# **DYNAMICS OF DIARRaETIC SHELLFISH TOXINS FROM THE DINOFLAGELLATE PROROCENZRUM** *UMA* **IN THE BAY SCALLOP ARGOPECTEN** *IRRADIANS*

by

**Andrew G. Bauder** 

Submitted in partial fulfillment for the requirements for the degree of

**Master of Science** 

**at** 

**Department** of **Oceanography Dalhousie University Halifax, Nova Scotia** 

**March, 1997** 

O **Copyright by Andrew** *G.* **Bauder, 1997** 



**National Library 1\*1 of Canada** 

**Acquisitions and Acquisitions et** 

**395 Wellington Street 395, rue Wellington Canada Canada** 

**Bibliothèque nationale du Canada** 

services bibliographiques

**Ottawa ON K1A 0N4**<br>Canada

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

**sxclusive licence allowing the exclusive permettant** à **la reproduce, loan, distribute or seU reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou paper or electronic formats. la forme de microfiche/fih, de** 

may be printed or otherwise de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés **reproduced without the author's ou autrement reproduits sans son** 

**The author has granted a non- L'auteur a accordé une licence non National** Library **of Canada to Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de copies of this thesis in microfonn, vendre des copies de cette thèse sous reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.** 

**The author retains ownership of the L'auteur conserve la propriété du copyright** in **this thesis. Neither the droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. thesis nor substantial extracts from it** Ni **la thèse ni des extraits substantie1s permission. autorisation.** 

0-612-24799-6



*For* **my** *parents,* 

 $\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{A}}$ 

*Nita* **and** *Don* 

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**





# **List of Figures**







# **List of Tables**

 $\sim 10^7$ 



## **Abstract**

Bivalve molluscs can acquire diarrhetic shellfish poisoning (DSP) toxins via ingestion of toxigenic dinoflagellates. The dynamics and metabolic fate of DSP toxins were investigated in the bay scallop, *Argopecten irradians*, when exposed to cells of the epibenthic dinoflagellate Prorocentrum lima, a known producer of DSP toxins, in controlled laboratory microcosms. Toxin parameters determined were uptake and detoxification rates, and anatomical compartmentalization of toxin components. Tissue and algal extracts were analyzed by liquid chromatography-mass spectrometry (LC-MS) and by liquid chromatography with UV detection (LC-UV) for okadaic acid (OA), dinophysistoxin-1 (DTX1) and recently identified OA-esters.

No mortalities occurred and no feeding inhibition was observed for juvenile and adult bay scallops during the two week exposure to  $P$ , *lima* cells. Clearance rates were similar for scallops exposed to equivalent biovolume cell concentrations of toxigenic P. lima and the non-toxic diatom Thalassiosira weissflogii; however, absorption efficiency of organic matter was significantly lower for P. lima as a diet relative to T. weissflogii. Examination of scallop fecal ribbons revealed that a significant portion of ingested P. lima cells were capable of survival and cell division following passage through the scallop gut. Although DSP toxin concentrations in bay scallop viscera tissue exceeded commonly accepted regulatory levels  $(2 \mu g g^{-1})$  within 24 hours of exposure to P. lima, after 2 weeks of exposure, total DSP toxin retained in scallop tissues was  $\lt 1\%$  of the total toxin ingested over the same period. Most of the total toxin body burden was associated with the viscera (76%) in adult scallops, however a significant portion was associated with gonadal tissue (12%). Toxin levels were relatively low in gill, mantle and adductor tissue  $\ll 12\%$  of total toxin body burden). During the depuration period, rapid release of DSP toxins from scallops indicated that toxins were poorly bound to the tissues. Detoxification of viscera tissue was biphasic, comprised of a loss of labile toxin components (30% of the total toxin load) within the initial 16 hours of depuration, followed by a much slower release of the remaining toxin at a rate of  $8.4\%$  d<sup>-1</sup>. Metabolic conversion pathways of DSP toxins were examined in vitro by incubating purified DSP toxins with scallop tissue homogenates. Dinophysistoxin-4 (DTX4), a sulfated ester derivative of OA, was hydrolyzed within minutes to form OA-diol ester and OA in tissue homogenates containing ruptured P. lima cells. However, in the absence of P. lima esterases, both DTX4 and OA-diol ester remained stable in scallop tissue homogenates. This suggests that in vivo conversions of DSP toxins within scallops occur exclusively as a result of endogenous esterases liberated from P. lima cells during digestion within the scallop gut.

# **Abbreviations and Symbols**





 $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$ 

# **Acknowledgments**

This thesis was accomplished with the help and guidance of numerous friends and **cokagues** at **both** the Institute for Marine Biosciences **(NRC)** and the Dalhousie Department of Oceanography. First and foremost, I would like to express my gratitude to my supervisor Dr. Allan Cembella. His insight and criticism shaped my research, but more **impomntly his uiendship will always be appreciated. 1** am also gratefiil for the input and support of my co-supervisor Dr. Jon Grant, and my other committee members, Dr. Robert Moore and, especially Dr. **Monica Bricelj,** who **always** found **the** to **advise me** on bivalve feeding theory and for sharing with me her ever-growing reprint collection. Thanks also to Dr. **Sandra** Shumway (Southampton College, **NY)** for her **advice,** support and humour via fax **and e-mail,** 

At the Institute for Marine Biosciences I would like to acknowledge Dr. Mike **Quilliam** for **his expertise** in **DSP-toxin chemistry** and for **providing me with** the opportunity to have my samples analyzed by liquid chromatography-mass spectrometry. His input **vuly added** another dimension to my **research. 1** would also like to **thank** Dr. **Neil** Ross for guiding **rny** research in **DSP-toxin enzyme chemistry. The technical skills and** assistance of **Larry Staples** were indispensable in helping me to **maintah my** scallops at **Sandy** Cove. **Nancy** Lewis introduced me to **the world** of **algai** culture and **was always**  avaiiable for assistance and **advice. Also at** IMB, **1 would like to acknowledge Bill**  Hardstaff, Gunther Morstatt, Peter Shacklock, Cindy Leggiadro, Dale Johnson and Joe Uher.

At Dalhousie Oceanography **1 am** appreciative for the initial guidance of Dr. **Craig**  Emerson, **as weii** as the **technical** assistance of **Gary Mailet** and Paul Macpherson. **1** would also **iike** to **thank severai** of my feiiow students for good **advice** and even better kiendship over the past **few years: Geoff MacIntyre, Janice Lawrence,** Tony Windust, **Terri**  Sutherland, Conrad Piditch, **Curtis Roegner,** Peter Cranforci and **Brian** May.

Finally, I am most grateful for the constant support of my parents, for whom this **thesis is dedicated.** 

# **Chapter 1. General introduction and objectives**

## *Bac&ground*

DiarrIietic **shennsh poisonhg (DSP) poses a serious public health risk and constitutes an economic threat to harvesters of cultured and wild shellfish (Shumway, 1990). Bivalve molluscs acquire DSP toxins by ingesting dinoflagellates from the water column and perhaps via feedmg on resuspended** benthic **materiaL The known dinoflagelhte prodm of DSP**  toxh **hIude several species of the genus** *Dinophysis* and **a few bathic** *hmcentnun* **species (Yasumoto et al, 1990,** Andecsen. **19%).** 

**Consumption of shellfish contaminated by DSP toxins results in symptoms similar to severe gastroenteritis, including diarrhea, nausea, abdominai** cramps **and vomitmg.** Diarrfietic **shellfish**  toxins **induce dianheic symptoms by acting as potent protein phosphatase inhibitors in**  metabolic processes, resulting in the passive loss of fluids (Aune and Yndestad, 1993). Although at present, Canada does not have official regulations concerning DSP toxins in **sbellfish** the **reguiatory kveI m** Japan and **some European countries is 0.2 pg OA g\*' total** soft **tissue (Quilliam, 1995)** or 2  $\mu$ g OA/g digestive gland tissue (Hallegraeff, 1993). The **diarrheagenic effects of DSP toxins are not known to be lethal to humans,** and victmis **usually recover within a few days However, it has recentiy been proposai that OA and DTXl are powemil** cancer **promoters** and **that chronic exposure to these toxins could stimulate the pwth of gastrointestinal nimours (Dickey et al., 1993; Aune and Yndestad, 1993).** The **turnorgenic properties of DSP toxins have only been demonstrated in mice (Fujiki et al. 1989) and have not yet been** linked **to such activity m humans.** 

### **Global Distribution**

Diarrhetic shellfish poisoning has been an expensive problem for the shellfish industry  $\mu$  worldwide during the past two decades (Fig. 1.1), especially in Japan and Europe, where it is the most significant phycotoxin problem (Cembella and Stabell, 1990; Andersen, 1996)). One **DSP incident alone** afliected **5000 mussel connuners in Spain in 1981 and** resulted **m costiy shellfish harvesting closures (Reguera** *et al.***, 1993). The French (Belin, 1993), Chilean mbeye et** *al..* **1993), Swedish (Underdahi et cd., 1985), Norwegian and** Danish (Andersen,





1996) mussel industries have also been significantly by DSP events. Cases of DSP have been confirmed following the consumption of toxic scallops (Yasumoto et al., 1978; 1989). Pacific ovsters (Yasumoto et al., 1978; Kawabata, 1989), cockles and clams (Andersen, 1996; Lembeve et al., 1993). Most of the reported DSP events have implicated *Dinophysis* spp. as the causative dinoflagellates (Kat. 1985; Gago et al., 1991; Hageltorn, 1989); however, a few incidents have been linked to the presence of Prorocentrum lima (Yasumoto et al., 1989; Van Egmond et al., 1993; ICES, 1992).

North America has been relatively free of confirmed DSP cases until recently. Retrospective examination of documented shellfish-related illnesses has led researchers to suggest that previous DSP cases in Canada and the United States may have been misdiagnosed as bacterial gastroenteritis. Cembella and Todd (1993) suggested that one of the first DSP episodes may have occurred in New Brunswick in 1972 when dozens of people became ill after consuming oysters, whereas Freudenthal and Jijina (1998) estimated that 12 unconfirmed DSP cases probably occurred in New York during the 1980's due to contaminated mussels, clams and scallops. Cembella (1989) confirmed the presence of DSP toxin (OA) in natural phytoplankton populations dominated by *Dinophysis norvegica* and *D. acuminata* in the Gaspé region of Quebec, but this was not linked to shellfish toxicity in this region. In 1990, 16 people experienced DSP related symptoms after consuming cultured mussels from Mahone Bay, Nova Scotia (Quilliam et al., 1993). High levels of DTX1 was detected in the suspect mussels, as well as the presence of the cal fragments attributable to  $D$ . *norvegica* in the mussel gut contents, leading investigators to suggest that the DSP causative organism was *D. norvegica* (Ouilliam et al., 1993). However, phytoplankton samples collected in the vicinity two weeks after the incident contained a relatively high abundance of *Dinophysis* species but DSP toxins were not detected when these samples were analyzed (Jackson et al., 1993). Repeated attempts to confirm the presence of either OA or DTX1 in net-haul material rich in *Dinophysis* spp. from Nova Scotia waters, using both high-performance liquid chromatography with fluorescence detection (HPLC-FD) and mass spectrometry (ISP-MS) have been consistently unsuccessful (A. Cembella, pers. comm.). This is in spite of the fact that episodic low levels  $(< 0.1 \,\mu g$  OA eq.  $g<sup>-1</sup>$ ) of DTX1 are frequently detected in mussels and scallops from local aquaculture sites.

A strain of the benthic dinoflagellate *Prorocentrum lima* (Fig. 1.2) was isolated from the **same bcaliey as the 1990 DSP incident m Mahone Bay and was shown to produce OA and**  DTXl **m** aiiture **(Jackson et al., 1993). The occurrence of P.** üma **was reIativeiy rare in the original phnldomtow samples subsequent to the 1990 DSP** incident, **however this couki be explained** by its predominately benthic existence. It has been suggested that P. *lima* was the **source of the DSP toxins in the Mahone Bay mussels (Quilliam et al., 1993) and this has been** further supported by the presence of *P. lima* on the byssal threads and shells of DSP **oontammated** rnusseis **hm the same** site **during a** later **DSP episode (Jackson et al. 1993). nie DSP** *mcident* **in Uahone Bay in 1990 occd in the aftennath of a major stom with**  strong onshore winds and a rapid increase in surface temperatures (Cembella, 1992). It is **possible that this meteorological event may have caused vertical mixing of the water column. This could have resulted in the resuspension of P.** *lima* **from the benthos, or dislodging of epizootic colonies of P.** *lima* **cells attached to mussels and their substrate (mesh "socks"), into the water column where it would be available for fileration by musseis hanging on lonpimes.** 

### **Toxin Chemistry**

The lipophilic polyether compounds associated with the DSP toxin complex include okadaic acid (OA) and its dinophysistoxin derivatives (DTX 1-3) (Fig. 1.3), pectenotoxins (PTX 1-3), and **yesoto~ (Hu et aL, 1993). Although all of these compouods have been shown to be acutely toxic to mice following intraperitoneal injection, only OA, DTX1 and DTX3 are** associated with diarrfiea **in humans (Aune and Ymkstad, 1993).** 

**Recently, within the timeframe of this thesis research, liquid chromatography combined with ion-spray mass spectrometry (LC-MS) has been used to identify new naturally-occurring ester derivatives of OA hm an eastem Canadian strasi of** *Pmmcenmun* üma, **including okadaic acid di01 ester (D80A) and DTX4, a** polar **cornpound, in which the prirnary h>aioxyl group of D8OA** is esterified with a trisulfated end group (Hu et al., 1995; Quilliam and Ross, 1996). **Quilliam et aL (1996) demonstrated** that **DTX4 is the dominant** intraœIluIar **DSP component in a** strah **of** *P.* lima **(PA)** isolated **hm NOM Scotoê. However, when cells were** dimpted during simple extraction procedures, a rapid enzymatically-catalyzed reaction occurred in which DTX4 was hydrolyzed to D8OA, which in turn, was more slowly hydrolyzed to OA



Fig. 1.2. Nomarsky interference micrograph of *Prorocentrum lima* (strain **PA) cell.** 



**Fig. 1.3. Structures of okadaic acid and its naturally occurring denvatives.** 

(Fig. 1.4). Furthermore, in the presence of aqueous methanol, a portion of the D8OA component underwent methanolysis to form methylated okadaic acid (Me-OA), an artifact of the extraction procedure. Quilliam et al. (1996) hypothesized that digestion of P. lima cells by shellfish would result in similar hydrolysis reactions due to esterases derived from disrupted cells and from the shellfish digestive gland. Although DTX4 and OA both act as phosphatase inhibitors, D8OA does not display this property. Thus, processes influencing the biotransformation of DSP toxins in shellfish can affect the total toxicity of the tissues and thereby have serious implications for regulatory authorities.

### **Motivation**

In recent years, several researchers have expressed concern regarding the apparent increase in both the global distribution and frequency of occurrence of harmful algal blooms (eg. Smayda, 1990). Whether this phenomenon is due to a shift in oceanographic conditions that favour the growth of flagellates, or simply, a result of an increase in the use of coastal water for aquaculture leading to increased detection of toxic events (Hallegraeff, 1993), it is inevitable that the risk DSP is a problem that will continue to hamper the growing aquaculture industry in future years (ICES, 1992). Regulatory authorities and shellfish harvesters must have an understanding of how exposure to DSP toxins will affect commercial shellfish products. Thus, it is critical to understand species-specific kinetics and metabolism of DSP toxins in shellfish (Van Egmond, 1993), including rates of uptake and depuration, anatomical compartmentalization and pathways of biotransformation.

Controlled feeding studies of paralytic shellfish poisoning (PSP) toxins in bivalve molluscs have provided much needed information concerning the kinetics and metabolism of such toxins in a number of shellfish species (Bricelj et al., 1990, 1991; Bricelj and Cembella, 1995). Although several reports have related the incidence of DSP toxins in shellfish to phytoplankton blooms (Rodriguez et al., 1989; Zhao et al., 1993; Gilgan et al., 1994), few studies have attempted to describe the actual kinetics of DSP toxins in bivalve molluscs either under laboratory controlled conditions (Pillet et al., 1995) or in field populations (Haamer et al., 1990; Marcaillou Le-Baut et al., 1993a; Reguera et al., 1993). Furthermore, previous studies of DSP toxin kinetics have been unable to examine biotransformation processes due to limitations



**Fig. 1.4. Hydrolytic conversion of DTX4 to okadaic acid di01 ester (D80A) and OA** . **Dashed line indicates methmolysis of OA-esters to methylated OA (Me-OA).** 

imposed by the employed methods of detection. The most widely used DSP toxin detection method, the mouse bioassay, is unable to discriminate between the various toxins and only provides a value of total toxicity; moreover, false positives are prone to occur following intraperitoneal injection into mice due to the lethal effect of shellfish-derived free fatty acids (Hamano et al., 1985). Detection of DSP toxins by high performance liquid chromatography followed by fluorescence detection (HPLC-FD) is a much more sensitive and reliable method. However, only DSP toxins with a free carboxylic acid group (OA, DTX1, DTX3) are detected by derivation with the fluorescent reagent (Lee et al., 1987; Quilliam, 1995). Liquid chromatography combined with ion-spray mass spectrometry (LC-MS) has proven to be an extremely valuable analytical method for the identification and quantification of novel DSP toxin analogues, such as D8OA and DTX4 (Pleasance et al., 1990; 1992; Hu et al., 1995; Ouilliam, 1995). The application of LC-MS to the analysis of DSP toxins in shellfish is highly advantageous since toxin kinetic parameters can be determined for individual toxin compounds. Thus, resolving biotransformation pathways, along with rates of toxin uptake and release, would provide insight into how DSP toxins are affected following ingestion of toxigenic dinoflagellates by shellfish.

An investigation of phycotoxin kinetics in shellfish must also consider physiological feeding parameters of the species, and whether these processes are altered by exposure to toxigenic dinoflagellates. Species-specific selection against PSP toxin-producing dinoflagellates has been demonstrated in feeding studies performed by Shumway and co-workers (Shumway et al., 1985; Shumway and Cucci, 1987; Gainey and Shumway, 1988), in which bivalve responses included shell valve closure, reduced clearance rates and increased pseudofeces production. Shumway et al. (1985) also argued that bivalves can use post-ingestive sorting mechanisms, such as decreased digestion and absorption rates, to limit assimilation of toxins into tissues. Although it has been hypothesized that similar protective feeding mechanisms are employed by shellfish to prevent accumulation of DSP toxins (Haamer et al., 1995), few studies have attempted to test this hypothesis (Pillet and Houvenaghel, 1995). If toxigenic dinoflagellate cells are selectively egested by bivalves in fecal ribbons, it is of interest to determine whether undigested cells remain viable and are capable of continued growth following release into the water column and/or the benthos. Previous studies, demonstrating the survival of PSP-

toxigenic Alexandrium tamarense (Scarratt et al., 1993) and A. fundyense (Briceli et al., 1993) in mussel feces, have warned that such a process could serve as a potential seed source for subsequent dinoflagellate blooms, particularly when live shellfish stocks are transferred to new locations.

In the present study, DSP toxin kinetics and related physiological feeding processes in the northern bay scallop (Argopecten irradians irradians) were investigated when exposed to DSP toxigenic *Prorocentrum lima* cells as a food source. The bay scallop was selected for this study due to the abundance of literature on feeding physiology available for this species (Davis and Marshall, 1961; Palmer, 1980; Bricelj and Kuenstner, 1989) and its potential as a prime aquaculture species. Although at present, blue mussels (*Mytilus edulis*) are the most important cultured bivalve species in Nova Scotia, there is considerable local interest in the commercial culture of the bay scallop (Argopecten irradians) in Nova Scotia (Scarrattt, 1992; Couturier, 1990). This species has traditionally been an important bivalve product for shellfish harvesters in the northeastern United States (Rhodes, 1991). Recently, the bay scallop has been successfully established in culture in China (Chew, 1990) where it has become a 200,000 tonne per year fishery since 1980. Field grow-out studies at selected sites along the eastern shore of Nova Scotia, including Mahone Bay, (Mallet and Carver, 1987; 1988) have suggested that the bay scallop is a feasible candidate for culture in this region. The extremely fast growth rate of the bay scallop makes it the only bivalve species that can be grown to marketable size in Nova Scotian waters in a single grow-out season. However, due to the relatively small size of the adductor muscle, marketability for the bay scallop depends largely on the growers' ability to sell the product on the half-shell as either whole or "roe-on" (gonads attached) scallops. Thus, a clear understanding of compartmentalization of DSP toxins in the various tissues of the bay scallop (e.g.- adductor vs. gonad vs. viscera) is required.

#### **OBJECTIVES**

The main goal of this research project was to investigate the dynamics of diarrhetic shellfish toxins from the dinoflagellate *Prorocentrum lima* in the bay scallop *Argopecten irradians*. Specific objectives were to determine:

1) The fate of *Prorocentrum lima* cells ingested by bay scallops.

- 2) How feeding physiology parameters of the bay scallop are affected by exposure to DSPtoxigenic Prorocentrum lima.
- 3) The rate of DSP toxin uptake into scallop tissues from a homogeneous suspension of Prorocentrum lima supplied at a constant rate in a closed system.
- 4) Tissue compartmentalization of DSP toxins in juvenile and adult scallops.
- 5) Processes affecting biotransformation of DSP toxins within scallop tissues, in vivo and in vitro.
- 6) The detoxification rate of DSP toxins from various scallop tissues.

## **Chapter 2. Uptake of DSP toxins by invenile bay scallops**

## 2.1. Introduction

**The dation of DSP incidence in bivalve mofluscs to blooms of pIanktonic** *Dinophysis*  **spp. has been frequently documented over the past two decades (Yasumoto et ai., 1980; Van Egmond et aL, 1993); however** very **few studies** have **attempted to** describe **the physiological feeding parameters resulting in the uptake and accumulation of DSP toxins** by bivalves. Although field studies have provided useful information concerning in situ **toxin concentrations in shellfish (Haamer et al., 1990; Marcaillou-Le Baut et al, 1993a). the kinetics of DSP toxins m bivalves can ody be appmximated in the** field **due to hck of cuntrol of environmental variables such as water temperature, phytopiankton concentration and cellular toxin content. By exposing bivalves to simuiated "blooms" of**  toxigenic dinoflagellates in controlled laboratory microcosms, a more precise **detemination of physiological feeding parameters leading to the accumulation of toxins in sheIlfish tissue can be achieved (BriceIj et aL, 1990). An additional advantage of laboratory feeding studies is that bivalves can be more closely monitored for detrimental effects caused by exposure to toxic dhfiageUates (Shumway et ai., 1987; Bardouil et ai., 1993).** 

The **focus of the present chapter is to examine rates of feeduig and DSP toxïn uptake in juvenile bay scallops when exposed to DSP-toxigenic cells of** *Prorocentrum lima* **as a** food source in a controlled laboratory environment. The effect of toxic microalgal exposure on the feeding physiology and survival of juvenile bivalves is of special interest **due** to their high weight-specific metabolic rates and specific nutritional needs to meet **growth requirements (Lesser and Shumway, 1993). Bay scallop populations are especidiy**  susceptible to harmful effects caused by microalgal blooms. Since these animals usually **spawn oniy once in their lifetime, the loss of a single juvenile year-class could well resdt in severe recruitment failure for the population** (Rhodes, **1991; BnceIj and Kuenster, 1989).** 

**Scallop tissues were** analm **for DSP toxui content using high perfomiance liquid chromatography with fluorescence detection (HPLC-FD) techniques used in previous DSP toxin studies** (Lee **et al, 1987; Marcaillou-Le Baut and Masseiin, 199û), as weli as by** 

liquid chromatography combined with ion-spray mass spectrometry (LC-MS). The latter technique, a powerful analytical tool for the detection and identification of DSP toxins **(Quilliam and** Ross, 19%). **was used** to **dteTmine** the concentration of **DSP toxh**  derivatives, **including** okadaic **acid (OA), DTX1, as well** as ester **derivatives** of OA **recently** discoverai **in** *Prorocentmm* cultutes *(Hu* et **al,** 1992; 1993). but never reported **before** in **shellfish tissue.** 

## **2.2. Materials and** *Methods*

## 2.2.1. Algal culture

The epibenthic marine **dinofiagellate** *Prorocentnun lima* **(strain** *PA),* **isolated fiom Mahone Bay, Nova Scotia, was cultured in modified K-medium (Keller et al., 1985)** prepared from **fïltered W-sterilized** (1 **pm)** natural **seawater** fkom the IMB Aquaculture Station at Sandy Cove, Nova Scotia. Dinoflagellates were grown in non-axenic, unialgal batch cultures **contained** in 2.8 L polycarbonate Fembach **fiasks** on a **1410 L:D**  photocycle, at an incident irradiance of 90  $\mu$ mol m<sup>-2</sup> s<sup>-1</sup> at 17 °C. Relatively low light **irradiance was selected** to provide **optimum** growth conditions for P. *lima,* a **species**  known **to be shade adapted** (Morton and Norris, 1990; Faust, 1995). Polycarbonate Fernbach flasks were selected to minimize cell adhesion and to provide adequate surface **area** for **gas** exchange. **Fiasks were swirIed fkquentiy** to **prevent algal ce& hm** further aggregating on the **bottom** or **adhering** to the **sides** of the **fiasks.** 

The growth cycle of P. lima under **these** conditions **was** monitored to determine the **rate of ce11 division,** duration of culture cycle phases and the **maximum** ceii **concentrations**  in the cultures. **Ceii concentrations were determinecl by taking** 5 **mL** aliquots fiom **swirled**  Fernbach **!lasks, fixing** the hornogenized **sample** in Lugol's iodine solution and enumerating **ceiis** in a **0.1 rnL** Palmer-Maloney **chamber** under a phase contrat microscope (100 X magnification). Division rates **were** calculated according to Ouillard (1973) using the equations:  $k$  (div  $d^{-1}$ ) =  $K_e/\ln 2$  and  $K_e = \ln(N_1/N_0)/(t_1-t_0)$ , where  $k =$ division rate,  $K_e$  = growth constant,  $t =$  time and  $N =$  cell concentration. The mean **division rate of P.** *lima* **cultures**  $(n = 5)$  **during exponential growth was calculated to be**  $0.17 d^{-1}$ .

For **feedmg experiments,** cultures of P. lima **were inocdateci in staggered sequence** and harvested at the same point of late exponential growth (cell density  $ca$ ,  $2 \times 10^7$  cells  $L^{-1}$ ) to ensure **that each** culture **fed to scaüops was in the same growth phase 2.1). The diatom** *Thalassiosira weissjlbgii* **(isoiated nom** Long Island, **N.Y.),** a species **known** to **be**  nutritionally suitable for bay scallop growth (Bricelj and Kuenstner, 1989), was used as a non-toxic food **source during acclimation** of scallops and as a control experirnentai **diet** for **feeding** study comparisons with toxic P. *lima* cells. Thalassiosira weissflogii was cultured on **Fritz's U2 growth** medium supplemented with **silicate in 30** L columns at 17 **OC** and **at**  an incident irradiance of  $600 \text{ mmol m}^2 \text{ s}^{-1}$ .

## **2.2.2. ScalIop maintenance**

**Several** hundred **juvenile** bay **scaiiops** were obtainecl **hm** the provincial **sheiifïsh hatchery in Ship Harbour, Nova** Scotia **and transferred** to **the National Research** Council Aquaculture Station at **Sandy Cove** in May, 1993. Scallops **were** held in upwelers in flowthrough **raceways (ca** 9 **L min-' unnltered seawater) and maintainecl at 18 OC. During pre**conditioning, scallops were fed a cultured diet of the diatom *Thalassiosira weissflogii* delivered via a peristaltic pump from a 200 L feeding column and dripped into the **upwekrs at** a rate adjusted to provide an **ambient** concentration of diatom **cells** of approximately 2000 cells  $mL^{-1}$  in the upwellers.

