Substitution of the fish meal by the earthworm and maggot meal in the feed of Nile tilapia Oreochromis niloticus reared in freshwater
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The present experiment was conducted to evaluate the efficacy of dietary protein from maggot meal and earthworm meal to replace fish meal protein in Oreochromis niloticus juvenile feed. The fish used for this experiment come from the experience of the larval phase during which fish were fed with the formulated diets [fish diet (FD), maggot diet (MD) and earthworm diet (ED)] content 40% crude protein and the commercial diet (CD) content 34.5% crude protein. At the end of this larval phase, the average weights were 0.75 ± 1.93, 0.71 ± 3.55, 0.55 ± 2.52 and 0.62 ± 2.52 g for FD, MD, ED and CD respectively. These different weights constitute the initials weights for this experience. In this experimental, the formulated diets (FD, MD and ED) content 30% crude protein and 29.5% crude protein for CD. Fish were fed four times daily to triplicate groups at 10.7% body weight for consecutive 90 days. After these days, fish fed with FD gave significantly higher average daily gain (ADG, 0.3 ± 0.03 g.day⁻¹) than MD (0.22 ± 0.18 g.day⁻¹). Fish fed with ED had the lowest ADG (0.14 ± 0.12 g.day⁻¹). The specific growth rate (SGR) were higher in fish group fed with FD, MD and ED and shows no significant difference (p > 0.05) compared to ED. Feed conversion ratio (FCR), protein efficiency ratio (PER) and survival rate (SR) show no significant difference (p > 0.05) in all the test. The production cost of 1 kg of fish (PC) and the carcass chemicals composition were evaluated. In conclusion, these results of this study indicate the possibility of completely using maggot meal as a source protein in the diet of O. niloticus juvenile to increase the growth of fish and reduce the cost of 1 kg of fish produced.

Key words: Ivory Coast, fish nutrition, replace fishmeal, invertebrates meal, zootechnic, economics parameters.

INTRODUCTION

Fishmeal is so far the main source of protein for composing fish feed. However, fishmeal is increasingly expensive (current prices on the market, 300 to 700 F.CFA/kg) and fish feed represents more than 50%
of the cost of production on farms (FAO, 2014; Coyle et al., 2004). Its inaccessibility is a source of abandonment of fish farming activity by small-scale fish farmers, most of them in developing countries. Nevertheless, aquaculture has become the fastest growing food industry in the world. That is why, the introduction of others protein sources as alternatives to replace fishmeal in fish feed is necessary to enhance the efficient production of aquaculture (Suarez et al., 2013; Katya et al., 2014). Numerous studies have been conducted to replace or reduce the level of inclusion of fishmeal and to identify promising alternative sources of protein in aquaculture feeds. These protein sources include plant proteins (Koumi et al., 2009; Bamba, 2017) and animal protein sources (Achi et al., 2017). However, less attention has been paid to the use of unconventional protein sources, which are promising feeds such as insect larva (maggot) meal and earthworm meal in fish feed formulation. In recent years, considerable research has shed light on the effectiveness of these ingredients in the diet of several aquaculture species, including tilapia, Oreochromis niloticus, Lates calcarifer and Litopenaeus vannamei (Ogunji et al., 2008; Katya et al., 2017; Cummins et al., 2017). The crude protein, crude lipid, and essential amino acid content of insect larval flours (maggot) resemble that of fishmeal. The crude protein content of maggots is around 40 to 64% (John, 2015). Earthworms have similar amino acid profiles to fish (Dedeke et al., 2010) and have been used as additional protein in fish feed (Sogbesan et al., 2007; Monebi and Ugwumba, 2013). However, recent research has shown that growth stimulation in some cases is observed at less than 50% substitution for earthworms (Sogbesan and Madu, 2008) and maggots (Ezewudo et al., 2015).

