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ABSTRACT

Biomass is an important parameter in studying a variety of energetic processes in food webs, community structure, and composition of aquatic organisms. Biomass determinations are based on direct weighing of animals, biovolume determination, and length-weight conversion. Although direct weighing of individual organisms is the most accurate methodology, its application is not very common due to its time consuming nature. Length-weight regressions are the most widely used approach for estimating benthic invertebrate biomass because they are less time consuming and more precise than other methods. In this research, length-weight relationships are evaluated for the most common benthic invertebrates found in an Iranian mountain river in the Southern Caspian Sea Basin by fitting the power function (linearized by logarithmic transformation) to data of wet and dry weights against body length of aquatic invertebrates at both family and order level. A general predictive equation was also obtained for all individuals measured in this study. Regressions obtained were significant at a $P$ value of $< 0.05$ and explained a high proportion of variation of the dependent variable, as expressed by the correlation coefficient ($r = 0.82$-0.99). Regression equations obtained in this study for three major orders of aquatic invertebrates were also compared to those in previous studies from different geographical locations. Relationships developed in this study, can be useful for future assessments of benthic community structure and for understanding the importance of these invertebrates in the energy flux of the river.
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INTRODUCTION

Benthic invertebrates are one of the most important communities of rivers and streams, and aquatic insects are the major group in these communities (Nakagawa and Takemon, 2015; Rajab Nezhad, 2007). Aquatic insects are a group of organisms that live on, in, or near the substratum of the streams and rivers in their larval and pupal life stages and mountainous rivers that have clean and unpolluted water are suitable for a wide range of aquatic insects (McCafferty, 1981). These organisms are an important component of aquatic (and sometimes terrestrial) food webs because they break down and process organic matter and provide food for invertebrates and vertebrates (e.g. fish, birds) (Kiyak et al., 2007; Bouchard, 2012). Biomass is a key factor in quantifying a variety of energetic processes in food webs, ranging from individual consumption and bioenergetics to the spatial transfer of energy between habitats (Sabo et al., 2002). Biomass of aquatic macro-invertebrates is also important to determine growth rates and secondary production, as well as to understand life histories, seasonal patterns, and trophic relationships between functional feeding
groups (Becker et al., 2009; Burgherr and Meyer, 1997).

There are three main approaches to biomass determination: (1) Direct weighing of fresh, frozen, or preserved animals; (2) Biovolume determination; and (3) Length-weight conversion (Burgherr and Meyer, 1997; Benke et al., 1999). Despite its accuracy, direct weighing of individual organisms is not the most applicable method due to its time consuming nature, while length-weight conversions usually are considered more suitable than other approaches because they are less time consuming and more precise (e.g. Burgherr and Meyer, 1997; Becker et al., 2009; Miserendino, 2001). The length-weight relationships of stream invertebrates have been reported in several regions, such as North America (Smock 1980; Benke et al., 1999; Johnston and Cunjak, 1999), Europe (Meyer, 1989; González et al., 2002) and New Zealand (Towers et al., 1994).

Length-weight regressions can be used for many purposes in ecological studies where measuring length (or some other linear dimension) is easier and less time consuming than obtaining weight (Benke et al., 1999): (1) They are useful for estimating biomass in the laboratory, where growth rates or other bioenergetics variables are measured; (2) They enable estimation of population or community biomass, given length-frequency data from the field; (3) They are useful in establishing size-specific weight for most secondary production methods; and (4) They allow for more comprehensive comparisons of invertebrate populations within and between habitats and ecosystems.

A parabolic or power curve has most often been used to estimate Weight (W) from Length (L) in studies of freshwater macro-invertebrates, and a power function usually provides a better fit to the data than most other mathematical formulations (e.g. Smock, 1980; Burgherr and Meyer, 1997; Towers et al., 1994; Benke et al., 1999).

Although different biological studies have been carried out on the benthic invertebrates of the Iranian running waters (e.g. Abdoli et al., 2016; Rajabi Nezhad, 2007; Salavatian, 2012), studies on length-weight relationships for benthic invertebrates from Iranian river ecosystems are scarce. Indeed, prior to the present study, no length-weight relationship has been reported for benthic invertebrates in streams and rivers of Iran, except the one study that was carried out for determining length-weight relationships for aquatic beetles in a marsh in Iran (Heydarnejad, 2010). In general, researchers should make their own regressions for a target taxon in the local area.

