calculated by log probit analysis using statistical program SPSS version 20. The lethal concentration data are presented with their upper and lower limit at a 95% confidence interval. The joint toxicity of the pesticides was analyzed in Microsoft Excel based on formulae described by Marking (1985).

Results

Lethal Toxicity of Chlorpyrifos

Lethal toxicity testing of chlorpyrifos was conducted in five different concentrations ranging from 0.25 mg/L to 4 mg/L. Chlorpyrifos at a low dose (0.25 mg/L) was slightly toxic to fish where mortality started at a later phase (after 72 h) where only 10% of the fish population died by the end of the experiment (96 h). In contrast, chlorpyrifos concentrations 1 mg/L, 2 mg/L and 4 mg/L caused 100% fish mortality after 72 h, 48 h and 24 h of exposure periods, respectively (Fig. 1).

The median lethal concentrations (LC₅₀) of chlorpyrifos with their 95% confidence limit were found to be 0.906 (0.689–1.179), 0.527 (0.433–0.633), 0.435 (0.366–0.517) and 0.380 (0.319–0.450) mg/L at 24 h, 48 h, 72 h and 96 h, respectively (Table 1). The range of LC₁₀ to LC₉₀ at 24 h, 48 h, 72 h and 96 h were

0.312 (0.167–0.445) to 2.630 (1.873–4.737), 0.311 (0.203–0.388) to 0.894 (0.727–1.316), 0.287 (0.195–0.345) to 0.659 (0.547–0.973) and 0.251 (0.172–0.302) to 0.575 (0.479–0.829) mg/L, respectively, showing a decreasing trend of lethal pesticide concentration with increasing time of exposure (Table 1).

Table 1
24–96 h lethal concentrations (LC₁₀–LC₉₀) of chlorpyrifos to mrigal

Toxicity	24 h (mg/L)	48 h (mg/L)	72 h (mg/L)	96 h (mg/L)
LC ₁₀	0.312 (0.167–0.445)	0.311 (0.203–0.388)	0.287 (0.195–0.345)	0.251 (0.172–0.302)
LC ₂₀	0.450 (0.280–0.603)	0.373 (0.268–0.451)	0.331 (0.246–0.389)	0.289 (0.217–0.340)
LC ₃₀	0.586 (0.401–0.762)	0.425 (0.325–0.507)	0.367 (0.289–0.428)	0.320 (0.253–0.374)
LC ₄₀	0.734 (0.536–0.945)	0.475 (0.379–0.566)	0.400 (0.329–0.469)	0.350 (0.287–0.409)
LC ₅₀	0.906 (0.689–1.179)	0.527 (0.433–0.633)	0.435 (0.366–0.517)	0.380 (0.319–0.450)
LC ₆₀	1.118 (0.867–1.503)	0.585 (0.489–0.718)	0.472 (0.403–0.576)	0.412 (0.352–0.500)
LC ₇₀	1.401 (1.083–1.994)	0.654 (0.550–0.832)	0.515 (0.442–0.654)	0.450 (0.385–0.565)
LC ₈₀	1.824 (1.376–2.838)	0.746 (0.622–1.001)	0.571 (0.486–0.768)	0.498 (0.424–0.660)
LC ₉₀	2.630 (1.873–4.737)	0.894 (0.727–1.316)	0.659 (0.547–0.973)	0.575 (0.479–0.829)
Values in parentheses are lower and upper bound at 95% confidence limit				

Lethal Toxicity of Dichlorvos

Lethal toxicity of dichlorvos to mrigal was assessed by exposing fish to five different concentrations ranging from 4 mg/L to 64 mg/L. The lower dichlorvos concentrations (4 mg/L and 8 mg/L) exhibited no fish mortality during 96 h exposure. Other pesticide concentrations viz. 16 mg/L, 32 mg/L and 64 mg/L killed 100% of stocked fish after 96 h, 48 h and 24 h of exposure, respectively (Fig. 2).

The median lethal concentrations (LC₅₀) at 24 h, 48 h, 72 h and 96 h with 95% confidence limits were 38.432 (33.625–47.866), 22.477 (19.047–26.646), 12.442 (9.619–14.196) and 11.367 (9.496–13.536) mg/L, respectively (Table 2). The range of LC₁₀ to LC₉₀ at 24 h, 48 h, 72 h and 96 h were calculated to be 28.710 (20.917–32.898) to 51.447 (43.129–87.287), 17.453 (13.322–20.394) to 28.948 (24.723–38.344), 9.837 (6.003–11.713) to 15.736 (13.759–19.275) and 9.068 (6.821–10.655) to 14.250 (12.146–18.718) mg/L, respectively, showing a decreasing trend of lethal pesticide concentration with increasing time of exposure (Table 2). The acute toxicity results of both pesticides clearly indicate that chlorpyrifos is more toxic than dichlorvos to freshwater fish such as mrigal (Tables 1 and 2).

