[Gulf Research Reports](http://aquila.usm.edu/gcr?utm_source=aquila.usm.edu%2Fgcr%2Fvol11%2Fiss1%2F3&utm_medium=PDF&utm_campaign=PDFCoverPages)

[Volume 11](http://aquila.usm.edu/gcr/vol11?utm_source=aquila.usm.edu%2Fgcr%2Fvol11%2Fiss1%2F3&utm_medium=PDF&utm_campaign=PDFCoverPages) | [Issue 1](http://aquila.usm.edu/gcr/vol11/iss1?utm_source=aquila.usm.edu%2Fgcr%2Fvol11%2Fiss1%2F3&utm_medium=PDF&utm_campaign=PDFCoverPages)

January 1999

Effects of Diflubenzeron on the Ontogeny of Phototaxis by *Palaemonetes pugio*

J.E.H. Wilson *Morgan State University*

R.B. Forward Jr.

J.D. Costlow

DOI: 10.18785/grr.1101.03 Follow this and additional works at: [http://aquila.usm.edu/gcr](http://aquila.usm.edu/gcr?utm_source=aquila.usm.edu%2Fgcr%2Fvol11%2Fiss1%2F3&utm_medium=PDF&utm_campaign=PDFCoverPages) Part of the [Marine Biology Commons](http://network.bepress.com/hgg/discipline/1126?utm_source=aquila.usm.edu%2Fgcr%2Fvol11%2Fiss1%2F3&utm_medium=PDF&utm_campaign=PDFCoverPages)

Recommended Citation

Wilson, J., R. Forward Jr. and J. Costlow. 1999. Effects of Diflubenzeron on the Ontogeny of Phototaxis by *Palaemonetes pugio*. Gulf Research Reports 11 (1): 7-14. Retrieved from http://aquila.usm.edu/gcr/vol11/iss1/3

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by The Aquila Digital Community. It has been accepted for inclusion in Gulf and Caribbean Research by an authorized editor of The Aquila Digital Community. For more information, please contact Joshua.Cromwell@usm.edu.

EFFECTS OF DIFLUBENZURON ON THE ONTOGENY OF **PHOTOTAXIS BY** *PALAEMONETES PUG10*

J.E.H. Wilsont, R.B. Forward, Jrm2 and J.D. Costlow3

'Department of Biology, Morgan Stale University, Balrimore, Maryland 21251. USA I135 Duke Marine Lab Rd., Beauforf, North'C~rolina 28516, USA j201 Ann Street. Beaufort. North Caroha 28516, USA

^ABSTRACTThe phototaxis by **larvae** ofthe **grass** shrimp *Palaemonetespiigio* **that** hatched from embryos which **were exposed** to **a** single pulse concentration of diflubenzuron (DFB; Dimilinm) **was** quantified. Stage **IV embryos** *(6-day-old)* **were exposed** to 0.5 pglL of **DFB** for **4** days **followed** by **transfer** into clean **seawater** for the rest of the incubation period. The photoresponses of light-adapted **larvae from** untreated **embryos and** embryos treated **with 0.5** pg/L **DFB were** monitored from **1 day** through **8 day post** hatch **for** phototactic responses to 500 nm light. Larvae from **untreated** embryos exhibited strong positive phototaxis at high light intensities (3 \times 10⁻² and 3 \times 10⁻¹ Wm⁻²) but became negatively phototactic at lower light intensities (3 \times 10⁻⁵ to **3 x IC3 Wm-l).** This phototactic pattern continued **during** the monitoringperiod. On theother hand, larvaefrom DFB-treated **embryos** exhibited **altered** phototaxis **for** the first 3 **days.** Alterations **were especialfy evident on** Day I, **as** larvae were **only negativeiy** phozotactic. By Day **4,** these **larvae** reverted to the normal pattern of photoresponses **shown** by untreated larvae. These results **indicated** that the alterations in photoresponses **of** larvae **caused by** embryonic **exposure to DFB** are only transitory **and** can be corrected within **4 days** ofhatching if the **Larvae** are exposed to water lacking **DFB.**

INTRODUCTION

Diflubenzuron (DFB; Dimilin[®]) is an insect growth regulator that interferes with chitin formation and molting in arthropods. It is approved for and is being used **in** the United States for control **ofawide** variety of insect pests, including foliage feeders **on soybeans,** cotton-leaf perforator, and forest **insects. In** California DEB **is** used to control **mosquito** larvae (Fischer and Lenwood 1992). The effects of DFB on non-target anthropods, especially aquatic **organisms,** is well documented **(see** review by Fischer and Lenwood 1992). There *is* always the potential for DFB impacting aquatic organisms because of overspray or **spills,** especially where **it** is being applied **closeto water** or directly onto wetlands for mosquito control.

