



Research article

EVALUATION OF GROWTH PERFORMANCE AND BODY COMPOSITION OF CLARIAS GARIEPINUS FED GRADED LEVEL INCLUSION OF SOYBEAN WASTE

Orire, A.M. and Ozoadibe, T.N.

Department of Water Resources, Aquaculture and Fisheries Technology,
Federal University of Technology, Minna-Nigeria. P.M.B. 65

E-mail: abdul.orire@futminna.edu.ng



OPEN ACCESS

This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

Abstracts

An 8 weeks feeding trial was conducted to evaluate the utilization of soybean waste meal as replacement for fish meal in the diet of *Clarias gariepinus* fingerlings (1.09±0.23g). 20 fishes were randomly distributed in 15 tanks in replicate and fed varied inclusion levels of soybean waste at 0%, 25%, 50%, 75%, and 100%. The results showed significant differences (P<0.05) among the growth parameters. However, diet containing 25% soybean waste gave the best growth performance in terms of mean weight gain, specific growth rate, protein efficiency ratio, and food conversion ratio. The use of soybean waste meal has the potentials to improve the growth performance and body composition of fish. **Copyright © WJFASR, all rights reserved.**

Keywords: Soybean waste, Fish meal, *Clarias gariepinus*, Growth.

Introduction

The higher cost of the feed makes it impossible for the farmer to feed adequately as it accounts for 30-60% of the total variable expenses depending on the culture system (Lim and Webster, 2006). Fish meal is an indispensable



ingredient in the diets of almost all aquaculture species because of the high quality and concentration of essential nutrients, especially of well-balanced amino acids, essential fatty acids and also energy content. High digestibility and palatability of fish meal serves as the benchmark ingredient in aquaculture diets due to its nutrient content (Dersjanti-Li, 2002). Consequently, a concomitant increase in the demand for fish meal makes it the most expensive protein source in animal feed (Tacon, 1993). In addition, the growing rates towards the culture of premium valued carnivorous fish which are required in high portions of fish meal in their diets, will introduce further pressure on an already stable supply of this ingredient (Khan *et al.*, 2003). Soybean meal is rated as most nutritive plant ingredients widely used in animal feed as in pig, poultry including fish feed. It is also highly resistant to oxidation and spoilage and is naturally clean from organisms such as fungi, viruses and bacteria that are harmful to shrimp and fish (Swick *et al.* 1995). Soybean meal can be used to partially replace fish meal or animal protein in fish and shrimp diets. In general, however, at high replacement levels the growth rates of fish and shrimp are reduced this is traced to the antinutritional components in it (Olli *et al.* 1989; Viola *et al.* 1983; Wilson and Poe, 1985; and Abel *et al.*, 1984). However, it is reported that, up to 55% of fish meal is included in fish feed which makes aquaculture a fastest growing food production sector of the world (FAO, 1977). In view of replacement of fish meal without reducing the growth performance would yield a more profitable fish production (Nguyen, 2008). Studies have revealed that soy protein concentrate can replace fish meal up to 40% in the diet of shrimp and up to 100% in fish (Nguyen, 2008). However, the antinutritional factors inherent in some plant proteins in addition to limiting in some may be improved upon with further processing (NRC, 1998).

Moreover, soybean waste which is the focus of this research has not been exploited as possible protein source in fish feed. Soybean waste is practically an agro-waste generated when processing soybean into soy milk and cheese. The residue generated is normally fed to ruminant animals as protein supplement or at best discarded as waste. Therefore, this research seeks to investigate into the effect of feeding soybean waste as replacement for fish meal in the diet of *Clarias gariepinus* fingerling.

Materials and Methods

The experiment was carried out in the laboratory department of water resources aquaculture and fisheries Technology, Federal university of technology Minna, Niger state. The experiment was conducted for 8 weeks in 24 plastic bowls, with treatments randomly allotted in a complete randomised design. The plastic bowls been covered with nets collectively and are been fastened to the bowls with the aid of a plastic clips. The bowls was filled with water up to 12liters and the water that was used was changed daily.

Fingerlings of *Clarias gariepinus* (1.09 ± 0.23 g) used for the experiment were purchased from a hatchery farm in Ibadan, Oyo state-Nigeria. Twenty (20) fishes were distributed into the 15 tanks following two weeks acclimation. The fishes was fed with 3% body weight daily with adjustment fortnightly for 56days. 10 fishes were sacrificed and oven dried at 120°C for initial carcass analysis. And at the end of the experiment were called from each diet for final carcass analysis according to the method of AOAC (2000).



