The Bioscan
AN INTERNATIONAL QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF LIFE SCIENCES
20(3): S1: (3) 47-70, 2025
www.thebioscan.com

Ecological Dynamics and Conservation Strategies for Sustainable Lake Ecosystems

Seema[1], Anil Kumar[1*], Suresh Kumar[2]

[1]Department of Zoology, Baba Mastnath University, Rohtak (Haryana), India.

[2]Department of Zoology, CRM, Jat College, Hisar (Haryana), India.

*Corresponding author – akchaudhry20@gmail.com

KEYWORDS
Lake ecology,
Biodiversity,
Conservation strategies,
Sustainable management,
Freshwater ecosystem

Received on: 03-06-2025
Accepted on: 08-07-2025

Published on: 18-07-2025

ABSTRACT

Lakes are essential freshwater ecosystem that support biodiversity help purify water and play a role in climate regulation. Their delicate balance is influenced by many factors natural, human and environmental. This study explores key elements of lake ecosystem focusing on water quality, pH, nutrient level and habitat structure. Water quality is a direct indicator of lake health. Factors like pH, nutrient buildup and pollution can cause major change. For example, excess nitrogen from agricultural runoff often led to eutrophication triggering harmful algal bloom like cyanobacteria that disrupt the ecosystem. Other threat includes invasive species, habitat loss due to urban development and climate change all of which alter species makeup and ecological function. The research also emphasizes the role of phytoplankton and zooplankton in lake food webs. Phytoplankton act as primary producers, while zooplankton which feed on them, help drive nutrient cycling and energy flow. Beyond ecology these organisms have practical uses in aquaculture biofuel and pollution control. Understanding their relationship and the pressure they face is key to building smart management strategy. Protecting lake means preserving their biodiversity, productivity and the essential service they provide for both nature and people.

1. INTRODUCTION

Freshwater lakes are critical ecological systems that play a vital role in sustaining both natural biodiversity and human life. Although they occupy only a small fraction of the Earth's surface, their ecological, hydrological and socio economic importance is disproportionately large. Lakes regulate local climates provide freshwater for drinking and agriculture which support fisheries and offer recreational and cultural services. Beyond their practical uses they are dynamic ecosystems where physical, chemical and biological processes interact continuously to maintain ecological balance. Yet in recent decades the health and functioning of lake ecosystems have been severely compromised by a range of anthropogenic and climatic stressors. Globally water is a finite and vulnerable resource. Although about 71% of the Earth is covered in water only around 2.5% is freshwater and less than 1% of this freshwater is accessible in rivers, lakes and reservoirs (Oksana & Dmytro, 2021; Gilbert, 2021). Lakes are among the most accessible freshwater resources and are crucial for human consumption, agriculture and industry. However their sustainability is under constant threat due to pollution, land-use changes, climate change and overexploitation. Given their limited capacity to recover from ecological disturbance lakes require continuous and careful monitoring to ensure their long term health and functionality. The importance of lakes extend to their ability to buffer environmental change. They act as sentinels of climate and environmental shifts due to their sensitivity to changes in temperature, precipitation, nutrient input and land use. As integrator of their catchment environment lakes reflect the cumulative impact of all activities taking place in their surrounding areas. This make them ideal for studying ecosystem respons to both localized human activities and global environmental change (Albert et al., 2021; Tibebe et al., 2022). Therefore monitoring lake ecosystem can serve as an early warning system for environmental degradation and can guide effective resource management policies. One of the most pressing threat to freshwater lake is eutrophication a condition marked by excessive nutrient enrichment particularly nitrogen and phosphorus. While some degree of nutrient cycling is natural and essential to aquatic productivity anthropogenic activity have drastically accelerated nutrient loading through agricultural runoff wastewater discharge and urban development (Herren et al., 2022). This nutrient enrichment stimulate the rapid growth of phytoplankton and aquatic macrophytes often leading to harmful algal bloom. These blooms can reduce water clarity block sunlight alter oxygen dynamic and in extreme case produce toxins harmful to both aquatic life and human (Belfiore et al., 2020). The decomposition of algal biomass further depletes dissolved oxygen in bottom water resulting either in hypoxic or anoxic condition that threaten fish and benthic organism. This chain of events not only disrupts the natural food web but also undermine the recreational, aesthetic and economic value of lake. Moreover eutrophication can cause shift in species composition, reduce biodiversity and lead to irreversible ecological change. Addressing this issue require a thorough understanding of nutrient source, transport mechanisms and biological response which can only be achieved through regular seasonally informed monitoring of lake health. Compounding the threat of eutrophication is the growing impact of climate change on lake ecosystem. Climate induced change such as increased temperature, altered rainfall pattern and more frequent extreme weather event significantly affect the physical and chemical properties of freshwater bodies. Rising water temperature can alter thermal stratification patterns affect dissolved oxygen level and shift the timing and intensity of phytoplankton bloom. Additionally altered precipitation pattern can influence nutrient runoff sediment loading and hydrological connectivity thereby intensifying eutrophication risk (Ran et al., 2023). Climate change not only magnifies existing stressor but also introduces new challenges in managing freshwater ecosystem sustainably.

A key component in understanding lake ecosystems lies in the study of planktonic communities particularly phytoplankton and zooplankton. These microscopic organism form the base of the aquatic food web and play essential role in nutrient cycling energy transfer and water quality regulation. Phytoplankton through photosynthesis contribute to primary production while zooplankton graze on them transferring energy to higher trophic level such as fish and invertebrates. The population dynamic of plankton are highly sensitive to changes in environmental parameter making them effective bioindicator of ecological health (Mishra, 2014). Changes in water chemistry such as nutrient concentrations, pH, temperature and dissolved oxygen directly influence plankton composition, abundance and diversity. Zooplankton in particular serve as excellent indicators of water quality because they integrate short-term and long term change in their environment. Disruption in zooplankton communities due to pollution, habitat modification and climate variability can cascade through the food web affecting fish population and overall lake productivity. Therefore integrating plankton monitoring into lake assessments provide valuable insight into ecosystem functioning and potential stressor (Smitha et al., 2013). Despite the known ecological importance of freshwater lake and plankton communities comprehensive assessments remain limited especially in developing countries. Many studies focus on either physicochemical analysis or biological monitoring but few integrate both to understand ecosystem dynamic holistically. Furthermore temporal variation particularly seasonal changes is often overlooked even though lakes exhibit pronounced seasonal cycles that influence temperature nutrient availability, primary productivity and species interaction. Failing to capture these seasonal dynamic can lead to incomplete or misleading conclusions about lake health.

In this context a multidisciplinary and seasonally informed approach is essential for effective lake management. This study addresses that need by conducting an integrated assessment of freshwater lakes through the measurement of key physicochemical parameters (such as temperature, pH, dissolved oxygen, total dissolved solids and nutrient concentrations) evaluation of primary productivity and analysis of zooplankton diversity and abundance across different seasons. This approach not only allow for an understanding of the current ecological status of the lake but also offers insight into temporal trend early warning sign of degradation and pathway for recovery.

2. Factors Affecting Lake Ecosystems

Lakes, as dynamic and multifaceted ecosystems, encompass diverse interconnected habitats-pelagic, benthic, and riparian-each contributing to nutrient cycling, biodiversity support, and ecological stability (Schindler & Scheuerell, 2002). Despite their intrinsic connectivity, much of the existing research has approached these zones in isolation, leading to incomplete ecological assessments that fail to capture the full complexity of lake ecosystems (Albert et al., 2021; Godana et al., 2022). This compartmentalized approach has limited our ability to formulate holistic conservation strategies, despite growing evidence that the interactions among these habitats are critical for long-term ecosystem resilience. The pelagic zone forms the basis of aquatic food webs, supporting primary productivity through phytoplankton and sustaining higher trophic levels. However, anthropogenic stressors, such as nutrient enrichment and climate-induced temperature shifts, increasingly disrupt planktonic dynamics, leading to imbalances in food web structures and ecosystem functions. Similarly, the benthic zone, crucial for organic matter decomposition and nutrient regeneration, faces degradation due to sedimentation, pollution, and hypoxia, threatening benthic biodiversity and biogeochemical cycling. The riparian zone, often overlooked in lake management, plays a pivotal role in water quality regulation and habitat stability, yet land-use changes and urbanization have drastically reduced its buffering capacity. While its role in pollutant filtration and shoreline stabilization is well-documented, riparian degradation remains a persistent issue that exacerbates nutrient loading and accelerates eutrophication. Beyond their biological significance, lakes contribute to carbon sequestration, flood regulation, and irrigation support, underscoring their broader ecological and socio-economic importance (Williams et al., 2004). However, current conservation efforts rarely integrate these multifunctional roles, leading to fragmented management approaches that fail to address cumulative environmental threats. A shift toward ecosystem-based conservation strategies is essential, emphasizing cross-habitat interactions, sustainable land-use practices, and integrated water management to enhance lake resilience against climate change and anthropogenic pressures. Future research should focus on quantifying cross-habitat dependencies, assessing ecosystem service trade-offs, and developing adaptive conservation frameworks to safeguard lake ecosystems holistically and sustainably.

A variety of natural and man-made variables can have a significant impact on the structure and functioning of lake ecosystems. Therefore, understanding these elements is essential to managing and conserving them. The following are important variables that affect lake ecosystems: pollution (Kumaraswamy *et al*., 2020), climate change (Woolway *et al*., 2020), invasive species (Higgins *et al*., 2019), changes in land use (Liu *et al*., 2021), water extraction (Tao *et al*., 2020), and hydrological factors (Xie *et al*., 2021).

