

Food and Feeding Habits of Two Dominant Fish Species in Ureje Reservoir Ado-Ekiti, Ekiti State, Nigeria.

ABSTRACT

This study was designed to investigate the food and feeding habit of two dominant fish species in Ado-Ekiti Reservoir, Ado-Ekiti, Ekiti State. The reservoir was demarcated into three zones based on the inputs from its tributaries, the fish samples were collected using fishing gears and chilled with iced blocks from point of collection to the aquaculture unit where each sample was identified, sorted, weighed, dissected and the stomach content was analysed. *Sarotherodon galilaeus* and *Coptodon zillii* were found as the two dominant fish species. A total of one hundred and fifty-five samples were collected from the reservoir comprising seventy-three (73) *Sarotherodon galilaeus* and eighty-two (82) *Coptodon zillii*. This gives a male/female ratio of 2:1 and 1:1 respectively. It was observed that a total of 114 (73.55%) out of 155 fish species had food items in their stomachs while the remaining 41 (26.45%) specimens had empty stomach. The items encountered in the stomach of both species examined include phytoplankton, zooplankton, insects, insect larvae, worms, sand grains and unidentified mass/mud. The index relative importance indicated that phytoplankton is the most important food items of both species in the dam and constituted 208.14% and 160.78% for *Sarotherodon galilaeus* and *Coptodon zillii* respectively which showed a considerably high similarity in the diet of the two species. This suggests a level of possible competitiveness for food between the two species, although occurrence of empty stomach was significantly low which could indicate food is available for the fish in the reservoir.

Keywords: Diet, Planktons, Fish, Stomach, Reservoir

INTRODUCTION

Living organism irrespective of its diversity have to feed not only because they "want to" but because they "have" to as it is one of the functional attributes of being a living thing. Fishes in general are not excluded from this as they need food like every organism for its nutritional values and benefits for growth, development and other life processes. Feeding according to Royce (1972) is the dominant activity of the entire life cycle of fish and food is the main source of energy which plays an important role in determining the population levels, rate of growth and condition of fishes (Begum *et al.*, 2008). Like all organisms, fishes require energy to fuel their body machinery and processes, including growth, metabolism and reproduction. Fish feed on a great diversity of food items but in their own peculiarity, they feed on food items such as phytoplankton, zooplankton, benthic and non-benthic invertebrates,

Commented [TECNO KH61]: This should be a fullstop

Commented [TECNO KH62]: These details can be left for material and methods section.

Commented [TECNO KH63]: This results should be either reported as fullness index/ vacuity index. You could kindly check out on a paper of food and feeding selectivity of *Oreochromis niloticus* in Lakes Naivasha and Oloiden

Commented [TECNO KH64]: You could consider stating some percentages here instead of listing them.

Commented [TECNO KH65]: This conclusion is not based on the objective. Consider revising; if you are looking at food and feeding habits for these 2 species, what were they?

Commented [TECNO KH66]: You could consider removing words that are in the title e.g., reservoir

Commented [TECNO KH67]: Consider starting the deleting the sentences before this.

benthic deposits, other fish and aquatic macrophytes. They also absorb nutrients extraenterally such as glucose and calcium (Begum *et al.*, 2008).

The diet of cultured fish species does not provide precise and reliable information on the food and feeding habits and condition factor of such species. Hence, most studies which are aimed at obtaining such information are based on the analysis of gut contents of fish caught from their natural habitats (Begum *et al.*, 2008). The study of the food and feeding habits of fish species is a subject of continuous research because it constitutes the basis for the development of a successful fisheries management programmed on fish capture as well as culture and because the aquatic ecosystem is dynamic. The gut content is a reflection of the water quality, all other factors being constant. The natural habitats offer a great diversity of organisms that are used as food by fish, which differ in sizes (microscopic and macroscopic) and taxonomy groups (Lowe-McConnel, 2007). The dietary analysis of fish in their natural habitats enhances the understanding of the growth, abundance, productivity and distribution of organisms. Condition factor is used as an index of growth and feeding intensity and decrease with increase in length. It influences the reproductive cycle in fish and it is an important fishery management tool in estimating the relative well-being of a fish population in a particular river system (Teugels *et al.*, 1992).

