Live Feeds in Marine Aquaculture

Live Feeds in Marine Aquaculture

Aquaculture Nutrition

Aquaculture Nutrition provides

- a global perspective on the nutrition of all cultivated aquatic animals
- papers in a range of topics from extensive aquaculture to laboratory studies of nutritional biochemistry and physiology
- an international forum for the presentation of reviews and original research papers to improve our understanding of the nutrition of aquacultured species

The journal is now also expanding into the shellfish subject area

Aquaculture Nutrition publishes papers which strive to:

- increase basic knowledge of the nutrition of aquacultured species and clevate the standards of published aquaculture nutrition research.
- improve understanding of the relationships between nutrition and the environmental impact of aquaculture.
- increase understanding of the relationships between nutrition and processing, product quality, and the consumer.



- help aquaculturalists improve their management and understanding of the complex discipline of nutrition.
- help the aquaculture feed industry by providing a focus for relevant information, techniques, tools and concepts.

Now available online as full text HTML or page layout PDF. Register FREE to view abstracts and for your personalised alerting service at

www.blackwell-science.com/anu/

The journal is covered by ASFA (Aquatic Sciences and Fisheries Abstracts), BIOSIS, Chemical Abstracts, Current Contents/Agriculture, Biology & Environmental Sciences, FISHLIT, ISI Alerting Services, Nutritional Abstracts and Reviews: Series B, Research Alert and SciSearch (Science Citation Index-Expanded).

Published quarterly, ISSN 1353 5773

(b) Blackwell

Osney Mead,

Telephone

Fax +44 (0)1865 72120

http://www. blackwell-science.com

Live Feeds in Marine Aquaculture

Edited by

Josianne G. Støttrup, PhD Danish Institute for Fisheries Research, Charlottenlund, Denmark

and

Lesley A. McEvoy, PhD North Atlantic Fisheries College, Shetland Isles, UK

Blackwell Science © 2003 by Blackwell Science Ltd, a Blackwell Publishing Company Editorial Offices: 9600 Garsington Road, Oxford OX4 2DQ, UK Tel: +44 (0)1865 776868 Blackwell Publishing, Inc., 350 Main Street, Malden, MA 02148-5018, USA Tel: +1 781 388 8250 Iowa State Press, a Blackwell Publishing Company, 2121 State Avenue, Ames, Iowa 50014-8300, USA Tel: +1 515 292 0140 Blackwell Publishing Asia Pty Ltd, 550 Swanston Street, Carlton South, Victoria 3053, Australia Tel: +61 (0)3 9347 0300 Blackwell Wissenschafts Verlag, Kurfürstendamm 57, 10707 Berlin, Germany Tel: +49 (0)30 32 79 060

The right of the Author to be identified as the Author of this Work has been asserted in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, except as permitted by the UK Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988, without the prior permission of the publisher. First published 2003 by Blackwell Science Ltd

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data is available

ISBN 0-632-05495-6

A catalogue record for this title is available from the British Library

Produced and set in Times by Gray Publishing, Tunbridge Wells, Kent Printed and bound in Great Britain by MPG Books, Bodmin, Cornwall

For further information on Blackwell Science, visit our website: www.blackwell-science.com

Contents

F	oreword	xiii
Preface		XV
С	Contributors	xvi
Abbreviations		xviii
1	Status of Marine Aquaculture in Relation to Live Prey: Past, Present and Future <i>David A. Bengtson</i>	1
	1.1 A Historical Perspective	1
	1.2 Marine Aquaculture Today and in the Future	5
	1.3 The Status of Larviculture and Live Feed Usage	7
	1.3.1 Africa	7
	1.3.2 Asia	8
	1.3.3 Europe	9
	1.3.4 North America	10
	1.3.5 Oceania	10
	1.3.6 South America, including Central America and the Caribbean	11
	1.4 Why is Live Feed Necessary?	11
	1.5 Problems and Prospects with Alternatives to Live Feed	12
	1.6 Conclusions	13
	1.7 References	13
2	Production and Nutritional Value of Rotifers	17
	Esther Lubzens and Odi Zmora	
	2.1 Introduction	17
	2.2 Biology and Morphological Characteristics of Rotifers	19
	2.2.1 General biology	19
	2.2.2 Taxonomy	21
	2.2.2.1 The genus <i>Brachionus</i>	21
	2.2.3 Morphology and physiology	23
	2.2.3.1 Feeding	23
	2.2.3.2 Digestion	25

2.2.3.3 Body fluids and excretion	26
2.2.3.4 Movement	26
2.2.3.5 Nervous system and sensory organs	26
2.2.4 Reproduction	27
2.2.4.1 Asexual and sexual reproduction	27
2.2.4.2 Reproductive rates	29
2.2.4.3 Sexual reproduction and resting egg formation	31
2.3 Culturing Rotifers	31
2.3.1 Selection of species and/or strain	31
2.3.2 Maintaining water quality in culture tanks	32
2.3.2.1 Organic particles	33
2.3.2.2 Bacteria and other organisms in the culture tanks	33
2.3.3 Choosing the most appropriate culture techniques	34
2.3.3.1 Small-scale laboratory cultures	35
2.3.3.2 Mass cultures	36
2.4 Advanced Warning on State of Cultures	43
2.4.1 Egg ratio	43
2.4.2 Swimming velocity	44
2.4.3 Ingestion rate	44
2.4.4 Viscosity	44
2.4.5 Enzyme activity	44
2.4.6 Diseases	44
2.5 Nutritional Quality of Rotifers	45
2.5.1 Number of rotifers consumed by larvae	45
2.5.2 Dry weight and caloric value	46
2.5.3 Biochemical composition	46
2.5.3.1 Protein and carbohydrate content	46
2.5.3.2 Lipid composition	47
2.5.3.3 Vitamin enrichments	48
2.5.4 Effects of starvation	48
2.6 Preserved Rotifers	49
2.6.1 Preservation at low temperatures	49
2.6.2 Cryopreservation	50
2.6.3 Resting eggs	50
2.7 Future Directions	52
2.8 References	52
3 Biology, Tank Production and Nutritional Value of Artemia	65
Jean Dhont and Gilbert Van Stappen	
3.1 Introduction	65
3.2 Biology of Artemia	67
3.2.1 Morphology and life cycle	67
3.2.2 Ecology and natural distribution	73
3.2.3 Taxonomy	75

	324	Strain-specific characteristics	76
	5.2.1	3 2 4 1 Size and energy content	78
		3.2.4.2. Hatching quality	77
		3.2.4.3 Diapause characteristics	77
		3.2.4.4 Growth rate of nauplii	78
		3.2.4.5 Temperature and salinity tolerance	78
		3.2.4.6 Life-history traits and reproductive capacity	78
		3.2.4.7 Nutritional value	79
	3.2.5	Cyst biology and diapause	79
		3.2.5.1 Cyst morphology and physiology	79
		3.2.5.2 Cyst metabolism and hatching	80
		3.2.5.3 Diapause	81
3.3	Produ	action Methods: Tank Production of Artemia Biomass	83
		3.3.1 Advantages of tank production and	
		tank-produced biomass	83
		3.3.2 Physicochemical conditions	84
		3.3.3 Artemia strain selection and culture density	86
		3.3.4 Feeding	86
		3.3.5 Infrastructure	88
		3.3.6 Culture techniques	91
		3.3.7 Control of infections	92
		3.3.8 Harvest and processing of cultured Artemia	93
		3.3.9 Production figures of intensive Artemia cultures	93
3.4.	Bioc	hemical composition	94
	3.4.1	Proximate composition	94
		3.4.1.1 Cysts and decapsulated cysts	94
		3.4.1.2 Nauplii	94
		3.4.1.3 Juveniles and adults	95
	3.4.2	Lipids	96
		3.4.2.1 Cysts and nauplii	96
		3.4.2.2 Ongrown Artemia	97
	3.4.3	Proteins	97
	3.4.4	Vitamins	98
3.5	Appli	ications of Artemia	99
	3.5.1	The future use of Artemia in aquaculture	99
	3.5.2	Hatching	99
	3.5.3	Harvesting hatched nauplii	102
	3.5.4	Decapsulation	104
	3.5.5	Enrichment	105
		3.5.5.1 Lipid enrichment	105
		3.5.5.2 Phospholipid enrichment	107
		3.5.5.3 Protein enrichment	108
		3.5.5.4 Vitamin enrichment	109
		3.5.5.5 Enrichment with prophylactics	110
		3.5.5.6 Enrichment with other products	110