The diets were formulated using the Pearson's square method of feed formulation. And five isonitrogenous diets containing 50% crude protein at varying replacement level of fish meal (FM) and Soybean waste (SBW) were formulated thus diet 1 [0% SBW/100% FM], diet 2 (25% SBW/75% FM), diet 3 (50%/ 50% SBW/FM), diet 4 (75% SBW/25% FM), diet 5 (100% SBW0% FM) as presented in Table 1 with their proximate compositions. The feedstuffs were mixed thoroughly with estimated quantity of water (100g v/w of 1kg diet) to form consistent dough for each diet. The dough was then fed into a meat grinder machine for pelleting. The pelleted diets were oven dried at 60°C for 24 hours and then kept in a refrigerator at -4°C.

Table 1: Formulated Diets and Their Proximate Compositions

Feed stuff (%)	Diet 1	Diet 2	Diet 3	Diet 4	Diet 5
	(0% SBW)	(25% SBW)	(50% SBW)	(75% SBW)	(100% SBW)
Fish meal (FM)	68.85	28.63	21.48	14.32	0
Maize meal	26.15	52.0	52.0	52.0	13.3
Soya bean waste (SBW)	0	14.32	21.48	28.63	81.7
Vegetable oil	2	2	2	2	2
Vitamin-Mineral Premix	3	3	3	3	3
Total	100.00	99.95	99.96	99.95	100
Proximate compositions (%)					
Crude protein	48.61	43.40	46.88	46.88	48.61
Crude fat	11.60	11.25	10.00	11.12	10.00
Crude fibre	6.09	7.50	5.71	4.11	5.80
Ash	3.20	3.09	4.10	3.20	3.01
Moisture	4.77	4.58	4.01	4.11	3.86

Water exchange were done on a daily bases by first siphoning off faeces and uneaten feed whose values were recorded for biological analysis. The water quality parameters were taking on a weekly bases for temperature using clinical thermometer, dissolved oxygen according to the method of wrinkle's (Lind, 1979, APHA, 1980), hydrogen ion concentration (pH) were measured using a EIL 7045/46 pH meter in the Laboratory at room temperature while conductivity were monitored using conductivity meter (Table 2).

Table 2: Water Quality Parameters for the feeding trial

Parameters	Diet 1	Diet 2	Diet 3	Diet 4	Diet 5
Temperature (°C)	22.20	23.03	21.13	22.13	22.03
Ph	6.80	6.71	6.06	6.79	6.79
Dissolved oxygen (mg/ml)	2.17	2.17	2.23	2.19	2.17
Conductivity (µm/g)	2.25	2.21	2.26	2.26	2.04



Experimental Analyses and Growth Parameters:

Final values for each group represent the arithmetic mean of the triplicates. Feed intake was monitored to measure average feed intake and their effects on growth. The growth and nutrient utilization parameters measured include weight gain, specific growth rate (SGR), feed conversion ratio (FCR), protein efficiency ratio (PER), Apparent Net Protein Utilization (ANPU) and Apparent Digestibility Co-efficient (%). The growth parameters were computed according to the methods of Maynard *et al.*, (1979); and Halver (1989);

Mean weight gain = Mean final weigh – mean initial weight

$$\text{Specific Growth Rate (SGR)} = \frac{(\text{Log}_e W_2 - \text{Log}_e W_1) \times 100}{T_2 - T_1}$$

Where, W_2 and W_1 represent – final and initial weight,

T_2 and T_1 represent – final and initial time (Brown, 1957)

Feed conversion ratio – Feed fed on dry matter/fish live weight gain

Protein efficiency ratio (PER) = Mean weight gain per gram of crude protein fed (Osborne *et al.*, 1919)

Protein intake (g) = Feed intake x crude protein of feed.