The major factors that can influence feeding behavior of fish, such as stocking density, sex ratio, reproductive status, and biologic rhythms, have been subject to limited investigation and results often conflict between and within species (Madrid *et al.*, 2011). The feeding behavior of fish is complex and has been studied extensively in cultured fish and wild fish from ecological perspectives (Gerking, 2014; Houlihan *et al.*, 2011). Several behavioral responses have been linked to methods of feeding, feeding habits, frequency of feeding, mechanisms of food detection, and food preferences. The food organisms consumed by fish in natural environments may range from algae, plants, and detritus to small prey, such as crustaceans, mollusks, polychaetes, and other fish. It is well recognized that various combinations of sensory systems during the different phases of gustation and feeding are required to achieve desired food consumption; however, the acceptance or rejection of feed is physiologically dependent on inputs from chemoreception (Hara, 2014).

The study of the food and feeding habits of fish species is a subject of continuous research. It is an important biological factor for selecting a group of fish for culture in ponds to avoid competition for food among themselves; live in association and to utilize all the available food. Food and feeding habits of fish constitute the basis for the development of a successful fisheries management program on fish capture and culture and because the aquatic ecosystem is dynamic, the gut content is a reflection of the water quality, all other factors being constant. It is virtually impossible to gather sufficient information on food and feeding habit of fish in their natural habitat without studying its gut contents. A thorough knowledge on the food and feeding habit of fishes provide keys for the selection of culturable species and the importance of such information is necessary for successful fish farming. Moreover, studies on natural feeding of fish enable to identify the trophic relationships present in aquatic ecosystems, identifying feeding composition, structure and stability of food webs in the ecosystem. The information is also vital for management of the fish in the controlled environment and for formulation of the appropriate diet given for the fish in aquaculture. Without knowledge of the food requirements, feeding

Commented [TECNO KH68]: The previous sentence is contradictory.
Consider deleting it (you were not dealing with cultured fish).

Commented [TECNO KH69]: Why do you state this?
There is diversity in aquatic ecosystems, e.g., there may be lakes with no inlet (river)_ visible and outlet e.g., Lake Oloiden.

Commented [TECNO KH610]: Consider revising.
Changes do occur in an aquatic ecosystem and they influence biodiversity.
If someone else did the same study as you, there may be variation (in science results/ findings don't conflict- either similar to your findings/ different).

Commented [TECNO KH611]: This sentence is too long you could consider revising.

Commented [TECNO KH612]: This is a repetition of what you have previously written.

Commented [TECNO KH613]: Whats the difference between the first sentence in this paragraph and this?

behavior pattern, and predator-prey relationships, it is not possible to understand the predicted changes that might result from any natural or anthropogenic intervention. Therefore, understanding of its food and feeding behavior is a key factor to its successful culture in a controlled environment.

Commented [TECNO KH614]: End the introduction by stating the Objective.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Study area

The study was carried out at Ado-Ekiti reservoir. The Reservoir is a major source of water supply for domestic uses and also supports artisanal fisheries. The Reservoir lies between latitude 7° – 70° North and longitude 10° – 50° East at an altitude of about 440m above sea level.

Commented [TECNO KH615]: Consider revising and writing well the latitude and longitude.

You could also consider including the study area map.

Fish Collection and Sampling Procedures

The reservoir was demarcated into three zones based on the inputs from its tributaries. Specimens of *Sarotherodon galilaeus* and *Coptodon zilli* were collected using fishing gears with the aid of the fishermen operating on the reservoir. Gears employed included gill nets, cast nets, traps, hooks and lines. Samples were chilled in iced blocks at the point of collection before being transported to the Aquaculture unit of the Department of Zoology and Environmental Biology, Ekiti State University Ado-Ekiti, for analysis.

The weight of each specimen was taken using a top loading metler balance to the nearest 0.1 g after draining excess water with a pile of filter paper while the length was measured from the most anterior part of the fish to the tip of the longest caudal fin for *Sarotherodon galilaeus* and *Coptodon zilli*. Standard length was measured in the nearest 0.1 cm using a measuring board. Fish samples were collected during day time when fishes were actively feeding.