Phototaxis and its ecological significance in crustaceans **is** well documented **in** the literature (White 1924, Thorson 1964, Forward **1** 974, **Vernberg** et **al. 1974,** Forward **et** a!. **1984, Sulkin 1984). For** example, in a review by Thorson (I **964) of marine benthic invertebrates,** of the **I41** species **studied,** 82% ofthe early larval **stages** respond positively to light. Phototaxis has also been reported to play an important role in diel vertical migration of crustacean larvae (Forward **1976,** Forward and Cronin **1980,** Forward et al. 1984, Forward 1985). Vertical migration contributes to the dispersal. of crustacean larvae and helps in their **retention** in the **estuary** (Sulkin 1975, Cronin 1979, **Cronin** and Forward **1986).**

For larval **stages of** estuarine **crustaceans,** the phototactic **pattern, when** tested in a narrow light **field,** is generally negative phototaxis to low light intensities and positive **phototaxis** to moderate Intensities **(e.g.** Forward and Costtow **1974).** Also, ontogenetic changes in photoresponses are **observed** *in* **same** crustaceans. Generally, the younger stages are **more** positively phototactic while negative phototaxis increases in the older larval stages, **postlarvae,** and adults (see review by Pardi and Papi 1961, Dingle 1969). Because of the role of phototaxis in vertical migration of crustacean larvae, any alteration in this photoresponse as a result of exposure to toxicants **may** affect the ecology and **conceivably** the larvae's recruitment **into** the adult population.

Photo behavior has been shown **to** be **very** sensitive to changes in environmental factors such **as** temperature, salinity, and chemicals. Changes in photobehavior **have** also been **used** in aquatic toxicology **as asensitive** indicator of anthropogenic stress (Rosenthal and Alderdice 1976, Simonetetal. 1978, Lang etal. 1981, Rand 1985). Specifically for larval crustaceans, **the** following studies **have** employed changes in photobehavior **as** indicators **of** sublethal toxicity: Forward and **Costlow (1976)** for insect juvenile hormone mimic on *Rhithropanopeus harrisii*; Moyer and Barthalmus (1979) for the herbicide Weeder-64 on *Palaemonetes pugio*; Lang et al. (1980) for copper on *Balanus improvisus,* **In** all these studies, the larvae were directly **exposed** to thetoxicant followed **by** measurement of phototaxis. Only Wilson *(1985)* and Wilson etal. **(1** *985)* **have** reported alterations in phototaxis by larval stages of **crustaceans** as **a** result of embryonic exposure **to** atoxicant. Both the **level** and **sign** of **phototaxis were** altered **in** light**adapted first stage iarvae** of *P. pugio* after **4-day** single pulse exposure ofthe embryos **to DFB.** These alterations in phototaxis **were shown** to be dependent on the **DFB** concentration and the embryonic stage at exposure

(Wilson et al. **1985).** The present study **was** conducted **to** determine if and when **larval** grass shrimp **from** DFBtreated **embryos** which exhibit altered phototaxis regain normal pattern of phototaxis during **larva1** development.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Ovigerous female grass shrimp *P. pugio* that **were** induced to spawn in the laboratory **(Duke** University Marine Laboratory, Beaufort, NC) **were** sorted according to stage of embryonic development as described **by** Wilson (1985). Laboratory animals were used in this study because they were relatively homogeneous and gave less variable results than field animals. Only ovigerous females carrying Stage IV embryos (6-day-old; body segmentation **stage,** at *25* 1 **"C)** were used in this study. Earlierstudies by Wilson(1985)and **Wilsonetal.(1985)haveshownthat** Stage IV embryos are the most sensitive embryonic **stage** and represent **a** midpoint in the embryonic development of *P.* pugio. The shrimp **were placed** in large culture dishes (inside diameter = 20 cm) containing 0.5 μ g/L of wettable powder **(WP-25%)** formation of **DFB** dissolved in *20%0* filtered (to **45 pm)** seawater. Untreated 20%e filtered seawater served **as** the control. This test concentration **was** used because Wilson et al. **(1985)** have **shown** that for phototaxis, 0.5 **pg/L** is the lowest observed effect concentration (LOEC) when various embryonic exposure **concentrations** were **used.** The shrimp **were** maintained at **a** density of **5** per liter of test solution for **4 days** without renewal (single dose exposure). After the 4-day exposure, the shrimp **were** transferred into clean seawater *(20%0),* which was changed **every** day until the **eggs** hatched. The larvae **were** then used in phototaxis experiments. The rationale for exposing embryos rather than larvae is that this test protoco1, delayed sublethal **bioassay** (DSB), has been shown to be more sensitive than shrimp or crab larval bioassays (see Wilson 1985 for details). Ovigerous females and larvae **were** reared in an environmental chamber set at 25°C and **f2L:** 12D photoperiod, centered at 1200 h. Animals **were** fed freshly hatched *Ariemia* sp. nauplii daily.