The Apparent Digestibility Coefficient was also evaluated using the formula of Mayard *et al.*, (1979); Bondi, (1987)

$$(\text{ADC}) = 100 - \frac{(100 \times \% \text{AIA (Acid Insoluble Ash) of diets} \times \% \text{Nutrient in Faecal})}{\% \text{AIA of faecal} \times \% \text{Nutrient in diets}}$$

while Acid insoluble Ash as internal indicator (Church and Pond, 1988) which was carried out according to the method of Cokrell *et al.* (1987), the diets and faecal samples were ashed at 600°C for 6 hours. After which they were boiled with 250 ml 10% HCl for 5-10 minutes. The solution was filtered through ash less filter paper and thoroughly washed with hot water. The filter paper include the residue on the filter paper were then put into a crucible and placed in a muffle furnace at 600°C for 2 hours. The resulting acid insoluble ash were cooled and weighed as;

$$\% \text{Acid insoluble Ash (AIA)} = \frac{\text{Wt. of AIA} \times 100}{\text{Wt of sample taken}}$$

Statistical analysis

The experimental design was a one-way anova and the data were analyses using statistical package Minitab Release 14 at 5% significant level. The mean were separated using Turkey's method (Steel and Torrie, 1980; Duncan and Binder, 1995) while graph was drawn using the Microsoft excel window 2007.



Results

Table 3 shows the growth and feed utilization of *Clarias gariepinus* fed for 56 days with diet containing soybean waste meal. From the result it was observed that there were significant differences ($p < 0.05$) in some cases among the diets. There were significant difference ($p > 0.05$) between diets 1(5.31) and 5 (1.37) while there were insignificant difference ($p > 0.05$) between diets 2 and 3 in the mean weight gain (MWG) However, diet 1 (5.31) (control diet) gave the highest mean weight gain (MWG) while diet 5 exhibited the lowest mean weight gain (MWG) (1.31). The food conversion ratio (FCR) followed the same trend showing insignificant difference ($p > 0.05$) between diet 3 (2.40) and 4 (2.37) except diets 1 and 5 which showed significant difference ($p < 0.05$) between each other (Table 3). Consequently on the specific growth rate (SGR), there was insignificant difference between ($p > 0.05$) between diets 2(2.32) and 3(2.73) while there was significant difference ($p < 0.05$) between diets 1(3.10) and 5(1.63) however, diet 1(3.10) showed the highest specific growth rate (SGR). Also observed from table 4.1 that there were significant differences ($p < 0.05$) between diet 1(0.52) and diet 5(0.31) and there were insignificant difference ($p > 0.05$) between 3(0.44) and 4(0.44) in the protein efficiency ratio (PER). However, diet 1(0.52) showed the highest protein efficiency ratio (PER) with diet 5 (0.31) gave the lowest value. The apparent net protein utilization (ANPU) there was insignificant difference ($p > 0.05$) between diet 1(68.04) and diet 3(72.43) while there was significant difference ($p < 0.05$) between diet 2 (80.23) and diet 5(0.43) and the highest was diet 2(80.23) of apparent net protein utilization (ANPU).

Table 4 shows the nutrients utilization of *Carias gariepinus* fed soybean waste meal. The results also showed significant difference ($p < 0.05$) between initial carcass value (35.18) and diet 5 (14.33) while there were insignificant difference ($p > 0.05$) between diet 2 (70.00) and 3 (69.13) in the body crude protein (CP). However, diet 2 (70.00) was the highest while diet 5 (14.33) was the lowest in the body crude protein values (CP). Consequently, there was significant difference ($p < 0.05$) between initial body lipid value (31.09) and diet 5 (10.12) while there was insignificant difference ($p > 0.05$) between diets 1 (25.30) and 2 (23.09) in the body lipid values (LP). The body crude fiber (CF) also showed significant difference ($p < 0.05$) between diets 1 (8.71) and 3 (6.05) while there was insignificant difference ($p > 0.05$) between initial (6.13) and diet 3(6.05) in the crude fiber (CF) values and the highest was diet 1(8.71) in the crude fiber (CF). In ash there is insignificant difference ($p > 0.05$) between initial (12.64) and diet 3 (12.50) while there were significant difference ($p < 0.05$) between initial (12.64) and diet 5(1.02) and the highest was initial (12.64) in ash value. Finally, the dry matter (DM) contents also exhibited significant difference ($p < 0.05$) between diets 1(85.35) and initial carcass value (16.64) and insignificant difference between ($p > 0.05$) between diets 1(85.35) and 5 (79.77) with diet 1 been highest in dry matter (DM) value.

