

Recent trends in the mobulid fishery in Indian waters

Rekha J. Nair*, P.U Zacharia, S. Dinesh Kumar, T.GKishor, N. D. Divya, P.K Seetha, K.S Sobhana
Demersal Fisheries Division, Central Marine Fisheries Research Institute, Kochi-682018 India.

[E-mail: rekhacmfri@gmail.com]

Received 7 November 2013; revised 19 May 2014

Mobulidae are zooplanktivorous elasmobranchs, found circumglobally in tropical, subtropical and temperate coastal waters. It comprises of two recognized species of manta rays (*Manta* spp.) and nine recognized species of devil rays (*Mobulus* spp.). Although the reports of mobulid fishery in India were only from 1960s, however it was commercially exploited only after 2007 for their valuable gillrakers. *Mobuladiabolus*, *M. tarapacana*, *M. japonica*, *M. kuhlii*, *M. thurstoni*, *Manta birostris* and *M. alfredi* are the seven species which contribute to mobulid fishery. White gilled *Mobulatarpacana* is highly targeted for its high priced gill raker which fetches upto Rs. 8,000 kg⁻¹ in dry weight. Few mobulid species has already reached the IUCN Red list status. Thorough monitoring of mobulid fish exploitation level is essential in India. It is necessary to ensure standardized sampling and modelling methodologies to estimate the stock position of these fishes from Indian waters.

[**Keywords:** Mobulids, fishery, gill rakers, exploited, Indian waters.]

Introduction

Mobulids are large sized zooplanktivorous elasmobranchs which are found circumglobally in tropical, subtropical and temperate coastal waters. Mobulids are harmless to human beings, although earlier literature painted them as 'diabolical creatures' and 'ferocious brutes'^{1,2}. Although their existence has been documented since the 17th century³, information on their biology and ecology is scanty⁴.

World over, mobulids are represented by two species of manta rays, *Manta alfredi* (Kreffft, 1868) and *M. birostris* (Walbaum, 1792) and nine species of devil rays, *Mobula eregoodootenkee* (Bleeker, 1859), *M. hypostoma* (Bancroft, 1832), *M. japonica* (Muller and Henle, 1841), *M. kuhlii* (Muller and Henle, 1841), *M. mobular* (Bonnaterre, 1788), *M. munkiana* (Notarbartolo-di-Sciara, 1987), *M. rochebrunei* (Vaillant, 1879), *M. tarapacana* (Philippi, 1892) and *M. thurstoni* (Lloyd, 1908)^{8,9}. Mobulids are highly epipelagic rays that are challenging to observe.

Species identification of mobulids is problematic because of the close external resemblance of many species which has led to taxonomic ambiguities. Till 2009, *Manta* rays were recorded only as *Manta birostris*. With the redescription of *Manta* spp.⁹, a new species *Manta alfredi* was recognized. Misidentification of *Mobulus* spp. is very common even in current literature⁴. This has led to problems in the IUCN assessment of many mobulid species. The 2011 IUCN Red List reassessment has listed the two *Manta* species *Manta birostris* (Walbaum, 1792) and *M. alfredi* (Kreffft, 1868) as globally Vulnerable^{10,11}. Data deficiency status has been given for three *Mobula* species (*Mobula hypostoma*, *M. kuhlii* and *M. tarapacana*),¹²⁻¹⁴ Near Threatened for *M. eregoodootenkee*, *M. japonica*, *M. munkiana* and *M. thurstoni*, Vulnerable for *M. rochebrunei* and Endangered for *M. mobular*¹⁵⁻²⁰.




Figure 1: Landings of *Manta* spp. in west and east coast of India from 2007-2011.

Mobulids were not of much commercial value in fishery till late 2007; however, across the globe, large numbers are being landed in targeted and bycatch fisheries due to increasing demand for mobulid products in the Asian markets^{5,6,7}. Fisheries for mobulids are considered to be unsustainable because of large, directed catches coupled with the very low fecundity, long gestation period⁴. Manta rays bear only one pup on an average every two to three years, which makes them highly vulnerable to overexploitation. They are killed as bycatch and in targeted fisheries throughout the Atlantic, Pacific, and Indian Oceans. In recent years, manta ray fishing has expanded in many places throughout their range, primarily in response to the emerging international market for their gill plates. *Manta* ray gill plates, which are sold in some Asian markets in a tonic with purported health benefits, are the part most valued in international trade, with cartilage and skins of lesser importance. Population depletion for oceanic and reef mantas is high in several regions, with declines by more than 85 percent of the baseline⁵.