According to these same authors, the total substitution of fishmeal by these protein sources has not yet given satisfactory results in terms of growth performance of fish. Therefore, it is important in this study to evaluate growth, feed use, economic value, and carcass composition of juvenile tilapia O. niloticus fed with feeds formulated with maggot and earthworm proteins without the addition of fishmeal.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Description of the study area

The place of the experiments is the Blondey fish farm, 25 km from Abidjan (Ivory Coast) in the sub-prefecture of Azaguié (Ivory Coast). It is located between 5° and 6° North Latitude and between 4° and 5° West longitude. This farm has an area of three hectares whose feed water comes from a 3 ha dam also (Figure 1). According to Eldin (1971), this region is home to a warm equatorial climate composed of four seasons. First there is a succession of a great rainy season (from April to July) and a short dry season (from August to September). Then, we have a small rainy season (October and November) and finally a long dry season that runs from December to March. Concerning the hydrographic network, this zone abounds several rivers and in particular a river (Comóé). Examples include the Agnéby River, secondary courses (Mé, Nieky, and Betté) that are in flood during the long rainy season (Girard et al., 1971).

Experimental diets

Proportion (%) of ingredients used in the composition of experimental diets is shown in Table 1. Three isoproteic practical diets (30% crude protein content) were formulated with fishmeal, housefly maggot meal, earthworm meal, soybean meal, cotton meal, copra meal, corn flour and wheat bran meal as the main protein
Table 1. Proportion (%) of ingredients used in formulated diets (FD, MD and ED).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ingredient (%)</th>
<th>FD</th>
<th>MD</th>
<th>ED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corn flour</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soybean meal</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotton meal</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copra meal</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheat bran</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishmeal</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maggot meal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earthworm meal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm oil</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitamins (premix(^1))</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lysine</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methionine</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FD: Fish diet, MD: Maggot diet, ED: Earthworm diet, - = Absents Ingredients. \(^1\)Composition for 2.5 kg of premix; Vitamins A = 10,000,000 UI; Vitamins D3 = 2,000,000 UI; Vitamins E = 6,000 mg; Vitamins K3 = 1500 mg; Vitamins B1 = 500 mg; Vitamins B2 = 2000 mg; Vitamins B6 = 800 mg; Vitamins B12 = 5 mg; Vitamins B9 = 1500 mg; Vitamins B3 = 8000 mg; Vitamins C = 10,000 mg; Choline Chloride = 100,000 mg; Manganese = 60,000 mg; Cobalt = 100 mg; Zinc = 40,000 mg; Selenium = 100 mg; Iodine = 500 g; Copper = 3000 mg; Iron = 40,000 mg; Antioxidant = 30000 mg.

Table 2. Proximate composition (% Dry matter) and cost of experimental diets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component (%)</th>
<th>Diets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moisture</td>
<td>FD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crude protein</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ash</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crude lipid</td>
<td>5.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crude fiber</td>
<td>5.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen free extract (NFE)</td>
<td>42.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross energy (kJ.g(^{-1}))</td>
<td>16.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (F.CFA.kg(^{-1}))</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FD: Fish diet, MD: Maggot diet, ED: Earthworm diet, CD: Commercial diet. Nitrogen free extract (NFE) = 100 - (% Moisture + % Protein + % Ash + % lipid + % fiber). Gross Energy = 22.2 \times % protein + 38.9 \times % lipid + 17.2 \times % Nitrogen free extract (Luquet and Moreau, 1989). Price in CFA pound: 100 CFA = 0.18 $ based on 2017 exchange prices in Ivory Coast.

sources. Fishmeal was replaced totally with earthworms (Eudrilus eugeniae) and housefly maggots. These ingredients were included in diet at the level 20%. An industrial commercial diet used as the reference was purchased in local markets of Abidjan. The proximate composition (% Dry matter) and cost to formulate diets and the commercial diet (CD) are shown in Table 2. The crude protein content of the commercial diet (CD) used at the same juvenile stage is 29.5%. Housefly maggots used were produced in Ivory Coast from poultry droppings, pig manure and waste from fish evisceration following the description of Mpoame et al. (2004). The collected maggots were killed in hot water, oven dried at 70°C for 24 h and ground into powder to obtain maggot meal. The earthworm was produced according to the method of Sogbesan and Madu (2003). The earthworm Eudrilus eugeniae was cultured for three months. After these days, they are sorted, washed, killed with hot water and then dried in an oven at 80°C and crushed into powdery to obtain earthworm meal. The three formulated diets were designated as MD (diet containing maggot meal), ED (diet containing earthworm meal) and FD (control diet containing fishmeal). All diets were prepared according to the method of Bamba et al. (2014).

