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Abstract

In order to enhance ecological knowledge for coastal and mangrove ecosystem conservation in Ghana, the study documents the taxonomic groups of benthic macrofauna and fish assemblages in an urban mangrove swamp as its fundamental objective with emphasis on their composition, richness and diversity. This is because benthic and fish fauna of mangrove habitats are amongst the least studied biota in Ghana. Fish and benthos sampling was undertaken from five randomly selected pools within a mangrove stand during the wet and dry seasons using pole-seine net (7 m long and 1.5 m depth, with stretched mesh size of 5 mm) and an Ekman grab (15 cm × 15 cm dimensions), respectively. All samples were preserved in 10% formalin for laboratory analysis. The results indicated a more diverse macrozoobenthic community in the wet (H指数 = 1.8) than dry season (H指数 = 1.5). Overall, five out of a total of 13 genera found are intolerant to pollution and four moderately tolerant, while four comprising polychaetes and the midge Chironomus, are pollution tolerant. This suggests that the mangrove habitat is less polluted. A grand total of 917 fish specimens, belonging to 15 species and nine families, were encountered for both seasons (371 and 546 specimens for wet and dry seasons, respectively). The black-chinned tilapia, Sarotherodon melanotheron, was the dominant fish species in the wet season, accounting for 54.2% of the total fish caught, whilst the grey mullets, Mugil babinensis and Mugil curena, were the dominant species in the dry season, with a combined total of 51.4% of the fish population. However, over 70% of these dominant fish species from both seasons were juveniles providing a strong justification for the observation that the mangrove habitats are nursery grounds for fish inhabiting adjacent riverine, estuarine and inshore marine habitats. Considering this relevance of mangroves and the ongoing conversion attempts of mangrove habitats to other land uses, a concerted mangroves conservation effort is strongly advocated.

Introduction

The uniqueness of mangrove habitats as ecotones linking freshwater marshes to estuarine biomes has since been recognized especially from their physiographic attributes (Singkran & Sudara, 2005; George, et al., 2009) to their role as refuge for benthic macroinvertebrates (George et al., 2009; Olomukoro & Azubuike, 2009; George et al., 2010), and habitat for fish fauna have been documented (Little et al., 1988; Rehage & Loftus, 2007). Other exploratory studies have also revealed the usefulness of mangrove habitats as nursery grounds for juvenile fishes from both freshwater and marine sources (Little et al., 1988; Singkran & Sudara, 2005; Mwandya et al., 2009), as biotope for benthic macrofauna, which play a vital role in the circulation and recirculation of nutrients in aquatic ecosystems (Gallep et al., 1978), as well as serve as food for a wide range of fishes (Idowu & Ugwumba, 2005; Arslan et al., 2007). Consequently, the need for conserving mangrove ecosystems with the ultimate goal of protecting their biota, ecological functions

and other socio-economic services is extremely important (Aheto, 2011). A better understanding of the fish community structure and benthic macrofauna assemblages in mangrove systems is relevant for understanding the functional role of mangroves, which could ultimately inform and shape management and conservation decisions (Scherer-Lorenzen, 2005), especially in face of the ongoing degradation of mangrove wetlands at local and global scales (Field, 1998; Bosire et al., 2008).

Unfortunately in Ghana, benthic macroinvertebrate and fish biota of mangrove habitats are the least studied coastal ecosystem communities. Most of the studies have focused on communities of lagoons (Blay & Dongdem, 1996; Gordon, 2000; Lamptey & Armah, 2008; Okyere et al., 2011a; Aggrey-Fynn et al., 2011), estuaries (Blay, 1997; Okyere et al., 2011a) and associated marshes (Okyere et al., 2011b; Okyere et al., 2012).

