# Bacteriological Studies on Fish Affected by Epizootic Ulcerative Syndrome (EUS) in Kerala, India

N. THAMPURAN, P. K. SURENDRAN, M.K. MUKUNDAN and K. GOPAKUMAR

Central Institute of Fisheries Technology Cochin-682029, India

### Abstract

Bacteriological studies were conducted on fish affected by epizootic ulcerative syndrome (EUS) in Kerala, India, with emphasis on the hydrobiological features of the environment. Among the nine fish species analyzed, the most severe symptoms were observed in *Channa striatus, Wallago attu* and *Puntius*. The bacterial species isolated from the lesions and internal organs of these fishes showed a dominance of *Aeromonas hydrophila*. The frequency of isolation of *A. hydrophila* was low in fish showing mild symptoms and in apparently healthy fish collected from the affected areas. Repeated isolation of *A. hydrophila* from ulcerated parts of fish indicate that this organism could be responsible for the secondary infection. Water samples showed acidic pH, low salinity, and levels of mercury and cadmium within limits.

# Introduction

Towards the end of August 1991, an outbreak of epizootic ulcerative syndrome (EUS) occurred in several parts of Kerala, in the southwestern part of India, causing largescale fish mortality. The disease was first observed in the freshwater lake of Kuttanad and rapidly spread to other freshwater lakes of Kerala. The disease was most severe in an area that had been receiving heavy rainfall between June and July, and was ravaged by floods four times in the season.

Fish varieties like *Etroplus suratensis*, *Puntius* sp., *Wallago attu* and *Channa striatus* were affected. Diseased fish developed large hemorrhagic lesions on the body surface, became sluggish and tended to keep to surface waters before dying.

A similar fish ailment had been reported from Australia (Burke and Rodgers 1981), Indonesia (Roberts et al. 1986), Sri Lanka (Frerichs 1988) and Bangladesh (Roberts et al. 1989). In India, reports of the occurrence of the disease came from Assam, the north eastern states of India (Das et al. 1990) and Uttar Pradesh (Chattopadhyay et al. 1990).

A number of aetiologies have been proposed for the outbreak of EUS in which the primary agent is thought to be virus, fungi, bacteria or parasites. Virus like *Rhabdovirus* (Frerichs 1988), fungi *Aphanomyces* (Callinan et al. 1990) and *Achlya* (Pichyangkura and Bodhalamik 1983), and chemoautotrophic

Nocardioform bacteria (Dastidar and Chakraborty 1992) have been frequently isolated from EUS-affected fish. Bacteria like *Aeromonas, Vibrio, Pseudomonas* and *Micrococcus* that are mostly opportunistic pathogens, have been associated with necrotic ulcers which are thought to be the secondary infections leading to death in severely ulcerated fish (Lilley et al. 1991).

The present paper is an account of the salient findings of the bacteriological and chemical studies conducted on diseased fish and the environment.

r radar rege

## **Materials and Methods**

Fish samples were collected by cast nets from 11 locations where largescale fish mortality was reported. Both affected and apparently healthy fish were collected along with mud and water samples.

Altogether, 55 fish were obtained comprising nine species: *Puntius* sp., pearlspot (*Etroplus suratensis*), attuwalla (*Wallago attu*), oxeyed herring (*Megalops cyprinoides*), striped snakehead (*Channa striatus*), freshwater garfish (*Xenotodon cancila*), catfish (*Heteropneustes fossilis*), *Anabas* sp. and freshwater prawn (*Macrobrachium rosenbergii*). The fish were transported to the laboratory in sterile polyethylene bags under ice and examined immediately.

The specimens were examined for any gross external abnormalities before attempting bacteriological analysis. In the case of body lesions, Gram-stained smears were prepared for observation under microscope.

Bacteriological analysis of the fish followed the procedure outlined by Gillespie et al. (1974) and Frerichs and Hendrie (1985). The lesions material was directly inoculated into tryptic soy broth (Difco), and streaked on pre-set plates of tryptic soy agar (Difco), *Pseudomonas* isolation agar (Hi media), TCBS agar (Oxoid), Muellor Hinton agar and Rimler Shott agar (Hi media). The internal parts (muscle, liver and kidney) were dissected out and analyzed as in the case of lesions material.

