

# The final spawning ground of *Tachypleus gigas* (Müller, 1785) on the east Peninsular Malaysia is at risk: a call for action

Bryan Raveen Nelson<sup>1,2</sup>, Behara Satyanarayana<sup>3,4,5</sup>, Julia Hwei Zhong Moh<sup>1</sup>, Mhd Ikhwanuddin<sup>1</sup>, Anil Chatterji<sup>6</sup> and Faizah Shaharom<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Institute of Tropical Aquaculture (AKUATROP), Universiti Malaysia Terengganu—UMT, Kuala Terengganu, Terengganu, Malaysia

<sup>2</sup>Horseshoe Crab Research Group (HCRG), Universiti Malaysia Terengganu—UMT, Kuala Terengganu, Terengganu, Malaysia

<sup>3</sup>Mangrove Research Unit (MARU), Universiti Malaysia Terengganu—UMT, Institute of Oceanography and Environment (INOS), Kuala Terengganu, Malaysia

<sup>4</sup>Laboratory of Systems Ecology and Resource Management, Université Libre de Bruxelles—ULB, Brussels, Belgium

<sup>5</sup>Laboratory of Plant Biology and Nature Management, Vrije Universiteit Brussel—VUB, Brussels, Belgium

<sup>6</sup>Biological Oceanography Division, National Institute of Oceanography (NIO), Goa, India

<sup>7</sup>Institute of Kenyir Research (IPK), Universiti Malaysia Terengganu—UMT, Kuala Terengganu, Terengganu, Malaysia

## ABSTRACT

Tanjung Selongor and Pantai Balok (State Pahang) are the only two places known for spawning activity of the Malaysian horseshoe crab - *Tachypleus gigas* (Müller, 1785) on the east coast of Peninsular Malaysia. While the former beach has been disturbed by several anthropogenic activities that ultimately brought an end to the spawning activity of *T. gigas*, the status of the latter remains uncertain. In the present study, the spawning behavior of *T. gigas* at Pantai Balok (Sites I-III) was observed over a period of thirty six months, in three phases, between 2009 and 2013. Every year, the crab's nesting activity was found to be high during Southwest monsoon (May–September) followed by Northeast (November–March) and Inter monsoon (April and October) periods. In the meantime, the number of female *T. gigas* in 2009–2010 (Phase-1) was higher (38 crabs) than in 2010–2011 (Phase-2: 7 crabs) and 2012–2013 (Phase-3: 9 crabs) for which both increased overexploitation (for edible and fishmeal preparations) as well as anthropogenic disturbances in the vicinity (sand mining since 2009, land reclamation for wave breaker/parking lot constructions in 2011 and fishing jetty construction in 2013) are responsible. In this context, the physical infrastructure developments have altered the sediment close to nesting sites to be dominated by fine sand ( $2.5X\varphi$ ) with moderately-well sorted ( $0.6-0.7\sigma\varphi$ ), very-coarse skewed ( $-2.4SK\varphi$ ), and extremely leptokurtic ( $12.6K\varphi$ ) properties. Also, increased concentrations of Cadmium (from 4.2 to 13.6 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>) and Selenium (from 11.5 to 23.3 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>) in the sediment, and Sulphide (from 21 to 28 µg l<sup>-1</sup>) in the water were observed. In relation to the monsoonal changes affecting sheltered beach topography and sediment flux, the spawning crabs have shown a seasonal nest shifting behaviour in-between Sites I-III during 2009–2011. However, in 2012–2013, the crabs were mostly restricted to the areas (i.e., Sites I and II) with high oxygen (5.5–8.0 mg l<sup>-1</sup>) and moisture depth (6.2–10.2 cm). In view of the

Submitted 20 March 2016  
Accepted 17 June 2016  
Published 19 July 2016

### Corresponding authors

Bryan Raveen Nelson,  
brav\_11@hotmail.com  
Behara Satyanarayana,  
satyam2149@gmail.com

### Academic editor

María Ángeles Esteban

Additional Information and  
Declarations can be found on  
page 25

DOI 10.7717/peerj.2232

© Copyright  
2016 Nelson et al.

Distributed under  
Creative Commons CC-BY 4.0

## OPEN ACCESS

sustained anthropogenic pressure on the coastal habitats on one hand and decreasing horseshoe crabs population on the other, it is crucial to implement both conservation and management measures for *T. gigas* at Pantai Balok. Failing that may lead to the loss of this final spawning ground on the east coast of P. Malaysia.

**Subjects** Aquaculture, Fisheries and Fish Science, Conservation Biology, Marine Biology

**Keywords** Anthropogenic disturbance, Conservation and management, Living fossil, Monsoonal impact, Nest shifting behaviour, Seasonal nesting

## INTRODUCTION

The surviving horseshoe crab species, three Asian—*Tachypleus gigas* (Müller, 1785), *Tachypleus tridentatus* (Leach, 1819), *Carcinoscorpius rotundicauda* (Latreille, 1802), and one American—*Limulus polyphemus* (Linnaeus, 1758) persist from the Ordovician period (Rudkin & Young, 2009). Its body with armour-like carapace, degenerated spines (adult), appendages with setae, spine-like telson, etc., shows their prehistoric appearance clearly (Walls, Berskson & Smith, 2002; Ruppert, Fox & Barnes, 2004; Smith, Millard & Carmichael, 2009). Of the four species, only *C. rotundicauda* breeds in the muddy areas near mangroves while the rest spawn along the intertidal beaches of the estuarine coasts (Cartwright-Taylor et al., 2011; Nelson et al., 2015). The selective nesting behaviour of the crabs is usually facilitated by appendage setae (chemoreceptors) which can sense and detect suitable sandy/muddy substratum for their egg incubation and hatching (Botton, 2009).

Horseshoe crabs are encountered only when they come ashore to shallow and surf-protected beaches for nesting. A male crab attached to the rear end of a female crab (using their pedipalps) is distinguished as one mating pair or amplex (Brockmann, 2003; Duffy et al., 2006; Brockmann & Smith, 2009). In addition, satellite males - single and available close to the amplexed pairs to fertilize their eggs and, solitary females - if they are alone, are also visible on the beaches (Mattei et al., 2010; Nelson et al., 2015). A female crab is capable of laying 200–300 eggs (Chatterji & Abidi, 1993) in varying depths (10–20 cm) below the sand (Botton, Tankersley & Lovel, 2010). However, its spawning activity is largely governed by season and local environmental (sediment and water) conditions (Smith, 2007; Weber & Carter, 2009). Despite the increased scientific attention on the horseshoe crabs globally (Smith, Millard & Carmichael, 2009; Chatterji & Shaharom, 2009; Mattei et al., 2010; Cartwright-Taylor et al., 2011; Srijaya et al., 2014), their population is consistently decreasing over the years due to natural (e.g., coastal erosion) as well as anthropogenic disturbances (e.g., pollution, overexploitation, etc.) (Jackson, Nordstrom & Smith, 2005; Ngy et al., 2007; Faurby et al., 2010; Nelson et al., 2015). In addition, the delayed maturity (between 9 and 11 years) and longer embryogenesis period (up to 42 days) (Coursey et al., 2003; Chabot & Watson, 2010) are making these crabs vulnerable to recent changes in the coastal environments (Botton et al., 2006; Chatterji & Shaharom, 2009; Nelson et al., 2015). In fact,

*L. polyphemus* is recognised as ‘near threatened’ species, while the remaining three Asian horseshoe crabs are under “data deficient” category in the IUCN red list (IUCN, 2016).

In Malaysia, all three Asian horseshoe crabs are available. While *T. gigas* and *C. rotundicauda* are present in the coastal areas of Peninsular Malaysia, the distribution of *T. tridentatus* is restricted to East Malaysia (i.e., Sabah and Sarawak) (Chatterji et al., 2008). Although several researchers in P. Malaysia have worked on *T. gigas*, most of their findings are based on short-term investigations (e.g., Zaleha et al., 2010; John et al., 2011; Kamaruzzaman et al., 2011; Tan, Christianus & Satar, 2011; John, Jalal & Kamaruzzaman, 2013). The only long-term (2009–2011) study that examined the nesting behaviour of *T. gigas* was carried out by Nelson et al. (2015) from Tanjung Selongor. In fact, Tanjung Selongor and Pantai Balok (in State Pahang) are the only two places known for *T. gigas* spawning on the east coast of P. Malaysia. According to Nelson et al. (2015), the physical infrastructural developments such as jetty and road/bridge constructions at Tanjung Selongor have already brought an end to the spawning activity of *T. gigas*. In the case of Pantai Balok, Zaleha et al. (2012), Tan et al. (2012), and John et al. (2012) have observed the spawning populations and nesting behaviour of *T. gigas*, but for different months in 2009–2010 with no seasonal cross-checking. Therefore, an assessment on the seasonal impact as well as state-of-the-art information on *T. gigas* is necessary and still to be ascertained from Pantai Balok.


The present study was aimed at investigating the relationship between the nesting activity of *T. gigas* and the environmental (water/sediment) conditions noticed at Pantai Balok. In specific, identification of major environmental factors predisposed by lunar and monsoonal changes that support *T. gigas* spawning formed the main forte of this study. In recent years, several anthropogenic activities such as sand mining (2009 - to present), land reclamation (2011), and construction of a fishing jetty (2013) also appeared to influence *T. gigas* population. At the end, a few recommendations were offered for possible conservation and management of *T. gigas* at Pantai Balok.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

### Study area

We recall that Pantai Balok, in State Pahang, is one of the two spawning grounds for *T. gigas* on the east coast of P. Malaysia (Lat: 3°56'16.58"-3°55'39.33"N; Long: 103°22'32.74"-103°22'27.12"E) (Fig. 1A). River Balok and its tributaries opens here into South China Sea and provide a regular exchange of water (Fig. 1B). The climate of Pantai Balok is influenced by Northeast (NE) (November–March) and Southwest (SW) monsoons (May–September), separated by two Inter-monsoon (IM) periods (April and October). The weather—with a temperature varying between 20 and 36 °C, is generally hot and humid (WU, 2014). The annual (average) rainfall is about 1710.5 mm and occurs mostly during September–December. The tides with a range of 0.1–3.4 m are mixed in nature (NHC, 2013).

Pantai Balok is under sustained human intervention over the last few decades. In addition to the sand mining since 2009 (Fig. 1B), both land reclamation for wave breaker and parking lot constructions in 2011 (Fig. 1D), and fishing jetty construction in 2013



**Figure 1 Study area.** (A) Geographic location of State Pahang and Pantai Balok (square box) on the east coast of Peninsular Malaysia; (B) The sampling sites (I–III) in River Balok estuary along with the locations of sand mining (▲), wave breaker/parking lot construction and, fishing jetty construction (\*) in the vicinity (Google Map © 2013). Photographs shows the physical infrastructural developments at Site-I - (C) beach condition in 2009–2010, (D) wave breaker/parking lot construction in 2011 and, (E) fishing jetty construction in 2013.

(Fig. 1E) have brought considerable changes to the beach topography, sediment and water characteristics (present study). Local people also catch the mating pairs of *T. gigas* for their food and processed feed preparations (to use in chick and fish farms). In order to carry out the present study, the local fishermen's association at Pantai Balok was consulted and their permission was obtained.

### Sampling protocol

The spawning activity of *T. gigas* was observed over a period of thirty six months in three phases between 2009 and 2013. Phase-1 corresponds to the observations made from July 2009 to April 2010 (for both full moon and new moon periods), while Phase-2 from June 2010 to June 2011 (only for full moon due to financial limitations), and Phase-3 from May 2012 to May 2013 (for full moon and new moon periods). Overall, the dataset represents 15 months of observations each for SW and NE monsoons and 6 months of observations for IM periods. Restricted to a gentle slope in-between high and mid tide markings, the spawning activity of *T. gigas* was found only in a portion of 381 m along the beach at Pantai Balok. The places that have shown regular yield of nests were divided into three sampling sites namely, Site-I ( $3^{\circ}56'15.76''N$ ,  $103^{\circ}22'33.96''E$ ), Site-II ( $3^{\circ}56'12.90''N$ ,  $103^{\circ}22'36.62''E$ ) and, Site-III ( $3^{\circ}56'16.30''N$ ,  $103^{\circ}22'40.36''E$ ) (located 105–142 m apart). Although biological and environmental parameters (as outlined below) were obtained from each site for every month, the months that have shown eggs and/or spawning crabs



were only considered for the present analysis/interpretation (for complete details, see the [Supplemental Information](#)). In order to have a better understanding on the nesting activity of *T. gigas* vis-à-vis environmental conditions, the pollution indicating factors such as heavy metal (i.e., Lead (Pb), Chromium (Cr), Selenium (Se), Cadmium (Cd), Copper (Cu) and Zinc (Zn)) concentrations in the sediment; nutrient (i.e., Nitrite ( $\text{NO}_2^-$ ), Nitrate ( $\text{NO}_3^-$ ) and Phosphate ( $\text{PO}_4^{3-}$ ) and Sulphide ( $\text{S}^{2-}$ ) concentrations in the water were also tested (for Phases 2 and 3).

### Biological observations

All sampling sites were visited at night/early morning during high tide for spawning crabs estimation and to mark their nesting locations, whereas in daytime during low tide for nest/eggs counting. The spawning (male/female) crabs of *T. gigas* were counted by sight if they are available ashore and by catch (using hand) if they are submerged in water and releasing the air bubbles. The places that shown air bubbles were marked with wooden stakes for nest/eggs counting. The number of nests was obtained through removing the sand at the point of crab imprints (using plastic hand shovel). The egg clutches from each nest were gently removed and washed *in situ* with seawater (using 2 mm sieve) to count the number of eggs. After counting, all eggs were placed back into the same pit and covered by sand. However, the data on overexploitation of the crabs by local fishermen were qualitative (learnt from other villagers more than from our observations) and hence used only for the analysis.

### Hydrological observations

The data on surface water quality parameters such as temperature ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ), salinity ( $\text{‰}$ ), pH and dissolved oxygen (DO) ( $\text{mg l}^{-1}$ ) were obtained *in situ* using YSI 556 multi-probe sensors (YSI Inc., Yellow-Springs, OH, USA). In addition, 1,000 ml of water was collected from each site for laboratory analyses. All samples were first filtered through microglass filter paper (Whatman<sup>®</sup> GF/C 47 mm, England) and then kept in the ice-box. While the filter paper used for each sample was preserved separately in 90% Acetone for Chl-*a* estimation ([Parsons, Maita & Lalli, 1984](#)), the pH of the filtered water was adjusted to 2 by adding hydrochloric acid (HCl) (to arrest microbial activity and stabilize organic carbon) ([USEPA, 2004](#); [Wilde et al., 2009](#)). The analyses of nutrients and sulphide were carried out in the laboratory using spectrophotometer kit (HACH DREL 2400, USA) ([HACH, 2004](#); [Magarde et al., 2011](#)).

### Sedimentological observations

Both soil temperature (using thermometer, sensitivity:  $\pm 0.2$   $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ) and pH (DM-13 Takamura Electric Works, Japan) were recorded *in situ* at the time of nest/egg counting. A transparent PVC tube with 3" diameter and 1 m length (marked up to 50 cm) was pushed into the sediment and, the depth above the anoxic/black sand layer was measured as moisture depth at each sampling site. In addition,  $\sim 500$  g of surface sediment was collected from each site (using hand shovel) for the laboratory analyses. About 100 g of the sediment was oven dried for 3 days (at 45  $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ) and then separated into different fractions (using  $< 63$  to 4,000  $\mu\text{m}$  sieves) using a mechanical sieve shaker (Retsch AS 200

Basic, Germany). The logarithmic method of moments was used to estimate mean ( $\varphi$ ), sorting ( $\sigma\varphi$ ), skewness ( $SK\varphi$ ) and kurtosis ( $K\varphi$ ) values in the samples (Blott & Pye, 2001). The sediment fraction  $<63\ \mu\text{m}$  was used for heavy metal analysis through Inductively Coupled Plasma Optical Emission Spectrometry (ICP-OES) (Varian Vista-Pro, USA) (Noriki *et al.*, 1980). The total organic carbon (TOC) in the samples was estimated using a TOC analyser (Shimadzu, TOC-VCPH, Japan) (Schumacher, 2002; USEPA, 2004). In addition, the sediment enrichment factor (Leong, Kamaruzzaman & Zaleha, 2003) and the geo-accumulation index (Din, 1992) were derived for understanding the impact of pollution in the vicinity.


