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Elsadig A Hagar, Zuheir N Mahmoud and Abdelrahman I Elhag

**Abstract**

Wild and hatchery fingerlings of *Clarias gariepinus* were cultured in recirculated aquaculture system. They were fed five diets composed of fish meal: poultry by-product meal at a ratio of 100:0%, 75:25%, 50:50%, 25:75% and 0:100%, respectively. The gross chemical composition showed no significant differences in the flesh of wild and hatchery fingerlings in composition, except that the fat content of 25:75% diet was significantly higher (p<0.01) in the wild fingerlings. The highest caloric values was shown by wild fingerlings given 25:75% diet. The lowest fat to protein ratio was obtained by fingerlings fed 75:25% diet. The 29 fatty acid obtained from the oil of *C. gariepinus* included 15 saturated fatty acids, 7 monounsaturated and 7 polyunsaturated fatty acids.
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1. **Introduction**

Fish is an important source of nutritious animal proteins locally, regionally and worldwide. They are rich in minerals, vitamins, amino and fatty acids with high protein digestibility (Mahmoud) [1]. Fish oil is valuable oil, due to its high level of polyunsaturated fatty acids required by human body to maintain good health (Kolanowski and Laufenberg, [2]; Jabeen and Caudhry) [3]. Fish oils mainly fatty acids play an important role in the development and function of brain and reproductive system, immune system, preventing cardiovascular disorder, reduce risk of cancers, and treatment of inflammatory diseases (Mahmoud) [1]. The gross chemical composition of fish vary considerably in response to abiotic and biotic factors (Silva and Chamul,) [4] and cultural systems (Rahman *et al.*; Ashraf *et al.*; Anyanwu *et al.*) [5, 6, 7].

The culture of African catfish *C. gariepinus* is profitable due to its fast growth, high fecundity, fleshy and palatable meat, tolerance and resistance to intensive and supper intensive culture and high economic value (Offem *et al.*; Hagar) [8, 9].

In Sudan, the chemical composition of captured *C. gariepinus* was assessed from different perspectives. It was tackled in relation to fish grading and quality (Mahmoud; Babiker; Karrar; Obany *et al.*) [10, 11, 12, 13]; as an indicator of fish raising in treated sewage effluent (Ahmed, and Ahmed,) [14, 15]; in relation to changes associated with post-harvest treatment (Khalifa) [16] and biological contamination of the on shelf dry commodity (Ahmed *et al.* [17]).

With respect to aquaculture of *C. gariepinus* the growth performance was studied by Hagar, [9] in recirculating aquaculture system and by El Hassan, [18] in ponds, both [9, 18] studied the fatty acids as well.

Comparative studies of the flesh quality of *C. gariepinus* captured and cultured was given attention in West Africa, reference can be made to the work of Ayinla *et al.* [19]; Osibona [20]; Olapade *et al.* [21]; Onyia *et al.* [22]; Solomon and Oluchi [23]; Michael and Adedayo [24]; Mmanu and Clement [25].

The objective of this study was to compare the proximate composition and fatty acid content of wild and hatchery fingerlings of *C. gariepinus* cultured in recirculating aquaculture system.
(RAS), fed partial replacement of fish meal with poultry by-product meal.

Materials and Methods

Source of fish

Fingerlings of *C. gariepinus* (average weight 10.6g) from wild and hatchery sources were collected and cultured under intensive condition system. The experimental work was conducted in a private farm (18.06, 28°N and 45.63, 28°E). Fingerlings were reared in 15 plastic tank each of 100L capacity. Five treatments and 3 replicates were set up. The experiments were conducted in a semi closed recirculated aquaculture system (RAS).

Experimental diets

Five experimental diets were formulated. The main protein source was fish meal with poultry by-product, carbohydrates, plant oil and vitamin preix substituted at a rate of 0% (T1), 25% (T2), 50% (T3), 75% (T4) and 100% (T5), respectively. The physical composition and proximate compositions of the diet Table 1. Proximate analysis followed AOAC [26].

