# EFFECT OF FEEDING REGIMES ON REPRODUCTIVE PERFORMANCE OF NILE TILAPIA BROODFISH IN COMMERCIAL HATCHERIES

#### Ramadan M. Abou-Zied

#### Anim. Prod. Dept. Faculty of Agriculture, Fayoum University, Egypt.

#### **ABSTRACT:**

The present work was conducted in commercial hatchery at Shakshouk, El-Fayoum Governorate. The trial was started at 6/5/2005 and lasted for 122 days.

A number of 105 females and 35 males of one year old broodfish weighing 170 to 175 g in average were used per hapa. Five feeding regimes were used (0.5, 1.0, 1.5, 2.0 and 3.0% of broodfish body mass/day) forming 5 treatments (regimes). Eggs were collected at 10 day intervals starting from 28/5/2005. Data obtained were on reproductive performance, growth performance and economic evaluation.

Data revealed that the 1% feeding rate showed better reproductive performance and economic evaluation. The 0.5% feeding rate tended to show slightly lower values. The other higher levels of feeding were not recommended. To increase the number of eggs per female, hatcheries should try higher CP level in the diet and the reduction of sex ratio to 2:1 (female: male) along with a sort of broodfish selection.

**Key words:** Nile tilapia, broodfish, feeding rate, productive performance fecundity and economics.

# **INTRODUCTION:**

Nile tilapia (*Oreochromis niloticus*) has rapidly became an important species for aquaculture although their intensive culture remains constrained by poor spawning synchrony and low fecundity adding

significant cost to hatchery production (**Campos-Mendoza** *et al.*, **2004**). In traditional systems tilapia broodfish are reared in ponds with or without supplementary feed and fry are collected from the edges of ponds. Recently, spawning of broodfish in large nylon hapas suspended in ponds has been developed (**Little** *et al.*, **1995, 1997 and Bhujel** *et al.*, **1998**) and became commercialized and proven to be economically viable (**Little** *et al.*, **1997 and Bhujel, 1997**).

In tilapia quantity and quality of food can affect its frequency of spawning (Hughes and Behrends, 1983; Guerrero and Guerrero, 1985; Macintosh and Little, 1995) and the number of seed per clutch (Guerrero and Guerrero, 1985; Rana, 1986, 1988; Macintosh and Little, 1995). Moreover, Izquierdo *et al.* (2001) sited that Broodstock nutrition is one of the most important factors limiting fish fry production and larval quality. Gunasekera *et al.* (1997) pointed out to the critical role of nutrition to brooding females, in supplying the essential nutrients required for gonadal development as well as the performance of their seeds and larvae. Macintosh and Little (1995) fed brooding females at a rate of 1.5 % of the total fish biomass/day, but Beveridge and McAndrew (2000) used a feeding rate of 1 % of body weight/day.

As the feeding rate is one of the constraints in commercial hatcheries at Fayoum Governorate, the present work was conducted aiming to study the effect of feeding regime on performance of Nile tilapia broodfish. A simple economic evaluation was conducted.

#### **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

The present work was conducted in commercial hatchery at Shakshouk, El-Fayoum Governorate. The trial was started at 6/5/2005 and lasted for 122 days.

Five feeding regimes were used (0.5, 1.0, 1.5, 2.0 and 3.0% of broodfish body mass/day) forming five treatments (regimes).

One year old Nile tilapia (*Oreochromis niloticus*) belonging to the year 2004 generation with an average weight of  $172 \text{ g} \pm 2.0$  were stocked for spawning into ten hapas (each of 7 m length × 4 m width × 1.2 m height), two per each treatment. The distance between each treatment to another 1 m. Hapas were fixed in an earthen pond (one feddan area × 1 m depth) where 1/3 of the water level was exchanged with fresh water every 3 days. Fish were stocked at a density of 140 fish (105 female and 35 male) per hapa. Fish were fed the commercial diets containing 25.34% CP and 4.450 kcal/g GE at a rate of five regimes once daily. Fish body mass was determined at 4 week intervals and feeding rates were adjusted accordingly.

Production of seed and rate of spawning were compared with the feeding regimes.

Seeds were collected at 10 day intervals from 28/5/2005. Early in the morning, females carrying the seeds were taken from the hapa and returned after taking out the seeds. Seeds were taken to hatchery laboratory, then washed by potassium permengenate solution to prevent bacterial and fungal infection. All seeds were weighed, seed samples were taken, weighed and counted, then seeds were placed for hatching in 15 litter plastic jars, where a gentle and continuous flow of water was maintained. Broodfish were weighed at the end of the trial.

