



ACETYLCHOLINE ESTERASE ACTIVITY IN EARTHWORM *EUDRILUS EUGENIAE* EXPOSED TO LOW DENSITY POLYETHYLENE MICROPLASTICS CONTAMINATED SOIL

Zoology

Padayappa Murugan	Ph.d. Research Scholar, Pg & Research Department Of Zoology, Chikkaiah Naicker College, Erode – 638 004. Tamil Nadu, India.
Dr. Senthilkumar Arumugam*	Associate Professor, Pg & Research Department Of Zoology, Chikkaiah Naicker College, Erode – 638 004. Tamil Nadu, India. *Corresponding Author
Dr. Moorthi Mahaly	Assistant Professor, Pg & Research Department Of Zoology, Avc College Autonomous, Mayiladuthurai – 609 305. Tamil Nadu, India.
Sivakumar Marappa	Ph.d. Research Scholar, Pg & Research Department Of Zoology, Chikkaiah Naicker College, Erode – 638 004. Tamil Nadu, India.
Dr. Saraswathi Krishnan	Assistant Professor, Pg & Research Department Of Zoology, Chikkaiah Naicker College, Erode – 638 004. Tamil Nadu, India.

ABSTRACT

Microplastic made of low-density polyethylene poses an environmental hazard because to its haphazard disposal and slow rate of degradation in landfills. The importance of evaluating the effects of pollution on soil ecosystems has increased, and interest in using invertebrates as sentinel creatures has increased as well. The necessity for a deeper comprehension of earthworm biomarker reactions has been emphasized in recent papers. This study looked at the earthworm acetylcholinesterase (AChE) activity of *Eudrilus eugeniae* following exposure to varying amounts of LDPE microplastic-contaminated soil (0, 50, 200, 350, 500, and 650 mg) combined with nanoparticles and naturally occurring microorganisms. The results obtained in the avoidance assay indicated a lack of preference for either soil type; however, upon moving, the earthworms lost surface mucus, resulting in burns and lesions on their bodies, which were reflected in the increase in AChE enzyme levels, which was not directly related to microplastic ingestion, but rather likely acts as an external physical stress agent. The results of the ingestion bioassay showed that microplastic was present in the earthworm segments, with a higher number of particles in the hindgut. The *Eudrilus eugeniae* did not distinguish microplastics from soil particles, and given the high exposure concentrations, microplastics produced physical lesions on the mucous membranes of earthworms showed to be a suitable for bioremediation of LDPE contaminated soil.

KEYWORDS

LDPE microplastics, Contaminated soil, *Eudrilus eugeniae*, Acetylcholinesterase.

INTRODUCTION

Concerns over plastic and low density polyethylene (LDPE) microplastics entering soil and possibly affecting soil biota biodiversity through commercial fertilizer use have grown. The overall amount of LDPE microplastics present can have a significant effect on the bulk density, microbial activity and water-holding capacity of the soil. The biophysical system and soil biota are also impacted by these LDPE microplastics. Thus, removing LDPE microplastics from the planet is essential to preserving healthy soil. Thus, plastic pollution in the soil, especially with regard to LDPE microplastics, has a substantial effect on human health and the food chain.

In the field of ecology and the environment, LDPE microplastics rank as the second most important scientific issue, according to Barnes *et al.* (2009). LDPE Microplastics are extensively distributed across aquatic environments, according to a number of studies (Derraik, 2002). Many studies have shown that LDPE microplastics may accumulate in the body and cause harm to a wide range of animals, especially those that live in water (Gambardella *et al.*, 2017; Anbumani and Kakkar, 2018). However, terrestrial ecosystems have received a great deal less attention regarding LDPE microplastics than aquatic ones. According to Horton *et al.* (2017), plastic contamination in terrestrial ecosystems may be four to twenty-three times higher than that in seas, with land being the primary source of LDPE microplastic pollution in aquatic settings.

Reports on the state of microplastic pollution in the terrestrial ecosystem have also been published. Prior research has demonstrated the presence of microplastics in a broad range of soil types, including industrial, coastal, and farming soils (Fuller and Gautam, 2016). Additionally, people could ingest plastic particles by the food chain, which could be detrimental to their health. Thus, studies on the effects of microplastics on terrestrial animals can contribute to our knowledge of the toxicity of plastic particles in the environment and support the need for environmental management.