Commented [TECNO KH616]: You could consider revising. The sentence is too long.

You could also revise (length measured to nearest centimetre on a measuring board)

look for authority over these scientific names Copton Zillii (Peter, 1852)

Commented [TECNO KH617]: Consider changing this to Fullness index.

Degree of Fullness of Stomach

The fullness of the stomach was determined by grading the volume of the items in the stomach relatively to the stomach as :0/4- Empty stomach, 1/4- One quarter full stomach, 2/4- Half full stomach, 3/4- Three quarter full stomach, 4/4- Full stomach

Analysis of Stomach

Specimens were dissected and the gut taken out to remove the stomach. Specimens of *Sarotherodon galilaeus* and *Coptodon zillii* with food contents in their stomachs were considered for stomach analysis and their stomachs were preserved in 4% formalin in labelled bottles. In the Laboratory, the number of prey organisms were identified to the lowest possible level. Analysis was done using an index of Relative Importance (IRI) for each prey. This was determined by using the formula;

Commented [TECNO KH618]: Was identification done under a microscope?

State the type.

Were identification keys used? e.g., plankton. State them.

$$\% \text{ Index of Relative Importance (IRI)} = \% N + \% F + \% V$$

Where, % N was the number of individuals for each prey category recorded in all food items expressed as the percentage of the total number recorded for food items, %V was the volume of each food item

expressed in percentage. %F was the number of stomachs in which each prey item occurred and expressed as a percentage of the total number of stomachs.

Numerical Method

The stomach contents were emptied into a petri dish and food items were sorted out into categories using binocular (x50) microscope. Each category of food items was identified and counted under the microscope

$$\text{Numerical \%} = \frac{\text{number of food item } i}{\text{total number of identified food item}} \times 100$$

Frequency of Occurrence

In the frequency of occurrence method, the individual food items were sorted out and identified. The number of stomachs in which food items occurred was recorded and expressed as a percentage of the total number of the stomach examined. Empty stomachs were not recorded.

$$\text{Frequency of Occurrence} = \frac{\text{total stomach with food item } i}{\text{total stomach with food item}} \times 100$$

Percentage Volume

The volume of each food item was determined by knowing the volume of the stomach alone using water displacement method and subtracting it from the volume of stomach with food content. The volume of each food item was then expressed as a percentage.

$$\% \text{ Volume} = \frac{\text{Volume of each food item}}{\text{total volume of identified food item}} \times 100$$

Data Analysis

Analysis of Variance was used to analysis data collected in this study.

RESULTS

Fish Species

The two dominant fish species observed in the reservoir are *Sarotherodon galilaeus* and *Coptodon zillii* hence the food and feeding habits of both species were examined. A total of one hundred and fifty-five samples were collected from the reservoir comprising seventy-three (73) *Sarotherodon galilaeus* (46 males and 27 females) and eighty-two (82) *Coptodon zillii* (42 males and 40 females) as illustrated in Figure 1a and b This gives a male/female ratio of 2:1 and 1:1 respectively.

Commented [TECNO KH619]: ANOVA of what? FI? e.t.c

ANOVA was done in which software?

Commented [TECNO KH620]: State this at materials and methods section




Figure 1a and b: showing the abundance and sex ratio of *S.galileaus* and *C.zilli*

Biometric Measurements of Two Dominant Fish Species from Ado-Ekiti Reservoir

The body weight of examined fish species from Ado-Ekiti Reservoir ranged from 22.68-216.88g and 46.6-271.50g with a mean± S.D weight of 116.40±56.11 and 176.99±68.19 in the male and female species of *Coptodon zillii* respectively while the body weight of the male and female species of *Sarotherodon galilaeus* ranged from 47.91-509g and 33.45-279.82g with a mean± S.D weight of 194.32±81.34 and 124.37±67.64 respectively. The male *Coptodon zillii* had an average total and standard length of 24.64±4.89 and 22.20±4.25 ranging from 15.5 to 32.1 cm total length (TL) and 13.8 to 29.0 cm standard length (SL) respectively, while the female had an average total and standard length of 21.89±3.56 and 18.62±3.06 ranging from 16.1 to 29.2cm total length (TL) and 13.5 to 27.6cm standard length (SL) respectively. The average total and standard length of *Sarotherodon galilaeus* are 22.55±3.24 and 18.63±3.09 ranging from 16.5 to 33.3 cm total length (TL) and 14.2 to 29.3 cm standard length (SL) in the male while the female had 25.13±5.57 and 22.12±5.03 ranging from 15.5 to 35.2 cm total length (TL) and 12.2 to 31.0 cm standard length (SL) respectively. Table 1 shows the body measurement of fish species examined during the period of the study.