### Statistical analyses

The statistical variations within biological and environmental parameters (at  $P < 0.05$ ) were tested through One-Way ANOVA (using OriginPro v.9.1 software), for which the data obtained for each (select) parameter from every month in Phases 1-3 were considered. In this context, the phase-wise information was treated as (1-3) dependent groups and tested against to the samplings (I-III) sites, monsoon (SW, NE and IM) seasons, and lunar (full moon and new moon) periods as independent groups. The Principle Component Analysis (PCA) was also used to identify the percentage (%) variation between environmental (sediment and water) parameters and *T. gigas* egg counts (root-transformed data) (using PRIMER v.6 software) (Clarke & Gorley, 2006). To establish the species-environment relationship, a routine called BEST - amalgamating BIO-ENV and BVSTEP procedures, in PRIMER v.6 was followed (with 999 permutations). In this context, the Spearman's rank correlation coefficients ( $\rho$  values) were considered for denoting positive and negative impact of the environmental variables on *T. gigas* nesting sites.

## RESULTS

### Spawning population and nesting

Out of thirty-six months investigation, the spawning activity of *T. gigas* was found only for twenty-two months, especially during SW monsoon followed by NE and IM periods (Tables 1–5) (Fig. 2A). The full moon observations revealed higher egg/nest yield (102–208 nos.) than the new moon observations (82–121 nos.) (Fig. 2B), where the differences were non-significant (Table 6). In total, 117 spawning crabs (males: 63 and females: 54) were recorded for the entire period of investigation. Despite the highest number of spawning crabs at Site-II, Site-III showed maximum egg/nest yield followed by Site-I (Fig. 2C). Although number of the spawning crabs was higher for 2009–2010 (Phase-1: 69 crabs), it decreased during 2010–2011 (Phase-2: 20 crabs) and 2012–2013 (Phase-3: 28 crabs) (Fig. 2D). Another important observation is that the female crabs dug more number of nests (up to 32) and released more number of eggs (3,977 nos. in 43 clutches) in Phase-3 than to Phase-1 (23 nests and 3,025 eggs in 28 clutches) or Phase-2 (9 nests, 1,952 eggs in 10 clutches) (Tables 1–5). Also, the number of amplexed pairs decreased from 12 in Phase-1 to 7 in Phase-2 and 4 in Phase-3, along with the solitary females from 25 in Phase-1 to 5 in Phase-3. At the time of less anthropogenic intervention (i.e., Phase-1), *T. gigas* displayed



**Figure 2** Egg/nest yield of *Tachypleus gigas* at Pantai Balok in relation to - (A) season, (B) lunar period, (C) sampling sites and, (D) the number of male and female spawning crabs arriving at Balok beach.

a seasonal nest shifting behaviour from open coastal area (Sites II-III) in SW monsoon to sheltered beach (Site-I) in NE and IM periods (Tables 1–2) (Fig. 6).

### Sediment characteristics

The beach sediment that was largely represented by medium sand ( $1-2X\phi$ ) in Phase-1 (Tables 1–2) was changed into fine sand ( $>2X\phi$ ) in Phases 2 and 3 (Tables 3–5). Categorically, the sediment fraction that contained 0.250 mm (representing medium sand) was more in Phase-1, whereas it replaced by 0.180 mm (representing medium-fine sand) in Phase-2 and 0.125 mm (representing fine sand) in Phase-3. For Phase-1, the sediment was represented by moderately-well sorted to poorly sorted ( $0.5 - 1.7\sigma\phi$ ), symmetrical to very-fine skewed ( $0.0 - 0.7SK\phi$ ), and very leptokurtic to extremely leptokurtic ( $2.1 - 4.6K\phi$ ) properties (Tables 1–2). In the case of Phase-2, except skewness (i.e., fine skewed to very-fine skewed:  $0.1 - 3.1SK\phi$ ), both sorting ( $0.5 - 1.4\sigma\phi$ ) and kurtosis ( $2.5 - 20.5K\phi$ ) remained as same as Phase-1 (Table 3). The well-sorted to moderately sorted ( $0.4 - 1.0\sigma\phi$ ), very-coarse skewed ( $-3.1 - -1.1SK\phi$ ), and extremely leptokurtic ( $7.8 - 16.8K\phi$ ) properties have characterised the sediment collected for Phase-3 (Tables 4–5). Although there was not much variation in the moisture depth between Phase-1 and Phase-2 (average, 4.2–4.4 cm), it was rather increased in Phase-3 (to 6.8 cm). A significant decrease in (average) silt and clay, and pH measurements was observed between Phase-1 and Phase-3 (Table 6). The changes in TOC between Phase-2 and Phase-3 were insignificant, except for SW vs. NE monsoon (Table 6).

In terms of the season, also both fine and medium-fine sand contents (with moderately to moderately-well sorted nature) were high for NE and IM periods whereas more gravel and silt and clay (with poor to moderately sorted nature) for SW monsoon (Tables 1–5). The three sampling sites that represented largely by medium sand (average,  $1.4 - 1.8X\phi$ ) and moderate sorting ( $0.8 - 1.0\sigma\phi$ ) characteristics in Phases 1-2 were replaced by fine sand ( $2.5X\phi$ ) with moderately-well sorted sediment ( $0.6 - 0.7\sigma\phi$ ) in Phase-3. While its skewness decreased from symmetrical ( $0.1SK\phi$ ) to very-coarse skewed ( $-2.4SK\phi$ ),

**Table 1** Ecobiological observations from the three (I-III) nesting sites of *T achypleus gigas* at Pantai Balok during Phase-1 (2009–2010) full moon surveys.

	2009												2010					
	July			August			October			November			March			April		
	I	II	III	I	II	III	I	II	III	I	II	III	I	II	III	I	II	III
<b>(A) Biology</b>																		
Nest (nos.)	–	–	3	–	3	–	2	–	–	1	–	–	2	–	–	4	–	–
Egg (nos.)	–	–	502	–	318	–	340	–	–	114	–	–	237	–	–	455	–	–
Clutches (nos.)	–	–	4	–	3	–	2	–	–	1	–	–	3	–	–	5	–	–
Male (nos.)	1	4	–	–	1	2	1	2	–	2	–	–	1	1	–	1	2	–
Female (nos.)	–	2	4	2	2	4	4	–	–	2	1	–	2	–	–	–	–	3
<b>(B) Sediment</b>																		
Mean ( $X\varphi$ )	2.1	1.4	1.1	1.8	1.1	1.5	1.1	2.4	1.7	1.2	2.5	2.0	1.2	2.1	2.4	1.0	2.1	2.1
Sorting ( $\sigma\varphi$ )	1.0	0.9	1.1	1.0	1.0	1.2	0.9	0.5	1.4	0.8	0.7	1.7	1.0	0.9	0.9	1.0	1.0	1.1
Skewness ( $SK\varphi$ )	0.5	0.5	0.1	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.3	0.0	0.2	0.6	0.0	0.1	0.7	0.0	0.1	0.4
Kurtosis ( $K\varphi$ )	3.3	2.5	2.5	3.0	3.9	2.3	2.5	4.6	2.4	2.1	4.4	2.2	2.6	3.9	2.7	2.7	3.7	3.1
Gravel (%)	1.3	0.8	2.4	2.6	2.8	1.8	2.8	0.0	0.5	2.2	0.1	0.4	2.4	0.4	1.9	2.1	0.4	2.3
Sand (%)	93.6	97.1	94.7	92.8	94.6	95.1	93.7	99.5	95.2	94.6	99.7	94.5	94.6	98.4	94.0	94.7	97.5	94.1
Silt & Clay (%)	5.1	2.1	2.9	4.7	2.6	3.1	3.5	0.5	4.2	3.3	0.1	5.1	3.0	1.1	4.2	3.2	2.2	3.6
0.125 mm (%)	4.7	2.2	1.7	3.2	1.4	2.4	1.9	6.0	4.1	1.9	5.3	4.3	1.9	3.2	3.2	1.7	3.6	2.7
0.180 mm (%)	16.1	9.8	11.4	14.6	10.6	11.3	12.3	15.6	15.6	11.6	16.0	16.4	12.4	14.9	14.6	11.4	13.4	13.7
0.250 mm (%)	22.3	20.2	19.5	21.7	19.0	20.1	19.5	20.7	25.8	19.6	22.5	27.2	19.7	24.5	22.7	19.5	22.7	20.3
Moisture depth (cm)	3.2	5.7	4.8	4.1	4.6	4.3	3.5	2.8	2.4	2.7	1.9	2.2	5.1	5.6	5.9	6.7	6.3	6.8
Temperature (°C)	32.2	31.2	32.7	30.8	31.2	31.5	30.1	29.9	29.9	28.7	29.1	28.8	30.2	30.8	30.6	32.5	32.0	32.5
pH	6.1	6.1	5.9	6.2	6.5	6.5	6.5	6.6	6.6	6.3	6.1	6.4	5.8	5.9	5.8	5.8	5.2	5.5
<b>(C) Water</b>																		
Temperature (°C)	29.4	29.7	29.5	30.0	29.6	29.5	32.9	33.2	33.4	29.3	29.4	29.5	29.5	29.7	30.1	31.2	30.8	30.5
pH	7.8	7.5	7.5	7.7	7.7	7.8	7.8	7.1	7.6	8.2	7.6	7.7	6.9	7.1	6.7	7.2	7.3	7.0
Salinity (‰)	28.7	31.0	32.1	32.5	33.5	32.0	34.2	38.4	31.8	31.7	26.4	28.8	37.2	39.2	40.4	34.6	37.8	38.5
DO (mg l <sup>-1</sup> )	5.4	5.1	5.0	4.3	5.4	6.0	5.0	3.5	5.5	6.2	4.9	6.0	5.8	5.2	6.1	5.6	5.7	6.0

**Notes.**

“–” No sample observed at the time of investigation.



**Table 2** Ecobiological observations from the three (I–III) nesting sites of *T achypleus gigas* at Pantai Balok during Phase-1 (2009–2010) new moon surveys.

	2009									2010					
	August			October			November			March			April		
	I	II	III	I	II	III	I	II	III	I	II	III	I	II	III
<b>(A) Biology</b>															
Nest (nos.)	–	1	–	2	–	–	1	–	–	2	–	–	2	–	–
Egg (nos.)	–	104	–	385	–	–	92	–	–	158	–	–	320	–	–
Clutches (nos.)	–	1	–	3	–	–	1	–	–	2	–	–	3	–	–
Male (nos.)	–	2	1	–	–	–	1	–	–	1	4	1	–	2	1
Female (nos.)	2	–	–	–	–	–	2	–	–	–	1	4	3	–	–
<b>(B) Sediment</b>															
Mean ( $X\varphi$ )	1.9	1.3	1.3	1.2	2.1	1.7	1.2	2.4	1.9	1.1	2.1	2.2	1.1	1.9	1.9
Sorting ( $\sigma\varphi$ )	1.0	1.0	1.2	1.0	0.7	1.4	0.9	0.6	1.5	1.1	0.8	1.1	1.1	1.0	1.0
Skewness ( $SK\varphi$ )	0.3	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.3	0.3	0.0	0.2	0.5	0.0	0.1	0.5	0.0	0.1	0.5
Kurtosis ( $K\varphi$ )	3.1	3.3	2.3	2.7	4.0	2.3	2.4	4.5	2.3	2.7	3.7	2.9	3.1	3.4	3.3
Gravel (%)	2.0	2.4	2.2	2.8	0.4	0.8	2.8	0.1	0.4	2.3	0.4	2.0	1.9	0.5	2.8
Sand (%)	93.2	95.9	94.8	93.5	98.4	95.0	93.9	99.6	94.8	94.9	97.9	94.1	94.6	96.9	93.1
Silt & Clay (%)	4.8	1.8	3.0	3.7	1.2	4.2	3.3	0.3	4.7	2.9	1.7	3.9	3.5	2.6	4.2
0.125 mm (%)	4.1	1.8	2.1	2.3	5.4	3.7	1.8	5.8	4.2	1.6	3.3	2.8	2.7	4.2	3.0
0.180 mm (%)	15.3	10.0	11.4	13.7	14.6	14.7	11.9	15.8	16.0	11.8	14.0	14.1	11.9	14.7	13.0
0.250 mm (%)	21.9	19.4	19.7	20.0	20.2	23.9	19.7	21.5	26.3	19.6	23.2	21.6	18.5	20.4	18.7
Moisture depth (cm)	3.7	5.1	4.5	3.7	3.0	3.1	3.1	2.3	2.3	5.9	5.9	6.3	6.2	6.5	6.5
Temperature (°C)	32.6	32.4	32.5	30.0	30.2	30.5	29.3	29.3	29.5	29.9	30.0	30.2	32.3	32.3	32.5
pH	6.2	6.2	6.1	6.2	6.3	6.4	6.5	6.7	6.7	6.0	5.8	5.9	5.5	5.4	5.3
<b>(C) Water</b>															
Temperature (°C)	29.7	29.6	29.5	31.1	31.3	31.3	31.0	31.2	31.4	30.3	30.2	30.3	31.6	31.3	31.0
pH	7.7	7.6	7.7	7.6	7.2	7.6	8.0	7.4	7.7	7.0	7.2	6.8	7.1	7.5	7.3
Salinity (‰)	30.6	32.3	32.1	35.4	37.1	31.9	32.9	32.1	30.2	35.9	38.6	39.4	36.6	35.4	36.7
DO ( $\text{mg l}^{-1}$ )	4.8	5.2	5.5	4.6	4.2	5.0	5.6	4.2	5.8	5.7	5.5	6.0	5.9	6.0	5.7

**Notes.**

“–” No sample observed at the time of investigation.

the kurtosis increased from very leptokurtic ( $2.7K\varphi$ ) to extremely leptokurtic ( $12.6K\varphi$ ) between Phase-1 and Phase-3 (Tables 1–5).

Heavy metal concentrations at the three nesting sites have followed the order of  $\text{Cr} > \text{Zn} > \text{Se} > \text{Pb} > \text{Cu} > \text{Cd}$  for Phase-2 (Tables 3–5). In Phase-3, the increased concentrations of Se and Cd at Sites I-II (in the order of  $\text{Se} > \text{Zn} > \text{Cr} > \text{Cd} > \text{Pb} > \text{Cu}$ ) and increased concentrations of Zn, Se, Cd at Site-III (in the order of  $\text{Zn} > \text{Se} > \text{Cr} > \text{Pb} > \text{Cd} > \text{Cu}$ ) observed. However, in terms of metal induced enrichment at the sampling sites, only Cd and Se have shown their extremity (Tables 7–8). Also, the geo-accumulation index suggests a heavy to extreme contamination of both Cd and Se at all sampling sites, especially during 2011–2013 (Tables 7–8).

**Table 3** Ecobiological observations from the three (I–III) nesting sites of *T achypleus gigas* at Pantai Balok during Phase-2 (2010–2011) full moon surveys.