Table 2
24 h – 96 h lethal concentrations (LC₁₀ - LC₉₀) of dichlorvos to mrigal

Toxicity	24 h (mg/L)	48 h (mg/L)	72 h (mg/L)	96 h (mg/L)
LC ₁₀	28.710 (20.917–32.898)	17.453 (13.322–20.394)	9.837 (6.003–11.713)	9.068 (6.821–10.655)
LC ₂₀	31.733 (25.407–36.257)	19.037 (15.208–22.140)	10.663 (7.093–12.449)	9.800 (7.704–11.473)
LC ₃₀	34.109 (28.721–39.581)	20.267 (16.638–23.622)	11.302 (7.980–13.041)	10.363 (8.371–12.159)
LC ₄₀	36.279 (31.377–43.364)	21.381 (17.882–25.083)	11.877 (8.803–13.604)	10.871 (8.952–12.828)
LC ₅₀	38.432 (33.625–47.866)	22.477 (19.047–26.646)	12.442 (9.619–14.196)	11.367 (9.496–13.536)
LC ₆₀	40.713 (35.671–53.374)	23.630 (20.200–28.427)	13.033 (10.466–14.876)	11.887 (10.037–14.335)
LC ₇₀	43.304 (37.710–60.428)	24.929 (21.415–30.603)	13.697 (11.384–15.738)	12.469 (10.606–15.304)
LC ₈₀	46.546 (39.997–70.309)	26.540 (22.812–33.534)	14.517 (12.430–16.988)	13.186 (11.260–16.602)
LC ₉₀	51.447 (43.129–87.287)	28.948 (24.723–38.344)	15.736 (13.759–19.275)	14.250 (12.146–18.718)
Values in parentheses are lower and upper bound at 95% confidence limit				

Lethal Toxicity of Mixture Pesticides

To assess the lethal toxicity of chlorpyrifos and dichlorvos mixture, fish were exposed to 5 different pesticide mixtures prepared in an equitoxic concentration ranging from 12.5–200% 96 h-LC₅₀ values of the respective pesticide. 12.5% pesticide mixture caused no fish mortality whereas 25%, 50% and 100% of pesticide mixture killed 20%, 40% and 70% of the fish population respectively during 96 h of exposure. 200% pesticide mixture was highly toxic and killed all fish within 48 h of exposure (Fig. 3).

In the pesticides mixture, the LC₅₀ values of chlorpyrifos with 95% confidence limit were 0.761 (0.535–1.665), 0.337 (0.279–0.413), 0.306 (0.252–0.374) and 0.217 (0.170–0.279) mg/L and dichlorvos were 22.774 (16.010–49.793), 10.088 (8.332–12.358), 9.155 (7.533–11.200) and 6.484 (5.089–8.333) mg/L at 24 h, 48 h, 72 h and 96 h, respectively (Table 3). In joint toxicity assessment, the dominating action of chlorpyrifos and dichlorvos mixture was found to be antagonistic (Table 4).

Table 3
24–96 h lethal concentrations (LC₁₀ - LC₉₀) in mg/L of pesticide mixture (chlorpyrifos 'CPF' and dichlorvos 'DDVP') to mrigal

