Egyptian Journal of Aquatic Biology & Fisheries Zoology Department, Faculty of Science, Ain Shams University, Cairo, Egypt. ISSN 1110 – 6131 Vol. 27(2): 685 – 696 (2023) www.ejabf.journals.ekb.eg



### Growth Performance, Feed Utilization and Body Composition of the Nile and Red Hybrid Tilapia Fingerlings Reared in Mono and Polycultures

Ali S.M. El-Nadi<sup>1</sup>\*, Hamed A.A. Omer<sup>1</sup>, Saad M. AlSaiad<sup>2</sup>, Mohamed M. El-Nawasany<sup>2</sup>, Doaa K. Khames<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Animal Production Department, National Research Centre, 33 El-Bohouth Street, Giza, Egypt <sup>2</sup>Animal Production Department, Faculty of Agriculture, Al-Azhar University, Cairo, Egypt <sup>3</sup>Department of Fish Nutrition, Central Laboratory of Fish Research, Sharkya Governorate, Egypt. \*Corresponding Author: ali\_elnadi\_nrc@yahoo.com

## **ARTICLE INFO**

Article History: Received: Sept. 5, 2023 Accepted: March 19, 2023 Online: March 28, 2023

#### **Keywords**:

Stock density, Mono and poly culture, Nile and Red hybrid tilapia, Growth performance, Feed utilization, Body composition

### ABSTRACT

The present work aimed to investigate the impact of stocking density of two types of fish species, the Nile tilapia (NT) and the red hybrid tilapia (RHT) fingerlings, reared in monoculture or polyculture, on their growth performance, feed utilization and chemical body composition. The experimental groups were designed as the following: G<sub>1</sub>: contained 40 fingerlings of NT that stand for 100% of NT; G<sub>2</sub>: contained 30 fingerlings of NT and 10 fingerlings of RHT, representing a portion of 75% of NT and 25% of RHT; G3: contained 10 fingerlings of NT and 30 fingerlings of RHT, providing a portion of 25% of NT and 75% of RHT, and G<sub>4</sub>: contained 40 fingerlings of RHT that were a 100% of RHT. All tested groups received the same diet of 32.2% crude protein and 4638 kcal for 60 days. The result showed that polyculture ( $G_2$  and  $G_3$ )showed the highest final weight (FW), total body weight gain (TBWG) and average daily gain (ADG) in comparison with monocultures ( $G_1$  or  $G_4$ ). Survival ratio was decreased with rearing two types of fingerlings together in one hap (polyculture), compared to the other two fingerlings reared in monoculture for NT or RHT. Mono or polycultures affected significantly (P < 0.05) their TBWG, FI, FCR; CPI and PER. While the body composition was not affected by the type of reared haps (mono or polycultures). G<sub>1</sub> recorded the highest value of energy retention (ER %, 108.10%); meanwhile,  $G_4$  recorded the lowest value (66.61%). Protein productive value (PPV %) was a significant (P<0.05) affecting factor among the different groups. It can be mentioned that reared fingerlings of the Nile tilapia or the red hybrid tilapia together in one hap (polyculture) can be realized successfully without occurring any adverse effect on growth performance, feed utilization, and body composition ...

### **INTRODUCTION**

Indexed in Scopus

In Egypt, as reported by **GAFRD** (2012) and **Abdel-Hakim1** *et al.* (2014), the total fish productions from all resources during 2012 were 1371975 ton. In addition, all aquaculture activities contributed by 1017738 ton during the same year, which represented about 74.18% of the total national fish production. During 2012, Egypt imported 335023 ton (**GAFRD**, 2012) to increase the fish per capita consumption in the country from 16.48 to 20.55kg/ year. Abdel-Hakim1 *et al.* (2014) recorded that, the facts mentioned above reflect the importance of aquaculture activities in securing the fish

ELSEVIER DOA

IUCAT

protein demand for the Egyptian people. Because of the limited fresh water resources required to increase the production of fresh water fish species (Tilapia, Mullets and Carp species .... etc), it is necessary to develop a system to increase the production of fish vertically by performing new methods concerned with fish feeding, fish cultured species and the fish stocking density. On the other hand, applying the developed method in aquaculture activities could help the fish farmer increase his production vertically per unit area. Meanwhile, it is considered to be one of the important factors affecting fish growth (Liu & Chang, 1992). Additionally, Chang (1988) postulated that, fish stocking density is an important factor used in aquaculture as it can influence natural food availability, the efficient utilization of food resource and total fish yield in ponds. Furthermore, poly culture of fish is usually used to combine omnivorous tilapia sp. with benthphagic mullet sp. (Malecha et al., 1981). As noted by Ellis et al. (2002), the increase in stocking density may cause stress which subsequently depresses growth. Morever, Thorarensen and Farrell (2010) mentioned that, the fish increase the swimming speed to obtain food, which requires energetic cost. Furthrmore, increasing the stocking density may cause an increase in competition between the fish for space and food, and thus decreasing their growth (Quiros, 1999). Dos Santos et al. (2007) and Ponzonia et al. (2008) mentioned that, different strains of the Nile tilapia show different growth performance, yield, mortality and resistance for environmental changes. Moreover, Wohlfarth et al. (1985) showed that growth performance and survival of tilapia were influenced by their stocking rate, the species of fish co-stocked with them and feeding regimes. In this context, Herrera (2015) reported that, most studies pointed a decrease in final weight when stocking density increased, and added that survival is depressed by increasing the stocking density. However, he discussed that the yield fish is high at the higher stocking density in many references. The FCR is decreased by increasing the density. In addition, he reported that some researchers observed the deterioration of water quality at higher densities.