	2010												2011											
	June			July			August			October			March			April			May			June		
	I	II	III	I	II	III	I	II	III	I	II	III	I	II	III	I	II	III	I	II	III	I	II	III
<b>(A) Biology</b>																								
Nest (nos.)	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	2	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
Egg (nos.)	-	-	-	-	-	581	-	455	-	-	-	-	556	-	-	342	-	18	-	-	-	-	-	-
Clutches (nos.)	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	2	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
Male (nos.)	-	1	1	-	3	-	-	2	-	-	1	-	2	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1
Female (nos.)	-	1	1	-	2	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1
<b>(B) Sediment</b>																								
Mean ( $X\phi$ )	1.9	1.8	1.9	1.7	1.7	2.1	1.2	1.6	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	2.0	1.6	2.4	2.6	2.3	2.2	2.2	2.3	2.2	2.2	2.2
Sorting ( $\sigma\phi$ )	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.0	1.0	0.9	1.4	1.1	1.3	0.5	0.5	0.6	0.9	1.1	1.2	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.7	0.7	0.8
Skewness ( $SK\phi$ )	1.7	1.6	1.6	1.1	0.7	1.8	0.1	0.7	0.5	1.4	0.9	2.1	1.9	1.4	0.8	2.4	2.5	2.2	2.6	2.6	2.7	3.1	2.9	2.5
Kurtosis ( $K\phi$ )	5.5	5.1	5.3	4.5	3.9	6.8	3.5	3.6	2.5	6.5	4.9	8.8	7.3	5.3	2.7	19.8	20.5	17.4	14.6	14.0	14.0	15.4	13.3	10.7
Gravel (%)	5.0	5.2	4.3	3.1	1.9	1.4	7.7	3.2	10.2	0.6	0.7	0.5	2.3	3.0	3.2	0.3	0.3	0.3	1.3	0.9	0.6	1.3	1.7	2.1
Sand (%)	94.3	94.3	95.0	95.5	96.0	97.2	88.7	93.5	86.8	99.4	99.3	99.5	97.4	96.3	95.7	99.2	99.2	99.4	98.5	98.7	99.0	98.6	98.0	97.5
Silt & Clay (%)	0.6	0.5	0.7	1.4	2.1	1.4	3.6	3.3	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.8	1.1	0.5	0.5	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.1	0.2	0.3
0.125 mm (%)	18.8	17.1	18.5	13.9	9.6	11.9	5.9	7.7	2.6	0.1	0.1	0.2	14.3	14.8	13.3	17.6	16.2	11.7	9.3	8.3	7.8	11.4	10.7	9.7
0.180 mm (%)	28.5	26.1	27.8	28.4	29.6	60.5	25.7	26.3	18.6	0.3	0.2	0.6	47.5	43.7	34.0	66.1	62.9	66.7	63.4	65.7	70.6	71.5	69.3	64.8
0.250 mm (%)	41.3	40.5	37.7	26.5	15.9	7.4	14.8	16.5	9.3	2.0	0.3	3.9	18.5	15.2	9.9	6.4	10.6	12.8	16.6	13.7	11.3	8.3	10.3	12.0
Moisture depth (cm)	6.3	5.2	6.7	4.3	4.8	6.1	3.6	4.4	5.7	3.7	4.1	5.2	2.5	3.7	3.2	2.8	4.3	2.7	4.3	3.2	2.5	4.8	3.6	3.1
Temperature (°C)	34.4	32.3	32.7	32.5	31.8	31.6	32.8	32.4	32.2	31.3	30.7	31.2	36.5	36.1	35.9	36.3	36.3	36.5	35.3	35.7	35.5	33.8	33.6	33.8
pH	6.6	6.2	6.3	6.1	6.1	6.0	6.5	6.3	6.5	6.4	6.4	6.4	6.5	6.6	6.5	4.1	4.2	4.1	3.5	3.4	3.4	4.2	4.2	4.0
Total Organic Carbon (%)	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.2
Cd (mg kg <sup>-1</sup> )	4.6	3.3	5.4	4.4	3.6	4.0	3.9	3.6	3.3	1.9	2.5	1.5	5.5	5.7	5.2	6.6	7.0	6.0	5.5	3.7	2.0	6.2	4.1	1.8
Cr (mg kg <sup>-1</sup> )	30.9	27.4	31.0	29.0	27.6	27.0	26.7	24.0	22.7	19.9	21.5	20.6	33.0	31.2	25.3	29.7	29.6	23.8	25.8	23.1	21.3	24.1	25.5	26.0
Cu (mg kg <sup>-1</sup> )	6.6	8.7	3.8	6.2	8.8	8.9	17.3	15.0	15.3	7.1	7.2	7.7	2.7	1.9	0.9	2.6	2.8	2.5	3.3	2.1	0.9	3.2	2.2	1.1
Pb (mg kg <sup>-1</sup> )	5.2	4.6	5.1	6.3	7.6	9.1	10.4	9.3	8.9	7.6	8.4	7.7	11.0	12.9	13.0	10.3	12.4	12.1	9.5	9.4	9.7	8.7	9.7	10.4
Se (mg kg <sup>-1</sup> )	9.8	8.3	10.3	8.1	6.0	9.3	14.4	11.2	13.9	8.3	8.6	8.9	14.0	14.3	12.6	17.0	18.4	16.4	6.2	6.3	6.6	14.8	15.6	15.9
Zn (mg kg <sup>-1</sup> )	32.8	29.5	32.6	27.2	22.5	23.9	32.2	27.5	28.7	18.0	18.7	19.3	21.6	20.7	17.0	20.7	22.3	19.7	15.6	14.9	14.8	17.8	18.8	19.2

(continued on next page)

Table 3 (continued)

	2010												2011											
	June			July			August			October			March			April			May			June		
	I	II	III	I	II	III	I	II	III	I	II	III	I	II	III	I	II	III	I	II	III	I	II	III
<b>(C) Water</b>																								
Temperature (°C)	29.4	29.5	29.5	29.5	29.6	29.5	30.0	30.0	29.8	29.8	29.6	29.6	30.4	30.2	30.3	29.8	29.9	29.7	30.3	30.4	30.4	30.0	30.1	30.1
pH	7.8	7.5	7.2	7.3	7.6	7.5	7.6	7.8	7.4	7.1	7.5	7.1	6.7	6.2	5.9	6.9	6.5	6.3	8.1	7.7	7.5	8.8	8.4	8.2
Salinity (‰)	32.1	32.8	33.6	32.0	32.8	33.6	32.5	32.9	33.3	6.6	10.7	12.0	8.2	9.4	10.2	4.1	5.6	6.4	11.1	12.6	13.3	14.9	15.3	17.0
Dissolved Oxygen (mg l <sup>-1</sup> )	5.4	5.3	5.3	6.0	5.9	5.8	4.3	4.7	4.8	4.0	3.7	3.4	3.1	3.2	3.4	5.3	5.2	5.2	2.8	3.0	3.1	3.3	3.3	3.3
NO <sub>2</sub> <sup>-</sup> (mg l <sup>-1</sup> )	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
NO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup> (mg l <sup>-1</sup> )	0.9	1.3	1.4	1.4	1.6	1.5	1.1	1.1	0.8	0.3	0.6	0.3	1.5	1.6	1.4	1.1	1.9	1.8	0.8	0.5	0.9	0.6	0.2	0.2
PO <sub>4</sub> <sup>3-</sup> (mg l <sup>-1</sup> )	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4
S <sup>2-</sup> (μg l <sup>-1</sup> )	1.3	1.7	1.0	4.0	4.7	6.0	11.7	7.0	12.7	15.0	9.0	12.7	31.3	28.7	29.7	68.0	66.0	63.3	14.3	12.7	14.0	27.3	29.0	26.3
Chl- <i>a</i> (mg l <sup>-1</sup> )	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1

**Notes.**

“-” No sample observed at the time of investigation.

**Table 4** Ecobiological observations from the three (I–III) nesting sites of *T achypleus gigas* at Pantai Balok during Phase-3 (2012–2013) full moon surveys.

	2012												2013								
	May			June			July			August			February			March			April		
	I	II	III	I	II	III	I	II	III	I	II	III	I	II	III	I	II	III	I	II	III
<b>(A) Biology</b>																					
Nest (nos.)	–	6	–	–	–	–	8	4	–	1	–	–	2	–	–	–	1	1	–	1	–
Egg (nos.)	–	868	–	–	–	–	1,074	613	–	254	–	–	80	–	–	–	108	314	–	32	–
Clutches (nos.)	–	5	–	–	–	–	10	6	–	2	–	–	3	–	–	–	1	3	–	1	–
Male (nos.)	1	2	–	–	2	–	1	3	1	–	–	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	1
Female (nos.)	–	1	1	–	–	1	–	–	2	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	–
<b>(B) Sediment</b>																					
Mean ( $X\varphi$ )	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.4	2.5	2.6	2.4	2.4	2.3	2.4	2.4	2.3	2.5	2.4	2.5	2.4	2.4	2.4	2.6	2.6	2.6
Sorting ( $\sigma\varphi$ )	0.6	0.7	0.6	0.9	0.9	0.8	0.8	1.0	0.9	0.8	0.9	0.9	0.6	0.7	0.5	0.7	0.8	0.6	0.5	0.6	0.4
Skewness ( $SK\varphi$ )	–2.7	–2.8	–2.8	–2.7	–2.6	–3.1	–2.7	–2.2	–2.2	–2.6	–2.5	–2.6	–2.0	–1.8	–1.1	–2.2	–2.3	–2.2	–2.1	–2.3	–1.8
Kurtosis ( $K\varphi$ )	14.9	14.0	15.7	11.3	10.8	14.6	11.7	8.4	7.8	11.2	9.9	10.4	10.7	8.3	8.6	9.9	10.4	12.3	13.3	12.6	13.8
Gravel (%)	0.4	1.8	0.4	3.4	5.1	2.4	2.7	3.3	2.0	2.2	2.7	2.8	0.4	0.6	0.2	0.7	1.8	0.7	0.4	0.5	0.2
Sand (%)	99.4	97.6	99.1	96.3	94.1	97.0	96.8	96.0	97.6	97.4	96.5	96.8	99.1	98.3	99.4	98.5	97.3	99.1	99.2	97.9	99.4
Silt & Clay (%)	0.2	0.6	0.5	0.4	0.8	0.6	0.4	0.7	0.4	0.4	0.8	0.4	0.5	1.2	0.3	0.8	0.9	0.3	0.5	1.7	0.4
0.125 mm (%)	40.7	37.5	39.4	34.9	41.9	46.6	39.2	34.6	36.0	35.4	37.2	34.0	29.9	28.5	29.5	37.2	35.4	26.7	39.9	37.7	39.3
0.180 mm (%)	40.8	44.2	41.1	40.0	30.1	30.3	36.1	32.9	37.0	40.3	33.2	41.4	39.8	34.5	50.3	35.7	35.2	49.6	39.8	32.2	44.8
0.250 mm (%)	7.7	7.5	7.6	10.5	5.1	4.2	7.8	9.3	7.2	8.2	7.9	9.1	11.3	13.0	10.6	8.6	9.3	13.6	9.0	8.5	5.5
Moisture depth (cm)	6.0	6.1	6.8	4.9	5.0	4.4	7.1	6.4	7.5	6.3	6.4	9.1	8.4	8.4	7.4	6.2	6.2	6.3	10.1	10.2	10.6
Temperature (°C)	30.0	28.1	28.9	31.7	32.8	32.3	28.6	32.4	33.5	33.8	32.5	31.4	30.5	28.8	29.4	33.5	33.8	33.7	39.1	37.3	36.6
pH	5.9	5.8	6.1	6.8	6.5	6.8	4.0	5.4	4.6	3.0	3.8	2.8	5.6	5.6	5.8	4.9	4.9	4.9	2.8	3.2	4.0
Total Organic Carbon (%)	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0
Cd (mg kg <sup>-1</sup> )	15.7	13.3	2.7	18.5	16.4	11.9	26.7	16.8	14.7	9.3	11.1	15.5	9.9	15.4	8.0	20.0	16.1	8.1	21.8	9.6	13.3
Cr (mg kg <sup>-1</sup> )	28.8	17.0	17.9	37.7	10.7	13.5	22.4	43.7	10.7	11.0	9.6	15.6	13.7	12.2	13.8	33.3	21.6	29.0	16.0	29.3	16.0
Cu (mg kg <sup>-1</sup> )	2.9	2.2	2.4	2.2	2.3	1.6	2.1	3.7	2.1	5.9	2.5	4.0	2.5	4.3	2.9	10.1	3.4	7.2	19.0	7.1	14.7
Pb (mg kg <sup>-1</sup> )	6.4	7.8	5.1	5.6	7.4	4.9	4.1	4.7	4.8	8.3	8.3	10.8	23.3	12.7	19.1	20.7	12.9	16.2	20.7	13.5	16.8
Se (mg kg <sup>-1</sup> )	29.4	32.1	18.2	27.8	26.3	14.2	27.4	28.0	17.0	18.2	19.9	20.9	15.5	15.2	28.0	36.6	23.4	10.1	21.3	28.0	19.7
Zn (mg kg <sup>-1</sup> )	19.0	20.8	15.0	14.6	19.2	14.6	12.3	14.0	14.1	20.6	23.5	27.5	23.8	23.2	23.6	41.6	28.9	30.0	26.8	26.3	27.3

(continued on next page)



Table 4 (continued)

	2012												2013									
	May			June			July			August			February			March			April			
	I	II	III	I	II	III	I	II	III	I	II	III	I	II	III	I	II	III	I	II	III	
<b>(C) Water</b>																						
Temperature (°C)	27.6	27.6	27.5	29.9	29.6	30.1	30.9	31.3	30.7	30.0	30.1	30.6	28.5	28.7	27.7	30.8	31.1	30.9	32.8	31.6	30.6	
pH	6.2	6.5	6.6	8.4	8.4	8.4	8.0	8.1	7.6	7.9	8.4	8.4	7.9	7.7	7.4	8.6	8.7	8.7	8.2	7.9	7.4	
Salinity (‰)	3.1	2.7	2.3	33.3	33.4	33.3	34.5	34.5	34.6	30.0	31.0	31.2	3.7	3.9	5.4	20.9	21.7	21.7	16.9	15.0	16.7	
Dissolved Oxygen (mg l <sup>-1</sup> )	2.8	3.2	4.1	5.3	5.1	5.6	6.8	5.4	6.7	7.8	5.8	9.1	7.6	5.0	7.9	5.3	6.4	4.5	4.6	6.0	5.5	
NO <sub>2</sub> <sup>-</sup> (mg l <sup>-1</sup> )	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	
NO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup> (mg l <sup>-1</sup> )	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.7	1.4	0.3	0.7	0.3	0.6	3.4	0.6	0.7	0.4	0.6	0.7	2.9	1.7	2.4	0.6	0.7	0.9	
PO <sub>4</sub> <sup>3-</sup> (mg l <sup>-1</sup> )	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2	
S <sup>2-</sup> (μg l <sup>-1</sup> )	47.7	42.3	50.3	20.0	16.3	10.3	5.3	7.3	7.7	39.3	97.3	124.7	23.3	22.0	66.7	0.0	4.7	5.0	58.7	35.7	22.0	
Chl- <i>a</i> (mg l <sup>-1</sup> )	0.2	0.5	0.2	0.4	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.5	0.7	0.9	0.5	0.6	0.9	0.5	0.4	0.6	0.5	1.0	1.2	1.0	

**Notes.**

“–” No sample observed at the time of investigation.

**Table 5** Ecobiological observations from the three (I–III) nesting sites of *T achypleus gigas* at Pantai Balok during Phase-3 (2012–2013) new moon surveys.