In this research, length-weight relationships are developed for the most common benthic invertebrates found in an Iranian mountain river in the Southern Caspian Sea Basin. Most of the studies that have examined these relationships for aquatic invertebrates are restricted to dry weight of the organisms. However, wet weight is used in some ecological and bioenergetics models (e.g. inSTREAM, Railsback et al., 2011). We therefore present dry-to-wet weight ratios for the benthic organisms to enable conversion from wet weight to dry weight values and vice versa. It should be noted that this study is part of a comprehensive ecohydraulics research that has been going on since 2014 (Hajiesmaeili et al., 2014) with a focus on fish species and developed with considering benthic invertebrates and bioenergetics modeling approaches. To our knowledge, this paper presents the first published length-weight relationships for benthic invertebrates in an Iranian river ecosystem. These relationships are required and useful for future assessments of benthic community structure and of the feeding ecology of benthivorous fishes.

**MATERIALS AND METHODS**

**Study Area**

This study was carried out in the Elarm River, Lar National Park (LNP), Iran. In the southern Caspian Sea Basin, the LNP system, including the Lar Lake, and the
rivers of Dalichay, Absefid, Elarm, Kamardasht, Khoshkehrud and Lar, provide a unique habitat for the brown trout (Figure 1). Elarm River is considered one of the main and unique habitats of brown trout in LNP and a research site for this fish as well. This river was selected for this study because it had diverse hydrological, morphological and hydraulic conditions in a relatively small length of the river. LNP is located in the north of Iran between Tehran and Mazandaran Provinces. Because the water resources of the park are exploited to supply the drinking water for the city of Tehran and because of the protected nature of the park, no industrial or agro-aquaculture activities are permitted in the area. Consequently, wildlife and especially brown trout populations have ample habitat, which is hard to find in other parts of the Caspian Sea Basin (Esteve et al., 2018).

Sample Collection

Benthic invertebrate samples were collected from 36 cross sections along the river. These organisms were collected from two different points on each cross section. A total of 72 samples were collected from about 2 km of river. Field data collection and sampling were carried out in August 2017. Benthic invertebrate samples were collected using a Surber sampler (30×30 cm, 250 µm mesh size). Organisms were collected by stirring and removing the substratum by hand to a depth of a few centimeters. The samples were packed in plastic containers, labeled, fixed in a 4% formalin solution, and transported to the laboratory for processing. We assumed that formalin-preserved invertebrates provided weight estimates very close to those of fresh invertebrates (Ross, 1982; Leuven et al., 1985), unlike estimates from ethanol-preserved invertebrates, which lose a substantial portion of their dry weight through leaching (Howmiller, 1972; Dermott and Paterson, 1974; Leuven et al., 1985).

In the laboratory, each sample was transmitted to a white tray for separation, counting, and identification. Samples were sorted in Petri dishes, using a stereomicroscope. Benthic invertebrates were identified to the family level using specific identification keys (Usinger, 1956; Needham and Needham, 1941; Haney, 2013; Adams and Vaughan, 2003; Beauchene, 2016; Bouchard, 2004). After identification, the organisms were counted and the weight of the identified families was determined. In order to determine biomass of benthic invertebrates in terms of wet weight, organisms of each taxon were placed on a blotting paper for a few minutes to remove excess moisture and then weights of each family were measured to the nearest 0.001 g.
To determine dry weight, organisms were dried at 60°C for 24 hours, and then weighed on a KERN PB balance. In order to determine a length-weight relationship for each family and order, body length and weight of individuals of each family were determined. Body length was measured as the distance from the anterior of the head to the end of the last abdominal segment. Table 1 provides information on the number of individuals used in each family for the statistical analysis and building the relationships, the range and mean values of the body length, and weight of these individuals.

### Data Analysis

Regression analysis was employed to determine lines of best fit relating individual Body Length (BL) and wet (or dry) weight at both the family and order level. Power functions of the form \( W = aL^b \) were fit by log transforming weights and length so that linear equations of the following form could be used to estimate weight:

\[
\ln W = \ln a + b \ln L
\]

Where, \( W \) is dry or wet Weight (mg), \( L \) is body length (mm), “a” and “b” are regression constants. In practice, when interpreting a length–weight regression equation, “b” values represent the rate of increase (i.e. slope) of weight against length in a linear relationship, whereas the constant “a” only represents the weight of an organism at a unit length (i.e. 1 mm). The fit of the regression equations was judged by the correlation coefficient (r), the significance level (P, obtained from regression ANOVA) and residual analysis.

