

## Metabolic Changes Associated with Diverse Protein Concentrates in *Cyprinus Carpio*

Imtisunep<sup>1</sup>, Prof. Sharif U. Ahmed<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1,2</sup>Department of Zoology, Nagaland University, Lumami, 798627, India

### \*Corresponding Author:

Imtisunep

Email: [Imtisunepjune@gmail.com](mailto:Imtisunepjune@gmail.com)

**Abstract:** Although the growth and feed performance of the fishes after inclusion of varying doses of proteins, lipids and carbohydrate has been established by so many authors in different classes of fishes. The present research work is based on the protein concentrate variation to assess the growth performance. Inclusion of 25, 30, 35 and 40% crude protein in diet of *Cyprinus carpio* showed promising growth parameters in treatment 4 with 35% CP inclusion. Results revealed that fish meal can be a good choice for better economic returns from the carp culture.

**Keywords:** *Cyprinus carpio communis*, Crude Protein, FCR, SGR, PER

### INTRODUCTION

Aquaculture is the back bone of Fisheries Industry throughout the world. In India fisheries industry contributes 2% to GDP. Focus has been on the innovations and research for development of fisheries sector through physical and feeding management. Since pond management has been an old science, with little innovations being implemented from time to time. A major determinant of successful intensification of aquaculture is feed. It accounts for a major part of the total operation cost of an average fish farm. The performance of a feed is not only dependent on its quality but also on feeding management. Good quality, nutritionally adequate feed can give poor performance unless proper feeding practice (feed allowance, feeding frequency and method, and daily feeding schedules) are employed [23]. Thus, particular attention must be directed towards the development of feeding strategies necessary to obtain economical production and maintain a clean environment.

Aquaculture nutrition research has developed significantly over the past 35 years. More recently attention has also been paid to other important species of fish cultured in different parts of the world, as well as new fish species with aquaculture potential [46]. Aquaculture nutrition has been of immense importance since times immemorial. A lot of research has so far been done on the inclusion and substitution of various proteins and protein products to see their impact on the growth of commercially available fish species. Species specific changes in metabolic and biological profile has been reported by many authors throughout the world, but a proper and nominal protocol has not be devised even after progressive implementation of the research from laboratory to land. A lacunae is still left, which

needs further research in nutritional aspects of fisheries science. The present research aims at the inclusion of different crude protein concentrations in feed formula for Common carp, to assess its impact on various physio-biological parameters on early life stages.

### MATERIALS AND METHODS

*Cyprinus carpio communis* fingerlings were procured from the Brooder Fish Farm Half-Nagarjan, Dimapur District, Nagaland. The fingerlings with an average weight of 1.5 g were collected after proper health check up and stocked in glass tanks. In each tank, 30 fingerlings were stocked and the treatment replica was named as per the protein concentrate tested. The composition of the feed formulations is presented in table 1. Following parameters were recorded to asses the growth and feed performance of the *Cyprinus carpio communis* fingerlings fed on formulated diets (DT<sub>1(25%)</sub>, DT<sub>2(30%)</sub>, DT<sub>3(35%)</sub> and DT<sub>4(40%)</sub>) with respect to conventional feed (CTRL<sub>(20%)</sub>) during the experimental period

#### a) Net Weight Gain (NWG)

Net Weight Gain (g) = Mean final fish weight (g) - Mean initial fish weight (g) [50]

#### b) Body Weight Gain (%)

Body weight gain (BWG, %) = [(final body weight (g) - initial body weight (g)) / initial body weight (g)] × 100. [8]

#### c) Average Daily Weight Gain (ADWG)

Average Daily Weight Gain (ADWG) = Wt-W<sub>0</sub>/T (days)

**d) Average Weekly Weight Gain (AWWG)**

Average Weekly Weight Gain (AWWG) =  $(W_t - W_o) / T$  (Weeks)

**e) Specific Growth Rate (SGR % / day)**

SGR is the average percentage weight change per day between any two weightings provided that the growth curve is exponential in form.

$$\text{SGR (\% / Day)} = [(\text{Ln}W_2 - \text{Ln}W_1) / (T_2 - T_1)] \times 100 \quad [16]$$

Where  $W_1$  is the initial fish weight (g) at time  $T_1$  (day) and  $W_2$  is the final fish weight (g) at time  $T_2$  (day)

**f) Feed Conversion Ratio (FCR)**

FCR is defined as the feed consumed in dry weight per unit live weight gain.

$$\text{FCR} = \text{Feed consumed (g dry weight)} / \text{Live weight gain (g)} \quad [16]$$

**g) Feeding Rate**

$$\text{Feeding rate} = (\text{Diet consumption} / \text{Weight Gain}) \times \text{No. of days}$$

**h) Daily Growth Coefficient**

$$\text{Daily growth coefficient (DGC)} = 100 \times [(\text{final body weight}^{0.333} - \text{initial body weight}^{0.333}) / \text{days of experiment}] \quad [11]$$

**i) Thermal Growth Coefficient**

$$\text{Thermal growth coefficient (TGC)} = [(\text{final body weight}^{0.333} - \text{initial body weight}^{0.333}) / (\text{water temperature} \times \text{days of experiment})]$$

**j) Daily Feed Intake (g d<sup>-1</sup>fish<sup>-1</sup>)**

$$\text{Daily feed intake (FI, g d}^{-1}\text{fish}^{-1}) = \text{diet consumed} \times 100 / \text{duration in days} / \text{fish number per tank} \quad [57]$$

**k) Protein Intake (PI)**

This was determined following Sveier *et al.*, (2000) method using the formula:

$$\text{PI} = \text{Total feed intake} \times \% \text{ crude protein in the diet.}$$

**l) Assimilation**

$$\text{Assimilation} = \text{Food consumption} / \text{Fecal output}$$

**m) Survival (%)**

$$\text{Survival (\%)} = (\text{Nt} / \text{No}) \times 100 \quad [3]$$

Study on growth and feed performance of *Cyprinus carpio communis* fingerlings involved assessment of growth and feed performance of fingerlings fed on formulated diets (DT<sub>1</sub>(25%), DT<sub>2</sub>(30%), DT<sub>3</sub>(35%) and DT<sub>4</sub>(40%)) with respect to conventional feed (Control(20%)). *Cyprinus carpio communis* fingerlings were fed @ 3% of their body weight, three times a day. All the dietary treatments and control were in

triplicates. The comprehensive Mean±SD values of different growth parameters are presented in table 1.

