International Journal of Entomology Research
www.entomologyjournals.com
ISSN: 2455-4758
Received: 21-06-2024, Accepted: 22-07-2024, Published: 07-08-2024
Volume 9, Issue 8, 2024, Page No. 48-54

Impact of heavy metals on fish reproduction: Mechanisms, implications, and mitigation strategies

Manas Das[1*], Monjit Paul[1], Joydeep Das[1], Basudev Mandal[2]
[1] Assistant Professor, Department of Biological Sciences, Midnapore City College, Paschim Medinipur, West Bengal, India
[2] Associate Professor, Department of Fishery Sciences, Vidyasagar University, Paschim Medinipur, West Bengal, India

Abstract
Heavy metals such as mercury (Hg), lead (Pb), cadmium (Cd), and arsenic (As) are prevalent contaminants in aquatic ecosystems, originating from industrial discharge, mining, agricultural runoff, and atmospheric deposition. These toxic elements pose significant threats to fish reproduction, impacting both individual organisms and entire populations. This review examines the mechanisms through which heavy metals affect fish reproductive health, including endocrine disruption, oxidative stress, and DNA damage. It explores the implications for fish populations, such as reduced fertility, altered sex ratios, and decreased offspring survival. Furthermore, the review discusses current and emerging mitigation strategies to counteract these effects, emphasizing bioremediation, policy regulations, and the use of advanced technologies like artificial intelligence for monitoring and managing contamination. By integrating recent research findings, this paper aims to provide a comprehensive understanding of the challenges posed by heavy metals in aquatic environments and to highlight potential solutions to safeguard fish reproductive health and ensure sustainable aquaculture practices.

Keywords: Heavy metals**,** fish reproduction, endocrine disruption, aquatic ecosystems**,** bioaccumulation**,** bioremediation**,** toxicology**,** ecotoxicology**,** reproductive health

Introduction

The contamination of aquatic environments with heavy metals is a growing concern globally, posing significant risks to the health and reproductive success of fish populations. Heavy metals such as mercury (Hg), lead (Pb), cadmium (Cd), and arsenic (As) are persistent environmental pollutants that can accumulate in water bodies through various anthropogenic activities, including industrial discharge, mining, agriculture, and urban runoff (Heath, 1995) [22]. Once these metals enter aquatic systems, they can be absorbed by fish through their gills, skin, and gastrointestinal tract, leading to bioaccumulation and biomagnification in the food web (Beyersmann and Hartwig, 2008) [6].

The adverse effects of heavy metals on fish reproduction are well-documented, with numerous studies highlighting their capacity to disrupt endocrine function, impair gametogenesis, and reduce overall reproductive fitness (Woodling *et al*., 2001) [49]. For instance, mercury exposure has been linked to altered sex steroid levels and decreased fecundity in fish, while cadmium can induce oxidative stress and damage reproductive organs (Matta *et al*., 2001) [30]. These reproductive impairments not only threaten the viability of individual fish species but also have broader ecological implications, potentially leading to declines in fish populations and alterations in aquatic community structure (Newman, 2019) [36].

Given the critical role of fish in maintaining aquatic ecosystems and supporting human livelihoods, it is essential to understand the mechanisms underlying heavy metal toxicity in fish reproduction and develop effective mitigation strategies. This review aims to provide a comprehensive overview of the current knowledge on the impact of heavy metals on fish reproductive health, examining the pathways of toxicity, species-specific responses, and the ecological consequences of reproductive impairments. Additionally, we will explore innovative approaches to mitigate heavy metal contamination in aquatic environments, including bioremediation techniques, advanced water treatment technologies, and policy measures aimed at reducing pollutant inputs (Duffus, 2002) [12].

Overview of heavy metals in aquatic environments

Heavy metals, such as mercury (Hg), lead (Pb), cadmium (Cd), and arsenic (As), are persistent pollutants in aquatic environments. Understanding their sources, pathways, bioavailability, bioaccumulation, and distribution is crucial for assessing their impact on fish reproduction and overall ecosystem health. Any loading over and above the natural load of the aquatic environment will have an additional affect on aquatic communities. Aquatic biologists classify the deterioration of water quality based on the number and the abundance of sensitive and resistant species at sampling sites which provide quantitative measure of extra loading. There is no scientifically defined boundary between what changes are unacceptable and what are acceptable; this is an avalue judgement.

