

The effect of continuous light at low temperatures on growth in Atlantic salmon reared in commercial size sea pens

Albert Kjartan Dagbjartarson Imsland^{1,2*}, Bjorn Roth³, Per Gunnar Fjellidal⁴, Sigurd O. Stefansson², Sigurd Handeland⁵, Bjørn Mikalsen⁶

¹ *Akvaplan-niva, Iceland Office, Akralind 4, 201 Kópavogur, Iceland*

² *Department of Biology, Thormøhlensgate 53 A/B, University of Bergen, N-5020 Bergen, Norway*

³ *Nofima, Dept. of Processing Technology, P.O. Box 8034, N-4068 Stavanger, Norway*

⁴ *Institute of Marine Research, Postbox 1870 Nordnes, Bergen, Norway*

⁵ *Uni Research, 5020 Bergen, Norway*

⁶ *Lerøy Aurora, Postbox 2123, 9267 Tromsø, Norway*

Running title: Enhancing growth of salmon at low temperatures

Keywords: Salmon; Temperature; Photoperiod; Growth; Vertebra morphology

* Corresponding author: Tel: +354 562 5800. *E-mail address:*

albert.imsland@akvaplan.niva.no (A.K.D. Imsland)

1 **Abstract**

2 The aim of this study was to investigate the effect of continuous light of different duration,
3 applied from late autumn to spring in the second year of the production cycle, on the
4 production performance of Atlantic salmon in Northern Norway. The underlying hypothesis is
5 that the introduction of continuous light (LL) superimposed on the natural light before
6 December (the preferred continuous light regime in Northern Norway) could enhance growth
7 and inhibit maturation in the subsequent year. To test this, two large, commercial scale
8 experiments were performed [Experiment 1 in 2014 at 69.47°N, 18.26°E, and Experiment 2 in
9 2015 at 69.80°N, 19.42°E] where salmon of initial size of 1-1.5 kg were subjected to LL at
10 different time points during the period between 11 November to 13 December, and reared
11 under LL until 31 March the following year. In Experiment the water temperature at 6 m
12 depth ranged between 6.7 °C in November to 3.6 °C in March and in experiment 2 the water
13 temperature at 6 m depth ranged between 8.3 °C in November to 3.6 °C in March and 6.8 °C
14 in May 2016. Before and after the period with LL, all fish were reared under natural light.
15 Growth was improved by 13-20 % in the early exposed groups (15 Nov and 11 Nov)
16 compared to the late exposed groups (13 Dec.). No maturation was seen in the experimental
17 groups at slaughter (Exp. 1: July – September 2015, Exp. 2: May 2016). Vertebra deformities
18 did not differ between the early and late exposed groups suggesting that continuous light
19 promotes growth at lower temperatures, while supporting normal vertebra development. Only
20 minor differences in flesh texture (measured as differences in Cathepsin L+B activity) were
21 found in both experiments. It is concluded that a considerable growth benefit may be achieved
22 by exposing Atlantic salmon to continuous light from early November in their first year in
23 seawater, i.e. one month earlier than presently used by the salmon farming industry in
24 Northern Norway.

25

26

1 **1. Introduction**

2

3 To better utilize available area for an increasing Atlantic salmon, *Salmo salar* L.,
4 production, the industry has expanded at high latitudes in Northern Norway, north of the
5 Arctic Circle (66.6°N). In southern Norway slaughtering may start in early summer after
6 about 12-14 months in sea water due to good winter growth, while in Northern Norway,
7 growth rate is lower and production time is 2-3 months longer in order to regain lost winter
8 growth (Roth et al., 2005). These sub-optimal production conditions are particularly related to
9 short day-length and low temperatures during the winter. For Atlantic salmon, Handeland, et
10 al. (2008) suggested an optimum temperature for growth of 12.8 °C for 70–150 g and 14.0 °C
11 for 150–300 g post-smolts, whereas ambient temperatures in Northern Norway decline from
12 approx. 6°C in October to 3°C in March and an average of 5°C during this period.

13 The growth enhancing effect of continuous light (LL) has been reported for Atlantic
14 salmon in both freshwater (Stefansson et al., 1991) and sea water (Kråkenes et al., 1991;
15 Handeland et al., 2003); however, these studies have been performed at near optimal
16 temperatures for Atlantic salmon (Handeland et al., 2008). For the early post smolt stage (size
17 range 96-300 g), Døskeland et al. (2016) investigated the interactive effects of low
18 temperatures (4.3, 6.5 or 9.3°C) and photoperiods (continuous light, LL or simulated natural
19 photoperiod (69°N), LDN) on growth and found significant interactive effect between
20 temperature and photoperiod, as post-smolts exposed to low temperature and continuous light
21 regime (4LL) had a significantly higher growth (30 % gain in overall SGR) than the LDN
22 group corresponding to the effect of approx. 1.2 °C temperature increase. Similar interaction
23 between temperature and photoperiod was reported for other aquaculture species. In turbot,
24 *Scophthalmus maximus*, the interactive effects of temperature and photoperiod can cause a
25 downward shift in the optimum temperature for growth when the photoperiod is altered

1 (Imsland and Jonassen, 2001). The growth-promoting effect of continuous light has been
2 shown to be inversely related to temperature for turbot (Imsland et al., 1995), and Atlantic
3 halibut, *Hippoglossus hippoglossus* (Norberg et al., 2001). It is, therefore, of interest to
4 identify to what extent light can compensate for the growth disadvantages associated with
5 rearing at low temperatures (Handeland et al., 2008) during the seawater phase of Atlantic
6 salmon farming. At present little is known about possible interactions between temperature
7 and photoperiod at the post-smolt stage of Atlantic salmon in seawater. Imsland et al. (2014)
8 investigated the long term effect of continuous light and constant temperature and their
9 interaction on growth physiology in Atlantic salmon pre- and post-smolts. They reported a
10 growth-enhancement in fresh water of continuous light corresponding to a 4.5 °C increase in
11 water temperature. Imsland et al. (2014) also found that proportion of mature males was
12 higher at 12.7°C (66%) compared to 8.3°C (11%); however, those findings have not been
13 validated under full scale rearing conditions. Continuous light is commonly used from
14 December to March in the current production regime of Atlantic salmon in Norway to
15 promote growth without triggering maturation (Oppedal et al., 1997, 2006).