The inoculated plates and tubes were incubated at 37°C for 18-20 h. Bacteria were recovered from the tubes by streaking loopfuls of suspension on plates of tryptic soy agar, *Pseudomonas* isolation agar, TCBS agar, Muellor Hinton agar and Rimler Shott agar. Representative numbers of the most numerous colony type were isolated, purified and maintained on tryptic soy agar at  $29\pm1$ °C. The bacterial isolates were identified up to generic or species level based on the scheme proposed by Shotts and Bullock (1975). In addition to various confirmatory and supplementary tests mentioned in the scheme, the hemolytic and proteolytic ability of the isolates were also determined. The antibiotic spectrum of the isolates were determined by placing antibiotic discs (Pasteur Biological Laboratories [India], Gujarat) listed in Table 1 on a lawn of young culture, grown in nutrient agar incubating at 37°C and noting the diameter of the inhibitory zone around each disc.

The water samples were subjected to tests for pH, (Systronics, Bombay) dissolved oxygen and salinity (Stainton et al. 1974). For bacteriological analysis, appropriate dilutions of the water samples were spread plated on tryptic soy agar. After incubation at 37°C for 24 h, typical colonies were picked for identification (Gillespie et al. 1974). Mercury and cadmium in the water were also

estimated by wet digestion method, as these two elements are often suspected in this area (AOAC 1976). Mercury was analyzed using a mercury analyzer (ECIL model MA5800) by cold vapor absorption, and cadmium using GBC 902 Atomic Absorption Spectrophotometer.

|                               | Antibiotic spectrum of the bacterial isolates |                  |         |             |                  |
|-------------------------------|---|------------------|---------|-------------|------------------|
| Antibiotic                    | A. hydrophila                                 | A. calcoaciticus | E. coli | Pseudomonas | Arthrobacter sp. |
| Amoxycillin                   | NA  | NA               | NA      | NA          | NA               |
| Carbencillin                  | NA  | NA               | NA      | NA          | NA               |
| Cephaloridine                 | NA  | R                | S       | NA          | NA               |
| Cloxocillin                   | NA  | NA               | NA      | NA          | NA               |
| Gentamycin                    | S   | S                | S       | S           | S                |
| Kanamycin                     | М   | S                | М       | NT          | S                |
| Neomycin                      | М   | М                | R       | R           | М                |
| Nalidixic acid                | S   | S                | S       | R           | S                |
| Ampicillin                    | NA  | S                | S       | NA          | S                |
| Bacitracin                    | S   | NA               | NA      | NA          | NA               |
| Chloromycetin                 | S   | М                | S       | R           | Μ                |
| Nitrofurantoin                | S   | R                | S       | NA          | R                |
| Sulphadiazene                 | R   | М                | NA      | S           | NA               |
| Penicillin G                  | NA  | NA               | NA      | NA          | NA               |
| Streptomycin                  | R   | NA               | NA      | S           | NA               |
| Terramycin<br>No. of cultures | S   | S                | S       | NA          | NA               |
| tested                        | 16  | 2                | 5       | 2           | 5                |

Table 1. Sensitivity of the major bacterial isolates toward some common antibiotics.

R - resistant, M - Intermediate, S - sensitive, NT - Not tested, NA - No action

Based on zone size interpretative chart, Span Diagnostics, Surat, India.

#### Results

The symptoms and the degree of infection of the fish collected from the affected areas differed considerably. Table 2 presents a description of their external appearance and major symptoms. Apparently healthy fish showing no external symptoms of the disease were considered as category A; fish with mild inflammation and degeneration of epidermis as category B. The most severe cases with massive inflammation or ulcerations were placed in category C and observed for *C. striatus, W. attu* and *Puntius* sp. (Fig. 1). All the fish in this group exhibited infection. In category B, all the fish were also infected, but the infection was milder and ulcerations were absent.

The internal organs of the clinical and subclinical cases failed to give evidence of a gross pathological condition except petechial hemorrhagic spots on the dorsal muscle in the case of *C. striatus*, and serum exudations in the visceral cavity of *E. suratensis*.

