Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

# Aquaculture

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/aquaculture

# Stocking density of Amazon fish (*Colossoma macropomum*) farmed in a continental neotropical reservoir with a net cages system

Rosimery Menezes Frisso<sup>a</sup>, Flávia Tavares de Matos<sup>b</sup>, Giovanni Vitti Moro<sup>b</sup>, Bruno Olivetti de Mattos<sup>c</sup>,\*

<sup>a</sup> University Nilton Lins and National Institute of Amazonian Research, Postgraduate Program in Aquaculture, 69058-030 Manaus, Amazonas, Brazil <sup>b</sup> Brazilian Agricultural Research Corporation (EMBRAPA), Fisheries and Aquaculture, 77008900 Palmas, Tocantins, Brazil

<sup>c</sup> Federal Institute of Education, Science and Technology of Amazonas, 69830-000 Lábrea, Amazonas, Brazil

#### ARTICLE INFO

Keywords: Colossoma macropomum Intensive system Cage farming Growth Welfare

#### ABSTRACT

A 60-day experiment was conducted to evaluate the best stocking density (SD) and net cage (NC) size for rearing tambaqui juveniles (*Colossoma macropomu*) in a continental neotropical reservoir. 57,688 tambaqui juveniles ( $50.10 \pm 1.39$  g, mean  $\pm$  S.E.M.) had been randomly stocked in 16 NC. The experiment was run with a 2 × 2 factorial scheme at two SD (15 kg/m<sup>3</sup>; 24 kg/m<sup>3</sup>) and two NC sizes (22.5 m<sup>3</sup>; 40 m<sup>3</sup>), with four replications: T1: 15 kg/m<sup>3</sup> x 22.5 m<sup>3</sup>; T2: 24 kg/m<sup>3</sup> x 22.5 m<sup>3</sup>; T3: 15 kg/m<sup>3</sup> x 40 m<sup>3</sup>; T4: 24 kg/m<sup>3</sup> x 40 m<sup>3</sup>. After 60 days, growth performance, biochemical parameters and body composition of fish were evaluated. Individual weight gain, feed conversion ratio, feed efficiency rate, specific growth rate and protein efficiency ratio were better at SD 24 kg/m<sup>3</sup>. For body composition, the crude protein and lower crude fat values in NC 24 kg/m<sup>3</sup> and NC 40 m<sup>3</sup> were higher. The biochemical parameters showed no significant difference for total proteins and plasma cholesterol. Triglycerides had higher rates for the fish stored in NC 40 m<sup>3</sup>. An SD-NC interaction appeared for glucose and cortisol, with higher values for SD 15 kg/m<sup>3</sup> in NC 40 m<sup>3</sup>; the highest values were observed in SD 24 kg/m<sup>3</sup> for NC 22.5m<sup>3</sup>. Therefore, the production of the fish stocked in SD 24 kg/m<sup>3</sup> was more efficient as the biochemical parameters had better indices for the fish raised in 40m<sup>3</sup>. The findings in this study suggest using SD 24 kg/m<sup>3</sup> in NC 40 m<sup>3</sup> to maximise fish productivity and welfare.

#### 1. Introduction

The world's demand for food is increasingly imposed, which implies extending these inputs (FAO, 2018). In general, fish is the protein with the best nutritional quality, and it acts as an important tool to meet the world population's nutritional requirements (FAO, 2018). Thus the creation of intensive systems can be a viable alternative for this purpose because it maximises productivity in units (Watanabe et al., 2010).

One of the main technology followed to produce intensive systems is net cages, which are closed mesh structured on all sides that retain fish and allow water to flow (Colt, 1991). These net cages can be installed in coastal areas, and in large lakes and reservoirs, and sustainably extend production because they use readily available aquatic environments and allow higher productivity than other production systems (Demétrio et al., 2012). Despite being a proven efficient system, it requires developing both monitoring and management to produce fish sustainably and periodically (Chowdhury et al., 2020). In view of this, government policies are extending actions and areas of action to increase fish production to keep social, economic and environmental aspects balanced (Demétrio et al., 2012; Bueno et al., 2015).

Very few fish farming studies have been conducted in intensive farming systems, such as net cages, especially in connection with the best stocking density (SD) and breeding structure size. According to Brandão et al. (2004), determining SD is important for fish to obtain better performance indices and for successful production cycles. Hence the SD that refers to the number or weight of fish per unit volume, when stored above or below production capacity, can be a limiting factor for productivity and may determine fish farms' profitability (EFSA, 2008; Chowdhury et al., 2020). In fact Rahman et al. (2006) suggest that optimal SD should be determined so that production and welfare indices can provide the highest possible economic return. According to Beveridge (1987), net cage size can be a relevant factor as it influences production and productivity levels. Silva et al. (2007) report how defining net cage size is necessary to understand species' feeding and locomotor behaviour. This definition is species-specific and is related to the environmental support capacity, renewal rates, and the temperature

\* Corresponding author at: Federal Institute of Education, Science and Technology of Amazonas, Lábrea, Amazonas, Brazil. *E-mail addresses:* mattos.bo@gmail.com, bruno.mattos@ifam.edu.br (B.O.d. Mattos).

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aquaculture.2020.735702 Received 15 May 2020; Received in revised form 5 July 2020 Available online 11 July 2020 0044-8486/ © 2020 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.









Fig. 1. Study area at Palmas Reservoir in the Sucupira Aquaculture Park.

and water body that net cages are installed in (Canzi et al., 2017). Given all the above facts, SD combined with net cage size can significantly affect not only growth performance (Slembrouck et al., 2009; Chowdhury et al., 2020), but also the physiological responses associated with animal health and welfare (Zahedi et al., 2019).

Fish farming in net cages is carried out in different regions of the world: Italy for *Seriola dumerili* (Mazzola et al., 2000); the USA for *Melanogrammus aeglefinus* (Chambers and Howell, 2006); Thailand and Brazil for *Oreochromis niloticus* (Yi and Lin, 2001); Norway and Chile for *Salmo salar* (Korsøen et al., 2009; Meyer et al., 2019); the UK for *Oncorhynchus mykiss* (North et al., 2006); China for *Lates calcarifer* (Luo et al., 2019). In the Amazon region, the main fish species raised in intensive systems are not representative, and fish farming in this region is characterised by small properties using extensive and semi-intensive systems (Saint-Paul, 2017). This situation occurs because the logistics, transport infrastructure, inputs and fish conservation in the Amazon region present deficits (Oliveira, 2009), which make it difficult to expand and maximise production in intensive systems.

According to Watanabe et al. (2010), the environments provided by intensive systems can act as a stressor because animals are subjected to densification, confinement, limited available area and effects on feeding that may have a negative influence (Nash et al., 2000; Rahman et al., 2006; Demétrio et al., 2012; Nhan et al., 2019). Under these conditions, fish present primary responses that activate the central nervous system by stimulating the secretion of adrenocorticotropic hormone (ACTH) from the anterior pituitary (Fryer and Lederis, 1986; Wendelaar-Bonga, 1997), as well as the subsequent release of cortisol in the current sanguine by interrenal cells (Randall and Perry, 1992; Arends et al., 1999). Secondary defence occurs as subsequent action, with affects animal metabolism (Barton and Iwama, 1991) and brings about changes in plasma, such as higher concentrations of glucose, cholesterol, triglycerides and total proteins (McDonald and Milligan, 1992; Begg and Pankhurst, 2004; Cuesta et al., 2004). If this scenario continues, fish productive performance and health status can be compromised (Wendelaar-Bonga, 1997). Therefore, fish welfare in intensive breeding systems is essential to seek maximum performance and economic success, while also providing fish of nutritional quality (Poli et al., 2005; Maricchiolo et al., 2011). Despite the very high potential of Amazonian species for breeding in net cages, no studies are available about developing these species in intensive production systems, which are key issues for maximising their production, especially tambaqui.

