

E-ISSN: 2347-5129 P-ISSN: 2394-0506 (ICV-Poland) Impact Value: 76.37 (GIF) Impact Factor: 0.549 IJFAS 2024; 12(2): 45-48 © 2024 IJFAS www.fisheriesjournal.com Received: 02-01-2024 Accepted: 01-02-2024

#### Vivek Kumar

Department of Zoology, Bareilly College Bareilly, MJP Rohilkhand University, Bareilly, Uttar Pradesh, India

#### Sunil Kumar

Department of Zoology, Bareilly College Bareilly, MJP Rohilkhand University, Bareilly, Uttar Pradesh, India Effects of dietary administration of probiotics (*Bacillus subtilis*) on the growth parameters of the fish *Labeo rohita* 

# Vivek Kumar and Sunil Kumar

## DOI: https://doi.org/10.22271/fish.2024.v12.i2a.2911

#### Abstract

In this study, we have evaluated the effects of dietary probiotic bacteria (*Bacillus subtilis*), on the growth parameters of the fish *Labeo rohita*. The probiotic (*Bacillus subtilis*) was procured from the market and mixed with the basal food in different combinations according to experimental need. In the present study, feeding trials were conducted in for 90 days in triplicate. For this feeding trial, live *Labeo rohita* were captured from the local fish farm located in Bareilly district. Fishes of similar body weight were distributed randomly into five glass tank that were continuously aeriated at Department of Zoology, Bareilly College, Bareilly, U.P. These five fish treatment groups were given five concentrations of *Bacillus subtilis viz*, 0.0 (T<sub>1</sub>), 0.5(T<sub>2</sub>). 1.0 (T<sub>3</sub>) 1.5 (T<sub>4</sub>) and 2.0 (T<sub>5</sub>) with basal feed. T<sub>1</sub>(0.0) was the control group that was fed on basal food only, without *Bacillus subtilis* for the same period. The effects of the probiotic (*Bacillus subtilis*) were analyzed by observing body length and weight after an interval of 15 days (at 0,15, 30,45, 60,75 and 90 days). Two treatment groups (T<sub>4</sub> and T<sub>5</sub>) showed better growth of fishes, than any other treatment group. These results suggest that *Bacillus subtilis* can be an effective fish feed probiotic in the concentration 1.5% or 2% mixed in the basal feed for *Labeo rohita* in aquaculture practices.

Keywords: Probiotic, Bacillus subtilis, Growth Performance, Labeo rohita

#### 1. Introduction

Nearly 17% of the animal protein intake of human being is provided by the aquaculture (Shah and Mraz 2020)<sup>[23]</sup>. Different types of nutrients particularly essential amino acids and fatty acids that our body needs are provided by the fishes. Vitamins and essential minerals like iodine and selenium that are very rarely present in other food sources are also provided by fishes. (Kwasek et al., 2020)<sup>[15]</sup>. Higher quantity of fat-soluble vitamins A, D, E, and K, is present in fish liver oil as well as fishes are good source of vitamin B complex, (Mohanty BP., 2015)<sup>[17]</sup>. Rohu, Labeo rohita is a very important fish species in India (FAO, 2001). It is an important species of carp polyculture system with catla (Catla catla) and mrigal (Cirrhinus mrigala). Labeo rohita is a graceful Indo-Gangetic riverine species. It is an important commercially cultured fish in India that has vast market demand due to its good taste and healthy flesh. In south India, it provides a major portion of the freshwater fish production. In aquaculture, fish diseases are considered as a serious problem and these are spread worldwide (Boonthai et al., 2011)<sup>[4]</sup>. In India infection of bacteria is the most important cause of diseases in aquaculture, particularly in the culture of catfish (Kesarcodi-Watson et al., 2008)<sup>[13]</sup>. In aquaculture the use of antibiotics for the treatment of bacterial infection and to prevent fish mortality is reducing day by day as pathogens become able to develop resistance against antibiotics (Nikoskelainen et al., 2003)<sup>[20]</sup>. So that the use of probiotics in aquaculture is expected as an excellent strategy to prevent the infectious diseases as probiotics have potential to replace antibiotics and other harmful chemicals (Balcazar et al., 2006)<sup>[2]</sup>. "Probiotics are live microbial feed supplement that beneficially affects the host animal by improving its intestinal balance". Today, probiotics are used as functional foods that improve the health and also used as growth supplements for human health as well as for animal production and growth (Mombelli, 2000) [18]. "Bacillus subtilis is a spore producing multifunctional probiotic bacterium.