	2012									2013									
	May			June			July			February			March			May			
	I	II	III	I	II	III	I	II	III	I	II	III	I	II	III	I	II	III	
<b>(A) Biology</b>																			
Nest (nos.)	–	–	–	–	2	–	–	–	–	–	2	–	4	–	–	–	–	–	
Egg (nos.)	–	–	–	–	169	–	–	–	–	–	47	–	418	–	–	–	–	–	
Clutches (nos.)	–	–	–	–	4	–	–	–	–	–	2	–	6	–	–	–	–	–	
Male (nos.)	–	4	–	–	1	–	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	
Female (nos.)	–	1	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	–	–	
<b>(B) Sediment</b>																			
Mean ( $X\varphi$ )	2.4	2.3	2.6	2.6	2.6	2.7	2.5	2.4	2.4	2.6	2.6	2.4	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.7	
Sorting ( $\sigma\varphi$ )	0.8	0.8	0.6	0.5	0.6	0.5	0.7	0.8	0.7	0.5	0.7	0.6	0.6	0.7	0.5	0.5	0.6	0.5	
Skewness ( $SK\varphi$ )	–2.7	–2.2	–2.9	–2.5	–2.6	–2.5	–2.4	–2.7	–2.5	–2.4	–2.4	–2.2	–2.2	–2.4	–1.5	–2.0	–2.4	–2.4	
Kurtosis ( $K\varphi$ )	11.3	8.7	16.2	15.9	14.6	16.2	10.9	12.0	10.9	15.0	11.5	11.3	12.6	11.4	9.4	12.3	13.5	16.8	
Gravel (%)	2.5	1.9	0.8	0.2	0.6	0.2	0.7	1.4	0.6	0.3	1.9	2.0	0.2	1.0	0.2	0.2	0.7	0.3	
Sand (%)	97.1	97.7	98.4	99.5	98.5	98.8	98.9	98.1	99.1	99.1	97.1	97.8	99.2	98.1	99.3	99.0	98.6	99.3	
Silt & Clay (%)	0.3	0.4	0.8	0.4	0.9	1.0	0.4	0.5	0.3	0.6	1.0	0.3	0.6	0.9	0.5	0.8	0.6	0.4	
0.125 mm (%)	37.1	28.7	50.4	43.7	41.3	47.5	39.3	37.8	36.2	39.8	39.8	25.9	37.6	33.7	32.2	35.9	35.6	41.0	
0.180 mm (%)	38.6	41.4	29.3	37.1	34.8	30.3	37.2	36.6	43.3	38.4	32.2	47.7	39.0	33.4	43.0	41.0	40.5	33.4	
0.250 mm (%)	8.9	13.7	5.1	6.7	7.5	3.8	8.0	8.8	6.5	7.3	7.1	15.3	9.1	10.0	14.5	11.2	10.7	5.8	
Moisture depth (cm)	5.8	6.1	6.0	6.3	4.3	4.5	6.6	9.2	9.9	3.7	4.4	3.2	6.6	6.6	6.8	9.0	8.7	8.8	
Temperature (°C)	29.7	30.2	30.0	26.4	28.5	29.2	34.0	33.2	32.5	34.0	33.3	32.7	31.5	31.9	31.3	38.5	36.3	37.0	
pH	6.5	6.6	6.7	5.8	6.0	5.8	2.5	2.2	2.8	6.2	6.4	6.3	4.8	4.8	4.3	3.5	4.2	5.0	
Total Organic Carbon (%)	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.1	
Cd (mg kg <sup>–1</sup> )	14.0	8.8	13.8	22.7	16.4	14.0	16.1	12.0	21.9	2.3	8.9	10.4	7.3	11.0	1.0	9.6	5.7	39.8	
Cr (mg kg <sup>–1</sup> )	20.3	12.5	30.3	23.9	14.3	18.9	14.4	15.5	9.2	28.8	25.1	14.8	13.1	13.3	16.2	38.1	16.4	26.4	
Cu (mg kg <sup>–1</sup> )	5.7	3.0	4.1	2.8	1.7	4.5	3.3	2.6	1.6	4.3	5.0	2.1	3.2	4.9	2.9	9.8	5.4	5.0	
Pb (mg kg <sup>–1</sup> )	8.9	6.0	6.7	6.8	6.4	9.1	5.7	4.8	4.7	27.7	26.8	21.4	24.8	15.1	37.8	21.0	23.1	37.1	
Se (mg kg <sup>–1</sup> )	19.7	25.8	31.7	24.6	25.3	16.2	17.3	25.4	28.0	15.5	17.0	18.9	29.0	15.2	25.1	30.2	26.9	40.2	
Zn (mg kg <sup>–1</sup> )	22.0	16.3	20.0	21.7	17.4	22.6	15.9	14.3	13.7	31.6	36.5	23.3	28.1	25.9	29.3	30.5	31.4	46.2	

(continued on next page)

Table 5 (continued)

	2012									2013									
	May			June			July			February			March			May			
	I	II	III	I	II	III	I	II	III	I	II	III	I	II	III	I	II	III	
<b>(C) Water</b>																			
Temperature (°C)	29.8	29.7	29.8	29.5	29.7	29.5	29.1	28.9	31.2	30.3	29.6	30.0	29.4	29.6	29.5	30.5	31.4	31.6	
pH	6.0	6.2	6.4	8.3	8.3	8.4	7.0	7.5	8.1	8.1	8.1	7.6	8.1	8.1	7.8	8.7	8.6	8.0	
Salinity (‰)	36.0	35.9	36.8	33.2	33.0	33.1	27.4	28.4	33.5	4.1	4.4	5.4	12.4	12.6	13.9	22.0	23.2	26.2	
Dissolved Oxygen (mg l <sup>-1</sup> )	7.0	6.8	7.0	6.1	5.5	6.5	5.2	9.1	8.0	7.9	10.8	3.1	6.6	9.6	6.3	6.2	10.0	10.1	
NO <sub>2</sub> <sup>-</sup> (mg l <sup>-1</sup> )	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.1	
NO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup> (mg l <sup>-1</sup> )	0.5	1.7	1.1	0.3	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.3	0.6	1.4	1.0	0.8	0.9	1.6	1.1	1.9	1.9	0.5	
PO <sub>4</sub> <sup>3-</sup> (mg l <sup>-1</sup> )	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.3	0.5	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.2	
S <sup>2-</sup> (μg l <sup>-1</sup> )	2.0	3.0	1.3	41.0	33.3	9.0	5.3	7.3	7.7	48.0	50.3	54.3	25.3	40.3	11.0	13.0	27.3	18.7	
Chl- <i>a</i> (mg l <sup>-1</sup> )	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.5	0.6	0.4	0.5	0.4	0.6	0.6	0.5	0.5	0.4	0.3	0.2	0.5	0.6	0.5	

**Notes.**

“\_” No sample observed at the time of investigation.

**Table 6** Pair-wise statistical variations (*F* values based on One-Way ANOVA) within biological and environmental parameters in relation to their study phases, seasons, sampling sites and lunar periods.

	Biology	Sediment				Water						
	Egg/nest	Gravel	Silt & Clay	pH	TOC	Temperature	pH	DO	NO <sub>2</sub> <sup>-</sup>	NO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup>	PO <sub>4</sub> <sup>3-</sup>	Chl- <i>a</i>
Full moon vs. new moon	1.96	0.47	0.16	0.05	0.06	0.002	0.24	1.59	–	0.25	0.04	0.002
Phase-1 vs. Phase-2	4.51	0.40	–	–	#	20.12	3400*	280*	#	#	#	#
Phase-1 vs. Phase-3	0.03	2.69	3721*	20.49*	#	2.90	33.98*	2.09	#	#	#	#
Phase-2 vs. Phase-3	2.04	1.85	2.08	3.0	3.0	0.13	61.79	3.09	–	280.33*	1.23	3.76
SW vs. NE	0.45	0.79	0.06	1.24	81.0*	2.15	0.80	0.02	1.0	25.19*	0.03	0.02
SW vs. IM	0.44	6.22	0.32	0.49	0.16	3.96	1.65	0.25	0	0.06	0.46	0.36
NE vs. IM	0.01	1.43	0.11	1.83	0.25	2.19	0.04	0.02	1.0	9.63	1.34	0.27
Site-I vs. Site-II	1.03	0.35	0.25	0.01	5.0	0.16	0.10	0.03	–	0.05	0.02	0.03
Site-I vs. Site-III	0.66	0.06	6.9 × 10 <sup>-4</sup>	0.02	0.53	0.37	0.52	0.03	–	0.17	0.01	9.9 × 10 <sup>-4</sup>
Site-II vs. Site-III	2.22	0.10	0.29	0.01	0.004	0.05	0.14	7.9 × 10 <sup>-4</sup>	–	0.20	0.03	0.05

**Notes.**

Phase-1: 2009–2010, Phase-2: 2010–2011 and Phase-3: 2012–2013.

SW, Southwest monsoon; NE, Northeast monsoon; IM, Inter-monsoon; TOC, Total Organic Carbon; DO, Dissolved Oxygen; NO<sub>2</sub><sup>-</sup>, Nitrite; NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>, Nitrate; PO<sub>4</sub><sup>3-</sup>, Phosphate; S<sup>2-</sup>, Hydrogen Sulphide.

\**P* < 0.05

“–” Data not strong enough for statistical comparison.

“#” No Phase-1 observations.



**Table 7** Metal induced Enrichment Factor (EF) and Geo-accumulation Index ( $I_{geo}$ ) at the three (SI-III) nesting sites of *T. achypleus gigas* at Pantai Balok during Phase-2 (2010–2011) survey.

	2010											
	June			July			August			October		
	I	II	III	I	II	III	I	II	III	I	II	III
<b>(A) EF</b>												
Cd	85.6 <sup>E</sup>	55.3 <sup>E</sup>	112.9 <sup>E</sup>	104.8 <sup>E</sup>	90.1 <sup>E</sup>	86.3 <sup>E</sup>	144.9 <sup>E</sup>	130.4 <sup>E</sup>	123.3 <sup>E</sup>	104.6 <sup>E</sup>	138.6 <sup>E</sup>	82.8 <sup>E</sup>
Cr	1.7 <sup>D</sup>	1.3 <sup>D</sup>	1.9 <sup>D</sup>	2.0 <sup>M</sup>	2.0 <sup>M</sup>	1.7 <sup>D</sup>	2.8 <sup>M</sup>	2.5 <sup>M</sup>	2.4 <sup>M</sup>	3.2 <sup>M</sup>	3.4 <sup>M</sup>	3.2 <sup>M</sup>
Cu	0.5 <sup>D</sup>	0.6 <sup>D</sup>	0.3 <sup>D</sup>	0.6 <sup>D</sup>	0.9 <sup>D</sup>	0.8 <sup>D</sup>	2.6 <sup>M</sup>	2.2 <sup>M</sup>	2.3 <sup>M</sup>	1.6 <sup>D</sup>	1.6 <sup>D</sup>	1.7 <sup>D</sup>
Pb	0.5 <sup>D</sup>	0.4 <sup>D</sup>	0.5 <sup>D</sup>	0.7 <sup>D</sup>	0.9 <sup>D</sup>	1.0 <sup>D</sup>	1.9 <sup>D</sup>	1.7 <sup>D</sup>	1.7 <sup>D</sup>	2.1 <sup>M</sup>	2.3 <sup>M</sup>	2.1 <sup>M</sup>
Se	131.7 <sup>E</sup>	100.5 <sup>E</sup>	155.2 <sup>E</sup>	136.1 <sup>E</sup>	107.1 <sup>E</sup>	144.0 <sup>E</sup>	380.2 <sup>E</sup>	293.9 <sup>E</sup>	373.2 <sup>E</sup>	327.1 <sup>E</sup>	342.7 <sup>E</sup>	348.0 <sup>E</sup>
Zn	0.9 <sup>D</sup>	0.7 <sup>D</sup>	1.0 <sup>D</sup>	1.0 <sup>D</sup>	0.8 <sup>D</sup>	0.8 <sup>D</sup>	1.8 <sup>D</sup>	1.5 <sup>D</sup>	1.6 <sup>D</sup>	1.5 <sup>D</sup>	1.6 <sup>D</sup>	1.6 <sup>D</sup>
<b>(B) <math>I_{geo}</math></b>												
Cd	3.3 <sup>H</sup>	2.9 <sup>MH</sup>	3.6 <sup>H</sup>	3.3 <sup>H</sup>	3.0 <sup>MH</sup>	3.1 <sup>H</sup>	3.1 <sup>H</sup>	3.0 <sup>MH</sup>	2.9 <sup>MH</sup>	2.1 <sup>MH</sup>	2.5 <sup>MH</sup>	1.7 <sup>MC</sup>
Cr	-2.1 <sup>U</sup>	-2.3 <sup>U</sup>	-2.1 <sup>U</sup>	-2.2 <sup>U</sup>	-2.3 <sup>U</sup>	-2.3 <sup>U</sup>	-2.3 <sup>U</sup>	-2.5 <sup>U</sup>	-2.6 <sup>U</sup>	-2.8 <sup>U</sup>	-2.6 <sup>U</sup>	-2.7 <sup>U</sup>
Cu	-3.4 <sup>U</sup>	-3.0 <sup>U</sup>	-4.2 <sup>U</sup>	-3.4 <sup>U</sup>	-2.9 <sup>U</sup>	-2.9 <sup>U</sup>	-2.0 <sup>U</sup>	-2.2 <sup>U</sup>	-2.1 <sup>U</sup>	-3.3 <sup>U</sup>	-3.2 <sup>U</sup>	-3.1 <sup>U</sup>
Pb	-2.5 <sup>U</sup>	-2.7 <sup>U</sup>	-2.5 <sup>U</sup>	-2.3 <sup>U</sup>	-2.0 <sup>U</sup>	-1.7 <sup>U</sup>	-1.5 <sup>U</sup>	-1.7 <sup>U</sup>	-1.8 <sup>U</sup>	-2.0 <sup>U</sup>	-1.8 <sup>U</sup>	-2.0 <sup>U</sup>
Se	3.5 <sup>H</sup>	3.2 <sup>H</sup>	3.5 <sup>H</sup>	3.2 <sup>H</sup>	2.7 <sup>MH</sup>	3.4 <sup>H</sup>	4.0 <sup>H</sup>	3.6 <sup>H</sup>	4.0 <sup>H</sup>	3.2 <sup>H</sup>	3.2 <sup>H</sup>	3.3 <sup>H</sup>
Zn	-2.1 <sup>U</sup>	-2.3 <sup>U</sup>	-2.1 <sup>U</sup>	-2.4 <sup>U</sup>	-2.7 <sup>U</sup>	-2.6 <sup>U</sup>	-2.1 <sup>U</sup>	-2.4 <sup>U</sup>	-2.3 <sup>U</sup>	-3.0 <sup>U</sup>	-2.9 <sup>U</sup>	-2.9 <sup>U</sup>
	2011											
	March			April			May			June		
	I	II	III	I	II	III	I	II	III	I	II	III
<b>(C) EF</b>												
Cd	616.0 <sup>E</sup>	601.2 <sup>E</sup>	481.4 <sup>E</sup>	537.1 <sup>E</sup>	579.8 <sup>E</sup>	524.8 <sup>E</sup>	439.0 <sup>E</sup>	282.4 <sup>E</sup>	147.9 <sup>E</sup>	402.3 <sup>E</sup>	254.6 <sup>E</sup>	109.0 <sup>E</sup>
Cr	10.4 <sup>S</sup>	9.4 <sup>S</sup>	6.7 <sup>S</sup>	6.9 <sup>S</sup>	7.0 <sup>S</sup>	5.9 <sup>S</sup>	5.9 <sup>S</sup>	5.1 <sup>S</sup>	4.5 <sup>M</sup>	4.4 <sup>M</sup>	4.5 <sup>M</sup>	4.4 <sup>M</sup>
Cu	1.1 <sup>D</sup>	0.8 <sup>D</sup>	0.4 <sup>D</sup>	0.8 <sup>D</sup>	0.9 <sup>D</sup>	0.9 <sup>D</sup>	1.1 <sup>D</sup>	0.6 <sup>D</sup>	0.3 <sup>D</sup>	0.8 <sup>D</sup>	0.5 <sup>D</sup>	0.3 <sup>D</sup>
Pb	6.2 <sup>S</sup>	4.2 <sup>M</sup>	6.1 <sup>S</sup>	4.2 <sup>M</sup>	5.1 <sup>S</sup>	5.2 <sup>S</sup>	3.8 <sup>M</sup>	3.6 <sup>M</sup>	3.6 <sup>M</sup>	2.8 <sup>M</sup>	3.0 <sup>M</sup>	3.1 <sup>M</sup>
Se	1121.2 <sup>E</sup>	984.7 <sup>E</sup>	839.5 <sup>E</sup>	984.3 <sup>E</sup>	1091.7 <sup>E</sup>	1015.4 <sup>E</sup>	353.6 <sup>E</sup>	342.8 <sup>E</sup>	345.9 <sup>E</sup>	678.8 <sup>E</sup>	691.4 <sup>E</sup>	680.0 <sup>E</sup>
Zn	3.6 <sup>M</sup>	2.5 <sup>M</sup>	2.4 <sup>M</sup>	2.5 <sup>M</sup>	2.8 <sup>M</sup>	2.6 <sup>M</sup>	1.9 <sup>D</sup>	1.7 <sup>D</sup>	1.6 <sup>D</sup>	1.7 <sup>D</sup>	1.7 <sup>D</sup>	1.7 <sup>D</sup>
<b>(D) <math>I_{geo}</math></b>												
Cd	3.6 <sup>H</sup>	3.9 <sup>H</sup>	3.5 <sup>H</sup>	3.9 <sup>H</sup>	4.0 <sup>H</sup>	3.7 <sup>H</sup>	3.6 <sup>H</sup>	3.0 <sup>MH</sup>	2.2 <sup>MH</sup>	3.8 <sup>H</sup>	3.2 <sup>H</sup>	2.0 <sup>MC</sup>
Cr	-2.0 <sup>U</sup>	-2.2 <sup>U</sup>	-2.4 <sup>U</sup>	-2.2 <sup>U</sup>	-2.2 <sup>U</sup>	-2.5 <sup>U</sup>	-2.4 <sup>U</sup>	-2.5 <sup>U</sup>	-2.7 <sup>U</sup>	-2.5 <sup>U</sup>	-2.4 <sup>U</sup>	-2.4 <sup>U</sup>
Cu	-4.7 <sup>U</sup>	-4.7 <sup>U</sup>	-6.2 <sup>U</sup>	-4.7 <sup>U</sup>	-4.6 <sup>U</sup>	-4.7 <sup>U</sup>	-4.4 <sup>U</sup>	-5.0 <sup>U</sup>	-6.2 <sup>U</sup>	-4.4 <sup>U</sup>	-4.9 <sup>U</sup>	-6.0 <sup>U</sup>
Pb	-1.4 <sup>U</sup>	-1.5 <sup>U</sup>	-1.2 <sup>U</sup>	-1.5 <sup>U</sup>	-1.3 <sup>U</sup>	-1.3 <sup>U</sup>	-1.7 <sup>U</sup>	-1.7 <sup>U</sup>	-1.6 <sup>U</sup>	-1.8 <sup>U</sup>	-1.6 <sup>U</sup>	-1.5 <sup>U</sup>
Se	4.0 <sup>H</sup>	4.2 <sup>HE</sup>	3.8 <sup>H</sup>	4.2 <sup>HE</sup>	4.4 <sup>HE</sup>	4.2 <sup>HE</sup>	2.8 <sup>MH</sup>	2.8 <sup>MH</sup>	2.9 <sup>MH</sup>	4.0 <sup>H</sup>	4.1 <sup>HE</sup>	4.1 <sup>HE</sup>
Zn	-2.7 <sup>U</sup>	-2.8 <sup>U</sup>	-3.1 <sup>U</sup>	-2.8 <sup>U</sup>	-2.7 <sup>U</sup>	-2.9 <sup>U</sup>	-3.2 <sup>U</sup>	-3.3 <sup>U</sup>	-3.3 <sup>U</sup>	-3.0 <sup>U</sup>	-2.9 <sup>U</sup>	-2.9 <sup>U</sup>