## **2.23. Determination of clearance rates**

**Short-term measurements** of clearance rates (volume of water swept clear of **particles**  pet **unit tirne) (Bayne and Neweii, 1983) were** conducted to determine the feeding **activity**  of juvenüe **bay** scallops **exposed to** DSP **toxin-producing** *Prorocentnun lima* **cek.**  *Clearance* **rates were also** determined for juvenile **scdiops exposed** to **equivalent**  biovolume concentrations of *T. weissflogii*, a species used in previous studies of bay **scallop feeding** activity **(Bricelj** and Kuenstner, 1989; **Briceij** and Shumway, 1991). Using **celi** dimension measurements **determinecl** using **an** optical micrometer with phase **contrast**  microscopy (400 X magnification), the cellular biovolume for P. *lima* (spheroid volume)



**Fig. 2.1. Growth cycle of** *Procentrum* **lima cultures used for toxin uptake experiments. Shaded area marks period when ceUs were harvested**  for feeding experiments.

and *T. weissflogii* (cylinder volume) were calculated as 2.5  $\times$  10<sup>4</sup>  $\mu$ m<sup>3</sup> and 1.5  $\times$  10<sup>3</sup>  $\mu$ m<sup>3</sup>. respectively. **Thus, the cell** biovolume of P. *lima* **was approximately 16.7 tirnes larger than**  that of **T.** weissflogii.

Twenty-five scallops of similar size (mean shell ht.  $= 12.71$  mm,  $SE = 0.48$ ; mean wet tissue weight = 166.75 **mg, SE** = **11.65) were divided** into **five** groups of **five animals and placed in 500** mL **glass beakers** containing **algai** suspensions at an initial **cell** concentration of 5000 cells  $mL<sup>-1</sup>$  (*T. weissflogii*) or 300 cells  $mL<sup>-1</sup>$  (*P. lima*). Two other beakers containing the **dgal suspension** without **scaliops were used** as controls for each expriment. **The algae were** kept in suspension by an air Stone **placed** in **each** beaker. No pseudofeces were produced **at** these ceii concentrations and no feces were produced within the short feeding period of this study. Samples of the suspension (5 mL) were taken from each beaker at the beginning of the exposure period and after 20 minutes for determination of ceil concentration by microscopic counts. FoIlowing each feeding study, scallops were **sacrificed** for determination of total wet tissue weight.

Clearance rates were estimated according to the equation:  $CR = ln(C<sub>0</sub>/C<sub>1</sub>) \times V/t \times n^{-1}$ (Bricelj et **al..** 1990). **where Co** and **Ci are the initiai and final ceiI density, respectively,** V **is** the volume of suspension, **t is** the time **interval** and n **is** the number of scaiiops. Clearance rates were converted to weight-standardized rates for a **scallop** of **1** g to ta1 wet body weight according to the equation:  $CR_s = CR_o/W_e^b$ , where  $CR_e$  and  $W_e$  are the clearance rate and total wet tissue weight of the experimental animal, respectively and  $b$  is the exponent of the allometric equation relating clearance rate and body size  $(= 0.75;$ Bayne and NeweU, **1983).** 

#### 2.2.4. Long-term toxin exposure

Juvenile bay scallops (mean shell ht.  $= 19.65$  mm,  $SD = 1.55$ ; mean total wet tissue weight  $= 0.498$  g,  $SD = 0.129$ ,  $n = 99$ ) were held for 14 days in a recirculating aquarium containing 30 L of filtered (1  $\mu$ m) UV-treated seawater at a constant temperature of 17 °C **(Fig.** 2.2). Cultures of P. **lima** were harvested **daily** and continuously **metered fkorn** a stock tank into the aquarium with a **peristaitic** pump to yield an approximately constant cell density of  $10^5$  cells  $L^{-1}$  throughout the toxification period. Water was also pumped from the aquarium into a **waste** tank at the same rate as the **inûow** to **maintain** a constant



**Fig. 2.2. Experimental apparatus used for the toxin exposure experiment. Measured parameters are indicated below.** 

volume of **water** in **the aquarium.** *Prorocentmm lima* ceils **were maintained** in suspension in the stock tank by a magnetic stir-bar. Cells were kept in suspension in the aquarium by the action of two recirculating purnps mounted on each end and two aeration tubes **mounted** dong **the** bottom of the **aquarîum.** The **apparatus was tested** over a 24 h **period**  prior to the experiment to ensure that P. *lima* cells were not lost by mechanisms other than **ingestion by scallops (e.g.** - sedimentation, **attachent** to **tank** surfaces, **disniption** by purnps). **The** flow cteated by **the pumps did not appear** to **inhibit** the **feedhg activity** of **the scdops (Le.** - normal **"sheil gape"** of **scaiIops was observeci).** The **entire** volume of waer in the aquarium was exchanged every two days to prevent fouling and re-ingestion of fecal **material by** the scallops.

**Algal** celi concentrations in the aquarium **were determinecl** microscopically (100 X rnagnincation) using a 1.0 **mL** Sedwick-Rafter counting chamber. **The** number of **ceils**  ingested by all of the scallops in the aquarium was determined each day by calculating the number of cells delivered from the stock tank, the number of cells removed by the exit (waste) flow **and** the change in **celi** concentration in the **aquarium. Weight-specific ingestion** rates **were standardized** according to the **mean wet weight** of **all** scaliops **used** in this study  $(0.50 \text{ g}, SD = 0.13, n = 99)$ . Weight-specific values of cumulative toxin ingested **(CTI)** were **deterrnined according** to the equation: CïI = **TC1 x** CïC, **where TC1 is** the weight-specific total number of cells ingested, CTC is the time-specific cellular toxin content. Toxin accumulation efficiency (TAE) was determined by the equation:  $TAE =$ **TIBB/CTI x** 100, where **TTBB** is the total toxin body burden (as determined by LC-MS) **and CTI** is the cumulative toxin ingested.

Replicate  $(n = 3)$  samples of three pooled *juvenile scallops* were removed at regular **intervals** from the aquarium for toxin **analysis** and **replaceci with** scallops not previously exposed to P. *lima,* **which** were sarnpled at the end of the **experiment.** Scallops were pooled to ensure that adequate quantities of tissues were extracted for toxin detection. The replacement scallops **maintained** a constant **number** of scailops in the aquarium and **provided** a **duplicate time series** for toxin **analysis (Series** II). For each pool, the **tissues**  were removed and **divided** into **two** groups: **viscera (digestive** gland-stomach **cornplex)**  and all other **tissues (including gills, mantle and adductor muscle** ). Tissues were weighed,

**quick-hzen in isopmpanol** dry **iœ and kept on** dry **iœ until transfer to the main laboratory**  $(ca, 2 - 4 h)$  where they were stored at  $-80$  °C.

## 2.2.5. Toxin extraction

**Tissues were extracted in 8.0 mL of 80% aqueous methanol by homogenization for 3** min using a Brinkman tissue homogenizer. Following centrifugation for 20 min at 4000 x **g (4°C). an accurare 5.0 mL aiiquot of the supernatant was transfenred to a glass**  centrifuge tube, and subjected to a liquid-liquid partitioning clean-up procedure in which **the sample was extracted twice with 5 mL aliquots of hexane (Quilliam, 1995). After discarding the hexane iayers, the sample was extracted with 1 mL of water and 6 rnL of chlorofona The chioroform Iayer was transerred to another glas centrifuge tube foUowing which the aqueous layer was extmcteû again with 6 mL of chlorofona The combined chlorofonn iayers were evaporated to dryness under a stream of nitrogen The**  residues were re-dissolved in 0.25 mL methanol and filtered by centrifugation  $(2000 \times g)$ through a 0.45  $\mu$ m cartridge-filter (Millipore Ultrafree-MC) for analysis by HPLC-FD and **LC-MS.** 

**Toxin content of P. lima cells was determined by removing 400 mL of algae from the stock tank at two day intervais. The** celi **concentration in the sample was determined by**  microscopic counts and the cells were concentrated by centrifugation at  $4000 \times g$  for 20 **minutes (4 OC).** The **wet weight of the pellet was determined, &ter which the algal cells**  were disrupted by 10 s bursts of probe sonication for 3 minutes in 10 volumes of methanol. Sonicated samples were centrifuged for 10 minutes at  $4000 \times g$  (4 °C) and the supernatant was centrifuged through a 0.45  $\mu$ m cartridge-filter for analysis by HPLC-FD **and LC-MS.** 

## **2.2.6. Toxin anaiysis and quantitation**

## *Bigh-performance liquid chromatography with fluorescence detection (HPLC-FD)*

**Following methods developed by Lee et ai (1987) and modified by Quilliam (1995).**  fluorometric detection of OA and related compounds containing a carboxyl group (OA and DTX1) was enabled by derivatization with 9-anthryldiazomethane (ADAM), a fluorescent reagent.

**Aliquots** (10 **PL)** of **algai** and **scdop tissue extracts were transferred** to **15 mL amber vi& dong with 100 pL of ADAM solution (0.2% wlv in methanol)** and **10 pL of** an internal standard, deoxycholic acid (DCA) (7  $\mu$ g/mL). Solutions were vortexed for 0.5 min, and heated in the dark for 1 hour at 37<sup>o</sup>C to allow the derivatization reaction to reach **cornpletion.** 

A **silica solid-phase** extraction **(SPE)** clean-up procedure **was used** to **prepare ADAMderivatized samples for analysis by HPLC. Supelco SPE LC-Si cartridges were placed on** an SPE vacuum manifold and conditioned twice with 5 mL of ACS-grade chloroform followed by **5 mL** of chloroform/hexane **(1:l). The derivatized residues were redissolved**  and transferred to the **cartridges using 3** x **300 pL** aliquots of chloroform/hexane and **drained** slowly **through** to **waste. The cactndges** were **washed** slowly **with** 5 **mL** of chloroform/hexane and 5 **mL** of **cbioroform.** ADAM **derivatives were eluted directly** into clean **glass cenuifuge** tubes **with 5 mL** of 10% methano1 in chlorofona **The elutates were evaporated to dryness under** a stream of **nitrogen,** foliowing **which** the **dried residues were**  redissolved in **500 pL** of **methanol** and **transferred to a 15 mL amber via1 for storage.** 

**Toxin peaks** were **resolved** on a **Lichrospher 100 RP-18 column (25 cm x 4** mm **id., 5 pm particle size) maintahxi at 25 OC with a flow rate of 1** mL **min-'** and an injection volume of 10 **pL** Isocratic elution **was** performed with **80% acetonitrile** in deionized **water.** The fluorescence detector **was** set for excitation at 254 nm **and** emission at 412 nm, **Toxin** peaks **were quantified directiy by** cornparison of relative chrornatogram **peak areas**  with **OACS-1**, a standard okadaic acid calibration solution [National Research Council **Marine Analytical Chemistry Standards Program (MACSP)].** Quantitation of **DTXl**  relative to OACS- **I was based** on the **valid** assumption **that the mola. response** for **DTXl and OA are quai (quilliam.** 1995). **Toxin** concentrations **were** converteci to **pg g-'** wet **wt** tissue **accordhg to** the **molar masses** of **the toxins Fig. 1.3).** 

## Liquid chromatography-mass spectrometry (LC-MS)

**As** an **atmospheric-pressure** ionization method for **mass spectrometry (MS).** ion-spray **has** been proven to **be highly** sensitive for detection and **quantitation** of **DSP toxins in algal and sheIlfish tissue extracts (Hu et al, 1992; Pleasance et al, 1990, 1992; Quiüiam 1995).**  Positive ion-spray Iiquid **chromatography (ISP-LC) was** used to **analyze** scaIIop **tissue** and

**algal extracts for DTXL, OA and OAesters: Me-OA, Me-DTX1** and **OAaiol ester (D8OA). Samples were anal@ using an APL-III LC-MS system (SCIEX, ThomhiU, Ont.)** equipped with an ion-spray interface (Quilliam, 1995). Toxin peaks were quantified **by direct cornparison of relative chromatogram peak areas with OACS-1. It was assumed that each of the** toxins **has a molar response equal to that of OA.** 

#### 2.2.6. Statistical analysis

**Statistical andysis of data were performed using SigmaStat statistical software (Version 1.0. 1992, Jandel Scientific, San Rafael, CA). Data sets were tested for normality (Kolmogorov-Smimov test) and equal variance (Levene median test) prior to use of pammetric tests (e.g., t-test, ANOVA, linear regression). Non-parameuic tests (e-g., KniskaEWalh one-way ANOVA, Wilcoxon signed-rank test) were employed for data that failed the assumptions of normality and equai vaciance. An analysis of variance**  (ANOVA) was used to determine if the  $\%$  molar toxin content varied significantly ( $P <$ 0.05) between tissue compartments and P. *lima* cells. Following the ANOVA, pairwise multiple comparisons of arc-sine transformed levels of individual toxins were made **beween each of the** tissue **cornpartments and the P.** *lima* **ceUs.** 

## 2.3. Results

## **23.1. Clearance rates**

**Mean weight-standadhd (1 g wet wt)** clearance **rates of juvenile bay scallops**  exposed to volume equivalent cell densities of *Thalassiosira weissflogii* or *Prorocentrum lima* were 634 mL  $h^{-1}$  (SD = 185) and 767 mL  $h^{-1}$  (SD = 149), respectively. There was no **significant differenœ between the clearance rates of the scaliops when exposed to either**  alga (t-test,  $t = -1.25$ ,  $df = 8$ ,  $P > .05$ ). Scallops did not exhibit any unusual feeding **behaviour when exposed to P. lima, such as shell valve closure or violent clapping/** swimming activity. Cell concentrations in the control beakers remained constant during the **feeding period for both of the algal suspensions, indicating that cd depletion in the**  beakers containing scallops was due to scallop ingestion and not settlement of cells.

#### **2.3.2.** Long-term toxin ingestion and uptake patterns

The time-averaged P. *lima* cell concentration in the feeding aquarium during the two week-exposure period was 131 cells  $mL^{-1}$  (SD = 90) (Fig. 2.3). Weight-specific ingestion rates (1 **g** wet **WL)** of scallops **remainecl** relatively constant around a **mean** of **1.0 x 106**  cells  $d^2g^{-1}$  wet wt.  $(SD = 2.5 \times 10^5)$ , thus the cumulative number of cells ingested increased linearly over the exposure period according to the equation:  $I = 0.936 \times 10^6$  t,  $r^2$  $= 0.99$ , where I = number of cells ingested and  $t =$  exposure time (days), equation forced through **zero (Fig.** 2.4).

**There were** no apparent **detrimental** physiological responses in **juvenile** scailops **caused**  by **long-tem** exposure to toxigenic P. lima. Scallops **appeared to be actively feeding** at aii **times (Le.** - **wide sheil** gape). **Prolonged** sheil closure, **shell clapping and** violent **swimming**  behaviour were not observed during the exposure period. Most of the scallops were **byssally** attached to **the** tank **walls** or bottom **surface during** the **experiment During periods when water in** the tank **was** exchanged, **the animals** were often **gently** removed **from the** tank surface to **facilitate** the exchange process. **Withui** a **day** most **of** the **animals were observed** to **re-attach** to **the tank** surface, **indicating** that byssus production and **climbing** behaviour **were** probably unaffected by exposure to P. lima. No rnortalities occurred during the entire exposure **period.** 

**Concentrations of DSP toxins in** *Prorocentrum lima* **cells and scallop tissues reported** in this section are results from LC-MS analysis. Total cellular toxin  $(DTX1 + OA +$ **D8OA)** content in *Prorocentrum lima* cells varied considerably during the exposure period (Fig. 2.5), ranging from  $31.9$  pg cell<sup>1</sup> at the beginning of the exposure period to 2.4 pg cell<sup>t</sup> on day 5. The mean total cellular toxin content was 9.8 pg cell<sup>t</sup> (SD = 11.2). however the coefficient of variation for **this value was 110%.** 

**Series 1** scallops attained toxin saturation **levels within** 24 h of exposure, followed by relatively constant toxin levels for the remainder of the experiment  $(ca. 4-5 \mu g g^{-1})$ . Series II scallops **(reverse the-series sampled** at the end of the experiment) **exhibited** a **simüar**  temporal toxin pattern except that a peak in visceral toxin content  $(7.3 \mu g g^{-1})$  occurred in scallops exposed to P. *lima* for *13* days. **Mean total** toxin content in **Series 1** and II visceral tissues, averaged for all samples after the first day of exposure, was  $4.39 \mu g g^{-1}$ 



Fig. 2.3. Concentration of *Procentrum lima* cells in aquarium during **exposure period. Dashed line indicates tirne-averaged ceil density.**


Fig. **2.4. a) Ingestion rates of P.** *lima* **ceUs by** *Argopecten irradians* **during exposure penod. Dashed line indicates time-weighted mean.**  b) **Cumulative number of cells ingested.** 



Fig. 2.5. Temporal pattern of DSP toxin content in *Prorocentrum lima* cells and scallop tissues during exposure period.

 $(SD = 0.86)$  and  $3.97 \mu$ g g<sup>-1</sup> (SD = 1.47), respectively. There was no significant difference **between the toxin content of the two sets of visceral tissues (t-test,**  $t = 0.734$ **,**  $df = 16$ **,**  $p >$ **-05).** In **both series,** toxin leveis in **viscera** exceeded accepted **regulatory** limits (2 **pg OA g-'** tissue) within **one &y** of exposure. Remarkably, **this** limit **was** exceeded in Series **I viscerd** tissue after only **six** hours of exposure to P. lima.

Toxin concentrations **were** fat **greater** in scallop **visceml tissue than** in other **tissues**  *(giîis,* **mande,** adductor) **(Fig.** 2.5). For **thh reason,** the "other tissues" pool **was analyzed**  less frequently than viscera for Series I scallops and not analyzed at all for Series II scaüops. **Similat** to visceral **tissues,** other tissues **attained maximum** toxin content **within**  one day of exposure, **after** which **toxin** content **remained** relatively constant. **The** mean total toxin content in **Series 1** other tissues, averaged over **the** exposure period after one  $\frac{dy}{dx}$  of exposure to *P. lima*, was only 0.28  $\mu$ g  $g^{-1}$  (SD = 0.19).

**The mean** tissue contribution to to **tai wet** weight in **the** scdops for viscera and all other tissues was  $26.7\%$  and  $73.3\%$  (SD = 4.5), respectively (Fig. 2.6). However, the contribution of these tissues to total toxin body burden **was** essentially **reversed, with**  viscera and all other tissues comprising 85% and 15% (SD = **8.7),** respectively.

Unlike the relationship describing the cumulative number of P. lima cells ingested, **cumulative toxin ingested (CTI) was non-linear** over **the** two **week** exposure period 2.7). Due to the **extremely high** toxin content of P. lima ceUs at the **beginning** of the exposure period, **CTI** increased **very** rapidly **during** this period, followed **by** a relatively slower rate of **toxin** ingestion when the **toxin** content of P. *lima* ceUs **decreased** to Iower levels. The temporal pattern of total toxin body burden was quite different from that of cumulative toxin ingested. As described previously for visceral tissues, total toxin body burden **was saturated after** one day of toxin exposure and **remaineci** rehtively constant thereafter. This pattern is reflected in the calculated toxin accumulation efficiency (TAE) in **scaiiops** over the exposure period **(Fig.** 2.7). **After** six hours of exposure, **only** 10% of the ingested toxin **was** accounted for in scdop tissues. **This** value **decreased** rapidly to 2 to 3% after one day of exposure, followed by a gradual decrease to  $\lt 1\%$  after two weeks of exposure.

**a) TOTAL WET TISSUE WEIGHT** 



**Other tissues (73%)** 

# **b)** TOTAL TOXIN CONTENT



**Fig. 2.6. Contributions** (%) **of juvenile scallop tissues to: a) total wet tissue weight and b) total toxin body burden. Values averaged for** ail **samples afier the first day of exposure. Viscera composed of digestive gland**stomach complex.



Fig. **2.7. a) Total DSP toxin ingested and accumulated in whole scallop tissues.**  b) **Efficiency** (%) **of DSP toxin accumulation in whole scallop tissues. Data shown for Senes** I **scdlops only.** 

#### **233. Toxia composition**

**Examination of the individual toxh composition in P.** *lima* **and scaliop extracts was**  enabled by LC-MS analysis. Concentrations of the following compounds were quantified in extracts: Dinophysistoxin-1 (DTX1), okadaic acid (OA), okadaic acid diol-ester **(D8OA), and the methyl esters of OA and DTX1 (Me-OA and Me-DTX1) (Fig. 1.3). Me-OA and Me-DTXl have** ken **found to be artifacts** formed **hm DSOA** and **DTXl via a rathanolysis reaction during extraction of these toxins in methanol (N. Ross, pers. com., IMB,** National **Research Councjl, Halifax, NS), therefore Me-OA** and **Me-DTXl**  concentrations **were combùied with the** toxins **hm which they were** derived, **D80A and DTX1, respectively. On a mean**  $\%$  **molar basis, methyl esters comprised**  $4.9\%$  **(SD = 7.8)** of total toxin content in P. lima **extracts and 15.1% (SD** = **6.7) in scallop tissue extracts.**  The **higher** proportion of **methyl** esters in tissue extracts **is probably** due to **the** fact that **the tissues were** exvacted in 80% **aqueuus** *methanol* **while P.** *lima* celis were extracted in **100% methanol. This pattern is** consistent **with** fîncihgs **by Quüüam** and **Ross (1996) that methyl** esters formation **is** more **prevalent** in **the presence** of aqueous **methanol than** in **100% methmol.** 

Concentrations of **the individual** toxins following conversion of **methyl** ester values **back** to **D80A and DTXl in** P. *fimu* and scdlop **tissues** are **depicted in Fig. 2.8. AU of the toxh concentrations determined in P.** *lima* cell **extracts were weii above the detection**   $\lim_{x \to \infty}$  **limit** of 0.01 pg cell<sup>-1</sup>. The detection limit for the scallop tissue extracts was 30 ng  $g^{-1}$ tissue, which **was greatly exceeded by di** of the toxins, with the exception of DTXl in Series I non-visceral tissues. In general, individual toxin temporal variations in scallop tissues **seemed to paralle1** each other. A characteristic **rank** order of toxin concentration in **scallop tissues became** apparent: **D80A** > OA > DTXI. However, **this** pattern **was not**  consistent **in P.** *lima* ceIlS.

**Prorocentrum lima and scallop tissues were examined for temporal trends in individual** toxin composition on a **46** rnolar **basis (Fig. 2-9). Linear** regression **was us&** to **determine whether the** % **molar** contribution of each toxin **increased** or **decreased** over the two **week exposure period (H<sub>a</sub>: slope differs significantly from zero.**  $P < 0.01$ **). No significant trends** were observed for toxin composition in *P. lima* cells. As was the case with total toxin

Fig. 2.8. Concentration of individual DSP toxins (see Fig. 1.1) in P. lima cells and scallop tissues.

 $\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{R}}$ 



 $\mathbf{g}$ 



**Fig. 2.9. Relative** (% **molar) toxin composition in** *P. lima* **cells and scallop tissues.** 

content, toxin composition fluctuated **significantly** over the experiment. In P. *lima* **cells,**  the % molar contribution of DTX1 remained relatively constant (mean  $= 23.6\%$ , SD  $=$ **10.8),** however **D80A** and **its hydrolysis** end-product, **OA,** cycled inversely **relative** to each other throughout the time-course (mean  $D8OA = 41.9\%$ ,  $SD = 28.1$ ; mean  $OA =$ **34.5 96, SD** = **17.8). The** toxin composition in scallop **tissues** was **much more** consistent **b** over the exposure period. There were no significant temporal trends in % molar content for **any** of the toxins in the scaIlop tissues. **The** % **molar** contribution of DTXl in **scalIop**  tissues **was** constant over tirne, whereas slight fluctuations in **D80A** and **OA** content occurred at the **beginning** and end of the exposure period, coinciding with **peaks** in **the D80A** and total toxin content in ingested P. *lima* cells (Fig. 2.8).

The relative % molar content of each toxin, averaged over the experimental period, **was** compared between ingested P. *lima* **cells and scallop** tissues using Kruskal-Wailïs one-way ANOVA for sample **sets with unequal** variances coupled with **SNK** multiple pairwise comparisins  $(P < 0.05)$  (Fig. 2.10, Table 2.1). There were no significant **ciifferences** between the **96 moiar** toxin content of P. *lima* and scallop tissues for **D80A** or **OA,** however DTXl content **was determineci** to **be** signincantly higher in P. *lima* **ceiis** than in non-visceral tissues (Dunn's multiple comparison,  $H = 12.7$ ,  $df = 3$ ,  $P = 0.005$ ). Mean arc-sine transformed leveis of **individual** toxin **levels** in scaUop tissues were tested for significant differences using a one-way ANOVA coupled with Student-Newman-Keul's method for pairwise multiple comparisons  $(P < 0.05)$  (Fig. 2.10, Table 2.1). DTX1 was significantly higher in both series of visceral tissues than in other tissues ( $F = 32.6$ ,  $df = 2$ , **P** < **0.0001).** Although **D80A content was** slightly greater in visceral tissue **than** in other tissues, this difference **was** not signincant; however **OA,** the hydrolytic end-product of **D80A, was significantly higher in non-visceral tissues (** $F = 3.99$ **, df = 2,**  $P = 0.035$ **).** 

**Visceral tissue and P.** *lima* **cells share a very similar toxin profile, which may be** attributed to toxin derived from undigested cells in the scallop digestive system. However, non-viscerd tissues have **relatively less** DTXl and more **UA than** viscerd tissue. It **is interesting to** note **that** both senes of **visceral** tissue **had** extremely **similar** toxin **prohles.** 

To **test** whether **D80A was being converted to OA in scaîlop tissues, the ratio of UA to D80A was examined in ingested ceUs and** in each of the tissue **compartrnents.** An



**Fig. 2.10. Mean** (% **molar) Levels of individual DSP toxins in P.** *lima* **celis and scdop tissues during exposure period. Error bars** = 1 **standard deviation.** 

Toxin	P. lima	<b>Series</b> <b>Viscera</b>	<b>Series</b> <b>Viscera</b>	<b>Other</b> <b>Tissues</b>
DTX1	23.6 (10.7)	14.9(0.7)	14.6(1.7)	7.8(2.7)
<b>OA</b>	34.5 (17.8)	36.7 (10.0)	35.0(5.4)	49.3 (11.3)
D8OA	41.9 (28.1)	48.4 (10.3)	50.5(6.0)	42.9 (8.9)

**Table 2.1. Mean 46 molar toxin content (SD) of DSP toxins in ingested** *Prorocentnun*  lima cells and in scallop tissues. Means not connected by a line are significantly different at **P** < **0.05 (one-way ANOVA, SNK multiple pairwise comparisons).** 

increase **in the OA/D80A** ratio, over time or between cornpartments, would **indicate** that **either D80A was converted to OA or** possibly, **that** OA **was seiective1y retallied over D80A in scaliop tissues. Linear** regression **analysis was used** to determine whether the **OND8OA** ratio **changed over time** in either P. *lima* cells or in scdop tissues. No significant temporal trends in this ratio were detected  $(P > 0.05)$  in any of the **compartments, although variations in OA/D8OA were apparent between compartments (Fig. 2.11). There was no consistency in the OA/D8OA ratio in P.** *lima* **cells over time. During** the **beginning** and end of the experimental **period when** total towi content **was very** high, **the ratio was low (cl), however when the total toxin content was low,** the ratio **was relatively high. Overall, the time-averaged OA/D8OA ratio in** *P. lima* **cells was 2.0** (SD = **2.3).** however the **coefficient** of variation (CV) **was** > **100%.** 

In scallop tissues, the ratio of OA to **D80A was more constant. In** iisceral tissue, the ratio dropped within the first two days of exposure to P. lima and remained relatively **constant thereafkr,** however, the **ONDIOA** ratio **increased** during the **iast few** days of the experiment **in the remaining** tissues. The **mean OADSOA** ratio. averaged over the **entire**  exposure period, was  $0.79$  (SD =  $0.30$ ) and  $1.24$  (SD =  $0.53$ ) for viscera and non-viscera tissues, **respectively. There was** no signitrcant merence in the average **OAID8OA** ratio between **ingested P.** *lima* **cells** and scallop **visceral** tissues **(ANOVA** on arc-sine transformed values,  $P > 0.05$ ).