Tambaqui (*Colossoma macropomum*) is a large Amazon fish that can be grown during short culture periods as it can reach a marketable size of 2–3 kg after 8–12 culture months (Gomes et al., 2006). Studies on this species prove to be increasingly important, due to the expansion of their breeding in several regions of the world, such as Central America and Asia (Woynárovich and Van-Anrooy, 2019). Despite being an important tropical aquaculture species, knowledge about its basic biology is lacking, especially about fish farming intensive systems like largevolume net cages (NC), and adequate SD for this species in its early development stages (Gomes et al., 2006). Some authors have studied the creation of tambaqui in 1-m<sup>3</sup> net cage, which suggests optimal densities of 8 kg/m<sup>3</sup> (Brandão et al., 2004) and 14 kg/m<sup>3</sup> (Silva and Fujimoto, 2015). In these studies however, fish started with an average weight of 0.24 g and 0.35 g, respectively, but this condition does not represent the commercial scenario of production activity, where implementing breeding in large-volume net cages is sought (Rosini et al., 2019) by starting breeding at an average fish weight of 40–50 g.

Our study objective was to acquire information about tambaqui juveniles in NC to examine the effects of different SD and two NC sizes on the growth performance, biochemical parameters and body composition of fish.

### 2. Materials and methods

# 2.1. Study area

The experiment was conducted on a farm at Palmas Reservoir (Fig. 1) in the Sucupira Aquaculture Park at the Center for Research, Demonstration and Training of Fish Breeding in Net Cage of Brazilian Agricultural Research Corporation-Fisheries and Aquaculture (CRDTFB-EMBRAPA/PESC-AQUI), in Palmas/TO. The Palmas/TO municipality is located in central Brazil at an average altitude of 260 m, with geographical coordinates 10°11′04" south latitude and 48°20′01″ west longitude of Greenwich (BRASIL, 1992).

### 2.2. Fish origin and management

The aquaculture experimental facility of the CRDTFB-EMBRAPA/ PESC-AQUI, Brazil, housed 57,888 tambaqui juveniles (mean weight  $\pm$  S.E.M.: 50.10  $\pm$  1.39 g; mean length  $\pm$  S.E.M.: 11.53  $\pm$  0.14 cm), which were obtained from the Aquaculture Farm São Paulo (Tocantins, Brazil). At the beginning of the experiment, the fish were randomly stocked in 16 NC of 25 mm mesh internodes under the experimental conditions to be tested, whose average depth was 10.50 m. They were installed perpendicularly to the water current, and arranged in line with a distance between NC of 4 m. Fish were hand-fed 3 times a day until satiety with a specific commercial extruded diet for omnivore fish (Guabi\*, Brazil).

Water temperature, dissolved oxygen and pH were monitored 3 times a week in the morning with a U-50 Multiparameter Horiba probe and every 2 weeks, ammonia was monitored by the indophenol blue method, during the experiment period. The temperature, oxygen, pH and ammonia parameters were measured with values of  $29.00 \pm 0.25$  °C,  $8.35 \pm 0.21$  mg/l,  $6.96 \pm 0.09$  and  $0.07 \pm 0.01$  mg/l, respectively, in accordance with Resolution no. 357, of 2005, of the National Council of the Environment (CONAMA) for fresh water, classified in class II, for use in aquaculture (BRASIL, 2005).

This research complied with Brazilian guidelines for the care and use of animals for scientific and educational purposes (DBCA), and also with the ethics principles in animal experimentation of the Ethics Commission on the Use of Animals by Brazilian Agricultural Research Corporation - Fisheries and Aquaculture (CEUA-CNPASA: no. 01/2019).

#### 2.3. Experimental design

The experiment was carried out following a completely randomised design in a 2  $\times$  2 factorial scheme at two SD (15 kg/m<sup>3</sup>; 24 kg/m<sup>3</sup>) and with two NC sizes (3.0mx3.0mx3.0m: 22.50 m<sup>3</sup>; 4.0mx4.0mx3.0m: 40 m<sup>3</sup>): T1 (15 kg/m<sup>3</sup> x 22.50 m<sup>3</sup>–1980 fish); T2 (24 kg/m<sup>3</sup> x 22.50 m<sup>3</sup>–3168 fish); T3 (15 kg/m<sup>3</sup> x 40 m<sup>3</sup>–3548 fish); T4 (24 kg/m<sup>3</sup> x 40 m<sup>3</sup>–5676 fish); each treatment consisting of 4 repetitions and net cage taken as the experimental unit.

Fish were fed 3 times a day, 7 days a week, to apparent satiation, with commercial extruded fish feed containing 33% crude protein (CP) for the 60-day trial period. The amount of feed provided daily was recorded to calculate eaten food (feed intake).

At the beginning of the experiment and on day 30, a random sample of 100 fish from each net cage was taken after a 24-h fasting. The sampled fish were anesthetised with 20 mg/l of clove oil (Inoue et al., 2011), individually weighed and measured (standard length). After this procedure, the fish returned to the original net cages. At the end of the experiment (day 60), the same procedure was performed by counting 100% of fish from each experimental unit, and weighing and measuring 100 fish from each net cage to make performance evaluations.

# 2.4. Growth parameters

The effects of SD on zootechnical performance were determined by calculating the following parameters.

- Individual weight gain (IWG; g): final weight (g) initial weight (g);
- Feed conversion ratio (FCR): individual feed intake (g) / individual weight gain (g);
- Feed efficiency rate (FER; %): (individual weight gain (g) / individual feed intake (g)) x 100;
- Specific growth rate (SGR; %): [(Ln final weight-Ln initial weight)/ Time]x100;
- Protein efficiency ratio (PER; %): weight gain (g) / crude protein intake (g);
- Coefficient of variation (CV; %): (standard deviation final weight (g)/mean final weight (g)) x 100;
- Condition factor (CF) = 100 x final weight (g)/final length (cm)<sup>3</sup>;
- Survival (S,%) = (number of final animals x 100) / number of initial animals.

# 2.5. Biochemical analysis

Blood was collected from three fish in each experimental unit (12 fish per treatment) by puncturing the caudal vein with 1 ml syringes containing EDTA. For the plasma analysis, blood aliquots were centrifuged at 3500 rpm/5 min/25 °C for plasma separation. A cortisol concentration analysis (ng/mL) was performed by the ELISA method (Cortisol ELISA kit - DRG Diagnóstica); glucose (mg/dL), total protein (g/dL), cholesterol (mg/dL) and triglycerides (g/dL); which were tested by the colorimetric method with a commercial kit (In Vitro Diagnóstica Ltda, Itabira/MG).