In many species, acetylcholine esterase acts as a biomarker of

neurotoxicity by breaking down acetylcholine to counteract the neurotoxic effects of contaminants. Earthworms are vital to terrestrial ecosystems and are a valuable biomarker for toxicological studies. It was unknown how earthworms were affected by microplastics in terms of oxidative stress and neurotoxicity. To investigate the ecological toxicity of microplastics, earthworms must be chosen. The purpose of this study was to examine the neurotoxicity response, as shown by AChE activity, in earthworms (*Eudrilus eugeniae*) following exposure to LDPE microplastics containing nanoparticles and native bacteria. For this reason, LDPE was utilized as a representative in this investigation.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Low density polyethylene microplastics

Utilizing sterile spatulas, low-density polyethylene (LDPE) microplastics were gathered from several plastic waste disposal sites and landfills in Gobichettipalayam, Erode District, Tamil Nadu, India, and preserved in polythene bags with appropriate labeling for each sample. A laser particle size analyzer was used to measure the particular size distribution, with a range of 100 µm to 200 µm. For the studies, the LDPE particles had been dried overnight at 40°C after being cleaned twice with 70% ethanol for disinfectants and ultrapure water to eliminate contaminants (Kathiresan, 2003).

Collection And Culture Of Earthworm *Eudrilus Eugeniae*

These earthworms were collected from vermicomposting unit, Nasiyanur, Erode District, Tamil Nadu, India, and collected worms were cultured and further identified using Manual of earthworm identification (Julka, 2001).

Preparation Of Vermibed

A mixture of loam soil, cow dung and partially decomposed leaves in the first vermin bed while in the second bed was a mixture of cow dung, partially decomposed rice straw and rice hull and shredded moist newspapers. The succeeding layers earthworms were reared in garden soil and garden waste in a vermibeds of dimension 4 x 2 x 4.4 feet (length x breadth x height) sufficient for vermiculture with a controlled optimal moisture content of 60 to 70% by adequate watering and

maintained temperature between 26°C and 28°C. Nylon net was used to cover the bed to prevent the entry of predators. The earthworms *E. eugeniae* were stored in cement container and two to three weeks aged cow dung (CD) was used as feed substrate to culture the earthworms and sixty five to seventy five per cent of moisture content of the culture tanks were frequently maintained by sprinkling of water. Further, all the worms were well adapted to laboratory conditions before inoculating into the different experimental treatments.

Inoculation of earthworm

Immediately after the addition of additives, earthworms were sorted out from the holding containers, washed with clean water and 25 healthy and matured earthworms *Eudrilus eugeniae* measured, weighed and inoculated into the experimental pots. The setup was placed inside the laboratory under dark and sprinkled with water to maintain that the substrate moisture level which was maintained around 65-75% and checked morning and evening on a daily basis for 60 days. The experimental pots were supplemented with 1.250 L of molasses, 2 L of mineral medium and 750 ml of enriched microorganisms along with plastic waste contaminated soil (Senthilkumar, 2016).

Enzymatic Analysis

Earthworm Sample Collection

The test species are gathered by following specific procedure (Owa *et al.*, 2013). The test species are anaesthetized (10 mL of 95% ethanol to 90 mL of Ringer's solution) and kept in a prechilled mortar and pestle. An ice cold 50mM Tris-sucrose buffer (1:9, w/v, pH 7.5) is added to the mortar and ground well. The homogenate is taken and centrifuged at 3000 rpm at 4°C for 15 min. The supernatant is carefully pipetted out and be used for the desired analytic purpose.

Acetylcholinesterase (ache) Activity

The acetylcholinesterase (AChE) activity is measured by the procedures propounded by Dauberschmidt *et al.* (1997). The principle behind this modified method is the acetylthiocholine iodide on hydrolysis by AChE, yellow byproduct is synthesized, it leads the reaction of acetylthiocholine along with DTNB in adequate milieu. The rate of yellow product is correspondent to the rate of acetylcholinesterase activity which is measured by spectrophotometrical method at 410 nm.

Statistical Analysis

Two-way analyses of variance (ANOVA) (SPSS - Version No.10) are used for computing the level of significance and the difference between various samples with respect to physico-chemical and biochemical parameters.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1 Acetyl Cholinesterase (ache) Activity Of The Earthworm Grown In Different Concentrations Of Ldpe Contaminated Soil In Various Treatments (t1 To T4) For A Period Of 60 Days (each Value Represents An Average Performance (± Sd) Of Four Replica)

