ABSTRACT

It is really important, since the possible use of these pangasiid hybrids in aquaculture faces the problem of potential impact on wild population. Therefore, it is urgently needed to provide quick identification tools in the field. This study investigated morphological characters of *Pangasius djambal* and *Pangasianodon hypophthalmus* and their hybrids. A detailed morphological analysis using 32 morphometric measurements and five meristic counts was done on the hybridization of *P. djambal* and *P. hypophthalmus*. Morphometric analysis and meristic counts showed that the reciprocal hybrids have intermediate characters except for gill raker number in which lower than that of parental species. In general, the hybrids have tendency to be like *P. hypophthalmus* rather than *P. djambal*. The only typical character of *P. djambal* appeared on hybrids is teeth shape, both vomerine and palatine. It is clearly defined that the true hybrids have seven pelvic fin rays.
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INTRODUCTION

Catfishes of the family Pangasiidae are of great economic importance in Southeast Asia region such as *Pangasius djambal* in Indonesia (Legendre et al. 2000), *P. bocourti* in Vietnam (Hung et al. 1999), and *Pangasianodon hypophthalmus* (senior of *P. sutchi*) (Tarnchalanukit 1986). Thus, many efforts of breeding practices have been done to increase their production. As interspecific cross-breeding in fish may lead hybrid with valuable characteristics for aquaculture (sterility, monosex population, heterosis or growth etc.), it was decided to evaluate the effect of hybrid vigor on the artificial hybridization in pangasiid catfishes. In contrast with the abundant literature on the hybridization in other cultured fish families, in particular cichlids, salmonids, cyprinids and ictalurids (for review see Sneed 1971; Moav 1976; Chevassus 1979, Wohlfart and Hulata 1981; Chevassus 1983), reports on hybridization of pangasiid catfishes are rather scarce.
calliper following Pouyaud et al. (1999). Three additional measurements were done: (1) width of pectoral spine, measured at base of second dorsal spine; (2) anterior width of snout, taken between the border of anterior nostril; and (3) posterior width of snout, taken between the border of posterior nostril. Five counts were noted, i.e. total number of gill rakers on the first branchial arch and number of dorsal, anal, pectoral and pelvic fin rays. Morphological observations include the shape of the swimbladder and the shape of palatine and vomerine tooth patches.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A principal component analysis performed on the 235 specimens using the covariance matrix for 30 measurements enabled to separate *P. djambal*, *P. hypophthalmus*, and their hybrids. *Pangasius djambal* was located on the positive sector of factor 2, *P. hypophthalmus* was on the negative sector of factor 2, and their hybrids were in between parental species (Fig. 1).

Factor loading revealed that the second component of principal component analyses (PCA) was defined by vomerine length, palatine width, mandibulary barbel length, palatine length, post-ocular length, anal fin length, maxillary barbel length, caudal peduncle depth, and anal fin height (in decreasing order of importance). Further analysis showed that *P. djambal* differs from *P. hypophthalmus* by having a longer vomerine length, i.e. 3.8-14% head length (HL) vs 0.6-2.5% HL, and a larger palatine width (1.9-8.8% HL vs 0.7-1.8% HL). While on hybrids, those two characters were intermediate, i.e. 1.2-9.4% HL for vomerine length and 1.2-4% HL for palatine width. Morphometric analysis of the specimens demonstrated clearly the presence of two species as defined by Roberts and Vidthayanon (1991), Vidthayanon (1993), and Gustiano (2003), as well as hybrids in between of them. This intermediate shape of hybrids suggest that the products of present hybridization were "true" hybrids resulting from the fusions of both parents and not parthenogenesis as observed on general occasions in fish (Chevassus 1983).

The important characters revealed from PCA of parental species and reciprocal hybrids are listed on Table 1. Based on the morphometric data, even though the reciprocal hybrids have intermediate characters, in general their morphology was relatively *hypophthalmus*-like except the teeth (vomerine and palatine) that was relatively *djambal*-like. Plot of the second principal component (factor 2) referring to standard length (Fig. 2) supported this phenomenon in which the tendency of important character of hybrids was similar to that of *P. hypophthalmus*. Figure 2 also showed that the overlap between hybrids and parental species related to the size. For meristic observation, all of *P. djambal* have six pelvic