Experimental condition and fish feeding

The fish used for this experiment come from the experience of the
larval phase which lasted 30 days at the Blondey Aquaculture Station (5°6, N, 4°5, W), Ivory Coast. During this larval phase, the fish received feed containing 40% crude protein. These are the feed based on maggot meal, earthworm meal and fishmeal (control diet). The commercial diet used as the reference at the same larval stage contained 34.5% crude protein. At the end of this larval phase, 4800 fish of averaging weight 0.75 ± 1.93, 0.70 ± 3.55, 0.55 ± 2.52, and 0.62 ± 2.52 g respectively for FD, MD, ED and CD were randomly distributed in 12 hapas for this present experience. The feed ingredients, experimental diets, and fish samples were analyzed according to AOAC (1990) for moisture, crude protein, crude lipid, crude fiber, nitrogen free extract (NFE) and ash. The gross energy contents of the diets and fish samples were calculated using factors of 22.22, 38.9 and 17.2 kJ.g⁻¹ of protein, lipid, and nitrogen free extract, respectively (Luquet and Moreau, 1989).

### Measurement of growth performance, feeds utilization parameters and economic values

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

Average daily gain (ADG) = Gain (g) / Time (days)

Net biomass (kg) = Final biomass (kg) - Initial biomass (kg)

Feed conversion ratio (FCR) = Feed intake (g) / Weight gain (g)

Protein efficiency ratio (PER) = Weight gain (g) / Protein intake (g)

Survival ratio (SR %) = (Final fish / Initial fish) × 100

Specific growth rate (SGR %,day⁻¹) = [(LnFW-LnIW) × 100] / Time (days)

where FW is the final weight of fish, IW is the initial weight of fish and Ln is natural log.

Feed Used (FU) (kg) = Daily ration (kg) × Rearing time (days)

Cost of feed used (CFU) (F.CFA) = Feed used (kg) × CF (F.CFA)

where CF is the cost of 1 kg of feed.

Production cost (PC) (F.CFA)/kg fish produced = Cost of feed used / Net biomass (kg)

Reduction rate (R×R CF) of kg of tested feed compared to control feed (%) = [(Cost of 1 kg control feed - Cost of 1 kg tested feed) ×100] / Cost of 1 kg control feed

Reduction rate (R×R PC) of feed cost to produce 1 kg of fish (%) = [(Feed cost to produce 1 kg control fish - Feed cost to produce 1 kg tested fish) ×100] / Feed cost to produce 1 kg control fish

Production time (PT)/kg fish produced (Days.kg⁻¹) = Rearing time (days) / Weight gain (kg)

### Water quality parameters

Water quality parameters were monitored during rearing period. Water temperature, dissolved oxygen, and pH were measured daily 08:00 h using YSI 6920 V2. Nitrate, nitrite, ammonium, and phosphorus were measured once twice in month using HACH DR/2000 spectrophotometer by the method of Goltermann et al. (1978). The mean data of physicochemical parameters of water measured in the hapas are shown in Table 3.