Data obtained were spawned females number/hapa, % spawned females, seed weight/hapa, seed number/hapa, seed weight/female, absolute fecundity (Rana, 1988), relative fecundity (**Campos-Mendoza** *et al.*, 2004), number of spawning/female/period, female average weight/period, broodstock weight at the start and at the end, daily gain, % SGR, feed intake and feed conversion ratio (FCR) and a simple economic evaluation.

Statistical analysis were performed using SPSS, 1997. Statistical

significant between treatments was evaluated at the 5 % probability level. General liner model (ANOVA) and regression analysis were used.

# **RESULTS:**

## Water quality:

Averages of water temperature, dissolved oxygen (DO) and water pH during the experimental period are presented in Table 1.

Such data  $(30 \pm 0.5 \text{ °C}, 6.2 \pm 0.1 \text{ ml DO} \text{ and } 8.1 \pm 0.1 \text{ pH in}$ average) were in the ranges reported by **Mironova (1977); Popma and Lovshin (1996); Ambali (1990); Watanabe** *et al.* (1992); Bevis (1994); Siddiqui *et al.* (1997); Siddiqui *et al.* (1998) and Ali (2001).

 Table (1). Water quality parameters during the experimental period.

| Item                 | Min. | Max. | Average ± SE                 |
|----------------------|------|------|------------------------------|
| Temperature          | 29   | 33   | $30.55 \pm 0.48$             |
| Dissolved oxygen, ml | 5.8  | 6.5  | $\boldsymbol{6.17 \pm 0.08}$ |
| рН                   | 7.8  | 8.2  | $\boldsymbol{8.06 \pm 0.05}$ |

## **Broodstock reproductive performance:**

Reproductive performance parameters of Nile tilapia broodstock as affected by feeding regime is shown in Table 2.

Significant differences were found in reproductive performance of broodfish due to the tested feeding regimes. In general the lowest two feeding regimes (0.5 & 1.0% of live body weight) resulted in better reproductive performance than the other higher feeding regimes (1.5, 2.0 and 3.0% of live body weight) with Nile tilapia broodstock. Comparing the lowest two feeding regimes (0.5 & 1.0% of live body weight), both of them showed insignificant differences in seed weight and seed number/hapa/collection as well as in relative fecundity. However, the broodfish fed at a rate of 1.0% of their body weight had higher (P $\leq$ 0.05) number of spawning/female/period.

Table (2). Reproductive performance per collection of Nile tilapia broodstock as affected by feeding regime.

| Paramatars                        | Feeding regime, % of live body mass |                          |                     |                          |                          | SED    |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------|
|                                   | 0.5                                 | 1.0                      | 1.5                 | 2.0                      | 3.0                      |        |
| Spawned females number per        | 13.15 <sup>b</sup>                  | 17.85 <sup>a</sup>       | 10.85 <sup>bc</sup> | 9.30 <sup>bc</sup>       | 7.70 <sup>c</sup>        | 2.13   |
| collection                        |                                     |                          |                     |                          |                          |        |
| Spawned females % <sup>(1)</sup>  | 12.52 <sup>b</sup>                  | <b>17.00<sup>a</sup></b> | 10.33 <sup>bc</sup> | 8.86 <sup>bc</sup>       | 7.33 <sup>c</sup>        | 2.03   |
| Seeds weight/hapa, g              | 1088.0 <sup>a</sup>                 | 1117.5 <sup>a</sup>      | 722.5 <sup>b</sup>  | 605.0 <sup>b</sup>       | 535.0 <sup>b</sup>       | 157.29 |
| Seed No/hapa <sup>(2)</sup>       | 12424.7 <sup>a</sup>                | 13095.5 <sup>a</sup>     | 8035.5 <sup>b</sup> | 6310.3 <sup>b</sup>      | 5596 <sup>b</sup>        | 1755   |
| Seeds weight/ female, g           | 8.32 <sup>a</sup>                   | 6.16 <sup>b</sup>        | 6.52 <sup>b</sup>   | <b>6.46</b> <sup>b</sup> | 6.73 <sup>b</sup>        | 0.54   |
| Seed No/ female (absolute         | 940.7 <sup>a</sup>                  | 740.3 <sup>b</sup>       | 714.9 <sup>b</sup>  | 675.6 <sup>b</sup>       | 705.4 <sup>b</sup>       | 60.27  |
| fecundity) <sup>(3)</sup>         |                                     |                          |                     |                          |                          |        |
| Relative fecundity <sup>(4)</sup> | 5.31 <sup>a</sup>                   | <b>4.00</b> <sup>a</sup> | 3.45 <sup>b</sup>   | 3.15 <sup>b</sup>        | 3.08 <sup>b</sup>        | 0.31   |
| No of spawning/ female per        | 1.25 <sup>b</sup>                   | <b>1.70</b> <sup>a</sup> | 1.03 <sup>c</sup>   | <b>0.89</b> <sup>d</sup> | <b>0.73</b> <sup>e</sup> | 0.01   |
| period <sup>(5)</sup> .           |                                     |                          |                     |                          |                          |        |
| Female average weight             | 176.75                              | 185.3                    | 212.35              | 220.40                   | 233.9                    | 9.76   |

