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#### Abstract

Unacceptable risks are posed to ecological receptors from chemicals as well as many other pollutants. Chemical contamination is considered a major ecological stress factor on fresh water fish. Stress can cause a reduction in food intake, impair growth, reproduction and immunity. Copper sulfate, Malathion and Paraquat, as industriai overuse and agricultural pesticides, can cause extensive contamination to aquatic environments. This study is concerned with the determination of the modulating effect of acute sublethal doses of the three chemicals in the fresh water fish rainbow trout (Onchorynchus mykiss). A monoclonal antibody dependent indirect enzyme linked immunosorbant assay (ELISA) was used. The evaluation of the immune modulation was based on the determination of the IgM titers following KLH immunization. Significant changes in the IgM response patterns indicated suppression and/or enhancement of the immune system of fish. Such data could be of value for preliminary problem formulation and ecological effects evaluation in ecosystems.
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#### Abstract

Unacceptable risks are posed to ecological receptors from chemicals as well as many other pollutants. Chemical contamination is considered a major ecological stress factor on fresh water fish. Stress can cause a reduction in feed intake, impair growth, reproduction and immunity. Copper sulfate, Malathion and Paraquat, as industrial overuse and agricultural pesticides, can cause extensive contamination to aquatic environments. This study is concerned with the determination of the modulating effect of acute sublethal doses of the three chemicals in the fresh water fish rainbow trout (Onchorynchus mykiss). A monoclonal antibody dependent indirect enzyme linked immunosorbant assay (ELISE) was used. The evaluation of the immune modulation was based on the determination the lgM titers in correlation to KLH immunization. Significant changes in the $\operatorname{lgM}$ patterns indicated suppression and/or enhancement of the immune system of fish. Such data could be of value for preliminary problem formulation and ecological effects evaluation in ecosystems.


## INTRODUCTION

The use of fresh-water bodies for domestic and commercial activities is beneficial for all residents. Unfortunately, these water bodies are susceptible to chemical contamination (U S Department of Agriculture, 1968 and Eisler, R., 1991) from industrial and agricultural activities such as accidental spills, drainage from washing and cleaning of spray equipment and pesticide
containers, drift from spraying operations or runoff from newly treated fields. Chemical contamination is considered a major ecological stress factor on non-target organisms including fresh water fish.

The role of the ecological risk assessment is to: determine whether unacceptable risks are posed to ecological receptors from chemical stressors, derive contaminant levels which would not pose unacceptable risks and provide the information necessary to make a risk management decision concerning the practical need and extent of remedial action (Laws, 1994). The ecological risk assessment is in a beginning phase of development and therefore exists in a very dynamic state. Guidance is limited and there is uncertainty concerning the roles and processes of ecological risk assessment in the different programs.

By diffinition, stress is considered a change in homeostasis that can cause a reduction in feed intake, impair growth, reproduction and immunity (Van Muiswinkle et al., 1985). Pesticides and other chemical overuse, as stress factors, may not cause an apparent disturbance in aquatic and terrestrial environments, but adverse affects have been observed in nontarget organisms including fresh-water fish (Kimbrough and Gaines, 1970; Dueck et al., 1987 and Nor, 1987). Copper sulfate [CuSO 4 ], Malathion [ML, (O, O-dimethyl-S-1, 2-di-ethoxycarbamyl ethylphos-phor-dithioate)] and Paraquat [PQ, (1, 1'-dimethyl-4, 4'bipyridinium dichloride)] can cause extensive contamination to aquatic environments and accordingly, may cause stress effects ranging from changes at the molecular level to population and community levels (Segner and Braunbec, 1988 and Fairbairn et al., 1995).

