Jordan Journal of Biological Sciences

Diversity and Seasonal Variation of Fish Assemblages of Dingapota Haor an Eutrophic Wetland of Northeastern Bangladesh

Md. Nahiduzzaman^{*}, Ehsanul Karim, Md. Nazmul Hossen, Nazia Naheen Nisheeth and Yahia Mahmud

Bangladesh Fisheries Research Institute, Mymensingh-2201

Received: October 18, 2022; Revised: December 12, 2022; Accepted: January 25, 2023

Abstract

Wetlands are considered as the heart of natural feeding and breeding grounds of many indigenous fishes of Bangladesh. These are also the most diversified habitat in the world. However, the wetlands of Bangladesh are in danger of extinction due to various manmade and natural causes. Therefore, wetlands need special attention to conserve this unique ecosystem of Bangladesh. As a part of the conservation measures needed for wetland ecosystem, the present study was undertaken to describe the abundance and diversity status of fish in Dingapota wetland of Bangladesh and to identify the key environmental factors influencing the fish community assemblage. A total of 52 fish species were recorded from 7 orders during the study period. Cypriniformes comprises the most abundant order (47.91%) followed by Perciformes (20.71%) and Clupeformes (20.22%). Higher number of species was recorded in post-monsoon season. Fish community assemblage was significantly differentiated among the three seasons (ANOSIM, Global R = 0.803, P < 0.05), while the overall average differences in the period of three seasons was estimated as 39.92% and similarity percentage analysis (SIMPER) revealed the greater contribution of Osteobrama cotio, Esomus danricus, Nandus nandus, Gudusia chapra and Chanda nama to ascertain this dissimilarity. Multivariate analysis based on non-metric multidimensional scaling (nMDS) generated three separate groups of each seasonal samplings and cluster analysis to find out natural grouping of samples according to their abundance. Diversity indices (Shannon-Weiner diversity (H), Margalef's richness (D) and Pielou's evenness (e)) were found to vary significantly among the seasons. Canonical correspondence analysis (CCA) revealed the significant roles of temperature, depth, transparency, pH, dissolved oxygen and alkalinity for structuring the community assemblage of fish in Dingapota wetland. Essential baseline information generated by this study will help the respective authority to formulate sustainable conservation measures for Dingapota wetland.

Keywords: diversity indices, environmental parameters, fish community, Canonical correspondence analysis, similarity percentage analysis

1. Introduction

Haor (bowl-shaped massive geological depression in wetland) is the most diverse habitat in Bangladesh. These special ecosystems are considered as the sixth hotspot in the Delta Plan 2100 of Bangladesh. Haors are typically submerged during the rainy season and merge with riverine flood waters. Therefore, seasonal flooding in these haors mostly controls the variety and number of fish species. Owing to the increase in water areas, fish are not typically present in large numbers during the monsoon. There are about 373 haors, or roughly 43% of the entire area of the haor region, spread across the districts of Netrokona, Kishoreganj, Sunamganj, Habiganj, Sylhet, Maulvibazar and Brahmanbaria, (Ahmed, 2013; Islam et al., 2010; Master Plan of Haor Areas, 2012). They encompass an area of about 858,000 ha. Numerous freshwater fin fish species as well as several prawn species, including 143 indigenous and 12 exotic species,

are found in these haors (Mustafa *et al.*, 2019; Islam *et al.*, 2012; MoW, 2005; Muzaffar, 2004).

Since the turn of the century, there has been significant human meddling in the natural world, leading to overexploitation, loss of natural habitats, and terrible conditions for aquatic ecosystems. For this reason, many fish species are currently in danger of going extinct. Bangladesh is now facing a serious problem with the ongoing aquatic biodiversity declining from natural water bodies (Galib *et al.*, 2009 and 2013; Mohsin *et al.*, 2013 and 2014). The decline in fish biodiversity in inland water bodies serves as an example of the need for an extensive study, which is necessary for evaluating the present situation and ensure the effective management approach of a water body (Imteazzaman and Galib, 2013).

Dingaputa Haor is One of the significant inland freshwater wetland ecosystems, which is situated at Mohonganj Upazila of Netrakona District at 24°52'00''N 90°58'00''E / 24.8667°N 90.9667°E (Fig. 1) covering the surface area of 8000 ha. To the authors' knowledge, several research projects on the fish faunal biodiversity of

^{*} Corresponding author. e-mail: nahid.bfri83@gmail.com.

various water of diverse water bodies in Bangladesh have been carried out; however, there has only been one study on the aquatic fish faunal biodiversity of the Dingapota Haor, Netrokona. In this case, study is necessary to comprehend the wetland's overall state and maintain the appropriate management practices. The diversity of fish in the water must be known before implementing any fisheries management technique, but no report on the fish diversity and ecological status of the water has been released (Huda *et al.* 2009). Therefore, the current study examines seasonal variation in environmental variables as well as changes in various freshwater fish species diversity indices at Dingapota Haor (Mohangonj Upazilla) Netrokona, Bangladesh.

2. Materials and methods

2.1. Study area and duration

From July 2020 to June 2021, the study was carried

out over a 12-month period at three sampling sites (Karchapur, 24°77'72" N, 91°05'10"E; Mollikpur, 24°80'23" N, 91°03'57"E: Khurshimul, 24°88'66" N, 91°01'99"E) in the Dingapota haor, a wetland at Mohangonj Upazila (Sub-district) in Netrokona District, Bangladesh (Fig. 1). It is an important ecosystem that supports many different fish species and is regarded as an essential breeding and feeding habitat for inland freshwater fish species. Additionally, this region provides small-scale fishermen and nearby residents with a means of subsistence. Fish and environmental factors were sampled throughout each month, which was further divided into three distinct seasons; a) From July to October is monsoon season; b) from November to February is postmonsoon; and c) from March to June is pre-monsoon



Figure 1. Map of the Dingapota haor at Mohanganj Upazila of Netrokona district, Bangladesh.

2.2. Measurement of water quality parameters

Temperature, transparency, depth, dissolved oxygen, pH, NO₃-N, PO₄-P, alkalinity, and TDS were the water quality parameters measured each month and documented. Water quality parameters were measured between 9:00 am and 12:00 pm throughout every sampling month. On the sampling date, 500ml of surface water from each study locations were collected in black colored coded bottles. A highly advanced Multi-Parameter Water Quality Meter (HANNA, HI 98194, pH/EC/DO multi-parameter) was used to measure the water's temperature (°C), pH, DO, and TDS. Water depth was measured with a measuring tape. A Secchi disk was used to measure the water's transparency

(in cm). A spectrophotometer (DR-1900) was used to measure alkalinity (mg/l), NO₃-N, and PO₄-P.

2.3. Species collection and identification

Fish samples were collected from the specified sampling site with the assistance of experienced fishermen on each sampling date. A seine net with a length, width and mesh size of 100 m, 5 m and 1-2 mm, respectively, was used for sampling of fishes. After collecting, the fishes were identified and enumerated. Fishes which were difficult to identify were kept in 10% buffered formalin solution and transported to the laboratory of the Bangladesh Fisheries Research Institute, Mymensingh. Subsequently, morphometric and meristic data were used to identify the fishes up to species level followed by the keys of (Rahman et al. 2009). Identified fishes were categorized into taxonomic groups following Nelson et al. (2006).

2.4. Diversity indices

Shannon-Weiner diversity, Margalef's richness and Pielou's evenness were calculated by using the following formula-

 $H = -\sum i \frac{n_i}{n} \ln \frac{n_i}{n}$ Shannon-Weiner diversity, (Shannon and Weiner, 1949)

Where, S is the number of individuals for each species, N is the total number of individuals, ni is the relative abundance (S/N) H represents the diversity index,

Margalef's richness, $D = \frac{S-1}{\ln N}$ (Margalef 1968) Where, N is the total number of distinct species in the sample, S is the different species in the sample; D is Margarlef's richness index.

Pielou's evenness,
$$J \boldsymbol{e} = \frac{H}{L_n S}$$
 [L_n = the natural

logarithm] (Poule's, 1966)

Where, S indicates the number of distinct species in the sample and H is the Shannon-Weiner index.

