

# Effects Of Different Fish Feeds On Growth Performance Of African Catfish (Clarias

# Gariepinus (Burchell, 1822) Fingerlings

<sup>1</sup>D. Torsabo, <sup>1</sup>B.T Iber, <sup>2</sup>D.P Elizabeth, <sup>3</sup>M.A Nasir

- 1. Federal University of Agriculture P.M.B 2373 Makurdi Benue State, Nigeria
  - 2. Taraba State University P.M.B 1167 Jalingo Taraba State Nigeria
  - 3. Usman Polytechnic Binyaminu P M B 013 Hadejia Jigawa State Nigeria

# ABSTRACT

An investigation on the effects of different fish feeds on performance of African mud catfish *Clarias gariepinus* fingerlings was conducted in a semi flow through system at the outdoor facility of the Fisheries Department experimental farm of the Modibbo Adama University of Technology Yola for the period of 12 weeks. The fingerlings were stocked at the rate of 10 fish per tank, this was done in triplicate and the fingerlings were fed 5% of their body weight twice daily (9.00 and 16.00) in all the treatments. Water quality parameters observed were within tolerable limits and conducive for the growth and well being of the fingerlings. The highest mean weight gain of (125.99) was obtained in diet B (as well as the mean length gain of (19.65). The mean haematological parameters such as WBC was observed to be high in diet A (194.67) and low in diet B, but the differences were only observed in total protein and albumin in different treatments. Condition factor of diet A was the highest (2.02). The carcass proximate composition was significantly different in all the treatments with diet C having the highest crude protein (55.89); Diet A recorded the highest protein efficiency ratio (0.23). Therefore it can be concluded that indigenous or feeds locally formulated in the country in this research recorded the highest growth performance and nutrient utilization.

# Key words: Fish Feed, Clarias gariepinus, performance

# INTRODUCTION

Fish represents a valuable source of micro nutrients, essential fatty acids and proteins. The importance of fish as nutrient is particularly high in developing countries, where the total protein intake level may be low. For 2.6 billion people in developing countries, fish provide more than 20% of the animal protein consumed compared to 8% in industrial countries (World Bank, 2005).

A decline in fishery resources caused by over fishing, or a significant increase in the price of food fish would seriously affect the nutritional status of major population groups (World Bank, 2005).

The nutritional status of developing countries can be salvaged by Aquaculture, but due to the expensive nature of fish feed, Aquaculture has not been able to help in the situation (World Bank, 2005).

Feed has been estimated to account for about 60 - 80% of the total cost of production of fish depending on species and environment (Balogun, *et al.*, 1992 and Adeparusi, 2005). The over dependence on fish as a major ingredient is also a constraint in the aquaculture industry, this has forced fish farmers to seek for comparatively cheaper



alternative source of animal and plant feed-stuff that can partially or completely replace fish meal in practical fish feed formation (Webster *et al.*, 1995).

The nutritional value of feed stuff in terms of feed formation for cultured fish in particular depends on their digestible crude protein and digestible energy (Dong, 2006). Feed is a compounded diet, a combination of feed ingredients otherwise known as nutrient sources (protein, lipid, carbohydrate, vitamin and minerals). Ingredients are combined through a process known as feed formulation. The primary objective of diet formulation is to provide a nutritionally balanced mixture of ingredients that will support the maintenance, growth, reproduction and health of the animal at relatively low cost (Otubusin, 1987).

Haruna (2003) defined feed formulation as the bringing together of feed ingredients and additives practically for the benefit of the stock.

Kumar (1992) also stated that supplementary feed can be compounded by using locally available feed ingredients and mixing with vitamins premix and essential minerals.

However to formulate a suitable balanced supplementary feed, the background knowledge of the nutritional requirement of the fish needs to be understood, this is because the qualities of nutrient required by the fish for attaining maximum growth vary with size and stages of the life cycle (Otubusin, 1987).

The essential nutrients such as vitamins, protein, fat, carbohydrates and minerals for the formulation of body tissues, production of energy and also for regulation of vital physiological processes are necessary for fish culture (Haruna, 2003).