Although the presence of these mobulids in Indian waters were reported earlier^{21,22}, with the inclusion of manta rays in CITES Appendix II since May 2013, appropriate record of catch is essential. The present trend for fishing of the mobulids for the highly valuable gill rakers²³ will threaten the status of the mobulids further in the Indian EEZ. In this study we present landing data of mobulids in Indian waters from 1961-2011 to understand trends in fishery and highlight conservation needs.

Materials and Methods

Literature survey was carried out in detail with majority of the literature available through the Central Marine Fisheries Research Institute (CMFRI) website (www.eprints.cmfri.org.in) and published fishery data of CMFRI for the period 1961 - 2013. The published literature was tabulated to get an account of the landings reported from different coasts. Fishery data on rays was also taken from CMFRI website; besides regular weekly field observation was also conducted at Cochin Fisheries Harbour for a one year period to note the ray landing at the Harbour as well as the gill raker trade in practice. Species identification of mobulids and manta rays landed was done using Photoidentification guide of Manta Trust using gill rakers and ventral body markings.

The close resemblances in the external characters of *Mobula* and *Manta* species have proven to be a barrier in the field identification. In majority of cases during the study, the fishes were cut up in the harbour itself and gill rakers removed, meat sold in retail markets. Identification was easier for *Mobula* species using the gill raker plates rather than the body markings. The mobulid *Mobulatarpacana* was locally called "white" due to the white nature of the gills; the other species *Mobula japonica* and *M. thurstoni* was called "black" due to the black

colour of the gill plates. Recently named *Manta alfredi* was easily mistaken for *Manta birostris* except for the black collar like patch around the head. In addition to the species identification, pups of *Mobulajaponica*, *M. tarpacana* and *Manta alfredi* were collected from pregnant females during the study period

Results

Fishery

India along with Indonesia, Sri Lanka comprise the top three manta fishing countries and account for an estimated 90 percent of the world's manta catch and target mantas for their gill plates. Commerce in gill plates is not well-documented, although an estimate of the total volume of the gill plate trade has been produced from an analysis of market surveys in the major manta ray gill plate markets- Guangzhou, Hong Kong, and Macau in China, as well as Singapore, with an estimated 99 percent of the market based in Guangzhou. These surveys estimated the annual volume of gill plate sales as about 21,000 kilograms (46,300 pounds) of dried manta ray gill plates and representing an estimated 4,652 manta rays. Virtually no management exists for the international trade in manta products. (<http://www.pewenvironment.org/news-room/fact-sheets/cites-2013-manta-rays->).

In India, during the period 2007-12 *Mobula* landings on the west coast of India comprising of the states of Gujarat, Maharashtra, Karnataka and Gujarat have increased tremendously from 790 t to 2694 t. Gujarat contributed to over 50 % of the fishery, followed by Kerala. Landings showed an increase of 86 % in 2011 over 2007 on the west coast. Taking a specieswise account, two species namely *Mobuladiabolus* and *Mobulasp* was the major contributors. On the east coast, Tamil Nadu was the major contributor with 86 % share; landings have

shown a decline after 2009. Landings of *Manta* spp. increased on the west coast upto 2010 and showed a slight decline in 2011 (Fig.I). However, landings on the east coast were scarce. The presence of another unidentified *Mobulasp.* is also reported in the catch data. During the year 2012, 75 % of the mobulid landings in Kerala were constituted by *Mobulajaponica*, followed by *M. tarpacana*, *M. diabolus*, *M. birostris* and *M. kuhlii*. (Fig. II)




Figure II: Percentage contribution of different mobulid species to the fishery in Kerala during 2011-2012

Taking a species breakup of the fishery at Kochi during 2011, seven species contributed to the fishery namely *Mobuladiabolus*, *M. tarpacana*, *M. japonica*, *M. kuhlii*, *M. thurstoni*, *Manta birostris* and *M. alfredi*, *Mobula japonica* was the major contributor followed by *M. tarpacana* and contributed to 65 % of the ray fishery. The locations along the Indian coast where *Manta* and *Mobulid* rays landings were reported during the period 1961 - 2013 is shown in Fig.III.