Experiments **were** performed to determine ontogeny of phototaxis of larvae hatched from unexposed embryos (control) and embryos exposed **to 0.5** pg/L DFB. The general protocol for all phototaxis experiments was that described by Wilson et al. (1985) with few modifications. Phototaxis **was** determined by measuring the direction of swimming immediately following light stimulation. Ten to 15 larvae were **placed** in an acrylic trough measuring 14.9 **x 8.3 x 3.5 cm** containing approximately 1 10 **mt** filtered seawater *(2O0ho).* The trough was divided **into** 5 equal compartments **by** acrylic partitions which could be raised or lowered simultaneously. The stimulus light **was** presented horizontally **from a** slide projector fitted with a 300 watt incandescent bulb. The light was interference**filtered** to **500 nm** (7 nm halfbandwidth), This wavelength was selected because it has been shown to be the **spectral** sensitivity maximum for *P. pugio* (personal communication, John **K.** Douglas, University **of** Arizona, Tucson, **AZ** 8572 1, unpublished) and *P.* vulgaris(White **1924).** Intensity **was** regulated **by** neutral-density filters **(Detric** Optics, Inc.) and measured with a radiometer (from EG&C model 550).

Phototaxis measurements were performed in **a** photographic **darkroom** between midnight **and** 0300 h. This time was chosen to coincide with the time of maximum larval release by laboratory-maintained ovigerous females (personal observations), thereby **ensuring** that larvae were 24 ± 2 h old when first tested. By monitoring **phototaxis** at **the** same time **of** day for all experiments, complications due to biological rhythms in behavior (see Forward and Cronin 1980) were avoided. Shrimp larvae were light adapted for 4-6 h to 12.53 Wm⁻² light intensity **(cool-white fluorescent lamps) prior** to testing. **Ten** to **¹⁵** Iarvae **were** placed in the central compartment of the acrylic trough **and** allowed to adapt in darkness **for** 30 **s.** After this, the partitions **were** raised gently and the stimuius light turned on simultaneously. **Larvae were** then stimulated for 60 **s** then the partitions were lowered and the stimulus light turned off. The number of larvae in each compartment **was** recorded. Larvae were retumed to rearing conditions and tested **on** subsequent **days. A new** group of larvae were then introduced into the trough and tested as **previously** outlined. **ahis** procedure **wits** repeated at **least** 3 times before the neutral **density** fiIters **were** changed **to** test a different intensity of the stimulus light. **Six** to 7 different light intensities were tested **plus a** "dark control" in which the movements of larvae in the test trough were monitored without any stimulus light. Different **larvae were** used for each stimulus light level. The larvae **were** fed throughout the phototaxis experiments to reduce the possibility ofaltered phototaxisdue to starvation (Cronin and Forward 1980, **Lang** et all. 1980). The intensity versus response curves for these larvae **were** again determined on the second day (i.e., for 2-day-old larvae). Using the same batch of Iarvae, **this** procedure was repeated every day up to Day **4** and **again** on Day 8. Examination ofboth untreated and treated larvae on Day **4** indicated that they had stalked **eyes** and thus had molted to the 2nd **zoea1** stage.

Positive phototaxis was defined **as** movement **towards** the light source and negative phototaxis **as** movement away from the light source. The animals in the 2

compartments closest to the Iight source **were** regarded **as** showing positive phototaxis; those in the 2 compartments farthest from the light **source as** negatively phototactic. The **mean** percentage **positive** and negative response and their standard errors **(S.E.)** were cdculated at **each** light intensity. For statistical **analysis,** the percentages **were** first **arcsine** transformed. Statistical tests determined the difference between dark control **(no** light stimulus) response levels **due** to **movement** in the **test** trough in darkness **and** responses upon stimulation with light. Chi**square tests** and analysis of variance **were performed on** the resuIts **as** described **by** Sokal and **Rohlf(I98 I).** The **level** of **significance was set at** $P = 0.05$ **for all tests.**

RESULTS

Larvae from Unexposed Embryos

The intensity **versus** response curves for lightadapted larvae from unexposed embryos during ontogeny **areshown (Figure I). The** pattern ofphototaxis exhibited by Day I larvae (Stage I) remains virtually the same through Day **S of** development. **As** compared to the dark control level of responsiveness, larvae **were** positively phototactic (P < **0.05;** ANOVA) at the stimulation intensity of 3 \times 10⁻¹ (days 2, 4, and 8) or at 3 \times 10⁻² Wm⁻² and **higher** intensities **(Days I** and 3). Larvae were negatively phototactic (P < *0.05;* **ANOVA)** at lower light intensities with the threshold being 3 x 10⁻⁵ Wm⁻¹ for Days 1 to 4 and one **log** unit higher for Day **8.**