Table 5 shows the apparent digestibility co-efficient (ADC %) parameters. Where crude protein observed showed a significant difference ($p < 0.05$) between diets 4 (88.19) and 5 (81.43) while there was insignificant difference ($p > 0.05$) between diets 2 (86.42) and 3 (85.74). The crude fiber (CF) showed significant difference ($p < 0.05$) between diet 1(12.84) and diet 5(7.74) while there were no significant difference ($p > 0.05$) in the crude fiber digestibility of diets 1(12.84) and 2 (12.44) with diet 3 having highest value (19.17). Consequently, there was a



significant difference ($p < 0.05$) between diets 2 (57.32) and diet 3 (36.17) of the crude lipid (CL) digestibility while, there was insignificant difference ($p > 0.05$) in diets 1(39.05) and 5(40.96) of crude lipid the highest was diet 2 of the crude lipid (CL) value (57.32). In ash content, there was a significant difference ($p < 0.05$) between diets 1 (21.14) and 4 (6.98) and there was insignificant difference ($p > 0.05$) between diets 3 (10.15) and 5 (13.00) of ash digestibility while, the highest was diet 1 (21.14)

Table 3: Growth Response Of *Clarias Gariepinus* Fingerlings Fed Soyabean Waste for 56 Days


Growth parameters	Diet1	Diet 2	Diet 3	Diet 4	Diet 5	SD ±
Mean Initial Weight (g)	1.12 ^a ±0.007	1.34 ^a ±0.54	1.05 ^a ±0.52	1.07 ^a ±0.01	0.87 ^a ±0.16	0.23
Mean Final Weight (g)	6.44 ^a ±1.08	5.09 ^a ±1.736	5.06 ^a ±1.68	4.13 ^a ±2.50	2.25 ^a ±0.60	1.51
Mean Weight Gain (g)	5.31 ^a ± 1.15	4.08 ^a ±1.74	4.00 ^a ±1.67	2.79 ^a ±2.04	1.37 ^a ±0.74	1.41
Specific Growth Rate (%/day)	3.10 ^a ±0.40	2.32 ^a ±0.68	2.73 ^a ±0.55	2.17 ^a ±1.03	1.63 ^a ±0.74	0.65
Feed Conversion Ratio	1.95 ^a ± 0.19	2.89 ^a ±1.95	2.40 ^a ±0.57	2.37 ^a ±0.61	3.52 ^a ±1.25	1.01
Protein Efficiency Ratio	0.52 ^a ±0.05	0.38 ^a ±0.28	0.44 ^a ±0.12	0.44 ^a ±0.12	0.31 ^a ±0.11	0.14
Mortality (%)	36.67 ^b ± 2.89	31.67 ^b ±15.28	40.00 ^b ±18.03	50.00 ^a ±21.79	90.00 ^a ±5.00	13.33

Table 4: Body Compositions of *Clarias gareipinus* Fingerlings Fed Graded level inclusion of Soybean waste for 56 days

Proximate Compositions (%)	Initial Body Compositions (%)	Final Body Compositions (%)					SD±
		Diet 1	Diet 2	Diet 3	Diet 4	Diet 5	
Crude Protein	35.18 ^a ±0.01	54.91 ^a ±23.00	70.00 ^a ±0.01	69.13 ^a ±0.01	25.29 ^b ±0.01	14.33 ^b ±0.01	9.43
Crude fat	31.09 ^a ±0.0 1	25.30 ^b ±0.01	23.09 ^b ±0.01	14.29 ^d ±0.01	17.85 ^c ±0.01	10.12 ^c ±0.01	0.01
Crude fibre	6.13 ^b ±0.01	8.71 ^a ±0.01	7.98 ^a ±0.02	6.05 ^b ±0.01	5.88 ^b ±0.01	3.08 ^c ±0.01	0.01
Ash	12.64 ^a ±0.01	6.03 ^b ±0.006	14.00 ^a ±0.01	12.50 ^a ±0.01	5.50 ^b ±0.01	1.02 ^c ±0.01	0.03
Moisture	16.64 ^d ±0.01	85.35 ^a ±0.01	49.50 ^c ±0.01	58.93 ^c ±0.06	64.48 ^c ±0.01	79.77 ^b ±0.01	0.03

Table 5: Apparent Digestibility Co-efficient of *Clarias gapiepinus* Fingerlings fed Soybean waste for 56 days

