## MARINE ECOTOXICOLOGICAL TESTS WITH ZOOPLANKTON

P.G. WELLS

150582

Toxic Chemicals Management Program, Priority Issues Directorate Environment Canada Ottawa, Ontario K1A 108, Canada

and

Institute for Environmental Studies, University of Toronto Toronto, Ontario M5S 1A4, Canada

### ABSTRACT

Ecotoxicological tests on existing and new marine pollutants have long included those with zooplankton - both holoplankton and meroplankton. A considerable number of international workers and laboratories work either exclusively with marine zooplankters in toxicity test systems, or include them with other organisms in hazard assessment schemes. A wide variety of test types, and testing exposure regimes and durations are possible, ranging from short-term laboratory assays to longer-term laboratory and field microcosm experiments. The majority of reported studies and current effort have dealt with coelenterates, annelids, molluscs, arthropods (particularly crustaceans), echinoderms, and vertebrates (teleosts). Many workers study the responses of the meroplanktonic life stages (gametes, embryos and larvae) of the benthos and intertidal invertebrates.

Zooplankton assays offer a number of advantages to assessments of pollutants. Among them, the principal ones are small size accommodating large samples per treatment, high sensitivity, the observation and

measurement of fundamental biological responses, wide availability of test specimens, well-known biology of some species and good potential for standardization between laboratories. Disadvantages of zooplankton assays often include the highly specialized techniques and skills for the collection, culture, handling and assaying of organisms, the small volumes of tissues and test solutions for chemical analyses, the labor intensive methods with some species, and probable "physiological hardiness" of some readily cultured species.

In this paper, tests with zooplankters are briefly described for the major groups. The sensitivities to toxicants of some of these species are discussed, with examples. A number of these tests offer a high potential for successfully screening potential long-term toxicants which may negatively affect fundamental biological processes at very low concentrations. Crustacean, echinoid and teleost gamete-embryo-larva tests are of particular importance. This is recognized internationally and is reflected by efforts to apply these tests widely, to refine various techniques and develop new ones with both generic and highly specific applications.

The continued inclusion of zooplankton assays in hazard assessments of chemicals entering marine environments is highly encouraged. Areas of future research with zooplankton assays are: culture of new species and life stages; comparative physiology and toxicology, especially across salinities and developmental stages; the derivation of principles underlying sensitivities to common pollutants; studies of how toxicants affect young stages, <u>i.e.</u> modes of toxic action; significance of zooplankton sensitivities to success of their populations; and further development of applied, standardized, rapid screening planktonic assays.

#### KEYWORDS

Marine ecotoxicology, Hazard assessment, Bioassays, Methods, Zooplankton, Review .

### INTRODUCTION

"Ecotoxicology is concerned with the toxic effects of chemical and physical agents on living organisms, especially on populations and communities within defined ecosystems; it includes the transfer pathways of those agents and their interactions with the environment" (Butler, 1978). Reviews of bioassay procedures by Little and Maciorowski (1979) and Maciorowski et al. (1980, 1981, 1982, 1983) indicated that "there is a need for development and standardization of tests for effects of chemicals on ecological parameters that are indicative of interspecific interactions, community dynamics, and ecosystem function". This paper briefly reviews the current status of toxicological and ecotoxicological tests with marine zooplankton, with particular reference to work in North America and to applications of such tests in the assessment and control of toxic chemicals.

Zooplankton, both holoplankton and meroplankton, have been studied in toxicity tests for many years. Interest in this application of zooplankters has increased markedly in the past 15 years (post-Torrey-Canyon years) in many countries, resulting in a vast literature on their responses to toxic materials. Laboratories, with skilled personnel and facilities to culture, feed, and study specific zooplankters, soon developed specialized toxicity tests with organisms of their choice, typically gametes, embryos, and larvae of molluscs, crustaceans, echinoderms and teleosts. Examples of such laboratories are National Marine Fisheries Service, Milford Laboratory, Connecticut USA, for oyster larvae : Marine Science Laboratories, Menai Bridge, Wales, UK, for barnacle larvae : Duke University Marine Laboratory. North Carolina, USA, for brachyuran crab larvae : Institute for Marine Environmental Research, Devon, UK, for copepods; St. Andrews Biological Station, New Brunswick, Canada, for lobster larvae; Doshisha University, Biological Laboratory, Kyoto, Japan, and University of Tromsø, Tromsø, Norway, for echinoid life stages; and the Biological Station, Nanaimo, British Columbia, Canada, for fish eggs and embryos.

Work in this area was particularly stimulated by the need to control the settlement of barnacle larvae on ship's hulls, the scientific and commercial interest in the physiology and physiological ecology of molluscan and echinoderm larvae, and the concern about oil spill and pesticide impact on invertebrate fisheries. Important contributions included the reviews and recommendations of Sprague (1970, 1971, 1976) and Rosenthal and Alderdice (1976). Attractive features of zooplankton assays and microcosm approaches

are the size, sensitivity and practicality of the tests, the importance of understanding ecological factors influencing survival of young life stages, and the multitude of critical and fundamental biological processes, especially those of reproduction and development, that can be closely examined under toxicant exposures. Both simple chemical toxicity screening and more complex ecotoxicological testing can now be conducted with zooplankton, albeit with nonstandardized procedures for the most part.

The primary theme of this paper is that, if one accepts the concept of using "the most sensitive locally important species" in bioassays, as stated by Benfield and Buikema (1980), together with one or more "standard" species, marine zooplankters provide a most attractive set of species, life stages and responses.

The objectives of this paper are:

- to describe the types of tests, taxonomic groups, and biological responses currently utilized;
- to discuss the major characteristics of zooplankton tests;
- to discuss the tests on zooplankton proposed by major organizations and present one test in detail, with particular reference to the criteria that must be met in standardized tests (Hammons, 1980; Persoone, pers. commun.);
- to discuss the applications of selected tests; and
- to discuss future trends on methods and applications for marine zooplankton in hazard assessments.

The reader should also refer to other papers in this volume for additional descriptions of current work with zooplankton.

## ZOOPLANKTON TESTS - AN OVERVIEW

### TYPES OF TESTS

Four general types of tests with zooplankters exist and they vary greatly in objectives, duration, complexity, cost, reproducibility (precision), and realism.

## Acute lethal and sublethal tests

Acute lethal and sublethal toxicity tests in the laboratory are used for basic information on the toxicity of a material, or for data on the comparative toxicity of several materials. They are essentially "screening tests". They may last minutes (e.g. the 30 min echinoid sperm test) or days (1 to 4 day lethality tests with crustacean larvae). They are often static, with single endpoints to measure, and hence are relatively simple tests. Cost per toxicity test is low (\$ 100-\$ 500 Canadian dollars depending upon the number of tests run simultaneously). Precision is high, but realism (being representative of field conditions) is considered low (NRC, 1981b).

### Chronic sublethal tests

Chronic sublethal tests in the laboratory are used to determine the effects of longer low level exposures on key properties of individuals or populations. They are applied when the tested materials are persistent, bioaccumulative, and toxic in the acute tests. The tests may be several weeks in duration, such as with a 30 day lobster-larvae test, or a full life cycle (Calanus spp.). Complexity and logistics are greater - often semistatic or continuous-flow modes of exposure are used, with diluters, and many measurements are taken daily. The cost per trial per chemical could be as high as \$5-10 x 10<sup>3</sup> Canadian dollars, excluding expensive and detailed analytical chemistry. The precision, with skilled personnel, can be high. The exposure and other test conditions more closely represent field conditions. The concentrations are low and the effects of variables influencing toxicity (temperature, salinity, nutrition, etc.) can be studied.

### Chronic microcosm test

The first two types of tests are conducted in the laboratory and measure responses of single species to toxicants. The third type of test is conducted under simulated field conditions, and measures responses of populations of zooplankton to low levels of materials.

The chronic microcosm tests with zooplankton are one to several months in duration, and have as their main objective the measure of population processes and responses (diversity and abundance changes, shifts in predator-prey relationships, physiological-biochemical responses of specific

populations) when exposed to the introduced material(s). They are complex tests to conduct, requiring significant investments of materials, skill and time (see details of CEPEX and MERL tests in Reeve et al., 1976, 1977, Oviatt et al., 1982, and Kuiper, 1984). Schneider (1980) states that "microcosms of intermediate complexity, incorporating zooplankton, may be the best approach for testing chemicals". The complexity and cost (>>10<sup>4</sup> dollars/material) can be reduced with the selection of simpler laboratory-based microcosm tests (see Fowler and Elder, 1980). The precision of the large-scale outdoor tests is low, but measures of impact are probably more realistic.

# Acute or chronic in situ tests

The fourth test type, acute or chronic <u>in situ</u> tests, can be deployed at discharge sites, or sites of chronic contamination. An <u>in situ</u> test can either be a cage (container) of organisms being exposed, or a settling plate for meroplankton to settle on and grow. These tests with zooplankton (meroplankton) are in their infancy, but when developed could be a sensitive, realistic test of water quality at selected sites and be linked to other "effects monitoring" approaches. A cage test has been suggested by O'Brien and Kettle (1981). It consists of a simple bioassay chamber for zooplankton culture and testing in the laboratory and in the field. Also, settling plates contaminated with petroleum hydrocarbons have been tested in intertidal and shallow subtidal zones (Anderson, pers. commun.).

The choice of test depends upon the question(s) being asked and the level of confidence about the ecotoxicity of a material that is required (see Davis, 1977; Sprague and Fogels, 1977; NRC, 1981b; and Buikema et al., 1982). The test chosen with zooplankters ultimately depends upon the magnitude and progression of the hazard assessment required to establish reliable toxicity tolerance limits for the specific pollutant.

## TAXONOMIC GROUPS

This is a brief overview of the most common zooplankters incorporated into toxicological tests (Table I). This is an introduction to the topic and is not exhaustive in its coverage.

## Protozoa

Considerable research has been conducted with protozoans and pollutants (Persoone and Dive, 1978; Curds, 1982), with some work on marine species (Gray and Ventilla, 1973; Gray, 1974). There has not been wide application of techniques with this group, nor the preparation of standard assay techniques with a marine species. Most of the published studies pertain to toxicant studies with freshwater species (Dive and Leclerc, 1975ab; Dive, 1982; Rogerson et al., 1983). Observations have been made of protozoan survival and population dynamics in several large-scale experimental ecosystem experiments with metals and hydrocarbons (Grice and Reeve, 1981; many specific references). There is considerable current interest in more toxicity work with marine Protozoa, especially ciliates (Dive and Persoone, 1984; Laake, 1984).