Thus the main objective of this work aimed to investigate the impact of mono culture and poly culture on growth performance, feed utilization and body composition of the Nile and red hybrid tilapia fingerlings.

### MATERIALS AND METHODS

This work was carried out at the Fish Experimental Station belonging to the Animal Production Department, Faculty of Agriculture, Al-Azhar University, Cairo, Egypt in a co-operation work for the Animal Production Department, National Research Centre, 33 El-Bohouth Street, P.O. Box: 12622, Dokki, Cairo, Egypt.

The present study aimed to determine the influence of mono or poly cultures on the two types of fish fingerlings, including both the Nile tilapia (*O. niloticus*) and the red hybrid tilapia (*O. niloticus x O. mosambicus*).

### Description of experimental aquaculture units

Fish were reared in haps  $(1 \times 1 \times 1m)$ , with four haps (four replicates) per treatment. Fish specimens were randomly distributed approximately at the rate of 10 fish in each hap,

with an average initial weight of 10 g / fish. All experimental haps were supplied with air through an aeration system which connected with air pump (5hp). The fish used in this study were red hybrid tilapia (*O. niloticus* x *O. mosambicus*) and *O. niloticus* fingerlings. The experimental fish were transported in the early morning using a special fish transport car equipped with aeration facilities. They were acclimated for 14 days before starting the experiment.

## Feeding rate and techniques

Feeding ration amounted to 5% of total body weight daily throughout the experimental period (60 days). All the experimental groups received the same diet in a dried form, suitable to the fish size. Fish were fed 6 days per week, and the amount of feed was divided into four equal portions at 9:00 & 10.30 am and at 12:00 & 2:00 pm. Every 60 days, the fish in each hap were weighed, and the amount of feed was corrected according to the new fish biomass throughout the experimental period (Sveier *et al.*, 2000). The experimental design used in the present study is presented in **diagram** (1).

Treatment	Replication	Haps size	Stoc	king density	Species
T <sub>1</sub>	$     \begin{array}{r} R_1 / T_1 \\     R_2 / T_1 \\     R_3 / T_1 \\     R_4 / T_1 \\     P_4 / T_1   \end{array} $		10 10 10 10	Total 40 fingerlings	The Nile tilapia (Oreochromis niloticus)
$T_2$	$\begin{array}{c} R_{1}  /  T_{2} \\ R_{2}  /  T_{2} \\ R_{3}  /  T_{2} \\ R_{4}  /  T_{2} \\ \end{array}$	1 <b>M</b> <sup>3</sup>	10 10 10 10	Total 40 fingerlings	25 % Red hybrid tilapia (RHT) + 75 % Nile Tilapia (Oreochromis niloticus)
$T_3$	$\begin{array}{c} R_1  /  T_3 \\ R_2  /  T_3 \\ R_3  /  T_3 \\ R_4  /  T_3 \end{array}$		10 10 10 10	Total 40 fingerlings	75 % Red hybrid tilapia (RHT) + 25 % Nile Tilapia ( <i>Oreochromis niloticus</i> )
$T_4$	$\begin{array}{c} R_1  /  T_4 \\ R_2  /  T_4 \\ R_3  /  T_4 \\ R_4  /  T_4 \end{array}$		10 10 10 10	Total 40 fingerlings	Red hybrid tilapia (RHT)

Diagram 1. The experimental design used in the study

# **Experimental diet**

The experimental diets were purchased from the Scrating Industrial Company in 10<sup>th</sup> Ramadan City. The experimental diets were in the form of pelleted floating diets, with a diameter of 2mm; they were offered for the first eight weeks of the experiment, followed by pellets with a diameter of 3mm, with 32% protein till the end of the experimental period. The experimental diet composition as well as its proximate chemical analysis is shown in Table (1).