Toxicity	24 h (CPF and DDVP)	48 h (CPF and DDVP)	72 h (CPF and DDVP)	96 h (CPF and DDVP)
LC ₁₀	0.236 and 7.052 (0.113–0.332, 3.387–9.945)	0.190 and 5.671 (0.126–0.236, 3.781–7.063)	0.170 and 5.072 (0.112–0.212, 3.348–6.353)	0.086 and 2.563 (0.051–0.116, 1.537–3.465)
LC ₂₀	0.353 and 10.546 (0.225–0.495, 6.740–14.807)	0.231 and 6.911 (0.170–0.280, 5.075–8.364)	0.208 and 6.212 (0.151–0.252, 4.522–7.547)	0.118 and 3.525 (0.080–0.152, 2.388–4.548)
LC ₃₀	0.471 and 14.097 (0.334–0.730, 10.005–21.829)	0.266 and 7.970 (0.207–0.320, 6.202–9.558)	0.240 and 7.189 (0.186–0.289, 5.555–8.641)	0.148 and 4.435 (0.108–0.188, 3.233–5.613)
LC ₄₀	0.604 and 18.063 (0.435–1.095, 13.020–32.756)	0.301 and 9.002 (0.243–0.362, 7.272–10.843)	0.272 and 8.146 (0.219–0.328, 6.545–9.816)	0.180 and 5.397 (0.138–0.228, 4.123–6.825)
LC ₅₀	0.761 and 22.774 (0.535–1.665, 16.010–49.793)	0.337 and 10.088 (0.279–0.413, 8.332–12.358)	0.306 and 9.155 (0.252–0.374, 7.533–11.200)	0.217 and 6.484 (0.170–0.279, 5.089–8.333)
LC ₆₀	0.960 and 28.714 (0.645–2.583, 19.285–77.269)	0.378 and 11.304 (0.315–0.477, 9.423–14.268)	0.344 and 10.288 (0.286–0.433, 8.557–12.947)	0.260 and 7.790 (0.206–0.346, 6.171–10.355)
LC ₇₀	1.230 and 36.794 (0.777–4.185, 23.245–125.176)	0.427 and 12.768 (0.355–0.563, 10.617–16.846)	0.390 and 11.657 (0.324–0.512, 9.682–15.315)	0.317 and 9.480 (0.249–0.444, 7.458–13.287)
LC ₈₀	1.644 and 49.182 (0.958–7.425, 28.668–222.120)	0.492 and 14.724 (0.403–0.692, 12.066–20.702)	0.451 and 13.491 (0.369–0.631, 11.050–18.872)	0.399 and 11.928 (0.306–0.604, 9.162–18.075)
LC ₉₀	2.459 and 73.550 (1.271–16.591, 38.018–496.275)	0.600 and 17.942 (0.476–0.933, 14.225–27.906)	0.552 and 16.523 (0.438–0.854, 13.095–25.558)	0.548 and 16.403 (0.401–0.942, 11.981–28.175)
Values in parentheses are lower and upper bound at 95% confidence limit				

Table 4
Joint toxicity of chlorpyrifos and dichlorvos
to mrigal

Toxicity	Additive Index (AI) value			
	24 h	48 h	72 h	96 h
LC ₁₀	0.00	0.06	-0.11	0.37
LC ₂₀	-0.12	0.02	-0.21	0.23
LC ₃₀	-0.22	-0.02	-0.29	0.11
LC ₄₀	-0.32	-0.05	-0.37	-0.01
LC ₅₀	-0.43	-0.09	-0.44	-0.14
LC ₆₀	-0.56	-0.12	-0.52	-0.29
LC ₇₀	-0.73	-0.17	-0.61	-0.46
LC ₈₀	-0.96	-0.21	-0.72	-0.71
LC ₉₀	-1.36	-0.29	-0.89	-1.10

Table 5

Behavioral changes shown by mrigal during 96h acute exposure of chlorpyrifos (CPF), dichlorvos (DDVP) and their mixture

Fish behavior	CPF (mg/L)				DDVP (mg/L)				Mixed pesticides (mg/L)			
	0.25	0.5	1	2	4	8	16	32	CPF-0.047 DDVP-1.420	CPF-0.095 DDVP-2.841	CPF-0.190 DDVP-5.683	CPF-0.380 DDVP-11.367
Hypo-activity				NA				NA	+	+	++	++
Equilibrium loss	+	++	++	NA				NA				
Color change			+	NA			+	NA			+	+
Aggregating at corners of the aquarium	+	+	++	NA	+	+	++	NA	+	+	+	+
Avoiding schooling behavior		+	++	NA		+	+	NA	++	+	+	+
	+	+	++	NA	+	+	++	NA	+	+	+	++
Mixed concentrations were prepared as 12.5%, 25%, 50%, 100% and 200% of 96 h-LC ₅₀ values of the respective pesticides. 96 h-LC ₅₀ of CPF-0.380 mg/L and DDVP-11.367 mg/L (- : absent; + : mild; ++ : moderate; +++ : strong)												

Fish Behavior

Chlorpyrifos exposed fish were slow and sluggish; in contrast mixture pesticide treated fish were hyperactive. Such fish behavior was more intense with higher concentrations of pesticides. No remarkable change in body activity was observed in dichlorvos treated fish. Opercular movements of fish were elevated in all pesticides from low to high concentrations. Fish were unable to balance their body at higher concentrations of pesticide treatments. Fish schooling behavior was influenced by all pesticides and changes became more noticeable with increasing pesticide concentrations where swimming coordination among fish was lost and fish were scattered everywhere in the test chamber occupying a greater space than control fish. Frequently, fish were also aggregated at the corners of the test chambers. Slight color changes were observed in fish; caudal and pectoral fins were reddish and the body became pale. Some fish were overexcited and suddenly showed vigorous movements in different directions before death. In higher pesticide concentrations, the dead fish were found to be loaded with mucus around their respiratory organs.