It is reported that the Kakum estuary mangrove system has the highest species diversity in Ghana made up of the red mangroves (*Rhizophora harrisonii*, *Rhizophora racemosa* and *Rhizophora mangle*), the black mangrove (*Avicennia germinans*) and the white mangrove (*Laguncularia racemosa*) (Sackey et al., 1993). These species occur between the Kakum river estuary and the Kakum estuary salt marsh. Despite the functional role played by the mangrove habitats in terms of the provision of goods and other ecological services, very few published study exist on the mangroves and its adjoining biotopes as a whole. Aheto et al. (2011) assessed the structural parameters and above-ground biomass of the mangroves. Blay (1997) looked at the occurrence and diversity of fish species entering the estuary while Okyere et al. (2011b) and Okyere et al. (2012) investigated the macrozoobenthic and fish communities of the salt marsh adjoining the mangroves. None of these studies extended to investigate the biotic communities of the mangrove habitat fringing the estuary.

The gaps existing between the aforementioned studies largely constrain knowledge on the macrobenthic biota and fish community structure of the habitat, which is a very relevant precursor to inform, shape and promote mangrove management and conservational efforts on the local scale. This study, therefore, aims at bridging this research gap by investigating the richness, diversity and composition of the benthic macroinvertebrate and fish communities in the Kakum estuary mangrove habitat in Ghana.

**Materials and methods**

**Study site**

The Kakum estuary mangrove system is located in the Central Region of Ghana (Latitudes 5°5’40” N and 5°6’05” N; Longitudes 1°19’10” W and 1°19’20” W) (Fig.1). The mangroves fringe the banks and catchments of the estuary of River Kakum, which discharges into the Atlantic Ocean. Occurring within the mangrove system are patches of marshes and sparsely distributed but interconnected pools through tidal exchanges. The pools serve as microhabitats within the mangrove swamp and provide refuge for a variety of fauna. Sampling was conducted in five large pools; three pools within the forested areas (designated Pools A-C) and two from the marshy areas (designated Pools D & E). These pools were
selected along the stretch of the mangrove forest from the mouth of the estuary (Pool A) to the inland end of the mangrove (Pool E). This was to enable analysis of possible transition in faunal assemblages from the seaward portions of the swamp to the inland end (Fig. 1). Seasonal sampling was undertaken during two field visits in March and April 2011 for wet season survey, and November 2012 to January 2013 for dry season survey. Pools D and E dried up during the dry season and were, therefore, not sampled for the latter.

**Sampling of benthic and fish macrofauna**

A 15 cm × 15 cm Ekman grab was used for the benthic sediment sampling; three replicates per pool were taken on each of the two field visits. The samples were screened in the field using a set of sieves of mesh sizes 4 mm, 2 mm and 0.5 mm, and the retained organisms preserved in 10% formalin for detailed examination in the laboratory. Prior to sorting out the organisms, the samples were dyed with eosin to enhance their visibility. The macrofauna found were identified with the aid of laboratory manuals.

Fig. 1. Map of the study area showing sampled pools
Macrobenthos and fish data analysis

The macroinvertebrate and fish data were, respectively, analysed for generic and species composition, richness, diversity and evenness. The richness was determined using Margalef index ($d$):

$$d = \frac{s-1}{\ln N}$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)

where $s$ is the number of species in the sample, and $N$ is the number of individuals in the sample while diversity was ascertained by the Shannon-Wiener index ($H'$):

$$H' = -\sum_{i=1}^{s} p_i (\ln p_i)$$  \hspace{1cm} (2)

where $s$ is the number of species in the pool and $p_i$ is the proportion of individuals belonging to species $i$ in the pool (Krebs 1999). The evenness component ($J'$) of diversity was calculated from Pielou’s index (Pielou, 1966):

$$J' = H' / H_{\text{max}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (3)

where $H_{\text{max}} = \ln s$. The size range of the fish specimens from each of the pools was also analyzed and tabulated. The invertebrates were classified based on their pollution tolerance following Ward (1992).