**Notes.**

Cd, Cadmium; Cr, Chromium; Cu, Copper; Pb, Lead; Se, Selenium; Zn, Zinc.

The superscript letters in the Enrichment Factor shows—D, deficiency to minimal enrichment; M, moderate enrichment; S, significant enrichment; E, extremely high enrichment. The superscript letters in Geo-accumulation Index shows—U, uncontaminated; MC, moderately contaminated; MH, moderate to heavy contamination; H, heavy contamination; HE, heavy to extreme contamination.

**Table 8** Metal induced Enrichment Factor (EF) and Geo-accumulation Index (I<sub>geo</sub>) at the three (SI-3) nesting sites of *T achypleus gigas* at Pantai Balok during Phase-3 (2012–2013) survey.


	2012												2013											
	May			June			July			August			Feb			March			April			May		
	I	II	III	I	II	III	I	II	III	I	II	III	I	II	III	I	II	III	I	II	III	I	II	III
<b>(A) EF for full moon observations</b>																								
Cd	296.5 <sup>E</sup>	199.4 <sup>E</sup>	81.6 <sup>E</sup>	523.6 <sup>E</sup>	364.4 <sup>E</sup>	339.5 <sup>E</sup>	737.3 <sup>E</sup>	408.9 <sup>E</sup>	416.6 <sup>E</sup>	213.3 <sup>E</sup>	216.2 <sup>E</sup>	292.4 <sup>E</sup>	193.0 <sup>E</sup>	269.6 <sup>E</sup>	168.6 <sup>E</sup>	215.0 <sup>E</sup>	231.5 <sup>E</sup>	149.7 <sup>E</sup>	372.1 <sup>E</sup>	156.0 <sup>E</sup>	258.2 <sup>E</sup>	–	–	–
Cr	1.5 <sup>D</sup>	0.7 <sup>D</sup>	1.5 <sup>D</sup>	3.0 <sup>M</sup>	0.7 <sup>D</sup>	1.1 <sup>D</sup>	1.8 <sup>D</sup>	3.1 <sup>M</sup>	0.9 <sup>D</sup>	0.7 <sup>D</sup>	0.5 <sup>D</sup>	0.8 <sup>D</sup>	0.8 <sup>D</sup>	0.6 <sup>D</sup>	0.8 <sup>D</sup>	0.9 <sup>D</sup>	0.9 <sup>D</sup>	1.3 <sup>D</sup>	0.8 <sup>D</sup>	1.3 <sup>D</sup>	0.9 <sup>D</sup>	–	–	–
Cu	0.2 <sup>D</sup>	0.1 <sup>D</sup>	0.3 <sup>D</sup>	0.2 <sup>D</sup>	0.2 <sup>D</sup>	0.2 <sup>D</sup>	0.2 <sup>D</sup>	0.4 <sup>D</sup>	0.2 <sup>D</sup>	0.5 <sup>D</sup>	0.2 <sup>D</sup>	0.3 <sup>D</sup>	0.2 <sup>D</sup>	0.3 <sup>D</sup>	0.2 <sup>D</sup>	0.4 <sup>D</sup>	0.2 <sup>D</sup>	0.4 <sup>D</sup>	1.3 <sup>D</sup>	0.4 <sup>D</sup>	1.2 <sup>D</sup>	–	–	–
Pb	0.6 <sup>D</sup>	0.6 <sup>D</sup>	0.8 <sup>D</sup>	0.8 <sup>D</sup>	0.8 <sup>D</sup>	0.7 <sup>D</sup>	0.6 <sup>D</sup>	0.7 <sup>D</sup>	0.7 <sup>D</sup>	0.9 <sup>D</sup>	0.8 <sup>D</sup>	1.0 <sup>D</sup>	2.3 <sup>M</sup>	1.1 <sup>D</sup>	2.0 <sup>M</sup>	1.0 <sup>D</sup>	0.9 <sup>D</sup>	1.3 <sup>D</sup>	1.7 <sup>D</sup>	1.1 <sup>D</sup>	1.7 <sup>D</sup>	–	–	–
Se	396.9 <sup>E</sup>	345.7 <sup>E</sup>	390.0 <sup>E</sup>	555.9 <sup>E</sup>	418.0 <sup>E</sup>	290.9 <sup>E</sup>	547.2 <sup>E</sup>	490.1 <sup>E</sup>	343.3 <sup>E</sup>	292.1 <sup>E</sup>	280.8 <sup>E</sup>	287.9 <sup>E</sup>	216.9 <sup>E</sup>	190.4 <sup>E</sup>	419.8 <sup>E</sup>	287.8 <sup>E</sup>	239.9 <sup>E</sup>	121.6 <sup>E</sup>	253.5 <sup>E</sup>	311.5 <sup>E</sup>	279.1 <sup>E</sup>	–	–	–
Zn	5.3 <sup>S</sup>	4.7 <sup>S</sup>	6.6 <sup>S</sup>	6.2 <sup>S</sup>	6.4 <sup>S</sup>	6.3 <sup>S</sup>	6.4 <sup>S</sup>	5.5 <sup>S</sup>	5.9 <sup>S</sup>	7.0 <sup>S</sup>	6.9 <sup>S</sup>	7.8 <sup>S</sup>	7.0 <sup>S</sup>	6.0 <sup>S</sup>	7.4 <sup>S</sup>	6.1 <sup>S</sup>	6.2 <sup>S</sup>	7.0 <sup>S</sup>	6.6 <sup>S</sup>	6.2 <sup>S</sup>	8.0 <sup>S</sup>	–	–	–
<b>(B) EF for new moon observations</b>																								
Cd	266.3 <sup>E</sup>	210.4 <sup>E</sup>	290.6 <sup>E</sup>	544.4 <sup>E</sup>	359.6 <sup>E</sup>	317.7 <sup>E</sup>	432.4 <sup>E</sup>	309.2 <sup>E</sup>	634.1 <sup>E</sup>	–	–	–	30.9 <sup>V</sup>	88.6 <sup>E</sup>	218.7 <sup>E</sup>	110.1 <sup>E</sup>	174.6 <sup>E</sup>	19.5 <sup>S</sup>	–	–	–	114.9 <sup>E</sup>	57.9 <sup>E</sup>	572.1 <sup>E</sup>
Cr	1.1 <sup>D</sup>	0.9 <sup>D</sup>	1.8 <sup>D</sup>	1.6 <sup>D</sup>	0.9 <sup>D</sup>	1.2 <sup>D</sup>	1.1 <sup>D</sup>	1.1 <sup>D</sup>	0.8 <sup>D</sup>	–	–	–	1.1 <sup>D</sup>	0.7 <sup>D</sup>	0.9 <sup>D</sup>	0.5 <sup>D</sup>	0.6 <sup>D</sup>	0.9 <sup>D</sup>	–	–	–	1.3 <sup>D</sup>	0.5 <sup>D</sup>	1.1 <sup>D</sup>
Cu	0.4 <sup>D</sup>	0.3 <sup>D</sup>	0.3 <sup>D</sup>	0.3 <sup>D</sup>	0.1 <sup>D</sup>	0.4 <sup>D</sup>	0.4 <sup>D</sup>	0.3 <sup>D</sup>	0.2 <sup>D</sup>	–	–	–	0.2 <sup>D</sup>	0.2 <sup>D</sup>	0.2 <sup>D</sup>	0.2 <sup>D</sup>	0.3 <sup>D</sup>	0.2 <sup>D</sup>	–	–	–	0.5 <sup>D</sup>	0.2 <sup>D</sup>	0.3 <sup>D</sup>
Pb	0.8 <sup>D</sup>	0.7 <sup>D</sup>	0.7 <sup>D</sup>	0.8 <sup>D</sup>	0.7 <sup>D</sup>	1.0 <sup>D</sup>	0.8 <sup>D</sup>	0.6 <sup>D</sup>	0.7 <sup>D</sup>	–	–	–	1.8 <sup>D</sup>	1.3 <sup>D</sup>	2.3 <sup>M</sup>	1.8 <sup>D</sup>	1.2 <sup>D</sup>	3.5 <sup>D</sup>	–	–	–	1.3 <sup>D</sup>	1.1 <sup>D</sup>	2.6 <sup>M</sup>
Se	263.2 <sup>E</sup>	437.4 <sup>E</sup>	457.6 <sup>E</sup>	414.6 <sup>E</sup>	396.7 <sup>E</sup>	262.4 <sup>E</sup>	332.7 <sup>E</sup>	464.6 <sup>E</sup>	574.9 <sup>E</sup>	–	–	–	149.4 <sup>E</sup>	125.4 <sup>E</sup>	283.0 <sup>E</sup>	300.2 <sup>E</sup>	177.1 <sup>E</sup>	351.8 <sup>E</sup>	–	–	–	263.5 <sup>E</sup>	182.6 <sup>E</sup>	408.1 <sup>E</sup>
Zn	6.2 <sup>S</sup>	6.0 <sup>S</sup>	6.1 <sup>S</sup>	7.7 <sup>S</sup>	5.6 <sup>S</sup>	7.6 <sup>S</sup>	6.4 <sup>S</sup>	5.5 <sup>S</sup>	5.9 <sup>S</sup>	–	–	–	6.2 <sup>S</sup>	5.3 <sup>S</sup>	7.4 <sup>S</sup>	6.1 <sup>S</sup>	6.2 <sup>S</sup>	8.2 <sup>S</sup>	–	–	–	5.6 <sup>S</sup>	4.5 <sup>S</sup>	9.7 <sup>S</sup>
<b>(C) I<sub>geo</sub> for full moon observations</b>																								
Cd	5.0 <sup>HE</sup>	4.8 <sup>HE</sup>	2.2 <sup>MH</sup>	5.3 <sup>EC</sup>	5.0 <sup>HE</sup>	4.6 <sup>HE</sup>	5.9 <sup>EC</sup>	5.2 <sup>EC</sup>	5.0 <sup>EC</sup>	4.3 <sup>HE</sup>	4.5 <sup>HE</sup>	5.1 <sup>EC</sup>	4.3 <sup>HE</sup>	4.6 <sup>HE</sup>	4.0 <sup>HE</sup>	5.5 <sup>EC</sup>	5.1 <sup>EC</sup>	3.9 <sup>H</sup>	5.3 <sup>EC</sup>	4.4 <sup>HE</sup>	4.8 <sup>HE</sup>	–	–	–
Cr	–2.2 <sup>U</sup>	–3.0 <sup>U</sup>	–2.9 <sup>U</sup>	–1.8 <sup>U</sup>	–3.7 <sup>U</sup>	–3.3 <sup>U</sup>	–2.6 <sup>U</sup>	–1.6 <sup>U</sup>	–3.7 <sup>U</sup>	–3.6 <sup>U</sup>	–3.8 <sup>U</sup>	–3.1 <sup>U</sup>	–3.3 <sup>U</sup>	–3.5 <sup>U</sup>	–3.3 <sup>U</sup>	–2.1 <sup>U</sup>	–2.7 <sup>U</sup>	–2.3 <sup>U</sup>	–3.1 <sup>U</sup>	–2.2 <sup>U</sup>	–3.1 <sup>U</sup>	–	–	–
Cu	–4.6 <sup>U</sup>	–4.9 <sup>U</sup>	–4.9 <sup>U</sup>	–5.0 <sup>U</sup>	–4.9 <sup>U</sup>	–5.4 <sup>U</sup>	–5.1 <sup>U</sup>	–4.4 <sup>U</sup>	–5.0 <sup>U</sup>	–3.5 <sup>U</sup>	–4.8 <sup>U</sup>	–4.1 <sup>U</sup>	–4.8 <sup>U</sup>	–4.0 <sup>U</sup>	–4.6 <sup>U</sup>	–2.8 <sup>U</sup>	–4.3 <sup>U</sup>	–3.3 <sup>U</sup>	–1.8 <sup>U</sup>	–3.3 <sup>U</sup>	–2.2 <sup>U</sup>	–	–	–
Pb	–2.2 <sup>U</sup>	–1.9 <sup>U</sup>	–2.6 <sup>U</sup>	–2.4 <sup>U</sup>	–2.0 <sup>U</sup>	–2.6 <sup>U</sup>	–2.9 <sup>U</sup>	–2.7 <sup>U</sup>	–2.6 <sup>U</sup>	–1.9 <sup>U</sup>	–1.9 <sup>U</sup>	–1.5 <sup>U</sup>	–0.4 <sup>U</sup>	–1.2 <sup>U</sup>	–0.6 <sup>U</sup>	–0.6 <sup>U</sup>	–1.2 <sup>U</sup>	–0.9 <sup>U</sup>	–0.5 <sup>U</sup>	–1.2 <sup>U</sup>	–0.8 <sup>U</sup>	–	–	–
Se	4.9 <sup>HE</sup>	5.1 <sup>EC</sup>	4.3 <sup>HE</sup>	4.8 <sup>HE</sup>	4.9 <sup>HE</sup>	3.9 <sup>H</sup>	4.9 <sup>HE</sup>	4.9 <sup>HE</sup>	4.2 <sup>HE</sup>	4.3 <sup>HE</sup>	3.5 <sup>H</sup>	4.5 <sup>HE</sup>	4.0 <sup>HE</sup>	4.0 <sup>HE</sup>	4.8 <sup>HE</sup>	5.2 <sup>EC</sup>	4.6 <sup>HE</sup>	3.4 <sup>H</sup>	4.5 <sup>HE</sup>	4.9 <sup>HE</sup>	4.4 <sup>HE</sup>	–	–	–
Zn	–2.9 <sup>U</sup>	–2.8 <sup>U</sup>	–3.3 <sup>U</sup>	–3.3 <sup>U</sup>	–2.9 <sup>U</sup>	–3.3 <sup>U</sup>	–3.5 <sup>U</sup>	–3.3 <sup>U</sup>	–3.3 <sup>U</sup>	–2.8 <sup>U</sup>	–2.6 <sup>U</sup>	–2.4 <sup>U</sup>	–2.6 <sup>U</sup>	–2.6 <sup>U</sup>	–2.6 <sup>U</sup>	–1.8 <sup>U</sup>	–2.3 <sup>U</sup>	–2.3 <sup>U</sup>	–2.4 <sup>U</sup>	–2.4 <sup>U</sup>	–2.4 <sup>U</sup>	–	–	–
<b>(D) I<sub>geo</sub> for new moon observations</b>																								
Cd	4.9 <sup>HE</sup>	4.1 <sup>HE</sup>	4.9 <sup>HE</sup>	5.6 <sup>EC</sup>	5.2 <sup>EC</sup>	4.6 <sup>HE</sup>	5.2 <sup>EC</sup>	4.7 <sup>HE</sup>	5.6 <sup>EC</sup>	–	–	–	2.2 <sup>MH</sup>	4.2 <sup>HE</sup>	4.2 <sup>HE</sup>	3.2 <sup>H</sup>	4.4 <sup>HE</sup>	1.1 <sup>ME</sup>	–	–	–	4.3 <sup>HE</sup>	3.5 <sup>H</sup>	6.3 <sup>EC</sup>
Cr	–2.7 <sup>U</sup>	–3.4 <sup>U</sup>	–2.2 <sup>U</sup>	–2.5 <sup>U</sup>	–3.2 <sup>U</sup>	–2.8 <sup>U</sup>	–3.2 <sup>U</sup>	–3.1 <sup>U</sup>	–3.9 <sup>U</sup>	–	–	–	–2.2 <sup>U</sup>	–2.5 <sup>U</sup>	–3.2 <sup>U</sup>	–3.4 <sup>U</sup>	–3.3 <sup>U</sup>	–3.1 <sup>U</sup>	–	–	–	–1.8 <sup>U</sup>	–3.1 <sup>U</sup>	–2.4 <sup>U</sup>
Cu	–3.6 <sup>U</sup>	–4.5 <sup>U</sup>	–4.0 <sup>U</sup>	–4.6 <sup>U</sup>	–5.3 <sup>U</sup>	–4.1 <sup>U</sup>	–4.4 <sup>U</sup>	–4.7 <sup>U</sup>	–5.4 <sup>U</sup>	–	–	–	–4.0 <sup>U</sup>	–3.8 <sup>U</sup>	–5.1 <sup>U</sup>	–4.4 <sup>U</sup>	–4.2 <sup>U</sup>	–4.6 <sup>U</sup>	–	–	–	–2.8 <sup>U</sup>	–3.7 <sup>U</sup>	–3.8 <sup>U</sup>
Pb	–1.8 <sup>U</sup>	–2.3 <sup>U</sup>	–2.2 <sup>U</sup>	–2.1 <sup>U</sup>	–2.2 <sup>U</sup>	–1.7 <sup>U</sup>	–2.4 <sup>U</sup>	–2.7 <sup>U</sup>	–2.7 <sup>U</sup>	–	–	–	–0.1 <sup>U</sup>	–0.2 <sup>U</sup>	–0.5 <sup>U</sup>	–0.3 <sup>U</sup>	–1.0 <sup>U</sup>	0.3 <sup>UM</sup>	–	–	–	–0.5 <sup>U</sup>	–0.4 <sup>U</sup>	0.3 <sup>UM</sup>
Se	4.3 <sup>HE</sup>	4.4 <sup>HE</sup>	5.0 <sup>HE</sup>	4.7 <sup>HE</sup>	4.8 <sup>HE</sup>	4.1 <sup>HE</sup>	4.0 <sup>H</sup>	4.8 <sup>HE</sup>	4.9 <sup>HE</sup>	–	–	–	3.9 <sup>H</sup>	3.9 <sup>H</sup>	4.2 <sup>HE</sup>	5.0 <sup>HE</sup>	3.9 <sup>H</sup>	4.8 <sup>HE</sup>	–	–	–	5.0 <sup>HE</sup>	4.9 <sup>HE</sup>	5.4 <sup>EC</sup>
Zn	–2.7 <sup>U</sup>	–3.1 <sup>U</sup>	–2.8 <sup>U</sup>	–2.7 <sup>U</sup>	–3.0 <sup>U</sup>	–2.7 <sup>U</sup>	–3.2 <sup>U</sup>	–3.3 <sup>U</sup>	–3.4 <sup>U</sup>	–	–	–	–2.2 <sup>U</sup>	–2.0 <sup>U</sup>	–2.6 <sup>U</sup>	–2.3 <sup>U</sup>	–2.5 <sup>U</sup>	–2.3 <sup>U</sup>	–	–	–	–2.2 <sup>U</sup>	–2.2 <sup>U</sup>	–1.6 <sup>U</sup>