### Statistical analysis

Results were presented as mean ± standard deviation (SD) for three replicates. The statistical analyses were carried out using one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). The Tukey’s multiple range test and Duncan’s multiple-range test were used to compare

### Table 3. Physicochemical parameters of water in pond.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>FD</th>
<th>MD</th>
<th>ED</th>
<th>CD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T (°C)</td>
<td>29.1 ± 0.5ᵃ</td>
<td>29.3 ± 0.6ᵃ</td>
<td>29.4 ± 0.8ᵃ</td>
<td>28.8 ± 0.5ᵃ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pH</td>
<td>6.6 ± 0.08ᵇ</td>
<td>6.8 ± 0.07ᵃ</td>
<td>6.5 ± 0.04ᵃ</td>
<td>6.9 ± 0.05ᵃ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O₂ (mg.L⁻¹)</td>
<td>7.6 ± 0.33ᵇ</td>
<td>7.60 ± 0.42ᵃ</td>
<td>7.14 ± 0.32ᵃ</td>
<td>7.77 ± 0.37ᵃ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO₂ (mg.L⁻¹)</td>
<td>0.052 ± 0.03ᵃ</td>
<td>0.041 ± 0.05ᵇ</td>
<td>0.05 ± 0.05ᵇ</td>
<td>0.04 ± 0.05ᵇ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO₃ (mg.L⁻¹)</td>
<td>0.46 ± 0.01ᵇ</td>
<td>0.42 ± 0.04ᵇ</td>
<td>0.31 ± 0.03ᵇ</td>
<td>0.40 ± 0.02ᵇ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH₄⁺ (mg.L⁻¹)</td>
<td>0.05 ± 0.02ᵇ</td>
<td>0.04 ± 0.02ᵇ</td>
<td>0.05 ± 0.01ᵇ</td>
<td>0.05 ± 0.02ᵇ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO₃⁻₄ (mg.L⁻¹)</td>
<td>0.42 ± 0.03ᵇ</td>
<td>0.32 ± 0.02ᵇ</td>
<td>0.33 ± 0.02ᵇ</td>
<td>0.39 ± 0.01ᵇ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each value is the mean of three readings ± Standard deviation. Means has the different letters in the same row are significantly different at p < 0.05. NO₂⁻ = Nitrite, NO₃⁻ = Nitrate, PO₃⁻₄ = Phosphorus, NH₄⁺ = Ammonium.
differences among treatment means. Treatment effects were considered significant at p < 0.05. The analyses were performed using Statistica 7.1 software.

RESULTS

Physicochemical parameters of water

Water quality characteristics monitored throughout the study period are summarized in Table 3. There were no significant differences (p > 0.05) in the water temperature, pH and dissolved oxygen among the treatment during the whole experimental period. The water temperature ranged from 28.8 ± 0.5 (CD) to 29.4 ± 0.8°C (ED), pH from 6.5 ± 0.04 (ED) to 6.9 ± 0.05 (CD). Dissolved oxygen ranged from 7.14 ± 0.32 (ED) to 7.77 ± 0.37 mg.L⁻¹ (CD). Nitrate nitrogen (NO₃⁻) values were 0.40 ± 0.02 (CD), 0.42 ± 0.04 (MD) and 0.46 ± 0.01 mg.L⁻¹ (FD). These highest values of nitrate nitrogen were not significantly different (p > 0.05) in the water content of fish fed with FD, MD and CD. The water containing the fish fed with ED obtained the low values (0.31 ± 0.03 mg.L⁻¹) of nitrate nitrogen. Nitrite nitrogen ranged from (NO₂⁻) 0.04 ± 0.05 (CD) to 0.052 ± 0.03 mg.L⁻¹ (FD), ammonium from (NH₄⁺) 0.04 ± 0.02 (MD) to 0.05 ± 0.01 mg.L⁻¹ (FD, ED and CD). There were no significant differences (p > 0.05) in the water NO₂⁻ and NH₄⁺ among the treatment during the whole experimental period. The highest values of phosphorus were obtained in the water content of fish fed with FD and CD. These ranged from (PO₄³⁻) 0.39 ± 0.01 (CD) to 0.42 ± 0.03 mg.L⁻¹ (FD) and these values were not significantly different (p > 0.05). Therefore, the low values of phosphorus were obtained in the water content of fish fed with MD (0.32 ± 0.02 mg.L⁻¹) and ED (0.33 ± 0.02 mg.L⁻¹).

