

## WATER QUALITY AND ITS IMPACT ON PRODUCTIVITY OF CULTURED OREOCHROMIS NILOTICUS

**El-Gohary, A. H.; El-Bably, M. A.\*; Mohamed, A. A. and El-Demery, F. E.**

Dept. of Hygiene and Zoonoses, Fac. of Vet. Med., Mansoura University, Egypt.

\*Dept. of Hygiene and Zoonoses, Faculty of Vet. Med., Beni-Suef University, Egypt.

### ABSTRACT

*The physical, chemical and bacteriological parameters of ponds water were studied in order to optimize the conditions of fish productivity. Four fish ponds in Abbas-sa farm supplied from agriculture drainage water; were used. Water and fish samples were collected equally from the hatchery, fingerlings and two raising ponds each pond over a period of twenty months. fish samples were examined for their bacterial content, growth and survival rates. Results indicates that raising P2 had the highest average values of  $\text{NH}_3\text{-N}$ ,  $\text{NO}_2\text{-N}$ , Total coliform (TC), Fecal coliform (FC), faecal streptococci (FS) & Salmonella species were  $0.27 \pm 0.024$ ,  $0.99 \pm 0.12$ ,  $27.7 \pm 1.9$ ,  $14.0 \pm 1.8$ ,  $31.0 \pm 2.4$  & positive resp., followed by pond (I) were  $0.173 \pm 0.012$ ,  $0.084 \pm 0.008$ ,  $20.6 \pm 1.6$ ,  $10.8 \pm 2.4$  & positive respectively compared with the lowest values estimated in the hatchery were  $0.084 \pm 0.007$ ,  $0.068 \pm$ ,  $9.6 \pm 1.0$ ,  $4.1 \pm 0.6$ ,  $4.0 \pm 0.7$  & ND resp.. Correspondingly, fish samples from P2 had the highest percentages of TC, FC, FS and Salmonella species were  $37.6 \pm 4.2$ ,  $15.6 \pm 2.0$ ,  $5.7 \pm 0.5$  &  $3.62 \pm 0.28$  resp., followed by pond (I) were  $26.7 \pm 1.7$ ,  $10.6 \pm 0.9$ ,  $6.8 \pm 1.1$ ,  $2.02 \pm 0.4$  resp.. This explain that impairing of physical-chemical of P2 followed by P1 provide optimal conditions for multiplication and survival of coliform and Salmonella spp., in both pond's water and fishes. Moreover, growth rate; body weight gain & survival rates were higher in P1  $32.88 \pm 4.2\text{g}$  &  $96.0 \pm 1.7\%$  as compared with P2;  $27.60 \pm 3.0\text{g}$  &  $93.0 \pm 1.2\%$ . Therefore, fish productivity can be enhanced if the water quality in the ponds were maintained at optimum levels. On the other hand, the public health significance of Salmonella in fish as well as the potential environmental health impact of pond water with exceedingly high coliform counts released to water sources cannot be ignored.*

### INTRODUCTION

Aquaculture has been vigorously developed in recent years to achieve two major purposes of food security and income generation; the vast majority of this is conducted in ponds

(Okonji and Akolisa, 2005). The total Egyptian fish production reached about 960 thousand tons in 2006, of which more than 61 % was from aquaculture, (GAFRD, 2007). Tilapia is the most popular fish in Egypt for their

favorable characteristics and production (Yang et al., 2003). Good fish management begins with an understanding of the physical, chemical and biological characteristics of the ponds. These characteristics determine the quality of fish the ponds can produce and the problems that may be encountered (Ntengwe and Edema, 2008). Water quality parameters such as ammonia and nitrite in ponds may affect the level of bacterial contamination of fish, (Saeed and Sakr, 2009); this is probably due to the effect of water quality on the fish immune response, so profitable fishing can result from proper management of fish and ponds. The type and level of bacterial populations associated with farmed fish are useful indicators of quality and safety of fish for consumers, of much concern in ponds is the contamination of fishes by fecal coliform, (Kapetanovic et al., 2005), and their presence in fish may cause a potential danger for human health (Jha, et al., 2008). Therefore, the aim of the present study was to establish the levels of physico-chemical and biological characteristics of the ponds with a view for optimizing the conditions of water for optimum fish productivity.