**bear regression analysis was used** to examine the relationship between okadaic acid **derivatives (O& D80A)** and DTX1 in P. **lima ceiis** and in **scaiiop** tissues **(viscera** and other tissues **combined) (Fig.** 2.12). **The linear** relationship of **DTXl** to **OA and D80A**  was significant for both algae and tissues  $(P < 0.05)$ . In P. *lima* cells the slope was greater for **D80A than OA, while in scallop tissues the** dopes **were roughly equal.** 

#### **2.3.4. Cornparison of todn analysis by HPLC-FD and LC-MS**

*Prorocentrum lima* **samples and Series I visceral tissue were analyzed by HPLC-FD** (Fig. 2-13), as weïi **as LC-MS (Fig. 2-14),** enabiing a cornparison of **results** obtained by the two methods **(paired** t-test, P < 0.05). **Mean** OA and **DTXl the-series** values for the two **nethods** (Fig. 2.15), indicated that OA values obtained by HPLC-FD were significantly greater than those obtained by LC-MS, in both  $P$ . *lima* cells (df = 6,  $P = 0.019$ ) and



Fig. **2.1 1. Temporal pattern of OAD8-OA ratio in P.** *lima* **cells and scallop tissues.** 



**Fig. 2.12. Relationship between the concentration of DTX1 and okadaic acid derivatives in a) P.** *lima* **ceils and b) scdiop tissues.** 



Fig. 2.13. HPLC-FD analysis of bay scallop viscera extract derivatized with **ADAM.** 



**Fig. 2.14 Positive ion-spray LC-MS analysis of bay scailop viscera extract.** 



**Fig. 2.15. Mean OA and DTXl content in a) P.** *lima* **cells and b) scallop visceral tissue, as determined by HPLC-FD and LC-MS analyses.** 

scallop viscera (df  $= 31$ ,  $P < 0.0001$ ). Values for DTX1 determined by HPLC-FD were significantly greater in P. lima samples  $(P = 0.032)$ , however there was no significant **ciifference** for **viscera samples.** When total **DSP** toxin **results** were compareci for HPLC- $FD$   $(OA + DTX1)$  and  $LC-MS$   $(D8OA + OA + DTX1)$  samples  $(Fig. 2.16)$ , there was no **significant difference** in P. **lima** sarnples and **oniy** a **slightly** signincant ciifference **in viscera**  samples  $(P = 0.045)$ . The reduction in differences among the two methods when D8OA was added to LC-MS values suggests that the high OA values in the HPLC-FD analysis **may be partly due** to **hydrolytic** conversion of **D80A** to **OA during** ADAM derivatization. Linear regression analysis indicated that **HPLC-FD** and LC-MS values for P. lima samples were highly correlated for DTX1, OA and total toxin  $(P < 0.01)$ , however a linear correlation was only significant for OA in scallop viscera (Fig. 2.17).

# 2.4. Discussion

#### **Feeding and survival**

When exposed to high concentrations  $(10^5 \text{ cells } L^{-1})$  of DSP-toxigenic *Prorocentrum* lima, juvenile bay scaliops **were** able to ingest the **cells** without any apparent adverse physiological **effects. Uniïke** previous studies **which** reporteci **mortalities** of juvenïie Argopecten *irrdans* when exposed to **the dinoflagellates** Gyrodinium aureolum **(Lesser**  and Shumway, 1993) and *Prorocentrum mininum* (Wikfors and Smolowitz, 1993), no mortalities were experienced when bay scallops were exposed to P. lima in the present study. The high **survival** rate over the two-week study without reduction in **tissue** weight **suggests that the scallops were able** to **meet** their maintenance requirements by **feeding** on **P.** lima cells. This point was further strengthened by the similar clearance rates of scallops exposed to either P. lima or the diatom Thalassiosira weissflogii, a proven **source** of suitable nutrition for **A.** *inadians* **(Briceij** and Kuenster, 1989). An indirect, **yet** excellent **indication from this study that** *juvenile* bay scallops may be capable of surviving prolonged **exposure** to **DSP-toxigenic** P. lima **was** the persistent **climbing** behaviour that scallops exhibited in the **aquarium.** sirniiar to that of natural populations in **seagrass beds.** Climbing behaviour and the continued production of **byssal threaâs require metabolic** energy; **this** 



Fig. **2.16. Total DSP** toxin **content in a)** *P. Iima* **ceiis and** b) **scallop viscerai tissue as determined** by HPLC-FD **(OA** + **DTXI) and LC-MS (D80A** + **OA +DTXI).** 



**Fig. 2.17. Cornparison between values HPLC-FD and LC-MS values** for **DSP toxin content in P.** *lima* **ceils and scdop tissues. Regression lines are only shown for significant correlations (P** < **0.05, Pearson product moment correlation, r).** 

**demand** would **be** fulnlled **only if** basic **maintenance requirements** were fint **king met by a**  food **source** or **the utilizaton** of **endogenous resenres.** 

#### **Toxin uptake and accumulation**

The faster rate of toxin uptake in Series I scallops was a result of exposure to a very **highly** toxic culture of P. lima during the first **three days** of the **experiment.** Attempts were made to avoid such variations in the **cellular toxin** content of P. *lima* **by growing** batch cultures in staggered **sequence** under **identicai** growth conditions. Extreme variations in the toxin content of P. *lima* have also been reported in ecophysiological studies of this dinoflageilate **by McLachlan** et **aL** (1994) and by Morton **et aL** (1994). Both of **these**  studies attributed high toxin levels to cells which have been forced into stationary growth phase by growth **Iimited** conditions such as low temperature or depleted **nutrients.**  Following the same argument, the **highly** toxic batch of P. *lima* **fed** to scallops at the **beginning** of the experiment rnay **have** entered stationary growth phase much eariîer **than the** other **batches** due to an unusuaUy **high** growth rate and early depletion of **nutrients.** 

Although **unintendeci,** the extreme variation in P. **limn** toxin content **during** the **feedùig**  study **provided** an indication of how **bay** scallops respond **when** exposed to **varying** levels of **DSP** toxin content in dinofiagellates. Relatively constant ingestion rates throughout the study and similar temporal profiles for Series I and II scallops demonstrated that cellular toxin content **has** very little effect on the **feeding** parameters of bay scaiiops. **The** temporal profile of **Series I** scallops **indicated** that **peak** toxin loads **were** attauied within the fïrst day of exposure to P. lima, **after** which no more toxin **was** retained, suggesting that tissues had become saturated **with DSP** toxins or that scallops **had optimized** their digestive processes to **maximize** toxin elimination. In Series II **animals, peak** toxin Ioads were recordeci **in** scailops exposed to P. **lima** for 14 **days, however** it must **be remembered** that the Series II profile represents a reverse time-series. Thus, scallops with the highest toxin loads **were initiaily** exposed to the **highly** toxic batch of P. *lima* **fed** to scaliops at the **beginning** of the experiment. **This** evidence demonstrates that bay scaiiops only **retained**  DSP toxins from P. *lima* cells ingested at the beginning of the exposure period, after which ingested **DSP** toxins **were** efficiently eliminated **from** the **animals, preventing** hirther accumulation of toxins in **the tissues.** 

The **efsclency** of **DSP** toxin accumulation in bay scailop **tissues was less than** 1% after two **weeks** of exposure. **Thus, juvenile** bay scallops **readily ingested** P. **lima** ceils for two **weeks** but **retained very** little of the **DSP** toxins associated with the cells **after** the first day of exposure. Furthemore. since most of the toxin load **was** associated with **viscerd** tissue. it appears that the great majority of the toxin load associated with the scallop tissues **remains** a **labile (unbound)** component **within** the **gut,** rather than **king** transfed **and**  sequestered from **the viscera** to other tissues.

#### Toxin composition

The extreme variations **in** the toxin composition of *Prorocentmm* **lima** celis depicted in this study were consistent with similar observations made by Ouilliam and Ross (1996), who attributed the fluctuations to enzyme-mediated toxin conversion processes that **operate** when the cells are disrupted during extraction procedures. These researchers reported that following extraction of cell pellets in methanol, the main cellular DSP toxin component, **DTX4, is** rapidly converted to **D80k** which in **turn is** converted to OA and Me-OA at a much slower rate. To alleviate **this** problern, **Quilliam** et **ai.** (1996) found that immersion of the pellet in boiling water prior to extraction in methanol prevented the enzymatic conversion reactions from occurring. This information did not become available until after the present study was completed. Apparent fluctuations in the OA and D8OA content of P. lima cells fed to scallops were likely due to enzymatic conversions of D8OA to OA **during extraction** of fiozen tissues in methmoi. The degree to which the conversions were completed would depend on the length of time that the frozen pellets **were** aliowed to **thaw** prior to extraction in **methanoL** The relatively low Ievel of variation in cellular DTX1 content during the feeding study agrees with the findings of Quilliam and Ross (1996) and suggests that this toxin component **is** not directly **linked** to the **DTX4** - **D80A** - OA enzymatic pathway.

In scallop tissues, the relative amounts of each toxin component were much more consistent **than in** the dinoflagellate cells. This may **be** due to both physical and chemicai digestive processes within the scallop gut which would disrupt P. *lima* cells sufficiently to **faciltate** the **same enzymatic reactions that occurred during the extraction of ceil pellets. Since** the **bulk** of the conversion reactions **had probably already taken** place after ingestion

**of the ceh** by the scaiiops, extraction **procedures would** have **comparably less** effect on the **determined** toxin composition.

**The gradua1 decrease in** the relative **OA** content and concornittent increase in **DSOA depicted** in **visœral** tissue (especially **Series I) during the** *first* two **days** of the study suggested that the amount of **cell** hption **was decreasing during** this period, **resulting** in less **D80A king converteci** to **OA.** This **evidence may indicate feeding acclimation by** the scallop **resulting** in digestion **of P.** *lima* **ceils following initial exposure. As was the** *case*  with P. *lima* extracts, the relative DTX1 content in scallop tissues remained remarkably stable **during the feeding** study, **indicating** that toxin conversion **pathways** between DTXl **and** OA-derivatives **are uniikely to** exist **within scaiiop** tissues.

Toxin pronle cornparisons showed a **progressive** drop **in the 96 molar** composition of DTXl **fkom** P. *lima* **ceUs (24%) to visera** (15%). and subsequently to non-visceral **tissues**  (8%). This **evidence suggests** that **DTXl rnay be** eliminated **faster** than OA-derivatives **kom** scailops **following** ingestion of P. lima **cells. Since** OA and DTXl have **very** simüar chernical structures, it **seems unlikely** that **OA** would **be more** efficiently **bound** to scallop tissues **than DTX1.** However, **it is** possible that the **scallops may** have **selectively eliminated** DTXl **over** OA in order to **reduce exposure** to **DTX1, which has** ken shown **to** have a slightly **pater** cytotoxic potency **than** OA **(Hamano et al., 1985).** 

#### **Analytical methodology**

Cornparisons of toxin **andysis** resuits obtained by **HPLC-FD** and **LC-MS revealed that**  signifiant **discrepancies existai,** especially when **individual** toxin components **were examined.** In **both P. lima** celi **exuacts and scailop viscera,** OA levels **were** consistently **higher when analyzed by HPLC-FD. However, when total toxin was compared, including D80& LC-MS results** were **much closer** to **those** of **HPLC-m. Since** the fluorescent reagent (ADAM) **used** to **detect** toxin in the HPLC-FD **technique cannot bind** to **OA**esters due to the absence of **a** fkee carboxylîc **acid group, this evidence suggests that some of the D80A** component may have **been** hydrolyzed to OA **during** the ADAM derivatization **procedure. Since** DTXl **does** not **appear** to **be undergo** such hydrolytic pathways, **this would explain the** relatively **sirnilar results obtained by the two techniques**  for **this** toxin.

**Overad,** HPLC-FD **and LC-MS results were fairly weIi** correlated for **P.** *lima* extracts, **whereas** correlations for **scaliop viscera samples** were poor. **Failure** to **fuiiy** eliminate **iipids**  from tissue samples during the clean-up step of the extraction procedure may have **resulted** in **the** presence of cornpounds which **interfered** with ADAM derivatization and **thus,** contributeci to the **high variabiIity in** the **viscera HPK-FD analysis.** Such inconsistencies with the relatively tedious and labour intensive HPLC-FD procedure **agreed** with **observatons made** by **Cembella** and **Stabell (1990)** who reported that cornparisons of **results obtauied by** this method were discouraging, **mauiiy** due to complications associated with **uie** ADAM-derivatkation step. Although **Pleasance** et **aL (1990)** found good **correlations between** HPLC-FD **and LC-MS** results, **they** &O noted complications **associateù** with impunties and ADAM **derivatives in sampies anaiyzed by HPLC-FD,** 

For **research** purposes it **is** obvious **that** the **shorter extraction** procedure, higher **sensitivity, better accuracy and ability** to **analyze** OA-ester components prove **LC-MS** to **be** a superior technique for the **anaiysis** of **DSP** toxins. However, **since** ion-spray mass spectrometry is a luxury which few regulatory authorities can afford, HPLC-FD will continue to **be** used as a **more** accurate detection method **than** mouse bioassays which **have** been notoriously inconsistent for **DSP toxîn** detection **(Lee** et **al, 1987; Andersen, 1996; Quüliam, 1995). The resdts** of the **present** study suggest that **HPLC-FD** results for **DSP** toxin **analysis should be interpreted** carefuliy, **especially** with regard to **OA-esters that are not detected by this method. Esters denvatives** of OA represent a **hidden, yet**  potentiai group of toxins which **can be readily** hydrolyzed to yieId the active toxin **OA** A suggested **way** to alleviate this problem **would be** to hydrolyze the OA-esters in shellnsh **tissue to OA prior to HPLC-FD analysis. This could be accomplished by subjecting the** sample to a fkeze-thaw **process** as **Quilüam** et **aL** (1996) suggest, or perhaps, by simply adding a P. lima esterase solution to shellfish homogenates.

# **Chapter 3. DSP toxin uptake, compartmentalization and detoxifkation in adult bay scallops.**

### **3.1. Introduction**

**The results** of the previous chapter demonstrated that juvenile **bay** scallops **will ingest**  DSP-toxigenic *Prorocentrum lima* cells and accumulate low levels of toxins without any apparent physiological **impairment..** However, to **gain** a more complete **understanding** of **the** fate of **ingested DSP** toxins, post-ingestive **feeding processes must be investigated in**  addition to clearance rates. Several feeding studies have revealed that bivalve molluscs will compensate for changes in food quality and **quantity** by **adjusting digestive** processes, **thus infIuencing** the food ration dtimately absorbeci **(Bayne,** 1985; WiIlows, 1992; **Bayne** et **al,**  1984). Shumway et **aL** (1985) showed **that** although **the** oyster, Ostrea edulis, **hgested**  *Prorocentnun* **minimum** (non-toxic) **ceils** at relatively **high** rates, an **abundance of intact**  celis in **fecd ribbons** indicated that the **ceh were rejected hm the** digestive **system** via post-ingestive sorting **mechanism. A** focal point of the present chapter **is** the **fate** of P. *lima* cells and associated DSP toxin components following ingestion by Argopecten *irradians.* Physiological parameters including clearance rates (Hildreth and Crisp, 1976) and absorption **efficiencies** (Conover, 1966) **were deterrnined using** individual continuous**flow** feeding **chambers** (Bricelj and **Malouf,** 1984) **which** enable a more **precise**  measurernent of feeding rates **than** the **static chambers** used in the **previous chapter** 

The possibility of toxigenic dinoflagellate cells surviving passage through bivalve digestive **systems is** an **area** of special concern for **shellfish** growers. Shellfish stocks **may be transferred** fiom **areas where** toxic dinotlagellates **occur** to **"clean"** waters to **depurate (Silvert** and **CembeUa, 1995).** If live **dinoflagellate ceils** are **reieased** into **clean waters** via fecal deposition fiom newly **transferred** toxic **shellnsh, tky may divide** and form blooms in the **new region** Studies **have indicated** that **such** a scenatio **is** quite possible for **PSP-toxin**  *producing Alexandrium tamarense cells ingested by Mytilus edulis (Bricelj et al., 1993;* Scarratt et al., 1993), however no studies have examined whether DSP-toxin producing dinoflagellates **can survive** gut **passage.** An objective **of the work presented in the present** 

chapter was to investigate the likelihood of survival of P. *lima* cells following ingestion by **A.** *imadim.* 

Toxin **kinetics were investigated using tectmiques** similar to those **indicated** in the previous chapter, however pre-reproductive (gonads **not fully** mature) aduit scallops **were**  used rather than juveniles. New markets for scallons are encouraging the sale of "halfshell? (whole animal) and "me-on" **(gonad attached** to adductor) **products rather than** just the adductor **muscle (CembeUa** et **al.,** 1994). **which is** traditionaILy the only part of the **scdop** consumed in North **America Due** to **the** relative1y small adductor **muscle. interest**  in marketing go& and **other tissues** of bay scallops **is especially** strong (Couturier, 1990; Scarratt, 1992). Thus, knowledge of phycotoxin partitioning amongst bay scallop tissue **is** important for **industry** consideration Another important issue of concem to industry **is** the rate at **which** phycotoxins are depurated **fiom** contaminated shellfish stocks. Data from previous studies suggest that sea scallops (Placopecten magellanicus) are prone to **retain PSP toxinî for extended periods of time** (Shumway and **CembeIla,** 1993). however very little information is available concerning DSP toxin depuration rates from **scailops (Küruchi et aL, 1992; Tazawa** et **aL,** 1989).

# **3.2. Materials and Methods**

#### **3.2.1. Algal culture and scallop maintenance**

*Prorocentrum lima and Thalassiosira weissflogii* were cultured as previously described in **2.2.1.** Pre-reproductive **adult bay scallops** (shell ht. = 30 - **40** mm), **from** the same stock as the **juvenile** scailops **used** in the experiments **described** in Chapter 2, **were aquued fkom a** bottom grow-out site **managed** by **Little Harbour Fiheries** (Little Harbour, NS) in November. 1994. Scallops were **transferred** to the National **Research Council** Aquaculture **Research** Station in **Sandy Cove, NS, where they** were **held** in flow-through raceways maintained at 16 - 18 °C with a flow rate of approximately 9 L min.<sup>-1</sup> of unfiltered natural seawater. Scallops **were maintained** on **a diet** of **the** non-toxic **diatom** *Thnlmsiosim*  **weisspOgii as describeci** previously in **2.2.2.** 

#### **3.2.2. Determination of dearance rates**

Experiments **were** conducted to **determine the effect** of **cell** concentration **on clearance**  and ingestion rates of adult **bay** scailops **using** quivalent ceII biovolume **concentrations (22.3.)** of *Prorocentmm lima* or a **control diet, the** non-toxic **diatom** *Thaldiosira weissflogii.* Individual adult bay scallops  $(n = 7)$  (mean shell ht,  $= 40.34$  mm, SD  $= 2.94$ ) were randomly placed in parallel flow-through feeding chambers (Fig. 3.1). Empty scallop shells were placed in two of the chambers during each feeding study, serving as control **chambers. Feeding chambers were constructed nom transparent plexiglass to** enable **visual observation** of the scallops **during** feeding studies. **Each** feeding **chamber measured** 75 **mm wide x 110** mm **long x 75 mm deep.** An **inflow** valve **was** present 35 mm above the **chamber** bottom **and a plexigiass baffle was inserted 20** mm from the **inflow** end of the chamber. An exit **valve,** 15 mm **above** the bottom **was** fitted with an **elbow shaped**  segment of glas tubing, **which served** to control the **height** of **water in** each **chamber** (50  $mm$ ) and prevented fecal ribbons produced by the scallops from escaping the chamber **through** the outfiow.

**Algal** suspensions **were mixed** to **appropriate** concentrations with **nItereû (1 pm)** *UV***treated** natural **seawater** in a **100 L stock tank** and kept in suspension **by** an air-stone. **A Mastediex** high-capacity **peristaltic** pump **was used** to **pump the algal suspensions fiom**  the stock **tank** into a 30 **L aerated header** tank fitted with an **overflow** valve that maintained a constant volume in the tank. Suspensions were gravity-fed from the header tank to the individual **feeding** chambers via Tygon tubing (id. = **20 mm) at a** controlled flow rate **of** 180 **m. min?. The action of the pump was gentle** enough not to **disrupt** the **P.** lima or T. weissflogii cells and wide shell gapes exhibited by scallops indicated that the **flow did** not **inhibit** feeding **activity.** 

Scallons were exposed to six different cell concentrations of T. weissflogii (860, 1200, 3730, 6480, 14530, 20700 cells  $mL^{-1}$ ) and *P. lima* (36, 83, 135, 177, 243, 426 cells  $mL^{-1}$ ). Scaliops were ailowed **to** acclimate **to each ceil** concentration for 90 minutes, at which **tirne** samples of **algal suspersion (100 mL) were taken** sirnultaneously **fiom** the **outûow** of **each of the seven** feeding **chambers** and two control **chambers. Samples were preserved using Lugol's iodine solution and stored in glass scintillation vials. Cell concentrations** 

I

 $a)$ 



**Fig.** 3.1. **Top (a) and side (b) views** of **fiow-through feeding chambers. Dashed lines indicate direction of water flow.** 

51

**were determined** by microscopie enurneration in a 0.1 **mL** Palmer-Maloney chamber **(T.**  weissflogii) and a 1.0 mL Sedwick-Rafter chamber (P. lima). As a confirmation of optical cell counts, cell **conœntrations** were **also measured using** an electronic **particle** counter **(Coulter** Mdtisizer) **equipped** with a 100 **pm** aperture.

**Clearance rates (CR) were calculated according to the equation:**  $F \times (C_1 - C_2)/C_1$ **(Hildreth and Crisp, 1976), where**  $F$  **is the flow rate in the feeding chambers,**  $C_1$  **is the cell** concentration in the inflow (mean outflow of two control chambers) and  $C_2$  is the cell concentration in **the** outflow of each feeding chamber. Clearance rates were **converted** to weight-standatdized **rates** for a **scallop** of **Ig** total wet body weight as **described**  previousIy.

**Any** feces and pseudofeces **produced were** removed with a Pasteur pipette **five minutes prior** to collection of outflow suspension samples. Following clearance rate experiments, scallops were sacrificed for detemination of total wet tissue weight and total dry tissue weight **after lyophilization** for 24 hours in a freeze-dryer.

#### **3.2.3. Short-term toxin losding**

**A short-terni** (2 d) feeding study **was** conducted to determine **how** DSP **toxins** are compartmentalized **within** adult scallop **tissues** following **ingestion of** *Prorocentmrn lima*  ceUS.

Twenty-four pre-reproductive adult bay scallops (mean shell ht.  $= 38.63$  mm, SD  $=$ 0.50) were exposed to DSP-toxigenic P. lima cells (mean cell density =  $80$  cells mL<sup>-1</sup>) in **an 80** L **recitculating** aquarium using methods described previously in **2.2.4.** Triplicate 100 **mL** samples of the P. **lima** stock were **taken** over the course of the exposure period (Oh, 24h, 48h) to determine whether the total toxin content and/or relative toxin profile of P. *lima* cells in the stock tank varied over the two day period.

**AU** of the scallops **were removed** and divided **into three** pools of eight scallops at the end of the two day exposure. **The** following tissues were removed **fiom** each **scallop:**  viscera (stomach-digestive gland complex), gonad (including intestinal loop section), mantle, **gills** and adductor muscle. **Metanephridium and** heart tissue **were** included with the **viscem.** Within **each** pool **tissues** were combined, resulting in triplicate **samples** of each tissue. **The** combined tissue **samples,** each pooled **fiom** eight scallops, provided highly

concentrated **extracts** for the **analysis** of tolrins in non-viscerd **tissues,** which **were hypothesized** to **be** signincantiy lower in toxh content **than** viscetal tissue. Combined **tissue** pools **were weighed, imrnediately immersed in 4:l (v:w)** 80 % aqueous methanol and stored at -20 **OC** for **iater** toxin extraction and **analysis.** Tissues **were immersed** in methanol prior to freezing to avoid the possibility of toxin hydrolysis occurring during **fieezing and thawing** of **sarnpies (Quüliam** and **Ross,** 1996) which may have contributed **to**  the **toxin** profie **variations** noted **in** Chapter 2.

#### **3.2.4. Long-tenn feedùig study**

A long-term toxin exposure and detoxincation study **was** conducted to detemine the **kinetics** of **DSP** toxin uptake, compartmentaiization and detoxincation in **adult** bay scaiio p tissues. **Another** objective of **this** study **was** to measure physiological **indices** of scallop **feeding** activity **(clearance** rate, absorption efficiency, **fecal** deposition) during the long**term** toxin exposure **period.** 

#### Toxin uptake and detoxification

**Pre-reproductive adult bay scallops (n = 61, mean shell ht. =**  $38.21$  **mm,**  $SD = 3.89$ **;** mean total wet tissue wt.  $= 4.68$  g, SD  $= 1.22$ ) were exposed to DSP-toxigenic *Prorocentrum lima* for 13 days in an 80 L aquarium at 17 °C, using methods described previously in **2.2.4. Three** scallops were rernoved at fiequent **intervals** for toxin **analysis**  and **replaced with** scallops of **similar** size to **maintain** a constant number of scailops in the aquarium. ScalIops **were** immediately **dissected** into three tissue groups: **viscera,** gonad (including intestinal loop) and ail other tissues (including adductor muscle, **mantle** and **gius).** Wet tissue **weights** were **detennined,** foiiowing which the tissues **were placed** in plastic **centrifuge** tubes **containing** 9: 1 **(v:w) 80** % aqueous methanol and temporarily stored on dry ice  $(< 6h$ ). Samples were ultimately stored at  $-20$  °C to await subsequent toxin extraction.

Foilowing **the** toxin exposure period, scaüops were detoxified **for** one **week** by **immediate** tramfer to another 80 L aquarium containing the non-toxic diatom *Thalassiosira weissflogii,* **which was** continuously metered **kom** a **column** into the **aquarium** with a **peristaltic** pump to yie1d **an approximately** constant **celi** concentration of

2500 cells mL<sup>-1</sup>. Scallops were removed at frequent intervals for toxin analysis, as described previously. To reduce the chance of scallops re-ingesting toxic P. *lima* cells from fecal deposits, the entire volume of water in the tank was exchanged each day. Fecal **ribbons were** collected **from the** aquarium each **day** and examuied microscopicaIIy for intact P. lima **cells. After one week of** detoxification in an enclosed **aquarium, the rernaining** scallops **were trarisferred** to a flow through **seawater** raceway supplemented with *T. weissflogii*, from which scallops were sampled for toxin analysis for two more weeks. The remaining scallops  $(n = 6)$  were removed after eight weeks of detoxification to determine if any toxin remained in the tissues after a prolonged depuration period.