Discussion

The first step in determining a chemical's safety threshold in the aquatic environment is to ascertain its lethal toxicity. In our study 96 h-LC₅₀ value of chlorpyrifos to mrigal was found to be 0.380 (0.319–0.450) mg/L. Our recent work on common carp (*Cyprinus carpio*) and golden mahseer (*Tor putitora*) reported 96 h median lethal concentration of chlorpyrifos to be 0.44 and 0.753 mg/L respectively (Kunwar et al. 2021a, b). Similarly, 96 h-LC₅₀ values of chlorpyrifos were reported to be 0.44 mg/L in mrigal (Bhatnagar et al. 2017) and 0.58 mg/L in common carp (Xing et al. 2015). In this experiment, we found 96 h-LC₅₀ of dichlorvos was 11.367 (9.496–13.536) mg/L. The present finding corroborates to other experiments that documented 96 h median lethal concentration of dichlorvos to be 9.1 mg/L in mrigal (Velmurugan et al. 2009), 9.41 mg/L (Ural and Çalta 2005) or 15.705 mg/L in common carp (Kunwar et al. 2021a) and 12.964 mg/L in golden mahseer (Kunwar et al. 2021b). Our results distinctly reveal chlorpyrifos is relatively more toxic than dichlorvos for mrigal.

In general, toxicity evaluations are based on single pesticide assessments but these compounds are oftentimes found as complex mixtures in nature; therefore such assessment studies on individual pesticides cannot represent the actual threats posed to aquatic organisms. The combined pesticide toxicity can be additive (an effect produced by mixture pesticides is exactly equal to the sum of individual pesticide's effects), synergistic (an effect caused by mixture pesticides is higher than the sum of its individual pesticide's effect) or antagonistic (an effect caused by mixture pesticides is less than the sum of its individual pesticide's effect). In our study, the joint action of chlorpyrifos and dichlorvos to mrigal was observed to be antagonistic. An antagonistic effect of these two pesticides was also recorded in our recent experiment with golden mahseer (Kunwar et al. 2021b). Wang et al. (2017) documented antagonistic effect of chlorpyrifos and other pesticides mixture on zebrafish (*Danio rerio*). Antagonistic effects of chlorpyrifos and carbosulfan (Chen et al. 2014) and fenobucarb with triazophos or malathion (Wang et al. 2015) were also observed in common carp.

Chlorpyrifos and dichlorvos belong to the organophosphate group that have the same mode of action (MOA). Pesticides having the same MOA are not necessarily synergistic (LeBlanc et al. 2012; Wang et al. 2017). To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study to show that chlorpyrifos and dichlorvos have antagonistic effects in the freshwater fish mrigal. There are various explanations put forward by investigators for the antagonistic effect. Hernández et al. (2013) described that the pesticide mixture changes the toxicokinetics of the individual compounds, thus modifying their toxicity. Therefore, chemical interaction between two pesticides might be the reason for the antagonistic result (Imam et al. 2018). Likewise, authors (Stepić et al. 2013; Wang et al. 2017) stated enhanced metabolism processes leading to faster excretion of metabolites, eventually resulting in decreased pesticide toxicity. A potential basis for such an antagonistic outcome could be the elevation of carboxylesterases (CaEs) activity. CaEs can detoxify pesticides by hydrolysis (Jokanovic 2001; Wheelock et al. 2005). Moreover, this enzyme is also believed to protect AChE from pesticide toxicity by direct binding and sequestration (Jokanovic 2001; Maxwell 1992). Therefore, the observed outcome in this experiment might be due to the protective role of CaEs induced by the chlorpyrifos and dichlorvos mixture in mrigal. Another possible interpretation for antagonistic interaction could be Glutathione-S-transferase (GST) mediated pesticide detoxification.

Available reports suggest that GST promotes cellular detoxification of xenobiotics including pesticides (Booth et al. 1998; Jin-Clark et al. 2002). In response to pesticide co-exposure, GST activity was reported to be significantly higher compared to individual pesticide exposure (Stepić et al. 2013). Based on this, we hypothesized that combined treatment of chlorpyrifos and dichlorvos might have elevated GST activity in our experimental animal which played a role in efficient detoxification of metabolites leading to reduced toxicity.