3.5.6.1 Survival at low temperatures110 $3.5.6.2$ Maintenance of nutritional value110 $3.5.0.3$ Other advantages111 $3.5.7$ Use of juvenile and adult Artemia111 $3.5.7$ Use of juvenile and adult Artemia111 3.6 References112 4 Production, Harvest and Processing of Artemia from Natural Lakes122Gilbert Van Stappen122 4.1 Introduction of Artemia Cysts and Biomass123 $4.2.1$ Permanent solar salt operations123 $4.2.2$ Seasonal units124 $4.2.3$ Site selection125 $4.2.3.1$ Climatology126 $4.2.3.2$ Topography126 $4.2.3.3$ Soil conditions126 $4.2.4.2$ Dike construction127 $4.2.4.2$ Dixe construction127 $4.2.4.2$ Dike construction128 $4.2.5.2$ Preparation of ponds for Artemia cultivation128 $4.2.5.2$ Screening128 $4.2.5.3$ Fertilisation129 $4.2.5.4$ Inorganic fertilisers130 $4.2.6.1$ Artemia inculation131 $4.2.6.1$ Artemia inculation131 $4.2.6.1$ Artemia inculation131 $4.2.7.1$ Monitoring the Artemia population132 $4.2.7.2$ Abiotic parameters influencing Artemia populations133 $4.3.4$ Artemia and Processing Techniques134 $4.3.1$ Harvesting techniques137 $4.4.2.1$ Brine dehydration137 $4.4.2.3$ Increasing and Processing Techniques137 $4.4.2.4.3$ Diorie separation in brine139 $4.2.5$	3.5.6 Cold storage	110
$\begin{array}{rrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrr$	3.5.6.1 Survival at low temperatures	110
3.5.6.3 Other advantages111 $3.5.7$ Use of juvenile and adult Artemia111 3.6 References112 4 Production, Harvest and Processing of Artemia from Natural Lakes Gilbert Van Stappen122 4.1 Introduction122 4.2 Pond Production of Artemia Cysts and Biomass123 4.2.1 Permanent solar salt operations123 4.2.2 Seasonal units124 4.2.3 Site selection125 4.2.3.1 Climatology126 4.2.3.2 Topography126 4.2.3.3 Soil conditions126 4.2.4.1 Deepening the ponds127 4.2.4.2 Dike construction127 4.2.4.3 Streening128 4.2.5.1 Itiming128 4.2.5.2 Predator control128 4.2.5.3 Fertilisation129 4.2.5.4 Inorganic fertilisers130 4.2.5.5 Organic fertilisers130 4.2.6 Artemia incoulation of organic and inorganic fertilisers130 4.2.6 Artemia inoculation131 4.2.7 Monitoring the Artemia population131 4.2.6.1 Artemia inselection131 4.2.7.1 Monitoring the Artemia population132 4.2.7.3 Biotic factors influencing Artemia populations133 4.3 Artemia Harvesting and Processing Techniques134 4.3.1 Harvesting techniques137 4.4.2 Brine processing137 4.2.4 Divic factors influencing Artemia populations133 4.2.6 Artemia ind Processing Techniques137 4.2.7 Monitoring the Artemia population <td< td=""><td>3.5.6.2 Maintenance of nutritional value</td><td>110</td></td<>	3.5.6.2 Maintenance of nutritional value	110
$\begin{array}{rrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrr$	3.5.6.3 Other advantages	111
3.6 References1124 Production, Harvest and Processing of Artemia from Natural Lakes Gilbert Van Stappen1224.1 Introduction1224.2 Pond Production of Artemia Cysts and Biomass1234.2.1 Permanent solar salt operations1234.2.2 Seasonal units1244.2.3 Site selection1254.2.3.1 Climatology1264.2.3.2 Topography1264.2.3.3 Soil conditions1264.2.4.1 Deepening the ponds1274.2.4.2 Dike construction1284.2.5 Preparation of ponds for Artemia cultivation1284.2.5.1 Liming1284.2.5.2 Predator control1284.2.5.3 Fortilisation1294.2.5.4 Inorganic fertilisers1304.2.5.5 Organic fertilisers1304.2.5.6 Combination of organic and inorganic fertilisers1304.2.6.1 Artemia strain selection1314.2.7.2 Abiotic parameters influencing Artemia populations1334.2.7.3 Biotic factors influencing Artemia populations1334.3.4 Artemia trevesting and Processing Techniques1344.3.1 Harvesting techniques1374.4.2 Brine processing1374.4.2 Brine processing1374.4.2 Brine processing1374.4.2 Brine processing1374.4.2 Brine processing137 <t< td=""><td>3.5.7 Use of juvenile and adult Artemia</td><td>111</td></t<>	3.5.7 Use of juvenile and adult Artemia	111
4 Production, Harvest and Processing of Artemia from Natural Lakes 122 Gilbert Van Stappen 22 4.1 Introduction 122 4.2 Pond Production of Artemia Cysts and Biomass 123 4.2.1 Permanent solar salt operations 123 4.2.2 Seasonal units 124 4.2.3 Site selection 125 4.2.3.1 Climatology 126 4.2.3.2 Topography 126 4.2.3.3 Soil conditions 126 4.2.4.4 Pond adaptation 126 4.2.4.3 Screening 128 4.2.5 Preparation of ponds for Artemia cultivation 128 4.2.5.2 Predator control 128 4.2.5.3 Fertilisation 129 4.2.5.4 Inorganic fertilisers 130 4.2.5.5 Organic fertilisers 130 4.2.6.1 Artemia incoulation 131 4.2.6.2 Incoulation procedures 131 4.2.6.2 Incoulation procedures 131 4.2.7.3 Biotic factors influencing Artemia populations 132 4.2.6.1 Artemia atrain selection 131 4.2.6.2 Incoulation processing Techniques 134 4.2.7.3 Biotic factors influencing Artemia populations 133	3.6 References	112
4 Production, Harvest and Processing of Artemia from Natural Lakes 122 Gilbert Van Stappen 121 4.1 Introduction 122 4.2 Pond Production of Artemia Cysts and Biomass 123 4.2.1 Permanent solar salt operations 123 4.2.2 Seasonal units 124 4.2.3 Site selection 125 4.2.3.1 Climatology 126 4.2.3.2 Topography 126 4.2.3.3 Soil conditions 126 4.2.4.4.1 Deepening the ponds 127 4.2.4.2 Dike construction 127 4.2.4.3 Screening 128 4.2.5.5 Preparation of ponds for Artemia cultivation 128 4.2.5.1 Liming 128 4.2.5.2 Predator control 128 4.2.5.3 Fertilisation 129 4.2.5.4 Inorganic fertilisers 130 4.2.5.5 Organic fertilisers 130 4.2.6.1 Artemia inoculation 131 4.2.6.2 Inoculation procedures 131 4.2.6.2 Inoculation procedures 131 4.2.6.3 Notioring and managing the culture system 132 4.2.7.4 Abiotic parameters influencing Artemia populations 133 4		
4.1 Introduction1224.2 Pond Production of Artemia Cysts and Biomass1234.2.1 Permanent solar salt operations1234.2.2 Seasonal units1244.2.3 Site selection1254.2.3.3 Logography1264.2.3.1 Climatology1264.2.3.2 Topography1264.2.3.3 Soil conditions1264.2.4.1 Deepening the ponds1274.2.4.2 Dike construction1274.2.4.2 Dike construction1274.2.4.3 Screening1284.2.5 Preparation of ponds for Artemia cultivation1284.2.5.1 Liming1284.2.5.2 Predator control1284.2.5.3 Fertilisation1294.2.5.4 Inorganic fertilisers1304.2.5.5 Organic fertilisers1304.2.6 Combination of organic and inorganic fertilisers1304.2.6.1 Artemia strain selection1314.2.6.2 Inoculation procedures1314.2.7.3 Biotic factors influencing Artemia population1324.2.7.3 Biotic factors influencing Artemia populations1334.3 Arremia Harvesting and Processing Techniques1344.3.1 Harvesting techniques1354.4.1 Brine processing1374.4.2 Brine processing1374.4.2 Brine processing1374.4.2 Brine processing1374.4.2 Brine processing1374.4.3 Density separation in brine1394.3.4.2 Disk separation in brine1394.3.3 Density separation in brine1394.4.3 Density separation	4 Production, Harvest and Processing of <i>Artemia</i> from Natural Lakes <i>Gilbert Van Stappen</i>	122
4.2 Pond Production of Artemia Cysts and Biomass123 $4.2.1$ Permanent solar salt operations123 $4.2.2$ Seasonal units124 $4.2.3$ Site selection125 $4.2.3.1$ Climatology126 $4.2.3.2$ Topography126 $4.2.3.3$ Soil conditions126 $4.2.4.1$ Deepening the ponds127 $4.2.4.2$ Dike construction127 $4.2.4.3$ Screening128 $4.2.5.5$ Preparation of ponds for Artemia cultivation128 $4.2.5.2$ Predator control128 $4.2.5.3$ Fertilisation129 $4.2.5.4$ Inorganic fertilisers130 $4.2.5.5$ Organic fertilisers130 $4.2.5.6$ Combination of organic and inorganic fertilisers130 $4.2.6.1$ Artemia strain selection131 $4.2.6.2$ Inoculation procedures131 $4.2.7.1$ Monitoring the Artemia population132 $4.2.7.3$ Biotic factors influencing Artemia populations133 $4.3.1$ Harvesting techniques134 $4.3.2$ Processing Techniques134 $4.3.2$ Processing techniques137 $4.4.2$ Brine processing137 $4.4.2$ Brine dehydration137 $4.4.2$ Brine dehydration137 $4.4.2.2$ Size separation in brine139 $4.4.2.2$ Size separation in brine139 $4.4.2.2$ Size separation in brine139 $4.4.2.3$ Density separation in brine139 $4.2.5$ Density separation in brine139	4.1 Introduction	122
4.2.1 Permanent solar salt operations1234.2.2 Seasonal units1244.2.3 Site selection125 $4.2.3$ Site selection126 $4.2.3.2$ Topography126 $4.2.3.2$ Topography126 $4.2.3.3$ Soil conditions126 $4.2.3.3$ Soil conditions126 $4.2.4.1$ Deepening the ponds127 $4.2.4.2$ Dike construction127 $4.2.4.3$ Screening128 $4.2.5.7$ Preparation of ponds for Artemia cultivation128 $4.2.5.7$ Predator control128 $4.2.5.3$ Fertilisation129 $4.2.5.4$ Inorganic fertilisers130 $4.2.5.5$ Organic fertilisers130 $4.2.5.6$ Combination of organic and inorganic fertilisers130 $4.2.6.1$ Artemia strain selection131 $4.2.6.2$ Inoculation procedures131 $4.2.7.1$ Monitoring the Artemia population132 $4.2.7.2$ Abiotic parameters influencing Artemia populations133 $4.3.1$ Harvesting techniques134 $4.3.1$ Harvesting techniques137 $4.4.1$ Brine dehydration137 $4.4.2.3$ Density separation in brine139 $4.4.2.3$ Density separation in brine139	4.2 Pond Production of Artemia Cysts and Biomass	123
4.2.2 Seasonal units1244.2.3 Site selection125 $4.2.3$ Copography126 $4.2.3$ Topography126 $4.2.3.2$ Topography126 $4.2.3.3$ Soil conditions126 $4.2.4.3$ Soil conditions126 $4.2.4.1$ Deepening the ponds127 $4.2.4.2$ Dike construction127 $4.2.4.3$ Screening128 $4.2.5.1$ Liming128 $4.2.5.2$ Preparation of ponds for Artemia cultivation128 $4.2.5.3$ Fertilisation129 $4.2.5.4$ Inorganic fertilisers130 $4.2.5.5$ Organic fertilisers130 $4.2.5.6$ Combination of organic and inorganic fertilisers130 $4.2.5.6$ Combination of organic and inorganic fertilisers130 $4.2.6.1$ Artemia strain selection131 $4.2.6.2$ Inoculation procedures131 $4.2.7.2$ Abiotic parameters influencing Artemia populations133 $4.2.7.3$ Biotic factors influencing Artemia populations133 $4.3.1$ Harvesting techniques134 $4.3.2$ Processing techniques134 $4.3.2$ Processing techniques137 $4.4.1$ Harvesting techniques137 $4.4.2$ Brine dehydration137 $4.4.2.3$ Dira dehydration137 $4.4.2.3$ Density separation in brine139 $4.2.4.3$ Density separation in brine139	4.2.1 Permanent solar salt operations	123
4.2.3 Site selection125 $4.2.3.1$ Climatology126 $4.2.3.2$ Topography126 $4.2.3.2$ Topography126 $4.2.3.3$ Soil conditions126 $4.2.3.3$ Soil conditions126 $4.2.4.1$ Deepening the ponds127 $4.2.4.2$ Dike construction127 $4.2.4.3$ Screening128 $4.2.5.1$ Liming128 $4.2.5.2$ Preparation of ponds for Artemia cultivation128 $4.2.5.2$ Predator control128 $4.2.5.3$ Fertilisation129 $4.2.5.4$ Inorganic fertilisers130 $4.2.5.6$ Combination of organic and inorganic fertilisers130 $4.2.5.6$ Combination of organic and inorganic fertilisers130 $4.2.6.1$ Artemia strain selection131 $4.2.6.2$ Inoculation procedures131 $4.2.7.1$ Monitoring the Artemia population132 $4.2.7.3$ Biotic factors influencing Artemia populations133 $4.3.1$ Harvesting techniques134 $4.3.2$ Processing techniques135 $4.4.1$ Harvesting techniques137 $4.4.2$ Brine dehydration137 $4.4.2.3$ Density separation in brine139 $4.4.2.3$ Density separation in brine139 $4.4.2.3$ Density separation in brine139	4.2.2 Seasonal units	124
42.3.1 Climatology126 $4.2.3.2$ Topography126 $4.2.3.3$ Soil conditions126 $4.2.3.3$ Soil conditions126 $4.2.4.1$ Deepening the ponds127 $4.2.4.2$ Dike construction127 $4.2.4.2$ Dike construction128 $4.2.5.3$ Screening128 $4.2.5.1$ Liming128 $4.2.5.2$ Predator control128 $4.2.5.2$ Predator control128 $4.2.5.3$ Fertilisation129 $4.2.5.4$ Inorganic fertilisers130 $4.2.5.5$ Organic fertilisers130 $4.2.5.6$ Combination of organic and inorganic fertilisers130 $4.2.6.1$ Artemia insclution131 $4.2.6.2$ Inoculation procedures131 $4.2.6.2$ Inoculation procedures131 $4.2.7.1$ Monitoring the Artemia population132 $4.2.7.2$ Abiotic parameters influencing Artemia populations133 $4.3.1$ Harvesting and Processing Techniques134 $4.3.2$ Processing techniques137 $4.4.2$ Brine processing137 $4.4.2.1$ Brine dehydration137 $4.4.2.3$ Density separation in brine139 $4.4.2.3$ Density separation in brine139	4.2.3 Site selection	125
4.2.3.2 Topography126 $4.2.3.3$ Soil conditions126 $4.2.3.3$ Soil conditions126 $4.2.3.3$ Pond adaptation126 $4.2.4.1$ Deepening the ponds127 $4.2.4.2$ Dike construction127 $4.2.4.2$ Dike construction127 $4.2.4.3$ Screening128 $4.2.5.1$ Liming128 $4.2.5.2$ Predator control128 $4.2.5.2$ Predator control128 $4.2.5.3$ Fertilisation129 $4.2.5.4$ Inorganic fertilisers130 $4.2.5.5$ Organic fertilisers130 $4.2.5.6$ Combination of organic and inorganic fertilisers130 $4.2.6.1$ Artemia inoculation131 $4.2.6.2$ Inoculation procedures131 $4.2.7.1$ Monitoring the Artemia population132 $4.2.7.2$ Abiotic parameters influencing Artemia populations133 $4.3.1$ Harvesting and Processing Techniques134 $4.3.2$ Processing techniques137 $4.4.2.1$ Brine processing137 $4.4.2.1$ Brine dehydration137 $4.4.2.3$ Density separation in brine139 $4.4.2.3$ Density separation in brine139	4.2.3.1 Climatology	126
4.2.3.3 Soil conditions126 $4.2.4$ Pond adaptation126 $4.2.4.1$ Deepening the ponds127 $4.2.4.2$ Dike construction127 $4.2.4.2$ Dike construction127 $4.2.4.3$ Screening128 $4.2.5.4$ Preparation of ponds for Artemia cultivation128 $4.2.5.1$ Liming128 $4.2.5.2$ Predator control128 $4.2.5.3$ Fertilisation129 $4.2.5.4$ Inorganic fertilisers130 $4.2.5.5$ Organic fertilisers130 $4.2.5.6$ Combination of organic and inorganic fertilisers130 $4.2.6.1$ Artemia strain selection131 $4.2.6.2$ Inoculation procedures131 $4.2.7.1$ Monitoring the Artemia population132 $4.2.7.2$ Abiotic parameters influencing Artemia populations133 4.3 Artemia Harvesting and Processing Techniques134 $4.3.2$ Processing techniques137 $4.4.1$ Harvesting techniques137 $4.4.2$ Brine processing137 $4.4.2.1$ Brine dehydration137 $4.4.2.3$ Density separation in brine139 $4.4.2.3$ Density separation in brine139	4.2.3.2 Topography	126
4.2.4 Pond adaptation126 $4.2.4.1$ Deepening the ponds127 $4.2.4.2$ Dike construction127 $4.2.4.3$ Screening128 $4.2.4.3$ Screening128 $4.2.5.3$ Preparation of ponds for Artemia cultivation128 $4.2.5.1$ Liming128 $4.2.5.2$ Predator control128 $4.2.5.3$ Fertilisation129 $4.2.5.4$ Inorganic fertilisers130 $4.2.5.5$ Organic fertilisers130 $4.2.5.6$ Combination of organic and inorganic fertilisers130 $4.2.6.1$ Artemia strain selection131 $4.2.6.2$ Inoculation procedures131 $4.2.7.1$ Monitoring the Artemia population132 $4.2.7.2$ Abiotic parameters influencing Artemia populations133 4.3 Artemia Harvesting and Processing Techniques134 $4.3.2$ Processing techniques137 $4.4.1$ Harvesting techniques137 $4.4.2$ Brine processing137 $4.4.2.1$ Brine dehydration137 $4.4.2.3$ Density separation in brine139 $4.4.2.3$ Density separation in brine139	4.2.3.3 Soil conditions	126
4.2.4.1 Deepening the ponds1274.2.4.2 Dike construction1274.2.4.3 Screening1284.2.5 Preparation of ponds for Artemia cultivation1284.2.5 Preparation of ponds for Artemia cultivation1284.2.5.1 Liming1284.2.5.2 Predator control1284.2.5.3 Fertilisation1294.2.5.4 Inorganic fertilisers1304.2.5.5 Organic fertilisers1304.2.5.6 Combination of organic and inorganic fertilisers1304.2.5.6 Combination of organic and inorganic fertilisers1314.2.6.1 Artemia strain selection1314.2.6.2 Inoculation procedures1314.2.7.1 Monitoring the Artemia population1324.2.7.2 Abiotic parameters influencing Artemia populations1334.3 Artemia Harvesting and Processing Techniques1344.3.2 Processing techniques1374.4.1 Harvesting techniques1374.4.2 Brine processing1374.4.2 I Brine dehydration1374.4.2.3 Density separation in brine1394.4.2.3 Density separation in brine139	4.2.4 Pond adaptation	126
4.2.4.2 Dike construction1274.2.4.3 Screening1284.2.5 Preparation of ponds for Artemia cultivation1284.2.5.1 Liming1284.2.5.2 Predator control1284.2.5.3 Fertilisation1294.2.5.4 Inorganic fertilisers1304.2.5.5 Organic fertilisers1304.2.5.6 Combination of organic and inorganic fertilisers1304.2.6.1 Artemia inoculation1314.2.6.2 Inoculation procedures1314.2.7.1 Monitoring and managing the culture system1324.2.7.2 Abiotic parameters influencing Artemia populations1334.2.7.3 Biotic factors influencing Artemia populations1334.3.1 Harvesting and Processing Techniques1344.3.2 Processing techniques1374.4.1 Harvesting techniques1374.4.2 Brine processing1374.4.2.1 Brine dehydration1374.4.2.3 Density separation in brine1394.4.2.3 Density separation in brine139	4.2.4.1 Deepening the ponds	127
4.2.4.3 Screening1284.2.5 Preparation of ponds for Artemia cultivation1284.2.5.1 Liming1284.2.5.2 Predator control1284.2.5.3 Fertilisation1294.2.5.4 Inorganic fertilisers1304.2.5.5 Organic fertilisers1304.2.5.6 Combination of organic and inorganic fertilisers1304.2.6.1 Artemia inoculation1314.2.6.2 Inoculation procedures1314.2.7.1 Monitoring the Artemia population1324.2.7.2 Abiotic parameters influencing Artemia populations1334.3.1 Harvesting and Processing Techniques1344.3.2 Processing techniques1374.4.1 Harvesting techniques1374.4.2 Brine processing1374.4.2 Brine processing1374.4.2.3 Density separation in brine1394.4.2.3 Density separation in brine139	4.2.4.2 Dike construction	127
4.2.5 Preparation of ponds for Artemia cultivation1284.2.5.1 Liming1284.2.5.2 Predator control1284.2.5.2 Predator control1294.2.5.3 Fertilisation1294.2.5.4 Inorganic fertilisers1304.2.5.5 Organic fertilisers1304.2.5.6 Combination of organic and inorganic fertilisers1304.2.6.1 Artemia inoculation1314.2.6.2 Inoculation procedures1314.2.7.1 Monitoring and managing the culture system1324.2.7.2 Abiotic parameters influencing Artemia populations1334.3.1 Harvesting and Processing Techniques1344.3.2 Processing techniques1374.4.1 Harvesting techniques1374.4.2 Brine processing1374.4.2.1 Brine dehydration1374.4.2.3 Density separation in brine139	4.2.4.3 Screening	128
4.2.5.1 Liming1284.2.5.2 Predator control1284.2.5.3 Fertilisation1294.2.5.4 Inorganic fertilisers1304.2.5.5 Organic fertilisers1304.2.5.6 Combination of organic and inorganic fertilisers1304.2.6.1 Artemia inoculation1314.2.6.2 Inoculation procedures1314.2.7.1 Monitoring and managing the culture system1324.2.7.2 Abiotic parameters influencing Artemia populations1334.2.7.3 Biotic factors influencing Artemia populations1334.3.1 Harvesting and Processing Techniques1344.3.2 Processing techniques1374.4.1 Harvesting techniques1374.4.2 Brine processing1374.4.2.1 Brine dehydration1374.4.2.3 Density separation in brine139	4.2.5 Preparation of ponds for <i>Artemia</i> cultivation	128
4.2.5.2Predator control1284.2.5.3Fertilisation1294.2.5.4Inorganic fertilisers1304.2.5.5Organic fertilisers1304.2.5.6Combination of organic and inorganic fertilisers1304.2.6Artemia inoculation1314.2.6.1Artemia strain selection1314.2.6.2Inoculation procedures1314.2.7.1Monitoring and managing the culture system1324.2.7.2Abiotic parameters influencing Artemia populations1334.2.7.3Biotic factors influencing Artemia populations1334.3Artemia Harvesting and Processing Techniques1344.3.1Harvesting techniques1354.4Artemia Cyst Harvesting and Processing Techniques1374.4.1Harvesting techniques1374.4.2Brine processing1374.4.2.1Brine dehydration1374.4.2.3Density separation in brine1394.4.2.3Density separation in brine139	4.2.5.1 Liming	128
4.2.5.3 Fertilisation1294.2.5.4 Inorganic fertilisers1304.2.5.5 Organic fertilisers1304.2.5.6 Combination of organic and inorganic fertilisers1304.2.6 Artemia inoculation1314.2.6.1 Artemia strain selection1314.2.6.2 Inoculation procedures1314.2.7.1 Monitoring and managing the culture system1324.2.7.2 Abiotic parameters influencing Artemia populations1334.3.1 Harvesting and Processing Techniques1344.3.2 Processing techniques1354.4.1 Harvesting techniques1374.4.2 Brine processing1374.4.2.1 Brine dehydration1374.4.2.3 Density separation in brine1394.4.2.3 Density separation in brine139	4.2.5.2 Predator control	128
4.2.5.4 Inorganic fertilisers1304.2.5.5 Organic fertilisers1304.2.5.6 Combination of organic and inorganic fertilisers1304.2.6 Artemia inoculation1314.2.6.1 Artemia strain selection1314.2.6.2 Inoculation procedures1314.2.7 Monitoring and managing the culture system1324.2.7.1 Monitoring the Artemia population1324.2.7.2 Abiotic parameters influencing Artemia populations1334.2.7.3 Biotic factors influencing Artemia populations1334.3.1 Harvesting and Processing Techniques1344.3.2 Processing techniques1354.4 Artemia Cyst Harvesting and Processing Techniques1374.4.1 Harvesting techniques1374.4.2 Brine processing1374.4.2.1 Brine dehydration1374.4.2.2 Size separation in brine1394.4.2.3 Density separation in brine139	4.2.5.3 Fertilisation	129
4.2.5.5Organic ferminers1304.2.5.6Combination of organic and inorganic fertilisers1304.2.6.6Artemia inoculation1314.2.6.1Artemia strain selection1314.2.6.2Inoculation procedures1314.2.7Monitoring and managing the culture system1324.2.7.1Monitoring the Artemia population1324.2.7.2Abiotic parameters influencing Artemia populations1334.2.7.3Biotic factors influencing Artemia populations1334.3Artemia Harvesting and Processing Techniques1344.3.1Harvesting techniques1354.4Artemia Cyst Harvesting and Processing Techniques1374.4.1Harvesting techniques1374.4.2Brine processing1374.4.2.1Brine dehydration1374.4.2.3Density separation in brine1394.4.2.3Density separation in brine139	4.2.5.4 Inorganic fertilisers	130
4.2.3.6 Combination of organic and morganic fertilisers1304.2.6 Artemia inoculation1314.2.6.1 Artemia strain selection1314.2.6.2 Inoculation procedures1314.2.7 Monitoring and managing the culture system1324.2.7.1 Monitoring the Artemia population1324.2.7.2 Abiotic parameters influencing Artemia populations1334.2.7.3 Biotic factors influencing Artemia populations1334.3 Artemia Harvesting and Processing Techniques1344.3.1 Harvesting techniques1354.4 Artemia Cyst Harvesting and Processing Techniques1374.4.2 Brine processing1374.4.2.1 Brine dehydration1374.4.2.2 Size separation in brine1394.4.2.3 Density separation in brine139	4.2.5.5 Organic fertilisers	130
4.2.0 Artemia lifectiation1314.2.6.1 Artemia strain selection1314.2.6.2 Inoculation procedures1314.2.7 Monitoring and managing the culture system1324.2.7.1 Monitoring the Artemia population1324.2.7.2 Abiotic parameters influencing Artemia populations1334.2.7.3 Biotic factors influencing Artemia populations1334.3 Artemia Harvesting and Processing Techniques1344.3.1 Harvesting techniques1354.4 Artemia Cyst Harvesting and Processing Techniques1374.4.2 Brine processing1374.4.2.1 Brine dehydration1374.4.2.2 Size separation in brine1394.4.2.3 Density separation in brine139	4.2.5.6 Combination of organic and morganic fertilisers	130
4.2.0.1Artemia strain selection1314.2.6.2Inoculation procedures1314.2.7.1Monitoring and managing the culture system1324.2.7.1Monitoring the Artemia population1324.2.7.2Abiotic parameters influencing Artemia populations1334.2.7.3Biotic factors influencing Artemia populations1334.3Artemia Harvesting and Processing Techniques1344.3.1Harvesting techniques1354.4.2Processing techniques1374.4.1Harvesting techniques1374.4.2Brine processing1374.4.2.1Brine dehydration1374.4.2.2Size separation in brine1394.4.2.3Density separation in brine139	4.2.0 Artemia inoculation	131
4.2.0.2 Inocuration procedures1314.2.7 Monitoring and managing the culture system1324.2.7.1 Monitoring the Artemia population1324.2.7.2 Abiotic parameters influencing Artemia populations1334.2.7.3 Biotic factors influencing Artemia populations1334.3 Artemia Harvesting and Processing Techniques1344.3.1 Harvesting techniques1354.4.2 Processing techniques1374.4.1 Harvesting techniques1374.4.2 Brine processing1374.4.2.1 Brine dehydration1374.4.2.3 Density separation in brine1394.4.2.3 Density separation in brine139	4.2.6.1 Artenia strain selection	131
4.2.7Nonitoring and managing the current system1324.2.7.1Monitoring the Artemia population1324.2.7.2Abiotic parameters influencing Artemia populations1334.2.7.3Biotic factors influencing Artemia populations1334.3Artemia Harvesting and Processing Techniques1344.3.1Harvesting techniques1344.3.2Processing techniques1354.4Artemia Cyst Harvesting and Processing Techniques1374.4.1Harvesting techniques1374.4.2Brine processing1374.4.2.1Brine dehydration1374.4.2.2Size separation in brine1394.4.2.3Density separation in brine139	4.2.7 Monitoring and managing the culture system	131
4.2.7.1Homoring the Artemia population1324.2.7.2Abiotic parameters influencing Artemia populations1334.2.7.3Biotic factors influencing Artemia populations1334.3Artemia Harvesting and Processing Techniques1344.3.1Harvesting techniques1344.3.2Processing techniques1354.4Artemia Cyst Harvesting and Processing Techniques1374.4.1Harvesting techniques1374.4.2Brine processing1374.4.2.1Brine dehydration1374.4.2.2Size separation in brine1394.4.2.3Density separation in brine139	4.2.7 Monitoring the Artemia population	132
4.2.7.2 Foroite parameters influencing Artemia populations1334.2.7.3 Biotic factors influencing Artemia populations1334.3 Artemia Harvesting and Processing Techniques1344.3.1 Harvesting techniques1344.3.2 Processing techniques1354.4 Artemia Cyst Harvesting and Processing Techniques1374.4.1 Harvesting techniques1374.4.2 Brine processing1374.4.2.1 Brine dehydration1374.4.2.2 Size separation in brine1394.4.2.3 Density separation in brine139	4.2.7.2 Abjotic parameters influencing <i>Artemia</i> populations	132
4.3 Artemia Harvesting and Processing Techniques1344.3.1 Harvesting techniques1344.3.2 Processing techniques1354.4 Artemia Cyst Harvesting and Processing Techniques1374.4.1 Harvesting techniques1374.4.2 Brine processing1374.4.2.1 Brine dehydration1374.4.2.2 Size separation in brine1394.4.2.3 Density separation in brine139	4.2.7.3 Riotic factors influencing Artemia populations	133
4.3.1 Harvesting techniques1344.3.2 Processing techniques1354.4 Artemia Cyst Harvesting and Processing Techniques1374.4.1 Harvesting techniques1374.4.2 Brine processing1374.4.2.1 Brine dehydration1374.4.2.2 Size separation in brine1394.4.2.3 Density separation in brine139	4.3 Artemia Harvesting and Processing Techniques	133
4.3.2 Processing techniques1354.4 Artemia Cyst Harvesting and Processing Techniques1374.4.1 Harvesting techniques1374.4.2 Brine processing1374.4.2.1 Brine dehydration1374.4.2.2 Size separation in brine1394.4.2.3 Density separation in brine139	4.3.1 Harvesting techniques	134
4.4 Artemia Cyst Harvesting and Processing Techniques1374.4.1 Harvesting techniques1374.4.2 Brine processing1374.4.2.1 Brine dehydration1374.4.2.2 Size separation in brine1394.4.2.3 Density separation in brine139	4.3.2 Processing techniques	135
4.4.1 Harvesting techniques1374.4.2 Brine processing1374.4.2.1 Brine dehydration1374.4.2.2 Size separation in brine1394.4.2.3 Density separation in brine139	4.4 Artemia Cyst Harvesting and Processing Techniques	137
4.4.2 Brine processing1374.4.2.1 Brine dehydration1374.4.2.2 Size separation in brine1394.4.2.3 Density separation in brine139	4.4.1 Harvesting techniques	137
4.4.2.1 Brine dehydration1374.4.2.2 Size separation in brine1394.4.2.3 Density separation in brine139	4.4.2 Brine processing	137
4.4.2.2 Size separation in brine1394.4.2.3 Density separation in brine139	4.4.2.1 Brine dehydration	137
4.4.2.3 Density separation in brine 139	4.4.2.2 Size separation in brine	139
	4.4.2.3 Density separation in brine	139

