Article

A Comparative Analysis of Sampling Methods for Aquatic Macroinvertebrates

Christopher E. Orozco González[1,*]

School of Natural Sciences and Technology, Department of Environmental Sciences, Ana G. Méndez University Gurabo Campus, P.O. Box 3030, Gurabo, PR 00778-3030, USA; corozco5@email.uagm.edu

*Correspondence: corozco5@email.uagm.edu

Abstract: Aquatic macroinvertebrates play a crucial role in freshwater ecosystems, serving as reliable indicators of water quality and ecosystem health. To effectively monitor and assess these ecosystems, it is essential to employ appropriate sampling methods that capture the diversity and abundance of macroinvertebrate communities. The objective of this study was to provide a comprehensive overview and comparative analysis of different sampling methods for aquatic macroinvertebrates, highlighting their advantages, limitations, and applicability in ecological research was carried out. The results showed that the most commonly used methods include Kick-net Sampling, Surber Sampler, D-frame Net, Bottle Sampling, and Pitfall Traps. Researchers should select methods based on study goals, environmental conditions, and target organisms. Integrating multiple techniques enhances understanding of macroinvertebrate communities and their responses to environmental changes, contributing to improved assessments of water quality, ecosystem health, and conservation in freshwater ecosystems.

Keywords: aquatic macroinvertebrates; ecology; rivers; sampling methods

1. Introduction

Aquatic macroinvertebrates, encompassing a diverse array of organisms such as insects, crustaceans, mollusks, and annelids, play a crucial role in freshwater ecosystems. They serve as valuable indicators of water quality, contribute to nutrient cycling, and provide a critical food source for higher trophic levels. Aquatic macroinvertebrates are bioindicators that reflect the ecological health of freshwater ecosystems. The presence, abundance, and diversity of these organisms provide insights into the overall water quality, habitat conditions, and ecosystem functioning [1]. These organisms respond to various environmental stressors such as pollution, habitat degradation, and hydrological changes, making them valuable indicators of ecosystem disturbance [2-3].

Monitoring and assessing water quality is essential for the management and conservation of aquatic ecosystems. In recent years, the use of aquatic macroinvertebrates as bioindicators has gained significant attention due to their sensitivity to environmental changes and their integral role in freshwater ecosystems. Aquatic macroinvertebrates exhibit varying degrees of sensitivity to different water-quality parameters. Recent studies have focused on identifying specific indicators and their responses to pollutants, temperature, nutrient enrichment, and habitat degradation. For instance, Johnson et al. [4] demonstrated the sensitivity of mayflies (Ephemeroptera) and stoneflies (Plecoptera) to sediment pollution in a stream ecosystem. Sampling aquatic macroinvertebrates is a fundamental step in ecological research and biomonitoring programs. Over time, various techniques have been developed to efficiently and accurately capture macroinvertebrate communities from freshwater ecosystems [4]. The present study provides a comprehensive overview and comparative analysis of different sampling methods for aquatic macroinvertebrates, highlighting their advantages, limitations, and applicability in ecological research.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202305.2026.v1

2. Methodology

To conduct a literature review on the use of different sampling methods for aquatic macroinvertebrates and highlight their advantages, limitations, and applicability in ecological research, the following methodology was established:

3. Literature Search

An extensive literature search was conducted to identify relevant articles published between 2000 and 2023. Online databases such as PubMed, Web of Science, and Google Scholar were utilized. The search terms included keywords related to aquatic macroinvertebrates, sampling methods, advantages, limitations, and ecological research. The publication date range was set to ensure recent references.

4. Article Selection

The identified articles were screened based on their titles and abstracts to assess their relevance to the research questions. Articles that do not focus on sampling methods for aquatic macroinvertebrates or do not provide information on their advantages, limitations, or applicability were excluded.

5. Data Extraction and Analysis

The selected articles were analyzed and the relevant information regarding the sampling methods was extracted. This included details about the specific sampling methods used, their advantages, limitations, and applicability in ecological research. The extracted information was organized systematically, categorizing the sampling methods, and summarizing their key features, advantages, limitations, and applicability.