2.1 Water Quality and Eutrophication

Water quality is a fundamental determinant of lake ecosystem health, influencing biodiversity, species interactions, and overall ecological stability (Damseth et al., 2024). While extensive research has been conducted on individual physicochemical parameters such as temperature, dissolved oxygen, pH, and pollutants, the interactive effects of these variables remain underexplored. A more holistic, system-based approach is necessary to fully comprehend how water quality stressors interact to influence ecosystem resilience. Eutrophication and algal blooms, driven by nutrient overloading, are among the most well-documented consequences of declining water quality. However, research often focuses on phosphorus management, while nitrogen dynamics and their role in eutrophication remain relatively understudied (Bashir et al., 2020). Given that nitrogen compounds—particularly nitrates and ammonium—can further exacerbate hypoxic and anoxic conditions, there is a pressing need to adopt a dual-nutrient reduction strategy that considers both phosphorus and nitrogen in lake management plans. Furthermore, climate change-driven temperature variations pose an increasingly complex challenge to water quality. Rising temperatures not only reduce oxygen solubility but also accelerate microbial metabolism, potentially increasing organic matter decomposition and nutrient recycling (Payton et al., 2023). This, in turn, creates feedback loops that can intensify eutrophication and alter species distributions, often favoring harmful, opportunistic algal species over native aquatic flora and fauna. Current mitigation strategies, however, fail to account for these climate-driven influences, indicating a research gap in adaptive water quality management approaches. While dissolved oxygen depletion is well recognized as a key driver of fish mortality and biodiversity decline, most conservation efforts focus on acute oxygen stress events, such as seasonal hypoxia, rather than addressing the long-term shifts in oxygen availability resulting from cumulative pollution and warming trends (Mustafa et al., 2024). There is an urgent need for sustained monitoring programs that track longitudinal changes in oxygen dynamics, rather than relying solely on short-term assessments of oxygen fluctuations. Overall, while the importance of water quality management in sustaining lake ecosystems is well established, the current approach remains fragmented and reactive, primarily targeting localized water quality deterioration rather than addressing broader, systemic stressors. Future research must focus on integrating multiple water quality indicators into predictive models to anticipate long-term ecological shifts and develop proactive conservation strategies. Additionally, bridging the gap between scientific research and policy implementation is essential to ensure that water quality management frameworks lead to tangible ecological improvements rather than isolated, short-term interventions.

2.2 pH Dynamics

The regulation of pH levels in lake ecosystems is a well-recognized determinant of aquatic health and ecosystem stability. The biochemical processes associated with photosynthesis, organic matter decomposition, and atmospheric deposition are fundamental in shaping the pH dynamics of freshwater systems. However, while the influence of natural metabolic processes on pH fluctuations is widely acknowledged (Michaud, 1991), external anthropogenic pressures such as acid rain and industrial emissions present more severe and often irreversible alterations to the acid-base balance of lake waters (Moore, 1989). Despite global efforts to reduce sulfur dioxide (SO_2) and nitrogen oxides (NO_x) emissions through air quality regulations (EPA, 2020), acid deposition continues to pose a substantial threat to vulnerable lake ecosystems, particularly those lacking sufficient buffering capacity. One of the critical knowledge gaps in pH regulation studies is the long-term resilience of acidified lakes. While research has documented the immediate harmful effects of low pH on biodiversity, reproductive success, and ecosystem functionality (Chakraborty et al., 2021), fewer studies have explored the potential for natural recovery in acidified systems. Some lakes demonstrate gradual pH stabilization through biogeochemical feedback mechanisms, whereas others exhibit persistent acidification, suggesting that additional factors, such as catchment geology, hydrological connectivity, and climate variability, play a crucial role in pH recovery dynamics. Additionally, traditional assessments of lake buffering capacity focus primarily on carbonate equilibrium (e.g., limestone availability); however, recent studies suggest that biological buffering mechanisms, such as the presence of calcifying organisms and microbial alkalinity production, may also contribute to pH stabilization. These biological processes remain underexplored and warrant further investigation to develop more comprehensive predictive models of lake acidification and recovery.

Furthermore, climate change-driven alterations in precipitation patterns, CO_2 solubility, and organic matter decomposition introduce additional uncertainties into pH regulation dynamics. Increased precipitation can dilute buffering minerals, while rising temperatures may accelerate organic matter breakdown, both of which could contribute to greater acidification stress in already vulnerable lakes. The interactive effects of acid rain, climate change, and eutrophication demand an integrated research approach that goes beyond traditional chemical assessments and incorporates hydrodynamic, biological, and climatic interactions to predict long-term pH stability. From a management perspective, the mitigation of lake acidification has primarily focused on reducing atmospheric pollution and artificial liming ($CaCO_3$ application) to restore buffering capacity. However, liming has temporary effects and does not address the underlying causes of acidification. Future research should explore adaptive lake management strategies that enhance natural buffering mechanisms, such as restoring wetland ecosystems and promoting aquatic vegetation capable of stabilizing pH fluctuations. Moreover, the effectiveness of international air pollution control policies should be continuously evaluated to ensure that emission reductions translate into tangible improvements in freshwater pH regulation at both regional and global scales.

2.3 Nutrient loading

The issue of nutrient loading and eutrophication has been extensively studied, with research consistently highlighting the severe ecological consequences of excessive nitrogen (N) and phosphorus (P) inputs. While the role of agricultural runoff, wastewater discharge, and fertilizer overuse as primary contributors to nutrient loading is well-documented (Smith, 2003; Boyd & Boyd, 2020; Sahu et al., 2024), current mitigation strategies remain fragmented and insufficient in addressing this global concern. Despite the advancement of nutrient management policies, such as best management practices (BMPs) in agriculture and wastewater treatment technologies, eutrophication persists, particularly in highly industrialized and intensively farmed regions. This suggests that existing policy frameworks and enforcement mechanisms may be inadequate in mitigating nutrient influx at the watershed scale. Furthermore, while the ecological impacts of hypoxia, algal blooms, and biodiversity loss are well established (Chislock et al., 2013; Walker & Elias, 2025), there remains a lack of long-term, large-scale empirical studies examining the cascading effects of nutrient enrichment across trophic levels. Most research focuses on immediate water quality deterioration and species composition shifts, yet fewer studies investigate the broader biogeochemical and evolutionary consequences of chronic eutrophication. Additionally, there is a growing need for interdisciplinary research integrating hydrology, climate science, and socio-economic factors to better predict and manage the effects of nutrient loading under changing global conditions. One major oversight in conventional eutrophication management is the underestimation of internal nutrient cycling. While external nutrient inputs from agricultural and urban sources are widely acknowledged, the role of sediment nutrient release (legacy phosphorus) and biogeochemical feedback loops in sustaining eutrophic conditions is often overlooked. Lakes with a history of nutrient pollution may continue to experience recurrent algal blooms even after external inputs are reduced, highlighting the need for more holistic remediation strategies, such as sediment dredging, biomanipulation, and hypolimnetic oxygenation. Moreover, while technological advancements in remote sensing and water quality modeling have improved the monitoring of nutrient dynamics, challenges remain in scaling up these approaches for real-time, policy-relevant decision-making. Effective nutrient management requires a multi-pronged approach, combining regulatory policies, technological innovations, and stakeholder engagement to ensure sustainable freshwater ecosystem management. Moving forward, future research should focus on developing predictive models that incorporate climate variability, land-use changes, and socio-economic drivers to better anticipate and mitigate the effects of nutrient over-enrichment.

2.4 Habitat Alteration

Habitat alteration is a major driver of ecological disruption in lake systems, yet management approaches often fail to address the cumulative effects of these modifications. While shoreline development and dredging are well-documented causes of habitat loss, there is a lack of research on their long-term impacts on species population dynamics and genetic diversity (Cantonati et al., 2020). The destruction of wetland buffers is particularly concerning, as wetlands serve as natural filters that regulate water quality and nutrient cycles—a function that is often overlooked in conservation planning. Hydrological modifications, including dam construction and artificial water level regulation, disrupt seasonal water flow patterns, altering critical breeding and feeding habitats for aquatic species (Tong et al., 2023). However, studies tend to focus on large-scale hydrological changes, neglecting subtle but equally significant alterations such as minor water diversions and land use changes that cumulatively degrade habitat quality. Furthermore, the adaptive capacity of aquatic organisms to cope with shifting habitat conditions remains poorly understood, necessitating further investigation into species resilience and behavioral adaptations in altered lake environments. While the ecological consequences of habitat modification are well established, integrated conservation strategies remain fragmented and reactive, addressing isolated habitat disruptions rather than implementing holistic, ecosystem-wide restoration efforts. Future research must prioritize longitudinal studies that assess the cascading effects of habitat alteration over time and develop predictive models to guide proactive conservation measures.

2.5 Climate Change

Climate change-induced alterations in temperature, precipitation, and extreme weather patterns are increasingly destabilizing lake ecosystems. While the effects of rising temperatures on oxygen depletion and metabolic stress in aquatic organisms are well-documented (Poff et al., 2002), there is limited research on the thresholds of species adaptation to these changes, particularly for long-lived species and keystone organisms. Additionally, studies often focus on direct temperature effects, overlooking the indirect consequences such as shifts in trophic interactions, invasive species proliferation, and pathogen outbreaks that can exacerbate ecosystem imbalances. Climate change also disrupts seasonal ecological processes, including fish spawning and plant phenology (Reid et al., 2019), but research gaps remain in understanding the long-term implications of these phenological shifts on food web stability and ecosystem services. Furthermore, while the decline in biodiversity due to climate change is widely recognized, cumulative stressors—such as pollution and habitat fragmentation—are rarely integrated into climate impact assessments, leading to an underestimation of ecosystem vulnerability. Despite growing awareness of climate change threats to lakes, adaptive management strategies remain reactive rather than proactive. Future research must emphasize predictive modeling to anticipate ecosystem responses, prioritize climate-resilient conservation frameworks, and develop mitigation strategies that incorporate multi-stressor interactions for a more comprehensive approach to lake ecosystem management.