Nutrient profile of protein ingredients

The proximate compositions of fishmeal, maggot meal, earthworm meal, soybean meal, cotton meal, copra meal, corn flour and wheat bran meal used as the major protein ingredients in this study are shown in Table 4. The crude protein content was found to be the highest for fishmeal followed by soybean meal, cotton meal, earthworm meal and maggot meal, respectively. On the other hand, crude lipid was recorded to be the highest for maggot meal followed by earthworm meal, copra meal, fishmeal and soybean meal, respectively. Whereas, copra meal and cotton meal exhibited higher fiber content as compared to others ingredients meal. As for the ash concentration of the ingredients, the high values were observed in earthworm meal followed by fishmeal and maggot meal compared to other ingredients.

Growth performance, survival rate, feed utilization and production time

Significant effects (p < 0.05) of the dietary total replacement of fish meal with maggot meal and earthworm meal on the growth performance of O. niloticus juveniles were observed (Table 5). Use of fishmeal in the fish feed gave higher final weight (FW) and average daily gain (ADG) than maggot diet and commercial diet. These values were 27.64 ± 7.02 g and 0.3 ± 0.03 g.day⁻¹ for FW and ADG respectively. Interestingly, O. niloticus juveniles fed with MD and CD showed no significant differences (p > 0.05) between the FW and ADG. These values ranged from 17.28 ± 3.56 (CD) to 20.82 ± 4.71 g (MD) for FW and ADG from 0.19 ± 0.12 (CD) to 0.22 ± 0.18 g.day⁻¹ (MD). The lowest values (FW, ADG) were obtained in fish group fed on diet containing earthworm meal (13.38 ± 3.72 g and 0.14 ± 0.12 g.day⁻¹ for FW and ADG, respectively). Survival rate (SR), feed conversion ratio (FCR) and protein efficiency ratio (PER) were similar for all diets. Use of earthworm meal as protein source increased the production time (PT) of kg fish produced (6.81 ± 0.28 days.kg⁻¹ of fish produced) as compared to the others group. In contrast, the use of maggot meal as protein source in O. niloticus juvenile feed resulted in decrease PT (3.12 ± 0.09 days.kg⁻¹ of fish produced).

### Table 4. Analyzed nutrient composition (% Dry Matter) of protein ingredients.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component (%)</th>
<th>FM</th>
<th>MM</th>
<th>EM</th>
<th>CF</th>
<th>SM</th>
<th>CM</th>
<th>COM</th>
<th>WB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>8.99</td>
<td>9.01</td>
<td>10.05</td>
<td>11.88</td>
<td>6.99</td>
<td>8.24</td>
<td>10.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ash</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10.12</td>
<td>11.28</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>40.34</td>
<td>41.17</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>41.56</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23.68</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>6.95</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiber</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFE</td>
<td>12.44</td>
<td>13.55</td>
<td>13.86</td>
<td>71.96</td>
<td>28.91</td>
<td>32.81</td>
<td>41.76</td>
<td>57.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Growth performance, survival rate, feed conversion ratio, protein efficiency ratio, production time/kg of fish produced.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>FD</th>
<th>MD</th>
<th>ED</th>
<th>CD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SR (%)</td>
<td>88.5 ± 4.3a</td>
<td>88.95 ± 5.6a</td>
<td>85.33 ± 6.9a</td>
<td>89.41 ± 4.7a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IW (g)</td>
<td>0.75 ± 1.93b</td>
<td>0.71 ± 3.55b</td>
<td>0.55 ± 2.52a</td>
<td>0.62 ± 2.52a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FW (g)</td>
<td>27.64 ± 7.02c</td>
<td>20.82 ± 4.71b</td>
<td>13.38 ± 3.72a</td>
<td>17.28 ± 3.56b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WG (g)</td>
<td>26.89 ± 5.11c</td>
<td>20.11 ± 3.31b</td>
<td>12.83 ± 2.43a</td>
<td>16.66 ± 2.73b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADG (g.day⁻¹)</td>
<td>0.3 ± 0.03c</td>
<td>0.22 ± 0.18b</td>
<td>0.14 ± 0.12a</td>
<td>0.19 ± 0.12b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGR (%.day⁻¹)</td>
<td>4.01 ± 0.09b</td>
<td>3.75 ± 0.33b</td>
<td>2.017 ± 0.28b</td>
<td>3.69 ± 0.28b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCR</td>
<td>1.47 ± 0.43a</td>
<td>1.61 ± 0.66a</td>
<td>1.69 ± 0.45a</td>
<td>1.64 ± 0.45a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PER</td>
<td>2.26 ± 0.42b</td>
<td>2.07 ± 0.48a</td>
<td>1.97 ± 0.38a</td>
<td>2.03 ± 0.38a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT (days.kg⁻¹)</td>
<td>3.12 ± 0.09b</td>
<td>4.13 ± 0.33a</td>
<td>6.81 ± 0.28b</td>
<td>5.0 ± 0.28c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each value is the mean of three readings ± Standard deviation. Means has the different letters in the same row are significantly different at p < 0.05.

