**AN ASSESSMENT OF ICHTHYOFAUNAL DIVERSITY AND CONSERVATION STATUS OF FISH FROM CHARIPUNIA BEEL OF MORIGAON DISTRICT, ASSAM, INDIA**

**ABSTRACT**

The ichthyofaunal diversity of Charipunia Beel was studied over a period of 12 months, from May 2022 to April 2023. A total of 26 fish species, representing 18 genera, 11 families, and 4 orders, were identified in the beel. The order Perciformes was the most dominant, accounting for 5 families (45.45%), 5 genera (27.77%), and 7 species (26.92%) of the total fish population. The Siluriformes order contributed significantly as well, with 2 families (18.19%), 3 genera (16.67%), and 6 species (23.08%). Clupeiformes followed with 3 families (27.27%), 3 genera (16.67%), and 3 species (11.53%). The Cypriniformes order comprised 1 family (9.09%), 7 genera (38.89%), and 10 species (38.47%). The majority of species were categorized as Least Concern, with 20 species contributing 58.80% of the total. The Margalef’s Richness Index (d), Pielou’s Evenness Index (J), Shannon-Weiner Index (H'), and Simpson Index (1-λ) all indicated a high level of fish diversity in the beel, with a relatively even distribution of genera, suggesting the *beel* is favorable for fish production.
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**INTRODUCTION**

Wetlands are defined as areas that are either inundated or saturated with surface or groundwater for a duration and frequency that is sufficient to support, and typically does support, vegetation that is adapted to grow in conditions of saturated soil (Mitsch and Gosselink, 1986). Wetlands are a crucial part of the Ganga and Brahmaputra river basins, which are periodically flooded by overflow from the primary river channels (Srivastava and Bhattacharjya, 2003). These wetlands cover an area of 2.02 lakh hectares and are a significant source of fisheries in the states of Assam, West Bengal, Bihar, Manipur, Arunachal Pradesh, Tripura, and Meghalaya (Sugunan and Bhattacharjya, 2000).

Floodplain wetlands refer to natural low-lying areas next to large rivers, which are periodically flooded by overflow from the main river system. These regions often consist of small depressions or former riverbeds, typically connected to major rivers. They capture backflow from the rivers during flood events or after monsoon rains from the surrounding catchment areas (Sugunan and Bhattacharjya, 2000). In Assam, there are a total of 3,474 wetlands, of which 1,392 are floodplain wetlands, covering an area of 101,229.4 hectares, which constitutes 1.29% of the state's total geographical area (Bhagabati *et al*., 2002). Proper wetland management necessitates an integrated approach that blends scientific expertise with knowledge of legal, institutional, and economic factors. This holistic approach is crucial for ensuring the protection and long-term sustainability of these essential ecosystems (Good *et al*., 1978; Kusler and Montanari, 1978; Greeson *et al*., 1979; Mitsch and Gosselink, 1986).

Goswami, Kalita *et al*., 2012 reported a total of 424 fish species from Northeast India, spanning 133 genera and 38 families, with the Cyprinidae family exhibiting the highest diversity. Wetlands, in general, contribute to about one-third of the inland fish catch in developing countries (Jhingran, 1991). Gopal (1997) referred to wetlands as "distinct ecotones," acting as transitional zones between dry land and deeper water. These areas are not consistently wet or dry, fostering a unique ecological balance. In Assam, wetlands make up approximately 93% of the total lentic fish-prone areas in the state (Goswami *et al*., 2007). Protecting fish species in wetlands requires a comprehensive strategy that includes habitat preservation, sustainable resource management, pollution control, legal measures, and community engagement. By adopting these approaches, we can protect not only fish populations but also the essential ecosystem services that wetlands provide, such as water purification, carbon storage, and flood mitigation. Proper wetland management ensures the health of aquatic life and sustains the rich biodiversity these ecosystems harbor.