## Coelenterates

There have been efforts to develop sublethal assays with colonial hydroids (Stebbing, 1980), and some reports on sensitivities of medusae and coral larvae to hydrocarbons (Percy and Mullin, 1975; Loya and Rinkevich, 1980; for review, see Stebbing and Brown, 1984). There are no reported standard methods with planktonic life stages of coelenterates as of 1983 (see Standard Methods and reviews of Maciorowski et al., 1980, 1981, 1982, 1983).

## Polychaetes

Reish has published many accounts of culture and pollution studies with larval polychaetes, has contributed methodologies to ASTM publications (Reish, 1980) and Standard Methods (APHA, 1980), and has conducted intercalibration exercises (Reish et al, 1978). Many specific studies have been conducted (Chia, 1973; Hooftman and Vink, 1980; Reish, 1980), particularly with metals. Both Åkesson (1980) and Reish (1980, 1984) extensively reviewed the use of young life stages in bioassays. At the present, regulatory groups underutilize known procedures with these ecologically important organisms.

### Molluacs

This group is best known for the standard 48 h oyster embryonic and larval bicassay developed by Woelke and coworkers in the US in the 1960s (Woelke, 1967, 1972). In the US embryos and larvae of Crassostrea spp. are frequently studied under toxicant stress in the laboratory (e.g. Calabrese et al., 1973, Roberts, 1980). Round-robin oyster larval tests have been organized by the Office of Toxic Substances in the USA (Borthwick, 1979), using an ASTM test method. The oyster larval bioassay was considered a viable standard technique for water quality monitoring by an ICES panel report (Stebbing et al., 1980). A number of investigators also work with mussel (Mytilus edulis L.) embryos and larvae (see Wells, 1982a; Dixon, 1982, among others). Molluscan assays are frequently employed in routine testing in Europe (Renzoni, pers. commun.). A recent review was published in France on the toxicity of ten metals to marine larvae (Deslous-Paoli, 1981), and developmental stages of Mytilus galloprovincialis have been incorporated into toxicity studies on biocides (Luca et al., 1980), metals (Pavicic, 1977), and other pollutants. Calabrese (1984) gives further details of molluscan assays, their applications, and their reproducibility between laboratories.

## Crustaceans

Zooplankton from this class, including young life-history stages of benthic and epibenthic species, are widely used as toxicity testing organisms, and are usually the first choice for invertebrates for a hazard assessment of a material. Several organisms have been formally proposed as standard test organisms and are the subject of published or drafted testing protocols, and interlaboratory calibration exercises (see later sections). Organisms were selected for reasons of abundance, ecological importance, well-known biology, culture success, link to commercial fisheries, and sensitivity to specific pollutants. Gentile et al. (1984) also review crustaceans in detail, covering plankton and benthos and many specific questions on testing protocols.

## A. Brine shrimp

Artemia eggs, larvae, and adults have been used for toxicity studies for several decades, resulting in a large literature. A relatively simple one or 2- day lethal test with the freshly hatched nauplii has been

developed. It is being recommended by Vanhaecke et al. (1980) in Belgium as a standard "marine" test. An early version of the Artemia test is in some EPA testing protocol documents (e.g. oil spill dispersants). Some concern has been expressed about Artemia's physiological hardiness, hence most workers in the USA prefer planktonic stages of mysids, decapods, molluscs, and fish. Some investigators are comparing sensitivities of Artemia and endemic crustaceans (Wells et al., 1982), using lethal responses, while others are developing new test systems, such as the teratogen test system with Artemia nauplii (Kerster and Schaeffer, 1983). A European and North American round-robin intercalibration has been recently conducted (Persoone et al., 1981; Leonhard, pers. commun.). This Artemia nauplii 1-day toxicity test is one of the most developed and practical tests on marine zooplankton to date (Vanhaecke and Persoone, 1984).

# B. Copepoda

There is a very large pollution literature with copepods, because of their ecological importance and the ease of maintenance, culture, and testing of a number of genera (Stebbing et al., 1980; Corner, Harding, and Conover, pers. commun.). Both acute and chronic tests, especially multigeneration chronic exposures, are possible with calanoid copepods such as Acartia (Ward et al., 1979) and Calanus (Harding et al., 1981). They are useful planktonic test organisms particularly because cultured and endemic populations can be worked with and they offer many fundamental toxicity responses. A review on the use of the calanoid copepod, Acartia, was recently prepared by Heinle and Beaven (1980). Acartia tonsa is being suggested tentatively as a standard test organism (APHA, 1980). Comparative toxicity studies examining the sensitivity of copepods are relatively common now (Lassus et al., 1984).

# C. Cirripedia

Toxicity tests with barnacle naupliar larvae were developed several decades ago due to research on settlement-inhibiting paints for steel ships and general marine structures. Studies have recently been reported on heavy metals (Lang et al., 1980; Barber and Trefry, 1981), and petroleum hydrocarbons (Blundo, 1978; Nelson, 1981; Wells, 1982a). Several species of Balanus (balanoides, eburneus, improvisus) have been studied. Larvae can be cultured or are collected from natural habitats seasonally. Measures of survival, molting, behavior and successful larval settlement are most

often used. A computerized behavioral testing system has been developed and tested (Miller, 1980; Miller  $\underline{\text{et}}$   $\underline{\text{al}}$ , 1982). The settlement assay could prove to be a valuable, predictive laboratory-field test.

## D. Mysidacea

Juvenile mysids, particularly the opossum shrimp (Mysidopsis bahia), have been studied in acute and chronic toxicity tests in the past 10 years (Nimmo et al., 1977; Breteler et al., 1982; Nimmo and Hamaker, 1982a). Nimmo and Hamaker (1982b) recently reviewed mysids in toxicity testing. They have become a routine crustacean test organism in a number of USA laboratories (Anderson, pers. commun.), especially at EPA Gulf Breeze, Florida (Borthwick, 1979). There is an ASTM toxicity protocol subcommittee for mysids. Recently released (24 h) juveniles are used in tests and are sensitive to pollutants (Wells, 1982a; Carr et al., 1983; Gentile, pers. commun.). Their abundance in shallow waters, ease of mass culture, handling and feeding, and apparent sensitivity to a wide range of toxicants make juvenile mysids very attractive for acute tests. The oppussum shrimp "has a great potential as a bioassay organism and may become the marine counterpart of Daphnia" (Benfield and Buikema, 1980).

# E. Decapoda

Larval decapods have been studied in many toxicity tests over the past 10 to 20 years, and the applications of specific groups have been recently reviewed (shrimp: Couch, 1979; Buikema et al., 1980; lobsters: Wells, 1976ab; crabs: Bookhout and Costlow, 1974; Epifiano, 1979). Larvae from these groups are suggested crustacean test organisms in APHA (1980). Epifiano (1982) reviewed their use in the assessment of effects of pollutants.

Grass shrimp (Palaemonetes species) are important toxicity test animals, and static and flow-through studies with their larvae are becoming more common (Buikema et al., 1980). Principles for using grass shrimp larvae are thoroughly described (Buikema et al., 1980), and one protocol is presented in Standard Methods (APHA, 1980, in press for 1984). There are a considerable number of reported studies on specific pollutants and larval shrimp, e.g. oil (Wells, 1982a), that show their sensitivity, especially during molting. Larvae of prawns (Palaemon sp. and Penaeus spp.) and sand shrimp (Crangon spp.) have also been studied (Van Dijk et al., 1977; Price

and Uglow, 1979; Lassus et al., 1981). Techniques are as yet less standardized, but these genera and <u>Palaemonetes</u> spp. are now suggested test organisms (APHA, 1980). Guidelines for an acute shrimp test have recently been released by the Office of Toxic Substances, EPA (Brungs and Tarzwell, 1984).

Lobster larvae, primarily of Homarus americanus, and Homarus vulgaris, are used in both experimental and screening toxicity tests (Wells, 1976a; Wells and Sprague, 1976; Doe and Wells, 1978; Cobb and Phillips, 1980; Capuzzo, 1981; Capuzzo and Derby, 1982, among others). They offer many advantages as test organisms. Lobster larvae (stages one to three) are sensitive to heavy metals and petroleum hydrocarbons (see Wells, 1976b; Cobb and Phillips, 1980). They have been incorporated often into specific comparative toxicity studies by regulatory agencies (Environment Canada, Atlantic Region), by research institutes (Sprague and McLeese, 1968) and by industry (Hutcheson, pers. commun.). A tentative protocol for their culture and testing is published (APHA, 1980). In Eastern Canada, there is considerable interest in the effects of persistent pollutants on the lobster fisheries, and several experimental and commercial hatcheries have the capacity to provide larvae for toxicity testing on a year-round basis.

Larvae of true crabs, the Brachyura, have been frequently used as toxicity test organisms (Bookhout and Costlow, 1974: Epifiano, 1979). largely stimulated by J. Costlow's group of the Duke University Marine Laboratory, North Carolina. A long-term research program on the identification of larval stages of crabs, together with studies on their culture requirements and basic biology and physiology, resulted in a number of genera being available by the 1970s for acute and chronic tests. One mud crab, Rhithropanopeus harrisii, is used extensively, but other well-studied and either ecologically or commercially important species (e.g. Carcinus maenas, Callinectes sapidus) are incorporated into various toxicity testing schemes. Crab larvae are considered well-suited for bioassays by a recent National Academy of Sciences Committee (NRC, 1981a), and a list of suggested species and a tentative standard bioassay procedure are now published (APHA, 1980). The literature on acute lethal and chronic sublethal effects (growth, development, molting, respiratory physiology, metabolism, behavior) is now very extensive, particularly for dispersed oil to which the larvae are very sensitive (Wells, 1982a).

# Other arthropods

Larvae of horseshoe crabs (<u>Limulus</u> spp.) have also been incorporated into bioassays (<u>e.g.</u> Strobel and Brenowitz, 1981). They can be easily obtained in the eastern USA, and cultured and studied as with brachyuran larvae.

