Using Oman Sea *Sargassum illicifolium* meal for feeding white leg shrimp *Litopenaeus vannamei*
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**Abstract**

The brown seaweed *Sargassum illicifolium* is abundant along the Iranian coastline of the Oman Sea in which is rich in nutrients. The aim of the present study was to test the hypothesis which it can be used as a source of protein in shrimp diets. The experiment was conducted in a laboratory, 2013, where 3g shrimp juvenile acclimation in a 5000L tank. They were then kept in plastic tank containing 300L sea water and 30 shrimp juveniles in which were fed daily (3% of biomass) in four equal portions with one of four different diets in four repetitions for a period of 45 days. All diets contained 33% crude protein (isoprotein) and 355 kcal 100 g⁻¹ (isocaloric), with different percentages of Sargassum powder: Diet “A” 15%; Diet “B” 10%, Diet “C” 5%, and Diet “D” (Control) without seaweed. Final biomass values ranged from 120.89 to 128.66 g. L⁻¹; weight gains in biomass ranged from 106.49 to 124.36 g L⁻¹, and SGR ranged from 4.68 to 5.68% exhibited no significant differences between treatments(*p*>.05). Survival rate 95.2 to 97.0% was almost equal under the four experimental conditions (*p*>.05). Diets “A” and “B”, with a greater content of algae, exhibited better feed conversion (1.15:1 and 1.17:1) than diets “C” and “D” (1.30:1 and 1.33:1) (*p*<.05). The physicochemical variables of the water showed no significant variation and remained within the standards necessary for the wellbeing of the animals. If sufficient biomass of beached algae can be practically and economically collected, it can be used as a component in the making of shrimp feed.
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Introduction

Oman Sea divides Iran and the Arabian Peninsula and forms the link between the Persian Gulf and the Arabian Sea. It has 560 km long and at its widest point is 320 km wide. Fishing and shrimp aquaculture has been next to agriculture the most important economic activities for the coastal inhabitants. The Sea abounds with a great variety of fish that includes sardines, blue fish, mackerel, shark and tuna and seaweeds with 165 identified species including 83 red algae species, 41 green algae species, 40 brown algae species and one blue-green alga species. The most important identified seaweed families are Ulvaceae and Caulerpaceae belong to green algae, Sargassaceae belong to brown algae and Gracilariaceae, Gelidiaceae and Hypneaceae belong to red algae that have a lot to applications in feeding, industry and medical sciences fields.

Shrimp culture in the earth ponds started in more than 1000 ha at Gowater farms which has 120 km far from Chabahar Bay since 2002, first on Penaeus monodon, following on P. indicus and after the spreading white spot disease, the farmers shifted on Litopenaeus vannamei culture not only for their high tolerance to this pathogen but also because of better growth and survival rates compare to the previous shrimps.

There have been many studies on the use of seaweed in animal diets. For example, Cruz-Suárez et al. (2000) used Macrocystis pyrifera flour, and He and Lawrence (1993) used Laminaria digitata flour as a feed ingredient for the shrimp L. vannamei. Tahil and Juinio-Menez (1999) used the seaweeds Laurencia, Hypnea, Amphiroa and Coelothrix as food for Haliotis asinina (Gastropoda). Seaweeds are rich in proteins, vitamins, carbohydrates, fiber, lipids and minerals. When fresh, they are 75–85% water and 15–25% organic components and minerals. Dry matter is 65–85% organic substances and 30–35% ash (Halperin, 1971; FAO, 2005). Some species of algae may contain greater contents of protein, carbohydrates and fat than the ingredients traditionally used in shrimp diets. According to Diaz-Peferrer and Lopéz (1961), marine algae possess all the essential minerals for animals.

The utilization of algae in the feeding of shrimp should be possible and the aim of this study was to test whether seaweeds can be used as a source of protein in shrimp diets.

