

**The impacts of chemical discharges on the reproductive biology of the bullhead**  
***Cottus gobio* and the dipper**  
***Cinclus cinclus* in the Tamar catchment**

Submitted by

**Vivienne Frances Fowler**

To the University of Exeter as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in  
Biological Sciences, March 2011

This thesis is available for Library use on the understanding that it is copyright material  
and that no quotation from this thesis may be published without proper  
acknowledgement

I certify that all material in this thesis which is not my own work has been identified and  
that no material has previously been submitted and approved for the award of a degree  
by this or any other university

.....



---

## ABSTRACT

It is now well established that a wide range of natural and anthropogenic chemicals present in the aquatic environment have the potential to disrupt the endocrine system of many organisms. In fish, many of these effects appear to be of a feminising nature, including stimulation of vitellogenin production and induction of intersex. In piscivorous birds these so called endocrine disrupting contaminants have been shown to impair reproduction, influencing reproductive behaviour, sex ratio, eggshell thickness and reproductive success. The effects seen in fish have been associated with high levels of oestrogenic activity in the effluent from waste water treatments works (WwTWs), but few studies have focused on the effects of WwTWs effluents on birds.

In this thesis, the effects of effluents from WwTWs on fish and birds were investigated in the Tamar catchment, SW England. The work spanned making detailed assessment on the oestrogenic and anti-androgenic activity of 3 WwTWs effluents, using a variety of water sampling techniques and applying both recombinant yeast oestrogen screen (YES) and recombinant yeast androgen screen (anti-YAS) bioassays to quantify the different hormonal activities. A survey was undertaken of the hormonal activities at 13 sites to determine concentrations of contaminants in the surface waters throughout the Tamar catchment, using both recombinant yeast screens and targeted analytical chemistry for specific pollutants (LC/MS-TOF and GCMS). An ELISA was developed to quantify vitellogenin (VTG) in the bullhead (our study fish sentinel) as a biomarker of oestrogen exposure, and evidence of endocrine disruption was investigated in wild populations of the bullhead, *Cottus gobio* and the dipper, *Cinclus cinclus*. Macroinvertebrates from upstream and downstream of three WwTW's effluent discharges and from three sampling sites were also sampled as an index of overall water quality in the Tamar catchment, and as an assessment of food availability for the bullheads and dippers.

For the studies on the hormonal activities in three WwTWs in the Tamar catchment, samples were collected by both spot and passive sampling; passive samplers (in replicate) were placed in the effluent discharges for a three week period, and collected on days 7, 14 and 21, spot samples were taken simultaneously. Measurement of total oestrogenic and total anti-androgenic activity was conducted using the YES and anti-YAS, respectively. Spot and passive samples were collected from 13 sites within the Tamar catchment (sampling sites were >2 km downstream of effluent discharges). Additionally, liquid chromatography mass spectrometry time-of-flight (LC/MS-TOF) was used to measure the concentration of oestrone ( $E_1$ ),  $17\beta$ -oestradiol ( $E_2$ ) and  $17\alpha$ -ethinylestradiol ( $EE_2$ ) in each sample. Gas chromatography mass spectrometry (GCMS) was used to measure the concentration of individual PBDE and PCB congeners in the spot samples only.

Levels of oestrogenic and anti-androgenic activity observed in the WwTWs effluent were comparable with those measured in effluents in the UK and in other countries. Surface waters of the Tamar, away from the WwTWs effluent discharges, contained very little oestrogenic activity ( $<1.1$  ng  $E_2$  EQs  $L^{-1}$ ), and anti-androgenic activity was undetectable. Quantification of oestrogenic activity using passive samplers showed an increasing amount of total oestrogenic activity between days 7 and 21 when measured by the both the YES and LC/MS-TOF. Low levels of PBDE congeners 47, 99, 100, 138 and 153 were detected in the spot samples taken from the Tamar catchment, with BDE 47 being the most abundant. In contrast PCBs were undetectable. Neither PBDEs nor PCBs were detected in any of the extracts from the passive samples.

---

No assay was available to measure VTG (one of the most widely used biomarkers of oestrogen exposure in fish) in the bullhead and so an enzyme linked immunosorbant assay (ELISA) was developed for application to studies on wild bullheads in the Tamar catchment. The bullhead vitellogenin (bh-VTG) ELISA was developed successfully, and proved to be sensitive and robust, with a detection range between 10.5 and 300 ng bh-VTG mL<sup>-1</sup> (undiluted), comparing favourably with other fish VTG ELISAs. Plasma VTG concentrations measured in male bullheads (collected from the same sites as for the water samples) ranged from below the limit of detection to 990 ng bh-VTG mL<sup>-1</sup>. Whether these upper levels in the range reflected VTG induction was difficult to conclude. Because of this controlled caged exposures with bullheads and trout were used to assess the relative levels of oestrogenicity in two key WwTWs effluent discharges and to determine the response sensitivity of the bullheads (and trout) to those effluents. These controlled exposures found no responses in plasma VTG in bullheads (ranging between 126 and 934 ng bh-VTG mL<sup>-1</sup>) suggesting a lack of sensitivity for VTG induction. This was supported by the inability to induce VTG in fish held in the laboratory and treated with steroidal oestrogens. For the effluent exposures on the caged rainbow trout, it was also found that there was no significant induction of VTG, a species normally sensitive to oestrogens. These findings may indicate that the fish were highly stressed due to the river being in spate and the movement of the cages during the controlled exposures. It may also be the case, however, that the use of immature female rainbow trout with a highly variable baseline plasma VTG concentration may prevent any detection of a response.

There were no signs of sexual disruption in any of the gonads analysed from either male or female wild bullheads, demonstrating that any hormonal activity present in the catchment away from the WwTWs effluents was not sufficient to induce adverse effects on reproductive development. An interesting feature noted in the male testes of the bullheads was the presence of spermatid masses, which have been recorded in 10 other Cottidae species, but not previously in the bullhead.

