Impact of Unsustainable Aquaculture Practices on Water Quality Parameters in Fish Pond Ecosystem in Balaghat, Madhya Pradesh, India
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ABSTRACT

|  |
| --- |
| This study investigates the effects of unsustainable aquaculture practices on water quality, plankton diversity, and fish growth performance in the Balaghat district of Madhya Pradesh, India. Monthly samples collected from three ponds over a period of six months (May to October, 2025) revealed notable seasonal variations in water parameters such as temperature, dissolved oxygen (DO), ammonia, pH, and transparency. Pathan Pond exhibited the highest water quality and productivity, while Bramhan Pond showed reduced DO levels due to local pollution and poor management. Phytoplankton communities were predominantly composed of Chlorophyceae, while zooplankton were primarily represented by Cladocera and Copepoda, with peak abundance observed in October. The findings emphasize the importance of adopting sustainable aquaculture practices and conducting regular water quality assessments to improve fish productivity and maintain ecological stability, offering valuable insights for enhancing sustainability and supporting local fish farmers. |
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1. INTRODUCTION

Water quality plays a vital role in sustaining the health and productivity of aquatic ecosystems. In India, freshwater aquaculture has seen tremendous growth, with the country proudly holding the second spot globally in inland aquaculture production (Statista, 2024). Among them leading contributors is Madhya Pradesh, securing significant position nation-wide with total production of 3.42 lakh tonnes (Handbook on Fisheries Statistics, 2023 ), a region that has witnessed significant advancements in fish farming. The physico-chemical properties of water, shaped by climatic conditions, topography, and pollution, have a direct impact on biological productivity (Sharma et al., 2013; Sahni & Yadav, 2012). Unfortunately, poor water quality—often due to unsustainable aquaculture practices such as domestic sewage discharge, use of detergents, etc.—can trigger severe issues such as the spread of zoonotic diseases, high fish mortality rates, and environmental harm (Gauthier, 2015).

To ensure sustainable aquaculture and protect aquatic ecosystems, regular monitoring of critical water quality parameters like temperature, dissolved oxygen, chemical oxygen demand, and turbidity is essential. Fluctuations in these parameters can significantly influence biological communities, including sensitive species such as plankton, which often act as indicators of pollution levels. Zooplankton, in particular, play an important ecological role and provide valuable insights into the overall health of aquatic systems (Jose et al., 2015).

Keeping in view of the above facts the present study is designed with following objective:

1. To study the effects of unsustainable aquaculture practices on key limnological parameters to understand their implications on the local aquatic ecosystem.

2. material and methods

This study was conducted to assess the impact of unsustainable aquaculture practices on fish growth performance in Balaghat district, Madhya Pradesh.

**2.1 Materials**

* **Location**: The study was conducted in three fish ponds located at Waraseoni block, Balaghat, Madhya Pradesh. Coordinates for each site are as follows:

**Krishna Pond (P1)**: 21.643674°N, 80.107987°E

**Bramhan Pond (P2)**: 21.626906°N, 80.102594°E

**Pathan Pond (P3)**: 21.627345°N, 80.107712°E

* **Drugs, Chemicals, and Reagents**: Formalin, Lugol’s Iodine, Cedar wood oil.
* **Laboratory Equipment**: Plankton net, Sedgewick Rafter cell counting chamber, microscopes, weighing balance, and test kits (Valueman Organic, Bionix Master).

**2.2 Research Methodology and Experimental Design**

* **Experimental Sites**: The ponds chosen for the study are:
* **Krishna Pond (P1)**: 5 hectares
* **Bramhan Pond (P2)**: 7 hectares
* **Pathan Pond (P3)**: 4 hectares
* **Duration**: The study was conducted over 180 days (May–October 2024).**Water Sample Collection**: Water samples were collected monthly from each site into pre-cleaned one liter sampling plastic bottle for analysis of physico-chemical water parameters. A total of 54 water samples were collected during the study period. Each bottle was corked and labelled with full detail of site, time and date of sample collection and analysis will be done on the site.
* **Analysis of Water Quality**:

The various physico-chemical parameters of all the sites of ponds were analysed by using the commercially available kits (Valueman Organic Test kit, Bionix Master test kit)

1. **Chemical Parameters**: Dissolved Oxygen (DO), Ammonia (NH₃), Nitrite (NO₂⁻), Nitrate (NO₃⁻), pH.
2. **Physical Parameters**: Surface temperature (°C), transparency (Secchi disk).
* **Plankton Collection**: Planktons were collected by using the plankton net of bloting silk No.25.50L of water is strained through the plankton net and sample was preserved by adding 1 ml of Lugols solution and 3 drops of 4% formalin (APHA, 1988). Then sample was left undisturbed for 2 days so as to settle the Planktons (Sharma, 2000).
* Identification of the planktons was made by authentic literature (Edmondson, W. T., 1959).