Results

Occurrence, richness and diversity of macrobenthic fauna

The zoobenthic organisms collected in both seasons (Table 1) were predominantly larvae of insects from eight genera belonging to seven families of six orders, most of which were found in only one or two of the pools sampled. Three polychaete genera (Capitella, Nereis and Spio) were encountered only during the dry season. The only crustacean genus encountered, Echinogammarus, of the order Amphipoda was present in all pools in both seasons while gastropods of the genus Lymnaea were found in two of the pools only in the wet season. Amongst the 13 invertebrate genera encountered in the mangrove habitat, five are pollution intolerant, four are moderately tolerant while four comprising the polychaetes and the midge Chironomus are pollution tolerant.

In the wet season, Pools A and B which were nearer to the seaward portion of the mangrove swamp had slightly higher number of invertebrate genera (five each) inhabiting them compared to Pools D and E in the marshy patches (four genera each) with Pool C recording the presence of only three genera (Table 1). This was reflected in the generic richness and diversity indices where Pools A and B had richer ($d = 1.5$ and 1.4, respectively) and more diverse ($H' = 1.5$ each) macroinvertebrate genera than Pools D ($d = 0.9$, $H' = 1.3$) and E ($d = 0.8$, $H' = 1.3$) with least being recorded in Pool C.
TABLE 1
Seasonal occurrence and diversity of benthic macrofauna taxa in five pools in the Kakum estuary mangrove habitat in Ghana (pollution tolerance classification in parenthesis)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Order</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Genus</th>
<th>Wetseason (Mar.-Apr.)</th>
<th>Dryseason (Nov.-Jan.)</th>
<th>Pools</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A  B  C  D  E</td>
<td>A  B  C  D  E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gastropoda</td>
<td>Basommatophora</td>
<td>Lymnaeidae</td>
<td>Lymnaea</td>
<td>+  -  +  -  -</td>
<td>-  -  -  -  -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insecta</td>
<td>Crustacea</td>
<td>Amphipoda</td>
<td>Gammaridae</td>
<td>+  +  +  +  +</td>
<td>+  +  +  +  +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ephemeroptera</td>
<td>Oligoneuriidae</td>
<td>-  -  -  +  +</td>
<td>-  -  -  -  -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Baetidae</td>
<td>Cloeon (NT)</td>
<td>+  -  -  -  -</td>
<td>-  -  -  -  -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Centropilum (NT)</td>
<td>+  -  -  -  -</td>
<td>-  -  -  -  -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diptera</td>
<td>Chironomidae</td>
<td>Chironomus (T)</td>
<td>+  -  -  -  +</td>
<td>+  +  +  +  +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Megaloptera</td>
<td>Sialidae</td>
<td>-  +  -  -  -</td>
<td>-  +  -  -  -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trichoptera</td>
<td>Hydropsychidae</td>
<td>-  -  -  +  +</td>
<td>-  -  -  +  +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Odonata</td>
<td>Ischnura (MT)</td>
<td>-  +  +  +  -</td>
<td>+  +  +  +  -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coleoptera</td>
<td>Elmidae</td>
<td>-  -  -  +  +</td>
<td>-  -  -  +  +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Polychaeta</td>
<td>Phyllodocida</td>
<td>Nereida</td>
<td>-  -  -  -  -</td>
<td>+  +  +  +  +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spionida</td>
<td>Spio (T)</td>
<td>-  -  -  -  -</td>
<td>+  +  +  +  +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Capitellida</td>
<td>Caniellida</td>
<td>-  -  -  -  -</td>
<td>+  +  +  +  +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of orders sampled</td>
<td>4 5 3 4 4</td>
<td>8 4 5 5 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4 5 5 0 0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of families sampled</td>
<td>3 5 3 4 4</td>
<td>9 4 5 5 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4 5 4 0 0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of genera sampled</td>
<td>5 5 3 4 4</td>
<td>10 4 5 4 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4 5 4 0 0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margalef’s Richness (d)</td>
<td>1.5 1.4 0.6 0.9 0.8</td>
<td>1.8 0.9 1.1 1.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 5 4 0 0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shannon – Wiener diversity (H')</td>
<td>1.5 1.5 1.1 1.3 1.3</td>
<td>1.8 1.3 1.3 1.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 5 4 0 0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pielou’s evenness (J')</td>
<td>0.9 0.9 0.9 0.9 0.9</td>
<td>0.8 0.8 0.8 0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 5 4 0 0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ denotes present; - denotes absent; NT – Not tolerant to pollution; MT – Moderately tolerant to pollution; T – pollution tolerant
Comparatively, the overall community in the mangrove was richer and diverse in the wet season \( (d = 1.8, H' = 1.8) \) than in the dry season \( (d = 1.4, H' = 1.5) \). The closeness of the evenness index to 1.0 \( (J' = 0.8) \) in all pools and seasons indicates that the individuals are evenly distributed among the genera.