Sublethal doses of ecotoxic stress factors on fish can have detrimental effects upon immune system structures and/or functions that may ultimately can be as harmful as direct toxic doses (Spitsbergen et al., 1986 and Thuvander, 1990) . The aim of the present study is to determine the modulating effect of acute sublethal doses of $\mathrm{CuSO}_{4}, \mathrm{ML}$ and PQ on the humoral immune responce of the fresh water fish rainbow trout. The evaluation of such modulation, with the rarity of immunological information related to these stress factors, could be of value for preliminary problem formulation and ecological effects evaluation.

## MATERIAL AND METHODS

Fish:
Immature rainbow trout (Onchorynchus mykiss) with an average weight of $90(60-120) \mathrm{g}$ and average length of 20 (18-22) cm were obtained from an Utah local hatchery (Utah Division of Wildlife Resources, Springville Hatchery, Utah, USA). Fish were kept in glass aquaria supplied with aerated, charcoal-filtered circulating tap water ( $0.4 \mathrm{~L} / \mathrm{min}$ ) at a temperature of $15^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, under a $12-\mathrm{hr}$ light / 12-hr dark photoperiod. The fish were fed on homogenous commercial trout pellet (Ewos), and acclimatized to laboratory conditions for a minimum of one week before the experiments were performed.

## Experimental design:

The acute toxicity of a chemical to fish is usually expressed as $96 \mathrm{hr} \mathrm{LC}_{50}$ in ppm. Selection of the used $\mathrm{CuSO}_{4}, \mathrm{ML}$ and PQ sublethal concentrations was led by the available reports of acute toxicity rating classification and the previously determined levels of $\mathrm{LC}_{50}$ on fresh water fish (Mayer and Ellersieck, 1986). $\mathrm{CuSO}_{4}$ was classified as slightly toxic of 10-100 ppm $96 \mathrm{hr} \mathrm{LC}_{50}$ but with high acute screening value. ML and PQ were classified as highly toxic of 0.1-1.0 ppm $96 \mathrm{hr} \mathrm{LC}_{50}$ but with low acute screening value. Befor the main experiment was performed, the chosen sublethal doses of $\mathrm{CuSO}_{4}, \mathrm{PQ}$ and ML and their two folds were tested to determine their lethality. Each of the concentrations was tested on five fish for a period of one week. None of the fish was found dead. Fish were exposed to each of low and high concentrations of $\mathrm{CuSO}_{4}$ (low $=0.01$ and high $=1.0 \mathrm{ppm}$ ), ML (low $=0.0001$ and high $=0.01 \mathrm{ppm})$ and $\mathrm{PQ}($ low $=0.0001$ and high $=$ $0.01 \mathrm{ppm})$ by immersion in the aquaria for 96 hours. Additionally two control groups (each of five fish) were included: nonimmunized / nontreated control fish (negative control) and immunized / nontreated control fish (positive control).

Keyhole limpet hemocyanin (KLH, Sigma, USA) immunization was performed via intraperitoneal (ip) injection of $100 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{g}$ wet fish. The booster dose of KLH was given, at the same dose and route, after 3 weeks following the first immunization.

## Blood sampling:

Blood samples were collected from five fish of each fish group at time of first immunization and at one week interval for 7 weeks. In addition correlated blood samples were collected from fish of the negative control group. At time of sampling, fish were anaesthetized with MS-222 and blood was collected from the ventral aorta into none heparinized vacutainer tubes. The tubes were kept at $4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ overnight then centrifuged at 300 g for 10 min to separat serum. Collected samples were initially diluted 1:100 in PBS containing 2\% none fat dry milk and $0.5 \%$ Tween-20 (dilution buffer). Starting with this dilution, twelve serial 2 -fold dilutions (1:0.2 $\times 10^{3}-1: 409.6 \times 10^{3}$ were prepared in the same buffer. All dilutions were prepared immediatly before the detection of their lgM titers.