**2.3 Statistical Analysis**

The statistical data for Physico-chemical parameters were subjected to one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) using IBM SPSS statistics (version 22) for calculation of means and standard error values. Duncan’s multiple range test (DMRT) under post-hoc was used for observing significant differences among the mean values at 5% probability level (*P*<0.05) as per the standard procedures outlined by Snedecor and Cochran (1994). The analysed data were expressed as means ± standard error (SE).

3. results and discussion

The study assessed the impact of unsustainable aquaculture practices on fish growth in Balaghat district, Madhya Pradesh. A total of 54 water samples were collected, to monitor various physico-chemical parameters and plankton diversity.

**3.1 Physicochemical Parameters**

**3.1.1 Water Temperature:** The water temperature ranged between 27.7°C and 37.2°C (Table 1 and Fig. 1). The lowest temperature was recorded in July (Pond 1), while the highest occurred in June (Pond 2). Temperature variations were attributed to seasonal factors and local environmental conditions. The present study is consistent with Manickam *et al.* (2018), who found temperature variations in tropical ponds influenced by local climate factors, such as monsoon rains and intense summer heat. Similarly, Tamiru (2018) reported similar fluctuations in freshwater ponds, which also affected water chemistry, particularly dissolved oxygen levels.

**3.1.2 Water Transparency:** The water transparency ranged between 20.67 cm to 30.67 cm (Table 2 and Fig. 2). The lowest transparency was recorded in August (Pond 1), likely due to increased turbidity during the rainy season. The highest transparency occurred in October (Pond 3), reflecting reduced runoff. The present study aligns with Smith *et al.* (2017), who observed similar fluctuations in freshwater pond transparency linked to seasonal and environmental factors. Sonowal *et al*. (2018) noted that Pond A had the lowest transparency in August due to rainfall and runoff, while Pond B had the highest in October after reduced rainfall and lower turbidity. They concluded that weather patterns, vegetation, and sediment disturbance significantly influenced water transparency.

**3.1.3 pH:** The pH ranged between ranged from 7.50 to 10.33 (Table 3 and Fig. 3). The lowest pH was observed in July (Pond 2), likely due to increased decomposition, while the highest pH occurred in August (Pond 1), possibly due to heightened photosynthetic activity. The present study is in line with Singh *et al*. (2023), who found that water quality in aquaculture ponds in Uttar Pradesh fluctuated throughout the year. They reported pH levels ranging from 7.2 to 9.5, with the lowest values during the monsoon (June-July) and the highest during the dry season (August-November), likely due to increased photosynthetic activity that reduced carbon dioxide in the water.

**3.1.4 Dissolved Oxygen (DO):** The dissolved oxygen ranged 4.17 to 6.83 mg/l (Table 4 and Fig. 4), with the lowest DO recorded in May (Pond 2) and the highest in October (Pond 1). DO fluctuations were influenced by temperature, microbial respiration, and photosynthesis. The present study aligns with Bhutekar *et al*. (2018), who found that dissolved oxygen (DO) levels dropped during the monsoon in Maharashtra due to increased organic matter decomposition. Similarly, Sharma *et al*. (2018) observed a reduction in DO in Himachal Pradesh, linked to higher turbidity, nutrient levels, and planktonic activity. These findings are consistent with the observed decrease in DO levels in Balaghat pond during the rainy season, highlighting the impact of seasonal changes on oxygen dynamics.

**3.1.5 Ammonia-Nitrogen (NH₃-N):** The Ammonia ranged between 0.05 to 0.93 mg/l (Table 5 and Fig. 5), with the highest ammonia concentrations in August (Pond 2), likely due to microbial activity and higher temperatures. The present study is consistent with Shimin Lu *et al*. (2015), who found seasonal fluctuations in ammonia levels in freshwater aquaculture ponds. They observed that AOB were predominant in the water column, with their highest abundance observed during the summer months, particularly August. This increase was attributed to elevated temperatures and enhanced microbial activity. Cooler months saw lower ammonia levels, linked to reduced decomposition and increased plant uptake.

