

LIST OF TABLES

| Table | | Page |
|-------|---|------|
| 1 | World Fisheries (Capture and Aquaculture) Production* and Utilization (FAO, 2012). | 7 |
| 2 | Fish production of Egypt (tonnes), GAFRD 2012. | 8 |
| 3 | Experimental design of EXP 1. | 32 |
| 4 | Formula and chemical analysis (%) of the experimental diets. | 35 |
| 5 | Experimental design of EXP2 | 39 |
| 6 | Difference in water quality parameters status in the experimental period between (BFT) and (CS) during the first experiment | 49 |
| 7 | Zooplankton and phytoplankton count and species identification in experimental treatments with dietary crude protein levels (24, 20 and 16 %) and starch ratios (0, 30 and 60 %) of daily diet. | 56 |
| 8 | Mean \pm standard error (SE) of initial and final body weight (BW), weight gain specific growth rate (SGR), and survival rate of flathead grey mullet (<i>Mugil cephalus</i>) fingerlings as affected with dietary crude protein levels (24, 20 and 16 %) and starch ratios (0, 30 and 60 %) of daily diet | 59 |
| 9 | Condition Factor values for flathead grey mullet (<i>Mugil cephalus</i>) under control and biofloc treatments with different proteins ((24%, 20%, and 16% | 62 |
| 10 | Mean \pm standard error (SE) of total weight gain, offered feed and feed conversion ratio (FCR), protein energy ratio (PER), protein productive value (PPV), and energy retention of flathead grey mullet (<i>Mugil cephalus</i>) fingerlings as affected with dietary crude protein levels (24, 20 and 16 %) with three starch ratios (0, 30, and 60%) of daily diet | 64 |
| 11 | Mean \pm standard error (SE) of chemical composition of flathead grey mullet (<i>Mugil cephalus</i>) fingerlings as affected with dietary crude protein levels (24, 20 and 16 %) with three starch ratios (0, 30, and 60% of daily diet). | 66 |

LIST OF TABLES(Continued)

| | | |
|----|--|----|
| 12 | Mean \pm standard error (SE) of chemical composition of biofloc. | 67 |
| 13 | Cost of feed required for producing one Kg gain of <i>M cephalus</i> fingerlings as reared under control and/or BFT conditions. | 68 |
| 14 | Difference in water quality parameters status in the second experiment between different salinities (marine, brackish, and .fresh) water under 20% and 24% CP with 60% starch | 69 |
| 15 | Zooplankton and phytoplankton count and species identification in experimental treatments with dietary crude protein levels (24, 20 with 60 % starch) under different salinities (fresh, brackish, and marine water). system under clay and sandy clay soil ponds management conditions, during the first experiment. | 74 |
| 16 | Mean \pm standard error (SE) of initial and final body weight (BW), weight gain specific growth rate (SGR), and survival rate of flathead grey mullet (<i>Mugil cephalus</i>) fingerlings as affected with dietary crude protein levels (24, and 20 %) with starch ratios .60 % of daily diet under different salinities | 76 |
| 17 | Condition Factor values for flathead grey mullet (<i>Mugil cephalus</i>) fed two levels of proteins (24%,20% and 60% starch) under BFT condition in different salinities | 78 |
| 18 | Mean \pm standard error (SE) of offered feed and feed conversion ratio (FCR), protein energy ratio(PER), protein productive value (PPV), and energy retention of flathead grey mullet (<i>Mugil cephalus</i>) fingerlings as affected with dietary crude protein levels (24, 20 and 60 % starch) with three levels of salinity under BFT conditions. | 81 |
| 19 | Mean \pm standard error (SE) of chemical composition of flathead grey mullet (<i>Mugil cephalus</i>) fingerlings as affected with dietary crude protein levels (24, 20 and 60 % starch) with three levels of salinity under BFT system. | 83 |
| 20 | Mean \pm standard error (SE) of chemical composition of biofloc in the same column with different superscript are significantly different (P<0.05). | 83 |
| 21 | Cost of feed required for producing one Kg gain of <i>M cephalus</i> .fingerlings as reared in different salinities under BFT conditions | 85 |

