

International Comparative study of *Artemia* (Brine shrimp) and *Ceriodaphnia* (Zooplankton) as foods for catfish larvae

Ajepe RG¹, Hammed AM¹, Amosu AO^{2*}, Fashina-Bombata HA¹

¹Department of Fisheries, Faculty of Science, Lagos State University, P.O.Box 0001, LASU Post Office, Ojo, Lagos-Nigeria

²Department of Biodiversity and Conservation Biology, Faculty of Natural Science, University of Western Cape, Private Bag X17, Bellville, 7535, South Africa

Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration between all authors as team work. Author ARG was responsible for the initial idea and study design. Authors ARG, HAM and AAO collected and compiled all information, and performed the experiment. Authors ARG and HAM worked with authors AAO and FHA in data analysis and interpretation. All authors contributed to the editing, revision, and final preparation of the manuscript. All authors have read and approve the final manuscript.

Research Article

ABSTRACT

Artemia and *Ceriodaphnia* were used as "first food" for the larvae of *Clarias gariepinus*, *Heterobranchus bidorsalis* and their hybrid *Heteroclarias* in order to determine if *Ceriodaphnia* could effectively replace *Artemia* in Nigeria in the production of Catfish fingerlings. The 5-day old fry of *C. gariepinus*, *H. bidorsalis* and *Heteroclarias* weighing 18.5mg, 14.0mg and 13.5mg respectively were stocked in plastic tanks and fed with *Artemia nauplii* and *Ceriodaphnia* for 21 days. Growth indices such as Percentage Survival (PS), Specific Growth Rate (SGR), Daily Growth Rate (DGR) and Percentage Weight Gain (PWG) were determined. Measurement of weight changes was performed weekly. At the end of the experiment, PS, SGR, DGR and PWG were determined weekly. At the end of the experiment, PS, SGR, DGR and PWG were slightly better in *Ceriodaphnia*-fed fry of the three species, though the composition of crude protein in *Artemia nauplii* (63.0%) was higher than that of *Ceriodaphnia* (58%). However, analysis of variance (ANOVA) did not reveal any significant difference ($P>0.05$) in the performance of the two experimental foods. The study reveals the potential of *Ceriodaphnia* as natural food for catfish larvae to produce fast growing species of *C. gariepinus* (Burchell, 1822), *H. bidorsalis* (Geoffroy, 1809) and *Heteroclarias* (reciprocal hybrid).

Keywords: *Artemia*, *Ceriodaphnia*, *Clarias gariepinus*, *Heterobranchus bidorsalis*, *Heteroclarias*

Comment [S1]: delete

Comment [S2]: delete

Comment [S3]: differences

40

41 1. INTRODUCTION

42 The catfish families are among the most valued fresh and marine water fish species in West Africa.
43 African catfishes of the genera *Clarias* and *Heterobranchus* are highly esteemed in Nigeria and command
44 very high commercial value in our markets (1). They are very hardy and have accessory air breathing
45 organs, which enable them to tolerate low dissolved oxygen levels and other adverse aquatic condition
46 where most cultivable species cannot survive. With these unique characteristics of this omnivore, their
47 fingerlings are scarce due to inadequate hatchery techniques and insufficient live food of high quality
48 which is a major setback to fish farmers.

49 *Clarias* and *Heterobranchus* species are very popular among Nigerian fish farmers. Considerable interest
50 had been generated in the growth potential of *C. ~~lar~~arias gariepinus* and *Heterobranchus* spp. However,
51 because of the need for fast growing fingerlings that will satisfy the culture requirements and market value
52 of fish farmers, *Heteroclarias* (2), which is the hybrid of *Clarias* and *Heterobranchus*, came into being.

53 It has been noted that these species are very important to the sustainability of aquaculture industry
54 particularly in tropical countries. However, in spite of the break through recorded in the artificial
55 propagation of these species, demand for the fingerlings still outstrips the supply. The difficulties being
56 encountered in rearing hatchlings to fingerlings is the major cause of demand outstripping supply for
57 catfish fingerlings in Nigeria.