\* Average in the same row having different superscripts differ significantly  $P \le 0.05$ .

\* SED is the standard error of difference

\* All values are averages (n=20).

\* Female No/hapa = 105 female.

\* No of collection = 10

(1) = Spawned females number/hapa  $\times$  100/ No of female per hapa.

(2) = Seed weight per hapa,  $g \times$  Seed No per gm

(3) = (2) /Spawned females number per hapa

(4) = (3) / Female average weight per period

(5) = Spawned females number per hapa × No of collection/ Female No per hapa

#### Broodstock growth performance and feed utilization:

Table 3 presents growth performance and feed utilization of Nile tilapia broodstock as affected by feeding regime.

It was observed that as a level of feeding increased as Nile tilapia final weight and gain increased. However, such increases were not great specially when looking to specific growth rate (% SGR). Feed conversion showed gradual improvement as the level of feeding increased.

| Item (ner fish)                      | Feeding regime, % of live body mass |                     |                           |                     |                          | SED   |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|-------|
|                                      | 0.5                                 | 1.0                 | 1.5                       | 2.0                 | 3.0                      |       |
| Initial mean weight, g               | 172.5                               | 175.0               | 172.5                     | 170.0               | 170.0                    | 8.06  |
| Final mean weight, g                 | 180.0                               | 192.5               | 257.5                     | 275.0               | 317.5                    | 8.22  |
| Total gain, g <sup>(1)</sup>         | 7.5                                 | 17.5                | 85.0                      | 105.0               | 147.5                    | 9.35  |
| Daily gain, g <sup>(2)</sup>         | 0.06                                | 0.14                | 0.70                      | 0.86                | 1.21                     | 0.077 |
| SGR, % <sup>(3)</sup>                | 0.034                               | 0.077               | 0.328                     | 0.395               | 0.512                    | 0.037 |
| Total feed used, g/fish              | 96.6                                | 196                 | 289.8                     | 380.8               | 571.2                    |       |
| Total feed used, kg/hapa             | 13.524                              | 27.440              | 40.572                    | 53.312              | 79.968                   | 1602  |
| FCR                                  |                                     |                     |                           |                     |                          |       |
| Excluding seed weight <sup>(4)</sup> | 14.52 <sup>a</sup>                  | 11.69 <sup>ab</sup> | <b>4.8</b> 1 <sup>b</sup> | 4.20 <sup>b</sup>   | <b>3.86</b> <sup>b</sup> | 3.09  |
| Excluding fish weight <sup>(5)</sup> | 13.06 <sup>d</sup>                  | 25.21 <sup>d</sup>  | 63.42 <sup>c</sup>        | 102.63 <sup>b</sup> | 184.53 <sup>a</sup>      | 8.15  |
| Including fish weight and            | <b>7.95</b> <sup>a</sup>            | 6.85 <sup>ab</sup>  | 4.69 <sup>bc</sup>        | 4.03 <sup>bc</sup>  | 3.63 <sup>c</sup>        | 1.22  |
| seed weight <sup>(6)</sup>           |                                     |                     |                           |                     |                          |       |

Table (3). Growth performance and feed utilization efficiency of Niletilapia brood stock as affected by feeding regime.

\* Average in the same row having different superscripts differ significantly  $P \le 0.05$ .

\* SED is the standard error of difference.

\* period = 122 days

(1) = Final weight - Initial weight

(2) = (1) /period in days.

(3) = 100 (ln Final weight - ln Initial weight) / period in days, where ln is the natural log.

(4) = Total feed offered per hapa/(1).

(5) = Total feed offered per hapa/ Seed weight per hapa.

(6) = Total feed offered per hapa/ (Total gain per hapa + Seed weight per hapa).