**3.1.6 Nitrate-Nitrogen (NO₃⁻-N):** The nitrate ranged between 0.13 to 2.83 mg/l (Table 6 and Fig. 06), with the highest levels observed in October (Pond 2), possibly linked to post-monsoon nutrient runoff. The present study aligns with Tabassum *et al.* (2018), who found that nitrate-nitrogen levels in Uttarakhand’s Dehradun district were highest during the rainy season, linked to fertilizer use. While nitrates are less toxic than ammonia, they noted that prolonged exposure could lead to issues like algal blooms and deteriorating water quality.

**3.1.7 Nitrite-Nitrogen (NO₂⁻-N):** The nitrite ranged between 0.13 to 0.45 mg/l (Table 7 and Fig. 07), with the highest levels in July (Pond 3), likely due to agricultural runoff and incomplete ammonia breakdown. The present study aligns with Were (2021), who found that nitrite concentrations in Lawi pond were low during the dry season but spiked in the monsoon due to agricultural runoff. They noted that elevated nitrites, a sign of incomplete ammonia breakdown, can harm aquatic life as nitrites are toxic to many organisms.

**3.2 Plankton Diversity**

**3.2.1 Krishna Pond:** A total of 12 phytoplankton species were identified, dominated by *Chlorophyceae* (48%), followed by *Cyanophyceae* (24%), *Bacillariophyceae* (20%), and *Euglenophyceae* (8%) (Table 8 and Fig. 08,09 and 10 ). Phytoplankton abundance peaked in October and was lowest in May. The zooplankton community consisted of 9 species, with *Cladocera* (35%) as the dominant group, followed by *Rotifera* (31%), *Copepoda* (19%), and *Ostracoda* (15%). Zooplankton abundance also peaked in October, with the lowest count in May (Table 9, Fig. 11, 12 and 13 ). The present study aligns with several others on seasonal variations in plankton. Singh *et al.* (2024) observed phytoplankton peaks in October due to favorable environmental conditions. Singh and Kumar (2021) found higher phytoplankton diversity during the monsoon, linked to nutrient runoff. Vaghela et al. (2023) Protozoa, Cladocera, Copepoda and Rotifers are the main groups of zooplankton found in freshwater bodies.

**3.2.2 Bramhan Pond:** In total, 12 phytoplankton species were recorded, with *Chlorophyceae* (55%) as the dominant group, followed by *Cynophyceae* (24%), *Bacillariophyceae* (14%), and *Euglenophyceae* (7%). Phytoplankton abundance showed similar seasonal variation, with the highest counts in October and lowest in May. The zooplankton community also included 9 species, with *Copepoda* (37%) as the most abundant, followed by *Cladocera* (31%), *Rotifera* (18%), and *Ostracoda* (14%). Zooplankton counts were highest in October and lowest in May. The present study supports Dong *et al.* (2022), who found phytoplankton abundance linked to temperature and nutrients, peaking in the rainy season. Sultana *et al.* (2023) observed similar seasonal zooplankton fluctuations, with peaks in October, while Rani (2023) highlighted that rotifers thrived in the rainy season and copepods in the dry season, with nutrients influencing diversity. These trends were also seen in Balaghat pond.

**3.2.3 Pathan Pond:** A total of 12 phytoplankton species were recorded, with *Chlorophyceae* (58%) dominating, followed by *Cynophyceae* (16%), *Bacillariophyceae* (20%), and *Euglenophyceae* (6%). Phytoplankton abundance was highest in October and lowest in May, similar to the other ponds. The zooplankton community, comprising 9 species, had *Cladocera* (37%) as the dominant group, followed by *Copepoda* (33%), *Rotifera* (17%), and *Ostracoda* (13%). Zooplankton numbers were highest in October and lowest in May. The present study aligns with Gogoi (2021), who found that aquatic vegetation stabilizes plankton diversity. Rasconi *et al*. (2017) noted that environmental factors like temperature and light influence phytoplankton fluctuations, similar to findings in Pathan Pond. Sarkar et al. (2020) observed that pollution reduced zooplankton diversity in urban ponds, highlighting differences between rural and urban water bodies.