58 Lack of suitable feed as the main cause of mortality in catfish fry management and points out that the
59 food must be adequate not only in quality but also in quantity (3, 4 and 5). Therefore, feeding has been
60 recognized as the major problem in the management of clariids hatchlings to fingerlings (4).

61 Live food in feeding fry and fingerlings is obligatory for successful development of catfish aquaculture (4).
62 However, aquaculture research suggested rotifers (Zooplankton) as the most satisfactory "first food" for
63 fry (6, 7 and 8). It has been revealed that within the first two weeks of life, the food of *Clarias* hatchlings
64 should entirely be zooplankton and are healthy for most fish species since it leads to better larvae growth
65 (9 and 10). Report show that *C. gariepinus* requires, after yolk sac absorption an initial phase of
66 exogenous feeding with natural, preferably live food organisms such as *Artemia nauplii* meet their
67 nutritional requirements for optimization of growth and survival at this stage (3 and 11). *Artemia nauplii*
68 are being used today to feed fish larvae all over the world including Nigeria. However, high cost of
69 *Artemia* cysts, problem of hatching and irregularity in supply had been the bane of many Nigeria catfish
70 farmers that depended entirely on the use of *Artemia*. Therefore there is need for better alternatives.

Comment [S4]: space bar

Comment [S5]: space bar

71 Live organisms, particularly Rotifers, *Cladocerans* and *Artemia* have been used in the large scale rearing
72 of African catfish larvae. However, the collection of live food from the wild is cumbersome and only
73 available on a seasonal basis, and *Artemia* is expensive particularly for hatcheries in developing countries
74 in Africa. Additional benefit for commercial fingerling producers may reduce the need and the stress
75 required in harvesting fingerlings from culturing chambers and transporting them to holding tanks prior
76 shipping to growers (12).
77 The research was therefore aimed at comparing the performance of *Ceriodaphnia* with *Artemia nauplii* in
78 feeding of *C. ~~larias~~* *gariepinus* (Burchell, 1822), *H. ~~etero~~branchus* *bidorsalis* (Geoffroy, 1809) and
79 *Heteroclarias* spp (reciprocal hybrid) fry_s and also to determine if *Ceriodaphnia* can successfully
80 replace *Artemia* in the aquaculture production of African catfish fingerlings.
81




Fig. 1a: *Ceriodaphnia*

Fig. 1b: *Artemia nauplii*

Figure 1: (a) daphnia with body enclosed by an uncalcified shell (carapace) (b) artemia cysts hatched to provide live nauplii fish larvae

Comment [S6]: delete

2. MATERIAL AND METHODS

2.1 Experimental fish

Mature males and females of *C. gariepinus* and *H. bidorsalis* were selected and artificially spawned in the hatchery with ovaprim injected intramuscularly in a single dose of 0.5ml/kg fish weight. The ripe-running eggs were stripped and fertilized with milt as follows:

- | | | | |
|------|---|---|-------------------------------|
| i. | <i>Clarias gariepinus</i> (Male) | X | <i>C. gariepinus</i> (Female) |
| ii. | <i>Heterobranchus bidorsalis</i> (Male) | X | <i>H. bidorsalis</i> (Female) |
| iii. | <i>Heterobranchus bidorsalis</i> (Male) | X | <i>C. gariepinus</i> (Female) |

The larvae produced from the above parental species and hybrid was reared in three separate bowls for five days at the end of which the yolk was completely absorbed. After absorption of the yolk sac, the mean length ($\pm$ SD) of each larvae of *C. gariepinus* (8.75 ± 0.25 mm), *H. bidorsalis* (8.00 ± 0.00 mm) and *Heteroclaris* (8.50 ± 0.04 mm) was measured respectively.

2.2 Collection and preparation of experimental foods

The *Ceriodaphnia* (fig. 1a.) used for this study were collected daily with zooplankton net from a wetland located close to the [Lagos State University, Ojo, Nigeria](#) University campus. This zooplankton was confirmed to be *Ceriodaphnia* when examined under microscope with the aid of FAO plankton identification sheet in the fisheries laboratory prior to the commencement of the experiment. The proximate analysis of *Ceriodaphnia* was carried out in a laboratory at the Department of biological Sciences, [Federal](#) University of Agriculture Abeokuta Ogun State.