16 In Atlantic salmon the later stages of sexual maturation involve a redistribution of the
17 somatic resources and the development of nuptial colouration responsible for the low
18 commercial value of mature fish (Leclercq et al., 2010), altered feeding activity (Kadri et al.,
19 1997) and increased pathogen susceptibility (Currie and Woo, 2007). The suppression of pre-
20 harvest sexual maturation is therefore a priority in the salmon on-growing industry (Leclercq
21 et al., 2010). This is achieved by photoperiod manipulation of the stock in the form of
22 continuous artificial light (LL) applied between the winter and summer solstice during the
23 second year at sea. This 4-6-month period LL-regime is recognized as the most efficient by
24 providing a key environmental signal that phase-advances the so-called ‘spring decision
25 window’ such that a reduced proportion of the stock meets the developmental/energetic

1 thresholds required to proceed through maturation (Taranger et al., 1998 Oppedal et al.,
2 2006). Current knowledge on the photoperiodic control of puberty in Atlantic salmon suggests
3 that terminating LL-exposure before the summer solstice could be equally efficient at
4 suppressing sexual maturation (Leclercq et al., 2010), whereas knowledge about the effect of
5 onset time point of LL are currently lacking. Such knowledge may be an important tool to
6 increase winter growth and reduce the production time of Atlantic salmon in sea cages in
7 Northern Norway.

8 Development of vertebra deformities is a slow process that manifests itself months
9 after the actual induction (Grini et al., 2011; Fjelldal et al., 2012a), and can be modulated by
10 temperature (Grini et al., 2011). Further, Fjelldal et al. (2005) found that vertebrae in the trunk
11 and tail regions displayed a differential growth rate in response to photoperiod in Atlantic
12 salmon post-smolts reared in sea cages at ambient temperature in Southern Norway. Also,
13 continuous light was shown to promote bone resorption in postsmolts (Fjelldal et al., 2012b).
14 However, there is limited knowledge on the impact of different production regimes in sea
15 cages, i.e. duration of continuous light during winter, on the development of vertebra
16 deformities up to harvest size.

17 In fish, flesh texture is shown to be influenced by a number of different factors, such
18 as light regime (Hemre et al., 2004; Hagen and Johnsen, 2016), temperature (Roth et al.,
19 2005), feeding (Einen et al., 1999), slaughter and filleting method (Kiessling et al., 2004;
20 Kristoffersen et al., 2007). It has also been reported that cathepsin B, D and L activities have
21 an impact on specific structural proteins correlating to texture (Godiksen et al., 2009;
22 Bahuaud et al., 2010). Textural changes can be related to somatic muscle growth and
23 following protein turnover are an important factor that is affected by the intracellular enzyme
24 activity, in particular cathepsins and calpains (Lysenko et al., 2015). High protease activity is

1 related to decomposition of muscle proteins post mortem (Delbarre-Ladrat et al., 2006), which
2 in turn, would probably influence the drip loss (loss of fluid during storing and thawing).

3 The aim of this study was to investigate the effect of continuous light of different
4 duration applied from autumn to spring in the production cycle on Atlantic salmon on growth,
5 maturation and flesh quality, and thus, test the hypothesis that the introduction of additional
6 light before December (the preferred continuous light regime in Northern Norway) would
7 enhance growth and delay maturation in the subsequent year.

8

9

10

1 **2. Materials and methods**

2

3 Two large scale experiments were performed at a commercial Atlantic salmon sea
4 farm [Experiment 1 at 69.47°N, 18.26°E and Experiment 2 at 69.80°N, 19.41°E, Lerøy
5 Aurora, Troms county, Norway]. The salmon used in the study were S1 smolts produced at
6 the commercial smolt hatchery of Lerøy Aurora (location Laksefjord, Finnmark, Norway)
7 moved to sea cages in April 2014 (Experiment 1) and May 2015 (Experiment 2). The fish
8 were from the Aqua Gen strain and were vaccinated with Pentium Forte Plus (Novartis Aqua,
9 Oslo, Norway). The fish were held under natural light (NL) conditions until the start of each
10 experiment. Both experiments were performed during winter, but Experiment 2 lasted two
11 month longer. The initial fish size differed in the two experiments (see below).

12

13 *2.1 Experimental design*

14 *2.1.1 Experiment 1*

15

16 On 11 November 2014, six cages (160 m circumference, 37688 m³ volume) holding
17 one sea-winter (1-SW) Atlantic salmon ($n=124086 \pm 11898$ fish pen⁻¹) with a mean (\pm
18 standard error of mean, SEM) live body-weight (BW) of 1190 ± 106 g were exposed to LL
19 using four 360 W BlueLED lights per pen (AKVA group ASA, Tromsø, Norway). Three
20 photoperiod treatments were tested in duplicate where additional light was introduced on
21 three different dates i.e. 11 November (LL-11 Nov), 24 November (LL-24 Nov) and 13 Dec
22 (LL-13 Dec). The LL-13 Dec is the current production regime used by the commercial
23 partner. Water temperature at 6 m depth ranged between 6.7 °C in November to 3.6 °C in
24 March. All six cages were returned to NL on 31 March the following year (2015) and all fish

1 slaughtered from July to September 2015. The fish were fed a commercial dry diet according
2 the manufacturer recommendations (Ewos, Bergen, Norway).

