# EFFECT OF PROTEIN LEVEL AND STOCKING DENSITY ON GROWTH PERFORMANCE, SURVIVAL RATE, FEED UTILIZATION AND BODY COMPOSITION OF NILE TILAPIA

FRY (Oreochromis niloticus L.)

Yassir A. E. Khattab<sup>1</sup>, Mohsen Abdel-Tawwab<sup>2</sup> and Mohammad H. Ahmad<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Fish Nutrition Department, Central Laboratory for Aquaculture Research, Abbassa, Abo-Hammad, Sharkia, Egypt

<sup>2</sup>Fish Ecology Department, Central Laboratory for Aquaculture Research, Abbassa, Abo-Hammad, Sharkia, Egypt

#### **Abstract**

This study was carried out to evaluate the growth response of Nile tilapia; *O. niloticus* L. to dietary protein levels at two stocking densities. This study was bifactorial designed (3 protein levels  $\times$  2 stocking densities). Fish (1.8-2.5 g/fish) was randomly distributed into the aquaria at a rate of 15 or 30 fish/100 L. The temperature was adjusted at  $27\pm1^{\circ}$ C. Fish of each density were fed either a diet containing 25%, 35% or 45% CP with a feeding rate of 4% of life body weight twice daily for 5 days a week for 70 days.

The results showed that final body weight, percent weight gain, and specific growth rate (SGR) were positively affected by protein level and inversely affected by stocking density, but not affected by their interaction. Condition factor was significantly affected only by dietary protein levels (P<0.05), while survival rate was not significantly by protein levels or stocking densities. The maximum growth was obtained with 45% CP at low density (10.1 g/fish) whereas the lowest growth was obtained in 25% CP at high density (6.4 g/fish). On the other hand, the reduced growth at high density could be recovered by increasing the dietary protein level.

Feed intake increased significantly with increasing dietary protein level only (P<0.01). Feed conversion ratio (FCR), protein efficiency ratio (PER) and protein productive value (PPV) were significantly affected by protein level and stocking density (P<0.01). The best FCR was obtained with 45% protein diet at low density (1.72) and with 35% under low density (1.81) with insignificant difference (P>0.05). The highest values of PER and PPV were obtained with 25% CP at low (1.913 and 30.54%, respectively) and high density (1.720 and 26.64%, respectively) with significant difference (P<0.01).

Moisture was significantly affected by protein level only (P<0.05), while crude protein, total lipids and ash were significantly affected by protein level and stocking density. The highest protein content in fish body was obtained with 45% CP at low and high densities (58.0% and 57.9%, respectively; P>0.05). The highest content of body lipids was observed

in fish fed 25% protein diet at low and high densities (32.8 and 31.0%, respectively; P>0.05). Significant difference in carcass ash between low and high density of fish was observed (15.6% and 16.8%, respectively; P<0.05). The lowest carcass ash contents were obtained in fish fed 25% protein diet at low and high density with 13.0% and 13.9%, respectively. The difference in the low carcass ash content, however, was not significant (P>0.05).

#### Introduction

Tilapias are one of the most important fish species for aquaculture all over the world (El-Sayed, 1999) and represent the species of choice due to its high growth rate, significant tolerance to environmental stress, ease in reproduction, and its unquestionable market demand. Nile tilapia (*Oreochromis niloticus*), in particular is widely accepted to Egyptian consumers.

Intensification of tilapia culture is a good solution for increasing fish production, and to optimize fish intensification, both feed quality and stocking density should be considered. Addition of artificial feeds plays an important role especially under conditions of heavy stocking, when natural feed supply has declined or completely disappeared. The added feeds should be rich in protein, carbohydrate and fats, and should also contain vitamins, minerals and growth-promoting substances to be physiologically balanced (Huisman *et al.*, 1979). Fish malnutrition would reduce growth performance and may cause disease or even death (Lovell, 1989). So, it is essential to develop suitable feeds to be used either as a supplementary diet in pond or as a complete diet in tanks.

Protein is the most critical and/or costly ingredient in tilapia feeds where protein sources represent about 60% or more of the cost of fish feeds. Thus, optimal utilization of dietary proteins is essential for economical production (Andrews, 1977). The level of dietary protein producing maximum growth of tilapia depends upon the protein quality, energy content of the diet, the physiological state of the fish, age, reproductive state, and the environmental factors such as temperature, salinity, etc. (Lovell, 1989).