Fish behavior studies are an important non-invasive tool for toxicity assessment. Pesticide exposed fish exhibited loss of balance, loss of coordination, residing at corners of the test chamber, excess mucus secretion, becoming pale, both hyper and hypo excitement, rapid opercular movements and abrupt swimming before death. Alike behavioral expressions in response to pesticide were exhibited by common carp and golden mahseer (Kunwar et al. 2021a, b) under similar exposure environments. Many other authors (Kavitha and Rao 2008; Halappa and David 2009; Nwani et al. 2013; Ullah et al. 2014; Padmanabha et al. 2015; Saha et al. 2016; Soni and Verma, 2018) have also documented comparable behavioral changes in fish after pesticides exposure. Inhibition of acetylcholinesterase (AChE) leads to accumulation of acetylcholine (ACh) in cholinergic synapses and overstimulation resulting behavioral changes in fish (Halappa and David 2009). The excess mucus secretion by pesticide exposed fish would protect them by avoiding contact with toxicants or by getting rid of it through the shedding of the mucus layer (Patil and David 2008; Halappa and David 2009). Fish are stressed when exposed to pesticides and their oxygen demand becomes high during such circumstances (Schmidt et al. 2005). Therefore rapid opercular movements after pesticide exposure in mrigal would have facilitated in supplying high oxygen to detoxify pesticides and protect them from deleterious effects.

Conclusion

Compared to dichlorvos, chlorpyrifos is highly toxic to fish. Despite the same mode of action, the majority of the binary mixture effects were antagonistic in the present study. This requires in-depth investigation to explore the toxicity mechanism of these pesticides in co-exposure. Behavioral manifestations detected even at low pesticide concentration suggest that such observations should be incorporated in toxicity studies because it is a highly sensitive and non-invasive bio-monitoring tool. Such assessments can be correlated to the health status and growth performance of fish under the available rearing condition. To sum up, the application of toxic pesticides should be regulated and the use of bio-pesticides and integrated pest management programs should be promoted to save precocious aquatic flora and fauna from pesticide threats.

Declarations

Funding

No funding was received to assist with the preparation of this manuscript. However, laboratory facilities and chemicals required for the study were provided by Central Fisheries Promotion and Conservation

Centre, Balaju, Kathmandu, Nepal.

Conflicts of interest

The authors have no relevant financial or non-financial interests to disclose.

Availability of data and material

The datasets generated during and/or analysed during the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

Code availability

Not applicable

Authors' contributions

Prabesh Singh Kunwar designed this research, monitored the lab works and prepared the draft version of the manuscript. Bhawani Sapkota and Samikshya Badu conducted the exposure experiments and collected fish mortality and behavior data. Kusum Parajuli compiled and analyzed the data. Amit Kumar Sinha and Gudrun De Boeck reviewed, corrected and improved the manuscript. Kumar Sapkota approved the research design, validated the data and reviewed the manuscript for publication.

Ethics approval

Ethical approval for the study (Ref no. 1215) was received on 18 September 2019 from the Ethical Review Board of Nepal Health Research Council, Government of Nepal.

Consent to participate

Not applicable

Consent for publication

All the authors have read and approved this manuscript for publication in your esteemed journal- Archives of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology.

Acknowledgements

We are thankful to Central Fisheries Promotion and Conservation Centre, Balaju, Kathmandu, Nepal for providing research facilities. We extend our gratitude to Mr. Baikuntha Adhikari, Mr. Subhash Kumar Jha and Mr. Balaram Acharya for their help in different capacities.

