

Karyological Analysis of *Puntius conchonius* (Hamilton, 1822) (Pisces, Cyprinidae), a new cytotype from Dal Lake Srinagar Kashmir, J&K, India

A.G. Farooq^{1*}, A. R. Yousuf¹ and N.K. Tripathi².

¹Limnology and Fisheries Laboratory, Centre of Research for Development, University of Kashmir, Hazratbal Srinagar-190 006, India

²Animal Cytogenetics Laboratory, Deptt. Of Zoology, University of Jammu, India.

Abstract: The karyotypic and cytological characteristics of Rosy barb, *Puntius conchonius* (Hamilton, 1822) (cyprinidae) were investigated by examining metaphase chromosomes spreads from the anterior kidney following Thorgaard and Disney (1990). The fishes were obtained from the local fishermen and transported live to the Limnology and Fisheries Laboratory of Centre of Research for Development, University of Kashmir. Ten fish were injected intraperitoneally with two doses of phytohemagglutinin (PHA), 4 μ g g⁻¹body weight with a 20-h interval to induce cell division. After 8 h in 20°C water, the fish were injected intraperitoneally with colchicine 0.05% @ 0.5ml/50g body weight to depress the cell division in the metaphase stage and left for 2-3 h before sacrificing. Kidney and gill epithelia were used for karyotype analysis. The diploid chromosome number of the fish was 2n=50, consisting of 11 pairs of metacentric, 8 pairs of submetacentric and 6 pairs of telocentric chromosomes respectively. Centromeric index, arm ratio and Fundamental Number were determined as 0-50, 1- ∞ and 88 respectively. No heteromorphic sex chromosomes were cytologically detected.

[A.G. Farooq, A. R. Yousuf and N.K. Tripathi. **Karyological Analysis of *Puntius conchonius* (Hamilton, 1822) (Pisces, Cyprinidae), a new cytotype from Dal Lake Srinagar Kashmir, J&K, India.** *Academ Arena* 2014;6(9):65-69]. (ISSN 1553-992X). <http://www.sciencepub.net/academia>. 12

Key words: chromosome; *Puntius conchonius*; Dal Lake; karyotype

Introduction

Cyprinid fishes have been favourite subjects of extensive cytogenetic investigations with particular reference to evolutionary aspects (Taki *et al.* 1977). Polyploidization has been demonstrated in the course of chromosomal evolution of this family (Ohno *et al.* 1967). The increasing knowledge of chromosomes is now providing reliable information on the phyletic relationship in the cyprinidae to a certain extent (Taki *et al.* 1977).

The genus *Puntius* Hamilton represents the species of the largest number among all species of cyprinid genera in Asian tropics. Fishes of this genus occur throughout the region from Pakistan to southern China inhabiting various types of freshwaters. *Puntius conchonius* is found in north eastern India (Taki *et al.* 1977) and in Kashmir it is found in Dal Lake and Mansbal Lake (Kullander *et al.* 1999). The karyotype of various Indian *puntius* species has been worked out earlier but there has been no report from the valley of Kashmir.

The analysis of chromosomes is important for genetic control, taxonomy and evolutionary studies (MacGregor and Varly, 1993; Fister *et al.* 1999; Unlu and Kilic-Demirok, 2001; Suleyman *et al.* 2004; Kalbassi *et al.* 2006) and is widely used in various fish investigations (Pisano *et al.* 2007). In addition, the trend of karyological changes and fixation in various new species can be studied by this method (Winkler *et*

al. 2004). The aim of this study was to investigate the chromosomes and karyotype of *Puntius conchonius* from Dal lake Srinagar Kashmir and compare it with other species from taxonomic point of view.

Materials and Methods.