**MATERIALS AND METHODS**

**Study area**

The Charipunia with latitude 26ᵒ15’10.0” N and longitude 92ᵒ21’22.8” E. This *beel* is a part of APART fishery initiative and the communities are encouraged to collectively manage the *beel* and take forward the fish farming activities.Area of Charipunia *beel* is 7 hectares (17.297 acres). Minimum depth of this *beel* is 5 feet and maximum is 12 feet.It is a perennially close *beel.* There are around 250 families which depend on this *beel* for their livelihood. Government registered number is 3625/88-89, Morigaon, Assam.



**Map1**: GPS map locations of study sites of charipunia *beel*

**Fish sampling**

The ichthyofaunal diversity of Charipunia *beel* was studied over a one-year period, from May 2022 to April 2023. Two sampling stations were chosen for this study to represent the entire *beel.* Station 1 (S1) was situated at latitude 26°32'50.4" N and longitude 92°48'37.2" E, while Station 2 (S2) was located at latitude 26°32'30.8" N and longitude 92°48'97.3" E. Fish samples were identified directly in the field, and any unidentified samples were brought to the laboratory of Department of FRM, Faculty of Fishery Sciences, AAU, Raha for further examination. Before preservation, photographs of the fish were taken using a digital camera.

The collected specimens were preserved in a 5-8% aqueous formaldehyde solution. For the identification of fish species, the identification keys provided by Talwar and Jhingran (1991), Jayaram (2010), and Vishwanath (2000) were used as references. Statistical analysis was conducted using the PAST software.

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

**Fish fauna**

A total of 26 fish species, representing 18 genera, 11 families, and 4 orders, were recorded in Charipunia *beel*, indicating the rich ichthyofaunal diversity of the *beel* (Table 1 and Figs. 1, 2, 3 and 4). The **Cyprinidae** family was the most dominant, with 10 species (38.46%), followed by **Bagridae** with 4 species (15.38%), and **Channidae** with 3 species (11.53%). **Siluridae** accounted for 2 species (7.69%). The families **Clupeidae**, **Heteropneustidae**, **Claridae**, **Ambassidae**, **Gobiidae**, **Nandidae**, and **Anabantidae** each contributed one species (3.85%).

The Perciformes contributed 5 families (45.45%), 5 genera (27.77%) and 7 species (26.92%).The order Clupeiformes was contributed by 1 family, Clupeiformes (9.09%), 1 genera, *Gudusia* (5.55%) and 1 species, *Gudusia chapra* (3.84%). The order Siluriformes was comprised of 4 families (36.37%), 5 genera (27.78%) and 8 species (30.77%), followed by the order Cypriniformes with 1 family (9.09%), 7 genera (38.89%) and 10 species (38.47%).