### 2.6. Body composition and organo-somatic indexes

The proximate fish composition were collected from four fish in each experimental unit (16 fish per treatment). Body composition was determined by standard methods of the Association of Official Analytical Chemists (AOAC, 2012), and the following were determined: content moisture by drying for 24 h at 110 °C to constant weight; protein by the Kjeldahl method (N × 6.25); crude fat by diethyl ether extraction; ash by heating at 450 °C for 24 h.

The organo-somatic indexes were determined collecting the liver, visceral fat and viscera of 4 fish per experimental unit (16 fish per treatment), being removed, weighed and were calculated as follows:

- Hepato-somatic index (HSI; %): (liver weight (g) / final weight (g)) × 100;
- Lipo-somatic index (LSI; %): (visceral fat weight (g)/ final weight (g)) × 100;
- Viscero-somatic index (VSI; %): (viscera weight (g) / final weight (g)) × 100;

# 2.7. Data analysis

All data are presented as mean  $\pm$  S.E.M. Data normality was previously evaluated by the Shapiro-Wilk test and the homogeneity of variance was verified by the Levene test. The variables were subjected to an analysis of variance using the PROC MIXED command by the Statistical Analyzes System - SAS 9.1 programme according to the model described below:

#### Table 1

Effect of stocking density on the performance of Colossoma macropomum in net cages.

| Parameter            | SD                   | NC                  |                     | Mean P value      |       |      |         |  |
|----------------------|----------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-------------------|-------|------|---------|--|
|                      |                      | 22.50m <sup>3</sup> | 40.00m <sup>3</sup> |                   | SD    | NC   | SD x NC |  |
| IW <sup>1</sup> (g)  | 15 kg/m <sup>3</sup> | $49.75 \pm 0.62$    | $53.63 \pm 3.23$    | $51.69 \pm 1.69$  | 0.25  | 0.78 | 0.10    |  |
|                      | 24 kg/m <sup>3</sup> | $51.20 \pm 3.15$    | $45.82 \pm 2.73$    | $48.51 \pm 2.18$  |       |      |         |  |
|                      | Mean                 | $50.48 \pm 1.51$    | $49.73 \pm 2.45$    |                   |       |      |         |  |
| $IL^2$ (cm)          | 15 kg/m <sup>3</sup> | $11.51 \pm 0.11$    | $11.16 \pm 0.21$    | $11.34 \pm 0.13$  | 0.14  | 0.06 | 0.49    |  |
|                      | 24 kg/m <sup>3</sup> | $12.07 \pm 0.14$    | $11.37 \pm 0.42$    | $11.72 \pm 0.24$  |       |      |         |  |
|                      | Mean                 | $11.79 \pm 0.13$    | $11.26 \pm 0.22$    |                   |       |      |         |  |
| FW <sup>3</sup> (g)  | 15 kg/m <sup>3</sup> | 151.71 ± 7.87       | $164.03 \pm 10.22$  | $157.87 \pm 6.41$ | 0.07  | 0.84 | 0.12    |  |
|                      | 24 kg/m <sup>3</sup> | $181.88 \pm 2.78$   | $166.28 \pm 10.25$  | $174.08 \pm 5.73$ |       |      |         |  |
|                      | Mean                 | $166.80 \pm 6.89$   | $165.16 \pm 6.71$   |                   |       |      |         |  |
| FL <sup>4</sup> (cm) | 15 kg/m <sup>3</sup> | $15.55 \pm 0.62$    | $15.41 \pm 0.34$    | $15.48 \pm 0.33$  | 0.64  | 0.39 | 0.60    |  |
|                      | 24 kg/m <sup>3</sup> | $15.93 \pm 0.14$    | $15.39 \pm 0.27$    | $15.66 \pm 0.17$  |       |      |         |  |
|                      | Mean                 | $15.74 \pm 0.30$    | $15.40 \pm 0.20$    |                   |       |      |         |  |
| IWG <sup>5</sup> (g) | 15 kg/m <sup>3</sup> | $101.96 \pm 8.07$   | $110.40 \pm 12.65$  | $106.18 \pm 7.13$ | 0.04  | 0.92 | 0.31    |  |
| -                    | $24 \text{ kg/m}^3$  | $130.68 \pm 5.04$   | $120.46 \pm 7.99$   | $125.57 \pm 4.78$ |       |      |         |  |
|                      | Mean                 | $116.32 \pm 6.99$   | $115.43 \pm 7.18$   |                   |       |      |         |  |
| FCR <sup>6</sup>     | 15 kg/m <sup>3</sup> | $2.25 \pm 0.16$     | $2.15 \pm 0.31$     | $2.20 \pm 0.16$   | 0.01  | 0.96 | 0.60    |  |
|                      | $24 \text{ kg/m}^3$  | $1.61 \pm 0.04$     | $1.70 \pm 0.08$     | $1.65 \pm 0.04$   |       |      |         |  |
|                      | Mean                 | $1.93 \pm 0.14$     | $1.92 \pm 0.17$     |                   |       |      |         |  |
| FER <sup>7</sup> (%) | $15 \text{ kg/m}^3$  | $45.04 \pm 3.50$    | $49.07 \pm 6.18$    | $47.05 \pm 3.37$  | 0.004 | 0.88 | 0.39    |  |
|                      | $24 \text{ kg/m}^3$  | $62.08 \pm 1.46$    | $59.19 \pm 2.79$    | $60.64 \pm 1.56$  |       |      |         |  |
|                      | Mean                 | $53.56 \pm 3.67$    | $54.13 \pm 3.68$    |                   |       |      |         |  |
| SGR <sup>8</sup> (%) | $15 \text{ kg/m}^3$  | $1.85 \pm 0.09$     | $1.86 \pm 0.18$     | $1.85 \pm 0.09$   | 0.03  | 0.88 | 0.95    |  |
|                      | $24 \text{ kg/m}^3$  | $2.12 \pm 0.11$     | $2.14 \pm 0.05$     | $2.13 \pm 0.06$   |       |      |         |  |
|                      | Mean                 | $1.98 \pm 0.08$     | $2.00 \pm 0.10$     |                   |       |      |         |  |
| PER <sup>9</sup> (%) | 15 kg/m <sup>3</sup> | $1.38 \pm 0.11$     | $1.50 \pm 0.19$     | $1.44 \pm 0.10$   | 0.004 | 0.38 | 0.87    |  |
|                      | $24 \text{ kg/m}^3$  | $1.81 \pm 0.09$     | $1.90 \pm 0.04$     | $1.85 \pm 0.05$   |       |      |         |  |
|                      | Mean                 | $1.59 \pm 0.10$     | $1.70 \pm 0.12$     |                   |       |      |         |  |
| CV <sup>10</sup>     | $15 \text{ kg/m}^3$  | $25.71 \pm 0.46$    | 25.94 + 1.39        | $25.83 \pm 0.68$  | 0.30  | 0.43 | 0.55    |  |
|                      | $24 \text{ kg/m}^3$  | $23.70 \pm 0.89$    | $25.38 \pm 1.66$    | 24.54 + 0.93      |       |      |         |  |
|                      | Mean                 | $24.71 \pm 0.60$    | $25.66 \pm 1.01$    |                   |       |      |         |  |
| $CF^{11}$            | $15 \text{ kg/m}^3$  | $4.07 \pm 0.25$     | $4.46 \pm 0.05$     | $4.07 \pm 0.14$   | 0.09  | 0.14 | 0.23    |  |
| -                    | $24 \text{ kg/m}^3$  | $4.49 \pm 0.06$     | $4.53 \pm 0.08$     | $4.46 \pm 0.05$   |       |      |         |  |
|                      | Mean                 | $4.49 \pm 0.14$     | $4.53 \pm 0.04$     |                   |       |      |         |  |

Legend: <sup>1</sup>IW = Initial weight; <sup>2</sup>IL = Initial length; <sup>3</sup>FW = Final weight; <sup>4</sup>FL = Final length; <sup>5</sup>IWG = Individual weight gain; <sup>6</sup>FCR = Feed conversion ratio; <sup>7</sup>FER = Feed efficiency rate; <sup>8</sup>SGR = Specific growth rate; <sup>9</sup>PER = Protein efficiency ratio; <sup>10</sup>CV = Coefficient of variation; <sup>11</sup>CF = Condition factor. All values represents mean  $\pm$  S.E.M., n = 4 tanks per treatment. *P* values (p < .05) and means marked in bold indicate significant differences.

