

# Effect Of Chronic Diethylhexylphthalate Exposure On Antioxidant Enzyme Activities In Zebrafish (*Danio rerio*)

<sup>1</sup>S. Senthilnathan <sup>2</sup>P. Hemalatha, <sup>3</sup> M. Sellappan, <sup>4</sup> M. Rajasekara Pandian

<sup>1</sup>Guest Faculty, <sup>2</sup>Research Scholar, <sup>3</sup>Assistant Professor, <sup>4</sup>Head and Assistant Professor

<sup>1</sup>Department of Zoology, <sup>2</sup>Research scholar in Zoology, <sup>3</sup>Department of Zoology, <sup>4</sup>Department of Zoology

<sup>1</sup>Arignar Anna Government Arts College, Namakkal, <sup>2</sup>Manonmaniam Sundaranar University, Tirunelveli,

<sup>3</sup>Arignar Anna Government Arts College, Namakkal, <sup>4</sup>Arignar Anna Government Arts college, Namakkal.

\*Corresponding Author

Dr. S. Senthilnathan

Department of Zoology

Arignar Anna Government Arts College,

Namakkal - 637002

## Abstract

Diethylhexylphthalate (DEHP) in the waterways could cause metabolic changes in the fishes. Only few studies have documented the chronic toxicity of DEHP in rats, mice and humans. The present study focused on the changes elicited by DEHP on the enzyme activity Superoxide dismutase and Catalase of the various organs (gill, liver, muscle, testis and ovary) of male and female Zebrafish. The observation registered in this study reflects that antioxidant enzymes activities were significantly enhanced in all the tissues (gill, liver, muscle, testis and ovary) when compared to control (untreated DEHP). This could be due to the detoxification mechanism exhibited by the Zebrafish on exposure of DEHP.

## KEYWORDS:

Diethylhexylphthalate, Zebrafish, Superoxide dismutase, Catalase, Antioxidant defense

## I. INTRODUCTION

In India, DEHP is used as a perfume binder in the incense stick industry; hence workers in this industry are usually occupationally exposed to DEHP, as it involves manual rolling of a paste made by mixing DEHP with perfumed saw dust using bare hands (Sonde *et al.*, 2000). Release into the environment occurs primarily as a result of production and manufacturing of DEHP itself and during the use and disposal of products containing DEHP (Giam and Wong, 1987; Joblings *et al.*, 1995). Releases are also expected to be primarily to water or to soil as a result of leaching from land-fills (Silva *et al.*, 2004) and human exposure to phthalates is primarily due to ingestion of food contaminated from environmental sources (Kavlock *et al.*, 2002a, 2002b, 2002c).

Over the years, it is becoming increasingly recognized that humans are not exposed to single chemicals. Rather, humans are exposed sub-sequentially, by various routes of exposure, to a large number of chemicals from a variety of sources over varying periods of time. The magnitude of the problem is immense. In our daily living, exposures to mixture of chemicals are ubiquitous in the air, food and water. Currently, there is scientific and public concern about potential human health risks from exposure to phthalates and diesters of phthalic acid (Contzen Pereira and Vaman Rao, 2006). These concerns stem from studies viewing that most of the U.S. general population is exposed to phthalates (Silva *et al.*, 2004). Knowledge on the physiological action of the toxicants helps to predict important sub-lethal effects and analyses of biochemistry, hematology and histopathology may be used to determine the mode of action of the toxicant. Fish health may thus reflect, and be a reliable indication of the health status of a specific aquatic ecosystem (Burkepile *et al.*, 2000).

The antioxidant defense (AD) system of organisms provides a means of dealing with oxidative stress and includes several enzymes and vitamins (Filho, 1996; Rudeva, 1997; Kelly *et al.*, 1998; Marcon and Filho, 1999). A primary role of the AD system is protecting cellular components from ROS damage (Kelly *et al.*, 1998). The antioxidant enzymes, superoxide dismutase (SOD), catalase (CAT), and glutathione peroxidase, act to remove oxygen radicals produced within the cell (Filho, 1996; Filho *et al.*, 1993; Michiels *et al.*, 1994; Kelly *et al.*, 1998). Superoxide dismutase occurs in two forms: (1) a cytosolic form that has copper and zinc in its active site (CuZnSOD) and (2) a mitochondrial form that has manganese in its active site (MnSOD) (McCord and Fridovich, 1969). Both forms of SOD protect the cell from potential ROS damage by converting superoxide anions to H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> and H<sub>2</sub>O (McCord and Fridovich, 1969).