The goodness of fit of a regression model is dependent on the combination of variables, the distribution of the measured organisms over the range of the linear body dimensions and the range itself (Burgherr and Meyer, 1997). The logarithmic transformation of the power equation will

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taxon</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Length (mm)</th>
<th>Wet weight (mg)</th>
<th>Dry weight (mg)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>Mean±SD</td>
<td>Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diptera</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>2-11</td>
<td>5.65±1.97</td>
<td>1-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simuliidae</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>3-16</td>
<td>6.01±2.48</td>
<td>1-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chironomidae</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>4-21</td>
<td>11.67±3.23</td>
<td>2-58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tipulidae</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>2-9</td>
<td>4.48±1.16</td>
<td>1-38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupae of Diptera</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>2.5-6</td>
<td>3.75±1.01</td>
<td>2-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Diptera</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ephemeroptera</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>3-18</td>
<td>6.74±1.94</td>
<td>1-51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baetidae</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>4-18</td>
<td>9.29±3.91</td>
<td>4-105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heptageniiida</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trichoptera</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>5-18</td>
<td>10.42±2.97</td>
<td>4-111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caseless Trichoptera</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>6-19</td>
<td>11.91±2.68</td>
<td>18-413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cased Trichoptera</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coleoptera</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larvae</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4-7</td>
<td>5.63±0.89</td>
<td>1-48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2-9</td>
<td>3.09±1.40</td>
<td>2-61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* SD: Standard Deviation.
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have effect on the confidence limits. According to Wenzel et al. (1990), a difference of up to 20% between the actual and calculated biomass can be expected.

Regression functions were generated at both family and order level. The Coleoptera organisms were separated into adults and larvae, and regression equations for these two groups are only presented in terms of wet weight. For the predictive equations at the order level, all data of an order were pooled and computed again. A general predictive equation was also obtained by pooling data from all individuals measured in this study. These relationships were first developed in terms of Wet Weight (WW) and then Dry Weight (DW) of the organisms. Knowing the proportion of Dry-to-Wet Weight (PDW) and developing the relationship based on one measure of weight allows easy conversion to the other.

RESULTS

Information on the number of individuals used to calculate each regression at the order level, the range and mean values of the body length, and weight of these individuals are presented in Table 2. All the organisms of these orders are in their larval life stage, except for Diptera that contains also pupae and adult life stages.

Parameters for the regression equations relating body length to wet and dry weight for each order and family are presented in Table 3. Predictive equations were obtained for the most frequent and abundant invertebrates found in the river. All regression equations were significant at the $P < 0.05$ level.

The equations indicate a high difference in intercepts among the orders, reflecting their different average sizes (Table 3).

For Trichoptera, those families with a significant number of individuals are considered for length-weight regression analysis. Trichoptera are usually collected with their cases and we thought it would be interesting to determine if some relationship exists between length of the case and body weight. We have therefore provided parameters for weight determination for Trichoptera based on case presence or absence in Table 3. Since Oligochaeta and Amphipoda were not identified to family level, regression equations at the family level are only presented for aquatic insects.

There was no significant linear correlation between $\ln W$ and $\ln L$ for larvae of Coleoptera ($P > 0.05$), and a quadratic regression model yielded a better fit, suggesting a curvilinear relationship between body length and wet weight.

Whether regression equations at the order level had better goodness of fit than equations for the family level differed among taxon (Table 3). We obtained a general predictive equation by pooling data from all individuals measured in this study (Table 4).

Mean values of the $PDW$ for identified benthic organisms in the study river are presented in Table 5. Mean value of $PDW$ for benthic organisms was 0.16, with a range 0.06 to 0.47 among different families.