**Table 1.** **Mean water temperature (°C) ± standard error (SE) recorded in Pond 1, Pond 2, and Pond 3 at monthly intervals from May 2024 to October 2024**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Treatments** | **May-24** | **Jun-24** | **Jul-24** | **Aug-24** | **Sep-24** | **Oct-24** |
| **Pond1** | 32.07±0.03c | 36.7±0.00a | 27.73±0.03a | 33.27±0.12a | 33.23±0.07a | 34.33±0.09b |
| **Pond2** | 30.67±0.17a | 37.20±0.06b | 28.6±0.06b | 36.07±0.03c | 33.10±0.06a | 35.03±0.03c |
| **Pond3** | 31.27±0.03b | 36.77±0.03a | 29.27±0.03c | 35.7±0.23b | 33.13±0.03a | 34.00±0.06a |

*\**Values are presented as Mean ± S.E. (*P*<0.05; n = 10)

**Fig. 1. Temperature variations (°C) across three ponds (Pond1, Pond2, and Pond3) at six time intervals (May-24 to Oct-24)**

*Bars represent mean temperature values ± SE. Different letters denote significant differences (P < 0.05) among ponds within each time interval.*

**Table 2. Mean transparency(cm) ± standard error (SE) recorded in Pond 1, Pond 2, and Pond 3 at monthly intervals from May 2024 to October 2024**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Treatments** | **May-24** | **Jun-24** | **Jul-24** | **Aug-24** | **Sep-24** | **Oct-24** |
| **Pond1** | 22.67±0.33b | 24.67±0.33b | 23.67±0.00b | 20.67±0.33a | 22.67±0.33a | 29.33±0.33a |
| **Pond2** | 21.00±0.00a | 23.67±0.33ab | 21.00±0.00a | 22.33±0.33b | 23.67±0.33a | 29.00±0.00a |
| **Pond3** | 22.33±0.33b | 22.67±0.33a | 24.67±0.00c | 27.33±0.33c | 26.67±0.33b | 30.67±0.33b |

*\**Values are presented as Mean ± S.E. (*P*<0.05; n = 10)

**Fig. 2. Transparency (cm) variations across three ponds (Pond1, Pond2, and Pond3) at six time intervals (May-24 to Oct-24)**

*Bars represent mean transparency values ± SE. Different letters denote significant differences (P < 0.05) among ponds within each time interval.*

**Table 3. Mean pH ± standard error (SE) recorded in Pond 1, Pond 2, and Pond 3 at monthly intervals from May 2024 to October 2024**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Treatments** | **May-24** | **Jun-24** | **Jul-24** | **Aug-24** | **Sep-24** | **Oct-24** |
| **Pond1** | 8.73±0.07b | 9.53±0.2b | 7.77±0.03b | 10.33±0.03b | 8.83±0.09a | 9.43±0.07a |
| **Pond2** | 8.20±0.06a | 8.37±0.03a | 7.50±0.06a | 9.73±0.03a | 8.80±0.06a | 9.30±0.00a |
| **Pond3** | 8.07±0.03a | 8.47±0.03a | 7.57±0.03a | 10.30±0.1b | 8.97±0.03a | 9.30±0.06a |

*\**Values are presented as Mean ± S.E. (*P*<0.05; n = 10)

**Fig. 3. pH variations across three ponds (Pond1, Pond2, and Pond3) at six time intervals (May-24 to Oct-24)**

*Bars represent mean pH values ± SE. Different letters denote significant differences (P < 0.05) among ponds within each time interval.*

**Table 4. Mean dissolve oxygen (ppm) ± standard error (SE) recorded in Pond 1, Pond 2, and Pond 3 at monthly intervals from May 2024 to October 2024**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Treatments** | **May-24** | **Jun-24** | **Jul-24** | **Aug-24** | **Sep-24** | **Oct-24** |
| **Pond1** | 5.00±0.00b | 5.33±0.17b | 5.00±0.00a | 5.83±0.17b | 6.17±0.17b | 6.83±0.17a |
| **Pond2** | 4.17±0.17a | 4.50±0.29a | 5.00±0.00a | 4.83±0.17a | 5.17±0.17a | 6.33±0.17a |
| **Pond3** | 4.67±0.17b | 5.83±0.17b | 5.50±0.00a | 4.83±0.17a | 5.67±0.17ab | 6.33±0.33a |

