# SEX DISCRIMINATION AMONG FOUR MORMYRID SPECIES OF ANAMBRA RIVER SYSTEM NIGERIA

<sup>1</sup>NWANI, Christopher Didigwu, <sup>2</sup>INYANG, Nicholas Mathias and <sup>2</sup>EYO, Joseph Effiong <sup>1</sup> Department of Applied Biology, Ebonyi State University, Abakaliki, Ebonyi State, Nigeria. <sup>2</sup>Fisheries and Hydrobiology Research Unit, Department of Zoology, University of Nigeria Nsukka, Enugu State, Nigeria.

**Corresponding author:** NWANI, Christopher Didigwu, Department of Applied Biology, Ebonyi State University, Abakaliki, Ebonyi State, Nigeria.

# ABSTRACT

Sex discriminating characters of four mormyrid species caught from Anambra river basin, Nigeria were investigated. Sexual dimorphism occurred in only one transformed character – dorsal fin base length and in four raw morphometric characters namely total length, standard length, dorsal fin base length and anal fin base length. These characters are recommended as key characters in mormyrid taxonomy.

Key Words: Mormyridae, sex dimorphism, Anambra river

# INTRODUCTION

Mormyrus rume, Hyperopisus bebe, Campylomormyrus tamandua and Gnathonemus petersii are among the mormyrids inhabiting fresh waters of tropical Africa (Lowe-McConnell, 1975). They are very common, of commercial importance and are often seen in piles of smoke-cured fishes (Teugels et al 1992). They are used, along with Clarias species (Ezenwaji and Inyang, 1998), in preparing local delicacies for marriage and naming ceremonies. Despite their fisheries and importance, very little information exists on their morphometric characters and meristic counts. Venu and Kurup (2003) had noted the importance of morphometric characters for the differentiation of taxonomic units in fishes. Anyanwu and (2003) Ugwumba used morphometric parameters, meristic counts and electrophoresis traces to separate *Pseudotolithus senegalensis* caught from three zones in the Nigerian inshore waters. Morphometric characters and meristic counts have been used to delimit *Clarias* species in Anambra river (Ezenwaji, 1986; Eyo, 1997, 2003 a, b, Eyo and Inyang 2004) and to distinguish between Heterobranchus bidorsalis and Heterobranchus bidorsalis x Clarias gariepinus hybrid (Madu et al., 1993)

The present study aims at identifying specific differences in morphometric characters to establish sexual dimorphism in M. *rume*, *H. bebe*, *C. tamandua* and *G. petersii*.

#### MATERIALS AND METHODS

Fish specimens were collected monthly at Otuocha and Ogurugu between October, 2000 and March, 2002 using gill nets, drag nets, surface drift nets and cast nets of various mesh sizes. Baskets, traps and hook and line were also used to catch the fish. Specimens were also bought from the major landing Anambra river port at Otuocha. The multiple sampling methods were employed to eliminate gear selectivity and ensure good representation of all sizes of the Fish. Individuals required for the morphometric studies were iced and transported to the Pure and Applied Project Laboratory, Department of Zoology, University of Nigeria, Nsukka where they were kept under refrigeration until used.

Identification of fish collected was done using the keys of Holden and Reed (1972), Lowe-McConnell (1972), Teugels *et al.* (1992) and Olaosebikan and Raji (1998). The sex of each fish was determined. Prior to the measurement of the morphometric characters, each frozen specimen was allowed to thaw completely after which the weight was taken to the nearest 0.01 gram using a Metler PC 2000 electronic balance. Fish were measured to the nearest 0.01 centimeters using a fish measuring board, Veneir caliper and a pair of dividers. The characters measured were:

• Standard length (SL): The length from the tip of the snout to the anterior base of the caudal fin.