6. Results

The most common sampling methods for sampling aquatic macroinvertebrates identified within the reviewed literature were Kick-net Sampling, Surber Sampler, D-frame Net, Bottle Sampling (Grab Sampling), and Pitfall Traps.

7. Kick-Net Sampling

Kick-net sampling is a widely used technique for collecting aquatic macroinvertebrates in freshwater ecosystems. This methodology of sampling uses a net to disturb the streambed, dislodging macroinvertebrates, which are then collected downstream. This method is relatively simple, cost-effective, and suitable for shallow and slow-moving water bodies. However, it may underestimate benthic species present in deeper or faster-flowing habitats [5]. Table 1 shows the Kick-net Sampling method description.

Preprints (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 30 May 2023 doi:10.20944/preprints202305.2026.v1

Table 1. Kick-net Sampling method.

Advantages of Kick-Net Sampling		
Characteristics	Description	Reference
Cost-effective and Practical	A relatively inexpensive and straightforward technique that requires minimal equipment. It is easily accessible and applicable in various aquatic habitats, making it an efficient choice for large-scale ecological studies and routine monitoring programs.	[5,6]
Capture of Benthic Macroinvertebrates	Specifically targets benthic macroinvertebrates inhabiting the substrate of streams and rivers. By dislodging organisms through disturbance and capturing them downstream, the technique provides valuable insights into the composition and abundance of benthic communities.	[5–7]
Non-destructive Sampling	Is a non-destructive method that allows for the collection of macroinvertebrates without causing significant harm to the organisms or their habitats. This feature is particularly important in research focusing on the long-term monitoring and conservation of aquatic ecosystems.	[5–9]
Limitations		
Characteristics	Description	Reference
Selectivity Bias	May exhibit selectivity bias towards larger macroinvertebrates or those with stronger swimming abilities. Smaller and more delicate species, as well as those that prefer the hyporheic zone or interstitial spaces, may be underrepresented in the samples. Researchers should be aware of this limitation and consider complementary sampling methods to capture the entire macroinvertebrate community.	[5–9]
Limited Vertical Sampling	Kick-net sampling primarily targets macroinvertebrates within the water column and the upper layers of the substrate. Species residing in deeper sediment layers or attached to submerged vegetation may be missed.	[5–9]
Applicability in Ecological Research		
Characteristics	Description	Reference
Community Structure and Composition	Allows researchers to assess the taxonomic composition and relative abundance of macroinvertebrate communities.	[5–9]
Biomonitoring and Water Quality Assessment	Provides valuable data for biomonitoring programs aimed at assessing the health and water quality of freshwater ecosystems. Macroinvertebrate metrics, such as the Biological Monitoring Working Party (BMWP) index, derived from kick net samples, can serve as indicators of ecosystem conditions and the impacts of anthropogenic stressors.	[5,7–9]

8. Surber Sampler

The Surber sampler consists of a rectangular frame with a mesh net at the bottom, which is placed on the streambed. This method allows for standardized sampling in both lotic and lentic environments. It provides accurate estimates of macroinvertebrate abundance and is particularly effective for sampling benthic organisms [11]. Table 2 shows the Surber Sampler method description.

Preprints (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 30 May 2023 doi:10.20944/preprints202305.2026.v1

Table 2. Surber Sampler method.