4.4.2.4 Initial (or 'raw') storage	139
4.4.2.5 Cold storage	140
4.4.3 Freshwater processing	140
4.4.4 Drying	140
4.4.4.1 Layer drying in open air	141
4.4.4.2 Layer drying in oven	141
4.4.4.3 Fluidised bed drying	141
4.4.5 Prepackaging, packaging and storage	143
4.5 References	143
5 Production and Nutritional Value of Copepods	145
Josianne G. Støttrup	
5.1 Introduction	145
5.2 Biology	145
5.2.1 General characteristics	145
5.2.1.1 Calanoida	146
5.2.1.2 Harpacticoida	149
5.2.1.3 Cyclopoida	149
5.2.2 Copepod morphology	149
5.2.2.1 Digestive system	152
5.2.2.2 Circulatory system	153
5.2.2.3 Nervous system	153
5.2.2.4 Reproductive system	153
5.2.3 Reproduction	155
5.2.4 Resting of diapause eggs	150
5.2.5 Development, size and growth	156
5.2.5.1 Lite cycle	150
5.2.5.2 Mortality	15/
5.2.5.5 Size	158
5.2.6 Easding food quality and food quailability	130
5.2.6 Freeding, food quality and food availability	159
5.2.6.2 Herpacticoids	159
5.2.6.2 Malpacificolds	101
5.3. Production Methods	163
5.3.1 Extensive and outdoor cultures	168
5.3.1 1 Harvest of wild zoonlankton	168
5.3.1.2 Production in enclosed fiords or sea areas	168
5.3.1.2 Production in outdoor ponds or large tanks	100
5.3.2 Intensive culture of copepods	171
5.3.2.1 Calanoids	175
5.3.2.2 Harpacticoids	181
5.3.2.3 Cyclopoids	187