*\**Values are presented as Mean ± S.E. (*P*<0.05; n = 10)

**Fig. 04. Dissolved oxygen (ppm) variations across three ponds (Pond1, Pond2, and Pond3) at six time intervals (May-24 to Oct-24)**

*Bars represent dissolve oxygen values ± SE. Different letters denote significant differences (P < 0.05) among ponds within each time interval.*

**Table 5. Mean Ammonia ± standard error (SE) recorded in Pond 1, Pond 2, and Pond 3 at monthly intervals from May 2024 to October 2024**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Treatments** | **May-24** | **Jun-24** | **Jul-24** | **Aug-24** | **Sep-24** | **Oct-24** |
| **Pond1** | 0.42±0.03b | 0.45±0.00b | 0.05±0.00a | 0.05±0.01a | 0.05±0.00a | 0.78±0.03a |
| **Pond2** | 0.05±0.00a | 0.05±0.00a | 0.05±0.00a | 0.93±0.07b | 0.08±0.02a | 0.67±0.03a |
| **Pond3** | 0.42±0.03b | 0.45±0.00b | 0.06±0.00a | 0.68±0.32ab | 0.06±0.01a | 0.77±0.03a |

*\**Values are presented as Mean ± S.E. (*P*<0.05; n = 10)

**Fig. 5. Ammonia (ppm) variations across three ponds (Pond1, Pond2, and Pond3) at six time intervals (May-24 to Oct-24)**

*Bars represent mean ammonia values ± SE. Different letters denote significant differences (P < 0.05) among ponds within each time interval.*

**Table 6. Mean nitrate (ppm) ± standard error (SE) recorded in Pond 1, Pond 2, and Pond 3 at monthly intervals from May 2024 to October 2024**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Treatments** | **May-24** | **Jun-24** | **Jul-24** | **Aug-24** | **Sep-24** | **Oct-24** |
| **Pond1** | 0.53±0.03a | 0.43±0.07a | 0.47±0.02a | 0.48±0.02b | 1.87±0.07b | 2.00±0.00a |
| **Pond2** | 0.57±0.03a | 0.77±0.15b | 0.48±0.02a | 0.13±0.02a | 1.33±0.17a | 2.83±0.17b |
| **Pond3** | 0.93±0.07b | 1.00±0.00b | 1.83±0.17b | 2.00±0.00c | 1.90±0.05b | 2.17±0.17a |

*\**Values are presented as Mean ± S.E. (*P*<0.05; n = 10)

**Fig. 6. Nitrate (ppm) variations across three ponds (Pond1, Pond2, and Pond3) at six time intervals (May-24 to Oct-24)**

*Bars represent mean nitrate values ± SE. Different letters denote significant differences (P < 0.05) among ponds within each time interval.*

**Table 7. Mean nitrite (ppm) ± standard error (SE) recorded in Pond 1, Pond 2, and Pond 3 at monthly intervals from May 2024 to October 2024**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Treatments** | **May-24** | **Jun-24** | **Jul-24** | **Aug-24** | **Sep-24** | **Oct-24** |
| **Pond1** | 0.17±0.03a | 0.26±0.00b | 0.17±0.03a | 0.26±0.00b | 0.25±0.00a | 0.23±0.03a |
| **Pond2** | 0.20±0.00a | 0.20±0.00a | 0.17±0.02a | 0.13±0.02a | 0.15±0.00a | 0.31±0.02a |
| **Pond3** | 0.42±0.03b | 0.25±0.00b | 0.45±0.00b | 0.42±0.02c | 0.20±0.00a | 0.27±0.03a |

*\**Values are presented as Mean ± S.E. (*P*<0.05; n = 10)

**Fig. 7. Nitrite (ppm) variations across three ponds (Pond1, Pond2, and Pond3) at six time intervals (May-24 to Oct-24)**

*Bars represent mean nitrite values ± SE. Different letters denote significant differences (P < 0.05) among ponds within each time interval.*