\* As 70% of the produced seeds were hatched.

Table 4 shows the regression analysis between relative fecundity and broodstock body weight or feed intake.

Significant negative relationship was found between relative fecundity (RF) and broodstock body weight. Also, a negative relationship was found between RF and broodstock feed intake. This means that the increase in body weight due to the increase in feed intake reduced the relative fecundity of broodstock.

Table (4). Regression analysis between relative fecundity, RF,  $(\hat{Y})$  and

| Item | $\hat{\mathbf{y}} = \mathbf{a} + \mathbf{b} \mathbf{x}$ | r          | n  |
|------|---|------------|----|
| wt   | RF= 7.24 - 0.019 wt                                     | - 0.537 ** | 20 |
| FI   | RF= 4.931 - 0.00023 FI                                  | - 0.564 ** | 20 |

either broodstock body weight, wt or feed intake, FI.

## Economic evaluation of the tested feeding regimes:

Table 5 illustrates the economic evaluation of the tested feeding regimes.

The lowest two feeding regimes were more economic than the other higher feeding regimes (0.5 & 1.0% vs 1.5, 2.0 and 3.0% of body weight). Comparing the lowest feeding regimes, the 1.0% one tended to show better net returns (5.7%) than the 0.5% one. This is due to higher seed number/hapa/period.

## **Discussion:**

The present study acts that happened in commercial hatcheries at Fayoum governorate.

Nutrition is one of the factors that can limit fish fry production (**Izquierdo** *et al.*, 2001). Gunasekera *et al.* (1997) indicated that good nutrition supply the females by essential nutrients required for gonadal development as well as the performance of their seeds and larvae. **Macintosh and Little (1995)** fed their brooding females at a rate of 1.5 % of the total fish biomass/day. Therefore, in the present study feeding rates of 0.5, 1.0, 1.5, 2.0 and 3.0% of broodfish live body weight/day were tested to evaluate broodfish reproductive performance and its economics.

| Itom                                  | Diet % of body weight |          |          |          |             |  |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|----------|----------|----------|-------------|--|
| Item                                  | 0.5                   | 1.0      | 1.5      | 2.0      | 3.0         |  |
| Feed offered, kg                      | 13.52                 | 27.44    | 40.57    | 53.31    | 79.97       |  |
| Broodfish mass at the start           | 24.2                  | 24.5     | 24.2     | 23.8     | 23.8        |  |
| Broodfish mass at the end             | 25.2                  | 26.95    | 36.05    | 38.5     | 44.45       |  |
| Seed No/hapa/period                   | 124247                | 130955   | 80355    | 63103    | 55960       |  |
| Predicted fry No                      | 86973                 | 91669    | 56249    | 44172    | 39172       |  |
| Feed cost, L.E                        | 26.37                 | 53.51    | 79.12    | 103.96   | 155.94      |  |
| Other costs, L.E                      | 656.25                | 656.25   | 656.25   | 656.25   | 656.25      |  |
| Total costs, L.E                      | 682.62                | 709.76   | 735.37   | 760.21   | 812.19      |  |
| Broodfish selling, L.E                | 226.8                 | 242.55   | 360.5    | 385      | 444.50      |  |
| Predicted fry selling, L.E            | 4348.645              | 4583.425 | 2812.425 | 2208.605 | 1958.6      |  |
| Total selling price, L.E              | 4575.445              | 4825.975 | 3172.925 | 2593.605 | 2403.1<br>0 |  |
| Net return, L.E                       | 3,892.82              | 4,116.22 | 2,437.56 | 1,833.40 | 1,590.91    |  |
| Net return relative                   | 100                   | 105.74   | 59.22    | 75.21    | 86.77       |  |
| Total selling/Total costs             | 6.70                  | 6.80     | 4.31     | 3.41     | 2.96        |  |
| Total selling/Total costs relative, % | 100                   | 101.44   | 63.46    | 79.07    | 86.73       |  |

Table (5). Economic evaluation of the tested feeding regime.