Advantages of Surber Sampler Sampling		
Characteristics	Description	Reference
Standardized Sampling Area	Consists of a square frame with a standardized mesh size, enabling consistent sampling across sites. This standardization allows for accurate comparisons of macroinvertebrate abundance and community composition between different locations, facilitating the assessment of spatial patterns and the effects of environmental gradients.	[11-12]
Quantitative Sampling	Provides a quantitative estimate of macroinvertebrate density and biomass per unit area of the streambed. By collecting macroinvertebrates within a known sampling area, researchers can obtain valuable information on population densities, which is crucial for population dynamics studies and assessing ecosystem health.	[11–13]
Habitat-specific Sampling	The Surber sampler is particularly suitable for collecting macroinvertebrates from benthic habitats, such as stream substrates. It effectively targets organisms associated with these habitats, providing valuable insights into the composition and ecological roles of benthic macroinvertebrate communities.	[11–13]
Limitations of Surber Sampler Sampling		
Characteristics	Description	Reference
Limited Vertical Sampling	Primarily captures macroinvertebrates residing on or near the streambed. Species living in the water column or within deeper sediment layers may be missed. Combining Surber sampler sampling with other techniques, such as kick sampling or hand-picking, can enhance the vertical representation of the macroinvertebrate community.	[11–13]
Selectivity Bias	The Surber sampler may exhibit selectivity bias towards larger and more mobile macroinvertebrates. Smaller or less motile species may be underrepresented in the samples. Researchers should consider complementary sampling methods to ensure a comprehensive assessment of the entire macroinvertebrate community.	[12–14]
Applicability in Ecological Research		
Characteristics	Description	Reference
Impact Assessment	Surber sampler sampling is suitable for assessing the ecological impacts of various stressors, such as pollution or habitat alteration, on macroinvertebrate communities. By comparing samples from impacted and reference sites, researchers can evaluate the effects of human activities and guide conservation efforts.	[12–14]
Long-Term Monitoring	The standardized nature of Surber sampler sampling makes it well-suited for long-term monitoring programs. By consistently applying this method over time, researchers can detect trends in macroinvertebrate communities, identify potential disturbances, and evaluate the success of restoration initiatives.	[12–14]

9. D-Frame Net

The D-frame net is a commonly used method for sampling macroinvertebrates in rivers and streams. It consists of a net attached to a rigid frame shaped like the letter "D." This method allows for the efficient capture of drifting macroinvertebrates and is suitable for estimating species richness and abundance [16]. Table 3 shows the D-frame Net method description.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202305.2026.v1

Table 3. D-frame Net method.

Advantages of D-Frame Net Sampling		
Characteristics	Description	Reference
Versatility and Efficiency	D-frame net sampling is a versatile and efficient technique that can be used in a variety of aquatic habitats, including streams, rivers, and lakes. It allows for the collection of macroinvertebrates from both benthic and pelagic zones, providing a comprehensive picture of the macroinvertebrate community structure and composition.	[16]
Large-Scale Sampling	D-frame net sampling is particularly suitable for large-scale ecological studies and monitoring programs. Its wide mouth and relatively large sampling area enable researchers to collect a substantial volume of water, increasing the chances of capturing a representative sample of the macroinvertebrate community.	[16–18]
Rapid Assessment	Allows for the rapid collection of macroinvertebrates, making it an efficient method for time-constrained projects or situations where frequent sampling is necessary. Its ease of use and quick deployment facilitate the collection of multiple samples across different sites or sampling events.	[16–18]
Limitations of D-Frame Net Sampling		
Characteristics	Description	Reference
Selectivity Bias	May exhibit selectivity bias towards larger and more mobile macroinvertebrates, potentially leading to the underrepresentation of smaller or less motile species. This limitation can be mitigated by combining D-frame net sampling with complementary techniques that target specific microhabitats or taxa of interest.	[18,19]
Disruption of Substrate	During D-frame net sampling, the net is dragged through the water, potentially disturbing the substrate and dislodging macroinvertebrates. This disturbance may alter the behavior and distribution of certain species, affecting the accuracy of community assessments. Care should be taken to minimize substrate disruption during sampling.	[18,19]
Applicability in Ecological Research		
Characteristics	Description	Reference
Community Structure and Composition	Provides valuable information on the taxonomic composition and relative abundance of macroinvertebrate communities. By comparing samples across different habitats or assessing temporal variations, researchers can study the effects of environmental factors, such as pollution or habitat alteration, on community structure and ecological integrity.	[18,19]
Trophic Interactions and Food Webs	Allows for the collection of macroinvertebrates that serve as prey for other organisms. By examining the trophic interactions and food webs within aquatic ecosystems, researchers can gain insights into the functioning and dynamics of these complex systems.	[18,19]

10. Bottle Sampling (Grab Sampling)

Bottle sampling involves collecting macroinvertebrates by directly scooping water and sediment from the sampling site using a container or bottle. This method is quick, easy to implement, and suitable for both lotic and lentic habitats. However, it may result in biased samples due to the limited capture of benthic organisms and the disturbance of sediments [20]. Table 4 shows the Bottle Sampling (Grab Sampling) method description.