After 90 days of each replicate (R1<sub>90</sub>; R2<sub>90</sub>), the average final weight of 5.80g±0.00 was recorded in fingerlings fed on conventional feed. The highest average final weight of 8.40g±0.14 was recorded in DT<sub>3</sub>, followed by 7.95g±0.07 in the fingerlings fed on DT<sub>2</sub>. The pedigree of final weight in various dietary groups was as DT<sub>3</sub>>DT<sub>2</sub>>DT<sub>4</sub>>DT<sub>1</sub>>CTRL. Based on the final weight DT<sub>3</sub> was presumed to be the optimum feed with balanced PE ratio for sustained growth of the test fish species. There was no significant difference (P>0.05) in the average final weight of the fingerlings fed on conventional feed and DT<sub>3</sub>. Similarly, the net weight gain of 6.87g±0.16 was recorded in DT<sub>3</sub>, followed by 6.41g±0.01 in the fingerlings fed on DT<sub>2</sub>, which showed similar hierarchal values as those for final weight. Similar trend was reported for mean body weight gain and average daily weight gain.

The Common carp fingerlings showed highest average weekly weight gain of 0.57±0.01 in DT<sub>3</sub>, followed by 0.53±0.00 in the fingerlings fed on DT<sub>2</sub>, as compared to control (0.36±0.01). There was no significant difference (P>0.05) in the average weekly weight gain of the fingerlings fed on conventional feed and DT<sub>3</sub>. In case of specific growth rate (SGR), The highest specific growth rate of 1.89±0.03 was recorded in DT<sub>3</sub>, followed by 1.82±0.05 in the fingerlings fed on DT<sub>2</sub>, as compared to conventional diet (1.50±0.06).

The mean food conversion ratio of 2.41±0.00 was recorded in fingerlings fed on conventional feed. The lowest FCR of 1.08±0.07 was recorded in DT<sub>3</sub>, followed by 1.39±0.00 in the fingerlings fed on DT<sub>2</sub>. Fingerlings in DT<sub>4</sub> showed markedly lower food conversion ratio of 1.63±0.02 than DT<sub>1</sub> (1.74±0.09). The findings coincide with the value of SGR. The pedigree of FCR in various dietary groups was as DT<sub>3</sub><DT<sub>2</sub><DT<sub>4</sub><DT<sub>1</sub><CTRL. There was no significant difference (P>0.05) in the food conversion ratio of the fingerlings fed on conventional feed and DT<sub>3</sub>.

On the other hand, the lowest feeding rate of 0.97±0.06 was recorded in DT<sub>3</sub>, followed by 1.25±0.00 in the fingerlings fed on DT<sub>2</sub>, as compared to control (2.17±0.00). The pedigree of feeding rate in various dietary groups was as DT<sub>3</sub><DT<sub>2</sub><DT<sub>4</sub><DT<sub>1</sub><CTRL. There was no significant difference (P>0.05) in the feeding rate of the fingerlings fed on conventional feed and DT<sub>3</sub>. Daily growth coefficient showed a uniform value of 0.01±0.00 for all the treatment groups during the course of study. The pedigree of DGC in various dietary groups was as DT<sub>3</sub>=DT<sub>2</sub>=DT<sub>4</sub>=DT<sub>1</sub>=CTRL. There was no significant difference (P>0.05) in the feeding rate of the fingerlings fed on conventional feed and DT<sub>3</sub>.

At the end of the two experimented replicates (R1<sub>90</sub>; R2<sub>90</sub>), the mean thermal growth coefficient of 0.16±0.22 was recorded in fingerlings fed on conventional feed. All the other diet treatment groups showed the TGC value of 0.31±0.00, corresponding with the values of DGC. The pedigree of TGC in various dietary groups was as DT<sub>3</sub>=DT<sub>2</sub>=DT<sub>4</sub>=DT<sub>1</sub>=CTRL. There was no significant difference (P>0.05) in the feeding rate of the fingerlings fed on conventional feed and DT<sub>3</sub>. Similarly, the highest daily food intake of 47.10±1.70 was recorded in DT<sub>1</sub>, followed by 46.95±1.48 in the fingerlings fed on DT<sub>4</sub>. Fingerlings in DT<sub>2</sub> showed markedly higher daily food intake of 46.35±2.33 than DT<sub>3</sub> (46.05±0.64). The pedigree of DFI in various dietary groups was as DT<sub>1</sub>>DT<sub>4</sub>>DT<sub>2</sub>>DT<sub>3</sub>>CTRL. There was no significant difference (P>0.05) in the daily food intake of the fingerlings fed on conventional feed and DT<sub>3</sub>.

The highest protein intake of 151.62±3.35 was recorded in DT<sub>4</sub>, followed by 144.43±4.32 in the fingerlings fed on DT<sub>3</sub>. The pedigree of PI in various dietary groups was as DT<sub>4</sub>>DT<sub>3</sub>>DT<sub>2</sub>>DT<sub>1</sub>>CTRL. There was no significant difference (P>0.05) in the protein intake of the fingerlings fed on conventional feed and DT<sub>3</sub>. Coherently, the fingerlings in DT<sub>3</sub> showed markedly higher faecal output of 41.02±0.18 than DT<sub>1</sub> (38.54±0.58). The pedigree of faecal output in various dietary groups was as DT<sub>4</sub>>DT<sub>2</sub>>DT<sub>3</sub>>DT<sub>1</sub>>CTRL. There was no significant difference (P>0.05) in the faecal output of the fingerlings fed on conventional feed and DT<sub>3</sub>.