Halver and Hardy (2002) reported that diet production must be economical to manufacture, store, ship and deliver. Pelleted feeds must remain intact in water until fish consume them and must be of high quality and good stability in aquatic environment (Miller *et al.*, 2003). Feeds have been traditionally fed as supplement or sole diet to fish aimed at ensuring maximum and economical production. The fish production rate may be increased significantly by merely supplementing the natural food with artificial feeds. Fish growth and yields are usually much higher with liming, fertilizers, adding concentrated feed minerals or by providing concentrated nutrients that the fish need as prepared supplementary feeds (Haruna, 2003)

Stickney and Lovel (1977) reported that where high densities of fish are reared in ponds under intensive culture system, a complete ration must be provided since natural foods from the system may not be present to balance a nutritionally incomplete diet.

According to De Silva (1988), availability of well balanced nutritionally complete and low cost effective compounded feed is very necessary in intensive fish culture system.

Nutritionally complete diet should be used whenever natural foods make small contribution to the nutrition (Dong, 2006). A quality fish feed can produce fast gains in fish weight; reduce the production period from 8 - 12 months to 5 or 6 months (Miller, 2002). The use of quality feed permits several harvests yearly with greater revenue. Fish feeds besides complementing natural pond food organism and supporting high stocking densities, enable the



fish farmer to observe the behavior, health status, feeding level and size changes during feeding (Delbert and Gatlin, 2010). In feeding, the nutritional requirement of the fish needs to be understood and evaluated.

The nutritional requirement of fish for proper growth are the same as those required by other animals i.e. protein, carbohydrate, lipid, vitamins and minerals

These elements form the basis for the preparation and selection of artificial feeds. Fish requirement for the various classes of food depends on species and age of the fish (Haruna, 2003).

Feedstuffs can be classified into two groups; energy feedstuffs and protein supplement feedstuffs.

Energy feedstuffs contain less than 20% crude protein while protein supplement feedstuffs contain 20% or more crude protein (Eyo, 2003). The maximum tolerable carbohydrate level depends on the overall balance of fat, protein and gross energy in the diet (Hilon *et al.*, 1982).

Hence, the nutritional value of the fish feed must be evaluated before feeding the fish The catfish genus can be defined as displaying an eel shape, having an elongated cylindrical body with dorsal anal fins being extremely long with both fins containing only soft fin rays.

The outer pectoral ray is in the form of a spine and pelvic fin which normally has six soft rays. The head is flattened, highly ossified, the skull bone forming a casque and the body is covered with smooth, scaleless skin. The skin is generally darkly pigmented on the dorsal and lateral parts of the body, the color is uniformly marbled and changes from grayish olive to blackish according to substrate. On exposure to light, the skin color generally becomes lighter (WWW.discoverlife, 2008).

A supra-branchial or accessory respiratory system composed of a paired pear-shaped air-chamber containing two aborecent structures is generally present. These aborecent or cauliflower-like structures located on the fourth branchial arcs are supported by cartilage and covered by highly vascularized tissue which can absorb oxygen directly from the atmosphere (Moussa, 1956). Since the air-chamber communicates directly with the pharynx and the gill-chamber, this accessory air breathing organ allows the fish to survive out of water for many hours or for many weeks in muddy marshes.

*Clarias* species inhabit calm waters from lakes, streams, rivers, swamps to floodplains, many of which are subject to seasonal drying. The most common habitat frequented are floodplains, swamps and pools in which the catfish can survive during the dry seasons due to the presence of their accessory air breathing organs (Bruton, 1979a;Clay,1979).

Although, numerous studies on the food composition of C. *gariepinus* have been carried out, a consistent pattern has not emerged and they are generally classified as omnivorous or predators.

Micha (1976) examined catfish from the river Ubangui (Central African Republic) and found that *C.gariepinus* fed mainly on aquatic insects, fish and higher plant debris. They have been found to feed on terrestrial insects, molluscs and fruits.