---

**Fig. 1.** Plot of the second principal component (factor 2) versus the fourth principal component (factor 4) taken from a principal component analysis (PCA) of 30 metric measurements on 235 specimens of *Pangasius djambal*, *Pangasianodon hypophthalmus*, and their reciprocal hybrids.
fin rays, while eight on *P. hypophthalmus*. Of the hybrids, more than 97% of *P. hypophthalmus* x *P. djambal* have seven pelvic fin rays. On the other side, the percentage was lower on the *P. djambal* x *P. hypophthalmus* where it was about 17% of the hybrids have 6 or 8 pelvic fin rays. It is also clearly defined that the true hybrids appeared on the pelvic ray count. However, the case was contrary for gill raker number. The reciprocal hybrids have lower number than that of the parental species (Fig. 3). The only reason for the gill raker number was probably due to the recessive evidence.

Table 1. The important measured characters for specimens of *Pangasius djambal*, *Pangasianodon hypophthalmus*, and their reciprocal hybrids.

| Characters               | *P. djambal* | *P. hypophthalmus* | *P. hypophthalmus* x *P. djambal* | *P. djambal* x *P. hypophthalmus* |
|--------------------------|--------------|--------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Standard length (%)      |              |                    |                                   |                                   |
| Caudal peduncle depth    | N 114        | 30                 | 43                                | 45                                |
| Mean                     | 8.18         | 8.64               | 9.00                              | 9.32                              |
| Min                      | 6.70         | 7.40               | 7.67                              | 8.22                              |
| Max                      | 10.60        | 9.50               | 10.05                             | 11.77                             |
| SD                       | 0.59         | 0.53               | 0.53                              | 0.65                              |
| Anal fin height          | N 110        | 30                 | 45                                | 45                                |
| Mean                     | 13.09        | 14.86              | 15.03                             | 13.80                             |
| Min                      | 9.82         | 11.99              | 11.24                             | 9.93                              |
| Max                      | 18.89        | 18.25              | 17.66                             | 16.24                             |
| SD                       | 1.28         | 1.39               | 1.16                              | 1.30                              |
| Anal fin length          | N 114        | 30                 | 45                                | 45                                |
| Mean                     | 27.53        | 31.53              | 32.14                             | 29.96                             |
| Min                      | 23.78        | 29.07              | 27.00                             | 22.27                             |
| Max                      | 39.27        | 34.18              | 34.37                             | 32.91                             |
| SD                       | 1.80         | 1.45               | 1.51                              | 1.86                              |
| Head length (%)          |              |                    |                                   |                                   |
| Post-ocular length       | N 112        | 29                 | 45                                | 45                                |
| Mean                     | 8.71         | 10.72              | 9.49                              | 9.95                              |
| Min                      | 6.58         | 9.74               | 8.02                              | 7.92                              |
| Max                      | 17.56        | 14.32              | 11.86                             | 11.65                             |
| SD                       | 1.36         | 0.85               | 0.70                              | 0.83                              |
| Maxillary barbel length  | N 108        | 26                 | 45                                | 45                                |
| Mean                     | 56.23        | 38.79              | 47.70                             | 49.56                             |
| Min                      | 31.81        | 21.95              | 24.76                             | 21.10                             |
| Max                      | 88.32        | 57.16              | 63.05                             | 67.44                             |
| SD                       | 6.60         | 10.61              | 8.65                              | 13.03                             |
| Mandibulary barbel length| N 109        | 25                 | 45                                | 42                                |
| Mean                     | 37.41        | 20.80              | 30.45                             | 29.48                             |
| Min                      | 7.64         | 7.11               | 18.33                             | 15.60                             |
| Max                      | 65.69        | 33.91              | 44.56                             | 42.70                             |
| SD                       | 6.94         | 8.66               | 6.94                              | 9.05                              |
| Vomerine length          | N 113        | 27                 | 45                                | 45                                |
| Mean                     | 6.32         | 1.40               | 2.48                              | 2.89                              |
| Min                      | 3.79         | 0.61               | 1.22                              | 1.46                              |
| Max                      | 14.54        | 2.50               | 5.79                              | 9.38                              |
| SD                       | 1.86         | 0.39               | 0.98                              | 1.33                              |
| Palatine length          | N 113        | 25                 | 45                                | 45                                |
| Mean                     | 13.33        | 7.81               | 9.24                              | 9.70                              |
| Min                      | 8.29         | 5.25               | 6.06                              | 7.20                              |
| Max                      | 16.97        | 10.87              | 13.14                             | 13.61                             |
| SD                       | 1.62         | 1.51               | 1.66                              | 1.59                              |
| Palatine width           | N 112        | 25                 | 45                                | 45                                |
| Mean                     | 3.94         | 1.36               | 2.25                              | 2.35                              |
| Min                      | 1.94         | 0.69               | 1.45                              | 1.27                              |
| Max                      | 8.76         | 1.82               | 3.31                              | 4.00                              |
| SD                       | 0.89         | 0.31               | 0.49                              | 0.65                              |
**Fig. 2.** Plot of the second principal component (factor 2) referring to standard length of 235 specimens of *Pangasius djambal*, *Pangasianodon hypophthalmus*, and their reciprocal hybrids.