There is some indication of increased activity by the larvae with age **as** evidenced by the increase **in thedark** control responses of larvae. The positive control **(no** light present) increased **from** 26% **on** Day 1 to **40%** on day **8** (Figure **I).**

Larvae from Embryos Exposed to DFB

The ontogenetic changes observed **in** the photoresponses of light-adapted larvae that hatched from embryos (Stage **IV)** exposed to **0.5 pg/L DBF are** presented in Figure 2. Positive phototaxis was absent (relative to the dark controls) at the stimulation intensities that normally evoked significant positive responses in untreated larvae $(3 \times 10^{-2} \text{ Wm}^2 \text{ and higher};$ Figure 1). Compared with Day ¹untreated **larvae** (Figure 1),the larvae **from** DFB-treated embryos **exhibitednegativephototaxis (P** < 0.05; **ANOVA]** (Figure 2) over **amuch** wider range of stimulus **intensities** (3 **x 10-5 to 10-1** wm-2).

By Day 2, the **first** sign of **a** return to **the** normal pattern of **phototaxis** was **evident as** seen by an increase **in positive** phototaxis **from** the control level on Day **1** to 72% on the second day at $3x10^{-1}$ Wm⁻² stimulation intensity (Figure 2). The positive responses at **3x IO' Wm-*** on **Days** 2 and 3 by treated larvae are **not** significantly different (P > 0.05; chi-square) **from** each other (Figure 2). **At** an intensity of 3 x 10⁻² Wm⁻², Days 2 and 3 larvae remained strongly negatively phototactic. However, **by Day 4,** the larvae exhibited positive phototaxis at both 3 **x** 10" **and 3x10.' Wm" (see** Figure 2). Thus, the return to **noma[** photoresponse *is* **complete** by Day **4** for larvae from embryos exposed to **0.5** pglL **DFB.** The response patterns exhibited by **4-** and 8-day-old larvae **were** almost identical. The lowest light intensity evoking positive phototaxis and the highest intensity that evokes negative phototaxis for unexposed and exposed larvae are compared **in Table** 1. Although these threshold intensities were very different for I-day-old treated and untreated larvae, they became identical by Day **4.**

DISCUSSION

The phototactic pattern of Stage I larvae **from** the grass shrimp *P. pugio* has been extensively documented **by Wilson(1985)and** Wilsonetal.(**1985).** Thepatternof phototaxis of light adapted Stage I larvae from untreated embryos was positive phototaxis at high Iight intensities $(3x10⁻²$ and $3x10⁻¹$ Wm⁻²) and negative phototax is at lower light intensities $(3 \times 10^{-5} \text{ to } 3 \times 10^{-2} \text{ Wm}^{-2})$; Figure 1; Wilson et a]. **1985).** This pattern of phototaxis **persists** for Iarvae from untreated embryos **irrespective** of the **age** of the embryos when incubation started in the laboratory (Wilson **1985,** WiIson **et** al. **1985).** For larvae that hatched from DFB-treated **embryos,** both the magnitude and the **sign** of the photoresponse **were** altered. Such larvae consistently exhibited **negative** phototaxis at higher light intensities that normally evoke positive phototaxis (3x10⁻² and **3x** lo-' Wm-'). These alterations **En** phototaxis varied upon exposing embryos to concentration of DFB ranging from 0.3 **to 1.0 pg/L(Wilson etal. 1985).** Hawever,atexposure concentrations of $\geq 2.5 \mu g/L$, larvae exhibited severe structural abnormalities, and the magnitude of both positive and negative phototaxis **was** drastically reduced (Wilson 1985).

ResuIts of the present **study** indicate that **for** lightadapted Stage I larvae **from** unexposed embryos, phototaxis remains virtually unchanged during larval development. Both the pattern of the stimulus light intensity **versus** phototactic **response** curves and the magnitude of **the** phototactic **responses were** similar for all the larval stages tested **(up** to 8 **days** old). **It** should be pointed out that this pattern of phototaxis by light-adapted **larvae was also** observed up **to** Day **15** (Wilson unpublished data). However, at the **postlarva1 stage** (unpublished **data)** both positive and negative phototaxis are lost sincethe animals