Haruna (2003) reported that *C. gariepinus* is an opportunistic feeder, feeding on what ever is available in its habitat. *C.gariepinus* shows a seasonal gonadal maturation which is usually associated with the rainy seasons.



The maturation processes of *C. gariepinus* are influenced by annual changes in water temperature and photoperiodicity and the final triggering of spawning is caused by a rise in water level due to rainfall (De Graaf *et al.*, 1996). It migrates to rivers and temporary streams to spawn

# MATERIALS AND METHODS

#### **Description of Study Area.**

The study was conducted at the experimental farm of the department of fisheries at Modibbo Adama University of Technology, Yola located in Girei Local Government Area of Adamawa State, Nigeria

#### **Duration of the Study.**

The study lasted for the period of 12 weeks (84 days) from August to November 2014.

#### **Experimental Set-up**

The experimental set-up consisted of nine semi-flows through plastic tanks with 50liters water capacity. The plastic tanks were cleaned, disinfected with salt solution and allowed to dry for twenty-four (24) hours. After which, 30 liters of water was introduced in the tanks from a 2000 liters overhead tank

#### **Experimental Fish.**

Ninety *C. gariepinus* were obtained from Gesse Daddo farms along Yola-Numan road and was transported to the site of experiment using partially-cut 50 liters jerry can with cool water well aerated for about 40 minutes drive.

The fingerlings were starved for 24 hours prior to the time of transportation in order to reduce metabolic activities during the cause of transportation as recommended by Khanna and Sign (2003). The transportation was done at cool hours in order to avoid temperature increase as suggested by Haruna (2003). The fish were transferred to a holding tank and allowed to be acclimatized for two weeks (2 weeks). After the acclimatization period, the fish were stocked in plastic tanks at 10 fish per tank (30 liters of water).

#### Feeding of Fish.

Fish in all the treatments were fed two times a day (morning 9am and evening 4pm) on a protein balanced diet at the rate of 5% body weight per day. Feeding allowance was adjusted in accordance with increase in body weight and diet allotments were increased fortnightly after the length-weight determination.

# Fish Length and Weight Measurement.

The initial body weight of each set of the fish was determined by using an electronic weighing balance before stocking. Subsequently, batch weighing of the fish in each tank was carried out bi-weekly during the course of the experiment

#### Fish Growth Performance.

The following parameters were analyzed considering mean weight gain (MWG), specific growth rate (SGR) %, percentage weight gain (PWG), feed conversion rate (FCR), protein efficiency ratio (PER) and condition factor (K)



# Mean Weight Gain (MWG)

The fish weight gain was determined as the difference between the final mean weight of the fish at the end of the experiment and the initial mean weight gain in grams (Castel and Tiews, 1980).

 $MWG = \frac{W_{1-W_0}}{n}$ 

Where  $W_0 =$  Initial mean weight

W<sub>1</sub> = final mean weight

n = No. of fish in tank

# Specific Growth Rate (SGR)

This is the mean percentage increase in body weight per day over a given time interval (Brown, 1957).

 $SGR = \frac{L_{n W_1 - L_n W_0}}{T} \times 100$ 

Where  $W_0 = initial$  mean weight

 $W_1 = final mean weight$ 

T = time interval

#### Feed Conversion Ratio (FCR)

The feed conversion ratio is the unit weight of feed given, divided by the live weight of fish (Wilson,

1989).

 $FCR = \frac{Amount of feed fed (g)}{Weight gain by fish (g)}$ 

# **Protein Efficiency Ratio (PER)**

This is the efficiency with which the fish utilizes dietary protein and is defined by the equation below

(Osborne et al., 1919).

 $PER = \frac{\text{Weight gain by fish (g)}}{\text{Weight of protein fed (g)}}$ 

Where; weight of protein fed (g) = feed intake x % protein in the diet.