A tin of Vacuum-packed *Artemia* cysts (PRO 80) was purchased from a local supplier and hatched in the hatchery unit of department of fisheries, Lagos State University as directed by the manufacturer (Ocean Star International, INC. Snowville, UT. 84336 U.S.A.).

Comment [S7]: delete




Fig. 1a: *Ceriodaphnia*



Fig. 1b: *Artemia nauplii*

Figure 1: (a) daphnia with body enclosed by an uncalcified shell (carapace) (b) artemia cysts hatched to provide live nauplii fish larvae

Comment [S8]: Place the figure here; under 2.2 Collection and preparation of experimental foods

2.3 Feeding of fish larvae

Twelve circular plastic tanks each containing 20 litres of water from borehole supplied with aeration devices were used for the feeding experiment. The tanks were covered with mosquitoes net to prevent insect predators from entering.

Comment [S9]: Mention the producer and give the specification of the aeration devices used for the study

The twelve tanks were grouped into three A, B and C (i.e. four tanks per group; A (i-iv), B (i-iv) and C (i-iv). Each group of *C. gariepinus*, *H. bidorsalis* and *Heteroclarus* were stocked with 200 fry and fed *ad libitum* twice daily for 21 days.

Comment [S10]: italicized

Table 1: Different groupings and treatment methods adopted in feeding the fry for 21 days

Groupings		Treatment
A	Tanks i and ii	Fry fed with <i>Ceriodaphnia</i>
	Tanks iii and iv	Fry fed with <i>Artemia nauplii</i>
B	Tanks i and ii	Fry fed with <i>Ceriodaphnia</i>
	Tanks iii and iv	Fry fed with <i>Artemia nauplii</i>
C	Tanks i and ii	Fry fed with <i>Ceriodaphnia</i>
	Tanks iii and iv	Fry fed with <i>Artemia nauplii</i>

2.4 Statistical analysis

Growth indices such as percentage survival, specific growth rate, daily growth rate and percentage weight gain resulting from the experiment were subject to one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). Parameters such as analysis of variance [ANOVA] (13) and levels of significance of the experimental data were determined at 5% confidence limit using Bayesian Multiple Comparisons and Multiple Tests [BMCMT] (14).

Comment [S11]: delete

3. RESULTS

Table 2: Proximate composition (%) of the experimental foods

Nutrient	<i>Artemia nauplii</i>	<i>Ceriodaphnia</i>
Moisture	84.5	92.0
Crude protein*	63.0	58.8
Lipid*	18.2	17.9
Fibre*	8.5	7.1
Ash*	0.9	1.5

* On dry matter basis

There were slight differences in the proximate composition of *Artemia nauplii* and *Ceriodaphnia*. The crude protein, lipid and fibre contents of *Artemia* (63.0%, 18.2% and 8.5%) were higher than that of *Ceriodaphnia* whereas, *Ceriodaphnia* on the other hand had higher moisture content (92.05) and ash (1.5%).

Table 3: Growth performance and Survival rate of *C. gariepinus*, *H. bidorsalis* and *Heteroclinus* Fry fed *Artemia nauplii* and *Ceriodaphnia* for 21 days (Mean±SD)

Parameters	<i>Artemia nauplii</i>			<i>Ceriodaphnia</i>		
	<i>C. gariepinus</i>	<i>H. bidorsalis</i>	<i>Heteroclinus</i>	<i>C. gariepinus</i>	<i>H. bidorsalis</i>	<i>Heteroclinus</i>
Initial total length (mm)	9.0±0.35	8.0±0.00	8.5±0.00	8.5±0.34	8.0±0.00	8.5±0.00
Initial body weight (mg)	19.0±0.00	14.0±0.00	13.5±0.00	18.5±0.00	14.0±0.00	13.5±0.00
Final total length (mm)	18.0±0.71	18.0±1.41	19.5±1.06	18.5±0.70	19.5±1.77	21.0±0.00
Final body weight (mg)	91.5±0.35	80.0±0.00	100.0±0.00	140.0±0.71	125.0±0.35	170.0±1.41
Increase in length (mm)	9.0±5.20	10.0±5.30	11.0±5.77	10.0±5.39	11.5.905±	12.5±6.38
Increase in weight (mg)	72.5±37.59	66.0±34.78	86.5±46.54	121.5±65.47	111.0±60.45	156.5±86.72
SGR%	7.49±0.24	8.30±0.31	9.54±0.36	9.64±0.43	10.43±0.67	12.06±1.24
% survival	90.5	85.5	71.5	96.5	96.05	94.5
K (Condition factor)	2.08±0.38	2.30±0.41	1.66±0.26	2.83±0.97	2.69±0.58	2.34±0.43