Figure 1. *Pahemmetes puglo.* **Yntensity versus response curves for different ages of light-adapted larvae hatched from untreated embryos (i.e., incubated in seawater throughout embryonic development). Open circles, dashed lines represent negative phototaxis. Closed circles, solid lines represent positive phototaxis. DC** = **dark control values for larvae moving to the positive and negative chambers of the test trough in the absenceoflight. Data points are means** *5* **S.E. The sample size (n) for each stimulus intensity was 3. Asterisks indicate means that are significantly /P** *c* **0.05) greater or less than the appropriate dark control. Embryos were 6 days old when incubation started.**

Figure 2. *PuIuemoncfes pugio.* **Intensity versus response curves for different ages of light-adapted larvae hatched from embryos that were exposed to 0.5 pgIL diflubenzaron starting when they were 6 days old. Open circles, dashed lines represent negative phototaxis. Closed circles, solid Iines represent positive phototaxis. DC** = **dark control values for larvae moving to the positive and negative chambers of the test trough in the absenceof light. Data points are means? S.E. The sample size (n) For each light intensity was 3. Asterisks indicate means that are significantly (P** < **0.05) greater or less than the appropriate dark control.**

TABLE 1

Comparison of lowest light intensity that evokespositive phototaxisand highestlfght intensity evoking negative phototaxis in grass shrimp larvae from untreated control and diflubenzuron (DBF)-exposed embryos. NR is no phototactic response.

were unresponsive to even the highest stimulation intensity used $(3 \times 10^{-1} \text{ Wm}^2 \text{ at } 500 \text{ nm light})$. Forward and Costlow (1 974) havereported a similar pattern **in** phototaxis during ontogeny for the **mud** crab. R. harrisii. Both the action spectra and the intensity versus response **curves** for light- and dark-adapted animals were similar for all zoeal stages. On metamorphosis **into** the megabpa **stage, there was a** dramatic change in behavior similar to that reported here for the posttarvae of the **grass** shrimp. **These** findings are different **from** those reported by Welsh **(1** 932) for the mussel crab and **by Hunte** and **Myers (1 984)** for estuarine amphipods, where changes from positive to negative phototaxis were observed during larval development. In some instances, **(e.g.** in *Balanus)* there **is** a change **from** positive phototaxis in **newly** hatched nauplii to negative in Stage II and back to positive in the cyprid stage (Thorson 1964).

The lack of ontogenetic changes in phototaxis of P. *pugio* larvae from untreated embryos made it relatively **easy** to determine **when** larvae from DFB-treated embryos regained **normal** photobehavior. By comparing the pattem of the intensity **versus** response curves for **each** age of the larvae from untteated and DFB-treated embryos, it **was** observed that a return to normal **photobehavior** started with Day 2 larvae and by the time they were **4** days old, the response **pattems were** similar **to** that of the untreated group. Thus, it **is possible** for larvae with altered photobehavior resulting from embryotoxicity of DBF to regain their normal photoresponsiveness within 2 **to 4 days** if reared in clean seawater during larva1 development.

Microscopic examination indicated that 4-day-old treated and untreated Iarvae had molted to the 2nd **zoeal stage** in **the** present experiment. Therefore, the change **back** to normal pattern of phototaxis **by** light-adapted larvae from DFB-exposed **embryos was completedafterthe** larvaemolted to the 2nd **stage.** Although there are reports of altered phototaxis by crustacean larvae and adults resulting from exposure to toxicant **(Bigford** 1977, Forward and **Costlow ^t**936, Langet al. 1980, Moyerand **Barthalmus 1979,** Wilson **et** al. **1985),** the present study is the first report of reestablishment of normal phototaxis upon removal of the toxicant during larval development.

In untreated **Stage T** larvae the **eyes** are sessile with cuticular lens and apposition optics, i.e., the lenses form small inverted images on the rhabdoms (Land **1984,** Fincham **1984).** For details on the structure and function of **grass** shrimp eyes, see Parker **(1 897),** Douglass (I *9S6),* and **Douglass and** Forward (1989). Ontogenetic **study of** the compound *eyes* ofP. *pugio* from larval to postlarval stage **shows** that the basic morphological and anatomical organization of the **eyes** remain unchanged throughout larval development **(Douglass** and **Forward 1989).** It **is** therefore not surprising that the photoresponse of untreated larvae remain the **same during** larval development in this study. **The** altered photoresponse seen in larvae from DFB**exposed** embryos is conceivably the **result** of structural modification ofthe visual system ofthe larvae. Grass shrimp larvae hatched from embryos exposed to 0.5 µg/L DFB have been **shown** to exhibit slight morphological abnormalities (terata), which also affect swimming speed and vertical **distribvtioninaseawatercolumn(Wi1sonetal. 1985,** Wilson **etal.** 1987).