For the studies on dippers, eggs were collected from the nests of breeding dippers to measure for sperm numbers and morphology from sperm trapped in the perivitelline membrane (PVM), and the yolks were analysed for PBDEs, PCBs and organochlorine pesticides (OCPs) by GCMS, for E<sub>1</sub>, E<sub>2</sub>, and EE<sub>2</sub> by LC/MS-TOF. Eggs of the dipper were collected from nests at the 13 sampling sites, plus an additional three sites and over three years of field study. The number of sperm trapped in the PVM ranged between three and 188, with a mean of 68.78 ± 8.78 SE. Dipper sperm had not previously been characterised, and was found to be similar to other passerine sperm, in that the head was helical, complemented by a mitochondrial helix or keel, which continued in a spiral around the flagellum. Sperm were classed as 'abnormal' if they did not adhere to this typical structure. No assessment of motility could be made in relation to the structural abnormalities seen. Contaminants in the dipper eggs were dominated by BDE 99, an unusual result considering the dippers aquatic lifestyle. PCB 153 was the most common PCB, and *p,p'*-DDE was the most abundant OCP; all other pesticides tested were below the limit of detection, as were the levels of all three steroid oestrogens. There was inter- and intra-nest variability between contaminant burdens in all eggs as well as the number of sperm trapped in the PVM, but there was no relationship between sperm number and the level of contaminant loadings in the eggs.

There were no correlations between contaminants and oestrogenic activity measured in the water samples, and plasma VTG concentrations in bullheads or contaminant loadings in eggs, or indeed sperm number. Analysis of macroinvertebrate assemblages

---

proved that the surface waters of the Tamar catchment were of ‘very good’ quality, even in close proximity to WwTWs effluent discharges. Indeed the oestrogenicity and contaminant loadings in both eggs and surface waters were very low, and this study agrees with a national risk assessment that there appears to be no risk of intersex in fish in the Tamar catchment.

---

---

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my supervisor Professor Charles Tyler for his support and encouragement throughout this study, and for sharing his expertise with me while out on fieldwork looking for dippers, and for donning a wetsuit when needed. I would also like to thank the sponsors of this project; NERC and AstraZeneca.

I am eternally grateful to Jan Shears for being my fieldwork partner and unofficial second supervisor - Jan there's a bottle of gin waiting for you, and to Dr Anke Lange for her advice and assistance, which were invaluable in the last stages of this project. Thank you to all the members of the EMFB research group, and to all other members of the University of Exeter School of Biosciences who came out with me on fieldwork, especially Phil, Tess, Anna, Rhys, Rachel, Toby, Charlie, Laura, Okhyun (Lee), Alvine, Luanne, Lisa, Patrick, and Angela (sorry about the otters, Angela), without whom I would have had no egg samples, no water samples, and no bullheads, in fact, no project at all. And thank you to those that refused to come out because it wasn't their thing, but made me laugh anyway, especially Max. Another mention has to go to Toby and Rhys for the office banter and the Jerry Springer lifestyles.

A big thank you to Jon Goddard from the Environment Agency and Dr Ian Allen at Portsmouth University for involving me in their passive sampling project, and to the NLS, especially Anthony Gravell, who analysed the water and egg samples for me. Thank you also to Neil Cullum at Anglia Water for stepping in and conducting the oestrogen analyses on the water samples when the NLS could not. I would also like to thank Dr Christy Morrissey for supplying the PVMs of the Welsh dipper eggs, and to Dr Mike Siva-Jothy for showing me what to do with them.

A big thank you to my family for their love and support, especially my mum who I know worried about me but is also very proud, and to my sisters and their many children, my lovely nieces and nephews - you should have come and visited me more!

And finally, a very special thank you to Nick, for putting up with me through this process, for his patience, understanding, support and encouragement, and for being proud of what I do, although he admits he has no idea what that is, and for becoming a master chef and keeping house while I just messed it up.

This thesis is dedicated to my dad.

---

## **DISCLAIMER**

All work in this thesis, unless stated otherwise, was carried out by the candidate, including coordination, organisation and implementation of all fieldwork (daily for three to four months of each year), all lab work, including the yeast screens, VTG ELISAs, histopathology and PVM analyses, and all data analyses. Where lab work was carried out by a third party, coordination and organisation was carried out by the candidate. It was assumed previously that all lab work and analyses of samples would be carried out by the candidate at the facilities of the sponsor AstraZeneca (AZ), but, unfortunately due to unforeseen circumstances this was not possible. Therefore an outside supplier was sourced and, where required, funded by AZ. Due to this outsourcing, the candidate did not carry out the chemical analyses of the river water and egg yolk samples.



---

## CONTENTS

Abstract.....	iii
Acknowledgements .....	vii
Disclaimer .....	viii
List of Figures .....	xv
List of plates.....	xviii
List of tables.....	xviii
List of abbreviations .....	xx
Latin names of species .....	xxiii
<b>CHAPTER ONE: GENERAL INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>27</b>
1.1 Endocrine disruption .....	27
1.2. The endocrine system .....	29
1.2.1. Vitellogenesis .....	32
1.3. The oestrogen receptor (ER) .....	33
1.4. Mechanisms of endocrine disruption.....	33
1.5. Endocrine disrupting chemicals (EDCs) .....	35
1.5.1. Natural steroid oestrogens.....	37
1.5.2. Synthetic oestrogens .....	39
1.5.3. Natural and synthetic steroid androgens .....	41
1.5.4. Synthetic anti-androgens.....	43
1.5.5. Polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs).....	44
1.5.6. Polybrominated flame retardants (PBDEs).....	46
1.5.7. Organochlorine pesticides and fungicides .....	49
1.6. Endocrine activity of WwTWs effluents .....	50
1.6.1. Factors affecting endocrine activity of WwTWs effluents .....	52
1.7. Endocrine disruption in wildlife.....	53
1.7.1. Fish.....	53
1.7.2. Birds .....	56
1.7.3. Macroinvertebrates .....	58
1.8. Animals chosen for study .....	60
1.8.1. The bullhead <i>Cottus gobio</i> L. ....	60
1.8.1.1. Bullheads and endocrine disruption.....	63
1.8.2. The dipper <i>Cinclus cinclus</i> .....	64
1.8.2.1. Dippers and endocrine disruption .....	69
1.9. The Tamar catchment – the study area .....	70
1.10. Thesis aims.....	73
<b>CHAPTER TWO: ENDOCRINE ACTIVITY IN FIVE TRIBUTARIES OF THE RIVER TAMAR .....</b>	<b>77</b>
<b>2.1. INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>77</b>
2.1.1. The Tamar catchment and endocrine disruption .....	77
2.1.2. Methods for monitoring water quality .....	79
2.1.3. Passive sampling of river water and effluents.....	80
2.1.3.1. Polar organic chemical integrative sampler (POCIS).....	81
2.1.3.2. The Chemcatcher .....	82
2.1.3.3. Semi-permeable membrane device (SPMD).....	82
2.1.4. Methods used for monitoring water quality - measurement of endocrine activity and analytes in river and effluent samples .....	83
2.1.4.1. The use of the recombinant yeast screen (YES and anti-YAS) in determining total oestrogenic and total anti-androgenic activity.....	83
2.1.4.1.1. Theory behind the recombinant yeast screen (YES and anti-YAS).....	84
2.1.4.1.2. The yeast oestrogen screen (YES) .....	84