# **Condition Factor (K)**

Condition factor (K) was calculated as :( Fulton 1902; Ricker 1975)

K = 100W

 $L^3$ 

Where; W= Weight of fish

L= Standard length of fish

Percentage Weight Gain (PWG). (Cheikyula and Ofojekwu 2003; Adewolu et al., 2008).

 $PWG\% = \frac{\text{Mean Weight gain}}{\text{Initial Mean Weight}} \times 100$ 

Analysis of Data.



Data was analyzed using one way ANOVA and the difference among means were tested for significance (p = 0.05) using Least Significant Difference (LSD) method

# RESULTS

# **Composition of Formulated Diet**

The results of the percentage composition of the ingredients used for the experiment is shown in Table 1

#### **Proximate Composition of Experimental Diets**

Table 2 shows the proximate composition of the various feeds used for the experiment; formulated diet designated as diet A, vital fish feed designated as diet B and Coppens fish feed designated as diet C with varying levels of crude protein, crude fiber, crude lipid, ash, dry matter and NFE respectively.

# Weekly Mean Weight Gain of Clarias gariepinus Fingerlings Fed Different Fish Feed for 12 Weeks

Table 3 shows the weekly mean weight gain of *Clarias gariepinus* fingerlings fed diet A (formulated feed), Diet B (Vital fish feeds) and Diet C (Coppens fish feed). The highest mean weight gain of 125.99g was recorded in Diet B; while the lowest mean weight gain of 90.22g was recorded in Diet C.

# Weekly Mean Length Gain of Clarias gariepinus Fingerlings Fed Different Fish Feed for 12 Weeks

Table 4 shows weekly mean length gain of *Clarias gariepinus* fingerlings fed diet A (formulated feed), diet B (vital fish feed) and diet C (Coppens fish feed). The highest mean length gain of 19.65cm was recorded in diet B; while the lowest mean length gain of 16.80cm was recorded in diet A.

# Water Quality Parameters

Table 7 shows water quality parameters taken during the twelve weeks of the experiment. The temperature range was within 27.6 - 29.4; while pH was between the ranges of 6.1 -7.0. Dissolved oxygen was within the ranges of 5.2 to 6.0 and ammonia was within the range of 0.02 - 0.04.

| Ingredient   | % Composition |
|--------------|---------------|
| Fish meal    | 18.34         |
| G.N.C        | 18.34         |
| Soya bean    | 18.34         |
| Yellow maize | 19.74         |
| Rice bran    | 19.74         |

Table 1: Composition of Formulated Feed Used for the Experiment



| Bone meal      | 1.5 |
|----------------|-----|
| Salt           | 1.5 |
| Vitamin premix | 2.5 |
| Total %        | 100 |

# Table 2: Proximate Composition of Experimental Diets

| (%) Parameter | Formulated Feed (A) | Vital Fish Feed (B) | Coppens (C) |
|---------------|---------------------|---------------------|-------------|
| Crude protein | 37.09               | 37.90               | 41.05       |
| Crude fiber   | 4.05                | 3.45                | 1.75        |
| Crude lipid   | 11.05               | 8.99                | 12.85       |
| Ash           | 5.01                | 2.55                | 8.40        |
| Dry matter    | 90.60               | 93.59               | 95.80       |
| NFE           | 57.20               | 59.30               | 58.15       |

NFE: Nitrogen Free Extract.



Table 3: Weekly Mean Weight Gain of Clarias gariepinus Fed Different Fish Feeds for 12 Weeks