The gross chemical composition and fatty acids of fish:

The gross chemical composition followed AOAC [26]. The fatty acids were identified and quantified by gas chromatography with a flame ionization detector following D3-fatty acid analysis gc, method and attached to an integrator (Shimadzu- Japan GC 2010). For calorific value calculation followed Babiker, [11].

Calorific value (CV) Kcal/g:

CV = 4.1xprotein+9.3xfat+4.1 Carbohydrate

Digestibility:

Fat: Protein ratio.

| Table 2: The proximate composition of wild and hatchery fingerlings of *C. gariepinus* farmed under different protein sources in RAS. |
| % | Treatment | Wild fingerlings | Hatchery fingerlings | t-value | p-value |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Moisture | | | | | |
| T1 | 78.38±0.09 | 77.72±0.55 | 1.171 | 0.307 |
| T2 | 77.27±0.03 | 78.46±0.76 | 1.569 | 0.192 |
| T3 | 78.13±0.01 | 78.23±0.35 | 0.294 | 0.783 |
| T4 | 77.90±0.04 | 79.25±0.14 | 9.388 | 0.001 |
| T5 | 78.44±0.07 | 79.24±0.95 | 0.839 | 0.499 |
| Protein | | | | | |
| T1 | 19.21±0.01 | 19.83±0.40 | 1.546 | 0.197 |
| T2 | 20.31±0.01 | 20.86±0.34 | 1.618 | 0.181 |
| T3 | 20.18±0.03 | 19.35±0.74 | 1.122 | 0.325 |
| T4 | 19.92±0.02 | 20.71±0.64 | 1.236 | 0.284 |
| T5 | 20.08±0.04 | 19.15±0.43 | 2.171 | 0.096 |
| Fat | | | | | |
| T1 | 4.92±0.01 | 4.01±0.40 | 1.840 | 0.140 |
| T2 | 4.91±0.01 | 3.66±0.42 | 2.961 | 0.042 |
| T3 | 5.08±0.02 | 5.39±0.29 | 1.067 | 0.436 |
| T4 | 5.44±0.01 | 4.86±0.10 | 5.663 | 0.005 |
| T5 | 5.78±0.02 | 5.98±0.01 | 24.495 | 1.560 |
| Ash | | | | | |
| T1 | 2.68±0.01 | 2.69±0.26 | 0.323 | 0.763 |
| T2 | 2.13±0.03 | 2.44±0.49 | 0.650 | 0.563 |
| T3 | 3.37±0.21 | 3.72±0.18 | 1.239 | 0.283 |
| T4 | 2.78±0.01 | 2.98±0.11 | 1.877 | 0.134 |
| T5 | 2.92±0.02 | 2.08±0.44 | 1.907 | 0.129 |
**Calorific values**

The results of proximate chemical composition (Table 3) showed that *C. gariepinus* have an appreciable level of calorific values. Wild and hatchery fingerlings yield fed diet T1 recorded high level of calorific values (136.08±0.18) and (134.12±1.74) and fat to protein ratio (0.288:1) and (0.312:1) while the lowest levels were obtained by feed T5 in both wild and hatchery fingerlings yield (124.52±0.07) and (118.61±2.95) with significantly differences (p<0.05). The order of calorific value was T5>T4>T3>T2>T1 and ranged from 124 to 136 for wild fingerlings yield and T5>T4>T3>T2>T1 and ranged from 118 to 134 for hatchery fingerlings yield. While the order of fat to protein ratio was T5>T4>T3>T2>T1 and it ranged from 0.242:1 to 0.288:1 for wild fingerlings yield and T5>T4>T3>T2>T1 and it ranged from 0.202:1 to 0.312:1.