Corresponding Author: Vivek Kumar Department of Zoology, Bareilly College Bareilly, MJP Rohilkhand University, Bareilly, Uttar Pradesh, India It is recommended to support environmental, nutritional and metabolic changing conditions. *Bacillus subtilis* has versatility of growth nutrients utilization, high level of enzymes production, secretion of antimicrobial compounds, develops in aerobic and anaerobic conditions. *Bacillus subtilis* is generally recognized as safe (GRAS) by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA).

# Materials and Methods Experimental design

For the present experiment *Labeo rohita* of similar size and weight were collected from the local fish farm in the Bareilly district. These fishes were distributed in the five experimental groups (*viz*  $T_1$ ,  $T_2$ ,  $T_3$ ,  $T_4$ ,  $T_5$ ) and were stocked in properly washed five glass aquaria at Department of Zoology, Bareilly College Bareilly, UP. These experimental fish groups were acclimatized for 15 days before experimentation. Aerators were connected to fish aquaria for continuous aeriation and to maintain dissolved oxygen level in the water. Fishes were

provided with basal diet during the acclimatization twice daily. There were 10 fishes per aquarium and each aquarium contain 70 liter water. Thus, the fishes with similar weights were collected to stock in 6 different aquaria (n 10 fishes/aquarium containing 70 liters water). Water quality parameters viz temperature, pH, and dissolved Oxygen were observed at regular interval with the help of digital thermometer, universal pH meter and Winkler method. Temperature was maintained between 18 - 28 °C, dissolved oxygen between 5.5 - 6.5 ppm and pH between 7.20 - 8.0. At the starting of experimental period, length and weight measurement of all the experimental fish groups was done and recorded. In the control group  $(T_1)$  fishes were fed with basal feed only with 0% probiotics (Bacillus subtilis) for 90 days. While in other four groups, the fishes were fed with basal feed that have concentration of probiotic (Bacillus

subtilis) 0.5% (T<sub>2</sub>), 1.0% (T<sub>3</sub>), 1.5 (T<sub>4</sub>) 2.0% (T<sub>5</sub>), respectively,

Table 1: Percentage composition of experimental diet

for 90 days.

S. No.	Treatment	Percentage of different ingredients							
		<b>Rice Bran</b>	Soya bean meal	Mustard oil cake	Wheat flour	Vitamins and minerals	Bacillus subtilis		
1	T <sub>1</sub> (Control)	38.0	25.0	25.0	10.0	2.0	0.0		
2	$T_2$	37.5	25.0	25.0	10.0	2.0	0.5		
3	$T_3$	37.5	24.5	25.0	10.0	2.0	1.0		
4	$T_4$	37.5	24.5	24.5	10.0	2.0	1.5		
5	T5	37.5	24.5	24.5	9.5	2.0	2.0		

The length and weight of each experiment group were recorded at 0, 15, 30, 45, 60, 75 and 90 days of experimental period by using electronic balance and standard scale. Parameters of growth performance were determined using standard formulae as following.

- 1. Net Length gain = Final length Initial length
- 2. Percentage Length Gain =  $100 \times (Final \text{ Length} Initial \text{ length}) / Initial \text{ Length}$
- 3. Net Weight gain = Final weight Initial weight
- 4. Percentage Weight Gain = 100 x (Final weight Initial weight)/ Initial weight

5. Survival rate = 100 x number of fishes recovered / Number of fishes stocked

6. Feed Conversion Ratio (FCR) = Total dry feed intake (gm) / wet weight gain (gm)

7. Specific growth rate (SGR) = 100 x In (Final body weight)

- In (initial Body weight)/ Number of days.