**Fig. 3.** Scatter plot showing the gill raker number on the first branchial arch referring to standard length for *Pangasius djambal*, *Pangasianodon hypophthalmus*, and their reciprocal hybrids.
Based on the result found in the present study, several characters enable to separate between the hybrids and parental species, especially for pelvic fin rays. The results are very useful in providing cheap and quick identification tool in field rather than other genetic analysis, such as enzymatic and DNA. Hence, the result can also be used as a model to analyse other intergeneric hybridization in which there is no concern too much about homozygosity. Most of intergeneric hybridization succeeded under artificial breeding, but in the future the study to observe the fertility of the hybrids is needed.

CONCLUSION

The reciprocal hybrids of *Pangasius djambal* and *Pangasianodon hypophthalmus* have intermediate characters, except lower number of gill rakers than that of parental species. It is clearly defined that the true hybrids have seven pelvic fin rays.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The author thanks S. Lenormand, J. Slembrouck, A. Pariselle, M. Legendre, L. Pouyaud, Sudarto, W. Hadie, D. Sadili, A. Hari Kristanto, O. Komarudin, J. Subagya and Maskur for their help in collecting fish samples. Special thanks due to L. Pouyaud and G. Teugels for their encouragement to the present study. This paper forms part of the INCO.DC PROJECT “Catfish Asia” financed by the European Union (contract IC 18-CT 96-0043).

REFERENCES

Chevassus, B. 1979. Hybridization in salmonids, results and perspective. Aquaculture 17: 113-128.

Chevassus, B. 1983. Hybridization in fish. Aquaculture 33: 245-262.

Gustiano, R. 2003. Taxonomy and Phylogeny of Pangasiidae Catfishes from Asia. Ph.D Thesis KU Leuven, Belgium. 298 pp.

Hung, L.T., B.M. Tam, P. Cacot, and J. Lazard. 1999. Larval rearing of the Mekong catfish *Pangasius bocourti* (Pangasiidae, Siluridae): Substitution of *Artemia nauplii* with live and artificial feed. Aquat. Living Resour. 12: 229-232.

Legendre, M., L. Pouyaud, J. Slembrouck, R. Gustiano, A.H. Kristanto, J. Subagya, O. Komarudin, Sudarto, and Maskur. 2000. *Pangasius djambal*: A new candidate species for fish culture in Indonesia. Indon. Agric. Res. Dev. J. 22(1): 1-14.

Moav, R. 1976. Genetic improvement in the aquaculture industry. FAO Technical Conference on Aquaculture. Japan. FIR: Aq/Conf/76: R.9.

Pouyaud, L., G.G. Teugels, and M. Legendre. 1999. Description of new pangasid catfish from South-East Asia (Siluriformes). Cybium 23: 247-258.

Roberts, T.R. and C. Vidthayanon. 1991. Systematic revision of the Asian catfish family Pangasiidae with biological observation and description of three new species. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. Philad. 143: 97-144.

Sneed, K.E. 1971. Some current North American works in hybridization and selection of cultured fish. Report FAO/UNDP (TA) 2926: 143-150.

Tarnchanukit, W. 1986. Experimental hybridization between catfishes of families Claridae and Pangasiidae in Thailand. Environ. Biol. Fish. 16: 317-320.

Vidthayanon, C. 1993. Taxonomic revision of catfish family Pangasiidae. Ph.D. Thesis. Tokyo University of Fisheries, Japan. 203 pp.

Wohlfart, G.W. and G.I. Hulata. 1981. Applied genetics of Tilapias. ICLARM Studies and Review Vol. 6. ICLARM, Manila.