3

4 *2.1.2 Experiment 2*

5

6 On 15 November 2015, four cages (160 m circumference, 37688 m³ volume) holding
7 one sea-winter (1-SW) Atlantic salmon (n=20742 ± 2033 fish pen⁻¹) with a mean (±SEM)
8 live body-weight of 1536 ± 166 g were exposed to LL using four 360 W BlueLED light per
9 pen (AKVA group ASA, Tromsø, Norway). Two photoperiodic treatments were tested in
10 duplicate where additional light was introduced on two different dates i.e. 15 November (LL-
11 15 Nov) and 13 Dec (LL-13 Dec). Water temperature at 6 m depth ranged between 8.3 °C in
12 November to 3.6 °C in March to 6.8 °C in May 2016. The cages were returned to NL on 31
13 March and reared on NL until slaughtered in May 2016. The fish were fed a commercial diet
14 according the manufacturer recommendations (Biomar, Myre, Norway).

15

16 *2.2 Growth*

17

18 Growth measurements in the present study are based on counting and bulk weighing
19 of all fish in all sea pens at the start and termination of each experiment. In between, biomass
20 was controlled using an electronic data base system from FishTalk® (AkvaGroup, Norway)
21 for stock control and further documentation of the production. From the numbers stocked, fish
22 lost during production due to mortalities were deducted. Monitoring of biomass development
23 (growth) was based on daily recording of the fed amount and subsequent conversion into
24 biomass using an expected feed conversion ratio. Mean weights were indirectly derived as
25 total biomass divided by the number of fish in the unit. Supplemental biomass estimation was

1 done using automated systems and used to adjust the FCR and subsequent mean weight
2 estimations. These automated systems comprise stereo-camera systems or frame systems for
3 single fish biomass estimation in situ, both being based on optical readout and specific weight
4 algorithms (Beddow and Ross, 2005; Aunsmo et al., 2013). These daily estimates were
5 compiled into monthly estimates of biomass in each sea pen. Specific growth rate (SGR) was
6 calculated according to Houde and Schekter (1981):

$$7 \quad \text{SGR} = (e^g - 1) 100$$

8 where g is the instantaneous growth coefficient; expressed as $(\ln(W_2) - \ln(W_1)) (t_2 - t_1)^{-1}$ and W_2
9 and W_1 are weights on days t_2 and t_1 , respectively.

10

11 *2.3 Feeding and feed conversion ratio*

12

13 For both studies, the feeding regime was based on automatic feeding using commercial
14 automated feeding systems (Akvasmart CCS feeding system, AKVA group ASA, Tromsø,
15 Norway). Daily feed-delivery to each cage was registered, and changes in appetite noted
16 together with a continuous evaluation of the usage-characteristic of the feed. For each
17 duplicate treatment, mean weekly feed consumption and standard deviation (SD) was
18 calculated and those data compiled into monthly average. Feed conversion ratio (FCR) was
19 calculated as:

$$20 \quad \text{FCR} = C / (B_2 - B_1)$$

21 where C is feed consumption in the sea pen during the period and B_2 and B_1 are biomass in
22 tank (g) at days t_2 and t_1 , respectively. Daily feeding rate (F) was calculated from $F = 100 C /$
23 \bar{W} where \bar{W} is the mean daily fish weight over the experimental period.

24

25 *2.4 Radiography and vertebra morphometry*

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

At the terminal sampling in Experiment 1, 20 fish per treatment had their vertebral columns carefully dissected for lateral radiographs, and evaluated for vertebra deformities (Witten et al., 2009). The vertebral columns were radiographed (Porta 100 HF; Eickemeyer Medizintechnik für Tierärzte KG, Tuttlingen, Germany) onto a 35 × 43 cm image plate in a rigid cassette (Dürr Medical, Bietigheim-Bissingen, Germany) with 40 kV and 10 mAs with a distance of 70 cm. The image plate was scanned (CR 35 VET; Dürr Medical) and the resulting image converted into a TIFF file (Vet-Exam Plus Software, version 4.14.0).

2.5 Cathepsin B and L activities

Samples for cathepsin activity were taken from November 2015 to January 2016 from 6 fish from each sea pen ($N = 12$ from each experimental group) in Experiment 2. Analyses were prepared, using a modified method described by Bahuaud et al. (2010). Muscle samples were taken from the dorsal part of the Norwegian Quality Cut (NQC) from six fish in LL-15 Nov and LL-13 Dec on 16 November, 17 December and 14 January, immediately frozen at $-80\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$ prior to further analyses. Cathepsin B + L, cathepsin B and cathepsin L total activities were measured on muscle homogenates, prepared by homogenising 100 mg of muscle tissue in 300 μl of extraction buffer (100 mM Na-acetate in 0.2% Triton X-100, pH 5.5) in Precellys tubes CK 28 (2 ml), and homogenized using Ultra Turrax (IKA, USA) at 12500 rpm. Obtained homogenates were centrifuged at $16,016\times g$ ($4\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$, 30 min) and the supernatants were used to measure enzyme activities.

Cathepsin B + L and cathepsin B activities were measured fluorometrically, according to a modified method described by Kirschke et al. (1983). The release of the fluorogenic reagent 7-amido-4-methylcoumarin was determined by fluorescence measurements

1 (excitation and emission wavelengths were 360 and 460 nm, respectively). As substrates, Z-1-
2 phenylalanine-1-arginine-7-amido-4-methylcoumarin (Z-Phe-Arg-AMC) was used for
3 cathepsin B + L activity, whereas Z-1-arginine-1-arginine-7-amido-4-methylcoumarin (Z-Arg-
4 Arg-AMC) was used for cathepsin B activity. To estimate cathepsin L activity, the activity of
5 cathepsin B was subtracted from cathepsin B + L activity (Bahuaud et al., 2009). All samples
6 were analysed in triplicate, and the mean was calculated. The activity was expressed in $\mu\text{U g}^{-1}$
7 muscle where 1 U was defined as 1 μmol product produced per minute at 40°C.