In aquaculture, fish size and production determine the price of fish, which in turn depends on the growth. Subsequently, control of size and production are two important tasks to meet the market demands, and increasing the stocking density is a way of dealing with problem of land shortage and increasing fish intensification. Stocking density is an important factor to take into account when ranking families or progeny groups for growth performance. In many cultivated fish species, growth is inversely related to stocking density and this is mainly attributed to social interactions (Holm *et al.*, 1990; Haylor, 1991; Miao, 1992; Huang and Chiu, 1997; Canario *et al.*, 1998; Irwin *et al.*, 1999; Silva *et al.*, 2000). However, social interactions through competition for food and/or space can negatively affect fish growth. On the other hand, the price of fish is determined by the market demand of supply (size and production), that in turn depends on their growth. Papst *et al.* (1992) suggested that in intensive aquaculture the stocking density is an important factor that determines the economic viability of the production system.

A close relationship has been found between stoking density, growth of African catfish *Clarias gariepinus* (Burchell) fry (Haylor, 1991) and redtail shrimp *Penaeus penicillatus* (Alock) (Miao, 1992). Moreover, Wallace *et al.* (1988) cleared that high density culture reduced size variation in the early stage of Arctic charr (*Salvelinus alpinus* (Linnaeus), but Papst *et al.*, (1992) recorded that density had no effect on the size (weight) variation in juvenile Arctic charr. The objective of this study was to evaluate the effects of protein levels at two stocking densities on growth performance, survival rate, feed utilization and body composition of Nile tilapia fry (*O. niloticus* L.).

#### Materials and methods

This study was carried out at the Central Laboratory for Aquaculture Research, Abbassa, Abo-Hammad, Sharkia Governorate, Egypt. Nile tilapia (*O. niloticus* L.) was collected from Abbassa Hatchery, General Authority for Fish Resources Development. Fish size was 1.8-2.5 g/fish; the batch of fish was kept in indoor trough tanks for two weeks as an acclimatization period. Fish were fed on a commercial diet containing 25% protein during the acclimatization period. Fifty fish were frozen at -20 °C for analysis of body chemical composition.

This study was bifactorial designed (3 protein levels × 2 stocking densities). Fish with mixed sex were graded and randomly distributed into the aquaria at two stocking densities (15 and 30 fish/aquarium, respectively). Each aquarium contained 100 L of well-aerated tap water. Each aquarium was supplied with compressed air from air pump via air stones. The temperature was adjusted at 27±1°C by using thermostatically controlled heaters. Aquaria of each density were fed either a diet containing 25%, 35% or 45% CP with a feeding rate of 4% of live body weight twice daily for 5 days a week for 70 days. Three aquaria were assigned for each protein level treatment within each fish stocking density. Feed formulation and chemical composition of each diet are presented in Table 1. Fish faeces of each aquarium were removed daily by siphoning about 50% of water volume of each aquarium and replaced by well-aerated tap water. Dead fish were removed and recorded daily. Fish in each aquarium was biweekly weighed and subsequently the amount of the given feed was calculated.

At the end of experiment, fish were removed, counted and weighed. Different growth parameters and parameters of feed calculated as described by Ahmad (2000). Five fishes from each aquarium were taken to carry out chemical analysis of the fish body. Chemical analysis of feed ingredients, experimental diets and fish carcasses were carried out according to the methods of AOAC (1990). Moisture was determined by drying oven at 85°C until fixed weight. Crude protein was determined by Kjeldahl method (total nitrogen x 6.25). Total lipids (ether extract) were determined by Soxhlet extraction method using petroleum ether for 16 hrs. Ash was determined by ashing the samples in muffle furnace at 550°C for 6 hrs. Crude fiber was estimated according to Goering and Van Soest (1970). Growth energy of diet and fish carcass was estimated according to NRC (1993).

Data of growth performance, survival rate, feed utilization and chemical composition of fish body were subjected to two-way ANOVA according to Snedecor and Cochran (1982). Differences between means were done using Duncan's new multiple range tests (Duncan, 1955).

#### Results

The different growth parameters (final body weight, weight gain, percent weight gain, specific growth rate (SGR) of Nile tilapia (*O. niloticus*) fed with 25, 35 or 45% protein diets at low and high densities are shown in Table 2. The results showed that the different growth parameters were significantly affected by protein level and stocking density (P<0.05), but not their interaction. Condition factor was significantly affected only by dietary protein levels (P<0.05). Survival rate was not significantly affected by protein level or stocking density (Table 2).

It was also noticed that fish growth was positively affected by protein level and inversely affected by stocking density. The maximum growth was obtained in 45% CP at low density (10.1 g/fish) whereas the lowest growth was obtained in 25% CP at high density (6.4 g/fish). On the other hand, the reduced growth under high density could be recovered by increasing the protein level. The weight gain of Nile tilapia at high density fed with 45% protein diet and that at low density fed with 35% protein diet was approximately the same (7.0 and 6.8 g/fish, respectively). Similarly, Nile tilapia at high density fed 35% protein diet gave the same weight gain (5.5 g) to that obtained by low density with 25% protein diet (4.9 g).