Antioxidant system is located within different cellular compartments. These enzymes are found virtually in all tissue of vertebrates, but show in general high activity in the liver. A major organ of xenobiotics uptake and enzymatic transformation of ROS (Lamaire *et al.*, 1992) and eventually leak to blood. Some of these enzymes, like aminotransferase and phosphatase group, can constitute good molecular bioindicators for oxidative stress and can also indicate the magnitude of response in populations chronically exposed to contaminants such as metals and other xenobiotics (Livingstone *et al.*, 1994). Keeping this in view, the aim of this study was to assay the enzyme activity of SOD, CAT of the gill, liver, muscle, testis, and ovary of the both male and female of Zebrafish.

## II. MATERIALS AND METHODS

### Fish maintenance in aquarium

Fifteen days old fingerlings of Zebra fish were collected from Krishna Ornamental fish farm, Tiruchirappalli, Tamil Nadu, India. These fingerlings were reared in aquarium tanks for a period of 180 days at standard environmental conditions (28 °C and 14 hour photoperiod). At the end of the 60<sup>th</sup> day, ten Zebrafish from each of the treatments and control were collected. The Gill, liver, muscle, testis and ovary of zebrafish were dissected and subjected to enzyme assay, SOD and CAT. About 0.4 mg of tissue sample was homogenized in 800µl Tris-Hcl buffer (100mM, pH-7.4) using a glass homogenizer. Then the homogenate was centrifuged at 10000 rpm for 15 min at 4 °C, and the supernatant was collected for antioxidant enzymes. CAT activity was determined according to the method of Sinhas (1972) and SOD activity was assayed based on a modified method of Marklund and Marklund (1974).

### Statistical Analysis

Oneway analysis of variance (ANOVA) was performed using SPSS version 16.0 to assess the intergroup differences followed by Duncan Multiple Range Test (DMRT).

## III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Effect of DEHP exposure to male Zebrafish for SOD assay

The data displayed in (Table 1) reveal that DEHP has induced significant variation in mean SOD concentration of gill, liver, muscle and testis of male Zebrafish. DEHP at 2.5ppm, 5ppm and 10ppm registered mean SOD concentration of 0.725±0.017 µmol/mg, 0.893±0.127 µmol/mg and 0.930±0.109 µmol/mg, respectively. On the other hand, control fishes registered mean SOD concentration of 0.267±0.145 µmol/mg. (F=456.88, P<0.001). Liver mean SOD concentration significantly increased (F=304.735, P<0.001) on exposure of Zebrafish to DEHP (2.5ppm: 0.326±0.011 µmol/mg; 5ppm: 0.551±0.020 µmol/mg, 10ppm: 0.787±0.014 µmol/mg) when compared to the control (0.207±0.010 µmol/mg) Similarly muscle mean SOD concentration significantly (F=1.196, P<0.001) elevated an exposure of Zebrafish DEHP (2.5ppm: 4.288±0.014 µmol/mg; 5ppm: 5.249±0.013 µmol/mg; 10ppm: 7.117±0.011 µmol/mg) when compared to the control 3.211±0.020 µmol/mg. Testis mean SOD concentration significantly (F=6.426, P<0.001) elevated on exposure of Zebrafish to DEHP (2.5ppm: 4.261 ± 0.074 µmol/mg; 5ppm : 6.462 ± 0.011 µmol/mg; 10ppm: 9.244±0.008 µmol/mg) when compared to the control (2.158±0.007 µmol/mg).

**Table.1 Variation in the mean SOD concentration in various tissues of male Zebrafish dexposed to DEHP**

DEHP Treatment	Gill (µmol/mg protein)	Liver (µmol/mg protein)	Muscle (µmol/mg protein)	Testis (µmol/mg protein)
Control	0.267±0.145 <sup>d</sup>	0.207±0.010 <sup>d</sup>	3.211±0.020 <sup>d</sup>	2.158±0.007 <sup>d</sup>
2.5ppm	0.725±0.017 <sup>c</sup>	0.326±0.011 <sup>c</sup>	4.288±0.014 <sup>c</sup>	4.261±0.074 <sup>c</sup>
5ppm	0.893±0.127 <sup>b</sup>	0.551±0.020 <sup>b</sup>	5.249±0.013 <sup>b</sup>	6.462±0.011 <sup>b</sup>
10ppm	0.930±0.109 <sup>a</sup>	0.787±0.014 <sup>a</sup>	7.177±0.011 <sup>a</sup>	9.244±0.008 <sup>a</sup>
F	456.88***	304.735***	1.196***	6.426***

\*\*\*Significant at P < 0.001. In a column, figures having dissimilar letters differ significantly according to Duncan Multiple Range Test (DMRT). Values are expressed as mean ± standard error.