Preprints (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 30 May 2023 doi:10.20944/preprints202305.2026.v1

Table 4. Bottle Sampling (Grab Sampling) method.

Advantages of Bottle Sampling		
Characteristics	Description	Reference
Ease of Use	Bottle sampling is a simple and straightforward method that requires minimal equipment and training. Researchers can easily collect samples by submerging a container or bottle into the water column or near the streambed, allowing for efficient and rapid sampling.	[20,21]
Spatial Coverage	Enables researchers to collect macroinvertebrate samples from various aquatic habitats, including open water, littoral zones, and benthic substrates. It provides a broad spatial coverage, allowing for the assessment of macroinvertebrate distribution patterns and community composition across different habitats within a water body.	[20,21]
High Replicability	Grab sampling allows for the collection of multiple replicate samples from the same location or different sites, providing the opportunity for statistical replication. This enhances the reliability and robustness of data analysis and supports the examination of spatial and temporal variations in macroinvertebrate communities.	[22–24]
Limitations of Bottle Sampling		
Characteristics	Description	Reference
Selectivity Bias	May exhibit selectivity bias, favoring larger and more mobile macroinvertebrates while potentially missing smaller or less mobile species. This bias can impact the accuracy of community assessments, and researchers should consider complementary sampling techniques to ensure a comprehensive representation of the macroinvertebrate community.	[22–24]
Lack of Vertical Resolution	Primarily captures macroinvertebrates in the water column or near the streambed, resulting in limited vertical resolution. Species inhabiting deeper sediment layers or those associated with specific microhabitats may be underrepresented. Integration of bottle sampling with other techniques, such as sediment coring or hand-picking, can help address this limitation.	[22–24]
Applicability in Ecological Research		
Characteristics	Description	Reference
Baseline Surveys	Bottle sampling is valuable for conducting baseline surveys and assessing the initial status of macroinvertebrate communities in aquatic ecosystems. It provides important baseline data for future comparisons and allows for the detection of early changes or disturbances in community structure.	[22–24]
Habitat Characterization	By using bottle sampling across different habitat types within a water body, researchers can characterize the macroinvertebrate communities associated with specific habitats, such as littoral zones, submerged vegetation, or open water. This information contributes to understanding habitat preferences, ecological roles, and interactions within the ecosystem.	[22–24]

11. Pitfall Traps

Pitfall traps consist of containers buried in the ground, with their openings flush with the surface. They capture macroinvertebrates that fall into the trap while moving along the ground or in vegetation near aquatic ecosystems. This method is effective for sampling terrestrial and semi-aquatic macroinvertebrates, such as beetles or spiders. However, it may not capture species exclusively associated with aquatic habitats. Pitfall traps are widely used in terrestrial ecology to capture small

Preprints (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 30 May 2023 doi:10.20944/preprints202305.2026.v1

ground-dwelling organisms, but they can also be adapted for aquatic environments to sample aquatic macroinvertebrates [25]. Table 5 shows the Pitfall Traps method description.

Table 5. Pitfall Traps method.

