NUTRITIONAL RESPONSES IN INDIAN WHITE SHRIMP
Fenneropenaeus indicus
TO VARYING PROTEIN: ENERGY COMBINATIONS IN COMPOUNDED ARTIFICIAL FEEDS

G 8662

Thesis submitted to the
Cochin University
of
Science and Technology
in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy
in
Marine Biochemistry and Fish Nutrition
(Under the Faculty of Marine Sciences)

By

P. Vijayagopal

Department of Marine Biology, Microbiology and
Biochemistry

School of Marine Sciences
Cochin University of Science and Technology
Cochin – 682 016

November 2003

Prof. Dr. BABU PHILIP, M.Sc., Ph.D.
*Professor of Marine Biochemistry*

**Cochin University of Science and Technology
Department of Marine Biology, Microbiology
and Biochemistry, School of Marine Sciences**

**Fine Arts Avenue, Kochi – 682016, India
Tel.: +91-484-2351957, Fax: +91-484-2363055
E-mail: babuphilip@cusat.ac.in**

Certificate

This is to certify that this thesis entitled **'Nutritional responses in Indian white shrimp *Fenneropenaeus indicus* to varying protein: energy combinations in compounded artificial feeds'** is an authentic record of research work carried out by **Mr. P. Vijayagopal,** under my scientific supervision and guidance at Central Marine Fisheries Research Institute (CMFRI), Cochin in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the award of the degree of **Doctor of Philosophy** of the Cochin University of Science and Technology (CUSAT) under the Faculty of Marine Sciences, and no part thereof has been presented for the award of any other degree, diploma or associateship in any University.

Dr. Babu Philip

Prof. Dr. Babu Philip. M.Sc., Ph.D.
Professor of Marine Biochemistry
Dept. of Marine Biology, Microbiology & Biochemistry
Cochin University of Science & Technology
Fine Arts Avenue, Ernakulam, Kochi-682 016

Declaration

I, P. Vijayagopal, do hereby declare that this thesis entitled **'Nutritional responses in Indian white shrimp *Fenneropenaeus indicus* to varying protein: energy combinations in compounded artificial feeds'** is a genuine record of the research work done by me under the scientific supervision of Dr. Babu Philip, Professor and former Head of the Department, Department of Marine Biology, Microbiology & Biochemistry, Cochin University of Science and Technology, and has not previously formed the basis for award of any degree, diploma or associateship in any University.

P. Vijayagopal

(Reg. No. 1825)

Acknowledgements

To my late father

for all the love

Contents

Abbreviations and Acronyms

ADCP	Aquaculture development and coordination programme
ADE	Apparent digestible energy
ADMD	Apparent dry matter digestibility
AIA	Acid insoluble ash
ALD	Apparent lipid digestibility
APD	Apparent protein digestibility
AQUACOP	Aquaculture Research Centre of the Pacific, Tahiti, French Polynesia
CF	Crude fiber
CIBA	Central Institute of Brackishwater Aquaculture
CMFRI	Central Marine Fisheries Research Institute
CP	Crude protein
DE	Digestible energy
DM	Dry matter
E/P	Energy/protein
EE	Ether extract or crude fat
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organisation
FCE	Food conversion efficiency
FCR	Food conversion ration
FER	Feed efficiency ratio
GE	Gross energy
GE	Gross energy
GLP	Good laboratory practice
GMP	Good manufacturing practice
L: C	Lipid: carbohydrate
ME	Metabolisable energy
MT	Metric tonnes
NFE	Nitrogen free extract
NRC	National Research Council
P/E	Protein/energy
PER	Protein efficiency ratio
PNPD	Physiology Nutrition and Pathology Division
RGR	Relative growth rate
SGR	Specific growth rate

List of Tables

List of Figures

Preface

Shrimp[1] mariculture is the major aquaculture activity in India despite the challenges it poses. Even though 75 – 85% of it comes from low input extensive farming systems (Rosenberry 1999), India maintains a moderate sixth position in the production of farmed shrimp (114670 MT) with a positive growth of 41.4 % over 1998-1999 figures (FAO 2001). The remaining 10 – 20% of the farmed shrimp production is from semi-intensive and 5% from intensive production systems (Tacon 2002). Awareness and use of nutrient inputs thus appears to be limited to this 25% of the farming systems. The cost of feeds and feeding (23-56%) followed by seed cost (10-22%) according to an estimate by Ling *et al.* (1997), is the major expenditure in the operation that requires, research and refinement to be acceptable to the cost conscious aquafarmer for augmenting production.

The approach to reducing cost of production in aquaculture in general and mariculture in particular is focused on minimising the cost of feeds. Reduction in the inclusion of costly animal protein sources, mainly of marine origin is an area, which is incessantly worked upon. Definition of species-specific requirements, scientific rationing and unravelling of animal-specific requirement of nutrients are some of the other key areas of work. Improving the bioavailability of nutrients with biotechnological interventions is another frontline in aquatic nutrition research.

---

[1] The common names shrimp and prawn are applied to different species in different parts of the world. According to a convention by the United Nation's Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), the term shrimp refers to marine and brackish-water forms of Penaeidae and Palaemonidae, while fresh-water forms of Palaemonids are called prawn.

Identification of anti-nutritional factors, their amelioration and laying down of safety standards regarding their use is nascent in shrimp mariculture. Currently farming system intensification with biosecurity, vertical integration of inputs, organic farming etc., are adding new dimensions to this sector.

Focus of nutritional requirement studies have shifted from definition of absolute requirements in terms of protein, lipid and carbohydrate to definition of more precise nutritional requirements in terms of amino acids and fatty acids. Application of these findings has become easier now with linear programming software's available for feed formulation.

Nutrient interactions and interrelationships cannot be ignored in nutrition research. Among the macronutrient interaction mechanisms studied calorie protein interaction is the first to be taken up in any animal either terrestrial or aquatic. Shrimp is no exception in this regard. Thus research in crustacean nutrition began in the laboratories of Dr. Kanazawa and Dr. Provasoli in the 1960s in Japan (Kagoshima University) and United States (Yale University) respectively. Dr. Kanazawa focused on development of test diets by modifying his own diets designed for silkworm, to study the absolute macronutrient requirements in *Penaeus japonicus*. His effort was with a vision to support the commercially successful shrimp mariculture in Japan then. Dr. Provasoli, motivated by his success in defining the nutrient requirements in the culture media for freshwater and marine algae, extended his work to define the nutrient requirements of certain crustaceans like *Artemia* and *Moina*, which consumed algae. Some of the first descriptions of macronutrient and micronutrient interactions came from him.

Today even with an ever-growing shrimp mariculture industry led by Asian countries commercial aquaculture is dependent upon empirically formulated commercial feeds. Farming system crashes leading to heavy economic losses have led adoption of 'good farming practices' similar to good manufacturing practice (GMP) and good laboratory practice (GLP) standards followed in Europe and Americas. Organic aquaculture similar to organic agriculture is also in place today because there is a growing awareness regarding the long term benefits of its consumption coupled with a significant growth in the market segment for such produce.

It is in this context an investigation of this nature was taken up with the broad aim of definition of gross energy requirements in a shrimp abundant in Indian waters viz. *Fenneropenaeus indicus*[2], the Indian white shrimp. Interaction of protein in the feeds with energy, and how best energy can be utilised to spare protein without affecting the animals' growth and health, the possibility of cost reduction and effect of energy as a variable in shrimp feeds and its impact on growth are the two major facets in which the knowledge advanced through this investigation can be applied.

---

[2] Synonymous to *Penaeus indicus*

INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER - I

INTRODUCTION

Shrimp nutrition research really started off in the 1960s. Researches on location-specific problems both applied and basic are innumerable. Although majority of crustacean aquaculture operations are conducted within earthen-pond farming systems (New 1995; Rosenberry 1993) almost all published information on nutrient requirements in crustaceans is derived from laboratory or indoor tank based feeding trials. This according to Tacon and Akiyama (1997) has been due to a variety of reasons, including 1) the higher economic cost of conducting feeding trials within outdoor experimental ponds, 2) the difficulty of readily quantifying the contribution of natural food organisms in the overall nutritional budget of pond raised crustaceans, 3) the often large variability of results obtained from superficially identical outdoor ponds or pens, and 4) the general reluctance of the conventional laboratory based nutritionist to work under outdoor field conditions (for a review, please see Tacon 1995).

According to Tacon (2002) the shrimp farming sector currently consumes 470,386 MT of fish meal and 36,184 MT of fish oil within compound aquafeeds (dry basis) or the equivalent of 2,351,930 MT of fish (pelagic fish live weight equivalent) for the total global production of 1,130,737 MT of farmed shrimp in 1999; this is equivalent to the consumption of 2.08 kg of fish for every 1.0 kg of shrimp produced.

The mean fishmeal and fish oil content of shrimp aquafeeds in 1999 was estimated to be 26% and 2%, respectively.

The mean food conversion efficiency of shrimp aquafeeds was 2.0 in 1999, with 2.0 kg of shrimp feed (dry basis) being consumed for each 1.0 kg of shrimp biomass harvested (wet basis). This feed efficiency is equivalent to a shrimp

nutrient utilization efficiency of about 25% the remainder being lost to the surrounding aquatic environment.

At present the majority of shrimp aquafeeds used by farmers are nutritionally over-formulated as complete diets (DeVresse, 1995 and DeVresse, 2000) irrespective of the farming system, shrimp stocking density employed and natural food available and no practical guidelines exist concerning good on-farm feed manufacture and on-farm feed management practices.

Shrimp feeds available commercially in the Asian region are reported to be 'over-formulated' in the absence of accurate information regarding nutrient density in feeds used under different farming systems, viz., extensive, semi-intensive and intensive (Tacon 2002). Thus, relevance of laboratory based nutritional evaluation for nutrient requirements in shrimp is only in the context of 20-25% semi-intensive and intensive shrimp farms in the region (Rosenberry, 1999). However, energy requirement in shrimp feeds is still an area where even laboratory-based investigations are scant.

Fenneropenaeus indicus formerly *Penaeus indicus* (Perez-Farfante and Kensley, 1997)* popularly known as the Indian white shrimp is a major alternative species farmed and is ranked eighth contributor to the world production of farmed shrimp (FAO, 2001)**.

*Suggested new names for shrimp (Perez-Farfante and Kensely, 1997)

Old Name	New Name
Penaeus vannamei	*Litopenaeus vannmei*
Penaeus stylirostris	*Litopenaeus stylirostris*
Penaeus chinensis	*Fenneropenaeus chinensis*
Penaeus japonicus	*Marsupenaeus japonicus*
Penaeus schimitti	*Litopenaeus schimitti*
Penaeus setiferus	*Litopenaeus setiferus*
Penaeus occidentalis	*Litopenaeus occidentalis*

Old Name	New Name (Contd.)
Penaeus brasiliensis	*Farfantepenaeus brasiliensis*
Penaeus aztecus	*Farfantepenaeus aztecus*
Penaeus californiensis	*Farfantepenaeus californiensis*
Penaeus duorarum	*Farnfantepenaeus duorarum*
Penaeus noitalis	*Farnfantepenaeus notialis*
Penaeus subtilis	*Farnfantepenaeus subtilis*
Penaeus paulensis	*Farnfantepenaeus paulensis*
Penaeus merguiensis	*Fenneropenaeus merguiensis*
Penaeus pencillatus	*Fenneropenaeus pencillatus*

No name change

Penaeus monodon, P. esculentus and P. semisulcatus

**Total world production of farmed shrimp in 1999, by weight (FAO 2001).

Shrimp species	Production (MT)	Change 1998–99 (%)
Giant tiger prawn *Penaeus monodon*	575,842	+3.9
Whiteleg shrimp *Penaeus vannamei*	187,224	-5.6
Fleshy prawn *Penaeus chinensis*	171,972	+19.5
Penaeid shrimp *Penaeus* spp (spp not given)	95,634	+20.2
Banana prawn *Penaeus merguiensis*	53,109	+7.5
Metapenaeid shrimp *Metapenaeus* spp	22,421	+1.0
Blue shrimp *Penaeus stylirostris*	12,390	-22.1
Indian white prawn *Penaeus indicus*	7,043	+13.7
Kuruma prawn *Penaeus japonicus*	2,359	-6.6
Southern white shrimp *Penaeus schmitti*	1,364	-21.3
Natantian decapods *Natantia*	904	+175.0
Akiami paste shrimp *Acetes japonicus*	270	+2.3
Redtail prawn *Penaeus penicillatus*	107	-21.9
Palaemonid shrimp, spp. Not given	98	-39.9
Total	**1,130,737**	**+5.2**

CMFRI initially and CIBA subsequently, researched on the nutrition of this species of shrimp, addressing the absolute nutrient requirements both at macro and micro levels. However, macronutrient interaction studies were limited to Ali (1990 and 1996) and Hamid (1998). In *P. monodon* a couple studies of starting from AQUACOP (1977) to Chuntapa *et al.* (1999) is limited to not more than twenty reports in all.

This investigation is presented in six chapters. Chapter II deals with the review of literature, which contains only the reports, which are relevant to shrimp. However, reports dealing with the associated factors which directly or indirectly influences the protein: energy interaction are also included. Materials and methods are presented in the III Chapter. Results and discussion are dealt with in Chapters IV and V respectively. Chapter VI is summary and conclusions, followed by references.

CHAPTER - II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The importance of balance between dietary energy and protein was understood at the beginning of the century in the nutrition of human and farm animals. The ratio has been expressed as either percent of total dietary energy arising from protein or the energy/protein ratio. Protein/energy ratio (P/E) is somewhat analogous to protein content. In this thesis it is defined as mg crude protein or digestible protein per kilocalorie (kcal) and energy is expressed as kcal $100g^{-1}$. Values in joules (J) found in all the reports for the sake of uniformity have been converted to kilocalories (kcal). A brief review of the systems of expression of units in vogue is as follows.

2.1 Traditional Systems

The traditional measurement systems measured mechanical energy and work with "mechanically" derived units, while special thermal units were used to measure heat energy. Accordingly, the **Btu** (British thermal unit) was defined as: the quantity of heat that must be added to 1 lb of water to raise its temperature 1°F (in Canada, 60–61°F). Similarly, the kilocalorie is the quantity of heat needed to raise the temperature of 1 kg of water by 1°C, at its point of maximum density (4°C).

2.2 International System

The International System of Units (SI) has one common unit for work and energy — the joule (J), which measures all forms of energy and work, whether the discipline is mechanical, thermal, electrical, chemical or nuclear. Work is the expenditure or receipt of some form of energy. Energy is the capacity for doing work. The joule (J) is defined as the work done when the point of application of a force of one Newton is displaced a distance of one meter in the direction of the force. In symbolic language, the formula is J = N•m. The unit is named after James Prescott Joule, English, (1818–1889).

2.3 Historical Note

SI is the official abbreviation — in all languages — for the International System of Units (Système International d'Unitès), adopted in 1960 by the 11th General Conference on Weights and Measures. New units such as the Newton (N), Pascal (Pa), and Joule (J) were adopted. These units will gradually replace the traditional units for force, pressure, energy, work, etc. However, literature originating from the Americas and Europe is found to use J and reports from UK and Asia prefer kcal for which following conversion factors are routinely used.

Change:	To:	Multiply By:
Kilograms	Pounds	2.205
Pounds	Kilograms	0.454
Calorie	Joule (J)	4.185
Joule	Calorie (cal)	0.239
g/MJ	g/Mcal	4.185
g/Mcal	g/MJ	0.239

Capuzzo (1983) reviewed the information available on the effects of dietary energy on growth, body composition and feed efficiency in *Homarus, Macrobrachium* and *Penaeus* genera. This was the last review of the general method of partitioning of ingested food energy into various measurable energetic fates with particular reference to crustaceans. In its simplest form, and following the terminology suggested by the U.S. National Research Council (NRC 1981), the energy-partitioning budget of any growing animal is expressed as: IE = FE + HE + WE + RE. The intake of dietary energy (IE) is balanced by the sum of undigested energy lost to the animal through faeces (FE) plus catabolic wastes (WE) and the remaining energy available for use by the animal. Available energy for use consists of combination of the total heat production (HE), as a result of both the metabolic and behavioural activities, and the net energy gain which is channelled into growth or recovered energy (RE). While crustaceans use energy in the same fashion as other animals that have been studied, some characteristics unique to crustaceans appear at several levels of this partition scheme. Digestibility and

16

related faecal energy loss (FE) may differ among carnivorous, herbivorous and scavenger species. Waste energy (WE) losses arising from metabolism, primarily through urine and the gill excretions will be similar to those determined or calculated for ammonotelic fish rather than those for higher vertebrates. Heat energy (HE) will include energy losses associated with moulting, the shedding of the exoskeleton, which has been estimated by several investigators (Logan and Epifano, 1978; Capuzzo 1983; Khmeleva and Gobulev 1986).

2.4 Energy values of nutrients for crustaceans

To balance the energy level of crustacean diets appropriately, estimation of the energy value of dietary nutrients is necessary. In the absence of empirically determined values, the energy level of a diet can be estimated from gross energy (GE) values of the carbohydrate, fat and protein level in each of the feed ingredients. However, using gross energies of these macronutrients may be misleading due to incomplete digestion. Consequently, apparent digestible energy (ADE) values are better than GE values for estimating the biological value of nutrients. Using the standard National Research Council (NRC) terminology: IE – FE = ADE. FE includes not only undigested material that was never assimilated but also some energy from tissue products produced by the animal as well as products of bacterial action in the animals' gut. Therefore, ADE is slightly different (lower) than true digestible energy (TDE). A more accurate measure of usable dietary energy takes into account the other source of energy loss WE. Thus, available or metabolic energy (ME) is ADE – WE = ME. By using the three equations it is evident that ME = HE + RE. To estimate the ME of different nutrients, average values were compiled and standard estimates established for the various classes of nutrients in feeds (NRC, 1981). These estimates, termed physiological fuel values (pfv's), are routinely used in calculating the energy content of formulated feeds. The pfv's of 4, 9 and 4 kcal g^{-1} for carbohydrate, lipid and protein respectively (Brody, 1964) were obtained using arbitrary digestibilities and assuming the end product of protein catabolism to be urea. These assumptions are not applicable to crustaceans.

Brett and Groves (1979) stated that 4.78 kcal g^{-1} was more realistic digestible energy variable for protein in finfish. They derived this value from calculation of metabolism in finfish as well as crustaceans. Brett and Groves (1979) proposed focusing on ME values rather than on total nutrient levels. Although the value of 4.8 kcal g^{-1} can be used for minor nitrogenous compounds, as demonstrated in the study of Le Gal (1987), Elliot and Davidson (1975) still considered 4.8 kcal g^{-1} to be a GE value more appropriate than the pfv of protein (4 kcal g^{-1}) for mammals.

The values recommended by aquaculture coordination and development programme (ADCP), 1983 of FAO that are used in this study, are as follows:

Nutrient	Gross energy (GE) kcal g^{-1}	Digestible energy (DE) kcal g^{-1}	
Protein	5.5	Animal protein	4.25
		Vegetable protein	3.8
Fat	9.1		8.0
Carbohydrate	4.1	Animal carbohydrate	3.0
		Vegetable carbohydrate	2.0

2.5 Energy requirements in *Fenneropenaeus indicus*

Colvin (1976) reported that substitution of protein by potato starch, involving only a small change in caloric value (4.8 – 4.7 kcal g^{-1}) did not affect growth in *P. indicus* in spite of the reduction of protein from 53.1 to 42.8% in the first report on evaluation of protein requirement in this species.

Ali (1990) assessing the relative efficiencies of different lipids and lipid levels in the diet of *Penaeus indicus* tested four lipids viz. cod liver oil, prawn head oil, sardine oil and soybean lecithin at 60 g kg^{-1} level in a purified diet. Diets with prawn head oil and a mixed lipid consisting of all the four lipids in equal proportions registered significantly higher growth ($P < 0.01$) and food conversion ratio (FCR). Using this lipid mixture and starch in the ratio 1:7, the calorific value of the diet was varied

18

from 271.68 kcal $100g^{-1}$ to 462.43 kcal $100g^{-1}$, keeping the protein constant (400 g kg^{-1}). Feeding experiments conducted with these diets have shown that the growth of shrimps increased and the FCR improved with the increase in dietary energy. The diet having 414.72 kcal $100g^{-1}$ recorded the highest growth and least FCR. A further increase in the dietary energy is reported to have no beneficial effect on the growth or FCR.