### Effect of DEHP exposure to female Zebrafish for SOD assay

Similar pattern of change in mean SOD concentration was evinced in DEHP exposed female Zebrafish (Table 2). Mean SOD concentration of gill significantly (F=57.560, P<0.001) elevated in DEHP treated fishes (2.5ppm: 0.390±0.018 µmol/mg; 5ppm: 0.650±0.021 µmol/mg; 10ppm: 0.931±0.011 µmol/mg) when compared to the control (0.251±0.072 µmol/mg) DEHP untreated female. Zebrafish recorded liver mean SOD concentration of 0.277±0.012 µmol/mg which was found to be significantly higher (F=1.782, P<0.001) (2.5ppm: 1.878±0.014 µmol/mg; 5ppm: 3.730±0.017 µmol/mg; 10ppm: 4.740±0.014 µmol/mg) than the DEHP unexposed ones. Muscle SOD concentration significantly increased (F=2.276, P<0.001) (2.5ppm: 23.613±0.012 µmol/mg; 5ppm: 24.235±0.017 µmol/mg, 10ppm: 27.389±0.016 µmol/mg) in the DEHP exposed Zebrafish when compared with untreated ones (21.811±0.015 µmol/mg). Similar pattern of variation in mean SOD concentration was evinced in the ovary of Zebrafish exposed to DEHP (2.5ppm: 7.222±0.008 µmol/mg; 5ppm: 9.155±0.007 µmol/mg; 10ppm: 11.187±0.012 µmol/mg) when compared to the control (6.194±0.021 µmol/mg) (F=2.634, P<0.001).

**Table 2. Variation in the mean SOD concentration in various tissues of female Zebrafish exposed to DEHP**

DEHP Treatment	Gill (µmol/mg protein)	Liver (µmol/mg protein)	Muscle (µmol/mg protein)	Ovary (µmol/mg protein)
CONTROL	0.251±0.072 <sup>d</sup>	0.277±0.012 <sup>d</sup>	21.811±0.015 <sup>d</sup>	6.194±0.021 <sup>d</sup>
2.5ppm	0.390±0.018 <sup>c</sup>	1.878±0.014 <sup>c</sup>	23.613±0.012 <sup>c</sup>	7.222±0.008 <sup>c</sup>
5ppm	0.650±0.021 <sup>b</sup>	3.730±0.017 <sup>b</sup>	24.235±0.017 <sup>b</sup>	9.155±0.007 <sup>b</sup>
10ppm	0.931±0.011 <sup>a</sup>	4.747±0.014 <sup>a</sup>	27.389±0.016 <sup>a</sup>	11.187±0.012 <sup>a</sup>
F	57.560***	1.782***	2.276***	2.634***

\*\*\*Significant at P < 0.001. In a column, figures having dissimilar letters differ significantly according to Duncan New Multiple Range Test (DMRT). Values are expressed as mean ± standard error.

### Effect of DEHP exposure to male Zebrafish for CAT assay

Mean CAT concentration in gill of male Zebrafish enhanced significantly (F=1.516, P<0.001) on exposure to DEHP (2.5ppm: 7.372±0.009 µmol/mg; 5ppm: 8.783±0.019 µmol/mg; 10ppm: 11.125 ± 0.019 µmol/mg). On contrary, control fishes registered gill mean CAT concentration of 5.789±0.022 µmol/mg (table 3). Similarly, liver mean CAT concentration also significantly elevated (F=263.93, P<0.001) in male Zebrafish exposed to DEHP (2.5ppm: 24.253±0.008 µmol/mg; 5ppm: 27.189±0.009 µmol/mg; 10ppm:

29.157±0.012 µmol/mg) when compared to the control (24.738±0.279 µmol/mg). Muscle mean CAT concentration also exhibited similar pattern of increase in DEHP exposed fishes (2.5ppm: 33.223±0.066 µmol/mg; 5ppm: 35.494±0.208 µmol/mg; 10ppm: 38.223±0.075 µmol/mg) when compared to the control (28.375±0.014 µmol/mg) (F=1.297, P<0.001). Testis mean CAT concentration of DEHP treated Zebrafish also significantly enhanced (2.5ppm: 18.444 µmol/mg; 5ppm: 23.333±0.014 µmol/mg; 10ppm: 24.241±0.013 µmol/mg) when compared to the untreated ones (12.254±0.082) (F=1.667, P<0.001).