 $Yijk = \mu + SDi + NGj + Iixj + \epsilon_{ijk}$ 

where:

 $\mu$  = general average;

 $SD_i = fixed effect of SD_i (1-2);$ 

 $NC_i$  = fixed effect of net cage<sub>i</sub> size (1–2);

 $I_{ixk}$  = effect of the SD<sub>i</sub> and NC<sub>i</sub> size interaction;

 $\varepsilon_{iik}$  = random error for each observation (0,  $\delta^2$ ).

#### 3. Results

Significant differences were observed for individual weight gain (p = .04), feed conversion ratio (p = .01), feed efficiency rate (p = .004), specific growth rate (p = .03) and protein efficiency ratio (p = .004) for SD, with 24 kg/m<sup>3</sup> being the SD with the best production indices (Table 1). The survival rate was 99.91 ± 0.02% throughout the experimental period.

The crude protein and crude fat contents in the whole body were significantly different, and the higher SD and the larger NC presented high indices for crude protein content (SD: p = .009; NC: p = .001). An inversion appeared for body crude fat content, with higher values for the lower SD and the smaller NC (SD: p = .001; NC: p = .004) (Table 2). Organo-somatic indexes showed significant differences for lipo-somatic index (SD: p = .0001) and hepato-somatic index (NC: p = .01). Lipo-somatic index was higher for the fish stocked in final density 15 kg/m<sup>3</sup>. For net cages size, the parameter hepato-somatic index obtained higher values for the fish stored in NC 40 m<sup>3</sup> (Table 3).

No significant differences appeared between treatments for the plasma total protein (SD: p = .25; NC: p = .13) and cholesterol (SD:

p = .87; NC: p = .92) levels. For triglycerides however, values were higher when comparing NC sizes (p < .0001), and NC 40 m<sup>3</sup> showed this behaviour (Table 4). An SD and NC size interaction was observed (Table 4) for glucose (p < .0001) and cortisol (p < .0001). For both parameters, a higher value was obtained for SD 15 kg/m<sup>3</sup> in NC 40 m<sup>3</sup> (glucose: p < .0001; cortisol: p < .0001). For NC 22.50 m<sup>3</sup>, higher values were observed for both parameters with SD 24 kg/m<sup>3</sup> (glucose: p < .0001; cortisol: p < .0001). For NC 40 m<sup>3</sup>, SD 15 kg/m<sup>3</sup> presented the highest parameter values (glucose: p = .0002; cortisol: p = .0002).

#### 4. Discussion

The present study evaluated the effect of SD and different NC sizes installed in continental reservoirs for tambaqui juveniles to make fish production and welfare more efficient. This study provides information for the aquaculture sector to maximise production of juveniles in NC by providing better indices and concepts to be applied and to, thus, provide efficient fish production methods in NC installed in continental reservoirs. Significant differences were observed for growth performance with SD.

The main factors that affect growth performance in fish are food intake and nutrient absorption (National Research Council, 2011; Kitagawa et al., 2015). The space available in fish production systems is very important for growth performance because space limitations are a determining factor for fish development (EFSA, 2008). In fact higher densities reduce fish growth performance because of a smaller physical space due to occupancy rates in NC (Oppedal et al., 2011; Oliveira

#### Table 2

Effect of stocking density on proximate carcass composition of Colossoma macropomum in net cages.

| Parameter         | SD   | NC  |  | Mean  | P value | P value |         |
|-------------------|--|---|--|---|---------|---------|---------|
|                   |  | 22.50m <sup>3</sup>   | 40.00m <sup>3</sup>                                      |   | SD      | NC      | SD x NC |
| Moisture (%)      | 15 kg/m <sup>3</sup><br>24 kg/m <sup>3</sup><br>Mean | $63.35 \pm 0.66$<br>$63.76 \pm 1.28$<br>$63.56 \pm 0.67$                          | $64.01 \pm 0.40$<br>$65.37 \pm 0.66$<br>$64.69 \pm 0.44$ | $\begin{array}{rrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrr$                        | 0.29    | 0.19    | 0.56    |
| Crude protein (%) | 15 kg/m <sup>3</sup><br>24 kg/m <sup>3</sup><br>Mean | $\begin{array}{r} 44.69 \pm 0.08 \\ 45.90 \pm 0.23 \\ 45.29 \pm 0.25 \end{array}$ | $46.15 \pm 0.27 46.59 \pm 0.09 46.37 \pm 0.15$           | $\begin{array}{rrrrr} 45.42 \ \pm \ 0.30 \\ 46.24 \ \pm \ 0.18 \end{array}$ | 0.009   | 0.001   | 0.06    |
| Crude fat (%)     | 15 kg/m <sup>3</sup><br>24 kg/m <sup>3</sup><br>Mean | $\begin{array}{rrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrr$                              | $9.56 \pm 0.06$<br>$9.10 \pm 0.14$<br>$9.33 \pm 0.11$    | $\begin{array}{rrrr} 9.77 & \pm & 0.09 \\ 9.36 & \pm & 0.13 \end{array}$    | 0.001   | 0.004   | 0.60    |
| Ash (%)           | 15 kg/m <sup>3</sup><br>24 kg/m <sup>3</sup><br>Mean | $9.10 \pm 0.16$<br>$9.59 \pm 0.18$<br>$9.34 \pm 0.15$                             | $9.24 \pm 0.21$<br>$9.53 \pm 0.29$<br>$9.38 \pm 0.18$    | $9.16 \pm 0.12$<br>$9.56 \pm 0.16$  | 0.09    | 0.84    | 0.66    |

All values represents mean  $\pm$  S.E.M., n = 4 tanks per treatment. P value (p < .05) indicate significant differences. P values (p < .05) and means marked in bold indicate significant differences.

et al., 2012; Refaey et al., 2018; Ren et al., 2018). However, the juveniles stocked at SD 24 kg/m<sup>3</sup> showed better productive performance for individual weight gain (IWG), feed conversion ratio (FCR), feed efficiency rate (FER), specific growth rate (SGR) and protein efficiency deficiency ratio (PER). These results indicate that physical spaces were not a limiting factor for growth at the highest SD, which is similar to that reported by Hengsawat et al. (1997) for *Clarias gariepinus*, Brandão et al. (2004) and Gomes et al. (2006) for *Colossoma macropomum* and Rowland et al. (2006) for *Bidyanus bidyanus*. This finding may be related to the better use of nutrients, especially protein, which displayed more feed efficiency at the higher density and in NC 40 m<sup>3</sup>. In addition, the fish stocked at SD 24 kg/m<sup>3</sup> had higher protein composition, which corroborated the results of Refaey et al. (2018). FCR, FER and SGR were higher in this scenario, which corroborated previous information according to which fish better absorbed nutrients.