Table 6. Carcass chemical composition (% Dry matter) of Oreochromis niloticus juveniles fed experimental diets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>FD</th>
<th>MD</th>
<th>ED</th>
<th>CD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moisture (%)</td>
<td>77.32 ± 0.23a</td>
<td>78.12 ± 0.18a</td>
<td>77.28 ± 0.16a</td>
<td>78.30 ± 0.17a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crude protein (%)</td>
<td>49.43 ± 0.19b</td>
<td>48.4 ± 0.22b</td>
<td>45.75 ± 0.17a</td>
<td>48.1 ± 0.20b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ash (%)</td>
<td>19.53 ± 0.14b</td>
<td>17.43 ± 0.17a</td>
<td>16.32 ± 0.14b</td>
<td>19.32 ± 0.12b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crude lipid (%)</td>
<td>17.63 ± 0.14a</td>
<td>17.42 ± 0.12a</td>
<td>18.22 ± 0.15a</td>
<td>17.34 ± 0.12a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross energy (kJ.g⁻¹)</td>
<td>17.83 ± 0.13b</td>
<td>17.52 ± 0.10a</td>
<td>17.24 ± 0.11a</td>
<td>17.42 ± 0.12a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each value is the mean of three readings ± Standard deviation. Means has the different letters in the same row are significantly different at p < 0.05.

Carcass chemical composition of O. niloticus juveniles

The chemical composition of O. niloticus larvae at the end of feeding experiments are shown in Table 6. No significant differences were found in the carcass moisture content and ash of fish fed different experimental diets. In contrast, crude protein content was significantly affected by experimental treatment (p < 0.05). The carcass protein content was higher in fish fed FD (49.43 ± 0.19%) followed by fish group fed MD and CD (48.4 ± 0.22 and 48.1 ± 0.20%, respectively). In contrast, the lowest values were obtained in the fish group fed with ED (45.75±0.17%). No significant differences (p > 0.05) were found in carcass lipid and gross energy content of fish from one diet to another. This values ranged from 17.34 ± 0.12 (CD) to 18.22 ± 0.15% (ED) for crude lipid and from 17.24 ± 0.11 (ED) to 17.83 ± 0.13 kJ.g⁻¹ (FD) for gross energy.

Cost-benefit analysis

The data on the kilogram costs of the feeds used and the rates of reduction of these costs were evaluated (Table 7).

The costs per kilogram of feed (CF) were 309, 207, 214 and 300 F.CFA, respectively for FD, MD, ED and CD. Relatively to the cost linked to the total quantity of different feeds used to produce the kilogram of juveniles, the recorded values were 455, 334, 362, and 493 F.CFA, respectively for FD, MD, ED, and CD feeds. The analysis of financial profitability shows that the use of maggot meal and earthworm meal as a source of protein in the feed of O. niloticus juveniles resulted in a decrease in the cost of kg of feed (cost/kg of feed) as compared to the cost of kg of fishmeal-based feed and commercial diet. Regarding the production cost of kilogram (PC) of juveniles, it was lower in fish group fed with maggot diet followed by fish fed with earthworm diet. In addition, the use of maggot meal and earthworm meal as a source of protein in the feed of O. niloticus juveniles also helped reduce the production cost of kilogram of fish by 26.59% (MD) and 20.44% (ED) as compared to FD. This production cost per kilogram of fish also was reduced by 32.25% (MD) and 26.57% (ED) as compared to CD.