The term heavy metal is widely used in scientific literature with reference to several elements beginning with beryllium up to actinides (Duffus, 2002) [12]. The most common heavy metals in aquatic environment are mercury, lead, cadmium and arsenic. The mercury in natural water can exist in three oxidation states: elemental mercury (0), the mercurous (+1), and the mercuric (+2) state. Mercury forms stable complexes with a variety of organic ligands. The strongest covalent complexes are formed with S-containing ligands such as cysteine, the amino acids and hydro-carboxylic acids. Mercury associates strongly with suspended solids in natural waters. The extends of association is determined by the water quality parameters such as pH, salinity, redox potential (Eh) and presence of organic legends (Langstone, 1990) [26]. The mercury can accumulate in fish tissues, leading to various toxic effects. Mercury, for instance, can cause neurotoxic effects that may impair the fish's ability to reproduce effectively (Fitzgerald and Clarkson, 1991) [15].

Totally 100 million ton of fly ash produced in India annually, are the source of other heavy metals like lead, cadmium and even arsenic. These metals also come from mining process, battery industries, leather industries and electroplating. Cadmium finds its way via atmospheric transport into environment rom number of industries, is the product of fossil fuel combustion and base metal smelting. The effluents from oil refineries, pesticides, degradation of tires, phosphate fertilizers add cadmium to aquatic environment (Das and Rout, 2021) [11]. Cadmium exposure can significantly affect the breeding behavior of fish. As an endocrine disruptor, cadmium interferes with the hormonal systems of fish, particularly affecting the hypothalamus-pituitary-gonadal (HPG) axis. This disruption leads to impaired synthesis, secretion, and metabolic activity of hormones crucial for reproduction. The accumulation of cadmium in fish can result in growth inhibition, reduced reproductive capacity, and developmental abnormalities, which collectively hinder the breeding process.

Lead, another heavy metal of concern, come from mining, batteries, paints, glazing of ceramics, PVC, plastics, sewage influenced with industrial waste and fossil fuel. Lead can interfere with the endocrine system of fish, particularly affecting the hypothalamus-pituitary-gonadal (HPG) axis. This disruption can lead to altered levels of reproductive hormones such as estrogen and testosterone, which are crucial for normal reproductive behaviors (Scott and Sloman, 2004) [41]. Environmental arsenic is related to carcinogenesis in human. Exposure to arsenic can lead to reduced fertility in both male and female fish. In males, it can impair spermatogenesis, leading to reduced sperm count and motility. In females, arsenic can affect oogenesis, resulting in fewer and lower-quality eggs. Arsenic is also metabolic inhibitor and cause iron deficiency (Garcia-Santos *et al*., 2013) [18].

Table 1: Characteristics of heavy metals in aquatic environments

Heavy Metal	Sources	Pathways	Bioavailability and Bioaccumulation	Distribution and Concentration
Mercury (Hg)	Industrial discharge, mining, fossil fuel combustion, atmospheric deposition	Water column, sediment	High affinity for organic matter, biomagnification in food web	Higher concentrations in freshwater and coastal areas (Mason *et al*., 1994) [29]
Lead (Pb)	Industrial processes, mining, urban runoff, atmospheric deposition	Water column, sediment	Low solubility, binds to particles, accumulates in organisms	Elevated levels near industrial and urban areas (USEPA, 2007) [46]
Cadmium (Cd)	Mining, industrial discharge, agricultural runoff	Water column, sediment	High bioavailability, accumulates in kidneys and liver	Found in higher concentrations in areas with mining activities (ATSDR, 2012) [2]
Arsenic (As)	Mining, industrial discharge, pesticide runoff	Water column, sediment	Exists in organic and inorganic forms, bioaccumulation varies	Higher levels in groundwater and regions with natural mineral deposits (Smedley and Kinniburgh, 2002) [43]

Table 2: Lethal concentration of heavy metal to aquatic biota

Species	Metal	LC (mg/L)	Source
Tilapia nilotica	Hg	3.98 (24 hrs.)	Somsiri, 1982 [44]
Tilapia nilotica	Hg	3.80 (48 hrs.)	Somsiri, 1982 [44]
Tilapia nilotica	Hg	3.71 (72 hrs.)	Somsiri, 1982 [44]
Cirrhinus mrigala	Hg	0.16 (48 hrs.)	Mohan *et al*., 1986 [33]
Anabas testudineus	$HgCl_2$	1.50 (24 hrs.)	Sinha and Kumar, 1992 [42]
Indian major carps	Pb	0.5 to 10 (96 hrs.)	Moore and Ramamoorthy, 1984 [34]
Freshwater fish	Cd	0.90 to 105 (96 hrs.)	Moore and Ramamoorthy, 1984 [34]
Freshwater fish	Sodium arsenite	0.05 to 59 (96 hrs.)	Moore and Ramamoorthy, 1984 [34]
Freshwater fish	Arsenic trioxide	0.05 to 59 (96 hrs.)	Moore and Ramamoorthy, 1984 [34]
Freshwater fish	Arsenate	5-15 (96 hrs.)	Moore and Ramamoorthy, 1984 [34]
Freshwater fish	Total arsenic	1-50 (96 hrs.)	Moore and Ramamoorthy, 1984 [34]