Body Composition Parameters (%)	Diet 1	Diet 2	Diet 3	Diet 4	Diet 5 (100% SW)	SD±
	(0% SW)	(25% SW)	(50% SW)	(75% SW)		
Crude protein	79.57 ^d ±0.01	86.40 ^b ±0.01	85.74 ^b ±0.01	88.20 ^a ±0.01	81.43 ^c ±0.01	0.01
Crude Lipid	39.37 ^c ±0.01	57.30 ^a ±0.02	36.17 ^c ±0.01	54.50 ^b ±0.01	40.96 ^c ±0.01	0.01
Crude Fibre	12.84 ^{cb} ±0.01	12.43 ^c ±0.01	9.16 ^b ±0.01	13.8b±0.01	7.73d±0.01	0.01
Ash	21.13 ^a ±0.01	16.65 ^b ±0.01	10.14 ^d ±0.01	6.98 ^e ±0.01	13.00 ^c ±0.01	0.01
Dry Matter content	69.39 ^c ±0.01	86.19 ^b ±0.01	87.39 ^b ±0.01	91.91 ^a ±0.01	86.91 ^b ±0.01	0.01



Discussion

From the findings, diet 1 which had the 100% fish meal gave the best growth parameters results in terms of mean weight gain (MWG), food conversion ratio (FCR), specific growth rate (SGR) and protein efficiency ratio (PER). This is as a reflection of a good utilization of the diet. Diet 2 which had 75% fish meal and 25% soybean waste meal inclusion resulted in reduced growth performance which could be as a result of substitution of fish meal with soybean waste meal. Andrew and page (1974) reported that, substitution of fish meal with soybean meal in fish diet resulted in reduced growth and feed efficiency. Diets 2 (25%) and 3 (50%) soybean waste respectively showed insignificant difference ($p > 0.05$) in their performances which was very close in performance to diet 1 (control) which is an indication of positive contribution to growth of the fish as opined by Mambrini *et al.* (1999) who reported that, soy protein concentrate could replace 50% of dietary protein from fish meal in rainbow trout. The poor values observed in the food conversion ratio (FCR), specific growth rate (SGR), protein efficiency ratio (PER) and mean weight gain (MWG) in the diets 2, 3, 4 and 5 were indication of inefficient utilization of diets, this is not good enough especially at fingerling stage when the fish is still going through the lag phase. The slowdown in growth could be attributed to the high fiber content of the soybean waste as observed in the apparent digestibility value which is significantly lower than the control diets. Murai *et al.*, 1987; 1989 as cited by Kroghdahl, 1989 reported improvement in the utilization of soyabean meal when oligosaccharides was removed in the diet of salmon and



rainbow trout. Furthermore, the depressant growth observed can also be linked to anti-nutritive factors as reported in salmon (Olli et al. 1989), rainbow trout (Sandholm *et al.*, 1976, carps (Viola et al., 1983, Abel et al., 1984), Nile tilapia (Wee and Shu, 1989) and in channel catfish (Wilson and Poe, 1985). (Olli *et al.* 1989; Dersjant-Li, 2002). *Clarias gariepinus* has been reported to have a very poor handling of high fiber in its diets (Orire and Sadiku, 2014). Moreover, the study revealed that the fingerlings of *Clarias gariepinus* could tolerate up to 25% soybean waste meal in its diet beyond which there is decline in growth and survival. There are some relationships that featured in the carcass composition showed in table 5 where protein, lipid, ash and dry matter showed significant difference ($p < 0.05$) to the initial values. The performance of the diet is strongly in agreement with the work of Jauncey (1998) who stated that carcass composition should reflect the diets.

Conclusion

From the experiment the efficient diet utilization by *Clarias gariepinus* fingerlings feeding at 75% fish meal and 25% of soybean waste inclusion for diet 2. This indicates that, soybean waste meal could replace fish meal up to 25% in the fish feed composition without adverse effect.

Recommendation

Fingerlings producers can raise their fingerlings at economic rate by adding 75% fish meal and 25% soybean waste rather than 100% fish meal to reduce the inclusion level of fish meal in the feed production.

References

- [1] Abel, H.J., Becker, K., Meske, C.H.R., Friedrich, W., (1984). Possibilities of using heat-treated full-fat soybeans in carp feeding, 42, 97-108
- [2] Andrew, J.W., and Page, J.W. (1974). Growth factors in the fish meal component of catfish diets. J. Nutrition 104, 1091-1096
- [3] AOAC(2000): Official methods of Analysis of AOAC international vol. I Agriculture chemicals; contaminants, Drugs. 16th edn, AOAC int'l., Arlington, v.A.
- [4] APHA (1980) Standard Methods for the Examination of water and waste water, 18th edn. American Public Health Association, Washington DC, 1288 pp.
- [5] Dersjant-Li, Y. (2002). The use of soy Protein in Aquafeeds. In. Cruz-Suarez, I.E. Rieque-Marie, D. Tapa-Salazar, M. Gaxiola-Cortes, M.G., Simoes, N. (Eds.) Avances en Nutricion Acuicola VI. Memorias del VI. Simposium Internacional de Nutricion Acuicola 3 al 6 de Septiembre Cancun, Quintana Roo Mexico.
- [6] Duncan, D.B and Binder, A.E (1995): Multiple ranges and multiple F-Test Biometrics 11:1-42pp
- [7] Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO) (1997). Fisheries Statistics - Catch and landing (1995) Vol. 80. FAO Fisheries series No. 41. FAO of United Nation, Rome.
- [8] Jauncey, K. (1998). Tilapia Feeds and Feeding. Pisces Press Ltd., Stirling, Scotland. 240p.