The bacterial species isolated from the fish collected from EUS-affected areas are summarized in Table 3. Of the nine fish species analyzed, six (66%) carried *A. hydrophila*. The lesion material consistently revealed the presence of *A. hydrophila*, but they were isolated from liver and muscle tissues. In category A fish, muscle, liver, blood and kidney were screened. But only the muscle portion yielded bacterial colonies.

| Fish species                 | No. of<br>fish<br>examined* | Location                   | Category | Clinical symptoms  |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|----------|--|
| Puntius                      | 2 (2)                       | Keettupadam                | С        | Hemorrhagic lesion<br>on skin surface, putrid<br>odor, degeneration<br>of epidermal tissue,<br>necrotic    |
| Etroplus suratensis          | 2 (2)                       | Kollagin,<br>Kolathrapadam | В        | No external lesions but<br>petechial hemorrhagic<br>spots on body, mouth<br>and anal fin exoph-<br>thalmia |
| Wallago attu                 | 3 (3)                       | Kollagiri                  | С        | No hemorrhagic lesions<br>but massive degenera-<br>tion of epidermis; highly<br>putrid odor                |
| Megalops cyprinoides         | 10 (1)                      | Kannadichal                | A        | No visible symptoms<br>except hemorrhagic<br>lesion on head of one<br>fish                                 |
| Channa striatus              | 2 (2)                       | Kannadichal                | С        | Large deep ulceration;<br>highly necrotic with<br>hemorrhagic spots;<br>head eroded                        |
| Xenentodon cancila           | 8 (0)                       | Keettupadam                | А        | No visible symptoms  |
| Heteropneustes<br>fossilis   | 3 (3)                       | Keettupadam                | В        | Multiple inflammatory<br>spots on head and fin;<br>necrotic degeneration<br>of epidermis                   |
| Anabas sp.                   | 9 (0)                       | Keettupadam                | Α        | Externally normal  |
| Macrobrachium<br>rosenbergii | 16 (1)                      | Keettupadam                | А        | No visible symptoms<br>except head erosion<br>on one animal  |

Table 2. Description of the fish species collected from EUS-affected areas in Kerala, India, 1991.

\* Values in parentheses show the number of infected fish.

Enterobacteriaceae constituted the second dominant member and included two species, *Escherichia coli* and *Enterobacter cloacae*, occurring in 33% each of the fish species. They were isolated mainly from the muscle enrichments. The *Arthrobacter* sp. were isolated from 44% of the fish species. The other bacterial species viz., *Acinetobacter calcoaceticus* and *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*, were present in 33% and 22% of the fish, respectively. *Micrococcus* sp. (22%) and *Bacillus* sp. (11%) were also isolated. Table 4 presents the rate of prevalence of various bacterial species in the different categories of fish. Out of 55 bacterial cultures isolated from the fish, *A. hydrophila* constituted the major component (40%) of the total isolates, followed in the order of prevalence by *Arthrobacter* sp., *Escherichia coli* and *Acinetobacter calcoaceticus*. The Gram positives formed only 25% of the total isolates.



Fig. 1. Infected specimen of *Channa striatus* showing deep ulcerations in the head region.

Table 3. Occurrence of various bacterial species in fish collected from EUS-affected areas, Kerala, India.

| Fish species              | A. hydrophila | E. coli | E. cloacae | Pseudomonas |
|---------------------------|---------------|---------|------------|-------------|
| Puntius sp.               | x             |         |            | x           |
| Etroplus suratensis       | Х             | Х       | Х          | Х           |
| Wallago attu              | Х             |         |            |             |
| Megalops cyprinoides      |               |         |            |             |
| Channa striatus           | Х             |         | х          |             |
| Xenentodon cancila        | Х             | Х       |            |             |
| Heteropneustes fossilis   |               | х       |            |             |
| Anabas sp.                |               |         |            |             |
| Macrobrachium rosenbergii | Х             |         | х          |             |

| Fish species                          | A. calcoaceticus | Arthrobacter sp. | Micrococcus sp. | Bacillus sp. |
|---------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Puntius sp.                           |                  | X                |                 |              |
| Etroplus suratensi                    | Х                | Х                |                 | Х            |
| Wallago attu                          |                  | Х                |                 |              |
| Megalops cyprinoides                  |                  |                  |                 |              |
| Channa striatus                       | х                |                  |                 |              |
| Xenentodon cancila                    |                  | х                | х               |              |
| Heteropneustes fossilis<br>Anabas sp. | х                |                  |                 |              |
| Macrobrachium rosenbergi              | ï                |                  |                 |              |

Table 4. Species-wise distribution of bacteria in the fish.