Feed ingredient	%
Yellow corn	20
Wheat bran	20
Fish meal (72% CP)	10
Meat meal	20
Soy bean meal (44% CP)	24
Corn oil	3
Bone meal	1
Vitamin premix	1
Mineral premix	1
Total	100
Proximate chemical analysis (%)	
Moisture	9.86
Chemical composition on DM basis	
Organic matter (OM)	90.50
Crude protein (CP)	32.20
Ether extract (EE)	7.60
Crude fiber (CF)	4.21
Ash	9.50
Nitrogen free extract (NFE)	46.49
Gross energy kcal/ kg *	4638
Gross energy cal/ g DM	4.638

Table 1. Composition and chemical analysis (%) of the experimental diet used

\* Gross energy (kcal/kg DM) was calculated according to (**Blaxter 1968**) where, each g CP= 5.65 Kcal, g EE= 9.40 Kcal and g (CF & NFE) = 4.15 Kcal.

#### **Biological evaluation of fish growth performance**

A number of fish was selected from each hap as samples to be measured and weighed individually every two weeks (2WKS) in order to readjust the amount of feed required for the next two weeks. The dead fish were immediately removed from the experimental haps, and the mortality rate was recorded. At the end of the experiment, the final harvest was carried out through drainage of water by the water pump. The growth performance of each treatment group was determined, and the feed use was calculated as described by **Sveier** *et al.* (2000) as follows:

## Growth performance parameters

Fish growth performance, weight gain, average body weight gain, specific growth rate and survival rate were determined applying the following equations:

**Body weight gain**  $(BWG) = (W_1) - (W_0)$ 

Where,  $W_0$ : initial weight, and  $W_1$ : final weight.

**Specific growth rate** (SGR, % / day) = [Ln W<sub>1</sub> – Ln W<sub>0</sub> / T] 100

Where, Ln = the natural log;  $W_1 =$  final weight at the certain period (g);

 $W_0$  = initial weight at the same period (g) & T = experimental period (day).

Survival rate (SR %) = Number of fish at final / Number of fish at start X100

## Calculation of feed conversion ratio (FCR)

The feed conversion ratio (FCR) is expressed as the proportion of total dry matter intake (TDMI), g / total live body weight gain (TBWG), g as the following equation:

# FCR = total dry matter intake, (TDMI), g / total body weight gain (TBWG), g. Calculation of crude protein efficiency ratio (CPER)

(CPER) = total body weight gain (TBWG), g / total crude protein intake (TCPI), g. **Feed efficiency** 

Generally, the following equation using in calculation the feed efficiency

Feed efficiency (FE %) = [Weight gain (g) / Feed intake (g)]

**Protein productive value** (PPV %) =  $[PR_1 - PR_0 / PI]$  100.

Where,  $PR_1$  is the total fish body protein at the end of the experiment (on dry matter basis);

 $PR_0$  is the total fish body protein at the start of the experiment (on dry matter basis), & PI = Protein intake.

# Energy retention percentages (ER %)

The energy retention percentage was calculated according to the following equation: Energy retention (ER %) =  $E-E_0 / E_F X 100$ 

Where, E= the energy in fish carcass (kcal) at the end of the experiment;

 $E_0$ = the energy in fish carcass (kcal) at the start of the experiment, &

 $E_F$  = the energy (kcal) in feed intake

# Body composition of different experimental group fish

At the end of feeding trial, thirty two representative fish weights from each treatment were randomly chosen to determine the body composition.

# Analytical procedures

Chemical analysis of the basal diets fed to all tested groups and samples of body composition of fish were analyzed according to AOAC (2005) methods.

# Calculated data

According to **Blaxter (1968)**, the gross energy (kcal/ kg DM) of basal diet and body composition of tested group fish were calculated to evaluate the energy retention percentages, using the following values; each g CP= 5.65 Kcal, where g EE= 9.40 Kcal and g (CF & NFE) = 4.15 Kcal.

# Statistical analysis

Data collected were subjected to statistical analysis as one way analysis of variance according to SPSS (2008). Duncan's Multiple Range Test (Duncan, 1955) was used to separate means when the dietary treatment effect was significant according to the following model:

 $Y_{ij} = \mu + T_i + e_{ij};$ 

Where,  $Y_{ij}$  = observation;  $\mu$  = overall mean;

 $T_i$  = effect of experimental rations for i = 1–4; 1 = G<sub>1</sub> composed of 40 fingerlings of O. *niloticus* (100% O. *niloticus*); G<sub>2</sub> composed of 40 fingerlings divided into 10 fingerlings red tilapia plus 30 fingerlings O. *niloticus* (25 % Red tilapia + 75 % O. *niloticus*); G<sub>3</sub> composed of 40 fingerlings divided into 30 fingerlings red tilapia plus 10 fingerlings O. *niloticus* (75 % red tilapia + 25 % O. *niloticus*), and G<sub>4</sub> is composed of 40 fingerlings of red tilapia (100% red tilapia).

 $e_{ij}$  = the experimental error.

