

## Amphibians: Why Preserve?

Etielle B. Andrade\*

Federal Institute of Education, Science and Technology of Piauí, Campus Paulistana, Piauí, Brazil

Biodiversity conservation is guided by the transmission of the scientific knowledge, acquired over time on biological communities, to society and especially in our interest and personal involvement to carry out such action [1]. Lack of information about a particular taxonomic group, along with prejudices empirically transmitted across generations [2], contributes negatively to the biodiversity conservation. This occurs especially among the animals with "monstrous" appearance, as in the case of amphibians. These animals, generically repudiated in our society, are surrounded by myths and legends [2]. Furthermore, it are often considered as dangerous animals and closely related to witchcraft and black magic rituals. Thus, the human perception about the amphibians, partly determined by the beliefs related to these animals, is of fundamental importance from the viewpoint of conservation, since they are dead simply because they are considered dangerous and disgusting beings by the majority population [3]. This leads to an immediate elimination of any individual who approaches of the residences, whether in big cities or even in rural areas, contributing timidly, to the decline of local amphibian populations.

Recently, amphibian conservation has received considerable attention, especially after the information about the drastic reduction of many populations around the world [4]. Several reasons are cited for this decrease, among which highlights are the habitats destruction [5] climate change [6,7], introduction of exotic species [8], trafficking [9] and urban development [10]. Among herpetologists, the loss of amphibian diversity is a fact and the concern for conservation is well founded. However, among the lay population the importance of amphibians to nature and even to humans is not so widespread.

Despite its ugly appearance, amphibians are essential components in the ecological balance of natural ecosystems (terrestrial and aquatic), acting as key parts in the energy transfer between different levels of food chains [11]. They act both as predators, consuming and controlling the populations of insects and other invertebrates (including insects pests and disease vectors), or as prey, feeding different groups of animals, from invertebrates (spiders, crab, etc.,) to vertebrates (fish, reptiles, birds, mammals and certain species of amphibians) [12,13]. Numerous studies have reported the occurrence of amphibians in agroecological production systems [14-17], and the insect pests are important component from its diets [18]. Thus, the decline in amphibian populations may be directly linked to increase in the number of insects in large cities and of pests in rural areas.

Considering that, the amphibians have thin skin and highly permeable to gas exchange and other substances of the environment, and the occupation of aquatic and terrestrial habitats at different stages of life, amphibians are considered as sensitive bioindicators to various environmental factors [19]. A bioindicator is an organism or set of organisms whose vital functions are correlated so closely with certain environmental factors that permits characterize the state of the ecosystems and reveal as early as possible the natural or induced modifications [20]. Bioindicators are important tools for assessing the ecological integrity of the ecosystems.

Amphibians have strong sensitivity to changes in water quality [12,21]. Tadpoles have been used as indicators of water quality, due to its sensitivity to a wide variety of environmental disturbances in

the water, such as lethal concentrations of organochlorine pesticides, heavy metals and other contaminants [22]. Once the amphibians are quite sensitive to small changes in microhabitats, such as moisture, temperature increase, solar radiation incidence and water availability for reproduction, this may affect its distribution and habitat use [12]. Most of the species also relates strongly with the vegetation next the water bodies, being extremely sensitive to any changes in the vegetation structure, which may represent the destruction of specific substrates [23,24]. For these reasons are considered as true thermometers of disturbance level and of environmental quality. Therefore, the increase or decline in amphibian populations in certain regions can provides information about the environmental health of biological communities in the region, and help predict the level of degradation that these communities are subjected.

In addition, amphibians are considered true biochemical laboratories, due to the amount of substances they manufacture. The amphibian skin secretions constitutes a set very broad and diverse of substances (biogenic amines, sterols, alkaloids, peptides, and proteins) with different biological activities (myo-, cardio, or neurotoxic, cholinomimetic, sympathomimetic, anesthetic, hemolytic, hallucinogenic, cytotoxic, and antibiotic activities) [25], which can be used for human and veterinary medicine in the treatment of opportunistic infections. The skin secretion produced by amphibians is part of the immune system against pathogens and includes the production and secretion of numerous peptides with antimicrobial activity [26,27].