## Rchinoderns

Embryological and larval assays with various echinoderms have been used routinely and experimentally in Japan (Kobayashi, 1971, 1973, 1974, 1977, 1980, 1981; Kinae et al., 1981, among others). Norway (Hagstrom and Lönning, 1973; Lönning, 1977), Italy (Pagano et al., 1982, 1983), South Africa (Brown and Greenwood, 1978; Greenwood and Bennett, 1981), and the USA (Allen, 1971; Dinnel et al., 1981, 1982; Crawford and Gates, 1981; Landrum and Crosby, 1981; among others). They have been recommended for use in Canada (Wells, 1982b). The responses of these early stages to petroleum hydrocarbons have been recently reviewed (Wells, 1982a). Fertilization, development to the gastrula stage, and larval development seem to be sensitive to oil exposure. Kobayashi has exposed early stages to many materials, including oils and dispersants, and has written extensively on the topic (see Kobayashi, 1984). Both urchins and sand dollars have been incorporated into studies of oil effects on embryos. Embryological studies with the echinoid, Strongylocentrotus spp., could be conducted year-round with laboratory-held animals, and seasonally with field-caught animals. They require experimental and embryological expertise and a small working space, incubator and microscope. The embryological assays lend themselves to (a) routine screening of contaminants: (b) study of fundamental reproductive processes affected by pollutants; (c) study of multiple toxicity due to being able to examine large numbers of treatments; and (d) responses of young stages, as part of an overall assessment of effects throughout a life history. These applications are mentioned below.

The recent NRC report (NRC, 1981a) stated that "the larval forms most widely used, especially for short-term bioassays, are the developing egg and larva of the sea urchin and sand dollar", and extensively referenced the current methodology. Embryological assays with echinoderms could easily become recommended as "standard marine toxicity protocols" in the 1980s, internationally to join those on species such as <u>Artemia</u> (brine shrimp). Such assays, through the measure of genotoxic and developmental effects, may

prove to be a vital link in marine environmental research between human health and ecotoxicological effects. Some of the sperm bioassays are already being refined and validated "for use as a standard rapid sensitive method for the testing of toxic substances" (Stober et al., 1981). In addition, the sea urchin larval bioassay is one of the recommended tests for monitoring water quality (Stebbing et al., 1980). Such assays with echinoids have now been adopted in Fed. Rep. of Germany (Ernst, 1984), and are continuing in Norway on hydrocarbons (Falk-Petersen and Lunning, 1984), and in Yugoslavia on chlorinated hydrocarbons (Ozretic pers. commun.).

### Telenata

Extensive biological and toxicological work was conducted in the 1970s with young life stages of herring (Clupea spp.), cod (Gadus morhua), threespine stickleback (Gasterosteus aculeatus). Killifish (Fundulus spp.), and striped bass (Morone saxatilis). among other species, and effects of many pollutants have been described (Rosenthal and Alderdice, 1976; Wells, 1982a; NAS, 1984). A list of 21 marine and estuarine species, and techniques for their culture and bioassays is presented by APHA (1980), with suggestions for incorporating young life stages. Efforts are being made to reliably culture fish larvae for physiological/toxicological research (Houde and Taniguchi, 1979). There is a "proposed standard practice for conducting toxicity tests with the early life stages of fishes" in preparation with ASTM (Schimmel, pers. commun.), with one objective being to identify test procedures for hazard assessment. Considerable experimental work is underway with fish eggs to identify their cytologic, cytogenetic and embryological conditions in polluted coastal waters (Longwell and Hughes, 1980; Longwell, pers. commun.). and standard biological monitoring techniques may evolve from this work. Stebbing et al. (1980) concluded that "fish larval bioassays are needed in view of the ecological and economic importance of these groups of organisms". Some regulatory agencies have responded. The Office of Toxic Substances of EPA in the USA is working on a marine larval fish toxicity protocol (Brungs and Tarzwell, 1984).

# Microcosm (Model ecosystem) tests with zooplankton

Over the past 10 - 15 years, a number of microcosm experiments have been conducted and observations made on captured zooplankton populations exposed to low levels of toxicants (Reeve et al., 1976, 1977; Lee et al., 1977; Davies et al., 1980; Kuiper, 1981, 1982, 1984; Oviatt et al., 1981).

In North America, the CEPEX (Controlled Ecosystem Pollution Experiment) and the MERL (Marine Ecosystems Research Laboratory) microcosms have demonstrated survival, growth, respiration, behavioral, reproductive, predation, and diversity responses of zooplankters exposed to metals, petroleum hydrocarbons, chlorinated hydrocarbons, and oil-spill dispersants. Sensitive biochemical and physiological responses in fish eggs and larvae exposed to hydrocarbons in large tanks are being measured in the Battelle New England Laboratories (Neff, pers. commun.). Replication of observed responses has at times proven to be difficult (Lawson and Grice, 1977), but probably reflects the "natural variability" components of endemic populations.

Microcosm experiments have been conducted in Scotland (Davies et al., 1980), the Netherlands (Kuiper, 1981, 1982), the USSR (Beletskii et al., 1982) and in Sweden (Linden, pers. commun.). These experiments are a realistic and semi-controlled link between laboratory and full field assessments of the toxicity of materials, and represent the most detailed and expensive assessments available for materials not eliminated in earlier stages of the assessment process. The advantage of such experiments with zooplankton is that "major functional response parameters" with zooplankton under chemical stress can be measured (Adams and Giddings, 1982).

# Ecotoxicological tests with field populations

A number of physiological, biochemical and ecological responses of zooplankton have been measured under "stressed" natural conditions (Benon et al., 1975; Bamstedt, 1980; Samain, et al., 1980; Wells, 1982a), but such measurements are relatively rare. For example, zooplankton of the highly contaminated New York Bight do not reflect the suspected effects being caused by waste discharges (Wolfe et al., 1982). A clearer situation apparently exists with spilled oil. Laboratory studies on petroleum hydrocarbons have demonstrated the high sensitivities of certain developmental stages of zooplankton, especially before and during fertilization, and during early embryonic development, hatching, and larval phases. These studies suggest that substantial damage may occur to localized populations of zooplankton during oil spills (Wells, 1982a). Individual organisms at oil spills have been affected through direct mortality (fish eggs, copepods, mixed plankton), external contamination by oil (chorion of fish eggs, cuticles and feeding appendages of crustaceans), tissue contamination by aromatics, abnormal development of fish embryos, possibly temporary inhibition of feeding by copepods, and altered metabolic rates. Hence, individual zooplankters can be affected under natural conditions. Concern about effects at the population level is leading to quantitative approaches of damage detection that can be applied at sea with individual organisms, i.e. residue measurements in tissues, cytogenetic evaluations, enzyme studies, histopathological examinations and recognition of morphological aberrations.

It is in this area that the development of ecotoxicological tests with zooplankton for hazard assessments of new and existing chemicals overlaps with the need for sensitive and reliable field biomonitoring approaches with zooplankton. The cytogenetic and cytotoxicity techniques of Longwell (USA) and Moore (UK), the enzyme techniques of Samain et al., (1980), the physiological methods of Capuzzo (1981), and the ability to recognize morphological aberrations such as the white-eye syndrome in crustaceans (Minchew et al., 1979; Carls, pers. commun.), and intermediate larval stages (Wells, 1976b), and others, require support for further development and application. The general applicability of these zooplankton methods for detecting adverse responses to chemicals in the field, the interpretation of the effects as population responses, and the development of more, generic, sensitive and unequivocal methods clearly warrants further work.

### TYPES OF BIOLOGICAL RESPONSES

Some currently measured chemical stress responses among marine zooplankton are shown in Table I. Lethality has been measured in all groups. Developmental effects (rate, success, morphological aberrations), behavior, and biochemical/physiological effects are the most commonly reported sublethal responses, followed closely by feeding behavior, growth and reproduction. To date the uptake, metabolism and depuration of materials has been measured with relatively few groups. Lethal, behavioral, developmental, and reproductive responses are probably simplest to include in zooplankton assays, are sensitive and interpretable, and are of fundamental biological importance.

TABLE   SO	SOME OF MARINE F	THE MI	SOME OF THE MEASURED RESPONSES OF MARINE ZOOPLANKTON WHEN EXPO MARINE POLLUTANTS. BASED ON A LITERATURE SURVEY UP TO EARLY 1983.	ED RES	PONSE ON A	S OF M LITER,	ARINE ATURE	ZOOPL	ANK TO Y UP T	N WHE O EARI	N EXP Y 1983	OSED 1	TO A W	IDE R	THE MEASURED RESPONSES OF MARINE ZOOPLANKTON WHEN EXPOSED TO A WIDE RANGE OF COMMON POLLUTANTS. BASED ON A LITERATURE SURVEY UP TO EARLY 1983.	OMMON
	G	ROUPS	GROUPS OF ORGANISMS IN LABORATORY	GANIS	MS IN	LABOR	ATORY								LAB. FIELD	FIELD
RESPONSES	I				CR	CRUSTACEA	EA									
TO									DEC	DECAPODA					S	YTI
	PROTOZOA	COELENTERATES	POLYCHAETES	MOLLUSCA	ANOCOSTRACA	COFEPODA	CIKKIPEDIA	MASIDACEA	ЗНКІМР	LOBSTERS	CRABS	MISCELLANEOUS	ECHINODEBWS	TELEOSTS	MICROCOSM TEST	FIELD ECOTOXIC
LETHALITY	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	
SUBLETHALITY																
Behavior Feeding behavior	×			×		×××	××	×	××	$\times \times$	× >		×	××	×>	× >
Uptake, depur. Biochem., Physiol. Development		×	×	×	××	××		×	××	$\times \times$	<××	×	××	××	<××	<×
Growth Reproduction Abundance, diversity	ity ××			××	×	×		×		×	××		×	××	××	×

FORY
RAT
ABO
THE L
Z
ON TESTS IN THE LABORATO
Z
PLANKTON
AN
PL
F ZOOP
OF Z(
S
<b>FERISTICS OF</b>
RIS
TE
RACTE
HAR
-
=
LE

	Practical	Biological
Advantages	Many species, some available throughout year	Well-known biology
	Minimum space	High sensitivity.
	Minimum test volumes.	Clear and fundamental responses
	Some simple and rapid procedures	Endemic vs. cultured comparisons possible
		Suitable for interlaboratory comparisons
Disadvantages	Static test solutions	Simplicity/rapidity may be a trap
	Uncontrolled exposures	Considerable culture/food facilities
	Labor-intensive procedures	Radioisotope techniques required
	Seasonal availability of some species	Commonly used species "hardy"
	Skilled personnel needed	Mostly "single-species" tests

### CHARACTERISTICS OF ZOOPLANKTON TESTS IN THE LABORATORY

There are a number of practical and biological characteristics of zooplankton toxicity tests in the laboratory (Table II). These are grouped as advantages and disadvantages, for convenience.