At the end of the two experimented replicates (R1<sub>90</sub>; R2<sub>90</sub>), the mean assimilation of 8.59±0.16 was recorded in fingerlings fed on conventional feed. The

highest assimilation of 10.06±0.08 was recorded in DT<sub>3</sub>, followed by 9.18±0.13 in the fingerlings fed on DT<sub>2</sub>. Fingerlings in DT<sub>1</sub> showed markedly higher assimilation of 8.91±0.25 than DT<sub>4</sub> (8.07±0.09). The pedigree of assimilation in various dietary groups was as DT<sub>3</sub>>DT<sub>2</sub>>DT<sub>1</sub>>DT<sub>4</sub>>CTRL. There was no significant difference (P>0.05) in the assimilation of the fingerlings fed on conventional feed and DT<sub>3</sub>. The highest survival of 95.00±2.35 was recorded in DT<sub>3</sub>, followed by 93.33±0.00 in the fingerlings fed on DT<sub>1</sub>. There was no significant difference (P>0.05) in the survival of the fingerlings fed on conventional feed and DT<sub>3</sub>.

From table 2, it is clear that final weight (FW) showed negative correlation with FCR (-0.98) and FR (-0.98) while as a positive relation was established with rest of the parameters. Similarly net weight gain (NWG) showed negative relation with FCR (-0.98) and FR (-0.97), while as body weight gain (BWG) showed similar trend with rest of the parameters with negative correlation with FCR (-0.97) and FR (-0.97). Average daily weight gain (ADWG) and Average weekly weight gain (AWWG) showed similar trends with negative correlation with FCR (-0.97; -0.96) and FR (-0.97; -0.97) respectively. Specific growth rate showed positive relation with all the parameters except FCR (-0.98) and FR (-0.97). FCR and FR showed negative correlation with all the parameters. The correlation matrix for DGC could not be calculated because of non variance among the means. Daily food intake (DFI) showed negative correlation with assimilation (-0.20) only, while as faecal output (FO) showed negative relation with assimilation (-0.24). The correlation matrix could easily portray the interlinks between the growth parameters used for assessment of the protein concentrates on growth of *Cyprinus carpio* fingerlings.

**Table 1: Overall Mean ± SD of growth and feed performance of *Cyprinus carpio communis* fingerlings fed on conventional feed (Control) and formulated feeds (N = 180D)**

Treatment Groups	Replicas	Parameters															
		IW (g)	FW (g)	NWG	BWG	ADWG	AWWG	SGR	FCR	Feeding rate	DGC	TGC	DFI $\text{gd}^{-1} \text{fish}^{-1}$	PI Total (mg/fish)	Faecal Output	Ass.	S%
Ctrl	Mean	1.51	5.80	4.30	285.90	0.05	0.36	1.50	2.41	2.17	0.01	0.16	45.15	60.42	35.19	8.59	86.60
	±SD	±0.08 <sup>a</sup>	±0.00 <sup>b</sup>	±0.08 <sup>b</sup>	±19.95 <sup>a</sup>	±0.00 <sup>b</sup>	±0.01 <sup>b</sup>	±0.06 <sup>a</sup>	±0.00 <sup>b</sup>	±0.00 <sup>b</sup>	±0.00 <sup>a</sup>	±0.22 <sup>a</sup>	±2.33 <sup>a</sup>	±2.50 <sup>c</sup>	±0.09 <sup>b</sup>	±0.16 <sup>c</sup>	±0.00 <sup>a</sup>
DT1	Mean	1.57	6.85	5.28	336.67	0.06	0.44	1.64	1.74	1.56	0.01	0.31	47.10	85.86	38.54	8.91	93.33
	±SD	±0.06 <sup>a</sup>	±0.07 <sup>b</sup>	±0.13 <sup>a</sup>	±20.24 <sup>a</sup>	±0.00 <sup>b</sup>	±0.01 <sup>a</sup>	±0.05 <sup>b</sup>	±0.09 <sup>c</sup>	±0.08 <sup>a</sup>	±0.00 <sup>c</sup>	±0.00 <sup>a</sup>	±1.70 <sup>b</sup>	±3.67 <sup>a</sup>	±0.58 <sup>a</sup>	±0.25 <sup>b</sup>	±0.00 <sup>a</sup>
DT2	Mean	1.55	7.95	6.41	415.10	0.07	0.53	1.82	1.39	1.25	0.01	0.31	46.35	113.23	41.08	9.18	91.67
	±SD	±0.08 <sup>b</sup>	±0.07 <sup>a</sup>	±0.01 <sup>a</sup>	±21.36 <sup>a</sup>	±0.00 <sup>b</sup>	±0.00 <sup>a</sup>	±0.05 <sup>c</sup>	±0.00 <sup>b</sup>	±0.00 <sup>c</sup>	±0.00 <sup>a</sup>	±0.00 <sup>c</sup>	±2.33 <sup>b</sup>	±2.59 <sup>a</sup>	±0.13 <sup>c</sup>	±0.13 <sup>a</sup>	±2.35 <sup>b</sup>
DT3	Mean	1.54	8.40	6.87	447.35	0.08	0.57	1.89	1.08	0.97	0.01	0.31	46.05	144.43	41.02	10.06	95.00
	±SD	±0.02 <sup>a</sup>	±0.14 <sup>b</sup>	±0.16 <sup>b</sup>	±16.78 <sup>a</sup>	±0.00 <sup>b</sup>	±0.01 <sup>b</sup>	±0.03 <sup>a</sup>	±0.07 <sup>b</sup>	±0.06 <sup>a</sup>	±0.00 <sup>c</sup>	±0.00 <sup>c</sup>	±0.64 <sup>c</sup>	±4.32 <sup>a</sup>	±0.18 <sup>b</sup>	±0.08 <sup>a</sup>	±2.35 <sup>b</sup>
DT4	Mean	1.57	7.66	6.09	389.25	0.07	0.51	1.76	1.63	1.47	0.01	0.31	46.95	151.62	47.00	8.07	88.33
	±SD	±0.05 <sup>a</sup>	±0.13 <sup>b</sup>	±0.08 <sup>b</sup>	±6.89 <sup>c</sup>	±0.00 <sup>a</sup>	±0.01 <sup>b</sup>	±0.02 <sup>c</sup>	±0.08 <sup>a</sup>	±0.07 <sup>c</sup>	±0.00 <sup>b</sup>	±0.00 <sup>a</sup>	±1.48 <sup>c</sup>	±3.35 <sup>c</sup>	±0.04 <sup>a</sup>	±0.09 <sup>b</sup>	±2.36 <sup>a</sup>