Commented [TECNO KH621]: Consider revising these title.

Commented [TECNO KH622]: Separate the sentences for these two species.

Proportion of Examined Stomach of Two Dominant Fish Species from Ado-Ekiti Reservoir

As shown in table 2, it was observed that a total of 114 (73.55%) out of 155 fish species had food items in their stomachs while the remaining 41 (26.45%) specimens had empty stomach. In male *Sarotherodon galilaeus* the proportion of stomach with food items was 34 while 12 had empty stomach.

In the female 19 had stomach with food content and 8 were without food item. The male *Coptodon zillii* had 29 stomachs with food content while 13 were empty while the female had 32 stomachs with food and 8 empty stomachs.

Table 1. Body measurement of observed 2 dominant fish species from Ado-Ekiti reservoir.

	<i>Sarotherodon galilaeus</i>				<i>Coptodon zillii</i>			
	Male		Female		Male		Female	
	Rang	Mean± S.D	Rang	Mean± S.D	Rang	Mean± S.D	Rang	Mean± S.D
Weight (g)	47.91-509	194.32±81.34	33.45-	124.37±67.64	22.68-	116.40±56.11	46.6-	176.99±68.19
TL (cm)	16.5-33.3	22.55±3.24	15.5-35.2	25.13±5.57	15.5-32.1	24.64±4.89	16.1-29.2	21.89±3.56
SL (cm)	14.2-29.3	18.63±3.09	12.2-31.0	22.12±5.03	13.8-29.0	22.20±4.25	13.5-27.6	18.62±3.06

Table 2: Sexual dimorphism of fish stomach with food items

Parameters	Number of stomachs with food items		Number of stomachs without food items	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
<i>Sarotherodon galilaeus</i>	34	19	12	8
<i>Coptodon zillii</i>	29	32	13	8
Total	114		41	

Commented [TECNO KH623]: Reconsider this table; it looks like its raw data.

You could remove the table and state the sex ratios.

Degree of Stomach Fullness of Two Dominant Fish Species from Ado-Ekiti Reservoir

It was also observed from the degree of stomach fullness that the male *Sarotherodon galilaeus* had 13 one quarter full stomach, 3 half full stomach, 7 three quarter full stomach and 11 full stomachs while the female had 7 one quarter full stomach, 8 half full stomach, 3 three quarter full stomach and 1 full stomach. In *Coptodon zillii* the male had 10 one quarter full stomach, 10 half full stomach, 6 three quarter full stomach and 3 full stomachs while the female had 10 one quarter full stomach, 7 half full stomach, 8 three quarter full stomach and 7 full stomachs as shown in table 3.

Commented [TECNO KH624]: You could consider utilizing ANOVA- what you have stated is raw data

Table 3. Degree of fullness of stomach of observed two dominant fish species from Ado-Ekiti Reservoir

		Degree of Stomach Fullness							
		Empty stomach	¼ stomach	½ stomach	¾ stomach	quarter	full	Full stomach	
<i>Sarotherodon galilaeus</i>	Male	12	13	3	7			11	
	Female	8	7	8	3			1	
<i>Coptodon zillii</i>	Male	13	10	10	6			3	
	Female	8	10	7	8			7	
TOTAL		41	40	28	24			22	

Food and Feeding Habits Observed in Two Dominant Fish Species from Ado-Ekiti Reservoir

The items encountered in the stomach of both species examined include phytoplankton, zooplankton, insects, insect larvae, worms, sand grains and unidentified mass/mud (Table 4). In the diets of *Sarotherodon galilaeus*, it was observed that the Phytoplankton had 89.65% by number, 18.49% by volume and occurred in 100% of the stomach. Zooplankton accounted for 7.85% by number, 17.15% by volume and occurs in 100% of the stomachs. Worms accounted for 2.0% by number, 7.84% by volume and occur in 9.62% of the stomach content. Insect observed from the study had 0.3% by number, 11.26% by volume and occurred in 1.92% of the stomach content. The observed insect larvae during the study had 0.2% by number, 3.67% by volume and occurred in 1.92% of the stomach content. It was also observed that sand grains and unidentified mass/mud were common in the stomach content

Commented [TECNO KH625]: What species were identified?

