

GROWTH PROMOTING AND IMMUNOSTIMULATORY EFFECTS OF FEED PROBIOTIC (PROTEUS) IN *LABEOROHITA* (HAMILTON) FINGERLINGS

Praveen Kumar¹, B K Sharma², B Uppadhyay³, Sharad R Surnar¹ and Rohitash Yadav¹

¹Research Scholar, Department of Aquaculture, College of Fisheries, MPUAT,
Udaipur (Rajasthan)

²Professor, College of Fisheries, MPUAT, Udaipur (Rajasthan)

³Professor, Rajasthan College of Agriculture, MPUAT, Udaipur (Rajasthan)

Abstract: The present study deals with the “Growth Promoting and Immunostimulatory Effects of Feed Probiotic (Proteus) in *Labeo rohita* (Hamilton) Fingerlings”. The experiment was conducted in triplicate for each test diet. During experiment of 60 days, the fingerlings of rohu (*Labeo rohita*) were fed on four different probiotic (Proteus), mixed in basal diet containing rice bran, groundnut cake, fish meal and mineral mixture. The four doses of probiotic (Proteus) have been mixed with conventional carp diet at T₁ 2g/kg, T₂3g/kg, T₃ 4 g/kg, T₄5g/kg and Control 0g/kg of Probiotics were used. The control diet containing rice bran, groundnut cake, fish meal and mineral mixture was also run separately. These experimental feeds were given to fishes @4% of body weight per day. The growth performance of test fishes was observed at every fortnight and accordingly the diet of fishes was readjusted. During experimental period, the water quality parameters were found congenial for fish growth.

Keywords: Growth, Immunostimulatory, Probiotic, *Labeo rohita*, feed.

Introduction

In aquaculture feed accounts for bulk of the total cost and therefore hold key of success of fish farming. These growth point of view fish nutrition has great relevance to fish farming of intensive and semi intensive types. For achieving good growth of fish the feed must be nutritiously balanced with moderate amounts of protein, carbohydrate and minerals as deficiency for these ingredients in the supplementary diets may result ailment in the body of fish for growth. Considering this, search for ideal fish feed is growing process wherein, several attempts have been made so far upgrading the quality of supplementary fish diet for culturable fish.

Nowadays, probiotics are becoming an integral part of the aquaculture practices to obtain highproduction. Probiotics are live microorganisms thought to be beneficial to the host organism. The involvement of probiotics in nutrition, disease resistance and other beneficial

activities infish has proven beyond doubt. Indian freshwater aquaculture constitutes mainly culture of Indian Major Carp'sviz. (*Catla catla*, *Labeo rohita*, *Cirrhinus mrigala*). Carp culture in India constitutes 87% of total aquaculture production (Ayyappan and Jena, 2003). *Labeo rohita* is the most commercial fish with maximum market demand and acceptability as food by the consumers due to its taste and flesh quality in India.

Proteus is an optimum blend of feed probiotic of colony forming unit's counts of selected strains of *Proteus* spp. and entire spectrum of beneficial microorganisms for maintaining an optimal fish culture practices. They also help in decomposition of excess waste organic matter and suppress the growth of undesirable microbes in the pond and on the hosts, besides having an activity inside the gut. For pursuing such type of research probiotic (*Proteus*) have been taken as growth promoting ingredients in the traditional carp feed i.e. rice bran, groundnut cake, fish meal and mineral mixture for the rohu (*Labeo rohita*) fingerlings. These above four probiotic doses have been mixed with conventional carp diet at T₁ 2g/kg, T₂ 3g/kg, T₃ 4 g/kg, T₄ 5g/kg and Control 0g/kg of feed levels during the experimental period of 60 days, the fingerlings of rohu (*Labeo rohita*) were fed @ 4 % of their body weight per day.

Materials and Methods

This experiment was conducted in rectangular plastic tanks with 200 liters of bore-well water. In each tanks ten rohu (*Labeo rohita*) fingerlings were introduced from a homogenous stock with an average body weight of 4.637 ± 0.15 g. These fishes were acclimatized for 7 days prior to commencement of feeding trial with basal diet. Thereafter, the initial weight of fish was noted and food was given @ 4 % of their body weight per day. The quantity of feed required was adjusted accordingly with the increase in their body weight, which was recorded at every 15th day intervals. The growth parameters of fishes were monitored periodically, but haematological parameters were observed initially and at the end of experiments.