**Table 8. Month-wise Variation in Phytoplankton Population Density (Cell/ml) in Krishna, Bramhan, and Pathan Ponds during Study Period.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **S. No.** | **Phytoplankton** | **May** | **June** | **July** | **August** | **September** | **October** | **Krishna Pond (P1)** | **Bramhan Pond (P2)** | **Pathan Pond (P3)** |
| **A. Chlorophyceae** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | Chlorella sp. | 10 | 11 | 15 | 14 | 15 | 25 | 90 | 96 | 90 |
| 2 | Cosmarium sp. | 5 | 10 | 14 | 15 | 11 | 22 | 77 | 82 | 96 |
| 3 | Microspora sp. | 7 | 9 | 12 | 17 | 24 | 19 | 88 | 105 | 109 |
| 4 | Spyrogyra sp. | 3 | 5 | 8 | 13 | 20 | 24 | 73 | 73 | 77 |
| 5 | Volvox sp. | 9 | 13 | 19 | 26 | 32 | 30 | 129 | 112 | 117 |
| 6 | Zygnema sp. | 1 | 10 | 18 | 21 | 27 | 29 | 106 | 106 | 123 |
| 7 | Pedistarium sp. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| **B. Cynophyceae** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | Anabaena sp. | 3 | 5 | 10 | 23 | 20 | 25 | 86 | 88 | 67 |
| 9 | Notoc sp. | 1 | 7 | 12 | 19 | 23 | 32 | 94 | 100 | 70 |
| 10 | Oscillatoria sp. | 0 | 1 | 5 | 12 | 13 | 19 | 50 | 61 | 54 |
| **C. Bacillariophyceae** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | Diatoma sp. | 1 | 0 | 4 | 12 | 19 | 20 | 56 | 68 | 85 |
| 12 | Microcystis sp. | 2 | 4 | 8 | 13 | 17 | 24 | 68 | 79 | 75 |
| 13 | Nitzschia sp. | 3 | 6 | 10 | 17 | 9 | 21 | 66 |  | 81 |
| **D. Euglenophyceae** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 14 | Euglena sp. | 3 | 0 | 12 | 18 | 24 | 22 | 79 | 80 | 73 |
| **Total (Phytoplankton count per litre)** | **48** | **81** | **147** | **220** | **254** | **312** | **1062** | **1050** | **1217** |

**Table 9. Month-wise Variation in Zooplankton Population Density (Cell/ml) in Krishna, Bramhan, and Pathan Ponds during Study Period**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **S. No.** | **Zooplankton** | **May** | **June** | **July** | **August** | **September** | **October** | **Total (Krishna)** | **Total (Bramhan)** | **Total (Pathan)** |
| **A. Cladocera** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | Daphnia sp. | 5 | 11 | 12 | 16 | 20 | 23 | 87 | 109 | 108 |
| 2 | Leydigia sp. | 2 | 3 | 10 | 13 | 24 | 32 | 84 | 91 | 110 |
| 3 | Moina sp. | 5 | 10 | 13 | 12 | 23 | 36 | 99 | 103 | 105 |
| **B. Rotifera** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | Brachionus sp. | 2 | 4 | 4 | 13 | 16 | 25 | 64 | 65 | 66 |
| 5 | Keratella sp. | 4 | 7 | 12 | 16 | 17 | 22 | 78 | 88 | 84 |
| **C. Copepoda** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | Calanoid sp. | 0 | 5 | 11 | 14 | 23 | 34 | 87 | 90 | 97 |
| 7 | Cyclops sp. | 2 | 4 | 5 | 12 | 13 | 24 | 60 | 61 | 68 |
| 8 | Mesocyclops sp. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 71 | 86 |
| 9 | Pseudodiaoptomus sp. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 37 |
| **D. Ostracoda** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | Cypris sp. | 10 | 9 | 14 | 20 | 26 | 36 | 115 | 113 | 113 |
| **Total zooplankton count per litre** | **30** | **53** | **81** | **116** | **162** | **232** | **674** | **823** | **874** |