Commented [TECNO KH626]: What species were identified?

of the specimen, making up to 10.33% and 31.28% by volume and occurred in 100% of the stomach respectively (Table 4).

The stomachs of *Coptodon zillii* consisted mainly of phytoplankton, zooplankton, insects, insect larvae, worms, sand grains and unidentified mass/mud (Table 4). In the diets, it was observed that the Phytoplankton had 45.77% by number, 28.12% by volume and occurred in 86.89% of the stomach content. Zooplankton accounted for 21.92% by number, 20.62% by volume and occurs in 65.57% of the stomach content. Insect observed from the study had 32.31% by number, 3.69% by volume and occurred in 29.51% of the stomach content. It was also observed that sand grains and unidentified mass/mud were common in the stomach content of the specimen, making up to 26.06% and 21.51% by volume and occurred in 100% of the stomach respectively (Table 4).

Commented [TECNO KH627]: For these two species and for the 3 study sites stated you could use ANOVA State if the results are significantly different.

UNDER PEER REVIEW

Table 4. Class of food items in the diet of *Sarotherodon galilaeus* and *Coptodon zillii* from Ado-Ekiti Reservoir

Food item	Numerical method (%)		Frequency occurrence (%)	of method	Volumetric method (%)	
	<i>Sarotherodon galilaeus</i>	<i>Coptodon zillii</i>			<i>Sarotherodon galilaeus</i>	<i>Coptodon zillii</i>
Phytoplankton	89.65	45.77	100.00	86.89	18.49	28.12
Zooplankton	7.85	21.92	100.00	65.57	17.15	20.62
Worms	2.00	-	9.62	-	7.84	-
Insect	0.30	32.31	1.92	29.51	11.26	3.69
Insect larvae	0.20	-	1.92	-	3.67	-
Sand grain	-	-	100.00	100.00	10.33	26.06
Unidentified mass	-	-	100.00	100.00	31.28	21.51

Index of Relative Importance

The IRI indicated that phytoplankton is the most important food items of both species in the dam and constituted 208.14% and 160.78% for *Sarotherodon galilaeus* and *Coptodon zillii* as shown in figure 2.




Figure2: The index of relative importance (IRI) of the food items in the diet of 2 dominant fish species from Ado-Ekiti Reservoir

DISCUSSION

The major food items of *Sarotherodon galilaeus* and *Coptodon zillii* from Ado-Ekiti Reservoir were found to be similar. They include phytoplankton, zooplankton, insect, sand grains as well as mass of unidentified items. From the study, it was observed that the diet of these two species showed that there was moderate percentage of sand grains in their stomach. This is an indication that the species are bottom grazers. The data obtained in this study indicated how successful these fish population has been in exploiting the available food resources in the reservoir. The stomach content analysis indicated that both *Sarotherodon galilaeus* and *Coptodon zillii* fed on a wide range of food items. Generally, fishes are not rigid regarding the particular type of food they eat and will utilize the most readily available food item.