Preparation of Diet

Carp feed (with 24% protein) was formulated using groundnut cake, rice bran, fish meal and mineral mixture and a commercially available probiotic (*Proteus*). The treatment tank (T₀) considered as a control which was without probiotic, while groups T₁, T₂, T₃ and T₄ was included with probiotic and added at @ 2g/kg, 3g/kg, 4g/kg and 5g/kg of feed levels respectively.

Table: 1 Proximate composition of diet

| S. No. | Parameter | Control | T ₁ | T ₂ | T ₃ | T ₄ |
|--------|-------------------|---------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| 1 | Moisture (%) | 7.32 | 6.620 | 6.380 | 7.28 | 7.41 |
| 2 | Crude protein (%) | 23.50 | 23.66 | 23.85 | 23.78 | 23.48 |
| 3 | Fat (%) | 7.20 | 7.08 | 7.15 | 7.25 | 7.23 |
| 4 | Ash (%) | 9.45 | 10.08 | 9.75 | 9.12 | 9.29 |

Growth parameters of Fish

Growth measurement: Following growth parameters were studied using standard methods.

Growth:

Growth was measured as gain in body weight and also per cent gain in body weight.

Weight Gain

Weight gain was determined between the final weight and initial weight of experimental fish.

Weight gain (g) = Final weight (g) - Initial weight (g)

$$\% \text{ gain weight in g} = \frac{\text{Final weight} - \text{Initial weight}}{\text{Initial weight}} \times 100$$

Specific Growth Rate

$$\text{SGR (\%)} = \frac{(\ln \text{Wt} - \ln \text{Wo})}{D} \times 100$$

Where,

Wo = Initial weight of live fish (gm), Wt = Final weight of live fish (gm), D= Duration of feeding (days)

Feed Conversion Ratio (FCR):

$$\text{FCR (g)} = \frac{\text{Weight of food given (g)}}{\text{Weight gain of fish (g)}}$$

Gross conversion efficiency (GCE):

$$\text{GCE} = \frac{\text{Weight gained (g)}}{\text{Food given (g)}}$$

Proximate Analysis:

The proximate composition for experimental fish carcass was measured according to AOAC [1970] methods.

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

The statistical analysis of the measured parameters was carried out using standard statistical methods to draw meaningful conclusion.

Results:

The experimental results of water quality parameters, fish growth parameters and haematological parameters carried out during the experimental period are presented in (Tables 2 to 8). It is apprehended from the results of the present study that the fish growth parameters and haematological parameters were significantly different in all the treatments and control.

Growth parameters

Different doses of Proteus - a probiotic supplementation, revealed significant differences in growth rates among various treatments.

Weight gain

The diet T₃ bearing 4 g/kg gave the highest weight gain of (4.902 g), whereas, the lowest (3.090 g) being in (T₀) control (Table 2). The weight gain of fishes was noticed in the following ranking order T₃ (4.902) > T₄ (4.100) > T₂ (3.965) > T₁ (3.618 g) > T₀ (3.090). The total weight gain in per cent was highest (105.419 %) in T₃ as compared to (69.283 %) in Control. Whereas, the weight gain in T₄, T₂ and T₁ were 86.19 %, 82.43 % and 80.26 % respectively.

Statistical analysis of variance indicated that weight gain was significantly higher in all the treatments as compared to control. Moreover, the test of critical difference (CD) also indicated significantly difference CD = 0.188 between all the treatments in 0-60 days (Appendix-I). Similarly, the per cent weight gain in 60 days of feeding trial has also shown a statistically significant (CD = 6.619) increase in weight gain as compared to control).

Increase in length

The diet T₃ resulted in the highest increase in length of fish i.e. 5.531 cm, whereas, the lowest increase (3.104 cm) was recorded in T₀ i.e. control (Table 3). The diet (T₃) containing 4g/kg 'Probiotic (Proteus)' showed highest increase in length among the treatments followed by T₄ (4.017 cm), T₂ (3.981 cm) and T₁ (3.532 cm). Similarly, the total length increase in per cent was also higher in T₃ (71.893 %) followed by T₄ (53.041 %), T₂ (52.382 %), T₁ (49.746 %) and lowest in T₀ (41.204 %) i.e. control (Table 3).

Statistical analysis of variance indicated that length increase is significantly higher in all the treatments as compared to control. Moreover, the test of critical difference (CD) also indicated significant difference (CD= 0.315) between all the treatments. Similarly, the per cent length increase in 60 days of feeding trial has also shown a statistically significant (CD= 4.179) increase in length as compared to control.