**Composition of the benthic macroinvertebrate community**

As illustrated in Fig. 2, the amphipods, *Echinogammarus*, were common in all pools in both seasons, generally constituting between 20% and 45% of the individuals in the pools while damselfly larvae (*Ischnura*: Odonata), which were also abundant in most pools made up between 20% and 40% of the benthos. The composition of the three Ephemeroptera (mayfly) genera *Elassoneuria*, *Cloeon* and *Centropilum* varied between 10% and 35% in the various pools in which they occurred. The midge larvae (*Chironomus*: Diptera) were the least abundant benthos in the wet season constituting 6.6% of the macrofauna in only Pool A where they were sampled, but they became abundant in the dry season where their composition varied between 20% and 53% in the three existing pools. The polychaetes were also considerably represented (5%–20%) in the dry season.

**Fish species occurrence, richness and diversity**

A total of 917 fish specimens belonging to 19 species and 11 families including two species of marine crabs and two marine shrimps were sampled (Table 2). In both seasons, most of the species occurred in one or two pools especially (among Pools A, B and C), except the black-chinned tilapia, *Sarotherodon melanotheron* (Cichlidae), which was caught in all pools and the mudskipper, *Periophthalmus barbarus* (Gobiidae), which was found in four pools in the wet season. Ten species were caught in the wet season while 15 species were caught in the dry season. Species richness and diversity were higher in the dry season \( (d = 2.22; H' = 1.61) \) than in the wet season \( (d = 1.52; H' = 1.43) \). Also, individuals were somehow evenly distributed among the species \( (J' > 0.6) \) in both seasonal communities.

**Composition of the fish community**

Result of the percentage composition of the different fishes encountered from the pools in the two seasons is presented in Fig. 3. The community in the wet season was dominated by the black-chinned tilapia *S. melanotheron* (54.2%) and the grey mullet *Mugil curema* (20.2%) with the eeltilapia *Kribia nana* also occurred in considerably good numbers (6.7%). In the dry season, however, the four grey mullets *Mugil curema*, *Mugil bananensis*, *Mugil cephalus* and *Liza dumerilii*, together made up about 60% of the community while the banded lampeye *Aplocheilichthys spilauchen* constituted 22.5%. Each of the remaining 10 species were lowly represented (<4%).

**Size range of fish species**

The community consisted of fish from freshwater, brackishwater and marine sources (Table 3) of which majority were smaller individuals. Over 70% of the *S. melanotheron* caught measured 6.0–6.9 cm with the largest specimen measuring 7.6 cm while the four specimens of *Tilapia zillii* sampled measured 4.5 cm each. Similarly,
Fig. 2. Percentage composition of the different benthic macroinvertebrate genera collected from the five pools in the Kakum estuary mangrove in two seasons.
### TABLE 2
Seasonal occurrence and diversity of fish species in five pools in the Kakum estuary mangrove habitat in Ghana