Materials and methods

A total of 500 juvenile shrimp (3 g) were used. Samples were acquired from a commercial shrimp farm and transported in plastic bags with oxygen to the Laboratory of Offshore Fisheries Research Center, Chabahar 2013. In the laboratory, the animals were kept in a 5000 L tank for 7 days with constant aeration and fed ad libitum with a commercial feed for acclimation to local conditions.

The juveniles were then starved for 24h prior to the beginning of the experimental phase. For the feeding experiments, the shrimps were kept in 16 plastic tanks (each with 300 L water and 30 juveniles) for 45 days. The design was entirely randomized. Water was treated with activated carbon filters and aeration using two 3 L min⁻¹ airpumps in order...
to maintain stable physical and chemical conditions. The tanks were siphoned daily to remove fecal matter, uneaten feed, molted exoskeletons and other organic wastes. Feeding (3% of total biomass, adjusted weekly) was carried out in four portions at a proportion of 40% in the morning and 60% in the afternoon. The laboratory was illuminated with fluorescent light, maintaining a 14:10h Light: Dark photoperiod. During the experiments, oxygen, temperature, salinity and pH were measured every 2 days.

The diets were formulated as follows: algae flour (made up of the Sargassum algae), soybean meal and oil, corn flour, fish flour, meat and bone meal, wheat flour, cassava flour, mineral and vitamin blend, and iodized salt. The four treatments contained different proportions of seaweed flour and soy, fish and wheat flours (Table 1).

Table 1: Proportion of ingredients of the experimental diets used to feed the shrimp *Litopenaeus vannamei*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ingredients (% )</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seaweed flour a</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soy flour a</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish flour a</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheat flour a</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meat and bone flour a</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corn flour a</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassava flour a</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soy oil</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitamin and mineral blend b</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iodated salt</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Percentage composition according to supplier: soy flour – CP 44.84; DM 88.22; EE 5.57; F 5.73; DE 3.005 kcal kg⁻¹; fish flour – CP 54.06; DM 92.89; EE 15.30; F 5.15; A 22.92; DE 33.335 kcal kg⁻¹; wheat flour – CP 16.76, DM 87.74, EE 3.13, F 8.12, A 4.57; DE 2.930 kcal kg⁻¹; meat and bone flour – CP 40.60, DM 91.00; EE16.00; F 5.15; A 36.60; DE 2.929 kcal kg⁻¹; corn flour – CP 8.68, DM 87.45; EE 3.84, F 2.17, A 1.18; DE 3.110 kcal kg⁻¹; cassava flour – CP 5.84, DM 5.84, EE 0.55, F 13.83, A 1.55; DE 2.771 kcal kg⁻¹ (CP crude protein; DM dry matter; EE ether extract, F fiber, AAsh, DE digestive energy) b Guaranteed levels per kilogram of product: vitamin A 900,000 IU kg⁻¹, biotin 6.0 mg, vitamin B1 150 mg, vitamin B2 600 mg, vitamin B6 300 mg, vitamin B12 1,200 mg, E 2,000 IU kg⁻¹, niacin 2,500 mg, folic acid 80 mg, pantothenic acid 1,200 mg, selenium 25 mg
The selection of this species for the processing of seaweed meal was based on a preliminary study undertaken over a 12-month period (Gharanjic et al., 2011). The dominant seaweed species from the Chabahar area of the coastal area of the Oman Sea, Iran was collected and used as proportional feed for this experiment.

The total biomass of the dominant species was dried at 55°C for 36h and weighed. The seaweed meal, which was made in Havoorash Shrimp Feed Factory- Bushehr, was ground to a fine powder in a hammer mill (TC Thai). In formulating the isoprotein and isocaloric diets, with 33% crude protein and around 355 kcal 100 g⁻¹, the proportions of components were calculated following procedures described by Correia (2004), EMBRAPA (1989) and the National Research Council (1989), and employed in the seaweed analyses (Tables 2, 3). The feed ingredients were ground to a powder, homogenized with 40% water at 60°C, placed in a meat mincer pellet former (2 mm diameter - TC Thai) and then dried in an oven at 60°C for 24h. The feed was conditioned in plastic containers and stored at room temperature. Feed conversion was determined by the amount of feed ingested divided by the weight gain of the shrimps. Survival rate was determined from the number of animals alive at the end of the experiment. Specific growth rate was calculated using the formula:

\[
\text{SGR}=100 \frac{\ln P_f - \ln P_i}{t},
\]

Where: \(P_f\) is the final weight, \(P_i\) is the initial weight, and \(t\) is time.