Specific growth rate (SGR)

The value of specific growth rate is used to compare growth on a daily basis. The significantly higher growth rate and specific growth rate indicate the effective role of probiotics in the growth performance. The highest SGR (0.521%) was recorded in treatment T₃ (diet with 4g/kg *Proteus* supplement) after 60 days of experiment which was significantly different from T₀, T₁, T₂, and T₄ (P = 0.05). The treatments mean revealed that the best SGR was recorded in T₃ (0.521%), followed by T₄ (0.450), T₂ (0.435), T₁ (0.427) and lowest (0.381) in Control (Table 4) Thus, the treatment T₃ showed best SGR which was significantly (P = 0.05) high as compared to control T₀ as well as all other treatments.

Feed given

The amount of feed given to the fishes in 0-60 days, duration of investigation as per requirements. The maximum amount of food was given to the fishes in T₃ i.e., 14.5 g followed by T₄ (14.0 g), T₂ (13.9 g), T₁ (13.0 g) and T₀ (12.7 g) respectively.

The statistical analysis of variance indicates the amount of feed given was significantly higher from control to all other treatments.

Food conversion ratio (FCR)

The results on FCR in different treatment groups have been depicted in Table 5. The lowest FCR was found with T₃ (diet with 4g/kg. *Proteus* powder) which was significantly different from T₀, T₁, T₂, and T₄ (P = 0.05). The mean values of treatments revealed that the best FCR was recorded with T₃ (3.207), followed by T₄ (4.207), T₂ (4.653) and T₁ (4.765) and T₀ control (5.195). Thus, treatment T₃ showed best FCR which was significantly (P = 0.05, CD= 0.369) high as compared to control T₀ as well as all other treatments during 0-60 days of feeding experiment.

Gross conversion efficiency (GCE)

The results on gross conversion efficiency in different treatment groups have been depicted in Table 6. The best GCE (0.330) was recorded in treatment T₃ (diet with 4g/kg *Proteus*) followed by T₄ (0.282), T₂ (0.273), T₁ (0.267) and lowest in T₀ (0.236). The statistical analysis of variance also indicated significant difference (P = 0.05, CD= 0.022) of GCE between treatments and control during 0-60 days of experimental period.

Proximate Composition of Fish Carcass

The proximate composition of fish carcass has been assessed after the completion of experimental period, which has been shown in Table 7. The results have shown significant changes in the proximate composition of fingerlings fed with probiotic (*Proteus*) diets. The

protein, contents increased significantly in T₁, T₂, T₃ and T₄ as compared to control. The highest protein contents were recorded in T₃ (24.06%) followed by T₄, T₂, T₁ and Control, 22.82%, 22.75%, 20.64% and 20.22%, respectively. It is noteworthy that the protein values of fingerlings fed with basal diet was the lowest as compared to that of fingerlings fed with probiotic (Proteus) diets. That fat content was also found higher in the fingerlings fed with Probiotic (Proteus) diets as compared to that of control diet.

However, fat content of Control was higher (6.90 %) and lowest in T₃ (6.61%) followed by T₁, T₂, and T₄ i.e., 6.76, 6.74%, and 6.72, respectively. The carbohydrate values of Control, T₁, T₄, T₂ and T₃, were 3.71%, 3.34%, 2.25%, 1.26%, and 0.64% respectively. The moisture contents of whole fish were found in the order of T₂ > T₀ > T₁ > T₃ > T₄ where the moisture values of 66.77%, 66.45%, 66.26%, 66.08% and 65.50%, respectively were observed. The highest Ash contents recorded in treatment T₁, (3.00%), followed by Control, (2.72%), T₄, (2.71%), T₃ (2.61%) and lowest in treatment T₂ (2.48%) respectively.

Discussions

In general, the growth (net weight gain) in the control and other treatments in the present study was in following order: T₃ (4.902 g) > T₄ (4.100 g) > T₂ (3.965 g) > T₁ (3.618 g) > control (3.090 g). The per cent weight gain increase in treatments as compared to the control was as follows: T₃ (71.893 %) > T₄ (53.041 %) > T₂ (52.382 %) > T₁ (49.746 %) > control (41.204 %)

The mean values of treatments revealed that the best SGR was recorded in T₃ (0.521%), followed by T₄ (0.450), T₂ (0.435), T₁ (0.427) and lowest (0.381) in T₀ (control). The results are in conformity with the findings of Bisht and Pandey (2013) who found higher SGRs compared to control in *Labeo rohita* fed with *Bacillus subtilis* incorporated diets for 90 days. Sahu *et al.* (2007) and Dhawan and Kaur (2002) have also found that the provision of each additional input including fertilization such as cowdung, urea and single super phosphate, and supplementary feed did affect fish growth.