IW (g) = Initial weight; FW (g) = Final Weight; NWG = Net Weight Gain; BWG = Body Weight Gain; ADWG = Average Daily Weight gain; AWWG = Average Weekly Weight Gain; SGR = Specific Growth Rate; FCR = Food Conversion Ratio; DGC = Daily Growth Coefficient; TGC = Thermal Growth Coefficient; DFI ( $\text{gd}^{-1} \text{fish}^{-1}$ ) = Daily Feed Intake; PI (mg/fish) = Protein Intake; Ass. = Assimilation; S (%) = Survival

**Note:** Values are means±SD of three replications (d.f. 4, 9). Means in the same row having different superscripts are significantly different ( $P < 0.05$ ) and values in the same row with same superscript are not significantly different ( $P > 0.05$ ).

**Table 2: Correlation matrix of various growth parameters of *Cyprinus carpio communis* fed on four formulated diets with varying crude protein concentration**

Parameters	IW (g)	FW (g)	NWG	BWG	ADWG	AWWG	SGR	FCR	FR	DGC	TGC	DFI	PI	FO	Ass.	S%
IW (g)	1.00															
FW (g)	0.47	1.00														
NWG	0.44	1.00	1.00													
BWG	0.37	0.99	1.00	1.00												
ADWG	0.41	0.99	0.99	0.99	1.00											
AWWG	0.45	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.99	1.00										
SGR	0.41	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.99	1.00	1.00									
FCR	-0.47	-0.98	-0.98	-0.97	-0.97	-0.97	-0.98	1.00								
FR	-0.47	-0.98	-0.97	-0.97	-0.96	-0.97	-0.97	1.00	1.00							
DGC	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1.00						
TGC	0.85	0.83	0.82	0.78	0.78	0.82	0.80	-0.86	-0.86	NA	1.00					
DFI	1.00	0.42	0.40	0.32	0.36	0.41	0.37	-0.44	-0.44	NA	0.84	1.00				
PI	0.52	0.88	0.88	0.86	0.91	0.89	0.87	-0.80	-0.80	NA	0.73	0.47	1.00			
FO	0.69	0.68	0.67	0.63	0.67	0.69	0.65	-0.56	-0.56	NA	0.69	0.64	0.90	1.00		
ASS	-0.20	0.53	0.54	0.58	0.56	0.53	0.57	-0.65	-0.65	NA	0.28	-0.20	0.18	-0.24	1.00	
S%	0.37	0.66	0.66	0.65	0.66	0.65	0.66	-0.80	-0.81	NA	0.71	0.39	0.36	0.07	0.82	1.00

IW (g) = Initial weight; FW (g) = Final Weight; NWG = Net Weight Gain; BWG = Body Weight Gain; ADWG = Average Daily Weight gain; AWWG = Average Weekly Weight Gain; SGR = Specific Growth Rate; FCR = Food Conversion Ratio; FR = Feeding Rate; DGC = Daily Growth Coefficient; TGC = Thermal Growth Coefficient; DFI (gd<sup>-1</sup> fish<sup>-1</sup>) = Daily Feed Intake; PI (mg/fish) = Protein Intake; FO = Faecal output; Ass. = Assimilation; S (%) = Survival

## DISCUSSION

The growth and feed performance of the fishes after inclusion of varying doses of proteins, lipids and carbohydrate has been established by so many authors in different classes of fishes, which include commendable contribution of Noor *et al.* [32] (Silver barb, *Barbodes gonionotus* Bleeker); Hanumanthappa *et al.* [15]; Shoaib *et al.* [40]; Buyukcapar and Kamalak, [10]; Paltenea Elpida *et al.* [33]; Moein *et al.* [28]; Hojatollah Jafaryan *et al.* [17]; Kumar *et al.* [22]; Sudeshna *et al.* [47]; Moein, [27]; Akrami *et al.* [4]; Firas & Ramadan, [14]; Bambroo, [7]; Mohapatra & Patra, [29] (Common carp, *Cyprinus carpio*), Lixin Wu & Dong, [24] (Chinese shrimp, *Fenneropenaeus chinensis*); Abid and Salim, [1]; Kalita *et al.* [21] (*Cirrhinus mrigala*); Wilson *et al.* [56]; Solomon *et al.* [44]; Tonye and Sikoki, [54]; Zeinab *et al.* [58] (Nile tilapia, *Oreochromis niloticus* L.); Sheng Wang, [39]; Zhen-Yu Du *et al.* [59] (*Ctenopharyngodon idella*); Singh *et al.*, [41]; Mondal *et al.* [30]; Maity & Patra, [26]; Xue *et al.*, [57] (Japanese Sea Bass, *Lateolabrax japonicus*); Umaru, [55]; Adewole & Olaleye, [2]; Tiamiyu *et al.* [53] (*Clarias gariepinus*); Jatuporn Bundit, [20] (The Marble Goby, *Oxyeleotris marmoratus*); Kalita *et al.* [21]; Savita *et al.* [37] (*Catla catla*); Muthukumar & Kandeepan, [31] (*Mystus cavasius*); Radhika *et al.* [35] (*Mollinesia latipinna*); Effiong *et al.* [12] (*Heterobranchus longifilis*); Thepparath Ungsethaphand, [52] (Hybrid red tilapia (*Oreochromis mossambicus* × *O. niloticus*)); Stavros Chatzifotis *et al.* [45] (Meagre, *Argyrosomus regius*); Ta'ati *et al.* [49] (Great sturgeon, *Huso huso*); Tendulkar and Kulkarni, [51] (Banana prawn, *Fenneropenaeus merguensis* (De Man, 1888)); Arkadios Dimitroglou *et al.* 2011 (Atlantic Salmon (*Salmo salar* L.)); Bhavan and Radhakrishnan, [9] (*Macrobrachiu malcomsonii*); Lone *et al.* [25] (*Tor tor* (Hamilton, 1822)); and Jamali *et al.* [19] (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*).