Mormyrus rume						Hyperopisus bebe				
Males	Females	Τ-	2-Tail	Males	Female	T-	2-Tail			
		Value	Prob.			Value	Prob.			
37.38 <u>+</u> 0.55	45.03 <u>+</u> 0.85	-23.03	0.00*	27.59 <u>+</u> 0.64	29.55 <u>+</u> 0.74	-9.98	0.00*			
40.08 <u>+</u> 0.77	45.02 <u>+</u> 0.85	-18.88	0.00*	29.81 <u>+</u> 0.81	32.55 <u>+</u> 1.59	-5.05	0.00*			
4.14 <u>+</u> 0.53	4.23 <u>+</u> 1.21	-0.28	0.79	2.75 <u>+</u> .0.41	2.86 <u>+</u> 0.41	-0.68	0.51			
1.49 <u>+</u> 0.31	1.54 <u>+</u> 0.46	-0.26	0.80	1.01 <u>+</u> 0.24	0.85 <u>+</u> 0.28	1.62	0.13			
341 <u>+</u> 0.37	3.86 <u>+</u> 1.07	-1.54	0.15	2.20 <u>+</u> 0.26	247 <u>+</u> 0.19	-3.06	0.01*			
161 <u>+</u> 0.40	1.45 <u>+</u> 0.52	1.68	0.12	0.71 <u>+</u> 0.23	0.85 <u>+</u> 0.28	1.51	0.16			
16.28 <u>+</u> 0.40	17.32 <u>+</u> 0.44	-6.01	0.00*	2.02 <u>+</u> 0.19	2.50 <u>+</u> 0.31	5.72	0.00*			
285 <u>+</u> 0.21	3.62 <u>+</u> 0.42	-6.02	0.00*	2.78+0.25	2.58 <u>+</u> 0.28	2.05	0.06			
2.80 <u>+</u> 0.35	3.25 <u>+</u> 0.35	-4.70	0.00*	10.91 <u>+</u> 0.41	12.99 <u>+</u> 0.65	-8.28	0.00*			
582 <u>+</u> 0.74	7.47 <u>+</u> 0.51	-5.04	0.00*	5.01 <u>+</u> 0.33	5.04 <u>+</u> 0.46	-0.17	0.87			
471 <u>+</u> 0.30	5.35 <u>+</u> 0.15	-6.32	0.00*	2.60 <u>+</u> 0.49	3.35 <u>+</u> 0.28	-4.12	0.00*			
Campylomormyrus tamandua				Gnathonemus petersii						
Males	Females	T-	2-Tail	Males	Female	T-	2-tail			
		Value	Prob.			Value	Prob.			
27.40 <u>+</u> 0.36	28.82 <u>+</u> 0.63	-6.05	0.00*	34.02 <u>+</u> 1.72	39.55 <u>+</u> 3.81	-4.44	0.00*			
28.86 <u>+</u> 0.52	30.11 <u>+</u> 1.49	-2.52	0.03*	37.58 <u>+</u> 0.29	41.44 <u>+</u> 0.37	-6.79	0.00*			
3.95 <u>+</u> 0.56	4.85 <u>+</u> 0.56	-5/76	0.00*	4.15 <u>+</u> 0.47	4.62 <u>+</u> 0.71	-2.44	0.03*			
1.27 <u>+</u> 0.20	1.56 <u>+</u> 0.27	-3.19	0.01*	1.69 <u>+</u> 0.34	2.02 <u>+</u> 0.39	-1.92	0.08			
3.18 <u>+</u> 0.26	3.42 <u>+</u> 0.38	-2.11	0.06	2.45 <u>+</u> 0.54	2.60 <u>0.64</u>	-1.26	0.23			
1.10 <u>+</u> 0.21	1.99 <u>+</u> 0.37	-9.74	0.00*	1.14 <u>+</u> 0.39	0.53 <u>+</u> 0.37	-2.50	0.03*			
7.12 <u>+</u> 0.25	8.85 <u>+</u> 0.33	-1.86	0.05*	3.15 <u>+</u> 0.56	4.17 <u>+</u> 0.73	-4.31	0.00*			
3.12 <u>+</u> .0.45	3.45 <u>+</u> 0.44	-1.87	0.09	3.37 <u>+</u> 0.36	3.70 <u>+</u> 0.35	-2.60	0.02*			
10.52 <u>+</u> 0.49	11.02 <u>+</u> 56	-2.60	0.02*	8.26 <u>+</u> 0.68	9.36 <u>+</u> 0.56	-3.99	0.00*			
4.70 <u>+</u> 0.29	4.82 <u>+</u> 0.26	-0.99	0.34	4.32 <u>+</u> 0.52	4.35 <u>+</u> 0.53	-0.04	0.97			
2.77 <u>+</u> 0.31	2.77 <u>+</u> 0.31	-1.92	0.08	3.16 <u>+</u> 0.41	2.72 <u>+</u> 0.30	2.91	0.01*			
	$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	MalesFemales $37.38\pm0.55$ $45.03\pm0.85$ $40.08\pm0.77$ $45.02\pm0.85$ $4.14\pm0.53$ $4.23\pm1.21$ $1.49\pm0.31$ $1.54\pm0.46$ $341\pm0.37$ $3.86\pm1.07$ $161\pm0.40$ $1.45\pm0.52$ $16.28\pm0.40$ $17.32\pm0.44$ $285\pm0.21$ $3.62\pm0.42$ $2.80\pm0.35$ $3.25\pm0.35$ $582\pm0.74$ $7.47\pm0.51$ $471\pm0.30$ $5.35\pm0.15$ CampylomormyrdiMalesFemales $27.40\pm0.36$ $28.82\pm0.63$ $28.86\pm0.52$ $30.11\pm1.49$ $3.95\pm0.56$ $4.85\pm0.56$ $1.27\pm0.20$ $1.56\pm0.27$ $3.18\pm0.26$ $3.42\pm0.38$ $1.0\pm0.21$ $1.99\pm0.37$ $7.12\pm0.25$ $8.85\pm0.33$ $3.12\pm.0.45$ $3.45\pm0.44$ $10.52\pm0.49$ $11.02\pm56$ $4.70\pm0.29$ $4.82\pm0.26$	$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $			