8

9 *2.6 Statistical methods*

10

11 To assess normality of distributions a Kolmogorov-Smirnov test (Zar, 1984) was used
12 and homogeneity of variances was tested using Levene's F test (Brown and Forsythe, 1974).
13 Possible differences in mean weights, specific growth rates, feed conversion ratio, feed intake
14 and cathepsin activity among treatments were tested using a two way nested Model III
15 ANOVA, where the replicates (random) were nested within continuous light treatment groups
16 (fixed). Significant ANOVA were followed by a Student-Newman-Keuls multiple
17 comparison test (Zar, 1984) to identify differences among treatments. Data on mortality was
18 tested with a χ^2 test with the LL-13 Dec group in both experiments as expected value. A
19 significance level (α) of 0.05 was used if not stated otherwise.

20

21

1 **3. Results**

2

3 *3.1 Growth, maturation and mortality*

4

5 Mortality was higher ($\chi^2 = 4.1$, $P < 0.05$) for the smaller salmon in Experiment 1
6 (overall mean 4.7 %) compared to the larger salmon in Experiment 2 (overall mean 2.0 %).
7 There were no systematic differences in mortality related to duration of continuous light in
8 either experiment. In Experiment 1, mortality was 4.6, 5.8 and 2.9% for the LL-11 Nov, LL-
9 24 Nov and LL-13 Dec groups, respectively, whereas it was 1.9 and 2.1% for the LL-15 Nov
10 and LL-13 Dec groups in Experiment 2. Mean weight varied between experimental groups in
11 both experiments (Figs. 1-2). In Experiment 1, the mean weight of the LL-11 Nov group was
12 significantly higher (Student-Newman-Keuls (SNK) test, $P < 0.05$, Fig. 1) compared to the
13 LL-13 Dec group in February and March, and the final weight was 20% higher in the LL-11
14 Nov group. In Experiment 2, the final weight in June varied between the two experimental
15 groups (SNK test, $P < 0.05$, Fig. 2) and was 13% higher in the LL-15 Nov group compared to
16 the LL-13 Dec group. Growth rate differed between the experimental groups in both
17 experiments (Table 1). In Experiment 1, the overall growth was 20% higher (SNK test, $P <$
18 0.05 , Table 1) for the LL-11 Nov group compared to the LL-13 Dec group. Similar significant
19 growth differences were seen between the LL-15 Nov and LL-13 Dec groups in Experiment 2
20 (SNK test, $P < 0.05$, Table 1).

21 During the primary processing at slaughter, maturity status was evaluated in all fish in
22 all experimental groups based on external examination. All examined fish were classified as
23 immature.

24

25 *3.2 Feed intake and feed conversion efficiency*

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

Both daily feeding rate and feed conversion ratio (FCR) differed between the experimental groups (Table 1). In Experiment 1 LL-11 Nov had significantly better FCR compared to the other two groups (SNK test, $P < 0.05$) and in Experiment 2 the LL-15 Nov had significantly higher daily feeding rate compared to the LL-13 group (Table 1).

3.3 Cathepsin activity

Cathepsin L+B activity differed between the two experimental groups in Experiment 2 (two way nested ANOVA, $P < 0.05$, Fig. 3) as the LL-15 Nov group had higher cathepsin activity in January. No other differences in cathepsin activity were observed.

3.3 Vertebra deformities

No differences in vertebra deformities were found between the experimental groups in Experiment 1. In analysed groups 30 % of the sampled fish had vertebra deformities. In general, these were mild and consisted of aggravations of 2 to 4 fused vertebrae (Fig. 4A-C). Only one fish had a severe vertebra deformity with 9 deformed vertebrae (Fig. 4D).

1 **4. Discussion**

2

3 Despite the fact that growth was 13-20 % higher for the early November groups (LL-
4 11 Nov in Exp. 1, and LL-15 Nov in Exp. 2) compared to the commercial reference group in
5 both experiments (LL-13 Dec), there are surprisingly few studies specifically evaluating the
6 post-smolt stage in sea water relevant for direct comparison. A 13-20 % increase in SGR at
7 the sea temperatures in the present experiments (average, 5.2 °C) corresponds to approx. 1.5
8 °C increase in water temperature (Handeland et al., 2003). Furthermore, Imsland et al. (2014)
9 reported a growth enhancing effect of continuous light for Atlantic salmon in fresh water
10 corresponding to a 4.5 °C increase in temperature in an experiment investigating both smolt
11 and post-smolt at 8.3 and 12.7°C. Due to the low temperatures in the present experiments ,
12 maturation was not expected (Hutchings and Jones, 1998) and was not observed at slaughter.
13 Accordingly, we can conclude that the positive growth effect is associated with photoperiod
14 alone, with no interaction of early maturation. The optimal temperature for growth and FCE
15 for Atlantic salmon in this size range is approximately 11-14°C (Bromage et al. 2001;
16 Handeland et al. 2003, 2008) so all groups were reared far below their optimal rearing
17 temperature. The precise mechanism of photoperiod action on growth is not entirely
18 understood (Stefansson et al., 2007); however, it is clear Atlantic salmon differs from several
19 other species in that light plays a key role for ontogenetic shifts (Boeuf and Le Bail, 1999).
20 The findings of Døskeland et al. (2016) suggest that the magnitude of the effect of continuous
21 light on growth be inversely related with temperature which results in significant interaction
22 between temperature and photoperiod. Further support for this is found in studies on juvenile
23 turbot (Imsland et al., 1995) and Atlantic halibut (Jonassen et al., 2000) demonstrating that the
24 growth promoting effect of continuous light can be stronger at low temperature compared to
25 near optimum temperature. Clarke et al. (1978) suggested that the rate-controlling effect of

1 temperature might be the reason for the short duration of the growth-enhancing effect of long
2 photoperiod at higher temperature in sockeye, *Oncorhynchus nerka*, and coho, *O. kisutch*,
3 salmon.