#### **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

# Growth performance of different experimental group fish reared in mono or poly cultures

Data in Table (2) show that the stocking density for poly culture that is composed of both  $G_2$  (75% of fingerlings Nile tilapia plus 25% of RHT) and  $G_3$  (25% of fingerlings Nile tilapia & 75% of RHT) exhibited the highest FW, TBWG and ADG, compared to (mono cultures) the other two groups ( $G_1$  or  $G_4$  that contained only one type of fingerlings of fish either the Nile tilapia ( $G_1$ ) or RHT ( $G_4$ ). These improvements in their FW, TBWG and ADG reached 12.91, 19.73 and 18.75 % for  $G_2$ , compared to  $G_1$ . Meanwhile, it was improved by 3.46, 5.29 and 3.13% for  $G_3$  compared to  $G_1$ . On the other hand, the same parameters mentioned above were improved by 40.65, 71.44 and 72.73 % for  $G_2$  compared to  $G_4$ . However, it was improved by 28.88, 50.75 and 50.00 % for  $G_3$  compared to  $G_4$ .

Table 2. Growth	performance and	survival	ratio of	different	experimental	groups

Item	Experimental groups					
	Nile tilapia (G <sub>1</sub> )	75% Nile tilapia +25% of RHT (G <sub>2</sub> )	25% Nile tilapia + 75% of RHT G <sub>3</sub>	Red hybrid tilapia (RHT) (G <sub>4</sub> )	SEM	Sign. <i>P</i> <0.05
Initial weight, g (IW)	10	10	10	10	0.072	NS
Final weight, g (FW)	28.90 <sup>b</sup>	32.63 <sup>a</sup>	29.90 <sup>b</sup>	23.20 <sup>c</sup>	1.077	*
Total body weight gain, g (TBWG)	18.90 <sup>b</sup>	22.63 <sup>a</sup>	19.90 <sup>b</sup>	13.20 <sup>c</sup>	0.876	*
Duration experimental period			60 days			
Average daily gain, g (ADG)	0.32 <sup>b</sup>	0.38 <sup>a</sup>	0.33 <sup>b</sup>	0.22 <sup>c</sup>	0.015	*
Specific growth rate (SGR), %/ day	0.81	0.91	0.84	0.59	-	-
Number of fish at the starter	40	40	40	40	-	-
Number of fish at the end	36	32	24	36	-	-
Survival rate	90 %	80 %	60 %	90 %	-	-
Mortality rate percentages	10	20	40	10	-	-

a, b and c: Means in the same row having different superscripts differ significantly (P<0.05).

SEM: Standard error of mean NS: Not significant \*: Significant at (P<0.05).

G<sub>1</sub>: contained 40 fingerlings of Nile tilapia (*Oreochromis niloticus*) that equal 100% of Nile tilapia.

 $G_2$ : contained 40 fingerlings of fish composed of 30 fingerlings of Nile tilapia and 10 fingerlings of red hybrid tilapia (RHT); that equal portion was 75% of the Nile tilapia and 25% of RHT.

 $G_3$ : contained 40 fingerlings of fish composed of 10 fingerlings of the Nile tilapia and 30 fingerlings of red hybrid tilapia (RHT), that equal portion was 25% of the Nile tilapia and 75% of RHT.

G<sub>4</sub>: contained 40 fingerlings of red hybrid tilapia (RHT) that equal 100% of RHT.

Survival rate was decreased with rearing two types of fingerlings together in one hap compared to the fingerlings reared as individually or one type of fingerlings for the Nile tilapia or RHT that recorded 90% for  $G_1$  or  $G_4$ , compared to  $G_2$  or  $G_3$  that recorded 80 and 60% of the survival ratio, respectively. Furthermore, the survival ratio was decreased from 90% to 80 and 60%, with increasing the level of inclusion of RHT in haps and

decreasing percentages of the Nile tilapia, as described in the present design or plan of work. In contrast, mortality rate percentages were increased with increasing the level of RHT inclusion in haps and decreasing percentages of the Nile tilapia. The mortality rate values were 10, 20, 40 and 10% for  $G_1$ ,  $G_2$ ,  $G_3$  and  $G_4$ , respectively.

The present results are in harmony with those found by **Eid** *et al.* (2019) who stated that, stocking density of 30 fry/L<sup>3</sup> improved the growth performance, compared to the other stocking densities (10, 20 and 40 fry/L<sup>3</sup>). Also, **Abou Zied** *et al.* (2005) noted that, when the Nile tilapia and grey mullet were stocked at densities of 6000; 7700; 8000 and 11000 fish/feddan, the highest harvesting values of both species were recorded by the density of 7700 fish/feddan, followed by the density of 8000 fish/ feddan, 6000 fish/feddan and 11000 fish/feddan, respectively. Furthermore, **Abou Zied and Hassouna (2007)** observed that, culturing the Nile tilapia and mullet (15000 tilapia + 750 mullet/ feddan) with 0.0 or 150 or 300 meager/ feddan for 180 days in earthen ponds showed significant improvement in weight when meager was stocked at a rate of 300 fingerlings/ feddan. **Aksungur** *et al.* (2007) investigated the impact of stocking density of Turbot (30, 60, 90 and 120 fish m<sup>2</sup>) reared in sea cages for 206 days and noted that the mean final weight were 178.3; 182.7; 196.1 and 164.6 g, respectively.