Figure IV: Coastwise occurrence records of mobulids from 1961-2013

In all cases, only one pup was collected from the adult. Length at birth of the pups is given in (Table I).

Table 1: Length at birth of mobulids collected from Kochi, India.

Species	Disc Width (cm)	Total length (cm)	Weight (Kg)	DW of adult (cm)
<i>Manta alfredi</i>	114	112.5	9.8	1500
<i>Mobula japonica</i>	48.5	115	7.8	226
<i>Mobulatarpacana</i>	103		9	320

The adults of *Mobulajaponica* landed had a disc width (WD) of 230 - 238 cm; reports show that females with disc width of 236 cm are mature. *Mobulatarpacana* landed in the fishery had a disc width of 113-327 cm for female fishes and 226 - 248 cm for male fishes; landings were predominantly females; a female of disc width 320 cm had one pup of disc width 103 cm. W_D at maturity for female *M.japonica* is unknown¹⁶, based on the present study, W_D could be 320 cm as pups were not recorded in other fishes landed.

Mobulatarpacana landed at Cochin had a disc width of 112 -322 cm for females and 310 cm for males. Given the W_D for males and females

at maturity for *M. tarpacana* as 234-252 cm for males¹⁶, the fishes caught were mature. The W_D for females at maturity for *M. tarpacana* is unknown¹⁶; however, the fish of W_D 320 cm had a pup of 103 cm. Therefore the W_D for females may be tentatively taken as 320 cm




Figure III: Localities along the Indian coast where *Manta* and Mobulid rays landings were reported during the period 1961-2013

Of the mobulids reported landed from Indian waters, dominance was on the east coast compared to west coast of India (Fig. IV). During the period 1961- 2009, there were 20 reports of *Manta birostris* from Indian waters of which only five were from the west coast. List is not complete as there may be several landings along the coastline which may be unreported. Largest record was a *M. birostris* of disc width 553 cm and weight 2.4t from Tuticorin waters. The largest *Manta birostris* from west coast was of disc width 594 cm and weight 1.4t from Calicut. (Table 2) Length at first maturity of *Manta birostris* reported is 413 cm²³; hence most of the fishes caught were sexually mature. With the low fecundity

of one pup and a probably long gestation period, heavy exploitation of this species will pose a threat to the fishery of this species. Documented records of *Mobuladiabolus* from Indian waters (1961-2013) is given in Table II the list of localities is mentioned²⁵⁻⁴⁸.

In recent years, fishers have been targeting manta and mobula rays with modern fishing gear. The emerging market for dried gill rakers is the primary driver; rays provide a cheap substitute for shark cartilage used in

nutritional supplements⁴⁸. Documentation of the gill rakers trade from India is yet to begin. Statistics are not available; however, liver oil extraction from mobulids was popular in the Lakshadweep islands⁴⁹. Meat of manta and mobulid rays are mostly sold in local markets in Central Kerala in fresh form or as salted chunks. Fresh meat fetches only Rs.150 kg⁻¹.

Table 2: Mobulids landed at different locations in India.

Locality	Year	Disk width (cm)	Length (cm)	Weight (kg)	Sex
<i>Manta birostris</i>					
Saurashtra coast, Veraval ²⁵	28 Dec, 1961	626	359	1000	Female
	15 Mar, 1962	482	248	-	
Veraval ²⁶	26 March 1980	680		2000	Female
Nochikuppam, Madras ²⁷	23 rd Mar, 1981	427	187	750	Female
Karwar ²⁸	1 st Dec, 1987	447	386	800	Female
Tuticorin ²⁹	3 rd May, 1990	554	217	1200	Female
		525	211	1150	Male
Bhidiya, Veraval ³⁰	15 th Feb, 1993	490	286	1350	Unknown
Tuticorin ³¹	29 Mar, 1993	567	302	1375	Female
		570	305	1425	Female
Karwar ³²	16 Sep, 1995	550	300	1200	Female
Honavar ³³	20 Sep, 1995	120	-	-	Female