Results were calculated using standard statistical procedure.

Observation and Results: In the present study, effect of different combinations of probiotic diet (0%, 0.5%, 1, 0%, 1.5%, 2.0%) was observed on the growth of the fish *Labeo rohita*. The composition of the basal diet and concentration of probiotic (*Bacillus subtilis*) in five experimental feed is given in table 1.

Net weight gain(gm), % weight gain, Net length gain (cm), % length gain in *Labeo rohita* fed with different concentration of probiotic (*Bacillus subtilis*) are given in table 2. Specific growth rate (SGR), Feed conversion ratio (FCR) and survival rate with different experimental diet are given in table 3.

From the data given in the table 2, We can conclude that highest weight gain was found in  $T_4$  treatment group (64.40gm) followed by  $T_5(59.91)$ . Percentage weight gain was highest in Treatment  $T_4$  (405.54%) followed by  $T_5$  (375.14%). Net length gain was highest in treatment group  $T_4$  (9.35 cm) followed by  $T_5$  (8.58 cm). Maximum percentage length gain was found in group  $T_4$  (86.33%) followed by  $T_5$  (78.93%). From these observations we can conclude that 1.5% concentration of probiotic *Bacillus subtilis* ( $T_4$ ) is more favorable for maximum growth in *Labeo rohita* in control laboratory condition.

**Table 2:** Growth Performance of Rohu (*Labeo rohita*), fed with different experimental diet (mean ± SD)

Treat-ment	Fish weight (g)		Not weight $qoin(q)$	0/ waight gain	Fish length (cm)		Net length gain (cm)	0/ longth goin
	initial	Final	Net weight gain(g)	76 weight gam	initial	final	Net length gam (cm)	76 lengti gam
T <sub>1</sub>	$15.69\pm0.36$	$60.64 \pm 1.31$	44.95	286.48	$10.60\pm\!\!0.29$	$16.76\pm\!\!0.47$	6.16	58.11
T <sub>2</sub>	$15.85 \pm 0.43$	$69.84 \pm 1.03$	53.99	340.63	$10.77 \pm 0.34$	18.52±0.43	7.75	71.95
T3	$16.32 \pm 0.34$	$74.95{\pm}1.08$	58.63	359.25	$10.91 \pm 0.39$	$19.25 \pm 0.44$	8.34	76.44
<b>T</b> 4	$15.88\pm0.53$	80.28±1.28	64.40	405.54	$10.83 \pm 0.34$	$20.18 \pm 0.49$	9.35	86.33
T5	15.97 ±0.61	$75.88 \pm 1.26$	59.91	375.14	$10.87 \pm 0.36$	$19.45 \pm 0.42$	8.58	78.93

 Table 3: Growth Parameters of Labeo rohita fed with different experimental diet

Treatment	Specific Growth Rate	Feed Conversion Ratio	Survival rate
<b>T</b> 1	1.50	3.05	83.33
T <sub>2</sub>	1.64	2.85	86.66
T3	1.69	2.80	93.33
<b>T</b> 4	1.80	2.68	100
T5	1.73	2.75	100

Data regarding growth parameters is given in table 3. In these observations highest specific growth rate was recorded in  $T_4$  (1.80) followed by  $T_5$  (1.73). The highest feed conversion ratio was observed in  $T_1$  (3.05) Followed by  $T_2$  (2.85). Survival rate was maximum in  $T_5$  (100) and  $T_4$  (100).