Ultrastructural study of the exoskeleton **of** the **mud** crab R. harrisii by Christiansen **and** Costlow **(1982)** revealed that larvae exposed to DFB had disorganized and swollen exocuticle. Since the thickness of the cuticle is the same in *Rhithropanopeus* and *Pahemonetes* (Freeman 1993) and the effects of DFB **on** larval crustaceans is similar, it **can** be presumed that Iarvae **from** DFB-treated embryosmay have swollen **and** malformed cuticular facets in **the** eyes. Such swoilen cuticular facets **may** alter the entire optics of the larval **eyes** and could **account** for the observed reversal in phototaxis. In apposition eyes, the **ACKNQW LEDGMENTS** cuticular facet acts as a lens which focuses light on the rhabdom **(Cronin 1986).** Conceivably, **when** the **!ens** is not properly formed, e.g., has granular disorganized endocuticle (see Mulder **and Gijswijt 1973),** or **is** swollen, the **amount** of light passing through will be reduced. This may explain **why exposed** larvae responded negatively at **light** intensities to **which** they normally reactedpositively. Normal phototaxis is restored upon molting probably **as** a result of formation of **new** cuticular **facets** with normal thickness and endocuticle. It is also possible **that the** distribution of the visual pigments in DFB-treated larvae is altered **as** a **result** ofbiochemical changes. Irrespective of **what mechanism** caused alteration in phototaxis, it is clear from the present **study that** normal phototaxis was restored after the larvae molt to the 2nd zoeal stage.

Since larvae were tested in an unnatural light field **(e.g.** Forward **19XS),** relatingphototaxis toactual behavior in nature is difficult. Nevertheless, the results do indicate photobehavior was altered by exposure to DFB, **and** thus, aspects of larval ecology that depend on photobehavior would be altered. Photobehavior is involved in diel vertical migration ofthe **larvae,** and hence their temporal vertical distribution in **an estuary** (Allen and Barker **1985) could** be altered. Since their vertical distribution affects horizontal transport, recruitment to the adult population would be affected. The ability to avoid predators could **atso** be reduced by alterations in photobehavior, **since** the negative phototaxis participates **En** a predator **avoidance** shadow response (Forward 1977). Also, **Douglass** et al. **(1992)** demonstrated that *P. pugio* **larvae have** endogenous phototaxis rhythm, which if altered **would** change the photoresponse pattern throughout the tidal cycle in an the estuary. Thus, the survival potential of the shrimp population could be reduced **by** alteration in larval photobehavior.

In summary, the pattern of phototaxis by grass **shrimp** larvae **from** untreated embryos remains unchanged during Iarval development. This pattern consists of a positive phototaxis at high light intensity $(2 \times 3 \times 10^{2} \text{ Wm}^2)$ and negative phototaxis at lower intensities $(\leq 3 \times 10^{-3} \text{ Wm}^2)$. Although larvae from DFB-treated embryos had altered phototaxis, photobehavior **was** gradually restored **as** the larvae developed **in** clean water, **and** restoration was complete upon molting to the 2nd zoeal stage. Hence, altered **phototaxis** *as* aresult of embryotoxicity **to DFB** is only temporary in grass shrimp **Larvae.**

This material **is** based on research supported in part by **AFGMD** Fellowship from the African American Institute **and** National Science **Foundation** Grant No. **OCE-9596 175** to **J.E.H.** Wilson, **Duke** University Marine Laboratory graduate student research funds. The technical assistance of M. Forward, M. Hartwill and **A.** Wilson is gratefully acknowledged.