The results also indicated that SD 15 kg/m<sup>3</sup> presented lower values for the performance parameters, and higher values for the lipo-somatic index (LSI) and crude fat in carcass composition for the fish stocked at this density and in NC 22.5m<sup>3</sup>. These results may be related to the bigger space available for fish, which can increase energy use with activities and behavioural patterns and, consequently, reduce the energy employed for somatical growth. In addition, a higher crude fat reserve deposition observed in the fish stored at the lower density can be harmful for the fish production system. These results agree with Ni et al. (2016), who studied the SD of *Acipenser schrenckii* in NC, and found this same condition with lower occupancy rates. Given these scenarios, growth performance variedary between the fish species reared in NC, which may be related to species' eating habits, aggressive behaviour in fish agglomerations, water quality, life stages, environments in which NC are installed, time of year and breeding structure size (Rowland et al., 2006; Oppedal et al., 2011; Ren et al., 2018; Meyer et al., 2019; Chowdhury et al., 2020). This finding demonstrates that the aquaculture potential is high and much research must be conducted to provide a better understanding of this production system.

The biochemical parameters indicated a significant difference, but only for triglycerides in the tambaqui juveniles reared in NC 40 m<sup>3</sup>. These results could be related to more energy demands regardless of SD because the fish in this environment moved about more as they had a bigger space to explore, as described by Vijayan et al. (1990). The Hepato-somatic index (HSI) had higher values for the same situation. These results indicate that fish need more energy inputs and, as fat and glucose are energy sources, they meet fish demands (Walton and Cowey, 1982; Wendelaar-Bonga, 1997). The fat available in the bloodstream of tambaqui juveniles can be used immediately, as described by Moon (1988) and Sheridan (1988). The IHS is often used to estimate the energy status and metabolic activity of fish (Janssens and Waterman, 1988), and it herein indicated more demand for these energy reserves at the lower density.

The cortisol and glucose indices showed interactions in the tambaqui juveniles stocked at different densities for both NC sizes. The fish stocked at SD 15 kg/m<sup>3</sup> in NC 40 m<sup>3</sup> obtained higher glucose and cortisol values. In view of this scenario, we suggest that the bigger the space for fish, the more motivated they would be to perform more locomotor activity and, consequently, to use more energy. This meant that the plasma cortisol level was high compared to the other treatments. This condition was also observed by Oyarzún et al. (2020), who studied the effect of SD on NC for the species *Eleginops maclovinus*. According to Wendelaar-Bonga (1997), cortisol is the hormone of catabolic synthesis, which implies increased blood glucose through catabolic pathways, mainly gluconeogenesis, as fish need energy to

| Table 3 | 3 |
|---------|---|
|---------|---|

Effect of stocking density on organo-somatic indexes of Colossoma macropomum in net cages

| Parameter            | SD   | NC  | NC  |  | P value |      |         |
|----------------------|--|---|---|--|---------|------|---------|
|                      |  | 22.50m <sup>3</sup>                                   | 40.00m <sup>3</sup>                                   |  | SD      | NC   | SD x NC |
| HSI <sup>1</sup> (%) | 15 kg/m <sup>3</sup><br>24 kg/m <sup>3</sup><br>Mean | $\begin{array}{rrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrr$  | $1.64 \pm 0.17$<br>2.07 $\pm 0.11$<br>2.08 $\pm 0.09$ | $1.98 \pm 0.09$<br>$1.85 \pm 0.11$                                       | 0.31    | 0.01 | 0.42    |
| LSI <sup>2</sup> (%) | 15 kg/m <sup>3</sup><br>24 kg/m <sup>3</sup><br>Mean | $3.65 \pm 0.34$<br>$2.57 \pm 0.20$<br>$3.11 \pm 0.27$ | $3.03 \pm 0.12$<br>$2.31 \pm 0.21$<br>$2.67 \pm 0.18$ | $\begin{array}{rrrr} 3.34 \ \pm \ 0.20 \\ 2.44 \ \pm \ 0.14 \end{array}$ | 0.001   | 0.07 | 0.44    |
| VSI <sup>3</sup> (%) | 15 kg/m <sup>3</sup><br>24 kg/m <sup>3</sup><br>Mean | $\begin{array}{rrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrr$  | $3.88 \pm 0.41$<br>$4.03 \pm 0.31$<br>$3.96 \pm 0.24$ | $3.64 \pm 0.23$<br>$3.68 \pm 0.20$                                       | 0.89    | 0.06 | 0.69    |

All values represents mean  $\pm$  S.E.M., n = 4 tanks per treatment. P value (p < .05) indicate significant differences. P values (p < .05) and means marked in bold indicate significant differences.

#### Table 4

Effect of stocking density on biochemical parameters of Colossoma macropomum in net cages.

| Parameter             | SD   | NC   |  | Mean   | P value | P value  |          |  |
|-----------------------|--|--|--|--|---------|----------|----------|--|
|                       |  | 22.50m <sup>3</sup>                                  | 40.00m <sup>3</sup>  |  | SD      | NC       | SD x NC  |  |
| Glucose (mg/dL)       | 15 kg/m <sup>3</sup><br>24 kg/m <sup>3</sup><br>Mean | $\begin{array}{rrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrr$ | $\begin{array}{rrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrr$           | $\begin{array}{rrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrr$ | 0.04    | < 0.0001 | < 0.0001 |  |
| Triglycerides (mg/dL) | 15 kg/m <sup>3</sup><br>24 kg/m <sup>3</sup><br>Mean | $\begin{array}{rrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrr$ | $300.41 \pm 16.80$<br>$281.93 \pm 21.07$<br>$291.17 \pm 12.95$ | $\begin{array}{rrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrr$ | 0.81    | < 0.0001 | 0.14     |  |
| Total proteins (g/dL) | 15 kg/m <sup>3</sup><br>24 kg/m <sup>3</sup><br>Mean | $\begin{array}{rrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrr$ | $3.14 \pm 0.15$<br>$3.41 \pm 0.05$<br>$3.27 \pm 0.09$          | $3.30 \pm 0.12$<br>$3.45 \pm 0.05$                   | 0.25    | 0.13     | 0.35     |  |
| Cholesterol (mg/dL)   | 15 kg/m <sup>3</sup><br>24 kg/m <sup>3</sup><br>Mean | $\begin{array}{rrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrr$ | $124.38 \pm 3.60$<br>$119.67 \pm 6.33$<br>$122.02 \pm 3.49$    | $\begin{array}{rrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrr$ | 0.87    | 0.92     | 0.34     |  |
| Cortisol (ng/ml)      | 15 kg/m <sup>3</sup><br>24 kg/m <sup>3</sup><br>Mean | $\begin{array}{rrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrr$ | $\begin{array}{rrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrr$           | $\begin{array}{rrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrr$ | 0.65    | < 0.0001 | < 0.0001 |  |

All values represents mean  $\pm$  S.E.M., n = 4 tanks per treatment. P values (p < .05) and means marked in bold indicate significant differences. Means with different letters superscripts in the same row (a, b) and column (A, B) are significantly different.

perform such functions (Barton and Iwama, 1991). In line with this scenario, cortisol released into the bloodstream would activate physiological and behavioural mechanisms, which would relate secondary and tertiary stress responses, as described by Barton (2002).