## Enzyme linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA):

Levels of humoral antibodies to KLH were measured by indirect ELISA technique. One hundred $\mu \mathrm{l}$ of $100 \mu \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{KLH} / \mathrm{ml}$ is added to each of the wells of polystyrene microtitre plates (Nunc II Immunoplate, Nunc, Denmark). Plates were incubated for one hour at $37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. After tapiing off, free sites of the wells were immediately blocked for one hr at room temperature (rt) with 200 $\mu \mathrm{l}$ of $2 \%$ none fat dry milk in phosphate buffered saline (PBS). After blocking, plates were then washed five times with PBS containing $0.05 \%$ Tween-20 (washing buffer). Subsequently, 100 $\mu \mathrm{l}$ of each of the previously diluted fish plasma were added to each of three wells. Plates were incubated for one hr at room temperature.

After washing, $100 \mu \mathrm{l}$ of mouse monoclonal anti- rainbow trout $\operatorname{lgM}$ antibody, diluted 1:100 in dilution buffer, were added to each well. After incubation period of one hour at rt , plates were rewashed as above. An aliquote of $100 \mu$ l of rabbit anti-mouse IgG antibody conjugated to horseradish peroxidase, diluted 1:5000 in dilution buffer was then added to each well. The plates were further incubated for one hour at it and then extensively washed (ten times) with washing buffer. For coloure development, 200 $\mu \mathrm{l}$ 3,3,5,5-tetramethylbenzidine (TMB) were added per well. The reaction was stopped after 45 min with $50 \mu / /$ well of 2 M $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$. The optical density was read spectrophotometrically at 450 nm using multichannel photometer (Flow Laboratories). The highest dilutions expressing end point reaction for each group were used to express the titer of the $\lg \mathrm{M}$ antibody levels.

## Statistical evaluations:

The data were analysed for statistically significant differences between negative control and treated fish by the students's $t$-test. Analysis was based on comparing absorbance values, obtained at end-point titers, in relation to time laps.

## RESULTS

From data depected repeatedly in tables 1, 2 and 3 the titers of negative and positive control fish expressed the following behaviour (Fig 1): negative control fish expressed $\operatorname{lgM}$ titers ranging from $3.2 \times 10^{3}$ to $0.8 \times 10^{3}$. The pattern of the titers in correlation with time laps was decreasing, as indicated by the trend line. Positive control fish expressed titers of $3.2 \times 10^{3}$ for three weeks indicating a steady state phase followed by an increase to reach a maximum of $12.8 \times 10^{3}$ at the third week. Afterthen, the titer declined to reach a minimum of $1.6 \times 10^{3}$ at the fifth week. A reincrease of the titer was expressed in the sixth week reaching a value of $6.4 \times 10^{3}$, this persists till the end of experiment. The pattern of the titers was generally increasing, as indicated by the trend line.

Fish exposed to low and high $\mathrm{CuSO}_{4}$ concentrations showed changes in the IgM titers (table 1), as copmared to both negative and positive control fish. Exposure to low $\mathrm{CuSO}_{4}$ concentration lowered the $\operatorname{lgM}$ titer at the second week $\left(1.6 \times 10^{3}\right)$, followed by an increased titer during the subsequent three weeks of $6.4 \times 10^{3}$. During the fifth and sixth weeks another increase was observed $\left(25.6 \times 10^{3}\right)$ follwed by a sharp decline to reach a value of only 3.2 $\times 10^{3}$. The trend of titers was increasing as compared to that of positive control fish (Fig 2a). The IgM titer of fish exposed to the high $\mathrm{CuSO}_{4}$ concentration expressed the same behavior as of above with only on exception that the titer was markedly increased $\left(102.4 \times 10^{3}\right)$ at the end of experiment. The trend of the pattern was dramatically increasing, as compared to positive control fish (Fig 2a).

The IgM titers of fish exposed to low and high concentrations of ML showed an increasing trends (Fig 2b). As shown in table 2, the titers of fish exposed to low concentration of ML expressed two maxima at the third $\left(12.8 \times 10^{3}\right)$ and sixth $\left(102.4 \times 10^{3}\right)$ weeks. In case of fish exposed to high ML concentration, titers showed the same behavior with higher values of $51.2 \times 10^{3}$ and $204.8 \times 10^{3}$ (table 2) respectively. In addition, fish of the two experimental groups showed drops of their $\operatorname{lgM}$ titers at the last week.