| Treatment Diet | Week 0<br>(Initial) | Week<br>1          | Week<br>2          | Week<br>3           | Week<br>4           | Week<br>5           | Week<br>6           | Week<br>7           | Week<br>8           | Week<br>9           | Week<br>10          | Week 11              | Week 12              | MWG    |
|----------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------------|----------------------|--------|
|                |                     |                    |                    |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                      |                      |        |
| Diet A         | 2.60                | 3.75 <sup>aa</sup> | 7.08 <sup>a</sup>  | 9.34 <sup>aa</sup>  | 13.99 <sup>aa</sup> | 21.20 <sup>ab</sup> | 26.49 <sup>ab</sup> | 32.23 <sup>bb</sup> | 38.49 <sup>bb</sup> | 49.54 <sup>bb</sup> | 60.72 <sup>b</sup>  | 77.50 <sup>ab</sup>  | 98.32 <sup>aa</sup>  | 95.72  |
| Diet B         | 2.60                | 3.43 <sup>a</sup>  | 7.78 <sup>aa</sup> | 10.85 <sup>aa</sup> | 15.80 <sup>aa</sup> | 23.20 <sup>aa</sup> | 29.76 <sup>aa</sup> | 44.44 <sup>a</sup>  | 60.29 <sup>a</sup>  | 80.07 <sup>a</sup>  | 98.52 <sup>a</sup>  | 113.52 <sup>aa</sup> | 128.59 <sup>aa</sup> | 125.99 |
| Diet C         | 2.60                | 4.09 <sup>aa</sup> | 8.13 <sup>aa</sup> | 9.20 <sup>a</sup>   | 12.85 <sup>a</sup>  | 17.01 <sup>bb</sup> | 20.79 <sup>bb</sup> | 29.50 <sup>b</sup>  | 37.19 <sup>b</sup>  | 45.68 <sup>b</sup>  | 61.00 <sup>bb</sup> | 76.91 <sup>bb</sup>  | 92.82 <sup>a</sup>   | 90.22  |
| Mean           | 2.60                | 3.75               | 7.66               | 9.80                | 14.22               | 20.51               | 25.68               | 35.39               | 45.32               | 58.42               | 73.41               | 89.31                | 106.58               | 103.98 |
| Pr > F         | -                   | 0.63               | 0.28               | 0.54                | 0.42                | 0.10                | 0.08                | 0.04                | 0.02                | 0.03                | 0.03                | 0.08                 | 0.19                 | -      |
| Coeff. Var     | -                   | 20.96              | 9.05               | 19.15               | 17.21               | 13.10               | 13.80               | 13.28               | 13.84               | 18.00               | 16.96               | 17.88                | 19.33                | -      |

|                    | R IJR  |        | International Journal of Research<br>Available at<br>https://journals.pen2print.org/index.php/ijr/ |        |        |        |        | e-ISSN<br>p-ISSN<br>Volume<br>Decer | : 2348-6848<br>: 2348-795)<br>: 06 Issue 1<br><u>nber 201</u> 9 | 3<br>K<br>3 |         |         |         |     |
|--------------------|--------|--------|--|--------|--------|--------|--------|-------------------------------------|---|-------------|---------|---------|---------|-----|
| Treatment<br>Diets | Week 0 | Week 1 | Week 2   | Week 3 | Week 4 | Week 5 | Week 6 | Week 7                              | Week 8  | Week 9      | Week 10 | Week 11 | Week 12 | MLG |

Means with the same Superscript on the same row are not significantly Different (p >0.05)

Table 4: Weekly Mean Length Gain of Clarias gariepinus Fed Different Fish Feeds for 12 Weeks