The results regarding gains in biomass, specific growth, survival and feed conversion were assessed by analysis of variance (ANOVA) complemented with the Tukey test \((\alpha=0.05)\).

Table 2: Proximate analysis of Sargassum. CP: Crude protein, EE: ether extract, M: moisture; C: carbohydrate, Min: minerals (g.100 g⁻¹DW of seaweed) and caloric value (Kcal.100 g⁻¹)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ingredients</th>
<th>Sargassum sp.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crude Protein (N*6.25)</td>
<td>9.18±1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crude Fat</td>
<td>2.11±0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Fiber (a)</td>
<td>10.34±2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ash</td>
<td>29.15±3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbohydrate</td>
<td>33.11±2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humidity</td>
<td>16.11±1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caloric Value</td>
<td>235.1±7.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a): calculated by \(100-(\text{Crude Protein Crude Fat + Ash Carbohydrate})\)

Results

The shrimps exhibited satisfactory growth under all conditions tested. Growth was assessed through the data on final biomass, gains in biomass and specific growth rate
(SGR), under the four tested conditions: A=15% seaweed +7% soy flour, 37% fish flour and 13% wheat flour, B=10% seaweed +12% soy flour, 33% fish flour and 19% wheat flour; C=5% seaweed +16% soy flour, 30% fish flour and 25% wheat flour; and D=0% seaweed +22% soy flour, 26% fish flour and 27% wheat flour. revealed no significant differences (p>.05).

**Table 3: Calculated compositions of some nutrients and digestive energy in the experimental diets**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nutrient</th>
<th>Diet A</th>
<th>Diet B</th>
<th>Diet C</th>
<th>Diet D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Digestive energy (kcal 100 g⁻¹)</td>
<td>355.5</td>
<td>356.0</td>
<td>356.2</td>
<td>356.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crude protein (%)</td>
<td>33.12</td>
<td>33.12</td>
<td>32.98</td>
<td>33.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ether extract (%)</td>
<td>7.36</td>
<td>6.78</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>5.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raw fiber (%)</td>
<td>9.42</td>
<td>8.17</td>
<td>6.92</td>
<td>5.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ash (%)</td>
<td>11.12</td>
<td>10.35</td>
<td>9.59</td>
<td>8.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Growth was calculated for the 45 days of cultivation. Final biomass values ranged from 120.89 to 128.66 g L⁻¹; weight gains in biomass ranged from 106.49 to 124.36 g L⁻¹, and SGR ranged from 4.68 to 5.68%. A statistical comparison between treatments