References

1. Adhikari B, Kunwar PS, Jha SK (2018) Small-scale fisheries in Nepal. In: Giri SS (ed.) Small-scale fisheries in South Asia. SAARC Agriculture Centre, Dhaka, pp 42–66
2. Akoto O, Azuure AA, Adotey KD (2016) Pesticide residues in water, sediment and fish from Tono reservoir and their health risk implications. SpringerPlus, 5(1849), 1–11.
<https://doi.org/10.1186/s40064-016-3544-z>
3. Ali D, Nagpure NS, Kumar S, Kumar R, Kushwaha B, Lakra WS (2009) Assessment of genotoxic and mutagenic effects of chlorpyrifos in freshwater fish *Channa punctatus* (Bloch) using micronucleus assay and alkaline single-cell gel electrophoresis. Food and Chemical Toxicology, 47(3), 650–656.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fct.2008.12.021>
4. Bhatnagar A, Cheema N, Yadav AS (2017) Alterations in haematological and biochemical profile of freshwater fish, *Cirrhinus mrigala* (Hamilton) exposed to sub-lethal concentrations of chlorpyrifos. Nature Environment and Pollution Technology, 16(4), 1189–1194
5. Booth LH, Heppelthwaite V, Eason, CT (1998) Cholinesterase and glutathione S-transferase in the earthworm *apporectodea caliginosa* as biomarkers of organophosphate exposure. Proceedings of the New Zealand Plant Protection Conference, 51, 138–142
6. Chebbi SG, David M (2010) Respiratory responses and behavioural anomalies of the carp *Cyprinus carpio* under quinalphos intoxication in sublethal doses. Science Asia, 36, 12–17.
<https://doi.org/10.2306/scienceasia1513-1874.2010.36.012>
7. Chen C, Wang Y, Zhao X., Wang Q, Qian Y (2014) The combined toxicity assessment of carp (*Cyprinus carpio*) acetylcholinesterase activity by binary mixtures of chlorpyrifos and four other insecticides. Ecotoxicology, 23, 221–228. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10646-013-1165-7>
8. Halappa R., David M (2009) Behavioural responses of the freshwater fish, *Cyprinus carpio* (Linnaeus) following sublethal exposure to chlorpyrifos. Turkish Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences, 9, 233–238. <https://doi.org/10.4194/trjfas.2009.0218>
9. Hernández AF, Parrón T, Tsatsakis AM, Requena M, Alarcón R, López-Guarnido O (2013) Toxic effects of pesticide mixtures at a molecular level: Their relevance to human health. Toxicology, 307, 136–145. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tox.2012.06.009>
10. Ilyas R, Javed M (2013) Acute toxicity of endosulfan to the fish species *Catla catla*, *Cirrhina mrigala* and *Labeo rohita*. International Journal of Agriculture and Biology, 15, 149–152
11. Imam A, Sulaiman NA., Oyewole AL, Chengetanai S, Williams V, Ajibola MI, Folarin RO, Muhammad AS, Shittu ST, Ajao MS (2018) Chlorpyrifos- and dichlorvos- induced oxidative and neurogenic damage elicits neuro-cognitive deficits and increases anxiety-like behavior in wild-type rats. Toxics, 6(71), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.3390/toxics6040071>
12. Jin-Clark Y, Lydy MJ, Zhu, KY (2002) Effects of atrazine and cyanazine on chlorpyrifos toxicity in *Chironomus tentans* (Diptera: Chironomidae). Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry, 21(3), 598–603
13. Jokanovic M (2001) Biotransformation of organophosphorus compounds. Toxicology, 166, 139–160