Results of feed intake, feed conversion ratio (FCR), protein efficiency ratio (PER) and protein productive value (PPV) of Nile tilapia (*O. niloticus*) fed different protein levels at both densities are shown in Table 3. Feed intake increased significantly with increasing dietary protein level (P<0.01), but not differ significantly at both stocking densities. Meanwhile, FCR, PER and PPV were significantly affected by protein level and stocking density (P<0.01). The best FCR was obtained in 45% protein diet at low density (1.72) and in 35% under low density (1.81) with insignificant difference (P>0.01). The poorest FCR was obtained in 25% protein diet at low and high density (2.25 and 2.46, respectively). PER and PPV decreased with increasing protein level and stocking densities. The highest values of PER and PPV were obtained in 25% CP at low (1.913 and 30.54%, respectively) and high density (1.720 and 26.64%, respectively) with significant difference (P<0.05). The lowest values of PER and PPV were obtained in diet containing 45% CP at low and high density (1.340 and 1.25 for PER and 20.88% and 19.82% for PPV, respectively) with insignificant difference (P>0.05).

Results of the chemical composition of whole body fish are shown in Table 4. Moisture was significantly affected by protein level only (P<0.05) but not by stocking density. Other chemical components (crude protein, total lipids and ash) were significantly affected by protein level and stocking density. The highest protein content in fish body was obtained in 45% CP at low and high density (58.0% and 57.9%, respectively; P>0.05), while

the lowest one was obtained in 25% CP at low and high density (54.34% and 55.0%, respectively; P>0.05). Carcass total lipids content decreased with increasing dietary protein level. The highest content of body lipids was observed in fish fed 25% protein diet at low and high density (32.8 and 31.0%, respectively; P>0.05), while the lowest one was obtained in fish fed 45% protein diet at low and high density (26.3 and 25.2%, respectively; P>0.05). The highest content of carcass ash was noticed in fish fed 45% protein diet at low and high density with significant difference (15.6% and 16.8%, respectively; P<0.05). Meanwhile, the lowest ones were obtained in fish fed 25% protein diet at low and high density with insignificant difference (13.0% and 13.9%, respectively; P>0.05).

#### **Discussion**

The amount of researches concerning different tilapia species increased significantly in the last years, including many areas of interest for aquaculture because of the high importance of tilapias all over the world. The stocking density and the optimum protein level still attract the attention of researchers because these factors are aim at higher profit, but without significant losses in growth ratio and environmental quality. Furthermore, the growth of tilapia depends upon the stocking density, dietary protein quality, energy content of the diet, the physiological status of the fish, age, reproductive state, and the environmental factors such as temperature, salinity, etc. (Lovell, 1989).

It is important to take fish density into account when ranking families or progeny groups for growth performance where fish density is an important factor affecting growth and maturation of wild and laboratory fish, besides food supply and its quality, genetics and environmental conditions (Smith *et al.*, 1978). Also, fish density could affect the efficiency of food utilization where the number of fish stocked in a pond increases the amount of feed available to each fish decreases (Chang, 1988).

In this study, there was significant reduction in growth (P<0.05) with increasing stocking density in all protein levels. This result is in agreement with Huang and Chiu (1997) who studied the effects of stocking density (0.1, 0.2, 0.4, 1.6 and 3.2 fry/L) for fry Nile tilapia, and found that the fish size and production were found to be significantly affected by stocking density. Also, Canario et al. (1998) studied the effect of stocking density (0.35, 1.3 and 3.2 kg/m<sup>3</sup>) on the growth of gilthead sea-bream, Sparus aurata, and found that fish in the highest density group grew 25% slower than fish in the lowest density group. Irwin et al. (1999) studied the effect of stocking density (0.7, 1.1, 1.5 and 1.8 kg/m<sup>2</sup>) on the growth of turbot, Scophthalmus maximus for 45 days, and found that stocking density inversely affect growth rate and mean weights. Silva et al. (2000) also studied the effect of stocking density (2, 3 and 4 kg/m<sup>3</sup>) on the growth of tetra-hybrid red tilapia, and found that final body weight gain was significantly higher at density of 2 and 3 kg/m<sup>3</sup>, while the biggest biomass and feed consumption were observed at density of 4 kg/m<sup>3</sup>. Moreover, other fish species showed an inverse relationship between stocking density and growth parameters, which were considered as the density dependent category, such as the cases found for Chinook salmon *Oncorhynchus tshawytscha* (Walbaum) (Martin and Wertheimer, 1989), Nile tilapia *O. niloticus* (Siddiqui *et al.*, 1989; Rosa *et al.*, 1990), African catfish (Haylor, 1991) and Arctic charr, *Salvelinus alpinus* (JØrgensen *et al.*, 1993).