There are four practical advantages:

- 1. Many species of zooplankton suitable for testing can be cultured almost year-round, or can be obtained from field populations during long parts of the year. Hence availability of many of the currently most favored species for standard tests (i.e. polychaete larvae, oyster and mussel larvae, copepods, mysids, various crustacean larvae, echinoid larvae) is high, and some of these (specific copepods, Artemia, mysids, decapod larvae, echinoids) are widely available and can be easily shipped. Notable exceptions are barnacle larvae, some decapod larvae, and most if not all fish eggs and larvae.
- 2. Minimum space for testing (exposures, microscopic examination, chemical preparation) is required, making zooplankton testing especially ideal for mobile laboratories and ship-board studies.
- 3. Test volumes needed for individual organisms or stages are small, usually less than 50 ml, allowing large numbers of samples per treatment and large numbers of treatments to be tested simultaneously.
- 4. Many of the response measurements, from microscopic observations of dead or incapacitated organisms to sublethal measurements (biochemical to growth) are relatively simple and rapid to perform, have high precision, and can be competently conducted by careful, well-trained technicians.

There are several important biological advantages to conducting assays with zooplankton:

- 1. The species most commonly used or with a potential for greater use have well-known culture requirements and biology (see NRC, 1981b on this point).
- 2. Many zooplankters are very sensitive to the common pollutants (e.g. petroleum hydrocarbons, see Corner, 1978; Wells, 1982a). This point is well recognized. Reasons for the higher sensitivities may be the high metabolic rates, high surface to volume ratios, many growth and

developmental processes occurring simultaneously, lack of detoxification enzymes, high permeability, frequent molting and water uptake, continuous filtering of water, etc. The reasons are in most cases little studied, yet are basic to understanding the applicability of data from specific zooplankton tests.

- Zooplankton organisms offer many unequivocal stress responses of a fundamental nature, <u>i.e.</u> ability to fertilize, develop, hatch, molt, feed, or swim.
- 4. There are many opportunities to work with both cultured and endemic populations, for comparisons of sensitivities and reproducibility, <a href="e-g">e-g</a>. Cirripedia larvae, calanoid copepods, so as to calibrate and interpret the laboratory tests.
- 5. A number of species have wide geographic distributions, or can be shipped readily, allowing successful interlaboratory toxicity comparisons, e.g. Artemia cysts, Mytilus edulis, copepods, mysids, echinoids.

There are, however, a number of practical and biological disadvantages to the conduct of toxicological and ecotoxicological toxicity tests with marine zooplankton (Table II).

The first practical problem with most tests is that static or semi-static dosing regimes are employed, due to the extreme handling/jostling sensitivity of the species or life stages or for practical reasons of conducting continuous-flow assays with many very small compartments. Hence, the test solutions may change in composition over time, often in an unknown manner. The high temperatures of some recommended tests accentuates this problem, e.g Artemia at 25 °C. This problem can be corrected with considerable chemistry, especially with labelled compounds, and the employment of small-scale diluters, if these are affordable. Much criticism has been directed towards this problem and the effects on the interpretation of the data. The very short tests, such as those less than 1 - 2 h, would not be greatly affected at low temperatures and with highly soluble substances. However, there still may be a problem with losses to walls, into air spaces (Rogerson et al., 1983) or into the organisms themselves.

Other practical problems include the labor-intensive nature of many tests, especially if time-concentration-response relationships are required; the seasonal availability of some organisms, <u>e.g.</u> <u>Pseudocalanus</u> sp. and barnacle larvae in Nova Scotia coastal waters or barnacle larvae, the

frequent difficulty of keeping some of the preferred plankters alive, <u>e.g.</u> decapod and fish larvae; and the requirement of having very careful, skilled technical staff for each phase of the culture, maintenance, and testing.

Biological disadvantages are numerous (Table II). The primary one is that the apparent simplicity and rapidity of a recommended "standard" zooplankton test may be a trap. As for all organisms for experimental work, they require care, specialized knowledge and considerable experience for accurate and reproducible toxicity estimates. An example is the Artemia nauplii test, which can produce results influenced by the hatching, maintenance and exposure methods and times because the nauplii are developing so rapidly. Uniform training and routinely conducted intra- and inter-laboratory calibrations should be mandatory. It is not by accident that the reliable contributions on zooplankton responses to pollutants have been generated by laboratories with vast culture and biological expertise and experience, e.g. Artemia Reference Center, State University of Ghent, Belgium, for Artemia; Duke University Marine Laboratory, Beaufort, USA, for decapods; Chesapeake Biological Laboratory, USA, for copepods; Kobayashi's laboratory at Doshisha's University, Kyoto, Japan, for echinoid gametes; EPA, Gulf Breeze Laboratory, USA, for mysids, etc.

Another biological limitation is that the common zooplankton tests are conducted with readily cultured or easily maintained species, hence the "hardy species" are being used to establish threshold toxicity values, and water quality objectives. The species worked with must be successfully caught, held, fed and tested, with minimum control mortalities or other signs of stress (e.g. color changes in lobster larvae and copepods). Many groups of zooplankton are rarely or never worked with for these reasons, yet may be very sensitive to persistent materials and potentially useful in hazard assessment schemes, e.g. chaetognaths.

The last and most serious biological limitation is that most recommended and currently available tests with zooplankters are single-species tests, which do not measure effects on ecological processes. Hence most zooplankton tests are not true ecotoxicological tests. Cairns (1983) and the recent NRC report on test methods (NRC, 1981b) have discussed this problem in detail. Toxicants can be successfully screened with simple, single-species tests. However, many materials may need to be studied further with microcosm and field ecophysiological techniques which are for key

ORGANIZATION	SPE	SPECIES AND LIFE STAGES	TYPE OF TEST	RESPONSES
ICES	Viat	Viable techniques for effects monitoring		
1980)	$\Xi$	Oyster larval bioassay	A	48-h, embryo development
(suggested techniques)	(2)	Sea-urchin larval bioassay	¥.	fertilization and development assay
	Pote	Potentially useful bioassays		
	(3)	calanoid copepods	А, С	survival, growth, faecal pellet production
	(2)	mysids	A, C	survival growth life cycle tests
	(3)	other invertebrate larvae - polychaetes - shrinps - brachyurans	A, C	lethality fertilization frequency of abnormal larvae swimming activity rate of metabolism developmental rate
	(†)	fish larvae	A, C	embryonic or larval heart rate growth survival percent viable hatch

TABLE	SOME PROPOSED TEST PROCEDURES WITH MARINE ZOOPLANKTON. ACUTE TESTS DENOTED BY A AND CHRONIC TESTS
III cont'd	DENOTED BY C.

ORGANIZATION	SPE(	SPECIES AND LIFE STAGES	TYPE OF TEST	RESPONSES
APHA (1980) (tentative methods)	(3)	Protozoa - Tetrahymena pyriformis (Strain W)	U	growth rate of population maximum population density accumulation and concentration
	(2)	Adult calanoid copepods, especially Acartia tonsa	V	lethality, moribundity
	(3)	Larval shrimp, crabs, lobsters (Palaemonetes, Penaeus, Homarus, 5 spp. crabs)	⋖	egg hatchability rate and success of molting swimming ability tendency to lose appendages meta morphosis lethality
	(4)	Molluscs - embryos of 10 spp. of oysters, clams, scallops and mussels	٧	normal vs. abnormal larvae
	(5)	Fish - 21 spp cultured and field-caught larvae e.g., sheepshead minnow, Atlantic silverside	٧	egg viability egg hatchability lethality growth
ASTM (Subcommittee E47-01)	(1)	Mysids - Mysidopsis spp juveniles and adults	А, С	survival growth reproduction
(methods under review)	(2)	Fish - early life stages - Opsanus, Cyprinodon, Menidia	A, C	survival, growth abnormal development behavior time required for hatching

groups of zooplankton in an early stage of development (Samain et al., 1980; Conover, pers. commun.).

## REVIEW OF SELECTED ZOOPLANKTON TESTS

It is evident from the overview given and from previous recent reviews (Hart and Fuller, 1979; Buikema et al., 1980; Hammons, 1980; Stebbing et al., 1980; NRC, 1981ab; Leclerc and Dive, 1982) that a number of toxicity and ecotoxicological test procedures with zooplankton are being proposed as standard protocols, and others are being developed by organizations and individuals. The overall objective is to have a suite of nationally and internationally acceptable protocols with marine zooplankton, to supplement those with algae, bacteria, other invertebrates, and fish.

TABLE IV SUMMARY OF PROPOSED TEST PROCEDURES WITH MARINE ZOOPLANKTON. PROPOSED DENOTED BY X; POTENTIAL DENOTED BY O.

ORGANISMS	ORGANIZATION		
	APHA (1980)	ASTM (1983 a,b)	ICES (1980)*
Protozoa	X		
Polychaetes			0
Mollusca	X		X
Copepoda	X		0
Mysidacea		X	0
Decapoda	X		0
Echinoids			X
Teleosts	X	X	0

<sup>\*</sup> See Stebbing et al. 1980.

TABLE V MAIN FEATURES OF A ZOOPLANKTON TEST IN THE LABORATORY

FEATURES	ORGANISM:	Decapoda (Homarus spp.)	
Life Stage		Larvae, stages 1-4	
Toxicological Criteria		Lethality, rate of development, molting success, feeding, respiration, among others	
Test Conditions		Static; semi-static	
Sensitivity		High-see Wells 1976b, 1982	
Degree of Standardization		High for static, probably low for others	
Reproducibility		Intra-good Inter-good for oil, otherwise unknown	
Rapidity		L*-fast; SL**-up to 5 wks at 20C	
Cost/Test		L-<\$500/test; SL->>10 <sup>3</sup> /test	
Training - Expertise		High	
Usefulness		High; commercial species	
Major Advantage		Clear, easy to measure responses	
Major Disadvantage		Labor-intensive	
Documentation		Large-see Cobb and Phillips (1980)	
Main References		Wells (1976b); APHA (1980); Capuzzo (many references)	

<sup>\*</sup> L-lethal; \*\* SL-sublethal.