- Feed price 1950 L.E / ton

- Brood selling price 9 and 10 L.E for (160-200 g) and (250-500 g) respectively

- Total costs of hatchery 52500 L.E without price of diets

- The hatchery contains 80 hapa (total costs of hapa without feed = 656.25 L.E)

In the present study the reproductive performance was with the two lowest feeding rates (0.5 and 1.0% of live body weight/day) compared to the higher feeding rates tested (Table 2). The economic evaluation followed similar trend (Table 5) with better net returns with the feeding level of 1.0% of body weight. The regression analysis reflected the effect of the negative effect between relative fecundity and the feed consumed and consequently broodfish weight (Table 4). The low fecundity of broodstock of Nile tilapia was reported by **Rana (1988)**, **Baroiller and Jalabert (1989)**, **Macintosh and Little (1995)**, **Coward and Bromage** (1998), **Bhujel (2000) and Little and Hulata (2000)**. In the present study broodfish of Nile tilapia that reared in net enclosures had lower fecundity or relative fecundity than that reported by **Camps-Mendoza** *et al.* (2004) and **Lu and Takeuchi (2004).** Such trend could be illustrated through different factors.

**Gunasekera** *et al.* (1995) tested the effect of diet protein on oocyte maturation. They indicated that the 32% protein diet seems to be adequate for tilapia broodfish. In the present study the dietary protein was 25% of the diet (commercial) focusing the attention toward increasing the level of protein in the diet to improve broodfish fecundity.

**Hughes and Behrends (1983)** postulated that a sex ratio of 1:2 (male:female) has been found to be better than the ratio of 1:3. In the present study the sex ratio is 1:3. So, if commercial hatcheries put such results in consideration, broodfish seeds could increase.

Also, the photoperiod, the selection of new strains broodfish, play key roles in broodfish performance. **Hughes and Behrends (1983)** found a stocking density of 5 fish/m<sup>2</sup> was more productive as compared to 10 fish/m<sup>2</sup> in hapas in tanks. Such trend was followed in the present study showing the sutable stocking density in the hatchery. **Poma and Lovshin** (1996) mentioned an increase in seed production when the rearing temperature is above 25 °C up to 30 °C. In the present study the temperature ranged between 29 and 33 with average value of 30.55 °C (Table 1).

#### **Conclusion:**

Under the study conditions, a feeding rate of 1.0% of broodfish body weight is preferable followed by 0.5% one. Hatcheries need to test higher CP diets (32% CP or more) and reduce the sex ratio to 1:2 (male:female) along with a sort of broodfish selection. Also, the photoperiod should be considered.

#### REFERENCES

- Ali, A.A.A. (2001). The effect of some nutritional treatments on fecundity, sex reversal and productive performance of Nile tilapia.Ph.D. Thesis, Fac. Agric., El-Fayoum, Cairo Univ., ARE.
- Ambali, A.J.D. (1990). Effect of hapa size on conditioning of broodstock, (Oreochromis niloticus) in fertilized earthen ponds. M.Sc. Thesis.Asian Institute of Technology 101 pp.
- Baroiller, J.F. and Jalabert B. (1989). Contribution of research in reproductive physiology to the culture of tilapias. Aquatic Living Resource 2: 105-116.
- Beveridge, M.C.M. and McAndrew B.J. (2000) Tilapias: Biology and Exploitation. Kluwer, Dordrecht, The Netherlands, 505 pp.
- Bevis, R. (1994). The effect of artificial nests on reproductive performance in the Nile tilapia (*Oreochromis niloticus*, L.) spawned in net hapas. M. Sc. Thesis, Asian Institute of Technology 111 pp.
- Bhujel, R.C. (1997). A new record! Tilapia fry sale reached nearly 10 million a month. AASP Newsl. 2 4, 16.
- Bhujel, R.C. (2000). A review of strategies for the management of Nile tilapia (*Oreochromis niloticus*) broodfish in seed production system, especially hapa based systems. Aquaculture, 181: 37-59.
- Bhujel, R.C.; Little D.C. and Turner W.A. (1998). Quality monitoring of sex-reversed tilapia fry. Fish Farmer. pp. 34–37, (September/ October).
- Campos-Mendoza, A.; McAndrew B.J.; Coward K. and Bromage N. (2004). Reproductive response of Nile tilapia (*Oreochromis niloticus*) to photoperiodic manipulation; effects on spawning periodicity, fecundity and egg size. Aquaculture, 231: 299-314.