Fish exposed to low concentration of PQ revealed gradual
increase in their IgM titer (table 3), reaching a maximum value of $25.6 \times 10^{3}$ at the fourth week. After a week, a significant sudden drop was observed. A second maximum of $51.2 \times 10^{3}$ was expressed in the sixth week, then a drop follows. Similar behaviour was recorded for fish group treated with the high concentration of PQ but with higher maxima of $51.2 \times 10^{3}$ and $102.4 \times 10^{3}$ (table 3) and generaly higher trend of increased $\operatorname{lgM}$ level (Fig 2c). Fish of the two experimental groups showed drops of their $\lg \mathrm{M}$ titers to reach values of $12.8 \times 10^{3}$ and $25.6 \times 10^{3}$ at the last week.

In general, psitive control fish (Fig 1) had increased IgM titers at the third and sixth weeks. The second increase was expanded till the last week. The maximum titer of $12.8 \times 10^{3}$ was obtained at the third week. Data depected in table 4 indicates an average value of $5.4 \times 10^{3}$ and a doubling value of 2.8 as compared with data of the negative control fish. Table 4 shows also corresponding values in relation to fish exposure to each of the three tested ecotoxic stress factors. In relation to $\mathrm{CuSO}_{4}$, fish exposed to high concentration gave a maximum $\operatorname{lgM}$ titer of $102.4 \times 10^{3}$ at the last week with a doubling value of 18.3 of the average titer. Two maximal IgM peaks were shown by fish obtained ML treatment at the third and seventh weeks, independent of concentration (Fig $2 \mathrm{a})$. The higher maximum ( $204.8 \times 10^{3}$ ) was obtained with high concentration with adoubling value of the average titer of 25.9 (table 4). Similar behaviour was obtained with fish exposed to $P Q$, but the two maximal IgM peaks were shifted to the fourth and sixth weeks (Fig 2c). Evaluation parameters for PQ treated fish are depected also in table 4.

## DISCUSSION

To detect a less pronounced antibody responce or to reveal minor modulations of the humoral response due to environmental stress factors, more sensitive method would be of value. The ELISA technique has been used in several studies of the humoral antibody in rainbow trout (Cossarini-Dunier, 1985; Hamilton et al., 1986 and Thuvander et al., 1987) as it is a sensitive and inexpensivebmethod which permits rapid screening of large number of samples. Furthermore, only a small amount of plasma is required from each individual. This is an important advantage in studies of the immune respomse in fish. Additionally, The use of anti rainbow trout $\operatorname{lgM}$ monoclonal antibody in the present study is important to reduce the background level of nonspecific interactions in the ELISA.

Immunization of rainbow trout with two doses of KLH, as a soluble protein, induced enhanced $\operatorname{lgM}$ secretion in the form of primary and secondry humoral responce. The primary responce represents similar phases to those of mammals (Klein, 1982) except the prolonged lag phase in the begining of $\operatorname{lgM}$ secretion. Background level of KLH nonspecific background titers, detected in nonimmunized fish, must be due to interaction of immunogens originally present in the fishary.

Fish exposed to low acute dose of $\mathrm{CuSO}_{4}$ revealed early primary response which did not reach the level of positive control fish and marked with no decline phase. The secondry responce was enhanced but the sudden drop of the last value indicates a failieur of the immune system to offer prolonged humoral protection. This is in contradiction with the finding of Thuvander (1990) who stated that the greatest proportion of seropositive fish were found 7 weeks post vaccination. Hetrick et al. (1982) revealed that striped bass exposed to copper compounds for 96 hr increased the susceptibility of fish to bacterial diseases.