## **MATERIAL AND METHODS**

### **1. Study Site :**

This field study was carried out during the period from April 2008 till December 2009 at the central laboratory for aquaculture research, El- Abbassa, Sharkia governorate, Egypt. It conducted on different production units belonged to the farm besides their water supply including:

**1-The hatchery:** it consists of circular tanks with average size 8 m<sup>3</sup> for each, made from fiberglass and supplied with agricultural

drainage water after filtration. The fry of *Oreochromis niloticus* were reared in the hatchery for one week and fed on pelleted ration contained 40% protein.

2- Fingerlings earthen pond of average size 50 x 40 m<sup>2</sup> were stocked with at a rate of 50,000 /feddan and reared for 40 day; fed on pelleted ration contained 40% protein. Water losses were replaced by agricultural water every 2-3 weeks interval. The average final weight of fingerlings was  $7.6 \pm 1.3$  g.

**3- Raising ponds (P1 & P2):** Two rectangular shaped earthen ponds with different size; the first pond (P1) 170 x 50 m<sup>2</sup> with average stocking density 4 fish/ m<sup>2</sup>. Meanwhile, the second pond (P2) was 180 x 70 m<sup>2</sup> with stocking density 6 fish/ m<sup>2</sup>. Fish in raising ponds were fed on a pelleted ration contain crude protein 25%. Superphosphate, urea and chicken manure were added as a fertilizer. Water losses from ponds were replaced from the water supply every 2-3 weeks. Plankton and weeds were pronounced in P2 than P1.

### **2. Sampling Program:**

Three hundred water samples were collected from both water source & ponds besides 360 fish samples from each production units throughout the production period.

#### **2.1. Sampling of Water :**

Water samples were collected bi-weekly in sterilized glass bottles (250 ml) from three locations for each pond at a fixed hour of the day (9.0 hour) as described earlier by Boyd, (1998). Results were averaged monthly.

### 2.1 A. Physico-chemical analyses of water samples

Routine water quality parameters for temperature, turbidity, DO, pH,  $\text{NH}_3\text{-N}$ ,  $\text{NO}_2\text{-N}$ ,  $\text{NO}_3\text{-N}$ , Alkalinity and some heavy metals (lead & cadmium) were estimated according to methods as described by APHA (1998). Temperature was recorded using a mercury thermometer. Turbidity (cm) was measured using a secchi disc according to **Boyd (1998)**. The pH was measured in situ using a portable pH meter (Hanna Instruments) The dissolved oxygen (DO) was determined using the YSI DO meter,  $\text{NH}_3\text{-N}$ ,  $\text{NO}_2\text{-N}$ ,  $\text{NO}_3\text{-N}$  and total alkalinity were estimated using commercial kits, while Pb & Cd were measured using atomic absorption spectrophotometer (thermo 6600, thermo electron corporation, Cambridge, UK).

### 2. 1. B. Bacteriological analysis of water samples :

Water samples were subjected for determination of total coliform, faecal coliform, faecal streptococci and Salmonella according to the protocol provided in standard method for the examination of water and waste water analysis by APHA (1998). Total coliform, faecal coliform and faecal streptococci were detected using three tubes method (MPN), as recommended by AOAC (1999). While Salmonella isolation according to **Harrigan (1998)**.

### 2.2. Sampling of Fish :

A cast net used to collect fish samples from the various ponds. Five live tilapia (*Oreochromis niloticus*) were randomly selected from the catch at each sampling time as method described by AOAC (1999). The fish were placed in labeled sterile polypropylene bags

containing water from the pond and transported to the laboratory.

### 2.2. A. Determination of Lead and Cadmium level in Fish Samples :

Lead (Pb) and cadmium (Cd) were measured in the fish muscle samples according to the method of AOAC (1999), using atomic absorption spectrophotometer (Thermo 6600, thermo electron corporation, Cambridge, UK).

### 2.2. B. Bacteriological Examination of Fish Samples :

Fish surface swabs were used for total bacterial count, total coliform and faecal coliform and Salmonella spp. measurement according to the protocol provided by (A.P.H.A 1998).

### 2.2. C. Fish Performance :

The fish samples were weighted every month throughout the production period to calculate the following parameters:-

- i. Body weight gain: Weight gain % =  $100 \left[ \frac{\text{final weight (g)} - \text{initial weight (g)}}{\text{initial weight (g)}} \right]$ , according to **Likongwe et al. (1996)**.
- ii. Specific growth rate (SGR):  $\text{SGR} = 100 \left[ \frac{\text{final weight (g)} - \text{initial weight (g)}}{t} \right]$ ; where (t) is the culture period in days, according to **Jha et al. (2008)**.
- iii. Survival rate of examined fish: Survival % =  $(N_f / N_i) \times 100$ . Where  $N_f$  and  $N_i$  are the number of fish harvested and stocked respectively, according to **Hargreaves and Semra (2001)**.