Tests proposed by three major organizations concerned with standard toxicity and monitoring methods are shown in Table III. This table should not be interpreted as a review of all procedures being developed worldwide, simply some of those in North America and Europe. In addition, the APHA methods are being revised for 1984. The proposed tests cover eight groups of torganisms and a wide variety of suggested acute and chronic responses. Table IV shows clearly that molluscan and teleost tests are favored, followed by

the crustaceans (copepods, mysids, decapods). Somewhat surprisingly, the two big US organizations, APHA and ASTM, have apparently not yet drafted standard protocols for polychaetes and echinoids, yet an ICES working panel recognized the potential of both groups. To date the OECD has only considered freshwater testing protocols as they are addressing premarket testing of chemicals (MacGregor, pers. commun.). This reviewer is unaware of current activities in FAO on standard toxicity protocols. It is interesting, and perhaps significant, to note that the organizations in Tables III and IV have not yet included the Artemia naupliar test promoted and standardized by Persoone et al. (1981), yet this test together with others is being used by the US EPA in standardized oil dispersant testing. The Artemia test also has great potential as a reference zooplankton technique for laboratories working with other endemic species e.g. copepods (Wells et al., 1982).

Table V gives the main features of a typical laboratory zooplankton test. Such tables could be prepared for a variety of the most promising zooplankters based on information in this volume, and would be useful to a rapid selection of state of the art, standardized tests.

#### APPLICATIONS OF SELECTED TESTS

There are a number of testing protocols and toxicological approaches with marine zooplankton that can be applied in specific ways to describe effects of new and existing chemicals, formulations and materials. A few of these protocols are relatively well standardized (see above); most are not, as the tests are still under development (e.g. larval fish bioassays) or are used only by a few laboratories or agencies (e.g. echinoid assays).

The immediate need for standardized protocols and approaches with zooplankton, so as to have a standardized and comparable toxicity data base on chemicals, should not discourage the continued research and work to develop new tests and improve on existing ones. However, there is an immediate need internationally for commonly accepted test procedures with marine zooplankton. There are four reasons:

1. They are sensitive to persistent pollutants and should be included in estimates of hazards.

- 2. There are some standard procedures (e.g. with Artemia, oyster larvae, echinoid eggs and sperm) and others that with little additional effort could be worked with routinely, in many laboratories.
- 3. Hazard assessments should always consider responses of major phyla and trophic levels.
- 4. New chemicals or formulations that may impinge upon marine systems should be screened for toxicity and hazard uniformly from one country to another, following the example of the OECD toxicity testing protocols. These points have been stated earlier by others but are worth repeating.

Tests with marine zooplankton can be used in at least four ways:

- 1. Acute and chronic testing of chemicals and formulations during their development to ensure safer products or products with known effects. Examples: paints (barnacle larvae), oil spill dispersants (copepods and Artemia nauplii).
- 2. Acute screening tests for new chemicals, prior to use or recommendations for use. Examples: insect hormone mimics, components of drilling muds.
- 3. Incorporation into detailed hazard assessment schemes, for nondegradable and bioaccumulative compounds that were not identified as "environmental chemicals" by 1 and 2.
- 4. Biomonitoring of industrial effluents and ambient water quality (Gruber, pers. commun.; Stebbing et al., 1980; Capuzzo and Lancaster, 1981, with copepods in the New York Bight).

These applications require considerable interaction between marine toxicologists specializing in one or more of the zooplankton procedures and the regulatory agencies responsible for assessing and controling toxic chemicals, or the industries that are producing new chemicals. Chemicals entering or suspected of entering marine waters, from estuaries to offshore waters, may already have been screened with sensitive freshwater assays (i.e. the OECD premarketing tests), but should have their toxicities verified with the most sensitive marine tests possible. Some of these could include zooplankton as detailed above.

## CONCLUDING TRENDS WITH MARINE ZOOPLANKTON

In the past 15 years, considerable attention has been given to the development and application of toxicity tests with holoplankton and meroplankton. There is particular concern about the impact of pollutants on young life stages of commercial fisheries species (Waldichuck, 1979). This effort and concern can now be translated into the routine inclusion of zooplankters in marine hazard assessments, where the test procedures can be chosen by national and international groups.

These are many procedures available, crossing all applications, screening to predictive tests to monitoring in polluted areas. There is a need to direct effort now at the choice of a few international tests that can be rigorously standardized and applied. These tests should not just be single-species (Cairns, 1983). Some should be multispecies, microcosm tests (Hammons, 1980, 1981) or multispecies, process-response laboratory tests (Vandermeulen and Hemsworth, 1977). Some of the available choices and centers of development are described above, and in other papers in this volume. There is considerable activity with zooplankton testing protocols but much remains to be done. In particular, the principles behind the sensitivities of particular species and life stages, research on modes of toxic action, and the applications in effects-monitoring programs need to be pursued. Perhaps most importantly, the value of zooplankton tests at the regulatory level needs to be translated to the responsible technocrats and bureaucrats, so that sensitive tests are indeed applied on a routine basis, and the results translated into actions to prevent continued pollution. This paper attempted to describe the current scientific activity on marine zooplankton toxicity tests with this urgent application as the primary goal.

### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This paper was prepared with the combined support of Imperial Oil (Canada) Ltd, and Exxon, Houston, through a research grant to Drs D. Mackay and P.G. Wells at the University of Toronto; The Marine Ecology Laboratory, Fisheries and Oceans Canada, Bedford Institute of Oceanography; and the Toxic Chemicals Management Program, Priority Issues Directorate, Environment Canada, Ottawa. The staff of the libraries at the Bedford Institute, Dartmouth, N.S., and at Environment Canada, Hull, P.Q., are especially thanked for their assistance with the literature.

## LITERATURE CITED

Adams S.M. and J.M. Giddings. 1982.

Review and evaluation of microcosms for assessing effects of stress in marine ecosystems. Environ. Int. 7:409-418.

Akesson B. 1980.

The use of certain polychaetes in bioassay studies. Rapp. P.-v. Réun. Cons. int. Explor. Mer 179:315-321.

Allen H. 1971.

Effects of petroleum fractions on early development of a sea urchin. Mar. Pollut. Bull. 2(9):138-140.

American Public Health Association. 1980.

Standard Methods for the Examination of Water and Wastewater. Fifteenth Ed. Am. Publ. Hlth Ass., Washington D.C. 1134 p.

ASTM. 1983a.

Proposed standard practice for conducting life-cycle toxicity tests with saltwater Mysidacea. Draft No. 5. July 1983. (Document in preparation for American Society for Testing and Materials, Philadelphia, P.A.).

ASTM. 1983b.

Proposed standard practice for conducting toxicity tests with the early life-stages of fishes. Draft No. 6. June 1983. (Document in preparation for Am. Soc. Test. Mat. Philadalphia, PA).

Bamstedt U. 1980.

ETS activity as an estimator of respiratory rate of zooplankton populations. The significance of environmental factors. J. Exp. Mar. Biol. Ecol. 42:267-283.

Barber S. and J.H. Trefry. 1981.

<u>Balanus</u> <u>eburneus</u>. A sensitive indicator of copper and zinc pollution in the coastal zone. Bull. Environ. Contam. Toxicol. 27(5):654-659.

Beletskii VI., A.K. Vinogradov, Yu P. Zaitsev, and V.E. Filippenko. 1982. Possibility of using laboratory sea ecosystems in water toxicology. Biologicheskie Nauki (Moscow) 1(2):65-70.

Benfield E.F. and A.L. Buikema. 1980.

Synthesis of miscellaneous invertebrate toxicity tests. p. 174-187.  $\underline{\text{In}}$ : Aquatic invertebrate bioassays. Buikema A.L., Jr. and J. Cairns, Jr. (Eds). ASTM STP 715 Am. Soc. Test. Mat., Philadelphia, PA. 209 p.

Benon P., F. Blanc, B. Bourgade, R. Kantin, P. Kerambrun. M. Leveau, and D. Sautriot. 1975.

Proteinic ecotypological tests at the level of zooplankton sub-ecosystem of a polluted maritime region, Gulf of Fos. C.R. Séanc.

Acad. nat. Sci., Série D: Sciences Naturelles 281(4):235-238.

Blundo R. 1978.

The toxic effects of the water-soluble fractions of No. 2 fuel oil and of three aromatic hydrocarbons on the behavior and survival of barnacle larvae. Contrib. Mar. Sci. 21:25-38.

Bookhout C.G. and J.D. Costlow, Jr. 1974.

Crab development and effects of pollutants. Thalassia Jugosl. 10:77-87. Borthwick P.W. 1979.

OTS Round robin - Invertebrate larvae test. SSIE Current Research, No. ZMA 1719 l. (Abstract only).

Breteler R.J., J.W. Williams, and R.L. Buhl. 1982.

Measurement of chronic toxicity using the opossum shrimp, <u>Mysidopsis</u> bahia. Hydrobiologia 93:189-194.

Brown A.C. and P.J. Greenwood. 1978.

Use of the sea-urchin <u>Parechinus angulosus</u> (Leske) in determining water quality and acceptable pollution levels for the South African marine environment. S. Afr. J. Sci. 74:102-103.

Brungs W.A. and C.M. Tarzwell. 1984.

Marine ecotoxicological testing in the USA. p. 137-161. <u>In:</u> Ecotoxicological testing for the marine environment. Persoone G., E. Jaspers, and C. Claus (Eds). State Univ. Ghent and Inst. Mar. Scient. Res., Belgium. Vol. 1. 798 p.

Buikema A.L., Jr., B.R. Niederlehner, and J. Cairns, Jr. 1980.

Use of grass shrimp in toxicity tests. p. 155-173. <u>In</u>: Aquatic invertebrate bioassays. Buikema A.L., Jr. and J. Cairns, Jr. (Eds). ASTM STP 715. Am. Soc. Test. Mat., Philadelphia., PA. 209 p.

Buikema A.L., Jr., B.R. Niederlehner, and J. Cairns, Jr. 1982. Biological monitoring. Part IV - Toxicity testing. Water Res. 16:239-

Butler G.C. (Ed.). 1978.

Principles of ecotoxicology. Scope 12. John Wiley and Sons, Chichester, New York, Brisbane, London.  $350\ p.$ 

Cairns J., Jr. 1983.

262.

Are single species toxicity tests alone adequate for estimating environmental hazard? Hydrobiologia 100:47-57.

Calabrese A. 1984.

Ecotoxicological testing with marine molluscs. p. 455-477.  $\underline{\text{In}}$ : Ecotoxicological testing for the marine environment. Persoone G., E. Jaspers and C. Claus (Eds). State Univ. Ghent and Inst. Mar. Scient. Res. Belgium. Vol. 1. 798 p.