Table 1: Sex dimorphism in raw data among the mormyrid species in Anambra river

Key \*indicates significant difference @ P = 0.05

### Table 2: Sex dimorphism in ratio (percentage standard length) among the mormyrid species in Anambra river

	Mormyrus rume				Hyperopisus bebe				
Morphometric parameters	Males	Females	T-	2-Tail	Males	Female	T-	2-tail	
			Value	Prob.			Value	Prob.	
Total length (TL)	110.8 <u>+</u> 2.61	10723 <u>+</u> 2.18	4.44	0.00*	108.12 <u>+</u> 4.72	110.18 <u>+</u> 5.24	-1.16	0.27	
Pectoral fin Height (PFH)	11.08 <u>+</u> 1.41	11.09 <u>+</u> 1.17	-0.02	0.99	9.99 <u>+</u> 0.91	9.85 <u>+</u> 1.25	0.30	0.77	
Pectoral fin Base length (PFBL)	3.99 <u>+</u> 0.64	3.75 <u>+</u> 1.25	0.53	0.60	3.68 <u>+</u> 0.75	7.68 <u>+</u> 129	-10.94	0.00*	
Pelvic fin Height (PeFH)	9.12 <u>+</u> 01.07	10.20 <u>+</u> 1.02	-2.26	0.04*	7.98 <u>+</u> 1.05	8.35 <u>+</u> 0.68	-1.21	0.25	
Pelvic fin Base length(PeBL)	4.45 <u>+</u> 1.15	3.56 <u>+</u> 1.29	3.32	0.01*	2.58 <u>+</u> 0.87	2.91 <u>+</u> 1.02	-0.99	0.34	
Dorsal fin Base Length (DFBL)	45.51 <u>+</u> 1.44	42.32 <u>+</u> 1.75	1.57	0.02*	7.34 <u>+</u> 0.77	8.46 <u>+</u> 0.09	-3.73	0.00*	
Anal fin Height (AFH)	7.64 <u>+</u> 0.56	8.86 <u>+</u> 1.19	-3.45	0.00*	10.07 <u>+</u> 0.93	8.72 <u>+</u> 0.82	3.89	0.00*	
Anal fin Base length (AFBL)	7.95 <u>+</u> 0.88	7.49 <u>+</u> 0.96	1.63	0.13	39.55 <u>+</u> 1.35	43.96 <u>+</u> 2.28	-5.29	0.00*	
Pelvic-Anal fin space (PeAFS)	18.26 <u>+</u> 1.48	15.58 <u>+</u> 0.50	3.05	0.01*	9.42 <u>+</u> 1.71	11.37 <u>+</u> 1.07	-2.88	0.01*	
Pectoral-Pelvic fin space (PpeFS)	12.60 <u>+</u> 0.73	13.04 <u>+</u> 0.08	-1.92	0.08	9.46 <u>+</u> 1.74	11.37 <u>+</u> 1.07	-2.75	0.02*	
	Campylomormyrus tamandua				Gnathonemus petersii				
Morphometric parameters	Males	Females	T-	2-Tail	Males	Female	T-	2-tail	
			Value	Prob.			Value	Prob.	
Total length (TL)	105.32 <u>+</u> 2.22	10567 <u>+</u> 2.67	-0.33	0.75	110.76 <u>+</u> 6.91	105.53 <u>+</u> 9.33	1.70	0.12	
Pectoral fin Height (PFH)	14.41 <u>+</u> 1.61	16.41 <u>+</u> 1.98	-4.21	0.00*	12.36 <u>+</u> 1.43	11.71 <u>+</u> 1.70	1.27	0.23	
Pectoral fin Base length (PFBL)	4.59 <u>+</u> 0.48	5.42 <u>+</u> 0.97	-2.43	0.03*	5.02 <u>+</u> 1.26	5.14 <u>+</u> 0.88	-0.25	0.81	
Pelvic fin Height (PeFH)	11.51 <u>+</u> 1.05	11.90 <u>+</u> 1.59	-0.88	0.42	7.23 <u>+</u> 1.48	6.62 <u>+</u> 1.47	1.32	0.21	
Pelvic fin Base length(PeBL)	3.98 <u>+</u> 0.77	6.93 <u>+</u> 1.33	-8.37	0.00*	3.45 <u>+</u> 1.04	3.88 <u>+</u> 0.85	-1.27	0.23	
Dorsal fin Base Length (DFBL)	25.99 <u>+</u> 0.90	27.17 <u>+</u> 1.41	2.52	0.03*	9.30 <u>+</u> 1.85	10.48 <u>+</u> 1.79	-1.87	0.04*	
Anal fin Height (AFH)	11.40 <u>+</u> 1.63	11.96 <u>+</u> 1.61	-0.36	0.41	9.95 <u>+</u> 1.22	9.43 <u>+</u> 1.17	1.08	0.30	
Anal fin Base length (AFBL)	38.06 <u>+</u> 2.43	38.24 <u>+</u> 1.59	-0.22	0.83	24.37 <u>+</u> 2.36	23.85 <u>+</u> 2.53	0.44	0.67	
Pelvic-Anal fin space (PeAFS)	10.08 <u>+</u> 1.15	10.25 <u>+</u> 1.36	-0.47	0.64	9.32 <u>+</u> 1.17	6.94 <u>+</u> 1.16	5.40	0.00*	
Pectoral-Pelvic fin space (PpeFS)	10.10 <u>+</u> 1.13	10.18 <u>+</u> 1.44	-0.22	0.83	9.32 <u>+</u> 1.17	6.94 <u>+</u> 1.16	5.40	0.00*	

