

Original Research Article

Fruit powder of *Tetrapleuratetraptera* in a local feed on the survival, some growth characteristics and Bromatological composition of the flesh of juveniles of *Clariasgariepinus* (Burchell, 1822) in fastanks

Abstract

Objective: This study was carried out to evaluate the effect of the supplementation rate of *Tetrapleuratetraptera* fruit powder in a local feed on the survival and some growth characteristics of juveniles of *Clariasgariepinus* in fastanks in the Littoral Region of Cameroon. It was carried out from March 29 to June 30, 2023 in the ARD Group Fish Farm located in the Sanaga Maritime Department, Littoral Region of Cameroon.

Methodology: 225 juveniles weighing 10.00 ± 0.76 g were divided into five treatments arranged in triplicate in a randomized manner. T0+ branded imported feed (Gouessant), T0- feed without supplement, T0.4, T0.5 and T0.6 which were respectively supplemented with 0.4%, 0.5% and 0.6% of *Tetrapleuratetraptera* fruit powder. Each diet corresponds to a treatment. The fish were fed to satiety until the end of the experiment and every 24 days a control fishing was carried out during which the juveniles per treatment were counted and measurements were taken on the entire population.

Results: The main water parameters were recorded daily before feeding. The highest survival rate ($83.33 \pm 8.33\%$) was recorded with subjects fed T0.5 feed. average weight gain (162.97 ± 2.90 g), average daily weight gain (1.73 ± 0.03 g), specific growth rate ($3.39 \pm 0.01\%/g$) and condition factor K (1.12 ± 0.00) were significantly higher ($p < 0.05$) were recorded with the T0.4% treatment. The significantly lower ($p < 0.05$) consumption index (1.89 ± 0.07) was recorded with the subjects also fed T0.4% food. Furthermore, the lowest feed production cost was recorded with the T0% T.t treatment (868.8 ± 8.82 Fcfa).

Conclusion: This study clearly showed that supplementation of *Tetrapleuratetraptera* fruit powder improves tracking and growth performance as well as the feed cost of producing one kilogram of *Clariasgariepinus* market fish.

Keywords: *Clariasgariepinus*, Growth, Juveniles, Supplementation, *Tetrapleuratetraptera*

INTRODUCTION

Comment [Mushtaq1]: First élaborâtes

Comment [Mushtaq2]: And were

Comment [Mushtaq3]: ?????????

Comment [Mushtaq4]: Improve the lauguage

Comment [Mushtaq5]:

Comment [Mushtaq6]: Must be 5 keywords

Since 2000, Aquaculture has continued to develop more rapidly than other major sectors of food production to thus satisfy the needs for resources of fisheries origin of a population which is constantly growing [1], because fishing is relatively stable since the end of the 1980s [2]. Furthermore, the disparity in the level of development of the sector and the unequal distribution of production remain significant between countries throughout the world [2], thus despite the progress observed in Africa, more particularly in Cameroon, this production remains insufficient and fails to cover the ever-increasing needs of the populations. The main constraints responsible for this insufficiency are the high cost of the feed used (which represents approximately 50% to 60% of the production cost) because they are mostly imported due to the lack of mastery of fish feed production technologies. In the country, juvenile mortalities and their growth often slow down. However, the evolution of large-scale Aquaculture towards a more intensive system requires effective local feeds that maximize survival and growth [3]. Furthermore, in Cameroon there are several agricultural products known as nutrient-rich feed additives which, when added to a local food, could keep fish healthy and promote their growth [3]. Recent studies on the effect of some additives on domestic animals such as *Tetrapleuratetraptera* fruit powder have shown that it contains active ingredients: Flavonoids and Phenols which have growth promoter and immunostimulant properties. [4] From its common name four sides, *Tetrapleuratetraptera* is a species of the Fabaceae family [5], it is a forest tree very widespread in West and tropical Africa. The ripe fruits of this plant are used as condiments, as well as for their medicinal properties in the treatment of digestive diseases, against obesity, against convulsion, leprosy, rheumatism pain, schistosomiasis, asthma and hypertension [6], it is well known in Cameroon and other African countries [7]. The strong smell of the fruit is said to drive snakes out of homes. The species has been widely used in different forms in Ghana: tea, ingredient in the manufacture of sweets, etc. The fruits of *Tetrapleuratetraptera* possess chemicals such as tannin, saponin, flavonoids, alkaloids, and other compounds that give this plant antibacterial activity against *Escherichia coli*, *Staphylococcus aureus*, *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*, and *Salmonella typhi*[8]. Studies have shown that this plant has anti-oxidant and hepatoprotective properties [9]. Furthermore, [10] in their studies determined the antimalarial activity of the ethanolic extract of the fruit of this plant which is also very rich in vitamins [11]. The plant has sedative, anticonvulsant, and analgesic effects [12].