2.1.4.1.3. The anti-androgen yeast screen (anti-YAS) .....	85
2.1.4.2. Liquid chromatography-mass spectrometry with time of flight (LC/MS-TOF) applied to determine concentrations of E <sub>1</sub> , E <sub>2</sub> and EE <sub>2</sub> .....	87
2.1.4.3. E <sub>1</sub> , E <sub>2</sub> and EE <sub>2</sub> and the Tamar catchment.....	87
2.1.4.4. Gas chromatography-mass spectrometry (GCMS) applied to determine concentrations of different PBDE and PCB congeners .....	88
2.1.5. Biological monitoring of water quality.....	88
2.1.6. Aims.....	90
<b>2.2. MATERIALS AND METHODS .....</b>	<b>91</b>
2.2.1. Study area.....	91
2.2.1.1. Distance of sampling points from WwTWs discharges and population equivalent (PE) of each WwTWs.....	94
2.2.1.2. Discharge rates of effluent from WwTWs and dilution factor for each site .....	95
2.2.2. Preparation of test samples .....	95
2.2.2.1. Collection, clean up and extraction of 1 L river spot/test samples .....	95
2.2.2.2. Passive sampling.....	99
2.2.2.2.1. Conditioning of SDB-XC Empore <sup>TM</sup> disks for polar chemicals – theory .....	99
2.2.2.2.2. Polyethersulfone (PES) membrane cleaning/preparation.....	99
2.2.2.2.3. Preparation and make-up of SDB-XC passive samplers - protocol .....	100
2.2.2.2.4. Determination of exposure conditions for calibrations of E <sub>1</sub> , E <sub>2</sub> , and EE <sub>2</sub> using SDB-XC passive samplers.....	101
2.2.2.2.5. Estimation of exposure conditions for calibrations.....	103
2.2.2.2.6. Deployment of passive samplers and collection of test samples ..	105
2.2.2.2.7. Extraction of SDB-XC Empore <sup>TM</sup> disks .....	106
2.2.3. Recombinant yeast screen assay – YES and anti-YAS .....	107
2.2.3.1. Preparation of yeast stocks .....	107
2.2.3.2. Preparation of medium components .....	108
2.2.3.3. Growth medium.....	109
2.2.3.4. Assay medium .....	109
2.2.3.5. Preparation of standard reference chemicals.....	109
2.2.3.5.1. YES standard .....	109
2.2.3.5.2. Anti-YAS standard.....	110
2.2.3.6. Assay procedure.....	110
2.2.3.7. Calculation of endocrine activity in the YES and anti-YAS assays ....	111
2.2.4. Liquid chromatography with mass spectrometer time of flight (LC/MS-TOF) detection of E <sub>1</sub> , E <sub>2</sub> and EE <sub>2</sub> in spot and passive samples .....	113
2.2.5. Gas chromatography mass spectrometry (GCMS) detection of PBDEs and PCBs in spot and passive samples .....	114
2.2.6. Benthic macroinvertebrate analysis.....	115
2.2.6.1. Kick sampling .....	116
2.2.6.2. Identification, scoring, density and Simpson's Index of Diversity ....	116
2.2.7. Data analyses.....	118
<b>2.3. RESULTS .....</b>	<b>119</b>
2.3.1. Oestrogenic and anti-androgenic activity of three WwTWs within the Tamar catchment as determined by spot and passive sampling .....	119
2.3.1.1. Calibrations of passive samplers .....	119
2.3.1.2. Oestrogenic and anti-androgenic activity at St Leonards, Lifton and Trebulet WwTWs.....	120

---

2.3.1.3. Oestrogenic and anti-androgenic activity.....	121
2.3.1.4. Toxicity assessments of the test samples in the anti-YAS .....	123
2.3.1.5. Relationship between oestrogenic and anti-androgenic activity .....	123
2.3.2. Oestrogenic and anti-androgenic activity of surface waters in the Tamar catchment.....	123
2.3.2.1. Oestrogenic and anti-androgenic activity as determined by spot sampling .....	123
2.3.2.2. Oestrogenic and anti-androgenic activity as determined by passive sampling .....	125
2.3.2.3. Relationship between spot and passive sampling methods for oestrogenic activity.....	127
2.3.2.4. Effect of distance from nearest WwTWs on endocrine activity at sampling sites.....	127
2.3.2.5. Effect of population equivalent (PE) from nearest WwTWs on endocrine activity at sampling sites.....	129
2.3.2.6. PBDE and PCB congener concentrations determined by spot sampling .....	129
2.3.2.7. PBDE and PCB congener concentrations as determined by passive sampling .....	131
2.3.2.8. Community profiles and correlation of contaminants for each sampling site .....	131
2.3.3. Macroinvertebrates .....	134
2.3.3.1. Macroinvertebrate community analysis for each sampling site .....	135
<b>2.4. DISCUSSION .....</b>	<b>137</b>
2.4.1. Oestrogenic activity in WwTWs effluents.....	137
2.4.2. Anti-androgenic activity in WwTWs effluents .....	141
2.4.3. Oestrogenic activity in surface waters of the Tamar catchment .....	142
2.4.4. Anti-androgenic activity in surface waters of the Tamar catchment.....	145
2.4.5. Endocrine activity of study sites related to distance from, PE of, and treatment employed by, Tamar catchment WwTWs.....	145
2.4.6. PBDE and PCB concentrations in the Tamar catchment.....	146
2.4.7. Macroinvertebrates in the Tamar catchment.....	148
2.4.8. Conclusions .....	150
<b>CHAPTER THREE: ASSESSING WHETHER WILD BULLHEAD (<i>COTTUS</i> <i>GOBIO</i>) POPULATIONS FROM SITES DOWNSTREAM OF WWTWS EFFLUENT DISCHARGES SHOW SIGNS OF SEXUAL DISRUPTION IN THE TAMAR CATCHMENT .....</b>	<b>153</b>
<b>3.1. INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>153</b>
3.1.1. Population level effects of EDCs .....	154
3.1.2. Sex determination and reproduction in teleost fish .....	155
3.1.2.1. Spermatogenesis .....	156
3.1.2.2. Oogenesis .....	157
3.1.2.3. Spermatogenesis and oogenesis in the bullhead <i>Cottus gobio</i> .....	157
3.1.3. Vitellogenin (VTG) induction in fish .....	158
3.1.3.1. VTG induction as a biomarker of oestrogen exposure .....	159
3.1.4. DNA sequencing of the bullhead VTG gene .....	162
3.1.5. Experimental aims .....	163
<b>3.2. MATERIAL AND METHODS.....</b>	<b>165</b>
3.2.1. Study area and fieldwork .....	165
3.2.1.1. Electrofishing .....	166
3.2.2. Establishing a bullhead VTG (bh-VTG) ELISA.....	167
3.2.2.1. Exposure to E <sub>2</sub> and EE <sub>2</sub> .....	168