Comment [S12]: The level of significance or statistical differences was not reflected in all parameters presented in table 3. Please kindly effect this because this table shows only descriptive statistic

DGR (mg/fish/day)	0.038±0.01	0.039±0.00	0.041±0.00	0.041±0.01	0.042±0.01	0.044±0.02
PWG (%)	381.6±32.31	471.4±29.26	640.7±39.56	656.8±50.76	792.8±47.46	1159.3±68.75

166

167 | The highest greatest increase in total length (12.5mm), body weight (156.5g), specific growth rate
168 | (12.06%), daily growth rate (0.44mg/day) and percentage weight gain (1159.3%) as shown on table 3
169 | were achieved by *Heteroclaris* fry fed on *Ceriodaphnia*, while the lowest The least increase in total length
170 | (9.0mm) and body weight (66mg) were achieved by *Clarias gariepinus* and *Heterobranchus bidorsalis* fry
171 | fed on *Artemia nauplii*. *Clarias gariepinus* fry fed on *Artemia nauplii* also had the lowest least specific
172 | growth rate (7.49); daily growth rate (0.038mg/day) and percentage weight gain (381.58%). The condition
173 | factor (K) was closely related similar but slightly lower (1.66±0.26) for *Artemia nauplii* fed *Heteroclaris*
174 | fry. The highest survival rate (96.5%) was recorded by *Clarias gariepinus* fed on *Ceriodaphnia* while the
175 | lowest (71.5%) was recorded by *Heteroclaris* sp fed on *Artemia nauplii*.

176

177 | 4. DISCUSSION

178 | The growth performance of *C. gariepinus*, *Heterobranchus bidorsalis* and *Heteroclaris* larvae at the end
179 | of 21 days feeding trial reveals total length being slightly higher in *Ceriodaphnia*-fed larvae (18.5mm,
180 | 19.5mm and 21.0mm) compared with a length of 18.0mm, 18.0mm and 19.5mm recorded for the *Artemia*-
181 | fed larvae. The weight was also slightly better in the *Ceriodaphnia*-fed larvae (140.0mg, 125mg and
182 | 170mg respectively), compared to the weight of 91.5mg, 80mg and 100.0mg recorded for the *Artemia*-fed
183 | larvae. There were Analysis of variance (ANOVA) also reveals slight significant difference in length but
184 | wider significant differences in weight (P<0.05) between the three fish larvae fed *Ceriodaphnia* and
185 | *Artemia*. Survival rate, specific growth rate (SGR), condition factor (K), daily growth rate (DGR) and
186 | percentage weight gain (PWG) were all slightly higher in the *Ceriodaphnia*-fed larvae compared to the
187 | *Artemia*-fed larvae (Table 3).

188 | The growth of fish is generally believed to be a function of the crude protein level in the diet. In spite of
189 | the fact that crude protein level (Table 2) of *Artemia nauplii* (63.0%) was slightly higher than that of
190 | *Ceriodaphnia* (58.8%), the latter still perform well in this study. This could be attributed to the fact that
191 | catfish larvae may not require more than 58.85 C.P. for optimum growth. The result of this study support
192 | the report This assertion is in line with the work of (15) who reported 55% crude protein for fry feed stated
193 | that the proximate composition of fry feed should consist of 55% protein; and also (16) recommended
194 | dietary requirement of not more than 52% crude protein for catfish larvae. It was reported that Efficient
195 | growth of fish depend on feeding the best possible diets at levels not exceeding the dietary needs (17).
196 | The moisture content (Table 5) of Ceriodaphnia (92.0%) is higher than that of Artemia (84.5%). This could
197 | mean better digestibility for Ceriodaphnia by the fish larvae. However, the higher lipid content in Artemia
198 | (18.2%) compared to that of Ceriodaphnia might not necessarily be an advantage since lipid requirement
199 | for catfish rarely exceed 6% (18).