| Bacterial types             | No. of<br>isolates | %    |  |
|-----------------------------|--------------------|------|--|
| Aeromonas hydrophila        | 16                 | 40   |  |
| Escherichia coli            | 5                  | 12.5 |  |
| Enterobacter cloacae        | 2                  | 5    |  |
| Pseudomonas aeruginosa      | 2                  | 5    |  |
| Acinetobacter calcoaceticus | 3                  | 7.5  |  |
| Arthrobacter sp.            | 7                  | 17.5 |  |
| Micrococcus sp.             | 2                  | 5    |  |
| Bacillus sp.                | 1                  | 2.5  |  |
| Others                      | 2                  | 5    |  |
|                             |                    |      |  |

107

The antibiogram of the major bacterial groups were determined (Table 1). Of the 16 antibiotics tested, chloromycetin was most effective to the *A*. *hydrophila* species. The other antibiotics, gentamycin, kanamycin, neomycin, bacitracin and nadidixic acid, were also effective.

Water collected from the locations showed the presence of *Arthrobacter*, *Micrococcus* and *Bacillus* species; and the mud carried *Pseudomonas*, *Arthrobacter*, *Bacillus* and *Aeromonas* sp. The values for pH were distinctly acidic, and salinity was very low. The levels of mercury and cadmium were also within limits (Table 5).

| Location      | Mercury<br>(ppm) | Cadmium<br>(ppm) | рН  | Dissolved<br>oxygen<br>(mg·l <sup>-1</sup> ) | Salinity<br>(ppt) |
|---------------|------------------|------------------|-----|--|-------------------|
| Kollagiri     | 0.05             | 0.177            | 6   | 2.6  | 0.12              |
| Kannakari     | 0.02             | 0.165            | 5.4 | 3.8  | 0.3               |
| Kolathrapadam | 0.05             | 0.038            | 6.5 | 3.0  | 0.17              |
| Mankuzhi      | 0.09             | 0.139            | 4   | 2.9  | 0.26              |
| Veliyam       | ND               | ND               | 5.2 | 3.4  | 0.3               |
| Keeltupadam   | 0.05             | 0.048            | 5.5 | 3.6  | 0.28              |
| Kannadichal   | 0.10             | 0.170            | 4.8 | 2.8  | 0.16              |

Table 5. Hydrographic conditions of the water from various EUS-affected areas.

ND - not determined

#### Discussion

The fish in Kerala exhibiting symptoms of EUS belonged to a wide variety and covered most of the fish species reported in India (Jhingran and Das 1990) and other Southeast Asian countries (Lilley et al. 1991). In the present study, *C. striatus* was found to carry the most severe symptoms.

The study revealed the dominance of *A. hydrophila* over other microbial species by the frequency of isolation from the fish samples and its abundance. This microorganism has been consistently isolated from lesion and muscle tissue of fish from India (Kumar et al. 1990) and countries like Thailand (Tonguthai 1985), Malaysia (Wong and Leong 1987), Indonesia (Dana 1987), Myanmar (Roberts et al. 1986) and Sri Lanka (Balasurya 1987). While *A. hydrophila* is a common inhabitant of healthy fish (Wong and Leong 1987) and the aquatic system (Kaper et al. 1981), it is also an established opportunistic pathogen infecting fish under physiological or environmental stress (Groberg et al. 1978; Lio-Po and Duremdez-Fernandez 1986).

Although *A. hydrophila* was isolated from lesions and internal organs of the fish, there were also instances where fish showing mild symptoms did not carry this bacterium. The authors failed to isolate this microorganism from category A, i.e., normal fish. This points to the possibility that the primary cause of the disease is agents other than *A. hydrophila*; but the ulcerative lesions may be due to *A. hydrophila*. We also observed that the *A. hydrophila* strains were highly proteolytic and  $\beta$ -hemolytic. Chattopadhyay et al. (1990) isolated (cytotoxic enterotoxigenic) strains of *A. hydrophila* from many ulcerated fish, but

none from normal fish. The pathogenic nature of *A. hydrophila* is further emphasized by the study of Lio-Po and Duremdez-Fernandez (1986) who showed that unscaled fish remained unaffected at a challenge dose of  $10^5$  cells·ml<sup>-1</sup> of water medium, whereas descaled fish developed acute hemorrhage and septicemia at a lesser dose and in a shorter period. In the present study, the level of *A. hydrophila* in the water systems was low, being less than 1,000 cells·ml<sup>-1</sup> (unpubl. data).