Key \*Indicate significant difference @ P= 0.05

- Total length (TL): The length from the . tip of the snout to the end of the caudal fin.
- Pectoral fin height (PFH): The length of • the tallest pectoral fin ray.
- Pectoral fin base length (FBL): The • basal length of the pectoral fin.
- Pelvic fin height (PeFH): The length of • the tallest pelvic fin ray.
- Pelvic fin base length (PeFBL): The basal length of the pelvic fin i.e. the distance between the anterior base of the first pelvic fin ray to the posterior base of the last pelvic fin ray.

- Dorsal fin base length (DFBL): The distance between the anterior base of the first dorsal fin ray to the posterior base of the last dorsal fin ray.
- Anal fin height (AFH): The length of the tallest anal fin ray.
- Anal fin base length (AFBL): The basal length of the anal fin i.e. the distance between the first and last anal fin rays.
- Pelvic-anal fin space (Pe-AFS): The ventrobasal distance between the posterior end of the pelvic fin and the anterior end of the anal fin.
- Pectoral pelvic fin space (Ppe-Fs): The ventrobasal distance between the posterior end of the pectoral fin and the anterior end of the pelvic fin.

### **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

Sex differentiating characters in the raw data among males and females of all the mormyrid species (Table 1) were detected in 4 (36:4 %) of the 11 studied characters. These include total length, standard length, dorsal fin base length and anal fin base length. In the transformed data (ratio data), the only sex differentiating character among males and females in all the mormyrid species studied was dorsal fin base length (Table 2) These characters are recommended as key characters in mormyrid taxonomy.

Among *M. rume*, sex discrimination occurred in 7 (63.6 %) raw and 6 (60 %) ratio morphometric characters. Four characters (total length, dorsal fin base length, anal fin height and pelvic - anal - fin space) showed sex discrimination both in the raw and transformed (ratio) data. For H. bebe, sex discrimination was recorded in 6(54.6 %) raw and 6 (60 %) ratio characters. Three morphometric characters namely dorsal fin base length, anal fin base length and pectoral-pelvic fin space showed sex discrimination both in the raw and transformed data. Sex discrimination occurred in 7(63:6 %) raw and 4(40 %) morphometric characters in C. tamandua. Three characters (pectoral fin base length, pelvic fin base length and dorsal fin base length) showed sex discrimination both in the raw and transformed (ratio) data.

Considering *G. petersii*, sex discrimination was recorded in 3 (27.3 %) ratio and 8(80 %) raw morphometric characters. Two characters namely dorsal fin base length and pectoral-pelvic fin space showed sex discrimination both in the raw and transformed (ratio) data.