Tuticorin ³⁴	28 th Apr, 1997	553	224	2400	Female
		542	221		Female
Tuticorin ³⁵	24 th Mar, 2001	576	331	1850	Male
Kelwa-Dandarpada, Maharashtra ³⁶	24 th Sep, 2002	594	417	1500	Female
Tuticorin ³⁷	31 st Mar, 2006	620	370	1550	Female
Chennai ³⁸	15 th Apr, 2006	520	210	1050	Female
	6 th Oct, 2006	520	210	1000	Female
	10 th Oct, 2006	480	-	850	Male
Palk Bay ³⁹	9 th Mar, 2006	165.5	-	42	Unknown
		154	-	10	
Chennai ⁴⁰ (Bumper landings)	10 th & 20 th Feb, 2009	-	-	700-1200	Unknown
Calicut ⁴¹	18 Oct, 2009	594 cm	342	1400	Male
<i>Mobuladiabolus</i>					
Gulf of Mannar ⁴²	20 th July, 1993	235	122	90	Female
		260	138	120	Male
		266	141	125	Male
		266	145	130	Female
Vizhinjam ⁴³	19 th June, 1995	442	192	800	Female
		450	200	850	
	16 Jan, 1997	-	-	700	
	20 th Feb, 1997	396	150	500	
Chennai ⁴⁰ (Bumper landings)	10 th & 20 th Feb, 2009	230-320	-	250-450	Unknown

Ponnani ⁴⁴	23 rd June 2009	492	221	900 Kg	Unknown
Tuticorin ⁴⁵ 36 nos	15 th July, 2009	141-166	-	2486	Unknown
Dummulapeta and Bhairavapalem, Andhra Pradesh ⁴⁶ (23 nos)	21 Mar, 2012 to 23 Mar, 2012	97-163 cm	62-105 cm	40 and 110 kg	Unknown
<i>Mobulajapanica</i>					
CFH, Kerala ⁴⁷	Aug, 2009	310	-	-	Unknown
Tharuvaikulam, Tuticorin ⁴⁸ (10 nos)	13 th Sep, 2013	108-234 cm	-	-	Unknown



Figure V: a. Heavy landings of mobulids at Cochin Harbour, Kerala; b. Gill raker of *Mobulatarpacana*; c. Gillraker of *Manta birostris*; d. Gill raker of *Mobula japonica*

Filter plates of mantas are cut in the landing centres and sorted as “white” and “black”, based on the colour when dried. White filter plates are from *M. tarpacan* whereas black filter plates are from other manta and mobulids (Fig. V). The filter plates are sun dried and sent to Chennai where they are further processed before export. Dried filter plates of *Mobuladiabolus* fetches upto Rs.9,000 kg⁻¹; ‘white’ filter plates fetch upto Rs.8,000 kg⁻¹ dry weight while black fetches upto Rs.2,000 kg⁻¹ dry weight.

Discussion

The recent developments in international market in shark products will only voluminise

References

- Gill T, *The story of the devilfish*. Smithsonian Miscellaneous Collections, No.1816, 52 (1908) 155-180.
- Saenz-Arroyo A, Roberts C M & Torre J, The value of evidence about past abundance: marine fauna of the Gulf of California through the eyes of 16th to 19th century travellers, *Fish Fish.*, 7 (2006) 128–46.
- Willughby F, *De historiapisium* edited by Ray J, (Oxonii., Royal Society) 1686.
- Couturier L I E, Marshall A D, Jaine F R A, Kashiwagi T & Pierce S J, Biology, ecology and conservation of the Mobulidae, *J. Fish Biol.*, 80 (2012) 1075–1119.
- Lack M & Sant G, *Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated Shark Catch: A Review of Current Knowledge and Action*, (Canberra: Department of the Environment, Water; Heritage and the Arts and TRAFFIC Oceania) 2008.
- Lack M & Sant G, *Trends in global shark catch and recent developments in management*, (Cambridge., TRAFFIC International) 2009.
- FAO, Fishstat Capture Production Database 1950-2007, Available at www.fao.org/fishery/statistics/global-capture-production/en. (Accessed August 22, 2013) 2009.
- Compagno, L J V & Last P R, Mobulidae, in: *FAO species identification guide for fishery purposes: The living marine resources of the Western Central Pacific. Volume 3. Batoid fishes, chimaeras and bony fishes part 1 (Elopidae to Linophrynidae)*, edited by K E Carpenter & V H Niem, (FAO, Rome) 1999, pp1524-1529.
- Marshall A D, Compagno L J V & Bennett M B, Redescription of the Genus *Manta* with resurrection of *Manta alfredi* (Krefft, 1868) (Chondrichthyes: Myliobatoidei: Mobulidae), *Zootaxa.*, 2301 (2009) 1-28.
- IUCN, *Manta birostris*, IUCN RedList of Threatened Species. Version 2013.1, Available at <http://www.iucnredlist.org>, (Accessed August 22, 2013).
- IUCN, *Manta alfredi*, IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. Version 2013.1, Available at <http://www.iucnredlist.org>, (Accessed August 22, 2013).
- IUCN, *Mobulahypostoma*, IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. Version 2013.1, Available at <http://www.iucnredlist.org>, (Accessed October 22, 2013).