**Notes.**

Cd, Cadmium; Cr, Chromium; Cu, Copper; Pb, Lead; Se, Selenium; Zn, Zinc.

“–” no sample observed at the time of investigation.

The superscript letters in the Enrichment Factor shows—D, deficiency to minimal enrichment; M, moderate enrichment; S, significant enrichment; V, very high enrichment; E, extremely high enrichment. The superscript letters in Geo-accumulation Index shows—U, uncontaminated; UM, uncontaminated to moderately contaminated; ME, moderate contaminated; MH, moderate to heavy contamination; H, heavy contamination; HE, heavy to extreme contamination; EC, extremely contaminated.



**Figure 3** Principal Component Analysis (PCA) showing the % variance in sedimentological parameters in relation to –(A) *Tachypleus gigas* egg count, (B) season, (C) lunar period and, (D) sampling sites. The numbers 1–3 indicate study phases in the present investigation (1, Phase-1: 2009–2010; 2, Phase-2: 2010–2011 and 3, Phase-3: 2012–2013). The circle in each panel represents correlation circle and the orientation of the environmental (sediment) lines approximate their correlation to the ordination axes. Abbreviated environmental parameters: Temp, Temperature; Sort, Sorting; Skew, Skewness; Kurt, Kurtosis; Grav, Gravel; S&C, Silt and clay; MD, Moisture depth; and TOC, Total organic carbon.

### Water characteristics

Although Phase-2 and Phase-3 observations indicated a general trend of higher salinity during SW monsoon (25.3–28.0‰), followed by IM (7.6–16.2‰) and NE periods (9.3–10.8‰) (Tables 3–5), Phase-1 reveals a euhaline (>30‰) condition for all three seasons (Tables 1–2). The seasonal differences in surface water temperature, pH and DO were non-significant (Table 6). Also, the nutrients— $\text{NO}_2^-$ ,  $\text{NO}_3^-$  and  $\text{PO}_4^{3-}$ , and Chl-*a* (observed for Phases 2–3) showed non-significant differences in relation to the seasons, except by  $\text{NO}_3^-$  for SW vs. NE monsoon. The concentration of  $\text{S}^{2-}$  was however high for IM ( $38.9 \pm 25 \mu\text{g l}^{-1}$ ) (mean  $\pm$  SD), followed by NE ( $29.4 \pm 20 \mu\text{g l}^{-1}$ ) and SW ( $20.8 \pm 25 \mu\text{g l}^{-1}$ ) in the order. Overall, the variations in water quality parameters with respect to full/new moon periods, sampling sites and seasons were insignificant (Table 6).

### Correlation between biological and environmental parameters

The PCA drawn between biological and sediment parameters showed 49.7% variance along axis-1 (eigenvalue: 6.96), and 13.2% variance along axis-2 (eigenvalue: 1.85) (Fig. 3). The

total egg count was primarily associated with Phases 1 and 3, whereas its fall in Phase-2 was evident (Fig. 3A). While Phase-1 egg yield was largely associated with medium sand, silt and clay and gravel, the Phase-3 egg yield had other parameters like mean grain size, fine sand, medium-fine sand, temperature, moisture depth, etc., and shows the impact of monsoon (Fig. 3B), lunar period (Fig. 3C) as well as the preferred sites for *T. gigas* nesting (Fig. 3D). The BEST analysis has indicated that mean grain size is strongly correlated with the egg laying capacity of *T. gigas* ( $\rho = 0.137$ ). In the case of water quality, the PCA shows 46.8% variance along axis-1 (eigenvalue: 4.21), and 18.5% variance along axis-2 (eigenvalue: 1.67) (Fig. 4). In fact, majority of the water quality variables were associated with Phase-3 egg counts (Fig. 4A) that occurred largely during SW monsoon (Fig. 4B), full moon periods (Fig. 4C) and at Sites I and III (Fig. 4D). The BEST analysis indicated that both (water) temperature and  $\text{NO}_3^-$  were correlated with *T. gigas* nesting activity ( $\rho = 0.069$ ). Finally, the impact of heavy metals was seen only on Phase-3 (Fig. 5A) in relation to SW monsoon (Fig. 5B), full/new moon phases (Fig. 5C) and largely at Sites I-II (Fig. 5D) (cumulative variance along axis-1 (eigenvalue: 2.01) and axis-2 (eigenvalue: 1.83): 64.1 %). The BEST analysis showed a strong correlation of Cr and Se with the observed egg yield ( $\rho = 0.032$ ).


## DISCUSSION

### State-of-the-art on *Tachypleus gigas* population at Pantai Balok

The impact of local environmental changes can easily be witnessed through declining or loss of biodiversity (Essl et al., 2015). Although Pantai Balok has been supporting the arrival of *T. gigas* for decades (BR Nelson, pers. comm., 2009 with local people), the increased anthropogenic disturbances in recent years (e.g., settlements, pollution) are severely affecting the spawning crab's arrival (Tan et al., 2012; Azwarfarid et al., 2013). In fact, the present study also supports this scientific concern. After discovering that *T. gigas* stopped their spawning activity at Tanjung Selangor by 2011 (Nelson et al., 2015), we expected more crabs and higher spawning activity at Pantai Balok located ~37 km away from Tanjung Selangor (in the north). But the present study indicates further decline in the *T. gigas* population due to sediment/water quality changes caused by physical infrastructure developments locally (during 2011–2013).

The loss of horseshoe crabs can vary between genders. The male and female ratio of 31:38 in Phase-1 decreased to 13:7 in Phase-2 and 19:9 in Phase-3. More males can indicate 'spawning strategies' and 'sperm competition' (i.e., satellite behaviour and tandem mating) which is known to occur in the areas of small horseshoe crab assemblages (Schaller, Thayer & Hanson, 2002; Brockmann & Smith, 2009; Mattei et al., 2010; Brockmann & Johnson, 2011; Beekey & Mattei, 2015). On the other hand, overexploitation of the female crabs by local communities is also responsible (at least to some extent) for its reduced counts. The demand for female horseshoe crabs was reported previously from different countries like Thailand, India, America, Malaysia, etc. (Christianus & Saad, 2009; Basudev et al., 2013; Beekey & Mattei, 2015). Yet the negligible encrustation of fouling organisms on female *T. gigas* (with clear mating scars) at Pantai Balok shows






**Figure 4** Principal Component Analysis (PCA) showing the % variance in water quality parameters in relation to –(A) *Tachypleus gigas* egg count, (B) season, (C) lunar period and, (D) sampling sites. The numbers 1–3 indicate study phases in the present investigation (1, Phase-1: 2009–2010; 2, Phase-2: 2010–2011 and 3, Phase-3: 2012–2013). The circle in each panel represents correlation circle and the orientation of the environmental (water) lines approximate their correlation to the ordination axes. Abbreviated environmental parameters: Temp, Temperature; Sal, Salinity; DO, Dissolved oxygen; Chl-a, Chlorophyll-a;  $\text{NO}_2^-$ , Nitrite;  $\text{NO}_3^-$ , Nitrate;  $\text{PO}_4^{3-}$ , Phosphate;  $\text{S}^{2-}$ , Sulphide.

the healthy nature of the organisms (cf. Brockmann, 2002). Also, their arrival at Balok beach (despite the anthropogenic disturbances) confirms this place as a choice and still supporting the environmental cues (Chabot & Watson, 2010), beach topography (Chatterji et al., 2008; Jackson & Nordstrom, 2009; Brockmann & Johnson, 2011), and sediment/water characteristics (Chatterji & Shaharom, 2009; Smith et al., 2011; Zaleha et al., 2011; John et al., 2012; Nelson et al., 2015) that are necessary for *T. gigas* spawning. Therefore, appropriate conservation and management efforts would be able to retain not only this crab's population, but also its final spawning ground on the east coast of P. Malaysia.


### Factors influenced the spawning activity of *Tachypleus gigas* at Pantai Balok

At the beginning of this study (Phase-1), only sand mining was presumed to have an impact on water and sediment characteristics and affect the spawning activity of *T. gigas*. However, this specific concern couldn't be compared with earlier studies/findings from Pantai Balok. But the later developments in the form of wave breaker/parking lot



**Figure 5** Principal Component Analysis (PCA) showing the % variance in heavy metals in relation to – (A) *Tachypleus gigas* egg count, (B) season, (C) lunar period and, (D) sampling sites. The numbers 2–3 indicate study phases in the present investigation (2, Phase-2: 2010–2011 and 3, Phase-3: 2012–2013). The circle in each panel represents correlation circle and the orientation of the environmental (heavy metals) lines approximate their correlation to the ordination axes. Abbreviated environmental parameters: Cd, Cadmium; Cr, Chromium; Cu, Copper; Pb, Lead; Se, Selenium; Zn, Zinc.