4 Higher feed intake in the LL-15 Nov group in Experiment 2 could be linked to better
5 conditions for feeding due to the superimposed light in this group from November compared
6 to December. Although minor in magnitude, feed conversion ratio was significantly better in
7 the LL-11 Nov group in Experiment 2. This may reflect the positive effect of LL on FCR
8 similar to that seen in Døskeland et al. (2016) where FCR was lower at 4°C-LL compared to
9 4°C- LDN.

10 No maturation was seen in any of the groups at slaughter. The study was performed
11 under commercial conditions with low ambient temperatures. Previous studies have shown
12 that the switch from short to long days is the key photoperiodic signal regulating Atlantic
13 salmon maturation. An arrest of sexual development is indeed observed within 6 weeks of
14 LL-exposure in fish remaining immature (Taranger et al., 1998, 1999). This photo-inhibition
15 would have occurred before late March in all regimes tested here such that timing of LL
16 termination had no effect on maturation rates at harvest. The study of Vikingstad et al. (2015)
17 demonstrated that final sexual maturation and spawning in large (6-7 kg) Atlantic salmon is
18 strongly influenced by temperature, with elevated temperatures (14-16 °C) having a
19 deleterious effect on these processes. In contrast, rearing the females at cold (decreasing from
20 7 to 3°C) amplified and advanced the profiles of all three endocrine steroids investigated
21 compared with the ambient group (decreasing from 11 to 5°C), and increased the survival
22 rates to the eyed egg stage. However, the fish in Vikingstad et al. (2015) was reared at NL in
23 contrast to continuous light in the present study. As no maturation was seen in the present
24 study this demonstrates that continuous light from November to March is a very potent
25 mechanism to inhibit maturation.

1 Activity of proteases, such as cathepsins, is widely described in the literature to be an
2 important contributor to protein degradation and muscle softening (Bahuaud et al., 2009;
3 Lerfall et al., 2015). In present study, increased cathepsin activity was seen in the LL-15 Nov
4 group in January 2016 corresponding with higher growth in this group. Previously increased
5 cathpesin activity has been associated with pre-mortem stress-related factors (Bahuaud et al.,
6 2010). Lerfall et al. (2015) found a significant relation between cathepsin L and the drip loss
7 from fillets during storage. The higher cathapsin activity seen in the LL-15 Nov, is in line
8 with newer studies by Hagen and Johnsen (2016) showing that an exposure to continuous
9 light increases the activity of cathepsin L+B, and can be seen as an indication of higher
10 somatic muscular growth. Since cathepsins are involved in fast muscle protein breakdown and
11 turnover (Hagen et al., 2008) and may reflect softening of the muscle tissue. The present
12 findings indicate that slaughter of salmon should be avoided in the period of continuous light
13 superimposed on the natural light.

14 No differences in vertebra deformities were found in the samples analysed from
15 Experiment 1. A total of 30 % of the fish analysed had one or more deformed vertebra. In
16 earlier studies adult Atlantic salmon have shown prevalence of deformities ranging from 12 to
17 92% (Fjelldal et al., 2007, 2009; Korsøen et al., 2009; Grini et al., 2011; Taylor et al., 2013),
18 and between 33 and 50% in wild fish (Fraser et al., 2014; Sambraus et al., 2014).
19 Development of vertebra deformities is a slow process that manifests itself months after the
20 actual induction (Grini et al., 2011; Fjelldal et al., 2012a), and the vertebra fusions (Witten et
21 al., 2006) observed herein are most probably the result of changes prior to the onset of the
22 experiments in this study (Witten et al., 2006; Fjelldal et al., 2007). The fish used in the
23 present study were reared at near optimal temperatures (12-14 °C) during the late parr and
24 early smolt stage. It is known that vertebra deformities can be modulated by temperature
25 (Grini et al., 2011) as post-smolts at 16°C developed vertebra deformities, while post-smolts

1 at 10°C did not. Since the deformity prevalence in the present study were within that reported
2 for wild salmon, the present situation must be considered as normal.

3

4 **5. Conclusion**

5 It is concluded that a considerable growth benefit may be achieved by exposing post-smolt
6 Atlantic salmon to continuous light from early November i.e. one month earlier than presently
7 used by the salmon farming industry in Northern Norway.

8

9 **Acknowledgements**

10 Financial support was given by the Research Council of Norway (RFFNord, Contract:
11 226059 NORDLYS).

12

1 **References**

2

3 Aunsmo, A., Skjerve, E., Midlyng, P.J., 2013. Accuracy and precision of harvest stock
4 estimation in Atlantic salmon farming. *Aquaculture* 396-399, 113-118.

5 Bahuaud, D., Østbye, T. K., Torstensen, B. E., Rørå, M. B., Ofstad, R., Veiseth, E.,
6 Thomassen, M.S., Ruytera, B., 2009. Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*) muscle structure
7 integrity and lysosomal cathepsins B and L influenced by dietary n-6 and n-3 fatty acids.
8 *Food Chem.* 114, 1421–1432.

9 Bahuaud, D., Mørkøre, T., Østbye, T. K., Veiseth-Kent, E., Thomassen, M. S., Ofstad, R.,
10 2010. Muscle structure responses and lysosomal cathepsins B and L in farmed Atlantic
11 salmon (*Salmo salar* L.) pre- and post-rigor fillets exposed to short and long-term
12 crowding stress. *Food Chem.* 118, 602–615.

13 Beddow, T.A., Ross, L.G., 2005. Predicting biomass of Atlantic salmon from morphometric
14 lateral measurements. *J. Fish Biol.* 49, 469-482.