In animal feed, the fruit powder of this plant has long shown its effectiveness on survival and growth in poultry. This is the case of [13] who showed through their study that *T. tetraptera* fruit powder at 0.2% can be used as a feed additive to replace antibiotics for better

Comment [Mushtaq7]: Must be italic

Comment [Mushtaq8]: italic

growth performance and to produce chicken meat without antibiotic residues. Studies by [14] reported that the inclusion in feed of *T. tetraptera* fruit powder in water releases aqueous extracts of this plant allowing growth acceleration, improving blood parameters and controlling load. intestinal microbial pathogen of poultry. Furthermore, no data is mentioned regarding its use in *Clariasgariepinus*.

According to the organic, mineral and phyto-chemical composition of *Tetrapleura tetraptera* obtained by [15,16], its capacity to nuance microbial populations, its capacity to stimulate growth as shown in previous studies by [13,14] and its availability in all seasons in Cameroon, it is stipulated that the supplementation of powder from the fruits of *Tetrapleuratetraptera* to the feed of juveniles of *Clariasgariepinus* would improve zootechnical performances and economic profitability compared to foods not containing powder. **this fruit.**

Comment [Mushtaq9]: incomplete

MATERIAL AND METHODS

Area of study

The study was carried out from March 29 to June 30, 2023; i.e. 94 days of experimentation within the **ARD** Group Fish Farm located in the Littoral Region, Sanaga Maritime Department, Dibamba District at the "Logbadjeck" Village which extends between 3°48'39" and 3°58'42" North latitude 10°06'0" and 10°06'04" East longitude. The average altitude is 42 meters [17].

Comment [Mushtaq10]: mustelaborate

Ethical statement

Experimental device

From a cohort of *Clariasgariepinus* juveniles obtained after artificial reproduction and larval monitoring at the Farm, 225 subjects with an average weight of 10.00 ± 0.76 g and an average total length of 9.37 ± 1.2 cm were taken at random and distributed in fifteen happas of $0.4 \times 0.4 \times 0.8$ m³ arranged in a completely randomized manner in triplicate, thus being the subject of five treatments. Everything was placed in a 5m³fastanks with a depth of 1m, supplied with 32Ø PVC pipes and drained with 63Ø PVC pipes. Feeding took place three times a day at fixed times of 8 a.m., 1 p.m. and 6 p.m. until the end of the experiment; control fishing was carried out at regular intervals of 24 days (between 05:30 a.m. and 06:00 a.m. H 30 mins). During control fishing, the measurement of total length and weight was carried out respectively with a graduated ruler and a JIANYU brand scale with a sensitivity of 1 ± 0.00 g. The measurement of physicochemical parameters (temperature using a probe thermometer

Comment [Mushtaq11]: incorporate the ethicalstatment

and pH using the liquid pH-metric test) was carried out every day as well as the renewal of water in the tanks. The measurements obtained are recorded in Table 2.

Collection, identification, grinding, powder preparation of natural feed additives and also mention the part of the plant that were used in the experimental trail.

Comment [Mushtaq12]: incorporate these all respectively.

Diets and preparation

During the experiment, the imported feed Le Gouessant, used had a diameter of 2 mm for the first month and 3 mm for the second and third, this feed was used as a positive control (T0+), on the other hand the local feed for its part was formulated by the linear programming method using Microsoft Excel 2016 software which made it possible to determine the quantities specific to each ingredient. The percentage composition of the local feed is recorded in Table 1. After the formulation, followed the manufacture of the feed in a concrete way and the process was as follows: To make the local feed, the ingredients were purchased from the local feed mill. Once the purchasing operation was completed, they were crushed to make them powdery and fine, they were then weighed according to the previously established formula. Manually, these ingredients and the oil were mixed for a period of 10 to 12 minutes. A sample of the mixture obtained was taken to be analyzed in the laboratory (Table 1) and the rest was separated into four equal parts, each part thus being subject to a rate of supplementation with the fruit powder of *T. tetraptera* purchased at the local market. This is how T0-(Local feed supplemented with 0% *T. tetraptera*), T_{0.4} (Local feed supplemented with 0.4% *T. tetraptera*), T_{0.5} (Feed local supplemented with 0.5% *T. tetraptera*) and T_{0.6} (local feed supplemented with 0.6% *T. tetraptera*) were obtained. The final mixtures that became experimental feeds were moistened 1/5 with water and were subsequently shoveled. The excavator die (2mm or 3mm) was installed before the start of the production process according to the particle size corresponding to the size of the species. Then, the different feeds are passed through it, producing filaments of 2mm or 3mm in diameter. The feed from the excavator was collected on tarpaulins and spread out in the sun to eliminate some of the water to improve shelf life. Once dry, these were packaged in hermetically sealed plastic bottles.