#### **Physiological indices**

**Clearance** rates, **fecal** deposition rates **and** absorption efficiencies of scallops **were determined** after one hour. **three days, and** eight **days** of **exposure to** *Prorocentrum lima*  **ce&.** The **same measurements were** also **detennined** for **scallops** exposed to equivalent biovolume cell concentrations of *Thalassiosira weissflogii*, one day prior to exposure to P. **lima** and **after five** days of detoxification. Seven **labekd** scallops were removed from the **aquarium and placed in the flow-through feeding chambers prevïously describecl (Fig. 3.1).** Algal suspensions (P.  $\lim_{n \to \infty} a_n = ca$ . 100 cells  $mL^{-1}$ , T. weissflogii = ca. 1600 cells  $mL^{-1}$ ) **were** pumped **from** a stock tank into the feeding **chambers using** rnethods **describecl** in 3.2.2. Cell concentrations in the feeding **chambers were** approximately **the same** as that **which** the scallops **were exposed** to **in** the aquarium.

**After allowing** scalIops to **acclimate** for 90 **min.** in **the feeding chambers, cbarance rates were measured** as **descnbed** in 3.3.2. **Fecal nbbons** produced in each of the feeding chambers were gently removed using a Pasteur pipette and filtered onto preweighed, precombusted 25 mm **Whatman GF/F fiiltes. Samples** of conœntrated **algal** stocks (15 **mL)** (P. **lima and T.** *weissflogii)* **were** also **collected** by vacuum **filtration** ont0 **GFlF filters. Sait was removed nom** the **sampies** by **washing fiiters** under vacuum **with** 10 **mL 4% ammonium formate. Fiers were temporarily** stored on dry **ice** to prevent degradation of organic material, following which they were dried at 80 °C for 48 h, weighed, **combusted** at 450 **OC for** 6 h, and weighed **again after** cooling in a dessicator. Ail **weights**  were determined to  $\pm$  10  $\mu$ g.

**The absorption efficiency** (% **AE) of organic matter ingested by the scallops was calculated according to Conover (1966):**  $AE = (F-E)/(1-E) \times F \times 100$ , where F is the ash-free dry weight proportion of the algae and  $E$  is the ash-free dry weight proportion of **the feces.** Ash-free dry weight was determined as the difference between the dry and **combusted weights of the nIters. ka1 deposition rate (FDR) was determined as: FDR** = **DF/t, where DF is the dry weight of feces produced and**  $t =$  **time in feeding chambers. This value was standardized for a scallop of 1 g wet weight according to:**  $FDR_S = FDR_O/W_e^b$ **,** where  $W =$  the wet weight of the scallop and  $b =$  the allometric weight exponent (0.75) **(Bayne and Newell, 1983).** 

#### **Fecal samples: Toxin composition and cell viability**

Fecal ribbons produced by scallops after twelve days of exposure to *Prorocentrum lima* **ceils were gently removed using a Pasteur pipette and rinsed by aiiowing to the feces to settle in a scintillation** vial **containhg fltered seawater (1 pm). Feces were vansferred**  by Pasteur pipette to another vial containing filtered seawater and kept cool on dry ice. Fecal samples were further subsampled to determine the toxin profile, and to establish **viability of P.** *lima* cells.

**Fecal samples were prepared for toxin analysis by probe-sonicatîng (10 s bursts at 50% pulse-duty cycle) fecal ribbons in 2 m. of 80% aqueous methanol for 3 min followed by**  centrifugation for 10 min at  $4000 \times g$ . The supernatant was filtered through a 0.45  $\mu$ m **cutridge-filter for anaiysis by LC-MS.** 

**Viability of P.** *lima* **cells within fecal ribbons was determined by inoculating triplicate sampies of intact or disrupted (vonexed for 30 s) fecal nbbons in fïasks containing 200**  mL **of K-medium. A 5 rnL sarnple of P.** *lima* **stock culture was also inocuIated in triplicate as a conuol for cornparison of ceil division rates. Cultures were exposed to a 1410 L:D photocycle at an incident irradiance of 90**  $\mu$ **mol m<sup>-2</sup> s<sup>-1</sup> at 17 °C. Cell concentrations in each of the 5sks were determined every seven days over a four week period by enumerating 5 rnL subsamples in a O. 1 mL Palmer-Maloney chamber under phase contrast**  microscopy (100x magnification). Division rates were calculated according to Guillard **(1973) as describeci previously in 2.2.1.** 

**Fecal samples talren hm scaiIops after two and twelve days of exposure to P. lima**  cells were photographed at 1000x magnification using Nomarsky interference microscopy. **P.** *Irm* **œlls in the feces were examined for obvious** visuai **characteristics such as thecal integrity and œil motility.** 

#### 3.2.5. Toxin extraction and analysis

**Toxins were extracted hm scdop tissues accordhg to methods described in 2.2-5. Extract dues were re-dissolved in 100 pL methanol and prepared for LC-MS analysis by œntrifbgation through a 0.45 pm cartridge-fdter.** 

*Prorocenmun lima* **samples (100** mL,) **taken hm** *the* **stock** tank **during the toxin uptake period were concentrated to form a pellet by centrifugation at**  $4000 \times g$  **for 20 min (4 OC). Immediately foilowing centrifugation, 80** % **aqueous methanol was added to each**  pellet to a make up a volume of exactly 2.0 mL. Cells were disrupted by 10 s bursts of probe sonication for 3 min and centrifuged for 10 min at  $4000 \times g$  (4 °C). The **supernatants were centrifuged through a 0.45**  $\mu$ **m cartridge-filter for LC-MS analysis.** 

**Algai and scdop tissue extracts were andyzed for DTXI. OA and OA esters by**  positive ion-spray mass spectrometry following liquid chromatography as described in **2.2.6. Sekted scallop tissue extracts were also** anaiyzed **for DTX4, a water soluble toxh, using the negative LC-MS ion-mode (Quiniam and Ross, 1996). Tu ensure that DTX4**  was not lost to the water-soluble phase during the liquid-liquid partitioning clean-up of **scaIlop tissue extracts (see 2.2.6.).** bth **the water and lipid-soluble phases. as weli as the initial crude methanol extract, were subjected to LC-MS analysis. LC-UV detection** (puilliam **et al, 1996) was used to andyze for D80A and DTX4 in algal and scallop tissue extracts. Both of these compounds contain conjugated double bonds included in the diol-ester chah, which fluoresce at 238** m.

# 3.3. Results

#### **33.1. CeU density dependent clearancse ami ingestion** rates

**Clearance rates of scallops exposed to** *Prorocentrum lima* **cells declined exponentially over a concentration range of 36 to 426 cells mL<sup>-1</sup> (Fig. 3.2a). Pseudofeces production** 





A) Weight-standardized clearance and ingestion rates of Argopecten

was only observed at the highest P. *lima* cell concentration tested  $(426 \text{ cells } mL^{-1})$ . **therefore ckamnce** rates couId not **be calculated** at this concentration **since the number** of cells **rejected** in the **pseudofeces wodd have to be deterrnined. Maximum ingestion rates (CR x ceiI concentration) of P.** *lima* **cek occurred** at **cell** concentrations of **approximately**  130 cells  $mL^{-1}$ .

**Clearance** rates of scallops **fed quivalent** biovohme concentrations of **the** non-toxic diatom *13ralassiosiru weissfbgii* ais0 **declined** exponentiaüy **with increasing ceU**  concentrations, however log-transforrned mgression equations indicate that the rate **of**  decline this reiationship **was** much **less than** for **P.** *lima* cells **\*g. 3.2b).** Although **there was** no signincant dflerence in clearance rates of scaIlops exposed to the two **algal diets** at P. lima equivalent biovolume cell concentrations below 150 cells mL<sup>-1</sup> (t-test,  $P > 0.05$ , n  $=$  7), clearance rates were significantly lower for scallops exposed to *P. lima* at cell concentrations greater than 200 cells  $mL^{-1}$  (*t*-test,  $P < 0.0001$ ,  $n = 7$ ). The feeding **behaviour** of scaiiops **appeared** the **same** for **both diets:** scallops fed actively on P. lima, except at the highest cell concentrations, when scallop valves were observed to shut frequentiy.

#### 3.3.2. Anatomical compartmentalization of toxins

**Mean** total **@TX1** + **OA** + **D80A)** toxin content of P. lima **ceils** in the stock tank **was**  3.42 pg cell<sup>-1</sup> (SD = 0.49) over the course of the two day feeding study. There were no **significant** ciifferences in either **the** total toxin content or the relative % **molar toxin** profile **of P. lima cells sampled from the stock tank after 0, 24 and 48 h (repeated measures**  $ANOVA, P > 0.05$  (Fig. 3.3).

After two days of exposure to P. lima cells, total DSP toxin concentrations in visceral and gonadal tissues were approximately  $1 \mu g g<sup>-1</sup>$  while in the gills, mantle and adductor muscle toxin concentrations were less than 0.1  $\mu$ g g<sup>-1</sup> (Fig. 3.4). Total toxin concentrations were **slightly greater** in **viscerai than** in gonadal **tissues,** however this difference was not significant (t-test,  $P > 0.05$ ). Although gills, mantle and viscera comprised most of the wet weight of the scallops (Fig. 3.4), most of the total toxin body **burden was conhed to the Mscera (Fig. 3.5b).** Gonadal tissue **accounted** for oniy 4 % of



**Fig. 3.3. Relative** % **molar DSP toxin content of** *Prorocentrum* **lima cells in the stock tank over 48** h **feeding experiment.**


Fig. **3.4. Contribution of tissues to total wet body weight in bay scailops.** 





**Fig. 3.5. DSP toxin concentrations (a) and** % **contribution to total toxin body burden (µg) (b) in bay scallop tissues following 2 day exposure to P. lima cells. Viscera composed of digestive gland-stomach cornplex.** 

the **wet tissue** weight in the **reproductively** immature **scaiïops,** however 11 % of the total toxin body burden was present in this tissue.

An examination of the relative % molar toxin composition of P. *lima* cells and scallop tissues **indicated** that **the** dinoflagellate **œlls contained** a lower percentage of OA and **<sup>a</sup> higher percentage of D80A** and **DTXl than** the **tissues** *(Fxg.* **3.6a).** This **is** aiso evident in the **fact** that **both** the **ratios** of **OAfD8OA** and **OA-denvativedDTX1** were **markedly** lower in P. *lima* cells than in any of the tissues except for the gills (Fig. 3.6b). Among the **tissues, mantle, adductor muscle, gonads and viscera all had similar toxin profiles, characterized** by a dorninance of OA, **especially** in the adductor muscle. The toxin composition of gills was intermediate between that of ingested P. *lima* cells and the other tissues. The ratio of **OA-denvatives/DTX1** in the **gih,** which **resembled** that of P. *lima*  cells, was significantly less than in the other tissues (ANOVA,  $P = 0.0023$ ).

## **3.3.3. Effects of toxins on feeding physiology**

*Prorocentrurn limu* **ceii** concentrations in the aquarium fluctuated **around** a timeweighted mean of 173 cells  $mL^{-1}$ , during which time scallops ingested the cells at a mean rate of 1.57  $\times$  10<sup>6</sup> cells d<sup>-1</sup>  $g^{-1}$  (SD = 9.9  $\times$  10<sup>5</sup>) (Fig. 3.7a). Linear regression analysis was used to calculate the cumulative weight-specific ingestion rate:  $IR = 2.0 \times 10^6$  cells  $d^2 g^2$ **@g. 3.7b).** No mortaiities occuned over the 13 d exposure period, nor **did** scdops **exhibit unusual feeding behaviour.** In general, scallops appeared to be unaffected by exposure to toxigenic P. *lima* cells.

Weight-standardized clearance rates of scallops varied significantly over the preexposure, exposure and detoxification period (one-way repeated measures ANOVA,  $P =$ 0.0148,  $n = 7$ ) (Fig. 3.8a). Pairwise multiple comparisons indicated that clearance rates were significantly higher during the detoxification period than prior to exposure to P. lima or during the first three days of the exposure period  $(SNK, P < 0.05)$ . There was no significant shift in clearance **rates when** scdops were **changed nom** a diet of *ntaiassiosira*  **weissflogii** (pre-exposure) to P. lima. Clearance rates increased during the second week of exposure and continued **to ciimb** during detoxitication.

There was no significant difference in the % organic matter content of *Prorocentrum*  $\lim_{h \to \infty}$  (mean = 80.4 %, SD = 4.6) or Thalassiosira weissflogii cells (mean 79.0 %, SD =



**Fig. 3.6. a) Relative** % **molar DSP toxin content in** *Argopecten irradians* **tissues after two days exposure to** *Prorocentrum* **lima** cells. *b)* **DSP toxin ratios in P.** *lima* **ceUs** *and A. irradians* **tissues.** 

Fig. 3.7. cells ingested during 13 d exposure period. ingestion rates of  $Argopecten irradians$ . b) Linear regression of cumulative  $\sim$ a) Prorocentrum lima cell concentration and weight-specific cellular



 $\boldsymbol{\mathfrak{P}}$ 





9.2) (t-test,  $P > 0.05$ ,  $n = 5$ ). The absorption efficiency (AE) of organic matter by scallops **varied signifkantiy over the course of the feeding shidy (one-way repeated measures**  ANOVA on arc-sine transformed values,  $P = 0.0003$ ,  $n = 7$ ) (Fig. 3.8b). Absorption **efnciencies were signiscantly bwer after three days of exposure to P. lima than at the beginning of the exposure period (SNK,**  $P < 0.05$ **,**  $n = 7$ **). Although AE values appeared to** increase **duting detoxiacation when scallops were retumed to a diet of T.** *weissfIoggi,*  this increase was not significant.

Fécai **deposition rates by scallops were not signincantly different over the exposure period (one-way repeated measures ANOVA,**  $P = 0.0996$ **,**  $n = 7$ **), fluctuating around a** weight-standardized (1 g wet weight tissue) mean of  $325 \mu$ g dry weight h<sup>-1</sup> (SD = 60) **@g. 3.8b).** 

#### **3.3.4. Effects of gut passage on Prorocentrum lima cells**

**Microscopic examination of fecal samples (1000x magnification) revealed that intact** and motile *Prorocentrum lima* cells were prevalent in scallop fecal ribbons throughout the **exposure** petiod. **They were fkquently observed swimming within the fecal ribbons. as well as dong the exterior margins of the ribbons. suggesting that these** ceIls **had recently**  migrated from the feces into the surrounding medium. Evidence that some of the ingested **P.** *lima* cells were digested during passage through the scallop gut was provided by the **presence of P. lima thecal fragments and free starch granule bodies within the feces. A greater proportion of digested** *P. lima* **ceils** within **fecal ibbons was observeci at the beginning of the exposure period than during the latter portion (Fig. 3.9, coinciding with the observed decrease in absorption eficiency.** 

**Prorocentrum lima cells contained in fecal ribbons were able to divide at rates comparable to those of P. lima cultures when inoculated into growth media (Fg. 3.10).**  Growth curves were similar for cells inoculated from intact and dispersed fecal ribbons, **indicating that P. lima cells were capable of freeing themselves from feces.** 

### 3.3.4. Toxin dynamics: uptake and detoxification

**Total DSP toxin content (DTX4** + **D8OA** + **OA** + **DTX1) of** *Prorucenznun* **lima** ceils **fluctuated between 22.7 and 6.8 fmol cell<sup>-1</sup> over the exposure period, averaging 12.4 fmol** 



**partially digested P. lima cell** 

**ree starch granules** 

**thecal fragment** 





Fig. 3.9. Nomarsky interference photo micrographs of fecal samples produced **by bay scaiiops after 2 days (a) and 12 days (b) of exposure to**  *Prorocentrum lima* cells at 10<sup>5</sup> cells L<sup>-1</sup>



**Fig. 3.10. Growth of** *Prorocentrum lima* **cells in K-medium after inoculation from either P.** *lima* **culture or fecal ribbons of** *Argopecten irradians*  **foilowing ingestion of P.** *lima* **ceils (undisturbed and disrupted fecai**  ribbons). Error bars = 1 standard deviation,  $n = 3$ .

 $cell<sup>1</sup>$  (SD = 5.2) (Fig. 3.11a). These values were expressed in units of fmol cell<sup>1</sup> rather than **pg celt'l due** to the **considerab1y iarger** mokular weight of **DTX4** (1472.6) **relative**   $\text{to OA } (805.5)$ . Mean total toxin content of P. *lima* cells was  $10.0$  (SD = 4.2) if expressed in terms of pg OA eq. cell<sup>1</sup>. Total toxin content of scallop tissues as determined by LC-MS **was** < 1% of **the cumulative** toxin **ingested** by the **animais** over **the** exposure period Fig. 3.1 **lb). Aller 13 days** of exposure to P. **ümo** *ce&,* **scallops had ingested** an estirnated 197 **pg** total **DSP** toxin g **wet WC',** however total **toxui** concentration **in** whole **scallop**  tissues peaked at only 1.00  $\mu$ g g<sup>-1</sup> after 8 days of exposure (Fig. 3.10c). Thus. toxin accumulation efficiency (% TAE) in scallop tissues decreased exponentially from 8.1 % **afkr** oniy 2 hours of exposure to approximately 0.4 % for the **remainder** of the study **(Fg.**  3.1 lc). Total **toxh** concentration in whole scaliop tissue **exceeded DSP toxin** regdatory **levels** of **0.2 pg** g wet **wt." accepted** in Europe and **Japan (Quilliam,** 1995) **after only** 18 **hours** of exposure to P. lima. **A decrease** in total toxin concentration **in** scailop tissues observed midway through the study (8 d) coincided with the presence of P. *lima* cells containing **low** levels of toxin.

Temporal patterns of total **DSP** toxin content in **viscera,** gonad **and** other tissues **(rna.de. giUs** and adductor muscle) **were simüar during** the toxin exposure **penod** although toxin uptake rates were **greatest in** visceml and gonacial tissue (Fig. **3.12).** Pearson product-moment correlations **indicated** that total toxin concentrations in each of the tissue compartments were significantly correlated during the toxin uptake period ( $P < 0.05$ ). In ail tissues toxin content **peaked after** 8 days, foilowing **which** a **decline** in toxin leveis for the **remaining** 5 days of exposure coincided **with** a su **bstantial decrease** in the toxin content of ingested P. *lima* cells. Over the course of the uptake period, toxin concentrations in each of the tissue compartments foiiowed the **same rank order:** viscera > gonads >> other **tissues.** 

Tissue **wet** weights. expressed as **percentage** of to **ta1 body** weight, **remaineci** constant throughout the uptake and detoxification penods. Viscera, gonad and other **tissues**  averaged *ca.* 21%, 5% and 74% of the total body weight, respectively (Fig. 3.13a). **During** the uptake period, **viscerd tissue** comprised most (76%) of the total toxin body burden **WB), while gonadal** and other tissues accounted for 1 1% and 13%. **respectively** 







**Fig. 3.12. Temporal pattern of DSP toxin uptake and Ioss (hatched area) in**  *Argopecten irradians* **tissues dunng a 13 day exposure to** *Prorocentrum lima*, followed by a 3 week detoxification period. Error bars represent  $\pm 1$ standard deviation  $(n = 3)$ .



**Fig. 3.13. Contribution** (%) **of** *Argopecten irradians* **tissues to: a) total wet body weight;** b) **total DSP toxin** body **burden.** 

**(Fig. 3.13b). During the first two days of detoxification, visceral tissue represented 96% of 'LTBB, after which virtndy aii** of the **remaihg** toxin load **was** confinecl **to this** tissue.

**Total toxîn concentration in gonads was compared to the condition index** (gonad wet **weight/total body wet weight x 100) to determine whether the reproductive condition of** gonads **had an eflect** on **DSP toxin** content in **this tissue,** however no significant correlation existed between the two variables (Pearson product-moment correlation,  $P =$ O. **15).** 

Detoxification in all tissues followed an exponential pattern, however toxin release rates **were fat** more rapid in **gonads and** other **tissues** than in **viscera (Fig.** 3.14). Detoxification data was fitted to the general exponential loss equation:  $T_t = T_0 e^{-\lambda t}$ , where  $T_t = %$  of toxin concentration at start of detoxification,  $\lambda$  = exponential decay coefficient and  $t =$  time  $(d)$ . Toxin loss from the viscera appeared to follow a biphasic pattern, characteriad **by** a **rapid** release of toxuis during **the** initial 16 **hours** of detoxincation (30 **9b** of **the original** toxin **load), followed by a much more gradua1** detoxification process over **the ensuing weeks. although a higher sampling frequency would be required** yo confirm this pattern. Exponential loss curves were fitted to viscera data after the first day of detoxification. While toxin loss from visceral tissue was calculated to be 8.4  $\%$  d<sup>-1</sup>, gonads and other tissues detoxified far more rapidly at rates of 50 %  $d<sup>-1</sup>$  and 68 %  $d<sup>-1</sup>$ , respectively. Toxin **ieveis** in gonads **and** other **tissues were undetectable within** 5 days of detoxification, however toxin concentrations in visceral tissues still remained at levels above regulatory limits  $(1-2 \mu g g)$  viscera<sup>-1</sup>) after 11 days of detoxification. No DSP toxins were **detected** in **viscerai tissues** after two **months** of **detoxifcation.** 

Live *Prorocentrum lima* cells were observed by microscopy (400 X magnification) in fecal ribbons produced by scallops up until the fourth day of detoxification. Pigments and **thecal fragments derived from digested** *Thalassiosira weissflogii* **cells were abundant in fecal samples, however, unlike P.** *lima* **cells, very few of these diatom cells were intact.** 



**Fig. 3.14. Loss of DSP toxuis from** *Argopecten irrdiatts* **tissues following exposure to DSP-toxigenic Prorocentrum lima. Detoxification rates** fitted to the general exponential loss equation:  $T_t = T_0 e^{-\lambda t}$ , where  $T_t =$ toxin concentration ( $\mu$ g  $g^{-1}$ ) T<sub>0</sub> = toxin concentration at beginning of detoxification  $(T_0 = 16$  hours for viscera),  $\lambda =$  exponential decay coefficient  $(\% d^{-1})$  and  $t = \text{time (days)}$ .

> $Viscera: T<sub>t</sub> = 1.87e^{-0.088}, r<sup>2</sup> = 0.62$ **Gonad:**  $T_t = 0.96e^{-0.684}$ ,  $r^2 = 0.80$ Other tissues:  $T_t = 0.09e^{-1.137}$ ,  $r^2 = 0.90$

### 3.3.5. Toxin composition

### **Temporal patterns**

**Relative toxin composition (% molar) of** *Prorocentrum lima* **cells and scallop tissues** over the **periods** of **toxh uptake** and detoxification is **depicted** in **Fig. 3.15. As detennined by** U3-W **analysis, DTX4 was detected in** *P. lima* cell **extracts in extremely** variable amounts (0-5.5 fmol cell<sup>-1</sup>). While the relative proportions of OA and DTX1 in *P. lima* **samples remained fairly** constant over the **exposure period, D80A** levels fluctuated **UiverseIy** with **its sulfated parent** toxin, **DTX4.** 

**Analyses by** both LC-W and **negative** ion-spray **LC-MS failed** to **detect DTX4 in any**  of the **extract phases taken f?om viscerd** tissues on day 8 of **the** exposure **period,** at **which**  time **toxin** concentrations **had reached maximum kvek in the scallops. Since DTX4 was**  not detected in these samples, no other scallop tissues extracts were analyzed for DTX4. **In viscerd tissues, D80A was** the principal toxin **present,** fluctuating inversely **with** OA throughout the toxin uptake and detoxification periods (Fig. 3.15). Temporal changes in **the** relative concentrations of **D80A** and OA Ïn **viscetal tissues were not signiscant when**  tested by linear regression analysis  $(H_0: \text{slope differs from zero})$ , however a significant  $(P)$ = **0.00 15). yet slow, decrease in the relative concentration of DTX 1 occurred during** the toxin uptake **period.** LeveIs of DTXl **(96 rnolar) were** constant **in** viscerai **tissues during**  detoxification.

Levels of D8OA and OA also varied inversely in gonadal tissues throughout the feeding study, however **uniike** in **viscerai** tissue, **the two** toxuis **were** present in **rehtively quivalent** proportions. There **was** no temporal trend **detected** for **any** of **the** toxins in **the**  gonads. AIthough mantle/gilVadductor **tissues were sampIed** less fkequently **during** the exposure period, a significant enrichment in OA (linear regression,  $P = 0.0076$ ) and a **decrease in D8OA (** $P = 0.0265$ **) occurred in this tissue compartment over the time-frame** of the *uptake/detoxification* study.

A **trend common** to each of the **tissue** compartments, as well as ingested P. *lima* cells, **was** the **relatively** stable **leveis** of DTXl compared to the **large** fluctuations of other OA **deri~tives~** In **general,** for **each** of the **compartments studkd, DTXl accounted for 10** - **20** 



Fig. 3.15. Relative (% molar) composition of DSP toxins in *Argopecten irradians* tissues and ingested *Prorocentrum lima* cells during toxin exposure and **detoxification periods (begiming of detoxification indicated by dashed line).** 

% **(molar)** of the total toxin **present. The remainder varied widely among OA, D80A** and DTX4.

### **Relative toxin composition**

The toxin composition of scallop feces produced on day 12 of the uptake study was almost identical to that of P. *lima* cells and was characterized by the presence of DTX4 **(Fig. 3.16a), indicating** that a large proportion of **the feces was composed of** intact P. lima ce&. **Mean (averaged** over the whole uptake period) arcsine **transformeci** levels of individual DSP toxins in scallop tissues were compared to P. *lima* cells by pairwise multiple cornparisons **(Dumet's test, P** < **0.05). D80A ievels were significantly higher** in viscetal **and** other **tissues than in P.** *lima* **ceils, whik OA levels** were higher in visceral and **gonadal tissues. There was** no significant dinerence in **DTXl** levels **between** tissues and dinoflagellate cells. Comparisons between tissue compartments indicated that gonadal tissues **contained significantly more OA** and **less D80A** than **either** visceral or other tissues. OA e~chment in gonads **was also** apparent when the **OA/D80A moiar** ratios were examined (Fig. 3.16b). The ratio of all OA derivatives  $(DTX4 + D8OA + OA)$  to DTX1 **was similar** for P. lima **cells** and non-viscerd tissues, however viscerd tissues **were**  enriched in OA derivatives compared to DTX1, especially during the detoxification phase, when the **visceni** contained significantly lower proportions of DTXl **than during** the uptake **period (t-test,** P < **0.00 1) (Fig. 3.16~).** 

# **3.4. Discussion**

### Shed-term **feeding** *responses*

At *Prorocentrum lima* concentrations of 100 cells  $mL (10^5 \text{ cells } L^{-1})$ , adult bay scallops **ingested** the toxigenic celis as **readily** as equivalent biovolurne concentrations of the nontoxic diatom *Thalassiosira weissflogii*. However, scallop clearance rates were much more inhibited **by increases** in P. **lima** ce11 concentrations **than of T. weisflogii. This** evidence indicates that although bay scallops appear unaffected by exposure to DSP-toxigenic P.  $\lim_{\alpha \to 0}$  at concentrations of  $10^5$  cells  $L^{-1}$ , higher cell concentrations cause scallons to rapidly reduce feeding rates, presumably to reduce exposure to the harmful effects of DSP toxins.



Fig. **3.16. Mean DSP toxin profiles in ingested** *Prorocentrum lima* **ceiis,**  *Argopecten irradians tissues and* **fecal ribbons: a) relative** % **molar toxin content; b) ratio of OA to D80A;** *c)* **ratio of OA derivatives to DTXI. Arrows indicate direction of toxin flow. Dashed lines refer to toxin ratios**  in *P. lima* cells.