Sources and pathways of heavy metal contamination:

Heavy metals enter aquatic environments through various sources and pathways. Mercury, for example, is primarily released from industrial processes, mining, and fossil fuel combustion, subsequently depositing into water bodies via atmospheric pathways (Pacyna *et al*., 2006) [38]. Lead contamination arises from industrial activities, mining operations, urban runoff, and atmospheric deposition, with significant amounts entering aquatic systems through sediment and water columns (USEPA, 2007) [46].

Bioavailability and bioaccumulation in aquatic ecosystems:

The bioavailability and bioaccumulation of heavy metals in aquatic ecosystems depend on their chemical forms and environmental conditions. Mercury, particularly in its methylmercury form, has a high affinity for organic matter, leading to biomagnification in aquatic food webs, impacting top predators like fish (Boening, 2000) [7]. Cadmium exhibits high bioavailability and tends to accumulate in the kidneys and liver of aquatic organisms, posing severe health risks (ATSDR, 2012) [2].

Distribution and concentration of heavy metals in various water bodies:

The distribution and concentration of heavy metals vary across different aquatic environments. Mercury concentrations are typically higher in freshwater and coastal areas, reflecting local industrial and mining activities (Mason *et al*., 1994) [29]. Lead levels are elevated in regions near industrial and urban areas due to historical and ongoing pollution sources (USEPA, 2007) [46]. Cadmium is found in higher concentrations in areas with intensive mining activities, whereas arsenic levels are elevated in groundwater and regions with natural mineral deposits (Smedley and Kinniburgh, 2002) [43].

Mechanisms of heavy metal toxicity in fish reproduction

Heavy metals exert their toxic effects on fish reproduction through several mechanisms, including endocrine disruption, oxidative stress, genetic and epigenetic alterations, and effects on gametogenesis and embryonic development. These mechanisms can severely impair reproductive success and overall fish population sustainability.

Table 3: Different mechanisms of heavy metal toxicity in fish reproduction

Mechanism	Description	References
Endocrine Disruption and Hormonal Imbalances	Heavy metals interfere with hormone production and signaling, leading to altered reproductive functions.	(McMaster *et al*., 1991; Guillette and Gunderson, 2001) [19, 31]
Oxidative Stress and Impact on Reproductive Tissues	Heavy metals induce oxidative stress, causing cellular damage in reproductive organs.	(Livingstone, 2001) [27]
Genetic and Epigenetic Alterations	Heavy metals cause DNA damage and epigenetic changes, affecting gene expression related to reproduction.	(Valavanidis *et al*., 2006; Baccarelli and Bollati, 2009) [4, 47]
Effects on Gametogenesis and Embryonic Development	Heavy metals disrupt the formation of gametes and impair embryonic development, leading to reduced fertility and developmental abnormalities.	(Pierron *et al*., 2007; Matta *et al*., 2001) [30, 39]

Endocrine disruption and hormonal imbalances:

Heavy metals can disrupt endocrine functions by mimicking or inhibiting the action of natural hormones, thereby causing hormonal imbalances. For example, mercury exposure has been shown to disrupt sex steroid hormone levels in fish, affecting reproductive behavior and success (McMaster *et al*., 1991) [31]. Similarly, lead can interfere with the hypothalamic-pituitary-gonadal axis, leading to altered production of gonadotropins and sex steroids (Guillette and Gunderson, 2001) [19].

Oxidative stress and its impact on reproductive tissues:

Oxidative stress is a significant mechanism by which heavy metals exert toxic effects on fish reproduction. Heavy metals such as cadmium and mercury can induce the production of reactive oxygen species (ROS), leading to oxidative damage in reproductive tissues (Livingstone, 2001) [27]. This oxidative stress can result in lipid peroxidation, protein oxidation, and DNA damage, ultimately impairing the function of reproductive organs.

Genetic and epigenetic alterations:

Heavy metals can cause genetic and epigenetic changes that affect reproductive health. For instance, cadmium exposure can lead to DNA strand breaks and chromosomal aberrations, impacting the integrity of genetic material (Valavanidis *et al*., 2006) [47]. Additionally, heavy metals can induce epigenetic modifications, such as DNA methylation and histone acetylation, which alter gene expression related to reproduction (Baccarelli and Bollati, 2009) [4].