14. Kafle BK., Pokhrel B, Shrestha S, Raut R, Dahal BM. (2015) Determination of pesticide residues in water and soil samples from Ansikhola watershed, Kavre, Nepal. *International Journal of Geology, Earth and Environmental Sciences*, 5(2), 119–127
15. Kavitha P, Rao JV (2008) Toxic effects of chlorpyrifos on antioxidant enzymes and target enzyme acetylcholinesterase interaction in mosquito fish, *Gambusia affinis*. *Environmental Toxicology and Pharmacology*, 26(2), 192–198. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.etap.2008.03.010>
16. Kesharwani S, Dube KK., Khan R (2018) Effect of dichlorvos (Nuvan) on behaviour, haematology and histology of freshwater teleost *Labeo rohita*. *International Journal of Science and Research Methodology*, 8(3), 132–146
17. Kunwar PS, Adhikari B (2016 and 2017). Status and development trend of aquaculture and fisheries in Nepal. *Nepalese Journal of Aquaculture and Fisheries*, 3 and 4, 1–11
18. Kunwar PS, Basaula R, Sinha AK., De Boeck G, Sapkota K (2021a) Joint toxicity assessment reveals synergistic effect of chlorpyrifos and dichlorvos to common carp (*Cyprinus carpio*). *Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology Part C: Toxicology and Pharmacology*, 246, 108975. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cbpc.2021.108975>
19. Kunwar PS, Parajuli K, Badu S, Sapkota B, Sinha AK, De Boeck G, Sapkota K (2021b) Mixed toxicity of chlorpyrifos and dichlorvos show antagonistic effects in the endangered fish species golden mahseer (*Tor putitora*). *Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology Part - C: Toxicology and Pharmacology*, 240, 108923. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cbpc.2020.108923>
20. Laetz CA, Baldwin DH, Collier TK, Hebert V, Stark JD, Scholz NL (2009) The synergistic toxicity of pesticide mixtures: Implications for risk assessment and the conservation of endangered Pacific salmon. *Environmental Health Perspectives*, 117(3), 348–353. <https://doi.org/10.1289/ehp.0800096>
21. LeBlanc HMK, Culp JM., Baird DJ, Alexander AC, Cessna AJ (2012) Single versus combined lethal effects of three agricultural insecticides on larvae of the freshwater insect *Chironomus dilutus*. *Archives of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology*, 63(3), 378–390. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00244-012-9777-0>
22. Mahboob S, Ghazala, Al-Ghanim KA, Sultana S, Alkahem Al-Balawi HF, Sultana T, Al-Misned F, Ahmed Z (2015) A study on acute toxicity of triazophos, profenofos, carbofuran and carbaryl pesticides on *Cirrhinus mrigala*. *Pakistan Journal of Zoology*, 47(2), 461–466
23. Marking LL (1985) Toxicity of chemical mixtures. In: Rand G and Petrocelli S (eds) *Fundamentals of Aquatic Toxicology*. Hemisphere Publishing Corporation, Washington DC, pp 164–176
24. Maxwell DM (1992) Detoxication of organophosphorus compounds by carboxylesterase. In: Chambers JE and Levi PE (eds) *Organophosphates: Chemistry, Fate, and Effects*, Academic Press Inc, San Diego, pp 183–199
25. Mishra RN, Kunwar PS (2014) Status of aquaculture in Nepal. *Nepalese Journal of Aquaculture and Fisheries*, 1, 1–17. <http://nefis.org.np/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/NJAF-Vol-1-2014.pdf>
26. Nag SK, Saha K, Bandopadhyay S, Ghosh A, Mukherjee M, Raut A, Raman RK, Suresh VR, Mohanty SK (2020) Status of pesticide residues in water, sediment, and fishes of Chilika lake, India.

- Environmental Monitoring and Assessment, 192(2), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10661-020-8082-z>
27. Nwani CD, Ugwu DO, Okeke OC, Onyishi GC, Ekeh FN, Atama C, Eneje LO (2013) Toxicity of the chlorpyrifos-based pesticide Termifos®: effects on behaviour and biochemical and haematological parameters of African catfish *Clarias gariepinus*. African Journal of Aquatic Science, 38(3), 255–262. <https://doi.org/10.2989/16085914.2013.780153>
 28. OECD (1992) Guideline for testing of chemicals, fish acute toxicity test no. 203. 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264070684-en>
 29. Padmanabha A, Reddy H, Khavi M, Prabhudeva K, Rajanna K, Chethan N (2015) Acute effects of chlorpyrifos on oxygen consumption and food consumption of freshwater fish, *Oreochromis mossambicus* (Peters). International Journal of Recent Scientific Research, 6(4), 3380–3384
 30. Patil VK, David M (2008) Behaviour and respiratory dysfunction as an index of malathion toxicity in the freshwater fish, *Labeo rohita* (Hamilton). Turkish Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences, 8(2), 233–237.
 31. Rauf A (2015) Acute toxicity and effects of malathion exposure on behavior and hematological indices in Indian carp, *Cirrhinus mrigala* (Hamilton). International Journal of Aquatic Biology, 3(4), 199–207
 32. Sabra FS, Mehana E-S E-D (2015). Pesticides toxicity in fish with particular reference to insecticides. Asian Journal of Agriculture and Food Sciences, 3(1), 40–60
 33. Saha NC, Giri SK, Chatterjee N, Biswas SJ, Bej S (2016) Acute toxic effects of mancozeb to fish *Oreochromis mossambicus* (W. K. H. Peters, 1852) and their behaviour. International Journal of Advanced Research in Biological Sciences, 3(6), 40–44
 34. Schmidt K, Staaks GBO, Pflugmacher S, Steinberg CEW (2005) Impact of PCB mixture (Aroclor 1254) and TBT and a mixture of both on swimming behavior, body growth and enzymatic biotransformation activities (GST) of young carp (*Cyprinus carpio*). Aquatic Toxicology, 71(1), 49–59. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aquatox.2004.10.012>
 35. Singh S, Bhutia D, Sarkar S, Rai BK., Pal J, Bhattacharjee S, Bahadur M (2015) Analyses of pesticide residues in water, sediment and fish tissue from river Deomoni flowing through the tea gardens of Terai Region of West Bengal, India. International Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Studies, 3(2), 17–23
 36. Soni R, Verma SK (2018) Acute toxicity and behavioural responses in *Clarias batrachus* (Linnaeus) exposed to herbicide pretilachlor. Heliyon, 4(12). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2018.e01090>
 37. Srivastava N, Rai AK, Kumari U, Mittal S, Mittal, AK (2012) Behavioural dysfunctions in relation to the toxicity of 'NUVAN®', an organophosphorus insecticide in an Indian major carp, *Cirrhinus mrigala*. Research in Environment and Life Sciences, 5(4), 245–250
 38. Stepić S, Hackenberger BK, Velki M, Lončarić Ž, Hackenberger DK. (2013) Effects of individual and binary-combined commercial insecticides endosulfan, temephos, malathion and pirimiphos-methyl