LIST OF FIGURES

| Figure | | Page |
|--------|--|------|
| 1 | World Fisheries (Capture and Aquaculture) Production. (FAO, 2012). | 7 |
| 2 | World Fish Utilization and Supply, Excluding China. (FAO, 2012). | 9 |
| 3 | Biological features for flathead grey. | 11 |
| 4 | Scheme of Biofloc Technology pond. | 13 |
| 5 | Bio-floc System Ammonia Nitrite and Nitrate pathways. | 16 |
| 6 | Schematic calculation of the daily amount of organic carbon needed by bio-flocs to remove the nitrogen excreted in an intensive aquaculture pond of 50 kg fish m ⁻³ . | 18 |
| 7 | Tri-angle area ponds inside El-Max Research Station, National Institute of Oceanography and Fisheries, Alexandria, Egypt. | 33 |
| 8 | Condition of biofloc ponds during the first experiment with supplying of Aeration and strong Agitation Technique, at Almothalath area inside El-Max Research Station, National Institute of Oceanography and Fisheries, Alexandria, Egypt. | 34 |
| 9 | Fish weighting process to adjust the feed quantity during the first and the second experiments at El-Max Research Station, National Institute of Oceanography and Fisheries, Alexandria, Egypt. | 36 |
| 10 | ponds preparation process before the first and the second experiments at El-Max Research Station, National Institute of Oceanography and Fisheries, Alexandria, Egypt | 37 |
| 11 | Condition of biofloc ponds during the second experiment with supplying of Aeration and strong Agitation Technique. | 38 |
| 12 | Initiation of biofloc in the first and the second experiments by adding Starch at El-Max Research Station, National Institute of Oceanography and Fisheries, Alexandria, Egypt. | 40 |
| 13 | Manually quantification of total bacteria process during the first and the second experiments at El-Max Research Station, National Institute of Oceanography and Fisheries, Alexandria, Egypt. | 45 |
| 14 | Unionized ammonia (NH ₃) values for control and biofloc treatments proteins (24%, 20%, and 16). | 50 |

LIST OF FIGURES(Continued)

| | | |
|----|---|----|
| 15 | Nitrite nitrogen($\text{No}_2\text{ N}$) values for control and biofloc (treatments under different proteins (24%,20%, and 16% | 51 |
| 16 | Nitrate nitrogen ($\text{No}_3\text{- N}$) values for control and biofloc (treatments under different proteins (24%, 20%, and 16%. | 52 |
| 17 | Changes of biofloc volume (BFV) in control and two biofloc treatments with two C/N ratios (30% and, 60%starch) during the 70-days experimental period. Values are(means \pm S.D.) of three replicate ponds per sampling time in each treatment. | 55 |
| 18 | Condition Factor values for flathead grey mullet (<i>Mugil cephalus</i>) under control and biofloc treatments with different (proteins (24%, 20%, and 16%) | 62 |
| 19 | Un uionized ammonia (NH_3) values for biofloc treatments under different Salinities with (24%, 20% CP, and 60%starch). Where (MW): marine water, (B W): brackish water, (F W): fresh water. (CP): crude protein | 70 |
| 20 | Nitrogen ammonia (NO_2N) values for biofloc treatments (under different Salinities with (24%,20% CP, and 60%starch) | 70 |
| 21 | Nitrogen nitrate values for biofloc treatments under different (Salinities with (24%,20% CP, and 60%starch) | 71 |
| 22 | Changes in floc volume (BFV) in the bioflocs treatments with two levels of protein (24%, 20% with 60% starch) under different salinities during the 70-days experimental period. Values are means (\pm S.D.) of three replicate ponds per sampling time in each treatment. | 73 |
| 23 | Condition Factor values for flathead grey mullet (<i>Mugil cephalus</i>) fed two levels of proteins (24%, 20% and 60% starch) under BFT condition in different salinities. | 79 |

LIST OF ABBREVIATION

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| ADG | Average daily gain |
| AHRI | Animal Health Research Institute |
| ARC | Agricultural Research Center |
| AST | Activated suspension technique |
| BCM | Pillion cubic meters |
| BFT | Biofloc technology |
| BFV | Biofloc volume |
| CMC | Carboxy methyl cellulose |
| C: N | Carbon /Nitrogen ratio |
| W m ⁻³ | Watt / meter ³ |
| CP | Crud protein |
| LIFDC | low-income food-deficit countries |
| CS | Control system |
| d=CG-x | d is the maximum stable floc size, G is the average velocity gradient, C is the floc strength component and x is the stable floc size component. |
| DO | Dissolved oxygen |
| DP | Dietary protein |
| ER | Energy retention |
| FBW | Final body weight |
| FASW | Filtered artificial seawater |
| FCR | Feed conversation ratio |
| FI | Feed intake |
| FVI | Floc volume index |
| HUFA | Highly unsaturated fatty acid |
| ME | metabolize energy |
| mg/L | Milligram /liter |
| MIB | methyl iso borneol |
| NH ₃ N | Ammonia |
| NH ₄ | Ammonium |
| NO ₂ N | Nitrite |
| NO ₃ | Nitrate |
| NPP | Nutrient levels, phytoplankton population |
| PER | Protein efficiency ratio |
| pH | Hydrogen ion |
| PHB | Poly-p-hydroxybutyrate |
| PPV | Protein productive value |
| PUFA | Poly unsaturated fatty acid |
| RAS | Recalculating aquaculture systems |

LIST OF ABBREVIATION (Continued)

| | |
|------|-------------------------------------|
| SF | Standard feeding |
| SGR | Specific growth rate |
| TNA | Total nitrogen ammonium |
| TDS | Total dissolved solid |
| TSS | Total suspended solid |
| UA | Unionized ammonia |
| SVI | Sludge volume index |
| WG | Weight gain |
| WSSV | white spot syndrome virus |
| ZEAH | Zero Exchange Aerobic Heterotrophic |