In this study, the condition factor and survival rates were not affected significantly with stocking density because the stocking density here was below the critical level of density, however, fish is small sized and there was no competition for space. Also, Huang and Chiu (1997) found that condition factor and survival rate did not affect significantly by stocking density. Moreover, the high survival rate of Nile tilapia at high density indicates to its amenability to the intensive culture practice.

It was noticed that, the reduced growth can be recovered by increasing dietary protein level. Fish require diets relatively high in protein content because of their poor utilization of carbohydrates as energy source, thus sufficient supply of dietary protein is needed for rapid growth (Lovell, 1989). This result is reasonable and is in agreement with other authors. Tacon (1987) found out that dietary protein levels of 42% for fry and 35% for growing adult fish appeared to be the best. Moreover, El-Sayed and Teshima (1991) reported that the dietary protein requirements of several species of tilapia have been estimated to range from 20 to 56%. Also, Al-Hafedh (1999) found that the better growth rate of Nile tilapia was obtained at high dietary protein levels (40-45%) rather than 25 - 35% protein. On the other hand, Abdelghany (2000) and Khattab *et al.* (2000) found that, the optimum dietary protein level for Nile tilapia was 35% and 37%, respectively.

In this study, feed intake was significantly affected by protein level, but not affected by stocking density. JØrgensen *et al.* (1993) found that daily feed intake of Arctic charr (*Salvelinus alpinus*) at stocking densities of 100 and 200 fish/m³ was not to be significantly differed. In this study, FCR decreased significantly (P<0.05) under low stocking density than high stocking density and the best FCR for Nile tilapia was obtained with 45% protein diet under low density. This result is in agreement with those obtained by Jauncey (1982), Ofojekwu and Ejike (1984) and De Silva and Perera (1985) who reported that FCR decreased with increasing dietary protein level. In this study PER and PPV were affected by dietary protein level and stocking density where their higher values were obtain under low density than high density. Dabrowski (1979) and De-Silva *et al.* (1989) found that PER decreased with increasing dietary protein content.

On the contrary, McGeachin *et al.* (1987) reported that growth of *O. aureus* (21.2 g average weight) fed a 36% protein diet in marine cages with stocking densities of up to 300/m³ were not affected. Also, Siddiqui *et al.* (1989) reported that no difference in growth or FCR of *O. niloticus* (40.3 g average weight) reared in brackish water (3.5 - 3.9 ppt) tank for 164 days and fed on a 34% protein diet at densities of 16, 32 and 42.6 fish/m³.

On the other hand, Watanabe *et al.* (1990) showed that, the growth and feed conversion of Florida red tilapia fed two protein levels (28 and 32%) did not differ at densities ranging from 100 to 300/m<sup>3</sup>. Also, they found out that final mean weight, daily weight gain, specific growth rate and survival rate were higher and FCR was lower in fish fed the 28% protein diet than those fed the 32% protein diet under all densities. Omar *et al.* (1997) found that growth performance of Nile tilapia fingerlings fed with 30 and 40% crude

protein and stocking densities (10, 30 and 40 fish/105 L) were significantly reduced at higher dietary protein level and stocking densities, feed and nutrient efficiency was also significantly reduced at higher dietary protein and stocking densities. These results clearly showed that fish growth was best at the lowest stocking density and low dietary protein level tested.

Results in this study revealed that the reduced growth at high stocking density might be recovered by increasing the dietary protein level for Nile tilapia fry. The optimum dietary protein is 45% for intensive fish farming in Egypt where it realized the optimum growth and feed utilization

#### References

- Abdelghany, A.E. 2000. Optimum dietary protein requirements for *Oreochromis niloticus* L. fry using formulated semi-purified diets. pp. 101-108. *In*: K. Fitzsimmons and J.C. Filho (eds.). Tilapia Aquaculture in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century. Proceedings from the 5<sup>th</sup> International Symposium on Tilapia Aquaculture. Vol. 1. 3-7 Sept. 2000, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.
- Ahmad, M.H. 2000. Improve Productive Performance in Fish. Ph.D. Dissertation, Animal Prod. Depart., Faculty of Agriculture, Zagazig University.
- Al-Hafedh, Y.S. 1999. Effects of dietary protein on growth and body composition of Nile tilapia, *Oreochromis niloticus* L. Aquacult. Res., 30(5): 385-393.
- Andrews, J.W. 1977. Protein requirements. *In:* Regional Research Project. Catfish Production. Alabama Agricultural Experiment Station, University of Auburn, Al., USA, pp. 10-13.
- A.O.A.C. 1990. Official Methods of Analyses. 15th edition. *In:* K. Helrich (ed.). Association of Official Analytical Chemists, Inc., Arlington, VA, USA.
- Canario, A.V.M., Condeça, J., Power, D.M. and Ingleton, P.M. 1998. The effect of stocking density on growth in gilthead sea-bream, *Sparus aurata* (L.). Aquacult. Res., 29: 177-181.
- Chang, W.Y.B. 1988. Fish production: Data synthesis and model development. pp. 41-49. *In:* Pond Dynamics/Aquaculture Collaborative Research Support Program. 6<sup>th</sup>
  Annual Administrative Report, Oregon State University, Oregon, USA.
- Dabrowski, K. 1979. Feeding requirements of fish with particular attention to common carp, a review. Polish Arch. Hydrobiol., 26: 135-158.
- De Silva, S.S., Gunasekera, R.M. and Atapattu, D. 1989. The dietary protein requirements of young tilapia and an evaluation of the least cost of dietary protein levels. Aquaculture, 80: 271-284.
- De Silva, S.S. and Perera, M.K. 1985. Effects of dietary protein levels on growth, food conversion and protein use in young *Tilapia nilotica* at four salinities. Trans. Amer. Fish. Soc., 114: 584-589.
- Duncan, D.B. 1955. Multiple range and multiple (F) test. Biometrics, 11: 1-42.
- El-Sayed A.-F.M. 1999. Alternative dietary protein sources for farmed tilapia, *Oreochromis spp.* Aquacult., 179: 149-168.