Table 2. Number of individuals (n), ranges and mean values of body length, wet weight and dry weight of the identified orders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taxon (Order)</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Length (mm)</th>
<th>Wet weight (mg)</th>
<th>Dry weight (mg)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>Mean±SD</td>
<td>Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diptera</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>2-21</td>
<td>6.56±3.43</td>
<td>1-58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ephemeroptera</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>3-18</td>
<td>7.46±2.88</td>
<td>1-105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trichoptera</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>5-19</td>
<td>11.23±2.90</td>
<td>4-413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oligochaeta</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>14-74</td>
<td>39.76±11.87</td>
<td>25-404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphipoda</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>3-12</td>
<td>7.81±2.23</td>
<td>2-59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*SD: Standard Deviation.*
### Table 3. Values for the constants ln “a” and “b”, obtained from Equation (1) for Wet (and Dry) Weight (WW and DW, mg) and Body Length (BL, mm) of selected taxa of benthic invertebrates in Elarm River.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taxon</th>
<th>Conversion</th>
<th>Regression constants</th>
<th>$r$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ln $a \pm SE$</td>
<td>$b \pm SE$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diptera</strong></td>
<td>$BL \rightarrow WW$</td>
<td>-0.277±0.263</td>
<td>1.318±0.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$BL \rightarrow WW$</td>
<td>-2.397±0.263</td>
<td>1.318±0.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Simuliidae</strong></td>
<td>$BL \rightarrow WW$</td>
<td>0.019±0.506</td>
<td>1.124±0.282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$BL \rightarrow WW$</td>
<td>-2.641±0.505</td>
<td>1.125±0.282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chironomidae</strong></td>
<td>$BL \rightarrow WW$</td>
<td>-0.626±0.398</td>
<td>1.192±0.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$BL \rightarrow WW$</td>
<td>-3.456±0.400</td>
<td>1.198±0.186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tipulidae</strong></td>
<td>$BL \rightarrow WW$</td>
<td>-1.573±0.271</td>
<td>1.838±0.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$BL \rightarrow WW$</td>
<td>-3.233±0.271</td>
<td>1.838±0.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pupae of Diptera</strong></td>
<td>$BL \rightarrow WW$</td>
<td>0.188±0.239</td>
<td>0.895±0.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$BL \rightarrow WW$</td>
<td>-2.475±0.239</td>
<td>0.897±0.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adult Diptera</strong></td>
<td>$BL \rightarrow WW$</td>
<td>0.923±0.294</td>
<td>0.631±0.211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$BL \rightarrow WW$</td>
<td>-0.591±0.294</td>
<td>0.631±0.211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ephemeroptera</strong></td>
<td>$BL \rightarrow WW$</td>
<td>-1.305±0.350</td>
<td>2.055±0.155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$BL \rightarrow WW$</td>
<td>-3.512±0.349</td>
<td>2.055±0.155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baetidae</strong></td>
<td>$BL \rightarrow WW$</td>
<td>-0.122±0.550</td>
<td>1.281±0.271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$BL \rightarrow WW$</td>
<td>-2.781±0.551</td>
<td>1.280±0.271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heptageniidae</strong></td>
<td>$BL \rightarrow WW$</td>
<td>-0.764±0.271</td>
<td>1.907±0.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$BL \rightarrow WW$</td>
<td>-2.660±0.271</td>
<td>1.906±0.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trichoptera</strong></td>
<td>$BL \rightarrow WW$</td>
<td>-0.939±0.403</td>
<td>2.182±0.165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$BL \rightarrow WW$</td>
<td>-2.048±0.403</td>
<td>2.182±0.165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Caseless Trichoptera</strong></td>
<td>$BL \rightarrow WW$</td>
<td>0.502±0.364</td>
<td>1.379±0.151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cased Trichoptera</strong></td>
<td>$BL \rightarrow WW$</td>
<td>-1.157±0.364</td>
<td>1.379±0.152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coleoptera</strong></td>
<td>$BL \rightarrow WW$</td>
<td>-0.373±0.358</td>
<td>2.083±0.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$BL \rightarrow WW$</td>
<td>-1.148±0.358</td>
<td>2.083±0.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adult</strong></td>
<td>$BL \rightarrow WW$</td>
<td>-1.084±0.230</td>
<td>2.318±0.169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oligochaeta</strong></td>
<td>$BL \rightarrow WW$</td>
<td>-2.649±0.570</td>
<td>2.035±0.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$BL \rightarrow WW$</td>
<td>-4.420±0.570</td>
<td>2.035±0.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amphipoda</strong></td>
<td>$BL \rightarrow WW$</td>
<td>-1.271±0.279</td>
<td>2.059±0.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$BL \rightarrow WW$</td>
<td>-3.390±0.279</td>
<td>2.059±0.141</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $r$: Correlation coefficient, SE: Standard Error of the estimate.