**Table 3:** The Calorific value and fat to protein ratio of wild and hatchery fingerlings of *C. gariepinus* farmed under different protein sources in RAS.

| Parameter       | Treatment | Wild fingerlings | Hatchery fingerlings | t-value | p-value |
|-----------------|-----------|------------------|----------------------|---------|---------|
| **Calorific value** |  |  |  |  |  |
| T1              | 124.52±0.07 | 118.61±2.95      | 1.998                | 0.116   |
| T2              | 128.91±0.08 | 119.55±4.99      | 1.876                | 0.134   |
| T3              | 129.99±0.03 | 129.53±3.38      | 1.247                | 0.281   |
| T4              | 132.25±0.12 | 130.09±3.48      | 0.619                | 0.570   |
| T5              | 136.08±0.18 | 134.12±1.74      | 1.121                | 0.325   |
| **Fat : Protein** | T1        | 0.256:1.0        | 0.202:1.0            | -       | -       |
| T2              | 0.242:1.0  | 0.175:1.0        | -                    | -       | -       |
| T3              | 0.252:1.0  | 0.279:1.0        | -                    | -       | -       |
| T4              | 0.273:1.0  | 0.235:1.0        | -                    | -       | -       |
| T5              | 0.288:1.0  | 0.312:1.0        | -                    | -       | -       |

**Fatty acids composition**

The fatty acid compositions of *C. gariepinus* wild and hatchery fingerlings cultured under different diets showed the presence of 29 fatty acid.

**Table 4:** Fatty acid profile of wild and hatchery catfish fingerlings fed with five formulated diets in RAS.

| Fatty acid                  | Wild fingerlings | Hatchery fingerlings |
|-----------------------------|------------------|----------------------|
| **Saturated fatty acids (SFA)** | T1 | T2 | T3 | T4 | T5 | T1 | T2 | T3 | T4 | T5 |
| Myristic acid (C14:0)       | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   |
| Tricosenoic acid (C23:0)    | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   |
| Henecosenoic acid (C21:0)   | +   | +   | +   | -   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   |
| Stearic acid (C18:0)        | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   |
| Palmitic acid (C16:0)       | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   |
| Lauric acid (C12:0)         | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   |
| Pentadecenoic acid (C15:0)  | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   |
| Lignoceric acid (C24:0)     | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   |
| Behenic acid (C22:0)        | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   |
| Tricosanoic acid (C23:0)    | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   |
| Arachidic acid (C20:0)      | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   |
| caprylic acid (C8:0)        | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   |
| Capric acid (C10:0)         | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   |
| Undecanoic acid (C11:0)     | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   |
| Dodecanoic acid (C12:0)     | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   |
| **Monounsaturated fatty acids (MUFA)** | T1 | T2 | T3 | T4 | T5 | T1 | T2 | T3 | T4 | T5 |
| Palmitoleic acid (C16:1)    | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   |
| Eicosenoic acid (C20:1)     | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   |
| Nervonic acid (C24:1n9)     | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   |
| heptadecenoic acid (C17:1)  | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   |
| Erucic acid (C22:1)         | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   |
| Elaidic acid (C18:1n9)      | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   |
| Myristoleic acid (C14:1)    | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   |
| **Polyunsaturated fatty acids (PUFA)** |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |
| Linolelaic acid (C18:2n6)   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   |
| L- γ-Linolenic acid (GLA, C18:3n6) | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   |
| Eicosapentaenoic acid (EPA, C20:5n3) | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   |
| Docosahexaenoic acid (DHA; C22:6n3) | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   |
| Docosadienoic acid (DDA, C22:2n6) | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   |
| Eicosadienoic acid (C20:2)  | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   |
| Arachidonic acid (AA,C20:4n6) | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   | +   |
| **Total**                  | 18  | 19  | 21  | 19  | 21  | 22  | 21  | 22  | 19  | 19  | 20  |