LITERATURE CITED

- **Allen,** D.M. and **D.L.** Barker. 1985. Spatial and temporal distributions of grass shrimp **larvae** *(Palaemoneies* **spp.)** in a high salinity **southern** estuary. American Zooiogist **25:63a** (abstract).
- **Bigford, T.E. 1977.** Effects ofoil **on behavioral** responses to **light, and** gravity in **larvae** of the **rock crab,** *Cancer irroraius.* Marine Biology **45:** 137- **148.**
- Christiansen. M.E. and J.D. **Costlow. 1982. Ultrastructural study** of **the** exoskeleton of **thc estuarine crab.** *Rhifkropanapeus harrisii:* Effect of the insect growth regulator Dimilin® (diflubenzuron) on the formation ofthe **larval** cuticte, **Marine** Biology **66:217-226.**
- Cronin, T.W. 1979. Factors contributing **to** the retention of larvae of the crab *Rhilkropanupeus harrisii,* **in the Newport** River estuary, North Carolina. Ph. **D.** Dissertation. Duke University, Durham, NC. 206 **p.**
- Cronin. **T.W.** *1986.* Optical **design** and evolutionary adaptation in **crustacean compound eyes.** Journal **of** Crustacean Biology $6:1-23.$
- Cronin, T.W. **and** R.B. **Forward.** Jr. 1980. **The** effects of starvation on phototaxis and swimming of the larvae of the crab *Rhithropanopeus harrisii.* Biological Bulletin 158:283-294.
- Cronin.T. **W.** and R.B. Forward, **Jr. 1986. Vertical migration cycles of** crab **larvae and their** role **in** larval **dispersal.** Bulletin of Marine Science **39: 192-20 1.**
- Dingle, II. 1969. Ontogenetic changes in phototaxis and thigmokinensis in stomatopod Iarvae. **Crustacema I6:108-110.**
- **Douglass,** J.K. **1986.** The ontogeny of light **and dark** adaptation **in the** compound **eyes** of **grass** shrimp *Palaemonefes pugio.* Ph.D. Thesis. Duke University, Durham, NC, 277 p.
- **Douglass,** J.K., J.H. Wilson **and R.B.** Forward, **Jr.** *1992.* **A tidal rhythm** in phototaxis **of** larval grass shrimp *(Palaemonetes pugio).* Marine Behavior **and** Physiology **14:159-173.**
- Douglass, J.K. and R.B. **Forward,** Jr. **1989. The ontogeny** of facultative superposition **optics in a** shrimp **eye:** hatching through metamorphosis. **CelI** and Tissue **Research** *258:289-* **300.**
- Fincham, **A.A. 1 984. Ontogeny** and **opticsofthe eyes** ofthe common prawn Palaemon(Palaemon) serratus (Pennant 1777). Zoological Journal **of the** Linnean **Society 8 1** *:88-* **1** 13.
- Fischer, **S.A.** and H.W. Lenwood, Jr. **1992.** Environmental **concentrations** and aquatic toxicity data **on diflubenzuron** (QimiIin@). Critical Review **in Toxicology 2245-78.**
- **Forward, R.B.,** Jr. **1974. Negative phototaxis incrustacean Larvae:** possible functional significance. **lournal** Experimental Marine Biology **and Ecology 16: 1 1-1 7.**

Forward, R.B., Jr. **1977.** Occurrence **of a** shadow response **among** brachyuran larvae. Marine Biology **3953** 1-34 1.