2.6 Invasive Species

The introduction and spread of invasive species pose a severe challenge to lake ecosystem stability, often leading to biodiversity loss, habitat alteration, and disrupted ecological functions (Mayfield et al., 2021). While research has extensively documented the impacts of invasive species, there remains insufficient focus on the long-term evolutionary adaptations of native species in response to these pressures. Current studies predominantly examine short-term ecological disruptions, but a more comprehensive understanding of species resilience and adaptive mechanisms is needed to inform effective management strategies.

Furthermore, the role of human-mediated pathways in invasive species dispersal—such as ballast water discharge, aquarium trade, and climate-induced range expansions—requires stronger regulatory measures and preventive frameworks. The proliferation of invasive macrophytes like Myriophyllum spicatum and Eichhornia crassipes is well-documented, but research often overlooks their secondary impacts, such as altered microbial communities and increased methane emissions, which contribute to broader climate feedback loops.

Although invasive species are known to exacerbate eutrophication and disrupt nutrient cycling (Higgins et al., 2019), there is limited integration of these effects into lake management models. Many control efforts rely on mechanical removal and chemical treatments, which can have unintended consequences, such as harming non-target species and further destabilizing aquatic ecosystems. Moving forward, adaptive management approaches, including biological control measures, early detection systems, and ecosystem-based restoration, should be prioritized to mitigate the ecological and socio-economic impacts of invasive species in lake ecosystems.

2.7 Anthropogenic Factor

Anthropogenic activities have profoundly altered lake ecosystems, yet a comprehensive understanding of their cumulative impacts remains a challenge. While the discussion effectively outlines major stressors—pollution, habitat destruction, climate change, invasive species, and water extraction—it does not fully address the interdependencies between these factors. For instance, eutrophication caused by nutrient pollution does not occur in isolation; it is exacerbated by urbanization, deforestation, and hydrological modifications that increase runoff and sedimentation rates (Akhtar et al., 2021). This highlights the need for a more integrated approach to lake ecosystem management rather than addressing each stressor independently. The emphasis on agricultural runoff as a primary contributor to eutrophication is well-founded, as nitrogen and phosphorus enrichment from fertilizers are well-documented drivers of algal blooms (EPA, 2020). However, the discussion does not consider regional variations in nutrient loading or the role of climate change in amplifying these effects. Rising temperatures can enhance algal growth and extend bloom durations, intensifying oxygen depletion and biodiversity loss. Moreover, while the ecological consequences of eutrophication—hypoxia, fish mortality, and disruption of aquatic communities—are discussed, the socio-economic impacts, such as the loss of fisheries and increased water treatment costs, are not explored. Addressing these dimensions would provide a more holistic understanding of the problem. The review of urbanization and land-use changes correctly identifies impervious surfaces as key contributors to pollution through increased surface runoff (Paul & Meyer, 2001). However, it lacks discussion on mitigation strategies such as green infrastructure, wetland restoration, or sustainable urban planning, which are crucial for reducing runoff contamination. Similarly, while the loss of riparian zones and wetlands is recognized as a significant issue (Liu et al., 2021), the role of these ecosystems in carbon sequestration and climate regulation is underemphasized. This omission limits the broader ecological significance of habitat destruction beyond biodiversity loss. The discussion on invasive species provides relevant examples, such as the zebra mussel (Dreissena polymorpha) and the American bullfrog (Lithobates catesbeianus), which have significantly altered native ecosystems (Cottingham et al., 2025; Kats & Ferrer, 2003). However, the review primarily focuses on competition and predation while overlooking the cascading effects invasive species can have on entire food webs and ecosystem functions. For example, invasive filter-feeders like zebra mussels not only outcompete native species but also alter nutrient cycling, which can further exacerbate eutrophication. Additionally, climate change may create more favorable conditions for invasive species, yet this linkage is not explored in the discussion. One of the major limitations of the analysis is the lack of emphasis on integrated lake management strategies. While individual threats are well-documented, the interplay between these factors is not sufficiently addressed. A more comprehensive approach should consider the synergistic effects of anthropogenic activities and promote multi-scalar interventions, including stricter pollution control policies, habitat conservation efforts, and community-based conservation initiatives. Additionally, the discussion does not incorporate emerging technological solutions such as biofiltration, real-time water quality monitoring, or targeted bioremediation strategies that could help mitigate some of these challenges. While the discussion effectively identifies key anthropogenic threats to lake ecosystems, it would benefit from a more integrative perspective that considers the interconnectedness of these stressors, the socio-economic implications, and possible mitigation strategies. Future research and policy efforts should prioritize holistic, adaptive management approaches that address both the direct and indirect consequences of human activities on freshwater ecosystems.

3. Biological Indicators of Lake Health

The discussion on lake biodiversity effectively highlights the ecological richness of these ecosystems and their significance for various taxa. However, while the role of lakes as biodiversity hotspots is well acknowledged, the analysis lacks depth in explaining the ecological processes that sustain high species diversity. The assertion that lakes often have greater species richness than rivers or other freshwater systems (Vörösmarty et al., 2013) is intriguing but should be further explored in terms of the underlying factors, such as habitat heterogeneity, water retention time, and nutrient availability, which contribute to this diversity. A comparative analysis with other aquatic ecosystems, such as wetlands and estuaries, would provide a more nuanced understanding of their relative biodiversity significance. The discussion appropriately recognizes the functional role of key species, including aquatic plants (Phragmites, Nymphaeaceae), invertebrates (mollusks, aquatic insects), and fish, in maintaining ecosystem stability (Williams et al., 2004). However, a more detailed examination of species interactions and ecosystem services is needed. For instance, while aquatic plants provide food and shelter, they also contribute to oxygen dynamics, sediment stabilization, and water filtration. Similarly, invertebrates play critical roles beyond nutrient cycling, such as serving as bioindicators of water quality. The discussion could be strengthened by addressing these broader ecological functions, which are essential for conservation strategies. Another limitation of the discussion is the lack of emphasis on the threats to lake biodiversity. While the importance of conservation is briefly mentioned, there is no mention of the specific anthropogenic pressures—such as pollution, habitat fragmentation, invasive species, and climate change—that jeopardize biodiversity in these ecosystems. Given that previous research has identified eutrophication, hydrological alterations, and invasive species as major threats to freshwater biodiversity (Meerhoff &

Beklioglu, 2024), their omission weakens the argument for conservation. Incorporating discussions on these stressors, along with potential mitigation strategies, would provide a more holistic view. Additionally, while the text discusses the presence of different taxa in lakes, it does not consider genetic and functional diversity, both of which are critical for ecosystem resilience. Biodiversity is not just about species richness but also about the genetic variability within species and the functional roles that species play in the ecosystem. For example, some fish populations exhibit genetic adaptations to specific environmental conditions, and the loss of such genetic diversity can reduce the resilience of populations to environmental changes. The omission of these aspects limits the depth of the analysis.

Moreover, the role of lakes in supporting migratory species, particularly birds, is underexplored. Many lakes serve as critical stopover points for migratory waterfowl, contributing to global biodiversity connectivity. This aspect should be included to highlight the broader ecological significance of lakes beyond their immediate surroundings. In conclusion, while the discussion provides a good overview of lake biodiversity, it lacks depth in addressing ecological processes, species interactions, and ecosystem services. Furthermore, the absence of anthropogenic threats and conservation challenges weakens the argument for preserving lake ecosystems. A more comprehensive approach that includes ecosystem functions, genetic diversity, conservation threats, and mitigation strategies would provide a stronger, more balanced perspective.

31. Microbiological Variables

Lake Ecosystem health is mostly determined by microbiological indicators, especially the quantity and prevalence of various bacteria and diseases. The breakdown of organic waste, the cycling of nutrients, and the general operation of aquatic ecosystems are all significantly influenced by bacterial populations. Another crucial microbiological indicator is biochemical oxygen demand (BOD), which quantifies the quantity of oxygen needed by aerobic bacteria to break down organic materials in water. Elevated BOD levels are a sign of excessive organic pollution concentrations, which can stress aquatic life and deplete oxygen. While BOD readings exceeding 8 mg/L indicate considerable organic pollution and possible oxygen stress, levels below 3 mg/L are thought to be indicative of adequate water quality. Research on the microbial diversity of lakes has shown that the trophic state and environmental factors of the lake affect the bacterial populations.

Below is a table of microbial diversity from different lake systems: (Table 1)

Table 1: Microbial diversity in Lake Ecosystem

Sr No	***Genus***	**References**
1	*Bacillus licheniformis, Bacillus megaterium, Streptococcus thermophilus, Bacillus subtilis, Actinobacillus hominis. Paenibacillus alvei, Streptococcus pyogenes, Geobacillus stearothermophilus*	Kumar and Sharma , 2020
2	*Geobacillusspp, Thermus spp., Bacillus thuringiensis, Vibrio spp.*	Sharma *et al*. (2008)

3	*Oscillatoria salina, Phormidium sp., Spirogyaracrassa, Cosmariumgexangulase, Naviculasimilis, Cosmariumsp.,Oocystis gigas , Aspergilus sp.*	Jayashanakara*et al*., 2010
4	*Exiguobacterium*, *Vibrio*, *Candidatus* Bacilloplasma, *Pirellul*, *Pseudarthrobacter*, *Acinetobacter*, *Rhodopirellula* and *Photobacterium*	Zeng *et al*., 2020
5	*Deferrisoma* sp.,*Anaeromyxobacter* sp.*Thiohalocapsa* sp. and *Thiogranum* sp., *Clostridium sensustricto*	Joseph *et al*., 2021
6	*Pseudoxanthmonas, Dechlorosoma, Desulfovibrio, Agrobacterium, Methylocapsa, Rhodococcus, Sulfobacillus*,	Morales *et al*., 2005

Lake microbes play a fundamental role in maintaining nutrient balance, particularly in nitrogen and carbon cycles, which are crucial for ecosystem stability. Their function in nitrification and decomposition ensures the breakdown of organic matter and the recycling of nutrients, making them indispensable for water quality management (Wang et al., 2020). However, while microbial applications hold promise in enhancing aquatic health and bioremediation, their effectiveness is highly dependent on environmental conditions. Factors such as temperature, pH, and oxygen availability influence microbial efficiency, and disruptions to these parameters can lead to imbalances, potentially exacerbating issues like eutrophication rather than mitigating them (Smith et al., 2019). The use of microbes in bioremediation and aquaculture also presents challenges. While bacterial strains such as *Nitrosomonas* and *Nitrobacter* facilitate nitrogen removal, their activity can be inhibited by high pollutant concentrations or fluctuations in nutrient levels (Wang et al., 2020; Parshad et al., 2024; Hafeez et al., 2025). Furthermore, the over-reliance on microbial solutions without integrated ecological management can create unintended consequences, including shifts in microbial community composition or the emergence of harmful algal blooms . The application of anaerobic bacteria in organic waste decomposition is beneficial, yet excessive decomposition without proper oxygenation can lead to anoxic conditions, further endangering aquatic life. Despite these concerns, microbial applications remain a promising strategy for restoring degraded water bodies and supporting sustainable aquaculture. Their ability to regulate nutrient dynamics and detoxify pollutants highlights their ecological and commercial significance. However, for long-term success, microbial interventions should be implemented alongside broader ecosystem management strategies to ensure that natural balances are maintained and that unintended environmental consequences are minimized.