2.5. Statistical analyses

One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to assess seasonal fluctuation in water quality parameters using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (version 20.0) software. Seasonal distribution of water quality parameters was analyzed by principal component analysis (PCA). Species abundance and diversity indices were also analyzed by ANOVA. Mean differences among the seasons were determined by Duncan's multiple range test (DMRT) at 5% level of significance. Community assemblage pattern of fish species among the seasons was tested by multivariate analysis. Before analyzing the data, water quality parameters were square root transformed, and the fish abundance data was log_{10} (x+1) transformed for the normalization. Analysis of similarity (ANOSIM) was conducted to assess the differences in fish community assemblage among the seasons. Similarity percentage analysis (SIMPER) was also used to determine the most contributory species causing differences among the seasons (Clarke and Warwick 1994). The distribution pattern of the fishes among the season was visualized using non-metric multi-dimensional scaling (nMDS), and the species was categorized using a cluster analysis based on Bray-Curtis similarity matrix. The potential correlations between fish species and water quality parameters were determined by canonical corresponding analysis (CCA) using PAST (Paleontological Statistics, Version 4.10) program.

3. Results

3.1. Seasonal variation of water quality parameters

Table 1 provides an overview of the water quality metrics that were noticed and noted during the investigation. All the water quality measures showed a significant variation across the seasons (P < 0.05). Premonsoon had the greatest water temperature (29.89 \pm 0.65°C), while post-monsoon had the lowest (22.36 \pm 3.98°C). Observed transparency was ranged between

 39.59 ± 4.41 cm (Post-monsoon) to 24.66 ± 0.81 cm (Monsoon). The highest water depth was observed during the Monsoon (5.96±1.61 m) and the lowest during premonsoon (1.66±0.82 m) whereas pH was ranged between 7.00±0.78 (post-monsoon) to 6.38±0.60 (pre-monsoon). In addition, DO was between 6.63±0.74 mg/l (post-monsoon) to 4.56±0.53 mg/l (pre-monsoon). In case of NO₃-N and PO₄-P, pre-monsoon showed the greatest levels of (0.33 0.04 and 1.34 0.11 mg/l), while monsoon had the lowest levels (0.13 0.01 mg/l and 1.16 0.02 mg/l). The total alkalinity was 126.89±7.47 mg/l during pre-monsoon and 103.38±4.44 mg/l during monsoon while TDS was also the highest during pre-monsoon (135.73±5.50 mg/l) and the lowest during monsoon (100.97±5.16 mg/l). PCA was also used to explain the seasonal variation of water quality measures, with its first two axes accounting for 85.94% of the variability in the data (Fig. 2). PCA demonstrated a distinct seasonal separation of the samples, whereas the monsoon samples are related with water depth and the post-monsoon samples are associated with transparency, DO, NO₃-N and PO₄-P. Furthermore, pre-monsoon samples are correlated with alkalinity and TDS.

Table 1. Water quality parameters (Mean \pm SD) in different seasons

Variables	Monsoon	Post-monsoon	Pre-monsoon
Temperature (⁰ C)	$28.70{\pm}0.62^{a}$	22.36±3.98 ^b	29.89±0.65 ^a
Transparency (cm)	$24.66{\pm}0.81^{\circ}$	$38.02{\pm}3.29^{b}$	$39.59{\pm}4.41^{a}$
Depth (m)	5.96±1.61 ^a	$1.93{\pm}0.41^{b}$	1.66±0.82 ^c
pH	$6.99{\pm}0.85^{a}$	$7.00{\pm}0.78^{a}$	$6.38{\pm}0.60^{b}$
DO (mg/l)	5.72 ± 0.52^{b}	$6.63{\pm}0.74^{a}$	4.56±0.53°
NO ₃ -N (mg/l)	$0.13{\pm}0.01^{\circ}$	$0.21{\pm}0.11^{\text{b}}$	$0.33{\pm}0.04^{a}$
PO ₄ -P (mg/l)	1.16±0.02 ^c	$1.28{\pm}0.09^{b}$	1.34±0.11 ^a
Total alkalinity (mg/l)	103.38±4.44°	112.79±2.00 ^b	126.89±7.47ª
TDS (mg/l)	$100.97 \pm 5.16^{\circ}$	116.92±7.38 ^b	$135.73{\pm}5.50^{a}$

Mean values in the same row having difference superscript letters indicate significant (P< 0.05) differences.



Figure 2. Water quality parameters during the monsoon, postmonsoon, and pre-monsoon seasons were analyzed using the principle component method (Wt = water temperature, Trans = transparency, Depth, DO = dissolved oxygen, pH, NO3-N = nitrate-nitrite, PO4-P = phosphate-phosphorus, Alka = total alkalinity, TDS = total dissolved solids).

3.2. Catch composition

During the study period, 52 fish species from 17 families and 7 orders were recorded. Figure 3 demonstrates that the most abundant order was the cypriniformes followed by the perciformes (20.71%) and the clupeformes (20.22%). A total of 1242 individual of fishes was collected during the study period (Table 2) which consists of 52 species. The total abundance was

significantly higher during post-monsoon season (725) and the lowest in pre-monsoon season (107). Similarly, total number of species was significantly higher during postmonsoon season (47) and the lowest in pre-monsoon season (34). *Amblypharyngodon mola* (11.03%) was the most dominant species followed by *Gudusia chapra* (10.03%) and *Osteobrama cotio* (8.01%).



Figure. 4. Percentage composition of different fish taxonomic orders in the studied wetland **Table 2**. List of species with number of individuals and their contribution (%) in each season

Sl. No.	Species Name	Code	Total	Overall contribution (%)	Seasonal contribution (%)		
					Monsoon	Post-monsoon	Pre-monsoon
1	Xenentodon cancila	Xc	9	0.73	0.54	0.82	0.89
2	Hyporhamphus limbatus	Hl	1	0.07	0.21	0.00	0.00
3	Channa punctatus	Ср	21	1.65	0.61	1.85	4.35
4	Channa striatus	Cs	19	1.56	0.28	2.23	1.94
5	Channa orientalis	Co	6	0.52	0.32	0.50	1.36
6	Channa marulius	Cm	5	0.42	0.13	0.50	1.02
7	Corica soborna	Cso	114	9.20	18.49	3.15	14.24
8	Gudusia chapra	Gc	131	10.52	15.60	7.79	9.39
9	Gibelion catla	Gca	2	0.16	0.16	0.18	0.00
10	Labeo rohita	Lr	1	0.05	0.16	0.00	0.00
11	Labeo bata	Lb	11	0.90	0.33	0.66	4.69
12	Labeo calbasu	Lc	6	0.47	0.18	0.30	2.70
13	Labeo gonius	Lg	10	0.81	0.38	0.87	2.05
14	Cirrhinus cirrhosus	Cci	5	0.39	0.27	0.39	0.84
15	Amblypharyngodon Mola	Am	137	11.03	21.14	4.98	13.03
16	Chela Laubuca	Cl	64	5.19	5.06	5.10	6.35
17	Osteobrama cotio	Oc	99	8.01	11.11	7.24	1.26