Glucocorticoids can also reduce growth in teleosts. This mechanism may be associated with growth hormone (GH), insulin-like growth factor-I (IGF–I) and IGF-binding protein (IGFBP) (Auperin et al., 1997; Kelley et al., 2001; Peterson and Small, 2005). In fact, Small (2004) showed that cortisol promoted lower fish growth rates for *Ictalurus punctatus*. Thus, the increased plasma cortisol level observed for the animals kept at the lower density would be reflected as less growth performance for this treatment.

In this study, we verified that the fish stocked at SD 24 kg/m<sup>3</sup> in NC 22.5 m<sup>3</sup> had higher plasma cortisol and glucose levels. This situation could have been due to a small breeding environment containing many fish and would, thus, mean stressful conditions, like those described by Conte (2004). These conditions may have occurred upon feeding. As food was administered 3 times/day, fish movements to search for food in a small space could have increased the number of encounters and contacts made between fish, as observed by Ruane et al. (2001) and Barcellos et al. (2004). In such an environment, fish could have collided with the NC structure on the top, sides and bottom, as described by Le Ruyet and Le Bayon (2009) for Dicentrarchus labrax. Small spaces can also increase the continuous exposure of fish while they remain on the surface, and sun exposure, as confirmed for Salmo salar by Fernö et al. (1995) and Dempster et al. (2008). In these scenarios, the density and volume could have been stressful with negative effects throughout the experimental period. Therefore, several situations can promote harmful fish effects, which must be studied with more marked interactions to obtain answers for the aquaculture sector. So apart from evaluating growth performance, the evaluation of biochemical parameters and welfare variables should be studied more intensely to offer more direct responses to, thus, enhance the fish production system.

# 5. Conclusions

The best results in this study were for the fish stocked at SD 24 kg/ $m^3$ , whose production was more efficient, with more suitable biochemical parameters for the fish reared in NC 40  $m^3$ . So using SD 24 kg/ $m^3$  in NC 40  $m^3$  can provide the best fish productivity and welfare. However, our study did not indicate the maximum stocking limit for tambaqui juveniles in NC. Further studies are advisable to obtain the optimal density for this fish production system to maximise production, but by considering sustainable performance of fish welfare and activity.

#### Funding

This work was part of BRS Aqua Program, supported by the Brazilian Development Bank - Technologic Fund (BNDES-Funtec, Contract 16.2.0225.1), Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food Supply (MAPA, Process 00350.000111/2014-50) and Brazilian Agricultural Research Corporation (EMBRAPA, Grant number 21.17.02.001.05.00), in partnership with the Brazilian National Council for Scientific and Technological Development (CNPq, Process 421502/2017-7). Rosimery Menezes Frisso received a scholarship from CNPq (Process 381598/2018-7).

### **Declaration of Competing Interest**

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

#### Acknowledgements

The authors wise to thank Aquaculture Farm São Paulo for supplying the tambaqui juveniles, the Animal Physiology Laboratory and Bromatology Laboratory of the Federal University of Amazonas for technical support with the analyses.

#### References

- AOAC Association Official Analytical Chemists, 2012. Official Methods of Analysis of the AOAC International, 19th ed. Association of Official Analytical Chemists, Arlington, VA.
- Arends, R.J., Mancera, J.M., Muñoz, J.L., Wendelaar Bonga, S.E., Flik, G., 1999. The stress response of the gilthead sea bream (*Sparus aurata* L.) to air exposure and confinement. J. Endocrinol. 163, 149–157. https://doi.org/10.1677/joe.0.1630149.
- Auperin, B., Baroiller, J.F., Ricordel, M.J., Fostier, A., Prunet, P., 1997. Effect of confinement stress on circulating levels of growth hormone and two prolactins in freshwater-adapted tilapia (*Oreochromis niloticus*). Gen. Comp. Endocrinol. 108, 35–44. https://doi.org/10.1006/gcen.1997.6938.
- Barcellos, L.J.G., Kreutz, L.C., Quevedo, R.M., Fioreze, I., Cericato, L., Soso, A.B., Fagundes, M., Conrad, J., Baldissera, R.K., Bruschi, A., Ritter, F., 2004. Nursery rearing of jundia, *Rhandia quelen* (Quoy & Gaimard) in cages: cage type, stocking density and stress response to confinement. Aquaculture 232, 383–394. https://doi. org/10.1016/S0044-8486(03)00545-3.
- Barton, B.A., 2002. Stress in fishes: a diversity of responses with particular reference to changes in circulating corticosteroids. Integr. Comp. Biol. 42, 517–525. https://doi. org/10.1093/icb/42.3.517.
- Barton, B.A., Iwama, G.K., 1991. Physiological changes in fish from stress in aquaculture with emphasis on the response and effects of corticosteroids. Annu. Rev. Fish Dis. 129, 3–26. https://doi.org/10.1016/0959-8030(91)90019-G.
- Begg, K., Pankhurst, N.W., 2004. Endocrine and metabolic responses to stress in a

laboratory population of the tropical damselfish Acanthochromis polyacanthus. J. Fish Biol. 64, 133–145. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1095-8649.2004.00290.x. Beveridge, M.C.M., 1987. Cage Aquaculture. Fishing News Books, Surrey (352 p).

- Brandão, F.R., Gomes, L.C., Chagas, E.C., Araújo, L.D., 2004. Densidade de estocagem de juvenis de tambaqui durante a recria em tanques-rede. Pesq. Agropec. Bras. 39, 357–362. https://doi.org/10.1590/S0100-204X2004000400009.
- BRASIL, 1992. Ministério da Agricultura e Reforma Agrária. Normais climatológicas: 1961–1990. MARA, Brasília (84 p).
- BRASIL, 2005. Resolução CONAMA n.357, de 17 de março de 2005. Brasília.Resolução CONAMA n.357, de 17 de março de 2005. Brasília.
- Bueno, G.W., Ostrensky, A., Canzi, C., Matos, F.T., Roubach, R., 2015. Implementation of aquaculture parks in Federal Government waters in Brazil. Rev. Aquac. 5, 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1111/raq.12045.
- Canzi, C., Roubach, R., Benassi, S.F., Matos, F.T., Motter, I.M., Bueno, G.W., 2017. Selection of sites for establishing aquaculture parks, and estimation of fish production carrying capacity, for a tropical reservoir in South America. Lakes Reserv. Res. Manag. 20, 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1111/lre.12168.
- Chambers, M., Howell, W.H., 2006. Preliminary information on cod and haddock production in submerged cages off the coast ICES J. Mar. Sci. 63, 385–392. https://doi. org/10.1016/j.icesjms.2005.10.008.
- Chowdhury, M.A., Roy, N.C., Chowdhury, A., 2020. Growth, yield and economic returns of striped catfish (*Pangasianodon hypophthalmus*) at different stocking densities under floodplain cage culture system. Egypt. J. Aquat. Res. 46, 91–95. https://doi.org/10. 1016/j.ejar.2019.11.010.
- Colt, J., 1991. Aquacultural production systems. J. Anim. Sci. 69 (10), 4183–4192. https://doi.org/10.2527/1991.69104183x.
- Conte, F.S., 2004. Stress and the welfare of cultured fish. Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci. 86, 205–223. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applanim.2004.02.003.
- Cuesta, A., Meseguer, J., Esteban, M.A., 2004. Total serum immunoglobulin M levels are affected by immunomodulators in seabream (*Sparus aurata* L.). Vet. Immunol. Immunopathol. 101, 203–210. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vetimm.2004.04.021.