Ali (1996) in a set of three experiments reported the propensity of *P. indicus* to utilise carbohydrates to spare proteins. Keeping protein (350 g kg^{-1}) and lipid (70 g kg^{-1}) levels constant, he observed that an energy level (DE) of 348 kcal $100g^{-1}$ to be appropriate where the level of carbohydrate was 225 g kg^{-1}. In the next experiment with lipid (70 g kg^{-1}) levels kept constant and allowing protein and carbohydrate levels to vary he reported than a DE level of 399.4 kcal $100g^{-1}$ to be appropriate where the protein and carbohydrate levels were 219 and 534 g kg^{-1} respectively. When protein (350 g kg^{-1}) was kept constant and lipid and carbohydrate levels were allowed to vary, the optimum DE was 392.4 kcal $100g^{-1}$ where the lipid and carbohydrate levels were 70 and 332 g kg^{-1} respectively.

Hamid (1998) reported three nutritional evaluations with *P. indicus* in which the levels of protein (g kg^{-1}) and GE (kcal $100g^{-1}$) tested were 350: 380, 420, 460; 400: 380, 420, 460 and 450: 380, 420, 460 respectively in a 3x3 factorial experiment. In animals weighing <1g an optimum could not be delineated because, 450:460 combination of protein and energy registered the maximum growth. In animals of 1-5g a lowering of protein and GE was reported where the optimum combination was 400:420. A further lowering of protein and energy requirement was also reported in animals of 5-10g where the best combination was 350:380 which was not an optimum because levels/nutrient density below this was not tested. These results are also summarised in Table shown below. Hamid (1998) in another set of three experiments interestingly reported that *P. indicus* below 1g could utilise 120g kg^{-1} lipids in concert with 450g kg^{-1} proteins. In the animals weighing 1-5g optimum was reported to be 400:90 and in animals weighing 5-10g the maximum growth was at 350:60. These three experiments were also inconclusive as the former three experiments because, levels above 450:120 and below 350:360 in the sizes <1g and 5-10g were not tested.

19

Spp.	S ‰	I_W g	CP	L: C	Energy levels tested	Opt. Energy kcal100g^{-1}	P/E ratios tested	Opt. P/E ratio	Reference
P. indicus	15	0.075 w	40	1:7	272-462	415	87-147	96	Ali 1990
P. indicus	17	0.010 d	35	1:3	286-470	348	85-140	101	Ali 1996
P. indicus	17	0.010 d	22	1:8	379-401	399	55-135	55	Ali 1996
P. indicus	17	0.010 d	35	1:5	358-419	392	112-125	89	Ali 1996
P. indicus	25	< 1 w	45	1:11	380-460	460	79-112	95	Hamid 1998
P. indicus	25	1 – 5 w	40	1:8	380-460	420	79-112	95	Hamid 1998
P. indicus	25	5-10 w	35	1:6	380-460	380	79-112	95	Hamid 1998

S = salinity, I_W = Initial weight, w = wet weight, d = dry weight CP = crude protein, L: C = lipid: carbohydrate, Opt. = optimum

2.6 Energy requirements in *Penaeus monodon*

AQUACOP (1977) estimated that a total dietary energy content of 330 kcal 100g^{-1} was required for optimal growth of *P. monodon* growth with a diet containing 400 g kg^{-1} protein.

Bautista (1986) investigating on the response of *P. monodon* to varying protein/energy ratios in test diets reported the results of two sets of factorial experiments conducted for 8 weeks to determine the response of juveniles (average weights   0.60 ± 0.16 g and 0.80 ± 0.05 g) to diets containing various protein/energy ratios. The first experiment used casein as the sole source of protein, while the other used a combination of 70%: 30% casein: gelatin for its protein source. A two fold increase in the body weight was achieved for shrimps fed on diet combinations of 400-500 g kg^{-1} protein, 50-100 g kg^{-1} lipid and 200 g kg^{-1} carbohydrate with energy values of 285-370 kcal 100g^{-1}, regardless of the protein source used. Reduction in protein content of the diet from 500 to 400 g kg^{-1} while maintaining the total energy level at 330 kcal 100g^{-1} resulted in a non-significant decrease in growth. The inclusion of 150 g kg^{-1} lipid in diet produced adverse affects in the animal while sucrose levels beyond 200 g kg^{-1} resulted in decreased growth rate. An increase in energy level, at constant dietary protein level, resulted in improved utilisation of protein and feed conversion efficiency. Survival of the prawn was higher with diets containing casein and gelatin as the protein source than with those containing casein as the sole source of protein. Both, Bautista (1986) and Shiau and Peng (1992) concluded that a protein: energy ratio of 125 mg protein kcal^{-1} is optimal for *P. monodon* growth.

Hajra *et al.* (1988) indicating a transient protein sparing action exerted by digestible energy from dietary carbohydrate reported that, at 460 g kg^{-1} protein, weight gain, feed efficiency and protein utilization increased with increase in dietary energy level up to 412.60 kcal 100g^{-1} (P/E 112.2) in a 21-day study in near fresh water conditions (3.5 – 4.5 ‰ salinity).

Shiau and Chou (1991) testing two protein levels 360 and 400 g kg^{-1} and six energy levels 280, 300, 320, 340, 360 and 380 kcal 100g[-1], reported that the weight gain, FCR and protein gain of shrimp improved as dietary energy level was raised up to around 330 kcal/100g when 360 g kg^{-1} protein diet was fed and up to around 320 kcal 100g[-1] when 400 g kg^{-1} protein diet was fed. Further elevation in dietary energy level of the diet had no beneficial effect on either levels of protein. At a salinity 32-34 ‰, they opined that at 400 g kg^{-1} protein and 320 kcal 100g[-1] to be the optimum (P/E = 125) and at 360 g kg^{-1} protein energy level of 330 kcal 100g[-1] (P/E = 110) to be the optimum implying protein sparing of 4%.

Chuntapa et al. (1999), reported optimal lipid: carbohydrate and protein: energy ratios in semi-purified diets for P. monodon Fabricius juveniles. Two experiments were performed and reported using completely randomised designs in semi-closed recirculating water systems. Juveniles of 0.4- 0.8 g in weight and 4.0 to 5.5 cm in length stocked at a density of 80 individuals m[-2] were fed semi-purified diets. The first experiment determined optimal lipid: carbohydrate ratios: 40:390, 70:320, 90:250, 140:180 and 160:120 (g kg^{-1} wt/wt). The lipid: carbohydrate ratio of 70:320 gave the highest growth rate (P <0.05), while survival rates of shrimp in all other diet groups were similar but less. Thus, optimal lipid: carbohydrate ratio for the juvenile tiger shrimp was 1:4.6. In the second experiment, optimal protein: energy (P: E) ratio was studied using five protein levels (250, 300, 350 and 400 and 450 g kg^{-1}) with a fixed lipid: carbohydrate ratio of 1:4.6. Nine diets containing energy content (203-459 kcal[-1] 100g) with a protein: energy ratio (63-171 mg protein kcal[-1]) was formulated. Shrimp fed the diet containing 330-440 g kg^{-1} protein and an energy content of 223-371 kcal 100g[-1] had a significantly higher growth rate than those fed the other diets (P <0.05). A regression analysis indicated than an optimal P: E ratio for optimal growth and survival of juvenile tiger shrimp was 146-150 mg protein kcal[-1]. This diet contained 330-440 g kg^{-1} protein and had an optimal energy of 263-331 kcal 100g[-1].

Available data of P/E in P. monodon, which was compiled, by Cuzon and Guillaume (1997) is updated and Tabled below.

22

S‰	Coefficient values protein: lipid: CHO	P/E mg/kcal	Initial weight g	CP %	EE%	CHO%	Source of CHO	Reference
37	4:9:4(DE)	117-154	1.0	30-55	7	18	Gl. St.	AQUACOP 1997
37	4:9:4(DE)	130-153	1.0	40	2-10	14-20	Wh.	AQUACOP 1997
37	4:9:4(DE)	112-145	1.0	35-45	4-9	18-24	Wh.	AQUACOP 1997
32-34	4.5:8:3.3(ME)	71-127	1.3	25-60	7	8-43	Dx.	Alava and Lim 1983
32	4:9:4(DE)	90-204	0.6	30-50	5-15	0-20	Su.	Bautista 1986
32-34	5:9:4	112	0.6	45	10	10-30	Gl. Su. Tre.	Alava and Pascual 1987
4	4:9:4(DE)	94-121	0.5	46	9-14	26-31	Co. Mo.	Hajra et al. 1988
40	5:9:4(ME)	100-140	0.8	36-40	9	5-30	Dx.	Shiau and Chou 1991
32-34	5:9:4	83-116	0.5	30-40	4-5	20-30	Glu. Dx. St.	Shiau and Peng 1992
23-25	4:9:4	63-171	0.4-0.5	26-45	3-11	13.6-49.9	Co.	Chuntapa et al. 1999

S=salinity, CHO=carbohydrate, Gl.=glucose, St.=starch, Wh.=wheat, Dx.=dextrin, Su.=sucrose, Tr.=trehalose, Co.=corn, Mo.=molasses

2.7 Energy requirements in penaeids other than *P. monodon* and *F. indicus*

Sedgwick (1979) assessed the requirement of juvenile *Penaeus merguiensis* for dietary protein and energy (was) in growth trials by using rations based on freeze-dried *Mytilus edulis* meal. Evidence was obtained to indicate that the rate of food consumption in this shrimp is related to the energy content of the diet. Protein level required to support maximum growth and optimum protein conversion efficiency were reported to be energy dependent. Optimum protein levels were estimated in the range 340-420 g kg^{-1} for diets of energy content 290-440 kcal 100g^{-1}.

Cousin *et al.* (1992) and Koshio *et al.* (1993) studied other penaeid species. These studies differ from those with *P. monodon* because; practical diets containing crab meal (Koshio *et al.*, 1993) or casein and crab meal Cousin *et al.* (1992) were used. Results for these penaeids confirm a protein sparing effect of carbohydrate, and suggest differences in protein requirements; 320 –350 g kg^{-1} for *P. vannamei* and *P. setiferus*, Cousin *et al.* (1992) and 420 g kg^{-1} for *P. japonicus* (Koshio *et al.* 1993). By increasing the level of non-protein energy sources, the protein requirement of *P. japonicus* was reduced from 600 – 420 g kg^{-1}. The optimal dietary P/E values of other penaeid species are similar to those of *P. monodon* and *P. vannamei* (84 mg protein kcal^{-1}) and if this value is exceeded, a growth depression results.

P. japonicus a carnivorous species with a presumed high dietary protein requirement (Deshimaru and Shigueno, 1972) grows on a 420 g kg^{-1} protein diet containing a highly digestible protein source, 150 g kg^{-1} carbohydrate, 80g kg^{-1} lipids. *P. japonicus* reaches a plateau in growth expressed as specific growth rate (SGR), beyond its optimal level of dietary protein. *P. merguiensis* which requires a dietary protein level similar to that of *P. japonicus* is able to grow at equivalent levels when fed diets containing less dietary protein, provided that a non protein energy source is provided. Collectively these studies suggest that an increase in dietary energy tends to increase the performance when a diet low in protein is fed.

24

Species	S ‰	CP:EE:NFE	P/E mg/kcal	In. wt. g	CP%	EE%	NFE %	CHO source	Reference
P. merguiensis	37	5.55:9.45:4.2 (GE)	37-111	0.2	16-50	1-17	6-50	Wh. +St.	Sedgwick 1979
P. vannamei	37	4:8:3.8	80-120	1.0	25-30	6	20-40	Sa.	Cousin et al. 1993
P. japonicus	37	5.65:9.45:4.1 (DE)	90-120	0.4	20-60	3-14	5-24	De.	Koshio et al. 1992

S=salinity, CP=crude protein, EE=ether extract, NFE=nitrogen free extract, In.Wt.=initial weight, CHO=carbohydrate, Wh.=wheat, St.=starch, Sa.=saccharose, De.=dextrin

2.8 Effect of dietary protein and energy levels on other physiological and biochemical indices in shrimp

Rosas et al. (2001) reported the effect of dietary protein and energy levels on growth, oxygen consumption, haemolymph and digestive gland carbohydrates, nitrogen excretion and osmotic pressure of Litopenaeus vannamei (Boone) and Litopenaeus setiferus (Linne) juveniles. Influence of protein and energy levels on growth rate, survival, pre- and post-prandial oxygen consumption, ammonia excretion, haemolymph glucose (HG), glycogen in digestive gland and osmotic pressure (OP) in white shrimp L. vannamei and L. setiferus was studied. Diets containing high quality protein at a P/E ratio of 67, 109 and 151 were fed at 20% of the shrimp body weight of two sizes: <1 g and > 1 g. Both species showed an optimum P/E ratio of 151 (330-440 g kg^{-1} protein and 60 – 230 g kg^{-1} carbohydrate). In both experiments, the growth rate of L. vannamei was 2-3 times that observed in L. setiferus. Routine oxygen consumption and apparent heat increment (AHI) of L. setiferus was two times higher than that observed in L. vannamei juveniles, which could indicate that L. setiferus has a higher metabolic rate. The overall results showed that juveniles of > 1 g of both the species are less dependant of P/E ratio than juveniles of < 1 g. L. vannamei is indicated to be the most tolerant species with a high capacity to use a wide range of dietary P/E ratios for growth, which they attribute to lower energy requirements. L. setiferus is reported to have a lower capacity to accept different P/E in spite of its capacity to accept a high carbohydrate level. They stressed upon to take note of the importance of these species-specific physiological and nutritional differences in commercial culture.

Guzman et al. (2001) investigated the effect of dietary protein and energy content on the activity of digestive enzymes (total proteinases, trypsin, chymotrypsin, α-amylase and lipase), growth and survival of L. setiferus under controlled conditions. There was a clear relationship between the diet fed and the post larval growth and survival. Highest weight gain (2110± 96.7%) was obtained with a 400 g kg^{-1} protein and low energy diet (332 kcal 100 g^{-1}). The optimum P/E ratio estimated was 120 mg protein $kcal^{-1}$. Good survival was

obtained with low energy diets containing between 200 and 400 g kg^{-1} protein. Higher values for total proteinases, trypsin and α-amylase were obtained with low energy, 400 g kg^{-1} protein diet. Chymotryptic activity was considerably lower than that of other proteinases and lipase activity was too low to be reliably measured with the turbidometric method employed. Total proteinase activity was significantly lower than in experimentally grown post larvae. The α-amylase activity was at least two orders of magnitude higher in wild post larvae than in animals fed with the best experimental diet. Protein requirement was related to total energy content of the diet; best growth and digestive enzyme activity coincide with low energy, 400 g kg^{-1} protein diet. They opined that dietary carbohydrates could not spare protein because growth rates obtained with diets containing 200-300 g kg^{-1} protein (337 and 226 g kg^{-1} dextrin respectively) were significantly lowered.

2.9 Carbohydrate utilisation in shrimp

Since the level of lipid in shrimp diets cannot exceed 120 g kg^{-1} the choice of energy yielding nutrients excluding protein and lipid gets limited to carbohydrate. The status of knowledge essential for this work is summarised here. Cousin (1995) opined that energy retention is shrimp is more efficient in a higher protein diet than a low one because amino acids not used for protein synthesis were more efficiently used as energy source than dietary glucose. In L. sylirostris he showed that energy retention was less efficient in higher protein diet than low one as shown in the following Table.

Energy retention and wheat starch level (Cousin, 1995)		
Wheat starch %	Protein %	Energy retention %
30	35	19
25	45	17
17	50	15
11	55	14

In L. vannamei also, he showed the same trend that was lower (10-14%) compared to L. stylirostris. Shiau (1997) reviewed the work done in crustaceans extensively and Tabled the carbohydrate utilization by penaeid shrimp as shown in the following Table.

Carbohydrate utilization by penaeid shrimp (Shiau, 1997)

Carbohydrate source	% Tested	Species	Results	Reference
Glucose/starch	0, 20, 30, 40	P.setiferus	>utilization = starch	Andrews et al. (1972)
Glucose, starch	10, 40	P.duorarum	>Utilization = starch	Sick& Andrews (1973)
Glycogen, glucose Dextrin, glucose, Sucrose	10	P.japonicus	>weight gain = sucrose, >feed efficiency = starch < utilization = glucose	Deshimaru & Yone (1978)
Glucose, starch, Dextrin, potato Starch, glycogen, Galactose, fructose, Sucrose, maltose	19.5	P.japonicus	<utilization = monosaccharides (glucose, galactose)	Abdel- Rahaman et al. (1979)
Maltose, sucrose Dextrin, molasses, Cassava starch, Corn starch, sago, Palm starch	10, 40	P.monodon	>survival = sucrose	Pascual (1983)
Trehalose, sucrose Glucose	10, 20, 30	P.monodon	>utilization = trehalose and sucrose utilized	Alava & Pascual (1987)
Wheat flour; straight First grade clear Second grade clear	35	P.monodon	no difference	Shiau et al. (1991)
Gelatinised bread flour	5, 15, 25, 35	P.monodon	<weight gain and conversion ratio = 35%	Catacutan(1991)
Glucose, dextrin, Starch	20, 25, 30	P.monodon	>utilization = starch or dextrin	Shiau and Peng (1992)

> = highest, < = lowest

Recently, Cuzon *et al.* (2000) in their review examined the carbohydrate utilisation by shrimp and the biochemical mechanisms involved in carbohydrate metabolism. Their conclusions were – digestibility of carbohydrate in shrimp varied according to flour type, botanical origin of starch and inclusion level. Native starch was digested as well as pre-cooked starch. Best results were attained with standard wheat starch.

Levels of glucose in plasma varied according to the botanical origin of starch in the diet (Cousin, 1995). For starch levels in feed contributing up to 45% of available energy, no negative effect on growth was seen. Increasing the amount of starch from $0 - 400$ g kg^{-1} FCR was not affected. At low inclusion levels (ca. 30g kg^{-1}), starch promoted growth with a lowering in nitrogen excretion. Protein retention, PER, growth etc., depends on an optimal energy balance between protein and fat (Cousin, 1995), keeping the carbohydrate content enough for metabolic needs. Nature of starch fed had some correlation with the variations in hepatopancreatic glycogen. At 350 g kg^{-1} inclusion of amylose rich starch provided the lowest glycogen content in hepatopancreas; where as pre-cooked starch gave the highest hepatopancreatic glycogen values. Glycogen concentrations in muscle are very low and probably not affected by starch content in feed. Shrimps are equipped with digestive enzymes, which facilitate a large range of carbohydrate digestion. As in fishes, shrimp utilizes energy derived from protein better than energy derived from any other nutrient. Thus, the difficulty pointed out is to maintain optimal growth by balancing the P/E ratio including as much carbohydrates as possible.

On perusal of the literature on the subject in shrimp in general and *F. indicus* in particular it is evident that expensive protein inclusion in shrimp feeds can be reduced with a concomitant increase in the non-protein energy yielding constituents. Reduction in the inclusion of expensive proteins in feeds being the major application. GE, DE is used interchangeably due to the absence of experimental baseline data on DE and ME in shrimp. Ranges of protein and energy tested many at times are found to be insufficient to deduce the optima. Taking all these factors into consideration the present investigation was designed to delineate the P/E ratios in *F. indicus* early juveniles (< 1 g) in size with fixed level of protein and varying levels of lipid and carbohydrate under controlled conditions of culture. From the experimental data theoretical optima are also worked out.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

CHAPTER - III

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The feed material procurement, analysis and nutritional evaluations in this research were done in the Nutrition Laboratory of CMFRI and Marine Hatchery complex of CMFRI, Cochin. In total, one experiment of 28 days duration and six experiments of 42 days duration were conducted with different diet designs. The first experiment (A) conducted with feeds containing only natural and location specific feedstuffs is described first. The remaining six experiments that are similar are elaborated next as (B) 1 - 6.

III.1 Shrimp and experimental culture conditions – Experiment A

A feeding trial for 28 days was conducted with early juveniles of *Fenneropenaeus indicus* of one brood procured from MPEDA Hatchery, Vallarpadom, Cochin. Shrimp of mean average weight 0.43 ± 0.03 g (0.38 g – 0.48 g) were segregated into 18 groups of 10 animals each and were stocked in non-toxic plastic tubs (50 cm dia. x 25 cm h; 45-liter water volume) equivalent to a calculated shrimp density of 50 m^{-2} bottom surface area, in triplicate. After acclimatization and conditioning of the experimental animals for a period of three days, initial weights were recorded using an electronic balance. Seawater trucked from Manassery Beach, Cochin, stored in concrete tanks was used for the experiment. Aged seawater drawn through a biological filter and stored in 1-ton fibreglass tanks was diluted to 25‰ and used through out the experiment. All the experimental units received 30% water exchange daily and 100% exchange on weekends. All the plastic tubs were scrubbed clean weekly with minimum disturbance to the experimental animals to check plankton growth. Aeration was provided through a single air-stone inserted though the aperture on circular transparent lid. Water temperature, dissolved oxygen, pH and salinity measurements were made weekly (Table 1).