Calabrese A., R.S. Collier, D.A. Nelson, and J.R. MacInnes. 1973.

The toxicity of heavy metals to embryos of the American oyster, Crassostrea virginica. Mar. Biol. 18:162-166.

Capuzzo J.M. 1981.

Crude oil effects to developmental stages of the American lobster. Woods Hole Oceanographic Institute, Techn. Rep. WHOI-81-75, September 1981. 108 p.

Capuzzo J.M. and J.G.S. Derby. 1982.

Drilling fluid effects to developmental stages of the American lobster. Report EPA 600/4-82-039. April 1982. 64 p.

Capuzzo J.M. and B.A. Lancaster. 1981.

The effects of pollutants on marine zooplankton at Deep Water Dumpsite 106: preliminary findings. p.411-419. <u>In</u>: Ocean dumping of industrial wastes. Ketchum B.H., D.R. Kester and P.K. Park. (Eds). Plenum Press, New York, N.Y. 525 p.

Carr R.S., J.W. Williams, F.I. Saksa, R.L. Buhl, and J.M. Neff. 1983.

Dose-dependent bioenergetic alterations correlated with reduced growth, fecundity and body burden of cadmium for <a href="Mysidopsis bahia">Mysidopsis bahia</a> during a life-cycle exposure. Submitted to SETAC (Soc. Environ. Toxicol. Chem.) Proceedings, November 1983.

Chia F.S. 1973.

Killing of marine larvae by diesel oil. Mar. Pollut. Bull. 4:29-30.

Cobb J.S. and B.F. Phillips (Eds) 1980.

The biology and management of lobsters. Vol. 1, Physiology and behavior. Academic Press, New York, N.Y. 463 p.

Corner E.D.S. 1978.

Pollution studies with marine plankton. Part 1. Petroleum hydrocarbons and related compounds. Adv. Mar. Biol. 15:289-380.

Couch J.A. 1979.

Shrimps (Arthropoda = Crustacea = Penaeidae). Chapter 7. p. 235-258.

In: Pollution ecology of estuarine invertebrates. Hart C.W., Jr. and S.L.H. Fuller (Eds). Academic Press, New York, N.Y. 406 p.

Crawford R.B. and J.D. Gates. 1981.

Effects of a drilling fluid on the development of a teleost and an echinoderm. Bull. Environ. Contam. Toxicol. 26:207-212.

Curds C.R. 1982.

Pelagic protists and pollution: a review of the past decade. Annls Inst. Océanogr., Monaco 58(suppl.):117-136.

Davis J.C. 1977.

Standardization and protocols of bioassays — their role and significance for monitoring research and regulatory usage. p. 1-14. <u>In</u>: Proc. 3rd aquatic toxicity workshop. Parker W.R., E. Pessch, P.G. Wells, and G.F. Westlake (Eds) Environment Canada, Environmental Protection Service, Halifax, N.S. Report No. EPS 5-AR-77-1. 176 p.

Davies J.M., I.E. Baird, L.C. Massie, S.J. Hay, and A.P. Ward. 1980. Some effects of oil derived hydrocarbons on the pelagic food web from observations in an enclosed ecosystem and a consideration of their implications for monitoring. Rapp. P.-v. Réun. Cons. int. Explor. Mer. 179:201-211.

Deslous-Paoli J.M. 1981.

Toxicité des élements métalliques dissous pour les larves d'organismes marins : données bibliographiques. Rev. Trav. Inst. Pêches Marit., Nantes 45(1):73-83.

Dinnel P.A., Q.J. Stober, and D.H. DiJulio. 1981.

Sea urchin sperm bioassay for sewage and chlorinated seawater and its relation to fish bioassays. Mar. Environ. Res. 5:29-39.

Dinnel P.A., Q.J. Stober, S.C. Crumley, and R.E. Nakatani. 1982.

Development of a sperm cell toxicity test for marine waters, p. 82-98.  $\underline{\text{In}}$ : Aquatic toxicology and hazard assessment. Pearson J.G., R.B. Foster, and W.E. Bishop (Eds). 5th Conf. ASTM STP 766. ASTM, Philadelphia. 400 p.

Dive D. 1982.

Perspectives d'utilisation des protozoaires en écotoxicologie aquatique. p. 273-294. <u>In</u>: Acute aquatic ecotoxicological tests. Leclerc H. and D. Dive (Eds). Editions INSERM, 106, Paris. 599 p.

Dive D. and H. Leclerc. 1975a.

Utilization of a ciliated protozoan for measuring the toxicity of water pollutants. Western J. Medicine 123(3):80A.

Dive D. and H. Leclerc. 1975b.

Standardized test method using protozoa for measuring water pollutant toxicity. Progr. Water Technol. 7:67-72.

Dive D. and G. Persoone. 1984.

Protozoa as test organisms in marine ecotoxicology: luxury or necessity? p. 281-305. <u>In</u>: Ecotoxicological testing for the marine environment. Persoone G., E. Jaspers, and C. Claus (Eds). State Univ. Ghent and Inst. Mar. Scient. Res., Belgium Vol. 1. 798 p.

Dixon D.R. 1982.

Aneuploidy in mussel embryos (Mytilus edulis L.) orginating from a polluted dock. Mar. Biol. Lett. 3:155-161.

Doe K.G. and P.G. Wells. 1978.

Acute aquatic toxicity and dispersing effectiveness of oil spill dispersants: results of a Canadian oil dispersant testing program (1973 to 1977). p. 50-65. In: Chemical dispersants for the control of oil spills. McCarthy L.T., Jr., G.P. Lindblom, and H.F. Walter (Eds). ASTM STP 659. Am. Soc. Test. Mat., Philadelphia. 307 p.

Epifiano C.E. 1979.

Larval decapods (Arthropoda: Crustacea = Decapoda). Chapter 8, p. 259-292. <u>In</u>: Pollution ecology of estuarine invertebrates. Hart C.W., Jr. and S.L.H. Fuller (Eds). Academic Press, New York, N.Y. 406 p.

Epifiano C.E. 1982.

The use of decapod crustacean larvae in the assessment of effects of pollutants. Proc. Workshop on meaningful measures of marine pollution effects, Pensacola Beach, Florida. April 26-29, 1982. NOAA/National Ocean Survey, Rockville, MD. (in preparation).

Ernst W. 1984.

Marine ecotoxicological testing in the Federal Republic of Germany. p. 85-109. <u>In</u>: Ecotoxicological testing for the marine environment. Persoone G., E. Jaspers, and C. Claus (Eds). State Univ. Ghent and Inst. Mar. Scient. Res. Belgium. Vol. 1. 798 p.

Falk-Petersen I.-B. and S. Lönning. 1984.

Effects of hydrocarbons on eggs and larvae of marine organisms. p.  $\underline{\text{In}}$ : Ecotoxicological testing for the marine environment. Persoone G., E. Jaspers, and C. Claus (Eds). State Univ. Ghent and Inst. Mar. Scient. Res., Belgium. Vol. 2. p.

Fowler S.W. and D.L. Elder. 1980.

Chlorinated hydrocarbons in pelagic organisms from the open Mediterranean Sea. Mar. Environ. Res. 4:87-96.

Gentile J.H., D.M. Johns, J.A. Cardin, and J.F. Heltshe, 1984.

Marine ecotoxicological tests with crustaceans p. 479-502. <u>In</u>: Ecotoxicological testing for the marine environment. Persoone G., E. Jaspers, and C. Claus (Eds). State Univ. Ghent Inst. Mar. Scient. Res., Belgium. 798 p.

Gray J.S. 1974.

Symergetic effects of three heavy metals on growth rates of a marine ciliate protozoan. p.465-485. <u>In</u>: Pollution and physiology of marine organisms. Vernberg J.F. and W.B. Vernberg (Eds). Academic Press, New York, N.Y. 492 p.

Gray J.S. and R.J. Ventilla. 1973.

Growth rates of sediment living marine protozoa as a toxicity indicator for heavy metals. Ambio 2(4):118-121.

Greenwood P.J. and T. Bennett. 1981.

Some effects of temperature-salinity combinations on the early development of the sea urchin <u>Parechinus angulosus</u> (Leske) fertilization. J. Exp. Mar. Biol. Ecol. 51:119-131.

Grice G.D. and M.R. Reeve (Eds). 1981.

Marine Mesocosms. Biological and Chemical Research in Experimental Ecosystems. Springer Verlag, New York, N.Y. 430 p.

Hagstrom B.E. and S. Lönning. 1973.

The sea urchin egg as a testing object in toxicology. Acta Pharmacol. Toxicol. 32(suppl. 1):1-49.

Hammons A.S. (Ed.). 1981.

Methods for Ecological Toxicology. A critical Review of Laboratory Multispecies Tests. Ann Arbor Science, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Hammons A.S. 1980.

Methods for ecological toxicology: A critical review of laboratory multi-species tests. Report No. EPA 560/11-80-026. Oak Ridge National Laboratories, Oak Ridge, Tenn. 307 p.

Harding G.C., W.P. Vass, and K.F. Drinkwater. 1981.

Importance of feeding, direct uptake from seawater, and transfer from generation to generation in the accumulation of an organochlorine (p,p'-DDT) by the marine planktonic copepod <u>Calanus finmarchichus</u>. Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 38:101-119.

Hart C.W., Jr. and S.L.H. Fuller (Eds). 1979.

Pollution ecology of estuarine invertebrates. Academic Press, New York, N.Y. 406 p.

Heinle D.R. and M.S. Beaven. 1980.

Toxicity of chlorine-produced oxidants to estuarine copepods. p. 109-130. <u>In</u>: Aquatic invertebrate bioassays. Buikema A.L. and J. Cairns, Jr. (Eds). ASTM STP 715. Am. Soc. Test. Mat., Philadelphia. 209 p.

Hooftman R.N. and G.J. Vink. 1980.

The determination of toxic effects of pollutants with the marine polychaete worm Ophryotrocha diadema. Ecotoxicol. Environ. Saf. 4:252-262.

Houde E.D. and A.K. Taniguchi. 1979.

Laboratory culture of marine fish larvae and their role in marine environmental research. p. 176-205. <u>In</u>: Advances in marine environmental research. Jacoff F.S. (Ed.). EPA-600/9-79-035. September 1979. 411 p.

Kerster H.W. and D.J. Schaeffer. 1983.