### 4. Statistical Analyses :

The data obtained were subjected to statistical analysis using One Way ANOVA test and bivariate correlations in SPSS V.17 for Win-

dows Sp3 software in order to determine the significance of the results.

### RESULTS & DISCUSSION

The average values of physico-chemical parameters and bacterial findings of water inlet as shown in Table (1); revealed that physico-chemical values were within the acceptable ranges for fish culturing except for water turbidity and ammonia content ( $\text{NH}_3\text{-N}$ ) showed a significant increase ( $P < 0.05$ )  $9.8 \pm 0.4$  cm and  $0.158 \pm 0.06$  mg/l, respectively. On the other hand, water supply showed the least contents of TC, FC and FS counts (MPN/100 mL) were  $9.6 \pm 1.0$ ,  $4.1 \pm 0.6$  and  $4.0 \pm 0.7$  respectively with no detection for *Salmonella* spp.. This finding was further supported by **Okonji and Akolisa (2005)**, **Frei et al. (2006)** and **Bhatnagar and Singh (2010)**.

Concerning to the mean values of physico-chemical parameters of water collected from examined ponds Table (2), it noticed that no significant differences in the mean values of water temperature and pH meanwhile, dissolved oxygen (DO) contents showed a significant decrease ( $P < 0.05$ ) in P2 was  $5.8 \pm 0.02$  mg/l followed by P1 and fingerlings pond were  $6.2 \pm 0.14$  and  $6.3 \pm 0.12$  mg/l respectively. On the other hand, water turbidity showed a significant increase ( $P < 0.05$ ) in raising ponds; P2 and P1 were  $9.1 \pm 0.6$  and  $9.6 \pm 0.6$  cm, respectively compared with hatchery  $19.3 \pm 1.3$  cm. Correspondingly, P2 had the highest content of  $\text{NH}_3\text{-N}$  and  $\text{NO}_2\text{-N}$  were  $0.277 \pm 0.024$  and  $0.99 \pm 0.12$  mg/l followed by P1 were  $0.173 \pm 0.012$  and  $0.084 \pm 0.008$  mg/l, respectively. Whereas, the highest  $\text{NO}_3\text{-N}$  content and total alkalinity were recorded in fingerlings pond were  $1.88 \pm 0.2$  mg/l and

$275.8 \pm 8.5$  mg/l respectively, followed by raising ponds compared with hatchery. This finding was further supported by **Okonji and Akolisa (2005)**, **Frei et al. (2006)**, **Hossain et al. (2008)** and **Bhatnagar and Singh (2010)**.

Regarding to microbiological findings of water samples as shown in Table (3), the mean values of total coliform, faecal coliform, faecal streptococci and *Salmonella* spp. presence in examined ponds indicated that, the hatchery showed the lowest values of estimated parameters compared with those in P2 which showed the highest values ( $P < 0.05$ ) of TC, FC and FS were  $27.7 \pm 1.9$ ,  $14.0 \pm 1.8$  and  $31.0 \pm 2.4$  MPN/100ml respectively, followed by P1 were  $20.6 \pm 1.6$ ,  $10.8 \pm 1.5$  and  $24.0 \pm 2.8$  MPN/100ml respectively, then fingerlings pond were  $13.8 \pm 2.6$ ,  $9.0 \pm 1.2$  and  $13.0 \pm 1.5$  MPN/100ml, respectively. *Salmonella* spp. were detected in P2, P1 and fingerlings pond while, not detected in water from hatchery. It revealed impairment of water quality in fish ponds which exaggerated by excessive organic matter (high ammonia, nitrite and nitrate) as supported by **Markosova and Jezek (1994)** who observed that presence of organic matter (ammonia, nitrite and nitrate) in pond's water always increase the risk of bacterial growth. This results are in accordance with that obtained by **Al-Harbi and uddin (2003)**, **Newaj-Fyzul et al. (2006)** and **Harnisza and Tucholski (2010)**.