15 Boeuf, G., Le Bail, P.Y., 1999. Does light have an influence on fish growth? *Aquaculture*,
16 177, 129-152 doi: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0044-8486\(99\)00074-5](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0044-8486(99)00074-5)

17 Bromage, N., Porter, M., Randall, C., 2001. The environmental regulation of maturation in
18 farmed finfish with special reference to the role of photoperiod and melatonin. *Aquaculture*
19 197, 63-98 doi: 10.1016/s0044-8486(01)00583-x

20 Brown, M.B., Forsythe, A.B., 1974. Robust Tests for the Equality of Variances. *J. Am. Stat.*
21 *Assoc.* 69, 364-367 doi: 10.1080/01621459.1974.10482955

22 Clarke, W.C., Shelbourn, J.E., Brett, J.R., 1978. Growth and adaptation to sea water in
23 'underyearling' sockeye (*Oncorhynchus nerka*) and coho (*O. kisutch*) salmon subjected to
24 regimes of constant or changing temperature and day length. *Can. J. Zool.* 56, 2413-2421.

1 Currie J., Woo P., 2007. Susceptibility of sexually mature rainbow trout, *Oncorhynchus*
2 *mykiss* to experimental cryptobiosis caused by *Cryptobia salmositica*. Parasitol. Res.. 101,
3 1057–1067.

4 Delbarre-Ladrat, C., Chéret, R., Taylor, R., Verrez-Bagnis, V., 2006. Trends in postmortem
5 aging in fish: Understanding of proteolysis and disorganization of the myofibrillar
6 structure. Crit. Rev. Food Sci. Nutr. 46, 409–421.

7 Døskeland, I., Imsland, A.K.D., Fjellidal, P.G., Eriksen, K.E., Stefansson, S.O., Roth, B.,
8 Mikalsen, B., Handeland, S., 2016. The effect of low temperatures and photoperiods on
9 growth and vertebra morphometry in Atlantic salmon. Aquac. Int. 24, 1421-1434.

10 Einen, O., Mørkøre, T., Rørå, A.M.B., Thomassen, M.S., 1999. Feed ration prior to slaughter
11 – A potential tool for managing product quality of Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*)-
12 Aquaculture 178, 146–169.

13 Fjellidal, P.G., Nordgarden, U., Berge, A., Grotmol, S., Totland, G.K., Wargelius, A., Hansen,
14 T., 2005. Vertebrae of the trunk and tail display different growth rates in response to
15 photoperiod in Atlantic salmon, *Salmo salar* L., post-smolts. Aquaculture 250, 516-524.

16 Fjellidal, P.G., Hansen, T.J., Berg, A., 2007. A radiological study on the development of
17 vertebral deformities in cultured Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar* L.). Aquaculture 273, 721-
18 728.

19 Fjellidal, P.G., Hansen, T., Breck, O., Sandvik, R., Waagbø, R., Berg, A., Ørnstrud, R., 2009.
20 Supplementation of dietary minerals during the early seawater phase increase vertebral
21 strength and reduce the prevalence of vertebral deformities in fast growing under-yearling
22 Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar* L.) smolt. Aquac. Nutr. 15, 366–378.

23 Fjellidal, P.G., Hansen, T., Albrektsen, S., 2012a. Inadequate phosphorus nutrition in juvenile
24 Atlantic salmon has a negative effect on long-term bone health. Aquaculture 334-337, 117-
25 123.

1 Fjellidal, P.G., Lock, E.-J., Hansen, T., Waagbø, R., Wargelius, A., Gil Martens, L., El-
2 Mowafi, A., Ørnsrud, R., 2012b. Continuous light induces bone resorption and affects
3 vertebral morphology in Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar* L.) fed a phosphorous deficient diet.
4 *Aquac. Nutr.* 18, 610-619.

5 Fraser, T.W.K., Hansen, T., Mayer, I., Skjaeraasen, J.E., Glover, K.A., Sambraus, F., Fjellidal,
6 P.G., 2014. The effect of triploidy on vaccine side-effects in Atlantic salmon. *Aquaculture*
7 433, 481-490.

8 Godiksen, H., Morzel, M., Hyldig, G., Flemming, J., 2009. Contribution of cathepsin B, L and
9 D to muscle protein profiles correlated with texture in rainbow trout (*Oncorhynchus*
10 *mykiss*). *Food Chem.* 113, 889–896.

11 Grini, A., Hansen, T., Berg, A., Wargelius, A., Fjellidal, P.G., 2011. The effect of water
12 temperature on vertebral deformities and vaccine-induced abdominal lesions in Atlantic
13 salmon, *Salmo salar* L. *J. Fish Dis.* 34, 531-546.

14 Hagen, Ø., Solberg, C., Johnsen, I.A., 2008. Activity of Aspartate (Cathepsin D), Cysteine
15 Proteases (Cathepsins B, B + L, and H), and Matrix Metalloproteinase (Collagenase) and
16 Their Influence on Protein and Water-Holding Capacity of Muscle in Commercially
17 Farmed Atlantic Halibut (*Hippoglossus hippoglossus* L.). *J. Agric. Food Chem.* 56, 5953-
18 5959.

19 Hagen, Ø., Johnsen, C.A., 2016. Flesh quality and biochemistry of light-manipulated Atlantic
20 cod (*Gadus morhua*) and the significance of collagen cross-links on fillet firmness and
21 gaping. *Food Chem.* 190, 786-792.

22 Handeland, S.O., Björnsson, B.Th., Arnesen, A.M., Stefansson, S.O., 2003. Seawater
23 adaptation and growth of post-smolt Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*) of wild and farmed
24 strains. *Aquaculture* 220, 367-384 doi: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0044-8486\(02\)00508-2](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0044-8486(02)00508-2)

1 Handeland, S.O., Imsland, A.K., Stefansson, S.O., 2008. The effect of temperature and fish
2 size on growth, feed intake, food conversion efficiency and stomach evacuation rate of
3 Atlantic salmon post-smolts. *Aquaculture* 283, 36-42.

4 Hemre, G.I., Karlsen, Ø., Eckhoff, K., Tveit, K., Mangor-Jensen, A., Rosenlund, G., 2004.
5 Effect of season, light regime and diet on muscle composition and selected quality
6 parameters in farmed Atlantic cod, *Gadus morhua* L. *Aquac. Res.* 35, 683–697.