18Pontials saranaPs100.770.770.572.1819Puntius sophorePso655.211.098.022.0510Relia tictoPto181.430.671.742.2821Salmostoma BacailaSb20.130.110.170.0022Esonus danricusEd856.847.127.511.1523Botia darioEd20.180.310.130.0024Lepidocephalichthys GunteaLeg171.381.151.710.0025Notopterus chitalaNe40.350.090.550.0026Notopterus notopteruxNn00.040.060.030.0027Anabas testulineutAt161.300.081.822.4928Chanda namaCn473.791.445.531.0229Pseudambasis rangaPr131.040.401.560.0030Glossophius giurisGg120.950.391.400.0031Glossophius giurisMa302.451.433.052.2833Maccognathus parcalusMa110.890.301.131.5734Mascaembelus armausMa110.890.301.131.5735Nandus mardusMa110.890.311.311.57 <t< th=""><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th></t<>								
19Pantias sophorePso655.211.098.022.0520Pethia ticoPt181.430.671.742.2821Salmostoma BacailaSb20.130.110.170.0022Esomas danciasEd856.847.127.511.1523Botia darioBd20.180.310.130.0024Lepidocephalichthys GuateaLeg171.381.151.710.0025Notopterus otopterusNa00.040.060.030.0026Notopterus notopterusNa00.040.081.822.4927Anabas testudineusCa473.791.445.531.0229Pseudombassis rangaPr131.040.401.560.0031Glossogobius giurisGg120.950.391.400.0031Glossogobius chunoGoc493.911.325.681.9132Macrognathus calcatusMa302.451.433.052.2833Maccognathus candusMa110.890.301.131.5734Mastacembelus armatusMa110.830.111.211.0235Nandus andusNa120.620.493.401.7636Colsa facciataMa300.420.631.761.91<	18	Pontius sarana	Ps	10	0.77	0.77	0.57	2.18
20Pethia tictoPt181430.671.742.2821Salmostoma BacailaSb20.130.110.170.0022Esonus danricusEd856.847.127.511.1523Boita darioEd20.180.310.030.0024Lepidocephalichthys GunteaLeg171.381.151.710.0025Notopterus chitalaNe40.350.090.550.0026Notopterus chitalaNe40.370.081.822.4927Anabas testudineusAt161.300.081.822.4928Chunda namaCn473.791.445.531.0229Pseudambassis rangaPr131.040.401.560.0030Glossogobius ginisGg120.950.391.400.0031Macrognathus parcialusMa302.451.433.052.2833Macrognathus parcialusMa302.451.433.052.2834Mastaembelus armatusMa302.220.173.382.2535Nandus mandusNa282.220.173.382.2536Colisa fasciataGf311.650.301.131.5735Mandus mandusNa181.430.831.141.211.2	19	Puntius sophore	Pso	65	5.21	1.09	8.02	2.05
21Salmostoma BaccailaSb20.130.110.170.0022Esomus darricusEd856.847.127.511.1523Botia darioBd20.180.310.130.0024Lepidocephalichitys GunneaLeg1.781.381.151.710.0025Notopterus chitalaNc40.350.090.550.0026Notopterus notopterusNn00.040.060.030.0027Anabas testudineusAt161.300.081.822.4928Chanda namaCn473.791.445.560.0030Glossogobius sinargaPr31.911.325.681.9132Macrognathus acuteatusMa302.451.433.052.2833Macrognathus acuteatusMa302.451.433.052.2834Mastacembelus armatusMa100.040.000.070.0035Nandus nandusMa100.830.111.121.0236Kalas fasciataCf211.650.372.332.0537Badis badisMa100.830.111.211.0238Mystus vitatusMa100.830.111.211.0239Mystus vitatusMa100.830.140.631.36 <td>20</td> <td>Pethia ticto</td> <td>Pt</td> <td>18</td> <td>1.43</td> <td>0.67</td> <td>1.74</td> <td>2.28</td>	20	Pethia ticto	Pt	18	1.43	0.67	1.74	2.28
22Exonus danricusEd856.847.127.511.1523Bolia darioBd20.180.310.130.0024Lepidocephalichthys GunteaLeg171.381.151.710.0025Notopterus chitalaNe00.040.060.030.0026Notopterus notopterusNn00.040.060.030.0027Anabas testudineusAt161.300.081.822.4928Chanda namaCn473.791.445.531.0229Pseudambassis rangaPr131.040.401.560.0031Glossogobius chunoGe120.950.391.400.0031Macrognathus caleatusMa302.451.433.052.2833Macrognathus caleatusMa302.451.433.052.9634Mastacembelus armatusMa110.890.301.131.5735Nandus nandusNan282.220.173.382.2536Colisa fasciataCf2.141.650.000.0037Badis badisMa100.830.111.211.0238Mystus carMa100.830.111.211.2139Mystus carvassiusMe372.962.493.401.7641 <td>21</td> <td>Salmostoma Bacaila</td> <td>Sb</td> <td>2</td> <td>0.13</td> <td>0.11</td> <td>0.17</td> <td>0.00</td>	21	Salmostoma Bacaila	Sb	2	0.13	0.11	0.17	0.00
23Botia darioBd20.180.310.130.0024Lepidocephalichhys GuneaLeg171.381.151.710.0025Notopterus chitalaNc40.350.090.550.0026Notopterus notopterusNn00.040.060.030.0027Anabas testudineusAt161.300.081.822.4928Chanda namaCn473.791.445.531.0229Pseudambassis rangaPr131.040.401.560.0030Glossogobius giurisGg120.950.391.400.0031Glossogobius chunoGoc493.911.325.681.9132Macrognathus cauceatusMa302.451.433.052.2833Macrognathus cauceatusMa110.890.301.131.5734Mastaembelus armatusMa110.890.301.131.5735Nandus nandusNan282.220.173.382.2536Colisa fasciataCf2.11.650.372.332.0537Badis badisMa140.990.080.100.0038Mystus cavassiusMe372.962.493.401.7641Rita ritaRr10.090.080.100.00	22	Esomus danricus	Ed	85	6.84	7.12	7.51	1.15
24Lepidocephalichthys GunteaLeg171.381.151.710.0025Notopterus chitalaNe40.350.090.550.0026Notopterus notopterusNn00.040.060.030.0027Anabas testudineusAt161.300.081.822.4928Chanda namaCn473.791.445.660.0030Glossogobius giurisGg120.950.391.400.0031Glossogobius giurisGg120.950.391.400.0031Glossogobius chunoGoc493.911.325.681.9132Macrognathus aculeatusMa302.451.433.052.2833Macrognathus aculeatusMa302.451.414.051.9734Mastacembelus armatusMa110.890.301.131.5735NandusMa121.650.372.332.0536Colisa fasciataCf211.650.372.332.0537Badis badisNen181.430.831.141.5740Mystus aorMa100.830.111.211.0239Mystus aoraMc372.960.430.160.0041Rita ritaRr10.990.880.100.0042	23	Botia dario	Bd	2	0.18	0.31	0.13	0.00
25 Notopterus chitala Nc 4 0.35 0.09 0.55 0.00 26 Notopterus notopterus Nn 0 0.04 0.06 0.03 0.00 27 Anabas testudineus At 16 1.30 0.08 1.82 2.49 28 Chanda nama Cn 47 3.79 1.44 5.53 1.02 29 Pseudambastis ranga Pr 13 1.04 0.40 1.56 0.00 31 Glossogobius chuno Gg 12 0.95 0.39 1.40 0.00 31 Glossogobius chuno Goc 49 3.91 1.32 5.68 1.91 32 Macrognathus aculeatus Ma 30 2.45 1.43 3.05 2.28 33 Macrognathus aculeatus Ma 11 0.89 0.30 1.13 1.57 34 Mastacembelus arnatus Nan 28 2.22 0.17 3.33 2.05 <t< td=""><td>24</td><td>Lepidocephalichthys Guntea</td><td>Leg</td><td>17</td><td>1.38</td><td>1.15</td><td>1.71</td><td>0.00</td></t<>	24	Lepidocephalichthys Guntea	Leg	17	1.38	1.15	1.71	0.00