Comment [S13]: delete

Comment [S14]: delete

Comment [S15]: delete

Comment [S16]: delete

Comment [S17]: delete

Comment [S18]: delete

Comment [S19]: delete

Comment [S20]: delete

Comment [S21]: delete

Comment [S22]: delete

Comment [S23]: delete

Comment [S24]: delete

Comment [S25]: Please recast. This sentence does not have any meaning to this discussion.

The relatively longer life span of *Ceriodaphnia* in water as observed during the study, coupled with the fact that *Ceriodaphnia* is a fresh water zooplankton, makes it more available and acceptable to *C. gariepinus*, *Heterobranchius bidorsalis* and *Heteroclarus* larvae which also dwell naturally in fresh water compared with *Artemia nauplii* which is salt water zooplankton.

The better performance of *Heteroclarus* larvae (Table 3) recorded could be attributed to improved hybrid vigour; since similar experimental foods, rearing conditions and techniques were provided. This agrees with the findings of (19, 20, 21 and 22) who observed that hybrid in most cases were superior to the parental strains in growth, food conversion and resistance to diseases.

Survival of larvae (Table 3) ranged from 71.5% to 96.5%. The mortality recorded might be due to handling stress during the experiment. The general high survival rate however, could be attributed to proper management of larvae and level of acceptability of the two experimental foods by the fish.

5. CONCLUSION

It was discovered that *Ceriodaphnia* has a great potential as natural food that can produce fast growth rate of *C. gariepinus*, *H. bidorsalis* and *Heteroclarus* spp larvae. The results also show that *Ceriodaphnia* could be efficient in catfish larvae rearing and will enhance the aquaculture development in rural areas of Nigeria with little or no access to *Artemia*. The study therefore provides a good replacement for *Artemia*, which has inherent problem of high cost, scarcity, hatching difficulties and sometimes the question of viability of cysts. In spite of the great potential discovered in *Ceriodaphnia* however, collection from the wild is a herculean task; therefore there is need for further research on mass production of *Ceriodaphnia* in culture system with the development of effective culture recipes and techniques that can turn out large quantities of *Ceriodaphnia* throughout the year.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors wish to thank the Department of fisheries, Lagos State University and Department of Biological Sciences, Federal University of Agriculture Abeokuta, Nigeria for providing research equipment leading to the results in this study.

COMPETING INTERESTS

The authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Mohammed S, Omoregie E. An investigation into the fisheries potentials of Doma Lake, Nasarawa State. *Journal of Aquatic Science*. 2004; 19: 59-64.