- El-Sayed A.-F.M. and Teshima, S. 1991. Tilapia nutrition in aquaculture. Rev. Aquat. Sci., 5: 247-265.
- Goering, H.K. and Van Soest, P.G. 1970. Forage fiber analysis (apparatus, reagent, procedures, and some applications). US Dept. Agric. Handbook, Washington D.C., USA, p. 379.
- Haylor, G.S. 1991. Controlled hatchery production of *Clarias gariepinus* (Burchell 1922): growth and survival of fry at high stocking density. Aquacult. Fish. Manag., 22: 405-422.
- Holm, J.C., Refstie, T. and Bo, S. 1990. The effect of fish density and feeding regimes on individual growth rate and mortality in rainbow trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*). Aquacult., 89: 3-4.
- Huang, W-B. and Chiu, T.-S. 1997. Effects of stocking density on survival, growth, size variation, and production of *Tilapia* fry. Aquacult. Res., 28: 165-173.
- Huisman, E.J., M. Breterler and A. Vismans. 1979. Retention of energy, protein, fat and ash in growing carp (*Cyprinus carpio*) under different feeding and temperature regimes. Proceeding World Symposium on Fish Nutrition and Fish.
- Irwin, S., Halloran, J.O. and Fitzgerald, R.D. 1999. Stocking density, growth and growth variation in juvenile turbot, *Scophthalmus maximus* (Rafinesque). Aquacult., 178: 77-88.
- Jauncey, A. 1982. The effect of varying dietary protein level on the growth, food conversion, protein utilization and body composition of juvenile tilapias (Sarotherodon mossambicus). Aquacult., 27: 43-54.
- JØrgensen, E.H., Christiansen, J.S., Jobling, M. 1993. Effects of stocking density on food intake, growth performance and oxygen consumption in Arctic charr (*Salvelinus alpinus*). Aquacult., 110: 191-204.
- Khattab, Y.A.E., Ahmad, M.H., Shalaby, A.M.E. and Abdel-Tawwab, M. 2000. Response of Nile tilapia (*Oreochromis niloticus* L.) from different locations to different dietary protein levels. Egypt. J. Aquat. Biol. Fish., 4(4): 295-311.
- Lovell, T. 1989. Nutrition and Feeding of Fish. An AVI Book, Van Nostrand Reinhold, New York, p 260.
- Martin, R.M. and Wertheimer, A. 1989. Adult production of chinook salmon reared at different densities and released as two small sizes. Prog. Fish Cult., 51: 194-200.
- McGeachin, R.B., Wicklund, R.I., Olla, B.L. and Winton, J.R. 1987. Growth of *Tilapia aurea* in seawater cages. J. World Aquacult. Soc., 18(1): 31-34.
- Miao, S. 1992. Growth and survival model of redtail shrimp *Penaeus pencillatus* (Alock) according to manipulating stocking density. Bulletin of the Institute of Zo. Academia, 31: 1-8.
- NRC (National Research Council). 1993. Nutrient requirements of fish. Committee on Animal Nutrition. Board on Agriculture. National Research Council. National Academy Press. Washington DC., USA. p. 114.
- Ofojekwu, P.C. and Ejike, C. 1984. Growth response and feed utilization in the tropical cichlid *Oreochromis niloticus* fed on cotton seed based artificial diets. Aquacult., 42: 27-36.
- Omar, E., Al-Sagheer, F.M., Nour, A. M., Abou-Akkada, A.R. 1997. Effect of protein level and stocking density on growth performance, feed utilization and resistance of Nile tilapia (*Oreochromis niloticus*) to infection against *Aeromonas septicemia*