- Forward, R.B., Jr. *2936.* Light **and** diurnal vertical migration: photobehavior and photophysiology of plankton. In: **K.C.** Smith, ed., Photochemical and Photobiological **Reviews, Vol.** 1. Plenum Publishing Corporation, New **York,** NY, **p. 157-209.**
- Forward. R.B., Jr. **1985.** Behavioral responses of larvae ofthecrab *Rhithropanopeus harrisii* (Brachyura:Xanthidae) during diel vertical migration. Marine **Biology** *90:9-* **IS.**
- Forward. R.B.. Jr. and **J.D.** Costlow, Jr. 1974. **The** ontogeny of phototaxis by larvae of the **crab,** *Rkiihropanopeus hurrisit.* Marine Biology 26:27-33.
- Forward, R.B., Jr. and J.D. Costlow, Jr. **1976.** Crustacean larval behavior **as** an indicator of sublethal effects of **an** insect juvenile hormone mimic. In: M. Wiley, ed., Estuarine Processes, Vol. **1.** Academic Press **Inc.,** Orlando, FL, **p. 279-289.**
- Forward, R.B. and T.W. Cronin. 1980. Tidal rhythms of activity and phototaxis of an estuarine **crab** larva. Biological Bulletin **158295-3 03.**
- Forward, R.B., Jr., T.W. Cronin and D.E. **Steams. 1984.** Control ofdiel vertical migration: photoresponses ofa larva! **crustacean.** Limnology and Oceanography 29: **146-1 54.**
- Freeman, J.A. 1993. The crustacean epidermis during **larval** development. In: M.N. Horst and J.A. **Freeman, eds.,** The Crustacean Integument -- Morphology and Biochemistry. **CRC Press,** Boca Raton, **FL, p. 1 93-2 19.**
- Hunte. W. and R.A. Myers. 1984. Phototaxis and cannibalism in **gamarridean** amphipods. Marine Biology **8 1 :75-79.**
- Land, M.F. **1984.** Crustacean. In: M.A. Ali. ed., Photoreception and Vision in Invertebrates. NATE **AS1** Series, **Vol. 74,** Plenum **Press.** New **York. NY, p. 401-438.**
- Lang, W. H., R.B. Forward, Jr., S.C. Miller and M. Marcy. 1980. Acute toxicity and sublethal behavioral effects of copper on bamacle nauplii *(Balanus improvisus)*. Marine Biology 58:139-145.
- Lanp, W.H., **D.C.** Miller, **P.J.** Ritacco and M. Marcy. 1981. The **effects** of copper and cadmium **on** the behavior and **development** ofbarnacle larvae. In: **F.J.** Vernberget al., **eds..** Biological Monitoring ofMarinePollutants. Academic Press, **New** York, NY, p. **165-203.**
- Moyer, **J.C.** and T. Bathalmus. 1979. Phototactic behavior: An index for subacute effects of the herbicide **2,4** dichlorophenoxyacetic acid in estuarine grass shrimp. Neurotoxicology **1:105-123.**
- **Mulder, R. and** M.J. Gijswijt. **1973.** The laboratory evaluation of **two** promising **new** insecticides which interfere with cuticle deposition. Pesticide Science **4:73 7-745.**
- Pardi, **L. and** F. Papi. 196 I. Kinetic and tactic responses. **In:** T.H. Waterman, ed., The Physiology of Crustacea, Vol. 2. Academic **Press,** New York. NY, p. **365-399.**
- **Parker,** G.H. 1897. Photochemical changes in the retinal pigment cells of Palaemonetes and their relation to the central nervous system. Bulletin of **the** Museum of Comparative **Zoology** Harvard University **30:273-300.**
- **Rand, G.M.** 1985. Behavior. In: **G.M.** Rand and S.R. Petrocelli. eds., Fundamentals of Toxicology, Hemisphere Publishing Corporation. Washington, DC, p. 22 1-263.
- Rosenthal, **H. and** D.F. Alderdice. **1976.** Sublethal effects of environmental stressors natural and polIutional, on marine fish **eggs** and larvae. Journal ofthe Fisheries **Research** Board **ofCanada 33:2047-2065.**
- Simonet, D.E.. **W.I.** Knausenberger, **L.H.** Townsend. Jr. and E.L. Turner, Jr. 1978. A biomonitoring procedure utilizing negative phototaxis of first instar *Aedes aegypli* larvae. Archive of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology 7:339-347.
- Sokal. R.R. and F.J. Rohlf. **19x1.** Biometry. 2nd **ed.** Freeman and **Company,** San Francisco, CA.
- Sulkin. **S.D. 1975.** The influence of light in the depthregulation in crab larvae. Biological Bulletin 148:333-343,
- Sulkin, **S.D. 1984.** Behavioral basisofdepth regulation inthe **Iarvae** of brachyum **crabs.** Marine Ecolo~ **Progress Series** I *5:* **I8 1-205.**
- **Thorson,** G. **1964.** Light **as** an ecological factor in **the** dispersal and settlement **of larvae** of marine **bottom** invertebrates. Ophelia **1: 167-208.**
- Vernberg, **W.R., P.J.** De Coursey and J. **Q'Hara.** 1974. Multiple environmental factor effects on physiology and behavior of the fiddler crab, *Uca pugilator*. In: F.J. Vernberg and W.B. Vernberg, eds., Pollution and Physiology of Marine Organism. Academic Press, New **York, NY,** p. 38 **1-425.**
- Welsh, J.H. 1932. Temperature and light as factors influencing the rate of swimming of larvae of the mussel crab. *Pinatheres mnculutus.* BiologicaI Bulletin63:3 **10-326.**
- White, G.M. **1924.** Reactions of the **larvae** of the shrimp, *PdaemQnefeS* vulgaris and **the** squid. *LoIigo pealii,* to monochromatic light. Biological Bulletin 47:265-273.
- Wilson, J.E.H. 1985. Sublethal effects of diflubenzuron (Dimilin[®]) on the reproduction and photobehavior of the grass shrimp. $Palaemonetes pugio Holthuis Caridea, Palaemonidae). Ph.D.$ Dissertation. Duke University, Durham, NC. **21 1 p.**
- Wilson, J.E.H., R.B. Forward, Jr. and J.D. Costlow. 1985. Effects ofembryonicexposure tosubletha! **concentrationsofDimilin@ onthe** photobehavior **ofgrass** shrimp larvae. In: F.1. Vernberg, **E.P.** Thurberg, **A. Calabreseand W.B.** Yernberg.cds.. Marine Pollution **and** Physiology-Recent **Advances.** University of **South** Carolina Press, Columbia, **SC, p.** 377-396.
- Wilson, J.E.H., R.B. Forward, Jr. and J.D. Costlow. 1987. Delayed effects of difluknzuron on the **swimming** and vertical distribution of *Palaemoneiespugio.* In: **W.B.** Vernberg. A. Calabrese, **F.P.** Thruberg, **and** F.J. Vemberg, **eds..** Pollution Physiology **of** Estuarine Organisms. University of South Carolina **Press,** Columbia. SC, p. 3 **15-3 17.**