The results of the quantitative estimation of bacterial level of fish samples Table (4) showed that the highest averages of bacterial counts, total coliforms and *Salmonella* spp. (cfu/ml) of examined fishes were in raising ponds; P2 were  $37.6 \pm 4.2$ ,  $15.6 \pm 2.0$  and

3.62±0.28 respectively, followed by P1 were 26.2±1.7, 10.6±0.9 and 2.02±0.4, respectively meanwhile, the lowest content detected in fingerlings pond were 3.8±0.3, 2.8±0.2 and 1.07±0.2 respectively, then the hatchery were 2.4±0.4, 1.6±0.2 and ND respectively. On the other hand, faecal coliforms was significantly increase ( $P < 0.05$ ) in P1 followed by P2 and fingerlings pond were 6.8±1.1, 5.7±0.5 and 1.1±0.17 respectively, while not detected in hatchery. It's obviously means positive correlation between microbial parameters of pond water and fish samples. Besides, poor water quality in raising ponds which act as stress factor lead to increase susceptibility of fish to infections as well as stimulate the multiplication and survival of bacteria, as supported by **Uddin et al. (1990)**, **Guzman et al. (2004)** and **Onyango et al. (2009)**.

The average of body weight gain and survival rates of fishes in raising ponds throughout the production period Table (5) obvious that a significant increase ( $P < 0.05$ ) in all examined parameters; final body weight, body weight gain, daily weight gain and survival rate in P1 were 244.5±3.5 g, 32.88±4.2%, 0.87±0.02 g and 96.0±1.7% respectively, compared with P2 were 218.0±8.0 g, 27.60±3.0%, 0.77±0.05 g and 93.0±1.2%, respectively. These variations clarified the impact of physical, chemi-

cal and bacterial quality of water in both examined ponds on fish performance. These results are in parallel to that obtained by **Mohamoud et al. (2002)**, **Newaj-Fyzul et al. (2006)**, **Jha et al. (2008)** and **Bhatnagar and Singh (2010)** who reported that higher weight gain and survival rate of fish could be attributed to better water quality.

Table (6) discussed the correlations between water quality and bacterial content of water in P2 showed that, water temperature significantly correlated with NO<sub>2</sub>-N and NO<sub>3</sub>-N contents while, negatively with turbidity and DO content. On the other hand, DO level was negatively correlated with NH<sub>3</sub>-N, NO<sub>2</sub>-N and NO<sub>3</sub>-N, as increase of these parameters depend mainly on biological oxygen demand. Similar results obtained by **Tomasso (1994)**, **Takeuchi et al. (1998)**, **Chaurasia and Pandey (2007)** and **Mahmoud et al. (2009)**. Moreover, water turbidity, NH<sub>3</sub>-N and alkalinity were significantly positive correlated with TC, FC and FS. Meanwhile, DO was negatively correlated with them. These results are supported by **El-Shafai et al. (2004)**, **Abo-Elcla et al. (2005)** and **Hossain et al. (2008)** who indicated that distribution of the different bacterial population was affected with one or more chemical parameters of pond's water such as alkalinity, ammonia, nitrates.

Table (1): Mean  $\pm$ SE of physico-chemical parameters and bacterial findings of samples from the water inlet.

Examined parameters	Water inlet	Mean
<b>Physico-chemical parameters (mg/l):</b>		
Temp. (C <sup>o</sup> )		25.06 $\pm$ 0.5
Turbidity (cm)		9.8 $\pm$ 0.4 **
pH		8.25 $\pm$ 0.1
Dissolved oxygen (DO)		7.03 $\pm$ 0.18
Ammonia (NH <sub>3</sub> - N)		0.158 $\pm$ 0.06**
Nitrite (NO <sub>2</sub> - N)		0.061 $\pm$ 0.007
Nitrate (NO <sub>3</sub> - N)		0.069 $\pm$ 0.008
Total alkalinity		236.0 $\pm$ 7.2
<b>Bacterial findings (MPN/100ml):</b>		
Total Coliform (TC)		9.6 $\pm$ 1.0
Faecal coliform (FC)		4.1 $\pm$ 0.6
Faecal Streptococci (FS)		4.0 $\pm$ 0.7
Salmonella Spp		N D

\*\* Superscript indicate a significant difference at P &lt; 0.05

ND: Not Detected

Table (2): Mean  $\pm$ SE of physico-chemical parameters of pond's water samples throughout the study period.