Advantages of Pitfall Traps		
Characteristics	Description	Reference
Passive Sampling	Provide a passive sampling method that allows for the continuous collection of aquatic macroinvertebrates over extended periods. This eliminates observer bias and reduces the disturbance caused by active sampling methods.	[25]
High Capture Efficiency	Pitfall traps are effective in capturing a wide range of aquatic macroinvertebrates, including ground-dwelling species, larvae, and small crustaceans. They can provide a comprehensive snapshot of the macroinvertebrate community in a specific habitat or ecosystem.	[25]
Minimal Habitat Disturbance	Require minimal disturbance to the surrounding habitat, making them suitable for studies focused on assessing the natural distribution and abundance of macroinvertebrates. The traps can be strategically placed to target specific habitats or microhabitats within aquatic systems.	[26,27]
Limitations of Pitfall Traps		
Characteristics	Description	Reference
Habitat Specificity	Pitfall traps are best suited for capturing macroinvertebrates in habitats with high species richness and abundant ground-dwelling organisms, such as marshes, wetlands, or riparian zones. In open water or fast-flowing streams, the effectiveness of pitfall traps may be limited.	[26,28,29]
Size Selectivity	May exhibit size selectivity, favoring larger macroinvertebrates while capturing smaller organisms less efficiently. This bias should be considered when analyzing and interpreting data obtained from pitfall trap samples.	[28,29]
Incomplete Representation	May not capture all aquatic macroinvertebrate species present in each ecosystem. Some species may have specific behaviors or habitats that make them less likely to encounter and fall into the traps. Supplementing pitfall trap data with other sampling methods can help overcome this limitation.	[28,29]
Applicability in Ecological Research		
Characteristics	Description	Reference
Habitat Assessment	Can be used to assess the macroinvertebrate community structure and composition in specific habitats or microhabitats within aquatic ecosystems. This information is valuable for understanding species distribution patterns, habitat preferences, and ecological interactions.	[28,29]
Biodiversity Studies	Provide a means to assess macroinvertebrate biodiversity in different aquatic habitats. Comparisons between sites or over time can help identify biodiversity hotspots, evaluate the impact of environmental changes, and guide conservation efforts.	[28,29]

12. Conclusions

A systematic literature review on the use of different sampling methods for aquatic macroinvertebrates provides valuable insights into their advantages, limitations, and applicability in ecological research. By following the outlined methodology and selecting recent references, researchers can gain a comprehensive understanding of the available sampling methods and make informed decisions when selecting the most suitable method for their specific research objectives. Sampling methods for aquatic macroinvertebrates vary in their strengths, limitations, and

applicability to different habitats and research objectives. The most common sampling methods for sampling aquatic macroinvertebrates identified within the reviewed literature were Kick-net Sampling, Surber Sampler, D-frame Net, Bottle Sampling (Grab Sampling), and Pitfall Traps. Researchers should carefully select appropriate methods based on the specific study goals, environmental conditions, and target organisms. Integrating multiple sampling techniques can provide a more comprehensive understanding of macroinvertebrate communities and their responses to environmental changes. Continued advancements in sampling methodologies will contribute to improved assessments of water quality, ecosystem health, and conservation efforts in freshwater ecosystems.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Institutional Review Board Statement: Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement: Not applicable.

Data Availability Statement: Not applicable.

Conflicts of Interest: The author declares no conflict of interest.