- on biomarker responses in earthworm *Eisenia andrei*. Environmental Toxicology and Pharmacology, 36(2), 715–723. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.etap.2013.06.011>
39. Sun K-F, Xu X-R, Duan S-S, Wang Y-S, Cheng H, Zhang Z-W, Zhou G-J, Hong, Y-G (2015) Ecotoxicity of two organophosphate pesticides chlorpyrifos and dichlorvos on non-targeting cyanobacteria *Microcystis wesenbergii*. Ecotoxicology. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10646-015-1458-0>
40. Tišler T, Jemec A, Mozetič B, Trebše P (2009) Hazard identification of imidacloprid to aquatic environment. Chemosphere, 76(7), 907–914. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2009.05.002>
41. Ullah R, Zuberi A, Ullah S, Ullah I, Dawar FU (2014) Cypermethrin induced behavioral and biochemical changes in mahseer, *Tor putitora*. The Journal of Toxicological Sciences, 39(6), 829–836. <https://doi.org/10.2131/jts.39.829>
42. Ural M-Ş, Çalta M (2005) Acute toxicity of dichlorvos (DDVP) to fingerling mirror carp, *Cyprinus carpio* L. Bulletin of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology, 75(2), 368–373. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00128-005-0763-3>
43. Varó I, Navarro JC, Nunes B, Guilhermino L (2007) Effects of dichlorvos aquaculture treatments on selected biomarkers of gilthead sea bream (*Sparus aurata* L.) fingerlings. Aquaculture, 266(1–4), 87–96. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aquaculture.2007.02.045>
44. Velmurugan B, Selvanayagam M, Cengiz, EI, Unlu E (2009) Histopathological changes in the gill and liver tissues of freshwater fish, *Cirrhinus mrigala* exposed to dichlorvos. Brazilian Archives of Biology and Technology, 52(5), 1291–1296. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S1516-89132009000500029>
45. Wang Y, Chen C, Zhao X, Wang Q, Qian Y (2015) Assessing joint toxicity of four organophosphate and carbamate insecticides in common carp (*Cyprinus carpio*) using acetylcholinesterase activity as an endpoint. Pesticide Biochemistry and Physiology, 122, 81–85. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pestbp.2014.12.017>
46. Wang Y, Lv L, Yu Y, Yang G, Xu Z, Wang Q, Cai L (2017) Single and joint toxic effects of five selected pesticides on the early life stages of zebrafish (*Denio rerio*). Chemosphere, 170, 61–67. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2016.12.025>
47. Wheelock CE, Shan G, Ottea J (2005) Overview of carboxylesterases and their role in the metabolism of insecticides. Journal of Pesticide Science, 30(2), 75–83. <https://doi.org/10.1584/jpestics.30.75>
48. Xing H, Liu T, Zhang Z, Wang X, Xu S (2015) Acute and subchronic toxic effects of atrazine and chlorpyrifos on common carp (*Cyprinus carpio* L.): Immunotoxicity assessments. Fish and Shellfish Immunology, 45(2), 327–333. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fsi.2015.04.016>
49. Zahran E, Risha E, Awadin W, Palić D (2018) Acute exposure to chlorpyrifos induces reversible changes in health parameters of Nile tilapia (*Oreochromis niloticus*). Aquatic Toxicology, 197, 47–59. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aquatox.2018.02.001>

Figures

Figure 1

Mortality of mrigal at different concentrations of chlorpyrifos (CPF)

Figure 2

Mortality of mrigal at different concentrations of dichlorvos (DDVP)

Figure 3

Mortality of mrigal at different concentrations (12.5% to 200% of 96 h LC50) of pesticide mixture (CPF and DDVP) where 96 h-LC50 of CPF- 0.380 mg/L and DDVP-11.367 mg/L