The application of probiotic microorganisms and biofloc technology in aquaculture has gained considerable attention due to its potential to enhance productivity, improve water quality, and promote sustainability. Probiotic bacteria such as *Bacillus* and *Lactobacillus* have demonstrated beneficial effects on aquatic species by enhancing immune responses, digestion, and nutrient absorption. Their use reduces reliance on antibiotics, which is a crucial step in mitigating antimicrobial resistance concerns in aquaculture (Hai, 2015). However, the effectiveness of probiotics is highly dependent on environmental factors, dosage, and microbial community dynamics, which can vary across different aquaculture systems. Biofloc technology, which utilizes microbial flocs composed of bacteria, algae, and protozoa, presents another promising approach for improving water quality and nutrient recycling. By efficiently managing nitrogenous waste and providing an additional feed source, biofloc systems can reduce feed costs and support higher stocking densities, making them an attractive solution for intensive aquaculture (Avnimelech, 2012; Chauhan et al., 2024). However, while biofloc systems can enhance sustainability, their implementation requires careful monitoring of water quality parameters such as dissolved oxygen, pH, and carbon-nitrogen balance to prevent unintended ecological disturbances. Additionally, the long-term effects of continuous biofloc use on aquatic species' health and performance require further investigation. Despite the promising benefits of probiotic bacteria and biofloc systems, challenges remain regarding scalability, cost-effectiveness, and the potential for environmental risks if microbial communities become unbalanced. Future research should focus on optimizing these systems by integrating multi-species probiotics, refining biofloc composition, and assessing their combined impact on aquaculture sustainability. By addressing these challenges, aquaculture operations can maximize productivity while ensuring ecological and economic viability.

3.2 Plankton Diversity

The discussion on plankton diversity effectively establishes their fundamental role in aquatic food webs and nutrient cycling. However, while it highlights the importance of plankton in maintaining lake productivity, it lacks a deeper exploration of the mechanisms through which plankton diversity influences ecological stability and resilience. The assertion that phytoplankton serves as primary producers and supports higher trophic levels (Thakur et al., 2013; Rajak et al., 2023a; Rajak et al., 2023b; Singh et al., 2023) is well-founded, but the discussion could benefit from a more nuanced understanding of trophic interactions, such as top-down and bottom-up control mechanisms that regulate plankton populations. For instance, the role of zooplankton in controlling phytoplankton biomass through grazing pressure is an important aspect often overlooked in discussions of eutrophication. The mention of cyanobacteria dominance as an indicator of eutrophic conditions is relevant, but the review does not fully address the ecological consequences of algal blooms beyond their impact on nutrient balance. Harmful algal blooms (HABs), particularly those caused by cyanobacteria, can produce toxins that negatively impact aquatic organisms and human health (Reynolds et al., 2002). The omission of such consequences limits the discussion's applicability to real-world conservation and management efforts. Including the effects of HABs, such as hypoxia, fish kills, and toxin accumulation in aquatic food webs, would provide a more comprehensive perspective. Similarly, while the role of zooplankton in food webs is acknowledged, the discussion lacks specificity regarding their functional diversity. Zooplankton are not a homogenous group; different species play distinct roles in energy transfer and nutrient cycling. For example, cladocerans like *Daphnia* are efficient grazers of phytoplankton, whereas copepods exhibit more selective feeding behaviors and have different ecological impacts. Ignoring these distinctions reduces the depth of analysis regarding how different zooplankton communities influence lake dynamics under varying environmental conditions. Additionally, the influence of environmental factors such as climate change, pollution, and invasive species on plankton diversity is underexplored. Zooplankton populations are highly sensitive to shifts in temperature and chemical pollution, both of which can alter community structure and disrupt ecosystem stability (Juta and Marina, 2017). Climate change, for example, affects thermal stratification, which in turn impacts nutrient availability and seasonal plankton dynamics. Without addressing these external pressures, the discussion provides an incomplete picture of the threats to plankton diversity. Furthermore, while plankton are correctly identified as bioindicators of lake health, the discussion does not sufficiently elaborate on the methods used to monitor plankton diversity and abundance. Parameters such as chlorophyll-a concentration, species composition, and biomass fluctuations provide valuable insights, but there is little mention of modern monitoring techniques like remote sensing, flow cytometry, or molecular approaches that enhance our ability to assess plankton populations effectively. Including these aspects would strengthen the discussion by linking theoretical concepts to practical conservation applications. While the discussion highlights the significance of plankton diversity in lake ecosystems, it lacks depth in explaining functional diversity, trophic interactions, and ecological threats. A more comprehensive review should address harmful algal blooms, climate-driven changes in plankton dynamics, and modern monitoring techniques to better inform conservation strategies. Expanding these areas would provide a stronger, more actionable framework for managing lake biodiversity.

3.3 Phytoplankton in lake Ecosystems

The discussion effectively underscores the foundational role of phytoplankton as primary producers in lake ecosystems, emphasizing their role in energy transfer through the aquatic food web. Phytoplankton is the basis of the food chain because they are primary producers that use photosynthesis to transform solar energy into chemical energy. They are essential to maintaining the productivity of lake ecosystems since this energy is then passed on to higher trophic levels, such as zooplankton, tiny fish, and even birds. In these aquatic systems, phytoplanktons are essential for the movement of materials and energy, which supports the ecosystem's general health (Behrenfeld and Boss, 2014). Phytoplankton are fundamental to freshwater ecosystems, acting as the primary producers that convert dissolved nutrients into biomass, thereby supporting higher trophic levels (Reynolds, 2006). Their role as a food source for zooplankton, which in turn sustain fish populations, is critical to maintaining ecological balance in lakes. While the study of phytoplankton's role in food web dynamics is well-established, recent environmental changes—such as climate warming and altered nutrient loading—may significantly impact their community composition and productivity (Paerl & Huisman, 2008). Future research should focus on the resilience of phytoplankton communities to such environmental changes and their long-term effects on freshwater ecosystems. The commercial applications of phytoplankton, particularly in aquaculture, biofuel production, and nutrient cycling, highlight their economic significance. Their ability to regulate nutrient levels and prevent harmful algal blooms is a crucial aspect of maintaining water quality. However, excessive nutrient enrichment can lead to an imbalance in phytoplankton communities, favoring harmful cyanobacteria that produce toxins detrimental to aquatic life (Paerl et al., 2011). The challenge lies in managing phytoplankton populations effectively to optimize benefits while mitigating risks. Phytoplankton-based biofuel production has gained attention due to its potential as a renewable energy source (Chisti, 2007). The high lipid content of certain microalgae species allows for efficient biodiesel production. However, large-scale cultivation presents economic and technical challenges, including optimizing growth conditions, harvesting techniques, and ensuring cost-effectiveness. Despite these limitations, continued advancements in biotechnological approaches could enhance the feasibility of microalgal biofuels (Wijffels & Barbosa, 2010). Another important aspect is phytoplankton's role in integrated aquaculture systems, where they contribute to nutrient cycling and reduce reliance on artificial fertilizers (Boyd, 2018; Singh et al., 2025). This approach aligns with sustainable aquaculture practices, minimizing environmental impacts and promoting resource efficiency. However, achieving a stable phytoplankton community in such systems requires careful nutrient management to prevent shifts toward undesirable algal species that could degrade water quality. While phytoplankton offer both ecological and economic benefits, their management in freshwater systems must be approached with caution. Environmental factors such as climate change, nutrient pollution, and human interventions can alter phytoplankton dynamics, leading to unintended consequences such as eutrophication and biodiversity loss. Future research should emphasize ecosystem-based management strategies that balance phytoplankton's ecological roles with their commercial potential.

The review of various scholarly works and empirical studies reveals intricate ecological dynamics within lake ecosystems. A synthesized overview of microbial, phytoplankton, and zooplankton diversity highlights the vital contributions of these components to ecosystem functionality and resilience.

3.3.1 Diversity and Composition of Phytoplankton

The composition of phytoplankton communities in lakes is governed by multiple environmental factors, including nutrient levels, light availability, temperature, and water chemistry, which directly influence their diversity and distribution (Reynolds, 2006). While each phytoplankton group plays a distinct ecological role, their interactions and competitive dynamics are often overlooked. Diatoms, for example, are highlighted as primary producers in oligotrophic lakes with high transparency, yet their abundance in nutrient-rich waters appears contradictory, as eutrophic conditions typically favor cyanobacteria over diatoms (Bouwman et al., 2020). Furthermore, the role of diatoms in biogeochemical cycling, particularly in carbon fixation, is significant, but their susceptibility to environmental stressors such as pollution and climate change remains unaddressed. A more perspective would consider the shifting balance of phytoplankton groups due to anthropogenic influences and climate variability, which can alter lake ecosystem stability and trophic interactions.