Water parameters (mg/L)	Hatchery	Fingerlings Pond	P1	P2
Temp. (C <sup>o</sup> )	25.6 $\pm$ 0.5	26.2 $\pm$ 0.5	26.3 $\pm$ 0.6	25.9 $\pm$ 0.5
Turbidity (cm)	19.3 $\pm$ 1.3 <sup>c</sup>	9.9 $\pm$ 0.6 <sup>b</sup>	9.6 $\pm$ 0.6 <sup>b</sup>	9.1 $\pm$ 0.6 <sup>a</sup>
pH	8.3 $\pm$ 0.1	8.4 $\pm$ 0.06	8.4 $\pm$ 0.1	8.5 $\pm$ 0.07
Dissolved oxygen (DO)	6.8 $\pm$ 0.16 <sup>a</sup>	6.3 $\pm$ 0.12 <sup>b</sup>	6.2 $\pm$ 0.14 <sup>b</sup>	5.8 $\pm$ 0.02 <sup>c</sup>
Ammonia (NH <sub>3</sub> - N)	0.084 $\pm$ 0.007 <sup>c</sup>	0.145 $\pm$ 0.014 <sup>b</sup>	0.173 $\pm$ 0.012 <sup>ab</sup>	0.277 $\pm$ 0.024 <sup>a</sup>
Nitrite (NO <sub>2</sub> - N)	0.068 $\pm$ 0.007 <sup>c</sup>	0.081 $\pm$ 0.009 <sup>b</sup>	0.084 $\pm$ 0.008 <sup>b</sup>	0.99 $\pm$ 0.12 <sup>a</sup>
Nitrate (NO <sub>3</sub> - N)	0.081 $\pm$ 0.009 <sup>b</sup>	1.88 $\pm$ 0.2 <sup>a</sup>	1.19 $\pm$ 0.6 <sup>ab</sup>	1.2 $\pm$ 0.06 <sup>ab</sup>
Total alkalinity	244.7 $\pm$ 7.0 <sup>c</sup>	275.8 $\pm$ 8.5 <sup>a</sup>	268.5 $\pm$ 8.4 <sup>b</sup>	252.3 $\pm$ 6.5 <sup>bc</sup>

Means having the different letter are indicate a significant difference at P &lt; 0.05

Table (3): Mean  $\pm$ SE of bacterial findings of pond's water samples throughout the study period.

Water Bacterial Findings (MPN /100ml)	Hatchery	Fingerlings Pond	P1	P2
Total Coliform (TC)	9.6 $\pm$ 1.0 <sup>c</sup>	13.8 $\pm$ 2.6 <sup>b</sup>	20.6 $\pm$ 1.6 <sup>ab</sup>	27.7 $\pm$ 1.9 <sup>a</sup>
Faecal coliform (FC)	4.1 $\pm$ 0.6 <sup>c</sup>	9.0 $\pm$ 1.2 <sup>bc</sup>	10.8 $\pm$ 1.5 <sup>b</sup>	14.0 $\pm$ 1.8 <sup>a</sup>
Faecal Streptococci (FS)	4.0 $\pm$ 0.7 <sup>c</sup>	13.0 $\pm$ 1.5 <sup>b</sup>	24.0 $\pm$ 2.8 <sup>a</sup>	31.0 $\pm$ 2.4 <sup>a</sup>
Salmonella Spp.	ND	+ve	+ve	+ve

Means having the different letter are indicate a significant difference at P &lt; 0.05

ND: Not Detected

Table (4): Mean $\pm$ SE of bacterial findings of fish samples throughout the study period.

Fish collected from Bacterial findings	Hatchery	Fingerlings Pond	P1	P2
Total Bacterial Count (TBCx10 <sup>3</sup> )	2.4 $\pm$ 0.4 <sup>c</sup>	3.8 $\pm$ 0.3 <sup>c</sup>	26.2 $\pm$ 1.7 <sup>b</sup>	37.6 $\pm$ 4.2 <sup>a</sup>
Total Coliform (TC) (MPN/100ml)	1.6 $\pm$ 0.2 <sup>c</sup>	2.8 $\pm$ 0.2 <sup>c</sup>	10.6 $\pm$ 0.9 <sup>b</sup>	15.6 $\pm$ 2.0 <sup>a</sup>
Faecal coliform (FC) (MPN/100ml)	ND	1.1 $\pm$ 0.17 <sup>c</sup>	6.8 $\pm$ 1.1 <sup>a</sup>	5.7 $\pm$ 0.5 <sup>b</sup>
SalmonellaSpp.(cfu/ml)	ND	1.07 $\pm$ 0.2 <sup>c</sup>	2.02 $\pm$ 0.4 <sup>b</sup>	3.62 $\pm$ 0.28 <sup>a</sup>

Means having the different letter are indicate a significant difference at P &lt; 0.05

ND: Not Detected

Table (5): Mean $\pm$ SE of growth rate and survival rate (%) of fish in raising ponds (P1 and P2)