### Table 4. Results of the general regression equations for benthic invertebrates of Elarm River.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taxon</th>
<th>Conversion</th>
<th>Regression constants</th>
<th>$r$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ln $a \pm SE$</td>
<td>$b \pm SE$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All taxa</strong></td>
<td>$BL \rightarrow WW$</td>
<td>-0.073±0.24</td>
<td>1.365±0.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$BL \rightarrow WW$</td>
<td>-2.062±0.295</td>
<td>1.431±0.096</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table 5.** Mean values of the proportion of Dry-to-Wet Weight (PDW) for selected taxa of benthic invertebrates in Elarm River.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taxon</th>
<th>PDW±SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diptera</td>
<td>0.12±0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simuliidae</td>
<td>0.07±0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chironomidae</td>
<td>0.06±0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tipulidae</td>
<td>0.16±0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupae of Diptera</td>
<td>0.07±0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Diptera</td>
<td>0.22±0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ephemeroptera</td>
<td>0.11±0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baetidae</td>
<td>0.08±0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heptageniidae</td>
<td>0.15±0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trichoptera</td>
<td>0.33±0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caseless Trichoptera</td>
<td>0.19±0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cased Trichoptera</td>
<td>0.47±0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oligochaeta</td>
<td>0.17±0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphipoda</td>
<td>0.12±0.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*SD: Standard Deviation.*

**DISCUSSION**

Length-weight relationships are a useful tool in ecological research. Estimating weight indirectly from linear body measurements is less time consuming than direct weight determination, particularly for smaller invertebrates. Body length is widely used for determining length–weight relationships of aquatic invertebrates (Smock, 1980; Towers *et al.*, 1994; Burgherr and Meyer, 1997) mainly because it has a larger measuring range than other linear body dimensions like head capsule width and interocular distance, and allows to analyze size distribution pattern of invertebrate taxa (González *et al.*, 2002).

In our study, relationships between body length and weight (both wet and dry weight) for the most common benthic invertebrates of a mountain river in the LNP of Iran were obtained for the first time (Tables 3 and 4). We found that Diptera, Ephemeroptera and Trichoptera orders were the most important faunal groups in terms of both abundance and weight in Elarm River, which is consistent with findings from previous studies (Abdoli *et al.*, 2016; Salavatian, 2012).

Our estimate for the mean value of PDW supports that of Seiz (2011) who suggested that, for benthic invertebrates, dry weight is 15% of wet weight.

In this study, the value of b for different orders and families of benthic invertebrates was less than the expected value 3 (Table 3), which means that body weight of these invertebrates is more influenced by surface than by volume (Engelmann, 1961). It has been suggested that b is likely to be closer to a value of 2 for organisms that are relatively flattened; i.e., those that are more 2-dimensional than 3-dimensional (Wenzel *et al.*, 1990; Towers *et al.*, 1994). For all benthic invertebrates of this study, including insects and non-insects, we found no marked difference in regression slope (b value) and r values between regressions in terms of wet and dry weight. Regression equations obtained in this study for three major orders of aquatic invertebrates were compared to those in previous studies from different geographical locations (Table 6).
The "b" values we obtained were most similar to those found for New Zealand (Towers et al., 1994). The direct between-study comparisons in Table 6 suggest that sample size, body length range, differences in the physical-chemical environment and trophic conditions can influence the outcome of the length–weight relationship considerably, as also argued elsewhere (Giustini et al., 2008; Benke et al., 1999). Variation among length-weight relationships may also be attributable to methodological differences in the development or application of the relationships; and true spatio-temporal or taxonomic variation in weight at length (Johnston and Cunjak, 1999).

The variability among model predictions indicate that relationships obtained for aquatic invertebrates in a specific area are not transferable to other study sites and length-weight equations should be developed for the taxon and habitat under study. Our equations will enable river ecologists to derive biomass estimates for benthic invertebrates of similar running waters rapidly and economically. The taxa found in Elarm River are representative of the benthos of rivers in LNP in the Southern Caspian Sea Basin and regression equations developed in this study may be used for ecological studies of rivers in the Southern Caspian Sea Basin. Further investigation is needed on length-weight relationships within aquatic families and orders not studied here.