Green algae thrive in mesotrophic and oligotrophic lakes, where high light penetration and moderate nitrogen levels support their growth, yet their adaptability to varying nutrient conditions raises questions about their ecological plasticity (Pokhrel et al., 2021; Rani et al., 2023). While their high photosynthetic efficiency allows rapid proliferation and a significant contribution to primary production, this could lead to imbalances if unchecked, particularly in nutrient-enriched waters where green algae may compete with or be overshadowed by cyanobacteria. Their role as a fundamental food source for zooplankton and higher trophic levels underscores their importance in energy transfer, yet variations in species composition within Chlorophyta and other phytoplankton groups, such as Euglenophyta and Charophyta, may alter food web dynamics (Behera et al., 2021; Kumar et al., 2023; Dixit et al., 2023). Moreover, while the influence of environmental variables like temperature and nutrient availability on phytoplankton diversity is acknowledged, the potential impact of climate change and anthropogenic disturbances on these assemblages requires further consideration to fully understand long-term shifts in lake ecosystems.

Cyanobacteria, particularly in eutrophic lakes, play a dual role in aquatic ecosystems. While their ability to fix nitrogen allows them to thrive in nutrient-poor conditions, their unchecked proliferation in nitrogen-rich waters can trigger harmful algal blooms (HABs), leading to oxygen depletion and water quality degradation (Paerl and Otten, 2013). The production of cyanotoxins by certain species exacerbates these issues, posing significant threats to aquatic organisms, livestock, and human health. The presence of toxic cyanobacteria, such as *Gloeocapsa calcarean*, *Chroococcidiopsis cubana*, *Leptolyngbya halophile*, and

Cyanobacterium aponinum in Iraqi water bodies, highlights the widespread impact of nutrient enrichment, often driven by urban pollution, sewage discharge, and agricultural runoff (Hatem and Al-Sultan, 2023). While the ecological consequences of cyanobacterial blooms are well-documented, the long-term resilience of lake ecosystems under increasing anthropogenic stressors remains uncertain. Effective management strategies are crucial to mitigating these effects, yet the persistence of cyanobacteria suggests that controlling nutrient inputs alone may not be sufficient to prevent their dominance.

Dinoflagellates, despite their lower prevalence in freshwater lakes compared to marine environments, exhibit ecological significance in mesotrophic to eutrophic conditions. Their capacity to form transient blooms underscores their influence on nutrient cycling and energy transfer within aquatic ecosystems (Reynolds et al., 2006; Singh et al., 2021). However, while they contribute to primary production, their blooms can have destabilizing effects, including hypoxia and competitive exclusion of other phytoplankton groups. The extent of their impact is highly variable, contingent upon factors such as nutrient influx, temperature fluctuations, and water column stability. Furthermore, their unpredictable bloom dynamics pose challenges for ecosystem management, as their presence can be both beneficial and disruptive. This duality necessitates further research into their ecological roles and regulatory mechanisms to mitigate potential adverse effects while maintaining their functional contributions to lake ecosystems.

3.4 Zooplankton in lake Ecosystems

Zooplankton serve as a fundamental component of lake ecosystems, mediating energy transfer between phytoplankton and higher trophic levels while also contributing to essential biogeochemical processes. Their role in the Biological Carbon Pump (BCP) highlights their significance beyond trophic interactions, as they facilitate carbon sequestration by transporting organic matter to deeper waters (Kwon et al., 2009). However, their populations are highly sensitive to environmental changes, including climate fluctuations, nutrient loading, and pollution. Disruptions in zooplankton communities can lead to imbalances in food web dynamics, potentially causing cascading effects on both primary producers and higher consumers. Furthermore, while their ability to regulate phytoplankton populations is crucial for maintaining ecosystem stability, shifts in species composition or biomass due to anthropogenic stressors could alter nutrient cycling and productivity. Given their role as bioindicators, continuous monitoring of zooplankton diversity and abundance is essential to assess ecosystem health and predict the long-term impacts of environmental disturbances on lake functionality.

Zooplankton play a fundamental role in lake ecosystems by regulating phytoplankton populations, contributing to nutrient cycling, and supporting higher trophic levels. The study by Tõnno et al. (2016) emphasizes the significance of copepods, rotifers, and cladocerans in maintaining water clarity and preventing algal blooms in eutrophic and oligotrophic lakes. Their grazing on phytoplankton helps control excessive nutrient buildup, thereby reducing the likelihood of toxic algal blooms that could lead to oxygen depletion and ecosystem imbalances. However, while the study provides valuable insights, it does not account for potential shifts in zooplankton community structure due to climate change, invasive species, or anthropogenic disturbances, which could alter their effectiveness in regulating phytoplankton populations. The study also highlights the indirect role of zooplankton in maintaining water quality by consuming bacteria and detritus. This process facilitates the breakdown of organic matter and the recycling of nutrients, promoting overall lake productivity. However, the extent to which zooplankton influence nutrient cycling can vary depending on lake-specific conditions, such as temperature, nutrient levels, and predation pressure. For instance, the presence of planktivorous fish can significantly reduce zooplankton populations, disrupting their regulatory functions and potentially leading to uncontrolled algal growth (Hansson et al., 2010). This trophic cascade effect suggests that zooplankton's ability to sustain ecological balance is highly context-dependent and requires further investigation under different environmental scenarios.

In addition to their ecological functions, zooplankton have commercial applications in aquaculture due to their high nutritional value. Copepods, in particular, are favored as feed because of their essential fatty acids, which are crucial for fish larvae development (Dhert et al., 2001). Rotifers, another widely used zooplankton species in hatcheries, are valued for their digestibility and ability to be mass-cultured, enhancing fish survival and growth rates. However, large-scale zooplankton cultivation presents challenges, including maintaining stable population densities, preventing contamination, and optimizing feed quality. Despite their ecological and commercial importance, zooplankton populations are highly sensitive to environmental changes, such as nutrient pollution, climate variability, and invasive species introduction. The disruption of zooplankton communities can lead to cascading effects throughout the food web, highlighting the need for sustainable lake management practices. Future research should focus on the interactive effects of multiple stressors on zooplankton populations and their long-term impact on lake ecosystem stability.

3.4.1 Diversity and Composition

Lake zooplankton populations play a fundamental role in energy transfer and nutrient cycling, but their composition and abundance are highly susceptible to environmental changes. While protozoa such as *Paramecium*, *Vorticella*, and *Stentor* contribute significantly to nutrient recycling, their increased abundance in eutrophic lakes suggests potential ecosystem imbalances driven by nutrient enrichment (Gilbert et al., 2021; Sommer et al., 2012). The predominance of rotifers and crustaceans, including copepods and cladocerans, in many lake systems underlines their importance in phytoplankton regulation and as a food source for higher trophic levels (Sterner et al., 1989). However, the seasonal fluctuations in zooplankton communities indicate their sensitivity to stratification, temperature changes, and nutrient dynamics, which can either enhance or limit their distribution (Sommer et al., 2012). The disruptive effects of human activities, particularly urbanization and agricultural runoff, exacerbate these shifts by introducing pollutants and excess nutrients, thereby altering species composition and reducing biodiversity (Allen, 2004). Investigating the relationship between zooplankton diversity and trophic status is crucial for understanding the broader implications of anthropogenic influences on freshwater ecosystems.

Numerous crustacean species from the key families Cladocera, Copepoda, and Ostracoda were found in a lake habitat, according to research by (Nevalainen and Luoto 2017). According to the study, the summer months had the largest crustacean population, while the monsoon season had the lowest number. According to Nevalainen and Luoto (2017), this seasonal variation is usually ascribed to variations in environmental factors that affect the development and reproductive cycles of crustaceans, such as water temperature, nutrient availability, and water level fluctuations. Crustacean growth and reproduction thrive in the summer months, which are frequently marked by higher temperatures and stable water conditions. Crustaceans thrive and reproduce best in the summer months, which are frequently marked by higher temperatures and stable water conditions. By changing the water chemistry and habitat conditions, the monsoon's increased rainfall and turbulence, on the other hand, might disturb zooplankton populations and result in lower crustacean numbers at this time. Similar results have been shown in other research, where nutrient cycling and climate variables impact the seasonal dynamics of zooplankton in lakes (Gilbert *et al*., 2021).

Table 2: Diversity of zooplanktons in different lake

Sr No.	Organisms	References
1	*Daphnia pulex, Polyphemus pediculus, Simocephalusvetulus Bosmina longirostris, Daphnia ambigua, Cyclopoid copepods, Chydorussphaericus, Ceriodaphniapulchella, Daphnia ambigua, Daphnia galeata , Bosmina longirostris.*	Cottenie*et al*., 2001
2	*Monostyla sp., Keratella sp., Lapadella sp., Leydigia sp., Moinodaphnia sp., Diaptomus sp., Diaphanosoma sp., Mesocyclopes sp., Cypris sp. and Brachionussp*	Thakur *et al*., 2013
3	*Lepadella ovalis*, *Chydorussphaericus, Eudiaptomusgracilis, Eudiaptomusgracilis, Brachionusfalcatus, Lecanetenuiseta, Ceriodap hniadubia*	Kuczyńska-Kippen and Pronin ,2018
4	*Chydorus, Ceriodaphnia, or Bosmina, Simocephalus ,Diaphanosoma, Ceriodaphnia, Chydorus, Alona, and adult cyclopoid copepods, Alona*	Thakur *et al* 2013
5	*Branchionus dimidiatus inermis , Notholcasquamula , Keratellataurocephala, Lecaneludwigii and Macrochaetuscollinsibrazilensis, Diaphanosomabrachyurum, Mesocyclops edax, Cyclocyprisserena , Chironomus sp, Filiniapejleri, Brachionus dimidiatus inermis, Keratellataurocephala, Lepadella patella similis, Albertia sp, Lecaneungulata, Elosaworrali, Trichocercabcristata, Daphnia longiremis, Eucyprisfuscatus, Corethrellasp, Hesperocorixaobliqua, Hydracainasp, Horaellabrehmi, Brachionusbudapentinensis, Notholcasquamula, Lecaneludwigii, Lecanelunaris, Lecanemonostyla copies, Macrochaetuscollinsibraziliensis, Belostomasp*	Adedeji *et al*., 2013
6	*Brachionuscaliciflorus, B. quadridentatus, Keratella. tecta, K. tropica, Chydorus sp., Daphnia galeataMesocyclopsaustraliensis*	Pearson and Duggan, 2018