- (*Aeromonas hydrophila*). pp. 67-77. *In*: A. Tacon and B. Basurco (eds.). Feed-Tomorrow's Fish. Proceedings of the Workshop of the CIHEAM Network on Technology of Aquaculture in the Mediterranean (TECAM), Vol. 22, Zaragoza, Spain, 24-26 June 1996.
- Papst, M.H., Dick, T.A., Arnason, A.N. and Engel, C.E. 1992. Effect of rearing density on the early growth and variation in growth of juvenile Arctic charr, *Salvelinus alpinus* (L.). Aquacult. Fish. Manag., 23: 41-47.
- Rosa, P.V., Costa, P.M.A., Souza, J.R.D., Pereira, J.A.A. and Costa, C.L.S. 1990. Performance and determination of the ideal Nile tilapia density, fed swine excrements. Revista Da Sociedae Brasileira De Zooltecnia, 19: 530-541.
- Siddiqui, A.Q., Howlader, M.S. and Adam, A.B. 1989. Culture of Nile tilapia, *Oreochromis niloticus* (L.), at three stocking densities in outdoor concrete tanks using drainage water. Aquacult. Fish. Manag., 20: 49-58.
- Silva, P.C., Souza, V.L., Padua, D.M.C., Dalacorte, P.C. and Goncalves, D.C. 2000. Effect of stocking density on growth and fillet composition of tetra hybrid red tilapia, Israeli strain. pp. 341-345. *In*: K. Fitzsimmons and J.C. Filho (eds.). Tilapia Aquaculture in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century. Proceedings from the 5<sup>th</sup> International Symposium on Tilapia Aquaculture. Vol. 2. 3-7 Sept. 2000, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.
- Smith, H.T., Schreck, C.B. and Maughan, O.E. 1978. Effect of population density and feeding rate on the fathead minnow (*Pimephales promelas*). J. Fish Biol., 12: 449-455.
- Snedecor, G.W. and Cochran, W.G. 1982. Statistical Methods. 6th edition. Iowa State Univ. Press, Ames, IA, USA, pp. 593.
- Tacon, A.G.I. 1987. The nutrition and feeding of farm fish and shrimp a training manual. 1. The essential nutrients. FAO Brasilia Brazil, GCP/RLA/075/ITA Field Document 2/E, pp. 117.
- Wallace, J.C, Kolbeinshavn, A.G. and Reinsnes, T.G. 1988. The effects of stocking density on early growth in Arctic charr, *Salvelinus alpinus* (L.). Aquacult., 73: 1-4.
- Watanabe, W.O., Clark, J.H., Dunhkam, J.B., Wicklund, R.I. and Olla, B.L. 1990. Culture of Florida red tilapia in marine cages: The effect of stocking density and dietary protein on growth. Aquacult., 90: 123-134.

Table 1. Ingredients and chemical composition and the experimental diet (on dry matter basis).

|                                | Dietary protein levels |                  |                  |  |  |
|--------------------------------|------------------------|------------------|------------------|--|--|
| Ingredients                    |                        |                  |                  |  |  |
|                                | 25%                    | 35%              | 45%              |  |  |
|                                |                        |                  |                  |  |  |
| Fish meal                      | 15.6                   | 20.3             | 31.0             |  |  |
| Soybean meal                   | 20.0                   | 40.0             | 50.0             |  |  |
| Wheat bran                     | 5.0                    | 5.0              | 5.0              |  |  |
| Ground corn                    | 52.63                  | 28.42            | 9.44             |  |  |
| Fish oil + Corn oil (1:1)      | 2.0                    | 2.0              | 2.0              |  |  |
| Vitamins & minerals premix (1) | 1.5                    | 1.5              | 1.5              |  |  |
| Ascorbic acid                  | 0.06                   | 0.06             | 0.06             |  |  |
| Starch                         | 2.21                   | 1.72             | 0.0              |  |  |
| Carboxymethyl cellulose        | 1.0                    | 1.0              | 1.0              |  |  |
| Total                          | 100                    | 100              | 100              |  |  |
|                                |                        |                  |                  |  |  |
| Chemical analysis (%)          |                        |                  |                  |  |  |
| Dry matter                     | $92.48 \pm 0.7$        | $92.69 \pm 0.6$  | $93.09 \pm 0.6$  |  |  |
| Crude protein                  | $25.32 \pm 0.24$       | $35.41 \pm 0.33$ | $45.56 \pm 0.46$ |  |  |
| Crude fat                      | $5.87 \pm 0.15$        | $5.67 \pm 0.25$  | $5.99 \pm 0.20$  |  |  |
| Ash                            | $5.51 \pm 0.23$        | $6.31 \pm 0.36$  | $7.31 \pm 0.37$  |  |  |
| Fiber                          | $6.68 \pm 0.15$        | $5.50 \pm 0.12$  | $5.76 \pm 0.13$  |  |  |
| NFE (2)                        | 56.62                  | 47.11            | 35.38            |  |  |
| GE (Kcal/100 g) (3)            | 439.14                 | 446.85           | 458.92           |  |  |