**Table 3. Variation in the mean CAT concentration in various tissues of male Zebrafish exposed to DEHP**

DEHP Treatment	Gill (µmol/mg protein)	Liver (µmol/mg protein)	Muscle (µmol/mg protein)	Testis (µmol/mg protein)
Control	5.789±0.022 <sup>d</sup>	24.738±0.279 <sup>d</sup>	28.375±0.014 <sup>d</sup>	12.254±0.082 <sup>d</sup>
2.5ppm	7.372±0.009 <sup>c</sup>	24.253±0.008 <sup>c</sup>	33.223±0.066 <sup>c</sup>	18.444±0.007 <sup>c</sup>
5ppm	8.783±0.019 <sup>b</sup>	27.189±0.009 <sup>b</sup>	35.494±0.208 <sup>b</sup>	23.333±0.014 <sup>b</sup>
10ppm	11.125±0.019 <sup>a</sup>	29.157±0.012 <sup>a</sup>	38.223±0.075 <sup>a</sup>	24.241±0.013 <sup>a</sup>
F	1.516 <sup>***</sup>	263.93 <sup>***</sup>	1.297 <sup>***</sup>	1.667 <sup>***</sup>

\*\*\*Significant at P < 0.001. In a column, figures having dissimilar letters differ significantly according to Duncan Multiple Range Test (DMRT). Values are expressed as mean ± standard error.

#### Effect of DEHP exposure to female Zebrafish for SOD assay

Mean CAT concentration of gill female Zebrafish also exhibited a similar treated on exposure to DEHP (Table 4). DEHP at 2.5ppm, 5ppm and 10ppm recorded mean CAT concentration of 0.847±0.087 µmol/mg, 2.219±0.015 µmol/mg and 3.302±0.024 µmol/mg, respectively. On the other hand, control female Zebrafishes recorded mean CAT concentration of 0.804±0.014 µmol/mg. Thus significant variation in gill mean CAT concentration was evident between DEHP treated and untreated ones (F=0.657, P<0.001). Liver mean CAT concentration (F=2.301, P<0.001) also elicited significantly increase in DEHP treated fishes (2.5ppm: 35.756±0.009 µmol/mg; 5ppm: 36.506±0.021 µmol/mg; 10ppm: 39.236±0.009 µmol/mg) when compared to the untreated ones (33.606±0.016 µmol/mg). Muscle mean CAT concentration also significantly (F=4.335, P<0.001) enhanced in DEHP treated fishes (2.5ppm: 66.695±0.015 µmol/mg; 5ppm: 67.748±0.016 µmol/mg; 10ppm: 71.161±0.007 µmol/mg) when compared to the control (65.574±0.010 µmol/mg). Ovarian mean CAT concentration also elicited similar response in DEHP treated female fishes (2.5ppm: 0.543±0.017 µmol/mg; 5ppm: 0.676±0.007 µmol/mg; 10ppm: 0.884±0.015 µmol/mg) when compared to the untreated ones (0.311±0.015 µmol/mg) (F=283.161, P<0.001).

**Table 4. Variation in the mean CAT concentration in various tissues of female Zebrafish exposed to DEHP**

DEHP Treatment	Gill (µmol/mg protein)	Liver (µmol/mg protein)	Muscle (µmol/mg protein)	Ovary (µmol/mg protein)
Control	0.804±0.014 <sup>d</sup>	33.606±0.016 <sup>d</sup>	64.574±0.010 <sup>d</sup>	0.311±0.015 <sup>d</sup>
2.5ppm	0.847±0.087 <sup>c</sup>	35.756±0.009 <sup>c</sup>	66.695±0.015 <sup>c</sup>	0.543±0.017 <sup>c</sup>
5ppm	2.219±0.015 <sup>b</sup>	36.506±0.021 <sup>b</sup>	67.748±0.016 <sup>b</sup>	0.676±0.007 <sup>b</sup>
10ppm	3.302±0.024 <sup>a</sup>	39.236±0.009 <sup>a</sup>	71.161±0.007 <sup>a</sup>	0.884±0.015 <sup>a</sup>
F	0.657 <sup>***</sup>	2.301 <sup>***</sup>	4.335 <sup>***</sup>	283.161 <sup>***</sup>
P	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001