7 Houde, E.D., Schekter, R.C., 1981. Growth rates, rations and cohort consumption of marine
8 fish larvae in relation to prey concentrations. *Rapp. P.-v. Réun. Cons. Int. Explor. Mer.* 178,
9 441-453.

10 Hutchings, J.A., Jones, M.E.B., 1998. Life history variation and growth rate thresholds for
11 maturity in Atlantic salmon, *Salmo salar*. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* 55, 22-47 doi:
12 10.1139/d98-004

13 Imsland, A.K., Jonassen, T.M., 2001. Regulation of growth in turbot (*Scophthalmus maximus*
14 Rafinesque) and Atlantic halibut (*Hippoglossus hippoglossus* L.): aspects of environment x
15 genotype interactions. *Rev. Fish Biol. Fish.* 11, 71-90 doi: 10.1023/a:1014240430779

16 Imsland, A.K., Folkvord, A., Stefansson, S., 1995. Growth, oxygen consumption and activity
17 of juvenile turbot (*Scophthalmus maximus*) reared under different temperatures and
18 photoperiods. *Neth. J. Sea. Res.* 34, 149-159.

19 Imsland, A., Handeland, S., Stefansson, S.O., 2014. Photoperiod and temperature effects on
20 growth and maturation of pre- and post-smolt Atlantic salmon. *Aquac. Int.* 22, 1331-1345.
21 doi: 10.1007/s10499-014-9750-1

22 Jonassen, T.M., Imsland, A.K., Kadowaki, S., Stefansson, S.O., 2000. Interaction of
23 temperature and photoperiod on growth of Atlantic halibut, *Hippoglossus hippoglossus* L.
24 *Aqua. Res.* 31, 219-227.

1 Kadri S., Thorpe J.E., Metcalfe N.B., 1997. Anorexia in one-sea winter Atlantic salmon
2 (*Salmo salar*) during summer, associated with sexual maturation. *Aquaculture* 151, 405–
3 409.

4 Kiessling, A., Espe, M., Ruohonen, K., Mørkøre, T., 2004. Texture, gaping and colour of
5 fresh and frozen Atlantic salmon flesh as affected by pre-slaughter iso-eugenol or CO₂
6 anesthesia. *Aquaculture* 236, 645-657.

7 Kirschke, H., Wood, L., Roisen, F.J., Bird, J.W., 1983. Activity of lysosomal cysteine
8 proteinase during differentiation of rat skeletal muscle. *Biochem. J.* 214,871–877.

9 Korsøen, O.J., Dempster, T., Fjellidal, P.G., Oppedal, F., Kristiansen, T.S., 2009. Long-term
10 culture of Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar* L.) in submerged cages during winter affects
11 behaviour, growth and condition. *Aquaculture* 296, 373–381.

12 Kristoffersen, S., Vang, B., Larsen, R., Olsen, R.L., 2007. Pre-rigor filleting and drip loss
13 from fillets of farmed Atlantic cod (*Gadus morhua* L.). *Aquac. Res.* 38, 1556–1564.

14 Kråkenes, R., Hansen, T., Stefansson, S.O., Taranger, G.L., 1991. Continuous light increases
15 growth rate of Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar* L.) postsmolts in sea cages. *Aquaculture* 95,
16 281-287 doi: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0044-8486\(91\)90093-M](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0044-8486(91)90093-M).

17 Leclercq, E., Migaud, H., Taylor, J.F., 2010. The use of continuous light to suppress pre-
18 harvest sexual maturation in sea-reared Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar* L.) can be reduced to
19 a 4-month window. *Aquac. Res.* 41, 709-714.

20 Lerfall, J., Roth, B., Skare, E.F., Henriksen, A., Betten, T., Dziatkowiak-Stefaniak, M.A.,
21 Rotabakk, B.T., 2015. Pre-mortem stress and the subsequent effect on flesh quality of pre-
22 rigor filleted Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar* L.) during ice storage. *Food Chem.* 175, 157-
23 165.

24

1 Lysenko, L.A., Kantserova, N.P., Krupnova, M.Y., Krupnova, M.Y., Veselov, A.E., Nemova,
2 N.N., 2015. Intracellular protein degradation in the development of the Atlantic salmon
3 *Salmo salar* L. Russ. J. Bioorg. Chem. 41, 645-651.

4 Norberg, B., Weltzien, F.A., Karlsen, Ø., Holm, J.C., 2001. Effects of photoperiod on sexual
5 maturation and somatic growth in male Atlantic halibut (*Hippoglossus hippoglossus* L.).
6 Comp. Biochem. Physiol: B 129, 357-365.

7 Oppedal, F., Taranger, G.L., Juell, J.E., Fosseidengen, F., Hansen, T., 1997. Light intensity
8 affects growth and sexual maturation of Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*) postsmolts in sea
9 cages. Aquat. Liv. Res. 10, 351-357.

10 Oppedal, F., Berg, A., Olsen, R.E., Taranger, G.L., Hansen, T., 2006. Photoperiod in seawater
11 influence seasonal growth and chemical composition in autumn sea-transferred Atlantic
12 salmon (*Salmo salar* L.) given two vaccines. Aquaculture 254:396-410

13 Roth, B., Johansen, S.J.S., Suontama, J., Kiessling, A., Leknes, O., Guldborg, B., Handeland,
14 S., 2005. Seasonal variation in flesh quality, comparison between large and small Atlantic
15 salmon (*Salmo salar*) transferred into seawater as 0+ or 1+ smolts. Aquaculture 250, 830-
16 840. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.aquaculture.2005.05.009>

17 Sambraus, F., Glover, K.A., Hansen, T., Fraser, T.W.K., Solberg, M.F., Fjellidal, P.G., 2014.
18 Vertebra deformities in wild Atlantic salmon caught in the Figgjo River, southwest
19 Norway. J. Appl. Ichthyol. 30, 777-782.