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Species (Ecological range)</th>
<th>Wet Season (Mar-Apr)</th>
<th>Dry Season (Nov-Jan)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pool A, B, C, D, E</td>
<td>Overall A, B, C, D, E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FISH</td>
<td>Species (Ecological range)</td>
<td>Wet Season (Mar-Apr)</td>
<td>Dry Season (Nov-Jan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pool A, B, C, D, E</td>
<td>Overall A, B, C, D, E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINFISH</td>
<td>Tilapia zilli (BW-FW)</td>
<td>+ + - - -</td>
<td>+ - + - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CICHLIDAE</td>
<td>Sarotherodon melanotus (BW-FW)</td>
<td>+ + + + +</td>
<td>+ - + - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CICHLIDAE</td>
<td>Oreoichromis niloticus (FW-BW)</td>
<td>- - - - -</td>
<td>+ + - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARANGIDAE</td>
<td>Hemiconax bicolor (MN-BW)</td>
<td>- - - - -</td>
<td>+ - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELEOTRIDAE</td>
<td>Kribuana (BW)</td>
<td>+ + - - -</td>
<td>- - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELEOTRIDAE</td>
<td>Bostryxus africanus (MN-BW-FW)</td>
<td>- - - - -</td>
<td>+ - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELOPIDAE</td>
<td>Elops lacerta (MN-BW-FW)</td>
<td>+ + - - -</td>
<td>+ - + - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOBIIDAE</td>
<td>Awaous guineensis (MN-BW-FW)</td>
<td>+ + - - -</td>
<td>+ - + - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOBIIDAE</td>
<td>Sicydium crenilabrum (FW-BW)</td>
<td>- - - - -</td>
<td>+ - + - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUGILIDAE</td>
<td>Mugil cephalus (MN-BW)</td>
<td>- + - - -</td>
<td>+ + - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUGILIDAE</td>
<td>Mugil cephalus (MN-BW-FW)</td>
<td>- + - - -</td>
<td>+ + - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUGILIDAE</td>
<td>Mugil cephalus (MN-BW)</td>
<td>- + - - -</td>
<td>+ + - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSEUDOCILIAE</td>
<td>Aplodgei (BW-FW)</td>
<td>- - - - -</td>
<td>+ - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRUSTACEANS</td>
<td>Collinites annicola (MN-BW)</td>
<td>+ - + - -</td>
<td>+ - + - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PENAEIDAE</td>
<td>Penaeus setiferus (MN-BW)</td>
<td>- - - - -</td>
<td>+ - + - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAPSIDAE</td>
<td>Pachygrapsus transversus (MN-BW)</td>
<td>+ - - - -</td>
<td>+ - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARISTIDAE</td>
<td>Plesopenaeus edwardsianus (MN-BW)</td>
<td>+ + - - -</td>
<td>+ + - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of families sampled</td>
<td>7 7 4 2 2 8 6 2 7 0 0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of species sampled</td>
<td>8 9 4 2 2 10 12 2 10 0 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margalef's Richness (d)</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shannon - Wiener diversity (H')</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pielou's evenness (J')</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*+ indicates present; - indicates not found; FW-BW: Freshwater species occasionally entering brackishwater; BW-FW: Brackishwater species occasionally entering freshwater; MN-BW: Marine species occasionally entering brackishwater; MN-BW-FW: Marine species that primarily use estuarine mangrove*
Aheto et al.: Survey of the benthic macrofauna and fish species in a mangrove habitat

Fig. 3. Percentage composition of the different fish species sampled from the Kakum estuary mangrove habitat (Combined data from all five pools for each season)
over 90% of the grey mullets caught were within or below the class range of 6.0–6.9 cm, the West African lady fish *Elops lacerta* specimens had total length of 12 cm, or less, and the marine crabs *Callinectes anonicola* and *Pachygrapsus transversus* were less than 7 cm in carapace width.