**Fig. 8. Contribution (%) of different orders of Phytoplankton species in Krishna pond, Waraseoni, Balaghat**

**Fig. 9. Contribution (%) of different orders of Phytoplankton species in Bramhan pond, Waraseoni, Balaghat**

**Fig. 10. Contribution (%) of different orders of Phytoplankton species in Pathan pond, Waraseoni, Balaghat**

**Fig. 11. Contribution (%) of different orders of Zooplankton species in Krishna pond, Waraseoni, Balaghat**

**Fig. 12. Contribution (%) of different orders of Zooplankton species in Bramhan pond,Waraseoni,Balaghat**

**Fig. 13. Contribution (%) of different orders of Zooplankton species in Pathan pond, Waraseoni, Balaghat**

4. Conclusion

The study underscores the significant impact of anthropogenic aquaculture practices on water quality and fish growth in Balaghat District, Madhya Pradesh. Significant variations were observed in water quality, phytoplankton and zooplankton densities, across Krishna (P1), Bramhan (P2), and Pathan ponds (P3). Pathan Pond (P3) demonstrated the highest water quality and fish productivity, while Bramhan Pond (P2) showed lower dissolved oxygen (DO) levels, likely due to local aquaculture mismanagement, including sewage discharge. The comparison data revealed improvements in water quality and fish productivity, reflecting the positive impact of scientific interventions. Ongoing monitoring and targeted interventions are essential to further enhance sustainability, fish production, and the livelihoods of fish farmers. The findings emphasize the importance of adopting sustainable aquaculture practices and conducting regular water quality assessments to improve fish productivity and maintain ecological stability, offering valuable insights for enhancing sustainability and supporting local fish farmers.

**Disclaimer (Artificial intelligence)**

Option 1: NO generative AI technologies used.

Author(s) hereby declare that NO generative AI technologies such as Large Language Models (ChatGPT, COPILOT, etc.) and text-to-image generators have been used during the writing or editing of this manuscript.

Option 2:

Author(s) hereby declare that generative AI technologies such as Large Language Models, etc. have been used during the writing or editing of manuscripts. This explanation will include the name, version, model, and source of the generative AI technology and as well as all input prompts provided to the generative AI technology

Details of the AI usage are given below:

1. Nil

2.Nil

3.Nil

References

1. APHA. (1988). *Standard methods for the examination of water and wastewater* (18th ed.). American Public Health Association.
2. Bhutekar, D. D., Aher, S. B., & Babare, M. G. (2018). Spatial and seasonal variation in physic-chemical properties of Godavari River water at Ambad region, Maharashtra. *Journal of Environment and Biosciences*, *32*, 15-23.

doi: 10.1002/ece3.2889. PMID: 28479993; PMCID: PMC5415537.