Demétrio, J.A., Gomes, L.C., Latini, J.D., Agostinho, A.A., 2012. Influence of net cage farming on the diet of associated wild fish in a Neotropical reservoir. Aquaculture. 330-333, 172–178. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aquaculture.2011.11.026.

Dempster, T., Juell, J.E., Fosseidengen, J.E., Fredheim, A., Lader, P., 2008. Behaviour and growth of Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar L.*) subjected to short-term submergence in commercial scale sea-cages. Aquaculture 276, 103–111. https://doi.org/10.1016/j. aquaculture.2008.01.018.

EFSA, 2008. Scientific report on animal welfare aspects of husbandry systems for farmed Atlantic salmon. Annex I EFSA J. 736, 1–122.

FAO, 2018. The State of World Fisheries and Aquaculture 2018 - Meeting the sustainable development goals. Rome. Licence: CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO.

- Fernö, A., Huse, I., Juell, J.-E., Bjordal, A., 1995. Vertical distribution of Atlantic salmon (Salmo salar L.) in net pens - trade-off between surface light avoidance and food attraction. Aquaculture 132, 285–296. https://doi.org/10.1016/0044-8486(94) 00384-Z.
- Fryer, J.N., Lederis, K., 1986. Control of corticotropin secretion in teleost fishes. Am. Zool. 26, 1017–1026.
- Gomes, L., Chagas, E., Martins, H., Roubach, R., Ono, E., Lourenço, J.N., 2006. Cage culture of tambaqui (*Colossona macropomum*) in a Central Amazon floodplain lake.
- Aquaculture 253, 374–384. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aquaculture.2005.08.020. Hengsawat, K., Ward, F.J., Jaruratjamorn, P., 1997. The effect of stocking density on yield, growth and mortality of African catfish (*Clarias gariepinus*) cultured in cages. Aquaculture 152, 67–76. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0044-8486(97)00008-2.
- Inoue, L.A.K.A., Boijink, C.L., Ribeiro, P.T., Silva, A.M.D., Affonso, E.G., 2011. Avaliação de respostas metabólicas do tambaqui exposto ao eugenol em banhos anestésicos. Acta Amaz 41, 327–332. https://doi.org/10.1590/S0044-59672011000200020.
- Janssens, P.A., Waterman, J., 1988. Hormonal regulation of gluconeogenesis and glycogenolysis in carp (*Cyprinus carpio*) liver pieces cultured in vitro. Comp. Biochem. Physiol. 91, 451–455. https://doi.org/10.1016/0300-9629(88)90617-2.

Kelley, K.M., Haigwood, J.T., Perez, M., Galima, M.M., 2001. Serum insulin-like growth factor binding proteins (IGFBPs) as markers for anabolic/catabolic condition in fishes. Comp. Biochem. Physiol. Part B 129, 229–236. https://doi.org/10.1016/ S1096-4959(01)00314-1.

- Kitagawa, A.T., Costa, L.S., Paulino, R.R., Luz, R.K., Vieira-Rosa, P., Guerra-Santos, B., Fortes-Silva, R., 2015. Feeding behavior and the effect of photoperiod on the performance and hematological parameters of the pacama catfish (*Lophiosilurus alexandri*). Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci. 171, 211–218. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applanim. 2015.08.025.
- Korsøen, Ø.J., Dempster, T., Fjelldal, P.G., Oppedal, F., Kristiansen, T.S., 2009. Long-term culture of Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar* L.) in submerged cages during winter affects behaviour, growth and condition. Aquaculture 296, 373–381. https://doi.org/10. 1016/j.aquaculture.2009.08.036.
- Le Ruyet P., J., Le Bayon, N., 2009. Effects of temperature, stocking density and farming conditions on fin damage in European sea bass (*Dicentrarchus labrax*). Aquat. Living Resour. 22, 349–362. https://doi.org/10.1051/alr/2009047.
- Luo, D., Xu, L.W., Liu, X.H., Sato, H., Zhang, Y., 2019. Outbreak of trypanosomiasis in net cage cultured barramundi, *Lates calcarifer* (Perciformes, Latidae), associated with *Trypanosoma epinepheli* (Kinetoplastida) in South China Sea. Aquaculture 501, 219–223. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aquaculture.2018.11.029.
- Maricchiolo, G., Mirto, S., Caruso, G., Caruso, T., Bonaventura, R., Celi, M., Matranga, V., Genovese, L., 2011. Welfare status of cage farmed European sea bass (*Dicentrarchus labrax*): a comparison between submerged and surface cages. Aquaculture 314, 173–181. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aquaculture.2011.02.001.
- Mazzola, A., Favaloro, E., Sarà, G., 2000. Cultivation of the Mediterranean amberjack, Seriola dumerili (Risso, 1810), in submerged cages in the Western Mediterranean

Sea. Aquaculture 181, 257–268. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0044-8486(99)00243-4.
McDonald, D.G., Milligan, C.L., 1992. Fish Physiology - Chemical Properties of the Blood, XII. ed. Academic Press, San Diego.

- Meyer, A., Burroughs, A., Sadler, R., Happold, J., Cowled, B., Mackenzie, C., Lagno, A.L.G., Cameron, A., 2019. Quantifying the effects of sea lice burden and lice bathing treatments on salmonid rickettsial septicaemia in commercial salmon and trout farms in Chile. Aquaculture 513https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aquaculture.2019.734411. 734-411.
- Moon, T.W., 1988. Adaptation, constraint, and the function of the gluconeogenic pathway. Can. J. Zool. 66, 1059–1068. https://doi.org/10.1139/z88-156.
- Nash, C.E., Iwamoto, R.N., Mahnken, C.V.W., 2000. Aquaculture risk management and marine mammal interactions in the Pacific northwest. Aquaculture 183, 306–323. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0044-8486(99)00300-2.

National Research Council, 2011. Nutrient Requirements of Fish and Shrimp. National Academies Press, Washington DC, USA.