**It is** possible that scallops have post-ingestive mechanisms to protect **themselves fiom DSP** toxuis **whiîh may** become **overwhelmed** at **high ceii** concentrations. **This** would force scaiiops to **cope** with the **toxins** ushg pre-ingestive **rnechanisms, including reduceù**  clearance **rates,** pseudofeces production and intermittent valve closure, aJI of which **were**  observed at very high concentrations of P. lima. Peak ingestion rates determined at 130 P.  $\lim_{\alpha \to \infty}$  cells mL<sup>-1</sup> indicated that scallops were probably ingesting *P. lima* cells at maximal rates throughout **both the** juvenile and adult long-tenu **feeding** studies, during **which ceii**  concentrations were maintained at approximately 100 - 200 cells  $mL^{-1}$ .

## Anatomical compartmentalization of toxins

**Short-term** loadùig of scdops with **DSP** toxins indicated that most of **the** total toxin **body** burden **was confhed** to the **viscera (77%), whereas** gonadai tissue comprised a smaller, yet significant portion  $(11\%)$ . Although the subsequent depuration study indicated that high **DSP** toxin **levels** in gonadai tissues were deriveci fiom **labüe** toxin cornponents in the intestinal loop section of **this** tissue, shellnsh **marketing** authorities should nonetheless **be wmed** that bay scaliop roe **can** become **quite** toxic **during** exposure to DSP toxigenic dinofiagellates. **Gilis, mantle** and adductor tissue each **contained** only **4%** of the total toxin **load** and can **be considered** low **risk tissues** for **DSP** toxin accumulation. Due to the very low toxin concentrations in each of these tissues  $(< 0.1 \mu g g^{-1})$ , they were combined and treated as one cornpartment for the subsequent long-term toxin uptake and depuration study.

Examination of DSP toxin profiles revealed that all of the scallop tissue compartments were enriched in OA relative to P. *lima* cells, presumably due to hydrolysis of the D8OA component following ingestion of cells, as suggested in the previous chapter. Since D8OA **is** not considered to **be** a phosphatase inhibitor (Hu et **aL, 1995).** the **D80A** to OA shift in scallop tissues represents an increase in total toxicity. Also consistent with the **resuits** of the juvende toxin uptake study, **was** the **decrease in** relative DTXl content in tissues compared to P. ünia ceik, **supporthg the** hypothesis **that DTXl** rnay **be** selectively eliminated from scallop tissues at a slightly faster rate than OA-derivatives. An interesting result of this study was the unique toxin profile exhibited in gills, which contained a higher **percentage** of DTXl **and** a lower **OAID8OA** ratio **than** other tissues. The **resemblance** of **the gilI** toxin composition to that of P. lima celis suggests that a significant portion of **the**  toxin component may have been derived from intact P. lima cells trapped amongst the gill **filaments.** Although scallops **were** lightly **rinsed** with **filtered seawater** prior to **dissection,**  it **is quite** plausible that mucilage aggregates of **newly fïItered** P. *lima* ceUs rnay have **remained** amongst the **gin filaments** foflowing excision of the tissue. Although total toxin content in adductor **muscle was** low, it should **be noted** that this cornpartment contained the highest and Iowest proportions of OA and DTXI, respectively. This evidence **lends**  support to the hypothesis that **D80A is** hydrolyzed to **OA,** and **DTXI ici** seiectively **eliminated** as **DSP** toxins **are** subjecred to scallop **digestive** processes, **since** toxin **located**  in the adductor muscle **represents** a component **which has already been** digested and transferred from the **viscera.** 

## **Feeding physiology**

**As** was the **case** with juvenile bay scallops, when exposed **to** toxigenic *Prorocentmm lima* **ceiis, adults ingested** the **ceils over** a two **week duration** without **suffering any mortalities. Feeding** parameter **measurements** suggested that **bay** scaüops **rnay use** post**ingestive** selection to **cope** with **DSP toxins ingested with P.** *limu* **ceb.** Absorption of organic matter from **ingested** food **decreased by** approximately 25% when scdops **were**  changed kom a **diet** of non-toxic diatoms *(nialassiosira weissfrogii)* **to** toxigenic P. *lima.*  Since both species of microalgae were composed of 80% organic matter, it cannot be **argued** that P. *lima* **is** assimilateci **las** efficientiy due to poorer organic **content. One**  explanation for the lower AE for P. *lima* cells is that the cells may not have been as easily digested as those of *T. weissflogii*. The rapid increase in clearance rates exhibited when adult scallops were depurated on a diet of non-toxic diatoms may have been an attempt by the scallops to compensate for nutritional losses incurred during exposure to P. *lima* cells. *This* suggests that dthough scallops **were** able to survive two-weeks of exposure **to**  toxigenic P. lima, longer toxin exposure may have resulted in nutritional deficiencies and poor growth.

Fecal deposition rates of scallops were unaffected by exposure to P. lima, demonstrating that **scailops** did no t enhance **elimination** of **DSP** toxins via **decreasing** gut residence **times.** However. an apparent **increase in** the incidence **of** intact P. lima ceiis in **fecd ribbons** during **the** latter **portion** of the exposure period suggested that the proportion of intestinal feces **(ingested materiai** that **bypasses the digestive gland) may**  increase after extended P. *lima* exposure. An important finding of this study was that P. **lima cefi** were able to survive gut **passage** and subsequently divide in culture **media** This **evidence** dernonstrates that a **substantial rkk is incurred** when shellfish stock are **transferred fiom areas where** DSP-toxigenic **svains** of P. lima exist, since **release** of **live**  cells in fecal pellets can seed new sites with this dinoflagellate. Aquaculturists should be **advised** to **aJlow** stock to **clear** gut contents for at lest **three** days in contaùied tanks pnor to introduction to a **new** site.

### **Toxin uptake and depuration**

Adult bay scallops **accumuiated DSP** toxins at rates **rapid** enough to **exceed** regulatory levels  $(0.2 \text{ µg g}^{-1}$  whole tissue<sup>-1</sup>) in less than 18 hours. However, since overall toxin assimilation efficiency in scallop **tissue was** iess **than** 1%. the initial toxin load **was lürely** a result of **newly** ingested *P. lima* cells in *the* gut (including intestinal loop **passing** through **the** gonad). This point **is fûrther** supported by the similatity between fluctuations in P. *lima* cellular toxin content and tissue **toxin** content. **The observed decrease** in **DSP** toxin concentration in tissues **midway** and **again** at the **end** of the toxïn exposure, **was** clearly a result of **decreases** in the cellular toxin content of **ingested** P. **lima** celis. In each of the **tissue** cornpartments, toxin Ioads **peaked** on the eighth day of exposure, coinciding With a **peak in cellular DSP toxin content of 22.7 fmol cell<sup>-1</sup>. The close coupling of tissue toxin** load with cellular toxin content strongly **suggests** that **DSP** toxicity in scdop tissue **was mainly derived** hm **labile toxin** components **which experience** a short residence **tirne (c** 1 **&y)** in scallop tissues. **The** labile toxin load would have **been** a result of both intact and recently digested P. *lima* cells, primarily confined to the scallop gut. This would account for **both** the relatively high toxin **level** in gonadal tissue and low **levels in mantle. gilLs** and adductor, since the gonad includes part of **the** intestinal tract **while** the other tissues **have little** direct contact with the gut. **Evidence** that gonadal **toxin** content **was** independent of **its** condition index supported the **hypothesis** that **DSP** toxins in **gonads** were composai of a labile intestinal component rather than a sequestered fraction in the actual tissue. These **findïngs** are favourable for **shellnsh** growers, **since toxin** accumulation in **gonadal** tissue

would present a **long-term marketing** problem for **tissue** consumption, **as weU** as **pose a threat to the** reproductive **capacity** of **maauing** gonadal **tissue.** 

**Depuration** of **DSP toxins fiom bay** scailop **tissues reiterated finciings that the** majority of the toxin load in **scalIops was composed of a labile component. Rapid** detoxikation of gonadal tissue and the gill/mantle/adductor compartment in less than 5 days demonstrated that **DSP to&** were poorly, if at **ail.** bound to **these tissues.** Moreover, this **evidenœ suggests** that non-viscerd tissues should **be easily rendered** fit for human consumption via depuration following **DSP** toxin **contamination.** An apparent **biphasic** detoxification patterns **exhibited** in **visceral mue** suggests that **DSP** toxhs were present as **both** a labile and bound fiaction in this tissue. Rapid **release** of **approxirnately** 30% of viscerai toxin **during** the first 16 hours **of depuration was likely a result** of evacuation of intact and **partially digested P.** *lima* **cell via fecal deposition. However, depuration of the remaining** toxin load in **the** viscera **occurred** at a **considerably** slower rate (8.4% **4').** and **represents**  toxins that were **bound** to gut tissue. Persistent presence of **DSP** toxins in the **visera** even **after** two **weeks** of detoxincation **indicates** that scdop viscerd tissue **is** not iikely to **be**  depurated easily in the event a DSP incident. However, rapid loss of toxins from non**viscerd tissues suggests** that regulatory **authorities** shouid test **both sets** of **tissues** for **DSP toxkity since adductor and gonadal tissues appear to be** fit for consurnption long **before visceral tissue is free of toxins.** 

### **Toxin composition**

**Analyticai** methods for the **detection** of **DTX4,** a **slightly** water-soluble derivative of **OA,** were developed at the **the** the present study **was** conducted. **Evidence** of **DTX4** in Prorocentrum lima cells fed to scallops added another dimension in the examination of **DSP** toxh transformation in **scaiïops** foIlowing ingestion of P. **lima** ceils. **Although DTX4**  in **cell** extracts **was detected** at ievels **slightly** less **than D80A** and **OA,** it **is assumeci, accordhg to the** results **of Quilliam and Ross (1996), that DIX4 was the principle cellular DSP** toxin component prior to rupture of cells via the extraction process. Failure to detect **DTX4 in** scaliop **tissue indicates** that **this** compound **was** hydrolyzed to **D80A** and **OA upon digestion of P. lima cells by** scaiIops. **This pmcess may have been facilitateci either by scaiiops digestive enymes** or by **esterases** endogenous to P. lima **cells.** Detection of

**DTX4** in fecal pellets confirmed the presence of live, toxin-producing cells in the feces and **suggests that DTX4 in live P. lima cells present in the scallop viscera was hydrolyzed during homogenization of the tissue for toxin extraction.** 

**Amongst scallop tissues, relative toxin composition was simüar** with **the exception of evidence of OA encichment in gonadal tissues. Results of this study suggest that toxin in this tissue is connned to the intestinal loop, therefore it is possible that digestive processes**  influencing hydrolysis of DTX4 to D8OA are more complete in this section of the **digestive tract** than **in the viscera which would contain recently ingested cells as weii as digested materiai. Further support for the hypothesis that DTXl is selectively eluninated fiom scaIIop tissues was provided by detoxification data, which revealed a lower**  proportion of DTX1 in the viscera during the detoxification stage than during toxin **uptake-** 

# **Chapter 4. Biotransformation processes**

# **4.1. introduction**

**As weil as understanding pathways of phycotoxin uptake and loss in shellfish, knowledge of metabolic conversions of toxins following ingestion of toxigenic microalgae by bivalve moiluscs is also of** cntical **importancertance Such biotransformations can** lead **to**  dramaric **shifts in net tissue toxicity (Brjcelj and CembeIla, 1995; BriceIj et al. 1990), and possibly result in the appearance of** *de novo* **toxins not previously detected in ingested macrOalgal** celis **(Cembeiia et ai.. 1993). Such conversion processes can be fâditated by**  enzymes derived from either shellfish digestive glands or ingested microalgal cells.

**A combmation of physical (Beninger and Le Penoec. 1991) and chernical (Seiderer et al, 1982) digestive processes that operate within the** gut **of bivalve mo1luscs presents a**  multitude of complicating factors for attempts to distinguish toxin conversion processes linLed **to shellosh digestive enzymes hm cataboh processes endogenous to ingested cells. To alleviate this problem, researchers examining paralytic shellfish toxin conversions have incubateci purified PSP** tarins **with sbefih tissue homogenates (Shm and Yoshioka, 1981; Suliivan et al. 1983). thereby eliminating any physical processes induced by live** animais- **Although** QuiLüam and **Ross (19%) demonstrated that DTX4 in P.** *lima*  **ceh can be hyddyzed to D80A and OA following** ceiI **disnipticm, questions remained concerning the fate of this metabolic pathway in shellfish tissue. Therefore, an** *in vitro* **toxin incubation experiment, similar in design to those describeci above, was employed in the present study to determine the main factors responsible for the conversion of DSP observed in bay scaiiop tissue in the previous h~o chapters.** 

# **4.2. Materiaïs and Methods**

## **4.2.1.** *In vitro* incubation of DSP toxins with visceral and gonadal tissue

**Viid** and **gonadai (including intestinal loop) tissues were excised separately hm**  adult bay scallops  $(n = 7)$  (mean shell height = 38.6 mm), weighed and immediately **homogenized with 4:1 (v:w) 50 mM Tris HCI buffer (pH = 7.5), while cooling in an ice bath. Enymatically inactive homogenates were obtamed by pIacing 1.5 mL aliquots of**  **each homogenate in 2** mL **plastic microcenvifuge** tubes, foUowed **by immersion** in **boiling water** for 2 **min.** 

**Suspensions of ruptured** *Prorocentrum lima* **cells were obtained by passing cell pellets** (50 **m.** of culture **œntrifbged** at 4000 **x g for 10** min) **resuspended in 0.2 mL 50mM** Tris **HC1 buffer** through a chüled French press. **Pressures** produced **by** the press exceed IO Kpsi and are sufficient to rupture P. *lima* cells without harming the activity of endogenous **enzymes liberated from disrupted cells (Quilliam and Ross, 1996).** 

Pnrified DSP **toxins** produced by P. lima cultures **were** obtained **nom** Dr. **J.** Wright, Institute for Marine Bioscknces, Halifax, NS. **Aithough a** toxin solution **containing** only **DTX4 was preferred** for **this** study, this **was not** possible **due to** the **degradative** nature of **DTX4.** Therefore, the toxin solution containecl **DTX4** accompanied by slightly **lower**  concentrations of D8OA, OA and DTX1. Aliquots (350 µL) of purified toxin solution **were incubated** in **1.5** mL plastic microcentrifuge tubes with tissue **homogenates** according to Table **4.1 Each** tube **coniained one** of several different homogenates chosen to **determine** biotransformation processes **of DSP** toxins in the presence of scdop **andlor** P. lima endogenous **enzymes.** 

Incubations were performed in duplicate at room temperature  $(ca. 22 \text{ }^{\circ}C)$  and sampled at **intervals** of O, **0.5,** 4 and 22 h. **At** each **interval,** incubation **tubes were vortexed** for 30 s foliowing which, 100 pL aliquots were removed from each **tube** and **combined** with 400 pL of **methanol** in a 1.5 mL centrifuge tube, **thereby arresting enzymatic** activity. It **is**  important to note that the initial 'thne O' **sample actualIy** occurred **afier** 30 s of vortexing, **during** which **time** the toxins were **briefly** exposed to **enzymatic** actîvîty. Toxins were **extracted** by centrifuging **sarnples** at 6600 x g for 3 min, foilowing **which** the supernatants were decanted. Pellets were rinsed with 100  $\mu$ L of 80% aqueous methanol, centrifuged, and the combined supernatants were evaporated to dryness in a vacuum centrifuge. Following resuspension in 100  $\mu$ L of 80% aqueous methanol, extracts were passed through a 0.45 um cartridge-filter (Millipore Ultrafree-MC) and transferred to crimp**topped** autosampler **vials** for toxin **analysis** and quantitation by **LC-W @80& DTX4)**  and positive ionspray **LC-MS** *(O&* **DTXI)** as previously **described in sections 3.2.5 and 2.2.6, respectively.** 

**Table 4.1. Solution volumes (mL) used for** *in* **vitro incubation of purified DSP toxins**  with scallop tissue homogenates and/or *P. lima* cell homogenates. Incubation solutions are as follows:  $C =$  control;  $BV =$  boiled viscera;  $BG =$  boiled gonad;  $FV =$  "fresh" **viscera;**  $FG =$  "fresh" gonad;  $PL =$  ruptured P. *lima* cell homogenate;  $FV + PL =$  fresh viscera combined with P. lima homogenate.

	C	BV	<b>BG</b>	FV	FG	<b>PL</b>	$FV + PL$
<b>DSP</b> toxin solution	350	350	350	350	350	350	350
<b>Tris Buffer</b>	350	150	150	150	150	200	$\blacksquare$
Viscera homogenate				200		$\blacksquare$	200
<b>Boiled</b> viscera		200				$\blacksquare$	$\overline{\phantom{0}}$
Gonad homogenate					200		
Boiled gonad			200				
P. lima homogenate						150	150
Total volume (µL)	700	700	700	700	700	700	700

### **4.2.2. In vitro incubation of** *Rorocerrtnrm* lurtcr **ceüs wiîh visœral tissue**

**A 50** mL **culture of** *Prorocentwn lima* **(age** = 90 **days,** stationary phase **growth) was cenvifuged** at 4000 x g for 10 min. **The** supernatant **was decanted** to waste and the pellet **was** resuspended in **5** mL **of Tris HC1 buffer (pH** = **7.5). Ceils suspended** in the **buffet**  solution **were** observed to **be** intact when **examinecl under** phase contrast microscopy. Aliquots (700 pL) of the *P.* lima **suspension were** incubated **with 700** pL of either Tris **HCl buffer,** scallop **viscera** homogenate or **boiled** (2 **mh) viscera** hornogenate in 1.5 **mL**  plastic microcentrifbge tubes. Incubations were performed at room temperature and **sampled** (100 **pl,)** at **intervals** of **0,0.5,** 4 and 22 **h.** Toxins were **extracted** as **described** in 4.2.1. and **andyzed** for DTX4 and **D80A** by **LC-UV.** 

# 4.3. Results

# **4.3.1. Toxin incubations**

**Anaiysis** by U3-W indicated that concentrations of **DTX4 decreased** over the 22 h incubation petiod in ali of the samples **(Fig.** 4. la), however **this** trend **was much** more rapid and pronounced in incubations that included ruptured P. *lima* cell homogenate. In **these samples, DTX4** concentrations **decreased** to approxirnately 50% of the initial concentrations in the control incubations **after** only 30 s **exposure** to P. *lima* homogenate. After an incubation period of 30 **min,, DTX4 was** not detected in either of the samples **containhg** P. *lima* homogenate. **Thus,** hydrolysis of **DTX4 was rapid** in the presence of P. lima homogenate and the inclusion of **scdop viscera** homogenate **did** not **appear to have any** additional **effects. In** the incubations that did not **contain** P. **lima** homogenate, **DTX4**  concentrations remained relatively constant during the first 4 hours of incubation. After 22 h of incubation, **Dm4** levels **had decceased** to 30% of initial concentrations in the control and **6096** and 75% in **fresh** visçera and gonad incubations.

A rapid increase in D8OA concentration during the first 30 min. of incubation provided evidence that **DTX4** hydrolysis to D80A **had** occurred in both of the incubations containing P. lima homogenate **(Fig.** 4.lb). Net **increases** in D80A **were** not apparent in



**Fig. 4.1. Concentrations of DTX4 (a) and D8-OA(b) in homogenates incubated**  with **purified DSP toxins, as analyzed by** LC-UV.

**the** incubations **that did** not contain P. lima homogenate, with the exception of a slight D8OA increase in the fresh gonad incubation (38%).

Positive ion-mo& **EMS analysis was ody** perfonned on the convol **fresh viscera**  and P. lima homogenate + fresh viscera incubations. DTX1 results were used to normalize concentrations of the **okadaic acid** derivatives (DTX4, **D80A** and **OA).** Normalized **results indicated** that ail of the toxins **remained** at relatively constant **levels** in the **control,**  contrasting with the incubation containing P. *Lima* homogenate combined with scallop **viscera,** in **which DTX4 was rapidly hydrolyzed** to **D80A during** the **first** 30 **min.** of incubation followed **by** a **more** gradua1 hydrolysis to OA over the following 22 h **(Fg. 4.2).** In the incubation **containing only viscera** homogenate, a slight **decrease** in **DTX4**  levels over **the** 22 h incubation period **was accompanied** by a smd increase in **D80A, while** OA levels **appeared** to **remain** constant

## **4.3.2. P. lima cell incubations**

**As analyzed** by LC- *W,* DTX4 concentrations in the control homogenate **rernained** at levels near 0.9  $\mu$ M during the first 4 hours of incubation, however after 22 hours, the **D'LX4** concentration **had** decreased by approximately 80 % **(Fig. 4.3a).** Initial **DTX4**  concentrations in **boiled** viscera homogenate were substantially Iower **than** the control and **remallied** at this level for the **duration** of the incubation period. In fresh **viscera**  homogenate, initial **DTX4** concentration **was** 90% Iower than the controi, after which the concentration of this toxin **decreased** to negligible **Ievels** by the **end** of the incubation period.

Concentrations of **DSOA** in the control homogenate followed a **similar** temporal pattern **as DTX4,** characterized by a **marked** decrease **after** 22 hours of incubation (Fig. **4.3b).** In both of the **visera** homogenates, **D80A** concentrations increased **during** the **fkst**  30 **min.** of incubation, foliowed **by** a substantial decrease in this toxin over the **rest** of **the**  penod. Although **D80A** patterns **were similar** in the two viscera homogenates. the sharp



**Fig. 4.2. Concentrations of DTX4 (a), D8-OA (b) and OA (c) in homogenates incubated** with **purified DSP toxins. DTX4 and D8-OA analyzed** by **LC-UV. OA analyzed by LC-MS. Toxin concentrations normalized to**  DTX1, as analyzed by LC-MS.



**Fig. 4.3. Concentrations of DTX4 (a) and D80A (b) homogenates incubated** with **intact** *Prorocentrum* **lima cells, as analyzed by** LC-UV.

initial increase was much more pronounced in the enzymatically active "fresh" viscera homogenate.

# **4.4. Discussion**

In the **pfesence** of **mptured** *Prorocenmun* lima **ceii material, hydrolysis** of **DTX4** to **D80A was** complete within 30 minutes of incubation, followed by a more **gradual**  conversion of **D80A** to OA **during** the **remaining** 22 hours. **These results are** consistent **with** the findings of **Quilliam** and Ross (1996) which suggest that the **rapid** conversion of **DTX4** and the **much** slower conversion of **D80A** may **be** a result of two distinct esterase **pathways.** The addition of **bay** scailop **viscera** homogenate to incubations **already containhg mptured P.** lima **rnay** have slightly **increased the** conversion rate of **DTX4** to **D80A, however the overall contribution of scallop visceral enzymes to these metabolic** reactions can be considered insignificant.

Although **conversion** of **DTX4** to **D80A was** evident in **visceral** and gonadal homogenates, **simjlar results** occurred in control incubations, and in **boiled** tissue **samples**  in which enymatic **activity had been arrested. In these sampIes, significant degradation of**  DTX4 did not occur until after 4 hours of incubation, suggesting that transformation was **occuming** due to spontaneous hydrolysis of **DTX4** rather than a result of enzymatic activity. Transformation of D8OA to OA only took place in incubations containing P. *lima* **esterases,** demonstrating the **greater** s tability of **D8OA** relative to DTX4.

Incubation of intact P. *lima* cells with scallop tissue homogenates revealed that during the initial hours of incubation, transformation of **DTX4** to **DSOA was** most evident in the fresh viscera sample, suggesting that P. lima cells were lysed by visceral enzymes causing **P.** *lima* esterases to hydrolyze cellular DTX4. During this period, however, significant **DTX4** degradation **also** occurred in **the presence** of **boiied** viscera **Since enzymatic**  activity was destroyed by boiling, P. lima cells must have been ruptured by exposure to non-enzymatic chemical activity derived from viscera tissue. Although the Tris HCl buffer **was intended** to **maintain** a stable pH environment (pH 7.5) in the incubations, it **is**  possible that digestive acids released from viscera tissue may have caused P. *lima* cells to *lyse.* **Acidic** conditions **in mussels guu were also suggested by Briceij et aL (1990) as** 

environments conducive to hydrolysis of PSP toxins produced by the dinoflagellate *Alexandrium fundyense.* **Finally, hydrolysis of both DTX4 and D8OA in all incubations akr 22 hours was clearly** a result of P. lima **ceii lysis** due to poor conditions for **ceII**  maintenance,

**hightarrow results of the** *in vitro* **incubation study can be applied to findings obtained from the feeding experîments** to constnict a **hypothesbd** pathway **of DSP toxin metabolism** in bay scallons (Fig. 4.4). Following ingestion of DSP-toxigenic P. *lima* cells by scallons, the **ce& would be mptured due to physical and chernical digestive processes** that occur in **the scallop gut, including the grinding action of the chitinous crystalline style in the stomach** (Beninger and Le **Pem, 1991) and** the **catabok activity** of a wide **spectmm** of **enzymes**  secreted **by** the style and **digestive glands** (Seiderer **et aL,** 1982). **As demonstrated** in the present study, lysis of P. *lima* cells results in the release of esterases that rapidly hydrolyze **DTX4** to D8OA and more slowly degrade D8OA to OA. The differential rate of breakdown of the two toxins would explain the absence of DTX4 and relatively high proportions of **D80A** in **scaliop tissues during** the **feeding experirnents.** Although, bay **scallops** do not **appear** to **have esterases capable** of **eflkiently** hydrolyzing **D80A** to **OA,** it **is possible that other species of bivalve molluscs may be capable of such enzymatic** activity. In this **case, it wouid be expected** that OA would **be** the **predominate** toxin **accurnulated in** tissues. **resulting** in **increased** net toxicity due to the phosphatase inhibition **activity** of OA.



~i~~ **4.4. Diagramatic representation showing biotransformation of DTX4 to OAdi01 ester (D80A) and OA via digestion and rupture of P.** *lima* **cells**  in bay scallop stomach/digestive tract.