Brine shrimp (Artemia salina) nauplii as a teratogen test system. Ecotoxicol. and Environ. Saf. 7:342-349.

Kinae N., T. Hashizume, T. Makita, I. Tomita, and I. Kimura. 1981.

Kraft mill effluent and sediment can retard development and lyse sea urchin eggs. Bull Environ. Contam. Toxicol. 27:616-623.

Kobavashi N. 1971.

Fertilized sea urchin eggs as an indicatory material for marine pollution bioassay, preliminary experiments. Publ. Seto Mar. Biol. Lab. 18(6):379-406.

Kobayashi N. 1973.

Studies on the effects of some agents on fertilized sea urchin eggs, as a part of the bases for marine pollution bioassay. Publ. Seto Mar. Biol. Lab. 21(2):109-114.

Kobavashi N. 1974.

Marine pollution bioassay by sea urchin eggs, an attempt to enhance accuracy. Publ. Seto Mar. Biol. Lab. 21(5/6):377-391.

Kobayashi N. 1977.

Preliminary experiments with sea urchin pluteus and metamorphosis in marine pollution bioassay. Publ. Seto Mar. Biol. Lab. 24(1/3):9-21.

Kobayashi N. 1980.

Comparative sensitivity for various developmental stages of sea urchins to some chemicals. Mar. Biol. 58:163-171.

Kobayashi N. 1981.

Comparative toxicity of various chemicals, oil extracts and oil dispersant extracts to Canadian and Japanese sea urchin eggs. Publ. Seto Mar. Biol. Lab. 26(1/3):123-133.

Kobayashi N. 1984.

Marine ecotoxicologic testing with echinoderms. p. 341-405. <u>In</u>: Ecotoxicological testing for the marine environment. Persoone G., E. Jaspers, and C. Claus (Eds). State Univ. Ghent and Inst. Mar. Scient. Res., Belgium, Vol. 1. 798 p.

Kuiper J. 1981.

Fate and effects of cadmium in marine plankton communities in experimental enclosures. Mar. Ecol. Progr. Ser. 6(2):161-174.

Kuiper J. 1982.

The use of enclosed plankton communities in aquatic ecotoxicology. Krips Repro. Meppel., The Netherlands. 53 p.

Kuiper J. 1984.

Multispecies and model ecosystem experiments in marine ecotoxicology. p. 527-588. <u>In</u>: Ecotoxicological testing for the marine environment. Persoone G., E. Jaspers, and C. Claus (Eds). State Univ. Ghent and Inst. Mar. Scient. Res., Belgium. Vol. 1. 798 p.

Laake M. 1984.

Marine ecotoxicological tests with heterotropic micro-organisms. p. 257-279. <u>In</u>: Ecotoxicological testing for the marine environment. Persoone G., E. Jaspers, and C. Claus (Eds). State Univ. Ghent and Inst. Mar. Scient. Res. Belgium, Vol. 1. 798 p.

Landrum P.F. and D.G. Crosby. 1981.

Comparison of the disposition of several nitrogen-containing compounds in the sea urchin and other marine invertebrates. Xenobiotica 11(5):351-361.

Lang W.H., R.B. Forward, Jr., D.C. Miller, and M. Marcy. 1980.

Acute toxicity and sublethal behavioral effects of copper on barnacle nauplii (Balanus improvisus). Mar. Biol. 58:139-145.

Lassus P., P. Maggi, C. LeBaut, M. Bardouil, G. Bocquene, L. LeDean, and P. Truquet. 1981.

Influence de la chloration sur les premiers stades larvaires de <u>Palaemon serratus</u> (Pennant). Rev. Trav. Inst. Pêches Marit., Nantes 45(1):85-95.

Lassus P., C. LeBaut, L. Le Dean, M. Bardouil, P. Truquet, and G. Bocquene. 1984.

The use of harpacticoid copepods for testing the effects of chemicals on larval production. p. 131-142. In Ecotoxicological testing for the marine environment. Persoone G., E. Jaspers, and C. Claus (Eds). State Univ. Ghent and Inst. Mar. Scient. Res., Belgium, Vol. 2. 584 p.

Lawson T.J. and G.D. Grice. 1977.

Zooplankton sampling variability. Controlled ecosystem pollution experiment. Bull. Mar. Sci. 27(1):80-84.

Leclerc H. and D. Dive (Eds). 1982.

Acute aquatic ecotoxicological tests. Methodology-Standardization-Significance. Editions INSERM 106. Paris. 599 p.

Lee R.F., M. Takahashi, J.H. Beers, W.H. Thomas, D.R.L. Seibert, P. Koeller, and D.R. Green. 1977.

Controlled ecosystems: their use in the study of the effects of petroleum hydrocarbons on plankton. p. 323-342. <u>In</u>: Physiological responses of marine biota to pollutants. Vernberg F.J., A. Calabrese, F.P. Thurberg, and W.B. Vernberg (Eds). Academic Press, London, New York. 454 p.

Little L.W. and A.F. Maciorowski. 1979.

Bioassays - procedures and results. J. Water Pollut. Control Fed. 51(6):1573-1592.

Longwell A.C. and J.B. Hughes. 1980.

Cytologic, cytogenetic, and developmental state of Atlantic mackerel eggs from sea surface waters of the New York Bight, and prospects for biological effects monitoring with ichthyoplankton. Rapp. P.-v. Réun. Cons. int. Explor. Mer. 179:275-291.

Lönning S. 1977.

The sea urchin egg as a test object in oil pollution studies. Rapp. P.-v. Réun. Cons. int. Explor. Mer 171:186-188.

Lova Y. and B. Rinkevich. 1980.

Effects of oil pollution on coral reef communities. Mar. Ecol.-Progr. Ser. 3:167-180.

Luca C., J. Pavicic, M. Skreblin, and M. Mastrovic. 1980.

Toxicological effects of biocide slimicide C-30 on some marine invertebrates. Mar. Pollut. Bull. 11(10):294-296.

Maciorowski A.F., L.W. Little, and J.L. Sims. 1980.

Bioassays - procedures and results. J. Water Pollut. Control Fed. 52(6):1630-1656.

Maciorowski A.F., J.L.Sims, L.W.Little, and E.D.Gerrard. 1981.

Bioassays - procedures and results. J. Water Pollut. Control Fed. 53(6):974-993.

Maciorowski A.F., L.W. Little, L.F. Raynor, R.C. Sims, and J.L. Sims. 1982. Bioassays - procedures and results. J. Water Pollut. Control Fed. 54(6):830-848. Maciorowski A.F.,L.W. Little, L.F. Raynor, R.C. Sims, and J.L. Sims. 1983. Bioassays - procedures and results. J. Water Pollut. Control Fed. 55(6):801-816.

Miller D. 1980.

Some applications of locomotor response in pollution effects monitoring. Rapp. P.-v. Réun. Cons. int. Explor. Mer. 179:154-161.

Miller D.C., W.H. Lang, J.O.B. Greaves, and R.S. Wilson. 1982.

Investigations in aquatic behavioral toxicology using a computerized video quantification system. p. 206-220. <u>In</u>: Aquatic toxicology and hazard assessment: Fifth Conf. Pearson J.G., R.B. Foster, and W.E. Bishop (Eds). ASTM STP 766. Am. Soc. Test. Mat., Philadelphia. 400 p.

Minchew C.D., L.R. Brown, and C.M. Ladner. 1979.

The occurrence of "white eye syndrome" in shrimp (<u>Penaeus aztecus</u>). p. 537-539. <u>In</u>: Proc. 1979 oil spill conference (Prevention, Behavior, Control, Cleanup). Los Angeles, Ca., March, 1979. Amer. Petrol. Inst. Publ. No. 4308. Amer. Petrol. Inst., Wash. D.C. 728 p.

National Academy of Sciences. 1984.

Petroleum in the Marine Environment. Proc. of an update workshop, Nov. 9-13, 1981. National Academy of Sciences, Washington, DC (in press).

National Research Council. 1981a.

Laboratory animal management. Marine invertebrates. National Academy Press, Washington, D.C. 382 p.

National Research Council. 1981b.

Testing for effects of chemicals on ecosystems. A report by the committee to review methods for ecotoxicology. National Academy Press, Washington, D.C.  $103~\rm p.$ 

Nelson W.G. 1981.

Inhibition of barnacle <u>Balanus</u> <u>balanoides</u> settlement by Ekofisk crude oil. Mar. Ecol. Progr. Ser. 5(1):41-44.

Nimmo D.R. and T.L. Hamaker. 1982a.

A compilation of publications on the use of the estuarine mysid, <u>Mysidopsis bahia</u>, in acute and chronic testing. Manuscript report. Environmental Research and Technology, Inc., Fort Collins, Colorado. 91 p.

Nimmo D.R. and T.L. Hamaker. 1982b.

Mysids in toxicity testing - a review. Hydrobiologia 93:171-178.

Nimmo D.R., L.H.Bahner, R.A.Rigby, J.M. Sheppard, and A.J. Wilson, Jr. 1977.

Mysidopsis bahia: an estuarine species suitable for life-cycle toxicity tests to determine the effects of a pollutant p. 109-116. In: Aquatic toxicology and hazard evaluation. Mayer F.L. and J.L. Hamelink (Eds). ASTM STP 634. Am. Soc. Test. Mat., Philadelphia. 307 p.

O'Brien W.J. and D. Kettle. 1981.

A zooplankton bioassay chamber for laboratory and field use. J. Plankton Res. 3(4):561-566.

Oviatt C., J. Frithsen, J. Gearing, and P. Gearing, 1982.

Low chronic additions of No. 2 fuel oil: chemical behavior, biological impact and recovery in a simulated estuarine environment. Mar. Ecol. Progr. Ser. 9:121-136.

Pagano G., A. Esposito, and G.G.Giordano. 1982.

Fertilization and larval development in sea urchins following exposure of gametes and embryos to cadmium. Arch. Environ. Contam. Toxicol. 11:47-55.

Pagano G., A. Esposito, P. Bove, M. de Angelis, A. Rota, and G.G. Giordano. 1983.

The effects of hexavalent and trivalent chromium on fertilization and development in sea urchins. Environ. Res. 30:442-452.

Pavicic J. 1977.

Combined cadmium - zinc toxicity on embryonic development of <u>Mytilus</u> <u>galloprovincialis</u> Lmk. (Mollusca, Mytilidae). p. 79-80. <u>In</u>: Protection of the Mediterranean coast. Part I. 3rd study session on marine pollution. Commission Internationale pour l'Exploration Scientifique de la Mer Méditerranée. Monaco. 235 p.