- [9] Lin, J.H and Shiau, S.Y. (1995). Hepatic enzyme adaptation to different dietary carbohydrates I juvenile tilapia (*Oreochromis niloticus* x *O. aureus*). *Fisheries Physiology and Biochemistry*, 14, 165-170
- [10] Lim, C.E. and Webster, C.D. (2006). Nutrient requirements. In: Lim, C.E. and Wenster, C.D. (Eds), *Tilapia: Biology, Culture and Nutrition*. Food Products Press, New York, USA, pp. 469-501.
- [11] Mambrini, M., Roem, A.J., Cravedi, J.P., Kaushik, S.J., (1999). Effects of replacing fish meal with soy protein concentrate and of DL-methionine supplementation in high-energy, extruded diets on the growth and nutrient utilization of rainbow trout, *Oncorhynchus mykiss* *J. Anim. Sc.* 77. 2990-2999
- [12] Murai et al., 1987; 1989 In: Krogdahl, A. (1989). Alternative protein sources from plants contain antinutrients affecting digestion in salmonids. *Pro. Third. Int. symp. On feeding and Nutr. In Fish. Taha Aug. 28-Sept 1. Japan .* 353-361.
- [13] Nguyen, T.N. (2007). Total sulphur amino acid requirement and its application to practical diets for juvenile tilapia (*Oreochromis* spp) Ph.D dissertation. Auburn University, Auburn, Alabama, USA.
- [14] National Research Council (1993). Nutrent requirement of fish. Committee on Animal Nutrition. Board on Agriculture. National Academy of Sciences. National Academy Press. Washington DC., USA. P. 114.
- [15] Olli, J. Krogdahl, A., Berg-Lea, T., (1989). Effect of trypsin inhibitor activity on nutrient digestibility in trout reared in fresh water, *Acta Agric. Scand., Sect. A. Anim. Sci.* 44. 185-192
- [16] Orire A.M. and Sadiku S.O.E. (2014). Effects of Carbohydrate sources on the growth and body compositions of African catfish (*Clarias gariepinus*) *International Journal of Fisheries and Aquaculture* 6(5), 55-61
- [17] Osborne, T., Mendel, L. and Ferry, E. (1919) A method for expressing numerically the growth promoting value of proteins. *Journal of Biochemistry*, 37: 223-229.
- [18] Sandholm, M., Smith, R.R., Shih, J.C.H., Scott, M.L., (1976). Determination of antitrypsin activity on agar plates: relationship between antrypsin and biological value of soybean for trout. *J. Nutr.* 106, 761-766.
- [19] Steel, R.G.D and Torrie, J.H (1980): *Principle and procedure of statistic* McGraw-Hill New York. NY, 481pp
- [20] Swick, R.A., Akiyama, D.M., Boonyaratpalin, M., Creswell, D.C., (1995). Use of soybean meal and synthetic methionine in shrimp feed. *American Soybean Association, Technical Bulletin*.
- [21] Tacon, A.G.J. (1993). Feed ingredients for warmwater fish. Fish meal and other processed feedstuffs. *FAO Fish. Circ. No. 856*, FAO, Rome, Italy, 64 pp.
- [22] Viola, S., Mokady, S., Arieli, Y., (1983). Effects of soybean processing methods on the growth of carp (*Cyprinus carpio*) *Aquaculture* 32, 27-38
- [23] Wilson, R.P., Poe, W.E., (1985). Effects of feeding soybean meal with varying trypsin inhibitor activities on growth of fingerling channel catfish, *Aquaculture* 46, 19-25
- [24] Wee, K.L., Shu, S.W., (1989). The nutritive value of boiled full-fat soybean in pelleted feed for Nile tilapia. *Aquaculture* 81, 303-314.