# **Chapter 5. General summary and conclusions**

### 5.1 Feeding physiology and survival

**Exposure to DSP toxigenic** *Prorocentrum lima* **cells had very little effect on the** feeding **physiology of juvenile and addt** *Argopecten* **irradians.** nor **did** any mortalities occur. Clearance rates of bay scallops feeding on P. *lima* were comparable to those reported in other studies of A. *irradians* ingesting non-toxic diatom cells at similar biovolume concentrations (Pierson, **1983; Bricelj** and **Kuenstner,** 1989; BciceIj and Shumway, 1991; Palmer, 1980). Previous studies **involving** bivalve moiluscs feeding on PSP toxigenic **dinoflagellates** have **described a wide range** of physiological **effects**  exhibited **by** bivalves, including feeding inhibition **and mortalities** (Bardo **uil** et **al., 1993; Lesser and Shumway, 1993), while others reported no apparent effects or feeding** inhibition **(Bricel)** et al., 1990; Bricelj et al., 1991). Similarily, Whyte et al. (1995) observed no adverse reactions when *Mytilus edulis* were exposed to cells of *Pseudonitzschia rnultiseries* containing **the neurotoxin domoic acid.** Aside **fiom the present** study. **the only examination of the** effect of **DSP** toxigenic **algae exposure** on bivalve **feeding**  activity reported that P. *lima* had no influence on physiology, behaviour or survival in *Mytilus edulis* (Pillet and Houvenaghel, 1995). Under natural conditions, evidence of shellnsh mortalities during exposure to **dense** blooms of **DSP** toxigenic *Dinuphysis* spp. **is**  seldom, if ever described, however there are many reports of shellfish mass mortalities **upon exposure** to blooms of **paralytic shellnsh** toxin **producing** dinofiagellates (Shumway. 1990). Furthermore, blooms of non-DSP toxic *Prorocentrum mininum* have caused largescale mortalities **of** juvenile **bay scallops (Wikfors** and Smolowitz, **1993)** and **oysters**  (Luckenbach et al, **1993). Yet juvede** bay scallops **exhibited 100%** survival when exposed to toxic **cells** of P. *lima* **in the present study.** It **is** clear **that,** akhough DSP toxicity in shellnsh **is** a **serious** pro **blem** for **human** consumption, adverse **effects** on scdop survival and feeding **activity are minimal.** 

**Okadaic** acid and **its** derivatives are **powerful** cytotoxins that cause phosphorylation in a **broad** range of **animals** and **plants (Van** Egmond, **1993;** Dickey et **aL, 1993;** Terao **et al.**  1993), however as **noted** by **Windhust et al** (1996). **there is** very **little** known **regardhg** 

95
the effect of **these** compounds on marine **animals.** The evidenœ depicted in the present study, suggesting that bay scallops are not affected by exposure to DSP toxigenic cells, **impiies** that these animais **are** able to protect themselves **kom the effects of the toxins. Shumway** et **aL** (1987) postulated that **when** bivalves are **exposed to** toxigenic **algal ce&, they** wül **often** cope **with** the toxin by either closing their valves, **thereby arresting feeding**  activity completely, or by employing feeding **mechanisms** to reduce the amount of **toxin**  accumulated. Pre-ingestive methods to reduce ingestion of toxic cells would include **reduced** filtration rates or rejection of **cells** as pseudofees. Throughout the long-tenn feeding **studies, bay** scailops exhibited neither of **these** strategies when exposed to P. *limu.*  At concentrations greater than  $400$  cells  $mL^{-1}$ , however, pseudofeces production was observed and clearance rates were significantly reduced relative to the non-toxic control **diet Pre-ingestive rejection** of P. *lima* ceUS ody at high **ceii** concentrations **may** have been ernployed by the scaIiops as a secondary adaptation if post-ingestive **feeding mechanisms**  were overwhelmed by too many cells in the gut (Bayne et al., 1984). Similar results were reported **by Pillet** and Houvenaghel (1995) who noted that M. *edulis* feeding rates were lower for DSP toxic P. lima cells than non-toxic P. micans cells at cell concentrations of  $1000$  cells  $L^{-1}$ , however there were no differences at concentrations of  $100$  cells  $L^{-1}$ 

Post-ingestive feeding **mechanisms used by** bivalves to select for and against ingested **particles** were demonstrated **by** Shurnway et **al.** (1985) using flow-cytometric methods to **examine celi** composition in **fecal ribbons.** Although **Ostrea edulis** preferentially ingested *Prorocentmm minimum* **celis relative** to other dgal species, these **authors argued that the**  high incidence of P. *mininum* fragments and intact cells in the fecal ribbons indicated that these ceils **were** selectively **rejected** from the **animal's gut.** Post-ingestive strategies by bay scallops are proposed here to reduce **DSP** toxin absorption when exposed to P. lima as a food source. Evidence for post-ingestive rejection of P. lima cells is provided by the observed decrease in absorption efficiency (AE) exhibited by adult bay scallops following a change of **diet** fkom **T.** *weissfogii* to *P. lima,* and by the muency of **live** P. *lima* **ceUs** in fecal **ribbons. While** absorption efficiencies of bay scailops feeding on **T.** *weissfogii* cells were remarkably similar to those reported by Bricelj and Kuenstner (1989) and **by** Pierson (1983) for **A.** *irradians* feeding **on** the **same** diatom **species, lower** absorption efficiencies

for P. *lima* cells resembled those of scallops exposed to cells of poorer nutritive quality than **T. weissflogii** (Pierson, **1983). Cranforxi** and Grant (1990) **notd** that **AE** values for **sea scallops were correlated with** the organic matter content of the **ingested** food. **Since** P. *lima* and **T. weissjlbgii** were **determïned** to **be equal** in relative organic matter content **(80%), the decrease in AE during P. lima exposure was likely a result of P. lima cells king** Lzss **digestible than the diatoms. An** alternative **hypothesis is** that the **decreased**  absorption of P. *lima* organic material by the scallops may have been an attempt to limit **DSP** toxin absorption. Aithough **AE** values for bay scailops **exposed** to P. lima cells were comparable to **those** of other **bivalves** *(eg. Mercenuria mercenaria, Mytilus edulis)*  exposed to cells of PSP toxin-producing *Alexandrium* spp. (Bricel et al., 1990, 1991), PSP toxins **were** accumulated into **tissues at much higher** levels **than** those determined for DSP toxins in **the** present study.

**The** present study **is** the first to demonsvate **the survival** of **DSP** toxigenic **algal** cells in bivalve **fecal** ribbons. **Similar** studies (Scmtt et **aL,** 1993; **Bricelj** et **aL,** 1993) showed hew: PSP toxin-producing *Alexandrium* cells could survive and reproduce following **passage** through the gut of *Mytilu edulis.* Scarratt et ai. (1993) **reported** that **after** 3.9 h of depuration, almost ail of the *Alexandrium* ceils were gone **fkom** the **fecd** ribbons and recommended that 12 h of purging should be sufficient to rid mussels of toxic cells prior to transfehg stock to **new** waters. Passage of P. lima **ceb in bay scaiiop guts** occurred over a much longer timescale, **as** demonstrated by the presence of **iive** ceiis in **fecal** ribbons **after as much as 3 days of** depuration. Since **scdops were** continudy **ingesting** T. *weissflogii* cells during the depuration period, it is appears that the residence time for P. *lima* **cells greatly exceeded the normal** gut passage the for **particles in** the bivalve guts (Scarratt et **al,** 1993). **Bomber** et **aL** (1988) reported that live P. lima cells have **been**  found attached to the **viscera** of tropical fih and **suggested** that the ability of **these** ceiis to survive in **fish viscera** for **extended periods represents** an important system of dispersai for this species. **Sirnilarily,** the slow **passage** of P. **lima** cells in scaiiop guts represents a **risk** of dispersing cells to new aquaculture sites via stock transfer. Furthermore, the ability of P. *lima* to adapt and survive in a wide variety of benthic environments **(McLachlan** et al.,

1994; **Bomber** et **al,** 1985) **irnpües that celis reieased into a new** site via **fecd** deposition **from transferred stock would have a high probability of long-tem survival and** growth.

## **5.2 Toxin uptake, compartmentalization and detoxification**

Although **DSP toxin** concentrations **in** shellfish **rissue** commonly surpass regdatory **ievels (0.2 pg g whole** tissue-') in **Japan** and Europe where blooms of toxic Dinophysis spp. are common, **levels** rarely **approach those** reported for **PSP** toxin accumulation **in bivalve tissue**  $(> 100 \text{ µg} STXea g^{-1})$  **under natural conditions (Shumway and Cembella, 1993) and during** laboratory **feeding studies (Briceij** et **al,** 1990). **Peak** DSP toxui concentrations reported for bivalves exposed to natural blooms of *Dinophysis* spp. are consistently in the range of 0.5 to 2  $\mu$ g  $g^{-1}$  whole tissue (Underdal et al., 1985; Lembeye et al., 1993; Zhao et al., 1993) and 1 to 10  $\mu$ g  $g^{-1}$  digestive gland tissue (Sechet et al, 1990; Hageltom, **1989;** Haamer, 1995; Della Loggia et **ai,** 1993; **Quilliam et** al, **1993; Cannody**  et **al,** 1995; **Aune** and **Yndestad,** 1993). **The** highest **DSP** toxin **kvels** reported in the liierature, 17 **pg g-'** digestive **gland** (Rodriguez et **al,** 1989) and **40 pg g-' digestive gland (Gago et aL, 1991),** occurred **in** mussels exposed to *Dinophysis* spp. blooms in the **Spanish** Rias. In the **present** study, bay scallop viscera tissue **attained peak** toxin **Ievels** at 3 **to** 6 **pg g-',** which **agrees very well with values** reported **in the** literature. **Thus, it appears**  that the low DSP toxin accumulation efficiency exhibited by bay scallops emulates feeding processes that occur in scallops and **mussels during** exposure to **DSP toxigenic algae**  under natural conditions. **These** observations are supportexi by a field **study** by **Haamer et al** (1990) in which **DSP** toxin **leveis** were **much** lower than expected for mussels feeding on *Dinophysis* **ceils** in *a* **Swedish** fjord. **The** authors suggested **that** an OA blocking **mechanism** may operate within the mussels and hypothesized that such processes could include valve closure, **reduced** clearance rates, decreased absorption or an **increase** in depuration. The **results** of the present study argue against a reduction in **feeding** processes as a toxin blocking **mechanism,** and support **the hypothesis** that **bivalves are able** to **maintain** relatively **low DSP** toxin levels **primarily** via efficient toxin **elimination.** 

In **juvenile** and **adult** bay scallops, the majonty of the **DSP** toxin load **was** confinecl to the **viscerê** Although toxin concentrations **were relatively high in** adult gonadal tissue, rapid detoxification rates for gonads implied that toxicity in the gonads was represented by

**a labile component confined to the intestinal tract, rather than** bound to the tissue. This **evidence agrees** with observations for *Mytilw edulis* in which **DSP** toxin concentrations in digestive tissue **were seven** (Vernoux **et ai.,** 1994) to ten **(Pikt** et **al..** 1995) **times** greater **than that of the other tissues. Data for paralytic shellfish toxins also indicate that toxin** loads are greatest in visceral tissue during periods of toxin uptake *(Briceli et al., 1990)*, yet foilowing the loss of labile **toxins during depuration, most of the bound PSP** toxins are ofken **localized** in non-digestive tissue including **man&** and **gill tissue (Bricelj and CembeIla, 1995). In bay** scaüops, **DSP** toxins were only bound to **Msceral** tissue as demonstrateci **during** depuration **by** the slow loss of toxins fiom **this** cornpartment as **compared** to ail other tissues. This evidence suggests that **during periods** when **DSP**  toxigenic **dinofiagellates** are present in the **water** colurnn, **aU of** the **scallop tissues**  represent a potential toxin risk due to the presence of labile toxins from recently ingested toxic celis. However **during** depuration petiods, toxicity **wouki** only **be** expected to **be**  associated with **visceral** tissue, and possibly gonads, due to the inclusion of the intestine with this tissue. For areas prone to DSP toxicity, it may be advisable for shellfish growers to culture bivalve **spies** which do not **include the viscera** tissue as a market product Scaüops, for **example, can be** sold as adductor **muscle** alone, which does not sequester **DSP** toxins **above** regdatory **levels.** However mussels are **consumed** as **a** whole **animal**  product. and could **be** kept off market for extended periods if **DSP** toxins persist in visceral tissue.

**Detoxification** of **the** viscera was identified by **an immediate** and substantiai loss of DSP toxins **during the initial 16 h** of depuration **foliowed** by a **much** slower Ioss over the **subsequent weeks. Similar** detoxincation patterns have been observed for the loss of PSP *I*  toxins **fkom** *Mytilus* edulis **(Silvert** and Cembeila, 1995) and Mercenaria *mercenaria*  **(Bricel et al., 1990, 1991). prompting Silvert and Cembella (1995) to hypothesize that such** a **pattern** can **be** modelieâ as a two-stage process consisting of a rapid loss of labile toxins followed by a slow release of **the** bound fraction.

**Bricelj et ai. (1991) used general exponential** equations to describe the second-stage loss of PSP toxins from tissues of *Mercenaria mercenaria*. The same approach was employed in the present study to describe the release of DSP toxins from bay scallop

**tissues.** Unfortunately, **since** other studies have **ody** attempted to report depuration of DSP toxins from shellfish in descriptive terms, it is difficult to compare data in the existing fiterature. **To facilitate** such comparisons, exponentid decay equations **were fitted** to **data**   $extracted from DSP studies in which toxin concentrations in depurating shellfish were$ reported **(Fig.** 5.1). Thus. **DSP toxin** loss rates can **be** compared **between** studies as **percentage loss**  $d^{-1}$  **or toxin half-life in tissues (Table 5.1).** 

**As expected,** detoxification **rates** of bay scailop non-visceml tissues were much **faster than those calculated for visceral tissues from other studies. Bay scallop viscera detoxified** at a rate **of 8.4% d-'. which compared extremely weli with** data reported **by Japanese researchers** for loss of DSP toxins fiom the blue mussel *Mytilus* edulis (Yasumoto et **aL,**  1978) and **fkom** the Japanese scallop Pntinopecten yessoensis (Tazawa et **al,** 1989). **Küruchi** et **aL** (1992) reported simiIar detoxification rates for P. yessoensis depurated **on** a **diet** of the diatom Chaetoceros septenrrionalis, yet **when** an alternative diatom nialasiosira **was us&,** loss rates were hdved. MarcaiIlou-Le Baut et **al (1993b)**  reported loss rates **similar** to the present study for M. edulis depurated in naturd ponds, yet **animals** depurated in laboratory **tanks** on a diet of the flagellate *Tetraselmur* were very slow to detoxify. Natural **basins** also **proved** very effkctive sites for depuration of **Adriatic mussels** *(Mytilus* galbprovinciallis) which were toxin-6ree **withui** 22 days (Poletti et **al.,**  1996). Rates of **DSP** toxin loss **fiom** mussels at aquaculture sites in Mahone Bay, Nova Scotia were found to be slightly faster in one study (Ouilliam et al., 1993), yet slower in another **case (Gilgan** et **al, 1995), than** for **bay** scallops in the present study. This **similatity is** significant since the isolate of Prorocentmm lima used **as** the **DSP** toxin source in **this** study originated from Mahone **Bay** and **is** considered a suspect **as** the causative organism of **DSP** in that region.

**Ovedi, the DSP** detoxincation rate detennined for **bay** seailop **viscerd** tissue in the present study was comparable to rates calculated for elimination of DSP toxins from other bivalve species in the laboratory and **in** *situ* **(Quilliam** et **al,** 1993; **GiIgan** et **al,** 1995; Yasumoto et al, 1978; **Tazawa** et **aL,** 1989). However, such comparisons must **be** made **with** caution due to the variety of toxin **analysis** methods **used** for **each** study. **As discussed** previously in **this** thesis. mouse **assays** are not necessarily **specinc** to DSP toxins



**Fig.** 5.1 **Release of DSP toxins from bivalve mollusc species. Exponential decay curves fitted to data from studies listed in Table 5.1.** 

**Table 5.1 Detoxification races of DSP toxins from digestive tissues of bivalve mollusc species. Detoxification data from cited studies**  were fitted to the general exponential loss equation:  $T_t = T_0 e^{-\lambda t}$ , where  $T_t = \%$  of toxin concentration at start of detoxification,  $T_0 =$ initial toxin concentration,  $\lambda$  = exponential decay coefficient and  $t$  = time (d). Toxin concentrations from mouse bioassay data was converted according to Rodriguez et al. (1989), where 1  $\mu$ g DSP toxin  $g^{-1} = 4$  mouse units (MU)  $g^{-1}$ .

		Table 5.1 Detoxification rates of DSP toxins from digestive tissues of bivalve mollusc species. Detoxification data from cited studies were fitted to the general exponential loss equation: $T_t = T_0 e^{-\lambda t}$ , where $T_t = \%$ of toxin concentration at start of detoxification, $T_0 =$ initial toxin concentration, $\lambda$ = exponential decay coefficient and t = time (d). Toxin concentrations from mouse bioassay data was							
		converted according to Rodriguez et al. (1989), where 1 $\mu$ g DSP toxin g <sup>-1</sup> = 4 mouse units (MU) g <sup>-1</sup> .							
<b>DATA SOURCE</b>	<b>SPECIES</b>	<b>DETOXIFICATION</b> <b>SITE</b>	<b>DETECTION</b> <b>METHOD</b>	<b>TOXINS</b>	T. $(\mu g g^{-1})$	-ኢ		<b>HALF</b> <b>LIFE</b> (d)	$\sigma_{\!o}$ <b>LOSS</b> $\mathbf{d}^{\text{-1}}$
<b>Bauder</b>	A. irradians	Tank; fed T. weissflogii	<b>LCMS</b>	D8OA+OA					
(present study)				+DTX1					
viscera					3.055	0.088	.62	7.9	8.4
gonad other tissue					0.964 0.090	0.683	.80 .88	1.0	49.5
Poletti et al. (1996)	<b>Mytilus</b>	Natural basin,	<b>LCMS</b>	OA	4.25	1.350 0.210	.97	0.5 3.3	74.1 18.9
	galloprovincialis	<b>Italian Adriatic</b>							
Quilliam et al. (1993)	M. edulis	in situ; Mahone Bay, NS	<b>LCMS</b>	DTX1	0.82	0.167	.81	4.1	15.4
Gilgan et al. (1995)	M. edulis	in situ; Mahone Bay, NS	<b>HPLC-FD</b>	DTX1	0.46	0.059	.81	11.7	5.7
Yasumoto et al. (1978)	M. edulis	<b>Tank</b>	Mouse assay		20	0.088	.99	7.9	8.4
Kikuchi et al. (1992)	P. yessoensis	Tank; fed Thalassiosira	Micobial inhibition	<b>OA</b>	7.3	0.033	.98	21,0	3,2
Kikuchi et al. (1992)	P. yessoensis	Tank; fed C. septentrionalis	Micobial inhibition	<b>OA</b>	7.3	0.081	.89	8.6	7.8
Tazawa et al. (1989)	P. yessoensis	In situ; Japan	<b>ELISA</b>	<b>OA</b>	0.4	0.079	.90	8.8	7.6
Marcaillou-Le Baut et al. (1993a)	M. edulis	<b>Tank</b>	<b>HPLC-FD</b>	<b>OA</b>	16	0.030	.77	23.1	3,0
		Aquaculture pond	<b>HPLC-FD</b>	<b>OA</b>	16	0.118	.97	5.9	11.1
		Tank	<b>HPLC-FD</b>	<b>OA</b>	3	0.089	.63	7.8	8.5
		Aquaculture pond	<b>HPLC-FD</b>	<b>OA</b>	3	0.196	.86	3.5	17.8
		<b>Tank</b>	Mouse assay	<b>OA</b>	10.8	0.025	.64	27.7	2.5
		Aquaculture pond	Mouse assay	<b>OA</b>	10.8	0.147	.78	4.7	13.7
		<b>Tank</b>	Mouse assay	<b>OA</b>	2.4	0.017	.70	40.8	1.7
		Aquaculture pond	Mouse assay	<b>OA</b>	2.4	0.035	.85	19,8	3.4

and could result in inflated toxin values due to the presence of fatty acid derivatives in the **extracts used for the assays. This may** explain the **extrerneiy** slow detoxification **rates**  calcuiared for **mouse assay data** reported **by MarcaiiIou-Le** Baut et **al (1993a).**  Furthemore, it **is** difncult to **compare** detoxification rates **between various bivalve species**  due to species-specific differences in feeding physiology, as shown for PSP toxin depuration studies (Shumway, **1990).** 

**Several studies have relateci** very slow **DSP detoxincation** rates for **mussels** under naturai conditions. In **Norway (Underdal et al,** 1985; Dahl and **Yndestad,** 1985; **Sechet** et **al,** 1990) and **Sweden (Haamer** et **aL,** 1990) low ieveis of **DSP** toxicity have **been** found to **remah** in mussel tissue throughout the winter following toxin **uptake from** exposure to bloorns of *Dinophysis* **spp.** the **previous** autumn. **Similar** patterns **of** winter **DSP** toxin persistence have been reported for mussels depurated on the Italian (Della Loggia et al., 1993; **Boni** et **aL,** 1993) **and French Mediterranean** coasts **(Belin,** 1993). **Dahl** and **Yndestad** (1985) suggested **that** mussels **were** slow to detoxîfy due to **low metabolie** rates resulting from cold water and poor food conditions during the winter. According to Bayne **(1985). mussels respond to the** environmental stress **of** poor food quality by reducing clearance rates, **lengthening gut** residence **times and increasing** absorption efficiency. Since low cell concentrations of *Dinophysis* cells often occur sporadically at the above sites during the winter (Della Loggia et al., 1993; Underdal et al., 1985), winter DSP toxin persistence in mussels **may be** a **combined** result of unusuaily efficient absorption of **DSP**  toxins from ingested *Dinophysis* cells and very slow gut clearance and rates. This hypothesis **was** supported **by** Haamer's (1995) observation **that** mussels in Sweden detoxified most rapidly at **the** onset of the spring bloom when **high** concentrations of **non**toxic **diatoms** were **once again** avaiiable for **mussel** consumption.

## **5.3 Toxin composition and biotransformation**

The recent **discovery** of ester derivatives of okadaic acid (Hu et **aL,** 1992, 1993, 1995) poses questions critical to the understanding of DSP toxin chemistry, especially regulatory **strategies** for detection of **these toxins** in **sheiilïsh** for public consumption. **Although**  okadaic **acid-di01 esters (D80A)** do not **appear** to **be** phosphatase **inhibitors,** both **its**  biochemical precursor **(DTX4)** and end-product (OA) exhibit such cytotoxic activity (Hu

104

**et al, 1995).** New **evidenœ indicating** that OA **can be a poweriùl** tumour promoter needs to be investigated further to determine whether OA-esters are also tumourgenic. In any **case,** given the bioconversion **pathways Iuikllig** OA **ester** derivatives to OA (Quilliam and Ross, 1996), regulatory authorities should consider such compounds as potential toxins. Prior to **the** present study, no **information was** available **regarding** the accumulation and transformation of OA-esters in shellfish tissue, either in vivo or in vitro.

QuiIliam and **Ross** (1996) **hypothesized** that **DTX4** rnay **be** hydrolyzed in shelbh via **the activity** of digestive enzymes. In *vitro* experiments **performed** in the present study demonstrated that **DTX4** ïs indeed rapidly hydrolyzed in bay scailop viscera, however the transformation **is** solely a resulr of endogenous **esterases** denved **nom** ruptureci *Promcentmm* lima **celis.** Conversion of **DTX4** to **D80A** occurs aimost immediately upon digestion of P. *lima* cells in the gut of scallops. The absence of DTX4 in scallop tissues following ingestion of P. lima **cells indicates** that this compound **is** uniikely to **be** present in shellfish tissue. It is more likely that any DTX4 will be hydrolyzed to form D8OA or OA **Du~g f&g** studies, D80A comprised a **major** portion of the total **DSP** toxin load in all tissue compartments of bay scallops. This evidence, combined with the relatively slow rates of conversion of **D80A** to *O&* should **be** a concem for regulatory authonties **which** rely on detection methods specific to OA and DTXl. Although the **HPLC-FD**  ADAM method **yields** better quantitative **data** than mouse bioassays (QuiUiam, 1995) it **is**  unable to detect D8OA or other OA-esters which do not have a free carboxylic acid endgroup. Thus, there **is** a **high** probability that potentiai DSP-toxicity in the form of **OA**esters is being overlooked by shellfish monitoring programs. Numerous reports of erratic OA concentrations in sheilfïsh tissues **(PiUet** et **aL.** 1995; **Haamer** et al, 1990; Marcaillou-Le Baut et al., 1993a) may simply be a result of biotransformation processes occurring in **tissue samples. In** the present study, **D80A** and OA concentrations in scallop tissues fluctuated inversely throughout the feeding studies, however when total toxin concentrations were taken into **account,** the **results were** not nearly as erratic. Previous studies of **DSP** toxicity in **shellnsh** did not **analyze** for OA-esters and **rnay** have misinterpreted fluctuating toxin concentrations due to bioconversion processes as erratic toxin **uptake.** Although in the present study, **anaiysis** of OA-denvatives **by LC-MS** proved

to **be** a very effective tool for determining **the** composition of **DSP** toxins in scaüop **tissues,** routine **DSP** monitoring programs **must** rely on **sirnpler, iess** costiy methods. **Since HPLC-FD analysis cmot detect** potentïai toxins in the form of **OA-esters,** regulatory **authorities** should consider **using LC-UV** detection to **analyze** for diol esters and **Dm4.**  Perhaps an even simpler and more conservative solution would be to hydrolyze all OA**esters in shellfish extracts** to **OA, thereby** converthg potentiai toxins to OA for **HPLC-FD**  analysis.

**Significant** biotransformation pathways were not apparent for DTXl in bay scallop **tissues.** However, **slight decreases** in **D'El** concentrations in scallop tissues relative to P. ha **cells suggested** that DTXl may **be** either selectively eliminated by **scallops** or less etnciently **retained** in the tissues. An **aitemative** explanation **is** that DTXl **had** undergone biochemical conversion to a cornpound not **detected** in the **K-MS analysis.** Yasumoto et al (1989) suggested **that DTX3** may **be** fomed in vivo in scdiop *(Patinopecten*  **yessoensis)** digestive **glands** via acylation of **D'CX** 1. This **hypo thesis was based** on the fact that **DTX3 was** detected in scallop tissue **yet was** never found in **Dinophysis cells**  implicated **in** causing **DSP** toxicity. **Sirnilar** evidence of the presence of **DTX3** in **mussel viscera** firom **IreIand was** reported by **Marr** et **al (1989). Since DTX3 was** not **analyzd** for by **LC-MS** in **the** present study, the possibiüry **remaùis** that a portion of DTXl **ingested** by bay **scalIops was** biotransfonned to **DTX3** via acylation. Further **analysis** of bay scdop viscera **extracts** using **LC-MS** configureci for detection of **DTX3 is required** to investigate such a **possibiiity.** 

## 5.4 Conclusions

This study **has** demonstrated that the epibenthic **dinohgellate** *Prorocenhcm* lima **can**  act as a vector for **DSP toxins** in **sheiitkh tissue.** In the **bay** scaiiop, **Argopecten** *irradians,*  tolrigenic **P.** *lima* **ceUs were ingested** without **any** inhibitory effect on clearance rates, except at concentrations greater than  $400$  cells  $mL^{-1}$ , at which point scallops reduced feeding **rates** by **intermittent** valve closure and pseudofeces production. Detrimental **effects** on feeding physiology **were** not apparent **in** either adult or juvenile bay scdops during exposure to P. lima, nor were any mortalities observed, suggesting that DSPtoxigenic **algal** blooms pose **little threat** to **bay** scailop populations.

Aithough **DSP** toxin concentrations in **bay** scailop **tissues** surpasseci **accepted** closure levels in some countries  $(0.2 \text{ kg g}^{-1})$  whole tissue; Andersen. 1996) within 18 h of exposure to P. lima **ceUs,** after 2 **weeks** of exposure ovedi **DSP** toxin retention **was** less **than** 1% of that **ingested** by the scaiiops. This suggests that scallops are **able** to prevent signincant **DSP** toxin accumulation via efficient detoxification mechanisms. Furthermore, it does not appear that DSP toxins are **easily** bound to scallop tissues, **with** the exception of the **viscera** which **retained DSP** toxins **during three weeks** of depuration. **Gonadal** tissues can becorne **highly** toxic **during** exposure to toxigenic **microalgae** due to newly ingested celis and **labile** toxin in sections of the **intestine** that loop through the **gonads.** Depuration rendered gonads free of toxins within three days, indicating that DSP toxins were not **sequestered** in this **tissue.** 

In generai, the results of the present study, as well as data reported in the literature, **suggest** that **DSP** toxins can **be** efficiently **depumted fkom shelifïsh** when the **animais are**  exposed to a non-toxic food supply. However, in the case of *P.* lirna. **there is** a **real risk** of contaminating **clean** waters with this dinofiagellate due to its ability to survive in **fecal**  pellets released from depurating shellfish.