The quantity and quality of food item fed on by the fish may also vary with size, age, sex and time of feeding (Ugwumba, 2013). Food types of *Sarotherodon galilaeus* and *Coptodon zillii* were reported to be mainly plant materials such as remains of water hyacinth; *E. crassipes*. The water hyacinth is used as a substrate by epiphytic algae and, as the fish forage on the algae they consume even the substrate itself. Detritus as food type of indicates that the species is a bottom feeder. This finding is in agreement with the findings of (Njiru *et al.*, 2015; Adeyemi *et al.*, 2009). The two fish species exhibited the characteristics of an omnivore in the reservoir. Ecological studies in some reservoirs (Abayomi *et al.*, 2015) and ponds have shown that juveniles of *Sarotherodon galilaeus* fed in decreasing order of preference on insects and crustaceans, mollusks, detritus and plankton. *Coptodon zillii* has been observed to possess proteases similar to carnivorous species, starch digestive capabilities similar to those of specialized herbivore and lysozyme and alkaline phosphatase as detritivores. *Sarotherodon galilaeus* is physiologically equipped to cope with frequent and irregular meals as its digestive enzymes respond faster than those of eel (*Anguilla anguilla*) or carp (*Cyprinus carpio*) to feeding (Adeyemi *et al.*, 2009). The most frequent food component in this study was the phytoplankton. This result agreed with the observation of Adeyemi *et al.* (2009) for *Sarotherodon galilaeus* diets in Asi River and Gbedikere Lake. The food and feeding habit of *Sarotherodon galilaeus* from Olupanna Reservoir was studied and the diet was found to comprise mostly of phytoplankton in fingerling, juvenile and adult stages (Adeyemi *et al.*, 2009) which in agreement with the result of this study.

The general low numbers of zooplankton in the stomachs of *O. niloticus* could probably be attributed to turbidity of the lake water which reduces visibility of the predators and on feeding rhythms. The lack of clear zoo-plankton species selectivity pattern could be due to importance of other food items. It is important to emphasize that the effect of seasonality should always be considered in the studies on natural feeding of fish, because the temporal changes of biotic and abiotic factors alter the structure of the food web along the year and as a consequence, the fish often shows seasonal diet shifts.

CONCLUSION

Commented [TECNO KH628]: Is this paragraph about ON a review? in the discussion?

This study showed a considerably high similarity in the diet of the two species. This could suggest a degree of food competition in the reservoir. This competition makes them to occupy the same ecological niche within the dam. The percentages of occurrence of empty stomach were relatively low for both species and showed no significant difference. This observation indicates that food is available for these fish species but poor in variety. It could be said that the dam was not rich in natural foods.

Commented [TECNO KH629]: Consider revising this conclusion to answer the objective.

REFERENCES

- Abayomi, O. S., Arawomo, G. A.O. and Komolafe, O. O. (2015). Distribution, food and feeding habits of a catfish, *C. gariepinus* (Burchell 1822) in Opa Reservoir, Ile Ife, Nigeria. *Science Focus*. 10(1): 62 – 67.
- Begum, M.; Alam, M. J.; Islam, M. A. and Pal, H. K. (2008). On the food and feeding habit of an estuarine catfish *Mystus gulio* (Hamilton) in the south-west coast of Bangladesh. *University Journal of Zoology, Rajshahi University*. 27:91-94.
- Cabana, G., Tremblay, A., Kalf, J. and Rasmussen, J.B. (2014). Pelagic food chain structure in on namaycush). *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* 51: 381-389.
- Royce, W. F. (1972). *Introduction to the fishery sciences*. Academic Press, Inc., New York. 351 pp.
- Lung'Aiya, H.B.O. Mharzi, A. Tackx, M. Gichuki, J. and Symoens, J.J. (2018). Phytoplankton community structure and environment in the Kenyan waters of Lake Victoria. *Freshwater Biology*. 43:529-543.
- Lowe-McConnel, R.H. (2007). *Ecological Studies in tropical fish communities*. London: Cambridge University Press. Pp 148.
- Njiru, M., Muchiri, J. B., Okeyo-Owour, and Cowx, I. G. (2015). Distribution of phytoplankton and feeding of Nile tilapia, *Oreochromis niloticus* in Lake Victoria, Kenya. In LVFO 2015: Proceedings of Lake Victoria 2015. A new Beginning Conference.15-19 May. P45
- Ngupula, G. W. and Mlaponi, E. (2010). Changes in abundance of Nile shrimp, *Caridina nilotica* (Roux) following the decline of Nile perch and recovery of native haplochromine fishes, Lake Victoria, Tanzanian waters. *Aquatic Ecosystem Health and Environmental management*. 13: 196-202.
- Persson, L. and Crowder, L.B. (2018). Fish-habitat interactions mediated via ontogenetic niche shifts. In M. M. Caldwell, G. Helmaier, O. L., Lange, H.A. Mooney, U. Schulth, and E. Sommer, eds. *The Structuring Role of Submerged Macrophytes in lakes*. Springer, New York: Pages 3- 23
- Teugels, G. G., Reid, G. M. and King, R. P. (1992). Fishes of the Cross River Basin (Cameroun-Nigeria) taxonomy, zoogeography, ecology and conservation. *Ann. Mus. R. Afr. Centr. Zool.*, 266: 132pp.