Table 6. Regression coefficients for the relationships between body length and dry weight of individuals grouped according to the three major orders of aquatic invertebrates in the present and previous studies. a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order</th>
<th>Regression constants</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ln a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diptera</td>
<td>-2.397±0.263</td>
<td>1.32±0.12</td>
<td>2.0-21.0</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>Iran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-5.221±0.588</td>
<td>2.43±0.15</td>
<td>2.3-68.1</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>North America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-6.210±0.210</td>
<td>2.52±0.01</td>
<td>1.2-46.7</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-4.730±0.170</td>
<td>2.36±0.09</td>
<td>2.0-23.0</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>South America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-2.878±0.180</td>
<td>1.24±0.10</td>
<td>2.1-16.8</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-3.512±0.349</td>
<td>2.06±0.16</td>
<td>3.0-18.0</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>Iran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-5.021±0.095</td>
<td>2.88±0.07</td>
<td>1.1-24.1</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>North America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-6.560±0.210</td>
<td>3.41±0.10</td>
<td>1.2-16.0</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-6.980±0.280</td>
<td>3.51±0.14</td>
<td>2.5-15.0</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>South America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-4.645±0.215</td>
<td>2.70±0.09</td>
<td>3.9-19.5</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-2.048±0.403</td>
<td>2.18±0.17</td>
<td>5.0-19.0</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>Iran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-6.266±0.693</td>
<td>3.12±0.29</td>
<td>3.2-25.0</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>North America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-6.037±0.390</td>
<td>2.82±0.16</td>
<td>3.7-24.8</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-5.040±0.260</td>
<td>2.72±0.13</td>
<td>1.5-13.0</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>South America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-4.894±0.268</td>
<td>2.44±0.12</td>
<td>1.3-25.0</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Values for the constants ln a and b were reported with standard error of the estimate in all references except Smock (1980) who reported regression constants with 95% confidence intervals. Range= Range of body length; n= Number of individuals used to calculate each regression, SE: Standard Error of the estimate.
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روابط طول - وزن بی‌مهرگان کنترل شده در حوضه جنوبی دریای خزر، ایران

م. حاجی اسماعیلی، س. ع. ایوبزاده، و. ع. عبدی

چکیده

زیست‌توانه پارامتری مهم در مطالعه فرآیندهای انتقال انرژی زنجیره‌های غذایی و همچنین ساختار اجتماعی و ترکیب موجودات آبی می‌باشد. تعیین زیست‌توده بر اساس اندازه‌گیری مستقیم وزن جانوران، روش حجمی، و تبدیل طول وزن می‌باشد. اگرچه اندازه‌گیری مستقیم وزن می‌تواند از ارگانیسم‌ها صحیح ترین روش می‌باشد، اما به دلیل زمان بودن آن کاربرد این روش را بیشتر نیست. روابط رگرسیونی طول - وزن به دلیل سرعت و دقت آنها نسبت به سایر روش‌ها، رابطه ترین روش‌ها مورد استفاده برای برآورد زیست‌توده بی‌مهرگان کنترل شده می‌باشد. در این تحقیق روابط طول-وزن را پنج کنترول شناسایی شده در رودخانه‌ای کوهوستانی در ایران واقع در حوضه جنوبی دریای خزر با استفاده از روش‌های تابعی دریافتی (خط شده از طریق تبدیل لگاریتمی) بر داده‌های وزن توز و خشک در برای طول بدن بی‌مهرگان آبی در دو سطح خاوا و راسته توسط داده شده‌اند. یک رابطهی عاملی نیز بر اساس داده‌های کل کنترل شناسایی شده در تحقیق توسط داده شده است. روابط توصیه داده شده در سطح P<0.05 معنی‌دار بودند و ضریب همبستگی روابط در حدوده 0.99–0.82 بود. روابط رگرسیونی حاصل از تحقیق حاضر برای هر جنس عمدتاً از بی‌مهرگان آبی با روابط سایر تحقیقات انجام شده در مناطق جغرافیایی مختلف مورد مقایسه قرار گرفت. روابط توصیه داده شده در این تحقیق در بررسی‌های آینده ساختار جمعیت کنترل و نیز درک اهمیت این بی‌مهرگان در انتقال انرژی رودخانه مفید خواهد بود.