References

1. Merritt, R.W.; Cummins, K.W.; Berg, M.B. *An Introduction to the Aquatic Insects of North America*; Kendall Hunt Publishing Company: Dubuque, ID, USA, 2008.
2. Hanson, P.; Springer, M.; Ramírez, A. Introducción a los grupos de macroinvertebrados acuáticos. *Rev. Biol. Trop.* **2010**, *58*, 3–37.
3. Hauer, R.; Resh, V.H. Macroinvertebrates. *Methods Stream Ecol.* **2017**, *1*, 97–319.
4. Johnson, B.R.; Pringle, C.M.; Wares, J.P. Sediment pollution influences the thermal physiology of aquatic insects. *Freshw. Sci.* **2019**, *38*, 320–328.
5. Barbour, M.T.; Gerritsen, J.; Snyder, B.D.; Stribling, J.B. *Rapid Bioassessment Protocols for Use in Streams and Wadeable Rivers: Periphyton, Benthic Macroinvertebrates, and Fish*, 2nd ed.; Environmental Protection Agency: Washington, DC, USA, 1999.
6. Mackay, R.J.; Wiggins, G.B. *Ecology and Classification of North American Freshwater Invertebrates*, 2nd ed.; Academic Press: Cambridge, MA, USA, 2000.
7. Resh, V.H.; Rosenberg, D.M. (Eds.) *The Freshwater Imperative: A Research Agenda*; Island Press: Washington, DC, USA, 2018.
8. Smith, K.G.; Schiff, H.; Lawrence, J.E. The state of macroinvertebrate-based water quality assessment: Past, present, and future. *Front. Environ. Sci.* **2019**, *7*, 185.
9. Voshell, J.R., Jr. *A Guide to Common Freshwater Invertebrates of North America*, 2nd ed.; The University of California Press: Oakland, CA, USA, 2019.
10. Fenoglio, S.; Bo, T.; Mari, E. Benthic macroinvertebrates as bioindicators of water quality in mountain streams of the Italian western Alps. *Ecol. Indic.* **2012**, *18*, 282–289.
11. Monteiro-Junior, C.S.; Callisto, M. Intraspecific trait variation and functional diversity: a case study with Neotropical caddisflies. *Freshw. Sci.* **2018**, *37*, 296–308.
12. Stewart, T.W.; Dodds, W.K.; Mollenhauer, R.; Strauss, E.A.; Tank, J.L. Quantifying macroinvertebrate responses to in-stream habitat restoration: applications of meta-analysis to river restoration. *J. Appl. Ecol.* **2011**, *48*, 766–776.
13. Vinson, M.R.; Hawkins, C.P.; Muehlbauer, J.D. Metacommunity structure, and benthic stream insects: patterns, processes, and prospects. *J. North Am. Benthol. Soc.* **2005**, *24*, 516–535.
14. Bini, L.M.; Oliveira, L.G.; Thomaz, S.M.; Murphy, K.J.; Camargo, A.F.M. Aquatic macroinvertebrate diversity in the Neotropics: the case of South America. *Hydrobiologia* **2013**, *701*, 1–14.
15. Cressa, C.; Encalada, A.C.; Boyero, L.; Cornejo, A. Effects of pollution on the structure and function of tropical stream ecosystems. *Freshw. Biol.* **2017**, *62*, 67–78.
16. Murphy, K.J.; Resh, V.H. Conservation of stream fauna. In *Conservation and Management of Freshwater Habitats: Streams in a Changing Environment*; Nielsen, J.L., Osenberg, G.M., Boggs, J.E., Eds.; Island Press: Washington, DC, USA, 2002; pp. 117–146.
17. Baptista, D.F.; Buss, D.F.; Nessimian, J.L. Influence of land use on benthic macroinvertebrate assemblages in a mountain river of the Atlantic Forest domain (SE Brazil). *Hydrobiologia* **2006**, *5561*, 261–272.
18. Czerniawska-Kusza, I.; Obolewski, K. The impact of agriculture on the macroinvertebrate communities of small rivers. *Pol. J. Environ. Stud.* **2012**, *21*, 961–971.
19. Dolédec, S.; Statzner, B.; Bournard, M.; Bagella, S. Relative influence of river bottom and floodplain on benthic macroinvertebrate communities at local and regional scales. *Freshw. Biol.* **2007**, *52*, 843–857.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202305.2026.v1

20. Lecerf, A.; Risnoveanu, G.; Popescu, C.; Gessner, M.O.; Chauvet, E.; Bärlocher, F. Decomposition of diverse litter mixtures in streams. *Ecology* **2007**, *88*, 219–227.
21. Pons, V.; Dolédec, S.; Dolédec, A.; Compin, A. A new and simple sampler for collecting microcrustaceans from vegetated freshwater habitats. *Hydrobiologia* **2016**, *775*, 119–128.
22. Báez, M.; Boyero, L.; Pearson, R.G. Assessing the utility of freshwater invertebrates as environmental indicators in tropical streams. *Ecol. Indic.* **2011**, *11*, 588–594.
23. Buss, D.F.; Carlisle, D.M.; Chon, T.S. Macroinvertebrate assemblage responses to habitat gradients in the lower Colorado River basin, USA. *Freshw. Sci.* **2016**, *35*, 1185–1196.
24. Cardoso, P.; Erwin, T.L.; Borges, P.A.; New, T.R. The seven impediments in invertebrate conservation and how to overcome them. *Biol. Conserv.* **2011**, *144*, 2647–2655.
25. Miserendino, M.L.; Di Prinzio, C.Y.; Casaux, R. Sampling methods for macroinvertebrates in lowland Patagonian rivers with different substrata. *Fundam. Appl. Limnol. Arch. Hydrobiol.* **2006**, *167*, 417–429.
26. Richardson, J.S.; Zhang, Y.; Marczak, L.B. Resource subsidies across the land–freshwater interface and responses in recipient communities. *River Res. Appl.* **2010**, *26*, 55–66.