---

---

3.2.2.2. Fish maintenance .....	169
3.2.2.3. Exposure to E <sub>2</sub> – immersion in water .....	169
3.2.2.4. Exposure to EE <sub>2</sub> – peritoneal injection .....	169
3.2.2.5. Test chemicals .....	169
3.2.2.6. Blood sampling .....	170
3.2.2.7. Purification of bh-VTG by fast protein liquid chromatography (FPLC) .....	170
3.2.2.8. Production of polyclonal bh-VTG antibodies .....	172
3.2.2.9. Development of a homologous competitive ELISA for bullhead vitellogenin (bh-VTG).....	173
3.2.2.9.1. VTG ELISA buffers .....	175
3.2.2.9.2. Bh-VTG ELISA development and optimisation.....	176
3.2.2.9.3. Validation of the bh-VTG ELISA for the measurement of VTG in plasma in the bullhead .....	177
3.2.2.9.4. Bh-VTG coatings and standards .....	177
3.2.2.9.5. General protocol for the routine bh-VTG ELISA.....	177
3.2.2.9.6. Analysis of ELISA data.....	179
3.2.3. mRNA expression analysis of target genes.....	179
3.2.3.1. RNA extraction of bullhead livers .....	180
3.2.3.2. General protocol for RNA extraction .....	180
3.2.3.3. Agarose gel electrophoresis of bullhead RNA .....	182
3.2.3.4. General protocol for electrophoresis.....	182
3.2.3.5. Reverse transcription of bullhead RNA .....	183
3.2.4. Obtaining appropriate primers for amplifying the bh-VTG gene .....	184
3.2.4.1. Degenerate primer design and PCR.....	184
3.2.5. Sampling wild fish from the Tamar catchment .....	187
3.2.6. Condition factor (K), Gonadosomatic index (GSI) and Hepatosomatic index (HSI).....	187
3.2.7. Plasma concentrations of VTG in wild bullheads from the Tamar catchment .....	188
3.2.8. Gonadal histology.....	188
3.2.8.1. Fixation of bullhead gonads .....	188
3.2.8.2. Wax impregnation, embedding and sectioning of gonad.....	189
3.2.8.3. Staining of histological sections .....	190
3.2.8.4. Analysis of histological sections .....	191
3.2.9. Controlled caged exposure at two WwTws in the Tamar catchment .....	192
3.2.9.1. Cages .....	192
3.2.9.2. Fish.....	192
3.2.9.3. Collection and sampling of fish.....	193
3.2.9.4. Collection of water and effluent samples during exposure .....	193
3.2.9.5. Plasma concentrations of VTG bullheads and in rainbow trout from the controlled caged exposure in the Tamar catchment .....	193
3.2.10. Data analyses.....	194
<b>3.3. RESULTS .....</b>	<b>195</b>
3.3.1. Bh-VTG ELISA development.....	195
3.3.1.1. Purification of bh-VTG .....	195
3.3.1.2. Optimisation of the bh-VTG ELISA.....	196
3.3.1.3. Reproducibility and working range (sensitivity) .....	198
3.3.1.4. Dilution curves of plasma containing bh-VTG .....	198
3.3.2. RNA extraction and degenerate primers.....	200
3.3.3. Collection of wild bullheads .....	201

---

---

3.3.4. Analysis of wild bullheads: Condition factor (K), Gonadosomatic index (GSI) and Hepatosomatic index (HSI) .....	201
3.3.5. Analysis of wild bullheads: Plasma concentrations of VTG .....	202
3.3.6. Gonadal development and status of male and female bullheads .....	204
3.3.6.1. Ovaries .....	205
3.3.6.2. Testes .....	205
3.3.6.2.1. Spermatid masses .....	206
3.3.6.3. Intersex .....	206
3.3.7. Caged exposure study: oestrogenic activity of water and effluent samples during caged exposure study .....	210
3.3.8. Caged exposure study: fish .....	210
3.3.8.1. Condition factor (K) in caged fish .....	210
3.3.8.2. Caged exposure study: Plasma concentrations of VTG in exposed fish .....	211
<b>3.4. DISCUSSION .....</b>	<b>213</b>
3.4.1. Developing the Bh-VTG ELISA .....	213
3.4.2. Bh-VTG ELISA validation .....	215
3.4.3. Development of a VTG mRNA RT-qPCR assay .....	215
3.4.4. Analysis of wild bullheads: Plasma concentrations of VTG .....	216
3.4.5. Analysis of wild bullheads: GSI, HSI, and gonads, .....	218
3.4.6. Analysis of caged bullheads: Plasma concentrations of VTG .....	221
3.4.7. Conclusion .....	224
<b>CHAPTER FOUR: ASSESSING THE LEVEL OF CONTAMINANT LOADINGS AND SPERM NUMBER IN THE EGGS OF THE DIPPER <i>CINCLUS CINCLUS</i>, IN RELATION TO EDC CONCENTRATIONS IN THE TAMAR CATCHMENT .....</b>	<b>227</b>
<b>4.1. INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>227</b>
4.1.1. EDCs and the dipper .....	228
4.1.1.1. Bioconcentration and bioaccumulation of contaminants .....	229
4.1.1.2. Contaminant burden of eggs .....	232
4.1.2. Spermatozoa analyses .....	235
4.1.3. Aims .....	237
<b>4.2. MATERIALS AND METHODS .....</b>	<b>239</b>
4.2.1. Identification of nesting sites, and collection and measurement of eggs ....	239
4.2.1.1. Management of eggs for analysis .....	242
4.2.2. Analyses of dipper egg yolks .....	242
4.2.2.1. Gas chromatography mass spectrometry (GCMS) analysis of dipper eggs for PBDEs, PCBs and OPEs .....	242
4.2.2.2. Liquid chromatography with mass spectrometer time of flight (LC/TOF-MS) detection of E <sub>1</sub> , E <sub>2</sub> and EE <sub>2</sub> in dipper eggs .....	243
4.2.3. Bioconcentration Factor (BCFs) .....	243
4.2.4. Preparation of egg for yolk extraction and collection of perivitelline membrane (PVM) for sperm analysis .....	244
4.2.5. Welsh dipper eggs .....	245
4.2.6. Data analyses .....	245
<b>4.3. RESULTS .....</b>	<b>247</b>
4.3.1. Numbers and locations of dipper nesting (egg collection) sites .....	247
4.3.2. Egg morphometrics .....	247
4.3.2.1. Welsh dipper egg morphometrics .....	248
4.3.3. Chemical analysis of Tamar dipper egg yolks .....	254
4.3.3.1. Liquid chromatography with mass spectrometer time of flight (LC/TOF-MS) detection of E <sub>1</sub> , E <sub>2</sub> and EE <sub>2</sub> in eggs .....	254