Table 1 : Centesimal composition of the local feed

Ingredients (Kg)	T ₀₊	T ₀₋
Fishmeal	/	39,00
Soya flour	/	23,00
Peanut cake	/	31,00
Corn flour	/	4,00
Cassava flour	/	3,00

Comment [Mushtaq13]: Please also provide the data regarding the commercial fish feed that someone easily compared the difference between the local and commercial feed.

Premix 5%*	/	1,5
Peanutoil	/	4
Salt	/	0,5
Total	/	106,00
Calculated chemical composition (%of Dry matter)		
Protein	/	45
Digestible Energy(Kcal/kg)	/	2175,39
Fat	/	8,18
Calcium	/	2,78
Phosphore	/	1,55
Lysine	/	3,35
Méthionine	/	1,14
Chemical composition analyzed (%of Dry matter)		
Protein	46	38,4
Lipids	10	11,18
Fibers	2,7	5,7

*Premix 5%; Metabolizable energy = 2078 Kcal/Kg; Crude protein = 40%; Lysine = 3.3%; Methionine = 2.40; Calcium = 8%; Phosphorus = 2.05%. T₀₊ = imported feed; T₀ = local feed.

Bromatological composition of the fish flesh

Analysis of fish flesh

Analyses: the analyses carried out mainly included protein, lipid, ash, dry matter, fiber, and energy contents.

The methodology: The biochemical parameters contained in the samples were determined according to international methods.

- Protein: mineralization by acid attack of 0.1g of sample, distillation by steam distillation and determination with sulfuric acid (Kjedahl method, standard NF ISO 11261);
- Lipid: the lipid content is determined by the Soxhlet method (AOAC, 1990). This method is based on the solubilization of lipids in nonpolar organic solvents;
- Ash (%): the percentage of ash relative to dry matter is determined by incineration of 2g of the sample in a muffle furnace at 550°C for 6 hours (AOAC, 1990);
- Dry matter: the percentage of dry matter is determined by drying 05g of the sample in the oven at a temperature of 105°C until a constant dry mass is obtained (AOAC, 1990);
- Humidity rate (%): It is measured on samples of approximately 5 g, placed in an oven at 105°C for 24 hours;
- Fiber (%): the method described by AOAC (1995), "Official Methods for raw fiber" was used.

Zootechnical parameters

- **Survival rate (SR)**

$$SR (\text{en}\%) = 100 \times NF/Ni$$

NF = number of fish at the end of the experiment and Ni = number of fish at the start of the experiment.

Growth characteristics

➤ **Live weight**

At the start of the test and every 14 days thereafter, fish from each experimental unit were weighed. The weekly weight gain was obtained by taking the difference between 2 consecutive average weekly live weights

- **Average weight gain (AWG in g)** = final average fish weight (FAFW in g) - initial average fish weight (IAWG in g);
- **Average daily gain (ADG in g/day)** = (FAWG-IAWG)/t With IAW = initial average weight (g), FAW = final average weight (g), t = duration of the experiment (in days);
- **Specific growth rate (SGR in %day)** = [(ln Pmf -ln Pmi)/ rearing time (day)] x 100; Pmi = initial average weight (g), Pmf = final average weight (g);
- **Feed conversion ratio (FCR)** = Quantity of feed distributed / Body mass gain;
- **Condition factor (K)** = W×100/ LT³ with W: weight (g), LT: Total length (cm).
- **Bromatological composition of the fish flesh**

Statistical analyzes

Data on survival rate, growth and economic characteristics were subjected to one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA 1). In the event of significant differences between the means of the treatments, Duncan's test was applied to separate at the significance level of 5%. SPSS 20.0 (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) statistical software was used for these analyses.

RESULTS

Water characteristics

Water characteristics varied during the study period. The highest temperature was 28.17 ± 1.10 and the lowest was 26.77 ± 0.26. The pH varied from 6.73 ± 0.25 to 6.80 ± 0.16 over the entire study period

Table 2 : water characteristics during the experimental period

Characteristics	Breeding period (days)			
	1-24	25-48	48-72	73-94
Temperature (°C)	28,17± 1,10	27,97 ± 1,14	27,80 ± 1,10	26,77 ± 0,26
pH	6,73± 0,12	6,93 ± 0,05	6,80 ± 0,16	6,73 ± 0,25

Comment [Mushtaq14]: Mention the protocol for analysis of water characteristics in methodology

Zootechnical parameters

The summary of the zootechnical parameters of the juveniles of *C. gariepinus* during the trial is summarized in Table 3. It appears from this summary that apart from the survival rate, all other results of the characteristics studied were significantly affected ($p < 0.05$) by the supplementation of *T. tetraoptera* fruit powder in the local feed.