The first peptides with antimicrobial activity were recorded in 1987, in the study of Zasloff [28], since then, more than 700 new antimicrobial peptides have been isolated and characterized from the skin secretion of several amphibian species. In 2005, for example, six antimicrobial peptides have been isolated from the skin secretions of *Phyllomedusa hypochondrialis* and *P. oreades*, tree frogs typical of the Brazilian Cerrado. These peptides were effective against various bacterial and protozoan pathogens, including *Staphylococcus aureus*, *Escherichia coli*, *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* and *Trypanosoma cruzi* [29]. Recently, eight new peptides were isolated from the skin secretion of *Leptodactylus pustulatus*, a leptodactylid popularly known as "Caçote" [30]. The results show antibacterial activity against bacteria (*E. coli*, *S. aureus*, *Klebsiella pneumoniae* and *Salmonella choleraesuis*) and low activity against human cells, important features for future pharmacological applications [30]. In this context, the research and

---

\*Corresponding author: Etielle B. Andrade, Federal Institute of Education, Science and Technology of Piauí, Campus Paulistana, Piauí, Brazil, Tel: 86 8699313911; E-mail: [etlandrade@hotmail.com](mailto:etlandrade@hotmail.com)

Received December 14, 2015; Accepted December 17, 2015; Published December 25, 2015

Citation: Andrade EB (2015) Amphibians: Why Preserve? Entomol Ornithol Herpetol 5: e114. doi:[10.4172/2161-0983.1000e114](https://doi.org/10.4172/2161-0983.1000e114)

Copyright: © 2015 Andrade EB. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

characterization of new antimicrobial substances from the amphibian skin are quite valuable, especially by the possibility of developing more efficient drugs than those currently found on the market [31].

Besides these, several other utilities can be pointed out and credited to amphibians. Numerous researches in anatomy, muscle physiology, neurology and embryology were only made possible by the use of amphibians as model. However, such information, accumulated over decades, are restricted only to the scientific universe, where a small number of people can access them and use them consciously. In this case, it is fundamental the socialization of scientific knowledge, since the society can only understand the need for biodiversity conservation, especially of the amphibians, when knowing and understanding its real importance for everyone.

