



# APRIL 12-15 **2021**





## EFFECTS OF FISHMEAL REPLACEMENT BY DEFATTED Zophobas morio LARVAE MEAL ON GROWTH AND FEED EFICIENCY OF GILTHEAD SEABREAM (Sparus aurata)

Asimaki A.1\*, Psofakis P.1, Neofytou M.C.1, Gkalogianni E.Z., Mente E.1, Rumbos C.I.2, Athanassiou C.G.2, Fountoulaki E.3, Henry M.3, Karapanagiotidis I.T.1

#### Introduction

Aquaculture is still searching for suitable and sustainable alternative protein sources to replace fishmeal in aquafeeds. The use of insect meals for fishmeal replacement has recently attracted massive scientific interest, especially after their recent approval in the European aquafeed chain. So far, most research has focused on insect species which have already been approved for fish nutrition, such as Tenebrio molitor and Hermetia illucens, with very promising outputs (Henry et al. 2015). However, other insect species that have not yet been studied extensively could also be proved suitable as fishmeal replacers. For instance, the giant mealworm, Zophobas morio, is a large tenebrionid beetle species, with high nutritive value (Finke et al. 2002). The aim of the present study was to evaluate the use of different % inclusion of defatted mealworm in diets for sea bream juveniles; an important species of the Mediterranean Aquaculture.

#### Materials and Methods

Late-instar larvae of Z. morio coming from a colony raised in our laboratory were dried, milled and defatted under petroleum ether extraction in order to produce a Z. morio larvae meal containing 4% crude lipid and 69% crude protein. A total number of 360 S. aurata juveniles of 3.4g initial mean weight were obtained from a commercial fish hatchery, transferred to our Departmental facilities and then distributed after an acclimatization period of 10 days in triplicate to 12 closed seawater circulation system tanks (125L). Each of the four dietary group was fed isoenergetic (20 MJ/Kg) and isonitrogenous (52% CP) diets, in which fishmeal protein of the control diet (FM) was replaced by low-fat Z. morio at 10% (ZLF10), 20% (ZLF20) and 30% (ZLF30). Fish were fed to satiation twice a day, 6 days per week for 100 days in total.

### Results and Discussion

Survival rates higher than 95% were recorded in all dietary groups without statistical difference among them (Table 1). Feed intake was similar among the groups suggesting that Z. morio is a highly palatable feed ingredient for S. aurata. In addition, all dietary groups had similar (P>0.05) final weight, specific growth rate, FCR, PER, protein and lipid retention. Up to date, studies with Z. morio in fish nutrition are scarce. In a previous study, we used a full fat, instead of a defatted, Z. morio meal as FM replacer in seabream's diet and found that a 10% replacement is possible without affecting growth performance and feed efficiency (Asimaki et al. 2020).

Table 1. Growth performance and feed utilization of S.aurata fed the experimental diets

Parameters /	FM	ZLF10	ZLF20	ZLF30
dietary groups				
Survival (%)	$96.6 \pm 3.3$	$97.7 \pm 3.8$	$96.6 \pm 3.3$	$95.5 \pm 1.92$
Feed intake (%/day)	$2.5 \pm 0.1$	$2.5 \pm 0.2$	$2.4 \pm 0.1$	$2.6 \pm 0.1$
IBW (g/fish)	$3.4 \pm 0.0$	$3.4 \pm 0.0$	$3.4 \pm 0.0$	$3.4 \pm 0.0$
FBW (g/fish)	$38.4 \pm 2.1$	$42.2 \pm 2.4$	$38.8 \pm 1.8$	$39.2 \pm 2.3$
WG (g/fish)	$35.0 \pm 2.1$	$38.8 \pm 2.4$	$35.4 \pm 1.8$	$35.8 \pm 2.3$
SGR (%/day)	$2.4 \pm 0.1$	$2.5 \pm 0.1$	$2.4 \pm 0.0$	$2.4 \pm 0.1$
FCR	$1.2 \pm 0.1$	$1.2 \pm 0.1$	$1.2 \pm 0.0$	$1.3 \pm 0.1$
PER	$1.5 \pm 0.1$	$1.6 \pm 0.1$	$1.6 \pm 0.0$	$1.5 \pm 0.1$
Protein retention (%)	$27.3 \pm 1.8$	$28.2 \pm 1.6$	$28.3 \pm 1.1$	$26.9 \pm 0.7$
Lipid retention (%)	$63.1 \pm 7.8$	$74.8 \pm 0.6$	$69.8 \pm 3.2$	$74.9 \pm 4.5$

Note: Values represent means ± standard deviation of triplicates. No significant differences (P> 0.05) were noted among dietary groups for any of the parameters tested.

Aquaculture Laboratory, Department of Ichthyology and Aquatic Environment, University of Thessaly, Volos, Greece

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Laboratory of Entomology and Agricultural Zoology, Department of Agriculture, Crop Production and Rural Environment, University of Thessaly, Volos, Greece

<sup>3</sup> Hellenic Centre for Marine Research, Athens, Greece

<sup>\*</sup>mantwasim@gmail.com

Alves et al. (2021) testing Z. morio in Nile tilapia diet reported that even 30% fishmeal replacement had no adverse effects on growth performance and feed utilization, but changed the body proximal composition and modulated the innate immune response. Jabir et al. (2012) reported that even 100% FM replacement did not reduce significantly the growth of Nile tilapia. Interestingly, when Z. morio was used in combination with house cricket (Acheta domesticus) to replace FM at 25% in the diet of perch (Perca fluviatilis) the growth of fish and feed efficiency decreased (Tilami et al. 2020). Studies with other insect species in seabream's diet showed that up to 25-30% FM replacement is possible by T. molitor (Piccolo et al. 2017) and H. illucens (Karapanagiotidis et al. 2015). Overall, the findings of the present study suggest that the defatted Z. morio is an attractive feedstuff that could successfully replace fishmeal protein in seabream's diet up to 30%

#### Acknowledgements

This study was part of the project coded MIS 5045804 that has been co-financed by Greece and EU under the "Operational Programme Competitiveness, Entrepreneurship and Innovation - EPAnEK 2014-2020".

#### References

Alves, A.P., Paulino, R.R., Pereira, R.T., da Costa, D.V., Rosa, P.V. (2021). Aquaculture Research 52, 529-540.

Asimaki A., Psofakis P., Ekonomou G., Mente E., Rumbos C.I., Athanassiou C.G., Fountoulaki E., Henry M., Karapanagiotidis I.T. (2020). Journal of Insects as Food and Feed, 2020; 6 (Supplement 1), pp. S24. Finke, M.D. (2002). Zoo Biology 21, 269-285.

Henry, M., Gasco, L., Piccolo, G., Fountoulaki, E. (2015). Animal Feed Science and Technology 203, 1-22.

Jabir, M.D.A., Razak, S.A., Vikineswary, S. (2012). African Journal of Biotechnology 11, 6592-6598.

Karapanagiotidis I.T., Daskalopoulou E., Vogiatzis I., Rumbos C., Mente E., Athanassiou C.G. (2015). European Aquaculture Society, Rotterdam, The Netherlands, 20-23 October, pp. 410-411.

Piccolo, G., Iaconisi, V., Marono, S., Gasco, L., Loponte, R., Nizza, S., Bovera, F., Parisi, G. (2017). Animal Feed Science and Technology 226, 12–20.

Tilami, S. K., Turek, J., Červený, G., Lepič, P., Kozák, P., Burkina, V., Sakalli, S., Tomčala, A., Sampels, S., Mráz, J. (2020). Turkish Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences 20, 867-878.