In addition to A. hydrophila, several other bacterial types were encountered in the present investigation. P. aerugenosa, Acinetobacter calcoaceticus, Micrococcus, etc., were present in the fish in Kerala. Austin and Austin (1985) in their review on bacterial pathogens, cited a variety of bacteria causing ulcerative diseases. *Pseudomonas* species have been frequently reported to cause ulcerative fish diseases (Bullock et al. 1965; Li and Flemming 1967; Wong and Leong 1987). In another study, Micrococcus sp., in association with A. hydrophila, P. fluorescens and E. coli was isolated, and the ulcerated lesions and hematopoetic tissues consistently showed the presence of Micrococcus sp. (Jhingran and Das 1990). The presence of E. coli and E. cloacae in the fish points to the possibility of sewage pollution. Arthrobacter and Acinetobacter strains are common inhabitants of soil and water and hence their presence in the fish is expectable. It has been estimated that 0.001% of the heterotrophic aerobic population of soil and water is composed of Acinetobacters (Baumann 1968). Most of the bacterial species reported in this study were isolated in previous studies from fish collected from Assam, Tripura, Meghalaya and West Bengal in India (Kumar et al. 1990). The sensitivity of the bacteria collected from these fish towards a large number of antibiotics indicates that the area is not frequently exposed to antibiotic residues.

The abiotic factors, such as temperature, eutrophication, sewage and pollution, that result in sublethal stress to fish are considered important in initiating the disease (Lilley et al. 1991). Acidic water may damage the gill structure and epidermis of fish and lower their resistance to infection. Low salinity, as observed in this study, makes fish less tolerant to environmental toxins.

Although the aetiology of EUS is still uncertain, it has been conclusively shown that the underlying cause is an infectious biological agent (Lilley et al. 1991). Repeated isolation of *A. hydrophila* from the lesions of infected fish in this study points to the possibility of a secondary infection due to *A. hydrophila* when the fish is under stress.

# Acknowledgment

The authors are grateful to the Director, Central Institute of Fisheries Technology, for his kind permission to publish this paper.