Table 3: Zootechnical performance of *Clarias gariepinus* juveniles fed local feed supplemented with *T. tetraoptera* fruit powder


Caractéristiques	Treatments					p
	T ₀₊	T ₀₋	T _{0,4}	T _{0,5}	T _{0,6}	
IW (g)	10,00 ± 0,76	10,00 ± 0,76	10,00 ± 0,76	10,00 ± 0,76	10,00 ± 0,76	0,862
FW (g)	210,51 ± 5,58 ^a	159,69 ± 5,29 ^{cd}	172,97 ± 3,52 ^b	163,03 ± 2,59 ^c	154,60 ± 2,72 ^d	0,000
SR(%)	75,00 ± 8,30	72,22 ± 4,81	77,78 ± 4,80	83,33 ± 8,33	80,56 ± 4,81	0,329
AWG (g)	200,51 ± 6,58 ^a	149,69 ± 0,95 ^{cd}	162,97 ± 2,90 ^b	153,03 ± 1,40 ^c	144,60 ± 1,45 ^d	0,000
ADWG (g/j)	2,13 ± 0,69 ^a	1,59 ± 0,10 ^{cd}	1,73 ± 0,03 ^b	1,62 ± 0,01 ^c	1,53 ± 0,15 ^d	0,000
SGR(%/j)	3,60 ± 0,03 ^a	3,30 ± 0,01 ^c	3,39 ± 0,01 ^b	3,32 ± 0,09 ^c	3,27 ± 0,10 ^d	0,000
FCR	1,17 ± 0,07 ^c	1,93 ± 0,13 ^b	1,89 ± 0,08 ^b	2,11 ± 0,07 ^a	2,20 ± 0,12 ^a	0,000
CF	0,82 ± 0,00 ^c	0,71 ± 0,00 ^d	1,12 ± 0,00 ^a	0,99 ± 0,09 ^b	1,01 ± 0,00 ^b	0,000

a,b,c,d: ($p < 0.05$) values with different letters on the same line are significantly different. IW= initial weight; T₀₊ = Imported feed; T₀₋ = Local feed supplemented with 0% *T. tetraoptera*; T_{0,4} *T. tetraoptera* = Local feed supplemented with 0.4% *T. tetraoptera*; T_{0,5} = Local feed supplemented with 0.5% *T. tetraoptera*; T_{0,6} = Local feed supplemented with 0.6% *T. tetraoptera*. ; T= *tetraoptera*; FW= final weight; SR=survival rate; AWG: Average weight gain ADWG: Daily weight gain; ; SGR= Specific growth rate; FCR: Feed conversion ratio CF: Condition factor K; g= gram; %= percentage

Survival rate

The survival rates of juveniles fed with the different feeds during the experiment are recorded in the histogram in Figure 1. Analysis of this histogram reveals that the highest survival rate (83.33 ± 8.33%), but not significant ($p > 0.05$) was obtained with juveniles fed with feed supplemented with 0.5% *T. tetraoptera* (T_{0,5}) compared to juveniles fed with T₀₊ feeds, T₀₋, T_{0,4} and T_{0,6} T.t which respectively recorded the rates of 75.00 ± 8.30%, 72.22 ± 4.81%, 77.78 ± 4.80%, 80.56 ± 4.81%. However, juveniles fed with feeds supplemented with different levels of *T. tetraoptera* recorded the highest survival rates but not significantly different ($p > 0.05$) compared to juveniles fed with imported control feeds T₀₊ and T₀₋ without supplement.

Comment [Mushtaq15]: where is histogram
?????




a,b,c,d: ($p < 0.05$) values with different letters on the same line are significantly different. IW= initial weight; T0+ = Imported feed; T0- = Local feed supplemented with 0% *T. tetraptera*; T0,4% *T. tetraptera* = Local feed supplemented with 0.4% *T. tetraptera*; T0,5 = Local feed supplemented with 0.5% *T. tetraptera*; T0,6 = Local feed supplemented with 0.6% *Tetrapleura.t.*; T= *tetrapleura*;

Figure 1: Variation in survival rate of juvenile *C. gariepinus* depending on the treatments over the entire duration of the experiment