Table 1. Environmental conditions of culture containers in Experiment A

Parameter	Week 1	Week 2	Week 3	Week4
Temperature °C	28.4	28.9	29.0	28.8
Dissolved Oxygen (mg L^{-1})	5.5	6.1	5.8	5.9
pH	8.4	8.2	8.1	8.2
Salinity (g L^{-1})	25.2	25.0	25.4	25.5

III.2 Diets and feeding protocol - Experiment A

Six experimental diets were formulated using natural feed ingredients available locally. The proximate chemical compositions of these feed ingredients were determined prior to the experimental diet design (Table 2). The ingredient composition of the experimental diets is shown in Table 3. Ascending levels of protein were obtained (Table 4) in the experimental feeds formulated by varying the major proteinaceous ingredients viz., fish meal (dried, unsalted anchovies), shrimp meal (dried *Parapenaeopsis stylifera*), deoiled groundnut oil cake and clam meal (*Villorita cyprinoidis*). Varying the inclusion of oil and tapioca flour varied energy levels.

Table 2. Proximate chemical composition of feed ingredients (Exp.A)
        (As fed basis)

Ingredients	DM	OM	CP	CF	EE	NFE	Ash	AIA
Fish meal	84.06	68.51	61.75	-	5.39	16.83	15.55	0.90
Shrimp meal	89.06	61.17	37.98	11.00	2.83	20.31	27.87	0.31
GNOC	92.78	85.37	49.07	3.57	6.70	33.25	7.41	0.48
Tapioca flour	89.95	88.68	1.72	1.42	0.49	95.09	1.28	0.16
Clam meal	94.33	86.69	52.60	-	10.63	28.46	7.64	2.57

DM= Drymatter, OM=Organic matter, CP=Crude protein, CF= Crude fiber, EE=Ether extract, NFE= Nitrogen free extractives, AIA= Acid insoluble ash.

Table 3. Ingredient composition of the experimental diets (g kg^{-1}) (Exp.A)

Ingredients	Diet 1	Diet 2	Diet 3	Diet 4	Diet 5	Diet 6
Fish meal	-	150	-	160	200	200
Shrimp meal	200	-	-	260	200	200
GNOC	200	150	300	260	200	200
Tapioca flour	440	420	330	170	100	50
Clam meal	60	180	270	50	200	250
Oil[1]	60	40	20	20	40	60
CMC	-	20	40	40	20	-
Cholesterol	5	5	5	5	5	5
Vitamin mixture[2]	10	10	10	10	10	10
Mineral mixture[3]	20	20	20	20	20	20
Cr$_2$O$_3$	5	5	5	5	5	5

[1]Codliver oil and groundnut oil mixed in the ratio 1:1

[2]Contains Vitamin B$_1$ - 10 mg; Vitamin B$_2$ - 10 mg; Vitamin B$_6$ – 3 mg; Nicotinamide – 110mg; Calcium pantothenate – 50 mg; Folic acid - 1500 mcg; Vitamin B$_{12}$ – 15 mcg ; Vitamin C – 50 mg ; Choline chloride – 1200mg and Inositol – 4000 mg

[3]Salt mixture USP XIV from M/s Sisco Research Laboratories, Mumbai.

Table 4. Proximate chemical composition of the experimental diets (% on dry matter basis) and their gross energy content (Exp.A)

Proximate principles	— Diet Nos.					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
CP	22.43	31.99	35.71	43.28	47.65	52.68
EE	6.2	7.74	7.34	4.26	9.31	10.69
CF	3.14	1.41	1.76	3.4	2.61	2.19
NFE	57.05	50.06	47.03	31.92	25.61	20.18
Ash	11.18	8.8	8.16	17.64	14.82	14.26
AIA	0.64	1.41	1.42	0.36	0.74	1.17
GE kcal 100 g^{-1}*	413.69	451.63	438.17	407.68	429.97	470.83
DE kcal 100g^{-1}**	259.0275	297.9975	304.5475	281.86	328.2125	349.77
P/E ratio	54.22	70.83	81.5	106.16	110.82	111.89
E/P	18.44	14.12	12.27	9.42	9.02	8.94
L:C ratio	1:9.2	1:6.5	1:6.4	1:7.5	1:2.8	1:1.9
L:C (% weight)	6:57	8:50	7:47	4:32	9:26	11:20
NFE + EE	63.25	57.8	54.33	36.18	28.22	30.87

*Analysed values for protein, EE and NFE multiplied by 5.5, 9.1 and 4.1kcal g^{-1} respectively (ADCP1983)

**Analysed values for animal protein x 4.25, vegetable protein x 3.8, EE x 8, animal NFE x 3 and vegetable NFE x 2 kcal g^{-1} respectively (ADCP 1983)

All the ingredients were pulverized and sieved through 200 μ mesh to obtain uniform particle size. The dry ingredients except tapioca flour and carboxymethylcellulose (CMC) were weighed and mixed well and blended with oil manually. Tapioca flour and CMC were gelatinised in 200 ml water and subsequently mixed with other ingredients into thick dough. The dough was so formed that its consistency was soft enough to facilitate manual pelletization using a kitchen noodle maker. Moist noodles were made using a 2 mm (dia.) die and dried in a hot air oven at constant temperature (65± 2°C). The dry pellets were then crumbled and stored in airtight containers for subsequent chemical analyses and feeding.

The gross energy (GE) values were calculated from the values reported by ADCP (1983) i.e., 5.5 kcal g^{-1} for protein, 4.1 kcal g^{-1} for carbohydrate (excluding crude fibre) and 9.1 kcal g^{-1} for fat. Thus, six known protein: energy combinations formed the treatments tested in shrimps. The P/E i.e., mg protein $kcal^{-1}$ of the experimental diets was also calculated. Chromic oxide was incorporated at 0.5% level in all the feeds for estimating the apparent dry matter digestibility (ADMD) and apparent protein digestibility (APD).

Feeding was started at the rate of 15% of the body weight during the acclimatization period and the rate of feeding was decreased to 10% of the body weight, which was the level at which minimum feed residues were observed. Feeding was carried out at the rate of 10% of the body weight at 10.00 h and 17.00 h daily in two divided doses of 40% in the morning and 60% in the evening. The tubs were cleaned before each feeding daily throughout the experimental duration. Faecal strands and leftover feed from each tub were siphoned out and collected daily with the help of a thin tube and bolting silk and rinsed with distilled water to remove traces of adhering salts. Feed residue and faecal output were quantified and dried in a hot air oven at 55±2°C and pooled for analyses.

Growth was measured as biomass gain $shrimp^{-1}$ (g), relative growth rate (RGR) and specific growth rate (SGR); protein efficiency ratio (PER), food conversion ratio (FCR) and survival % was also estimated. Apparent dry matter digestibility

(ADMD) and apparent protein digestibility (APD) were calculated using the formula, apparent digestibility coefficient (ADC) = 100 – 100 (% Cr_2O_3 in feed / % Cr_2O_3 in faeces) x (% nutrient in faeces/ % nutrient in feed).

III.3 Chemical analyses of diets and water – Experiment A

Feed ingredients, experimental feeds and faeces were analysed for their proximate chemical compositions according to A.O.A.C. (1990). Chromic oxide (Cr_2O_3) was estimated according to Furukawa and Tsukahara (1966). Seawater was analysed according to the standard methods of Strickland and Parsons (1972).

III.4 Statistics - Experiment A

Comparison of means was carried out through analysis of variance (ANOVA) of the data according to Snedecor and Cochran (1973) using SPSS software. To estimate the optimum levels of protein and GE second-degree polynomials were fitted.

III.5 Shrimp and experimental culture conditions – Experiments (B 1-6)

Shrimp post larvae from a single brood were procured separately for each experiment from M/s SS Hatchery, Kodungallur, Cochin. The post larvae were reared in the wet laboratory to mean average weight 0.040 – 0.050g using a commercial post larval feed. The animals were hand sorted and weighed individually and stocked in the culture units (circular Perspex tanks of 50 cm dia. x 25 cm h; 45-liter water volume) at the rate of 15 animals (Photograph of the experimental set-up in the next page). The calculated densities of shrimp in these experimental units equal 75 m^{-2}, in triplicate. Seawater diluted to 25‰ was used in all the experiments. Unlike experiment A, 90% water exchange was done in all the experimental units daily and 100% water exchange and scrubbing of the tubs were done weekly. Sampling of seawater for analysis for pH, D.O. and salinity was reduced to fortnightly intervals due to the absence of marked fluctuations. Temperature was recorded daily.

34

Experimental setup

III.6 Diets and feeding protocol - Experiments (B 1-6)

Six experiments performed were by using a uniform diet design. For each experiment the protein content in the diets were 250, 300, 350, 400, 450 and 500 g kg^{-1}. GE levels varied from 280 kcal $100g^{-1}$ to 450 kcal $100g^{-1}$. All the feeds contained a common ingredient mixture (CIM). By varying mainly the content of CIM and starch (tapioca flour) content the variations protein and GE and thereby DE was brought about. Wherever, desirable variation in energy was not obtained lipid levels were adjusted to obtain them. Experiment B-1 was conducted with diets containing a CIM, which had a lower nutrient density (Table 9), compared to the experiments B 2-6 because fishmeal and albumin used in the former experiment were lower in their protein and energy contents (Table 14 and 15). In diets where tapioca flour was less than 100g kg^{-1} or avoided, carboxymethylcellulose (CMC) was used as a binder. Cellulose was used as the filler. CIM was blended separately. Tapioca flour and CMC were gelatinised in water and CIM and cellulose were mixed and blended to form the dough for hand pelleting using a kitchen noodle maker with a 2 mm die. The pellets were air dried first and oven-dried at 55°C, crumbled, crushed using a food mixer and sieved through 0.5 mm and stored in airtight containers in a refrigerator and used. Experiment-wise, the composition feed ingredients used; CIM, and the ingredient composition of the experimental diets are shown in Tables 8, 9, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, 17, 20, 21, 24, 25, 28, 29, 32 and 33 respectively.

Table 8. Proximate composition of the natural and purified feed ingredients used for experimental diet compounding (Exp.B-1)

	DM	CP	EE	CF	NFE	Ash	AIA
Fish meal	98.28	70.58	3.09	0.93	0.36	23.32	11.52
Shrimp meal	92.51	67.45	3.29	0.00	5.27	16.50	4.39
Clam meal	94.37	59.79	13.01	0.00	15.10	6.47	1.94
GNOC	94.55	43.75	8.13	5.49	30.10	7.08	2.36
Tapioca flour	87.18	2.82	0.29	1.79	80.26	2.02	0.10
Cellulose	93.80	0.65	0.28	92.56	0.00	0.31	0.00
Albumin	92.91	80.50	0.00	0.00	5.97	6.44	0.00

Table 9. Ingredient composition, proximate analysis and calculated values of gross energy (GE) and digestible energy (DE) in common ingredient mixture (CIM) (Exp. B-1)

CIM	g kg^{-1}	CP	EE	CF	NFE	Ash	AIA
Fish meal	50	3.53	0.15	0.00	0.02	1.17	0.58
Shrimp meal	50	3.37	0.16	0.00	0.26	0.83	0.22
Clam meal	50	2.99	0.65	0.00	0.76	0.32	0.10
GNOC	50	2.19	0.41	0.27	1.51	0.35	0.12
Oil[1]	90		9.00				
Albumin	710	57.16			4.24	4.57	
Calculated	1000	69.23	10.38	0.27	6.78	7.24	1.01
Analysed		68.25	10.52	0.32	7.02	7.52	1.10
GE kcal 100 g^{-1}		380.78	94.42		28.78		503.99
DE kcal 100 g^{-1}		290.06	84.16		14.04		388.26

[1]As in experiment A (Table 3).

GE and DE calculated according to ADCP (1983) as shown in Table 4.

Table 10. Ingredient composition of the experimental feeds (g kg^{-1}) (Exp. B-1)

Ingredients	Feed 1	Feed 2	Feed 3	Feed 4	Feed 5	Feed 6	Feed 7	Feed 8
CIM	350	350	350	350	350	350	350	350
Cellulose	300	250	190	130	70	10	0	0
Tapioca flour	300	350	410	470	530	590	570	540
Oil[1]	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	60
Lecithin	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Cholesterol	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Mineral mixture[2]	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20
Vitamin mixture[3]	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20

[1]As in experiment A (Table 3)

[2] U.S.P. XIV (1950) Salt mixture M/s Sisco Research Laboratories, Mumbai. As required in the various biological test diets listed U.S.P. XIV p.789. % Composition: Calcium carbonate 6.86000, Calcium citrate 30.83000, Calcium phosphate monobasic 11.28000, Magnesium sulphate.7H$_2$O 3.83000, Manganese carbonate 3.52000, Potassium chloride 12.47000, Dipotassium phosphate 21.88000, Sodium chloride 7.71000, Copper sulphate.5H$_2$O 0.00777, Ferric citrate (16-17% Fe) 1.52815, Manganese sulphate.H$_2$O 0.02008,Potassium aluminium sulphate 0.00923, Potassium Iodide 0.00405, Sodium flouride 0.05070.

[3]According to recommended levels of vitamins for shrimp by Conklin (1997)
Vitamin premix to supply mg or IU kg^{-1} diet. Thiamin 60 mg, Riboflavin 25 mg, Niacin 40 mg, Pyridoxine 50 mg, Pantothenic acid 75 mg, Biotin 1 mg, Folic acid 10 mg, Cyanocobalamin 0.2 mg, choline 600 mg, Myo-inositol 400 mg, Ascorbic acid polyphosphate 200 mg, Retinol 5000 IU, Vitamin E 100 mg, Vitamin D$_3$ 0.1 mg and Vitamin K 5 mg.

Table 11. Nutrient composition of the experimental diets (% on dry matter basis) and their energy contents and ratios of non-protein energy yielding nutrients (Exp. B-1)

Proximate principles	Diet Nos.							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
DM	90.06	89.73	89.34	88.94	88.54	88.14	88.46	88.85
CP	24.93	25.04	25.17	25.30	25.43	25.56	25.49	25.41
EE	4.85	4.85	4.85	4.85	4.86	4.86	7.85	10.84
NFE	26.54	30.55	35.36	40.18	44.99	49.81	48.21	45.80
Ash	5.33	5.42	5.52	5.62	5.72	5.83	5.78	5.72
AIA	0.42	0.42	0.43	0.43	0.44	0.44	0.44	0.44
GE kcal 100g^{-1}	290.06	307.12	327.58	348.05	368.51	388.98	409.27	426.16
DE kcal 100g^{-1}	197.84	206.33	216.52	226.71	236.90	247.09	267.54	286.30
P/E ratio	85.94	81.52	76.83	72.68	69.00	65.70	62.29	59.63
E/P ratio	11.64	12.27	13.02	13.76	14.49	15.22	16.05	16.77
L: C ratio	1:5.5	1:6.3	1:7.28	1:8.28	1:9.27	1:10.26	1:6.1	1:4.2
L: C (% weight)	5:27	5:31	5:35	5:40	5:45	5:50	8:48	11:46
EE+NFE	31.39	35.40	40.22	45.03	49.85	54.67	56.05	56.64

GE and DE calculated according to ADCP (1983) as shown in Table 4.

Table14 . Proximate composition of the natural and purified feed ingredients used for experimental diet compounding (EXPERIMENTS B 2-6)

	DM	CP	EE	CF	NFE	Ash	AIA
Fish meal	95.16	68.50	8.49	0.00	0.61	17.56	2.71
Shrimp meal	92.51	67.45	3.29	0.00	5.27	16.50	4.39
Clam meal	94.37	59.79	13.01	0.00	15.10	6.47	1.94
GNOC	94.55	43.75	8.13	5.49	30.10	7.08	2.36
Tapioca flour	87.18	2.82	0.29	1.79	80.26	2.02	0.10
Cellulose	93.80	0.65	0.28	92.56	0.00	0.31	0.00
Albumin	100.00	94.00	0.00	0.00	1.50	4.50	0.00

Table 15. Ingredient composition, proximate analysis and calculated values of gross energy (GE) and digestible energy (DE) in common ingredient mixture (CIM). (EXPERIMENTS B 2-6)

Ingredients	g kg^{-1}	CP	EE	CF	NFE	Ash	AIA
Fish meal	50	3.43	0.42	0.00	0.03	0.88	0.14
Shrimp meal	50	3.37	0.16	0.00	0.26	0.83	0.22
Clam meal	50	2.99	0.65	0.00	0.76	0.32	0.10
GNOC	50	2.19	0.41	0.27	1.51	0.35	0.12
Oil[1]	90	0.00	9.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Albumin	710	66.74	0.00	0.00	1.07	3.20	0.00
Calculated	1000	78.71	10.65	0.27	3.62	5.58	0.57
Analysed		73.02	11.21	0.44	2.59	6.65	0.54
GE kcal 100g^{-1}*		401.61	102.01		10.62		514.24
DE kcal 100g^{-1}**		310.34	89.68		5.18		405.20

[1] As in experiment A (Table 3)
GE and DE calculated according to ADCP (1983) as shown in Table 4.

39

Table 16. Ingredient composition of the experimental feeds (g kg^{-1}) (Exp. B-2)

Ingredients	Feed 1	Feed 2	Feed 3	Feed 4	Feed 5	Feed 6	Feed 7	Feed 8
CIM	400	400	400	400	400	400	390	390
Tapioca flour	210	270	330	390	450	500	550	530
Cellulose	340	280	220	160	100	50	0	10
Oil[1]	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	20
Lecithin	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Cholesterol	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Mineral mixture[2]	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20
Vitamin mixture[3]	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20

[1] As in Experiment A (Table3)
[2] As in Exp. B 1 Table 10
[3] As in Exp. B 1 Table 10

Table 17. Proximate chemical composition of the experimental diets (% on dry matter basis) and their energy contents and ratios of non-protein energy yielding nutrients (Exp. B-2)

Nutrients and energy	Diet Nos.							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
DM	89.12	90.61	90.22	89.83	89.44	89.11	88.84	91.03
CP	30.01	30.15	30.28	30.41	30.54	30.65	30.03	29.98
EE	5.63	5.64	5.64	5.64	5.64	5.64	6.53	9.53
NFE	17.89	22.71	27.52	32.34	37.15	41.17	45.15	43.55
Ash	5.18	5.29	5.39	5.50	5.60	5.69	5.70	5.67
AIA	0.24	0.24	0.25	0.26	0.26	0.27	0.27	0.26
GE kcal 100g^{-1}	289.67	310.26	330.72	351.19	371.66	388.71	409.72	430.14
DE kcal 100g^{-1}	208.39	218.68	228.87	239.06	249.25	257.74	270.18	290.73
P/E ratio	103.59	97.18	91.56	86.60	82.18	78.85	73.29	69.70
E/P ratio	9.65	10.29	10.92	11.55	12.17	12.68	13.64	14.35
L:C ratio	1:3.1	1:4.0	1:4.9	1:5.7	1:6.6	1:7.3	1:6.9	1:4.6
L:C (% weight)	6:18	6:23	6:28	6:32	6:37	6:41	7:45	10:44
EE+NFE	23.53	28.35	33.16	37.98	42.80	46.81	51.68	53.08

GE and DE calculated according to ADCP (1983) as shown in Table 4.

Table 20. **Ingredient composition of the experimental feeds (g kg⁻1)**
(Exp. B-3)

Ingredients	Feed 1	Feed 2	Feed 3	Feed 4	Feed 5	Feed 6	Feed 7	Feed 8
CIM	480	480	480	480	480	470	470	470
Tapioca flour	90	150	210	270	330	400	450	440
Cellulose	360	320	260	200	140	80	30	20
CMC	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Oil[1]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Lecithin	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Cholesterol	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Mineral mixture[2]	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20
Vitamin mixture[3]	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20

[1] As in Experiment A (Table3)
[2] As in Exp. B 1 Table 10
[3] As in Exp. B 1 Table 10

Table 21. Proximate chemical composition of the experimental diets (% on dry matter basis) and their energy contents and ratios of non-protein energy yielding nutrients (Exp. B-3)

Nutrients and energy	Diet Nos.							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
DM	89.96	91.44	91.05	90.66	90.27	89.81	89.48	87.79
CP	35.54	35.68	35.81	35.94	36.07	35.50	35.61	35.56
EE	6.51	6.51	6.51	6.52	6.52	6.41	6.41	8.40
NFE	8.47	13.28	18.10	22.91	27.73	33.32	37.33	36.53
Ash	5.49	5.59	5.70	5.80	5.90	5.96	6.04	6.01
AIA	0.27	0.27	0.28	0.29	0.29	0.29	0.30	0.30
GE kcal 100g^{-1}	289.39	309.98	330.44	350.91	371.37	390.17	407.22	421.77
DE kcal 100g^{-1}	220.03	230.32	240.51	250.70	260.89	268.77	277.26	291.36
P/E ratio	122.80	115.11	108.37	102.42	97.13	90.98	87.44	84.31
E/P ratio	8.14	8.69	9.23	9.76	10.30	10.99	11.44	11.86
L:C ratio	1:1.30	1:2.04	1:2.78	1:3.52	1:4.26	1:5.20	1:5.83	1:4.35
L:C (% weight)	7:8	7:13	7:18	7:23	7:27	6:33	6:37	8:37
EE+NFE	14.97	19.80	24.61	29.43	34.24	39.73	43.74	44.93

GE and DE calculated according to ADCP (1983) as shown in Table 4.