	5.4 1	Biochemical Composition	189
	4	5.4.1 Carbon	189
	4	5.4.2 Lipids	190
	4	5.4.3 Protein	190
	4	5.4.4 Free amino acids	191
	4	5.4.5 Vitamin C	191
	4	5.4.6 Carotenoids	191
	4	5.4.7 Chitin	191
	4	5.4.8 Enzymes	191
	5.5 1	Nutritional Value for Fish Larvae	191
	5.6	Application in Marine Aquaculture	194
	5.7 1	References	195
6	The	Microalgae of Aquaculture	206
	Arna	ud Muller-Feuga, Jeanne Moal and Raymond Kaas	
	6.1 I	ntroduction	206
	6.2 1	Biology of Microalgae	206
	(5.2.1 General characteristics of microalgae	206
	(5.2.2 Growth	209
	6	5.2.3 Substrates of photoautotrophy	213
		6.2.3.1 Light	213
		6.2.3.2 Mineral nutrients	217
	6	5.2.4 Substrates of heterotrophy	217
	6	5.2.5 Other factors affecting growth	218
		6.2.5.1 Temperature	218
		6.2.5.2 Salinity	219
		6.2.5.3 Metabolites	219
		6.2.5.4 pH	220
		6.2.5.5 Mixing	220
	6.3 1	Biochemical Composition of Microalgae	221
	6	5.3.1 Gross biochemical composition	222
	6	5.3.2 Vitamins	223
	6	5.3.3 Sterols	223
		6.3.3.1 Bacillariophyceae	225
		6.3.3.2 Prymnesiophycaea	227
		6.3.3.3 Prasinophyceae	227
		6.3.3.4 Cryptophyceae	228
	6	5.3.4 Fatty acids	228
		6.3.4.1 Bacillariophyceae	229

6.3.4.2	Prymnesiophycaea
---------	------------------

- 6.3.4.3 Prasinophyceae
- 6.3.4.4 Chlorophyceae
- 6.3.4.5 Cryptophyceae
- 6.3.4.6 Eustigmatophyceae232