Raising ponds Fish performances	P1	P2
Initial body weight( g)	7.6 $\pm$ 1.3	7.6 $\pm$ 2.0
Final body weight( g)	244.5 $\pm$ 3.5 <sup>a</sup>	218.0 $\pm$ 8.0 <sup>b</sup>
Daily weight gain( g)	0.87 $\pm$ 0.02 <sup>a</sup>	0.77 $\pm$ 0.05 <sup>b</sup>
Body weight gain (%)	32.88 $\pm$ 4.2 <sup>a</sup>	27.60 $\pm$ 3.0 <sup>b</sup>
Survival rate (%)	96.0 $\pm$ 1.7 <sup>a</sup>	93.0 $\pm$ 1.2 <sup>b</sup>

Means having the different letter are indicate a significant difference at P &lt; 0.05

**Table (6):** Correlations between physico-chemical and bacterial parameters of water in pond (2).

Water parameters	Temp.	Turbidity	pH	DO	NH <sub>3</sub> -N	NO <sub>2</sub> -N	NO <sub>3</sub> -N	Alkalinity
Temp.	1							
Turbidity	0.688**	1						
pH	0.362	-0.139	1					
DO	-0.250	-0.228	-0.171	1				
NH <sub>3</sub> -N	0.315	0.296	0.327	-0.821**	1			
NO <sub>2</sub> -N	0.647**	-0.141	0.554*	-0.519*	0.674**	1		
NO <sub>3</sub> -N	0.529*	0.022	0.735**	-0.502*	0.727**	0.844**	1	
Alkalinity	-0.041	0.204	0.048	-0.569*	0.372	0.134	0.147	1
TC	-0.414	0.700**	-0.126	-0.508*	0.522*	-0.018	0.028	0.534*
FC	-0.207	0.636**	-0.010	-0.518*	0.659**	0.203	0.239	0.494*
FS	-0.358	0.676**	-0.049	-0.610**	0.620**	0.101	0.161	0.680**

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level

\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level



## REFERENCES

- Abo-Elcla, G. M.; El-Sersy, N. A.; El-Shenawy, M. and Abdel-Mawla, E. (2005) :** Microbial Assessment of El-Max Fish Farm. J. Aquatic research, vol .31 (1): 325-341.
- Al-Harbi, A. H. and Uddin, N. M. (2003) :** Quantitative and qualitative studies on bacterial flora of hybrid tilapia (*Oreochromis niloticus* \* *Oreochromis aureus*) cultured in earthen ponds in Saudi Arabia. Aquaculture research, 34 (1): 34-48.
- AOAC (Association of Official Analytic Chemists), (1999) :** Official Methods of analysis. 16th Ed., MD. USA.
- A. P. H. A. (American Public Health Association), (1998):** Standard Methods for the Examination of water and waste water. 20th Ed.A.P.H.A., Washington, D.C. USA.
- Bhatnagar, A. and Singh, G. (2010) :** Assessment of Culture Fisheries in Village Ponds: a Study in District Hisar, Haryana, India. Int. J. Environ. Res., 4(1):57-64.
- Boyd, C. E. (1998) :** Water quality and Pond soil analysis for Aquaculture. Auburn University, Auburn, Alabama.
- Chaurasia, M. and Pandey, G. C. (2007) :** Study of Physico-chemical Characteristics of Some Water Ponds of Ayodhya-Faizabad. Indian J. Environmental Protection, vol 27 (11):1019-1023.
- El-Shafai, S. A.; El-Gohary, F. A.; Nasr, F. A. and Gijzen, H. J. (2004) :** Microbial quality of tilapia reared in fecal-contaminated ponds. Environmental Research, Vol. 95 (2): 231-238.
- Frei, M.; Razzak, M. A.; Hossain, M. M. and Oehme, M. (2006):** Performance of common carp, *Cyprinus Carpio* and Nile tilapia, *Oreochromis niloticus* (L) in integrated rice- fish culture in Bangladesh. Aquaculture, 11: 619-627.
- GAFRD (General Authority for Fishery Resources Development), (2007) :** Fish production statistics yearbook. Ministry of Agriculture Publications, Cairo, Egypt
- Guzmán, M. C.; Bistoni, M.; Tamagnini, L. M. and González, R. D., (2004) :** Recovery of *Escherichia coli* in fresh water fish, *Jenynsia multidentata* and *Bryconamericus iheringii*. Water Res., 38, 2368-2374.
- Hargreaves, J. A. and Semra, K. (2001) :** Effect of diel unionized ammonia fluctuation on juvenile hybrid striped bass , channel cat fish and blue Tilapia . Aquaculture, 195: 163-181.
- Harnisza, M. and Tucholskib, S. (2010) :** Microbial quality of common carp and pike-perch fingerlings cultured in a pond fed with treated wastewater Ecological Engineering, 36: 466-470.
- Harrigan, W. F. (1998) :** Laboratory methods in food microbiology. 3rd Ed., academic press, London, U.K.
- Hossain, M. K.; Hossain, M. D.; Rahman, M. H.; Afzal, R. and Khanom, D. A. (2008):** Physicochemical condition of two nursery ponds at Iswarganj, Mymensingh Univ. J. zool. Rajshahi Univ. Vol. 27 : 43-46.
- Jha, P.; Barat, S. and Nayak, C. R. (2008) :** Fish Production, Water Quality and Bacteriological Parameters of Koi Carp Ponds Under Live-food and Manure Based Management Regimes. Zoological Research, 29 (2):165-173.
- Kapetanovic, D.; Kurtovic, B.; Teskeredzic, Z. and Teskeredzic, E. (2005):** Incidence of *E. coli* in aquaculture areas of the Adriatic Sea. Medycyna-Weterynaryjna, 61 (12): 1366-1367.