the trade from India leading to more rampant exploitation of mantas and mobulids. *Mobula japonica*, the highest contributor to the fishery is already under Near Threatened category. *Manta birostris* and *M. alfredi* is under Vulnerable status.¹⁰⁻²⁰ Recent increase in the landings of *M. japonica* will threaten the resource further. Given the slow growth and very low fecundity for these species, it is imperative that more research is carried out on the biology and population characteristics of these fishes to estimate available fishing stock from Indian waters.

Acknowledgements

Authors wish to acknowledge the support and guidance of the Director, CMFRI

13. IUCN, *Mobulakuhlii*, IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. Version 2012.2, Available at <http://www.iucnredlist.org>, (Accessed August 20, 2013).
14. IUCN, *Mobulatarapacana*, IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. Version 2013.1, Available at <http://www.iucnredlist.org>, (Accessed November 01, 2013).
15. IUCN, *Mobulaeregootenkee*, IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. Version 2012. 2, Available at <http://www.iucnredlist.org>, (Accessed August 20, 2013).
16. IUCN, *Mobulajaponica*, IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. Version 2012. 2, Available at <http://www.iucnredlist.org>, (Accessed August 22, 2013).
17. IUCN, *Mobulamunkiana*, IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. Version 2013. 1, Available at <http://www.iucnredlist.org>, (Accessed November 01, 2013).
18. IUCN, *Mobulathurstoni*, IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. Version 2012. 2, Available at <http://www.iucnredlist.org>, (Accessed August 20, 2013).
19. IUCN, *Mobularochebrunei*, IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. Version 2012. 2, Available at <http://www.iucnredlist.org>, (Accessed August 22, 2013).
20. IUCN, *Mobulamobular*, IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. Version 2012. 2, Available at <http://www.iucnredlist.org>, (Accessed August 20, 2013).
21. Day F, *The fishes of India: being a natural history of the fishes known to inhabit the seas and fresh waters of India, Burma, and Ceylon*, (William Dawson & Sons Ltd., London) 1875, Part 1, pp.1-168.
22. Jones S and Kumaran M, *Fishes of the Laccadive archipelago*. (The Nature Conservation and Aquatic Sciences Service) 1980.
23. Rajapackiam S, Mohan S & Rudramurthy N, Utilization of gill rakers of lesser devil ray *Mobuladiabolus* - a new fish byproduct, *Mar. Fish. Infor.Serv. T & E Ser.*, 191(2007) 22-23.
24. Sivaprakasam T E, On the capture of two giant devil rays *Manta birostris* (Walbaum) at Veravel, Saurashtra, *J. Mar. Biol. Ass. India*, 7 (1965) 204-205.
25. Kunjipalu K.K & M R Boopendranath. Note on the catch of a giant ray *Manta birostris* (Walbaum) off veraval, North West coast of India. *Indian J. fish.*, 28(1981) 1-2.
26. James D B, Notes on a giant devil ray, *Manta birostris*(Walbaum), caught off Madras, *Indian J. fish.*, 32 (1985) 492-494.
27. Telang K Y & Harikantra T B, on a large devil ray landed at Karwar, *Mar. Fish. Infor.Serv. T & E Ser.*, 85 (1988)11.
28. Arumugam G, On a giant devil ray *Manta birostris* (Walbaum) landed at Tuticorin fishing harbour, *Mar. Fish. Infor. Serv. T & E Ser.*, 171 (2002) 9.
29. Rajapackiam S, Balasubramanian T S & Arumugam G, On a large Devil ray *Manta birostris* landed at Tuticorin. *Mar. Fish. Infor.Serv. T & E Ser.*, 106 (1990) 11.
30. Koya K P, S Savaria Y D & Vanvi J D, On a giant ray, *Manta birostris* landed at Bhidiya in Veraval, *Mar. Fish. Infor.Serv. T & E Ser.*, 122 (1993) 23.
31. Gurusamy R & Balasubramanian T S, On two large specimens of devil ray *Manta birostris* (Walbaum) landed at Tuticorin, *Mar. Fish. Infor.Serv. T & E Ser.*, 127 (1994) 15.
32. Kakati V S & Dinesh C K, Devil ray landed at Karwar, *Mar. Fish. Infor. Serv. T & E Ser.*, 140 (1995) 9-10.
33. Rajapackiam S, Sundararajan, D & Balasubramanian T S, On two large devil rays landed at Tuticorin, *Mar. Fish. Infor. Serv. T & E Ser.*, 149 (1997) 16.
34. Arumugam G, On a giant devil ray *Manta birostris* (Walbaum) landed at Tuticorin fishing harbor, *Mar. Fish. Infor.Serv. T & E Ser.*, 171 (2002) 9.
35. Rane U H, On a female devil ray *Manta birostris* (Walbaum) entangled in bottom set gill net at Kelwa-Dandarpada, Maharashtra. *Mar. Fish. Infor. Serv. T & E Ser.*, 174 (2002) 14.