Growth parameters

Average daily weight gain

Figure 2 shows the evolution of the average daily weight gain of fish maintained with the different feeds as a function of time. The evolution of the average daily weight gain curve has a regular and increasing pattern, however, with the supplementation of the feed with powder from the fruit of *T. tetraptera*, the juveniles fed with the feed supplemented at 0.4 % of *T. tetraptera* recorded the average daily weight gain ($2.13 \pm 0.69\text{g/d}$) significantly higher ($p < 0.05$) compared to juveniles fed with feed supplemented at 0.5% (1.62 ± 0.01), 0.6% (1.53 ± 0.15) and without T0- supplement (1.59 ± 0.10).




a,b,c,d: ($p < 0.05$) values with different letters on the same line are significantly different. T₀₊ = Imported feed; T₀₋ = Local feed supplemented with 0% *T. tetraptera*; T_{0,4} = Local feed supplemented with 0.4% *T. tetraptera*; T_{0,5} = Local feed supplemented with 0.5% *T. tetraptera*; T_{0,6} = Local feed supplemented with 0.6% *Tetrapleura.t.*; T= *Tetrapleura*

Figure 2: Evolution of the average daily weight gain of juveniles of *C. gariepinus* as a function of time

Feed conversion ratio

Figure 3 illustrates the variation in the feed conversion ratio of juveniles of *C. gariepinus* depending on the treatments over the entire period of the experiment. The significantly ($p < 0.05$) lower conversion ratio recorded with the juveniles fed the imported feed T0+ (1.17 ± 0.07) compared to the rest of the treatments. With the supplementation of the feed with powder from the fruit of *T. tetraptera*, the significantly ($p < 0.05$) lower conversion ratio was recorded with the juveniles fed with feed containing 0.4% powder of *T. tetraptera* fruit T0.4 (1.89 ± 0.08) compared to feed T0.5 (2.11 ± 0.07) and T0.6 (2.20 ± 0.12) but comparable to the conversion ratio of the feed without supplement T0- (1.93 ± 0.13).




a,b,c,d: ($p < 0.05$) values with different letters on the same line are significantly different. T₀₊ = Imported feed; T₀₋ = Local feed supplemented with 0% *T. tetraptera*; T_{0.4} = Local feed supplemented with 0.4% *T. tetraptera*; T_{0.5} = Local feed supplemented with 0.5% *T. tetraptera*; T_{0.6} = Local feed supplemented with 0.6% *T. tetraptera*; T = *tetrapleura*.

Figure 3: Variation in the consumption index of juveniles of *C. gariepinus* depending on the treatments over the entire duration of the experiment

Specific growth rate

Figure 4 illustrates the variation in the specific growth rate depending on the treatments of *C. gariepinus* juveniles. Overall, analysis of variance revealed a significant difference ($p < 0.05$) in specific growth rate between treatments over the entire study period. With the supplementation of the feed with the powder of the fruit of *T. tetraptera*, the juveniles fed with the feed supplemented at 0.4% recorded a significantly ($p < 0.05$) higher growth rate (3.39 ± 0.01) compared to juveniles fed the feed supplemented at 0.5% (3.32 ± 0.09), 0.6%

(3.27 ± 0.10) and those fed the feed without supplement (3.30 ± 0.01). Furthermore, all these treatments recorded significantly ($p < 0.05$) lower growth rates compared to the T0+ treatment (3.60 ± 0.03), juveniles fed imported feed.



a,b,c,d: ($p < 0.05$) values with different letters on the same line are significantly different. T₀₊ = Imported feed; T₀₋ = Local feed supplemented with 0% *T.tetraptera*; T_{0,4} = Local feed supplemented with 0.4% *T. tetraptera*; T_{0,5} = Local feed supplemented with 0.5% *T.tetraptera*; T_{0,6} = Local feed supplemented with 0.6% *T.tetraptera*. ; T = *tetrapleura*

Figure 4: Variation in the specific growth rate of juveniles of *C. gariepinus* depending on the treatments over the entire duration of the experiment

Condition factor K

The condition factor K was significantly higher ($p < 0.05$) in juveniles fed with feed supplemented with 0.4% *T. tetraptera* T0.4 (1.12 ± 0.00) compared to juveniles fed with other foods. However, for juveniles fed with the two other supplemented foods T0.5% (0.99 ± 0.09) and T0.6% (1.01 ± 0.00) the condition factor K did not present a significant difference. ($p > 0.05$). But compared to juveniles fed with control feeds T0+ (0.82 ± 0.00) and T0- (0.71 ± 0.00), the condition factor K was significantly lower ($p < 0.05$) than those fed with supplemented feeds T0.4, T0.5 and T0.6.