## Feed utilization of different experimental group fish reared in mono or poly cultures

Data in Table (3) reveal that the reared fish fingerlings in different cultures as designed in the present study (mono culture that includes  $G_1$  and  $G_4$ ) or (poly culture that includes  $G_2$  and  $G_3$ ) significantly (P<0.05) affected their TBWG, FI, FCR; CPI and protein efficiency ratio (PER). The best values of TBWG and FCR were recorded in  $G_2$ ; meanwhile, the highest values of FI, CPI and PER were recorded by  $G_3$ . Abdel-Hakim *et al.* (2014) reported that, the stocking density showed a significant difference in dry matter, protein NFE and gross energy contents of tilapia's whole body. In aadition, our results were in agreement with those of Abdel-Hakim *et al.* (2001), Abdel-Hakim and Ammar (2005) and Abdel-Hakim and Salah (2008). These studies postulated that, in the lower stocking density, more live food was available to be consumed than in higher stocking densities where the fish were more dependable on the artificial diet which increased the FCR. In this context, Herrera (2015) observed that FCR increases with increasing density.

# Body composition of different experimental group fish reared in mono or poly cultures

All parameters of body composition of different experimental groups (Table 4) were not affected by the type reared haps (mono or poly cultures). However, values of moisture for  $G_2$  and  $G_3$  (poly culture) were significantly (*P*>0.05) lower, compared to  $G_1$  and  $G_4$  (mono culture). On the other hand,  $G_2$  recorded the highest value of CP content (65.99 %); meanwhile, G3 recorded the highest value of EE content (25.65 %) and ash (13.96 %). Furthermore, the values of gross energy were 5852, 5703, 5823 and 5821 Kcal/ kg

for  $G_1$ ,  $G_2$ ,  $G_3$  and  $G_4$ , respectively. Abo-State *et al.* (2021) detected no significant differences among all treatments for the body composition of the Nile tilapia fingerlings.

Item	Experimental groups					
	Nile tilapia (G <sub>1</sub> )	75% Nile tilapia + 25% of RHT (G <sub>2</sub> )	25% Nile tilapia + 75% of RHT (G3)	Red hybrid tilapia (RHT) (G <sub>4</sub> )	SEM	Sign. <i>P&lt;</i> 0.05
Total body weight gain, g (TBWG)	18.90 <sup>b</sup>	22.63 <sup>a</sup>	19.90 <sup>b</sup>	13.20 <sup>c</sup>	0.876	*
Feed intake (FI), g	22.06 <sup>d</sup>	26.31 <sup>b</sup>	27.64 <sup>a</sup>	24.87 <sup>c</sup>	0.479	*
Feed conversion ratio (FCR)	$1.167^{a}$	1.163 <sup>a</sup>	1.389 <sup>b</sup>	1.884 <sup>c</sup>	0.067	*
Crude protein %			0.3220	%		
Crude protein intake (CPI), g	$7.10^{d}$	8.47 <sup>b</sup>	$8.90^{a}$	8.01 <sup>c</sup>	0.154	*
Protein efficiency ratio (PER)	2.66 <sup>b</sup>	2.672 <sup>b</sup>	2.236 <sup>a</sup>	1.648 <sup>a</sup>	0.096	*

**Table 3.** Feed utilization of different experimental groups

a, b, c and d: Means in the same row having different superscripts differ significantly (P<0.05).

SEM: Standard error of mean NS: Not significant \*: Significant at (P<0.05).

G<sub>1</sub>: contained 40 fingerlings of the Nile tilapia (*Oreochromis niloticus*) that equal 100% of the Nile tilapia.

G<sub>2</sub>: contained 40 fingerlings of fish composed of 30 fingerlings of the Nile tilapia and 10 fingerlings of red

hybrid tilapia (RHT); that equal portion was 75% of the Nile tilapia and 25% of RHT.

 $G_3$ : contained 40 fingerlings of fish composed of 10 fingerlings of Nile Tilapia and 30 fingerlings of red hybrid tilapia (RHT); that equal portion was 25% of the Nile tilapia and 75% of RHT.

G<sub>4</sub>: contained 40 fingerlings of red hybrid tilapia (RHT) that equal 100% of RHT.

Feed conversion ratio (FCR) expressed as g FI / g. gain

Protein efficiency ratio (PER) expressed as g. gain / g. of CPI.