Reyntjens, D. and Tesfaye, W. (2018). Fisheries management: A review of the current status and research needs in Ethiopia. *SINET: Ethiopia Journal of Science.*, 21: 231-269.

National Research Council (2013). *Nutrient requirements of fish*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press. p. 114.

Gerking, S. D. (2014). *Feeding ecology of fish*. New York: Academic Press. p. 416.

Lamb, C. F. (2011). Gustation and feeding behaviour. In: Houlihan D, Boujard T, Jobling M, editors. *Food intake in fish*. Oxford (UK): Blackwell Science Ltd. p. 130–56

Hara, T. J. (2014). Olfaction and gustation in fish: an overview. *Acta Physiol Scand.* 152:207–96.

Morley, J. E. (2015). The role of peptides in appetite regulation across species. *Am Zool.* 35:437–45.

Morley, J. E. (2017). Neuropeptide regulation of appetite and weight. *Endocr Rev.* 8:256–87.

Wynne, K., Stanley, S. and McGowan B. (2015). Appetite control. *J Endocrinol.* 184:291–318.

Stanley, S., Wynne, K. and McGowan, B. (2015). Hormonal regulation of food intake. *Physiol Rev.* 85:1131–58.

Madrid, J. A., Boujard, T. and Sanchez-Vazquez, F. J. (2011). Feeding rhythms. In: Houlihan D, Boujard T, Jobling M, editors. *Food intake in fish*. Oxford (UK): Blackwell Science Ltd; 2011. p. 189–215.tr45y

Daan, S. (2011). Adaptive daily strategies in behavior. In: Aschoff J, editor. *Handbook of behavioral neurobiology 4, biological rhythms*. New York: Plenum Press; 2011. p. 275–98.

Smith, I. P., Metcalfe, N. B. and Huntingford, F.A. (2013). Daily and seasonal patterns in the feeding behaviour of Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*) in a sea cage. *Aquaculture.* 117:165–78.

Saether, B. S., Johnsen, H. K. and Jobling, M. (2016). Seasonal changes in food consumption and growth of Arctic char exposed to either simulated natural or a 12:12 LD photoperiod at constant water temperature. *J Fish Biol.* 48:1113–22.

Mallekh, R., Lagarde`re, J. P. and Begout-Anras, M. L. (2018). Variability in appetite of turbot, *Scophthalmus maximus* under intensive rearing conditions: the role of environmental factors. *Aquaculture.* 165:123–38.

McCarthy, I. D., Carter, C.G. and Houlihan, D. F. (2013). Individual variation in consumption in rainbow trout measured using radiography. In: Kaushik SJ, Luquet P, editors. *Fish nutrition in practice*. Paris: INRA Editions. p. 85–8.

Boujard, T. and M. edale, F. (2014). Regulation of voluntary feed intake in juvenile rainbow trout fed by hand or by self-feeders with diets containing two different protein to energy ratios. *Aquat Living Resour.* 7:211–5.

Thorpe, J.A. and Cho, C.Y. (2015). Minimising waste through bioenergetically and behaviourally based feeding strategies. *Water Sci Technol.* 31:29–40.

Dhulkhed, M. H. (2002). Food of the oil sardine taken by bottom net and surface gill net in the Mangalore area. *Indian J. Fish.*, 19pp.

Nair, R.V. and Subrahmanyam, R. (2005). The diatom, *Fragilaria oceanica* Cleve, an indicator of abundance of the Indian oil sardine, *Sardinella longiceps* Cuv. and Val. *Curr. Sci.*, 24:41-42.

Darnell, R.M. (2017). Organic detritus in relation to the estuarine ecosystem. In: *Estuaries*, G. H. Lauff (Ed.), *American Association for the Advancement of Science.* 367-382.