Conversions of DSP toxins in bay scallop tissues occurred as a result of the activity of **esterases released fiom lysed** P. *lima* ceUs subjected to physical and **biochemical** digestive processes in the scailop gut. The major **DSP** toxin component in **ingested** P. *lima* celis. **DTX4, is** hydrolyzed immediately in **scallops** to fom **D80k** Transformation of **D80A** to OA **occurs** over a span of severai hours, **resulting** in **these** compounds **existing** in roughly **equal** proportions in scallop tissues. Uniike the fluctuations O **bserved** for OA-derivatives in scallop tissues, **DTXl** leveis **were** datively stable. However, slight **decreases** in the relative proportion of **DTX 1 in** scdop tissues reIative to ingested **cells implies** that either DTXl **is** selectively eliminated over OA-derivatives in scdops, or that **DTXl is** converted to an **undetected** compound, possibly **DTX3.** 

*Prorocentrum lima* is indeed capable of causing DSP toxin uptake in bay scallops **under laboratory** conditions. Yet, the question still **=mains: is** it possible for P. *lima* to cause **DSP** toxicity in bivalve molluscs in the natural environment? Aithough occasional **blooms of P. lima have been observed in the water column (Van Egmond, 1993), this** 

**epiknthic dinoflagellate is primarily found growing on either the benthos or on surfaces of macroalgae (Faust, 1995; Bomber et aL, 1985). Macroalgal cover, often termed "slub" by east Coast Canadian shellnsh growers, is commonly found attached to mussel socks and scallop lantern nets. In Spain, DSP toxigenic cells of P.** *lima* **have been found growing on macroalgae associated with musse1 rafts (ICES, 1992; Lee et ai., 1989). Although DSP toxicity in mussels is common in Spain, most evidence suggests that the toxicity is caused**  by dense blooms of *Dinophysis* spp. (Reguera, 1993). In Mahone Bay, Nova Scotia, **where chronic low levels of DSP have been detected in cuitured rnusseis since 199 1, DSP toxins have never been detected in concentrated net had material taken during blooms of**  *Dinophysis* **spp. (M. Quilliarn, Institute for Marine Biosciences, pers. comrn.). Yet, examination of macroaigal growth on mussels socks has revealed the presence of P.** *lima*  **growing on the seaweed in very close proxunity to the mussels (J. Lawrence, Ddhousie**  University, Dept. Oceanography, pers. comm). The results of the present study suggest **that P.** *lima* **cells would likely be ingested by shellfish if the cells were resuspended from the macroalgae, or perhaps fiom benthic sediments underneath the socks.** 