26 Notopterus notopterus Nn 0 0.04 0.06 0.03 0.00 27 Anabas testudineus At 16 1.30 0.08 1.82 2.49 28 Chanda nama Cn 47 3.79 1.44 5.53 1.02 29 Pseudambasis ranga Pr 13 1.04 0.40 1.56 0.00 30 Glossogobius giuris Gg 12 0.95 0.39 1.40 0.00 31 Glossogobius chuno Go 49 3.91 1.32 5.68 1.91 32 Macrognathus aculeatus Ma 30 2.45 1.43 3.05 2.28 33 Macrognathus aculeatus Ma 11 0.89 0.30 1.13 1.57 34 Mastacembelus armatus Nan 28 2.22 0.17 3.38 2.25 35 Nandus nadus Nan 28 2.22 0.17 3.38 2.05 36 Aystus aor Mao 10 0.44 0.00 0.07 0	25	Notopterus chitala	Nc	4	0.35	0.09	0.55	0.00
27 Anabas testudineus At 16 1.30 0.08 1.82 2.49 28 Chanda nama Cn 47 3.79 1.44 5.53 1.02 29 Pseudambassis ranga Pr 13 1.04 0.40 1.56 0.00 30 Glossogobius chuno Gg 12 0.95 0.39 1.40 0.00 31 Glossogobius chuno Goc 49 3.91 1.32 5.68 1.91 32 Macrognathus aculeatus Ma 30 2.45 1.43 3.05 2.28 33 Macrognathus pancalus Mp 37 2.96 1.31 4.05 1.97 34 Mastacembelus armatus Maa 11 0.89 0.30 1.13 1.57 35 Nandus nandus Maa 10 0.83 0.11 1.21 1.02 36 Colisa fasciata Cf 21 1.65 0.37 2.33 2.05 37 Badis badis Mac 10 0.83 0.11 1.21 1.02	26	Notopterus notopterus	Nn	0	0.04	0.06	0.03	0.00
28Chanda namaCn473.791.445.531.0229Pseudambassis rangaPr131.040.401.560.0030Glossogobius giurisGg120.950.391.400.0031Glossogobius chunoGoc493.911.325.681.9132Macrognathus aculeatusMa302.451.433.052.2833Macrognathus pancalusMp372.961.314.051.9734Masta andusNan282.220.173.382.2535Nandus nandusNan282.220.173.382.2536Colisa fasciataCf211.650.372.332.0537Badis badisBad00.040.000.070.0038Mystus aorMa100.830.111.211.0239Mystus avarssiusMc372.962.493.401.7641Rita ritaRr10.090.080.100.0042Ompok binaculataOb60.450.180.491.2143Ompok pabdaOpa80.620.420.631.3644Wallago attuWa80.630.540.780.0045Ailia coilaAc80.630.540.780.0046Clupisoma garua	27	Anabas testudineus	At	16	1.30	0.08	1.82	2.49
29 Pseudambassis ranga Pr 13 1.04 0.40 1.56 0.00 30 Glossogobius giuris Gg 12 0.95 0.39 1.40 0.00 31 Glossogobius chuno Goc 49 3.91 1.32 5.68 1.91 32 Macrognathus aculeatus Ma 30 2.45 1.43 3.05 2.28 33 Macrognathus pancalus Ma 10 0.89 0.30 1.13 1.57 34 Mastacembelus armatus Maa 11 0.89 0.30 1.13 1.57 35 Nandus nandus Maa 12 1.65 0.37 2.33 2.05 36 Colisa fasciata Cf 21 1.65 0.37 2.33 2.05 37 Badis badis Mao 10 0.43 0.11 1.21 1.02 38 Mystus cavassius Mc 37 2.96 2.49 3.40 1.21	28	Chanda nama	Cn	47	3.79	1.44	5.53	1.02
30 Glossogobius giuris Gg 12 0.95 0.39 1.40 0.00 31 Glossogobius chuno Goc 49 3.91 1.32 5.68 1.91 32 Macrognathus aculeatus Ma 30 2.45 1.43 3.05 2.28 33 Macrognathus pancalus Mp 37 2.96 1.31 4.05 1.97 34 Mastacembelus armatus Maa 11 0.89 0.30 1.13 1.57 35 Nandus nandus Nan 28 2.22 0.17 3.38 2.25 36 Colisa fasciata Cf 21 1.65 0.37 2.33 2.05 37 Badis badis Bad 0 0.04 0.00 0.07 0.00 38 Mystus arar Mao 10 0.83 0.11 1.21 1.02 39 Mystus arasitus Mc 37 2.96 2.49 3.40 1.76 41 Rita rita Rr 1 0.09 0.08 0.10 0.00 <td>29</td> <td>Pseudambassis ranga</td> <td>Pr</td> <td>13</td> <td>1.04</td> <td>0.40</td> <td>1.56</td> <td>0.00</td>	29	Pseudambassis ranga	Pr	13	1.04	0.40	1.56	0.00
31 Glossogobius chuno Goc 49 3.91 1.32 5.68 1.91 32 Macrognathus aculeatus Ma 30 2.45 1.43 3.05 2.28 33 Macrognathus pancalus Mp 37 2.96 1.31 4.05 1.97 34 Mastacembelus armatus Maa 11 0.89 0.30 1.13 1.57 35 Nandus nandus Nan 28 2.22 0.17 3.38 2.25 36 Colisa fasciata Cf 21 1.65 0.37 2.33 2.05 37 Badis badis Bad 0 0.04 0.00 0.07 0.00 38 Mystus aor Mao 10 0.83 0.11 1.21 1.02 39 Mystus vitatus Mc 37 2.96 2.49 3.40 1.76 41 Rita rita Rr 1 0.09 0.08 0.10 0.00 42 Ompok bimaculata Ob 6 0.45 0.18 0.49 1.21	30	Glossogobius giuris	Gg	12	0.95	0.39	1.40	0.00
32 Macrognathus aculeatus Ma 30 2.45 1.43 3.05 2.28 33 Macrognathus pancalus Mp 37 2.96 1.31 4.05 1.97 34 Mastacembelus armatus Maa 11 0.89 0.30 1.13 1.57 35 Nandus nandus Nan 28 2.22 0.17 3.38 2.25 36 Colisa fasciata Cf 21 1.65 0.37 2.33 2.05 37 Badis badis Bad 0 0.04 0.00 0.07 0.00 38 Mystus aor Mao 10 0.83 0.11 1.21 1.02 39 Mystus aor Mc 37 2.96 2.49 3.40 1.76 40 Mystus vittatus Mv 18 1.43 0.83 1.74 1.57 41 Rita rita Rr 1 0.09 0.08 0.10 0.00 42 Ompok binaculata Ob 6 0.45 0.18 0.49 1.21	31	Glossogobius chuno	Goc	49	3.91	1.32	5.68	1.91
33 Macrognathus pancalus Mp 37 2.96 1.31 4.05 1.97 34 Mastacembelus armatus Maa 11 0.89 0.30 1.13 1.57 35 Nandus nandus Nan 28 2.22 0.17 3.38 2.25 36 Colisa fasciata Cf 21 1.65 0.37 2.33 2.05 37 Badis badis Bad 0 0.04 0.00 0.07 0.00 38 Mystus aor Mao 10 0.83 0.11 1.21 1.02 39 Mystus vitatus Mc 37 2.96 2.49 3.40 1.76 40 Mystus vitatus Mc 18 1.43 0.83 1.74 1.57 41 Rita rita Rr 1 0.09 0.08 0.10 0.00 42 Ompok bimaculata Ob 6 0.45 0.18 0.49 1.21 43 Ompok pabda Opa 8 0.62 0.42 0.63 1.08	32	Macrognathus aculeatus	Ma	30	2.45	1.43	3.05	2.28
34Mastacembelus armatusMaa110.890.301.131.5735Nandus nandusNan282.220.173.382.2536Colisa fasciataCf211.650.372.332.0537Badis badisBad00.040.000.070.0038Mystus arrMao100.830.111.211.0239Mystus cavassiusMc372.962.493.401.7640Mystus vittatusMv181.430.831.741.5741Rita ritaRr10.090.080.100.0042Ompok bimaculataOb60.450.180.491.2143Ompok pabdaOpa80.620.420.631.3644Wallago attuVa80.630.540.780.0045Ailia coilaAc80.630.540.780.0046Clupisoma garuaClug90.730.610.910.0047Europiichthys vachaEucv10.050.160.000.0048Bagarius bagariusBb20.160.110.220.0049Clarias batrachusCb40.330.140.281.3950Heteropneustes fossilisHfo50.410.120.391.6551Chaca chaca <t< td=""><td>33</td><td>Macrognathus pancalus</td><td>Мр</td><td>37</td><td>2.96</td><td>1.31</td><td>4.05</td><td>1.97</td></t<>	33	Macrognathus pancalus	Мр	37	2.96	1.31	4.05	1.97
35 Nandus nandus Nan 28 2.22 0.17 3.38 2.25 36 Colisa fasciata Cf 21 1.65 0.37 2.33 2.05 37 Badis badis Bad 0 0.04 0.00 0.07 0.00 38 Mystus aor Mao 10 0.83 0.11 1.21 1.02 39 Mystus cavassius Mc 37 2.96 2.49 3.40 1.76 40 Mystus vittatus Mc 37 2.96 2.49 3.40 1.76 41 Rita rita Rr 1 0.09 0.08 0.10 0.00 42 Ompok binaculata Ob 6 0.45 0.18 0.49 1.21 43 Ompok pabda Opa 8 0.62 0.42 0.63 1.36 44 Wallago attu Wa 8 0.63 0.54 0.78 0.00 45 Ailia coila Ac 8 0.63 0.54 0.78 0.00 46 C	34	Mastacembelus armatus	Maa	11	0.89	0.30	1.13	1.57
36Colisa fasciataCf211.650.372.332.0537Badis badisBad00.040.000.070.0038Mystus aorMao100.830.111.211.0239Mystus cavassiusMc372.962.493.401.7640Mystus vittatusMv181.430.831.741.5741Rita riaRr10.090.080.100.0042Ompok binaculataOb60.450.180.491.2143Ompok pabdaOpa80.620.420.631.3644Wallago attuWa80.680.320.831.0845Ailia coilaAc80.630.540.780.0046Clupisoma garuaClug90.730.610.910.0048Bagarius bagariusBb20.160.110.220.0049Clarias batrachusCb40.330.140.281.3950Heteropneustes fossilisHfo50.410.120.391.6551Chaca chacaCch30.260.000.211.6552Neotropius atherinoidesNA141.160.321.800.00	35	Nandus nandus	Nan	28	2.22	0.17	3.38	2.25