The mean values of treatments revealed that the best FCR was recorded with T₃ (3.207), followed by T₄ (4.207), T₂ (4.653) and T₁ (4.765) and T₀ control (5.195). Ramos *et al.* (2013) have conducted an experiment to evaluate the effect of dietary supplementation of multi species (*A. bacillus sp.*, *Pediococcus sp.*, *Enterococcus sp.*, *Lactobacillus sp.*) and single species probiotics (*B. pediococcus acidilactici*) on growth performance and gut microbial composition of rainbow trout (*Onchorhynchus mykiss*). The results showed that dietary supplementation changed the gut microbial composition and improved growth in the

fish. De Silva and Davy (1992) have stated that digestibility of fish plays an important role in lowering the FCR value by efficient utilization of food. The digestibility depends on daily feeding rate, its frequency, and the type of food used (Chiu *et al.*, 1989). The wastage of food might also lead to poor feed utilization and higher FCR.

In the present study the best GCE (0.330) was recorded in treatment T₃ (diet with 4g/kg. *Proteus*) followed by T₄ (0.282), T₂ (0.273), T₁ (0.267) and lowest in T₀ (0.236). Suzer *et al.* (2008) in his study investigated the influence of commercial probiotic supplementation on the larval stages of Gilthead Sea bream (*Sparusaurata*, L.). Both growth performance and digestive enzyme activities increased in the treatment as compared to control. This is in agreements with those of Steffens (1989). Thus, it is evident that the diet T₃ (diet with *Proteus* 4 g/kg) has a great potential in aquaculture as a growth promoter for *Labeo rohita* (Ham.) fingerlings. In view of the above discussion and results it may be concluded that the growth (net weight gain) and its indices such as SGR, FCR and GCE are found to be favorable in T₃ with diet having *Proteus* 4 g/kg was incorporated in diet of *Labeo rohita* (Ham.) fingerlings. Hence, it is inferred that this diet T₃ is optimum under agro-climatic condition of southern Rajasthan.

Acknowledgement

Authors record their sincere thanks to Dean, College of Fisheries for their encouragement and for extending facilities for conducting this research.

Table: 2 Average weight gain of Rohu, *Labeo rohita* (Ham.) fingerlings fed with varying levels of Probiotic (*Proteus*) mixed diet

| S. No. | Treatment | Initial weight (g) | Fish weight gain (g) | | | | Total net weight gain (g) | Percent weight gain |
|--------------|----------------|--------------------|-------------------------|---|--|---|---------------------------|---------------------|
| | | | 0 -15 th day | 16 th - 30 th day | 31 th -45 th day | 46 th - 60 th day | | |
| 1. | Control | 4.460 | 0.265 | 0.738 | 0.990 | 1.097 | 3.090 | 69.283 |
| 2. | T ₁ | 4.507 | 0.283 | 0.764 | 1.227 | 1.344 | 3.618 | 80.275 |
| 3. | T ₂ | 4.810 | 0.315 | 0.786 | 1.410 | 1.454 | 3.965 | 82.432 |
| 4. | T ₃ | 4.650 | 0.595 | 1.177 | 1.428 | 1.702 | 4.902 | 105.419 |
| 5. | T ₄ | 4.757 | 0.365 | 0.987 | 1.311 | 1.437 | 4.100 | 86.189 |
| CD at 0.05 % | | 0.221 | 0.017 | 0.040 | 0.064 | 0.068 | 0.188 | 6.619 |
| CV % | | 2.62 | 2.53 | 2.49 | 2.76 | 2.66 | 2.63 | 4.29 |