During the present experiment, the maximum growth was observed in fingerlings fed on DT<sub>3</sub> (35%) in terms of average final weight (8.50 in replica first and 8.30 in replica second; 8.40±0.14<sup>b</sup>), NWG (6.98 in replica first and 6.75 in replica second; 6.87±0.16<sup>b</sup>), BWG (459.21 in replica first and 435.48 in replica second; 447.35±16.78<sup>a</sup>), ADWG (0.08 in replica first and 0.08 in replica second; 0.08±0.00<sup>b</sup>), AWWG (0.58 in replica first and 0.56 in replica second; 0.57±0.01<sup>b</sup>), SGR (1.91 in replica first and 1.86 in replica second; 1.89±0.03<sup>a</sup>), Daily growth coefficient (0.01±0.00<sup>c</sup>), Thermal growth coefficient (0.31±0.00<sup>c</sup>), Daily feed intake (45.60 in replica first and 46.50 in replica second; 46.05±0.64<sup>c</sup>), Protein Intake (144.01 in replica first and 144.86 in replica second; 144.43±4.32<sup>a</sup>), Faecal output (41.14 in replica first and 40.89 in replica second; 41.02±0.18<sup>b</sup>), Assimilation (10.0 in replica first and 10.12 in replica second; 10.06±0.08<sup>a</sup>) and survival

(96.66 in replica first and 93.33 in replica second; 95.00±2.35<sup>a</sup>), while as two parameters showed minimum values i.e., FCR (1.03 in replica first and 1.13 in replica second; 1.08±0.07<sup>b</sup>), and Feeding Rate (0.93 in replica first and 1.02 in replica second; 0.97±0.06<sup>a</sup>), which proved that inclusion of 35% crude protein in diet of Common carp has good growth results.

Erkan *et al.* [13] studied the inclusion of isonitrogenous and isoenergetic (38% crude protein, 15.75 kJ g 100% FM protein in Common carp diet for 13 weeks. Results indicated that final weight, specific growth rate and feed efficiency ratio of fish fed with different SSM replacement diets did not differ significantly (p>0.05) from fish fed the control diet. No significant differences were noted among experimental treatments on dry matter, protein, lipid and ash contents of the fish body composition (p>0.05). The authors focused on sand smelt exclusive inclusion for better growth performance of fish. Common carp (*Cyprinus carpio*) is one of the most widely cultured fish species in the world. The nutritional requirements for growth, reproduction and normal physiological functions of fish are similar to other animals, but generally fish need more proteins in their diet. Due to this, the efficiency in the use and utilization of proteins is more significant for fish than for other animals.

A 90-day feeding experiment was conducted to evaluate the influences of vitamin C (Ascorbic Acid, AA) on growth parameters Common Carp (*Cyprinus carpio*) by Moein [27]. At the end of the experiment, growth and feeding parameters, carcass composition and survival rate of fries were evaluated using 38% CP. The authors reported that the specific growth rate (SGR), food conversation efficiency (FCE) were increased significantly (P<0.05) and highest SGR was observed. However, no significant differences in survival rate was observed between the treatments (P<0.05).

In yet another trial, a study evaluated the suitability of chicken intestine as an alternate protein source of fish meal for grass carp fry diet by Amtul and Amna [5]. All the diets were designed to contain equivalent levels of -nitrogen -lipids and energy resulting in diets with 35% protein, 10% lipid and 429-431kcal energy per 100g diet. The authors reported higher growth and lowest feed conversion ratio for treatments with higher growth and vice versa. Sivani *et al.* (2013) reported best growth in terms of weight gain (35.2g), specific growth rate (4.67), protein efficiency ratio (PER) (2.7), feed conversion ratio (FCR) (2.5) in Common carp fed with 30% crude protein. The observations by the above authors lends complete support to our findings. Mohapatra and Patra [29] lends support to our findings who observed highest total weight gain (9.48±0.47) body weight gain



(578.04±2.74) growth rate (g/day) (0.079±0.03) in Common carp fed with diets containing 34% CP. Studies by Jahan et al. [18] have revealed an increase in final weight, average live weight gain, specific growth rate (SGR), lower food conversion ratio (FCR), protein efficacy ratio (PER) and apparent net protein utilization (ANPU%) and survival of fingerlings of *Labeo rohita* fed on 28% CP, a soybean meal based diet. Carcass composition also revealed high protein and lipid in fish fed on the same protein diet.

Peyman et al. [34] reported the significantly higher ( $P<0.05$ ) values for final weight, weigh gain rate (WGR%), specific growth rate (SGR), food conversion ratio (FCR) and protein efficiency rate (PER) in Common carp fingerlings fed with diets containing 30%±0.8 crude protein. Similarly, the nutritional value of feeding *Cyprinus carpio* with various levels of raw watermelon seed meal was evaluated by Tiamiyu et al. [53]. Five diets of 35% crude protein were formulated with different levels of raw seed meal at 0%, 5%, 10%, 15% and 20% inclusion. The results revealed best mean weight gain, feed conversion ratio, feed conversion efficiency, protein efficiency ratio, apparent net protein utilization, specific growth rate and survival rate. The authors lend complete support to our findings.

