THE GROWTH AND SURVIVAL RATE OF {PRIVATE }OREOCHROMIS NILOTICUS FINGERLINGS FED WITH VARYING PERCENTAGES OFLEUCAENA LEUCOCEPHALA LEAF MEAL BASED DIETS

BY

FALAYE, A.E., OLANIRAN, T.S. and AROSO, B.O. Department of Wildlife and Fisheries Management, University of Ibadan, Ibadan.

ABSTRACT

A-ten-week feeding trial was carried out to evaluate the growth and survival rate of *Oreochromis noloticus* fed with varying percentage levels of *Leucaena leucocephala* leaf meal for groundnut cake in the various diets were 0% - Diet 1, 25 & - Diet 2, 50& - Diet 3 and 75% - Diet 4.

Ten fingerlings with an average weight of 0.44g were stocked at the rate of 10 fish per bowl and fed at 5% body weight.

Diet 1 with 0% inclusion of leucaena leaf meal gave a significant difference (P>0.05) in growth and survival rate compared with diets 2, 3 and 4.

The water quality parameters recorded were appropriate for fist culture.

INTRODUCTION

The incessant soaring costs of conventional fish feed ingredients in Nigeria is a major cause of increase in the production cost and reduction in the profit margin of commercial aquaculturists. Niamat and Jafti (1984) reported that between 40 - 60 percent of the variable costs in expended on feeding in an intensive fish culture system. Agricultural by-products and unconventional feed stuffs can be used as alternative to the very expensive conventional feed stuff in fish feed (Falaye, 1992). Falaye (1988) stressed the need to consider the nutrient composition, relative cheapness and availability of the feedstuff to be selected in fish feed.

Leucaena Leucocephala is a vigorous and drought resistant leguminous tree whose highprotein leaves have been widely used in animal feeds, particularly for ruminants in the tropics. Nuwanyaka (1986) reported 20 percent crude protein level in the leaves of 3 years old stands of leucaena. Ekpenyong (1984) recorded 25.05 and 23.33 crude protein levels in the fresh and dry leaves of leucaena respectively. However, caution should be taken in the use of unconventional dietary ingredients in fish feed due to the presence of some toxic anti-nutritional factors as well as their deficiencies in certain amino acids.

This study aimed at assessing the growth and survival rate of <u>O niloticus</u> fed with varying percentages of <u>I. Leucocephala</u> leaf meal based diets.

MATERIALS AND METHOD

The feeding trialwas conducted for 10 weeksin experimental plastic bowls with a flowthrough system. Oreochromis niliticus fingerlings with average weight of 0.44g were stocked at the rate of 10 fish per bowl.

The leucaena leaves collected from University of Ibadan research fkarm were processed bu soaking inwater for 48 hours and sundrying for about 24 hours. The dried leaves were ground and incorporated into the formulated experimental diets at 0% (diet 1), 25% (diet 2), 50% (diet 3) and 75% (diet 4) replacement levels for groundnut cake.

Moisture, protein, lipid, fibre and ash content of experimental diets and experimental fish (at the start and end of the feeding trial) were determined using A.O.A.C. (1990) methods.

Water temperature, pH and dissolved oxygen concentration were monitored and analyzed throughout the period of the experiment according to the techniques of Boy (1980) to maintain desirable level for freshwater fish. The fish were weighed every week and the feed offered was adjusted accordingly.

Computations at the end of the feeding trial were made for the following:

Mean wet weight gain(g) = Initial mean wet

weight (g) - final mean wet weight (g)

Total percentage weight gain (%) = Total wet

weight gain (g) x 100/Initial wet weight.

specific growth rate (%/day) = 100 [In (final wet weight) - In (Initial wet weight)]/time in vs.

days.

Protein efficiency ratio =Net wet weight gain(g)

x 100 /Protein intake (g).

Food conversion ratio = Food intage (g)/wet weight gain (g).

Net Protein Utilization = 100 (body protein at the end of the feeding trial) - (body protein at the start of feeding trial / (amount of protein consumed).

Incidence of cost = Cost of feed (N) /kg of fish produced.

Profit index = value of fish crop (N) / cost of feed (N).

Results from all calculations were subjected to analyses of variance (ANOVA) and ducan's multiple test as described by steel and Torrie (1960).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results of proximate analysis of leucaena leat meal are presented in Table 1. While Table 2 shows the growth performance, nutrient utilization and survival rate of *O. niloticus* fed increasinglevels of leucaena leaf meal based diets.