Live fish were obtained from local fishermen in the Dal Lake and transported live to the Limnology and Fisheries Laboratory of Centre of Research for Development University of Kashmir and placed into 50 l fully aerated aquarium at 20°C for several days. Air dried chromosome preparation method with some modifications was used as described by Thorgaard and Disney (1990). Fish received two doses of phytohemagglutinin (PHA) injections (4 μ gg⁻¹ bw), in a 20-h interval at 20°C. Eight hours after the second PHA injection, 0.05% colchicine was injected intraperitoneally (0.5ml/50g body weight) to depress the mitotic division at the metaphase stage and left for 2-3 hours before sacrificing. The fish were anesthetized by 300 ppm clove oil for 40s, their anterior kidney and gill filaments were removed, homogenized and hypotonised simultaneously by trisodium citrate 1% for 35 minutes at room temperature. Because of their tiny tissues, they were well mixed. Suspensions were centrifuged at 1300 rpm for 10 minutes. Supernatant was removed and the cells were fixed by cold fresh Carnoy (3:1 methanol and glacial acetic acid). This process was repeated three times and

the cold fresh Carnoy was replaced at 30 minute intervals. Smears were prepared on cold lamellae using splash method from 1m height and air dried for 24 h, then stained with 2% Giemsa.

Chromosomal analysis

Leica DM LS2 microscope with 100x magnification lens immersion oil was used for taking the photographs and analysing the chromosomes. Eighty metaphase plates were counted and a proper plate was selected to obtain karyotype formulae. Microsoft Excel 2007 software was used to calculate the centromeric indices and to draw ideogram. For each chromosome Centromeric index, arm ratio and total length were calculated as described by Levan *et al.* (1964) and the fundamental number was also calculated. Chromosomes were classified into metacentric, sub-metacentric and telocentric following the method of Levan *et al.* (1964).

Results

Eighty metaphases of the ten specimens of *Puntius conchonius* were counted. The observed

diploid number per metaphasic plate ranged from 47-50. A modal diploid number of $2n=50$ constituted 72.5% ($22m+16Sm+12t$) and $2n=48$ constituted 20% of the counted metaphase plates (Table I). Other diploid numbers other than $2n=50$ are usually the result of losses or additions during the karyotype preparation, including splashing due to their downfall from various heights from nearby cells, as reported in other studies (Suleyman *et al.* 2004; Esmaeli and Piraver 2006; Nasri *et al.* 2010). Using a proper metaphasic plate (Fig.1a) chromosomal indicators were calculated (Table II) and the chromosomal formulae obtained as $2n=50$ including eleven metacentric, eight sub-metacentric and six telocentric pairs respectively and fundamental number as $FN=88$. Based on chromosomal indicators (Table II) an ideogram (Fig.2) was drawn in MS Excel 2007. Comparison with already worked out species of *Puntius conchonius* in Jammu and other parts of the country (Nayyar, 1964; Sharma and Agarwal, 1981; Tripathi and Sharma, 1987) reveals that it is a new cytotype, inhabiting Dal lake Kashmir.




Fig.1: (a) chromosomal complement and (b) Karyotype.




Fig. 2: Haploid ideogram of *Puntius conchoniensis*.

Table I: Showing frequency of metaphases.

Number of chromosomes in each metaphase plate.	47	48	49	50
Number of metaphase plates.	4	16	2	58
Frequency (%).	5	20	2.5	72.5

Table II: Chromosome morphometry of *Puntius conchoniensis*.