**Figure 1**: Fish species recorded under different orders and families in Charipunia *beel*.

**Table 1**: Fish species recorded in Charipunia *beel* along with their conservation status as per the IUCN (2023).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Sl.No** | **Order** | **Family** | **Species** | **Common Name** | **IUCNConservationStatus(2023)** | **CAMPStatus,1998** |
| 1 | Cypriniformes | Cyprinidae | *Labeo catla*(Hamilton,1822) | Catla | LC | LRnt |
| 2 | *Labeo calbasu*(Hamilton,1822) | Orangefinlabeo | LC | LRnt |
| 3 | *Cyprinus carpio* | Commoncarp | LC |  |
| 4 | *Cirrhinus mrigala*(Hamilton,1822) | Mrigalcarp | LC | VU |
| 5 | *Labeo rohita*(Hamilton,1822) | Rohu | LC | LRnt |
| 6 | *Labeo gonius*(Hamilton,1822) | Kurialabeo | LC | LRnt |
| 7 | *Hypophthalmichthys molitrix*(CuvierandValenciennes,1844) | Silvercarp | NT | LRnt |
| 8 | *Puntius sophore*(Hamilton,1822) | Poolbarb | LC | LRnt |
| 9 | *Ctenopharyngodon idella*(Valenciennes,1844) | Grasscarp | DD | LRnt |
| 10 | *Amblypharyngodon mola* | Molacarplet | LC | LRlc |
| 11 | Clupeiformes | Clupeidae | *Gudusia chapra*(Hamilton,1822) | Indianrivershad | LC | LRlc |
| 12 | Siluriformes | Bagaridae | *Mystus vittatus*(Bloch,1794) | Stripeddwarfcatfish | LC | VU |
| 13 | *Mystus tengara*(Hamilton,1822) | Tengaracatfish | LC | VU |
| 14 | *Mystus bleekeri*(Day,1877) | Day’smystus | LC | LRnt |
| 15 | *Mystus cavacius*(Hamilton,1822) | Gangeticmystus | LC | LRnt |
| 16 | Siluridae | *Wallago attu*(BlochandSchneider,1801) | Freshwatershark | VU | LRnt |
| 17 | *Ompok pabda* | Pabocatfish | NT | EN |
| 18 | Heteropneustidae | *Heteropneustes fossilis(Bloch,1794)* | Stingingcatfish | LC | VU |
| 19 | Claridae | *Clarius magur(Linnaeus,1758)* | Walkingcatfish | EN | VU |
| 20 | Perciformes | Ambassidae | *Chandanama*(Hamilton,1822) | Elongateglassyfish | LC | NE |
| 21 | Nandidae | *Nandus nandus*(Hamilton,1822) | Gangeticleaffish | LC | LRnt |
| 22 | Anabantidae | *Anabus testudinius*(Bloch,1793) | Climbingperch | DD | VU |
| 23 | Channidae | *Channagachua* | Dwarfsnakehead | LC | VU |
| 24 | *Channa punctatus* | Spottedsnakehead | LC | LRnt |
| 25 | *Channa striatus* | Snakeheadmurrel | LC | LRlc |
| 26 | Gobiidae | *Glossogobiusgiuris* | Tankgoby | LC | LRnt |

Fig 2: Recorded Fish Species of Charipunia Beel

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | |  | |  |  | |
| *Mystus tengara* | | *Ctenopharyngodon idella* | | *Labeo rohita* | *Labeo calbasu* | |
|  | |  | |  |  | |
| *Cyprinus carpio* | | *Amblypharyngodo mola* | | *Channa striatus* | *Hypophthalmichthy smolitrix* | |
|  | |  | |  |  | |
| *Mystus cavasius* | | *Mystus vittatus* | | *Labeo gonius* | *Cirrhinus mrigala* | |
|  | |  | |  |  | |
| *Channa punctatus* | | *Anabus testudineus* | | *Glosso gobius giuris* | *Clarius magur* | |
|  | |  | |  |  | |
| *Ompok pabda* | *Heteropneustes fossilis* | | *Nandus nandus* | | | *Channa gachua* |
|  | |  | |  |  | |
| *Gudusia chapra* | | *Mystus bleekeri* | | *Puntius sophore* | *Wallago attu* | |
|  | |  | |
| *Chanda nama* | | *Labeo catla* | |

The seasonal abundance of fish species in Charipunia *beel* is presented in Table 2. At Station 1, the highest species abundance was recorded during the pre-monsoon season, with 6,369 individuals, followed by 6,050 in the post-monsoon season and 1,207 in the monsoon season. At Station 2, the peak abundance occurred in the pre-monsoon season, with 5,834 individuals, followed by 5,487 in the post-monsoon and 1,161 in the monsoon season. The most dominant species were ***Amblypharyngodon mola****,* followed by ***Puntius sophore*** and ***Mystus tengara****.*

Acharjee *et al*. (1998) recorded 29 fish species from 28 genera and 21 families in the Dighali, Dora, and Ghorjan beels of Assam. Fernandes and Achuthankutty (2010) documented 22 fish species, belonging to 21 families and 4 orders, from several wetlands in Goa, including the Betul Assolna Velim wetland, Loutolim Raia Ambora wetland, and Curtorim Macazana wetland in the Salcete Taluka. Barhai *et al*. (2015) recorded 30 species from Hasila Beel, 27 species from Urpad Beel, 29 species from Sidli Beel, and 31 species from Sekselia Beel in Goalpara district, Assam (India).