DISCUSSION

The average values of physicochemical water parameters
In which found 23.6

tests of juvenile

e present study, the survival rate values

However, the

centration of phosphorus must vary

As

fish diet obtained the higher final weight (FW) followed by

between 0.005 and 2 mg.L⁻¹

the concentration of ammonium must be between 0.2 and 2

the nitrite concentration must be less than 0.3 mg.L⁻¹

for temperature and 6.32 to 9.11 for pH. These

Bamba et al. (2014) in the same statio

and 29.4 ± 0.8°C for temperature and 6.5 ± 0.04 and 6.9

from one hapa to another. They are between 28.8 ± 0.5

During the period of the experiment did not differ

from one hapa to another. They are between 28.8 ± 0.5

and 29.4 ± 0.8°C for temperature and 6.5 ± 0.04 and 6.9

± 0.05 for pH. These values corroborated the results of

Bamba et al. (2014) in the same station which found 23.6
to 31.6°C for temperature and 6.32 to 9.11 for pH. These

values were within the tolerant range of *O. niloticus.* As

for the dissolved oxygen during the experiment, the

values obtained are between 7.14 ± 0.32 and 7.77 ± 0.37

mg.L⁻¹. These mean values of dissolved oxygen in the

hapa are consistent with the recommended limits for
tilapia breeding. They can survive an oxygen

concentration of 1.2 mg.L⁻¹ (Coche, 1978). The highest

values of nitrate nitrogen in the water containing the fish

fed with FD, MD and CD could be explained by the actual

use of dietary nitrogen by fish as reported by Chakraborty

et al. (1992). Fishmeal contains a high level of

phosphorus (NRC, 1993). The greater part of this

phosphorus cannot be absorbed by certain species of fish, particularly Cichlidiae

(Yone and Tochima, 1979) and is rejected in the breeding

environment. This would explain the high phosphorus

content of pond water when the *O. niloticus* species is fed

FD and CD feeds. Indeed, FD and CD have been

formulated based on fishmeal. According to Boyd (1998),

the nitrite concentration must be less than 0.3 mg.L⁻¹. The

concentration of ammonium must be between 0.2 and 2

mg.L⁻¹ and the concentration of phosphorus must vary

between 0.005 and 0.2 mg.L⁻¹ for good survival of fish.

After 90 days of fish monitoring, juveniles fed with the

fish diet obtained the higher final weight (FW) followed by

fish fed with maggot diet when compared with those of

other group. On the other hand, the growth of *O. niloticus*

juvenile fed with earthworm diet is low when compared

with that obtained in any breeding. However, the

juveniles fed on the commercial diet registered similar
growth with those fish fed MD. The similarities observed

between SGR when the fish were fed FD and MD show

that the feed formulated with maggot meal is of interest

for aquaculture. Nearly, similar values of growth

performance obtained in fish fed with MD and fish fed FD

were in agreement with those obtained by Samuel and

Nyambi (2013). For these authors, growth is proportional

when fish meal is totally replaced by that of maggot.

However, these obtained values are in contradiction with

the results of Ezewudo et al. (2015). For these authors,

the growth performance of fish is better when the

fishmeal is replaced by maggot meal at a rate of 50% in a

diet based on fishmeal. The low growth rates of juvenile

fed with earthworm diet corroborated the results of

Nandeeshra et al. (1988). For these authors, in common

carp without free access to abundant natural food

resources, the replacement of fishmeal by dried

earthworm meal (*E. eugeniae*) resulted in reduced growth.