**Discussion**

A multiplicity of factors including habitat physiographic attributes and microhabitat diversity influence the structure, distribution, diversity, and composition of the benthic macroinvertebrate communities (Galdean *et al.*, 2000, 2001; Callisto *et al.*, 2001; Aggrey-Fynn *et al.*, 2011). Although generic richness and diversity of benthos did not vary markedly among the sampled pools, the slight variability observed could be a reflection of microhabitat heterogeneity within the habitat, with conditions being somehow more favourable in the wet than the dry season, the pools nearer to the estuarine waters (Pools A and B) being slightly richer and diverse than those further away (Pools C, D and E). This is because a little more macrofauna were found in the former pools than the latter. In the same regard, microhabitat variability may have accounted for the obvious disparity in fish assemblages in the pools, where species richness and diversity were higher in Pools A and B ($d > 1.5; H^l > 1.4$) but markedly poor in Pools D and E ($d < 0.3; H^l < 0.3$) located in the marshy patches of the habitat.

Overall, 13 genera of benthic macrofauna belonging to 12 families found in the habitat were comparatively similar to the communities in other West African habitats where over 12 families of 19 species including polychaete and oligochaete worms have been recorded (George *et al.*, 2009; Olomukoro & Azubuike, 2009; George *et al.*, 2010). The data showed marked variations in occurrence and diversity of the macrobenthic community in the wet and dry seasons. This finding supports earlier studies that confirm that macrobenthos abundance and diversity is influenced by seasonality (Oliveira *et al.*, 1997; Bispo & Oliveira, 1998; Gordon, 2000; Lamptey & Armah, 2008).

The Kakum habitat supports a considerably higher number of benthic macrofauna taxa than the adjoining salt marsh where Okyere *et al.* (2011b) found only chironomid larvae (Diptera) and oligochaete worms (Oligochaeta) in an 8-month study. In addition, the abundance of pollution intolerant invertebrates such as mayflies (Ephemeroptera) and moderately tolerant ones such as the damselfly (Odonata) is a possible indication of low levels of pollution in the mangrove swamp, compared to the salt marsh, which was highly dominated by the pollution tolerant chironomid larvae (Okyere *et al.*, 2011b). The occurrence and composition of fish species in brackishwater habitats in the tropics mostly has its driving force to be salinity (Little *et al.*, 1988). This is a major reason why most of the fish species observed in the dry season were from the marine and brackishwater origins (Table 2).

In the dry season, there is little or no rainfall and evaporation is a dominant factor that facilitates a net landward flux of saline water into mangrove habitats. However, occasional rainfall or runoffs is a controlling factor of the salinity budgets in these habitats (Benfer *et al.*, 2007). This may have accounted for the presence of freshwater fish species during the dry season. In the wet
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPECIES</th>
<th>Wet season (Mar.-Apr.)</th>
<th>Dry season (Nov.-Jan.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total length (cm)</td>
<td>Composition of modal class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*No.</td>
<td>Min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Finfish</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Tilapia zillii</em> (BW-FW)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sarotherodon melanotheron</em> (BW-FW)</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Oreochromis niloticus</em> (FW-BW)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hemicaranx bicolor</em> (MN-BW)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Kribia nana</em> (FW-BW)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Bostrychus africanus</em> (M-BW-FW)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Periophthalmus barbarus</em> (BW-FW)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Awaous guineensis</em> (MN-BW-FW)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sicydium crenilabrum</em> (FW)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Mugil curema</em> (MN-BW-FW)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Mugil bananensis</em> (MN-BW-FW)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Mugil cephalus</em> (MN-BW-FW)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Liza dumerilii</em> (MN-BW-FW)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Aplocheilichthys spiluachen</em> (FW)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crustaceans</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Callinectes amnicola</em> (MN-BW)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Penaeus notialis</em> (MN-BW)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pachygrapsus transversus</em> (MN-BW)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Plesiopenaeus edwardsianus</em> (MN-BW)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BW=brackishwater; FW=freshwater; MN=marine; (*) Carapace width.