## References

- AOAC. 1976. Official methods of analysis, 12th edition. Association of Official Analytical Chemists. McGraw and Hill, Washington, D.C.
- Austin, B. and D.A. Austin. 1985. A review of bacterial pathogens of fish. Journal of Applied Bacteriology 58: 483-506.
- Balasurya, L.K.S.W. 1987. Current fish disease problems in Sri Lanka. In: Fish quarantine and fish diseases in South and Southeast Asia: 1986 update (ed. J.R. Arthur), pp. 36-40. Special Publication No. 1, Asian Fisheries Society, Manila.
- Baumann, P. 1968. Isolation of Acinetobacter from soil and water. Journal of Bacteriology 96: 39-42.
- Bullock G.L., S.F. Snieszko and C.E. Dunbar. 1965. Characteristics and identification of oxidative Pseudomonads isolated from diseased fish. Journal of General Microbiology 38: 1-7.
- Burke, J.B. and L.J. Rodgers. 1981. Identification of pathogenic bacteria associated with the occurrence of 'red spot' in sea mullet *Mugil cephalus* L., in South Eastern Queensland. Journal of Fish Diseases 4: 153-159.
- Callinan, R.B., G.C. Fraser and J.L. Virgona. 1990. Pathogenesis of red spot disease, a cutaneous ulcerative syndrome of estuarine fish in Australia. Paper presented at the First Symposium on Diseases in Asian Aquaculture, 26-29 November 1990. Asian Fisheries Society, Manila.
- Chattopadhyay, U.K., D. Pal, M.S. Das, S. Das and R.N. Pal. 1990. Microbiological investigations into epizootic ulcerative syndrome (EUS) in fishes. The National Workshop on Ulcerative Disease Syndrome in Fish, Calcutta.
- Dana, D. 1987. Current fish health problems in Indonesia. In: Fish quarantine and fish diseases in South and Southeast Asia: 1986 update (ed. J.R. Arthur), pp. 9-11. Special Publication No. 1. Asian Fisheries Society, Manila.
- Das, M.K., R.N. Pal, A.K. Ghosh, R.K. Das, H.C. Joshi, M.K. Mukhopadhya and A. Hajra. 1990. Epizootic ulcerative syndrome - a comprehensive account. The National Workshop on Ulcerative Disease Syndrome in Fish, Calcutta.
- Dastidar, S.G. and A.N. Chakraborty. 1992. Bacteriological and histopathological studies on epizootic ulcerative syndrome in fish. Journal of Aquaculture in the Tropics 7: 85-87.
- Frerichs, G.N. 1988. Ulcerative fish diseases in Sri Lanka. Aquaculture News 6: 17. Institute of Aquaculture, Stirling University, Stirling.
- Frerichs, G.N. and M.S. Hendrie. 1985. Bacteria associated with diseases of fish. In: Isolation and identification of microorganisms of medical and veterinary importance (eds. C.H. Collins and J.M. Grange), p. 355. Academic Press, London.
- Gillespie, D.C., T.P.T. Evelyn, C. Frantsi, R.M. MacKelvie and N. Newfeld. 1974. Methods for the detection of certain pathogens of salmonid fishes. Fisheries Research Board of Canada, Miscellaneous Special Publication 23. 19 pp.
- Groberg, W.J. Jr., R.H. McCoy, K.S. Pilcher and J.L. Fryer. 1978. Relation of water temperature to infection of coho salmon Oncorhynchus kisutch, chinook salmon O. ishawytscha and steelhead trout Salmo gairdneri with A. salmonicida and A. hydrophila. Journal of the Fisheries Research Board of Canada 35: 1-7.
- Jhingran, A.G. and M.K. Das. 1990. Epizootic ulcerative syndrome in fishes. Bulletin No. 65. Central Inland Capture Fisheries Research Institute, Barrackpore.
- Kaper, J.B., L. Lockman, R.R. Colwell and S.W. Joseph. 1981. Aeromonas hydrophila. Ecology and toxigenicity of the isolates from an estuary. Journal of Applied Bacteriology 50: 359-377.
- Kumar, D., R.K. Dey and A. Sinha. 1990. Outbreak of epizootic ulcerative syndrome of fish in India. In: Aquaculture and productivity (eds. V.R.P. Sinha and H.C. Srivastava), pp. 345-357. Oxford and IBH Publishing Co. Pvt. Ltd., Bombay.
- Li, M.F. and C. Flemming. 1967. A proteolytic pseudomonad from the skin lesions of rainbow trout Salmo gairdneri. I-Characteristics of the pathogenic effects and the extracellular proteinase. Canadian Journal of Microbiology 13: 405-416.
- Lilley, J.H., M.J. Phillips and K. Tonguthai. 1991. A review of epizootic ulcerative syndrome (EUS) in Asia. Aquatic Animal Health Research Institute and Network of Aquaculture Centres in Asia-Pacific, Bangkok. 73 pp.
- Lio-Po, G. and R. Duremdez-Fernandez. 1986. The pathogenicity of bacteria associated with transport stressed *Chanos chanos* fingerlings. The First Asian Fisheries Forum: 223-226.
- Pichyangkura, S. and V. Bodhalamik. 1983. The study of Achlya sp. of fish disease in Ophicephalus striatus. The Symposium on Fresh Water Fish Epidemic 1982-1983: 197-205. (In Thai with English abstract.)

- Roberts, R.J., D.J. Macintosh, K. Tonguthai, S. Boonyaratpalin, N. Tayaputch, M.J. Phillips and S.D. Miller. 1986. Field and laboratory investigation into ulcerative fish disease in Asia Pacific region. Technical Report of FAO Project TCP/RAS 4508, Bangkok.
- Roberts, R.J., R. Wootten, I. Macrae, S. Millar and W. Struthers. 1989. Ulcerative disease survey, Bangladesh. Final report to the Government of Bangladesh and the Overseas Development Administration. Institute of Aquaculture, Stirling University, Stirling. 104 pp.
- Shotts, E.B. Jr. and G.L. Bullock. 1975. Bacterial diseases of fishes. Diagnostic procedures for Gram negative pathogens. Journal of the Fisheries Research Board of Canada 32: 1243-1247.
- Stainton, M.P., M.J. Capel and F.A.J. Armstrong. 1974. The chemical analysis of fresh water fish. Research Board of Canada. Miscellaneous Bulletin No. 25: 77-113.
- Tonguthai, K. 1985. A preliminary account of ulcerative fish diseases in Indo Pacific region. FAO/ TCO/RAS/4508 Project, Government of Thailand, Bangkok. 39 pp.
- Wong, S.Y. and T.S. Leong. 1987. Current fish disease problems in Malaysia. In: Fish quarantine and fish diseases in South and Southeast Asia: 1986 update (ed. J.R. Arthur), pp. 12-21. Special Publication No. 1. Asian Fisheries Society, Manila.