(Phase-2) and fishing jetty (Phase-3) construction provided a better understanding of the local environmental changes vis-à-vis *T. gigas* population dynamics. It was clear that the sediment close to spawning sites experienced a series of changes and finally became dominated by fine sand with moderate to well-sorting, very coarse skewed and extremely leptokurtic properties. However, the occurrence of more nests and eggs in Phase-3 was suggesting that fine sand, along with medium sand (of moderate sorting, symmetrical and very leptokurtic properties) as reported by [Zaleha et al. \(2012\)](#) and [Nelson et al. \(2015\)](#), also supports the spawning activity of *T. gigas* (mean grain size as strongly correlated). In addition, the average egg laying capacity of a female in Phase-3 (>400 nos.) was five times higher than to Phase-1 (80 nos.), and exceeded the counts (as max. 200–390 eggs) reported from Malaysia and India ([Chatterji & Abidi, 1993](#); [Chatterji, Kotnala & Mathew, 2004](#); [Chatterji et al., 2004](#); [Zaleha et al., 2012](#)). In this context, the restricted distribution of the spawning crabs to the areas of high moisture depth and well oxygenated water was found to be crucial. The enhanced primary productivity in the estuaries due to nitrogen and its derivatives could attract not only lower tropic level organisms, but also other potentially important predators like horseshoe crabs which feed on a variety of prey ([Carmichael et al., 2004](#)). While the



**Figure 6** Schematic diagram showing the nest shifting behaviour of *Tachypleus gigas* between the three sampling sites (I–III) at Pantai Balok (Google Maps©2013). The impact of environmental processes (indicated in boxes) in relation to monsoon (SW/IM/NE) seasons are found to be important for spawning site(s) selection by the adult crabs.

correlation observed between  $\text{NO}_3^-$  and *T. gigas* nesting is likely to benefit the adult crab forage (Carmichael et al., 2004; Haramis et al., 2007), the temperature could cause physical stress for the eggs (e.g., desiccation) (Ehlinger & Tankersley, 2004; Botton et al., 2006).

Although earlier researchers from Malaysia claimed year-round spawning activity of *T. gigas* (Zaleha et al., 2012; John et al., 2012; John, Jalal & Kamaruzzaman, 2013), the present study confirms it only between March and November, but covering all three seasons. However, there seemed to be a considerable influence of salinity on the egg laying capacity of female *T. gigas*. For instance, in Phases 2 and 3 when there was a general trend of high salinity during SW monsoon, the average number of eggs laid by a female was only 148–372 (despite the fact that SW favoured more spawning crabs, more nests and eggs). But with few observations of female crabs ( $n = 0 - 1$ ), and if the total number of eggs is taken into account for other two seasons, there were as many as 556–967 for the NE monsoon and 32–360 for the IM period. While the maximum egg yield in the SW and IM periods is rather similar, it was remarkably high for the NE monsoon. This is however in contrast to the findings of Nelson et al. (2015) who reported no *T. gigas* spawning during the NE monsoon at Tanjung Selangor. Perhaps the differences in geographic location, beach topography, low/high impact of the seasonal water current (especially during NE monsoon) on spawning sites, etc., account for the differences encountered between the present study and Nelson et al. (2015). In the case of Phase-1, the euhaline conditions should have impacted the normal spawning activity of *T. gigas* (average no. of eggs laid by

a female: 58 in SW, 50 in NE and 150 in IM). The poor sediment sorting which, in turn represents a weak water circulation/tidal mixing ([Watanabe et al., 2014](#)), very-fine skewed and extremely leptokurtic properties all support the observed euhaline situation. The narrowed river mouth in 2009–2010 was believed to be the main reason for this condition.

Horseshoe crabs avoid areas with vigorous tides and prefer relatively calm places for spawning ([FitzGerald et al., 2008](#); [Smith et al., 2011](#); [Tan et al., 2012](#)). At Pantai Balok, the spawning crabs preferred Site-I during the NE and IM periods, and Sites II and III during the SW monsoon. In South China Sea, the strong water current (with strong wind and waves) prevails during NE and IM ([Camerlengo & Demmler, 1997](#); [Akhir, Sinha & Hussain, 2011](#)), and therefore the spawning crabs chose the interior location (i.e., Site-I) for their nesting. In fact, the spawning behaviour of the horseshoe crabs in relation to seasonal water current was explained by authors from India ([Chatterji, Parulekar & Qasim, 1996](#)), Malaysia ([Nelson et al., 2015](#)), America ([Berkson & Shuster Jr, 1999](#)), etc. Nevertheless, the horseshoe crabs are able to detect metal contamination and usually stay away from such locations ([Itow, 1997a](#); [Itow, 1997b](#)). However, the extremity of Cd and Se (though found strongly correlated) in the sediment didn't completely challenge the spawning crab's arrival at Pantai Balok and so there is hope for its resurgence if the ongoing anthropogenic disturbances are regulated through appropriate conservation and management efforts.

### **Conservation and management measures for *Tachypleus gigas* at Pantai Balok**

Due to poor understanding of the horseshoe crab population dynamics and breeding biology, several of its known and unknown spawning grounds are on the verge of extinction ([Chiu & Morton, 2003](#); [Ehlinger & Tankersley, 2007](#); [Moore & Perrin, 2007](#); [Cartwright-Taylor, Lee & Hsu, 2009](#)). On the east coast of P. Malaysia, the current situation of halted spawning activity by *T.gigas* at Tanjung Selangor might also occur at Pantai Balok if no regulations on the beach construction are imposed. For instance, the concerned governmental and/or non-governmental authorities should conduct an “Environmental Impact Assessment” before starting any construction work at Pantai Balok. Also, appropriate care should be taken to prevent overexploitation of the crabs (especially females) for edible and fishmeal preparations. The awareness of the horseshoe crab's significance and possible health hazards, if they are caught and consumed from polluted areas, must be communicated to the local people. Also, the standardized sampling protocols can develop a strong database for future scientific comparisons and effective long-term monitoring (cf. [Botton, 2001](#); [Sekiguchi & Shuster Jr, 2009](#); [Shuster Jr & Sekiguchi, 2009](#)). Although several law and enforcement rules are available for the protection of the forest reserves, biodiversity, etc., in Malaysia, the horseshoe crabs do not have gazetted status. In fact, the additional protection offered to the majority of animals under the Fisheries Act 1985 (Act 317) and the Wildlife Conservation Act 2010 (Act 716) in Malaysia did not include the horseshoe crabs so far. Therefore, it is mandatory to have a nationwide priority on the conservation and management of these crabs. Perhaps community involved management efforts would deliver better results than merely imposing rules and regulations in the vicinity. For a quick start, the signboards indicating ‘prohibited

horseshoe crab fishing' at Pantai Balok are necessary. In addition, the knowledge sharing programs like 'touch and feel', 'measure, tag and release', etc., which were conducted in the places like Taiwan (*Chen, Yeh & Lin, 2004; Hsieh & Chen, 2009*) could be adopted and incorporated into the local conservation module. If the above propositions are followed then it is going to benefit not only *T. gigas*, but also the other two Asian horseshoe crabs (*T. tridentatus* and *C. rotundicauda*) existing in Malaysia.

## CONCLUSIONS

The present study, with a wide array of biological and environmental observations, evaluated the major environmental factors that influencing *T. gigas* nesting at Pantai Balok. After discovering the severity of anthropogenic disturbances that finally stopped the spawning activity of *T. gigas* at Tanjung Selangor, the present paper intends to protect these crabs at Pantai Balok—the last spawning ground for them on the east coast of P. Malaysia. Both medium and fine sand compositions were found to be suitable for *T. gigas* spawning, provided that moderate to well-sorting, symmetrical to very-coarse skewed and very leptokurtic to extremely leptokurtic conditions exist. Although the SW monsoon received more crabs, the average egg yield from a female was found higher for NE followed by SW and IM, respectively. The differences in male/female ratio at the spawning sites were largely due to overexploitation of the female crabs for edible and fishmeal preparations. The spawning crabs have also shown a seasonal nest shifting behaviour by choosing Site-I (interior estuary) during NE and IM periods (to avoid strong water current), and Sites II and III for SW monsoon (mild water current). In light of the crabs' choice to spawn at Pantai Balok (despite the increased anthropogenic disturbances and pollution in recent years), it is crucial to implement all possible conservation and management measures. Importantly, the horseshoe crabs should be placed under both Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation Acts to bring nation-wide attention as well as priority in Malaysia.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The present study was administratively supported by AKUATROP, INOS and the School of Marine Science and Environment (PPSMS) at the UMT. The authors wish to thank Mohammad Mokhtari and the two unnamed referees for their objective criticism and valuable suggestions.

## ADDITIONAL INFORMATION AND DECLARATIONS

### Funding

Funding was provided by the Ministry of Higher Education, Malaysia [scholarship (MyBrain-15) to Mr. BRN]. The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

### Grant Disclosures

The following grant information was disclosed by the authors:  
Ministry of Higher Education, Malaysia.



## Competing Interests

The authors declare there are no competing interests.

## Author Contributions

- Bryan Raveen Nelson conceived and designed the experiments, performed the experiments, analyzed the data, contributed reagents/materials/analysis tools, wrote the paper, prepared figures and/or tables, reviewed drafts of the paper.
- Behara Satyanarayana conceived and designed the experiments, analyzed the data, contributed reagents/materials/analysis tools, wrote the paper, prepared figures and/or tables, reviewed drafts of the paper.
- Julia Hwei Zhong Moh reviewed drafts of the paper, support during fieldworks.
- Mhd Abdullah Ikhwanuddin reviewed drafts of the paper.
- Anil Chatterji conceived and designed the experiments, reviewed drafts of the paper.
- Faizah Shaharom contributed reagents/materials/analysis tools, reviewed drafts of the paper.

## Field Study Permissions

The following information was supplied relating to field study approvals (i.e., approving body and any reference numbers):

The present research work proposal on *T. gigas* was formally reviewed and approved by both the Institute of Tropical Aquaculture (AQUATROP) and the Post-Graduate Centre (PGC) of UMT. In addition, the local fishermen association was consulted to obtain their permission. In this context, the association has given a verbal permission and no written consent was deemed necessary.

## Data Availability

The following information was supplied regarding data availability:

The raw data has been supplied as [Data S1](#).

## Supplemental Information

Supplemental information for this article can be found online at <http://dx.doi.org/10.7717/peerj.2232#supplemental-information>.

## REFERENCES

- Akhir MF, Sinha PC, Hussain ML. 2011.** Seasonal variation of South China Sea physical characteristics off the east coast of Peninsular Malaysia from 2002–2010 datasets. *International Journal of Environmental Science* **2**(2):569–575.
- Azwarfarid M, Faridah M, Izzatul-Huda AG, Fawwaz Afham MS, Asyraf AA, Amir-rudin BA, Ismail N. 2013.** A preliminary study on Asian Horseshoe Crab, *Tachypleus gigas* (Müller, 1785) nesting activity in balok and cherating, Pahang, Malaysia. In: *Proceedings of the 2nd international conference on Alfred Russel Wallace-his predecessors and successors*. Kuching, Sarawak, Malaysia, 7–8 Nov 2013.

- Basudev T, Sivakumar K, Sajan J, Satyaranjan B, Choudhury BC. 2013.** Assessment of the population status and threats to the horseshoe crabs along the northern east coast of India. In: Venkataraman K, Sivaperuman C, Raghunathan C, eds. *Ecology and conservation of tropical marine faunal communities*. Berlin Heidelberg: Springer, 137–146.
- Beekey MA, Mattei JH. 2015.** The mismanagement of *Limulus polyphemus* in Long Island Sound: what are the characteristics of a population in decline? In: Carmichael R, Botton ML, Cheung SG, eds. *Changing global perspectives on biology, conservation, and management of horseshoe crabs*. New York: Springer, 1–25.
- Berkson J, Shuster Jr CN. 1999.** The horseshoe crab: the battle for a true multiple-use resource. *Fisheries* **24**(11):6–10.
- Blott SJ, Pye K. 2001.** Gradistat: a grain size distribution and statistics package for the analysis of unconsolidated sediments. *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms* **26**:1237–1248 DOI [10.1002/esp.261](https://doi.org/10.1002/esp.261).
- Botton ML. 2001.** The conservation of horseshoe crabs: what can we learn from the Japanese experience? In: Tanacredi JT, ed. *Limulus in the Limelight*. New York: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 41–51.
- Botton ML. 2009.** The ecological importance of horseshoe crabs in estuarine and coastal communities: a review and speculative summary. In: Tanacredi JT, Botton ML, Smith DR, eds. *Biology and conservation of horseshoe crabs*. New York: Springer, 45–63.
- Botton ML, Pogorzelska M, Smoral L, Shehata A, Hamilton MG. 2006.** Thermal biology of horseshoe crab embryos and larvae: a role for heat shock proteins. *Journal Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology* **336**:65–73 DOI [10.1016/j.jembe.2006.04.014](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jembe.2006.04.014).
- Botton ML, Tankersley RA, Lovel RE. 2010.** Developmental ecology of the American horseshoe crab *Limulus Polyphemus*. *Current Zoology* **56**:550–562.
- Brockmann HJ. 2002.** An experimental approach to altering mating tactics in male horseshoe crabs (*Limulus polyphemus*). *Behavioural Ecology* **13**(2):232–238 DOI [10.1093/beheco/13.2.232](https://doi.org/10.1093/beheco/13.2.232).
- Brockmann HJ. 2003.** Male competition and satellite behaviour. In: Shuster Jr CN, Barlow RB, Brockmann HJ, eds. *The American Horseshoe Crab*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 50–82.
- Brockmann HJ, Johnson SL. 2011.** A long-term study of spawning activity in a Florida Gulf Coast population of horseshoe crabs (*Limulus polyphemus*). *Estuaries and Coasts* **34**:1049–1067 DOI [10.1007/s12237-011-9419-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/s12237-011-9419-1).
- Brockmann HJ, Smith MD. 2009.** Reproductive competition and sexual selection in horseshoe crabs. In: Tanacredi JT, Botton ML, Smith DR, eds. *Biology and conservation of horseshoe crabs*. New York: Springer, 199–221.
- Camerlengo A, Demmler MI. 1997.** Wind-driven circulation of Peninsular Malaysia's eastern continental shelf. *Scientia Marina* **61**(2):203–211.
- Carmichael RH, Rutecki D, Annett B, Gaines E, Valiela I. 2004.** Position of horseshoe crabs in estuarine food webs: N and C stable isotopic study of foraging