Serial no.	Short arm	Long arm	Total length	L/S	Centromeric index	Category
1	1.25	1.25	2.5	1	50	metacentric
2	1	1.5	2.5	1.5	40	metacentric
3	1	1.5	2.5	1.5	40	metacentric
4	1	1.5	2.5	1.5	40	metacentric
5	1	1	2	1	50	metacentric
6	1	1	2	1	50	metacentric
7	1	1	2	1	50	metacentric
8	0.75	1	1.75	1.33	42.85	metacentric
9	0.75	0.75	1.5	1	50	metacentric
10	0.5	0.75	1.25	1.5	40	metacentric
11	0.5	0.75	1.25	1.5	40	metacentric
12	0.5	1.5	2	3	25	Sub-metacentric
13	0.5	1.5	2	3	25	-do-
14	0.5	1.5	2	3	25	-do-
15	0.5	1	1.5	2	33.33	-do-
16	0.5	1	1.5	2	33.33	-do-
17	0.5	1	1.5	2	33.33	-do-
18	0.5	1	1.5	2	33.33	-do-
19	0.5	1	1.5	2	33.33	-do-
20	0	2.5	2.5	∞	0.00	telocentric
21	0	2	2	∞	0.00	-do-
22	0	2	2	∞	0.00	-do-
23	0	2	2	∞	0.00	-do-
24	0	1.5	1.5	∞	0.00	-do-
25	0	1.5	1.5	∞	0.00	-do-

Discussion

Because of their smaller size and usually abundant and more contracted structures, studying and measuring fish chromosomes is somewhat more difficult than those of mammals (Suleyman *et al.* 2004). Besides, identification of fish chromosomes is difficult due to the lack of any standard karyotype for fishes; polymorphism exists not only among various fish species but also within species (Al-Sabti, 1991).

The most commonly occurring diploid number in family cyprinidae is 50, considered to be the modal number in case of this family (Manna, 1984; Rishi, 1989). According to the studies performed by various workers on *Puntius* species of India (Nayyar, 1964; Taki *et al.* 1977; Tripathi and Sharma, 1987), it seems that $2n=50$ in the genus *Puntius*, as in many other cyprinids. The present study also revealed the same diploid number. Despite the similarity of the diploid number in species of *Puntius*, there are differences in their karyotype formulae. Whereas Nayyar (1964) reported the presence of all acrocentric chromosomes in *Puntius conchoniensis*, the present study confirms the presence of both biarmed and acrocentric chromosomes. The primitive teleost karyotype is thought to have consisted of 46-48 acrocentrics (Nayyar, 1966; Ohno *et al.* 1968; Ohno, 1970; Fitzsimons, 1972; LeGrande, 1975). Karyotypes with biarmed chromosomes are generally regarded to represent a derived condition (Ohno *et al.* 1968; Ohno, 1970; Denton, 1973; Gold, 1979). Therefore *Puntius conchoniensis* investigated in the present study shows a derived karyotype configuration. No heteromorphic sex chromosomes were found and the fish appears to be a cytotype of *Puntius conchoniensis* found in Jammu region of the State as that species has only 48 chromosomes.

The present study is the first to describe the chromosomal characteristics of *Puntius conchoniensis* from Kashmir.

Acknowledgments

The authors wish to thank the Director of the department for research facilities. We are also thankful to CSIR, New Delhi for providing financial assistance in the form of JRF to Farooq Ahmad.