## References

1. Ricklefs RE (2010) A economia da natureza. 6<sup>a</sup> Edição. Editora Guanabara Koogan, Rio de Janeiro.
2. Dornelles MF, Marques MGB, Renner MF (2010) Revisão sobre toxinas de Anura (Tetrapoda, Lissamphibia) e suas aplicações biotecnológicas. Cien Moviment 24: 103-117.
3. Lana Pinto LC, Cruz AJR, Pires MRS (2015) Incorporando o conhecimento ecológico local na conservação dos lagartos da Serra do Ouro Branco, Minas Gerais, Brasil. Biosci J 31: 613-622.
4. Ferrier U (2002) Monitorización de anfibios. Reptilia 33: 63-65.
5. Mazerolle MJ (2001) Amphibian activity, movement patterns and body size in fragmented peat bogs. J Herpetol 35: 13-20.
6. Hof C, Araújo MB, Jetz W, Rahbek C (2011) Additive threats from pathogens, climate and land-use change for global amphibian diversity. Nature 480: 516-519.
7. While GM, Uller T (2014) Quo vadis amphibia? Global warming and breeding phenology in frogs, toads and salamanders. Ecography 37: 921-29.
8. Seebacher F, Alford RA (1999) Movement and microhabitat use of a terrestrial amphibian (*Bufo marinus*) on a tropical island: seasonal variation and environmental correlates. J Herpetol 33: 208-214.
9. Summers K (2002) Forests for the frogs, frogs for the forests. Herpetol Review 33: 16-18.
10. Jansen KP, Summers AP, Delis P.R. (2001) Spadefoot toads (*Scaphiopus holbrookii*) in a urban landscape: effects of non-natural substrates on burrowing in adults and juveniles. J Herpetol 35: 141-145.
11. Stebbins RC, Cohen NW (1995) A natural history of amphibians. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.
12. Duellman WE, Trueb L (1994) Biology of amphibians. The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore.
13. Andrade EB, Melo SCA, Cunha JAS (2013) Predation on *Leptodactylus macrosternum* (Anura: Leptodactylidae) by *Botaurus pinnatus* (Pelecaniformes: Ardeidae) in Northeastern Brazil. Herpetol Notes 6: 201-202.
14. Silva FR, Santos RS, Nunes MA, Rossa-Feres DC (2009) Anuran captured in pitfall traps in three agroecosystem in Northwestern São Paulo State, Brazil. Biota Neotrop 9: 253-255.
15. Peltzer PM, Attademo AM, Lajmanovich RC, Junges CM, Beltzer AH, et al. (2010) Trophic dynamics of three sympatric anuran species in a soybean agroecosystem from Santa Fe Province, Argentina. Herpetological J 20: 261-269.
16. Souza FL, Martins FI, Raizer J (2014) Habitat heterogeneity and anuran community of a agroecosystem in the Pantanal of Brazil. Phylomedusa 13: 41-50.
17. Teixeira RL, Ferreira RB, Silva-Soares T, Mageski MM, Pertel, W et al. (2015) Anuran community of a cocoa agroecosystem in southeastern Brazil. Salamandra 51: 259-262.
18. Menin M, Santos RS, Borges RE, Piatti L (2015) Notes on the diet of seven terrestrial frogs in three agroecosystems and forest remnants in Northwestern São Paulo State, Brazil. Herpetol Notes 8: 401-405.
19. Blaustein AR, Hoffman PD, Hokit DG, Kiesecker JM, Walls SC, et al. (1994) UV repair and resistance to solar UV-B in amphibian eggs: a link to population declines? Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 91: 1791-1795.
20. Hodkinson ID, Jackson JK (2005) Terrestrial and aquatic invertebrates as bioindicators for environmental monitoring, with particular reference to mountain ecosystems. Environ Manage 35: 649-666.
21. Hecnar SJ, M'Closkey RT (1996) Amphibian species richness and distribution in relation to pond water chemistry in south-western Ontario, Canada. Freshwater Biol 36: 7-15.
22. Power T, Clark KL, Hernfenist A, Peakall DB (1989) A review and evaluation of the amphibian toxicological literature, Tech Report 61, Ottawa, Canada.
23. Parris KM (2004) Environmental and spatial variables influence the composition of frog assemblages in sub-tropical eastern Australia. Ecography 27: 392-400.
24. Renken RB, Wendy KG, Debra KF, Stephen CR, Timothy JM et al. (2004) Effects of forest management on amphibians and reptiles in Missouri Ozark Forests. Conserv Biol 18: 174-188.
25. Clarke BT (1997) The natural history of amphibian skin secretions, their normal functioning and potential medical applications. Biol Rev Camb Philos Soc 72: 365-379.
26. Conlon J (2004) The therapeutic potential of antimicrobial peptides from frog skin. Rev Microbiol 15:17-25.
27. Apponyi MA, Pukala TL, Brinkworth CS, Maselli VM, Bowie JH et al. (2004) Host-defence peptides of Australian anurans: Structure, mechanisms of action and evolutionary significance. Peptides 25:1035-1054.
28. Zasloff M (1987) Magainins, a class of antimicrobial peptides from *Xenopus* skin: isolation, characterization of two active forms, and partial cDNA sequence of a precursor. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 84: 5449-5453.
29. Leite JR, Silva LP, Rodrigues MI, Prates MV, Brand GD, et al. (2005) Phylloseptins: a novel class of anti-bacterial and anti-protozoan peptides from the Phylomedusa genus. Peptides 26: 565-573.
30. Marani MM, Dourado FS, Quelemes PV, de Araujo AR, Perfeito ML, et al. (2015) Characterization and Biological Activities of Ocellatin Peptides from the Skin Secretion of the Frog *Leptodactylus pustulatus*. J Nat Prod 78: 1495-1504.
31. Gomes A, Giri B, Saha A, Mishra R, Dasgupta SC, et al. (2007) Bioactive molecules from amphibian skin: their biological activities with reference to therapeutic potentials for possible drugs development. Indian J Exp Biol 45: 57.