229

230

231

232

	6.4	Production Methods for Aquacultural Microalgae	233
		6.4.1 State of the art of microalgal production	
		techniques in hatcheries	233
		6.4.1.1 Asepsis and quality controls	234
		6.4.1.2 Culture medium and temperature	236
		6.4.1.3 Running the cultures	236
		6.4.1.4 Efficiency	236
		6.4.2 Methods of improvement	237
		6.4.2.1 Continuous cultures	238
		6.4.2.2 The increase in production yields	238
		6.4.3 Heterotrophic production	240
		6.4.4 Discussion	242
	6.5	References	243
7	Use	es of Microalgae in Aquaculture	253
	<i>A. N</i>	Muller-Feuga, R. Robert, C. Cahu, J. Robin and P. Divanach	
	7.1	Introduction	253
	7.2	Microalgae as Food for Molluscs	254
		7.2.1 Microalgae as a potential food source in mollusc hatcheries	255
		7.2.1.1 Size	255
		7.2.1.2 Digestibility	256
		7.2.1.3 Nutritional value: biochemical composition of microalgae	257
		7.2.1.4 Microalgae bulk production	257
		7.2.2 Microalgal requirements in mollusc hatcheries	257
		7.2.2.1 Feeding broodstock	258
		7.2.2.2 Feeding larvae	259
		7.2.2.3 Feeding spat	261
		7.2.3 Microalgal substitutes for bivalve feeding	261
	7.3	Microalgae as Food for Shrimp	263
		7.3.1 Development of penaeid shrimp	263
		7.3.2 Selection of algal species used for rearing shrimp larvae	263
		7.3.3 Ingestion and filtration rates for shrimp larvae fed microalgae	265
		7.3.4 Nutrient supply from algae in relation to larval	2
		shrimp requirements	266
		7.3.5 Substitution of spray-dried algae or	2(0
		microparticulate compound diets for live algae	268
		7.3.6 Other roles of algae in shrimp larval growth	269
	7 4	7.3.7 Feeding microalgae to shrimp juveniles and adults	269
	7.4	Microalgae as Food for Live Prey	270
		7.4.1 Feeding live prey with live microalgae	270
		7.4.2 Nutritional value of algae for live prey	271
		7.4.2.1 Proteins and proximate composition	271
		7.4.2.2 Fatty acids	272
		1.4.2.3 Other lipid components	274

	7.4.3	Vitamins	275
	7.4.4	Minerals	275
	7.4.5	Influence of algae on live feed and larval microbiology	275
	7.4.6	Substitutes for live microalgae	276
7.5	Import	ance of Microalgae in Marine Finfish Larviculture	279
	7.5.1	Range of microalgal action	279
	7.5.2	Effects on endotrophic larval stages	279
	7.5.3	Effects on the yolk-sac drinking stage	280
		7.5.3.1 Drinking and ingestion of dissolved organics	280
		7.5.3.2 Ingestion of microalgae	281
		7.5.3.3 Digestion and assimilation of microalgae	282
	7.5.4	Resistance to delay in first zooplanktonic feeding	283
	7.5.5	Process and efficiency of first feeding	283
	7.5.6	Effect on survival and growth efficiency at first feeding	284
	7.5.7	Stimulation of digestive functions and gut flora	285
	7.5.8	Effects on early exotrophic larvae	286
	7.5.9	Indirect effects of microalgae on larvae	286
	7.5.10	Future developments	288
7.6	Refere	nces	288
	Appen	dix I	300
Appe		dix II	304
	Appendix III		306
	Appen	dix IV	307
	Taxono	omic Index	309
	Comm	on Names Index	312
Subject Index		313	

Foreword

In the preface the editors point out that marine aquaculture has shown an important evolution from a relatively modest operation to a mature bio-industry, both in its research and development as well as for the industry.

The maturation of the commercial ventures is seriously indebted to the huge progress in research and development in various disciplines relevant to aquaculture. Various indeed: if one feature can typify aquaculture research it is multidisciplinarity. Originally, the typical aquaculture researcher was a combination of a marine biologist, engineer, biochemist, physiologist, ecologist (at best), and a part-time plumber. Common knowledge on distinct topics was limited and progress was often achieved through sound, albeit empirical, experiments. Trial and error ruled, not necessarily in a one-to-one ratio. But as knowledge has broadened and deepened, aquaculture scientists became more specialized and fundamental research gradually came to underpin empirical findings.

With the drive for specialization it became harder for the individual scientist to keep track of all pertinent information as well as new developments in research fields other than his or her own. This explains and justifies the multiple initiatives to provide publications, like this book, offering comprehensive updates on a selected topic. To initiate such an initiative may well turn out to be a tedious job, but fortunately strong bonds were forged between leading research groups back in the days when the aquaculture '*who's who'* could still be printed on a single sheet of paper. And although some degree of (mostly healthy) competition exists, it is still rather easy to find enthusiastic and dedicated authorities willing to contribute to essential reviews of the state-of-the-art of, for instance, live feed technology.

As aquaculture developed, live feed has often been a bottleneck in the larviculture of many species of fish and shellfish, especially at times when upscaling from laboratory and pilot trials to large industrial units.

It is therefore a pleasure and an honor to introduce *Live Feed in Marine Aquaculture* wherein all its relevant issues are covered by representatives of some of world's finest aquaculture research groups.

Prof. Dr Patrick Sorgeloos

Preface

The past two decades have witnessed a dramatic expansion in the culture of marine finfish and crustaceans. Marine larviculture without live feed, or crustacean cultures without microalgae, are rarities in commercial aquaculture. The development of commercial formulated feeds remains today's upcoming challenge. In the meantime, the industry continues the struggle to produce stable quantities of high-quality live feeds. The different species used in marine aquaculture differ in their biology and culture requirements, providing ample challenges for the novice and requiring expertise in a commercial enterprise.

This book includes information on the biology and culture of copepods as well as of the better-known traditional live feeds such as rotifers and *Artemia*. Enrichment techniques for rotifers and *Artemia* have greatly improved their nutritional value for marine fish species and have contributed to the expansion of the industry. Nutritional defects, however, are still evident in some species and in other cases subtle differences such as decreased tolerance to low temperatures observed during the juvenile stages in marine fish are attributed to poor nutritional diets during the larval stages. With the increasing emphasis on fish welfare and the need to produce high quality fish both for the aquaculture industry and for stocking purposes, larval nutrition will continue to be a main focus area for research within marine aquaculture.

Filtering molluscs and penaeid shrimps require microalgal diets at least during some stage in their development. The development of mollusc culture is closely related to the quantity and quality of phytoplankton produced. In shrimp culture, despite the development of formulated diets, phytoplankton is still used in hatcheries to supplement the diet during the larval stages. Survival and growth in marine fish larvae can be improved by the addition of live cultures. Although their role is not fully understood, their positive effects are well documented.

This book provides the reader with the compiled information on most of the live feeds used in modern marine aquaculture. Although it may not be exhaustive, it will supply the basic information needed on the biology of the species and an introduction to the relevant literature. It will also serve as a practical guide, intended to provide the reader with a good overview on culture techniques for the different species involved and with substantial reference to related literature. Three chapters deal with the hatchery production, use and nutritional value of respectively *Artemia*, rotifers and copepods. A further chapter deals with the production, harvest and processing of *Artemia* from natural lakes. Two chapters on microalgae deal with their use and production in aquaculture providing the reader with a broad insight on the importance of phytoplankton in marine aquaculture, their production and nutritional value.

The book is intended for advanced undergraduates, postgraduates and researchers in the field of marine aquaculture. It may also be relevant to experimental researchers working on physiology, behaviour or energetics in these species, or to hatchery biologists who may wish to diversify or improve their culture methods.

Contributors

David A. Bengtson Professor and Graduate Program Director, Department of Fisheries, Animal and Veterinary Science, University of Rhode Island, Kingston, RI 02881, USA. Tel.: (1) 401 874 2668, fax: (1) 401 874 4017, e-mail: bengtson@uriacc.uri.edu

Chantal Cahu Senior research scientist, Laboratoire Nutrition, IFREMER, Centre de Brest, BP 70, 29280 Plouzané, France. Tel.: (33) 2 98 22 40 40, fax: (33) 2 98 22 45 45, e-mail: chantal.cahu@ifremer.fr

Pascal Divanach Head of Aquaculture Department, Institute of Marine Biology of Crete, PO Box 2214, Post of Poros, 71003 Iraklion, Crete, Greece. Tel.: (308) 81 24 15 43, e-mail: imbc@imbc.gr

Jean Dhont Researcher, Laboratory of Aquaculture & Artemia Reference Center, Ghent University, Rozier 44, 9000 Gent, Belgium. Tel.: (32) 9 264 3754, Fax: (32) 9 264 4193, e-mail: jean.dhont@rug.ac.be

Raymond Kaas Senior research scientist, Laboratoire Algae Biotechnology, IFREMER, Centre de Nantes, BP 21 105, 44 311 Nantes cedex 03, France. Tel.: (33) 2 40 37 41 09, fax: (33) 2 40 37 40 71, e-mail: raymond.kaas@ifremer.fr

Esther Lubzens Department of Marine Biology and Biotechnology, Israel Oceanographic and Limnological Research, National Institute of Oceanography, PO Box 8030, Haifa 31080, Israel. Tel.: (972) 4 8515202, fax: (972) 4 8511911, e-mail: esther@ocean.org.il

Jeanne Moal Senior research scientist, Laboratoire Invertebrate Physiology, IFREMER, Centre de Brest, BP 70, 29280 Plouzané, France. Tel.: (33) 2 98 22 40 40, fax: (33) 2 98 22 45 45, e-mail: jeanne.moal@ifremer.fr

Arnaud Muller-Feuga Head, Laboratoire Algae Biotechnology, IFREMER, Centre de Nantes, BP 21 105, 44 311 Nantes cedex 03, France. Tel.: (33) 2 40 37 42 20, fax: (33) 2 40 37 40 71, e-mail: amuller@ifremer.fr

René Robert Senior research scientist, Laboratoire Invertebrate Physiology, IFREMER, Centre de Brest, BP 70, 29280 Plouzané, France. Tel.: (33) 2 98 22 40 40, fax: (33) 2 98 22 45 45, e-mail: rene.robert@ifremer.fr

Jean Robin Senior research scientist, Laboratoire Nutrition, IFREMER, Centre de Brest, BP 70, 29280 Plouzané, France. Tel.: (33) 2 98 22 40 40, fax: (33) 2 98 22 45 45, e-mail: jean.robin@ifremer.fr

Josianne G. Støttrup Senior research scientist, Danish Institute for Fisheries Research, Department for Marine Ecology and Aquaculture, Charlottenlund Castle, DK-2920 Charlottenlund, Denmark. Tel.: (45) 3396 3394, fax: (45) 3396 3333, e-mail: jgs@dfu.min.dk

Gilbert Van Stappen Researcher, Laboratory of Aquaculture & Artemia Reference Center, Ghent University, Rozier 44, B-9000 Ghent, Belgium. Tel.: (32) 9 264 37 54, fax: (32) 9 264 41 93, e-mail: gilbert.vanstappen@rug.ac.be

Oded Zmora National Center for Mariculture, Israel Oceanographic and Limnological Research Ltd, PO Box 1212, Eilat 88112, Israel. Tel.: (972) 7 6361442, fax: 972 7 6375761, e-mail: zmora@agri.huji.ac.il