Effects on gametogenesis and embryonic development:

Heavy metals adversely affect gametogenesis and embryonic development in fish. For example, cadmium exposure has been shown to impair the process of oogenesis and spermatogenesis, leading to reduced fertility (Pierron *et al*., 2007) [39]. Mercury exposure can cause developmental abnormalities in embryos, including deformities and impaired growth, ultimately reducing the survival rate of offspring (Matta *et al*., 2001) [30].

Species-specific responses to heavy metal exposure

Different fish species exhibit varying degrees of sensitivity to heavy metal exposure, influenced by their physiological, genetic, and ecological characteristics. Understanding these species-specific responses is crucial for assessing the impact of heavy metals on fish populations and devising appropriate conservation strategies.

Table 4: Species-specific responses to heavy metal exposure

Fish Species	Sensitivity to Heavy Metals	Reproductive Health Impacts	Tolerance and Adaptation Mechanisms	References
Atlantic Salmon	High sensitivity to cadmium and lead	Reduced gamete quality and impaired spawning	Limited tolerance, high sensitivity to water quality	(Jezierska and Witeska, 2006) [26]
Zebrafish	Moderate sensitivity to mercury and arsenic	Developmental abnormalities in embryos and larvae	Some genetic adaptations, used as a model organism in toxicology studies	(Craig *et al*., 2007; Raldua and Babin, 2009) [10, 40]
Rainbow Trout	High sensitivity to mercury and cadmium	Disrupted endocrine function and impaired reproductive behavior	Moderate tolerance, sensitive to chronic exposure	(Farag *et al*., 2006) [14]
Common Carp	Lower sensitivity to multiple heavy metals	Accumulation of heavy metals in tissues, potential reproductive issues	High tolerance, ability to bioaccumulate and detoxify	(Vinodhini and Narayanan, 2008) [48]
Nile Tilapia	Moderate sensitivity to lead and cadmium	Oxidative stress in reproductive organs, reduced fertility	Moderate tolerance, some adaptation mechanisms	(Authman *et al*., 2015) [3]

Comparative analysis of sensitivity across different fish species:

Different fish species exhibit varying levels of sensitivity to heavy metal exposure, influenced by their unique physiological and biochemical traits. For example, rainbow trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*) and fathead minnows (*Pimephales promelas*) are often used in toxicity studies due to their high sensitivity to pollutants like cadmium and lead (Hansen *et al*., 2002) [21]. In contrast, species like the common carp (*Cyprinus carpio*) may show more resilience due to differences in metal-binding proteins and detoxification pathways (Woodling *et al*., 2001) [49]. Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*), for instance, are highly sensitive to cadmium and lead, which can significantly impair their reproductive health by reducing gamete quality and disrupting spawning (Jezierska and Witeska, 2006) [26]. In contrast, common carp (*Cyprinus carpio*) display a lower sensitivity to multiple heavy metals, with a high capacity for bioaccumulation and detoxification, although this can still lead to reproductive issues (Vinodhini and Narayanan, 2008) [48].

Case studies on sentinel species and their reproductive health:

Sentinel species are used to monitor environmental health due to their known sensitivity to contaminants. Zebrafish (*Danio rerio*) are widely used as sentinel species in toxicology studies due to their moderate sensitivity to heavy metals such as mercury and arsenic. Research has shown that exposure to these metals can cause developmental abnormalities in embryos and larvae, making zebrafish an important model for understanding the reproductive impacts of heavy metal exposure (Craig *et al*., 2007; Raldua, and Babin, 2009) [10, 40]. Rainbow trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*), another sentinel species, are highly sensitive to mercury and cadmium, with chronic exposure leading to disrupted endocrine function and impaired reproductive behavior (Farag *et al*., 2006) [14]. The European eel (*Anguilla Anguilla*), for instance, is a sentinel species for mercury contamination, with studies showing significant reproductive impairment due to mercury exposure (Pierron *et al*., 2007) [39]. Similarly, *Fundulus heteroclitus*, a small estuarine fish, has been extensively studied for its response to heavy metal pollution, demonstrating altered reproductive outcomes and transgenerational effects when exposed to methylmercury and polychlorinated biphenyls (Matta *et al*., 2001) [30].