Table 24. Ingredient composition of the experimental feeds (g kg^{-1}) (Exp. B-4)

Ingredients	Feed 1	Feed 2	Feed 3	Feed 4	Feed 5	Feed 6	Feed 7	Feed 8
CIM	540	540	540	540	540	540	540	540
Tapioca flour	20	60	120	180	240	300	360	380
Cellulose	370	330	290	230	170	110	50	30
Oil[1]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CMC	20	20	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lecithin	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Cholesterol	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Mineral mixture[2]	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20
Vitamin mixture[3]	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20

[1]As in Experiment A (Table 3)
[2]As in Exp. B 1 Table 10
[3]As in Exp. B 1 Table 10

Table 25. Proximate chemical composition of the experimental diets (% on dry matter basis) and their energy contents and ratios of non-protein energy yielding nutrients (Exp. B-4)

Nutrients and energy	Diet Nos							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
DM	92.33	92.07	91.68	91.29	90.90	90.51	90.11	89.98
CP	39.74	39.83	39.96	40.09	40.22	40.35	40.48	40.52
EE	7.17	7.17	7.17	7.17	7.17	7.17	7.17	7.17
NFE	3.00	6.21	11.03	15.85	20.66	25.48	30.29	31.90
Ash	5.75	5.82	5.92	6.03	6.13	6.23	6.33	6.37
AIA	0.29	0.30	0.30	0.31	0.32	0.32	0.33	0.33
GE kcal $100g^{-1}$	296.12	309.77	330.23	350.70	371.16	391.63	412.09	418.91
DE kcal $100g^{-1}$	232.25	239.05	249.24	259.42	269.61	279.80	289.99	293.39
P/E ratio	134.20	128.57	121.00	114.31	108.36	103.03	98.23	96.73
E/P ratio	7.45	7.78	8.26	8.75	9.23	9.71	10.18	10.34
L:C ratio	1:0.42	1:0.87	1:1.54	1:2.21	1:2.88	1:3.55	1:4.22	1:4.45
L:C (% weight)	7:3	7:6	7:11	7:16	7:21	7:25	7:30	7:32
EE+NFE	10.17	13.38	18.20	23.02	27.83	32.65	37.46	39.07

GE and DE calculated according to ADCP (1983) as shown in Table 4.

Table 28. Ingredient composition of the experimental feeds (g kg^{-1})
(Exp.B-5)

Ingredients	Feed 1	Feed 2	Feed 3	Feed 4	Feed 5	Feed 6	Feed 7	Feed 8
CIM	610	610	610	610	610	610	610	610
Tapioca flour	0	50	80	110	140	170	200	280
Cellulose	320	270	240	230	200	170	140	60
Oil[1]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CMC	20	20	20	0	0	0	0	0
Lecithin	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Cholesterol	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Mineral mixture[2]	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20
Vitamin mixture[3]	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20

[1]As in Experiment A (Table 3)
[2]As in Exp. B 1 Table 10
[3]As in Exp. B 1 Table 10

Table 29. Proximate chemical composition of the experimental diets (% on dry matter basis) and their energy contents and ratios of non-protein energy yielding nutrients (Exp. B-5)

Nutrients and energy	Diet Nos							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
DM	92.51	92.18	91.98	91.79	91.59	91.40	91.20	90.68
CP	44.76	44.87	44.94	45.00	45.07	45.13	45.20	45.37
EE	7.93	7.93	7.93	7.93	7.93	7.94	7.94	7.94
NFE	1.58	5.59	8.00	10.41	12.82	15.22	17.63	24.05
Ash	6.16	6.25	6.30	6.35	6.40	6.45	6.50	6.64
AIA	0.33	0.33	0.34	0.34	0.34	0.35	0.35	0.36
GE kcal 100g^{-1}	324.87	341.92	352.16	362.39	372.62	382.85	393.09	420.37
DE kcal 100g^{-1}	256.87	265.36	270.46	275.55	280.64	285.74	290.83	304.42
P/E ratio	137.79	131.23	127.60	124.18	120.95	117.88	114.98	107.93
E/P ratio	7.26	7.62	7.84	8.05	8.27	8.48	8.70	9.27
L:C ratio	1:0.20	1:0.70	1:1.00	1:1.31	1:1.62	1:1.92	1:2.22	1:3.03
L:C (% weight)	8:2	8:6	8:8	8:10	8:13	8:15	8:18	8:24
EE+NFE	9.51	13.53	15.93	18.34	20.75	23.16	25.57	31.99

GE and DE calculated according to ADCP (1983) as shown in Table 4.

Table 32. Ingredient composition and proximate composition of the experimental feeds (g kg^{-1}) (Exp. B-6)

Ingredients	Feed 1	Feed 2	Feed 3	Feed 4	Feed 5	Feed 6	Feed 7	Feed 8
CIM	680	680	680	680	680	680	680	680
Tapioca flour	0	50	80	110	140	170	200	270
Cellulose	250	200	170	160	130	100	70	0
Oil[1]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CMC	20	20	20	0	0	0	0	0
Lecithin	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Cholesterol	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Mineral mixture[2]	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20
Vitamin mixture[3]	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20

[1] As in Experiment A (Table 3)
[2] As in Exp. B 1 Table 10
[3] As in Exp. B 1 Table 10

Table 33. **Proximate chemical composition of the experimental diets (% on dry matter basis) and their energy contents and ratios of non-protein energy yielding nutrients (Exp. B- 6)**

Nutrients and energy	Diet Nos.							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
DM	90.68	92.23	92.03	91.83	91.64	91.44	91.25	90.79
CP	49.82	49.94	50.00	50.07	50.13	50.20	50.26	50.42
EE	8.69	8.70	8.70	8.70	8.70	8.70	8.70	8.70
NFE	1.76	5.77	8.18	10.59	13.00	15.41	17.81	23.43
Ash	6.60	6.69	6.74	6.79	6.85	6.90	6.95	7.07
AIA	0.37	0.37	0.38	0.38	0.38	0.38	0.39	0.39
GE kcal 100g^{-1}	360.31	377.49	387.72	397.96	408.19	418.42	428.65	452.53
DE kcal 100g^{-1}	284.78	293.37	298.47	303.56	308.66	313.75	318.85	330.74
P/E ratio	138.26	132.29	128.96	125.81	122.82	119.97	117.26	111.41
E/P ratio	7.23	7.56	7.75	7.95	8.14	8.34	8.53	8.98
L:C ratio	1:0.20	1:0.70	1:1.00	1:1.22	1:1.49	1:1.77	1:2.05	1:2.69
L:C (% weight)	9:2	9:6	9:8	9:11	9:13	9:15	9:18	9:23
EE+NFE	10.45	14.47	16.88	19.29	21.70	24.11	26.51	32.13

GE and DE calculated according to ADCP (1983) as shown in Table 4.

Feeding was carried out at the rate of 15% of the body weight in two doses. Pre-weighed petri dishes containing 40% of the feed was provided at 10:00 h and 60% was provided at 16:00 h. Feed residue and faecal matter was removed daily prior to water-exchange. Feeding rates were adjusted based on daily observations to compensate mortality if any, and reduce feed residues to minimum. Daily record of mortality was also maintained. On termination of the experiment shrimps were weighed and dried and pooled treatment wise for chemical analyses.

Growth was measured as biomass gain shrimp^{-1} (g), absolute growth rate (AGR), relative growth rate (RGR) and specific growth rate (SGR). Protein efficiency ratio (PER), food conversion ratio (FCR), food conversion efficiency (FCE) and survival % were also estimated.

III.7 Chemical analyses of diets, water and shrimp - Experiments (B 1-6)

Feed ingredients, CIM and all experimental feeds were analysed for their proximate chemical compositions according to A.O.A.C. (1990). GE and DE were calculated using the conversion factor according to ADCP (1983). Seawater was analysed according to the standard methods of Strickland and Parsons (1972). Shrimps dried and pooled treatment wise were analysed for moisture, CP and EE and ash.

III.4 Statistics - Experiments (B 1-6)

Comparison of means and analysis of variance (ANOVA) of the data was done according to Snedecor and Cochran (1973) using SPSS software. To estimate the optimum levels of protein and GE, second-degree polynomials of the form $y = a + bx + cx^2$ were fitted.

G78662

RESULTS

CHAPTER - IV

RESULTS

IV.1 Experiment A

The results of the nutritional trial are presented in Table 5, where nutritional responses assessed were in terms of biomass gain, RGR, SGR, PER, FCR, ADMD and APD. Statistically significant differences were observed only in final biomass per shrimp (P <0.05), PER (P <0.01), ADMD and APD (P <0.05).

Growth was observed to be similar with diets 2 and 5, which registered RGRs of 112.20 and 113.95 respectively (Table 5). Other nutritional responses mentioned above were also found to support the aforementioned result. Statistically significant differences however, were recorded only with final biomass, PER, ADMD and APD (P <0.05).

Second degree polynomials of the form $y = a + bx + cx^2$ were fitted for deriving subjectively the optimum protein level and optimum energy level from the data obtained. The estimated values for protein were $r^2 = 0.51$, $\hat{a} = -0.0724$, $\hat{b} = 0.0859$, $\hat{c} = -0.0015$ and $SE(\hat{c}) = 0.000658$ and the optimum protein level was obtained by the equation $-\hat{b}/2\hat{c}$, which was 37.14%. Similarly for optimum energy level the estimated values were $r^2 = 0.527$, $\hat{a} = -37.6804$, $\hat{b} = 0.178462$, $\hat{c} = -0.000207$ and $SE(\hat{c}) = 0.000144$. The optimum energy level derived ($-\hat{b}/2\hat{c}$) was 430.95 kcal/100g. Using the estimated optimum level of protein and GE, the P/E obtained was 86.18 mg protein/ kcal. Similar performance in terms of growth of *Fenneropenaeus indicus* during a 28-day feeding regimen was observed with diet 2 and diet 5. In diet 5 the protein level was 476.5g kg^{-1} and GE was 429.97 kcal 100g^{-1}. However, in diet 2 the protein level was 319.9 g kg^{-1} and energy level was 451.63 kcal 100g^{-1}. It was also observed that the percent of non-protein energy yielding constituents viz., EE or crude fat and NFE or soluble carbohydrates in diet 2 and diet 5 were 57.80 and 28.22 respectively (Table 4).

50

Table 5. Average values of initial and final biomass, biomass gain, RGR, SGR, PER, ADMD and APD when fed test diets (Exp.A)

Diet Nos.	Initial biomass/ shrimp g	Final Biomass/ shrimp g	Biomass gain/ shrimp g	RGR	SGR	PER	FCR	ADMD	APD	Survival %
1	0.39	0.64	0.25	64.10	0.89	2.60	4.40	83.11	57.03	80
2	0.41	0.87	0.47	112.20	1.64	3.16	2.56	83.33	54.17	87
3	0.38	0.72	0.34	89.47	1.20	2.54	3.05	84.00	58.35	73
4	0.46	0.84	0.38	82.61	1.36	1.27	3.52	89.00	74.58	85
5	0.43	0.92	0.47	113.95	1.75	1.44	2.52	92.89	74.20	87
6	0.48	0.91	0.43	89.58	1.54	1.42	2.86	79.11	71.11	84
F test	NS	*	NS	NS	NS	**	NS	*	*	NS

NS – Not significant

* Significant at 5% level

** Significant at 1% level

RGR = Final wt. – Initial wt./ Initial wt. X 100

SGR = Ln. final wt. – Ln. initial wt./ No. of days x 100

PER = Wet wt. Gain/ Dry wt. of protein consumed

FCR = Dry wt. of feed consumed/ Wet wt. Gain

IV.2 Experiment B-1

Protein levels in the diet were 250 g kg^{-1} and GE levels varied from 290.06 kcal $100g^{-1}$ to 426.16 kcal $100g^{-1}$. DE levels ranged from 197.84 to 286.30 kcal $100g^{-1}$ and P/E ratios ranged from 59.63 to 85.94 (Table 11). The eight feeds in this experiment contained 350g kg^{-1} CIM; 0 – 350g kg^{-1} cellulose (filler) and 300 – 590g kg^{-1} of tapioca flour (Table 10). Lipid content in diets 7 and 8 were 7.85 and 10.84% respectively due to incorporation of additional oil at the level of 3 and 6 % to obtain higher levels of energy.

Growth of shrimp was significantly high (P <0.05) with feeds 6 and 7 (395.54 and 410.55 respectively in terms of RGR) containing 388.98 and 409.27 kcal $100g^{-1}$ GE, 247.09 and 267.54 kcal $100g^{-1}$ DE. P/E ratios of these feeds were 65.70 and 62.29. RGR, SGR, PER, FCR, FCE and survival were significantly higher (P <0.05) with diet 7 (Table 12).

Regressions of RGR on P/E, GE, DE and E/P; Survival, FCE and FCR on P/E indicated the RGR optimum to be between 383.68 – 392.68, GE to be 417.89 kcal $100g^{-1}$, DE to be 261.21 kcal $100g^{-1}$. The optimum P/E ranged from 51.54 – 65.28. The optima for survival %, FCE and FCR were 93.85, 49.80 and 3.96 respectively. The optimum E/P ratio obtained was 16.17 (Figures 1 –7). These derived values were close to the observed values.

Table 12. Average values of initial and final biomass, biomass gain, AGR, RGR, SGR, PER, FCR and FCE when fed test diets (Exp. B-1). Means with the same superscript do not differ significantly ($P < 0.05$).

Diet Nos.	Initial biomass/ shrimp g	Final biomass/ shrimp g	Biomass gain/ Shrimp g	AGR g	RGR	SGR	PER	FCR	FCE	Survival %
1	0.041	0.125[a]	0.084[a]	0.0020[a]	305.71[a]	2.66[a]	1.22[a]	7.72[a]	26.72[a]	72[a]
2	0.042	0.134[b]	0.092[b]	0.0022[b]	316.65[ab]	2.74[ab]	1.33[b]	6.67[b]	32.65[b]	77[ab]
3	0.042	0.142[c]	0.100[c]	0.0024[c]	337.47[bc]	2.90[bc]	1.43[c]	5.80[c]	41.22[c]	83[bc]
4	0.043	0.145[c]	0.102[c]	0.0024[c]	337.48[bcd]	2.90[bcd]	1.55[d]	4.68[d]	44.73[d]	90[d]
5	0.042	0.157[d]	0.114[d]	0.0027[d]	370.47[e]	3.12[e]	1.62[e]	4.27[d]	44.60[de]	92[de]
6	0.042	0.167[e]	0.125[e]	0.0030[e]	395.54[f]	3.27[f]	1.75[f]	3.58[e]	53.92[e]	95[e]
7	0.043	0.175[f]	0.132[f]	0.0031[f]	410.55[f]	3.36[f]	1.82[g]	2.18[f]	57.23[g]	99[f]
8	0.043	0.154[d]	0.111[d]	0.0027[d]	358.95[cde]	3.04[de]	1.71[h]	5.80[c]	42.17[ce]	89[cde]

AGR = Wt. gain day^{-1}
RGR = Final wt. – Initial wt./ Initial wt. X 100
SGR = Ln. final wt. – Ln. initial wt./ No. of days x 100
PER = Wet wt. Gain/ Dry wt. of protein consumed
FCR = Dry wt. of feed consumed/ Wet wt. Gain
FCE = Wet wt. gain/ Dry wt. of feed consumed

Fig.1 Regression of RGR on P/E in shrimp fed 25 g100^{-1} protein and varying levels of energy

Fig.2 Regression of RGR on GE in shrimp fed 25 g100^{-1} protein and varying levels of energy

$y = -0.0053x^2 + 4.4492x - 545.56$

$R^2 = 1$

Opt. RGR = 384.09
Opt. GE = 417.89

♦ RGR
■ Predicted RGR
— Poly. (Predicted RGR)

GE kcal100g^{-1}

RGR%

Fig. 3 Regression of RGR on DE in shrimps fed 25 g100^{-1} protein and varying levels of energy

$$y = -0.0235x^2 + 12.264x - 1213.4$$
$$R^2 = 0.7507$$

Legend:
- ◆ RGR
- ■ Predicted RGR
- —— Poly. (RGR)

Opt. RGR = 388.35
Opt. DE = 261.21

DE kcal 100g^{-1}

RGR%

Fig. 4 Regression of survival % on P/E in shrimps fed 25 g100^{-1} protein and varying levels of energy

Survival%
Predicted Survival%
Poly. (Predicted Survival%)

Opt. Survival% = 93.85
Opt. P/E = 63.14

$y = -0.0457x^2 + 5.7765x - 88.5$
$R^2 = 1$

P/E mg protein kcal^{-1}

Survival%

Fig. 5 Regression of FCE on P/E in shrimps fed 25 g100^{-1} protein and varying levels of energy

Legend:
- ♦ FCE
- ■ Predicted FCE
- Poly. (Predicted FCE)

Opt. FCR = 49.80
Opt. P/E = 64.02

$y = -0.0513x^2 + 6.5698x - 160.5$
$R^2 = 1$

X-axis: P/E mg protein kcal^{-1}
Y-axis: FCE

Fig. 6 Regression of FCR on P/E in shrimps fed 25 g100^{-1} protein and varying levels of energy

Fig. 7 Regression of RGR on E/P in shrimps fed 25 g100^{-1} protein and varying levels of energy

$y = -4.2628x^2 + 137.82x - 730.33$
$R^2 = 1$

Opt. RGR = 383.68
Opt. E/P = 16.17

- ◆ RGR
- ■ Predicted RGR
- —— Poly. (Predicted RGR)

RGR%

E/P ratio

IV. 3 Experiment B-2

In this experiment protein level of 300 g kg^{-1} was obtained by incorporating 400 g kg^{-1} of CIM. Filler levels varied from 0 to 320 g kg^{-1}. Oil at the levels of 10 g kg^{-1} and 20 g kg^{-1} was added to obtain higher energy levels in diets 7 and 8 respectively (Table 16). GE levels in this experiment varied between 289.67 kcal 100g^{-1} and 430.14 kcal 100g^{-1}. DE levels were between 208.39 kcal 100g^{-1} and 290.73 kcal 100g^{-1} (Table 17).

Growth of shrimps was significantly higher with diet 5 (493.02 % in terms of RGR) with a GE of 371.66 kcal 100g^{-1} and DE of 249.55 kcal 100g^{-1}. P/E ratio of this feed was 82.18. RGR, SGR, PER FCR, FCE and survival were also significantly higher (P <0.05) with this diet (Table 18).

Regressions of RGR on P/E, GE, DE and E/P; Survival, FCE and FCR on P/E indicated the RGR optimum to be between 453.28 – 457.98, GE to be 346.49 kcal 100g^{-1}, DE to be 237.84 kcal 100g^{-1}. The optimum P/E ranged from 81.51 – 89.35. The optima for survival %, FCE and FCR were 90.10, 48.89 and 3.00 respectively. The optimum E/P ratio obtained was 11.49 (Figures 8 –14).