Abbreviations

AA	Amino acids
ARA	Arachidonic acid; 20:4n-6
AscA	Ascorbic acid
AscAS	Ascorbic acid-2-sulfate
ATP	Adenosine triphosphate
AWL	Air-water lift system
BOD	Biochemical oxygen demand
DHA	Docosahexaenoic acid; 22:6n-3
DPH	Days post-hatching
DPF	Days post-(first) feeding
DPPC	Dipalmitoyl phosphatidylcholine
DW	Dry weight
EEZ	Exclusive economic zones
EFA	Essential fatty acids
EPA	Eicosapentaenoic acid; 20:5n-3
ESD	Equivalent spherical diameter
FAO	United Nations Food and Agriculture Organisation
FCE	Food conversion efficiency
FW	Weight after preservation in buffered saline formaldehyde
GMO	Genetically modified organisms
GSL	Great Salt Lake
HUFA	Highly unsaturated fatty acids with 20-22 carbon atoms and more than three
	double bonds
ILL	Incipient limiting level
ISA	International Study on Artemia
LC_{50}	Lethal concentration for 50% of the sampled population
LNA	Linolenic acid; 18:3n-3
L-type	Large type
PAR	Photosynthetically active radiation
PL	Phospholipid
PLa	Post-larvae
PUFA	Polyunsaturated fatty acids with more than one double bond
SCP	Single cell proteins
SFB	San Francisco Bay
SGR	Specific growth rate
SL	Standard length
S-type	Small type
TAG	Triacylglycerols
WW	Wet weight

Chapter 1 Status of Marine Aquaculture in Relation to Live Prey: Past, Present and Future

David A. Bengtson

1.1 A Historical Perspective

It is difficult to determine exactly where and when marine aquaculture began. Milkfish culture has been conducted in Asia for centuries, based on the capture of fry from the wild (Pamplona & Mateo 1985; Liao 1991), so that modern rearing methods and live feed in the hatchery were not required. The efforts to repopulate the seas of Europe and North America in the late 1800s may provide a more useful starting point for a brief historical review of the modern methods. In response to the fishery crisis at that time, 'hatcheries' were constructed in several countries for the purpose of providing fertilised eggs, developing embryos and larvae for distribution back into the ocean. The hope was that these would thrive and be recruited into the commercial fisheries. Given the knowledge of freshwater fish culture in Europe and the Americas, especially of salmonid culture, which had been rapidly developing since the mid-1800s and the attendant propagation, transportation and introduction of salmonid populations (Stickney 1996), this was not an unreasonable hope for the times. By the 1890s, Britain, France, Canada and the USA all had fish hatcheries devoted to the propagation of commercially important species, such as cod (Gadas morhua), haddock (Melanogrammus aeglefinus), turbot (Scophthalmus maximus = Psetta maxima), winter flounder (*Pleuronectes americanus*) and lobster (*Homarus* sp.). The prevailing practice was to obtain gravid adults of a given species, strip them of their gametes for purposes of controlled fertilisation, sometimes on-board ship (some of the hatcheries were in fact ships), sometimes on shore, and maintain them no longer than the prolarva stage prior to release back to the ocean. The reason for the release at such an early stage of development was simple: there was no convenient live feed with which to provide them for their postlarval survival and growth. Cod larvae were raised in concrete ponds in Flødevigen, Norway, in the 1880s on a diet of natural zooplankton and in the absence of predators (Rognerud 1887), but apparently the results of this 'experiment' were interpreted to mean that the larvae should survive in nature, not that juveniles could be reared for release. It is only with the benefit of hindsight that we know that these ocean stocking efforts were doomed to fail, owing to the high mortality rates of fish early life-stages in the oceans. Nevertheless, many of these programmes were sustained for decades until the lack of evidence of any success from them became apparent. We will never know whether earlier discovery of easily culturable live

feeds would have allowed hatchery culture of these species to a later stage when they might have had better chances of oceanic survival. Indeed, the field of stock enhancement might have been advanced by several decades had convenient live feeds been available in the late 1800s.

Just as many of the ocean stocking programmes of the late 1800s and early 1900s were being phased out, two developments occurred half a world apart that paved the way for much of the development of modern marine aquaculture. First, nauplii of the brine shrimp, *Artemia*, were found to be a good food for raising both freshwater and some marine larval fish (Seale 1933; Gross 1937; Rollefsen 1939). This allowed the culture of at least some fish species (those with mouths large enough to ingest *Artemia* nauplii as a first food). The use of *Artemia* nauplii as a convenient live feed, not only for fish, but also (and especially) for crustaceans, has perhaps done as much for the explosion of marine aquaculture in the late 1900s as any other development. Secondly, in the 1930s, Japanese researchers, beginning with Dr M. Fujinaga, began research on the culture of the kuruma prawn, *Penaeus japonicus*, which subsequently led to the development of the shrimp industry that we know today (Liao & Chien 1994). That research, interrupted unfortunately by World War II, continued through the 1960s, when commercial culture of *P. japonicus* was finally achieved.

Meanwhile, techniques were developed in the 1920s and 1930s that led to the development of molluscan hatcheries. Oyster culture, which has been known since Roman times, expanded in Japan in the seventeenth century with the finding that oyster larvae would settle on bamboo stakes, and expanded further in Europe, North America and Australia in the nineteenth century based on bottom culture (Bardach et al. 1972). Similarly, clam culture has been known in Japan and mussel culture has been known in France for several hundred years (Bardach et al. 1972). However, molluscan culture always relied on the settling of larvae from the natural zooplankton (and still does in many areas). Wells (1920) used a milk clarifier to retain oyster larvae while their water was being changed. Although hatchery spawning of oysters had been demonstrated as early as 1879, no one had been able successfully to change oyster culture water, and therefore replenish the algal food, without losing the larvae (Wells 1920). Wells (1927) then went on to raise clam larvae as well. Spawning and successful larval culture of mussels was not achieved until the early 1950s (Loosanoff & Davis 1963). Investigations of algal feeds for the rearing of molluscan larvae took place in the 1930s at both the Conwy, Wales, Fisheries Experiment Station (Walne 1974) and the Milford, USA, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries Biological Laboratory (Loosanoff & Davis 1963). Fertilisation of large tanks of filtered seawater to induce mixed phytoplankton blooms as food for molluscan larvae was carried out continuously beginning in 1938 (Loosanoff & Davis 1963), despite the contention that 'large-scale cultivation of microalgae ... was probably first considered seriously in Germany during World War II' (Becker 1994). Decades of work at the Conwy and Milford laboratories paved the way for hatchery production of molluscs for commercial aquaculture in which natural settling of larvae was either impossible or undesirable.

The culture of algae seems to have its origins in the late 1800s and was enabled by the methods developed by bacteriologists (Bold 1950). Marine algal culture lagged behind its freshwater counterpart, which successfully used uncomplicated media (Pringsheim 1924; Schreiber 1927) in the early 1900s. A significant advance in marine algal culture was reported by Gross (1937), who tried to culture diatoms and dinoflagellates, but whose

attention was drawn to 'nannoplankton flagellates, most of them probably unknown systematically' of about 2–10 μ m in size. He was able to culture these and use them as feed for harpacticoid copepods over three copepod generations. He summarised his work by writing 'All these experiments led me to the conclusion that the autotroph nannoplankton flagellates are of great importance in the food economy of the sea.' Little did he know that they would also be of great importance in aquaculture. Methods for marine algal culture continued to advance during the middle of the twentieth century with the development of artificial media (Provasoli *et al.* 1957) and the development of 'f' medium for the enrichment of seawater (Guillard & Ryther 1962). Improved methods for monospecific algal cultures allowed expansion of hatcheries for molluscan aquaculture and enabled culture of live invertebrates as feed for larval fish and crustaceans.

Another extraordinarily important advance was made in the 1960s, when Japanese researchers discovered that rotifers, *Brachionus plicatilis*, previously considered a pest in culture ponds, could be used as a first food for larvae of both freshwater and marine fish species (Hirata 1979). This advance clearly allowed the culture of many more species whose larvae hatched at such a small size that their mouth gapes were insufficient for the ingestion of the larger *Artemia* prey. In retrospect, considering the large number of commercially important marine fish species that have been brought into culture and that rely on rotifers as first food in culture facilities, the debt to those initial Japanese culturists is profound.

The 1960s saw widespread interest in the culture of commercially important marine fish species, first from a research perspective. In Japan, efforts were made to culture larvae of red sea bream, flounder and puffer fish, among others. In Britain, the White Fish Authority engaged in activities particularly in the area of flatfish culture (Shelbourne 1964) that ultimately led to the first commercial production of turbot in 1976 (Person-Le Ruyet et al. 1991). In France, research conducted primarily in the 1970s led to the development of the French sea bass and turbot industries in the 1980s (Person-LeRuyet et al. 1991; Coves et al. 1991). In many countries, including the USA, interest in larval fish biology from a fisheries perspective caused many laboratories to begin rearing larval fish on fieldcollected zooplankton, sometimes supplemented with rotifers and Artemia nauplii (e.g. Houde 1972), in order to conduct fisheries research (e.g. Laurence et al. 1981). Norwegian scientists, using some pertinent results from the cod-spawning and restocking efforts 100 years earlier, began pond culture of cod larvae using natural zooplankton in the mid-1970s, and followed that with a major research programme on halibut culture beginning in the 1980s. Many of the above efforts documented the difficulty of rearing the extremely delicate marine larvae through the first-feeding stages and on to metamorphosis and subsequent grow-out (e.g. Jones 1972). Clearly, early efforts at rearing larval marine fish, whether using natural zooplankton, rotifers or Artemia, were fraught with difficulties, to the point that the famous Kyoto conference in 1976 declared larval rearing a major bottleneck in marine aquaculture (Pillay 1979).

As the 1970s saw the beginning of commercial production of several marine finfish and penaeid shrimp species, this decade is also noteworthy for the discovery that live feeds vary significantly in quality. From early reports suspecting pollutants (Bookhout & Costlow 1970) to later, more definitive, studies (Watanabe *et al.* 1978; and several papers from the International Study on *Artemia*: see Persoone *et al.* 1980), it became very obvious that different geographical strains of brine shrimp differed in their ability to support good survival and growth of marine larvae. The finding that the differences were due primarily to

fatty acid profiles led to productive collaborations between aquaculturists and biochemists that have resulted in literally hundreds of publications on the subject, as well as commercial products that have played no small role in the development of marine aquaculture. The lessons learned from brine shrimp were also shown to apply to rotifers (Lubzens *et al.* 1984), to be intimately connected to algal food supply (Léger *et al.* 1986) and to explain much of the high quality of natural zooplankton as a food item. The necessity for aquaculturists to understand in detail the physiology and biochemistry of the organisms that they raise has contributed much to making marine aquaculture a sophisticated industry.

One event of the 1970s played a major role in the development of marine aquaculture, especially stock enhancement: the establishment of exclusive economic zones (EEZs). This event convinced the Japanese that they needed to become self-sufficient in seafood production, because they could no longer fish at will in the coastal waters of many nations and because they saw that an interruption of supplies on an international scale was a real possibility (Sproul & Tominaga 1992). The Japanese government responded by embarking on a massive research and hatchery-building campaign (Davy 1990, 1991). National and prefectural hatcheries now produce millions of fish, prawns and crabs for release into Japanese waters each year through the efforts of the national and prefectural Sea Farming Associations. As part of this effort, Japanese researchers have often led the way in marine aquaculture research and the practical applications of that research can be seen around the world. Investigations into the improvement of live feed, especially rotifers and *Artemia*, have certainly been a major contribution of the Japanese research programme.