- ranges and diet composition. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology* **299**(2):231–253 DOI [10.1016/j.jembe.2003.09.006](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jembe.2003.09.006).
- Cartwright-Taylor L, Bing YV, Chi HC, Tee LS. 2011.** Distribution and abundance of horseshoe crabs *Tachypleus gigas* and *Carcinoscorpius rotundicauda* around the main island of Singapore. *Aquatic Biology* **13**:127–136 DOI [10.3354/ab00346](https://doi.org/10.3354/ab00346).
- Cartwright-Taylor L, Lee J, Hsu CC. 2009.** Population structure and breeding pattern of the mangrove horseshoe crab *Carcinoscorpius rotundicauda* in Singapore. *Aquatic Biology* **8**:61–69 DOI [10.3354/ab00206](https://doi.org/10.3354/ab00206).
- Chabot CC, Watson WH. 2010.** Circatidal rhythms of locomotion in the American horseshoe crab *Limulus polyphemus*: underlying mechanisms and cues that influence them. *Current Zoology* **56**:499–517.
- Chatterji A, Abidi SAH. 1993.** The Indian horseshoe crab—a living fossil. *Journal of Indian Ocean Studies* **1**:43–48.
- Chatterji A, Alam H, Joshi BK, Bhonde RR. 2004.** Regeneration of gill lamellae of the Indian horseshoe crab, *Tachypleus gigas* (Müller). *Current Science* **87**:1511–1512.
- Chatterji A, Kotnala S, Mathew R. 2004.** Effects of salinity on larval growth of horseshoe crabs, *Tachypleus gigas*. *Current Science* **87**:248–250.
- Chatterji A, Parulekar AH, Qasim SZ. 1996.** Nesting behavior of the Indian horseshoe crab, *Tachypleus gigas* (Muller) (Xiphosura). In: Qasim SZ, Roonwal GS, eds. *India's exclusive economic zone*. India: Omega Scientific Publishers, 142–155.
- Chatterji A, Shaharom F. 2009.** Unusual spawning behaviour of the horseshoe crab (*Tachypleus gigas*, Müller) after the Tsunami along Orissa coast, India. *Pertanika Journal of Science and Technology* **17**:263–268.
- Chatterji A, Zaleha K, Shahuddin H, Shaharom F. 2008.** Abundance of three species of the horseshoe crab along the coast of Malaysia. *Journal of the Bombay Natural History Society* **105**:209–211.
- Chen CP, Yeh HY, Lin PF. 2004.** Conservation of the horseshoe crab at Kinmen, Taiwan: strategies and practices. *Biodiversity & Conservation* **13**:1889–1904 DOI [10.1023/B:BIOC.0000035868.11083.84](https://doi.org/10.1023/B:BIOC.0000035868.11083.84).
- Chiu HMC, Morton B. 2003.** The sediments and hydrographic characteristics of three horseshoe crab nursery beaches in Hong Kong. *Journal of Ocean University of Qingdao* **2**:35–43 DOI [10.1007/s11802-003-0023-2](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11802-003-0023-2).
- Christianus A, Saad CR. 2009.** Traditional uses of horseshoe crabs in Malaysia and Thailand. In: Tanacredi JT, Botton ML, Smith DR, eds. *Biology and conservation of horseshoe crabs*. New York: Springer, 616–617.
- Clarke KR, Gorley RN. 2006.** *PRIMER v6: user manual/tutorial*. Plymouth: PRIMER-E.
- Coursey Y, Ahmad N, McGee BM, Steimel N, Kimble M. 2003.** Amoebocyte production begins at stage 18 during embryogenesis in *Limulus polyphemus*, the American horseshoe crab. *Biological Bulletin* **204**:21–27 DOI [10.2307/1543492](https://doi.org/10.2307/1543492).
- Din Z. 1992.** Use of aluminum to normalize heavy-metal data from estuarine and coastal shelf sediments of Straits of Melaka. *Marine Pollution Bulletin* **24**:484–491 DOI [10.1016/0025-326X\(92\)90472-I](https://doi.org/10.1016/0025-326X(92)90472-I).



- Duffy EE, Penn DJ, Botton ML, Brockmann HJ, Loveland RE. 2006. Eye and clasper damage influence male mating tactics in the horseshoe crab *Limulus polyphemus*. *Journal of Ethology* 24:67–74 DOI 10.1007/s10164-005-0163-5.
- Ehlinger GS, Tankersley RA. 2004. Survival and development of horseshoe crab *Limulus polyphemus* embryos and larvae in hypersaline conditions. *Biological Bulletin* 206:87–94 DOI 10.2307/1543539.
- Ehlinger GS, Tankersley RA. 2007. Reproductive ecology of the American horseshoe crab *Limulus polyphemus* in the Indian River Lagoon: an overview. *Florida Scientist* 70:449–463.
- Essl F, Dullinger S, Rabitsch W, Hulme PE, Wilson PPR, Richardson DM. 2015. Delayed biodiversity change: no time to waste. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 20:1–4 DOI 10.1016/j.tree.2015.05.002.
- Faurby S, King TL, Obst M, Hallerman EM, Pertoldi C, Funch P. 2010. Population dynamics of American horseshoe crabs historic climatic events and recent anthropogenic pressures. *Molecular Ecology* 19:2088–3100 DOI 10.1111/j.1365-294X.2010.04732.x.
- FitzGerald DM, Fenster MS, Argow BA, Buynevich IV. 2008. Coastal impacts due to sea-level rise. *Annual Review of Earth and Planetary Sciences* 36:601–647 DOI 10.1146/annurev.earth.35.031306.140139.
- HACH. 2004. *HACH DR/2400 Spectrophotometer procedure manual (Document 59400-22)*. USA: Hach Company.
- Haramis GM, Link WA, Osenton PC, Carter DB, Weber RG, Clark NA, Teece MA, Mizrahi DS. 2007. Stable isotope and pen feeding trial studies confirm the value of horseshoe crab *Limulus polyphemus* eggs to spring migrant shorebirds in Delaware Bay. *Journal of Avian Biology* 38(3):367–376 DOI 10.1111/j.0908-8857.2007.03898.x.
- Hsieh HL, Chen CP. 2009. Conservation program for the Asian horseshoe crab *Tachypleus tridentatus* in Taiwan: characterizing the microhabitat of nursery grounds and restoring spawning grounds. In: Tanacerdi JT, Botton ML, Smith D, eds. *Biology and conservation of horseshoe crabs*. New York: Springer, 417–438.
- Itow T. 1997a. The pollution of coastal waters and malformations of horseshoe crab embryos. *Bulletin of the Education Faculty, Shizuoka University. Natural Science Series* 48:15–33.
- Itow T. 1997b. Changes in segment differentiation by trichostatin A in horseshoe crab embryos. *Animal Biology* 6:3–11.
- IUCN (International Union for the Conservation of Nature). 2016. *Tachypleus gigas*—the IUCN red list of threatened species. Available at [www.iucnredlist.org](http://www.iucnredlist.org) (accessed on 10 January 2016).
- Jackson NL, Nordstrom KF. 2009. Strategies to conserve and enhance sandy barrier habitat for horseshoe crabs (*Limulus polyphemus*) on developed shorelines in Delaware Bay, United States. In: Tanacredi JT, Botton ML, Smith DR, eds. *Biology and conservation of horseshoe crabs*. New York: Springer, 399–416.
- Jackson NL, Nordstrom KF, Smith DR. 2005. Influence of waves and horseshoe crab spawning on beach morphology and sediment grain-size characteristics on a sandy

- estuarine beach. *Sedimentology* 52:1097–1108  
DOI 10.1111/j.1365-3091.2005.00725.x.
- John BA, Jalal KCA, Kamaruzzaman BY. 2013.** Macrobenthic diversity in horseshoe crab nesting ground-Balok station, Pahang, Malaysia. *Oriental Journal of Chemistry* 29:1311–1318 DOI 10.13005/ojc/290406.
- John BA, Kamaruzzaman BY, Jalal KCA, Zaleha K. 2011.** Hydrology of the horseshoe crab nesting grounds at Pahang Coast, Malaysia. *Oriental Journal of Chemistry* 27:1475–1483.
- John BA, Sihin S, Kamaruzzaman BY, Jalal KCA. 2012.** Sediment profiling of the nesting grounds of horseshoe crabs at East Peninsular Malaysia. *International Journal of Biology* 4:159–165 DOI 10.5539/ijb.v4n2p159.
- Kamaruzzaman BY, John BA, Megat MHA, Zaleha K. 2011.** Bioaccumulation of heavy metals in horseshoe crabs (*Tachypleus gigas*) from Pekan, Pahang, Malaysia. *Research Journal of Environmental Toxicology* 5:222–228 DOI 10.3923/rjet.2011.222.228.
- Leong HF, Kamaruzzaman BY, Zaleha K. 2003.** Interpretation of anthropogenic input of metals in mangrove sediments using aluminium as a reference element. In: *Proceedings of the KUSTEM 2nd annual seminar on sustainability and management 2003*. Malaysia, 82–85.
- Magarde V, Iqbal SA, Iqbal N, Zaafarany I. 2011.** Limological studies of upper lake of Bhopal (India). *Oriental Journal of Chemistry* 27:703–711.
- Mattei JH, Beekey MA, Rudman A, Woronik A. 2010.** Reproductive behaviour in horseshoe crabs: does density matter? *Current Zoology* 56:634–642.
- Moore S, Perrin S. 2007.** Seasonal movement and resource-use patterns of resident horseshoe crab (*Limulus polyphemus*) populations in a Maine, USA estuary. *Estuaries and Coasts* 30:1016–1026 DOI 10.1007/BF02841392.
- Nelson BR, Satyanarayana B, Moh JHZ, Shaharom F, Sukumaran M, Chatterji A. 2015.** Episodic human activities and seasonal impacts on the *Tachypleus gigas* (Müller, 1795) population at Tanjung Selangor in Peninsular Malaysia. *Estuaries, Coasts and Shelf Science* 164:313–323 DOI 10.1016/j.ecss.2015.08.003.
- Ngy L, Yu CF, Takatani T, Arakawa O. 2007.** Toxicity assessment for the horseshoe crab *Carcinoscorpius rotundicauda* collected from Cambodia. *Toxicon* 49:843–847 DOI 10.1016/j.toxicon.2006.12.004.
- NHC (National Hydrographic Centre of Malaysia). 2013.** *Malaysia Tide Table 1 & 2*. Kuala Lumpur: Royal Malaysian Navy, Ministry of Defence, 46–51.
- Noriki S, Nakanishi K, Fukawa T, Uematsu M, Uchida T, Tsunogai S. 1980.** Use of a sealed Teflon vessel for the decomposition followed by the determination of chemical constituents of various marine samples. *Bulletin of the Faculty of Fisheries, Hokkaido University* 31:354–361.
- Parsons TR, Maita Y, Lalli CM. 1984.** *A Manual of Chemical and Biological Methods for Seawater Analysis*. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 22–173.
- Rudkin DM, Young GA. 2009.** An ancient ancestry revealed. In: Tanacredi JT, Botton ML, Smith DR, eds. *Biology and conservation of horseshoe crabs*. New York: Springer, 25–26.

- Ruppert EE, Fox RS, Barnes RB. 2004.** *Invertebrate zoology, a functional evolutionary approach*. California: Brooks Cole Thompson, 10–25.
- Schaller SY, Thayer P, Hanson S. 2002.** Survey of Maine horseshoe crab (*Limulus polyphemus*) spawning populations, 2001. Report to Maine Department of Marine Resources, West Boothbay Harbor, Maine, USA, 1–34.
- Schumacher BA. 2002.** *Methods for the determination of Total Organic Carbon (TOC) in soils and sediments (NCEA-C-1282)*. North Carolina: United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), National Exposure Research Laboratory, 1–23.
- Sekiguchi K, Shuster Jr CN. 2009.** Limits on the global distribution of horseshoe crabs (*Limulicidae*): lessons learned from two lifetimes of observations: Asia and America. In: Tanacredi JT, Botton ML, Smith DR, eds. *Biology and conservation of horseshoe crabs*. New York: Springer, 5–24.
- Shuster Jr CN, Sekiguchi K. 2009.** Basic habitat requirements of the extant species of horseshoe crabs (*Limulacea*). In: Tanacredi JT, Botton ML, Smith DR, eds. *Biology and conservation of horseshoe crabs*. New York: Springer, 115–129.
- Smith DR. 2007.** Effect of horseshoe crab spawning density on nest disturbance and exhumation of eggs: a simulation study. *Estuaries and Coasts* **30**:287–295 DOI 10.1007/BF02700171.
- Smith DR, Jackson NL, Nordstrom KF, Weber RG. 2011.** Beach characteristics mitigate effects of onshore wind on horseshoe crab spawning: implications for matching with shorebird migration in Delaware Bay. *Animal Conservation* **14**:575–584 DOI 10.1111/j.1469-1795.2011.00481.x.
- Smith DR, Millard MJ, Carmichael RH. 2009.** Comparative status and assessment of *Limulus polyphemus* with emphasis on the New England and Delaware Bay populations. In: Tanacredi JT, Botton ML, Smith DR, eds. *Biology and conservation of horseshoe crabs*. New York: Springer, 361–386.
- Srijaya TC, Pradeep PJ, Hassan A, Chatterji A, Shaharom F, Jeffs A. 2014.** Colour preference and light sensitivity in trilobite larvae of mangrove horseshoe crab, *Carcinoscorpius rotundicauda* (Latreille, 1802). *Indian Journal of Experimental Biology* **52**:281–290.
- Tan AN, Christianus A, Satar MK. 2011.** Epibiont infestation on horseshoe crab *Tachypleus gigas* (Muller) at Pantai Balok in Peninsular Malaysia. *Our Nature* **9**:9–15.
- Tan AN, Christianus A, Shakibazadeh S, Hajeb P. 2012.** Horseshoe crab, *Tachypleus gigas* (Müller, 1785) spawning population at Balok beach, Kuantan, Pahang, Malaysia. *Pakistan Journal of Biological Sciences* **15**:610–620 DOI 10.3923/pjbs.2012.610.620.
- USEPA (United States Environmental Protection Agency). 2004.** SW-846 Test Method 9060A: total organic carbon (Rev. 1, November 2004), 1–5. Available at <https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-12/documents/9060a.pdf>.
- Walls EA, Berskson J, Smith SA. 2002.** The horseshoe crab, *Limulus polyphemus*: 200 million years of existence, 100 years of study. *Reviews in Fisheries Science* **10**:39–73 DOI 10.1080/20026491051677.

- Watanabe K, Kasai A, Antonio ES, Suzuki K, Ueno M, Yamashita YY. 2014.** Influence of salt-wedge intrusion on ecological processes at lower trophic levels in the Yura Estuary, Japan. *Estuaries, Coasts and Shelf Science* **139**:67–77 DOI [10.1016/j.ecss.2013.12.018](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecss.2013.12.018).
- Weber RG, Carter DB. 2009.** Distribution and development of *Limulus* egg clusters on intertidal beaches in Delaware Bay. In: Tanacredi JT, Botton ML, Smith DR, eds. *Biology and conservation of horseshoe crabs*. New York: Springer, 249–266.
- Wilde FD, Radtke DB, Gibs J, Iwatsubo RT. 2009.** Processing of water samples: preservation, US geological survey techniques of water-resources investigations 9. Available at <http://pubs.water.usgs.gov/twri9A5/>.
- Weather Underground. 2014.** Weather history for Kuantan Malaysia (2009–2013), certified by National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). Available at <http://www.wunderground.com/history.html> (accessed on 23 March 2014).
- Zaleha K, Hazwani I, Siti Hamidah H, Kamaruzzaman BY, Jalal KCA. 2011.** Effect of salinity on the egg hatching and early larvae of horseshoe crab *Tachypleus gigas* (Müller, 1785) in laboratory culture. *Journal of Applied Sciences* **11**:2620–2626 DOI [10.3923/jas.2011.2620.2626](https://doi.org/10.3923/jas.2011.2620.2626).
- Zaleha K, John BA, Erni-Atika H, Kamaruzzaman BY, Jalal KCA. 2012.** Spawning and nesting behaviour of *Tachypleus gigas* along the East Coast of Peninsular Malaysia. *International Journal of Biology* **4**:102–111.
- Zaleha K, Kamaruzzaman BY, John BA, Ong MC. 2010.** Cd, Cu and Pb concentration levels in horseshoe crab nesting grounds of Pahang Coast, Malaysia. *Journal of Biological Sciences* **10**:790–794 DOI [10.3923/jbs.2010.790.794](https://doi.org/10.3923/jbs.2010.790.794).