\*\*\*Significant at  $P < 0.001$ . In a column, figures having dissimilar letters differ significantly according to Duncan Multiple Range Test (DMRT). Values are expressed as mean  $\pm$  standard error

SOD and CAT play important roles in protecting the cell against the potentially toxic effects of experimental pollutants (Kuthan *et al.*, 1986). SOD, catalyzes the dismutation of the superoxide ion ( $O_2^-$ ) to hydrogen peroxide and oxygen molecule during energy processes. The reaction diminishes the caustic oxidative processes in cells. The level of antioxidant enzymes have been extensively used as an early warning indicator of lake pollution (Lin *et al.*, 1998). The present result is in good accord with the findings of Neeraj kumar *et al.* (2011) who have confirmed that activities of anti-oxidative enzymes was significantly ( $P < 0.01$ ) influenced by endosulfan in a dose dependent manner in *Tilapia Oreochromis mossambicus*. They have noticed significant ( $P < 0.01$ ) increase in the activity of CAT, SOD and GST in gill and liver of *Tilapia*. Superoxide dismutase is an antioxidant enzyme involved in the elimination of ROS (reactive oxygen species). The antioxidant enzymes that make up the antioxidant defense system are expected to be intrinsically linked and dependent upon the activity of one another. Therefore, one could expect to see correlative changes in the activity of SOD and CAT (Filho *et al.*, 1993). Thus such pattern was observed in their study and correlative activity among catalase and superoxide dismutase has been evinced. The present findings in agreement with Ezemonye and Erineku (2011) who have reported significant ( $P < 0.05$ ) dose dependent increase in the specific activity of SOD and CAT relative to controls in the liver of *Hoplobatrachus occipitalis* exposed cadmium (0.25, 0.5, 100 and 2.00 mg L<sup>-1</sup>) for 28 days. SOD and CAT are important antioxidants and play a crucial role in counteracting oxidative stress. The increase in SOD and CAT observed in the study of Gupta *et al.* (1991) who have reported that cells increase the production of antioxidant enzymes such as SOD, CAT and glutathione peroxidase in order to circumvent oxidative stress.

Mustafa Kaplan *et al.* (2009) found significant decrease in kidney SOD and CAT activities in cadmium exposed rat when compared to unexposed ones. The same authors have also reported increased SOD and CAT activities of liver in melatonin ( $CdCl_2$  : 200 $\mu$ g/ml+0.02% melatonin) for 3 months. Further  $CdCl_2$  (200 $\mu$ g/ml) + 0.08% melatonin exposed rats for a period of 3 months and 7 days elicited increased SOD activity in the kidney of rat but did not induce any change in CAT activity. Kidney tissue contains same antioxidant enzymes such as SOD and CAT to protect itself from the hazardous effects of oxidative attack. Guluzar Atli and Mustafa Canli (2007) showed a significant increase in CAT activity in the liver of *Oreochromis niloticus* exposed to 10 $\mu$ M Cd. On the other hand, lowest liver CAT activity was evinced at 10 $\mu$ M Zn exposure. The liver was found to be stronger into the face of oxidative stress than the other tissues and a uniform organ with the highest antioxidant enzyme activities (SOD and CAT). It is well known that xenobiotics can generate reactive oxygen species such as hydrogen peroxide and superoxide anion, which in turn are responsible for cell and tissue damage (Roche and Boge, 1993; Filho *et al.*, 2001; Pinto *et al.*, 2003). Antioxidant defense mechanisms including CAT have a considerable importance for fish because it is induced to protect them from free radicals produced due to oxidative stress and other factors. In this study, the increase in CAT activity may be related to increased oxidative stress caused by DEHP exposures. Similar response was observed in Liver CAT, SOD and GST activity in liver of rainbow trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*) exposed to sublethal concentration of carbosulphan (25  $\mu$ g L<sup>-1</sup>) for a period of 60 days.