### Discussions

The use of probiotics in aquaculture shows promise, but continuous and quality research is needed. However, a number of products have been evidenced their efficacy and possible use in aquaculture. Probiotics help to boost appetite in the fishes due to detoxification of feeds and decomposition of undigested compounds (Irianto A and Austin B., 2002) <sup>[12]</sup>. Microorganisms have high rate of replication in the gastrointestinal tract (GIT) so that they can colonize in it after prolonged administration. Probiotics help to maintain fish health by improving a few immunological characteristics and reducing pathogen burden on intestinal mucus layer as they cover the visible surface (Banerjee *et al.*, 2017) <sup>[3]</sup>. Microorganisms are present in large numbers within the intestine of fishes and are generally considered harmless (Giri *et al.*, 2013)<sup>[10]</sup>.

The rise in nutrition digestibility is caused by the high number of digestive enzymes (protease, amylase, cellulose, phytase, etc.). These enzymes are released by the probiotic microorganisms associated within the intestines of the host (Ghosh et al., 2017)<sup>[9]</sup>. Bacterial probiotics prevent the colonization of pathogens by the physical competition for adhesions in the gut mucosal layer of the host. It is necessary to adhere in the gut mucosa of host for bacteria to remain in the intestines of aquatic animals (Cruz et al., 2012; Roesler et al., 2011)<sup>[6, 22]</sup>. Probiotics reduces the effects of disease and bacterial infection as they perform a beneficial function as immunostimulatory and assist protection in aquatic species (Dawood and Koshio, 2016)<sup>[7]</sup>. Therefore, probiotics work as immunostimulants and boost the immune response, resistance to disease. Due to this it help to sustain in the aquaculture. (Wu et al., 2015)<sup>[24]</sup>. The probiotic type Bacillus subtilis E20 improves antibacterial activities in grouper fish (Liu, et al. 2012) [16]. According to the recent studies higher rate of hatching and fast embryonic development is achieved in Zebrafish by the administration of probiotics (Gioacchini et al., 2013)<sup>[11]</sup>.

Besides of these beneficial effects, Probiotics also have some limitations as follows: A few probiotic strains may also elevate the histamine levels in the fishes: it is a molecule which is produced by the immune system when a threat is being sensed. Due to increased concentration of histamine, the blood flow also increases, that is results into the redness and swelling in the infected tissue (Branco *et al.*, 2018) <sup>[5]</sup>. Increase in the number of probiotic bacteria more than a limit in the body may cause toxicity and results into the organ failure or death also (Kothari *et al.*, 2019) <sup>[14]</sup>. In the present study, probiotics show positive effect on the body weight of

the fish *Labeo rohita* in the treatment  $T_4$  and  $T_5$  in comparison the control ( $T_1$ ). It may be due to increase in the activity of digestive enzyme in the gut.

### Conclusion

In the present study it is observed that feed with different concentration of probiotics (*Bacillus subtilis*) help to improve growth in the fish *Labeo rohita*. The experimental diet with 1.5% and 2.0% *Bacillus subtilis* is more suitable for fish growth. It is because of increased enzymatic activity and disease resistance in the fishes. So that probiotic can help to increase fish growth but continuous and quality research is needed.