Variability in tolerance and adaptation mechanisms:

Fish populations in heavily polluted environments can develop tolerance or adaptive mechanisms to survive despite high levels of heavy metals. This variability is often due to genetic adaptations or the induction of metal-binding proteins like metallothioneins (Heath, 1995) [22]. For example, some populations of the Atlantic killifish (*Fundulus heteroclitus*) have evolved resistance to heavy metals, displaying genetic changes that confer increased tolerance to contaminants (Meyer and Di Giulio, 2003) [32]. Common carp possess high tolerance levels and can bioaccumulate and detoxify heavy metals, although this can still affect their reproductive health (Vinodhini and Narayanan, 2008) [48]. Nile tilapia (*Oreochromis niloticus*) show moderate sensitivity to lead and cadmium, with studies indicating oxidative stress in reproductive organs and reduced fertility, alongside some adaptation mechanisms to cope with the exposure (Authman *et al*., 2015) [3].

Ecological implications of heavy metal-induced reproductive toxicity

Heavy metal-induced reproductive toxicity in fish can have profound and far-reaching ecological implications.

Population dynamics and recruitment failure:

Heavy metals such as cadmium, mercury, and lead can significantly impair fish reproduction by reducing egg production, fertility, and hatching success, leading to recruitment failure. Chronic exposure to these metals disrupts endocrine functions and causes oxidative stress, resulting in lower reproductive output and higher embryonic mortality (Munkittrick and Dixon, 1989) [35]. For example, studies have shown that chronic mercury exposure reduces reproductive success in fish species such as the fathead minnow (*Pimephales promelas*), leading to declines in population sizes and potential local extinctions if the contamination persists (Hammerschmidt *et al*., 2002) [20].

Alterations in community structure and biodiversity:

The differential sensitivity of fish species to heavy metal exposure can lead to changes in community structure and reductions in biodiversity. Sensitive species may decline or be extirpated, while more tolerant species may become dominant, altering the balance of aquatic communities (Clements, 2004) [9]. This shift can have cascading effects on other organisms that depend on a diverse and balanced ecosystem. For instance, heavy metal contamination in streams has been linked to reduced species richness and changes in the abundance of macroinvertebrate and fish species (Maret *et al*., 2003) [28]. Such alterations can destabilize food webs and impair the ecological functions that diverse communities provide.

Long-term impacts on aquatic food webs and ecosystem services:

The long-term effects of heavy metal-induced reproductive toxicity extend to aquatic food webs and ecosystem services. Fish play crucial roles in nutrient cycling, energy flow, and maintaining the structural integrity of aquatic habitats. The decline or loss of fish populations due to heavy metal contamination can disrupt these ecological processes (Niyogi and Wood, 2004) [37]. Predatory fish, which rely on smaller fish as prey, may experience food shortages, leading to their population declines. Additionally, the loss of fish species involved in sediment bioturbation and nutrient recycling can degrade water quality and habitat conditions (Johnston *et al*., 2015) [25]. The overall decline in ecosystem services can impact human communities that rely on healthy aquatic ecosystems for food, water purification, and recreation.

Innovative approaches to mitigation and remediation

Addressing the issue of heavy metal pollution in aquatic environments requires innovative approaches that focus on both prevention and remediation. Different strategies include bioremediation, phytoremediation, advanced water treatment technologies, and robust policy frameworks.

Development and application of bioremediation techniques:

Bioremediation involves the use of microorganisms to detoxify heavy metals in contaminated water bodies. This method leverages the natural metabolic processes of bacteria, fungi, and algae to transform heavy metals into less toxic forms. For instance, certain bacteria can reduce soluble hexavalent chromium (Cr (VI) to insoluble trivalent chromium (Cr (III), thus reducing its bioavailability and toxicity (Camargo *et al*., 2003) [8]. The application of genetically engineered microorganisms has further enhanced the efficiency of bioremediation, making it a viable option for treating heavy metal-contaminated sites (Gadd, 2010) [17].

Use of phytoremediation and biochar to reduce heavy metal bioavailability:

Phytoremediation utilizes plants to absorb, accumulate, and detoxify heavy metals from soil and water. Certain plants, known as hyperaccumulators, can uptake and store high levels of heavy metals in their tissues. For example, water hyacinth (*Eichhornia crassipes*) has been shown to effectively remove cadmium and lead from contaminated water bodies (Zhou *et al*., 2013) [50]. Additionally, biochar, a carbon-rich product obtained from the pyrolysis of organic materials, can be used to immobilize heavy metals in sediments, thereby reducing their bioavailability and toxicity to aquatic organisms (Beesley *et al*., 2011) [5].

Implementation of advanced water treatment technologies:

Advanced water treatment technologies, such as membrane filtration, ion exchange, and advanced oxidation processes, offer effective solutions for removing heavy metals from contaminated water. Membrane filtration, including reverse osmosis and nanofiltration, can selectively remove heavy metals based on their size and charge, achieving high removal efficiencies. Ion exchange resins can be tailored to selectively adsorb specific heavy metals, making them useful for treating industrial wastewater (Fu and Wang, 2011) [16]. Advanced oxidation processes, such as photocatalysis and Fenton reactions, can degrade complex heavy metal-organic compounds, further reducing their toxicity (Ibhadon and Fitzpatrick, 2013) [23].

