Microplastic ingestion in freshwater fish: Implications for ecosystem and human health.

Jessica Adams*

Division of Molecular Biology, Global Institute of Life Sciences, New York, USA.

Introduction

Microplastic ingestion in freshwater fish is an increasingly pressing issue that reflects the broader environmental crisis caused by plastic pollution. Microplastics, defined as plastic particles less than five millimeters in size, enter freshwater systems through various channels, including wastewater effluent, urban runoff, industrial discharges, and the breakdown of larger plastic debris. Once in the aquatic environment, these particles are often mistaken for food by fish and other aquatic organisms, leading to widespread ingestion across multiple trophic levels [1, 2].

Freshwater fish are especially vulnerable due to their proximity to human settlements and industrial activities. Studies have revealed that both benthic and pelagic species ingest microplastics, which accumulate in their gastrointestinal tracts and, in some cases, migrate into other tissues [3, 4].

This ingestion can lead to physical harm such as intestinal blockages, reduced feeding behavior, and impaired growth. Moreover, microplastics often act as vectors for toxic pollutants, including heavy metals and persistent organic pollutants (POPs), which adhere to their surfaces. When fish ingest these contaminated particles, the toxins can bioaccumulate, potentially affecting the fish's physiology and reproductive systems [5, 6].

The implications of microplastic ingestion extend beyond individual fish and threaten the integrity of entire freshwater ecosystems. Disruption in fish health can alter predator-prey relationships, reduce fish populations, and impair the ecosystem services these organisms provide, such as nutrient cycling and water purification. Furthermore, many of the affected species are integral to local food webs and economies, making this issue both an environmental and socioeconomic concern [7, 8].

From a human health perspective, the consumption of contaminated freshwater fish poses significant risks. Although the extent to which microplastics and associated toxins transfer to human tissues through dietary intake is still under investigation, the potential for long-term health effects cannot be dismissed. Regular consumption of fish that have ingested microplastics could lead to the accumulation of hazardous substances in the human body, raising concerns about food safety and public health [9, 10].

Conclusion

In conclusion, microplastic ingestion in freshwater fish represents a multifaceted threat that spans ecological, economic, and human health domains. As plastic production and pollution continue to rise, urgent action is required to reduce plastic inputs into freshwater environments. This includes improving waste management systems, enforcing stricter regulations on plastic use and disposal, and promoting public awareness of the issue. Further research is also essential to fully understand the long-term effects of microplastic contamination and to develop effective mitigation strategies. Only through a comprehensive and collaborative approach can we safeguard aquatic life, ecosystem stability, and human well-being.

References

1. Wilgus TA. Regenerative healing in fetal skin: a review of the literature. Ostomy/wound management. 2007;53(6):16-31.
2. Moore AL, Marshall CD, Barnes LA, et al. Scarless wound healing: transitioning from fetal research to regenerative healing. Wiley Interdiscip Rev Dev. 2018;7(2):e309.
3. King A, Balaji S, Le LD, et al. Regenerative wound healing: The role of interleukin-10. Adv Wound Care. 2014;3(4):315-23.
4. Schmidt-Bleek K, Schell H, Schulz N, et al. Inflammatory phase of bone healing initiates the regenerative healing cascade. Cell Tissue Res. 2012;347:567-73.
5. Nauta A, Gurtner GC, Longaker MT. Wound healing and regenerative strategies. Oral diseases. 2011;17(6):541-9.
6. Ud-Din S, Volk SW, Bayat A. Regenerative healing, scar-free healing and scar formation across the species: current concepts and future perspectives. Exp Dermatol. 2014;23(9):615-9.
7. Herdrich BJ, Danzer E, Davey MG, et al. Regenerative healing following foetal myocardial infarction. Eur J Cardiothorac Surg. 2010;38(6):691-8.
8. Vorotnikova E, McIntosh D, Dewilde A, et al. Extracellular matrix-derived products modulate endothelial and progenitor cell migration and proliferation in vitro and stimulate regenerative healing in vivo. Matrix Biology.

***Correspondence to:** Jessica Adams**,** Division of Molecular Biology, Global Institute of Life Sciences, New York, USA, E-mail: jessica.adams@bioinstitute.org

***Received:** 03-Apr-2025, Manuscript No. AAJFR-25-164731; **Editor assigned:** 04-Apr-2025, PreQC No. AAJFR-25-164731(PQ); **Reviewed:** 18-Apr-2025, QC No AAJFR-25-164731; **Revised:** 21-Apr-2025, Manuscript No. AAJFR-25-164731(R); **Published:** 28-Apr-2025, DOI:10.35841/ aajfr -9.2.259*

***Citation:** Adams J. Microplastic ingestion in freshwater fish: Implications for ecosystem and human health. J Fish Res. 2025;9(2):259.*

2010;29(8):690-700.

9. Hu MS, Maan ZN, Wu JC, et al. Tissue engineering and regenerative repair in wound healing. Ann Biomed Eng. 2014;42:1494-507.
10. Ghatnekar GS, O 'Quinn MP, Jourdan LJ, et al. Connexin43 carboxyl-terminal peptides reduce scar progenitor and promote regenerative healing following skin wounding. Regen Med. 2009;4(2):205-23.

Citation: *Adams J. Microplastic ingestion in freshwater fish: Implications for ecosystem and human health. J Fish Res. 2025;9(2):259.*