37 Badis badis Bad 0 0.04 0.00 0.07 0.00 38 Mystus aor Mao 10 0.83 0.11 1.21 1.02 39 Mystus cavassius Mc 37 2.96 2.49 3.40 1.76 40 Mystus vittatus Mv 18 1.43 0.83 1.74 1.57 41 Rita rita Rr 1 0.09 0.08 0.10 0.00 42 Ompok binaculata Ob 6 0.45 0.18 0.49 1.21 43 Ompok pabda Opa 8 0.62 0.42 0.63 1.36 44 Wallago attu Wa 8 0.63 0.54 0.78 0.00 45 Ailia coila Ac 8 0.63 0.54 0.78 0.00 46 Clupisoma garua Clug 9 0.73 0.61 0.91 0.00 47 Eutropitichthys vacha Eucv 1 0.05 0.16 0.00 0.00 48	36	Colisa fasciata	Cf	21	1.65	0.37	2.33	2.05
38 Mystus aor Mao 10 0.83 0.11 1.21 1.02 39 Mystus cavassius Mc 37 2.96 2.49 3.40 1.76 40 Mystus vitatus Mv 18 1.43 0.83 1.74 1.57 41 Rita rita Rr 1 0.09 0.08 0.10 0.00 42 Ompok bimaculata Ob 6 0.45 0.18 0.49 1.21 43 Ompok pabda Opa 8 0.62 0.42 0.63 1.36 44 Wallago attu Wa 8 0.63 0.54 0.78 0.00 45 Ailia coila Ac 8 0.63 0.54 0.78 0.00 46 Clupisoma garua Clug 9 0.73 0.61 0.91 0.00 47 Eutropiichthys vacha Eucv 1 0.05 0.16 0.00 0.00 48 Bagarius bagarius Bb 2 0.16 0.11 0.22 0.00 49	37	Badis badis	Bad	0	0.04	0.00	0.07	0.00
39Mystus cavassiusMc372.962.493.401.7640Mystus vittatusMv181.430.831.741.5741Rita ritaRr10.090.080.100.0042Ompok bimaculataOb60.450.180.491.2143Ompok pabdaOpa80.620.420.631.3644Wallago attuWa80.680.320.831.0845Ailia coilaAc80.630.540.780.0046Clupisoma garuaClug90.730.610.910.0047Eutropiichthys vachaEucv10.050.160.000.0048Bagarius bagariusBb20.160.110.220.0049Clarias batrachusCb40.330.140.281.3950Heteropneustes fossilisHfo50.410.120.391.6551Chaca chacaCch30.260.000.211.6552Neotropius atherinoidesNA141.160.321.800.00	38	Mystus aor	Mao	10	0.83	0.11	1.21	1.02
40Mystus vittatusMv181.430.831.741.5741Rita ritaRr10.090.080.100.0042Ompok bimaculataOb60.450.180.491.2143Ompok pabdaOpa80.620.420.631.3644Wallago attuWa80.680.320.831.0845Ailia coilaAc80.630.540.780.0046Clupisoma garuaClug90.730.610.910.0047Eutropiichthys vachaEucv10.050.160.000.0048Bagarius bagariusBb20.160.110.220.0049Clarias batrachusCb40.330.140.281.3950Heteropneustes fossilisHfo50.410.120.391.6551Chaca chacaCch30.260.000.211.6552Neotropius atherinoidesNA141.160.321.800.00	39	Mystus cavassius	Mc	37	2.96	2.49	3.40	1.76
41Rita ritaRr10.090.080.100.0042Ompok bimaculataOb60.450.180.491.2143Ompok pabdaOpa80.620.420.631.3644Wallago attuWa80.680.320.831.0845Ailia coilaAc80.630.540.780.0046Clupisoma garuaClug90.730.610.910.0047Eutropiichthys vachaEucv10.050.160.000.0048Bagarius bagariusBb20.160.110.220.0049Clarias batrachusCb40.330.140.281.3950Heteropneustes fossilisHfo50.410.120.391.6551Chaca chacaCch30.260.000.211.6552Neotropius atherinoidesNA141.160.321.800.00	40	Mystus vittatus	Mv	18	1.43	0.83	1.74	1.57
42Ompok bimaculataOb60.450.180.491.2143Ompok pabdaOpa80.620.420.631.3644Wallago attuWa80.680.320.831.0845Ailia coilaAc80.630.540.780.0046Clupisoma garuaClug90.730.610.910.0047Eutropiichthys vachaEucv10.050.160.000.0048Bagarius bagariusBb20.160.110.220.0049Clarias batrachusCb40.330.140.281.3950Heteropneustes fossilisHfo50.410.120.391.6551Chaca chacaCch30.260.000.211.6552Neotropius atherinoidesNA141.160.321.800.00	41	Rita rita	Rr	1	0.09	0.08	0.10	0.00
43Ompok pabdaOpa80.620.420.631.3644Wallago attuWa80.680.320.831.0845Ailia coilaAc80.630.540.780.0046Clupisoma garuaClug90.730.610.910.0047Eutropiichthys vachaEucv10.050.160.000.0048Bagarius bagariusBb20.160.110.220.0049Clarias batrachusCb40.330.140.281.3950Heteropneustes fossilisHfo50.410.120.391.6551Chaca chacaCch30.260.000.211.6552Neotropius atherinoidesNA141.160.321.800.00	42	Ompok bimaculata	Ob	6	0.45	0.18	0.49	1.21
44Wallago attuWa80.680.320.831.0845Ailia coilaAc80.630.540.780.0046Clupisoma garuaClug90.730.610.910.0047Eutropiichthys vachaEucv10.050.160.000.0048Bagarius bagariusBb20.160.110.220.0049Clarias batrachusCb40.330.140.281.3950Heteropneustes fossilisHfo50.410.120.391.6551Chaca chacaCch30.260.000.211.6552Neotropius atherinoidesNA141.160.321.800.00	43	Ompok pabda	Opa	8	0.62	0.42	0.63	1.36
45Ailia coilaAc80.630.540.780.0046Clupisoma garuaClug90.730.610.910.0047Eutropiichthys vachaEucv10.050.160.000.0048Bagarius bagariusBb20.160.110.220.0049Clarias batrachusCb40.330.140.281.3950Heteropneustes fossilisHfo50.410.120.391.6551Chaca chacaCch30.260.000.211.6552Neotropius atherinoidesNA141.160.321.800.00	44	Wallago attu	Wa	8	0.68	0.32	0.83	1.08
46Clupisoma garuaClug90.730.610.910.0047Eutropiichthys vachaEucv10.050.160.000.0048Bagarius bagariusBb20.160.110.220.0049Clarias batrachusCb40.330.140.281.3950Heteropneustes fossilisHfo50.410.120.391.6551Chaca chacaCch30.260.000.211.6552Neotropius atherinoidesNA141.160.321.800.00	45	Ailia coila	Ac	8	0.63	0.54	0.78	0.00
47Eutropiichthys vachaEucv10.050.160.000.0048Bagarius bagariusBb20.160.110.220.0049Clarias batrachusCb40.330.140.281.3950Heteropneustes fossilisHfo50.410.120.391.6551Chaca chacaCch30.260.000.211.6552Neotropius atherinoidesNA141.160.321.800.00	46	Clupisoma garua	Clug	9	0.73	0.61	0.91	0.00
48 Bagarius bagarius Bb 2 0.16 0.11 0.22 0.00 49 Clarias batrachus Cb 4 0.33 0.14 0.28 1.39 50 Heteropneustes fossilis Hfo 5 0.41 0.12 0.39 1.65 51 Chaca chaca Cch 3 0.26 0.00 0.21 1.65 52 Neotropius atherinoides NA 14 1.16 0.32 1.80 0.00	47	Eutropiichthys vacha	Eucv	1	0.05	0.16	0.00	0.00
49Clarias batrachusCb40.330.140.281.3950Heteropneustes fossilisHfo50.410.120.391.6551Chaca chacaCch30.260.000.211.6552Neotropius atherinoidesNA141.160.321.800.00	48	Bagarius bagarius	Bb	2	0.16	0.11	0.22	0.00
50 Heteropneustes fossilis Hfo 5 0.41 0.12 0.39 1.65 51 Chaca chaca Cch 3 0.26 0.00 0.21 1.65 52 Neotropius atherinoides NA 14 1.16 0.32 1.80 0.00	49	Clarias batrachus	Cb	4	0.33	0.14	0.28	1.39
51 Chaca chaca Cch 3 0.26 0.00 0.21 1.65 52 Neotropius atherinoides NA 14 1.16 0.32 1.80 0.00	50	Heteropneustes fossilis	Hfo	5	0.41	0.12	0.39	1.65
52 Neotropius atherinoides NA 14 1.16 0.32 1.80 0.00	51	Chaca chaca	Cch	3	0.26	0.00	0.21	1.65
	52	Neotropius atherinoides	NA	14	1.16	0.32	1.80	0.00