## **References**

- Alvito, P., I. Sousa, S. Franca and M.A. de M. Sampayo. 1990. Diarrhetic shellfish toxins **in bivalve rnoliuscs dong the Coast of Portugal In: E. Graneilï, B. Sundstrom, L. Edler and D.M. Anderson, eds., Toxic** *Marine* **Phytoplankron, Elsevier. N.Y., pp. 443-448.**
- **Andersen, P. 1996. Design and implementation of some harmful dgal monitoring systems. IOC Technicd Series No. 44, UNESCO, Paris.**
- Aune, T. 1989. Toxicity of marine and fresh water biotoxins towards freshly prepared hepatocytes. In: S. Natori, K. Hashimoto and Y. Ueno, eds., Mycotoxins and *Phycotoxïm* **'88, Elsevier, Amsterdam, pp. 461-468.**
- **Aune, T. and M. Yndestad 1993. Diarrhetic shellnsh poisoning. In: I.A. Falconer, ed.,**  *Algal* **Tds in** *Seafood and Drinking Water,* **Academic Press, London, pp. 87- 104.**
- **Baden, D.G. and V.L. Trainer. 1993. Mode of action of toxins of seafood poisoning. h: LA. Falconer, ed., Algal Toxins in Seafood and Drinking Water, Academic Press, London, pp. 49-74.**
- **Barber, BJ. and N.J. Blake. 1991. Reproductive physiology. In: S.E. Shumway, ed.,**  *Scalbps: Biology, Ecology* Md *Aquaculture,* **Elsevier. N.Y., pp. 377-428.**
- **Bardouil, M., M. Bohec, M. Cormerais, S. Bougrier and P. Lassus. 1993. Experimental study of** the **effects of a toxic microalgal diet on feeding of the oyster** *Crassostera*  **gigas Thunberg. J. Shellfish Res. 12(2): 417-422.**
- **Bayne, B .L. 1985. Response to environmental stress: tolerance, resistance and adaptation.**  In: J.S. Gray and M.E. Christiansen, eds., *Marine Biology of Polar Regions and Effects* **of** *Stress an Marine Organismr,* **John Wiley and Sons Ltd., London, pp. 331- 349.**
- **Bayne, B.L. and C. Newell. 1983. Physiologicai energetics of marine molluscs. In: AS.M, Saleuddin and KL. Wilbur, eds.,** *The Molluscn.* **Volume** *4:* **Physiology, Part 1, Academic Press, N.Y.. pp. 407-5 15.**
- **Bayne, B.L., D.W. Klumpp and KR Clarke. 1984. Aspects of feedùig, including estimates of gut tesidence time, in three** rnytilici **species (Bivalvia, Mollusca) at two**  contrasting sites in Cape Peninsula, South Africa. Oecologia 64: 26-33.
- **Belin, C. 1993. Distribution of** *Dinophysis* **spp. and** *Alexandrium minutum* **along French coasts sine 1984 and their DSP and PSP toxicity levels. In: T.J. Srnayda and Y. Shimuzu, eds.,** *Toxic Phytoplankton Blooms in the Sea***, Elsevier, N.Y., pp. 469-474.**
- **Beninger, P.G. and M. Le Pennec. 1991. Functional anatomy** of **scallops.** In: **S.E. Shumway, ed.,** *Scalbps: Biology, Ecobgy* und **Aquaculture, Elsevier, N.Y., pp. 133- 223.**
- **Blanco, J., M. Fernandez, J. Mdo, B. Reguera, A Miguez, J. Maneiro, E. Cacho and A Martinez. 1995.** From *Dïiwphysis* spp. toxicity to **DSP** outbreaks: a **preliminary mode1**  of **toxin** accumulation in **mussels. In: P. Lassus,** *G.* ArzuI, **E. Erard,** P. Gentien, C. **Marcaillou. eds.,** *Harmful Marine Algal Blooms***, Lavoisier, Intercept Ltd., Paris, pp. 777-782,**
- Bomber, J.W. and K.E. Aikman, 1988. The ciguatera dinoflagellates. Biol. Oceanogr. 6: **291-31 1.**
- **Bomber, LW., D.R Norris and L.E. Mitchell. 1990. Benthic dinoflageUates associated with ciguatera hm the** Horida **Keys. IL. TemporaI, spatial and substrate** heterogeneity **of** *Prorocenm~n* lima. **In: E. Granelli, B, Sundstrom, L. Edler and D.M. Anderson, eds., Toxic** Marine *Phytoplankton,* Eisevier, **N.Y., pp.** 45-50.
- **Bomber, LW., S.L.** Morton, **J.A Babinchak, D.R. Norris** and J.G. Morton **1988. Epiphytic dinofiageiiates of drift algae** - **another toxigenic cornmunity in the ciguatera**  food **chah. Bull.** Mar. **Sci. 43(2): 204-2** 14.
- **Boni, L.,** A Milandri, **R** Poletti **and** M. Pornpei 1993. **DSP cases dong** the Coast of Emilia-Romagna **(northwestern Adriatic Sea). In: TJ. Smayda and Y. Shimuzu, eds.,**  Toxic Phytoplankton Blooms in the Sea, Elsevier, N.Y., pp. 475-481.
- Boudreau, P., M. Durand-Clement, M. **Ammar** and **V. Fessard. 1995. Ecological and**  toxicologicd **characteristics** of benthic dtiotlagellates in a **ciguateric area** (Saint **Barthelemy** French **Indies). In: P. Lassus, G.** *Amil* **E. Erard,** P. **Gentien,** C. Marcaillou, eds., *Hannful* Marine Algal Blooms, **Lavoisier,** Intercept **Ltd.,** Paris, pp. **133-137.**
- **BriceIj, V.M. and AD. Cernbella 1995. Fate** of gonyautoxins in **surficlams,** *Spisula*  **solidksima, grazing** upon **toxigenic** Alexandk In: **P. Lassus,** *G.* Arzul, **E.** Erard, P. Gentien, C. Marcaillou, eds., *Harmful Marine Algal Blooms*, Lavoisier, Intercept Ltd., **Paris, pp. 413-418.**
- **Bricelj, V.M.** and **S.H.** Kuenstner. **1989. Effects** of **the %own** tide" **on the feeding physiology and growth of** bay **scallops and** mussels. In: **E.M. Cosper, V.M. Bricelj** and **EJ. Carpenter,** Novel *Phytoplonkton* Blooms, **Springer-Verlag. N.Y.,** pp. **49** 1-509.
- **Bricelj, V.M.** and RE. Malouf. 1984. **Influence** of **algal** and **suspended** sediment concentrations **on** the feeding physiology of the **hard clam Mercenaria mercenaria. Mar. Biol. 84: 155-165.**
- Briceli, V.M. and S.E. Shumway. 1991. Physiology: energy acquisition and utilization. In: **S.E. Shumway, ed,** *ScaUops: Biofugy, Ecology and Aquuculture,* **Elsevier, N.Y., pp. 305-346.**
- **Bkij. VM.. J. Epp and RE, Mdouf. 1987. Comparative physiology of young** and **old CO horts of bay scallop Argopecten** irradaians irradians **(Lamarck): mortality, growth and oxygen consumption. J. Exp. Mar. Biol EcoL 1 12: 73-91.**
- **B~i~dj. VMOT M Greene and AD. Cembella 1993. Growth of the blue musse1 Mytiius eduüs on toxic Alexandrium furidyense and effects of gut passage on dinoflagellate cells. In: TJ. Srnayda and Y. Shimuzu. eds.. Toxic** *Phytoplankon Blooms in* **the Sea. Elsevier, N.Y., pp. 37 1-376.**
- **Briœij, V.M., J.H. Lee** and **AD. CembeIla 1991. Influence of dinoflagellate toxicity on uptalre and loss of paralytic shellfish toxïns in the northern quahog** *Meremara mercenaria.* **Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 74 33-46.**
- Bricelj, V.M., J.H. Lee, A.D. Cembella and D.M. Anderson. 1990. Uptake kinetics of paralytic shellfish toxins from the dinoflagellate Alexandrium fundyense in the mussel *Mjdu edulis.* **Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 63: 177-188.**
- Carmody, E.P., K.J. James, S.S. Kelly and K. Thomas. 1995. Complex diarrhetic shellfish **toxin profiles in Irish mussels. In: P. Lassus, G.** Amui, **E. Erard. P. Gentien, C.**  Marcaillou, eds., *Harmful Marine Algal Blooms*, Lavoisier, Intercept Ltd., Paris, pp. 273-278.
- Cembella, A.D. 1989. Occurrence of okadaic acid, a major diarrhetic shellfish toxin, in **natural populations of** *Dinophysis* **spp. from the eastern coast of North America. J. AppL Phycoi. 1: 3û7-3 10.**
- **Cembella, AD. and C. Léger. 1992. Diarrhetic shellfish poisoning in Canada. In: J.4. Therfiault and M. Levasseur,** eds, *Proceedings* **of the Third Canadian** *Workrhop* **on**  *Ham Ma~e* **Afgac, Maurice Lamontagne Institute, Mont-Joli, Quebc, May 12- 14, 1992. Cm. Tech. Rep. Fih. Aqua** Sci **1893: 57-65.**
- **CernbeUa, AD and 0. StabeiL 1990. Standardizing extraction and** analysis **techniques for marine phytoplankton In: E. GraneIli, B. Sundstrom. L. Edkr and D.M. Anderson,**  *eh., Toxic Marine Phytoplankron,* **Elsevier, N.Y** .. **pp. 5 18-52 1.**
- Cembella, A.D. and E. Todd. 1993. Seafood toxins of algal origin and their control in **Canada.** In: I.A. Falconer, ed., Algal Toxins in Seafood and Drinking Water, **Academic Press, London. pp. 12% 144.**
- **Cembeh, AD-, S.E. Shumway and R Larocque. 1994. Sequestering and putatative biotransformation** of paralytic shellfish toxins by the sea *scallop Placopecten magellanicus:* **seasonal and spatial scales in naturd populations. J. Exp. Mar. BioL Ec01, 180: 1-22.**
- **Cembek, AD., S.E. Shumway and N1.** LRwis. 1993. **Anatomical** distribution **and** spatiotemporal variation in paralytic shellfish toxin composition in two bivalve species from the **Gulf** of **Maine.** J. **Shellfish Res. 12(2):** 389-403.
- **Chang, F.H., L. MacKenzie, D.** Tiu, **D. Hannah and** L. Rhodes. **1995. The first toxic**  shellfish outbreaks and the associated phytoplankton blooms in early 1993 in New **2kahd. In: P.** Lassus, **G.** hi, E. **Erard,** P. Gentien, C. **MarcaiIIou, eds., HarmfuI Manne** *Algal* **BIwmî,** Lavoisier, Intercept **Ltd.,** Paris, pp. **145- 150.**
- **Chew, KK.** 1990. Global bivalve **shellfish** introductions. Worid **Aquaculture** 21(3): 9-22.
- Conover, R.J. 1966. Assimilation of organic matter by zooplankton. Limnol. Oceanogr. 1 1: **338-354.**
- Couturier, C. **1990.** Scaiiop aquaculture in **Canada: fact** or **fantasy.** World Aquaculture <sup>2</sup>**1** (2) : 54-62.
- Cradord, **P.J.** 1994. Relationships **between** food quantity and **quality** and absorption **efficiency** in **sea scallops** *Placopecten magellanicus* (Gmelin). J. Exp. Mar. BioL EcoL 189: 123- 145.
- **Cranford, P.J.** and **J.** Grant. 1990. Particle clearance and absorption of phytopIankton and detritus by the sea scallop *Placopecten magellanicus* (Gmelia). *J.* Exp. Mar. Biol. ECOL 137: 105-121.
- **Crantord, P.J. and B.T. Hargrave. 1994.** In **situ** tirne-series measurernent of ingestion and absorption rates of suspension-feeding bivalves: *Placopecten magellanicus*. Limnol. Oceanogr. 39(3): **730-738.**
- Dahl, E. and M. Yndestad. 1985. Diarrhetic shellfish poisoning **(DSP)** in Norway in the autumn 1984 **related** to the occurrence of *Dinophysis* spp. In: **D.M. Anderson, AW. White and D.G. Baden, eds., Toxic Dinoflagellates. Elsevier, N.Y.. pp. 495-500.**
- Davis, R.L. and N. Marshall. 1961. The feeding of the bay scallop, *Aequipecten irradians.* Proceedings of the National Shellfish Association 52: 25-29.
- **Della Loggia, R, M. Cabrini,** P. Del Negro, **O. Honseil** and A Tubaro. 1993. Relationship between *Dinophysis* spp. in seawater and DSP toxins in mussels in the northern Adriatic Sea. In: T.J. Smayda and Y. Shimuzu, eds., *Toxic Phytoplankton Blooms in the* **Sea,** Elsevier, **N.Y.,** pp. 483-488.
- **Delmas, D.,** k **Herbland and S.Y. Maesvini 1993.** Do *Dinophysis* **spp.** corne fcom the "open sea" along the French Atlantic coast? In: T.J. Smayda and Y. Shimuzu, eds., *Toxic Phytophkton Blwmr in the Sea,* Elsevier, N.Y., pp. 489-494.
- **Dkkey, kW., H.R Granade and F.A.** Bencsath. 1993. **Improved analytical** methodology for the derivatization and HPLC-fluorometric determination of okadaic acid in phytoplankton and shellfish. In: T.J. Smayda and Y. Shimuzu, eds., Toxic *Phytoplankton Blooms in the Sea, Elsevier, N.Y., pp. 495-499.*
- **Edebo, L., S. Lange, X.P. Li, S. Allenmark and E. Jennische. 1989. Diarrhetic shellfish** toxins induœ **rapid** swehg of the intestinal **epitheIium** and hypersecretion in the rat srnail intestine. In: S. **Natori, K.** Hashimoto and Y. Ueno, **eds.,** *Mycotoxinr* and *Phycot~~ns '88,* Elsevier, Amsterdam, pp. **437-444.**
- EdIer, **L.** and M. Hageltorn **1990.** Identification of *the* causative **organism** of a DSPoutbreak on the Swedish coast. In: E. **Granelli,** B. Sundstrom, **L.** Edler and **D.M.**  Anderson, eds., *Toxic Marine Phytoplankton*, Elsevier, N.Y., pp. 345-349.
- **Faust, M.A. 1993. Altemate** asexual reproduction of *Prorocentmm lima* **in culture. In: TJ. Smayda and Y. Shimuzu, eds.,** *Toxic Phytoplankton Bloom in the* Sea, Elsevier, **N.Y.,** *pp. 1* **15- 1** *19.*
- Faust, *M.k* **1993. Sexuality in a toxic** dino **fiagellate,** *Prorocenhum lima.* **In:** *T. J.* Smayda and Y. Shimuzu, eds., *Toxic Phytoplankton Blooms in the Sea*, Elsevier, N.Y., pp. **121-125-**
- **Faust, MA 1995.** Benthic, toxic dinoflageilates: **an** overview. **In:** P. Lassus, *G.* hi, E. **Erard,** P. Gentien, C. MarcailIou, eds., *Harmfirl Marine Algal Bloom,* Lavoisier, **htercept Ltd., Paris,** pp. **847-854.**
- Freudenthal, AR and **J.L. Jijina 1988. Potential hazards** of *Dinophysis* to consumers and shellfisheries. J. Shellfish Res. 7(4): 695-701.
- **Fuji, A. and M Hashizume. 1974. Energy budget for a Japanese common scallop,** *Patinopecten yessoensis.* Bull. Fac. Fish. Hokkaido Univ. 25(1): 7-19.
- **Fujïki,** H., M. Suganuma, **H. Suguri,** S. Yoshizawa, K. **Tagaki,** T. Sassa, **N.** Uda, K. Wakamatsu, **K. Yamada,** T. **Yasumoto, Y. Kato,** N. **Fuset- K.** Hashimoto and T. **Sugimura.** *1989.* **New** tumor promoters **nom** marine sources: the okadaic acid **class.**  In: S. Natori, K. Hashimoto and Y. Ueno, eds., *Mycotoxins and Phycotoxins '88*, **Eisevier, Amsterdam, pp. 453-460.**
- Gago, A, E. de la Fuente. *J.k* Rodriguez and *A* Ibaniez. 1991. DSP contaminated **sheU%h** in **Galician Rias** dong *1990.* In: **J-M. Frèmy, ed., P** *roceedngs of Symposium on Marine Biotoxim,* **Centre National d'Etudes Vétérinaires, Paris, pp. 225-227.**
- Gago Mactinez, **A.,** E. de la Fuente Santiago, *J.A* Rodriguez **Vaquez** *P.* Alvito and **1.**  Sousa *1993.* **Okadaic** acid *as* the main component of **diarrhetic shellnsh** toxins **in moiluscs** fiom **the** west coast of Spain **and Portugal.** In: T.J. **Smayda** and Y. **Shimum,**  eds., **Tuxic** *Phytoplankton Bloom in the* **Sea,** Elsevier, **N.Y** ., *pp. 537-540.*
- **Gainey, L.F.** and **S.E.** Shumway. 1988. **A** compendium of **the responses** of bivalve **molluscs to toxic dinoflagellates. <b>J.** Shellfish Res. 7(4): 623-628.
- Garcia-Esquivel **Z** and **V.M. Bricelj.** 1993. Ontogenetic changes **in** microhabitat distribution of **juvenüe** bay **scallops,** Argopecten *inadians* **irradias (L),** in eelgrass beds, **and** their **potential** significance **to** early **recnitment. BioL** BulL 185: 42-55.
- **Gügan, M.W., J. van de Riet, M. Dorey and B.G. Burns. 1995. The detection** of a **DSP**  contamination of cultured mussels from Nova Scotia, Canada by bioassay, hunoassay and chernical assay. In: P. Lassus, **O.** Arzui, E. **Erard,** P. Gentien, C. Marcaiilou, **eds.,** *Ham@* **Manne** *Algul* Bloonts, Lavoisier, **Intercepi** Ltd., Paris, pp. 29 1-296,
- **Gilgan, M.W.,** C. Poweii, **I. van** de **Riet, B.G. Bum, M.A. Quilliam, K. Kennedy** and C.H. MacKenzie. 1994. The occurrence of a serious diarrhetic shellfish poisoning episode in mussels from Newfoundland during the late autumn of 1993. In: J.R. Forbes, ed., Proceedings of the Fourth Canadian Workshop on Harmful Marine **Algae, Can. Tech.** Rep. **Aquat Sci.** No. 2016. pp. 92.
- **Grant, J.** and P.J. **Cranford.** 1989. **The effect** of **laboratory diet** conditioning on **tissue** and gonad **growth** in the **sea** scallop Placopecten *magellanicus.* In: J.S. **Ryland and P.A**  Tyler, eds., *Reproduction, Genetics and Distribution of Marine Organisms*, Olsen and Olsen, Fradensborg, **Denmark, pp.** 95- 105.
- Guillard, R.L. 1973. Division rates. In: J.Stein, ed., *Handbook of Phycological Methods*, Cam bridge University **Ress,** London. pp. 289-3 12.
- **Haamer,** J. 1995. Presence of the **phycotoxin** okadaic acid in **mussels** *(Mytilw* edulis) in relation to nutrient composition in a Swedish coastal water. J. Shellfish Res. 14(1): **209-216.**
- **Haamer, J., P.-O. Andersson, S. Lange, X.P. Li and L. Edebo.** 1990. **Effects** of transplantation and **reimmersion** of **mussels** *Mytilus* edulis Linnaeus, 1728, on their contents of okadaic acid. J. Shelifiih **Res.** 9(1): 109-1 12.
- Hageltorn, M. 1989. Algal toxins contaminating shellfish and shellfish monitoring in Sweden. In: S. Natori, K. Hashimoto and Y. Ueno, eds., Mycotoxins and Phycotoxins **'88,** Elsevier, Amsterdam, pp. 289-294.
- **Hdd, B., T.** Bjergskov and **H.** Emshoh. 1991. Monitoring and analytical programmes on phycotoxins in Denmark. In: J.-M. Frèmy, **ed.,** Proceedings of **Symposium** on *Marine Bior~xim,* **Centre** National **d'Etudes** Vétérinaires, **Paris,** pp. 18 1 - 187.
- **Hallegraeff, G.A.** 1993. **A review** of harmhil **algai** blooms **and** their apparent global **increase.** Phycologia 32(2): 79-99.
- **Hamano, Y.,** Y. **Kinoshita** and T. Yasumoto. **1985. Suckluig mice assay** for diarrhetic **shellnsh** toxins. **Ln: D.M.** Anderson, **kW. White and D.G. Baden, eds.,** Toxic Dinoflagellates, Elsevier, N.Y., pp. 383-388.
- Hawkins, **ALS.** and B.L. **Bayne. 1985. Seasonai** variation in the relative utilkation of carbon and nitrogen by the **mussel** *Mytilus edulb:* budgets, **conversion** effeiciencies and maintenance requirements. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 25: 181-188.
- **Hawkins,** A.J.S., **E. Navm** and J.L.P. **Iglesias.** 1990. Comparative **allometrics** of **gut**passage **tirne,** gut content and **metabolic faecal** loss in *Mytilus edulis* **and**  *Cerastodem edule.* **Mar,** Biol. 105: 197-204.
- Hawkins, A.J.S., **B.L. Bayne, REC.** Mantoura and **C.A LleweIlyn.** 1986. Chlorophyll **degradation** and absorption throughout the digestive **system** of **the** blue musse1 *Mytilw ecltlis* L. L **Exp. Mar.** Biol. Ecol. 96: 2 **13-223.**
- **He& C.A, L. Maranda and** Y. **Shimuzu.** 1993. Mucus-associated dinoDagellates: **large scale** culturing and estimation of **growth** rate. In: T.J. Smayda and Y. **Shimuzu, eds.,**  Toxic Phytoplankon *BIwms* in the **Sea,** Elsevier, **N.Y.,** pp. 501-506.
- **Hildreth, D.I. and D.J. Crisp.** 1976. **A** corrected formula for calculation of filtration rate of bivalve moliuscs **in** an experimental flowing system. J. Mar. BioL **Ass. U.K.** 56: 11 1- **120.**
- Hu, T., **J.M. Curtis, J.A. Walter and** J.L.C. Wright. **1995.** Identification of **DTX4,** a new - water-soluble phosphatase inhibitor **fiom the** toxic **dinoflagellate** Prorocentrum **lima. J, Chem. Soc., Chem.** Commun.: 597-599.
- Hu, T., J. **Marr, AS.W.** deFreitas, **M.A QuiUiam, J.A** Walter, **J.L.C.** Wright and S. Pleasance. 1992. New diol esters isolated from cultures of the dinoflagellates Prorocentrum lima and Prorocentrum *concavum*. J. Nat. Prod. 55(11): 1631-1637.
- **Hu, T., AS.W.** de **Freitas, J.** Doyle, **D.** Jackson, **J. Marr;** E. Nixon, S. Pleasance, **M.A Quilliam,** J.k Walter **and J.L.C. Wright.** 1993. New **DSP toxin** denvatives isolated from toxic mussels and the dinoflagellates, Prorocentrum lima and Prorocentrum concavum. In: T.J. Smayda and Y. Shimuzu, eds., Toxic Phytoplankton Blooms in the **Sea,** Elsevier, **N.Y.,** pp. **507-5** 12.
- Hurlbert, **S.H.** 1984. Pseudoreplication and the design of ecological field experiments. Ecol. Moogr. 54: 187-21 1.
- ICES. 1992. Effects of harmful algal blooms on mariculture and marine fisheries. Cooperative Research Report No. 181. International Council for the Exploration of the **Sea,** Copenhagen, **Denmark,** pp. 38.
- Jackson, D. and J. **Silke.** 1995. *Dimphysis* spp. *and the* **occurrence** of **diarrhetic** shellnsh poisons in Ireland, In: P. Lassus, G. Arzul, E. Erard, P. Gentien, C. Marcaillou, eds., *Hannfirf* Marine **Algd** *BtOoms,* Lavoisier, **Intercept Ltd,** Paris, pp. 789-794.
- Jackson, **AE., J-C. Marr** and J.L. **McLach1a.m 1993. The production** of **diarrhetic** shellnsh toxins by an isolate of *Prorocentrum lima* from Nova Scotia, Canada. In: T.J. Smayda and Y. Shimuzu, eds., *Toxic Phytoplankton Blooms in the Sea*, Elsevier, N.Y., pp. **513-518-**
- Kat, **M. 1979. The occurrence** of *Promcentnim* **species and** coincidental **gastrointestinal**  illness of **mussel** consumers. In: **D.L.** Taylor and H.H. **Seiiger, eds..** Toxic *Dinoflagellate Bboms,* Elsevier North **Holland, Inc.,** Amsterdam, pp. 215-220.
- Kat, M. 1985. *Dinophysis acumimta* blooms. **The** distinct cause of Dutch **musse1**  poisoning. In: **D.M.** Anderson, **kW.** White and **D.G.** Baden, **eds., Toxic**  *Dinoflagellates,* **Elsevier, N. Y** ., **pp. 73-77.**
- Kawabata, **T.** 1989. Regulatory aspects of **marine** biotoxins in Japan. In: S. Natori, **K**  Hashimoto and Y. Ueno, eds., *Mycotoxins and Phycotoxins '88*, Elsevier, Amsterdam, **pp. 469-476.**
- **Keller, M.D.,** RC. **Selvin,** W. Claus and RL. **GuiUard.** 1985. Factors significant to **marine dino5gekte** culture. In: D.M. Anderson, **kW. White and D.G.** Baden, **eds., Toxic**  Dinoflagelates, Elsevier, **N.Y** ., pp. 1 **13-** 1 16.
- **Kikuchi, S., T. Oshirna, Y. Oshima, T. Takeuchi, T. Nakamura** and M. Tatewaki **1992. Decrease** of **shellfish toxins during** the cultivation of toxic scallops in **filtered** and **sterilized** seawater. **1.** Food **Hygienic Soc.** Japn. **33(3):** 223-230.
- Lange, S., E. Jennische, H. **Fujiki** and L. **Edebo. 1990a** Okadaic acid, aplysiatoxin and teleocidin induœ rapid **cellular** changes and hypersecretion in the rat srnali intestine. In: E. **Graneiii, B. Sundstrom, L. Edler** and **D.M.** Anderson, **eds.,** Toxic *Marine*  Phytoplankton, Elsevier, **N.Y** ., **p p. 362-3 67.**
- Lange, S., G.L. Anderson, E. Jennische, I. Lonnorth, X.P. Li and L. Edebo. 1990b. **Okadaic** acid produces **drastic** histopathologic changes of the rat intestinal **mucosa** and with concomitant hypersecretion. In: **E. GraneUi, B. Sundstrom, L. Edler** and D.M. Anderson, eds., *Toxic Marine Phytoplankton*, Elsevier, N.Y., pp. 356-361.
- **Lee, 1.** 1993. The **kinetics** of PSP toxin **transfer fiom** the toxic dinoflagellate *Alexandrium*  spp. to **two** bivalve **moliusc species,** *Mytilw edulis* **and** *Mercenarin mercenaria.* M.S. **Thesis, State** University of **New** York, N.Y., 169 pp.
- **Lee, J-S., T. Yanagi, R Kenma** and T. Yasumto. 1987. Fiuorometric determination of **diarrhetic sheiilish** toxins by high-performance **liquid** chrornatography. Agric. **BioL**  Chem. **5 l(3):** 877-88 **1.**
- **Lee, J-S., T. Igarashi,** S. **Fraga,** E. DahL P. Hovgaard and T. Yasumoto. 1989. Determination of diarrhetic shellfish toxins in various dinoflagellate species. J. Appl. Phycol. 1: **147-152.**
- Lembeye, G., T. Yasumoto, J. Zhao and R. Fernandez. 1993. DSP outbreaks in Chilean fiords. In: T.J. Smayda and Y. Shimuzu, eds., *Toxic Phytoplankton Blooms in the Sea*, Elsevier, **N.Y.,** pp. **525-529.**
- **Lesser, M.P.** and **S.E. Shumway.** 1993. Effects of toxic dinofiagellates on clearance rates and survival in juvenile bivalve molluscs. J. Shellfish Res. 12(2): 377-381.
- Luckenbach, **M.W..** KG. **Sellner, S.E.** Shumway and **K** Greene. 1993. Effects of two bloom-forming dinoflagellates, *Prorocentrum minimum* and *Gyrodinium uncatenum*, on the **growth** and **survival** of the **eastem oyster,** *Crassostrea virginica* **(Grnelin** 1791). **J.** Sheffish **Res. 12(2):** 41 **1-45.**
- Mallet, **AL. and C.** Carver. **1987. The** feasibilty of **bay** scallop culture in Nova Scotia: a **preliminary** study. **E.U.A.** Rep. No. **5, Halifax,** Canada, pp. 37.
- Mallet, AL. and C. **Carver.** 1988. **Within** and among site **variation** in bay **scaliop**  production. **E.RD.A.** Rep. No. 13, **Halifax,** Canada, pp. **26.**
- Malouf, RE. and **V.M. Bricelj.** 1989. Comparative **biology** of clams: **environmental**  tolerances, feeding and growth. In: J.J. Manzi and M. Castagna, eds., Clam Mariculture in North America, Elsevier, Amsterdam, pp. 23-73.
- **Maranda. L. and Y. Shimuzu.** 1987. **Diarrhetic** shellnsh poisoning in **Narragansett** Bay. **Estuaries** lO(4): 298-302.
- **Marcaiilou-Le Baut, C. and P. Masselin. 1990. Recent** data on **shellnsh** poisoning in **France. In:** E. **Granelli,** B. Sundstrom, L. **Edler** and **D.M.** Anderson, eds., **Toxic**  Marine Phytoplankton, Elsevier, N.Y., pp. 487-492.
- Mardiou-Le Baut, C., B. **Bardin,** M. Bardouil, M. **Bohec, L.** Le **Dean.** P. Masselin and P. Truquet. 1993a. **DSP** depuration rates of **mussels reared** in a laboratory and an aquaculture pond. In: T.J. Smayda and Y. Shimuzu, eds., Toxic Phytoplankton *Bloomr* in **the Sea,** Elsevier, N.Y., pp. 531-535.
- Marcaillou-Le Baut, C., **D. Delmas.** A Herbland, P. Gentien, **S.Y. Maestrini,** P. **Lassus and P. Masselin. 1993b** Cinétique **de** contamintaion de **moules** Mytilus **edulis**  exposees à **une** population naturelle **de** Dinofiageiiés Dinophysis spp.. C.R **Acad. Sci Paris, Life Sciences 316:** 1274-1276.
- **MmT** J.C., T. Hu, S. **Pieasance, M.k Quilliam** and **J.LC.** Wright 1992. Detection of **new 7-OACYL** derivatives of **dianhetic** shellnsh poisoning toxins by **liquid**  chrornatography-mass **spectrometry. Toxicon.** 30(12): 162 1 - **1630.**
- **McKenzk, C.H.,** M. **Patanjape,** C. Powell, **M.W. Gilgan** and **M.A Quüüam.** 1994. **A**  *Dinophysis nontegica* bloom and its implications in the occurrence of a **diarrhetic shellijsh poisonhg** episode in **mussels** fiom Newfoundland **during late autumn in 1993.**  In: J.R. Forbes, ed., Proceedings of the Fourth Canadian Workshop on Harmful **Marine Algae, Can. Tech. Rep. Aquat** Sci. **No. 2016,** pp. **92.**
- **McLachlan,** J.L., **J.C. Marr, A** Codon-Kelly and A Adamson. 1994. **Effects** of nitrogen concentration and cold **temperature** on **DSP-toxin** concentrations in **the** dinoflagellate Prorocentrum *fima* (Prorocentrales, Dinophyceae). J. **Nat** Toxins 2: **263-270.**
- **Moita, M.T. and M.&** de M. Sampayo. 1993. Are **there** cysts in the **genus** *Dinophysis?*  In: T.J. Smayda and Y. Shimuzu, eds., *Toxic Phytoplankton Blooms in the Sea*, Elsevier, N.Y., pp. **153-** 157.
- Morton, **S.L. and D.R** Norris. 1990. **Rob** of temperature, salinity and **light** on the seasonality of Prorocentrum **lima (Ehrenberg)** Dodge. In: E. **GraneU,** B. Sundstrom, L. Edler and D.M. Anderson, eds., *Toxic Marine Phytoplankton*, Elsevier, N.Y., pp. 201-205.
- Morton, **S.L.,** J.W. Bomber and **P.M. TindaIL 1994. Environmental effects** on **the**  production of okadaic acid from *Prorocentrum hoffmannianum* Faust I. Temperature, **light** and **salinity.** J. Exp. Mar. Biol. Ecol. 178: 67-77.
- Napolitano, **G.E.** and RG. **Ackman. 1993.** Fatty acid dynarnics in **sea** scdops PIacopecten magelhicus **(Grnelin,** 1791) kom Georges **Bank, Nova Scotia I. Sheilfish Res. 12(2):** 267-277.
- Navarro, J.M. and R.J. Thompson. 1994. Comparison and evaluation of different techniques for measuring absorption efficiency in suspension feeders. Limnol. Oceanogr. **39(1):** 159- **164.**
- **Norte, M., R Gonzalez and J.J. Fernandez 1991. Biosynthesis of DSP toxins. Prelirninary**  results. In: J-M. Frèmy, ed., *Proceedings of Symposium on Marine Biotoxins*, Centre National **d'Etudes Vétérinaires, Paris,** pp. 2 1-27.
- Novaczek, I., M.S. Madhyastha, R.F. Ablett, A. Donald, G. Johnson, M.S. Nijjar and D.E. Simms. 1992. Depuration of domoic acid from live blue mussels *(Mytilus edulis)*. Can. J. **Fish. Aquat** Sci. 49: 3 12-3 18.
- Palmer, RE. 1980. Behaviorai and **rhythrnic** aspects of filtration in the bay scailop, Argopecten *indans concentricas* (Say), and the oyster, Crassostrea virginica (Gmeh). **J. Exp.** Mar. **Biol. Ecol. 45: 273-295.**
- Palmer, RE. and L.G. **Williams.** 1980. The effect of **particle** concentration on filtration efficiency of the bay scallop *Argopecten irradians* and the oyster *Crassostrea* virginica. Opheiia 19(2): 163- 174.
- **Peirson, WM. 1983. Utüization of eight &al species by the bay scallop, Argopecten**   $i$ *rradians concentricus* (Say). **J. Exp. Mar. Biol. Ecol. 68: 1-11.**
- **Pillet, S. and** *G.* **HouvenagheL 1995. Innuence of experimental toxifircation by DSP producing microalgae, Prorocentmm** ümo, **on clearance rate in blue mussek Mydlus**   $e$ *dulis.* In: P. Lassus, G. Arzul, E. Erard, P. Gentien, C. Marcaillou, eds., Harmful **Marine Algal Blooms, Lavoisier, Intercept Ltd., Paris, pp. 481-486.**
- **Pillet, S., A Pereira, J-C.** Braekman **and G. HouvenagheL 1995. Patterns in long-term**  accumulation of okadaic acid and DTX1 in blue mussels. Mytilus edulis, **experimentally fed with the DSP-containing alga Prorocentrum lima. In: P. Lassus, G.** ArzuI, **E. Erard, P. Gentien, C. MafcaiU~u~ eds.,** *Ham@ Mhe* **Algd Bloomr, Lavoisier, Inîercept** Ltd, **Paris, pp. 487492.**
- **Pleasance, S., M.A Quilliam and J-C. Marr. 1992. Ionspray mass spectmmetry of marine toxins IV. Determination of diarrtietic shellfish poisoning toxuls in musse1 tissue by**  Muid **chromatography/mass spectrometry. Rapid Commun. Mas. Spectron 6: 12 1- 127.**
- Pleasance, S., M.A. Quilliam, A.S.W. deFreitas, J.C. Marr and A.D. Cembella. 1990. Ion**spray mass spectrometry of marine toxins II. Analysis of diarrhetic shellfish toxins in plankton by** liquid **chromatography/mass spectrometry. Rapid Commun. Mas. Spectron. 4(6): 206-213.**
- **Poletti, R, R Viviani, C. Casadei L Lucentini, L Giannetti, E. Funari and R Draisci**  1996. Decontamination dynamics of mussels naturally contaminated with diarrhetic **toxins** relocated **to a basin of the Adriatic Sea, In: T, Yasumoto, Y. Oshima and Y, Fuhi yo, eds.,** *Hannful and* **Toxic** *Algal Bloom,* **Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission of UNESCO, Paris.**
- **Quilliam, M.A 1995. Analysis of diarrhetic shefih poisoning toxins in shellosh tissue by**  liquid chromatography with fluorometric and mass spectrometric detection. J. AOAC **ht. 78(2): 555-570.**
- **Quiniam, M.A and N.W. Ross. 1996. Anaiysis of diarrhetic shelifish poisoning toxins and**  metabolites in plankton and shellfish by liquid chromatography-ionspray mass **spectrometry. In: AP. Snyder, ed.,** *Biochemical and Biotechnological* **Applications of**  *Electrospray Ionization Mass Spectrometry*, *ACS Symposium Series 619*, **Washington, DC.**
- QuiUiam, **MA, W.R Hardstaff, N. Ishida, J.L. McLachlan, AR Reeves, N.W. Ross and AJ. Windhust. 1996. Roduction of diarrhetic shellfish poisoning (DSP) toxins by Prorocentrum lima in culture and development of analytical methods. In: T. Yasumoto, Y. Oshima and Y. Fukuyo, eds.,** *Harmful and Toxic Algal Blooms***, Intergovermnental Oceanographic Commission of UNESCO, Paris, pp. 289-292.**
- **Quiniam, M.& MW. Gilgan, S. Pleasance, AS.W. deEreitas, D. Douglas, L Fritz, T. Hu, J-C. Mm, C. Smyth and J.LC. Wright. 1993. Confhation of an incident of diarrhetic shelifish poisonhg in eastem** Canada. **In: TJ. Srnayda and Y. Shimuzu,** eds., *Toxic Phytoplankton Blooms in the Sea***, Elsevier, N.Y., pp. 547-552.**
- **Rausch de Traubenberg, C. and M. Morlaix.** 1995. Evidence of okadaic acid release into **extracellular medium in cultures of** *Prorocentrum lima* **(Ehrenberg) Dodge. In: P.** Lassus, G. Arzul, E. Erard, P. Gentien, C. Marcaillou, eds., *Harmful Marine Algal Blwmr,* **Lavoisier, Intercept Ltd, Paris, pp. 493499.**
- **Reguera, B., L Bravo, C. Marcidou-Le Bauf P. Masselin,** ML **Feniandez, A Miguez**  and A. Martinez. 1993. Monitoring of *Dinophysis* spp. and vertical distribution of **okadaic acid on mussel rafts in Ria de Ponteverda (NW Spain). In: T.J. Smayda and Y. Shimuzo. eds., Toxic** *Phytoplankton Bboms* in **die Sea,** Elsevier, **N.Y., pp. 553-558.**
- **Rhodes, E.W. 1991. Fisheries and aquaculture of the bay scallop,** *Argopecten irradians***, in the eastern United States. S.E. Shumway, d,** *Scallops: Biobgy, Ecology and Aquaculmre,* **Elsevier, N.Y** ., **pp. 9 13-924.**
- **Rodtiguez,** *J.k,* **AG. Marthe5 Y. Oshima. K Sugino, J.S.** Lee and **T. Yasumoto. 1989.**  Analysis **of toxins in mussels hm the Atlantic Coast of Spain Ln: S. Natori, K.**  Hashimoto and Y. Ueno, eds., *Mycotoxins and Phycotoxins '88*, Elsevier, Amsterdam, **pp. 367-374.**
- Sampayo, M.A. de M. Trying to cultivate *Dinophysis* spp. 1993. In: T.J. Smayda and Y. **Shimuzu, eds.,** *Toxic Phytoplankton Blooms in the Sea***, Elsevier, N.Y., pp. 807-810.**
- **Scarrattt, D.J. 1992. Bay scallop aquaculture development plan. Technical Report #92-11, Nova Scotia Department of Fiheries and Oceans, Halifax, Canada, 21 pp.**
- Scarrattt, D.J. and C. Martin. 1992. Transfer of phycotoxins in the benthic food web. In: **L.-C.** Therriault and M. Levasseur, eds., Proceedings of the Third Canadian *Workshop on Harmful Marine Algae, Maurice Lamontagne Institute, Mont-Joli,* **Quebc, May 12-14, 1992. Cm. Tech. Rep. Fiih. Aqua Sci 1893: 67-71.**
- **Scarrattt, A.M., D.J. Scarratt and M.G. Scarratt. 1993. Survival of live Alexandrium** *tamarense* cells in mussel and scallop spat under simulated transfer conditions. J. **Shdlfï~h Ra. 12(2): 383-388.**
- **%%et, V., P. Salim, P. Hovgaard** and **T. Yasumoto. 1990. Causative species of diarrhetic shellfish poisoning (DSP) in Noway. Mar. Biol. 105: 269-274.**
- Seiderer, L.J., R.C. Newell and P.A. Cook. 1982. Quantitative significance of style **enymes hm two Maine mussels** *(Chromo~lw meridionalis* Krauss **and** *Penza pema* **Linnaeus) in relation io diet Marine Biology Letters 3: 257-271.**
- **Shimizu, Y. and M. Yoshioka.** 1981. Transformation of paralytic shellfish toxins as **demonstrated** in scallop **homogenates. Science** 2 12: 547-549.
- Shumway, **S.E.** 1990. A **review** of the effects of **algai blooms on shefih and aquaculture. Journal** of the World **Aquaculture** Society 21(2): **65- lO4.**
- **Shumway, S.E.** and **M. Castagna 1994. Scallop fiheries, culture and enhancernent in the United States. Mernoirs** of the Queensland **Museum 36(2):** 283-298.
- Shumway, **S.E.** and AD. **Cernbella** 1993. **The** impact of **toxk** aigae on **scallop culture and fisheries. Reviews** in Fitheries **Science** l(2): 121-150.
- **Shumway, S.E. and A.D. Cembella. 1994. Toxic algal blooms: potential hazards to scallop culture** and **îkheries.** Mernoirs of **the Queensland Museum 36(2): 36 1-372.**
- **Shumway, S.E.** and TL Cucci 1987. The effects of **the toxic dinoflagellate**  *Protogonyaulax tamarensis* on the feeding and behaviour of bivalve molluscs. Aquat. **T0xic01.** 10: **9-27,**
- Shumway, S.E., **T.L. Cocci L Gainey** and **CM. Yentsch** 1985. A preliminary study of the behavioral and physiological effects of Gonyaulax tamarensis on bivalve molluscs. In: D.M. Anderson, A.W. White and D.G. Baden, eds., Toxic Dinoflagellates, *EMer,* **MY.,** pp. 389-394.
- **Shumway, S.E., T.L. Cucci, R.C. Newell and C.M. Yentsch. 1985. Particle selection, ingestion, and** absorption in **fdter-feeding** bivalves. **J.** Exp. **Mar. BioL EcoI. 91: 77-92**
- Shumway, **S.E., KP.** von **Egmond, LW. Hurst and** L.L. **Bean.** 1996. **Management** of **shellfish resources. In: G.M. Hallegraeff, D.M. Anderson and A.D. Cembella, eds.,** *Manual on Harmful Marine Algae, IOC Manuals and Guides No. 33, UNESCO,* **Pd, pp. 443-462.**
- Silvert, **W.L.** and AD. **Cembella. 1995. Dynamic modehg of phycotoxin kinetics in marine invertebrates. Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 52(3): 521-531.**
- *Siivert,* **W.** and D.V. **Subba** Rao. 1992. **Dynamic** mode1 of the flux of domoic **acid,** a **neumtoxin, through** a *Mytilus* **edulis** population. **Can** J. Fish. **Aquat Sci.** 49: **400-405.**
- **Smayda, TJ. 1990. Novel** and **nuisance phytoplanlcton** blooms in **the sea:** evidence for a **global epidemic. In:** E. **GrmeIli,** B. Sundstrom, L. Edler and **D.M.** Anderson, **eds., Toxic** Marine *Phytoplankton,* Elsevier, **N.Y.,** pp. 29-40.
- **Steidinger, ICA 1993. Some** taxonomie and biologic aspects of toxic **dinoflageliates.** In: **I.A. Falconer, ed., Algal Toxins in Seafood and Drinking Water, Academic Press,** London, **pp.** 1-28.
- **Steidinger,** KA 1995. Ecology of **benthic dinoflagellates.** In: **P. Lassus, G. Amil E.**  Erard, P. Gentien, C. Marcaillou, eds., *Harmful Marine Algal Blooms*, Lavoisier, **Intercept La.,** Paris, pp. 855-857.
- **Subba Rao, D.V., Y. Pan, V. Zitko, O. Bugden and K MacKeigan. 1993. Diarrhetic shellfish** poisoning **(DSP) associateci with** a subsurface bloom of *Dinophysis* rwrvegica in Bedford **Basin, eastem Canada** Mar. EcoL Prog. Ser. 97: 1 17-126.
- **Sullivan,** J.J. 1993. Methods of analysis for **algal tod:** dinofiageIlates and diatom **toxhs.**  In: I.A. Falconer, ed., *Algal Toxins in Seafood and Drinking Water*, Academic Press. London, **pp.** 29-48.
- Sullivan, **J.J., Iwaoka, W.T.** and J. Liston. **1983. Entymatic** transformation of PSP toxins in the littleneck clam *(Protodurca stuminea).* Biochem. Biophys. **Res.** Comm. 114(2): **465-472.**
- Taylor, R.E. and J.M. Capuzzo. The reproductive cycle of the bay scallop, *Argopecten* **inadiuns** *imadicuts* **(Lamarck),** in a **smaU** coastal embayment on Cape **Cod, Massachusetts, Estuaries 6(4): 43 1 435.**
- **Tazawa, T., M. Ishige,** S. **Kawase,** T. Ito and **N. Satoh. 1989. Seasonal** variations of **diarrhetic shellnsh** poison in scailops **nom** the Okhotsk **Sea Coast** of **northem**  Hokkaido. Report **Hokkaido Inst.** Public **Heaith.** 39: 8 1-83.
- **Terao,** K, E. Ito, M. Ohkusu and **T.** Yasumoto. **1993.** A comparative study of the **effects**  of DSP-toxins on **mix** and rats. In: T.J. Smayda and Y. Shirnuzu. **eds.,** Toxic Phytoplankton *Blooms in the Sea*, Elsevier, N.Y., pp. 581-586.
- Todd, E.C.D. 1995. Estimated costs of paralytic shellfish, diarrhetic shellfish and ciguatera poisoning in **Canada.** In: **P. Lassus, G.** Am& **E. Erard,** P. **Gentien,** C. MarcaiiIou, eds., *Harmful Marine Algal Blooms*, Lavoisier, Intercept Ltd., Paris, pp. 831-834.
- Todd, **E.C.D., T.** Kuiper-Goodman, W. Watson-Wright, **M.W. Gilgan,** S. **Stephen, J. Marr, S. Pleasance, M.A. Quilliam, H. Klix, H.A Luu** and **C.F.B. Holmes.** 1993. **Recent** illness **hm** seafood toxins in Canada: paralytic, **amnesic** and diarrhetic shellfish poisoning. In: T.J. **Smayda** and Y. **Shimuzu, eds., Toxic** *Phyroplunkton Bloomr in the* **Sea,** Elsevier, **N.Y.,** pp. **335-339.**
- **Tubaro, A, S. Sousa, D. Bussani, L. Sidari, G. Honseil and R Deiia Loggia.** 1995. Diarrhoeic **toxicity** induction in **mussels** of the **Gulf** of Trieste. **In: P. Lassus, G.** Arad, E. Erard, P. Gentien, C. Marcaillou. **eds.,** *Hannfil* Marine Algal *Blooms,* Lavoisier, Intercept **Ltd., Paris,** pp. **249-252.**
- Underdal, B., M. **Yndstead** and T. **Aune.** 1985. **DSP** intoxication in **Norway** and **Sweden, autumn** 1984 - spring 1985. In: **D.M.** Anderson, AW. White and **D.G. Baden, eds.,**  *Toxic Dinoflagellates,* **Elsevier, N.Y., pp. 489-494.**
- **Van** Egrnond, H.P., **GJ.A Speyers** and **H.J.** van den Top. **1992.** Current situation on worldwide regulations for marine phycotoxins. J. Nat. Toxins 1: 67-85.
- **Van** Egmond, **H.P.,** T. **Aune, P. Lassus, GJ.A Speijers** and M. Waldock 1993. **Pafalytic**  and diarrhoeic shellfish poisons: occurrence in Europe, toxicity, analysis and regulation. **J. Nat** Toxins 2(1): 41-83.
- Vernoux, J.P., S. Bansard, J.F. Simon, D. Nwal-Amang, C. Le-Baut, E. Gleizes, J.M. **Fremy** and **M.C.** Lasne. 1994. Cooked **mussels** contaminated by Dinophysis sp.: a source of **okadaic** acid. **Naturai** Toxins 2: 184-188.
- **Whyte, J.N.C., N.G. Ginther and L.D.** Townsend. 1995. **Accumulation** and depuration of domic acid by the mussel, *Mytilus californianus*. In: P. Lassus, G. Arzul, E. Erard, P. **Gentien, C. Marcaillou, eds.,** *Harmful Marine Algal Blooms***, Lavoisier, Intercept Ltd., Paris, pp.** 531-537.
- Wikfors, **G.H.** and RM. SmoIowitz. 1993. **Detrimental effects of** *a Prurocentnrm* **isolate**  upon hard clams and bay **scaüops** in laboratory **feeding** studies. In: **T.J.** Smayda and **Y. Shimuzu, eds.,** *Toxic Phytoplankton Blooms in the Sea***, Elsevier, N.Y., pp. 447-452.**
- Willows, RI. **1992.** Optimal digestive investment: a mode1 for nIter feeders experiencng variable **die&.** Limnol Oceanogr. **37(4):** 829-847.
- Windust, A.J., J.L.C. Wright and J.L. McLachlan. In press. The effects of the diarrhetic shellfish poisoning toxins, okadaic acid and *Dinophysistoxin*-1, on the growth of microaigae. **Mar.** Biol.
- Wohlgeschaffen, G.D., **KH. Mann,** D.V. Subba Rao **and R** Pocklington. 1992. **Dynamics**  of **the** phycotoxin domoic acid: accumulation and excretion in two commercîaily **important** bivalves. **J.** Appl. Phycol4: 297-3 10.
- Yasumoto, **T.** 1985. Recent **progress** in the **chemistry** of dinoflagellate **toxins.** In: **D.M.**  Anderson, **kW.** White and D.G. Baden, **eds.,** Toxic Dinoflagellates, Elsevier, **N.Y..**  pp. **259-270.**
- Yasumto, T. 1990. Marine microrganisms toxins: an overview. In: E. Granelli, B. Sundstrom, L. **Edler** and **D.M.** Anderson, **eds.,** Toxic *Manne* Phytoplankron, Elsevier, **N.Y., pp.** 3-8.
- Yasumoto, T., Y. Oshima and M. Yamaguchi. 1978. Occurrence of a new type of shellfish poisoning in **the** Tohoku **Distric~ Bull. Japan. Soc.** Sci. **Fish.** 44(11): 1249-1255.
- Yasumoto, T., Y. Oshima and M. Yamaguichi 1979. Occurrence of new type of toxic shellnsh in Japan and chernicd properties of the **toxin.** In: **D.L.** Taylor and H.H. Seliger, **eds., Toxic** Dinoflagellate *Blwmr,* Elsevier **North** Holland, Inc., Amsterdam, **pp. 395-398.**
- Yasumoto, T., M. Murata, J.-S. Lee and K. Torigoe. 1989. Polyether toxins produced by **dinoflagellates.** In: S. Natori, K. Hashimoto and Y. Ueno, eds., Mycotoxins and **Phycotoxins '88, Elsevier, Amsterdam, pp. 375-382.**
- Yasumoto, T., M. Murata, Y. Oshima, M. Sano, G.K. Matsumoto and J. Clardy. 1985. **Diarrhetic shelifiih toxins, Tetrahedron 4 1** : **<sup>10</sup>19- 1025,**
- **Yasumoto, T., Y. Oshima, W. Sugawara, Y. Fukuyo, H. Oguri, T. Igarashi and N. Fujita. 1980. Identikation of** *Dimphysis fortii* **as the causative organism of diarrhetic shellfish poisoning. Bull. Japan. Soc. Sci. Fish.**  $46(11)$ **: 1405-1411.**
- **Zhao, J., G. Lembeye, G. Cenci, B. Wall and T. Yasumoto. 1993. Determination of okadaic acid** and **Dinophysistoxin-1 in mussels fiom Chüe. Italy and Ireland. In: T.J.**  Smayda and Y. Shimuzu, eds., *Toxic Phytoplankton Blooms in the Sea*, Elsevier, **N.Y., pp. 587-592.**
- **Zhou, J. and L. Fritz. 1993. Ultrastructure of two toxic marine dinoflagellates,**  *Prorocentrum lima* **and** *Prorocentnm* **maculosum. Phycologia: 32(6): 444-450.**
- **Zhou, J. and L. Fritz. 1994. Okadaic acid antibody localizes to chloroplasts in the DSPtoxin-producing dinotlageUates Prorocentmm** *lima* **and** *Prorocentrurn* **maculosum. Phycologia 33(6): 455-46 1.**



**CONSULTANT REPORT CONTROLLER** 



TEST TARGET (QA-3)