In addition, some authors indicate that the replacement

of fishmeal with earthworm meal at an inclusion level of 50

to 75% is appropriate for optimal growth and optimum

utilization of nutrients in fish (Monebi and Ugwumba,

2013). In the present study, the survival rate values

obtained 85.33 ± 4.7% (CD) and 89.41 ± 4.7% (CD) were

low. These survival rate values in this study are also

inferior to those obtained (100%) by Ogunji et al. (2008)

when maggot meal is used in fish feed.

**Table 7. Cost-benefit analysis of *Orechromis niloticus* juveniles.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Diets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INF</td>
<td>1214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNF</td>
<td>1076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB(kg)</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FB(kg)</td>
<td>29.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB (kg)</td>
<td>28.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QFU(kg)</td>
<td>42.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF (F.CFA)</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFU (F.CFA)</td>
<td>13120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC (F.CFA/kg)</td>
<td>455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R×R CF/FD</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R×R PC/FD</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R×R CF/CD</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R×R CP/CD</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INF: Initial number of fish, FNF: Final number of fish, IB: Initial biomass, FB: Final biomass, NB: Net biomass, QFU: Quantity of feed used, CF: Cost of 1 kg of feed, CFU: Cost of feed used, PC: Production cost of 1 kg of fish, R×R CF/FD: Reduction rate of CF compared to fish diet (FD), R×R PC/FD: Reduction rate of PC compared to fish diet (FD), R×R CF/CD: Reduction rate of CF compared to commercial diet (CD), R×R PC/CD: Reduction rate of PC compared to commercial diet (CD). Price in CFA pound: 100 CFA= 0.18 $ based on 2017 exchange prices in Ivory Coast. - = Absents values.
The results of the current study showed that feed utilization (feed conversion ratio, protein efficiency ratio) was similar in all groups of juvenile, one diet to another. However, feed conversion ratio (FCR) was the lowest in fish fed FD and MD, indicating that they were most efficient in converting their food to body growth. Protein efficiency ratio (PER) were the highest in fish fed fish meal and maggot meal diet, an indication of good protein digestibility and bioavailability for optimum body protein increase and growth. In this study, the values of FCR and PER observed with fish fed ED show no significant difference with those obtained in all livestock. These results show that feed based-earthworm meal was also used by these fish. These results agree with those obtained by Dedéke et al. (2013) who concluded that fish meal can be substituted with earthworm meal up to 25% in the diet of Clarias gariepinus fry without adverse effects on growth and nutrient utilization. These results corroborated with those of Ali et al. (2015). These authors indicate that the used maggot meal as ingredients in O. niloticus feed did not affect the palatability of the diets. The crude carcass lipids are not different in all fish groups. In addition, the crude protein content of the carcasses is low in fish fed with earthworm diet, unlike other groups. This indicates that the juvenile of O. niloticus is effectively used the crude lipid supplied by maggot meal and fishmeal in the diets. These results also indicate that the formulated feed based on the earthworm meal would not be efficiently used for the growth of the O. niloticus juvenile, but increased the lipid deposits. In this study, the cost (cost/kg of feed) of fish diet as those of CD were overprice. Fishmeal and fish oil is overprice in international market (FAO, 2014). The production of maggot meal and earthworm meal is less costly resulting in the reduction of the cost/kg of feed formulated and the cost/kg of fish produced. These results agree with those obtained by Ali et al. (2015) who concluded that 100% maggot meal can be included in the diet of O. niloticus niloticus to reduce cost and maximize profit. However, the time required to produce 1 kg of fish increased in fish fed with ED. It is 6.81 ± 0.28 days of fish produced for ED. The increase in production time (PT) observed with the ED would be a consequence of the reduction in growth observed.

**Conclusion**

The present study concludes that maggot meal positively improved growth performance and feed efficiency of O. niloticus juveniles as well. It reduced the cost of kg of fish produced and the time/kg of fish produced. The earthworm meal slows down the growth of the juveniles and increases the production time of kg of fish produced. This study revealed that maggot meal can completely replace fish meal in the diets of O. niloticus juvenile without adverse effects on fish growth and carcass composition. And most importantly, reduce the cost of producing 1 kg of fish and promote semi-intensive and intensive fish farming in developing countries.
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