High acute dose of $\mathrm{CuSO}_{4}$ caused disaperance of the lag phase at the begining of immunization, followed by enhanced primary responce marked by elevated titers of fish IgM. The secondary response was accumulative with sharp increase at the last week of expriment. This indicates hypoactivity of the down loading limb of the immune responce. Such charachteristic behavior of persistant $\operatorname{lgM}$ increase could lead to fish autoimmunefunctions. Copper, as a metal, blocks the active sites of antibody molecules and disturb the metabolism (O'Neill, 1981b). Also, reactivation of the humoral response is sometimes dangerous, especially when soluble antigens are employed. Antigen might fix to tissue cells, and upon boosting, refix to newly injected antigen causing anaphylactic shock (Barrett, 1983).
Fish exposed to acute doses of ML showed similar IgM primary and secondary patterns when compared with positive control fish in relation to time laps and secretion phases. The marked observation of elevated titers, wheter of primary or secondary responses, reflect overstimulation of the fish humoral activity. Fish exposed acute doses of PQ for revealed no indication of the lag phase, but a steady state was remarkably expressed for a whole week. The maxima of the primary response were delayed independent on the dose. The patterns of the secondary response were similar to those of fish treated with ML. These findings contradict with several reports (Zeeman and Brindley, 1975; Areechon and Plumb, 1990; Cossarini-Dunier et al., 1991). From
the very limited work that has been done on rainbow trout (Thuvander et al., 1987 and Thuvander, 1989), pesticides may exhibit immunotoxicity on immune cells and correspondingly the secretion of $\operatorname{lgM}$ is a matter of variability. Up to date, it is somewhat surprising that so little is known about how pesticides affect the immune system of fish (Areechon and Plumb, 1990).

In conclusion the ELISA used in this study was able to detect changes in the pattern of IgM secretion of the fresh water fish rainbow trout. Accordingly, the modulatory effect of the used chemical stressors, especially CuSO4, could be life threatening to fish. A different local fish modell might contribute effectively, with the present data to the problem formulation and ecological effects evaluation in Egypt.
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Table 1: Absorbance values of rainbow trout $\operatorname{IgM}$ and their corresponding reactive titers in correlation with $\mathrm{CuSO}_{4}$ treatmernt.

| Time Laps\# (weeks) |  | IgM Abs $\pm$ SE (Titer $\times 10^{3}$ ) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Negative Control Fish | Positive Control Fish | Test Fish(CuSO4 Treated) |  |
|  |  | low |  | high |
| 0 | 1st |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.020 \pm 0.003 \\ (3.2) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.020 \pm 0.003 \\ (3.2) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.020 \pm 0.003^{*} \\ (3.2) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.020 \pm 0.003 \\ (3.2) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 1 |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.030 \pm 0.003 \\ (3.2) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.030 \pm 0.005 \\ (3.2) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.001 \pm 0.001^{*} \\ (1.6) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.040 \pm 0.003 \\ (6.4) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 2 |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.010 \pm 0.005 \\ (3.2) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.010 \pm 0.001 \\ (3.2) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.040 \pm 0.010 \\ (6.4) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.120 \pm 0.008^{*} \\ (12.8) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 3 | 2nd | $\begin{gathered} 0.020 \pm 0.003 \\ (1.6) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.180 \pm 0.010^{*} \\ (12.8) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.150 \pm 0.010^{*} \\ (6.4) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.250 \pm 0.010^{* *} \\ (25.6) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 4 |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.020 \pm 0.003 \\ (1.6) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.080 \pm 0.010 \\ (6.4) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.070 \pm 0.010 \\ (6.4) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.140 \pm 0.010^{*} \\ (25.6) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 5 |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.030 \pm 0.003 \\ (0.8) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.110 \pm 0.010 \\ (1.6) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.070 \pm 0.003^{\star \star} \\ (25.6) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.500 \pm 0.003^{* *} \\ (51.2) \end{gathered}$ |
| 6 |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.020 \pm 0.003 \\ (0.8) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.080 \pm 0.010^{*} \\ (6.4) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.900 \pm 0.020^{\star \star} \\ (25.6) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.600 \pm 0.030^{\star *} \\ (51.2) \end{gathered}$ |
| 7 |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.020 \pm 0.003 \\ (0.8) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.160 \pm 0.010^{*} \\ (6.4) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.080 \pm 0.010 \\ (3.2) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.600 \pm 0.003^{* *} \\ (102.4) \end{gathered}$ |