https://journals.pen2print.org/index.php/ijr/

e-ISSN: 2348-6848 p-ISSN: 2348-795X Volume 06 Issue 13

December 2019

| Diet A     | 4.21 | 6.03 <sup>aa</sup> | $7.57^{a}$         | 8.26 <sup>a</sup>         | 9.80 <sup>a</sup>   | 11.21 <sup>aa</sup> | 12.98 <sup>aa</sup> | 13.96 <sup>aa</sup> | 14.67 <sup>b</sup>  | 16.11 <sup>b</sup>  | 17.49 <sup>b</sup>  | 19.28 <sup>a</sup>  | 21.02 <sup>a</sup>  | 16.80 |
|------------|------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-------|
|            |      |                    |                    |                           |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |       |
|            |      |                    |                    |                           |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |       |
| Diat B     | 4 10 | 6 00 <sup>a</sup>  | 7 72 <sup>aa</sup> | <b>8</b> 75 <sup>aa</sup> | 10 13 <sup>aa</sup> | 11 70 <sup>aa</sup> | 12 22 <sup>aa</sup> | 14 62 <sup>aa</sup> | 17 13 <sup>aa</sup> | 18 05 <sup>aa</sup> | 20.35 <sup>a</sup>  | 21 01 <sup>aa</sup> | 22 Q 1 aa           | 10.65 |
| Dict B     | 4.19 | 0.00               | 1.12               | 0.75                      | 10.15               | 11.70               | 15.55               | 14.02               | 17.15               | 10.95               | 20.33               | 21.91               | 23.04               | 19.05 |
|            |      |                    |                    |                           |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |       |
| Diet C     | 4.20 | 6.10 <sup>aa</sup> | $7.75^{aa}$        | $8.54^{aa}$               | $10.17^{aa}$        | 11.05 <sup>a</sup>  | 12.41 <sup>a</sup>  | 13.86 <sup>a</sup>  | $15.44^{abb}$       | $17.11^{abb}$       | 18.03 <sup>bb</sup> | 19.76 <sup>aa</sup> | 21.03 <sup>aa</sup> | 16.83 |
|            |      |                    |                    |                           |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |       |
|            |      |                    |                    |                           |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |       |
| Mean       | 4.20 | 6.04               | 7.68               | 8.52                      | 10.04               | 11.32               | 12.91               | 14.15               | 15.75               | 17.39               | 18.62               | 20.31               | 21.96               | 17.76 |
|            |      |                    |                    |                           |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |       |
| Dec E      |      | 0.00               | 0.00               | 0.54                      | 0.67                | 0.26                | 0.21                | 0.20                | 0.02                | 0.00                | 0.02                | 0.20                | 0.02                |       |
| PT > F     | -    | 0.96               | 0.80               | 0.54                      | 0.67                | 0.26                | 0.21                | 0.39                | 0.03                | 0.09                | 0.03                | 0.20                | 0.23                | -     |
|            |      |                    |                    |                           |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |       |
| Coeff. Var | -    | 6.87               | 4.36               | 5.81                      | 5.26                | 3.69                | 4.08                | 4.65                | 4.85                | 6.65                | 4.59                | 7.63                | 8.62                | -     |

Means with the same Superscript are not Significantly Different (p > 0.05)

Table 5: Water Quality Parameters Taken From the Experimental Set-up for 12 Weeks.



e-ISSN: 2348-6848 p-ISSN: 2348-795X Volume 06 Issue 13 December 2019

| Parameters      | Week 1 | Week 2 | Week 3 | Week 4 | Week 5 | Week 6 | Week 7 | Week 8 | Week 9 | Week 10 | Week 11 | Week 12 |
|-----------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|---------|---------|
|                 |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |         |         |         |
| Temperature(°C) | 28.6   | 28.8   | 29.3   | 27.6   | 28.7   | 29.4   | 29.5   | 28.2   | 28.3   | 29.1    | 29.1    | 28.3    |
|                 |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |         |         |         |
| рН              | 6.5    | 6.5    | 6.4    | 7.1    | 6.2    | 7.1    | 6.5    | 6.1    | 6.00   | 7.0     | 7.0     | 6.2     |
|                 |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |         |         |         |
|                 |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |         |         |         |
| Dissolved       | 5.2    | 5.3    | 6.0    | 6.0    | 5.4    | 5.2    | 6.0    | 6.0    | 5.9    | 5.3     | 5.3     | 5.4     |
| Oxygen(mg/l)    |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |         |         |         |
|                 |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |         |         |         |
| Ammonia (mg/l)  | 0.04   | 0.03   | 0.03   | 0.02   | 0.03   | 0.03   | 0.03   | 0.04   | 0p.02  | 0.04    | 0.04    | 0.03    |
|                 |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |         |         |         |
|                 |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |         |         |         |



#### DISCUSSION

The feeding trials revealed that Clarias gariepinus responded to all the diets, irrespective of their composition. Clarias gariepinus was able to effectively utilize the locally formulated diet for growth. It is interesting to note that better growth and nutrient utilization were achieved in diet B followed by diet A which had lower levels of crude protein compared to diet C.