*Species with few numbers (i.e. less than 17 individuals) were not subjected to statistical analysis to determine modal class ranges. Evaluation, therefore, based on maximum and minimum size ranges of species with few individuals.
season, fewer fish species of marine origin were encountered in comparison to the dry season attributable to salinity tolerance factors. However, in the wet season, the dominating fish species was *S. melanotheron*. This may be due to the species' ability to adapt better to freshwater conditions. Apart from their adaptability to freshwater condition, it may also be possible that most of the juveniles of *S. melanotheron* followed the flooding rivers to feed in these ecosystems which could have accounted for their high composition in the fishery.

During the dry season, *M. bananensis, M. cephalus* and *L. dumerilii* were the dominating species. This may be as a result of their high salinity tolerance making them better adapted to brackishwater conditions. This observed community structure is similar to reports by Quinn (1980) and Little et al. (1988) that indicate the dominance of a few species in the total fish biomass of brackishwater habitats. Like the benthic community, the presence and absence of fish species during the different seasons is indicative of the seasonal dependence of some of the fish species.

The crustacean, *C. amnicola*, was dominant in the dry season compared to the wet season. This could be because they are better adapted to saline conditions relative to freshwater environments, recording higher abundance in the pool which was located close to mangroves during the dry season. Works by Heald & Odum (1970) and Middleton & McKee (2001) revealed that the leaves of the mangroves fall into the water where they are consumed by various detritivores. Arimoro & Idoro (2007) also confirmed that *C. amnicola* fed mainly on detritus, which could explain why *C. amnicola* was abundant in the dry seasons when mangrove plants were present. On the other hand, one species of shrimp, *P. notialis*, from the marine system was encountered (Pool C) probably as a result of the spring high tide that previously occurred prior to sampling.

In terms of size distribution, the modal classes recorded for the wet and dry seasons were generally smaller than the reported common maturity sizes in the literature (Schneider 1990; Puagy et al., 2003), suggesting that the habitat is an important nursery area for fish species inhabiting adjacent estuarine and inshore marine habitats. However, the sizes of fish species in the wet season were relatively bigger than that of the dry season. This could be as a result of high amount of nutriments present at the time, introduced into the ecosystems by the flooding river waters during the wet season, facilitating high primary productivity. The high occurrence of macrozoobenthos during the wet season provides a strong justification for this observation.

The overall fish species diversity for the dry season ($H' = 1.61$) was higher than that of the wet season ($H' = 1.43$). This may be as a result of the contributions of pools A, B and C (Table 2), which recorded very high richness of marine and brackishwater species during the dry season. The higher the species richness, the more diverse the system is. The overall richness of the entire mangrove swamp for the dry season ($d = 2.22$) was higher than that of the wet season ($d = 1.52$). The observed higher richness and diversity of fish species in the dry season of marine, brackish and freshwater origins points to the fact that the mangrove ecosystem is subject to tidal and seasonal inundation that allows for the different...
species to enter and leave the habitat irrespective of the dry period (Blay, 1997; Okyere et al., 2012). The overall species evenness ($J' = 0.60$) for the dry season was the same as that of the wet season ($J' = 0.60$). This indicates that individuals were evenly distributed among species.

The Kakum estuary mangrove habitat supports a considerably diverse macrozoobenthic fauna most of which are pollution intolerant and moderately tolerant invertebrates suggesting that the mangrove swamp is less polluted. The fish community comprised of marine, brackishwater and freshwater species most of which were dominated by juvenile individuals; an indication that the habitat is an important nursery site for fishes inhabiting adjacent riverine, estuarine and inshore marine habitats. Commercially important fish species are dominant in the dry season due to the input of seawater into the mangrove habitat. Considerable numbers of marine fish species tend to use the ecosystem as nursery grounds. It can be argued, therefore, that the habitat contributes immensely to the productivity of the marine system. Therefore, considering the ongoing degradation, including encroachment of people from nearby communities, the mangrove habitat should be protected by putting in place serious management measures preferably through community-based management interventions.
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