Bromatological composition of the fishflesh

The bromatological composition of the fish flesh from the different treatments is recorded in Table 4. From this table, it appears that whatever the level of supplementation, the percentage of dry matter (96%) of the flesh fish remains the highest. same and higher than that of juveniles fed with control foods T0+ and T0- (95%). The protein level of this fishflesh was high for the juveniles fed with feed T0.4 (63.6%), followed in a decreasing manner by those fed with feed T0+ (59.3%), T0.5 (55.3%), T0.6 (54.9%) and T0- (49.2%), the protein levels in

the flesh of juveniles maintained with supplemented foods are therefore higher than the levels obtained by fish maintained with the local control feed T0-. As for the lipid levels, the juveniles fed with feeds T0+ and T0.4 had the same value (15%), but it remains low compared to those obtained by the juveniles fed with T0.5 (17%) and T0, 6 (16.4%). Fish in the T0% T.t treatment recorded the lowest value (14%). Fiber was more present in subjects fed with the T0+ feed (8%) followed by feeds supplemented or not. The energy levels of juveniles fed the supplemented feeds increased with the level of supplementation, T0.4 (394.02 Kcal/g), T0.5 (398.60 Kcal/g) and T0.6 (399.15 Kcal/g), and were superior to subjects fed with control feeds T0+ (398.398 Kca/g) and T0- (386.40 Kcal/g).

Table 4: Bromatological composition of the flesh of *C. gariepinus* fish by treatment

Characteristics studied	Treatments				
	T ₀₊	T ₀₋	T _{0,4}	T _{0,5}	T _{0,6}
Dry matter (%)	95	95	96	96	96
Humidity level (%)	5	5	4	4	4
Protein (%)	59,3	49,2	63,6	55,3	54,9
Lipids (%)	15	14	15	17	16,4
Ashes (%)	7,9	8,3	8,4	10,3	9,6
Fiber (%)	8	7,8	7,6	7,3	7,5
Energy (kcal/g)	392,98	386,4	394,02	398,6	399,15

T₀₊ = Imported feed; T₀₋ = Local feed supplemented with 0% *T.tetraptera*; T_{0,4} = Local feed supplemented with 0.4% *T. tetraptera*; T_{0,5} = Local feed supplemented with 0.5% *T.tetraptera*; T_{0,6} = Local feed supplemented with 0.6% *Tetrapleura.t.*; T = *tetrapleura*.

Discussion

The average survival rates recorded during the experiment varied from $72.22 \pm 4.81\%$ to $83.33 \pm 8.33\%$ depending on the treatments, this range is higher than that obtained by [18] which was $68 \pm 2.44\%$ to $77 \pm 2.44\%$, when they evaluated the effect of *Tetracarpidium conophorum* leaves on growth performance and histopathology on juveniles of *C. gariepinus*. Furthermore, it is lower than 92 - 96% obtained by [19] when they evaluated the effects of *Alium sativum* on the growth performance of *C. gariepinus*, at $94.67 \pm 0.00\%$ - $100.00 \pm 0.00\%$ obtained by [20] evaluating the effect of supplementing *Afrostryx lepidophyllus* bark powder in local food on growth, nutrient utilization and flesh composition of juveniles of *C. gariepinus*. These differences in results could be attributable to the action of molecules (type and concentration) capable of boosting the immune system contained in the additives used and to the breeding conditions.

The average daily weight gain of the fish varied from 1.53 ± 0.15 g/d to 2.13 ± 0.69 g/d depending on the treatments, these values are higher than those obtained by [19] evaluating

Comment [Mushtaq16]: No data available on the histopathology

Comment [Mushtaq17]: The justification is not enough to support the findings of the study. Please specify with reference

the effects of *Aliumsativium* on the growth performance of *C. gariepinus* which was from 0.36g/d to 0.59g/d and to that recorded by [20], when they studied the effect of supplementation of *Aliumsativium* powder. bark of *Afrostryraxlepidophyllus* in local feed on the growth, use of nutrients and composition of the flesh of juveniles of *C. gariepinus* obtaining for their best treatment 1.028 g/d. This variability of results could be due to the growth activating and immune system stimulatory effects of the photochemical elements contained in *T. tetraptera* fruit powder.

The specific growth rate results ranged from $3.27 \pm 0.10\%$ /day to $3.60 \pm 0.03\%$ /day. These values are within the trend recommended by [21] which is 3g%/day for juvenile catfish. Furthermore, they are higher than the values obtained by [20] with the treatments containing 1% and 1.5% of powder from the bark of *Afrostryraxlepidophyllus* which were respectively 2.3%/day and 2.2%/day but lower than the value obtained with the treatment containing 2% powder from the bark of *Afrostryraxlepidophyllus* (4.9%/day) when they studied the effect of supplementing powder from the bark of *Afrostryraxlepidophyllus* in local food on growth, nutrient utilization and flesh composition of juvenile *C. gariepinus* and . This disparity in results could be due to the growth activating and immune system stimulatory effects of the photochemical elements contained in *T. tetraptera* fruit powder.