Biomarkers such as protein level, enzyme activity and DNA can be used to measure the interaction between biological systems and chemical, physical or biological environmental agents (Watson and Mutti, 2004; Hernandez *et al.*, 2010). The liver is the primary organ for detoxification of xenobiotics and excretion of toxic substances in fish (El-Naggar *et al.*, 2009). The important function of the liver is to clean of any pollutant from the blood, but these pollutants could subsequently lead to structural damage in liver (Pathan *et al.*, 2010) as seen in the present study. Liver antioxidant enzymes are used to determine if the liver is functioning normally or if it has an injury or disease. Studies showed that enzymatic techniques are inexpensive and reliable to determine the toxicities of pollutants on marine animals in the living environment (Telli Karakoc *et al.*, 1997; Sunmonu and Oloyede, 2006; Hegazi *et al.*, 2010).

Oxidative stress occurs if the activity of the antioxidant defence systems such as SOD, CAT and GPx (glutathione peroxidase) enzymes change by environmental pollution induces the production of reactive oxygen species (Li *et al.*, 2011). SOD is a vital antioxidant defence enzyme in nearly all cells to catalyze the dismutation of superoxide into oxygen thus protecting the cell from superoxide toxicity. SOD enzyme is more sensitive to the lethal effects of superoxide generating chemicals (Gardner *et al.*, 1995). CAT is found in highest levels in the liver as a result of breaking down toxins present in the blood and processing metabolic products for degradation (Aebi, 1984; Chelikani *et al.*, 2004). The other study indicated that CAT and SOD activities were significantly higher in liver than in brain and gill of fish exposed to pesticide (Li *et al.*, 2011). The present results agree with earlier reports of increased antioxidant enzymes in fish exposed to environmental pollutants.

#### IV. Conclusion

The elevation in the enzyme activity observed in the present study could be due to the formation of reactive oxygen species such as hydrogen peroxide, superoxide anion ( $O_2^-$ ), hydroxyl radicals ( $OH^\cdot$ ), which has to be neutralized by antioxidant enzymes. Due to their elevated reactivity, these species may damage lipids, proteins, carbohydrates and nucleic acids..

#### V. References

1. Aebi, H.E., (1984). Catalase. In: Bergmeyer, H.U. (Ed.), *Methods of Enzymatic Analysis*, vol. 3. Verlag Chemie, Weinheim, Germany, pp. 273–286.
2. Burkepile, D.E., Moore, M.T., Holland, M.M., (2000). Susceptibility of five nontarget organisms to aqueous diazinon exposure. *Bull. Environ. Contam. Toxicol.* 64, 114–121.
3. Chelikani, P., Fita, I., Loewen, P.C., (2004). Diversity of structures and properties among catalases. *Cell. Mol. Life Sci.* 61 (2), 192–208.
4. Contzen Pereira and Vaman Rao, C., (2006). Chronic toxicity of diethylphthalate in male Wister Rats Adose response study. *Regula. toxicol and Pharma.*, 45 :169-177
5. Ezemonye, L.I.N., Enuneku, A.A., (2011). Biochemical Alterations in *Hoplobatrachus occipitalis* Exposed to Sub Lethal Concentrations of Cadmium. *Turkish J. of Fisheries and Aquatic Sci.*, 11: 485-489.
6. Filho, D.W., (1996). Fish antioxidant defenses - a comparative approach. *Braz. J. Med. Biol. Res.* 29, 1735–1742.
7. Filho, D.W., Giulivi, C., Boveris, A., (1993). Antioxidant defenses in marine fish: I. Teleosts. *Comp. Biochem. Physiol.* 106C, 409–413.
8. Filho, D.W., Torres, M.A., Tribess, T.B., Pedrosa, R.C., Soares, C.H.L., (2001). Influence of season and pollution on the antioxidant defenses of the cichlid fish acara (*Geophagus brasiliensis*). *Braz. J. Med. Biol. Res.* 34, 719–726.
9. Gardner, P.R., Raineri, I., Epstein, L.B., White, C.W., (1995). Superoxide radical and iron modulate aconitase activity in mammalian cells. *J. Biol. Chem.* 270 (22), 139–405.
10. Giam, C.S. and Wong, M.K., (1987). Plasticizers in food. *J. Food Prod.* 15(9), 769-782.
11. Guluzar Atli, MustafaCanli, (2010). Response of antioxidant system of freshwater fish *Oreochromis niloticus* to acute and chronic metal (Cd,Cu,Cr,Zn,Fe) exposures *Ecotoxicology and Environmental Safety* 73,1884–1889.
12. Gupta, S., Athar, M., Behari, J.R., Srivastava, R.C., (1991). Cadmium-mediated induction of Cellular Defence Mechanism: a Novel Example for the Development of Adaptive Response against a Toxicant. *Ind. Health*, 29: 1–9.
13. Hegazi, M.M., Attia, Z.L., Ashour, O.A., (2010). Oxidative stress and antioxidant enzymes in liver and white muscle of Nile tilapia juveniles in chronic ammonia exposure. *Aquat. Toxicol.* 99 (2), 118–125.
14. Hernandez, D., Soler, F., Miguez, M.P., Pérez López, M., (2010). Brain acetylcholinesterase, malondialdehyde and reduced glutathione as biomarkers of continuous exposure of tench, *Tinca tinca*, to carbofuran or deltamethrin. *Sci. Total Environ.* 408 (21), 4976–4983.