3.3. Species diversity

Table 2. cont

The seasonal values of the Pielou's evenness, Margalef's richness, and Shannon-Wiener diversity indices are presented in Fig. 6. The studied haor is more diverse in post-monsoon season with the Shannon–Wiener diversity value of 3.27 \pm 0.17. Furthermore, fish species of the studied haor were more evenly distributed for the period of post-monsoon season (Pielou's evenness value 0.89 \pm 0.08). Species richness was also higher in post-monsoon season with the Margalef's richness value 7.97 \pm 0.24.



Figure 5. Seasonal variation of species diversity indices. (A) Shnnon-wiener, (B) Pielou evenness, (C) Magalef richness.

3.4. Species assemblage

According to analysis of similarity (ANOSIM), the species assemblage varied significantly among each of the seasonal groups (Table 3), with global R values of 0.5313, 0.0.8646, and 0.9063 and P values of 0.0477, 0.0293, and 0.0323. According to SIMPER analysis, there is an average dissimilarity of 36.61, 39.89, and 43.25 % between monsoon and post-monsoon, monsoon and pre-monsoon, and post-monsoon and pre-monsoon, respectively, whereas the most contributory species from **Table 3**. ANOSIM and SIMPER analysis of fish species assemblage

each group were *Nandus nandus* (5.55%), *Esomus danricus* (5.53%) and *Gudusia chapra* (4.34%). ANOSIM (P < 0.0007, R = 0.8032) has revealed significant variation in species assemblage among the seasons with an overall average dissimilarity of 39.92% determined by SIMPER analysis. Five most contributory fish species responsible for these seasonal variations are *Osteobrama cotio* (4.04%), *Esomus danricus* (3.96%), *Nandus nandus* (3.90%), *Gudusia chapra* (3.36%) *and Chanda nama* (3.30%).

Groups	ANOSIM		Dissimilarity index	% contribution	
	R P		Ave. Diss. (%)	Typical species	
		0.0477	36.61	Nandus nandus	5.55
M D				Gudusia chapra	4.17
Monsoon vs. Post-	0.5313			Channa striatus	3.83
monsoon				Chanda nama	3.57
				Puntius sophore	3.36
	0.0.8646	0.0293		Esomus danricus	5.53
			39.89	Osteobrama cotio	5.35
Monsoon vs. pre-				Gudusia chapra	4.18
monsoon				Lepidocephalichthys guntea	3.80
				Amblypharyngodon mola	3.65
	0.9063	0.0323	43.25	Gudusia chapra	4.34
				Chanda nama	4.15
Post-monsoon vs. Pre-				Osteobrama cotio	4.07
monsoon				Neotropius atherinoides	3.76
				Glossogobius giuris	3.59
		0.0007	39.92	Osteobrama cotio	4.04
				Esomus danricus	3.96
overall or pool all	0.8032			Nandus nandus	3.90
groups				Gudusia chapra	3.36
				Chanda nama	3.30

According to the Bray-Curtis similarity index (stress 0.043), three distinct seasonal groupings of fish assemblage were found by nMDS. (Fig. 6) which is

indicating dissimilarity of fish samples among the three seasons. The fish samples collected from different sites of Dingapota haor are grouped separately indicating their similarity. Samples within a group are more similar compared to the other groups.

Cluster analysis also separated the collected fish species into three distinct groups at 50.00% similarity (Fig. 7), whereas the first cluster (from the left side of the Fig. 7) consists of the species which had lower abundance during the study period. However, fish species with a moderate abundance are classified into the second cluster, and the fish species with the greatest abundance are represented by the third cluster.



Figure 6. Non-metric multidimensional scaling (NMDS) of fish species



Figure 7. Dendrogram demonstrating 2D ordination of a cluster analysis of fish species using the Bray-Curtis similarity matrix.

3.5. Canonical correspondence analysis (CCA)

Results obtained from CCA were plotted in Fig. 8 whereas the species placed nearer the vector were more closely related to them. The length and direction of the arrows show the relative significance of the water quality parameters. The CCA ordination directs that transparency, depth, DO and TDS are the most influential water quality parameters shaping fish species accumulation in the studied wetland. Water temperature and depth have close affinity with Esomus danricus, Gudusia chapra and Amblypharyngodon mola which are describing the monsoonal abundance of these species. Osteobrama cotio, Chanda nama and Macrognathus pancalus are found to be influenced mainly by DO, pH, NO₃-N and PO₄-P, and this interaction is highlighting the post monsoonal species abundance. Transparency, alkalinity and TDS showed their highest value during pre-monsoon season and the fish species Glossogobius chuno. Channa striatus, Chela

laubuca and *Puntius sophore* are found to be influenced mostly by these parameters



Figure 8. Biplot for canonical correspondence analysis. Wt = Water temperature, Trans = Transparency, Depth, DO = Dissolved oxygen, pH, NO₃-N = Nitrate-nitrite, PO_4 -P = Phosphate-phosphorus, Alk = Total alkalinity, TDS = Total dissolved solids. Species codes are shown in Table 2.

4. Discussion

The maximum average temperature was 29.89±0.65 °C in pre-monsoon, and the minimum temperature was 22.36±3.98°C in post-monsoon. The temperature in Ashulia beel ranged between 28.7 to 31.7°C and 22.4 to 25.6°C during wet and dry season, respectively (Islam et al.2010). During the study period, transparency was fluctuated from 39.59±4.41 cm (Post-monsoon) to 24.66±0.81 cm (Monsoon). Chowdhury and Mazumder (1981) reported the instances of excessive turbidity during the monsoon season. Productive water body should contain transparency of less than 40 cm (Salauddin and Islam 2011). The Water depth was found to range between 5.96±1.61 m in Monsoon to 1.66±0.82 m during premonsoon. The water level in the haor area becomes lowest during February, reaching its peak during July and declining again from August onward (Salauddin and Islam 2011). The maximum pH was noted 7.00±0.78 in postmonsoon and the lowermost was 6.38±0.60 in premonsoon. pH ranged between 7.15 and 7.45 was recorded by (Islam et al. 2017) at Karimganj haor in Kishoreganj, which is more or less similar to the present study. The DO contents ranged from 6.63±0.74 mg/L in post-monsoon to 4.56±0.53 mg/L in pre-monsoon. DO in Hakaluki haor and Karimganj haor (Akter et al.2017) ranged between 3.1 to 7.0 and 6.4 to 6.8 mg/L, respectively, which are mostly similar to the current investigation. NO3-N was the highest during pre-monsoon (0.33±0.04 mg/L), and the lowest during monsoon (0.13±0.01 mg/L). Nitrate-N (NO₃-N) concentrations ranged from 0.01 to 0.33 mg/L at different locations in Chalan Beel, and in Kaptai Lake (Halder et al. 1992) of Bangladesh. The PO₄-P was 1.34±0.11 mg/L in pre-monsoon to 1.16±0.02mg/L in monsoon. The PO₄-P in the Kaptai Lake ranged from 0.32 to 0.41 mg/L with an average of 0.367 mg/L. Khan et al. (1996) also revealed a higher level of PO₄-P in dry season compared to rainy season in their study location. Total alkalinity was 126.89±7.47 mg/L in pre-monsoon to 103.38±4.44 mg/L during monsoon season which is more or less similar to the findings of Ahatun et al. (2020) in Korotoa River (122.05 mg/L). The peak TDS content of the haor was 135.73±5.50 mg/L throughout pre-monsoon mg/L, and the lowermost was 100.97±5.16 mg/L in monsoon season. The TDS at various sampling locations of Hakaluki haor ranged

between 80.75 to 184.0 mg/L with the mean value of 132.38 mg/L (Akter *et al.*, 2017), which was comparable to the present study.