20 Stefansson, S.O., Bjornsson, B.T., Hansen, T., Haux, C., Taranger, G.L., Saunders, R.L.,
21 1991. Growth, parr-smolt transformation, and changes in growth-hormone of Atlantic
22 salmon (*Salmo salar*) reared under different photoperiods. Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 48,
23 2100-2108.

24 Stefansson, S.O., Nilsen, T.O., Ebbesson, L.O.E., Wargelius, A., Madsen, S.S., Bjornsson,
25 B.T., McCormick, S.D., 2007. Molecular mechanisms of continuous light inhibition of

1 Atlantic salmon parr-smolt transformation. *Aquaculture* 273, 235-245. doi:
2 10.1016/j.aquaculture.2007.10.005.

3 Taranger G.L., Haux C., Stefansson S.O., Björnsson B.T., Walther B.T., Hansen T., 1998.
4 Abrupt changes in photoperiod affect age at maturity, timing of ovulation and plasma
5 testosterone and oestradiol-17 β profiles in Atlantic salmon, *Salmo salar*. *Aquaculture* 162,
6 85–98.

7 Taranger G.L., Haux C., Hansen T., Stefansson S.O., Björnsson B.T., Walter B.T., Kryvi H.,
8 1999. Mechanisms underlying photoperiodic effects on age at sexual maturity in Atlantic
9 salmon, *Salmo salar*. *Aquaculture* 177, 47–60.

10 Taylor, J.F., Sambraus, F., Mota-Velasco, J., Guy, D.R., Hamilton, A., Hunter, D., Corrigan,
11 D., Migaud, H., 2013. Ploidy and family effects on Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*) growth,
12 deformity and harvest quality during a full commercial production cycle. *Aquaculture* 410–
13 411, 41–50.

14 Vikingstad, E., Andersson, E., Hansen, T.J., Norberg, B., Mayer, I., Stefansson, S.O., Fjelldal,
15 P.G., Taranger, G.L., 2015. Effects of temperature on the final stages of sexual maturation
16 in Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar* L.). *Fish Phys. Biochem.* 41, 895-907.

17 Witten, P.E., Obach, A., Huysseune, A., Bæverfjord, G., 2006: Vertebrae fusion in Atlantic
18 salmon (*Salmo salar*): development, aggravation and pathways of containment.
19 *Aquaculture* 258, 164–172.

20 Witten, P.E., Gil-Martens, L., Huysseune, A., Takle, H., Hjelde, K., 2009. Towards a
21 classification and an understanding of developmental relationships of vertebral body
22 malformations in Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar* L.). *Aquaculture* 295, 6–14.

23 Zar, J.H., 1984. *Biostatistical Analysis*, 2nd edition, Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs,
24 N.J., 718 pp.

25

26

1 Table 1. Specific growth rate (SGR, % day⁻¹), daily feeding rate (F%) and feed conversion
 2 ratio (FCR) of Atlantic salmon reared at different periods of continuous light. Values are
 3 given as mean (SEM). Significant differences between treatment groups are indicated with
 4 superscripted letters (Student–Newman–Keuls test, $P < 0.05$).

Treatment group	SGR	F (%)	FCR
Experiment 1 ($N = 20$)			
LL-11 Nov	0.49 (0.03) ^a	0.44 (0.02)	1.09 (0.001) ^b
LL-24 Nov	0.42 (0.02) ^b	0.45 (0.03)	1.12 (0.006) ^a
LL-13 Dec	0.39 (0.02) ^b	0.44 (0.03)	1.13 (0.007) ^a
Experiment 2 ($N = 28$)			
LL-15 Nov	0.39 (0.04) ^a	0.43 (0.04) ^a	1.06 (0.03)
LL-13 Dec	0.31 (0.03) ^b	0.33 (0.05) ^b	1.07 (0.04)

5

6

7

1 **Figure legends**

2

3 Fig. 1. Mean weight (g) of Atlantic salmon reared at three different periods of continuous
4 light (LL) from 11 November (LL-11 Nov), 24 November (LL-24 Nov) and from 13
5 December (LL-13 Dec). LL treatment was terminated on 31 March in all groups. Prior to
6 onset all groups were reared under natural light. Vertical whiskers indicate standard error of
7 mean (SEM). Letters indicate significant difference between treatments on sampling date
8 (Student–Newman–Keuls test, $P < 0.05$).

9

10 Fig. 2. Mean weight (g) of Atlantic salmon reared at two different periods of continuous light
11 from 15 November (LL-15 Nov) and from 13 December (LL-13 Dec). LL treatment was
12 terminated on 31 March in both groups. Vertical whiskers indicate standard error of mean
13 (SEM). Letters indicate significant difference between treatments on sampling date (Student–
14 Newman–Keuls test, $P < 0.05$).

15


16 Fig. 3. Cathepsin L+B activity in Atlantic salmon reared at two different periods of
17 continuous light from 15 November (LL-15 Nov) and from 13 December (LL-13 Dec).
18 Vertical whiskers indicate standard error of mean (SEM). Letters indicate significant
19 difference between treatments on sampling date (Student–Newman–Keuls test, $P < 0.05$).

20

21 Fig. 4. Lateral radiographs of different vertebra deformities seen in the sampled fish from
22 Experiment 1. (A) An individual with vertebra fusion in vertebrae nos. 18 and 19. (B) An
23 individual with vertebra fusion in the two most caudal vertebrae (white and black
24 arrowheads). The urostyle is indicated by a black astrix. (C) An individual with vertebra fusion
25 in vertebrae nos. 34 and 35, and 37 and 38. (D) An individual with 9 deformed vertebrae; one-

- 1 sided compression in vertebra no. 2 (most cranial vertebra on the radiograph), fusion in
- 2 vertebrae nos. 3 to 6, and 7 to 10.
- 3

1




2

3 Fig. 1. Imsland et al.


4

5



1
2 Fig. 2. Immsland et al.
3


1



2
3

4 Fig. 3. Imsland et al.

1



2

3 Fig. 4. Imslund et al.

4

5