It was observed that diet B showed a remarkable weight gain (125.99) compared to diet A (95.72) and diet C (90.22) in table 3, statistically using ANOVA; it was found that there is a significant difference in the body weight with different fish feeds.(P<0.05). This is not in agreement with the study of Suphada and Kiriratnikom (2011) that body weights of catfish fed diet containing high levels of protein (40-44%) had the highest body weight gain.

This study clearly showed that diet B have the highest length (19.65) followed by diet C (16.83), statistically it was found that there was no significant difference in the length of the fingerlings with different fish feeds (P<0.05). The coefficient of variation (CV) in all the weeks indicates that the research work was reliable because none of its value was up to 50. Water quality parameters during the period of the study were all within the acceptable range for the culture of African catfish *Clarias gariepinus* as recommended by Boyd and Lichotkoter (1979) and did not have any negative effects on the performance of fish in all the treatments

#### CONCLUSION

Based on this investigation on the effects of different fish feeds on performance of African catfish *Clarias gariepinus* fingerlings, it was found that the locally formulated diets or feeds gave good performance. This could also reduce the cost of fish farmers going for foreign fish feeds which are expensive and may take longer time on the port to arrive in the country; it may as well give rise to nutrients leaching in the course of transportation.

#### REFERENCES

- Adeparusi, E.O. (2005), Growth Performance of Orechromis niloticus fed Diets in Which Cooked Soybean Replace Fishmeal. Nigerian Journal of Animal Production Published by Nigeria Society of Animal Production. 32. (1), 158-168.
- Aderolu, A.Z. and Akinremi, O.A. (2009). Dietary effects of coconut oil and peanut oil in improving biochemical characteristics of *Clarias gariepinus* juvenile. *Turkish Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 9.105-110
- Aderolu, A.Z., Bello, R., Aarode, O.O., and Sanni, R.O. (2011). Utilization of Two Dietary Plant oil Sources on Growth, Haematology, Histometry and Carcass Analysis of Juvenile Clarias gariepinus. Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences 7, 117-130.



- Adewolu, M.A., Ogunsami, A.O. and Yunusa A. (2008). Studies on Growth Performance and Feed Utilization of two *Clarias* catfish and their hybrid reared under different culture systems. *European Journal of Scientific Research*. 23. (2), 252-260.
- Balogun, J.A., Adesinasi, C.O. and Marzouk, D.K. (1992). The effects of a wobble board exercise training program on static balance performance and strength of lower extremity muscles. *Physiotherapy Canada*. 44. (4), 23-30.
- Brown, M.C. (1957). Experimental studies on Growth. The Physiology of Fishes Vol. 1 academic press London: 360-440.
- Bruton, N. M. (1979). The breeding biology and early Development of *Clarias gariepinus* Pisces. (*Clariidae*) in lake Sibiya, South Africa, with review of breeding in species of sub genus *Clarias*. *Transaharan Zoology Science London*. 35, 1-45.
- Boyd, C.E. and Lichotkoper, F. (1979). Water quality management in pond fish culture. Research and development series. No. 22 international centre for aquaculture. Agricultural experimental station. Auburn university. Alabama.
- Castel, J.D. and Tiews, k. (1980). Rector of the EIFAC IUNS and ICES working Group on standardization of methodology in fish Nutrition Research MEIPAC/T36 EIPAC/FAO PP 24.
- Cheikyula, J.O. and Ofojekwu, P.C. (2003). Growth Responses and Survival of Gold Fish, *Carassius auratus (Cyprinidae)* Fry reared on Moina (*Cladocera*) and Cyclops (*Copepoda*). Journal of Aquaculture Sciences 18. (1), 43-46.
- Clay, D. (1979). Population biology, growth and feeding of the African catfish, *Clarias gariepinus*, with special reference to juveniles and their importance in fish culture. *Archeology Hydrobioly*. 87 (4), 453-482.
- DeGraaf, G. and Janssen, H. (1996). The Artificial production and pond rearing of the African catfish *C. gariepinus* in sub-Sahara Africa. A handbook of FAO fisheries technical paper No. 362.FAO Rome 1996: 37.
- Dong, Z.J. (2006). Fish nutrition and feeds handout presented at the training programme on integrated fish farming at Asian pacific regional research and training centre integrated fish farming, China.
- Eyo, A.A. (2003). Fundamentals of nutrition and Diet Development- An overview. National Workshop on Fish Feed Development and Feeding Practices in Aquaculture Organized by Fisheries Society of National Institute for Freshwater Fisheries Research (NIFFR) and FAO National Programme for Food Security (FAO- NSPFS) New Bussa, Nigeria.
- Haruna, A B. (2003). Aquaculture in the tropics. Theory and practice. An Alhassan publication printed in Kano-Nigeria. pp 163.
- Hilton, J.W., Alkinson, J.L.and Slinga, S.L. (1982). Maximum Tolerable Level, Digestion and Metabolism of D- Glocuse (Cerolose) in Rainbow Trout, *Salmo gairneri*, and reared on a Practical Trout Diet. *Canadian Journal Fish Aquaculture Science* 29. 1229-1234.