- Nhan, H.T., Tai, N.T., Liem, P.T., Ut, V.N., Ako, H., 2019. Effects of different stocking densities on growth performance of Asian swamp eel *Monopterus albus*, water quality and plant growth of watercress (*Nasturtium officinale*) in an aquaponic recirculating system. Aquaculture 503, 96–104. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aquaculture.2018.12. 067.
- Ni, M., Wen, H., Li, J., Chi, M., Bu, Y., Ren, Y., Zhang, M., Song, Z., Ding, H., 2016. Effects of stocking density on mortality, growth and physiology of juvenile Amur sturgeon (*Acipenser schrenckii*). Aquac. Res. 47, 1596–1604. https://doi.org/10.1111/are. 12620.
- North, B.P., Turnbull, J.F., Ellis, T., Porter, M.J., Migaud, H., Bron, J., Bromage, N.R., 2006. The impact of stocking density on the welfare of rainbow trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*). Aquaculture 255, 466–479. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aquaculture.2006.01. 004.
- Oliveira, R.C., 2009. O panorama da aquicultura no Brasil: a prática com foco na sustentabilidade. Rev. Inter. Toxic. Risc. Ambient. Socied. 2, 71–89. https://doi.org/10. 22280/revintervol2ed1.18.
- Oliveira, E.G., Pinheiro, A.B., Oliveira, V.Q., Silva-Júnior, A.R.M., Moraes, M.G., Rocha, I.R.C.B., Sousa, R.R., Costa, F.H.F., 2012. Effects of stocking density on the performance of juvenile pirarucu (*Arapaima gigas*) in cages. Aquaculture 370-371, 96–101. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aquaculture.2012.09.027.
- Oppedal, F., Vågseth, T., Dempster, T., Juell, J.E., Johansson, D., 2011. Fluctuating Seacage environments modify the effects of stocking densities on production and welfare parameters of Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar L.*). Aquaculture 315, 361–368. https:// doi.org/10.1016/j.aquaculture.2011.02.037.

Oyarzún, R., Paredes, R., Saravia, J., Morera, F.J., Muñoz, J.L.P., Ruiz-Jarabo, I., Mancera, J.M., Vargas-Chacoff, L., 2020. Stocking density affects the growth performance, intermediary metabolism, osmoregulation, and response to stress in Patagonian blennie *Eleginops maclovinus*. Aquaculture 515, 734565. https://doi.org/ 10.1016/j.aquaculture.2019.734565.

- Peterson, B.C., Small, B.C., 2005. Effects of exogenous cortisol on the GH/IGF-I/IGFBP net cage in channel catfish. Domest. Anim. Endocrinol. 28, 391–404. https://doi.org/10. 1016/j.domaniend.2005.01.003.
- Poli, B.M., Parisi, G., Scappini, F., Zampacavallo, G., 2005. Fish welfare and quality as affected by pre-slaughter and slaughter management. Aquac. Int. 13, 29–49. https:// doi.org/10.1007/s10499-004-9035-1.
- Rahman, M.M., Islam, M.S., Halder, G.C., Tanaka, M., 2006. Cage culture of sutchi catfish, *Pangasius sutchi* (fowler 1937): effects of stocking density on growth, survival, yield and farm profitability. Aquac. Res. 2006 (37), 33–39. https://doi.org/10.1111/j. 1365-2109.2005.01390.x.

Randall, D.J., Perry, S.F., 1992. Fish Physiology - Catecholamine, XII. ed. Academic Press, New York.

- Refaey, M.M., Li, D., Tian, X., Zhang, Z., Zhang, X., Li, L., Tang, R., 2018. High stocking density alters growth performance, blood biochemistry, intestinal histology, and muscle quality of channel catfish *Ictalurus punctatus*. Aquaculture 492, 73–81. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aquaculture.2018.04.003.
- Ren, Y., Wen, H., Li, Y., Li, J., 2018. Stocking density affects the growth performance and metabolism of Amur sturgeon by regulating expression of genes in the GH/IGF axis. J. Oceanol. Limnol. 36, 956–972. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00343-018-7018-8.
- Rosini, E.F., Tucci, A., Carmo, C.F., Barros, H.P., 2019. Water quality in Ponte Pensa Aquaculture Park, Solteira Island reservoir, SP, Brazil, where fish are cultivated under great-volume cage system. Rev. Ambient. Água. 14, 1–14. https://doi.org/10.4136/ ambi-aqua.2382.
- Rowland, S.J., Mifsud, C., Nixon, M., Boyd, P., 2006. Effects of stocking density on the performance of the Australian freshwater silver perch (*Bidyanus bidyanus*) in cages. Aquaculture 253, 301–308. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aquaculture.2005.04.049.
- Ruane, N.M., Huisman, E.A., Komen, J., 2001. Plasma cortisol and metabolite level profiles in two isogenic strains of common carp during confinement. J. Fish Biol. 59, 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1095-8649.2001.tb02334.x.

Saint-Paul, U., 2017. Native fish species boosting Brazilian's aquaculture development. Acta Fish. Aquat. Res. 5, 1–9. https://doi.org/10.2312/ActaFish.2017.5.1.1-9.

- Sheridan, M.A., 1988. Lipid dynamics in fish: aspects of absorption, transportation, deposition and mobilization. Comp. Biochem. Physiol. 90, 679–690. https://doi.org/10. 1016/0305-0491(88)90322-7.
- Silva, C.A., Fujimoto, R.Y., 2015. Crescimento de tambaqui em resposta a densidade de estocagem em tanques-rede. Acta Amaz 45, 323–332. https://doi.org/10.1590/1809-4392201402205.
- Silva, C.R., Gomes, L.C., Brandão, F.R., 2007. Effect of feeding rate and frequency on tambaqui (*Colossoma macropomum*) growth and feeding costs during the first growth phase in cages. Aquaculture 264, 135–139. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aquaculture. 2006.12.007.

Slembrouck, J., Baras, E., Subagja, J., Hung, L.T., Legendre, M., 2009. Survival, growth

and food conversion of cultured larvae of *Pangasianodon hypophthalmus*, depending on feeding level, prey density and fish density. Aquaculture 294, 52–59. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aquaculture.2009.04.038.

- Small, B.C., 2004. Effect of dietary cortisol administration on growth and reproductive success of channel catfish. J. Fish Biol. 64, 589–596. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1095-8649.2004.00322.x.
- Vijayan, M.M., Ballantine, J.S., Leatherland, J.F., 1990. High stocking density alters the energy metabolism of brook charr, *Salvelinus fontinalis*. Aquaculture 88, 371–381. https://doi.org/10.1016/0044-8486(90)90162-G.
- Walton, M.J., Cowey, C.B., 1982. Aspects of intermediary metabolism in salmonid fish. Comp. Biochem. Physiol. 73, 59–79. https://doi.org/10.1016/0305-0491(82) 90201-2.
- Watanabe, W.O., Losordo, T.M., Fitzsimmons, K., Hanley, F., 2010. Tilapia production Systems in the Americas: technological advances, trends, and challenges. Rev. Fish.

Sci. Aquac. 10, 465-498. https://doi.org/10.1080/20026491051758.

- Wendelaar-Bonga, S.E., 1997. The stress response in fish. Physiol. Ver. 77, 591–625. https://doi.org/10.1152/physrev.1997.77.3.591.
- Woynárovich, A., Van-Anrooy, R., 2019. Field guide to the culture of tambaqui (Colossoma macropomum, Cuvier, 1816). In: FAO: Fisheries and Aquaculture Technical Paper n° 624, (132 p).
- Yi, Y., Lin, C.K., 2001. Effects of biomass of caged Nile tilapia (*Oreochromis niloticus*) and aeration on the growth and yields in an integrated cage-cum-pond system. Aquaculture 195, 253–267. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0044-8486(00)00558-5.
- Zahedi, S., Akbarzadeh, A., Mehrzad, J., Noori, A., Harsij, M., 2019. Effect of stocking density on growth performance, plasma biochemistry and muscle gene expression in rainbow trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*). Aquaculture 498, 271–278. https://doi.org/10. 1016/j.aquaculture.2018.07.044.