4. Interaction between Phytoplankton and Zooplankton

The interaction between phytoplankton and zooplankton is a crucial determinant of lake ecosystem dynamics, influenced by environmental factors, predation, and nutrient availability. Studies, such as those by Nevalainen and Luoto (2017), have highlighted how functional diversity within zooplankton communities, particularly cladocerans, shifts in response to nutrient enrichment. Their research in eutrophic lakes of southern Finland demonstrated that increased food availability initially fosters functional diversity, with more filter feeders and predators emerging. However, such responses may not always be beneficial, as excessive nutrient enrichment can disrupt ecosystem stability. Similarly, (Hansson et al., 2003) examined the influence of fish predation on zooplankton-phytoplankton interactions, emphasizing how piscivorous fish indirectly support zooplankton populations by preying on smaller fish, thereby regulating phytoplankton levels. Conversely, high planktivorous fish populations reduce zooplankton numbers, leading to unchecked phytoplankton growth and potential eutrophication. Trophic cascades further illustrate the complexity of these interactions, where the presence of piscivorous fish alleviates grazing pressure on zooplankton, allowing them to regulate phytoplankton growth and maintain water clarity. However, when planktivorous fish dominate, zooplankton populations decline, leading to uncontrolled phytoplankton proliferation and eutrophication, a process that depletes oxygen and alters nutrient cycling. This ecological imbalance has far-reaching consequences, including reduced biodiversity and deteriorating water quality. The role of phytoplankton and zooplankton in primary production, nutrient cycling, and energy transfer is fundamental to maintaining lake health, making their diversity and abundance strong indicators of ecosystem productivity. As zooplankton serve as a key regulator of phytoplankton populations, disruptions to their communities can cascade throughout the food web, affecting fish populations and overall ecosystem stability.

5. Commercial Applications of Microbes, Zooplankton, and Phytoplankton in lake

The commercial utilization of microbes, zooplankton, and phytoplankton in lake ecosystems plays a significant role in industries such as aquaculture, agriculture, and environmental management. These organisms contribute to fisheries productivity and water quality maintenance, making them indispensable in aquaculture. Herbivorous zooplankton, primarily sustained by phytoplankton, serve as a critical food source for fish and other aquatic species. Additionally, species such as rotifers and Daphnia are widely employed as live feed to enhance the survival and growth of shrimp and fish larvae. However, while zooplankton supports aquaculture, its population dynamics can be affected by environmental fluctuations, influencing overall production stability (Lubzens et al 1989; Millset al 1993; Suleman et al., 2025). Microbial populations further enhance commercial applications by facilitating organic waste decomposition, nutrient recycling, and preventing harmful algal blooms. Their role in maintaining water quality is crucial, yet excessive reliance on microbial processes without proper ecosystem management can lead to imbalances. Despite their potential benefits, the commercial application of these organisms must be carefully regulated to ensure sustainability. Overexploitation or mismanagement could disrupt ecological balance, leading to unintended consequences such as trophic disruptions or invasive species dominance. Ultimately, integrating these biological components into industrial applications offers long-term benefits, but their use must align with ecological stability to sustain both economic and environmental interests.

6. Conclusion and Future Directions

This review emphasizes just how important microbes, zooplankton and phytoplankton are in keeping lake ecosystem healthy and thriving. Each of these microscopic organisms plays a unique and powerful role not just in sustaining the food web but also in maintaining water quality, supporting biodiversity and even offering real world commercial benefits. Microbes like bacteria and fungi quietly work behind the scenes to clean up lakes. They help break down organic waste, recycle essential nutrients like nitrogen and carbon and prevent the water from becoming overloaded with harmful substance. These microbial communities are also finding their way into aquaculture and environmental industries where they're being used to improve fish health clean polluted waters, and reduce the need for chemical. Zooplankton the tiny animal like organism in lake act as a vital bridge between primary producers and larger aquatic animals. They graze on phytoplankton (microscopic plants) helping keep algal populations in check and maintaining clear balanced water conditions. Their importance doesn't stop there they are also a major food source for fish. However factors like changing seasons, nutrient level and fish predation can all influence their populations. Understanding and managing these dynamics is essential for preserving the lake's natural balance. Phytoplankton the base of the aquatic food chain are central to lake productivity. They convert sunlight into energy through photosynthesis, supporting entire ecosystems from the bottom up. While they boost lake productivity and serve as critical food for zooplankton and fish, too many nutrients can cause their populations to explode resulting in harmful algal blooms, oxygen loss, and threats to aquatic life. At the same time, phytoplankton are being tapped for innovative uses, including biofuel production, nutrient cycling, and integrated aquaculture systems. Despite all these benefits human activities continue to place serious pressure on freshwater ecosystems. Pollution, climate change, urban growth, and uncontrolled nutrient runoff are disrupting natural processes. These stressors can damage microbial balance weaken zooplankton communities and allow harmful phytoplankton blooms to flourish. If left unmanaged such changes can reduce biodiversity and threaten both ecosystem stability and economic uses. To protect these vital ecosystems, we need smart, science-based management. That means improving water quality monitoring, limiting nutrient pollution, and understanding the natural relationships between microbial life, plankton, and fish. Supporting sustainable aquaculture, investing in ecological restoration, and integrating cutting-edge research—such as microbial probiotics or biofloc systems—can help us strike a better balance between productivity and environmental protection. The future of freshwater ecosystems depends on how well we understand and respect these tiny but powerful organisms. More research is needed to explore how they respond to environmental changes, how they interact with one another, and how we can use them more effectively in restoration projects, sustainable fish farming, and renewable energy. By combining ecological knowledge with sustainable practices, we can protect our lakes not just as water bodies, but as vibrant, living ecosystems that benefit both nature and people.

REFRENCES

1. Adedeji A A B, Adeniyi I F and Masundire H. 2013. Zooplankton abundance and diversity of fishponds exposed to different management practices. International Journal of Biological and Chemical Sciences. 7(2) pp.631-640.
2. Akhtar N, Ishak S, M I Bhawani S A and Umar K. 2021. Various natural and anthropogenic factors responsible for water quality degradation: A review. Water. 13(19) pp 2660.
3. Albert J S, Destouni G, Duke-Sylvester S M, Magurran A E, Oberdorff T, Reis R E, Winemiller K O and Ripple W J. 2021. Scientists' warning to humanity on the freshwater biodiversity crisis. Ambio. 50 (1) pp 85–94. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s13280-020-01318-8
4. Allen J D. 2004. Landscapes and Riverscapes: The Influence of Land Use on Stream Ecosystems. Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution and Systematics. 35 pp 257-284. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ecolsys.35.120202.110122
5. Anand S and Paul N. 2022. Occurrence of ciliates (protozoa) in ponds Lucknow City, Uttar Pradesh.
6. Avnimelech, Y. 2012. Biofloc Technology: A practical guide Book . World Aquaculture Society

7. Bashir I, Lone F A, Bhat R A, Mir S A, Dar Z A and Dar S A. 2020. Concerns and Threats of Contamination on Aquatic Ecosystems. Bioremediation and Biotechnology. pp 1-26. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-35691-0_1
8. Behera C, Pradhan B, Panda R R, Nayak R, Nayak S and Jena M. 2021. Algal Diversity of Saltpans, Humma (Ganjam), Odisha, India. The Journal of Indian Botanical Society. 101(1and2) pp 107-120.
9. Behrenfeld M J and Boss ES. 2014. Resurrecting the ecological underpinnings of ocean plankton blooms. *Annual review of marine science*. **6**(1) pp.167-194.
10. Belfiore A P, Buley R P, Fernandez-Figueroa E G, Gladfelter M F, Bhagowati B, Talukdar B and Ahamad K U.2020. Lakeeu trophication: causes,concerns and remedial measures. *Emerging Issues in the Water Environment during Anthropocene: A South East Asian Perspective*. pp 211-222. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-32-9771-5_12

11. Bocci V, Galafassi S, Levantesi C, Crognale S, Amalfitano S, Congestr R, Matturro B, Rossetti S, Pippo F D. 2024. Freshwater plastisphere: a review on biodiversity, risks, and biodegradation potential with implications for the aquatic ecosystem health. *Front. Microbial. Sec. Aquatic Microbiology*. **15**. doi: https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2024.139540
12. Bouwman A F *et al*. 2020. Phytoplankton ecology and primary production in lakes. Hydrobiologia. 847 (1) pp 55-70.
13. Boyd C E and Boyd C E. 2020. Eutrophication. Water Quality: An Introduction. pp.311-322
14. Boyd C E. 2019. Water Quality: An Introduction (2nd ed.). Springer.
15. Cantonati M, Poikane S, Pringle CM, Stevens LE, Turak E, Heino J, Richardson JS, Bolpagni R, Borrini A, Cid N, *et al*. 2020. Characteristics, Main Impacts, and Stewardship of Natural and Artificial Freshwater Environments: Consequences for Biodiversity Conservation. Water. 12(1) pp 260. Doi: https://doi.org/10.3390/w12010260
16. Chakraborty S, Karmaker D, Rahman M A, Bali S C, Das S K and Hossen R.. 2021. Impacts of pH and salinity on community composition, growth and cell morphology of three freshwater phytoplankton. Plant Science Today. 8(3) pp 655-661.
17. Chauhan, A., Chauhan, M., Sethi, M., Bodhe, A., Tomar, A., Shikha and Singh, N., 2024. Application of flower wastes to produce valuable products. *Valorization of biomass wastes for environmental sustainability: Green practices for the rural circular economy*, pp.251-268. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-52485-1_14
18. Chislock M F, Doster E, Zitomer R A and Wilson A E. 2013. Eutrophication: causes, consequences, and controls in aquatic ecosystems. Nature Education Knowledge. 4(4) pp10.
19. Chisti Y. 2007. Biodiesel from microalgae. Biotechnology advances. 25(3) pp.294-306.
20. Choi Y, Oh H J, Lee D H, Jang M H, Lee K L, Chang K H and Kim H W. 2023. Current Utilization and Further Application of Zooplankton Indices for Ecosystem Health Assessment of Lake Ecosystems. Sustainability. 15. Doi: https://doi.org/10.3390/su151410950
21. Cottingham A, Newsome R, Gillies C, and Tweedley J R. 2025. Can Ecosystem Transformations by Non-Indigenous Mussel Introductions Inform Shellfish Reef Restoration?. Journal of Marine Science and Engineering. 13(3) pp 441. Doi: https://doi.org/10.3390/jmse1303044