15. Joblings S., Reynolds T., White R., Parker M.G., Sumpter J.P., (1995). A variety of environmentally persistent chemicals, including some phthalate plasticizers, are weakly estrogenic. *Environ Health Perspect* 103:582–587.
16. Kato K, Silva MJ, Reidy JA, et al. Mono(2-ethyl-5-hydroxyhexyl) phthalate and mono-(2-ethyl- 5-oxohexyl) phthalate as biomarkers for human exposure assessment to di-(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate. *Environ Health Perspect* 2004;112:327–30.
17. Kavlock, R., Boekelheide, K., Chapin, R., Cunningham, M., Faustman, E., Foster, P., Golub, M., Henderson, R., Hinberg, J., et al., (2002a). NTP Center for the Evaluation of Risks to Human Reproduction: Phthalates expert panel report on the reproductive and Developmental toxicity of di(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate. *Reprod. Toxicol.* 16, 529–653.
18. Kavlock, R., Boekelheide, K., Chapin, R., Cunningham, M., Faustman, E., Foster, P., Golub, M., Henderson, R., Hinberg, I., Little, R., Seed, J., Shea, K., Tabacova, S., Tyl, R., Williams, P., and Zacharewski, T. (2002b). NTP Center for the Evaluation of Risks to Human Reproduction: Phthalates expert panel report on the reproductive and developmental toxicity of butyl benzyl phthalate. *Reprod. Toxicol.* 16:453–487.
19. Kavlock, R., Boekelheide, K., Chapin, R., Cunningham, M., Faustman, E., Foster, P., Golub, M., Henderson, R., Hinberg, I., Little, R., Seed, J., Shea, K., Tabacova, S., Tyl, R., Williams, P., and Zacharewski, T. (2002c). NTP Center for the Evaluation of Risks to Human Reproduction: Phthalates expert panel report on the reproductive and developmental toxicity of di-n-butyl phthalate. *Reprod. Toxicol.* 16:489–527.
20. Kelly, S., Havrilla, C.M., Brady, T.C., Abramo, K.H., Levin, E.D., (1998). Oxidative stress in toxicology: established mammalian and emerging piscine models. *Environ. Health Perspect.* 106, 375–384.
21. Kuthan, H.H.J, Haussmann and Werringloer J. (1986): A spectrometric assay for superoxide dismutase activities in crude tissue fractions, *Biochem.J.*, 237:175-180.
22. Lemaire P., Berhaut S., Lemaire –Gony Lafaurie M., (1992). Ultrastructural changes induced by benzopyrene in sea bass (*Dicentrarchus labrax*) liver and intestine : important of intoxication route, *Environ, Resor* 57(1): 59.72
23. Li, Z.H., Zlabek, V., Velisek, J., Grabic, R., Machova, J., Kolarova, J., Li, P., Randak, T., (2011). Acute toxicity of carbamazepine to juvenile rainbow trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*): effects on antioxidant responses, hematological parameters and hepatic EROD. *Ecotoxicol. Environ. Saf.* 74 (3), 319–327.
24. Lin H.C, Hwang. P.P., (1998). Acute and chronic effects of gallium chloride (GaCl<sub>3</sub>) on tilapia (*Oreochromis mossambicus*) larvae. *Bull. Environ. Contam. Tox.* 60: 931-935.
25. Livingstone, D.R., Forlin L., George S.G., (1994). Molecular biomarkers and toxic consequences of impact by organic pollution in aquatic organism. D.W Sutcliffe, editor water quality and stress indicators in marine and fresh water ecosystem UK. *Freshwater Biol. Asso.*, PP:154-171.
26. Marcon, J.M., Filho, D.W., (1999). Antioxidant processes of the wild tambaqui, *Colossoma macropomum* (Osteichthyes, Serrasalminidae) from the Amazon. *Comp. Biochem. Physiol.* 123C, 257–263.
27. Marklund and Marklund, G., (1974). Involvement of the auto-oxidation of pyrogallol and a convenient assay for superoxide dismutase. *Euro. J. Biochem.* 47, 469-547.
28. McCord, J.M., Fridovich, I., (1969). Superoxide dismutase. An enzymatic function for erythrocyte hemocuprein. *J. Biol. Chem.* 244, 6049–6055.
29. Michiels, C., Raes, M., Toussaint, O., Remacle, J., (1994). Importance of Se-glutathione peroxidase, catalase, and Cu/Zn-SOD for cell survival against oxidative stress. *Free Radic. Biol. Med.* 17, 235–248.
30. Mustafa Kaplan, Irfan Huseiyan Atakan, Nurettin Aydogdu, Tevfik Aktoz, Fulya oz puyan, Gulay seren, Burcu Tokuc, Osman Inci, (2009). The effect of melatonin on cadmium – induced renal injury in chronically exposed rats, *Turk J. of Urology*; 35 (2) : 139-147
31. Naggar, E.I., Mahmoud, A.M., Tayel, S.A., (2009). Bioaccumulation of some heavy metals and histopathological alterations in liver of *Oreochromis niloticus* in relation to water quality at different localities along the River Nile, Egypt. *World J. Fish Mar. Sci.* 1 (2), 105–114.
32. Neeraj Kumar, P., Antony Jesu Prabhu, A.K., Pal, S., Remya, Md. Aklakur, R.S., Rana, Subodh Gupta, R.P., Raman, S.B., (2011). Jadhao Anti-oxidative and immuno-hematological status of Tilapia (*Oreochromis mossambicus*) during acute toxicity test of endosulfan Pesticide. *Biochem. and Physiol.*, 99 :45–52.
33. Pathan, T.S., Shinde, S.E., Thete, P.B., Sonawane, D.L., (2010). Histopathology of liver and kidney of *Rasbora daniconius* exposed to paper mill effluent. *J. Biol. Sci.* 5 (5), 389–394.
34. Pinto, E., Sigaud-Kutner, T.C.S., Leitao, M.A.S., Okamoto, O.K., Morse, D., Colepicolo, P., (2003). Heavy metal-induced oxidative stress in algae. *J. Phycol.* 39, 1008–1018.
35. Roche, H., Boge, G., (1993). Effects of Cu, Zn and Cr salts on antioxidant enzyme activities in vitro of red blood cells of a marine fish *Dicentrarchus labrax*. *Toxicol. in Vitro* 7, 623–629.
36. Rudeva, I.I., (1997). Blood antioxidant system of Black Sea elasmobranch and teleosts. *Comp. Biochem. Physiol.* 118C, 255–260.