Vitamin & minerals premix: each 2.5 kg contain vitamin A 12 MIU; D<sub>3</sub> 2 MIU, E 10 g, K 2 g, B<sub>1</sub> 1 g, B<sub>2</sub> 4 g, B<sub>6</sub> 1.5 g, B<sub>12</sub> 10 mg, Pantothenic acid 10 g, Nicotinic acid 20 g; Folic acid 1 g, Biotin 50 mg, Choline chloride 500 mg, copper 10 g, iodine 1 g iron 30 g; manganese 55 g, zinc 55 g and selenium

<sup>0.1</sup> g.

(2) NFE (nitrogen free extract) = 100 – (protein + lipid + ash + fiber)

(3) GE (gross energy): Calculated after NRC (1993) as 5.64, 9.44 and 4.11 Kcal/g for protein, lipid and

Table 2. Different growth parameters of Nile tilapia (*O. niloticus*) fed different levels of dietary protein at two stocking densities (with 2-way ANOVA).

|              | Treatments          |                    |                     |                     |                     |                     |  |  |
|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--|--|
| Items        | 25% CP              |                    | 35%                 | o CP                | 45% CP              |                     |  |  |
|              | S1                  | S2                 | S1                  | S2                  | S1                  | S2                  |  |  |
| Final weight | 7.0 cd              | 6.4 d              | 8.9 b               | 7.6 c               | 10.1 a              | 9.1 b               |  |  |
| (g/fish)     | ± 0.14              | ± 0.17             | ± 0.23              | ± 0.09              | ± 0.03              | ± 0.43              |  |  |
| Weight gain  | 4.9 cd              | 4.3 d              | 6.8 b               | 5.5 c               | 8.0 a               | 7.0 b               |  |  |
| (g/fish)     | ± 0.16              | ± 0.17             | ± 0.23              | ± 0.09              | $\pm 0.07$          | ± 0.43              |  |  |
| Wt. gain %   | 233.3               | 204.8              | 323.8               | 261.9               | 381.0               | 333.3               |  |  |
| S G R (%)    | 1.720 d             | 1.591 d            | 2.063 b             | 1.837 c             | 2.344 a             | 2.094 ab            |  |  |
|              | $\pm 0.032$         | ± 0.041            | ± 0.04              | ± 0.016             | ± 0.016             | ± 0.069             |  |  |
| K factor (%) | 1.563 ab<br>± 0.008 | 1.617 a<br>± 0.023 | 1.497 bc<br>± 0.026 | 1.560 ab<br>± 0.006 | 1.497 bc<br>± 0.031 | 1.530 bc<br>± 0.005 |  |  |
| Survival (%) | 93.3 a<br>± 1.9     | 93.3 a<br>± 2.2    | 93.3 a<br>± 2.2     | 95.6 a<br>± 1.13    | 96.7 a<br>± 2.2     | 96.7 a<br>± 1.9     |  |  |

Initial weight was 2.1 g/fish.

S1 = 15 fish/100 L; S2 = 30 fish/100 L.

The same letter in the same row is not significantly different at P<0.05.

## ANOVA

| Source  | df | Mean      | square  |         |          |          |
|---------|----|-----------|---------|---------|----------|----------|
|         |    | Final wt. | Gain    | SGR     | K factor | Survival |
|         |    |           |         |         |          | rate     |
| St      | 1  | 4.11**    | 3.83**  | 0.097** | 0.004    | 30.42    |
| Pr      | 2  | 12.35**   | 11.94** | 0.387** | 0.0104*  | 17.31    |
| Pr x St | 2  | 0.22      | 0.22    | 0.005   | 0.0048   | 2.42     |
| Error   | 12 | 0.1506    | 0.1522  | 0.0049  | 0.0013   | 16.667   |

St = stocking density; Pr = protein level.

<sup>\*</sup> P<0.05; \*\* P<0.01.