22. Cottenie K, Nuytten N, Michels E and De Meester L. 2001. Zooplankton community structure and environmental conditions in a set of interconnected ponds. Hydrobiologia, 442, pp.339-350.
23. Damseth S, Thakur K, Kumar R, Kumar S, Mahajan D, Kumari H, Sharma D and Sharma A K. 2024. Assessing the impacts of river bed mining on aquatic ecosystems: A critical review of effects on water quality and biodiversity. Hydro Research. 7 pp 122-130. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hydres.2024.01.004
24. Dixit, P., Singh, N., Singh, L., Srivastava, R.P., Pandey, S., Singh, S., Singh, A., Devkota, H.P., Verma, P.C., Saxena, G. and Ali, B., 2023. Screening for the biochemical profile and biological activity in Cephalotaxus and Taxus collected from north-eastern Himalayas. *ACS Agricultural Science & Technology*, *3*(8), pp.694-700. https://doi.org/10.1021/acsagscitech.3c00126
25. EPA (2017). Nutrient Pollution. (https://www.epa.gov/nutrientpollution)
26. Gilbert L. 2021. The Impacts of Climate Change on Ticks and Tick-Borne Disease Risk. Annual Review of Entomology. 66 (1) pp 373-388. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-ento-052720-094533
27. Godana G, Fufa F, Debesa G. 2022. Eichhornia crassipes expansion detection using geospatial techniques: lake Dambal, Oromia, Ethiopia. Environ Challeng. 9 pp 100616. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envc.2022.100616
28. Hai N V. 2015. The use of probiotics in aquaculture. Journal of Applied Microbiology. 119 (4) pp 917–935. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1111/jam.12886
29. Hansson L A, Nicolle A, Brönmark C. *et al*. 2010. Waterfowl, macrophytes, and the clear water state of shallow lakes. Hydrobiologia. 646 pp 101–109 .doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10750-010-0169-z
30. Hafeez, A., Batool, R., Arshad, A., Khan, M.N., Ali, S., Singh, N., Garhwal, V., Javed, M.A., Fatima, E., Suleman, F. and Ali, B., 2025. Soil and water conservation under changing climate. In *Challenges and Solutions of Climate Impact on Agriculture* (pp. 307-328). Academic Press. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-443-23707-2.00012-X
31. Hatem M T and Al-Sultan E Y. 2023. Morphological and Molecular Identification of Four Blue-Green Algae Isolated from Some Water Bodies in Basrah Governorate, Southern Iraq. Egyptian Journal of Aquatic Biology and Fisheries. 27(5) pp.661-675.
32. Herren L W, Brewton R A, Wilking L E, Tarnowski M E, Vogel M A, Hibbert L and Taylor G. 2022. Improving phosphate use efficiency in the aquatic crop watercress (*Nasturtium officinale*). *Horticulture research*. **9**. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1093/hr/uhac011
33. Higgins G O, *et al*. 2019. Invasive species in lake ecosystems: Impacts and management strategies. Environmental research. 14(3) pp 501-516.
34. Jayashankara V, Girish R and Hosmani S P. 2010. Microbial diversity and water quality index in temple ponds of Udupi district, Karnataka, India. Nature Environment and Pollution Technology. 9(1) pp 197-202.
35. Joseph V, Chellappan G, Aparajitha S, Ramya R N, Vrinda ,Rejish Kumar V J and Bright Singh I S. 2021. Molecular characterization of bacteria and archaea in a bioaugmented zero-water exchange shrimp pond. SN Applied Sciences. 3 pp.1-20.
36. Juta H and Marina H. 2017. How are spring zooplankton and autumn zooplankton influenced by water temperature in a polymictic lake? Proceedings of the Estonian Academy of Sciences. 66 pp 264. Doi: https://doi.org/10.3176/proc.2017.3.03
37. Kats L B and Ferrer R P. 2003. Alien predators and amphibian declines: Review of two decades of science and the transition to conservation. Diversity and Distributions. 9(2) pp99-110.

38. Keough J R, Thompson T A, Guntenspergen G R *et al*. 1999. Hydrogeomorphic factors and ecosystem responses in coastal wetlands of the Great Lakes. Wetlands. 19 pp 821–834. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03161786
39. Kwon E Y, Primeau F and Sarmiento J L. 2009. The impact of remineralization depth on the air–sea carbon balance. Nature Geoscience. 2(9) pp.630-635.
40. Kuczyńska-Kippen, N. and Pronin, M., 2018. Diversity and zooplankton species associated with certain hydroperiods and fish state in field ponds. Ecological Indicators, 90, pp.171-178.
41. Kumaraswamy T R, Javeed S, Javaid M and Naika K. 2020. Impact of Pollution on Quality of Freshwater Ecosystems. In: Qadri H, Bhat R, Mehmood M, Dar G. (eds) Fresh Water Pollution Dynamics and Remediation. Springer. pp 69-81. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-8277-2_5
42. Kumar R and Sharma R C. 2020. Microbial diversity in relation to physico-chemical properties of hot water ponds located in the Yamunotri landscape of Garhwal Himalaya. Heliyon. 6(9).
43. Kumar, M., Mehra, R., Yogi, R., Singh, N., Salar, R.K., Saxena, G. and Rustagi, S., 2023. A novel tannase from Klebsiella pneumoniae KP715242 reduces haze and improves the quality of fruit juice and beverages through detannification. *Frontiers in Sustainable Food Systems*, *7*, p.1173611. https://doi.org/10.3389/fsufs.2023.1173611
44. Kumar V. 2021. Microorganisms in Freshwater Ecosystems. Microbiology Notes. doi: https://microbiologynotes.org/microorganisms-in-freshwater-ecosystems/
45. Liu Y, Chen G, Jacob C M, Huang L, Liu X, *et al*. 2021.Land-use and climate controls on aquatic carbon cycling and phototrophs in karst lakes of southwest China. Science of The Total Environment. 751. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.141738
46. Lubzens E, Tandler A and Minkoff G. 1989. Rotifers as food in aquaculture. *Hydrobiologia*. **186** pp 387–400. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00048937
47. Mallick S and Ghosal R. 2022. Roadmaps for Environmental Protection and Sustainable Development. In Environmental Toxicology and Ecosystem (pp. 267-285). CRC Press.
48. Mammides C. 2020. A global assessment of the human pressure on the world's lakes. Global Environ Change. 63 pp 102084. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2020.102084
49. Mayfield A E, Seybold S J, Haag W R, Johnson M T, Kerns B K, Kilgo J C, Larkin D J, Lucardi R D, Moltzan B D, Pearson D E and Rothlisberger J D. 2021. Impacts of invasive species in terrestrial and aquatic systems in the United States. Invasive species in forests and rangelands of the United States: A comprehensive science synthesis for the United States forest sector. pp 5-39.
50. Meerhoff, M. and Beklioğlu, M., 2024. Shallow lakes and ponds. In Wetzel's Limnology (pp. 859-892). Academic Press.
51. Michaud J P. 1991. A citizen's guide to understanding and monitoring lakes and streams. Washington State Dept. of Ecology. 360. pp 407-7472.
52. Mills E L, Leach J H, Carlton J T and Secor C L. 1993. Exotic species in the Great Lakes: A history of biotic crises and anthropogenic introductions. *Journal of Great Lakes Research*. **19**(1) pp 1–54. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/S0380-1330(93)71197-1
53. Mishra K D. 1991. Impact of sewage and industrial pollution on physicochemical characteristics of water in river Betwa at Vidisha, Madhya Pradesh. *Indian Journal of Environmental Health*. **25** pp 288–299.
54. Moore M L. 1989. NALMS management guide for lakes and reservoirs. North American Lake Management Society. (http://www.nalms.org).