Table: 3 Average increase in length of Rohu, *Labeo rohita* (Ham.) fingerlings fed with varying levels of Probiotic (Proteus) mixed diet

| S. No. | Treatment | Initial length (cm) | Fish length (cm) | | | | Total net increase in length (cm) | Percent increase in length |
|--------------|----------------|---------------------|-------------------------|---|---|--|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|
| | | | 0 -15 th day | 16 th - 30 th day | 31 th - 45 th day | 46 th -60 th day | | |
| 1. | Control | 7.533 | 0.270 | 0.741 | 0.994 | 1.099 | 3.104 | 41.204 |
| 2. | T ₁ | 7.100 | 0.285 | 0.767 | 1.131 | 1.349 | 3.532 | 49.746 |
| 3. | T ₂ | 7.600 | 0.317 | 0.789 | 1.415 | 1.460 | 3.981 | 52.382 |
| 4. | T ₃ | 7.693 | 0.597 | 1.791 | 1.434 | 1.709 | 5.531 | 71.893 |
| 5. | T ₄ | 7.573 | 0.367 | 0.891 | 1.317 | 1.442 | 4.017 | 53.041 |
| CD at 0.05 % | | 0.351 | 0.017 | 0.045 | 0.065 | 0.070 | 0.315 | 4.179 |
| CV % | | 2.58 | 2.53 | 2.47 | 2.85 | 2.72 | 4.30 | 4.28 |

Table: 4 Specific growth rate (SGR) of Rohu, *Labeo rohita* (Ham.) fingerlings fed with varying levels of Probiotic (Proteus) mixed diet

| S. No. | Treatment | Specific growth rate (SGR) of fingerlings (g/day) in per cent | | | | Average SGR |
|--------------|----------------|---|--|--|--|-------------|
| | | 0 -15 th day | 16 th -30 th day | 31 th -45 th day | 46 th -60 th day | |
| 1. | Control | 0.167 | 0.420 | 0.482 | 0.455 | 0.381 |
| 2. | T ₁ | 0.176 | 0.428 | 0.578 | 0.524 | 0.427 |
| 3. | T ₂ | 0.184 | 0.413 | 0.619 | 0.525 | 0.435 |
| 4. | T ₃ | 0.349 | 0.586 | 0.581 | 0.568 | 0.521 |
| 5. | T ₄ | 0.214 | 0.510 | 0.563 | 0.513 | 0.450 |
| CD at 0.05 % | | 0.010 | 0.022 | 0.029 | 0.025 | 0.035 |
| CV % | | 2.54 | 2.51 | 2.78 | 2.66 | 4.32 |

Table: 5 Food conversion ratio (FCR) of Rohu, *Labeo rohita* (Ham.) fingerlings fed with varying levels of Probiotic (Proteus) mixed diet

| S. No. | Treatment | Food conversion ratio (FCR) of fingerlings | | | | Average (FCR) |
|--------------|----------------|--|--|--|--|---------------|
| | | 0 -15 th day | 16 th -30 th day | 31 th -45 th day | 46 th -60 th day | |
| 1. | Control | 10.098 | 3.841 | 3.311 | 3.529 | 5.195 |
| 2. | T ₁ | 9.555 | 3.762 | 2.716 | 3.027 | 4.765 |
| 3. | T ₂ | 9.162 | 3.912 | 2.515 | 3.021 | 4.653 |
| 4. | T ₃ | 4.689 | 2.674 | 2.698 | 2.767 | 3.207 |
| 5. | T ₄ | 7.820 | 3.114 | 2.796 | 3.098 | 4.207 |
| CD at 0.05 % | | 0.413 | 0.175 | 0.125 | 0.150 | 0.369 |
| CV % | | 2.75 | 2.78 | 2.45 | 2.66 | 4.60 |

Table: 6. Gross conversion efficiency (GCE) of Rohu, *Labeo rohita* (Ham.) fingerlings fed with varying levels of Probiotic (*Proteus*) mixed diet

| S. No. | Treatment | Gross conversion efficiency (GCE) of fingerlings | | | | Average |
|--------------|----------------|--|--|--|--|---------|
| | | 0 -15 th day | 16 th -30 th day | 31 th -45 th day | 46 th -60 th day | |
| 1. | Control | 0.099 | 0.260 | 0.302 | 0.283 | 0.236 |
| 2. | T ₁ | 0.105 | 0.266 | 0.368 | 0.330 | 0.267 |
| 3. | T ₂ | 0.109 | 0.256 | 0.398 | 0.331 | 0.273 |
| 4. | T ₃ | 0.213 | 0.374 | 0.371 | 0.361 | 0.330 |
| 5. | T ₄ | 0.128 | 0.321 | 0.358 | 0.323 | 0.282 |
| CD at 0.05 % | | 0.006 | 0.013 | 0.018 | 0.016 | 0.022 |
| CV % | | 2.53 | 2.51 | 2.80 | 2.67 | 4.32 |