Talukdar and Rajbongshi (2018) recorded 46 indigenous fish species, representing 37 genera, 8 orders, and 19 families, in Puthimari *beel* of Barpeta, Assam. Nag *et al*. (2017) documented 72 fish species from 53 genera, across 25 families and 8 orders, in Dhir Beel of Dhubri district, Assam. Singha and Deka (2017) reported 67 fish species, including 4 exotic species, from 49 genera across 25 families and 8 orders, in Diplai Beel of Kokrajhar district, Assam. Hussain et al. (2015) recorded 71 fish species from Dhir Beel, Assam. Gogoi *et al*. (2016) observed 75 fish species, spanning 45 genera and 23 families, in Dulkhojiya Beel in Lakhimpur district, Assam. A total of 45 species were identified, consisting of 42 native species, 3 non-native species, and one species each categorized as vulnerable and endangered (Kalita et al., 2025). Biological methods such as phytoremediation, phycoremediation, and the use of ecological floating beds have the potential to significantly boost the populations of aquatic organisms while enhancing the overall health of aquatic ecosystems (Chawla et al., 2024).
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**Figure 3**: Percentage composition of fish genera (A) and species (B) across different families.

**Figure 4**: IUCN conservation status of fish fauna represented as a percentage.

**Biodiversity index**

The diversity indicators of Charipunia *beel* are presented for three seasons (Table 2). Biodiversity indices serve as valuable tools for assessing the rarity and frequency of species within a population. One of the simplest measures of biodiversity is **Margalef’s Richness Index (d)**, which counts the number of different species in a specific area. During the study period, the highest value of Margalef’s Richness Index (d) was recorded in the monsoon season (June-September) at 3.53, while the lowest value was observed in the post-monsoon season. Siddique et al. (2016) reported the highest value of Margalef’s Richness Index (d) in July (9.58) and the lowest in December (4.03) in Chalan *beel*, Bangladesh.

**Pielou’s Evenness Index (J')** measures the uniformity with which individuals are distributed among various species. During the study period, the mean value of Pielou’s Evenness Index was recorded as 0.63 in the pre-monsoon, 0.76 in the monsoon, and 0.61 in the post-monsoon season, respectively. These results indicate that fish species in the *beel* were almost evenly distributed across all seasons. Siddique et al. (2016) found the highest value of Pielou’s Evenness Index in July (0.69), with the lowest recorded in November (0.25) in Chalan Beel, Bangladesh. Ghosh and Biswas (2017) reported Pielou’s Evenness Index values ranging from 0.36 to 0.64, with a mean of 0.51, in a semi-closed oxbow lake, Chhariganga, in the Naida district of West Bengal. Sudhan (2017) observed the highest value of Pielou’s Evenness Index (J') in the Pechipari Reservoir in Kanyakumari district, Tamil Nadu, ranging from 446 to 956, suggesting a significant fish diversity and a uniform distribution of the fish population.

The **Shannon-Wiener Diversity Index** is a measure of biodiversity that accounts for both species richness and the relative abundance of those species. In this study, the Shannon-Wiener Index was recorded as 2.79 during the pre-monsoon season (February-May), 2.99 during the monsoon season (June-September), and 2.77 during the post-monsoon season (October-January). According to Mugurran (2004), the Shannon-Wiener Index (H') typically ranges from 1.5 to 3.5, with values greater than 3.0 indicating greater diversity. Hossain *et al*. (2012) suggested that seasonal differences in the Shannon-Wiener Index could be influenced by various factors, such as climatological and environmental conditions. Siddique et al. (2016) observed the highest value of the Shannon-Wiener Index (H') in December (3.15), with the lowest value recorded in July (2.54) in Chalan Beel, Bangladesh. Murugan and Prabhaharan (2012) indicated that lower H' values occur due to the depletion of water spread area, while higher diversity in the post-monsoon season may result from adequate water volume and sufficient food resources. Sudhan (2017) found H' values ranging from 3.14 to 3.27 at the Pechiparai Reservoir in Tamil Nadu. The findings of the present study align with these previous observations.