55. Morales T A, Dopson M, Athar R and Herbert R B. 2005. Analysis of bacterial diversity in acidic pond water and compost after treatment of artificial acid mine drainage for metal removal. Biotechnology and Bioengineering. 90 (5) pp 543-551. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1002/bit.20421
56. Mustafa S A, Al-Rudainy A J and Salman N M. 2024. Effect of environmental pollutants on fish health: An overview. Egyptian Journal of Aquatic Research. 50 (2) pp 225-233. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejar.2024.02.006
57. Nevalainen L and Luoto T P. 2017.Relationship between cladoceran (Crustacea) functional diversity and lake trophic gradients. Functional ecology. 31 (2) pp 488-498. doi: https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2435.12737
58. Nezbrytska I, Usenko O, Konovets I, Leontieva T, Abramiuk I, Goncharova M and Bilous O. 2022. Potential use of aquatic vascular plants to control cyanobacterial blooms: A review. *Water*. **14** (11) pp 1727.
59. Oksana, T. and Dmytro, G., 2021. Earth's Water Distribution. In Clean Water and Sanitation (pp. 1-14). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
60. Payton E A *et al*. 2023. Ch. 4: Water. Fifth National Climate Assessment. U.S. Global Change Research Program. Washington, DC. p. 4-5.
61. Paul M J and Meyer J L. 2001. Streams in the Urban Landscape. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics*. **32**(1) pp 333-365.
62. Paerl H W and Huisman J. 2009. Climate change: A catalyst for global expansion of harmful cyanobacterial blooms. Environmental Microbiology Reports. 1(1) pp 27-37.DOI: 10.1111/j.1758-2229.2008.00004.x
63. Paerl H W, Hall N S and Calandrino E S. 2011. Controlling harmful cyanobacterial blooms in a world experiencing anthropogenic and climatic-induced change. Science of the Total Environment. 409(10) pp 1739-1745. DOI: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2011.02.001
64. Paerl H W and Otten T G. 2013. Harmful Cyanobacterial Blooms: Causes, Consequences, and Controls. Microbial Ecology. 65 pp 1-18.
65. Parshad, J., Kumar, R., Chhokar, V., Partil, N., Beniwal, V., Singh, N., Kumar, A., Singh, N., Rajesh, Y.O.G.I. and Kemar, M., 2024. Paddy straw management: Alternative strategies and emerging technology for sustainable ecosystem. *Pedosphere*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pedsph.2024.06.004
66. Poff N L, Brinson M M and Day J W. 2002. Aquatic ecosystems and global climate change. Pew Center on Global Climate Change, Arlington, VA, 1-44.
67. Pokhrel S, Ghimire N P and Rai S K. 2021. Seasonal variation of algal diversity with reference to water quality in Jagadishpur Reservoir, Nepal. *Limnological Review*. **21**(4) pp.189-199.
68. Ran J, Xiang R, He J, Zheng B. 2023. Spatiotemporal variation and driving factors of water quality in Yunnan-Guizhou plateau lakes, China. J ContamHydrol. 25 pp 104141. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jconhyd.2023.104141
69. Rajak, B.K., Rani, P., Singh, N. and Singh, D.V., 2023a. Sequence and structural similarities of ACCase protein of Phalaris minor and wheat: An insight to explain herbicide selectivity. *Frontiers in Plant Science*, *13*, p.1056474.
70. Rani, S., Gupta, A., Kaushik, D., Rustagi, S., Malik, S., Yogi, R. and Singh, N., 2024. Insilico structural modeling of normal and mutated subunits of ADP-glucose pyrophosphorylase from Triticum aestivum to study protein-protein interactions. https://doi.org/10.14719/pst.2701
71. Rajak, B.K., Rani, P., Mandal, P., Chhokar, R.S., Singh, N. and Singh, D.V., 2023b. Emerging possibilities in the advancement of herbicides to combat acetyl-CoA

carboxylase inhibitor resistance. *Frontiers in Agronomy*, *5*, p.1218824. https://doi.org/10.3389/fagro.2023.1218824
72. Reid G K, Gurney-Smith H J, Flaherty M, Garber A F *et al*.2019. Climate change and aquaculture: considering adaptation potential. Aquacult Environ Interact. 11 pp 603-624. doi: https://doi.org/10.3354/aei00333
73. Reynolds C S, Huszar V, Kruk C, Flores L N and Melo S. 2002. Towards a functional classification of the freshwater phytoplankton. Journal of Plankton Research. 24 (5) pp 417–428. doi: https://doi.org/10.1093/plankt/24.5.417
74. Reynolds C S. 2006. The Ecology of Phytoplankton. Cambridge University Press.
75. Sahu A K, Mir S, Nayak B and Baitharu I. 2024. Sustainable management of eutrophication and problems associated with the algal toxin in ponds and lakes of rural areas. *In Water Resources Management for Rural Development*. pp 155-170.
76. Schindler D and Scheuerell M D.2002. Habitat coupling in lake ecosystems. Oikos advancing ecology. 98 (2) pp 177-189. doi: https://doi.org/10.1034/j.1600-0706.2002.980201.x
77. Singh, N., Mansoori, A., Jiwani, G., Solanke, A.U., Kumar, R. and Kumar, A., 2021. Evaluation of antioxidant and antimicrobial potential of Thespesia lampas root extracts. *Journal of experimental biology and agricultural sciences*, *9*(1), pp.87-99.
78. Singh, N., Jiwani, G., Rocha, L.S. and Mazaheri, R., 2023. Bioagents and volatile organic compounds: An emerging control measures for rice bacterial diseases. In *Bacterial Diseases of Rice and Their Management* (pp. 255-274). Apple Academic Press. https://doi.org/10.1201/9781003331629
79. Singh, S., Thakur, A., Dulta, K., Sharma, A.J., Kumar, N., Dwivedi, S., Choudhury, M.D., Verma, K. and Singh, N., 2025. Effects of exogenous proline treatment on antioxidant and biochemical parameters in Lepidium sativum L. plants cultivated in a water-stressed condition. *Plant Science Today*, *12*, p.5560. doi:10.14719/pst.5560
80. Smitha S, Shivashankar P and Venkataramana G. 2013. Zooplankton diversity of Chikkadevarayana canal in relation to physico-chemical characteristics. *J Environ Biol*. **34** pp 819- 824
81. Smith V H. 2003. Eutrophication of freshwater and coastal marine ecosystems: A global problem. Environmental Science and Pollution Research. 10(2) pp 126-139.
82. Smith V H, Joye S B and Howarth R W. 2006. Eutrophication of freshwater and marine ecosystems. Limnology and Oceanography. 51(1) pp 351-355. DOI: https://doi.org/10.4319/lo.2006.51.1_part_2.0351
83. Sommer U, Adrian R, Domis L D S, Elser J J, Gaedke U, Ibelings B *et al.* J 2012.Beyond the Plankton Ecology Group (PEG) Model: Mechanisms Driving Plankton Succession. Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics. 43(1) pp 429-448. doi: https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-ecolsys-110411-160251
84. Sterner R W. 1989. The Role of Grazers in Phytoplankton Succession. In: Sommer, U. (eds) Plankton Ecology. Brock/Springer Series in Contemporary Bioscience. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-74890-5_4
85. Suleman, F., Arshad, A., Fatima, M., Batool, R., Hafeez, A., Ali, S., Khan, M.N., Singh, N., Fahad, S. and Ali, B., 2025. Regulation of mineral nutrition in plants by biochar under abiotic stress. In *Biochar in mitigating abiotic stress in plants* (pp. 135-144). Academic Press.
86. Tao S, Fang J, Ma S, Cai Q, Xiong X, Tian D, Zhao X *et al*. 2020. Changes in China's lakes: climate and human impacts. National Science Review. 7 (1) pp 132–140. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1093/nsr/nwz103
87. Thakur R K, Jindal R, Singh U B. *et al*. 2013. Plankton diversity and water quality assessment of three freshwater lakes of Mandi (Himachal Pradesh, India) with special

reference to planktonic indicators. Environ Monit Assess. 185 pp 8355–8373. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10661-013-3178-3

88. Tibebe D, Zewge F, Lemma B, Kassa Y. 2022. Assessment of spatio-temporal variations of selected water quality parameters of Lake Ziway, Ethiopia using multivariate techniques. BMC Chem. 16(1) pp 11. doi: https://doi.org/10.1186/s13065-022-00806-0
89. Tong Q, Dong W J, Long X Z, Hu Z F, Luo Z W, Guo P and Cui L Y, 2023. Effects of fine-scale habitat quality on activity, dormancy, habitat use, and survival after reproduction in Rana dybowskii (Chordata, Amphibia). *BMC zoology*. **8** (1) pp 1.
90. Tõnno I, Agasild H, Kõiv T, Freiberg R, Nõges P and Nõges T. 2016. Algal Diet of Small-Bodied Crustacean Zooplankton in a Cyanobacteria-Dominated Eutrophic Lake. PLoS ONE. 11(4). Doi: https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0154526
91. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 2020. "Acid Rain and its Effects on Freshwater Ecosystems." EPA Report.
92. Vörösmarty C J, Wostl C P, Bunn S E and Lawford R. 2013.Global water, the anthropocene and the transformation of a science. Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability. 5 (6) pp 539-550. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2013.10.005
93. Walker I R and Elias S A. 2025. Chironomid overview. Editor(s): Elias S. Encyclopedia of Quaternary Science (Third edition). Elsevier. 1 pp 409-417. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-323-99931-1.00127-6
94. Weber H and Sciubba J D. 2018. The Effect of Population Growth on the Environment: Evidence from European Regions. *European journal of population*. **35**(2) pp 379–402. Doi:https://doi.org/10.1007/s10680-018-9486-0
95. Wijffels R H and Barbosa M J. 2010. An outlook on microalgal biofuels. Science. 329(5993) pp 796-799. DOI: 10.1126/science.1189003
96. Williams P, Biggs J, Fox G, Nicolet P and Whitfield M. 2010. History, origins, and importance of temporary ponds. *Freshwater Biology.* **55**(5) pp 626-635.
97. Williams P, Whitfield M, Biggs J, Bray S, Fox G, Nicolet P and Sear D. 2004. Comparative biodiversity of rivers, streams, ditches, and ponds in an agricultural landscape in southern England. *Biological Conservation*. **115** (2) pp 329-341.
98. Woolway R I, Kraemer B M, Lenters J D *et al*. 2020. Global lake responses to climate change. Nature Reviews Earth and Environment. 1 pp 388–403. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1038/s43017-020-0067-5
99. Xie M, Li Y and Cai X. 2024.Hydrological responses to the synergistic climate and land-use changes in the upper Lancang river basin. Environ. Res. Lett. 19. doi: https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/ad1347
100. Zeng S, Wei D, Hou D, Wang H, Liu J, Weng S, He J and Huang Z. 2021. Sediment microbiota in polyculture of shrimp and fish pattern is distinctive from those in monoculture intensive shrimp or fish ponds. *Science of The Total Environment*. **787** pp 47594.