- Likongwe, J. S.; Stecko, T. D.; Stauffer, J. R. and Robertf, C. (1996)** : Combined effect of water temperature & salinity on growth and feed utilization of Juvenile Nile Tilapia *Oreochromis niloticus* (Linneaus). *Aquaculture* 146: 37-46.
- Mahmoud, M. G.; Tadros, A. B.; Goma, R. H. and Mouad, M. N. (2009)** : Some Physicochemical Investigations on Water Resources Used in Feeding Ponds of El-Max Fish Farm, Egypt. *World Journal of Fish and Marine Sciences* 1 (3): 230-238.
- Markosova, R. and Jezek, J. (1994)** : Indicator bacteria and limnological parameters in fish ponds. *Water research*, vol. 28 (12): 2477-2485.
- Mohamoud, A. R.; Kamel, A. E. A.; Ashraf, A. R. and Rex, A. D. (2002)** : Comparative growth of Egyptian Tilapia in response to declining water temperature. *Aquaculture*, 207: 239-247.
- Newaj-Fyzul, A.; Adestyun, A. A. and Mutani A. (2006)** : Evaluation of management practices and water quality of selected freshwater fish farms in Trinidad. *J. of Food, Agriculture & Environment* 4 (1) : 295-300.
- Ntengwe, F. W. and Edema, M. O. (2008)** : Physico-chemical and microbiological characteristics of water for fish production using small ponds. *Physics and Chemistry of the Earth* 33 (8-13): 701-707.
- Okonji, V. A. and Akolisa, O. (2005)** : Growth performance of *Oreochromis niloticus* in combination with *Clarias* Catfishes in monoculture and polyculture. *Tropical Freshwater Biology*. Vol. 14: 117-132.
- Onyango, D. M.; Wandili, S.; Kakai, R. and Waindi, E. N. (2009)** : Isolation of *Salmonella* and *Shigella* from fish harvested from the Winam Gulf of Lake Victoria, Kenya. *J. Infect Developing Countries*, 3 (2): 99-104.
- Saeed, S. M. and Sakr, S. F. (2009)** : Studies on water quality, Culture performance and health aspects of Nile tilapia (*Oreochromis niloticus*) in fresh and brackish water fish farms. *Abbassa Int. J. of Aquaculture*, 1:20-25.
- Takeuchi, T.; Hirota, T.; Yoshiza, K. and Sakaiktyoshi, S. (1998)** : Relationship between Water Quality and Growth of Tilapia, *Oreochromis niloticus*, under the Recirculating Filter Tank System. *Suisan Zoshoku*. Vol.46: 547-555.
- Tomasso, J. R. (1994)** : Toxicity of nitrogenous wastes to aquaculture animals. *Rev. Fish. Sci.*, 24, pp. 291-314.
- Uddin, M. A.; Islam, M. N. and Rahman, M. A. (1990)** : Comparative studies on the seasonal variation in viable bacterial counts of two artificial lakes. *Progressive Agriculture* 1: 59-63.
- Yang, Y.; Kweilin, C. and Diana, J. S. (2003)** : Hybrid cat fish (*Clarias macrocephalus* X *C. gariepinus*) and Nile Tilapia (*Oreochromis niloticus*) culture in an integrated pen cum pond system: growth performance and nutrient budgets. *Aquaculture*, 217 : 395-408.