\# Time laps refers to the elapsed time after the beginning of the experiment in none immunized fish or after the 1st immunization in the test fish. 1st and 2nd indicates immunization doses.
Significant at $\mathrm{P}<0.05$ and ** significant at $\mathrm{P}<0.01$, otherwise are none significant, as compared to the corresponding absorbance values of negative control fish.

Table 2: Absorbance values of rainbow trout IgM and their corresponding reactive titers in correlation with ML treatmernt.

| Time Laps\# (weeks) |  | IgM Abs $\pm$ SE (Titer $\times 10^{3}$ ) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Negative Control Fish | Positive Control Fish | Test Fish(ML Treated) |  |
|  |  | low |  | high |
| 0 | 1st |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0.020 \pm 0.003 \\ & (3.2) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline 0.020 \pm 0.003 \\ (3.2) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.020 \pm 0.003^{*} \\ & (3.2) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline 0.020 \pm 0.000 \\ (3.2) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| 1 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0.030 \pm 0.003 \\ & (3.2) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline 0.030 \pm 0.005 \\ (3.2) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.001 \pm 0.001^{*} \\ & (1.6) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline 0.040 \pm 0.003 \\ (6.4) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| 2 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0.010 \pm 0.005 \\ & (3.2) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline 0.010 \pm 0.001 \\ (3.2) \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.030 \pm 0.003 \\ & (6.4) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline 0.020 \pm 0.003 \\ (6.4) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| 3 | 2nd | $\begin{aligned} & 0.020 \pm 0.003 \\ & (1.6) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.180 \pm 0.010^{*} \\ & (12.8) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline 0.140 \pm 0.010 \\ (12.8) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.600 \pm 0.070^{* *} \\ & (51.2) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| 4 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0.020 \pm 0.003 \\ & (1.6) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.080 \pm 0.010 \\ & (6.4) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.050 \pm 0.008 \\ & (6.4) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline 0.070 \pm 0.008 \\ (6.4) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| 5 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0.030 \pm 0.003 \\ & (0.8) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.110 \pm 0.010 \\ & (1.6) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.100 \pm 0.020 \\ & (6.4) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.400 \pm 0.090^{*} \\ & (12.8) \end{aligned}$ |
| 6 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0.020 \pm 0.003 \\ & (0.8) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.080 \pm 0.010^{*} \\ & (6.4) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.300 \pm 0.100 \\ & (102.4) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.100 \pm 0.200^{* *} \\ & (204.8) \end{aligned}$ |
| 7 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0.020 \pm 0.003 \\ & (0.8) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.160 \pm 0.010^{*} \\ & (6.4) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.800 \pm 0.200 \\ & (25.6) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.300 \pm 0.100^{* *} \\ & (102.4) \end{aligned}$ |

\# Time laps refers to the elapsed time after the beginning of the experiment in none immunized fish or after the 1st immunization in the test fish. 1st and 2nd indicates immunization doses.

* Significant at $\mathrm{P}<0.05$ and ** significant at $\mathrm{P}<0.01$, otherwise are none significant, as compared to the corresponding absorbance values of negative control fish.