Table 3. Feed intake, FCR, PER and PPV of Nile tilapia (O. niloticus) fed different protein levels at two stocking densities (with 2-way ANOVA).

|               | Treatments |             |             |             |          |             |  |  |
|---------------|------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|----------|-------------|--|--|
| Items         | 25% CP     |             | 35%         | 6 СР        | 45% CP   |             |  |  |
|               | S1         | S2          | S1          | S2          | S1       | S2          |  |  |
| Feed intake   | 10.8 b     | 10.7 b      | 12.7 ab     | 11.6 ab     | 14.9 a   | 13.4 a      |  |  |
| (g feed/fish) | ± 0.22     | ± 0.33      | ± 0.13      | ± 0.15      | ± 1.45   | ± 0.35      |  |  |
|               |            |             |             |             |          |             |  |  |
| FCR           | 2.25 b     | 2.46 a      | 1.81 de     | 2.07 c      | 1.72 e   | 1.89 d      |  |  |
|               | ± 0.02     | ± 0.01      | $\pm 0.06$  | ± 0.02      | ± 0.05   | ± 0.06      |  |  |
|               |            |             |             |             |          |             |  |  |
| PER           | 1.913 a    | 1.720 b     | 1.623 b     | 1.467 c     | 1.340 cd | 1.250 d     |  |  |
|               | ± 0.052    | $\pm 0.052$ | $\pm 0.049$ | $\pm 0.043$ | ± 0.040  | $\pm 0.035$ |  |  |
|               |            |             |             |             |          |             |  |  |
| PPV (%)       | 30.54 a    | 26.64 b     | 24.82 b     | 22.25 c     | 20.88 cd | 19.82 d     |  |  |
|               | ± 0.88     | $\pm 0.77$  | $\pm 0.72$  | ± 0.64      | ± 0.60   | ± 0.57      |  |  |

S1= 15 fish/100 L; S2 = 30 fish/100 L.

The same letter in the same row is not significantly different at P<0.05.

## **ANOVA**

| Source  | df | Mean square |         |         |         |  |  |
|---------|----|-------------|---------|---------|---------|--|--|
|         |    | Feed        | FCR     | PER     | PPV     |  |  |
|         |    | intake      |         |         |         |  |  |
| St      | 1  | 0.281       | 0.216** | 0.097** | 28.4**  |  |  |
| Pr      | 2  | 0.998**     | 0.501** | 0.408** | 103.5** |  |  |
| Pr x St | 2  | 0.969       | 0.003   | 0.004   | 3.01    |  |  |
| Error   | 12 | 1.2128      | 0.0051  | 0.0064  | 1.4919  |  |  |

St = stocking density; Pr = protein level. \* P<0.05; \*\* P<0.01.

Table 4. Proximate chemical analysis (%; on dry matter basis) of Nile tilapia (*O. niloticus*) fed different protein levels at two stocking densities (with 2-way ANOVA).

| Items    | Initial | Treatments |            |          |            |            |            |
|----------|---------|------------|------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|
|          |         | 25% CP     |            | 35% CP   |            | 45% CP     |            |
|          |         | S1         | S2         | S1       | S2         | S1         | S2         |
| Moisture | 75.5    | 71.8 c     | 72.9 bc    | 73.5 ab  | 74.5 a     | 73.8 ab    | 73.4 ab    |
|          | ± 0.35  | $\pm 0.23$ | ± 0.31     | ± 0.88   | $\pm 0.49$ | $\pm 0.39$ | $\pm 0.38$ |
|          |         |            |            |          |            |            |            |
| Crude    | 55.9    | 54.34 c    | 55.0 c     | 56.5 b   | 57.7 a     | 58.0 a     | 57.9 a     |
| protein  | ± 0.17  | $\pm 0.33$ | ± 0.10     | ± 0.29   | $\pm 0.23$ | $\pm 0.15$ | ± 0.34     |
|          |         |            |            |          |            |            |            |
| Total    | 30.3    | 32.8 a     | 31.0 ab    | 28.83 bc | 27.6 cd    | 26.3 d     | 25.2 d     |
| lipids   | ± 0.17  | $\pm 0.07$ | $\pm 0.32$ | ± 0.56   | $\pm 0.54$ | ± 1.64     | $\pm 0.36$ |
|          |         |            |            |          |            |            |            |
| Ash      | 13.8    | 13.0 d     | 13.9 cd    | 14.7 c   | 14.6 c     | 15.6 b     | 16.8 a     |
|          | ± 0.29  | $\pm 0.54$ | ± 0.17     | ± 0.13   | $\pm 0.23$ | $\pm 0.20$ | $\pm 0.10$ |

S1 = 15 fish/100 L; S2 = 30 fish/100 L.

## **ANOVA**

| Source  | df | Mean     | square  |         |         |
|---------|----|----------|---------|---------|---------|
|         |    | Moisture | Crude   | Total   | Ash     |
|         |    |          | protein | lipids  |         |
| St      | 1  | 1.614    | 1.572*  | 8.36*   | 1.29*   |
| Pr      | 2  | 4.658*   | 17.11** | 57.04** | 10.09** |
| Pr x St | 2  | 1.035    | 0.671   | 0.242   | 0.601   |
| Error   | 12 | 0.7283   | 0.197   | 1.755   | 0.2198  |

St = stocking density; Pr = protein level.

The same letter in the same row is not significantly different at P < 0.05.

<sup>\*</sup> P<0.05; \*\* P<0.01.