Table: 7. Proximate composition of whole body of *Labeo rohita*(Ham.) fed with graded levels of probiotic (*Proteus*)

| S. No. | Treatments | Proximate composition of fish (in %) | | | | |
|--------|----------------|--------------------------------------|------|---------|------|------|
| | | Moisture | Fat | Protein | Ash | NFE |
| 1. | Control | 66.45 | 6.90 | 20.22 | 2.72 | 3.71 |
| 2. | T ₁ | 66.26 | 6.76 | 20.64 | 3.00 | 3.34 |
| 3. | T ₂ | 66.77 | 6.74 | 22.75 | 2.48 | 1.26 |
| 4. | T ₃ | 66.08 | 6.61 | 24.06 | 2.61 | 0.64 |
| 5. | T ₄ | 65.50 | 6.72 | 22.82 | 2.71 | 2.25 |

Literature Cited

- [1] AOAC, 1970. Methods of analysis of the Association of Official Analytical Chemists 12th Ed.
- [2] Ayyappan, S. and Jena, J.K., 2003. Grow-out production of carps in India. *Journal of Applied Aquaculture*, **13**; 251-282.
- [3] Aziz, H., M. Javed and Kazimi, R., 2002. Studies on the growth performance of major carps in poultry droppings fertilized ponds supplemented with feed. *Asian Journal of Animal and Veterinary Advances.*, **1**(3): 113-115.
- [4] Bisht, S.P.S. and Panday, A.K., 2013. DNA Sequencing: Methods and Applications, *Advances in Biotechnology*, pp11-23.
- [5] Blaxhall, P.C., 1972. The haematological assessment of the health of freshwater fish. *Journal of Fish Biology*; **4**: 593-604.
- [6] Chiu, Y.N., 1989. Consideration for feeding experiments to quantify dietary requirements of essential nutrients in fish, p. 46-57. In S.S., De Silva (ed.) *Fish Nutrition Research in Asia. Asian Fisheries Society, Special Publication 4, Manila, Philippines.*

- [7] De Silva, S.S. and F.B. Davy, 1992. Strategies for finfish nutrition research for semi-intensive aquaculture in Asia. *Asian Fisheries Science*; **5**: 129-144.
- [8] Dhawan, A. and Kaur, S., 2002. Effect of pig on water quality and polyculture of carp species during winter and summer. *Aquaculture International*; **10**: 297-307.
- [9] Hefher, H., 1962. Ten years of research in fish ponds fertilization in Israel. 1. The effect of fertilization on fish yields. *Bamidgeh*, **14**: 29–38.
- [10] Lilly, D.M. and Stillwell, R.H., 1965. Probiotics: growth promoting factors produced by microorganisms. *Science*; **147**: 747-8.
- [11] Osuigwe, D.I., Obiekezie, A.I. and Onuoha, G.C., 2005. Some haematological changes in hybrid catfish (*Heterobranchus longifilis* × *Clarias gariepinus*) fed different dietary levels of raw and boiled jackbean (*Canavalia ensiformis*) seedmeal. *African Journal of Biotechnology*, **4** (9): 1017-1021.
- [12] Ramos, M.A., Weber, B., Gonçalves, G.F., Santos, G.A., P. Rema and Ozorio, R.O.A. 2013. Dietary probiotic supplementation modulated gut microbiota and improved growth of juvenile rainbow trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*). *Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology*. **166**: 302-307.
- [13] Sahu, S., Das, B.K., Pradhan, J., Mohapatra, B.C., Mishra B.K. and Sarangi, A. 2007. Effect of *Magnifera indica* kernel as a feed additive on immunity and resistance to *Aeromonas hydrophila* in *Labeo rohita* fingerlings. *Fish and Shellfish Immunology*, **23**: 109-118.
- [14] Sherwani, F.A., Parwez, I., 2000. Effect of stress and food deprivation on catfish, *Heteropneustes fossilis* (Bloch). *Indian Journal of Experimental Biology*; **38**(4): 379-84
- [15] Suzer, C., Coban, D., Kamaci, H.O., Saka, S., Firat, K., Otgucuoglu, O. and Kucuksari, H., 2008. *Lactobacillus* spp. bacteria as probiotics in gilthead sea bream (*Sparus aurata*, L.) larvae: Effects on growth performance and digestive enzyme activities. *Aquaculture*; **280** (4): 140–145.
- [16] Steffens, W., 1989. Principle of fish nutrition. New York, Chichester, Brisbane, Toronto, Norwood, pp.384.