The last quarter of the twentieth century saw the explosion of marine aquaculture, both shrimp and fish. The aforementioned Japanese work on kuruma prawn led ultimately to the culture of numerous penaeid species around the world. Although postlarval shrimp for stocking into grow-out ponds were for years collected from the wild, the recent trend has been toward hatchery production, which is heavily dependent on microalgae and Artemia nauplii as larval feeds. Japanese research on red sea bream (Pagrus major) similarly led to the development of that species for commercial aquaculture in Japan as well as for stock enhancement. Research on other fish species in various areas of the world has led to large-scale aquaculture production of gilthead sea bream (Sparus aurata) and sea bass (Dicentrarchus labrax) in the Mediterranean region, Asian sea bass (Lates calcarifer) in the Indo-West Pacific region, turbot in western Europe and olive flounder (Paralichthys olivaceus) in east Asia, among other species, all dependent on live feed in the hatchery stage. Although commercial aquaculture of these species has become well established, a variety of species is still undergoing commercial growing pains, for example, Atlantic halibut (*Hippoglossus hippoglossus*), several groupers (Epinephelus spp.) and cod; again, all require live feed in the hatchery. Indeed, of all the marine fish species in production or in the research and development pipeline, it seems that only the wolfish species (Anarhichas spp.) can be routinely fed formulated diets directly upon hatching. It appears likely that live feed will be required well into the future, not only for the established and nearly established species, but also for the plethora of new bream, sciaenid, flounder and sole species currently poised to make their debut appearances on the world's commercial aquaculture stage.

One of the more interesting controversies in the live feed area is the view that natural or cultured copepods are necessary for at least some species, as opposed to the view that rotifers and *Artemia* nauplii are quite sufficient. The former view seems to come from the

Nordic countries, particularly Norway and Denmark. A valuable result of this controversy has been the extensive biochemical analyses of natural zooplankton to determine whether particular nutritional ingredients are present there, but lacking in rotifers and Artemia. Van der Meeren and Naas (1997) provide an excellent review of larval fish rearing in large, enclosed systems primarily through the use of natural zooplankton. Norwegian scientists have pioneered this field of larviculture in ponds and natural inlets that have been closed off from the sea. The procedure requires either the filtration of incoming water or the use of rotenone to kill any predators. The enclosures can be fertilised to increase the phytoplankton productivity within, so that large populations of copepods are available on which the larvae can feed. Alternatively, larvae can be reared in a bag enclosure and provided with additional zooplankton that has been collected from the adjacent waters by the use of a plankton wheel (see van der Meeren & Naas 1997, p. 373). Cod have been raised successfully in Norwegian lagoons using these methods and halibut have been raised there in bags. A company in Denmark produces turbot larvae in large concrete tanks in which zooplankton 'blooms' are induced. In addition, at least one of the tanks is devoted exclusively to extensive copepod culture and used to feed the larval fish tanks if live prey levels therein fall too low. While larvae of all these species grow extremely well on the natural zooplankton, the production at such facilities is, almost by definition in the temperate zone, seasonal and not amenable to more intensive production methods in which juveniles must be produced year-round. However, some species produce larvae with mouths that are too small to ingest even rotifers at first feeding and an alternative live prey, such as copepod nauplii, would be necessary to culture such species. Furthermore, it is well known that the nutritional value of copepods is better than that of the convenient live feeds such as rotifers and brine shrimp. Thus, abundant rationale exists for research on the mass production of copepods. Research efforts into rearing copepods in intensive indoor systems have shown some promise, but commercial-scale production has not been achieved (see review by Støttrup 2000).

Oddly, the use of live prey in hatcheries may be strongly related to one of the banes of the marine larviculturist, disease. As beneficial, indeed critical, as rotifers have been to the development of marine fish larviculture, it has been known for some time that rotifer cultures fed to a tank of fish can also carry pathogenic bacteria, such as *Vibrio* spp., that can lead to subsequent disease problems (Gatesoupe 1982). In a similar way, bacteria from *Artemia* hatching water, if the *Artemia* cysts have not been decapsulated or otherwise disinfected, can introduce to the fish tanks xenobiotics from wherever in the world the *Artemia* cysts originated. Disease has become a major consideration in hatcheries and the microbial ecology of hatchery tanks has become an area of intense research which one hopes will lead to more predictable hatchery outputs (Vadstein *et al.* 1993; Vadstein 1997). Live feeds thus have both good and bad aspects, and one challenge of the future is to minimize the bad aspects.

1.2 Marine Aquaculture Today and in the Future

At the time of writing, the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) had just released its preliminary estimates for fisheries and aquaculture statistics from 1999, which indicate that world aquaculture production was 32.9 million tonnes (19.8 million t from freshwater, 13.1 million t from marine) (FAO 2000). Thus, aquaculture makes up

more than 35% of the total 92.6 million tonnes of fisheries products consumed by humans. Marine aquaculture has been growing by about 0.9 million tonnes per year in recent years, while the growth of freshwater aquaculture has been closer to 1.1 million tonnes per year. In 1998, the last year for which full statistics are available, aquaculture production of purely marine fish was 781,000 t, thus lagging behind crustaceans, mostly shrimp (1,564,000 t), and diadromous fish, mostly salmonids (1,909,000 t), and far behind freshwater fish, mostly carp (17,355,000 t) (FAO 2000).

The major research endeavours in marine hatchery aquaculture today can be divided into three broad categories: improving reliability of production for existing species, development of culture methods for new species, and maximising the survival probability in the wild for hatchery-reared fish in stock enhancement programmes. Production reliability is being improved by several strategies. Selective breeding programmes for both fast growth and disease resistance should result in improved hatchery production in future years and those for improved flesh quality should ultimately yield a better product going to market. Improved management of microbial ecology in hatchery tanks through better husbandry, use of probiotics, etc., should also help production reliability. Development of vaccines, delivered by injection to older juveniles and by immersion to younger juveniles, should likewise aid in the minimisation of disease problems. Finally, the search for replacements for live feed proceeds apace as the world-wide availability of Artemia remains a question (see below) and the culture of algae and rotifers continues to be a labour-intensive requirement for marine hatcheries. The development of culture methods for new species tends to demonstrate the similarity of the requirements for raising different marine fish species, rather than differences between them. The research in this area generally involves the fine-tuning of widely accepted principles and procedures for application to the new species in question; if the culture of a species requires more than fine-tuning, its commercial development can be slowed or impaired (as in the case of Atlantic halibut). For example, if live feed other than rotifers and Artemia are required, the development of a new species is immediately hindered. The maximisation of survival of hatchery fish in the wild has been primarily the province of Japanese researchers (e.g. Tsukamoto et al. 1989; Yamashita et al. 1994), but their methods have more recently been adapted by others (e.g. Leber et al. 1997; Otterå et al. 1999). The basis of this area of research is the production of very high-quality juveniles from hatcheries (using only first-generation broodstock to maintain genetic integrity with the natural population), the identification of optimal release strategies (fish size, season, release site) and the use of conditioning methods, both in the hatchery and in the wild, to allow the fish to make the transition from hatchery to natural environment with maximum likelihood of survival. The fish are generally released as juveniles and therefore well adapted to formulated diets, but clearly the use of high-quality live feed is necessary earlier in the hatchery to produce the high-quality juveniles needed for release.

As we proceed into the future, a few big questions dominate the landscape. The overriding one is 'How do we make aquaculture sustainable?' The environmental consequences of the explosion of marine aquaculture in the last quarter of the twentieth century have become a major international concern within the past decade. From shrimp farming in mangrove areas to organic enrichment from salmon net-pen culture, the ecological insults brought about by marine aquaculture are trumpeted to the world's consumers by environmental groups. The global aquaculture industry is responding (Boyd 1999; SSFA & NAFC 2000) and there is cause for optimism that improved practices will be the norm in the future. A second major question is 'What will we feed aquacultured organisms in the future?' This question applies both to hatchery-reared fish and crustaceans and to those in grow-out operations. At the hatchery level, the industry is currently undergoing a kind of crisis in Artemia cyst availability. This is due in large part to recent poor harvests from the traditionally productive Great Salt Lake, Utah, USA, along with increased regulation of harvests from those waters. The identification of new sources of Artemia cysts for harvest, for example in Asian countries that once belonged to the Soviet Union, allow some hope that this crisis will soon fade. Recalling that the last Artemia crisis in the mid-1970s led to the discovery of new geographical strains and focused research on Artemia cyst quality, one wonders what the current crisis will yield. A renaissance in research on formulated diets to replace Artemia is already underway (Kolkovsky et al. 1997; Yúfera et al. 1999) and one hopes that the results will be more commercialisable than those from the flurry of research on microdiets that arose from the last Artemia crisis. In a manner similar to the Artemia crises, periodic shortages of fish meal world-wide (usually due to climatic conditions off western South America) bring about intensive research into fish meal replacements. Recently, however, the aquaculture industry, as well as environmental groups, have questioned whether the projected growth of the industry over the next 30 years is possible in the light of fish meal availability even in the best of times (Naylor et al. 2000). It appears that partial or complete replacement of fish meal in the formulation of diets for some species will be necessary or desirable if the industry hopes to grow to the degree necessary. While this is a question primarily for grow-out producers, the ramifications will certainly be felt all the way back to the hatchery phase of the industry (Will we no longer grow species that require fish meal? Should we select for individuals that have minimal fish meal requirements?). One final major question concerns the role that biotechnology will play in aquaculture. Clearly, the biotechnology industry is already playing a role in products for the prevention, diagnosis and treatment of disease. Genome mapping is beginning for some of the major aquaculture species (M. Gomez-Chiarri, personal communication), but the question of whether genetically modified organisms (GMO) will be allowed in the marketplace is still a question for regulators. An even greater question is whether consumers will accept such products. It is likely that the answers to those questions will become apparent with GM products from terrestrial agriculture before aquaculture will address them in a major way.

1.3 The Status of Larviculture and Live Feed Usage

It may be useful in this introductory chapter to describe the status of marine finfish and crustacean larviculture and live prey usage in different regions of the world, so that the reader receives a broad overview on a global scale. The review will be presented continent by continent, in alphabetical order, based on production figures supplied by FAO for the calendar year 1997 (FAO 1999) and various articles as cited.

1.3.1 Africa

Africa's marine finfish and crustacean production comes largely from countries bordering the Mediterranean. Egypt is the leading producer, with over 16,000 t of mullet production, but

these are grown from wild-captured fry, so no live feed is used (Wassef 2000). Egypt also produces more than 2000 t each of sea bass and seabream; the fry are mostly collected from the wild, but hatchery production is expanding, therefore requiring the use of rotifers and *Artemia* (Wassef 2000). Morocco and Tunisia also produce hundreds of tonnes each of sea bass and sea bream, so also require hatchery production using rotifers and *Artemia* (Romdhane 1992). Madagascar and the Seychelles Islands produce significant quantities of shrimp, *Penaeus monodon*, and South Africa has a small production of *Penaeus indicus* and *P. japonicus*, all of which require algae and *Artemia* as live feeds in the hatchery.