 Table 4. Body composition of different experimental groups

Item						
	Nile	75% Nile tilapia	25% Nile	Red hybrid	-	
	tilapia	+25% of RHT	tilapia + 75%	tilapia		Sign.
	(G <sub>1</sub> )	(G <sub>2</sub> )	of RHT (G3)	(RHT) (G <sub>4</sub> )	SEM	<i>P</i> <0.05
Moisture	77.94	73.69	72.36	75.13	2.12	NS
Dry matter (DM)	22.06	26.31	27.64	24.87	1.15	NS
Chemical analysis on DM bas	ris					
Organic matter (OM)	87.56	87.00	86.04	87.00	0.15	NS
Crude protein (CP)	63.42	65.99	60.39	62.85	0.76	NS
Ether extract (EE)	24.14	21.01	25.65	24.15	0.96	NS
Ash	12.44	13.00	13.96	13.00	0.19	NS
Gross energy kcal/ kg	5852	5703	5823	5821	12.20	NS
Gross energy cal/ g DM	5.852	5.703	5.823	5.821	0.06	NS

SEM: Standard error of mean NS: Not significant

 $G_1$ : contained 40 fingerlings of the Nile tilapia (*Oreochromis niloticus*) that equal 100% of the Nile tilapia.  $G_2$ : contained 40 fingerlings of fish composed of 30 fingerlings of the Nile tilapia and 10 fingerlings of red hybrid tilapia (RHT); that equal portion was 75% of the Nile tilapia and 25% of RHT.

 $G_3$ : contained 40 fingerlings of fish composed of 10 fingerlings of the Nile tilapia and 30 fingerlings of red hybrid tilapia (RHT); that equal portion was 25% of the Nile tilapia and 75% of RHT.

 $G_4$ : contained 40 fingerlings of red hybrid tilapia (RHT); a portion of 100% of RHT.

Additionally, the results of the present study seemed to be near the results obtained by **Abdel-Hakim** *et al.* (2014) who recorded that the averages of DM were 28.53; 27.49 and 30.57 % for  $T_1$ ,  $T_2$  and  $T_3$ , respectively, and those of DM followed a decreasing order (*P*<0.05) by  $T_1$  and  $T_2$ , respectively. Moreover, the present results coincide with those of **Abdel-Hakim** *et al.* (2013) who reported that, DM contents in whole tilapia bodies ranged between 30.65 and 27.29%. On other hand, **Abdel-Hakim** *et al.* (2014) noted that, for the CP contents in tilapia whole bodies, the values were 64.20 and 64.85 and 65.40% for  $T_1$ ;  $T_2$  and  $T_3$ , respectively, and in  $T_3$  the CP value was higher, compared to those of the other two groups,  $T_1$  and  $T_2$ .

# Energy retention (ER) and protein productive value (PPV) % of different experimental group fish reread in mono or poly cultures

Data on energy retention (ER) and protein productive value (PPV) percentages presented in Table (5) show that  $G_1$  that contained 100 % of the Nile tilapia (mono culture) recorded the highest value of energy retention (ER) % (108.10%); while,  $G_4$  that contained 100 % of RHT displayed the lowest value of ER % (66.61%). On the other hand, both  $G_2$  and  $G_3$  reared in poly culture haps recorded moderate values of ER % (105.76 vs. 90.40%) for  $G_1$  and  $G_2$ , respectively.

Item						
	Nile	75% Nile tilapia	25% Nile	Red hybrid	-	
	tilapia	+ 25% of RHT	tilapia + 75%	tilapia		Sign.
	(G <sub>1</sub> )	(G <sub>2</sub> )	of RHT (G3)	(RHT) (G <sub>4</sub> )	SEM	<i>P</i> <0.05
Initial weight (IW), g	10	10	10	10	0.072	NS
Final weight (FW), g	28.90 <sup>b</sup>	32.63 <sup>a</sup>	29.90 <sup>b</sup>	23.20 <sup>c</sup>	1.077	*
Calculation the energy retention (ER) $\%$						
Energy content in body fish (cal / g body	5.852	5.703	5.823	5.821	0.06	NS
fish)						
Energy at the end in body fish (E)	169.12 <sup>c</sup>	186.09 <sup>a</sup>	174.11 <sup>b</sup>	135.05 <sup>d</sup>	4.349	*
Energy at the start in body fish $(E_0)$	58.52 <sup>a</sup>	57.03 <sup>b</sup>	58.23 <sup>a</sup>	58.21 <sup>a</sup>	0.144	*
Energy retained in body fish $(E-E_0)$	110.60 <sup>c</sup>	129.06 <sup>a</sup>	115.88 <sup>b</sup>	76.84 <sup>d</sup>	4.418	*
Energy of the feed (Cal / g feed)			4.638			
Quantity of feed intake	22.06 <sup>d</sup>	26.31 <sup>b</sup>	27.64 <sup>a</sup>	24.87 <sup>c</sup>	0.479	*
Total energy feed (EF)	102.31 <sup>d</sup>	122.03 <b>b</b>	128.19 <sup>a</sup>	115.35 <sup>c</sup>	2.220	*
Energy retention (ER) %	108.10 <sup>a</sup>	105.76 <sup>b</sup>	<b>90.40<sup>c</sup></b>	66.61 <sup>d</sup>	3.799	*
Calculation the protein productive value (P	PV) %					
Crude protein % in body fish	63.42	65.99	60.39	62.85	0.76	NS
Total protein at the end in body fish $(PR_1)$	18.33 <sup>b</sup>	21.53 <sup>a</sup>	18.06 <sup>b</sup>	14.58 <sup>c</sup>	0.567	*
Total protein at the start in body fish $(PR_2)$	6.34 <sup>ab</sup>	6.60 <sup>a</sup>	6.04 <sup>b</sup>	6.29 <sup>b</sup>	0.063	*
Protein energy retained in body fish $(PR_3)$	11.99 <sup>b</sup>	14.93 <sup>a</sup>	12.02 <sup>b</sup>	8.29 <sup>c</sup>	0.546	*
$= (\mathbf{PR}_1 - \mathbf{PR}_2)$						
Crude protein in feed (CP%)			32.20 %			
Total protein intake (PI), g	7.10 <sup>d</sup>	8.47 <sup>b</sup>	8.90 <sup>a</sup>	8.01 <sup>c</sup>	0.154	*
Protein productive value (PPV) %	168.87 <sup>b</sup>	<b>176.27</b> <sup>a</sup>	135.00 <sup>c</sup>	<b>103.50<sup>d</sup></b>	6.726	*