The work of Rahman et al. [36] contradicts with the present findings in the crude protein inclusion versus the growth rate. The authors reported better growth in *Cyprinus carpio* fingerlings (Av. Wt. (g) = 14.54±2.02) fed with food containing 45.64%±1.47. However authors reported a decreasing trend in growth after inclusion of 48.10%±1.75 crude protein, which supports our findings of inclusion of 40% CP showing retarded growth coefficients. Effect of dietary probiotics supplementation on growth performance of Rohu, *Labeo rohita* fingerlings was carried out by Sayanti et al. [38], who reported highest growth performance and feed utilization efficiencies in fishes with protein inclusion levels of 36%, which completely supports our findings. Tiamiyu et al. [53] reported highest mean weight gain, specific growth rate, protein efficiency ratio in DT2 (CP = 35.14%) while lower values were recorded in DT5 (CP = 34.73%). Zeinab et al. [58] used 37.58% CP in the basal diet to evaluate effect of *Spirulina platensis* and *Lactobacillus rhamnosus* on growth and biochemical performance of Nile Tilapia (*Oreochromis niloticus*) fingerlings. The authors reported highest Average daily gain (0.48), Weight gain (20.16) and SGR (0.33) in test fishes with inclusion level of 37.58% CP, which more or less supports our findings.

## REFERENCES

1. Abid, M., & Salim, M. (2004). Efficacy of varying dietary protein levels on growth, feed conversion and body composition of *Cirrhinus mrigala* fingerlings. *Pak. j. life soc. Sci*, 2(2), 91-94.
2. Adewole, H. A., & Olaleye, V. F. (2014). Growth performance in *Clarias gariepinus* Burchell fingerlings fed blood meal – bovine rumen digesta blend diets. *Ife Journal of Science*, 16 (3), 495-503.
3. Ai, Q., Mai, K., Tan, B., Xu, W., Duan, Q., Ma, H., & Zhang, L. (2006). Replacement of fish meal by meat and bone meal in diets for large Yellow croaker (*Pseudosciaena crocea*). *Aquaculture*, 260, 255-263.
4. Akrami, R., Razeghi-Mansour, M., Chitsaz, H., Ziaee, R., & Ahmadi, Z. (2012). Effect of dietary mannan oligosaccharide on growth performance, survival, body composition and some hematological parameters of carp juvenile (*Cyprinus carpio*). *J. Anim. Sci. Adv*, 2(11), 879-885.
5. Tabinda, A. B., & Butt, A. (2012). Replacement of fish meal with poultry by-product meal (chicken intestine) as a protein source in Grass carp fry diet. *Pakistan J. Zool*, 44(5), 1373-1381.
6. Dimitroglou, A., Reynolds, P., Ravnay, B., Johnsen, F., Sweetman, J. W., Johansen, J., & Davies, S. J. (2011). The effect of Mannan oligosaccharide supplementation on Atlantic salmon smolts (*Salmo salar* L.) fed diets with high levels of plant proteins. *J. Aquac. Res. Development*. doi:10.4172/2155-9546.S1-011.
7. Bambroo, P. (2012). On the diet substitution and adaptation weight in carp *Cyprinus carpio* larvae. *Indian J. Sci. Res*, 3(1), 133-136.
8. Bekcan, S., Dogankaya, L., & Cakirogullari, G. C. (2006). Growth and body composition of European catfish (*Silurus glanis* L.) fed diets containing different percentages of protein. *The Israeli Journal of Aquaculture Bamidgeh*, 58,137-142.
9. Bhavan, P. S., & Radhakrishnan, S. (2012). Nutritional indices and biochemical constituents in the prawn *Macrobrachium malcomsonii* fed with formulated feeds. *International Journal of Pharma and Biosciences*, 3 (2), 327-336.
10. Buyukcapar, H. M., & Kamalak, A. (2007). Partial replacement of fish and soyabean meal protein in mirror carp (*Cyprinus carpio*) diets by protein in hazelnut meal. *South African Journal of Animal Sciences*, 37(1), 35-44.
11. De Silva, S. S., & Anderson, T. A. (1995). Fish Nutrition in Aquaculture. Chapman & Hall, New York, Tokyo, London. 319p.
12. Effiong, B. N., Sanni, A., & Fakunle, J. O. (2009). Effect of partial replacement of fishmeal with duckweed (*Lemna pauciscostata*) meal on the growth performance of *Heterobranchus longifilis* fingerlings. *Report and Opinion*, 1(3), 76-81.
13. Gümüş, E. (2011). Fatty acid composition of fry Mirror carp (*Cyprinus carpio*) fed graded levels of