Similar work in sexual dimorphism among the teleosts has been reported by Libosvarsky and Bishara (1987). Their report demonstrated sexual differences in three characters in *O. niloticus* and seven characters in T. zilli. This finding is also similar to the report of Beacham et al (1988) who noted sexual dimorphism in four morphometric characters (head width, caudal peduncle depth, anal fin base length and dorsal fin height) between male and female pink salmon Onchorhychus gorbuscha in British Columbia. This report also relates to the findings of Reist et al (1995) who demonstrated sexual dimorphism in pelvic and anal fin rays among male and female artic char Salveinus alpinus from lake Hazen. Furthermore, the present study is consistent with the report of Nwani (1998) who reported sexual dimorphism in four raw morphometric characters (fork length, anal fin height, pectoral – pelvic fin space and pelvic anal fin space) among Distichodus species of Anambra river.

#### REFERENCES

- ANYANWU, A. O and UGWUMBA, O. A. (2002). Studies on the morphometric, meristic and electrophoresis patterns of *Pseudotolitus spp. The Zoologist. (In press).*
- BEACHAM, T. D., WITHER, R. E., MURRAY, C. B and BAINER, L. W. (1988). Variation in body size, morphology, egg size and biochemical genetics of pink salmon in British Columbia. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society*, *117(2*): 109 – 126.
- EYO, J. E. (1997). Morphometric and cytogenetic variations among Clarias species (Clariidae) in Anambra River, Nigeria. PhD Thesis, University of Nigeria, Nsukka. 267 pp.
- EYO, J. E. (2002a). Conspecific discrimination in ratio morphometric characters among members of Pisces Genus: Clariidae Scopoli 1777. *The Zoologist* (In press).
- EYO, J. E. (2002b). Congeneric discrimination of morphometric characters among members of the Pisces Genus: Clariidae: Scopoli 1777. *The Zoologist* (in press)
- EYO, J. E. and INYANG, N. M. (2004). Mayr's coefficient of difference and taxonomy of *Clarias* (Clariidae-Scopoli, 1777). Animal *Research International, 1(1):* 36 41.

- EZENWAJI, H. M. G. (1986). The problems of the taxonomy of *Clarias* species (Pisces: Clariidae) in Africa and suggestions for the field worker. *Journal of Science Education, 2:* 22 – 34.
- EZENWAJI, H. M. G. and INYANG, N. M. (1998). Observations on the biology of *Clarias agboyiensis* Sydenham, Nigeria. *Fisheries Research, 36*: 47 – 60.
- HOLDEN, M. J. and REED, W. (1972). *West African fresh water fish.* Longman, London. 63 pp.
- LIBOVARSKY, J. and BISHARA, N. F. (1981). Biometrics of Egyptian Tilapine Fishes: Methodology and diagnosis. *Acta. Sc. Nat. Brno, 21(1):* 1-46.
- LOWE MCCONNELL, R.H (1972). *Fresh water fishes of the Volta and Kainji lakes.* Accra: Ghana University Press. 284 pp.
- LOWE-MCCONNELL, R.H. (1975). Fish Communities in tropical fresh waters: their distribution, ecology and evolution. Longman Inc. New York. pp 22 – 38.
- MADU, C.T., MOHAMMED, S. ISA, J. and ITA, E.
  O. (1993). Further studies on the growth, morphometric and meristic characteristics of *Clarias anguillaris, Heterobranchus bidorsalis* and their hybrid. Pages 23 29. *In. NIFFR, National Institute for Fresh Water Fisheries Research Annual Report 1993.*

Federal Ministry of Agriculture, Water Resources and Rural Development.

- NWANI, C.D (1998). *Aspects of the Biology of Distchodus species in Anambra river Nigeria.* M. Sc. Thesis University of Nigeria, Nsukka. 133 pp.
- OLAOSEBIKAN, B. D and RAJI, A. (1998). *Field guide to Nigerian freshwater fishes.* Federal College of Freshwater Fisheries Technology, New Bussa. 106 pp.
- REIST, J. D., GYSELMAN, E., BABALUK, J., JOHNSON, J. and WISSINK, R. (1995). Evidence for two Morphotypes of Arctic char (*Salvelinus alpinus*) (L), from Hazen, Ellesmere Island, Northwest Territories, Canada. *Nordic Journal of freshwater Research, 71*: 394-410.
- TUEGELS, G. G., REID, G. M. and KING R. P. (1992). Fishes of the Cross River Basin (Cameroon-Nigeria): Taxonomy, zoogeography Ecology and conservation. Musee Royal de L'Afrique centrale, Tervuren, Belguim. *Annals of Scientific Zoology*, 182 p.
- VENU, T. J. and KURUP, B. M. (2003). Length Weight relationship of some deep-sea fish inhabiting the continental slope beyond 250m depth along the West coast of India. *Naga, The ICLARM Quarterly, 26(2):* 17 – 21.