1.3.2 Asia

Moving out of Africa and proceeding through Asia from west to east, one finds that Israel and Turkey, like Egypt, produce significant quantities of sea bass and sea bream, all apparently from hatchery production and requiring rotifers and *Artemia*. Iran and Saudi Arabia both report production of hundreds of tonnes of penaeid shrimp, requiring the use of algae and *Artemia* in hatcheries. A small amount of marine finfish culture is reported from Kuwait and Qatar.

Penaeid shrimp culture dominates the mariculture of Pakistan (ca. 50t), India (>50,000t), Sri Lanka (ca. 5000t), Bangladesh (>50,000t), Myanmar (ca. 8t) and Vietnam (ca. 80,000t). Although some extensive culture using wild-caught shrimp still exists in India and Vietnam (Binh & Lin 1995; Shetty & Satyanarayana Rao 1996), the majority of the above production appears to rely on hatchery production using the normal methods with algae and *Artemia* (Shetty & Satyanarayana Rao 1996; Nien & Lin 1996).

Thailand is the world's largest shrimp producer (FAO 2000), based primarily on P. monodon, with production of >200,000 t in 1997 (FAO 1999). Since this production is almost exclusively hatchery based, use of algae and Artemia is extremely heavy. Thailand also has significant production of Asian sea bass, L. calcarifer (>4000t), grouper, Epinephelus spp. (ca. 800 t), and threadfin, *Eleutheronema tetradactylum* (ca. 400 t), requiring hatchery usage of rotifers and Artemia. The Philippines, Indonesia and Malaysia are somewhat similar to Thailand, having predominantly shrimp culture with P. monodon as the major species (although with substantial culture of *Penaeus merguiensis* and *Metapenaeus* spp. as well), but also exhibiting increasing production levels of finfish, L. calcarifer in the case of Indonesia and a variety of species (e.g. snappers, basses, rabbitfish, groupers) in the case of the Philippines and Malaysia. Thus, these countries also have significant hatchery production of both shrimp (using algae and Artemia) and fish (using rotifers and Artemia). It should be pointed out that both Indonesia and the Philippines are predominated by milkfish culture, but that industry still depends largely on capture of fry from the wild and therefore does not require live feed for larviculture. Singapore, Hong Kong and Taiwan are similar to each other in having their fish and crustacean mariculture activities dominated by finfish culture, with relatively little, if any, penaeid shrimp culture. They all culture Asian sea bass, groupers and snappers to greater or lesser degrees, and Hong Kong produces significant quantities (ca. 800t) of silver bream, Rhabdosargus sarba, but Taiwan produces a wide variety of marine finfish, including over 4000t of black sea bream, Acanthopagrus schlegeli, and ca. 400t of red sea bream, Pagrus major, among many others. Culture of these high-value species is quite industrialised, with significant hatchery production relying on the standard formula of rotifers and Artemia.

The People's Republic of China is the world's largest aquaculture producer, responsible for a remarkable two-thirds of all aquaculture production globally. Their marine finfish and crustacean production is a fairly minor component of their total production, but still dwarfs that of most other countries. Shrimp production, mostly *Penaeus chinensis*, still exceeds 100,000 t per year despite problems with disease epidemics in the 1990s. Cen and Zhang (1998) state that all shrimp seed for production now comes from 'a controlled environment', rather than being collected from the wild. It is impossible to determine from FAO statistics the production of individual marine fish species in China, but Cen and Zhang (1998) report 145,000 t of production in 1995 (which had apparently increased to >250,000 t by 1997), including mullets, breams, groupers, tilapia, Asian sea bass, puffer fish and olive flounder.

Japan produces far more marine finfish than shrimp. Only a little more than 2000 t of kuruma prawn, P. japonicus, the species that began the industry, is still produced commercially in Japan. Japanese hatcheries, however, produce prodigious amounts of both finfish and shrimp for stock enhancement and sea ranching efforts. Oddly, yellowtail, Seriola quinqueradiata, the fish with the largest production in commercial aquaculture (nearly 140,000 t) is still dependent on wild-caught fry. Other major finfish produced commercially include red sea bream (>80,000 t), olive flounder (>8500 t), Tetraodontidae (nearly 6000 t) and jack mackerels, Trachurus spp. (>5700 t). These require hatchery production using the rotifer and Artemia techniques that the Japanese largely developed. Hatchery rearing with rotifers and Artemia is also necessary for the production of fry for the stock enhancement programmes. Major species with numbers of finfish fry released in 1995 are: P. olivaceus (23 million), P. major (19 million) and A. schlegeli (6 million) (Fushimi 1998). These impressive numbers are, however, surpassed by those for kuruma prawn, 305 million, which requires algae and Artemia in the hatcheries. Overall, Japan produced seed for stock enhancement of 80 species in a total of 284 facilities (such as national, prefectural and local hatcheries), with 11 species receiving more than 10 million seed and 33 species receiving at least 1 million seed (Fushimi 1998). This production included molluscs and echinoderms as well as fish and crustaceans, but clearly Japan is a major user of live feeds such as algae, rotifers and Artemia for marine finfish and crustacean culture in both commercial aquaculture and governmental stock enhancement efforts.

Finally, South Korea has been rapidly expanding its marine finfish culture, primarily *P. olivaceus* (\geq 26,000 t), while maintaining production of a few hundred tonnes of red sea bream and yellowtail and \geq 12,000 t of various other species. The flounder culture, as in Japan, is totally dependent on hatchery production of fingerlings, with both rotifers and *Artemia* required as live feed.

1.3.3 Europe

Although minimal production of penaeid shrimp species is reported in Albania, Cyprus, France, Greece, Italy and Spain (requiring use of algae and *Artemia*), the production of marine finfish far outweighs that of marine crustaceans in Europe. In the Mediterranean countries plus Portugal, the dominant species are sea bass, with over 24,000 t, and sea bream, with nearly 30,000 t, reported for 1997 (FAO 1999). Greece is by far the leader, with over 15,000 t of sea bass and over 18,000 t of sea bream. Cyprus, France, Greece,

Italy, Portugal and Spain all produce minor to significant quantities of other finfish species as well, for an additional total of between 4500 and 5000 t. All of this production is based on hatchery-raised fry. Sea bass can feed on *Artemia* as a first feed, whereas sea bream also require rotifers prior to feeding on *Artemia*.

In northern Europe, the major species are cod and halibut and there is much greater usage of natural zooplankton in addition to, or in place of, rotifers and *Artemia*. Although research on culture of both species has been going on since the early 1970s, the actual commercial production is still rather small, but growing. Norway is the leader in cod production, with slightly more than 300 t of commercial production in 1997, but Norwegian scientists have also been engaged for a number of years in production of cod fingerlings for stock enhancement projects. Cod larvae are produced in tanks, ponds or blocked-off sections of fjords, and are fed natural zooplankton obtained from the same or similar enclosed bodies of water which have been fertilised to bring about phytoplankton blooms (Huse 1991). Halibut are produced in a variety of enclosed systems and can eat *Artemia* as first food, but Norwegian producers argue that natural zooplankton is also necessary during the larval stages for production of good-quality fry. Production of halibut has more recently been effected in Iceland, which has now become the leading producer of halibut juveniles, despite the fact that the halibut larvae in Iceland are raised without natural zooplankton (K. Pittman, personal communication).

1.3.4 North America

Relatively little culture of marine finfish and crustaceans is reported from North America. Culture of cold-water finfish in Canada, using rotifers and *Artemia* as live feed for larvae, is still in the trial phases. In the USA, commercial production is reported for red drum (*Sciaenops ocellata*) and summer flounder (*Paralichthys dentatus*), both of which require rotifers and *Artemia* as prey in the hatchery. Oddly, FAO includes hybrid striped bass (*Morone saxatilis* × *Morone chrysops*) as a marine fish species in its statistics, even though the fish are reared in fresh water. The larvae of those bass are mostly raised in earthen ponds, which are fertilised in spring to induce blooms of phytoplankton and zooplankton before the introduction of the fish larvae (Harrell 1997). Since the early 1980s, hatchery production of a few species has been necessary for enhancement, restoration of stocks or mitigation of environmental impacts; striped bass (*M. saxatilis*), red drum (*S. ocellata*) and spotted sea trout (*Cynoscion nebulosus*) are the most noteworthy of these. In addition, the USA reported production of 1200 t of *Litopenaeus vannamei* in 1997, originating from intensive hatcheries with heavy use of algae and *Artemia*.

Mexico has become a large producer of shrimp (*L. vannamei*), with over 17,000 t of production reported in 1997.

1.3.5 Oceania

The majority of production here is penaeid shrimp. Australia reported nearly 1600t of *P. monodon* production in 1997 and New Caledonia over 1100t of *Penaeus* spp. All are from hatchery origin, requiring algae and *Artemia*. Other island nations (Fiji Islands,

French Polynesia, Guam and the Solomon Islands) all report minor production (<50 t each) of various penaeids. Australia also reported over 500 t of Asian sea bass production.

1.3.6 South America, including Central America and the Caribbean

With the exception of Chile, the culture of marine finfish and crustaceans in this region is overwhelmingly dominated by penaeid shrimp. Ecuador is the clear leader, with 1997 production of over 120,000 t. Other countries producing between 2000 and 10,000 t include Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru and Venezuela. Although wild seed is still used in some places, the trend is for increased reliance on hatchery production of postlarvae. The hatchery techniques are by now quite standard throughout the region, with algae and *Artemia* as the live feeds of choice, just as they are elsewhere in the world. Chile has been rapidly increasing its finfish aquaculture industry and is poised to become the world leader in salmon production, but it also is producing turbot in significant quantities for export to Europe. Hatchery rearing of these turbot depends on both rotifers and *Artemia* in the same way that they are used by the European turbot industry.

To summarise this geographical review, hatchery production of penaeid shrimp postlarvae around the world depends on the use of live algae for the early stages and *Artemia* for the later stages. Usage of formulated diets to supplement and eventually replace *Artemia* is apparently increasing (see below), but live feed is still dominant at this point. For marine finfish, hatchery production of juveniles globally is normally accomplished just with *Artemia*, if the mouth gape is large enough at first feeding, or with rotifers and *Artemia*, if a smaller initial feed is required. It should be pointed out that algae is routinely used in marine fish culture of the so-called 'green-water' method, but it is still not clear to what degree the algae may be contributing directly to the nutrition of the larvae (Reitan *et al.* 1997). The use of natural zooplankton, or the use of cultured foods other than algae, rotifers or *Artemia*, is limited to a few places in the world, but it can be very important in those particular places.

1.4 Why is Live Feed Necessary?

Fish biologists categorise larvae of two types: precocial and altricial. Precocial larvae are those that, when the yolk sac is exhausted, appear as mini-adults, exhibiting fully developed fins and a mature digestive system including a functional stomach. Such fish can ingest and digest formulated diets as a first food and are best exemplified by the salmon and trout raised extensively in hatcheries around the world without the benefit of live food. Altricial larvae are those that, when the yolk sac is exhausted, remain in a relatively undeveloped state. The digestive system is still rudimentary, lacking a stomach, and much of the protein digestion takes place in hindgut epithelial cells (Govoni *et al.* 1986). Such a digestive system seems (at this point) to be incapable of processing formulated diets in a manner that allows survival and growth of the larvae comparable to those fed on live feed. Altricial larvae therefore appear to require live feed, but there may be other reasons besides the digestibility question. Live feeds are able to swim in the water column and are thus constantly available to the