**Simpson’s Diversity Index** is a measure of biodiversity that evaluates both the number of species and their relative abundance. The Simpson Index ranges from 0 (indicating poor diversity) to 1 (indicating high diversity). In the present study, the Simpson Diversity Index was recorded as 0.90 during both the pre-monsoon season (February-May) and post-monsoon season, and 0.92 during the monsoon season. Kumzuk (2019) reported that the Simpson Diversity Index ranged from 0.965 to 0.974 in the Doyang Reservoir in Nagaland, India. Ghosh and Biswas (2017) found the Simpson Index to vary from 0.49 to 0.79 in the semi-closed oxbow lake, Chhariganga, in the Naida district of West Bengal.

The results from the diversity indices—Margalef’s Richness Index (d), Pielou’s Evenness Index (J), Shannon-Weiner Index (H'), and Simpson Index (1-λ)—indicate high fish diversity in the beel, with a relatively even distribution of fish species and genera. This suggests that the beel is in favorable condition for fish production.

**Table 2** : Season Wise Diversity Indices of Fish Species of the Charipunia *beel*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Margalef’s Richness Index(d)** | **Pielou Evenness Index(J’)** | **Shannon-Wiener Index(H’)** | **Simpson Index(1-λ’)** | **Margalef’s Richness Index(d)** | **Pielou Evenness Index(J’)** | **Shannon-Wiener Index(H’)** | **Simpson Index(1-λ’)** | **Margalef’s Richness Index(d)** | **Pielou Evenness Index(J’)** | **Shannon-Wiener Index(H’)** | **Simpson Index(1-λ’)** |
| **Station**  **1** | 2.85 | 0.63 | 2.80 | 0.90 | 3.51 | 0.78 | 3.01 | 0.93 | 0.33 | 0.62 | 2.79 | 0.90 |
| **Station**  **2** | 2.88 | 7.62 | 2.78 | 0.90 | 3.54 | 0.74 | 2.97 | 0.92 | 2.88 | 0.60 | 2.75 | 0.89 |
| **Mean** | 2.86±0.01 | 0.63±0.01 | 2.79±0.01 | 0.90±0.01 | 3.53±0.01 | 0.76±0.01 | 2.99±0.02 | 0.92±0.01 | 1.61±1.27 | 0.61±0.01 | 2.77±0.01 | 0.90±0.01 |

**Conservation status of fish species**

Based on the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species (2023), the conservation status of fish species in the current study showed that 20 species (50.8%) were classified as Least Concern, 3 species (8.82%) as Near Threatened, and 6 species (17.64%) as Vulnerable. One species (2.94%) fell under the Endangered, Not Evaluated, and Deficient categories. For instance, Clarius magur was listed as Endangered and was found to be quite scarce in the beel. Species like Hypophthalmichthys molitrix, Wallago attu, and Ompok pabda were categorized as Near Threatened. These species require special attention for their conservation and propagation. According to the Conservation Assessment and Management Plan (CAMP, 1998), the majority of species (13 species, 38.22%) were categorized as Lower Risk Near Threatened (LRnt), 3 species (8.82%) as Lower Risk Least Concern (LRlc), 7 species (20.58%) as Vulnerable (VU), 3 species (8.82%) as Near Threatened (NT), 1 species (2.94%) was Not Evaluated, and 2 species (5.88%) were Data Deficient (DD). Since the CAMP report's release in the late 1990s, threats to these fish species have likely increased due to habitat loss, degradation, climate change, and other environmental pressures. Our findings for Charipunia Beel reflect a similar pattern, with 2.94% of the species classified as threatened, underscoring the importance of long-term management and conservation efforts to maintain sustainability.

**CONCLUSION**

From the study it can be concluded that the *beel* supports a high level of fish diversity, with a fairly balanced distribution of fish genera, which suggests a healthy ecosystem conducive to fish production. However, the study also identified challenges faced by local fishermen, such as water pollution, inadequate aquaculture management, environmental degradation, and a lack of knowledge regarding the characteristics of cultured species. The ornamental fish industry, which represents 35.28% of the species (12 species) recorded, offers an opportunity for local youth. Nevertheless, human activities such as jute retting, the disposal of domestic waste, and frequent fishing could negatively impact fish growth and overall production, unless effective management measures are implemented.
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