References

1. Al-Sabti, K (1991). Handbook of Genotoxic Effects and Fish Chromosomes. Ist. Ed. Ljubljiana: Jozef Stefan Institute.
2. Denton, T. E (1973). Fish Chromosome Methodology. Charles C. Thomas.
3. Esmaili, H. R And Piravar, Z (2006). On the karyotype of *Cyprinion tednuiradius* Heckel, 1849 (Cyprinidae) from the Southeast of Iran. Zoology in the Middle East, **39**:75-80.
4. Fister, S., Cakic, P. And Kataranovski, D (1999). Karyotype analysis of *Barbus barbus* L. and *Barbus peloponnensis* V. (Cyprinidae) and frequencies of breaks and gap-type structural chromosome changes in fishes from river Vapa. *Acta veterinaria* (Belgrade), **49**:385-392.
5. Fitzsimons, J. M (1972). A revision of two genera of goodied fishes (Cyprinodontiformes, Osteichthyes) from the Mexican Plateau. *Copeia*, **1972**:728-756.
6. Gold, J. R (1979). Cytogenetics. p.353-405. In: Fish physiology vol.VIII. W.S. Hoar, D.J. Randall and J.R. Brett (eds.). Academic press, New York and London.
7. Kalbassi, M. R., Dorafshan, S., Tarakolian, T., Khazab, M. And Abdolhay, H (2006). Karyological analysis of endangered Caspian Salmon, *Salmo trutta caspius* (Kessler, 1877). *Aquaculture Research*, **37**:1341-1347.
8. Kullander, O.S., Fang, F., Delliny, B. And Ahlander, E (1999). The fishes of Kashmir Valley. In :River Jhelum, Kashmir Valley, impacts on aquatic environment. Lenart Nyman (ed.), p.99-163.
9. Legrande, W.H (1975). Karyology of six species of Louisiana flatfishes (Pleuronectiformes: Osteichthyes). *Copeia*, **1975**:516-522.
10. Levan, A., Fredga, K. And Sandberg, A. A (1964). A nomenclature for centromeric position on chromosomes. *Hereditas*, **52**:201-220.
11. Macgregor, H. And Varly, J (1993). Working With Animal Chromosomes. Ist.ed. New York. John Wiley.
12. Manna, G. K (1984). Progress in fish cytogenetics. *Nucleus*, **27(13)**:203-231.
13. Nasri, M., Keivany, Y. And Dorafshan, S (2010). Karyological study of bigmouth lotak (*Cyprinion macrostomum* Heckel, 1843) from Godarkhosh River, Ilam Province, Iran. Submitted.
14. Nayyar, R. P (1964). Karyotype studies in seven species of cyprinidae. *Genetica*, **35**:95-104.
15. Nayyar, R. P (1966). Karyotype studies in thirteen species of fishes. *Genetica*, **37**:78-92.
16. Ohno, S., Muramoto, J., Christen, L. And Atkin, N. B (1967). Diploid-tetraploid relationship among old world members of fish family cyprinidae. *Chromosoma*, **23**:1-9.
17. Ohno, S., Wolf, U. And Atkin, N. B (1968). Evolution from fish to mammals by gene duplication. *Hereditas*, **59**:169-187.
18. Ohno, S (1970). Evolution By Gene Duplication. Springer-Verlag, Berlin and New York.

19. Pisano, E., Ozouf-Costaz, C., Foresti, F. And Kapoor, B. G (2007). Fish Cytogenetics. Ist.ed. Enfield, N.H: Science publishers.
20. Rishi, K. K (1989). Current status of fish cytogenetics. In: Fish Genetics in India; (eds. Das, P and Jhingran, V.G), pp.1-20, Today and Tomorrows Printers and Publishers, New Delhi.
21. Suleyman, G., Ahmet, C., Ilhan, S. And Bertal, K (2004). Karyotype analysis in *Alburnus heckeli* (Battalgil, 1943) from Lake Hazer. *Turkish Journal of Veterinary and animal Sciences*, **28**:309-314.
22. Taki, Y., Urvushido, T., Suzuki, A. And Seriziawa, C (1977). A comparative study of *Puntius* (Cyprinidae: Pices).I. Proc.Japan.Acad., **53(B)**:231-235.
23. Thorgaard, G. H. And Disney, J. E (1990). Chromosome preparation and analysis. In: Schreck, C.B., Moyle, P.B,editors. Methods for fish biology. Bethesda, M.D: American Fisheries Society, pp.171-190.
24. Tripathi, N. K. And Sharma, O.P (1987). Cytological studies on six cyprinid fishes. *Genetica*, **73(3)**:243-246.
25. Unlu, E. And Killic-Demirok, N (2001). Karyotype of cyprinid fish *Capoeta trutta* and *Capoeta capoeta umbla* (cyprinidae) from the Tigris River. *Turkish Journal of Zoology*,**25**:389-393.
26. Winkler, F. M., Garcia, M. D And Palma, R.C (2004). Karyotype of three southeast pacific flounder species of the family Paralichthidae. *Aquaculture Research*, **35**:1295-1298.

9/15/2013