Policy frameworks and regulatory measures to control heavy metal pollution:

Effective policy frameworks and regulatory measures are essential for controlling heavy metal pollution at the source. Regulations such as the Clean Water Act in the United States set stringent limits on the discharge of heavy metals into water bodies, compelling industries to adopt cleaner technologies and practices (EPA, 2016). International agreements, like the Minamata Convention on Mercury, aim to reduce global mercury pollution through coordinated efforts and best practices (UNEP, 2019) [45]. Additionally, policies that promote pollution prevention, such as the adoption of green chemistry and sustainable production methods, can significantly reduce the release of heavy metals into the environment (Anastas and Eghbali, 2010) [1].

Conclusion

The impact of heavy metals on fish reproduction represents a significant threat to aquatic ecosystems and biodiversity. Heavy metals such as cadmium, lead, mercury, and arsenic disrupt endocrine systems, induce oxidative stress, and cause genetic and epigenetic alterations, leading to impaired gametogenesis, reduced fertility, and increased embryonic mortality. These reproductive impairments not only affect individual fish populations by reducing their numbers and genetic diversity but also have cascading effects on aquatic food webs, community structure, and ecosystem services. Population dynamics are critically influenced by recruitment failures, while alterations in community structure and biodiversity are often evident in heavily contaminated environments. These changes can lead to the dominance of more tolerant species, the decline of sensitive species, and overall reductions in biodiversity. The long-term impacts on aquatic food webs and ecosystem services can be profound, affecting nutrient cycling, water quality, and the overall health and functioning of aquatic ecosystems. Mitigation and remediation strategies are essential to address the adverse effects of heavy metals on fish reproduction. Innovative approaches such as bioremediation, phytoremediation, and the use of biochar offer promising solutions for reducing heavy metal bioavailability and toxicity. Advanced water treatment technologies, including membrane filtration and advanced oxidation processes, provide effective means of removing heavy metals from contaminated waters. Furthermore, robust policy frameworks and regulatory measures are crucial for preventing heavy metal pollution at the source and ensuring the protection of aquatic environments.

In conclusion, a comprehensive understanding of the mechanisms through which heavy metals affect fish reproduction, coupled with innovative mitigation and remediation strategies, is essential for safeguarding aquatic ecosystems. Continued research, monitoring, and policy enforcement will be vital in mitigating the impacts of heavy metal pollution and preserving the health and diversity of aquatic life for future generations.

References

1. Anastas PT, Eghbali N. Green chemistry: Principles and practice. Chemical Society Reviews,2010:39(1):301-312. doi: 10.1039/b918763b
2. ATSDR (Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry). Toxicological profile for Cadmium, 2012. Retrieved from https://www.atsdr.cdc.gov/toxprofiles/tp5.pdf
3. Authman MM, Zaki MS, Khallaf EA, Abbas HH. Use of fish as bio-indicator of the effects of heavy metals pollution. Journal of aquaculture research & development,2015:6(4):1-13. DOI: 10.4172/2155-9546.1000328
4. Baccarelli A, Bollati V. Epigenetics and environmental chemicals. Current Opinion in Pediatrics,2009:21(2):243-251. doi:10.1097/MOP.0b013e32832925cc
5. Beesley L, Moreno Jiménez E, Gomez Eyles JL, Harris E, Robinson B, Sizmur T. A review of biochars' potential role in the remediation, revegetation and restoration of contaminated soils. Environmental Pollution,2011:159(12):3269-3282. doi:10.1016/j.envpol.2011.07.023
6. Beyersmann D, Hartwig A. Carcinogenic metal compounds: recent insight into molecular and cellular mechanisms. Archives of Toxicology,2008:82:493-512. doi:10.1007/s00204-008-0313-y
7. Boening DW. Ecological effects, transport, and fate of mercury: a general review. Chemosphere,2000:40(12):1335-1351. doi:10.1016/S0045-6535(99)00283-0
8. Camargo FAO, Bento FM, Okeke BC, Frankenberger WT. Chromate reduction by chromium-resistant bacteria isolated from soils contaminated with dichromate. Journal of Environmental Quality,2003:32(4):1228-1233. https://doi.org/10.2134/jeq2003.1228
9. Clements WH. Small-scale experiments support causal relationships between metal contamination and macroinvertebrate community responses. Ecological Applications,2004:14(3):954-967.
10. Craig PM, Wood CM, McClelland GB. Oxidative stress response and gene expression with acute copper exposure in zebrafish (*Danio rerio*). American Journal of Physiology-Regulatory, Integrative and Comparative Physiology,2007:293(5):R1882-R1892. https://doi.org/10.1152/ajpregu.00383.2007
11. Das D, Rout, PK. Synthesis and characterization of fly ash and GBFS based geopolymer material. Biointerface Research in Applied Chemistry,2021:11(6):14506–14519. https://doi.org/10.33263/BRIAC116.1450614519