---

---

4.3.3.2. Gas chromatography mass spectrometry (GCMS) detection of PBDEs, PCBs and OCPs in eggs.....	255
4.3.3.2.1. Contaminant profiles for eggs analysed by GCMS .....	259
4.3.4. The relationship between contaminants in dipper eggs and contaminants in the environment.....	262
4.3.4.1. Bioconcentration factor (BCF) of contaminants in dipper eggs.....	262
4.3.5. Analyses of sperm trapped in the PVM of dipper eggs .....	263
4.3.5.1. Inter- and intra- river, and intra-nest analysis of sperm number .....	264
4.3.5.2. Sperm morphology .....	265
4.3.5.2.1. Welsh dipper sperm number and morphology.....	271
4.3.5.2.2. Analysis on sperm number in relation to nest-site location and distance of nearest WwTW's effluent discharge .....	271
<b>4.4. DISCUSSION .....</b>	<b>272</b>
4.4.1. Nest-sites and prey availability in the Tamar catchment .....	272
4.4.2. Environmental contaminants in dipper eggs .....	274
4.4.2.1. PBDEs.....	274
4.4.2.2. <i>p,p'</i> -DDE and PCBs.....	277
4.4.2.3. Bioconcentration and biomagnification factors.....	280
4.4.2.4. Possible sources of organic pollutants in dipper eggs in the Tamar catchment .....	282
4.4.3. Spermatozoa number in the PVM .....	283
4.4.4. Sperm morphology .....	286
4.4.5. Relationship between contaminant loadings measured in eggs and sperm characteristics.....	287
4.4.6. Conclusions .....	288
<b>CHAPTER FIVE: GENERAL DISCUSSION.....</b>	<b>291</b>
<b>REFERENCES .....</b>	<b>303</b>
<b>APPENDIX A – WILD BULLHEAD DATA.....</b>	<b>345</b>
<b>APPENDIX B – CAGED BULLHEAD DATA.....</b>	<b>355</b>
<b>APPENDIX C – CAGED TROUT DATA .....</b>	<b>357</b>

---

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1	The hypothalamic-pituitary-gonadal axis	30
Figure 1.2	Chemical structures of cholesterol and representatives of the three major classes of vertebrate sex steroids	31
Figure 1.3	The chemical structure of (A) 17 $\alpha$ -ethinylestradiol (EE <sub>2</sub> ) and (B) diethylstilbestrol	39
Figure 1.4	The chemical structure of (A) testosterone and (B) 5 $\alpha$ - dihydrotestosterone (DHT)	42
Figure 1.5	The chemical structure of PCBs	44
Figure 1.6	The basic structure of BDE congeners	47
Figure 1.7	Distribution within the UK of the bullhead <i>Cottus gobio</i>	61
Figure 1.8	Distribution of the dipper <i>Cinclus cinclus</i> in the UK and Ireland 1988 – 1991	67
Figure 1.9	The Tamar Catchment	71
Figure 2.1	The yeast screen construct	86
Figure 2.2	Geographical location of the 16 sites that were spot sampled, 13 sites that were sampled using passive samplers, and 3 WwTWs discharges that were spot and passively sampled	92
Figure 2.3	Schematic diagram of SDB-XC passive sampler configuration	100
Figure 2.4	The rig used for the calibrations of the passive samplers	102
Figure 2.5	Chemcatcher passive samplers from the first survey	107
Figure 2.6	Plate configuration for the YES and the anti-YAS	112
Figure 2.7	Chromatogram of the standard profile of BDE congeners under GCMS conditions	115
Figure 2.8	Diagram of kick sampling method	117
Figure 2.9	Mean uptake rates of E <sub>1</sub> , E <sub>2</sub> and EE <sub>2</sub> in calibration study for passive samplers	119
Figure 2.10	Oestrogenic and anti-androgenic activity of Lifton and St Leonards WwTWs as determined by spot and passive sampling	120
Figure 2.11	The total oestrogenic activity of two WwTWs effluents, collected by passive and by spot sampling, on days 7, 14 and 21	122
Figure 2.12	Total anti-androgenic activity of two WwTWs effluents collected passively and by spot sampling on days 7, 14 and 21	122
Figure 2.13	Mean oestrogenic activity at all 13 sites passively sampled for days 7, 14 and 21, as assessed by the YES	126
Figure 2.14	Mean total oestrogenic activity (E <sub>1</sub> + E <sub>2</sub> + EE <sub>2</sub> ) at all 13 sites passively sampled for days 7, 14 and 21, as assessed by LC/MS-TOF	126