- sand smelt (*Atherina boyeri*) meal. *Asian-Aust. J. Anim. Sci*, 24(2), 264 – 271.
14. Al-Jader, F. A. M., & Al-Sulevany, R. S. (2012). Evaluation of common carp *Cyprinus carpio* L. performance fed at three commercial diets. *Mesopotamia J. of Agri*, 40 (4), 20-26.
  15. Hanumanthappa, H., Keshavanath, P., Ramachandra, A. T., & Gangadhar, B. (2001). Effect of a non-hormonal feed additive, Cholymbi on growth, body composition and digestive enzyme activity of common carp, *Cyprinus carpio*. *Indian Journal of Experimental Biology*, 366-368.
  16. Hevroy, E. M., Espe, M., Waagbo, R., Sandness, K., Rund, M., & Hemre, G. (2005). Nutrition utilization in Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*) fed increased level of fish protein hydrolyses during a period of fast growth. *Aquacul. Nutr*, 11, 301-313.
  17. Jafaryan, H., Taati, M. M., & Jafarzadeh, M. (2011). The enhancement of growth parameters in common carp (*Cyprinus carpio*) larvae using probiotic in rearing tanks and feeding by various *Artemia nauplii*. *International Journal of the Bioflux Society*, 4(4), 511-518.
  18. Jahan, D. A., Hussain, L., Islam, M. A., & Khan, M. (2013). Comparative study of mustard oil cake and soybean meal based artificial diet for Rohu, *Labeo rohita* (Ham.) fingerlings. *The Agriculturists*, 11(1), 61-66.
  19. Jamali, H., Moghadam, H., Pariche, N., & Jafaryan, H. (2015). Effects of probiotic bacteria on survival, growth and body composition of rainbow trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*) larvae fed diets with various fish meal. *Journal of Coastal Life Medicine*, 3(2), 91-97.
  20. Bundit, J. (2007). The nutrition and feeding of a native thai species, the marble goby (*Oxyeleotris marmoratus*), involving on-farm and experimental studies. Ph.D. Thesis. Institute of Aquaculture, University of Stirling, Scotland.
  21. Kalita, P., Mukhopadhyay, P. K., & Kukherjee, A. K. (2008). Supplementation of four non-conventional aquatic weeds to the basal diet of *Catla catla* and *Cirrhinus mrigala* fingerlings: Effect on growth, protein utilization and body composition of fish. *Acta Ichthyologica Et Piscatoria*, 38(1), 21-27.
  22. Kumar, R. V., Ramesh, K. S., Patil, P., Kumar Naveen, B. T., & Manissery, J. K. (2011). Dietary protein requirement of stunted fingerlings of rohu, *Labeo rohita* (Hamilton) during grow out stage. *Indian Journal of Fisheries*, 58(4), 49-53.
  23. Lim, C., & Poernomo, A. (1985). Problems in shrimp feeds and feeding. In: *Fish Nutrition and Feed Technology Research in Indonesia*. RIIF, CRFI, AARP, Ministry of Agriculture, Republic of Indonesia, 139-149pp.
  24. Wu, L., & Dong, S. (2002). Effects of protein restriction with subsequent realimentation on growth performance of juvenile Chinese shrimp (*Fenneropenaeus chinensis*). *Aquaculture*, 210, 343-358.
  25. Akram, L., Swapna, L., & Rakhmat, S. (2014). Growth patterns of *Tor tor* (Hamilton, 1822) fed with various concentrations of protein diet. *Brazilian Online Journal*, 3, 01-06.
  26. Joydev, M., & Patra, B. C. (2008). Effect of replacement of fishmeal by *Azolla* leaf meal on growth, food utilization, pancreatic protease activity and RNA/DNA ratio in the fingerlings of *Labeo rohita* (Ham.). *Canadian Journal of Pure & Applied Sciences*, 2(2), 323-333.
  27. Faramarzi, M. (2012). Effect of dietary vitamin C on growth and feeding parameters, carcass composition and survival rate of Common carp (*Cyprinus carpio*). *Global Veterinaria*, 8 (5), 507-510.
  28. Faramarzi, M., Kiaalvandi, S., & Iranshahi, F. (2011). The effect of probiotics on growth performance and body composition of Common carp (*Cyprinus carpio*). *Journal of Animal and Veterinary Advances*, 10 (18), 2408-2413.
  29. Mohapatra, S. B., & Patra, A. K. (2013). Utilization of Water Hyacinth (*Eichhornia crasipes*) meal as partial replacement for fish meal on the growth performance of *Cyprinus carpio* fry. *International Research Journal of Biological Sciences*, 2(12), 85-89.
  30. Mondal, K., Kaviraj, A., Mukhopadhyay, P. K., Datta, M., & Sengupta, C. (2007). Evaluation of fermented fish offal in formulated diet of the Indian Major Carp, Rohu, *Labeo rohita* (Hamilton). *Acta Ichthyologica Et Piscatoria*, 37 (2), 99-105.
  31. Muthukumar, P., & Kandeepan, C. (2009). Supplementation of four protein percentage to the basal diet of Catfish (*Mystus cavasius*) fingerlings: to analyse the optimum level of protein and body composition of fish. *Journal of Aquaculture Feed Science and Nutrition*, 1(4), 84-89.
  32. Noor, J., Hossain, M. A., Bari, M. M., & Azimuddin, K. M. (2000). Effects of duckweed (*Lemna minor*) as dietary fishmeal substitute for silver barb (*Barbodes gonionotus* Bleeker). *Bangladesh J. Fish*, 4(1), 35-42.
  33. Elpida, P., Patriche, N., Elena, J., Marilena, T., & Elena, M. (2008). Rearing efficiency and nutritional quality assesment for carp sapling (*Cyprinus carpio* Linne, 1758) from recirculating systems. *Lucrari Stiintifice Zootehnie si Biotehnologii*, 41 (2), 112-118.
  34. Yar-Ahmadi, P., Moradi, N., & Ghysvandi, N. (2014). The effect of dietary supplemented with Synbiotic (Biomim IMBO) on growth performance, carcass composition, hematological and serum biochemical parameters of Common carp. *Journal of Chemical, Biological and Physical Sciences*, 4(3), 2129-2139.