## References

- 1. Abd El-Rhman AM, Khattab YA, Shalaby AM. Micrococcus luteus and Pseudomonas species as probiotics for promoting the growth performance and health of Nile tilapia (*Oreochromis niloticus*). Fish Shellfish Immunol. 2009;27:175-180.
- 2. Balcazar J, de Blas I, Ruiz-Zarzuela I, Cunningham D, Vendrell D, Muzquiz J, *et al.* The role of probiotics in aquaculture Reviews. Vet Microbiol. 2006;114:173-186.
- 3. Banerjee G, Nandi A, Ray AK. Assessment of hemolytic activity, enzyme production and bacteriocin characterization of *Bacillus* subtilis LR1 isolated from the gastrointestinal tract of fish. Arch Microbiol. 2017;199(1):115-124.
- Boonthai T, Vuthhiphandchai V, Nimrat S. Probiotic bacteria effects on growth and bacterial composition of black tiger shrimp (*Penaeus monodon*). Aquac Nutr. 2011;17(6):634-644.
- Branco ACCC, Yoshikawa FSY, Pietrobon AJ, Sato MN. Role of histamine in modulating the immune response and inflammation. Mediators Inflamm. 2018;2018:9524075.
- Cruz PM, Ibáñez AL, Hermosillo OAM, Saad HCR. Use of probiotics in aquaculture. ISRN Microbiol; c2012. p. 916845.
- Dawood MAO, Koshio S. Recent advances in the role of probiotics and prebiotics in carp aquaculture: A review. Aquaculture. 2016;454:243-251.
- 8. Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO). Yearbook on fisheries statistics. Rome: FAO; c2001.
- Ghosh K, Banerjee S, Moon UM, Khan HA, Dutta D. Evaluation of gut associated extracellular enzymeproducing and pathogen inhibitory microbial community as potential probiotics in Nile Tilapia, Oreochromis niloticus. Int J Aquac. 2017;7(23):143-158.
- Giri SS, Sukumaran V, Oviya M. Potential probiotic Lacto *Bacillus* plantarum VSG3 improves the growth, immunity, and disease resistance of tropical freshwater fish, *Labeo rohita*. Fish Shellfish Immunol. 2013;34(2):660-666.
- 11. Gioacchini G, Valle DL, Benato F, Fimia GM, Nardacci R, Ciccosanti F, *et al.* Interplay between autophagy and apoptosis in the development of Danio rerio follicles and the effects of a probiotic. Reprod Fertil Dev. 2013;25(8):1115-1125.
- Irianto A, Austin B. Use of probiotics to control furunculosis in Rainbow trout, *Oncorhynchus mykiss* (Walbaum). J Fish Dis. 2002;25:333-342.
- 13. Kesarcodi-Watson A, Kaspar H, Lategan MJ, Gibson L. Probiotics in aquaculture: The need, principles and

mechanisms of action and screening processes. Aquaculture. 2008;274:1-14.

- 14. Kothari D, Patel S, Kim SK. Probiotic supplements might not be universally-effective and safe: A review. Biomed Pharmacother. 2019;111:537-547.
- 15. Kwasek K, Thorne-Lyman AL, Phillips M. Can human nutrition be improved through better fish feeding practices? A review paper. Crit Rev Food Sci Nutr. 2020;60:3822-3835.
- 16. Liu CH, Chiu CH, Wang SW, Cheng W. Dietary administration of the probiotic, *Bacillus* subtilis E20, enhances the growth, innate immune responses, and disease resistance of the grouper, *Epinephelus coioides*. Fish Shellfish Immunol. 2012;33(4):699-706.
- 17. Mohanty BP. Nutritional value of food fish. In: Conspectus on inland fisheries management. India: ICAR
  Central Inland Fisheries Research Institute; c2015. p. 15-21.
- Mombelli B, Gismondo MR. The use of probiotics in medical practice. Int J Antimicrob Agents. 2000;16:531-6.
- 19. Nayak SK. Probiotics and immunity. A fish perspective. Fish Shellfish Immunol. 2010;29(1):2-14.
- 20. Nikoskelainen S, Ouwehand AC, Bylund G, Salminen S, Lilius EM. Immune enhancement in rainbow trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*) by potential probiotic bacteria (*Lacto bacillus rhamnosus*). Fish Shellfish Immunol. 2003;15:443-452.
- 21. Ringo E, *et al.* Lactic acid bacteria versus pathogens in the gastrointestinal tract of fish. Aquaculture Res. 2010;41:451-467.
- 22. Roeselers G, Mittge EK, Stephens WZ, Parichy DM, Cavanaugh CM, Guillemin K, *et al.* Evidence for a core gut microbiota in the zebrafish. ISME J. 2011;5(10):1595-1608.
- 23. Shah BR, Mraz J. Advances in nanotechnology for sustainable aquaculture and fisheries. Rev Aquac. 2020;12:925-942.
- 24. Wu ZQ, Jiang C, Ling F, Wang GX. Effects of dietary supplementation of intestinal autochthonous bacteria on the innate immunity and disease resistance of grass carp (*Ctenopharyngodon idellus*). Aquaculture. 2015;438:105-114.