Persoone G. and D. Dive. 1978.

Toxicity tests with ciliates — a short review. Ecotoxicol. Environ. Safety. 2: 105-114.

Persoone G., P. Vanhaecke, P. Sorgeloos, and C. Claus. 1981.

Intercalibration exercise on a short-term standard toxicity test with <u>Artemia</u> nauplii. Final report prepared for the Commission of the European Communities. Contract No. ENV-396-B(N). Art. Ref. Center, State Univ. Ghent, Belgium. 30 p.

Percy J.A. and T.C. Mullin. 1975.

Effects of crude oils on Arctic marine invertebrates. Beaufort Sea Project, Techn. Rep. No. 11. 167 p.

Price R.K.J. and R.F. Uglow. 1979.

Some effects of certain metals on development and mortality within the moult cycle of Crangon crangon (L). Mar. Environ. Res. 2:287-299.

Reeve M.R., J.C. Gamble, and M.A. Walter. 1977.

Experimental observations on the effects of copper on copepods and other zooplankton. Controlled ecosystem pollution experiment. Bull. Mar. Sci. 27(1):92-104.

Reeve M.R., G.D. Grice, V.R. Gibson, M.A. Walter, K. Darcy, and T. Ikeda. 1976.

A controlled environmental pollution experiment and its usefulness in the study of larger marine zooplankton under toxic stress. p. 145-162. In: Effects of pollutants on aquatic organisms. Lockwood A.P.M. (Ed.). Cambridge University Press, New York, N.Y. 193 p.

Reish D.J. 1980.

Use of polychaetous annelids as test organisms for marine bioassay experiments. p. 140-154. <u>In</u>: Aquatic invertebrate bioassays. Buikema A.L., Jr.and J. Cairns, Jr., (Eds). ASTM STP 715. Am. Soc. Test. Mat. Philadelphia. 209 p.

Reish D.J. 1984.

Marine ecotoxicological tests with polychaetous annelids. p. 427-454. In: Ecotoxicological testing for the marine environment. Persoone G., E. Jaspers, and C. Claus (Eds). State Univ. Ghent and Inst. Mar. Scient. Res., Belgium. Vol. 1. 798 p.

Reish D.J., C.E. Pesch, J.H. Gentile, G. Bellan, and D. Bellan-Santini. 1978.

Interlaboratory calibration experiments using the polychaetous annelid Capitella capitata. Mar. Environ. Res. 1:109-118.

Roberts M.H., Jr. 1980.

Flow-through toxicity testing system for molluscan larvae as applied to halogen toxicity in estuarine water. p. 131-139. <u>In</u>: Aquatic invertebrate bioassays.Buikema A.L.,Jr and J. Cairns, Jr. (Eds). ASTM STP 715. Am. Soc. Test. Mat. Philadelphia. 209 p.

Rogerson A., W.Y. Shiu, G.L. Huang, D. Mackay, and J. Berger. 1983.

Determination and interpretation of hydrocarbon toxicity to ciliate protozoa. Aquatic Toxicol. 3:215-228.

Rosenthal H. and D.F. Alderdice. 1976.

Sublethal effects of environmental stressors, natural and pollutional, on marine fish eggs and larvae. J. Fish. Res. Bd Can. 33:2047-2065.

Samain J.F., J. Moal, A. Coum, J.R. LeCoz, and J.Y. Daniel. 1980.

Effects of the  $\underline{\text{Amoco}}$   $\underline{\text{Cadiz}}$  oil spill on zooplankton: a new possibility of ecophysiological survey. Helgoländer Meeresunters. 33(1-4):225-235.

Schneider R. 1980.

Classes of ecotoxicological tests: their advantages and disadvantages for regulation. p. 175-191. <u>In</u> Working papers for the committee to review methods for ecotoxicology. Environmental Studies Board Commission on Natural Resources, National Academy Press, Washington, D.C. 257 p.

Sprague J.B. 1970.

Measurement of pollutant toxicity to fish - II. Utilizing and applying bioassay results. Water Res. 4:3-32.

Sprague J.B. 1971.

Measurement of pollutant toxicity to fish - III. Sublethal effects and "safe" concentrations. Water Res. 5:245-266.

Sprague J.B. 1976.

Current status of sublethal tests of pollutants on aquatic organisms. J. Fish. Res. Bd Can. 33:1988-1992.

Sprague J.B. and A. Fogels. 1977.

Watch the Y in bioassay. p. 107-118. <u>In</u>: Proc. 3rd aquatic toxicity workshop. Parker W.R., E. Pessah, G.F. Westlake, and P.G. Wells (Eds). Environment Canada, Environmental Protection Service, Halifax, N.S. Report No. EPS 5-AR-77-1. 176 p.

Sprague J.B. and D.W. McLeese. 1968.

Toxicity of Kraft pulp mill effluent for larval and adult lobsters, and juvenile salmon. Water Res. 2:753-760.

Stebbing A.R.D. 1980.

The biological measurement of water quality. Rapp. P.-v. Réun. Cons. int. Explor. Mer. 179:310-314.

Stebbing A.R.D., B. Akesson, A. Calabrese, J.H. Gentile, A. Jensen, and R. Lloyd. 1980.

The role of bioassays in marine pollution monitoring. Bioassay panel report. Rapp. P.-v. Réun. Cons. int. Explor. Mer. 179:322-332.

Stebbing A.R.D. and B.E. Brown. 1984.

Marine ecotoxicological tests with coelenterates. p. 307-339. <u>In</u>: Ecotoxicological testing for the marine environment. Persoone G., E. Jaspers, and C. Claus (Eds). State Univ. Ghent and Inst. Mar. Scient. Res. Belgium. Vol. 1. 798 p.

Stober Q.J., R. Nakatani, and S. Felton. 1981.

Development and validation of the echinoderm sperm bioassay for testing toxic substances. Smithsonian Science Information Exchange Current Research No. GBP 4807-1.

Strobel C.J. and A.H. Brenowitz. 1981.

Effects of Bunker C oil in juvenile horseshoe crabs (<u>Limulis</u> polyphemus). Estuaries 4:157-159.

Vandermeulen J.H. and T.C. Hemsworth. 1977.

Altered grazing patterns in a copepod/algal ecosystem by low level naphthalene exposure. ICES, C.M. 1977/E:70. 10 p.

Van Dijk J.J., C. Van der Meer, and M. Wijnans. 1977.

The toxicity of sodium pentachlorophenate for three species of decapod crustaceans and their larvae. Bull. Environ. Contam. Toxicol. 17(5):622-630.

Vanhaecke P. and G. Persoone. 1984.

The ARC-test: a standardized short-term routine toxicity test with Artemia nauplii: methodology and evaluation. p. 143-157. <u>In</u>: Ecotoxicological testing for the marine environment. Persoone G., E. Jaspers, and C. Claus (Eds). State Univ. Ghent and Inst. Mar. Scient. Res., Belgium. Vol. 2. 584 p.

Vanhaecke P., G. Persoone, C. Claus, and P. Sorgeloos. 1980.

Research on the development of a short-term standard toxicity test with Artemia nauplii. p. 263-285. In: The brine shrimp Artemia. Morphology, genetics, radiobiology and toxicology. Persoone G., P. Sorgeloos, O. Roels, and E. Jaspers. (Eds). Universa Press, Wetteren, Belgium. Vol. 1. 345 p.

Waldichuk M. 1979.

Review of the problems. Phil. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. B, 286:399-424.

Ward T.J., E.D. Rider, and D.A. Drozdowski. 1979.

A chronic toxicity test with the marine copepod <u>Acartia tonsa.</u> p. 148-158. <u>In</u>: Aquatic toxicology: second conference. Marking L.L. and R.A. Kimerle (Eds). ASTM STP 667. Am. Soc. Test. Mat., Philadelphia, PA. 392 p.

Wells P.G. 1976a.

Appendix 4. In: Effects of Venezuelan crude oil on young stages of the American lobster, <u>Homarus americanus</u>. Ph.D. Thesis, University of Guelph, Ontario. 274 p.

Wells P.G. 1976b.

Lobster and other decapod crustacean larvae as test organisms in marine acute toxicity bioassays. p. 266-290. In : Proc. 2nd annual aquatic toxicity workshop. Graig G.R. (Ed.). Ontario Ministry of the Environment, Toronto, Ontario. 340 p.

Wells P.G. 1982a.

Zooplankton. p. 65-80. <u>In</u>: Oil and dispersants in Canadian Seas - Research appraisal and recommendations. Sprague J.B., J.H. Vandermeulen, and P.G. Wells (Eds). Environment Canada, Environmental Protection Service, Econ. Techn. Rev. Rep. EPS 3-EC-82-2. 185 p.

Wells P.G. 1982b.

Green sea urchins (Strongylocentrotus droebachiensis) as toxicity test organisms and montitors of pollutants in Canadian marine coastal waters. Spill Technology Newsletter 7(5):114-120. Environment Canada, Ottawa.

Wells P.G., S. Abernethy, and D. Mackay. 1982.

Study of oil-water partitioning of a chemical dispersant using an acute bioassay with marine crustaceans. Chemosphere 11(11):1071-1086.

Wells P.G. and J.B. Sprague. 1976.

Effects of crude oil on American lobster (<u>Homarus americanus</u>) larvae in the laboratory. J. Fish. Res. Bd Can. 33:1604-1614.

Woelke C.E. 1967.

Measurement of water quality criteria with the Pacific oyster embryo bioassay. p. 112-120. <u>In</u>: Water quality criteria, ASTM STP 416. Am. Soc. Test. Mat. Philadelphia, PA.

Woelke C.E. 1972.

Development of receiving water quality bioassay criterion based on the 48-hr Pacific oyster (<u>Crassostrea gigas</u>) Embryo. Techn. Rep. No. 9, Washington Dep. Fish. Seattle, Washington. 93 p.

Wolfe D.A., D.F. Boesch, A. Calabrese, J.J. Lee, C.D. Litchfield, R.J. Livingston, A.D. Michael, J.M. O'Connor, M. Pilson, and L.V. Sick. 1982.

Effects of toxic substances on communities and ecosystems. p. 67-86. In : Ecological stress and the New York Bight: Science and management. Mayer G.F. (Ed.). Estuarine Research Foundation, Columbia, South Carolina. 715 p.