**Table 4: Growth data on shrimp fed with different feeds (mean ± SD, n=100 per treatment group). Different letters on the same line indicate statistical differences (p≤05)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Treatment</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial biomass (g. L⁻¹)</td>
<td>10.10±0.08 b</td>
<td>10.42±0.15 ab</td>
<td>11.78±0.15 ab</td>
<td>14.77±2.12 a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final biomass (g. L⁻¹)</td>
<td>128.66±3.19 a</td>
<td>134.82±2.03 a</td>
<td>120.89±2.08 a</td>
<td>121.27±2.97 a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGR (%/day)</td>
<td>5.65±2.85 a</td>
<td>5.68±1.81 a</td>
<td>5.17±1.86 a</td>
<td>4.68±2.65 a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain in biomass (g. L⁻¹)</td>
<td>118.56±3.11 a</td>
<td>124.36±1.97 a</td>
<td>109.12±2.72 a</td>
<td>106.49±3.15 a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survival (%)</td>
<td>96.20±4.18 a</td>
<td>97.00±2.73 a</td>
<td>97.00±2.73 a</td>
<td>95.20±6.73 a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feed conversion ratio</td>
<td>1.15±0.00 b</td>
<td>1.17±0.03 b</td>
<td>1.33±0.17 a</td>
<td>1.30±0.22 a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultivation periods (days)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile density /a300tank</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therefore, the replacement of proteins of soy, fish and wheat flour with seaweed resulted in no interference with regard to growth. Survival rate ranged from 95.20% (Feed D) to 97.00% (Feeds B and C). Comparatively, there were no statistical differences (p>.05) and there was an average of 96.35% in the stock density of one juvenile per 10 liter over the 45-day period. Statistical analyses demonstrated that the treatments had no influence on shrimp survival rate. Feed conversion ranged from 1.15 to 1.33, with differences among the four treatments (p≤05), but treatment A and B were similar to one another, as were treatments C and D (Table 4). The averages of the physicochemical variables of temperature: 27.44°C; salinity: 19.62; oxygen: 4.10 mg L⁻¹, and pH 7.43.
Discussion

Pedreschi-Neto (1999) obtained averages between 0.11 and 0.20 g for final biomass, and 1.68 to 3.17% in specific growth rate using post-larvae for a period of 60 days, i.e., well below the values obtained in the present study. Other experimental results from the same author showed a survival rate ranging between 51.7 and 60.0%, with an average of 55.35%, which were also well below the values obtained. On the other hand, data on feed conversion from this same experiment using popcorn residuals (Zea mays L.) in Litopenaeus vannamei juvenile feeds were between 1.23 and 1.81, which were little higher than those of the present study.

Cornejo et al. (1999) tested the effect of the seaweed Caulerpa sertularioides on the growth, survival and biomass of the brown shrimp Penaeus californiensis for a 10-week period in 150 L tanks with three repetitions of three treatments: Treatment 1—with no seaweed, but commercial feed with 35% crude protein; Treatment 2—indirect presence of seaweed with commercial feed; and Treatment 3—direct presence of seaweed with commercial feed. The results for growth, survival and production were the following: Treatment 1, 0.46±0.4g, 68.7±1.2% and 5.6±1.1g; Treatment 2, 0.73±0.4g, 75±1.0% and 7.8±1.2g; and Treatment 3, 3.98±0.4g, 100% and 36.2±4.3g, respectively. The author concludes that the presence of the algae C. sertularioides has a direct effect on the growth, survival and biomass of the brown shrimp P. californiensis under laboratory conditions.

In analyzing the digestibility of nine commercial shrimp feeds in Mexico, Cruz-Suárez et al. (2000) obtained survival rates of 100% in 14 days for three treatments. At 28 days, survival ranged from 94% to 98%. Feed conversion using Phaeophycea algae flour was 2.63±0.42; 2.80±0.27 and 3.12±0.54, using 0, 4 and 8%, respectively. These values were lower than those of the present experiment for survival. Two of the nine diets tested contained kelp flour Orphyco colloids in the formula. However, other parameters should be taken into consideration; for example: the cost of transport of raw materials and the storage structure, taking into account the feed composition.

The physicochemical variables remained within the range recommended for L. vannamei by Rocha et al. (1998), Clifford (1992), Barbieri et al. (2001), Álvarez et al. (2004) and McGraw and Scarpa (2004), such that these variables did not interfere with the treatments.

In conclusion, this study found that the marine algae Sargassum illicifoliumis viable for use in the feeding of L. vannamei, with effect on shrimp growth rates.

The results suggest that there is an decrease in feed conversion when the levels of algae are increased. Also, this decrease in the proportion of algae in the feed was associated with increased mineral and vitamin levels. However, it is necessary to test the algae potential for improving FCR dissociated from the levels of fish meal.
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