The feed consumption ratio significantly ($p < 0.05$) varied during the experiment between the treatments, ranging from 1.17 ± 0.07 to 2.24 ± 0.07 . The values obtained with the T_{0+} (1.17 ± 0.07) and $T_{0.4}$ (1.89 ± 0.08) treatments are satisfactory compared to 1.8 recommended by [22] for intensive cage rearing. of *C. gariepinus*. In addition $T_{0.4}$ (1.89 ± 0.08) corroborates with the value obtained by [19] on the effects of *Aliumsativium* on the growth performance of *C. gariepinus* which was 1.9 ± 0.00 . But in general, the values obtained with the supplemented diets $T_{0.4}$ (1.89 ± 0.08), $T_{0.5}$ (2.11 ± 0.07) and $T_{0.6}$ (2.20 ± 0.12) are lower than the values 0.80 ± 0.07 , 1.18 ± 0.14 and 1.20 ± 0.07 that had been obtained [20] with their supplemented diets when they evaluated the effect of supplementation of the powder of bark of *Afrostryraxlepidophyllus* in a local food on growth, nutrient utilization and flesh composition of juvenile *C. gariepinus*. The difference in indices between these authors could be due to the quantity and quality of foods consumed by the subjects, the type of infrastructure used for the experiments as well as the study area.

The condition factor K recorded during the experiment values ranging from 0.71 ± 0.00 to 1.12 ± 0.00 depending on the treatments. These values are in the same range as those (0.77 ± 0.56 to 1.06 ± 0.01) obtained by [20] when they studied the effect of supplementing the bark powder of *Afrostryraxlepidophyllus* in a local feed on the growth, nutrient utilization and flesh

Comment [Mushtaq18]: Elaborate the statement with reference and also specify the chemical agent/ingredient of *T. tetraptera* that possess the immunomodulation activities.

Comment [Mushtaq19]: Please specify the ingredient of the medicinal plant that possess the growth stimulating and immunomodulation activities with reference.

Comment [Mushtaq20]: No proper justification is provided by the author to support his statement. Please justify in scientific way that reader can able to understand the mechanism of action.

composition of juvenile *C. gariepinus*. This corroboration would be due to the similar actions of the different phytobiotics used.

Comment [Mushtaq21]: Please elaborate the similar action to justify the statement.

CONCLUSION

At the end of this study evaluating the effect of the supplementation rate of *T. tetraptera* fruit powder in a local feed on survival and some characteristics of growth of juveniles of *C. gariepinus*, the aim was to verify whether the supplementation of powder from the fruits of *T. tetraptera* in a local feed for juveniles of *C. gariepinus* would promote their survival and improve their growth compared to feeds not containing the powder of this fruit. This is to contribute to improving the production of commercial fish (*C. gariepinus*) through the use of phytobiotics. It appears that apart from the survival, growth characteristics and feed cost of production of juveniles of *C. gariepinus* fed with foods supplemented at different levels (0.4%, 0.5% and 0.6%) of the fruit powder of *T. tetraptera* were significantly different ($p < 0.05$) compared to the control treatments. Generally speaking, fish fed with feed supplemented with 0.4% *T. tetraptera* fruit powder obtained the best performances.

REFERENCES

1. ONU. Nations Unies Population 2022. <https://www.un.org/fr/global-issues/population>
2. FAO. La situation mondiale des pêches et de l'aquaculture, atteindre les objectifs de développement durable 2018, pp 1-32.
3. Alloui M. N. Les phytobiotiques comme alternative aux antibiotiques promoteurs de croissance dans l'aliment des volailles. *Livestock Research for Rural Development*. 2011 Volume 23, Article #133. Retrieved November 19, 2015, from <http://www.lrrd.org/lrrd23/6/allo23133.htm>
4. Kumar Bairwa M, Kumar Jakhar J, Satyanarayana Y, Devivaraprasad Reddy A. Immunostimulants d'origine animale et végétale utilisés en aquaculture. *Journal des ressources végétales des produits naturels*. 2012;2(3):397-400.
5. Schumacher et Thonn. The plant List version 1.1 : *Tetrapleuratetraptera* 2013 <https://www.theplantlist.org/>.
6. Ojewale J. A. and Adewunmi C.O., 2004 Antiinflammatory and hypoglycaemic Effect of Fruits of *Tetrapleuratetraptera* in rats. *Journal of Ethno Pharmacology*, 2004 : 95: 177 – 182.
7. Adjanohoun J. E., aboubakar N., Dramane K., ebote M. E., ekpere J. A., enow-oroock E. G., fotcho D., gbile Z. O., kamanyi A., kamsukom J., Keita A., mbenkum T., mbi C. N., mbielle A. L., mbone I. L., mubiru N. K., Nancy W. L., nkonmeneck B., satabie B.,