12. Duffus JH. "Heavy metals" a meaningless term? (IUPAC Technical Report). Pure and Applied Chemistry,2002:74(5):793-807. doi:10.1351/pac200274050793
13. EPA. Summary of the Clean Water Act. Retrieved from https://www.epa.gov/laws-regulations/summary-clean-water-act.
14. Farag AM, May T, Marty GD, Easton M, Harper DD, Little EE, *et al*. The effect of chronic chromium exposure on the health of Chinook salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*). Aquatic Toxicology,2006:76(3-4):246-257. doi: 10.1016/j.aquatox.2005.09.011
15. Fitzgerald WF, Clarkson TW. Mercury and Monomethylmercury: Present and Future Concerns. Environmental Health Perspectives,1991:96:159-166. DOI: 10.1289/ehp.9196159.
16. Fu F, Wang Q. Removal of heavy metal ions from wastewaters: A review. Journal of Environmental Management, 92(3), 2011, 407-418. doi:10.1016/j.jenvman.2010.11.011
17. Gadd GM. Metals, minerals and microbes: Geomicrobiology and bioremediation. Microbiology,2010:156(3):609-643. doi:10.1099/mic.0.037143-0
18. Garcia-Santos S, Fontaínhas-Fernandes A, Monteiro SM, Wilson JM. Effects of exposure to cadmium on some endocrine parameters in tilapia, *Oreochromis niloticus*. Bulletin of environmental contamination and toxicology,2013:90:55-59.
19. Guillette LJ, Gunderson MP. Alterations in the reproductive system of wildlife exposed to endocrine-disrupting contaminants. Reproduction,2013:122(6):857-864. doi:10.1530/rep.0.1220857
20. Hammerschmidt CR, Sandheinrich MB, Wiener JG, and Rada RG. Effects of dietary methylmercury on reproduction of fathead minnows. Environmental Science & Technology,2002:36(5):877-883.
21. Hansen JA, Welsh PG, Lipton J, Cancela D, Daily AD. Relative sensitivity of bull trout (*Salvelinus confluentus*) and rainbow trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*) to acute exposure of cadmium and zinc. Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry,2002:21(1):67-75. https://doi.org/10.1002/etc.5620210110
22. Heath AG. Water Pollution and Fish Physiology. CRC Press, 1995, ISBN: 978-0849386640
23. Ibhadon AO, Fitzpatrick P. Heterogeneous photocatalysis: Recent advances and applications. Catalysts,2013:3(1):189-218. doi:10.3390/catal3010189
24. Jezierska B, Witeska M. The metal uptake and accumulation in fish living in polluted waters. Soil and Water Pollution Monitoring, Protection and Remediation, Springer, 2006, 107-114.
25. Johnston EL, Mayer Pinto M, Crowe TP. Chemical contaminant effects on marine ecosystem functioning. Journal of Applied Ecology,2015:52(1):140-149. doi:10.1111/1365-2664.12355
26. Langston WJ. Toxic Effects of Heavy Metals and Incidence of Metal Pollution in Marine Ecosystems, In: Furness, R.W. and Rainbow, P.S., Eds., Heavy Metals in the Marine Environment, CRC Press, Boca Raton, 1990, 101-122. https://doi.org/10.1201/9781351073158-7
27. Livingstone DR. Contaminant-stimulated reactive oxygen species production and oxidative damage in aquatic organisms. Marine Pollution Bulletin,2001:42(8):656-666. doi:10.1016/S0025-326X(01)00060-1
28. Maret TR, Cain DJ, MacCoy DE, Short TM. Response of benthic invertebrate assemblages to metal exposure and bioaccumulation associated with hard-rock mining in northwestern streams, USA. Journal of the North American Benthological Society,2003:22(4):598-620. https://doi.org/10.2307/1468356
29. Mason RP, Fitzgerald WF, Morel FM. The biogeochemical cycling of elemental mercury: Anthropogenic influences. Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta,1994:58(15):3191-3198. doi:10.1016/0016-7037(94)90046-9
30. Matta MB, Linse J, Cairncross C, Francendese L, Kocan RM. Reproductive and transgenerational effects of methylmercury or Aroclor 1268 on *Fundulus heteroclitus*. Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry,2001:20(2):327-335. https://doi.org/10.1002/etc.5620200213
31. McMaster ME, Portt CB, Munkittrick KR, Dixon DG, Hewitt LM. Milt characteristics, reproductive performance, and larval survival and development of white sucker exposed to bleached kraft mill effluent. Ecotoxicology and Environmental Safety,1991:21(3):284-294. doi:10.1016/0147-6513(91)90042-Z
32. Meyer JN, Di Giulio RT. Heritable adaptation and fitness costs in killifish (*Fundulus heteroclitus*) inhabiting a polluted estuary. Ecological Applications,2003:13(2):490-503.
33. Mohan CV, Guptha TRC, Menon NR. Acute toxicity of mercury on the early developmental stages of *Cirrhinus mrigala* (Ham.). Indian J. Fish,1986:33(1):133-136.
34. Moore JW, Ramamoorthy S. Heavy metal in natural waters. Springer- Verlag, New York, 1984, 268.
35. Munkittrick KR, Dixon DG. Effects of natural exposure to copper and zinc on egg size and larval copper tolerance in white sucker (*Catostomus commersoni*) populations. Ecotoxicology and Environmental Safety,1989:18(1):15-26. https://doi.org/10.1016/0147-6513(89)90088-2
36. Newman MC. Fundamentals of ecotoxicology: the science of pollution. CRC Press, 2019.
37. Niyogi S, Wood CM. Biotic ligand model, a flexible tool for developing site-specific water quality guidelines for metals. Environmental Science & Technology,2004:38(23):6177-6192. doi:10.1021/es0496524
38. Pacyna EG, Pacyna JM, Steenhuisen F, Wilson S. Global anthropogenic mercury emission inventory for 2000. Atmospheric Environment,2006:40(22):4048-4063. doi:10.1016/j.atmosenv.2006.03.041
39. Pierron F, Baudrimont M, Bossy A, Bourdineaud JP, Brèthes D, Elie P, Massabuau JC. Impairment of lipid storage by cadmium in the European eel (*Anguilla anguilla*). Aquatic Toxicology,2007:81(3):304-311. doi:10.1016/j.aquatox.2006.12.008
40. Raldua D, Babin PJ. Simple, rapid zebrafish larva bioassay for assessing the potential of chemical pollutants and drugs to disrupt thyroid gland