35. Radhika, D., Veerabahu, C., & Marippandi, M. (2009). Effect of sewage cultured *Lemna minor* on growth of *Mollinesia latipinna* fed on mixed diets. *Current World Environment*, 4(2), 393-403.
36. Mahabubur, R. M., Hossain, M. D., Saha, A. K., & Islam, M. S. (2014). Effects of euglenophytes supplemented feed on the growth and carcass composition of common carp (*Cyprinus carpio* var. *specularis*). *Research Journal of Agriculture and Environmental Management*, 3(2), 137-144.
37. Kotnala, S., Dhar, P., Das, P., & Chatterji, A. (2010). Growth performance of fingerlings of the Indian Major Carp, *Catla catla* (Ham.) fed with feeds supplemented with different seaweeds. *Pertanika J. Sci. & Technol*, 18 (2), 255-262.
38. Saha, S., Hassan, M. A., & Sharma, A. P. (2015). Effect of dietary probiotics supplementation on growth performance of Rohu, *Labeo rohita* fingerlings. *Int J Pharm Bio Sci*, 6(1), 1260 – 1268.
39. Wang, S., Liu, Y. J., Tian, L. X., Xie, M. Q., Yang, H. J., Wang, Y., & Liang, G. Y. (2005). Quantitative dietary lysine requirement of juvenile grass carp *Ctenopharyngodon idella*. *Aquaculture*, 249, 419-429.
40. Shoaib, M., Kazmi, S., Ameer, F., Nasir, M., & Ali, M. (2006). Effect of dietary protein on growth response of Common carp (*Cyprinus carpio*). *Int. J. Biol. Biotech*, 3(2), 339-343.
41. Singh, P. K., Gaur, S. R., Barik, P., Shukla, S., & Singh, S. (2005). Effect of protein levels on growth and digestibility in the Indian Major Carp, *Labeo rohita* (Hamilton) using slaughter house waste as the protein source. *International Journal of Agriculture & Biology*, 07(6), 939–941.
42. Sivani, G., Reddy, D. C., & Bhaskar, M. (2013). Effect of Nymphaea meal incorporated diets on growth, feed efficiency and body composition in fingerlings of *Cyprinus carpio* L. *Journal of Applied and Natural Science*, 5 (1), 5-9.
43. Sivani, G., Sharma, G. R. K., & Bhaskar, M. (2013). Effect of commercial probiotic supplemented diet on the growth and digestive enzyme activity in the fingerlings of Common carp *Cyprinus carpio* (L). *International Journal of Advanced Scientific and Technical Research*, 3 (4), 1-11.
44. Solomon, S. G., Tiamiyu, L. O., & Agaba, U. J. (2007). Effect of feeding different grain sources on the growth performance and body composition of Tilapia (*Oreochromis niloticus*) fingerlings fed in outdoor hapas. *Pakistan Journal of Nutrition*, 6(3), 271-275.
45. Chatzifotis, S., Panagiotidou, M., Papaioannou, N., Pavlidis, M., Nengas, I., & Mylonas, C. C. (2010). Effect of dietary lipid levels on growth, feed utilization, body composition and serum metabolites of meagre (*Argyrosomus regius*) juveniles. *Aquaculture*, 307, 65–70.
46. Steffens, W. (1989). Principles of Fish Nutrition. Ellis Horwood Limited, Chichester, New York, Toronto. 384p.
47. Mukherjee, S., Parial, D., Khatoon, N., Chaudhuri, A., Senroy, S., Homechaudhuri, S., & Pal, R. (2011). Effect of Formulated Algal Diet on growth performance of *Labeo rohita* Hamilton. *J. Algal Biomass Utiln*, 2 (4), 1–9.
48. Sveier, H., Raae, A. J., & Lied, E. (2000). Growth and protein turnover in – Atlantic Salmon (*Salmo salar* L.): the effect of dietary protein level and protein size. *Aquaculture*, 185, 10-20.
49. Ta'ati, R., Soltani, M., Bahmani, M., & Zamini, A. A. (2011). Growth performance, carcass composition, and immunophysiological indices in juvenile great sturgeon (*Huso huso*) fed on commercial prebiotic, Immunoster. *Iranian Journal of Fisheries Sciences*, 10(2), 324-335.
50. Tacon, A. G. J (1990). Standard method for nutritional and feeding of farmed fish and shrimp. *Argent librations press*, 1, 117.
51. Medha, T., & Kulkarni, A. S. (2011). Effect of different dietary protein levels on growth, survival and biochemical aspects of Banana prawn, *Fenneropenaeus merguensis* (De Man, 1888). *Int J Biol Med Res*. 2(4): 1140 – 1143.
52. Ungsethaphand, T., Peerapornpisal, Y., Whanchai, N., & Sardud, U. (2010). Effect of feeding *Spirulina platensis* on growth and carcass composition of hybrid red tilapia (*Oreochromis mossambicus* x *O. niloticus*). *Maejo Int. J. Sci. Technol*, 4(2), 331-336.
53. Lateef, O. T., Ayuba, V. O., Okomoda, V. T., & Umar, S. (2014). Effect of various levels of raw *Citrullus lanatus* seed meal diets on growth performance of *Cyprinus carpio* fingerlings. *Jordan Journal of Biological Sciences*, 7(4), 269-274.
54. Adaba, T. I., & Sikoki, F. D. (2014). Growth performance and proximate composition of *Oreochromis niloticus* (Trewavas) fed cobalt chloride incorporated diet. *Journal of Biology, Agriculture and Healthcare*, 4(5), 106-125.
55. Korau, U. E. (2010). Evaluation of nutrient density on the growth performance of *Clarias gariepinus*. Ph.D. Thesis. Department of Water Resources, Aquaculture and Fishery Technology. School of Agriculture and Agricultural Technology, Minna, Niger State.
56. Wilson, R. P. (1994). Utilization of dietary carbohydrate by fish (review). *Aquaculture*, 124, 67-80.
57. Xue, M., Luo, L., Wu, X., Ren, Z., Gao, P., Yu, Y., & Pearl, G. (2006). Effects of six alternate lipid sources on growth and tissue fatty acid composition in Japanese sea bass (*Lateolabrax japonicus*). *Aquaculture*, 260, 206-214.

58. Zeinab, A. K., Aly, M. S., Faiza, A. K., & Fatma, E. M. (2015). Effect of *Spirulina platensis* and *Lactobacillus rhamnosus* on growth and biochemical performance of Nile Tilapia(*Oreochromis niloticus*) fingerlings. *International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences*, 4(4), 747-763.
59. Du, Z. Y., Tian, L. X., Liang, G. Y., Lan, H. B., & Liu, Y. J. (2009). The instestinal evacuation and maximum daily consumption of purified formulated diets by juvenile grass carp (*Ctenopharyngodon idella*). *The open Fish Science Journal*, 2, 1-5.