Table 18. Average values of initial and final biomass, biomass gain, AGR, RGR, SGR, PER, FCR and FCE fed test diets (Exp. B-2). Means with the same superscript do not differ significantly ($P < 0.05$)

Diet Nos.	Initial biomass/ shrimp g	Final biomass/ shrimp g	Biomass gain/ shrimp g	AGR	RGR	SGR	PER	FCR	FCE	Survival %
1	0.045	0.181[a]	0.136[a]	0.003[a]	406.15[a]	3.33[a]	1.11[a]	6.95[a]	31.39[a]	73[a]
2	0.047	0.197[b]	0.150[ab]	0.004[ab]	419.17[ab]	3.41[ab]	1.22[b]	5.44[b]	36.06[b]	78[ab]
3	0.045	0.198[bc]	0.153[bc]	0.004[c]	440.77[ab]	3.53[abc]	1.32[c]	4.22[c]	41.79[c]	83[bc]
4	0.044	0.203[bcd]	0.159[d]	0.004[bc]	462.36[bc]	3.65[bc]	1.45[d]	3.17[cd]	50.41[d]	87[c]
5	0.044	0.218[e]	0.174[e]	0.004[d]	493.02[c]	3.79[c]	1.54[e]	2.03[d]	55.86[e]	95[d]
6	0.045	0.175[e]	0.130[af]	0.003[e]	389.92[ab]	3.23[ab]	1.45[d]	3.64[cd]	44.67[f]	93[d]
7	0.044	0.163[ef]	0.118[cf]	0.003[e]	368.83[a]	3.10[d]	1.34[c]	3.59[cd]	41.10[c]	87[c]
8	0.046	0.156[f]	0.110[b]	0.003[f]	338.14[d]	2.90[d]	1.25[b]	5.63[b]	36.35[b]	82[bc]

AGR = Wt. gain day^{-1}

RGR = Final wt. – Initial wt./ Initial wt. X 100

SGR = Ln. final wt. – Ln. initial wt./ No. of days x 100

PER = Wet wt. Gain/ Dry wt. of protein consumed

FCR = Dry wt. of feed consumed/ Wet wt. Gain

FCE = Wet wt. gain/ Dry wt. of feed consumed

Fig.8 Regression of RGR on P/E in shrimp fed 30 g100^{-1} protein and varying levels of energy

$y = -0.1004x^2 + 14.514x - 75.602$

$R^2 = 0.7478$

Opt. RGR = 457.98
Opt. P/E = 89.35

RGR ◆
Predicted RGR ■
Poly. (Predicted RGR) —

P/E ratio mg protein kcal^{-1}

RGR%

Fig.9 Regression of RGR on GE in shrimp fed 30 g100^{-1} protein and varying levels of energy

Fig.10 Regression of RGR on DE in shrimp fed 30 g100^{-1} protein and varying levels of energy

$y = -0.0447x^2 + 21.27x - 2082.9$

$R^2 = 1$

RGR

Predicted RGR

Poly. (Predicted RGR)

Opt. RGR = 446.58
Opt. DE = 237.84

DE kcal 100g^{-1}

RGR%

Fig.11 Regression of survival on P/E in shrimp fed 30 g100^{-1} protein and varying levels of energy

Survival%

P/E mg prtoein kcal^{-1}

- ◆ Survival%
- ■ Predicted Survival%
- —— Poly. (Predicted Survival%)

Opt. Survival% = 90.10
Opt. P/E = 81.51

$y = -0.0405x^2 + 6.5944x - 178.66$
$R^2 = 1$

Fig.12 Regression of FCE on P/E in shrimps fed 30 g100⁻¹ protein and varying levels of energy

$y = -0.0555x^2 + 9.369x - 346.4$
$R^2 = 1$

Opt. FCE = 48.89
Opt. P/E = 84.38

- ◆ FCE
- ■ Predicted FCE
- — Poly. (Predicted FCE)

FCE

P/E mg protein kcal⁻¹

Fig. 13 Regression of FCR on P/E in shrimps fed 30 g100^{-1} protein and varying levels of energy

$y = 0.0109x^2 - 1.8188x + 79.009$
$R^2 = 0.7583$

FCR

P/E mg protein kcal^{-1}

◆ FCR
■ Predicted FCR
— Poly. (FCR)

Opt. FCR = 3.00
Opt. P/E = 83.58

Fig. 14 Regression of RGR on E/P in shrimps fed 30 g100^{-1} protein and varying levels of energy

$y = -15.505x^2 + 356.21x - 1592.5$
$R^2 = 1$

RGR%

E/P

◆ RGR
■ Predicted RGR
— Poly. (Predicted RGR)

Opt. RGR = 453.28
Opt. E/P = 11.49

IV. 4 Experiment B-3

Protein levels of 350 g kg^{-1} were obtained in the experimental diets in this experiment by incorporating 480 g kg^{-1} CIM. Filler levels varied between 0 – 360 g kg^{-1} and tapioca flour levels were varied between 90 g kg^{-1} and 440 g kg^{-1} to obtain the desired energy levels (Table 20). GE levels varied between 289.30 kcal $100g^{-1}$ and 421.77 kcal $100g^{-1}$ and DE levels varied between 220.03 kcal $100g^{-1}$ and 291.36 kcal $100g^{-1}$ (Table 21).

Growth of shrimp was significantly higher with diet 5 (778.56 % in terms of RGR) with a GE of 371.37 kcal $100g^{-1}$ and DE of 260.89 kcal $100g^{-1}$. P/E ratio of this feed was 97.13. RGR, SGR, PER FCR, FCE and survival were also significantly higher (P <0.05) with this diet (Table 22).

Regressions of RGR on P/E, GE, DE and E/P; Survival, FCE and FCR on P/E indicated the RGR optimum to be between 627.85 – 647.42, GE to be 352.03 kcal $100g^{-1}$, DE to be 252.20 kcal $100g^{-1}$. The optimum P/E ranged from 98.74 – 103.98. The optima for survival %, FCE and FCR were 89.06, 51.56 and 2.29 respectively. The optimum E/P ratio obtained was 9.89 (Figures 15 – 21)

Table 22. Average values of initial and final biomass, biomass gain, AGR, RGR, SGR, PER, FCR and FCE fed test diets (Exp. B-3). Means with the same superscript do not differ significantly ($P<0.05$)

Diet Nos.	Initial biomass/ shrimp g	Final biomass/ shrimp g	Biomass gain/ shrimp g	AGR	RGR	SGR	PER	FCR	FCE	Survival %
1	0.046	0.640[a]	0.501[a]	0.0040[a]	461.43[a]	3.63[a]	0.79[a]	6.95[a]	36.05[a]	84[a]
2	0.049	0.743[b]	0.597[b]	0.0047[b]	509.00[ab]	3.87[ab]	0.83[a]	5.44[b]	36.06[b]	84[a]
3	0.043	0.710[b]	0.580[c]	0.0046[b]	546.46[b]	4.04[bc]	0.90[a]	4.22[c]	47.12[c]	83[a]
4	0.051	0.930[c]	0.778[d]	0.0062[c]	612.36[c]	4.31[c]	0.96[a]	1.49[d]	55.07[d]	87[ab]
5	0.043	1.003[d]	0.874[e]	0.0069[d]	778.56[d]	4.89[d]	1.35[b]	1.81[d]	55.86[e]	95[c]
6	0.045	0.694[b]	0.558[bc]	0.0044[b]	510.89[ab]	3.88[abc]	0.94[a]	2.60[e]	44.67[f]	93[bc]
7	0.046	0.616[a]	0.479[a]	0.0038[a]	456.96[a]	3.60[ab]	0.86[a]	4.46[c]	41.10[g]	87[ab]
8	0.045	0.469[e]	0.335[f]	0.0027[e]	351.39[e]	2.99[e]	0.85[a]	5.91[f]	36.35[h]	82[ab]

AGR = Wt. gain day^{-1}
RGR = Final wt. – Initial wt./ Initial wt. X 100
SGR = Ln. final wt. – Ln. initial wt./ No. of days x 100
PER = Wet wt. Gain/ Dry wt. of protein consumed
FCR = Dry wt. of feed consumed/ Wet wt. Gain
FCE = Wet wt. gain/ Dry wt. of feed consumed

57

Fig. 15 Regression of RGR on P/E in shrimp fed 35 g100^{-1} protein and varying levels of energy

**Fig.16 Regression of RGR on GE in shrimp fed 35 g100^{-1} protein and varying levels of energy**

$y = -0.0581x^2 + 40.933x - 6560.8$
$R^2 = 1$

Opt. RGR = 643.92
Opt. GE = 352..03

RGR
Predicted RGR
Poly. (Predicted RGR)

Opt.

GE kcal 100g^{-1}

RGR

Fig.17 Regression of RGR on DE in shrimp fed 35 g100^{-1} protein and varying levels of energy

Fig.18 Regression of survival on P/E in shrimp fed 35 g100^{-1} protein and varying levels of energy

$y = -0.0132x^2 + 2.6007x - 39.334$
$R^2 = 1$

Opt. Survival = 89.06
Opt. P/E = 98.74

◆ Survival%
■ Predicted Survival%
⋯ Poly. (Predicted Survival%)

Survival%

P/E mg prtoen kcal^{-1}

Fig.19 Regression of FCE on P/E in shrimp fed 35 g100^{-1} protein and varying levels of energy

y = -0.0458x^2 + 9.341x - 424.43
R^2 = 0.7143

FCE
Predicted FCE
Poly. (FCE)

Opt. FCE = 51.56
Opt. P/E = 101.91

P/E mg protein kcal^{-1}

FCE

Fig.20 Regression of FCR on P/E in shrimp fed 35 g100^{-1} protein and varying levels of energy

$y = 0.0111x^2 - 2.2419x + 115.19$
$R^2 = 0.8112$

Opt. FCR = 2.29
Opt. P/E = 100.72

FCR
Predicted FCR
Poly. (FCR)

FCR

P/E mg protein kcal^{-1}

Fig.21 Regression of RGR on E/P in shrimp fed 35 g100^{-1} protein and varying levels of energy

y = -75.517x^2 + 1493.3x - 6734.9
R^2 = 0.6775

Opt RGR = 647.42
Opt. E/P = 9.89

RGR
Predicted RGR
Poly. (RGR)

RGR%

E/P

IV. 5 Experiment B-4

Protein levels of 400 g kg^{-1} were obtained in the experimental diets in this experiment by incorporating 540 g kg^{-1} CIM. Filler levels varied between 30 – 390 g kg^{-1} and tapioca flour levels were varied between 20 g kg^{-1} and 380 g kg^{-1} to obtain the desired energy levels (Table 24). GE levels varied between 296.12 kcal 100g^{-1} and 418.91 kcal 100g^{-1} and DE levels varied between 232.25 kcal 100g^{-1} and 293.39 kcal 100g^{-1} (Table 25).

Growth of shrimp was significantly higher with diet 5 (778.56 % in terms of RGR) with a GE of 371.16 kcal 100g^{-1} and DE of 269.61 kcal 100g^{-1}. P/E ratio of this feed was 108.36. RGR, SGR, PER FCR, FCE and survival were also significantly higher (P <0.05) with this diet (Table 26).

Regressions of RGR on P/E, GE, DE and E/P; Survival, FCE and FCR on P/E indicated the RGR optimum to be between 703.61 –708.33, GE to be 357.02 kcal 100g^{-1}, DE to be 262.57 kcal 100g^{-1}. The optimum P/E ranged from 112.05 – 114.95. The optima for survival %, FCE and FCR were 92.58, 53.09 and 2.37 respectively. The optimum E/P ratio obtained was 8.89 (Figures 22 – 28).

Table 26. Average values of initial and final biomass, biomass gain, AGR, RGR, SGR, PER, FCR and FCE fed test diets (Exp. B-4). Means with the same superscript do not differ significantly ($P < 0.05$)

Diet Nos.	Initial biomass/ shrimp g	Final biomass/ shrimp g	Biomass gain/ shrimp g	AGR	RGR	SGR	PER	FCR	FCE	Survival %
1	0.046	0.251[a]	0.204[a]	0.0049[a]	541.51[a]	4.02[a]	0.56[a]	7.07[a]	38.69[a]	84[a]
2	0.049	0.276[ab]	0.227[b]	0.0054[b]	567.18[a]	4.13[a]	0.65[b]	6.42[b]	42.26[b]	83[a]
3	0.043	0.273[ab]	0.230[b]	0.0055[b]	630.78[b]	4.38[b]	0.73[c]	4.22[c]	47.12[c]	87[ab]
4	0.051	0.353[a]	0.302[c]	0.0072[c]	696.72[c]	4.62[c]	0.82[d]	2.11[d]	55.07[d]	93[bc]
5	0.043	0.334[a]	0.291[c]	0.0069[c]	778.56[d]	4.89[d]	0.97[e]	1.81[e]	55.86[d]	95[c]
6	0.045	0.278[b]	0.232[b]	0.0055[b]	611.96[b]	4.31[b]	0.87[f]	2.60[f]	44.67[e]	93[bc]
7	0.046	0.240[a]	0.194[a]	0.0046[a]	527.21[a]	3.96[a]	0.79[d]	4.46[c]	41.10[b]	87[abc]
8	0.045	0.230[a]	0.186[a]	0.0044[a]	516.64[a]	3.91[a]	0.65[b]	5.91[g]	36.35[f]	77[a]

AGR = Wt. gain day^{-1}
RGR = Final wt. – Initial wt./ Initial wt. X 100
SGR = Ln. final wt. – Ln. initial wt./ No. of days x 100
PER = Wet wt. Gain/ Dry wt. of protein consumed
FCR = Dry wt. of feed consumed/ Wet wt. Gain
FCE = Wet wt. gain/ Dry wt. of feed consumed

Fig.22 Regression of RGR on P/E in shrimp fed 40 g100^{-1} protein and varying levels of energy

Fig.23 Regression of RGR on GE in shrimp fed 40 g100⁻¹ protein and varying levels of energy

Fig.24 Regression of RGR on DE in shrimp fed 40 g100^{-1} protein and varying levels of energy

Fig.25 Regression of survival on P/E in shrimp fed 40 g100^{-1} protein and varying levels of energy

$y = -0.0313x^2 + 7.146x - 315.93$
$R^2 = 1$

Opt. Surivival = 92.58
Opt. P/E = 114.33

Survival%
Predicted Survival%
Poly. (Predicted Survival%)

Survival%

P/E mg protein kcal^{-1}

Fig.26 Regression of FCE on P/E in shrimp fed 40 g100^{-1} protein and varying levels of energy

$y = -0.0458x^2 + 10.516x - 551.19$
$R^2 = 0.8075$

Opt. FCE = 53.09
Opt. P/E = 114.92

Legend:
- ◆ FCE
- ■ Predicted FCE
- — Poly. (FCE)

X-axis: P/E mg protein kcal^{-1}
Y-axis: FCE

Fig.27 Regression of FCR on P/E in shrimp fed 40 g100^{-1} protein and varying levels of energy

$y = 0.0114x^2 - 2.5617x + 145.89$
$R^2 = 1$

FCR

Opt. FCR = 2.37
Opt. P/E = 112.05

◆ FCR
■ Predicted FCR
— Poly. (Predicted FCR)

P/E mg protein kcal^{-1}

Fig.28 Regression of RGR on E/P in shrimp fed 40 g100^{-1} protein and varying levels of energy

$y = -96.303x^2 + 1711.5x - 6895.5$
$R^2 = 1$

RGR
■ Predicted RGR
---- Poly. (Predicted RGR)

Opt. RGR = 708.33
Opt. E/P = 8.89

IV. 6 Experiment B-5

Protein levels of 450 g kg^{-1} were obtained in the experimental diets in this experiment by incorporating 61 g kg^{-1} CIM. Filler levels varied between 60 – 340 g kg^{-1} and tapioca flour levels were varied between 0 g kg^{-1} and 280 g kg^{-1} to obtain the desired energy levels (Table 28). GE levels varied between 324.87 kcal 100g^{-1} and 420.37 kcal 100g^{-1} and DE levels varied between 256.87 kcal 100g^{-1} and 304.42 kcal 100g^{-1} (Table 29).

Growth of shrimp was significantly higher with diet 4 (778.63 % in terms of RGR) with a GE of 362.39 kcal 100g^{-1} and DE of 275.55 kcal 100g^{-1}. P/E ratio of this feed was 124.18. RGR, SGR, PER FCR, FCE and survival were also significantly higher (P <0.05) with this diet (Table 30).

Regressions of RGR on P/E, GE, DE and E/P; Survival, FCE and FCR on P/E indicated the RGR optimum to be between 707.60 –713.52, GE to be 360.61 kcal 100g^{-1}, DE to be 274.67 kcal 100g^{-1}. The optimum P/E ranged from 120.27 – 125.83. The optima for survival %, FCE and FCR were 94.36, 53.66 and 3.02 respectively. The optimum E/P ratio obtained was 8.01 (Figures 29 – 35).

Table 30. Average values of initial and final biomass, biomass gain, AGR, RGR, SGR, PER, FCR and FCE fed test diets (Exp. B-5). Means with the same superscript do not differ significantly ($P < 0.05$)

Diet Nos.	Initial biomass/ shrimp g	Final biomass/ shrimp g	Biomass gain/ shrimp g	AGR	RGR	SGR	PER	FCR	FCE	Survival %
1	0.043	0.278^a	0.235^a	0.0056^a	648.50^a	4.45^a	0.43^a	7.57^a	43.41^a	57^a
2	0.047	0.306^b	0.259^b	0.0062^b	647.86^a	4.45^a	0.55^b	6.53^b	48.35^b	60^{ab}
3	0.043	0.313^b	0.269^b	0.0064^b	721.82^b	4.71^b	0.64^c	5.08^c	55.18^c	64^{ab}
4	0.049	0.379^c	0.330^c	0.0079^c	778.63^c	4.89^c	0.76^d	2.27^d	57.86^d	84^c
5	0.043	0.318^b	0.275^b	0.0065^b	735.52^b	4.75^b	0.64^c	1.66^e	55.86^{cd}	78^c
6	0.045	0.287^{ab}	0.241^{ab}	0.0057^{ab}	632.84^{ad}	4.39^{ad}	0.55^b	2.67^f	45.63^a	68^b
7	0.042	0.254^d	0.213^d	0.0051^d	610.71^{de}	4.31^{de}	0.43^a	4.60^g	44.11^a	61^{ab}
8	0.044	0.253^d	0.209^d	0.0050^d	572.57^e	4.15^e	0.35^e	5.68^h	38.58^e	50^{ab}

AGR = Wt. gain day^{-1}
RGR = Final wt. – Initial wt./ Initial wt. X 100
SGR = Ln. final wt. – Ln. initial wt./ No. of days x 100
PER = Wet wt. Gain/ Dry wt. of protein consumed
FCR = Dry wt. of feed consumed/ Wet wt. Gain
FCE = Wet wt. gain/ Dry wt. of feed consumed

Fig.29 Regression of RGR on P/E in shrimp fed 45 g100^{-1} protein and varying levels of energy

$y = -0.5116x^2 + 128.75x - 7386.7$
$R^2 = 1$

RGR%

P/E mg protein kcal^{-1}

◆ RGR
■ Predicted RGR
— Poly. (Predicted RGR)

Opt. RGR = 713.52
Opt. P/E = 125.83

Fig.30 Regression of RGR on GE in shrimp fed 45 g100^{-1} protein and varying levels of energy

Opt. RGR = 707.60
Opt. GE = 360.61

$y = -0.0448x^2 + 32.333x - 5122.2$
$R^2 = 1$

RGR%

GE kcal 100g^{-1}

RGR
Predicted RGR
Poly. (Predicted RGR)

Fig.31 Regression of RGR on DE in shrimp fed 45 g100^{-1} protein and varying levels of energy

Legend:
- ◆ RGR
- ■ Predicted RGR
- — Poly. (Predicted RGR)

Opt. RGR = 707.60
Opt. DE = 360.61

$y = -0.1809x^2 + 99.349x - 12936$
$R^2 = 1$

X-axis: DE kcal 100g^{-1}
Y-axis: RGR%

Fig.32 Regression of survival on P/E in shrimp fed 45 g100^{-1} protein and varying levels of energy

$y = -0.0671x^2 + 16.61x - 934.13$
$R^2 = 1$

Opt. Survival % = 94.36
Opt. P/E = 123.84

Survival%
Predicted Survival%
Poly. (Predicted Survival%)

Survival%

P/E mg protein kcal^{-1}

Fig.33 Regression of FCE on P/E in shrimp fed 45 g100^{-1} protein and varying levels of energy

$y = -0.0606x^2 + 15.138x - 891.68$

$R^2 = 1$

Opt. FCE = 53.66
Opt. P/E = 124.90

- ◆ FCE
- ■ Predicted FCE
- —— Poly. (Predicted FCE)

FCE

P/E mg protein kcal^{-1}

Fig.34 Regression of FCR on P/E in shrimp fed 45 g100^{-1} protein and varying levels of energy

$y = 0.0174x^2 - 4.1862x + 254.75$
$R^2 = 1$

Opt. FCR = 3.02
Opt. P/E = 120.27

FCR

P/E mg protein kcal^{-1}

FCR
Predicted FCR
Poly. (Predicted FCR)

Fig.35 Regression of RGR on E/P in shrimp fed 45 g100^{-1} protein and varying levels of energy

$y = -102.14x^2 + 1636.8x - 5849.1$
$R^2 = 1$

Opt. RGR = 707.92
Opt. E/P = 8.01

RGR
Predicted RGR
Poly. (Predicted RGR)

E/P

RGR%

IV. 7 Experiment B-6

Protein levels of 500 g kg^{-1} were obtained in the experimental diets in this experiment by incorporating 680 g kg^{-1} CIM. Filler levels varied between 0 – 250 g kg^{-1} and tapioca flour levels were varied between 0 g kg^{-1} and 270 g kg^{-1} to obtain the desired energy levels (Table 32). GE levels varied between 360.31 kcal 100g^{-1} and 452.53 kcal 100g^{-1} and DE levels varied between 284.78 kcal 100g^{-1} and 330.74 kcal 100g^{-1} (Table 33).

Growth of shrimp was significantly higher with diet 4 (637.06 % in terms of RGR) with a GE of 397.96 kcal 100g^{-1} and DE of 303.56 kcal 100g^{-1}. P/E ratio of this feed was 125.81. RGR, SGR, PER FCR, FCE and survival were also significantly higher (P <0.05) with this diet (Table 34).