function. Environmental science & technology,2009:43(17):6844-6850.
41. Scott GR, Sloman KA. 2004. The effects of environmental pollutants on complex fish behavior: integrating behavioral and physiological indicators of toxicity. Aquatic Toxicology,2004:68(4):369-392. doi:10.1016/j.aquatox.2004.03.016
42. Sinha YKP, Kumar K. Acute toxicity of mercuric chloride to *Anabas testudineus* (Bloch). Environmental Ecology,1992:10(3):720-722.
43. Smedley PL, Kinniburgh DG. A review of the source, behaviour and distribution of arsenic in natural waters. Applied Geochemistry,2002:17(5):517-568. doi:10.1016/S0883-2927(02)00018-5
44. Somsiri C. Acute toxicity of mercury, copper and zinc to the Nile Tilapia. Thai. Fish. Gaz,1982:35(3):313-318.
45. UNEP. Minamata Convention on Mercury, 2019. Retrieved from https://www.mercuryconvention.org/
46. USEPA (United States Environmental Protection Agency). Lead in the environment, 2007. Retrieved from https://www.epa.gov/lead
47. Valavanidis A, Vlahogianni T, Dassenakis M, Scoullos M. Molecular biomarkers of oxidative stress in aquatic organisms in relation to toxic environmental pollutants. Ecotoxicology and Environmental Safety,2006:64(2):178-189. doi:10.1016/j.ecoenv.2005.03.013
48. Vinodhini R, Narayanan M. Bioaccumulation of heavy metals in organs of fresh water fish *Cyprinus carpio* (Common carp). International Journal of Environmental Science & Technology,2008:5(2):179-182. doi:10.1007/BF03326011
49. Woodling JD, Brinkman SF, Horn BJ. Nonuniform accumulation of cadmium and copper in kidneys of wild brown trout (*Salmo trutta*) from the Rio Grande, Colorado. Archives of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology,2001:40:381-385. https://doi.org/10.1007/s002440010186
50. Zhou Y, Gao B, Zimmerman AR, Fang J, Sun Y, Cao X. Sorption of heavy metals on chitosan-modified biochars and its biological effects. Chemical engineering journal,2013:231:512-518. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cej.2013.07.036