Table 3: Absorbance values of rainbow trout $\operatorname{IgM}$ and their corresponding reactive titers in correlation with PQ

## treatmernt.

| Time Laps* (weeks) |  | lgM Abs $\pm$ SE (Titer $\times 10^{3}$ ) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Negative Control Fish | Positive Control Fish | Test Fish(PQ Treated) |  |
|  |  | low |  | high |
| 0 | 1st |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.020 \pm 0.003 \\ (3.2) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.020 \pm 0.003 \\ (3.2) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.020 \pm 0.003 \\ (3.2) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.020 \pm 0.000 \\ (32) \end{gathered}$ |
| 1 |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.030 \pm 0.003 \\ (3.2) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.030 \pm 0.005 \\ (3.2) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.020 \pm 0.003 \\ (6.4) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.080 \pm 0.005^{*} \\ (12.8) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 2 |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.010 \pm 0.005 \\ (3.2) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.010 \pm 0.001 \\ (3.2) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.130 \pm 0.010^{*} \\ (12.8) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.210 \pm 0.030^{*} \\ (12.8) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 3 | 2nd | $\begin{gathered} 0.020 \pm 0.003 \\ (1.6) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.180 \pm 0.010^{*} \\ (12.8) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.300 \pm 0.030^{*} \\ (12.8) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.370 \pm 0.040^{\star} \\ (12.8) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 4 |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.020 \pm 0.003 \\ (1.6) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.080 \pm 0.010 \\ (6.4) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.340 \pm 0.020^{\star} \\ (25.6) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.700 \pm 0.090^{*} \\ (51.2) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 5 |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.030 \pm 0.003 \\ (0.8) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.110 \pm 0.010 \\ (1.6) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.020 \pm 0.003 \\ (3.2) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.100 \pm 0.009^{*} \\ (6.4) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 6 |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.020 \pm 0.003 \\ (0.8) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.080 \pm 0.010^{*} \\ (6.4) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.800 \pm 0.003^{\star *} \\ (51.2) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.300 \pm 0.003^{\star *} \\ (102.4) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 7 |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.020 \pm 0.003 \\ (0.8) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.160 \pm 0.010^{*} \\ (6.4) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.280 \pm 0.040 \\ (12.8) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.160 \pm 0.020^{*} \\ (25.6) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |

\# Time laps refers to the elapsed time after the beginning of the experiment in none immunized fish or after the 1st immunization in the test fish. 1st and 2nd indicates immunization doses.

* Significant at $\mathrm{P}<0.05$ and ** significant at $\mathrm{P}<0.01$, otherwise are none significant, as compared to the corresponding absorbance values of negative control fish.

Table 4: Evaluation parameters in relation to fish conditions.

|  | Evaluation Parameter of Titers |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \operatorname{Min}^{3} \\ \left(\times 10^{3}\right) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Max } \\ \left(\times 10^{3}\right) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Average $\left(\times 10^{3}\right)$ | Doubling* (folds) |
| Negative control | 0.8 | 3.2 | 1.9 | 1.0 |
| Positive control | 1.6 | 12.8 | 5.4 | 2.8 |
| $\mathrm{CuSO}_{4}$ treated Iow high | $\begin{aligned} & 1.6 \\ & 3.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25.6 \\ 102.4 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9.8 \\ 34.8 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.16 \\ & 18.3 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| ML treated Iow high | $\begin{aligned} & 1.6 \\ & 3.2 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 102.4 \\ & 204.8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20.6 \\ & 49.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10.8 \\ & 25.9 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| PQ treated Iow high | $\begin{aligned} & 3.2 \\ & 3.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 51.2 \\ 102.4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 16.0 \\ & 28.4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 26.9 \\ & 14.9 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |

* Doubling refers to the number of folds of the titer average values compared to the average titer of negative control fish.


## ILLUSTRATIONS

Figure 1: The $\operatorname{lgM}$ titers of rainbow trout fish in correlation with immunization with KLH. Negative control (dark shaded bars) represents the $\operatorname{lgM}$ pattern obtained from nonimmunized fish. Positive control (light shaded area) represents the normal $\lg M$ pattern of immunized fish. The trends of the two patterns were expressed as dotted line (negative control fish) and dashed line (positive fish).