36. Arumugam G & Balasubramanian T S., *Manta birostris* landed at Tuticorin, *Mar. Fish. Infor.Serv. T & E Ser.*, 188 (2006) 20.
37. Rajapackiam S, Gomathy S & Jaiganesh P, Devil ray *Manta birostris* landed at Chennai Fishing Harbour, *Mar. Fish. Infor. Serv. T & E Ser.*, 191 (2007) 29-30.
38. Kasinathan C & Sukumaran S, on the landing of giant devil ray *Manta birostris* at Pamban (Palk Bay), *Mar. Fish. Infor.Serv. T & E Ser.*, 188 (2006) 21.
39. CMFRI, Heavy landings of the Giant sized lesser devil ray *Mobuladiabolus* by gillnets at Chennai, *CMFRI Newsletter.*, 120 (2009) 13.
40. Manojkumar P P, Rare landing of devil ray, *Manta birostris*, at Calicut. *CMFRI Newsletter.*, 123 (2009) 9.
41. Rajapackiam S, Balasubramanian T S, Ameer Hamsa K M S & Mohamad Kasim H, On the unusual landings of lesser devil ray *Mobuladiabolus* (Shaw) from Gulf of Mannar, *Mar. Fish. Infor. Serv. T & E Ser.*, 129 (1994) 20-21.
42. Pillai S K, A note on giant devil ray *Mobuladiabolus* caught at Vizhinjam, *Mar. Fish. Infor. Serv. T E Ser.*, 152 (1998) 14-15.
43. Baby K G, A large ray *Mobuladiabolus* landed at Ponnani, *Mar. Fish. Infor.Serv. T & E Ser.*, 206 (2010) 18.
44. Zacharia P U & Kanthan K P, Unusual heavy landing of rays and skates at Tuticorin Fisheries Harbour, *Mar. Fish. Infor.Serv. T & E Ser.*, 205 (2010) 13-15.
45. Satish Kumar M, Uma Mahesh, Rao V, Hanumantha M & Ghosh S, Incidental landing of lesser devil ray *Mobuladiabolus* (Shaw, 1804) at Dummulapeta and Bhairavapalem, Andhra Pradesh, *Mar. Fish. Infor.Serv. T & E Ser.*, 216 (2013) 17-18.
46. CMFRI, Bumper catches of spinetail mobula, *Mobulajaponica* at Cochin fisheries harbour, *CMFRI Newsletter.*, 122 (2009) 9.
47. Sivadas M, Sathakathullah S M, Suresh Kumar K & Kannan K, Unprecedented landing of spine tail devil ray *Mobulajaponica* (Muller & Henle, 1841) at Tharuvaikulam, Tuticorin, *Mar. Fish. Infor. Serv. T & E Ser.*, 217 (2013) 30-31.
48. Raje S G, Sivakami S, Mohanraj G, Manojkumar P P, Raju A & Joshi K K, An atlas on the Elasmobranch fishery resources of India., *CMFRI Special Publication.*, 95 (2007) 1-253.