Regressions of RGR on P/E, GE, DE and E/P; Survival, FCE and FCR on P/E indicated the RGR optimum to be between 710.65 –715.75, GE to be 395.80 kcal 100g^{-1}, DE to be 302.47 kcal 100g^{-1}. The optimum P/E ranged from 120.27 – 127.35. The optima for survival %, FCE and FCR were 94.50, 53.89 and 3.02 respectively. The optimum E/P ratio obtained was 7.91 (Figures 36 – 42).

Table 34. Average values of initial and final biomass, biomass gain, AGR, RGR, SGR, PER, FCR and FCE fed test diets (Exp. B-6). Means with the same superscript do not differ significantly ($P < 0.05$)

Diet Nos.	Initial biomass/ shrimp g	Final biomass/ shrimp g	Biomass gain/ shrimp g	AGR	RGR	SGR	PER	FCR	FCE	Survival %
1	0.043	0.237[a]	0.194[a]	0.0046[a]	553.07[a]	4.07[a]	0.35[a]	7.57[a]	43.41[a]	84[a]
2	0.047	0.266[b]	0.219[b]	0.0052[b]	562.77[a]	4.11[ab]	0.43[b]	6.53[b]	48.35[b]	87[ab]
3	0.043	0.255[bc]	0.212[bc]	0.0050[bc]	589.04[ab]	4.22[abc]	0.53[c]	5.08[c]	55.18[c]	90[abc]
4	0.049	0.309[d]	0.260[d]	0.0062[d]	637.06[bc]	4.40[cd]	0.62[d]	2.27[d]	57.86[d]	98[d]
5	0.043	0.247[bc]	0.204[ac]	0.0048[ac]	570.93[ab]	4.15[abc]	0.50[c]	1.66[e]	55.86[cd]	97[d]
6	0.045	0.253[bc]	0.208[bc]	0.0050[bc]	560.02[ab]	4.10[abc]	0.39[b]	2.67[f]	45.63[a]	93[bc]
7	0.042	0.232[a]	0.190[a]	0.0045[a]	556.02[ab]	4.08[abc]	0.33[a]	4.60[g]	44.11[a]	87[abc]
8	0.044	0.243[ac]	0.199[ac]	0.0047[ac]	550.32[ab]	4.05[abc]	0.29[e]	5.68[h]	38.58[e]	77[ab]

AGR = Wt. gain day^{-1}
RGR = Final wt. – Initial wt./ Initial wt. X 100
SGR = Ln. final wt. – Ln. initial wt./ No. of days x 100
PER = Wet wt. Gain/ Dry wt. of protein consumed
FCR = Dry wt. of feed consumed/ Wet wt. Gain
FCE = Wet wt. gain/ Dry wt. of feed consumed

Fig.36 Regression of RGR on P/E in shrimp fed 50 g100^{-1} protein and varying levels of energy

$y = -0.6516x^2 + 165.97x - 9852.7$
$R^2 = 0.5982$

Opt. RGR = 715.75
Opt. P/E = 127.35

RGR
Predicted RGR
Poly. (RGR)

RGR%

P/E mg protein kcal^{-1}

Fig.37 Regression of RGR on GE in shrimp fed 50 g100^{-1} protein and varying levels of energy

$y = -0.0508x^2 + 40.218x - 7248.3$
$R^2 = 1$

Opt. RGR = 710.65
Opt. GE = 395.80

RGR
Predicted RGR
Poly. (Predicted RGR)

GE mg protein kcal^{-1}

RGR%

Fig.38 Regression of RGR on DE in shrimp fed 50 g100^{-1} protein and varying levels of energy

Opt. RGR = 710.65
Opt. DE = 302.47

RGR
Predicted RGR
Poly. (Predicted RGR)

$y = -0.2047x^2 + 123.81x - 18014$
$R^2 = 1$

RGR%

DE kcal 100g^{-1}

Fig.39 Regression of survival on P/E in shrimp fed 50 g100^{-1} protein and varying levels of energy

Survival%
Predicted Survival%
Poly. (Predicted Survival%)

Opt. Survival % = 94.50
Opt. P/E = 125.6

$y = -0.0835x^2 + 20.982x - 1223.3$
$R^2 = 1$

Survival%

P/E mg protein kcal^{-1}

Fig.40 Regression of FCE on P/E in shrimp fed 50 g100^{-1} protein and varying levels of energy

$y = -0.0768x^2 + 19.428x - 1175.4$

$R^2 = 1$

Opt. FCE = 53.89
Opt. P/E = 126.55

FCE

Predicted FCE

Poly. (Predicted FCE)

P/E mg protein kcal^{-1}

FCE

Fig.41 Regression of FCR on P/E in shrimp fed 50 g100^{-1} protein and varying levels of energy

Fig.42 Regression of RGR on E/P in shrimp fed 50 g100^{-1} protein and varying levels of energy

$y = -142.88x^2 + 2259.1x - 8218.8$
$R^2 = 1$

Opt. RGR = 710.92
Opt. E/P = 7.91

- ◆ RGR
- ■ Predicted RGR
- ---- Poly. (Predicted RGR)

RGR%

E/P

IV. 8 Whole body composition and water quality

Whole body composition of the experimental animals before and after the experiments in terms of moisture, CP, EE and ash is depicted in Tables 6, 13, 19, 23, 27, 31 and 35. Variations in protein and energy in the diets did not significantly influence the body composition of the animals.

Table 6. Proximate composition of shrimp carcass (whole body) at the beginning and end of the Experiment A

Diets	Moisture %	Crude protein %	Ether extract %	Ash %
Initial	74.56	65.88	6.01	18.95
1	72.45	64.47	5.45	19.56
2	73.25	64.81	4.46	19.68
3	73.69	63.36	5.78	20.51
4	72.51	68.75	6.34	19.52
5	71.49	65.62	5.82	20.16
6	72.69	63.36	6.02	21.56

Table 13. Proximate composition of shrimp carcass (whole body) at the beginning and end of the Exp. (B – 1)

Diets	Moisture %	Crude protein %	Ether extract %	Ash %
Initial	77.20	61.93	11.01	16.02
1	71.92	65.63	9.09	18.99
2	72.02	66.94	9.09	19.01
3	73.01	63.09	8.36	18.93
4	73.45	68.22	8.14	19.45
5	72.98	66.92	7.22	18.44
6	74.12	69.37	7.93	19.32
7	72.42	64.17	7.22	19.86
8	73.45	66.75	8.06	19.02

Table 19. Proximate composition of shrimp carcass (whole body) at the beginning and end of the Exp. (B – 2)

Diets	Moisture %	Crude protein %	Ether extract %	Ash %
Initial	77.22	66.43	6.83	16.44
1	71.70	69.35	4.99	19.27
2	74.94	70.24	4.56	20.16
3	75.00	70.83	4.86	19.92
4	74.41	70.45	4.98	20.31
5	74.64	67.94	4.45	20.07
6	74.94	68.15	4.60	20.17
7	73.83	70.97	5.15	19.63
8	72.25	68.65	5.52	16.95

Table 23. Proximate composition of shrimp carcass (whole body) at the beginning and end of the Exp. (B – 3)

Diets	Moisture %	Crude protein %	Ether extract %	Ash %
Initial	76.90	66.96	6.14	16.83
1	72.46	69.38	4.28	20.01
2	73.01	66.29	4.58	19.73
3	72.22	68.54	4.92	19.28
4	72.56	67.92	5.02	18.96
5	72.53	70.82	5.52	19.56
6	72.89	69.42	4.48	19.88
7	73.11	69.88	4.97	20.02
8	72.51	70.12	5.06	18.98

Table 27. **Proximate composition of shrimp carcass (whole body) at the beginning and end of the Exp. (B – 4)**

Diets	Moisture %	Crude protein %	Ether extract %	Ash %
Initial	72.75	68.94	4.85	19.37
1	73.85	70.24	4.45	20.01
2	72.55	69.42	4.60	19.36
3	73.44	70.83	4.51	19.82
4	72.55	69.25	4.82	20.07
5	73.83	69.21	4.92	20.17
6	72.98	70.05	4.64	20.22
7	74.55	65.89	3.92	19.43
8	73.22	68.06	4.52	21.11

Table 31. **Proximate composition of shrimp carcass (whole body) at the beginning and end of the Exp. (B – 5)**

Diets	Moisture %	Crude protein %	Ether extract %	Ash %
Initial	73.24	69.68	4.85	19.38
1	74.25	70.56	5.02	20.11
2	73.29	68.89	5.56	20.23
3	72.41	68.72	4.89	20.19
4	74.36	70.71	4.92	19.65
5	73.45	70.12	5.01	20.10
6	71.48	69.82	4.95	20.61
7	72.59	68.17	4.75	19.88
8	73.56	70.12	5.02	20.14

Table 35. Proximate composition of shrimp carcass (whole body) at the beginning and end of the Exp. (B – 6)

Diets	Moisture %	Crude protein %	Ether extract %	Ash %
Initial	72.14	69.85	4.86	19.84
1	74.22	70.51	4.96	21.12
2	73.21	70.12	5.02	20.11
3	72.56	71.09	4.88	19.73
4	71.09	69.88	5.04	19.85
5	74.56	70.11	4.89	19.56
6	73.82	68.45	5.47	21.01
7	72.31	69.12	4.98	19.54
8	74.82	70.12	4.98	19.99

Water quality in all the succeeding six experiments was within the acceptable ranges for aquatic life (Table 7).

Table 7. Environmental conditions of culture containers in Experiments B (1- 6)

Parameter	Fortnights			
	1	2	3	4
Exp.B – 1				
Temperature $^{\circ}C$	28.3	28.7	28.2	28.9
Dissolved Oxygen (mg L^{-1})	4.2	4.5	4.4	5.0
pH	7.9	8.2	8.3	8.3
Salinity (g L^{-1})	25.2	25.4	25.3	25.1
Exp.B –2				
Temperature	28.5	28.3	29.0	28.9
Dissolved Oxygen (mg L^{-1})	5.4	4.4	5.2	4.1
pH	8.3	8.5	7.9	7.6
Salinity (g L^{-1})	25.2	25.9	25.3	25.8
Exp.B – 3				
Temperature	29.8	29.1	29.7	29.3
Dissolved Oxygen (mg L^{-1})	6.2	5.8	5.4	5.2
pH	7.9	8.1	8.2	8.5
Salinity (g L^{-1})	25.1	25.4	25.6	25.4
Exp.B – 4				
Temperature	28.5	28.9	29.1	28.6
Dissolved Oxygen (mg L^{-1})	5.6	4.8	5.9	6.0
pH	8.1	8.2	7.9	8.0
Salinity (g L^{-1})	25.1	25.3	25.3	25.7
Exp.B – 5				
Temperature	28.9	28.7	29.0	28.9
Dissolved Oxygen (mg L^{-1})	5.2	5.8	5.9	5.6
pH	7.8	8.0	7.9	8.1
Salinity (g L^{-1})	25.4	25.3	25.3	25.2
Exp.B – 6				
Temperature	29.1	29.0	28.9	29.0
Dissolved Oxygen (mg L^{-1})	5.7	5.2	5.3	4.8
pH	8.1	7.9	8.2	8.0
Salinity (g L^{-1})	25.0	25.1	25.2	25.2

The salient findings from the Experiments B1-6 are summarized in Tables 36 and 37 respectively. Maximum growth was observed at protein levels of 350, 400 and 450 g kg^{-1} where the GE content in the feeds was 371, 371 and 362 respectively. DE values were, 261, 270 and 275 respectively. P/E ratios were 97, 108 and 124 and E/P ratios were 10, 9 and 8 respectively. The overall picture of growth vs. energy is also depicted in Figure 43.

Table 36. Observed maximum growth and requirements in *F. indicus* (Experiments B1-6)

Protein g kg-1	250	300	350	400	450	500
RGR	410.55	493.02	778.56	778.56	778.63	637.06
GE kcal 100g-1	409.27	371.66	371.37	371.16	362.39	397.56
DE kcal 100g-1	267.54	249.25	260.89	269.61	275.55	303.56
P/E	62.29	82.18	97.13	108.36	124.18	125.81
E/P	16.05	12.17	10.3	9.23	8.27	7.95
L:C (ratio)	1:6.1	1:6.6	1:4.26	1:2.88	1:1.62	1:1.22
L:C (weight)	8:48	6:37	7:27	7:21	8:13	9:11
EE+NFE	56.05	42.80	34.24	27.83	20.75	19:29

Table 37. Optimum requirements derived by fitting second-degree polynomials (Experiments B1-6)

Protein g kg-1	250	300	350	400	450	500
	383.68-	453.28-	627-	703-	707-	710-
RGR	392.68	457.98	647	708	713	715
GE kcal 100g-1	417.89	346.49	353.03	357.02	360	395
DE kcal 100g-1	261.21	237.84	252.2	262.57	274	302.47
	51.54-	81.51-	98-	112-	120.27-	120.27-
P/E	65.25	89.35	103	114	125	127.35
E/P	16.17	11.49	9.89	8.89	8.01	7.91

Fig. 43 Comparitive RGR in shrimp fed constant levels of protein and varying levels of energy in six experiments

Legend:
— Protein (250g kg-1)
— Protein (300g kg-1)
— Protein (350g kg-1)
— Protein (400g kg-1)
— Protein (450g kg-1)
— Protein (500g kg-1)

X-axis: Energy levels

Y-axis: % Growth (RGR)

DISCUSSION

CHAPTER - V

DISCUSSION

V. 1. Experiment: A

This experiment was designed and conducted using locally available (Cochin) natural feed ingredients. The diet design involved variations in both protein and energy as reported by Ali, (1996); Alava and Lim, (1983); Sedgwick, (1979) and Colvin, (1976). Protein levels ranged from 200 to 500 g kg^{-1} and energy levels ranged from 413.69 kcal 100g^{-1} to 470.83 kcal 100g^{-1} in terms of GE and 260 kcal 100g^{-1} to 350 kcal 100g^{-1} in terms of DE in the experimental diets. This was because protein requirement reported for *Penaeus indicus* was 420 – 430 g kg^{-1} by Colvin (1976) and 350 – 375g kg^{-1} by Gopal and Raj (1990). Bhaskar and Ali (1984) and Udayakumara and Ponniah (1984) reported that early post-larval and juvenile *P. indicus* require 400g kg^{-1} caesin in purified diets for optimum growth. Moreover, in a comparative evaluation of four purified proteins in *P. indicus* Ali (1994) had reported a requirement of 250g kg^{-1} with albumin and 290g kg^{-1} with caesin. Thus the diet design in this experiment covered these levels of protein.

In terms of energy and protein interrelationships AQUACOP (1977) estimated an optimum requirement of 330 kcal100g^{-1} energy and 400g kg^{-1} protein for *P. monodon*. In *Penaeus merguiensis*, Sedgwick (1979) reported that the optimum protein levels to be in the range of 340 – 420 g kg^{-1} with an energy content of 290 - 440 kcal 100g^{-1}. Later, Bautista (1986) opined that a twofold increase in body weights could be achieved with diets containing 400-500g kg^{-1} protein, 50-100g kg^{-1} lipid and 200g kg^{-1} carbohydrate with energy values of 285-370 kcal 100g^{-1} in *P .monodon* juveniles (0.60 - 0.80g). Hajra *et al.*, (1988) observed that at 460 g kg^{-1} protein 412 kcal 100g^{-1} GE to be the most appropriate dietary combination in *P. monodon* juveniles (0.5 g) reared in near freshwater conditions (3.5 - 4.5‰). Shiau and Chou (1991) reported that, 360 g kg^{-1} protein and 330-kcal 100g^{-1} GE combination to be the best in *P. monodon* juveniles (0.82 g) reared in seawater (32 - 34‰). However, the only report assessing the optimum energy level in

P. indicus is that of Ali (1990) stating that 414.75 kcal 100g^{-1} as the GE optimum in a purified diet containing 400g kg^{-1} protein (casein).

In this experiment, GE levels obtained cover a range of 407.68 kcal 100g^{-1} to 470.83 kcal 100g^{-1}. This includes a lower energy level of 414.75 kcal 100g^{-1} reported by Ali (1990) with 400 g kg^{-1} protein and a higher level of 472 kcal 100g^{-1} recorded with a protein optimum near 428 g kg^{-1} by Colvin (1976) in *P. indicus.*

The highest final biomass was observed in shrimps receiving diet 5 and diet 2. Even though, diet 5 recorded a 0.92g final biomass gain shrimp^{-1}, when absolute growth rate (AGR) was calculated according to Hopkins (1992), an average daily gain of 0.017 g was observed in both the diets 5 and 2. Similarly, biomass gains were the highest in the aforementioned diets without any statistically significant variations. Highest RGR of 113.95% was found in shrimps fed diet 5 followed by 112.20% in shrimps fed diet 2. PER's were least (1.25) in shrimps fed diet 5 and maximum (3.16) in shrimps fed diet 2 (P <0.01). FCR also indicated a similar trend without statistical significance. Highest ADMD coefficient of 98.89% and an APD coefficient of 74.20% were recorded with diet 5. Where as, the highest APD coefficient of 74.58% was obtained with diet 4. The lowest APD coefficient was found in diet 2.

Thus, a complementary reduction in the requirement of protein in feed for shrimps when adequate non-protein energy was available as hypothesized by Sedgwick (1979) holds good in this study. Protein sparing to the tune of 15% with an approximate increase of 30% non-protein energy was clearly evident. This in terms of GE was 21.66 kcal 100g^{-1} for a protein sparing of 15%. Shiau and Chou (1991) in their experiments with *P. monodon* (average weight 0.81±0.10 g) reported an energy requirement of 330 kcal 100g^{-1} with 360 g kg^{-1} protein and 320 kcal 100g^{-1} for 400 g kg^{-1} protein; which amounts to a protein sparing of 4% with an increment of 10 kcal 100g^{-1} calculated GE. This difference of almost two-fold protein sparing ability of *Fenneropenaeus indicus* appears to be due to the propensity of the early juveniles of this species to utilize higher amounts of carbohydrates reported by Ali (1996), using purified diets. PER was found to be significantly higher (P <0.01) in the shrimps fed diet 2 and significantly lower with

diet 5. Implications here are (1) diet 2 would have been adequately balanced in terms of amino acids (2) a good quality shrimp diet can be formulated avoiding shrimp meal. An inverse relationship between PER and dietary protein reported by Colvin (1976) was consistent with the present finding and reiterates the fact that dietary protein in excessive quantities may be either unassimilated or used as an expensive source of energy (Sedgwick, 1979). A high APD coefficient in the case of diet 5 could have been due to the excessive catabolism of protein to meet the energy demands. FCR also depicts the same trend with diets 2 and 5 registering similar feed: gain ratios and protein and energy densities below and above optimum leading to elevated FCR's.

Digestibility of dry matter and protein are two more facets of nutritional responses recorded and perused. However, plummeting of survival rate to a low of 73% in shrimps fed diet 3 may be due to the amino acid imbalance, because the feed was devoid of both shrimp meal and fishmeal. PER obtained with this diet is also indicative of the above, which is in accordance to the report of Colvin (1976).

In quantifying nutrient requirements in fish Zeitoun *et al.,* (1976) and Shearer (2001) had discussed the advantages and disadvantages of polynomial regression analyses to help improve the nutrient requirement estimates. With the present data set, an attempt was made to fit second degree polynomials by regressing the final biomass of shrimps with protein and energy concentrations in the experimental diets.

The equation obtained for protein was $y = -0.7274 + 0.0859 x - 0.0015 x^2$ ($r^2 = 0.51$) indicating a optimum growth at 37.14% protein which corresponds to the optimum protein reported by Gopal and Raj (1990) for this species. Similarly, for energy, the equation obtained was $y = -37.6804 + 0.178462 x - 0.000207 x^2$ ($r^2 = 0.527$) indicating a optimum growth at 430.95 kcal/100g energy. Being an empirical fit to the growth response of living organisms, the polynomial approach has the advantage of being continuous and is believed to be more accurate than other methods (Zeitoun *et al.,* 1976). Ali (1990) in *P. indicus* reported an optimum requirement of 400g kg^{-1} protein and 414.75 kcal $100g^{-1}$ GE when fed purified diets. The present estimate of 371g kg^{-1} protein and 430.95 kcal $100g^{-1}$ GE by

feeding a diet made of natural feed ingredients indicates a marginally lower requirement of protein (Gopal and Raj, 1990) and slightly higher requirement of energy. Ali (1996) using a series of purified diets in *P. indicus* (initial dry wt: 10 mg) with a fixed lipid level of 70g kg^{-1} and varying protein and carbohydrate levels observed increasing trends in live weight gain, FCR and apparent carbohydrate digestibility without an optimum. A protein level of 219g kg^{-1} and 534g kg^{-1} carbohydrates with a GE of 399.4 kcal 100g^{-1} registered maximum weight gain, least FCR and highest carbohydrate digestibility, even though survival rates dropped with diets containing more than 450g kg^{-1} carbohydrates. This report is consistent with the present estimate in terms of energy. However, a protein level as low as 220 g kg^{-1} may be due to the feeding of high quality purified proteins by Ali (1994). The estimated protein requirement of 370g kg^{-1} in the present study could be due to the natural sources of protein used in the experimental diets and strengthens the finding of Gopal and Raj (1990) who observed 375g kg^{-1} protein optimum. Shiau and Chou (1991) applying the same technique in *P. monodon* reported optimum levels of 320 kcal 100g^{-1} in 400g kg^{-1} protein diet and 330 kcal 100g^{-1} in 360g kg^{-1} protein diet which was in agreement with the reported by Bautista (1986) in the same species. However, in *Fenneropenaeus indicus* the animals' capability to derive large quantum energy from non-protein energy constituents established by Ali (1996) was obvious in this investigation where, diet 2 with 570 g kg^{-1} of non-protein energy constituents performing nutritionally at par with diet 5. Applicability of this result is that, unlike purified diets tested by Ali (1996) all the feed ingredients used for the diet design in this study were natural and location specific. Thus, the results are tangible enough for direct application in hatchery linked nursery systems in the country.