37. Silva, M.J., Barr, D.B., Reidy, J.A., Malek, N.A., Hodge, C.C., Caudill, S.P., (2004). Urinary levels of seven phthalates metabolites in the U.S. population from the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES) 1999-2000. *Environ. Health Perspect.*, 112, 331-338.
38. Sinhas, A. K., (1972). Calorimetric assay of catalase. *Anal. Biochem*, 47, 389-394.
39. Sonde, V., D Souza, A., Tarapore, R., Pereira, L., Khare, M.P., Sinkar, P.U., Krishnan, S., Rao, C.V., (2000). Simultaneous administration of diethylphthalate and ethyl alcohol and its toxicity in male Sprague Dawley rats. *Toxicology* 147, 23–31.
40. Sunmonu, T.O., Oloyede, O.B., (2006). Changes in liver enzyme activities in african catfish (*Clarias gariepinus*) exposed to crude oil. *Asian Fish. Sci.* 19, 107–112.
41. Telli Karakoc, F., Hewer, A., Phillips, D.H., Gaines, A.F., Yuregir, G., (1997). Biomarkers of marine pollution observed in species of mullet living in two eastern Mediterranean harbours. *Biomarkers* 2 (5), 303–309.
42. Watson, W.P., Mutti, A., (2004). Role of biomarkers in monitoring exposures to chemicals: present position, future prospects. *Biomarkers* 9, 211–242.