1. Dong, A., Yu, X., Yin, Y. & Zhao, K. (2022). Seasonal variation characteristics and the factors affecting plankton community structure in the Yitong River, China. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, **19**(24), 17030.
2. Edmondson, W.T. (1959). *Fresh-water biology*. John Wiley and Sons.
3. Gauthier, D.T. (2015). Bacterial zoonoses of fishes: a review and appraisal of evidence for linkages between fish and human infections. *Veterinary Journal*, *203*(1): 27-35.
4. Handbook on Fisheries Statistics. (2023). *Handbook on Fisheries Statistics 2023*. Government of India, Ministry of Fisheries, Animal Husbandry & Dairying.
5. Jose, E.C., Furio, E.F., Borja, V.M., Gatdula, N.C. and Santos, D.M. (2015). Zooplankton composition and abundance and its relationship with physico-chemical parameters in Manila Bay. *Oceanography*, **3**: 1-6.
6. Vaghela, Krishnakumar B., Devangee P. Shukla, and Nayan K. Jain. 2023. “A Study of Phytoplankton and Zooplankton Diversity in the River Sabarmati, Gujarat, India”. *Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology* 22 (4):28-38. <https://doi.org/10.9734/ajee/2023/v22i4505>.
7. Lu, S., Liao, M. & Xie, C*.* (2015). Seasonal dynamics of ammonia-oxidizing microorganisms in freshwater aquaculture ponds. *Ann Microbiol*ogy **65**, 651–657 (2015). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13213-014-0903-2>
8. Manickam, N., Bhavan, P. S., Santhanam, P., Bhuvaneswari, R., Muralisankar, T., Srinivasan, V. & Karthik, M. (2018). Impact of seasonal changes in zooplankton biodiversity in Ukkadam Lake, Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu, India, and potential future implications of climate change. *The Journal of Basic and Applied Zoology*, *79*, 1-10.
9. Rani, S. (2023). Impact of seasonal variations on the water quality and zooplankton diversity of pond in haryana, india. http: //hdl.handle.net/10603/577248.
10. Mishra, S.S., Das, R., Choudhary, P., Debbarma, J. and Sahoo, S.N. (2017). Present status of fisheries and impact of emerging diseases of fish and shellfish in Indian Aquaculture. *Journal of Aquatic Research and Marine Sciences*, **5**(26): 5-26.
11. Sultana, S., Khan, S., Hena, S. M., Ahmed, M. S., Sultana, M. S., Akhi, M. S. N., ... & Hossain, M. M. (2023). Seasonal dynamics of zooplankton in a eutrophic fish pond of Bangladesh in relation to environmental factors. *J Aquac Mar Biol*, *12*(2), 129-136.
12. Gogoi, P., Kumari, S., Sarkar, U. K., Lianthuamluaia, L., Puthiyottil, M., Bhattacharjya, B. K. & Das, B. K. (2021). Dynamics of phytoplankton community in seasonally open and closed wetlands in the Teesta–Torsa basin, India, and management implications for sustainable utilization. *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment*, **193**, 1-25.
13. Rasconi S., Winter K., Kainz M.J. (2017). Temperature increase and fluctuation induce phytoplankton biodiversity loss - Evidence from a multi-seasonal mesocosm experiment. Ecology Evolution 2017 Mar 22;7(9): 2936-2946.
14. Sahni, K. and Yadav, S. (2012).Seasonal variations in Physico-chemical parameters of Bharawas pond, Rewari, Haryana. *Asian Journal of Experimental Science,* **26**(1):61-64.
15. Sharma, A.P. (2000). Manual of fishery limnology. G.B. Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Pantnagar, 115.
16. Sharma, R. C., & Tiwari, V. (2018). Phytoplankton diversity in relation to physico-chemical environmental variables of Nachiketa Tal, Garhwal Himalaya. *Biodiversity International Journal*, **2**(2), 128-136.
17. Sharma, S., Solanki, C.M., Sharma, D. and Pir, Z. (2013), Distribution and diversity of Zooplanktons in Madhya Pradesh, India, *International Journal of Advanced Research*, **1(**1): 16-21.
18. Singh, A., & Kumar, M. (2021). Depicting the seasonal and spatial sensitivity of anthropogenic nutrient enrichment on phytoplankton in the Bay of Bengal, India. *Marine Pollution Bulletin*, *169*, 112554.
19. Singh, A., Verma, S., Mehta, P., Jatav, S. K. & Yadav, S. (2024). Study of hydrobiological parameters and their effect on plankton diversity in yamuna river at okhla barrage. *Journal of Experimental Zoology India*, **27**(1).
20. Sarkar, R., Ghosh, A. R. & Mondal, N. K. (2020). Comparative study on physicochemical status and diversity of macrophytes and zooplanktons of two urban ponds of Chandannagar, WB, India. *Applied Water Science*, **10**, 1-8.
21. Singh, R., Niranjan, S., & Nagar, S. (2023). Study of Physico-chemical Parameters on a Fresh Water Pond of Orai, UP, India. *Uttar Pradesh Journal of Zoology*.
22. Smith, A. B., Johnson, C. D., and Williams, E. F. (2017). Seasonal variation in water transparency and its ecological implications in freshwater ponds. *Aquatic Ecology,* **41**(2): 101-113.
23. Snedecor, G.W. and Cochran, W.G. (1994). Statistical Methods, 7th Edn., Oxford and IBH publishing Co., New Delhi, 350.
24. Sonowal, J., Rakshit, K. & Baruah, D. (2018). Study of phytoplankton diversity in relation to physico-chemical characteristics of water in Bordoibam Bilmukh, an Important Bird Area Site of Assam, Northeast India.
25. Statista. (2024). *India: Economic contribution of fishing and aquaculture 2023*.
26. Tabassum, S., Kotnala, C. B., Dobriyal, A. K., Salman, M., & Bamola, R. (2025). Distribution and dynamics for the ecological assessment of Asan Wetland through periphyton-a water quality indicator. *Frontiers in Environmental Chemistry*, *6*, 1529439.
27. Tamiru, S. M. (2018). *Assessment of the impact of anthropogenic activities on water quality, biodiversity and livelihood in Lake Tana, Northwestern Ethiopia* (Doctoral dissertation, Doctoral dissertation. University of South Africa. https://uir. unisa. ac. za/bitstream/handle/10500/25240/thesis\_tamiru\_sm. pdf).
28. Were, A. O. (2021). *Improving Aquaculture and Fisheries Productivity by Reducing Impacts of Pesticides Contamination in Ahero Fishponds, Kisumu County* (Doctoral dissertation, UON).