---

Figure 2.15	The total oestrogenic activity of the 13 sites passively sampled on days 7, 14 and 21, as assessed by the YES and LC/MS-TOF	127
Figure 2.16	Relationship between YES (ng E <sub>2</sub> EQ L <sup>-1</sup> s) and LC/MS-TOF (ng L <sup>-1</sup> ) methods in determining oestrogenic activity of all 156 samples	128
Figure 2.17	Relationship between oestrogenic activity determined by the YES (ng E <sub>2</sub> EQ L <sup>-1</sup> s) and LC/MS-TOF (ng L <sup>-1</sup> ) and the distance from each sampling site and the nearest WwTWs effluent discharge	128
Figure 2.18	Mean concentrations of the BDE congeners measured for all 16 sample sites	130
Figure 2.19	Total PBDE concentration for all 16 sample sites	131
Figure 2.20	Multidimensional scaling ordination of the contribution of each contaminant analysed from the river water samples for each site	132
Figure 2.21	Plot of loadings from PCA, showing correlations between contaminants at all sampling sites	134
Figure 2.22	Dendrogram of the similarity of each site, as determined by macroinvertebrate communities	136
Figure 3.1	Geographical location of bullhead sampling sites in September and October 2007, and caged trout and bullhead experiment at St Leonards WwTWs (STLW) and Lifton WwTWs (LW) in August and September 2010	166
Figure 3.2	Schematic representation of the bh-VTG ELISA protocol used to quantify levels of VTG in bullhead plasma	174
Figure 3.3	Vitellogenin elution profiles of bullhead plasma samples (absorbance 280 nm)	195
Figure 3.4	SDS-PAGE of fractions confirming the purity of bullhead VTG.	196
Figure 3.5	Determination of the optimal concentration of bullhead vitellogenin (bh-VTG) and primary antibody for development of the bh-VTG enzyme linked immunosorbant assay (ELISA)	197
Figure 3.6	Standard curve for percent binding (%) against bh-VTG concentration (ng mL <sup>-1</sup> )	199
Figure 3.7	Cross reaction of plasma from female and male bullheads <i>Cottus gobio</i> in the bh-VTG ELISA	199
Figure 3.8	High quality RNA extracted from the liver of female bullheads	200
Figure 3.9	Example of gels run using degenerate primers	200
Figure 3.10	Mean condition factor (K) of male and female bullheads at each site (A), mean GSI for male and female bullheads at all sites (B), and mean HSI for male and female bullheads at each site	206
Figure 3.11	The total bh-VTG concentration for both male and female bullheads at all sites	204
Figure 3.12	Mean bh-VTG concentration of male bullheads at all sites (closed bars), and mean bh-VTG concentration of female bullheads at all sites (open bars)	204



Figure 3.13	Proportion of the developmental stages of oocytes in female bullheads from each site in the Tamar catchment	206
Figure 3.14	Mean initial and final plasma vitellogenin levels in immature female rainbow trout exposed to effluents from both St Leonards and Lifton WwTWs	212
Figure 4.1	Location of dipper nests from which eggs were collected during the 2006, 2007 and 2008 breeding seasons	239
Figure 4.2	Mean egg length for years 2006 to 2008 (A), mean egg weight for years 2006 to 2008 (B), mean egg breadth for years 2006 to 2008 (C), mean egg volume for years 2006 to 2008 (D), mean ESI for years 2006 to 2008, for all sites.	251- 252
Figure 4.3	Comparison between the mean breadth (A) and mean volume (B) for eggs collected from the Tamar catchment and in Wales	254
Figure 4.4	Mean concentration of dominant contaminants (BDEs 47, 99, 100, 153 and 154, PCBs 138, 153, 180, and <i>p,p'</i> -DDE) measured in all egg samples	255
Figure 4.5	Total concentration of all contaminants ( $\text{ng g}^{-1}$ ) found in eggs collected at each site	256
Figure 4.6	Multidimensional scaling ordination of the contribution of each contaminant analysed from the dipper eggs for each site	259
Figure 4.7	Component score plot from principal component analysis: distribution of contaminants from different sites based on concentration	261
Figure 4.8	Multidimensional scaling ordination of contaminant loadings found in river water samples and dipper egg samples at each site	262
Figure 4.9	Total sperm number for each egg	264
Figure 4.10	Multidimensional scaling ordination of the contribution of sperm number at each site	265
Figure 4.11	Proportion (%) of sperm classified as normal or abnormal, for the years 2006, 2007 and 2008	270
Figure 4.12	Proportion (%) of sperm classified as normal or abnormal, for the Welsh dipper eggs	271

---

## LIST OF PLATES

Plate 1.1	The dipper <i>Cinclus cinclus</i>	65
Plate 1.2	Dipper nests	68
Plate 1.3	Dipper egg	68
Plate 3.1	Fast protein liquid chromatography (FPLC)	171
Plate 3.2	A coated plate showing the determination of the optimal concentration of bullhead vitellogenin (bh-VTG) and primary antibody for development of the bh-VTG enzyme linked immunosorbant assay (ELISA)	197
Plate 3.3	Photomicrograph of a section of a typical bullhead ovary	207
Plate 3.4	Photomicrograph of a section of a typical bullhead testis lobule	207
Plate 3.5	Photomicrograph of sections of bullhead ovaries from various sites within the Tamar catchment	208
Plate 3.6	Photomicrograph of sections of bullhead testes from different sites in the Tamar catchment	208
Plate 4.1	Dipper sperm classified as 'normal', stained with Hoescht 33342	266-267
Plate 4.2	Dipper sperm showing different levels of abnormality, stained with Hoescht 33342	268-269

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1	The proportions of each BDE commercial mixture made up of the different sized congener groups, tri-BDE with three bromines to deca-BDE with ten	48
Table 2.1	Comparisons of the advantages and disadvantages of samples collection using spot and passive sampling	81
Table 2.2	Site locations for spot and passive sampling	93
Table 2.3	List of discharges relevant to this study, the river in which they are located, the distance from discharge to selected study site, the final treatment of that WwTWs, and the population equivalent (PE).	94
Table 2.4	The mean flow rate for each WwTWs ( $M^3 S^{-1}$ ), the river mean flow rate ( $M^3 S^{-1}$ ) and the resulting dilution ratio	95
Table 2.5	Date samples collected for each method of collection (spot, passive or kick) and analysis (YES, anti-YAS, LC/MS-TOF or GCMS)	97-98
Table 2.6	Data used for calculations of passive sampler calibrations for $E_1$ , $E_2$ , and $EE_2$	104
Table 2.7	Mean oestrogenic activity (ng $E_2$ EQ L <sup>-1</sup> s) and mean anti-androgenic activity ( $\mu g$ L <sup>-1</sup> FLUT EQs) of all 16 sites spot sampled	124