**Discussion**

In the present study, five formulated feeds were fed to wild and hatchery *C. gariepinus* fingerlings. The gross chemical body composition of fish were significantly affected (p<0.05) by the different diets. Ahmed [15] studied the gross chemical composition of *Clarias (lazera) gariepinus* from sewage ponds and White Nile (at Jebel Aulia). He found no significant difference in moisture content but significantly
high (p<0.01) protein in fish from the White Nile. The fat, ash, calorific value and fat: protein ratio were significantly high (p<0.01) in fish from the sewage ponds Ahmed [15]. The highest fat 5.98% was observed in the hatchery fingerlings fish fed T3 and the lowest was 3.66% was in hatchery fingerlings fed T2. This confirmed the findings of Solomon and Oluuchi [23] in C. gariepinus. Olapade et al. [20] and Onyia et al. [21] worked on wild and farm raised C. gariepinus and reported that the proximate composition values were higher in wild fingerlings reared in earthen pond. In the present study wild and hatchery fingerlings had ash of 3.37±0.21% and 3.72±0.18% in T3, with a minimum of 2.13±0.03% and 2.08±0.44 in T2 and T1 respectively. Giri et al. [27] found Clarias batrachus fingerlings from the wild sources had high ash content, and linked this to the minerals content of the water body and/or the feed.

The study showed comparable protein content in wild and hatchery fingerlings and related variation in lipid content to variation of its level in the diets. This is in line with Goda et al. [28] in C. gariepinus; Giri et al. [27] and Sugumaran and Radhakrishnan [29] in C. batrachus, who reported that replacement of fish meal by poultry meal in diets did not affect the body protein content, but increased fish body lipid content. In C. gariepinus fat content increased due to water removal, but its polyunsaturated fatty acids are reduced by salting (Chukwu and Shaba) [30]. Ahmed et al. [37] reported 50.96% moisture, 42.88% protein, 12.75% fat, 6.00% ash, 396.91calorific value and 0.297:1.0 fat to protein ratio from shade dried Clarias spp.

The present study showed an appreciable level of calorific values and fat to protein ratio. The highest calorific values was shown by wild fingerlings given diet T3. The lowest fat to protein ratio was obtained when by fingerlings fed T2. Similar findings were obtained by Nwali et al. [31] in C gariepinus. Ahmed [15] in C gariepinus recorded on weight basis fat:protein of 0.337:1.0 and 0.319:1.0 from sewage ponds and White Nile, respectively. Nwali et al. [31] reported that C gariepinus wild and hatchery fingerlings cultured at earthen ponds yielded 89.38 and 102.18 caliberic value, respectively. Ahmed [15] recorded on weight basis calorific value of 456.48±5.54 and 451.51±5.41from sewage ponds and White Nile, respectively. According to Babiker [31] low calorific value is advantageous to those who want to keep low calories in their diet, and the low fat to protein ratio is indicative of high digestibility.

Twenty nine fatty acids were obtained from the oil of C. gariepinus in the present study. Thirteen fatty acids were identified from the skin of C. gariepinus oil by Sayem et al. [32] and 20 fatty acids from its viscera by Effiong and Fakunle [33] obtained twenty. The fatty acids reported in the three studies were Lauric acid (C12:0), Pentadecanoic acid (C15:0), Capric acid (C10:0), Undecanoic (C11:0), Dodecanoic acid (C12:0), Palmitoleic acid. It was found that Linoleic acid (Effiong and Fakunle) [33] and Oleic acid (Goyens et al.) [34] are highly required by human body to maintain good health status Both acids are not produced by the human body and can be assimilated from fish as food (Kolanowski and Laufenberg [2]; Sayem et al. [32] found that the total proportions of polyunsaturated fatty acids were higher in pure cultured catfish than wild ones.

**Conclusions**

The chemical composition of C gariepinus indicated that it has low calorific value and high digestibility. Wild and hatchery fingerlings grown in and fed five different diets showed no significant differences in protein content. The study showed that C. gariepinus exhibited 15 SFA, 7 MUF and 7 PUFA.
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