- sofowora A., tamze V., wirmum C. K. Contribution of ethnobotanical and floristical studies in Cameroun. 1996CSTR/OUA.
8. Uchechi et N., Ekwenye, Chigozie F., Okorie. antibacterial activity of *Tetrapleura tetrapterata* b. podextracts. *International Journal of Pharmacology and Biological Sciences*, 2010. 1 (4) : 734-741p.
 9. Jane T. N., Matthias O.A. and Ikechukwu F.U. Antioxidant and Hepatoprotective Activity of Fruit Extracts of *Tetrapleura tetraptera* (Schum and Thonn) Taubert. *Jordan Journal of Biological Sciences*, 2014 7(4): 251 – 255p.
 10. Okokon J.E., Udokpoh A.E., Antia B.S., 2007. Antimalaria activity of ethanolic extract of *Tetrapleura tetraptera* fruit. *Journal of Ethnopharmacology*, 2007 ; 3: 537-540p.
 11. Okwu D. E. The potentials of *Ocimum gratissimum*, *Penrgularia extensa* and *Tetrapleura tetraptera* as spice and flavouring agents. *Nigerian Agriculture Journal*, 2003 ; 35: 143-148p.
 12. Aderibigbe A.O., Iwaewa E.O., Adesina S.K., Adebajo A.O. and Ukponmwan O.E. Anticonvulsant, Analgesic and Hypothermic effects of Aridanin isolated from *Tetrapleura tetraptera* fruit in mice. *Journal of Biological Science*, 2007 ; 7(8): 1520-1524.
 13. Kana JR., MubeKuietche H., NgouanaTadjong R., Yangoue A., Komguez R. Growth Performance and Serum Biochemical Profile of Broiler Chickens Fed on Diets Supplemented with *Afrostryaxlepidophyllus* Fruit and Bark as Alternative to Antibiotic Growth Promoters. *Vet Med Res* 2017 ; 4(6): 1095, p2.
 14. Nweze B.O. and Nwankwagu A.E. Effects of *Tetrapleura tetraptera* under different feeding regimes on growth performance and gut microbes of broiler chicken. *Nigerian Society of Animal Production*. 14-17. Univ. of Ibadan, Nigeria 2010 ; pp 299.
 15. Tchiegang C., Mbougueng P. D. Chemical composition of spices used in the preparation of nahpoh and nkuifrom West Cameroon 2005; 194 – 199p.
 16. AbbasiGhadikolaei H., Kamali A., Soltani M., Sharifian M. Effects of *Zingiber officinale* as feed additive on the common carp body composition. *Journal Iraniendes sciences de la pêche*, 2016 ; 16(1), pp67-85.
 17. PCD Dibamba, 2012. Plan communal de développement de Dibamba 2012, pp20-90.
 18. Sodamola MO, Adejola YA et Folarin MF., 2022. Effet of African Walnut (*Tetracarpidium conophorum*) leaf powder on growth performance and histopathology of African Catfish (*Clarias gariepinus*) 2022 pp1-5.

19. Almeda. A. F. M, KpogueGangbazo, Aboh.B. A, Ogbon. M et Mensah. G. A. Effet de l'ail (*Allium sativum*) sur l'attractivité de l'aliment et la croissance pondérale chez *Clarias gariepinus* 2020.
20. YemdjieMane Divine Doriane, NgouanaTadjong Ruben, Nana Towa Algérie, AgwahEbileDayanb, Nanhou Raïssa Linda, Kana Jean Rapha, Teguaia Alexis., 2023. Dietary Inclusion Influence of *Aphrostryaxlepidophyllus*Bark on Growth, FeedNutrientsUtilization and Body Composition of *Clarias gariepinus*juvenile (Burchell, 1822),*Asian Journal of Fisheries and AquaticResearch* Volume 21, Issue 5, Page 29-39, 2023; Article no.AJFAR.96693 ISSN: 2582-376 30-39pp.
21. Barnabé Gilbert. Bases Biologiques et écologie de l'Aquaculture.1991 ; 520p.
22. CABI (Centre for Agricultural Bioscience International).Aquaculture: An IntroductoryText. Stickney RR. CABI Publishing,2002 ; p. 91.