**Table 5.** Energy retention (ER) % and protein productive value (PPV) % of different experimental groups

a, b, c and d: Means in the same row having different superscripts differ significantly (P<0.05).

SEM: Standard error of mean NS: Not significant \*: Significant at *P*<0.05.

G<sub>1</sub>: contained 40 fingerlings of the Nile tilapia (*Oreochromis niloticus*) that equal 100% of the Nile tilapia.

 $G_2$ : contained 40 fingerlings of fish composed of 30 fingerlings of the Nile tilapia and 10 fingerlings of red hybrid tilapia (RHT), that equal portion was 75% of Nile Tilapia and 25% of RHT.

 $G_3$ : contained 40 fingerlings of fish composed of 10 fingerlings of the Nile tilapia and 30 fingerlings of red hybrid tilapia (RHT), that equal portion was 25% of the Nile tilapia and 75% of RHT.

G4: contained 40 fingerlings of Red hybrid Tilapia (RHT) that equal 100% of RHT.

Moreover, protein productive value (PPV) % was significantly (P<0.05) affected in the four different tested groups. The values of PPV % ranged from 103.50 to 176.27%, and G<sub>2</sub> recorded the highest value of PPV% (176.27%), followed by G<sub>1</sub> that recorded (168.87%) then G<sub>3</sub> (135.00 %) of PPV. Whereas, G4 recorded the lowest value of PPV% that was evaluated by 103.50%. These results agree with those of **Abo-State** *et al.* (2021).

#### CONCLUSION

According to the results of the current study, reared of both the Nile red hybrid and the Nile tilapia in one hap (poly culture) could be realized or used successfully without occurring adverse effect on growth performance, feed utilization and body composition.

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors acknowledge the encouragement and guidance of the National Research Centre, Al-Azhar University and Central Laboratory of Fish Research, Abbassa.

### REFERENCES

- **Abdel-Hakim, N. F. and Salah, A. E. A.** (2008). Effect of initial stocking size and production cycle on growth performance of mono sex tilapia reared in earthen ponds. 8<sup>th</sup> International Symposium on Tilapia in Aquaculture pp.255-269.
- Abdel-Hakim, N. F.; Zaglul, A. M. and Awad, A. M. (2014). Effect of stocking density in poly culture system on growth performance of cultured Fish and productivity in Earthen Ponds. Egypt. J. Aquat. Biol. & Fish., 18 (1): 61-81. ISSN 1110-6131.
- Abdel-Hakim, N. F.; Al-Azab, A. D. A..; Allam, H.Y.H.; Toulan, A. E. and El-Wahsh, M. H. M. (2013). Studies on fertilization sources with artificial feeds on productivity of earthen ponds stocked with different fish species. Egypt. J. Aquat. Biol. & Fish. 17 (1): 35-53.
- Abdel-Hakim, N. F.; Hilali, I. A.; Khalil, M. H. and Al-Azab, A. A. (2001). Effect of stocking density and feeding rate on performance of Nile tilapia (*Oreochromis niloticus*) reared in Tanks. Egyptian J. Nutrition and Feeds (Special Issue), 705-717.