## الملخص العربى

### النوعية الصحية للمياه وتأثيرها على إنتاجية أسماك البلطي المستزرعة

أ. د / عادل حلمى الجوهري      أ. د / محمد عبدالرحمن البابلى\*  
أ. د / عمرو عبدالفتاح محمد      ط. ب / فاطمه الباز الدميرى

قسم الصحة والأمراض المشتركة - كلية الطب البيطرى - جامعة المنصورة

قسم الصحة والرعاية والأمراض المشتركة - كلية الطب البيطرى - جامعة بنى سويف\*

أجريت هذه الدراسة الحقلية فى الفترة مابين أبريل ٢٠٠٨ حتى نهاية ديسمبر ٢٠٠٩ بمركز بحوث الثروة السمكية بالعباسية التابعة لمحافظة الشرقية بهدف التعرف على بعض أنواع المياه المستخدمة فى المزارع السمكية وتأثيرها على معدلات النمو والإنتاج عن طريق تقدير بعض الخواص الفيزيائية والكيميائية والبكتيرية للمياه المستخدمة من جهة وتقدير معدلات النمو والبقاء فى الأسماك المستزرعة من جهة وتقدير معدلات النمو والبقاء فى الأسماك المستزرعة من جهة وتقدير معدلات النمو والبقاء فى الأسماك المستزرعة من جهة وتقدير معدلات النمو والبقاء فى الأسماك المستزرعة من جهة. بالإضافة إلى المفرخ وأحواض الزريعة وأحواض التربية لإجراء التحليل الفيزيائى والكيميائى والبكتيرى للمياه كما تم أخذ عدد ٣٦٠ عينة أسماك من مراحل الإنتاج المختلفة بالمزرعة طوال فترة الإنتاج حيث تم تقدير العدد الكلى لبكتريا ويكتريا الكوليفورم وكوليفورم البراز وميكروب السالمونيلا، وقد أوضحت النتائج أن حوض التربية ٢ سجل أعلى نتائج لكلا من الأمونيا والنيتريت ويكتريا الكوليفورم وكوليفورم البراز والميكروب السبحى البرازى وميكروب السالمونيلا وكانت  $0.27 \pm 0.024$  و  $0.99 \pm 0.12$  و  $27.7 \pm 1.9$  و  $14.0 \pm 1.8$  و  $31.0 \pm 2.4$  ونتيجة إيجابية لسالمونيلا على التوالى يليه حوض التربية ١ وكانت  $371 \pm 0.210$  و  $0.84 \pm 0.008$  و  $0.06 \pm 0.008$  و  $1.6 \pm 0.08$  و  $1.8 \pm 0.08$  و  $1.5 \pm 0.08$  و  $2.4 \pm 0.08$  ونتيجة إيجابية لسالمونيلا على التوالى مقارنة بالمفرخ الذى سجل أقل النتائج وكانت  $0.84 \pm 0.007$  و  $0.68 \pm 0.007$  و  $0.07 \pm 0.007$  و  $0.09 \pm 0.007$  و  $0.7 \pm 0.08$  و  $7.05 \pm 0.8$  ونتيجة سلبية لسالمونيلا على التوالى، وبالمثل عينات الأسماك المجمعة من حوض التربية ٢ سجلت أعلى القيم لكل من العد الكلى لبكتريا ويكتريا الكوليفورم وكوليفورم البراز وميكروب السالمونيلا وكانت  $376 \pm 4.2$  و  $15.6 \pm 2.0$  و  $5.7 \pm 0.5$  و  $3.62 \pm 0.28$  على التوالى يليه حوض التربية ١ وكانت  $262 \pm 1.7$  و  $1.6 \pm 0.9$  و  $1.8 \pm 0.9$  و  $2.2 \pm 0.4$  على التوالى، هذه النتائج تفسر سوء الصفات الفيزيائية والكيميائية للمياه فى حوض التربية ٢ يليه حوض التربية ١ مما يساعد على نمو وتكاثر الميكروبات فى كلاً من المياه والأسماك المستزرعة ومن ثم انعكس ذلك على الكفاءة الإنتاجية للأسماك حيث سجلت أعلى القيم لمعدلات النمو والبقاء فى حوض التربية ١ وكانت  $2388 \pm 2.4$  جم و  $69.0 \pm 1.7$  % على التوالى مقارنة بحوض التربية ٢ وكانت  $2760 \pm 3.0$  جم و  $93.0 \pm 1.2$  % على التوالى، لذا أوضحت النتائج أنه يمكن تحسين إنتاجية الأسماك عن طريق المحافظة على النوعية الصحية للمياه وفقاً للمعدلات المثلى.