V. 2. Experiments: B1-6

These six experiments were conducted with diet designs modified after Shiau and Chou (1991). The CIM provided the complement of natural feed ingredients such as fish meal, shrimp meal, clam meal and deoiled groundnut oil cake and oil. Chicken egg albumin rated to be the best purified animal protein source by Ali (1994) in *F. indicus* was the other major source of protein incorporated in the CIM.

73

A natural polysaccharide - starch was used as the carbohydrate source, viz., tapioca flour. Available reports indicate that shrimp are best able to utilize carbohydrates in the form of starch (polysaccharides) rather than monosaccharides (Abdel-Rahaman *et al.*, 1979, Deshimaru and Yone 1978; Andrews *et al.*, 1972; Forster and Beard, 1973; Ali 1988 and Cuzon *et al.*, 2000). Rapid absorption of free glucose (which requires no digestion) results in considerable amount of glucose entering the body tissue before sufficient elevation of the activities of carbohydrate metabolising enzymes. This is proposed to cause a 'negative physiological effect' (Piefer and Pfeffer, 1980) in fishes. Contrarily, starch has to undergo enzymatic hydrolysis and monosaccharides arising from starch hydrolysis appear at the gut absorption sites slower than free glucose. Abdel-Rahaman *et al.*, (1979) reported that the level of plasma glucose in *Penaeus japonicus* increased rapidly after they were fed a diet containing glucose and remained at high levels for 24 h. In contrast, plasma glucose was found to increase to a maximum level at 3 h and then decrease to a low level when the diet contained disaccharides and polysaccharides. These authors suggested that dietary glucose was quickly absorbed from the alimentary canal and released into haemolymph, resulting in a physiologically abnormal elevation of plasma glucose levels thereby impairing its utilisation as an energy source. Shiau and Peng (1992) also reported that plasma glucose levels in *P. monodon* fed glucose-containing diets peaked prior to those of shrimp fed dextrin or starch containing diets.

Another possible explanation for the poor growth performance of shrimp fed glucose containing diets is the possible inhibition of amino acid absorption in the intestine due to the presence of glucose (Alvarado and Robinson, 1979). Hokazeno *et al.*, (1979) reported that the presence of 10 mM of glucose reduced the uptake of L-lysine from 26.64 to 12.34% and from 23.24 to 5.4% in the mid-intestine and the posterior intestine, respectively in rainbow trout. However, this interaction has not been studied in crustaceans.

Ali (1993) demonstrated that pure starch imparted significantly superior (P <0.01) growth compared with glucose, fructose, galactose, sucrose, maltose and glycogen in *F.indicus*. Tapioca flour was used to the extent of 540 g kg^{-1} in this

investigation. The purpose was dual as reported by Ali (1988). Tapioca flour serves as an excellent binder other than being a good source of energy for shrimp. Hence, the energy variation is primarily brought about in the experimental feeds by varying the incorporation of tapioca flour from $0 - 540$ g kg^{-1}. The diets where tapioca flour was less than 100g kg^{-1} or avoided totally, CMC was incorporated as the binder at 20 g kg^{-1}. (Tables 20, 24, 28 and 32).

Cellulose is used as the filler because, incorporating cellulose as high as 471 g kg^{-1} did not have any detrimental effects in similar studies reported by Shiau and Chou (1991) and Chuntapa et al. (1999).

Oil used in the CIM is an equal mixture of cod liver oil and groundnut oil. In diet formulations for shrimps major emphasis has been on maintaining an optimum ratio between n-3 type of essential fatty acids generally present in marine oils and n-6 type of fatty acids, most abundant in plant oils (Mercian and Shim, 1994). Grossly this requirement is met by blending cod-liver oil with groundnut oil in the CIM used in this study. Optimal lipid requirement reported by Chandge (1997[a]) in *F. indicus* is in the range of 8% - 12%. Ali (1990) had reported that a 6% mixture of cod liver oil, prawn head oil, sardine oil and soybean lecithin in the ratio of 1:1:1:1 in the purified diets produced significantly higher growth ($P < 0.01$), best FCR and high survival in *F. indicus* weighing 0.075 g. In this investigation, 9% oil was included in the CIM (Tables 9 and 15). This CIM when incorporated at 35 - 68% (Tables 10, 16, 20, 24, 28 and 32) yielded lipid levels of 4.85 to 10.84% (Exp. B1), 5.63 to 9.53% (Exp. B2), 6.51 to 8.40% (Exp. B3), 7.17% (Exp. B4), 7.9% (Exp. B5) and 8.7% (Exp. B6). These variations were mainly due to (1) the ascent in the levels of CIM inclusion to bring about the increase in protein content and (2) in experimental diets where energy increment was not achievable in the formulation from the carbohydrate source (tapioca flour), oil inclusion was resorted to the tune of 1-6% in the diets of experiments B 1-3. Preferential use of carbohydrate over lipid as energy has been demonstrated in shrimp (Ali, 1996 and Cuzon, 2000). Chuntapa (1999) stressed upon the establishment of an appropriate lipid: carbohydrate ratio (L: C) in shrimp diets and reported an L: C ratio of 7:32 (% by weight) in diets of *P. monodon*. This ratio has been worked out

for all the experimental diets (B 1-6) in this research, which shall be discussed in relation to growth in the succeeding relevant section.

Shrimp are incapable of synthesizing the steroid ring. Many sterols and essential components such as moulting hormones, sex hormones, bile acids and vitamin D, are synthesized from cholesterol. Cholesterol also functions as a component of membranes and in the absorption of fatty acids. Therefore, cholesterol is considered an essential nutrient, which must be provided in the diet (Teshima and Kanazawa, 1971). Akiyama et al. (1992) recommended 0.25 – 0.4% cholesterol in commercial shrimp feeds because many marine invertebrate meals and oils, i.e., squid, shrimp, crab and clam to be excellent sources of cholesterol. However, cholesterol in all the experimental diets contained 0.5% cholesterol based on the report of Chandge and Raj (1997[b]) in *F.indicus*.

The beneficial effect of phospholipids on growth and survival of shrimp are well documented (Kanazawa, 1983). 1) It is reported that phospholipids containing choline or inositol are most beneficial; 2) phospholipids containing the essential fatty acids are most effective; 3) the position of the fatty acid affects the phospholipids' effectiveness; and 4) though phospholipids are synthesized by shrimp, the rate of synthesis is slow. It is also proven that an exogenous supply of phosphatidylcholine is required in shrimp feeds. Details of sources, their effectiveness and requirements still remain inconclusive (Russet, 2001). Regarding the requirement of phospholipid in *F.indicus* the only report is by Chandge and Raj (1997[b]) in larvae to the tune of 4%. Akiyama (1992) recommended a general phospholipid requirement of 2% in shrimp feeds and if lecithin is used the requirement can be brought down to 1%. In this study only 0.5% lecithin was used. This was considering the levels of phospholipids reported by Gill (1998) shown below. These ingredients used in the experimental diets should have contributed to the phospholipid availability excluding the possibility of a diet-induced deficiency.

Approximate Phospholipid Content of Aquafeed Ingredients (modified from Gill, 1998)

Ingredient	Phospholipid %
Clam meal	1.27
Albumin	2.14
Fish meal	2.47
Shrimp meal	1.02

There are only two reports regarding requirements of some water-soluble vitamins, Gopal (1987) and essentiality of vitamins in the Indian White Shrimp *F. indicus* (Reddy *et al.*, 1999), which were inadequate to formulate a vitamin mixture for this species. Therefore, based on a detailed review of vitamins required in crustacean diets by Conklin (1997), a vitamin mixture formulated based on the recommended levels given by Conklin (1997) was used. The composition is detailed as a footnote to Table 10 was used in all the diets in the experiments B1-6.

Similarly, in the case of minerals, Ali (1989) is the only report assessing the mineral requirements in *F. indicus*. Davis and Lawrence (1997) in a detailed review on mineral requirements in crustaceans have opined that the quantitative mineral requirements in most of the species have not been established. However, mineral deficiencies can occur in experiments with semi-purified diets as in this investigation. U.S.P salt mixture No. XIV (1950) whose detailed composition is given as a footnote to Table 10, was incorporated as a safe measure based on the authors' earlier experience with test diets in shrimp.

The results of the second set of six experiments demonstrated that shrimp fed on diets with 250 g kg^{-1} to 300 g kg^{-1} at all energy levels showed a lower growth rate compared with shrimp fed higher protein levels; protein levels below 300 g kg^{-1} appear to be insufficient for optimal growth.

Colvin (1976) while estimating protein requirement of *F. indicus* tested protein (g kg^{-1}): GE (kcal 100g^{-1}) combinations of 213:450, 334:460, 428:470 and 530: 480 respectively and found that 428: 470 to be the most appropriate combination. Ali (1990) was the next to report that in *F. indicus* with a diet containing 400g kg^{-1}

protein, 50 g kg^{-1} lipid and 350 g kg^{-1} carbohydrate 414 kcal 100g^{-1} GE as the optimum.

Further, Ali (1996) reported that with 348 g kg^{-1} protein and 70g kg^{-1} lipid; maximum growth was at 348 kcal 100g^{-1} DE (whether estimated or calculated was not mentioned) in *F. indicus*. With the same lipid level (70g kg^{-1}), and protein levels ranging from 220 g kg^{-1} to 510 g kg^{-1} maximum growth was registered at 400 kcal 100g^{-1}. Again, with 348 g kg^{-1} protein, lipid level ranging from 15 g kg^{-1} to 178 g kg^{-1}, maximum growth was at 392 kcal 100g^{-1}. This observation of Ali (1996), ascribing the preferential utilisation of carbohydrate as high as 530g kg^{-1} in a protein deficient (220 g kg^{-1}) situation was also reported to cause poor survival. In this study, it is observed that in Exp. B1 with 250g kg^{-1} protein the GE of 409 kcal 100g^{-1} (Tables 11 and 36) recorded maximum growth and survival. The effect was manifested as poorest growth recorded among the six experiments. Protein sufficiency in formulated feeds in this research is found ensured only in Experiments B3-6. Similar and superior growth resulted (780% RGR), with protein levels of 350, 400 and 450 g kg^{-1}. The potential of manipulating energy levels by altering the inclusion levels of non-protein dietary constituents to reduce protein level to the extent of not having an impact on growth is thus imminent.

In *P. monodon* AQUACOP (1977) estimated that a total dietary energy content of 330 kcal 100g^{-1} was required for optimal growth at 400 g kg^{-1} protein. Hajra *et al.*, (1988) reported that a GE level of 413 kcal 100g^{-1} to be the optimum at 460g kg^{-1} protein with feeds compounded using natural ingredients and shrimp reared in near freshwater conditions. In their review Cuzon and Guillaume (1997) found that the energy levels in crustacean diets generally ranged from 310 to 410 kcal 100g^{-1}. While attempting to discern the most appropriate range in this work, it is clear that there is a threshold level for protein (350g kg^{-1} here), which is responsible for optimum growth. GE level of 371 kcal 100g^{-1} required to sustain this is derived from an L: C (% weight) ratio of 7:27. Bautista (1986) reported that the *P. monodon* (0.60-0.80 g) fed with 300g kg^{-1} protein and GE ranging from 205-335 kcal 100g^{-1} had lower growth rates compared with shrimp fed on diets containing 350-450 g kg^{-1} protein at all energy levels. Shiau and Chou (1991) in their work on *P. monodon* reported that at 400 g kg^{-1} protein the optimum GE level was

320 kcal 100g^{-1} and at 360 g kg^{-1} protein the GE level was 330 kcal 100g^{-1}. In *P .monodon*, Chuntapa *et al.* (1999) documented observations similar to the present study. Low growth at energy levels ranging from 203-339 kcal 100g^{-1} with protein levels below 330g kg^{-1}. In shrimp fed on diets containing 330 – 440 g kg^{-1} protein and GE levels ranging from 223 – 459 kcal 100g^{-1} had greater growth. Further, growth was reported to be similar with 340 g kg^{-1} protein and GE levels of 223 and 331 kcal 100g^{-1}. At 330 g kg^{-1} protein with GE of 439 kcal 100g^{-1} growth rate tended to decrease. However, at 360 g kg^{-1} protein and 459 kcal 100g^{-1} GE, growth rate was similar in diets containing 330-440 g kg^{-1} protein at all GE levels. At 440 g kg^{-1} protein and GE levels of 263 – 371 kcal 100g^{-1} growth is again reported to match the levels of growth observed at 330 - 440 g kg^{-1} protein. Using regression analysis with this data they derived the optimum P/E ratio as 146-150 mg protein kcal^{-1}. This trend is observed in the present work also, however, the GE values corresponding to 350, 400 and 450 g kg^{-1} protein in the diets where maximum and similar growth was observed were 362 – 371 kcal 100g^{-1} and P/E ranged from 97-124 mg protein kcal^{-1}. With regression analysis these GE values ranged between 353 – 360 kcal 100g^{-1} and P/E ranged from 103-125 mg protein kcal^{-1}.

Thus, the optimal protein requirement in *F. indicus* in this study does conform to the earlier reports on this species by Colvin (1976) and Gopal and Raj (1990). The energy requirement even though decreases with an increase in the protein content in the diets as depicted in Figure 43, the protein sparing capability in this species appears to be lower when compared with the report on *P. monodon* (Shiau and Chou 1991). P/E ratio (103-125 mg protein kcal^{-1}) is also lower implying cheaper and more cost effective feeds can be formulated for this species.

L: C as a ratio in feed by weight is another important parameter perused which were 7:27, 7:21 and 8:13 by weight for the diets containing 350, 400 and 450 g kg^{-1} protein respectively. This ratio of non-protein energy constituents indicates the gross tolerance level of this organism towards unnatural levels of fat and carbohydrates without ignoring the fact that the natural disposition of shrimp in general is towards a protein rich food and environment. The ratio reported for *P. monodon* is 7:32 by weight by Chuntapa *et al.* (1999). Ali (1990) in *F. indicus*

reports this ratio to be 5:35 for the diet, which registered the optimum growth. The current research shows that 7:27, 7:21 and 8:13 to be the appropriate ratios for optimum growth for diets containing 350, 400 and 450 g kg^{-1} protein respectively. Moreover, these ratios recorded higher growth compared to the work of Ali (1990) who had not tested lipid level beyond 6.25% because his own finding that 6% gross lipid level was optimal. Chandge and Raj (1997[a]) reported a range of 8-12% for the same species. As shown in Table 36 the L: C ratio of 8:48, 6:37 and 9:11 at protein levels of 250, 300 and 500 g kg^{-1} protein produced sub-optimal growth. This indicated threshold levels of fat and carbohydrate beyond which abnormally high levels of these nutrients indirectly affecting protein deposition (growth).

SGR, PER, FCR FCE and survival are the other nutritional indices which conformed to the optimal values of growth in all the six experiments (B1-6) conducted. Significantly higher values (P <0.05) values for SGR, PER, FCE and significantly least values for FCR support the findings discussed. Varying levels of protein and energy in feed did not impact the body composition of the animals (Tables 13,19, 23, 27, 31 and 35).

The situation when viewed in totality, Exp. A with natural feed ingredients indicated that protein sparing to the tune of 150g kg^{-1} could be demonstrated with an increment of 21 kcal 100g^{-1} GE. However, with semi-purified diets (Exps.B1-6) this capability of the animal is not manifested as evident in Table 36 and Figure 43, where the possibility is only to the extent of 100g kg^{-1} protein, with a GE increment of 9 kcal 100g^{-1}.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

CHAPTER - VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

VI. 1   Summary

- Seven experiments were conducted with *Fenneropenaeus indicus* to deduce the appropriate protein: energy ratios in their feeds.

- The first experiment A was conducted with the shrimp of an initial weight of 0.390 − 0.480g with feeds compounded using natural feed ingredients - shrimp meal, fish meal, clam meal, groundnut oil cake and tapioca flour for a period of 28 days in 25 ‰ salinity.

- The six protein (%): gross energy (kcal/100g) combinations obtained were - 22.43: 413.69, 31.99:451.63, 35.71:438.17, 43.28:407.68, 47.65:429.97 and 52.68:470.83 respectively for diets numbered 1 to 6.

- The P/E ratio i.e., mg protein/kcal of these diets was 54.22, 70.83, 81.50, 106.16, 110.82 and 111.89.

- Nutritional responses assessed were weight gain, biomass gain/shrimp, relative growth rate (RGR), specific growth rate (SGR), protein efficiency ratio (PER) and food conversion ratio (FCR).

- Apparent dry matter digestibility (ADMD) and apparent protein digestibility (APD) were also assessed. Second-degree polynomials were fitted with the data set to derive optimum levels of protein and GE.

- Best nutritional performance was obtained with diets 2 and 5 containing protein (%): gross energy (kcal/100g) combinations 31.99:451.63 and 47.64:429.97 respectively

- Best performance was observed with the protein: GE combinations 2 and 5 respectively suggesting a protein sparing of 15% with an increase of 30% non-protein energy constituents in the diet. Optimum levels of protein and GE derived using second-degree polynomial regressions were 31.74% and 430.95 kcal/100g with a P/E ratio of 86.18.

- The remaining six experiments (B1-6) were conducted with shrimp of ≈0.040g initial weight for a duration of 42 days at 25 ‰ salinity.

- Experimental diets were formulated with a CIM containing shrimp meal, fishmeal, clam meal, groundnut oil cake, oil and albumin.

- CIM was incorporated as ascending levels into complete feeds to obtain fixed levels of protein (250g kg^{-1} to 500g kg^{-1}) for each experiment.

- Varying level of energy was obtained by increasing the levels of tapioca flour. Wherever the desired energy levels could not be obtained in a formulation, oil was substituted to achieve the same.

- Cellulose was used as the filler.

- In Exp. B1 the protein content of the feeds were 250g kg^{-1} and the GE levels were 290, 307, 327, 348, 368, 389, 409 and 426 kcal 100g^{-1} and P/E ratios were 86, 82, 77, 73, 69, 66, 62 and 60 mg kcal^{-1}. L: C ratios (% weight) tested were 5:27, 5:31, 5:35, 5:40, 5:45, 5:50, 8:48 and 11:46.

- In this experiment the growth was significantly higher (P <0.05) at the GE level of 409 kcal 100g^{-1} registering 411 % RGR.

- In Exp. B2 the protein content of the feeds were 300g kg^{-1} and the GE levels were 290, 310, 331, 351, 372, 389, 410 and 430 kcal 100g^{-1} and P/E ratios were 104, 97, 92, 87, 82, 79, 73 and 70 mg kcal^{-1}. L: C (% weight) was 6:18, 6:23, 6:28, 6:32, 6:37, 6:41,7:45 and 10:44.

- In this experiment the growth was significantly higher (P <0.05) at the GE level of 372 kcal 100g^{-1} registering 493 % RGR.

- In Exp. B3 the protein content of the feeds were 350g kg^{-1} and the GE levels were 289, 310, 330, 351, 371, 390, 407 and 422 kcal 100g^{-1} and P/E ratios were 123, 115, 108, 102, 97, 91, 87, 84 mg kcal^{-1}. L: C (% weight) was 7:8, 7:13, 7:18, 7:23, 7:27, 6:33, 6:37 and 8:37.

- In this experiment the growth was significantly higher (P <0.05) at the GE level of 371 kcal 100g^{-1} registering 779 % RGR.

- In Exp. B4 the protein content of the feeds were 400g kg^{-1} and the GE levels were 296, 310, 330, 351, 371, 392, 412 and 419 kcal 100g^{-1} and P/E ratios were 134, 129, 121, 114, 108, 103, 98 and 97 mg kcal^{-1}. L: C (% weight) was 7:3, 7:6, 7:11, 7:16, 7:21, 7:25, 7:30 and 7:32.