- Abdel-Hakim, N. F. and Ammar, A. A. (2005). Effect of stocking density on growth performance and pond productivity of Nile tilapia (*Oreochromis niloticus*) cultured in earthen ponds. Egypt. J. Aquat. Biol. & Fish. 9 (4):127-144.
- **Abo-State, Hanan A., El-Monairy, M.M.; Hammouda, Y.A. and Hassan, H.M.A.** (2021). Effect of dietary supplementation of manna oligosaccharide and β-glucan on the performance and feed utilization of Nile tilapia fingerlings. Current Science International, 10 (Issue: 1) Jan.-March. EISSN: 2706-7920 ISSN: 2077- 4435 DOI: 10.36632/csi/2021.10.1.21www.curresweb.com Pages: 226-233
- **Abou Zied, R. and Hassouna, M.** (2007). Effect of meagre (*argyrosomus regius*) stocking rate on Nile tilapia and grey mullet production that reared in earthen ponds under polyculture system. Annals of Agric. Sci., 45 (1): 121-132.
- **Abou Zied, R.; El-Maksoud A.A. and Ali A.** (2005). Effect of stocking rates of Nile tilapia (*Oreochromis niloticus* L.) and grey mullet (*Mugil cephalus* L.) on their performance in poly culture earthen ponds. Annals of Agric. Sci., 43 (3): 1057-1066.
- Aksungur, N.; Aksungur, M.; Akbulut, B. and Kutlu, I. (2007). Effects of stocking density on growth performance, survival and food conversion ratio of turbot (*psetta maxima*) in the net cages on the southeastern coast of the Black Sea. Turkish J. Fish & Aquat. Sci., 7: 147-152.
- AOAC (2005). Official Methods of Analysis, 18<sup>th</sup> ed. Association of Official Analytical Chemists, Washington, DC, USA.
- **Blaxter K.L.** (1968). The energy metabolism of ruminants.  $2^{nd}$  ed. Charles Thomas Publisher. Spring field. Illinois, U.S.A.
- **Chang W. Y. B.** (1988). Fish production: Data synthesis and model development. Collaborative Research Support Program (CRSP), pond dynamic. Aquaculture 6th annual administrative report, Oregon State University, Oregon, USA, pp. 41-49.
- **Dos Santos, V.; Fonseca de Freitas, R.; Fonseca, F. and Archangelo, T.** (2007). Evaluation of morhometric growth curves of tilapia of Nilo (*Oreochromis niloticus*) strains. Ciencia e Agrotecnologia 31 (5): 1486-1492.
- Duncan, D.B. (1955). Multiple Rang and Multiple F-Test Biometrics, 11: 1-42.
- **Eid, A. E.; Ali, Badia A. and Elfeky, Amal** (2019). The influence of stoking density on growth and feed utilization in gilthead seabream (*Sparus aurata*). Egyptian J. Nutrition and Feeds, 22(2): 415- 422
- Ellis, T.; North, B. and Scott, A. (2002). The Relationship between stocking density and welfare in farmed raibow trout. (T.F. isles, Ed.) Journal of Fish Biology, 61: 493-531.
- **GAFRD** (2012). Statistics of fish production Ministry of Agriculture and Land Reclamation, Cairo.
- Herrera, L. C. (2015). The effect of stocking density on growth rate, survival and yield of GIFT tilapia (*Oreochromis niloticus*) in Cuba: case study fish farm La Juventud. United Nations University Fisheries Training Programme, Iceland [final project].http://www.unuftp.is/static/fellows/document/lesvia

- Liu, K. M. and Chang, W. Y. B. (1992). Bioenergetic modelling of effects of fertilization, stocking density and spawning on growth of the Nile tilapia, (*Oreochromis niloticus* L.). Aquaculture Research, 23: 291-301.
- Malecha, S. R.; Buck, D. H.; Baur, R. J. and Onizuka, D. R. (1981). Poly culture of the freshwater prawn, Macro brachium rosenbergii, Chinese and common carps in ponds enriched with swine manure: I. Initial trials. Aquacult., 25:101-116.
- **Ponzonia, R.; Nguyen, N. and Khawa, H.** (2008). Genetic Improvement of Nile Tilapia (*Oreochromis Niloticus*) Present and Future.  $\delta^{th}$  International Symposium on Tilapia in Aquaculture. Malaysia.
- **Quiros R.** (1999). The relationship between fish yield and stocking density in reservoir from Tropical and Temperates Regions. (J. Tundisi, & M. Straskaba, Eds.) Brasil; Brasil: International Institute of Ecology, Brazilian Academy of Sciences.
- **SPSS** (2008). Statistical package for Social Sciences, Statistics for Windows, Version 17.0. Released 2008. Chicago, U.S.A.: SPSS Inc.
- Sveier, H.; Raae A. J. and Lied, E. (2000). Growth and protein turnover in Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar L.*); the effect of dietary protein level and protein particle size. Aquaculture, 185 (1): 101-120.
- Thorarensen, H. and Farrell, A. (2010). Comparative analysis of the biological Requirements for salmonid production at a range of densities in closed containment system. In E. Michael, Chadwick, G. P. Jay, & S. Boomy, *Evaluation of closedcontaiment Technologies for salwater salmon Aquaculture* (pp. 39-50). Ottawa: National Reseach Council of Canada.
- Wohlfarth, G. W.; Hulata, G.; Karplus, I. and Halevy, A. (1985). Poly culture of the freshwater prawn Machrobrachium rosenbergii in intensively manured ponds, and the effect of stocking rate of prawns and fish on their production characteristics. Aquacult., 46:143-156.