Table 2.8	Activity of E <sub>1</sub> , E <sub>2</sub> and EE <sub>2</sub> (ng L <sup>-1</sup> ) as measured by LC/MS-TOF from all 16 sites spot sampled in June 2008	124
Table 2.9	Concentration of PBDE congeners (ng L <sup>-1</sup> ) analysed by GCMS for all 16 sites spot sampled in June 2008	130
Table 2.10	SIMPER analysis of the top eight contaminants characterising the dissimilarity between the rivers Lyd and Inny	133
Table 2.11	BMWP score, ASPT score, density, and Simpson's Index of Diversity (1-D) as determined by macroinvertebrate kick sampling for six sites sampled	135
Table 3.1	Oligonucleotide primer sequences	186
Table 3.2	Autoembedder processing times	189
Table 3.3	Haematoxylin-Eosin staining protocol used for wax-embedded sections	191
Table 4.1	Data on all dipper eggs collected from nest-sites within the Tamar catchment for years 2006, 2007 and 2008	249-250
Table 4.2	Data on all dipper eggs collected from Welsh nest-sites in 2008	253
Table 4.3	Concentration of BDE congeners (ng g <sup>-1</sup> ) analysed by GCMS for all eggs collected from nests during the 2006, 2007 and 2008 breeding seasons	257
Table 4.4	Concentration of PCB congeners and OCPs (ng g <sup>-1</sup> ) analysed by GCMS for all eggs collected from nests during the 2006, 2007 and 2008 breeding seasons	258
Table 4.5	Bioconcentration factors (BCF) for contaminants BDEs 47, 99, 100, 153, 154	263
Table 4.6	Mean contaminant concentrations (ng g <sup>-1</sup> lipid) in different species of bird	281

---

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

°C	Degrees celsius
µg	Microgram
µL	Microlitres
µM	Micromolar
11-KT	11-ketotestosterone
AHH	Aryl hydrocarbon hydroxylase
ANOVA	Analysis of variance
Anti-YAS	Yeast anti-androgen screen
AR	Androgen receptor
ASD	Androstenedione
B/BO	Realative binding
BO	Maxium binding
BAF	Bioaccumulation factor
BCF	Bioconcentration factor
BDE	Brominated diphenyl ether
bh-VTG	Bullhead VTG
BLAST	Basic Local Alignment Search Tool
BMF	Biomagnification factor
BOD	Biological oxygen demand
bp	Base pair
BSA	Bovine serum albumin
C	Carbon
CA	Cortical alveolus
CAS	Chemical abstract service
cDNA	Complementary DNA
COD	Chemical oxygen demand
c-VTG	Carp VTG
DDT	Dichlorodiphenyltrichloroethane
DES	Diethylstilbestrol
DHT	5α-dihydrotestosterone
DNA	Deoxyribose nucleic acid
DNase	Deoxyribonuclease
dNTP	Deoxyribonucleotide triphosphate
E1	Oestrone
E2	17β-oestradiol
E2 Eqs	17β-oestradiol equivalents
E3	Oestrone
EA	Environment Agency
EDCs	Endocrine disrupting chemicals
EDTA	Ethylenedinitrilotetraacetic acid
EE2	17α-ethinylestradiol
ELISA	Enzyme linked immunosorbant assay
ER	Oestrogen receptor
EROD	Ethoxyresorufin O-deethylase
EtOH	Ethanol
EU	European Union
FLUT	Flutamide
FPLC	Fast protein liquid chromatography
FSH	Folicle stimulating hormone
FSSP	Female-specific serum protein
g	Gram
GCMS	Gas chromatography mass spectrometry
GFC	Gel filtration chromatography

---

GLM	General linear model
GnRH	Gonadotrophin-releasing hormone
GSI	Gonadosomatic index
GtH	Gonadotrophin hormone
HPG	Hypothalamic-pituitary-gonadal axis
HPLC	High performance liquid chromatography
HSI	Hepatosomatic index
IgG	Immunoglobulin G
IMS	Industrial methylated spirit
IUPAC	International Union of Pure and Applied Chemistry
K	Condition factor
kDa	Kilodalton
L	Litre
LC/MS-TOF	Liquid chromatography mass spectrometry with time of flight
LDL	Low density lipoproteins
LH	Leutinisising hormone
M	Molar
MeOH	Methanol
mg	Milligram
min	Minute
mL	Millilitre
mM	Millimolar
M-MLV	Moloney Murine Leukaemia Virus
mRNA	Messenger RNA
MT	Methyltestosterone
NaCl	Sodium chloride
NaOH	Sodium hydroxide
NCBI	National centre for biotechnology information
ng	nanogram
nm	Nanometre
NP	Nonylphenol
NSB	Non-specific binding
OCP	Organochlorine pesticide
OPD	Ortho-phenylene diamine
<i>p,p'</i> -DDE	Dichlorodiphenyldichloroethylene
P450	Cytochrome P450
Pab	Primary antibody
PAH	Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon
PBDEs	Polybrominated diphenyl ethers
PBS	Phosphate buffered saline
PCBs	Polychlorinated biphenyls
PCR	Polymerase chain reaction
PGC	Primordial germ cell
pM	Picomolar
PO	Primary oocyte
POP	Persistent organic pollutants
PVM	Perivitelline membrane
RIA	Radioimmunoassay
RNA	Ribose nucleic acid
Rnase	Ribonuclease
RT-qPCR	Real-time quantitative PCR
rt-VTG	Rainbow trout VTG
Sab	Secondary antibody
SC	Spermatocytes
SDS-PAGE	sodium dodecyl sulfate polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis
SGA	Spermatogonia A

---

---

SGB	Spermatogonia B
SO	Secondary oocyte
ST	Spermatids
STM	Spermatid masses
TBE	Tris-borate EDTA
TBT	Trbutyltin
TCDD	2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzo- <i>p</i> -dioxin
TIU	Trypsin inhibitor unit
Tris-HCl	Tris hydroxymethylaminomethane hydrogen chloride
Tween-20	Polyoxyethylene sorbitan mono laurate
UK	United Kingdom
US	United States
UV	Ultra-violet
VO	Vitellogenic oocyte
VTG	Vitellogenin
WwTWs	Waste water treatment works
YAS	Yeast androgen screen
YES	Yeast oestrogen screen