- 235 2. Owodeinde FG. A study on the growth and survival of *Clarias gariepinus*, *Heterobranchus bidorsalis*
 236 and their hybrids in earthen ponds. *PhD thesis*, Department of Fisheries, Faculty of Science, Lagos
 237 State University, Ojo, Lagos, Nigeria. 2007; 240pp
- 238 3. Huisman EA. Aquaculture research in the Africa Region. In: *Proceedings of the African Seminar on*
 239 *Aquaculture*. 1985; Vol.1: 7-11.
- 240 4. FAO (Food and Agricultural Organization). Seed production. Mass production of fry and fingerlings of
 241 the African Catfish *Clarias gariepinus* project reports. 1987; 118p.
- 242 5. FAO (Food and Agricultural Organization). *The State of World Fisheries and Aquaculture* 2012, Food
 243 and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. Rome. Italy. 2012.
- 244 6. Arimoro FO, Ofojekwu PC. Incidence of feeding, growth and survival of the toothed carp,
 245 *Aphyosemion gairdneri* larvae reared on the freshwater rotifer, *B. calyciflorus*. *Trop. Freshwater*
 246 *Biology*. 2003; 12/13: 35-43.
- 247 7. Arimoro FO, Ofojekwu PC. Some aspects of the culture, population Dynamics and reproductive rates
 248 of the freshwater rotifer, *B. calyciflorus* fed selected diets. *J. Aquatic Science*. 2004; 19: 95-98.
- 249 8. Arimoro FO. First Feeding in the African Catfish *Clarias anguillaris* Fry in Tanks with the Freshwater
 250 Rotifer *Brachionus calyciflorus* Cultured in a Continuous Feed Back Mechanism in Comparison with a
 251 Mixed Zooplankton Diet. *Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Science*. 2007; 2: 275-284.
- 252 9. Madu, CT, Basam HD, Isa J, Okwuego C. Optimum dietary protein level for female *Clarias anguillaris*
 253 (L) broodstock. *J. Fisheries Technology*. 2000; 2: 57-65.
- 254 10. Wang C, Xie S, Zheng K, Zhu X, Lei W, Yang Y. Effects of live food and formulated diets on the
 255 survival, growth and protein content of feeding larvae of *Pelteobagrus fulvidraco*. *J. Applied*
 256 *Ichthyology*. 2005; 21: 210-214.
- 257 11. Shiri HA, Charlery D, Auwerx J, Vught J, Slycken J, Dhert P, Sorgeloos P. Larval rearing of burbot
 258 (*Lota lota*) using *Brachionus calyciflorus* rotifer as starter food. *J. Applied Ichthyology*. 2003; 19: 84-
 259 87.
- 260 12. Yap WG, Villaluz AC, Soriano MGG, Santos MN. Milkfish production and processing technologies in
 261 the Philippines. Milkfish Project Publication Series. 2007; No.2; 96 pp.
- 262 13. Arimoro F. First Feeding in the African Catfish *Clarias anguillaris* Fry in Tanks with the Freshwater
 263 Rotifer *Brachionus calyciflorus* Cultured in a Continuous Feed Back Mechanism in Comparison with a
 264 Mixed Zooplankton Diet. *Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Science*. , 2007; 2: 275-284.
- 265 14. Westfall PH, Tobias RD, Rom D, Wolfinger RD, Hochberg Y, Chapter 13--Bayesian multiple
 266 comparisons and multiple tests. in *Multiple Comparisons and Multiple Tests Using the SAS*
 267 *System* (Cary, North Carolina: SAS Institute, 1999).
- 268 15. Robinson E. Catfish Nutrition. *Review of Aquatic Sciences*. 1989; 1: 365-391.
- 269 16. NRC (National Research Council). *Nutrient Requirement of fish National Academic of Science*,
 270 Washington, D.C U.S.A. 2000; 78pp.

- 271 | 17. Aderolu AZ, Seriki BM, Apatira AL, Ajaegbo CU. Effects of feeding frequency on growth, feed
272 | efficiency and economic viability of rearing African catfish (*Clarias gariepinus*, Burchell 1822)
273 | fingerlings and juveniles. *African Journal of Food Science*, 2010; 4(5): 286 – 290.
- 274 | 18. Robison EH, Edwin H, Li MH. *A practical guide on Nutrition, Feed and Feeding of Catfish*. MISSISSIPPI
275 | State University. 2001; 1-27pp.
- 276 | 19. Ojutiku RO. Comparative Survival and Growth Rate of *Clarias gariepinus* and *Heteroclarias*
277 | *Hathlings* Fed Live and Frozen Daphnia. *Pakistan Journal of Nutrition*, 2008; 7 (4): 527-529.
- 278 | 20. Jensen J, Durham R, Flynn J. Production of Channel catfish fingerlings. *Circular ANR-327* Alabama
279 | Cooperative Extension Service, Auburn University, Alabama. U.S.A. 1983; 19-21
- 280 | 21. Madu CT, Ita EO. Comparative growth and survival of hatchlings of *Clarias* sp; *Clarias* hybrid and
281 | *Heterobranchus* sp. Under indoor hatchery system. *NIFFR Annual Report*. 1991; 47-50
- 282 | 22. Salami AA, Fagbenro OA, Sydenham DHJ. The production and growth of hybrids in concrete tanks.
283 | *Israel Journal of Aquaculture Bamidgeh*. 1993; 45(1): 18-25.
- 284