- Coward, K. and Bromage N.R. (1998). Histological classification of oocyte growth and the dynamics of ovarian recrudescence in *Tilapia zillii*. J. of fish biology, 53: 285-302.
- Guerrero III, R.D. and Guerrero L.A. (1985). Effect of breeder size on fry production of Nile tilapia in concrete pools. Trans. Natl. Acad. Sci. Technol., Repub. Philipp. 7: 63–66.
- Gunasekera, R.M.; Shim K.F. and Lam T.J. (1995). Effect of dietary protein level on puberty, oocyte growth and egg chemical composition in the tilapia, *Oreochromis niloticus* (L.). Aquaculture 134: 169–183.
- Gunasekera, R.M.; Shim K.F. and Lam T.J. (1997). Influence of dietary protein content on the distribution of amino acids in oocytes, serum and muscle of Nile tilapia, *Oreochromis niloticus* (L.). Aquaculture, 152: 205–221.
- Hughes, D.G. and Behrends L.L. (1983). Mass production of *Tilapia nilotica* seed in suspended net enclosures. In: Fishelson, L., Yaron, Z. Eds., Proceedings of the International Symposium on Tilapia in Aquaculture. Tel. Aviv Univ., Tel Aviv, Israel, pp. 394–401 comps. .
- Izquierdo M.S.; Fernandez-Palacios H. and Tacon A.G.J. (2001). Effect of broodstock nutrition on reproductive performance of fish. Aquaculture 197: 25-42.
- Little, D.C. and Hulata G. (2000). Strategies for tilapia seed production. Handbook of Tilapias: Biology and Exploitation, pp 267-326.
- Little, D.C.; Lin C.K. and Turner W.A. (1995). Commercial scale tilapia fry production in Thailand. World Aquaculture, 26: 20–24.
- Little, D.C.; Macintosh D.J. and Edwards P. (1993). Improving spawning synchrony in the Nile tilapia, *Oreochromis niloticus* L. Aquacult. Fish. Manage, 24: 399–405.

- Little, D.C.; Turner W.A. and Bhujel R.C. (1997). Commercialization of a hatchery process to produce MT-treated Nile tilapia in Thailand. pp. 108-118. In: Alston, D.E. Green, B.W., Clifford, H.C. (Ms.), IV Symp., Aquaculture in Central America: Focusing on shrimp and tilapia, 22-24 April, Tegucigalpa, Honduras, Asociacion Nacional de Acuicultores de Honduras and the Latin American Chapter of the World Aquaculture Society, 237 pp.
- Lu, J. and Takeuchi T. (2004). Spawning and egg quality of the tilapia Oreochromis niloticus fed solely on raw Spirulina throughout three generations. Aquaculture 234: 625-640.
- Macintosh, D.J. and Little D.C. (1995). Nile tilapia Oreochromis niloticus
  In: Bromage, N.R., Roberts, R.J. Eds., Broodstock Management and Egg and Larval Quality. Blackwell, Cambridge, UK, 424 pp.
- Mironova, N.V. (1977). Energy expenditure on egg production in young *Tilapia mossambica* and the influence of maintenance conditions on their reproductive intensity. J. lchthyol. 17: 627-633.
- Popma, T.J. and Lovshin L.L. (1996). Worldwide prospects for commercial production of tilapia. Research and development No. 41, Dept., Fish., & Allied Aquacult., Auburn Univ., AL, USA, 23 pp.
- Rana, K.J. (1986). Parental influences on egg quality, fry production and fry performance in *Oreochromis niloticus* Linnaeus and *O. mossambicus* Peters . PhD Thesis, Institute of Aquaculture, Univ. of Stirling, UK, p. 295.
- Rana, K.J. (1988). Reproductive biology and the hatchery rearing of tilapia eggs and fry. In: Muir, J.F., Roberts, J.F., Roberts, R.J. Eds., Recent Advances in Aquaculture, vol. 3. Croom Helm, London and Sydney and Timber Press, Portland, OR, USA, pp. 343–406.

- Siddiqui, A.Q.; Al-Hafedh Y.S. and Ali S.A. (1998). Effect of dietary protein level on the reproductive performance of Nile tilapia, *Oreochromis niloticus* L. Aquaculture Res. 29: 349-358.
- Siddiqui, A.Q.; Al-Harbi A.H. and Al-Hafedh Y.S. (1997). Effects of food supply on size at first maturity, fecundity and growth of hybrid tilapia (*Oreochromis niloticus*× *O. aureus*) in outdoor concrete tanks in Saudi Arabia. Aquaculture Res. 28: 341-349.
- SPSS (1997). Statistical Package for Social Sciences, for windows. Release 8.0. SPSS Inc., Chicago, USA.
- Watanabe, W.O.; Smith S.T.; Wicklund R.I. and Ola B.L. (1992).
  Hatchery production of Florida red tilapia seed in brakishwater tanks under natural mouthbrooding and clutch removal methods.
  Aquaculture, 102: 77-88.

# **ARABIC SUMMARY:**