---

## LATIN NAMES OF SPECIES

### Fish

Atlantic cod	<i>Gadus morhua</i>
Atlantic croker	<i>Micropogonias undulatus</i>
Atlantic salmon	<i>Salmo salar</i>
Brown trout	<i>Salmo trutta</i>
Bullhead	<i>Cottus gobio</i>
Carp	<i>Cyprinus carpio</i>
Carrion crow	<i>Corvus corone</i>
Chinook salmon	<i>Oncorhynchus tshawytscha</i>
Chum salmon	<i>Oncorhynchus keta</i>
Clownfish	<i>Amphiprion spp</i>
Common Japanese conger eel	<i>Conger mynaster</i>
Cutthroat trout	<i>Oncorhynchus clarki</i>
European eel	<i>Anguilla anguilla</i>
European flounder	<i>Platichthys flesus</i>
Fathead minnow	<i>Pimephales promelas</i>
Gag grouper	<i>Mycteroperca microlepis</i>
Gibel carp	<i>Carassius auratus gibel carpio</i>
Goldsinny wrasse	<i>Ctenolabrus rupestris</i>
Greenback flounder	<i>Rhombosolea tapirina</i>
Gudgeon	<i>Gobio gobio</i>
Japanese eel	<i>Anguilla japonica</i>
Mangrove killifish	<i>Rivulus marmoratus</i>
Medaka	<i>Oryzias latipes</i>
Mosquitofish	<i>Gambusia affinis</i>
Mottled sculpin	<i>Cottus bairdii</i>
Moustached warbler	<i>Acrocephalus melanopogon</i>
Mummichog	<i>Funulus heteroclitus</i>
Parrot fish	<i>Scarus spp</i>
Perch	<i>Perca fluviatilis</i>
Rainbow trout	<i>Oncorhynchus mykiss</i>
River sculpin	<i>Cottus hangioensis</i>
Roach	<i>Rutilus rutilus</i>
Rockfish	<i>Sebastes schlegeli</i>
Sea bream	<i>Sparus aurata</i>
Siamese fighting fish	<i>Betta splendens</i>
Spoonhead sculpin	<i>Cottus ricei</i>
Three-spined stickleback	<i>Gasterosteus aculeatus</i>
Zebrafish	<i>Danio rerio</i>

---

**Birds**

Adelie penguin	<i>Pygoscelis adeliae</i>
American dipper	<i>Cinclus mexicanus</i>
Arctic tern	<i>Sterna paradisaea</i>
Bald eagle	<i>Haliaeetus leucocephalus</i>
Barn owl	<i>Tyto alba</i>
Black kite	<i>Milvus migrans</i>
Blue tit	<i>Cyanistes caeruleus</i>
Brown pelican	<i>Pelicanus occidentalis</i>
Bullfinch	<i>Pyrrhula pyrrhula</i>
Buzzard	<i>Buteo buteo</i>
Collared flycatcher	<i>Ficedula albicollis</i>
Common tern	<i>Sterna hirundo</i>
Domestic fowl	<i>Gallus domesticus</i>
Double-crested cormorant	<i>Phalacrocorax auritus</i>
Eider duck	<i>Somateria mollissima</i>
Forsters tern	<i>Sterna forsteri</i>
Golden eagle	<i>Aquila chrysaetos</i>
Great cormorant	<i>Phalacrocorax carbo</i>
Great crested grebe	<i>Podiceps cristatus</i>
Great tit	<i>Parus major</i>
Grey heron	<i>Ardea cinerea</i>
Guillemot	<i>Uria aalge</i>
Herring gull	<i>Larus argentatus</i>
Imperial eagle	<i>Aquila heliaca</i>
Japanese quail	<i>Coturnix japonica</i>
Kestrel	<i>Falco tinnunculus</i>
Kingfisher	<i>Alcedo Atthis</i>
Little egret	<i>Egretta garzetta</i>
Little owl	<i>Athene noctua</i>
Long-eared owl	<i>Asio otus</i>
Marsh harrier	<i>Circus aeruginosus</i>
Night heron	<i>Nycticorax nycticorax</i>
Osprey	<i>Pandion haliaetus</i>
Ostrich	<i>Struthio camelus</i>
Peregrine falcon	<i>Falco peregrinus</i>
Prothonatory warbler	<i>Protonaria citrea</i>
Ring dove	<i>Streptopelia risoria</i>
Ring-necked pheasant	<i>Phasianus colchicus</i>
Sparrowhawk	<i>Accipiter nisus</i>
Starling	<i>Sturnus vulgaris</i>
Tawny owl	<i>Strix aluco</i>
White-throated dipper	<i>Cinclus cinclus</i>
Zebra finch	<i>Taeniopygia guttata</i>



---

**Others**

African clawed frog	<i>Xenopus laevis</i>
American alligator	<i>Alligator mississippiensis</i>
American mink	<i>Mustela vison</i>
Bank vole	<i>Myodes glareolus</i>
Beluga whale	<i>Delphinapterus leucas</i>
Bottlenose dolphin	<i>Tursiops truncatus</i>
Cecropia moth	<i>Hyalophora cecropia</i>
Common dog whelk	<i>Nucella lapillus</i>
Eastern mudsnail	<i>Nassarius obsoletus</i>
Echiuran worm	<i>Bonellia viridis</i>
Fox	<i>Vulpes vulpes</i>
Green frog	<i>Rana clamitans</i>
Harbour porpoise	<i>Phocoena phocoena</i>
Harbour seal	<i>Phoca vitulina</i>
Humpback whale	<i>Megaptera novaeangliae</i>
Impala	<i>Aepyceros melampus</i>
Mink frog	<i>Rana septentrionalis</i>
Northern leopard frog	<i>Rana pipiens</i>
Old field mouse	<i>Peromyscus polionotus</i>
Otter	<i>Lutra lutra</i>
Polar bear	<i>Ursina maritimus</i>
Western spotted frog	<i>Rana petriosa</i>
Wood mouse	<i>Apodemus sylvaticus</i>
Zebra mussel	<i>Dreissena polymorpha</i>