- In this experiment the growth was significantly higher (P <0.05) at the GE level of 371 kcal 100g^{-1} registering 779 % RGR.

- In Exp. B5 the protein content of the feeds were 450g kg^{-1} and the GE levels were 325, 342, 352, 362, 373, 383, 393 and 420 kcal 100g^{-1} and P/E ratios were 138, 131, 128, 124, 121, 118, 115 and 108 mg kcal^{-1}. L: C (% weight) was 8:2, 8:6, 8:8, 8:10, 8:13, 8:15, 8:18 and 8:24.

- In this experiment also the growth was significantly higher (P <0.05) at the GE level of 363 kcal 100g^{-1} registering 779 % RGR indicating a marginal decline in energy requirement.

- In Exp. B6 the protein content of the feeds were 500g kg^{-1} and the GE levels were 360, 377, 388, 398, 408, 418, 429 and 453 kcal 100g^{-1} and P/E ratios were 138, 132, 129, 126,123, 120, 117 and 111 mg protein kcal^{-1}. L: C (% weight) was 9:2, 9:6, 9:8, 9:11, 9:13, 9:15, 9:18 and 9:23.

- In this experiment also the growth was significantly higher (P <0.05) at the GE level of 398 kcal 100g^{-1} registering 637% RGR.

- Growth of shrimp was observed to be uniform at 350, 400 and 450 g kg^{-1} protein with 450 g kg^{-1} protein and 363 kcal 100g^{-1} GE registering maximum growth

- Regression analyses of the data fitting second-degree polynomials were also found to confirm this trend.

VI. 2 Conclusions

Ratio of protein, carbohydrate and lipid in the feeds of shrimp play an important role in formulation of cost effective feeds. Absolute requirements become dynamic with the alterations in their ratio and knowledge of their interactions can be applied in reducing the cost of shrimp production.

With a short duration single experiment using feeds compounded with natural feed ingredients (Exp. A) it could be demonstrated that considerable protein sparing is possible in shrimp feeds. Two test feeds with 320 g kg^1 protein and 452 kcal $100g^1$ GE and 480g kg^{-1} protein and 430 kcal $100g^{-1}$ GE performed in concert. The optima derived by second-degree polynomial regressions were 320g kg^{-1} and 430.95 kcal $100g^{-1}$ with a P/E ratio (mg protein $kcal^{-1}$) of 86.18.

Experiments B1-6 with feeds compounded with purified ingredients mainly (semi-purified diet), showed that the optimum range of protein required in the feed to realise maximum growth at 350 to 450g kg^{-1}. The energy levels, which sustained this growth, were $362 - 371$ kcal $100g^{-1}$ GE and $262 - 276$ kcal $100g^{-1}$ DE. The optima derived through regression analysis were $353 - 360$ kcal $100g^{-1}$ GE and $252 - 274$ kcal $100g^{-1}$ DE. Within this range energy can be manipulated to lower the protein inclusion in the feed.

Even though the experiments are not directly comparable, Experiment A with natural feed ingredients indicated the potential to manipulate computations to such an extent that cost effectiveness could be achieved by reduction of nutrient densities prior to least cost formulation *per se*. The Experiments with purified ingredients that may not be directly applicable on farm lends leverage in experimentation in terms of testing the widest range of nutrient inclusions possible and testing only a single variable.

However, further precision in energy requirement data can only be achieved if the DE and ME values are available for shrimp. The future course of work should be on those lines examined in tandem with environmental interactions.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

Abdel-Rahaman, S. H., Kanazawa, A and Teshima, S.I., 1979. Effects of dietary carbohydrate on the growth and the levels of the hepatopancreatic glycogen and serum glucose of prawn. Nippon Suisan Gakkaishi, 45:1491-1494.

ADCP Aquaculture Co-ordination and Development programme, 1983. Fish feeds and feeding in developing countries. FAO, Rome. ADCP/REP/83/18:97p.

Akiyama, D.M., Dominy, W. G. and, Lawerence, A. L., 1992. Penaeid shrimp nutrition, In Marine Shrimp Culture: Principles and Practices, pp. 535-568. Eds. Arlo, W. Fast and L. James Lester, 1992 Elsevier Science Publishers, B.V.

Alava, V. R. & Lim, C., 1983. The quantitative dietary protein requirements of *Penaeus monodon* juveniles in a controlled environment. Aquaculture, 30:53-61.

Alava, V.R. and Pascual, F.P., 1987. Carbohydrate requirement of *P.monodon* (Fabricius) juveniles. Aquaculture, 61:211-217.

Ali, S. A. 1988 Water stability of prawn feed pellets prepared using different binding materials with special reference to tapioca. Indian Journal of Fisheries, 35(1) 46-51.

Ali, S. A. 1989. Studies on the evaluation of different sources of proteins, carbohydrates and mineral requirements of juveniles of penaeid prawn, *Penaeus indicus*. Abstracts of Ph.D. Theses 1990 awarded by Cochin University of Science and Technology from 1973 to 1989, CUSAT, 1990, pp.321-322.

Ali, S. A., 1990. Relative efficiencies of different lipids and lipid levels in the diet of prawn *Penaeus indicus*. Indian Journal of Fisheries, 37(2) 119-128.

Ali, S. A., 1993. Evaluation of different carbohydrates in the diet of the prawn *Penaeus indicus*. Journal of Aquaculture in the Tropics, 8:13-23.

Ali, S. A., 1994. Comparative evaluation of four purified dietary proteins for the juvenile *Penaeus indicus*. Journal of Aquaculture in the Tropics, 9:95 – 108.

Ali, S. A., 1996. Carbohydrate nutrition under different dietary conditions in prawn *Penaeus indicus*. Journal of Aquaculture in the Tropics, 11: 13 – 25.

Alvarado, F. and Robinson, J.W.L., 1979. A kinetic study of the interaction between amino acids and monosaccharides of the intestinal brush-border membrane. Journal of Physiology 295:457-475.

Andrews, J. W., Sick, L.V. and Baptist, G.J., 1972. The influence of dietary protein and energy level on growth and survival of penaeid shrimp. Aquaculture, 1:341-347.

Andrews, J.W., Sick, L.V. and Baptist, G.J.,1972. The influence of dietary proteins and energy levels on growth and survival of penaeid shrimp. Aquaculture, 1:113-127.

A.O.A.C.,1990. Official Methods of Analytical Chemists, (Editor: K. Helrich), 15th edition, Pub. AOAC Inc., Suite 400, 2200 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Virginia, 22201, USA, 684 p.

AQUACOP, 1977. Reproduction and growth of *Penaeus monodon* in Polynesia. Proceedings of the World Aquaculture Society, 8:927-947.

Bautista, M.N., 1986. Response of *P.monodon* juveniles to varying protein/energy ratios in test diets. Aquaculture, 53:229-242.

Bhaskar, T. I. C. J. and Ali S. A., 1984. Studies on the protein requirement of postlarvae of penaeid prawn *Penaeus indicus* H. Milne Edwards using purified diets. Indian Journal of Fisheries, 31:74 – 81.

Brett, J. R and Groves, T.D., 1979. Physiology and energetics, pp.280-344 In W.S Hoar, D.J. Randall and R.R. Brett, editors. Fish Physiology. Vol.VIII. Academic Press. New York. USA.

Brody, S., 1964. Bioenergetics and growth with special reference to the efficiency complex in domestic animals. Hafner Publication Company. New York, USA.

Cappuzo, J. M., 1983. Crustacean bioenergetics: the role of environment variables and dietary level of macronutrients on energetic deficiencies. Pages 71-86 in G.L. Pruder, C.J. Langdon and D.E. Conklin editors. Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Aquaculture Nutrition. World Aquaculture Society, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, USA.

Catacutan, M. R., 1991. Apparent digestibility of diets with various carbohydrates levels and growth response if *Penaeus monodon.*

DeVresse, B. 1995. Nutrient levels in some commercial shrimp feeds and feed ingredients of Asia and Latin America – A comparative analysis. In Proceedings of the Feed Ingredients Asia '95. Singapore International Convention and Exhibition Centre, Singapore. 19-21 Sept. 1995. Turret Group PLC, UK, pp. 49-70.

DeVresse, B., 2000. Shrimp Nutrition. Past, Present and Future. *In* Proceedings of Aqua Expo 2000, Guayaquil, Ecuador.

Chandge, M. S. and Paul Raj, R., 1997[b]. Cholesterol requirements of the juveniles of Indian White Prawn *Penaeus indicus* H.Milne Edwards. Journal of Aquaculture in the Tropics, 12: 227-237.

Chandge, M.S. and Paul Raj, R., 1997[a]. Dietary lipid requirements of the juveniles of Indian White Prawn *Penaeus indicus* H.Milne Edwards. Journal of Aquaculture in the Tropics, 12: 165 – 180.

Chuntapa, B., Piyatirativorakul, S., Nitithamyong, C., Viyakaran, V. and Menasveta, P., 1999. Optimal lipid:carbohydrate and protein: energy ratios in semi-purified diets for juvenile black tiger shrimp *Penaeus monodon* Fabricius. Aquaculture Research, 30, 825-830.

Colvin, P. M., 1976. Nutritional studies on penaeid prawns: Protein requirements in compounded diets for juvenile *Penaeus indicus* (Milne Edwards). Aquaculture, 7:315-326.

Conklin, D. E., 1997. Vitamins. In: D'Abramo, L. R., Conklin, D. E. and Akiyama, D. M. (Eds.) Advances in World Aquaculture - Crustacean nutrition, vol. 6, World Aquaculture Society, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, USA, pp. 123 – 149.

Cousin, M., 1995. Contribution á l'étude de l'utilisation des glucides et du rapport proteine/énergie chez *P.vannamei* et *P.stylirostris*. Thése INA/PG. Paris pp.201. (Not referred to in original)

Cousin, M. Cuzon, G., Blancet, E. Ruelle, F. and AQUACOP, 1992. Protein requirements following an optimum dietary energy to protein ratio for *P.vannamei* juveniles. Pages 599-606 In S.J.Kaushik and P.Luquet, editors. *Fish Nutrition in Practice* (France), June 24-27 1991. INRA, Paris, France.

Cuzon, G. and Guillaume, J., 1997. Energy and protein: energy ratio. In: D'Abramo, L. R., Conklin, D. E. and Akiyama, D. M. (Eds.) Advances in World Aquaculture - Crustacean nutrition, vol. 6, World Aquaculture Society, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, USA, pp.51-70.

Cuzon, G., Rosas, C. Gaxiola, G. Taboada, G. and Van Wormhoudt, A., 2000. Utilization of carbohydrates by shrimp. In Cruz-Suárez, L.E., Rieque-Marie, D., Tapia-Salazar, M., Olvera-Novoa, M.A. Civera-Cerecedo, R., (Eds) Avances en Nutrición Acuícola V. Memorias del V Simposium Internacional de Nutrición Acuícola. 19-22 Noviembre, 2000. Mérida, Yucatán.

Davis, A.D. and Lawerence, A.L., 1997. Minerals. In: D'Abramo, L. R., Conklin, D. E. and Akiyama, D. M. (Eds.) Advances in World Aquaculture - Crustacean nutrition, vol. 6, World Aquaculture Society, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, USA, pp.150-159.

Deshimaru and Shigueno, 1972. Introduction to artificial diet for prawn *P.Japonicus*. Aquaculture, 1(1): 115-133.

Deshimaru, O. and Yone, Y. 1978. . Effect of dietary carbohydrate source on growth and feed efficiency of prawn. Nippon Suisan Gakkaishi, 44:1161-1163.

DeVresse, B. 2000. Shrimp Nutrition. Past, Present and Future. In Proceedings of Aqua Expo 2000, Guayaquil, Ecuador.

Elliot, J.M. and Davidson, W. 1975 Energy equivalents of oxygen consumption in animal energetics. Oceologia, 19:195-201.

FAO., 2001. FAO Fisheries Department, Fishery Information, Data and Statistics Unit. FISHSTAT Plus: Universal software for fishery statistical time series. Version 2.30. 25 May 2001.

Forster, J.R.M and Beard. T. W., 1973. Growth experiments with prawn *Palaemon serratus* fed fresh compounded foods. Fisheries Investigation Service, II 27(7), 16 pp.

Furukawa, A. and Tsukahara, H., 1966. On the acid digestion for the determination of chromic oxide as an index substance in the study of digestibility of fish feed. Bulletin of the Japanese Society of Scientific Fisheries, 32(6): 502 – 506.

Gill, C., 1998. Shrimp Feeds: Update on Phospholipids from Raw Materials. Feed International, March, p. 12.

Gopal, C., 1987. Nutritional studies on juveniles of *Penaeus indicus.* Abstracts of Ph.D. Theses 1990 awarded by Cochin University of Science and Technology from 1973 to 1989, CUSAT, 1990, p.279.

Gopal, C. and Raj, R. P., 1990. Protein requirement of juvenile *Penaeus indicus* - I. Food consumption and growth. Proceedings of the Indian Academy of Sciences, (Animal Sciences), 99: 401 – 410.

Guzman, C., Gaxiola, G., Roasa, C. And Torre-Blanco, A., 2001. The effect of dietary protein and total energy content on digestive enzyme activities, growth and survival of *Litopenaeus setiferus* (Linnaeus 1767) postlarvae. Aquaculture Nutrition,7:113-122.

Hajra, A., Gosh, A. & Mandal, S. K., 1988. Biochemical studies on the determination of optimum dietary protein to energy ratio for *Penaeus monodon* (Fabricius) juveniles. Aquaculture, 71:71-79.

Hamid, A. N., 1998. Nutritional studies on different sizes of *Penaeus indicus* with special reference to protein-energy interaction. Ph.D. Thesis submitted to the Central Institute of Fisheries Education, Mumbai through PGPM, CMFRI, Cochin, India 157 p.

Hokazeno, S., Tanska, Y., Katayama, T. Chicchester, C. O. and Simpson, K.L., 1979. Intestinal transport of L-lysine in rainbow trout, *Salmo gairndneri*. Nippon Suisan Gakkaishi 45:845-848.

Hopkins, K. D., 1992. Reporting fish growth: A review of the basics. Journal of World Aquaculture Society, 23(3): 173 – 179.

Kanazawa, A., 1983. Effects of phospholipids in aquatic animals. Feed Oil Abstracts, B: (18) 1-5 (in Japanese)

Khmeleva, N. N. and Gobulev, A.P., 1986. La Productio n chez les crustacés. Rôle dand les écosytemes et utilisation. Edited and translated from Russian by C.Bellmont-Humbert (Editor) IFERMER. Plouzané. France. p.198. (not referred to in original)

Koshio , S., Teshima, S., Kanazawa, A and Watase, T., 1993. Determination of optimal dietary content for juveniles of *P.japonicus* by evaluating growth, digestive efficiency and ammonia excretion. Aquaculture, 113:101-114.

Le Gal, Y., 1987. Excretion azotée chez les crustacés. Pages 165-178 in C.L Leger, editor, La nutrition des crustacés des insects. CNRS Publication, Paris, France. (not referred to in original)

Ling, B.H., P. Leung and Y.C. Shang., 1997. Comparative advantage of Asian shrimp farms. Aquaculture Asia, 11(1): 24-30.

Logan, D.T. and Epifano, C.E., 1978. Excretion azotée chez crustacés. Laboratory energy balance for the larvae and juveniles of *Homarus americanus*. Marine Biology, 47:381-389.

Merican, Z. and Shim, K.F., 1994. Lipid and fatty acid utilization in adult *P.monodon* supplemented with various oils. Aquaculture, 123:275-347.

New, M. B., 1995 Status of freshwater prawn farming: a review. Aquaculture Research, 26:1-54.

NRC (National Research Council), 1981. Nutritional energetics of domestic animals and glossary of energy terms. National Academy Press, Washington, D.C., USA.

Pascual, F.P., Coloso, R.M. and Tamse, C.T., 1983. Survival and some histological changes in *P.monodon* Fabricius juveniles fed various carbohydrates. Aquaculture, 31:169-180.

Perez-Farfante, I. And Kensely, B., 1997. Penaeoid and Segestoid shrimps and Prawns of the World. Keys and Diagnoses for the Families and Genera. Editions of the Natural museum of National History, Paris, France. In Regional Notes, Center for Tropical and Subtropical Aquaculture,. 10:3, Spring 1999.

Reddy, H.R.V. Ashwin Rai and Annappaswamy T.S., 1999. Essentiality of vitamins for juvenile White Shrimp *Penaeus indicus*. The Israeli Journal of Aquaculture – Bamidgeh, 51(3): 122-123.

Rosas, C., Cuzon, G., Taboada, G., Pascual, C., Gaxiola, G. and Van Wormhoudt, A., 2001. Effect of dietary protein and energy levels on growth, oxygen consumption, haemolymph and digestive gland carbohydrates, nitrogen excretion and osmotic pressure of *Litopenaeus vannamei* (Boone) and *L.stiferus* (Linne) juveniles (Crustacea, Decapoda; Penaeidae), Aquaculture Research, 32:531-547.

Rosenberry, R., 1999. World Shrimp Farming 1999, No.12. Shrimp News International, San Diego, USA, 320p.

Rosenberry, R., 1993, World shrimp farming 1993. Aquaculture Digest, San Diego, California, USA.

Russett, J. C., 2001. Lecithin In Shrimp Mariculture. Chemurgy Research Notes. © 2001 Central Soya Company, Inc. USA from their website.

Sedgwick, R. W., 1979. Influence of dietary protein and energy on growth, food consumption and food conversion efficiency in *P.merguiensis*. Aquaculture, 16:7-30.

Shearer, K. D., 2001. Experimental design, statistical analysis and modeling of dietary nutrient requirement studies in fish: a critical review. Aquaculture Nutrition, 6:91-102.

Shiau, S-Y and Peng, C.Y. 1992. Utilisation of different carbohydrates at different dietary protein levels in grass tiger prawn *Penaeus monodon* reared in seawater. Aquaculture, 101:240-250.

Shiau, S-Y. & Chou, B. S., 1991. Effects of dietary protein and energy on growth performance of tiger shrimp *Penaeus monodon* reared in seawater. Nippon Suisan Gakkaishi, 57(12) 2271-2276.

Shiau, S-Y., 1997. Carbohydrate and fiber In: Crustacean Nutrition, Advances in World Aquaculture. Vol.6 (ed. By L. R. D'Abramo, D.E.Conklin and D.M. Akiyama) pp.108-122. The World Aquaculture Society, Baton Rouge, LA, USA.

Sick, L. V. and Andrews, J.W. 1973. Effect of selected dietary lipids, carbohydrates and proteins on growth, survival and body composition of *Penaeus duorarum*. Proceedings of the World Mariculture Society, 4: 263-276.

Snedecor , G. W. and Cochran W. G., 1973. Statistical Methods. 6th edition. Iowa state University Press. Ames. Iowa, 593 p.

Strickland, J. D. H. and Parsons, T. R., 1972. A Practical Handbook of Seawater Analysis. Fisheries Research Board of Canada, Bull. 167, 310 p.

Taboda , G., Gabriela, G., Garcia, T., Pedroza, R., Sanchez, A., Soto, L. A. and Rosas, C., 1998. Oxygen consumption and ammonia-N excretion related to protein requirements for growth of white shrimp *Penaeus setiferus*. Aquaculture Research, 29:1-11.

Tacon, A.G.J., 1995. Application of nutrient requirement data under practical conditions: Special problems of intensive and semi-intensive fish farming systems. Journal of Applied Ichthyology, 11:205-214.

Tacon, A.G.J., 2002. Thematic Review of Feeds and Feed Management Practices in Shrimp Aquaculture. Report prepared under the World Bank, NACA, WWF and FAO Consortium Program on Shrimp Farming and the Environment. Work in Progress for Public Discussion. Published by the Consortium. 69 p.

Tacon, A.G.J. and Akiyama, D. M., 1997. Feed ingredients. In: Crustacean Nutrition, Advances in World Aquaculture. Vol.6 (ed. By L. R. D'Abramo, D.E.Conklin and D.M. Akiyama) pp.411-472. The World Aquaculture Society, Baton Rouge, LA, USA.

Teshima, S. and Kanazawa, A., 1971. Biosynthesis of sterols in the lobster *Panulirus japonica*, the prawn, *Penaeus japonicus*, and the crab *Portunus trituberculatus*. Comparitive Biochemistry and Physiology, 38: 597.

Udayakumara, K. and Ponniah, A. G., 1988. Metabolic and excretory rates of the prawn *Penaeus indicus* H. Milne Edwards fed on different types of natural and artificial feeds. Mariculture Research under the Centre of Advanced Studies in Mariculture, CMFRI Spl. Pub. No. 19, pp. 1- 4.

Zeitoun, I. H., Ullrey, D. E., Magee, W. T., Gill, J. L. and Bergen, W. G., 1976. Quantifying nutrient requirements of fish. Journal of the Fisheries Research Board, Canada, 33: 167 – 172.

91