Treatments	Experimental days	Acetyl cholinesterase (AChE)($\mu\text{g m}^{-1}$) in Different concentrations of low-density polyethylene						P Value
		0mg	50mg	200mg	350mg	500mg	650mg	
T1 (Earthworm)	0 day	16.38±1.16	16.38±1.16	16.38±1.16	16.38±1.16	16.38±1.16	16.38±1.16	
	30 th day	17.42±1.24	17.87±1.76	18.20±1.16	18.54±1.66	18.16±1.31	18.00±1.09	0.000001*
	60 th day	18.18±1.28	18.25±1.98	18.64±1.86	18.81±1.25	18.40±1.33	18.16±1.71	
T2 (Microbes+ Earthworm)	0 day	16.38±1.16	16.38±1.16	16.38±1.16	16.38±1.16	16.38±1.16	16.38±1.16	
	30 th day	18.40±1.72	18.63±1.65	19.08±1.88	19.65±1.45	19.31±1.16	19.09±1.16	0.000001*
	60 th day	19.02±1.00	19.23±1.89	19.40±1.24	19.94±1.06	19.66±1.25	19.21±1.99	
T3 (Nanoparticles+ Earthworm)	0 day	16.38±1.16	16.38±1.16	16.38±1.16	16.38±1.16	16.38±1.16	16.38±1.16	
	30 th day	19.74±1.36	19.96±1.43	20.07±1.18	20.14±0.96	20.05±1.56	19.91±1.03	0.000001*
	60 th day	20.95±1.75	22.19±1.34	25.66±1.69	27.79±1.91	26.42±1.94	25.05±1.29	
T4 (Microbes+ Nanoparticles+ Earthworm)	0 day	16.38±1.16	16.38±1.16	16.38±1.16	16.38±1.16	16.38±1.16	16.38±1.16	
	30 th day	20.96±1.89	21.16±1.81	21.67±1.69	21.95±1.25	20.24±1.20	20.00±1.76	0.000001*
	60 th day	31.10±1.24	34.51±1.87	36.97±1.98	38.24±1.67	37.91±1.81	35.01±1.21	

Two-way ANOVA of acetyl cholinesterase activity

* Significance (P< 0.05)

** Insignificance (P>0.05)

REFERENCES

- Anbumani S, Kakkar P (2018) Ecotoxicological effects of microplastics on biota: a review. *Environ Sci Pollut Res Int* 25: 14373–14396.
- Barnes DKA, Galgani F, Thompson RC, Barlaz M (2009) Accumulation and fragmentation of plastic debris in global environments. *Phil Trans R Soc B* 364: 1985–1998.
- Caselli F, Gastaldi L, Gambi N, Fabbri E (2006) In vitro characterization of cholinesterases in the earthworm *Eisenia andrei*. *Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology Part C: Toxicology and Pharmacology* 143: 416–421.
- Dauberschmidt C, Dietrich DR, Schlatter C (1997) Esterases in the zebra mussel *Dreissena polymorpha*: activities, inhibition, and binding to organophosphates. *Aquatic Toxicology* 37(4): 295–305.
- Derraik JG (2002) The pollution of the marine environment by plastic debris: a review. *Mar Pollut Bull* 44: 842–852.
- Fuller SG, Gautam A (2016) A procedure for measuring microplastics using pressurized fluid extraction. *Environ Sci Technol* 50(11): 5774–5780.

7. Gambardella C, Morgana S, Ferrando S, Bramini M, Piazza V, Costa E, Garaventa F, Faimali M (2017) Effects of polystyrene microbeads in marine planktonic crustaceans. *Ecotoxicol Environ Saf* 145: 250–257.
8. Horton AA, Walton A, Spurgeon DJ, Lahive E, Svendsen C (2017) Microplastics in freshwater and terrestrial environments: evaluating the current understanding to identify the knowledge gaps and future research priorities. *Sci Total Environ* 586: 127–141.
9. Julka JM (2001) Earthworm diversity and its role in agroecosystem; VII National symposium on soil biology and ecology (Abstract Vol.) (Bangalore: University of Agricultural Sciences), 13-17.
10. Kathiresan K (2003) Polythene and plastic-degrading microbes in an Indian mangrove soil. *Rev Biol Trop* 51(3–4): 629–633.
11. Lionetto MG, Calisi A, Schettino T (2012) Chapter 16. Earthworm Biomarkers as Tools for Soil Pollution Assessment. In: Hernandez-Soriano, M.C., Ed. *Soil Health and Land Use Management*, InTech, Italy, www.intechopen.com.
12. Owa SO, Olowoparija SB, Aladesida A, Dedek GA (2013) Enteric bacteria and fungi of the Eudrilid earthworm *Libyodrilus violaceus*. *African Journal of Agricultural Research* 8(17): 1760-1766.
13. Rault M, Mazzia C, Capowiez Y (2007) Tissue distribution and characterization of cholinesterase activity in six earthworm species. *Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology Part B: Biochemistry and Molecular Biology* 147: 340-346.
14. Samal S, Sahoo S, Mishra CSK (2017) Morpho-histological and enzymatic alterations in earthworms *Drawida willsi* and *Lampito mauritii* exposed to urea, phosphogypsum and paper mill sludge. *Chemistry and Ecology* 33(2): 1-15
15. Senthil kumar A, Nagarajan K, Moorthi M (2016) Determination of maximum reduction of the hexavalent chromium using indigenous bacterial isolates. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, 6(4): 584–592.