Fifty-two fish species were incurred during the study period which was abundantly belonging to 17 families, and the Cypriniformes was the most dominant (47.91%) group. Previous study conducted by Hasan et al. (2017) reported 17 families from Kishorgonj haor in Bangladesh, while slightly higher number of families was recorded by Islam et al. (2021) and Pandit et al. (2015) from Dekhar haor, Bangladesh. Freshwater bodies of Bangladesh are mainly dominated by Cypriniformes as was stated by Maria et al. (2016), Chowdhury et al. (2019), Akhi et al. (2020), Mazumder et al. (2016), Sunny et al. (2020), and Jannatul et al. (2015). Therefore, the current results supported the previous investigations. A total of 52 fish species obtained during the present work, which was supported by the findings of Islam et al. (2021) who described 57 species of fishes in their study. Seasonal fluctuation in the total species abundance was significant, whereas the maximum abundance was found in post-monsoon and the lowest in pre-monsoon season. Amblypharyngodon mola (11.03%) was the most dominant species followed by G. chapra (10.03%) and O. cotio (8.01%) which were mainly influenced by water temperature and depth. Small indigenous fishes are the main and inexpensive form of indispensable vitamin and mineral in the diet of people in Bangladesh (Bogard et al., 2015). Therefore, market value of these fish species is increasing day by day. As a result, fishermen are currently enhancing their fishing effort in the haor to catch them.

Seasonal changes in diversity of the present study were depicted by several diversity indices such as the number of species in an assemblage (Gotelli and Chao, 2013), evenness (Jost, 2010) and richness (Delang and Li, 2013). Diversity indices in the present study were found to increase significantly in post-monsoon season and decrease for the period of monsoon season. Higher diversity index during post-monsoon indicates the increase in fish species by reproducing, feeding and sheltering themselves successfully (Aziz et al., 2021). Similar findings were also made by Nath and Deka (2012) and Iqbal et al. (2015), who observed the highest diversity of fish during the post-monsoon season. However, lower species diversity during monsoon can be described by the higher water depth which reduced the effectiveness of fishing gear to catch fish. On the other hand, comparatively lower diversity indices during pre-monsoon season are possibly because of the stress caused by overfishing and scarcity of water (Aziz et al., 2021). Increased water temperature is also causing higher evaporation rate and decreased surface water area. As a result, intensive rice production and irrigation activities are affecting the ecological process of haor. Reduced transparency caused by silt particle inhibits the light penetration into the water. As a result reduced the primary and secondary productivity of water, which might be responsible for declining fish diversity in the present study. However, the diversity index recorded during the present study (2.60-3.27) was within the range (2.90-3.12) reported by Iqbal et al. (2015), higher (1.22-1.36) than the findings of Hossain and Rabby (2020) and lower (3.76-3.81) than the findings of Aziz et al. (2021). According to

Biligrami (1988) improved status of an aquatic habitat for fish diversity is indicated by Shannon-Wiener index of 3.0-4.5. That means studied haor is light to slightly polluted during monsoon season and this might be due to the domestic discharge, poor water quality and the uses of different insecticides and pesticides. Evenness and richness of fish species was also peak in post-monsoon season. Evenness is the degree of relative diversity which can be higher when the entire habitat supports similar density and richness is the range of relative abundance of fish species. In an even population, all species are assumed to be distributed identically into the habitat. As observed in the present study, decreased water level during postmonsoon season leads to more fish species caught by fishing activities causing a homogenous catches of the fishes. On the contrary, higher water depth during monsoon season causes irregular distribution of fish species, and the majority of fishes were caught using selective fishing gears which have low evenness and richness indices. Similar patterns of seasonal variation of fishes are also observed in various aquatic habitat of Bangladesh (Jewel et al., 2018; Joadder et al., 2015; Akhi et al., 2020).

5. Conclusion

Along with 52 species, Dingapota haor is the most species-rich haor in Bangladesh. However, water depth and heavy post-monsoonal fishing pressure were the main causes of the seasonal variation in species diversity in this area. To protect the remaining fish species, control over the perennial water regions during post-monsoon season needs to be maintained. The present study recommends designation of the perennial water areas as a sanctuary for the survival of matured fish in the post-monsoon season.

Acknowledgement

The research was supported by Bangladesh Fisheries Research Institute through the project entitled "Ecological assessment of inland open water fisheries population with bio-physicochemical properties to frame EBFM approach (Comp-A)."

Reference

Ahatun S, Islam MS, Kabir MH, Rehnuma M and Hoq ME. 2020. Water quality and fish diversity in Korotoa River of Bogura, Bangladesh. Bangladesh J. Fish., **32**(1): 61-72.

Ahmed A. 2013. Bangladesh: Environmental and Climate Change Assessment. International Fund for Agricultural Development: Rome, Italy.

Ahmed KKU, Hasan RR, Ahamed SU, Ahmed T and Mustafa G.2004. Ecology of Shakla beel (Brahmanbaria), Bangladesh. *Bang J. Fish. Res.*, **8**(2): 101-111.

Akhi MM, Jewel MAS, Haque MA, Sarker BK, Khatun MS, Paul AK, Islam MS and Das SK. 2020. Multivariate approaches to determine the relationship between fish assemblage structure and environmental variables in Karatoya River, Bangladesh. Community Ecol., **21**(2): 171-181.

Akter S, Saha SK, Kabir MH, Mamun SA, Islam MS. 2017. Fluctuations in water quality at Hakaluki Haor of Bangladesh. *Bangladesh J. Environ. Sci.*, **32**: 35-40. Alam MS, Quayum MA and Islam MA. 2010. Crop Production in the Haor Areas of Bangladesh: Insights from Farm Level Survey. The Agriculturists, **8**(2): 88-97.

Aquatic Research Group (ARG).1986.Hydrobiology of the Kaptai reservoir. University of Chittagong, FAO /UNDP Final Report No. DP /BGD /79 /015-4/FI. 192 pp.

Aziz MSB, Hasan NA, Mondol MMR, Alam MM and Haque MM. 2021. Decline in fish species diversity due to climatic and anthropogenic factors in Hakaluki Haor, an ecologically critical wetland in northeast Bangladesh. *Heliyon*, **7**(1):e05861.

Bhuiyan AL. 1964. Fishes of Dacca. Dacca: Asiatic Society of Pakistan.

Biligrami KS. 1988. Biological monitoring of rivers, problems and prospect in India. *Aqua. Ecotoxicol.*,: 245–250.

Bogard JR, Thilsted SH, Marks GC, Wahab MA, Hossain MAR, Jokobesen J and Stangoulis J. 2015. Nutrient composition of important fish species in Bangladesh and potential contribution to recommended nutrient intakes. *J. Food Compos. Anal.*, **42**: 120–156.

Bray JR and Curtis JC. 1957. An ordination of the upland forest communities of southern Wisconsin. Ecological Monographs, 27, 325–349.

Chowdhury MA, Karim MA, Rahman MT, Shefat SHT, Rahman A and, Hossain MA. 2019. Biodiversity assessment of indigenous fish species in the Surma river of Sylhet Sadar, Bangladesh. *Punjab Uni. J. Zool.*, **34**(1): 73-77

Chowdhury SH and Mazumder A. 1981. Limnology of lake Kaptai I. Physicochemical features. *Bangladesh J. Zool.*, **9**(1): 59-72.

Clarke KR and Warwick WM. 1994. Similarity-based testing for community pattern: The 2-way layout with no replication. *Mar. Biol.*, **118**: 167–176.

Delang, Claudio O and Wing Man Li. 2013. Species richness and diversity. Ecological Succession on Fallowed Shifting Cultivation Fields. 39-66.

Froese R and Pauly D. 2015. List of freshwater fishes reported from Bangladesh. Fish Base, World Wide Web electronic publication. Retrieved October, 2015, from www.Fishbase. Org,version.

Galib SM, Naser SMA, Mohsin ABM, Chaki N and Hassan F. 2013. Fish diversity of the River Choto Jamuna , Bangladesh : Present status and conservation needs. *Int. J. Biodivers. Conserv.*, **5**: 389-395.

Galib SM, Samad MA, Mohsin ABM, Flowra FA and Alam MT. 2009. Present Status of Fishes in the Chalan Beel- the Largest Beel (Wetland) of Bangladesh. *Int. J. Ani. Fish. Sci.*, **2**(3): 214-218.

Gotelli Nicholas J and Chao Anne. 2013. Measuring and Estimating Species Richness, Species Diversity, and Biotic Similarity from Sampling Data. In: Levin S.A. (ed.) Encyclopedia of Biodiversity, second edition, Volume 5, pp. 195-211.