Ugwumba, A. A. (2013). Carbohydrases in the digestive tract of the African bony tongue *Heterotis niloticus* (Pisces: Osteichthyes). *Hydrobiologia.* 257: 95 – 100.

Idowu, E.O. (2007). Aspects of the Biology of African Pike *Hepsetus odoe* (Osteichthyes: Hepsetidae) in Ado-Ekiti Reservoir. Ph.D. Thesis, University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria. Pp23

Njiru, M., Muchiri, J.B., Okeyo-Owour, and Cowx, I.G. (2015). Distribution of phytoplankton and feeding of Nile tilapia, *Oreochromis niloticus* in Lake Victoria, Kenya. In LVFO 2015: Proceedings of Lake Victoria 2015. A new Beginning Conference. 15-19 May. P45

Adeyemi, S.O., Bankole, N.O., Adikwu, A.I. and Akumbo, P.M. (2009). Age, growth mortality of some commercially important fish species in Gbedikere Rivers. 2: 45- 51, 2009.

Qasim, S.Z., and Bhattathim, M.A. (2011). Primary production of a seagrass bed on Kavaratti Atoll (Laccadives). *Hydrobiologia*, 38:29-38.

Qasim, S.Z. (2007a). The biology of *Blennius pholis* L. (Teleostei). *Proc. zool. Soc. Land.*, 128:161-208.

Qasim, S.Z. (2007b). The biology of *Centronotus gunnellus* (L.) (Teleostei). *J. Anim. Ecol.*, -26:389-401.

Abayomi, O. S., Arawomo, G. A. and Komolafe, O. O. (2005). Distribution, food and feeding habits of a catfish, *C. gariepinus* (Burchell 1822) in Opa Reservoir, Ile Ife, Nigeria. *Science Focus.* 10(1): 62 – 67.

Adeyemi, S. O., Bankole, N. O., Adikwu, I. A., & Akombu, P. M. (2009). Age, growth and mortality of some commercially important fish species in Gbedikere Lake, Kogi State Nigeria. *International Journal of Lakes and Rivers*, 2(1), 45-51..

Begum, M.; Alam, M. J.; Islam, M. A. and Pal, H.K. (2008). On the food and feeding habit of an estuarine catfish *Mystus gulio* (Hamilton) in the south-west coast of Bangladesh. *University Journal of Zoology, Rajshahi University*. 27:91-94. <https://doi.org/10.3329/ujzru.v27i0.1962>

FAO (1995) Code of conduct for Responsible Fisheries Rome. 41p ISBN 92-5-103834-1

Hara, T. J. (2014). Olfaction and gustation in fish: an overview. *Acta Physiological Scandinavica*. 152:207–96. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1748-1716.1994.tb09800.x>

Lowe-McConnel, R.H. (2007). *Ecological Studies in tropical fish communities*. London: Cambridge University Press. Pp 148.

Madrid, J. A., Boujard, T. and Sanchez-Vazquez, F. J. (2011). Feeding rhythms. In: Houlihan D, Boujard T, Jobling M, editors. *Food intake in fish*. Oxford (UK): Blackwell Science Ltd; 2011. p. 189–215. tr45y Print ISBN:9780632055760 |Online ISBN:9780470999516 |DOI:10.1002/9780470999516

Njiru, M., Muchiri, J. B., Okeyo-Owour, and Cowx, I. G. (2015). Distribution of phytoplankton and feeding of Nile tilapia, *Oreochromis niloticus* in Lake Victoria, Kenya. In LVFO 2015: Proceedings of Lake Victoria 2015. A new Beginning Conference. 15-19 May. P45

Royce, W. F. (1972). *Introduction to the fishery sciences*. Academic Press, Inc., New York. 351 pp.

Teugels, G. G., Reid, G. M. and King, R. P. (1992). Fishes of the Cross River Basin (Cameroun-Nigeria) taxonomy, zoogeography, ecology and conservation. *Annales du Musee Royal de l'afrigue centrale in Zoology*, 266: 132pp.

Ugwumba, A. A. (2013). Carbohydrases in the digestive tract of the African bony tongue *Heterotis niloticus* (Pisces: Osteichthyes). *Hydrobiologia*. 257: 95 – 100. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00005949>