Figure 2: In addition to $\operatorname{IgM}$ patterns of negative and positive contol fish shows IgM patterns o ${ }^{\text {figigure }}$ (' 'expressed as in figure ) f fish exposed to low and high concentrations ( A and o marked curves, respectivly) of $\mathrm{CuSO}_{4}$ (2a), ML (2b) and PQ (2c). The trends of all patterns were expressed as lines.
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# MODULATION OF THE HUMORAL IMMUNE RESPONSE OF RAINBOW TROUT EXPOSED TO ECOTOXIC STRESS FACTORS 

Seddek M $\mathbf{N}^{1}$,<br>Heckmann $\mathbf{R}^{\mathbf{2}}$, Elserafy $\mathbf{S}^{\mathbf{1}}$, Elezaby $\mathbf{M}^{\mathbf{1}}$ and Sharaf Eldeen $\mathbf{K H}^{1}$<br>1- Zoology department, Banha Faculty of Science, Zagazig University, Banha, Egypt<br>2- Zoology Department, Brigham Young University, Utah, USA


#### Abstract

Unacceptable risks are posed to ecological receptors from chemicals as well as many other pollutants. Chemical contamination is considered a major ecological stress factor on fresh water fish. Stress can cause a reduction in feed intake, impair growth, reproduction and immunity. Copper sulfate, Malathion and Paraquat, as industrial overuse and agricultural pesticides, can cause extensive contamination to aquatic environments. This study is concerned with the determination of the modulating effect of acute sublethal doses of the three chemicals in the fresh water fish rainbow trout (Onchorynchus mykiss). A monoclonal antibody dependent indirect enzyme linked immunosorbant assay (ELIZA) was used. The evaluation of the immune modulation was based on the determination the IgM titers in correlation to KLH immunization. Significant changes in the $\operatorname{lgM}$ patterns indicated suppression and/or enhancement of the immune system of fish. Such data could be of value for preliminary problem formulation and ecological effects evaluation in ecosystems.


# تحور الاستجابة المناعية المصلية للرانبو تروت المعرض لعوامل بيئية سامة 

> محمد نور الدين صديق' ،
> ريتشارد هيكمـان'، صبرى الصيرفىى'، مـاجدة العزبى ' وخالد شرف الدين'
> 1- قسم علم الحيوان، كلية اللطوم ببنها، جامعة الزقازيق، مصر
> r- بـ قسم علم الحيوان، جامعة بريجهام يونج، يوتا، أمريكا

ملخص

تحمل الكيماويات مثلها مثل كثير من الملوثات الأخرى أخطارا للمستقبلات البيئية. و يعد التلوث الكيميائي عاملا ضاغطا بيئيا عظيم التّأثير على اسماك المياه اللعذبة. وهذا الضغظ قد يسبب نقصا في القّرة على الاغتذاء، اختلالا في النمو والتكاثر و المناعة. وقّ يسبب تزليد استخدام كبريتات النحاس، الملاثيون و الباراكوات صناعيا أو زراعيا كككافحات للآفات تلوثا للبيئات المائية. لألك، تناولت هذه الاراسة التأثير المحور لجرعات تحت مميتة من المواد الثلاثة على سمكة المياه العذبة رانبو تروت. استخذم اختبار الادمصاص المناعى غير المباشر و المعتمد على أحد الأجسام المضادة وحيدة النسيلة. واعتمد تقييم التحوير (لمناعى على قياس مستويات الأجسام المضادة "م" ارتباطا بتمنيعها بمادة "لك ل هـ". بييتت الأنماط المتميزة

للأجسام المضادة "م" تثبيط و/أو تنشيط للجهاز المناعى مما دل على ارتباك رد الفعل المناعى. مثل هذه النتائج من الممكن أن تكون ذات فائدة فى تحديد المشكلة و تقييم المؤثرات البيئية فى النظم البيئية المائية.