- Kiriratnakom, S. and Kiriratnakom, A. (2011). Growth, feed utilization, survival and body composition of fingerlings of slender walking catfish *Clarias nieuhofii*, fed diets containing different protein levels.*Songklanakarin Journal of Science Tecnology*.34. (1), 37-43.
- Kumar, D. (1992). Fish Culture in Undrainable Ponds. A manual for Extension F.A.O. Fisheries Technical paper.
- Khanna, S.S and Singh, H.R. (2003). A textbook of fish biology and fisheries. Narrenda Publishing House. Delhi 11006 (India).
- Micha, J.C. (1976). Synthèse des essais de reproduction, d'alevinage et de production chez un silure Africain: Clarias lazera Val. Symp. FAO/CPCA on Aquaculture in Africa. Accra, Ghana. CIFA Tech. Pap. 4 (1): 450-473.
- Miller, J. (2002). Fisheries and aquaculture models for training and discussion. National special programme for food security in Nigeria (NSPFS) FAO aquatic resources consulant sept October 2002: 1-3.
- Miller, J. Atanda, A.N. and Asala, G.N. (2003). Fish Pond Construction and management. A Field Guide and Extension Manual. pp 37
- Moussa, T.A. (1956). Morphology of the accessory air-breathing organs of the teleost *Clarias lazera* (C&V). *Journal Morphology*. 98.125-160.
- Osborne, T.B., Medel, L.B. and Frey, E.L. (1919). A Method for expressing numerically, the growth promotion value of proteins. *A Journal of Biological Chemistry*. 37.223-224.
- Otubusin, S.O. (1987). Effects of Different Levels of Blood Meal in Pelleted Feeds on Tilapia. *Orechromis niloticus* production in floating bamboo net cages. *Aquaculture*.65.263-6
- Stickney, R.R. and Lovel, R.T. (1977). Nutrition and Feeding of Channel Catfish. A report from Committee of Regional Subcommittee of Regional Research Project S. 83 Southern Co-operative. Series Bulletin 218: 1-6
- Wilson, R.P. (1989). Amino acids and proteins in fish nutrition (E.J. Halver, Ed) Academic press Inc. California: 111-115
- World Bank, (2005). The International bank for reconstruction and development saving fishes and fishers. Towards sustainable and equitable Governance of the global fishing sector 1818H.Street. Washington DC.
- Webster, C.D., Tidwel, J.H. Tiv, L.S. and Yancel, D.H. (1995). Use of Soybeans Meal as Partial or Total Substitute. Fish Meal in Diet of Blue Catfish ictalurufer catus, *Aquaculture* 103. 14-15

www.discoverlife.2008.