Table 1: Proximate composition of L. leucocephala

| {PRIVATE }Parameter | % Dry weight | |
|---------------------|--------------|--|
| Moisture | 7.50 | |
| Ash | 11.00 | |
| Fat | 2.05 | |
| Crude protein | 24.05 | |
| Crude fibre | 20.20 | |

Table 2: Growth performance, nutrient utilization and survival rate of *O. niloticus* fed increasing dietary levels of *L. leucocephala* leaf meal.

| Treatments | | | Prameters | | | | |
|------------|----------|----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1 | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | Numer | offish |
| stocked | 110 | 10 | | 10 | | 10 | Survival rate % |
| 90a | | 80a | | 40c | 60b | Initial n | nean wet weight (g) |
| 0.47a | 0.53a | 0.42 | | 0.42a | Final m | ean wet | |
| | | | weight | (g) | | | |
| 3.55A | 2.62b | 2.03b | 2.05b | Mean v | vet weig | ht | |
| | | gain (g) |) | | | | |
| 3.08a | 2.09b | 1.61b | 1.63b | Total p | ercentag | ge | |
| | | weight | gain (% |) | | | |
| 65.53a | 39.43b | 38.33b | 38.81b | Specific | c growtł | 1 | |
| | | rate | | | | | |
| 1.25a | 0.95b | 0.98b | 0.98b | Feed co | onversio | n | |
| | | ratio | | | | | |
| 2.44a | 3.41b | 3.42b | 3.41b | Protein | efficien | су | |
| ration 1 | .21a | 0.83b | 0.73b | 0.82b | | | |
| Figures | in the s | ame rov | v with di | fferent s | superscri | ipts are a | significantly different (p>).05). |

Leucaena has spectacularly increase in popularity over the last ten years among agonomists, forresters and animal nutritionists. its usefulness lies in its availability during the drought, high crude protein (CP) content and digestibility. The proximate analysis of leucaena leaf meal in this study gives 24.05 cp level.

Diet 1 with 0% inclusion of leucaena leaf meal gave the best growth performance and survival rate followed closely by diet 2 (25% replacement of GNC) while lowest value was recorded for diet 3 (50% replacement of GNC). Observation from this study indicates that substitution of leucaena leaf meal for GNC in this diet of Ω niloticus leads to reduction in growth performance and nutrient utilization without significant difference (P>0.05). W and Wang (1987) in a similar trial using Ω niloticus and substituting leucaena for fish meal stated that is is possible to include soaked leaf meal up to 25% of the dietary crude protein levl with no adverse effects on the growth. The significant difference (P>0.05) in the survival

Rate of fish in treatments 1,2,3 and 4 is probably due to effect of anti-nutritional factors. The presence of mimosine in L. leucocephala. has been a majore factor that limits its usefulness in fish nutrition. The level of anti-nutritional factor can be brought to minimallevelusing appropriate method of treatmentsuch as soaking in water, sundrying and heating.

Growth of fish does not depend on nutrition only but also on suitable environmental variable like temperature, dissolved oxygen and pH. Failure tomaintain optimum water quality parameters in ponds may result in poor growth or death of fish. However, the mean dissolved oxygen concentration (6.9 mg/l), pH (7.3) and temperature $(28^{\circ}c)$ appeared suitable for fish culture as recommended by Boyd (1980).

REFERENCES

- A.O.A.C., (1990): Official Methods of the Association of Analytical Chemists. K. Helrich (Editor), 15th Edition. Association of Official Analytical Chemists, Inc. Arlinton V.A 1298pp.
- Boyd, C.E. (1980): Water quality management in warmwater fish ponds. Aurburn University, Agric, Experiment Station. Publ. Auburn University.
- **Ekpenyong, T.E (1984):** "Toxic Effects of Feeding Leucaena leaves of growing rabbits". Nutritional Reports International.
- Falaye, A.E.(1988): Nutrient requirement of fish and guidelines in practical fish feed formation and preparation. invited paper presented at the fish farmers workshop organisation by DIFFRI Fed. Govt. of Nigeria.June 1988.
- Falaye, A.E. (1992): Utilization of Agro-Industrial wastes as fish feedstuffs in Nigeria. Proceedings of Annual Conference of Fishery Society of Nigeria (FISON), 16 - 20 November, 1992.

Niamat, R. and Jafri, A.K. (1984):

Growth responses of the siluroid *Heteropneustes fossils* Bloch, fed pelleted feed. Aquaculture, 37, 223 - 229 pp.

Nuwanyakpa, M. (1986):

Initial (lab.) screening of 70 cultivates of agronomical promising forage and browse legumes in Ethiopia - as supplements to cereal crop residue [ILCA Research report, being prepared for publication].

Steel, R.G.D. and Torrie, J.H.(1960):

Principles and procedures of Statistics, Mcgraw Hill Book Co. Inc. New York.

Wee, K.and wan, S.S. (1987):

Nutritive value for leucaena leaf meal in pelleted feed for Nile tilapia. Aquaculture, 62: 97 - 108.