Haldar GC, Mazid MA and Ahmed KKU. 1992. Limnology and primary production of Kaptai lake, Bangladesh. In: Reservoir Fisheries of Asia (ed. S.S. De Silva). Proceedings of the 2nd Asian reservoir fisheries workshop held in Hangzhou, People's Republic of China, 15-19 October, 1990. IDRC, Ottawa. ON, Canada. IDRC- 291e. pp. 2-11.

Hasan M, Hasan AS and Bhuyan MS. 2017. Fish diversity assessment of the haor region in Kishoreganj district, Bangladesh. *Res. J. Environ. Sci.*, **11**(1), 29-35.

Hossain MA and Rabby AF. 2020. Seasonality of physicochemical parameters and fin fish diversity at Hakaluki

Haor (Fenchungonj Upazilla), Sylhet, Bangladesh. Marine Life Sci., 2(2): 113-119.

Huda ATMN, Shah MS, Hasanuzzaman AFM and Azam MR. 2009. An Investigation on the Ichthyofauna of the Gorai-Modhumati River System. *Bang J. Zool.*, **37**(1):11-24.

Imteazzaman AM and, Galib SM. 2013. Fish Fauna of Halti Beel, Bangladesh. *Inter. J. Curr. Res.*, **5**(1): 287-290.

Iqbal MM, Nasren S and Mosarof Hossain M. 2015. Fish assemblage including threatened species in Hakaluki Haor, Sylhet, Bangladesh. J. Aqua. Trop., **30**(3–4): 223-246.

Islam J, Anisuzzaman, Minar MH and, Sarker J, "Fish Biodiversity of Dingaputa Haor and its Surrounding Area of Mohangonj Upazila, Netrakona District.2013. *J. Ocean Res.*, **1**(1): 1-5.

Islam MS, Jahan J, Mou MA, Kabir MH and Uddin MJ. 2017. Investigation of water quality and fish status of Karimganj Haor area in Kishoreganj. J. Environ. Sci. Nat. Reso, **10**(2): 19-27.

Islam MS, Suravi and Meghla NT. 2010. Investigation on water quality in the Ashulia Beel, Dhaka. *Bangladesh J. Fish. Res.*, **14**(1-2): 55-64.

Islam SM, Haque SA, Islam F, Rahman M, Rahman M, Das PS and Karmakar M. 2021. Diversity assemblages of fish genetic resources and conservation necessities in Hakaluki Haor, an ecologically sensitive natural wetland in north-eastern Bangladesh. *J. South Pacific Agri.*, **24**: 1-11.

Jannatul F M, Rashidul K, Amzad M and Arifur R. 2015. Fin fish assemblage and biodiversity status of carps on halda river. *Annals Vet. Ani. Sci.*, **2**(6): 151-161.

Jewel MAS, Haque MA, Khatun R and Rahman MS. (2018). A comparative study of fish assemblage and diversity indices in two different aquatic habitats in Bangladesh: Lakhandaha Wetland and Atari River. *Jordan J. Biol. Sci.*, **11**(4): 427-434.

Joadder MAR, Galib SM, Haque SMM and Chaki N. 2015. Fishes of the river Padma, Bangladesh: Current trend and conservation status. *J. Fish.*, **3**: 259–266.

Jost L. (2010). The Relation between Evenness and Diversity. *Diversity*, 2: 207–232.

Khan MAG, Chowdhury SH and Paul JC. 1996. Community structure and ecology of microbenthic invertebrate fauna of Lake Kaptai, Bangladesh. *Trop. Ecol.*, **37**(2): 229-245.

Khan MAI, Hossain AMM, Huda ME, Islam MS and Elahi SF. 2007. Physicochemical and biological aspects of monsoon waters of Ashulia for economic and aesthetic applications: preliminary studies. *Bangladesh J. Scien. Industr. Res.*, **42**(4): 377-396.

Khan MS, Haq E, Huq S, Rahman A, Rashid SMA and Ahmed H. 1990 Wetland of Bangladesh: A report. 1-79.

Margalef R. 1968. Perspectives in ecological theory. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Maria AB, Iqbal MM, Hossain MAR, Rahman MA Uddin S, Hossain MA and Jabed MN. 2016. Present status of endangered fish species in Sylhet Sadar, Bangladesh. Int. J. Nat. Sci., **6**(2): 104-110.

Mazumder SK, Das SK, Ghaffar MA, Rahman MH, Majumder MK and Basak LR. 2016. Role of co-management in wetland productivity: A case study from Hail haor in Bangladesh. *AACL Bioflux*, **9**(3): 466-482.

Mohsin ABM, Haque SkM, Galib SM, Hassan F, Chaki N, Islam N and Rahman M. 2013. Seasonal Abundance of Fin Fishes in the Padma River at Rajshahi District, Bangladesh. *World J. Fish Mar. Sci.*, **5**(6): 680-685.

MoW. 2005. Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh.

Mustafa MG, Sarker GC, Anwar SN, Ahsanuzzaman M, Rahman S, Azher S and Morshed RM. 2019. Analysis of pond fisheries in climate change scenario in the Haor region of Bangladesh. *Adv. Res.*, 1-14.

Muzaffar S. 2004. Diurnal time-activity budgets in wintering Ferruginous Pochard Aythya nyroca in Tanguar Haor, Bangladesh. Forktail, **20**(2): 25-27.

Nath B and Deca C. 2012. A Study on Fish Diversity, Conservation Status and Anthropogenic Stress of Chandubi Tectonic Lake, Assam, India. J. Bio. Innov., 1(6):148-155.

Nelson JS. (2006). Fishes of the world (4th ed.). London: Wiley.

Pandit D, Kunda M, Harun-al-rashid A, Sufian MA and Mazumder SK. 2015. Present status of fish biodiversity in Dekhar Haor, Bangladesh : a case study. *World J. Fish Mar. Sci.*, **7**(4): 278-287.

Pielou EC. 1966. Species diversity and pattern diversity in the study of ecological succession. J. Theor. Biol., 3: 131–144.

Poffenberger M. 2000. Communities and forest management in South Asia: a regional profile of the Working Group on Community Involvement in Forest Management. Communities and forest management

Quddus MMA and Shafi M. 1983. Bangaposagar Matsya Sampad (The Fisheries Resources of the Bay of Bengal). Dhaka: Kabir Publications.

Quddus MMA, Sarker MN and Banerjee AK.1988. Studies of the chondrichthyes Fauna (Sharks, Skates and Rays) of the Bay of Bengal. The Journal of Noami,, **5**: 19–39.

Rahman AKA, Kabir SMH, Ahmad M, Ahmed ATA, Ahmed ZU and, Begum ZNT. 2009. Encyclopedia of Flora and Fauna of Bangladesh. J. Asiatic Soci. Bangladesh. **24**: 2–57.

Rahman AKA.1989. Freshwater fishes of Bangladesh (1st ed., p. 364). Dhaka: Zoological Society of Bangladesh, University of Dhaka.

Rahman AKA.2005. Freshwater fishes of Bangladesh (2nd ed.). Dhaka: Zoological Society of Bangladesh, Department of Zoology, University of Dhaka.

Rahman MS.1992. Water quality management in aquaculture. Bangladesh: BRAC Prokashana, pp. 84.

Roy BJ, Dey MP, Alamand MF and Singh NK. 2007. Present status of shark fishing in the marine water of Bangladesh. UNEP/CMS/MS/Inf/10.17p. Retrieved March 15, 2009, from Sharks/pdf-docs/Inf-10-Bangladesh-Presentation-on-Shark-Fishing.pdf.

Saha BK and Hossain MA. 2002. Saldu Beel fishery of Tangail. *Bang. J. Zool.*, **30**(2): 187-194.

Salauddin M and Islam AKMS. 2011. Identification of land cover changes of the haor area of Bangladesh using modis images.In: 3rd international conference on water and flood management (ICWFM-2011).

Shannon CE and Wiener W. (1949). The mathematical theory of communication (p. 117). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Sunny AR, Alam R, Sadia MA, Miah Y and Hossain S. 2020. Factors affecting the biodiversity and human well-being of an ecologically sensitive wetland of North Eastern Bangladesh. *J. Coastal Zone Manag.*, **23**(1): 1-8.

Talwar PK and Jhingran AG. 1991. Inland fishes of India and adjacent countries (Vol. 1 and 2). New Delhi: Oxford and IBH Publishing Company Pvt. Ltd.

Thompson P, Das AK, Deppertand DL and Chouhury SN. 2007. Changes in biodiversity with wetland restoration and fish reintroduction, MACH technical paper 5. Dhaka: Winrock International.