

## **EFFECT OF *Mugil cephalus* SIZE AND DENSITY AT INITIAL STOCKING ON GROWTH PERFORMANCE AND SIZE AT HARVEST.**

**Bakeer, M. N. ; M. A. A. Mostafa and M.A. Samra**

**Central Laboratory for Aquaculture Research, Abbassa, Abo-Hammad Sharkia Governorate, Egypt.**

### **ABSTRACT**

A study on cultivation of mullet (*Mugil cephalus*) in one feddan earthen ponds (4200 m<sup>2</sup> each) was done. Twelve rectangular earthen ponds were used representing six treatments, three different stocking densities (SD<sub>1</sub>, SD<sub>2</sub> and SD<sub>3</sub> being 10000, 12000 and 14000 fish/feddan, respectively) within each of them two fish size (FS<sub>1</sub> and FS<sub>2</sub>, being 10.05 ± 0.12 and 20.03 ± 0.30 g, respectively). Two replicates were used for each treatment. The duration of the experiment was 12 months. The treatment of 12000 fish / feddan with 20 g/ fish showed the best results of marketable size, net yield (6562.58kg/feddan) and highest profit index (1.54 L.E). Based on the obtained results, it could be recommended that the best fish size and stocking density of mullet (*M.cephalus*) are 20 g/ fish and 12000 fish/feddan to get the optimal marketable fish size and economical return under pond farm management conditions.

**Keywords :** Stocking density, Fish size, Mullet (*M.cephalus*), Growth performance, Fish marketable size, Profit index.

### **INTRODUCTION**

In Egypt, grey mullet (*M.cephalus*) is one of the most popular and acceptable fish for human consumption. Information concerning the optimum stocking density of this species is still very limited. Bakeer (2006) used three stocking densities (1, 2 and 3 fish/m<sup>3</sup>) and one fish size (10 g/fish) and reported that the best stocking density of grey mullet (*M. cephalus*) in monoculture system was 2 fish/m<sup>3</sup> under the experimental conditions in Wady – El Natron, Behira governorate. Eid (2006) stocked grey mullet (*M. cephalus*) fingerlings with initial weight 2.1 g at a rate of 10000, 12000 and 14000 fish /feddan and fed diet containing 30.1% crude protein and 435.59 k.cal /100g gross energy. He reported that weight gain, absolute growth rate and feed conversion were significantly decreased with increasing stocking density. The highest fish production was obtained at stocking density 10000/feddan with average body weight 180.3g, while the lowest fish production was obtained at stocking density 14000 fish /feddan with average body weight 120.5g. Survival was negatively correlated with stocking densities through the experimental period (210 days).

Rearing fish density is one of the most important factor influencing the result of controlled fish cultivation. This has been described for almost all cultivable fish species, and also for all types of production systems (El- Syed, 2002; Abramo *et al.*, 2006; Islam *et al.*, 2006 and Menghe *et al.*, 2006).

Mostafa (2008) studied the effect of dietary protein level (25 and 30%) and stocking density (3 and 6 fish/ m<sup>3</sup>) on growth performance of grey mullet (*M.cephalus*) fingerlings (10g/fish). He reported that the best stocking rate was 3fish/m<sup>3</sup>.

In optimizing production from a system, a number of factors which are directly related to the stocking density must be considered, and some of these are the physico- chemical conditions of the water, the production system, the type and size of rearing tanks, water exchange rate, size of the fish and quantity of ration have been particularly emphasized (Frzebiatowski *et al.*, 1981 and Herbert *et al.*, 2006).

Therefore, the aim of the present study was to determine the optimal stocking density and initial stocking fish size of grey mullet (*M.cephalus*, purchased from El-Max collection station) to reach the marketable size throughout the evaluation of the effect of the treatments on growth traits, total production and economic efficiency.

## **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

This work was conducted in the region of Edku, El-Behera governorate, Egypt at a private fish farm during season 2008 (for 360 days), to investigate the effect of grey mullet (*M.cephalus*) density (SD) and initial fish size (FS) on fish size at harvest. Twelve rectangular earthen ponds (each of 4200m<sup>2</sup>) were used and represented 6 treatments (three stocking rates and two fish sizes) as follow :-

- Treatment (1) 10g/fish at 10000 fish/feddan (FS1 × SD1)
- Treatment (2) 10g/fish at 12000 fish/feddan (FS1 × SD2)
- Treatment (3) 10g/fish at 14000 fish/feddan (FS1 × SD3)
- Treatment (4) 20g/fish at 10000 fish/feddan (FS2 × SD1)
- Treatment (5) 20g/fish at 12000 fish/feddan (FS2 × SD2)
- Treatment (6) 20g/fish at 14000 fish/feddan (FS2 × SD3)

Experimental ponds were supplied with water from Edku drainage. The water level was maintain at approximately 1 m depth and loss of water due to evaporation and leakage was replaced whenever necessary.

A monthly fish sample of 150 fish/pond was weighted to adjust the feed quantity. Fish were fed on a commercial diet (25.6 % crude protein and 4900 kcal gross energy/kg diet). The protein, carbohydrate and lipids source were fishmeal, yellow corn, wheat bran, wheat flour and corn oil, respectively, feed was distributed in the pelleted form of 2.0mm (floating pellets, from the feed mill belonging to Barseq farm of general Authority for fish Resources, Ministry of Agriculture) at a rate of 3% of total biomass per day (5 days per week). The daily ration was offered at two portions at 10.00 a.m. and 2.00 p.m. The determined chemical composition of the diet used was 91.6% dry mater, 24.9% crude protein, 10.9% crude fat, 4.9% crude fibres and 9.4% ash.

Individual body weight to the nearest 0.1g was measure at the start of the experiment for samples of 150 fish/pond and repeated monthly. Fish samples were withdrawn from the experimented ponds by a seine net, and transferred to a tank containing water from the experimental ponds and returned back to ponds after measuring their weights. The experiment was started on 15 April and lasted for 360 days. Organic and chemical fertilizers were used in all experimental ponds to accelerate the production of

phytoplankton and zooplankton, at a biweekly rate of 200 kg cattle manure (treated by sun), 20 kg superphosphate and 10 kg ammonium sulphate .

Chemical analysis of the diet was performed according to the methods describe by A.O.A.C. (2000).

**Parameters tested :**

Daily weight gain (g/day), specific growth rate (SGR,%/d), feed conversion ratio (FCR) and survival rate(SR) were calculated according to the following equations:

Daily weight gain (g/day) = final fish w (g) – initial fish w (g) / time (day),

SGR =( Ln final w – Ln initial w) × 100 / time (days),FCR = feed intake (g) / W gain(g), and Survival rate (%) = Nt ×100/Ni

Were :W=weight, Nt = Number of fish at t days, and Ni = number of fish initially stocked.

Water quality criteria (physical, chemical and biological characteristics) were tested monthly for all ponds according to APHA (1985) and Boyd (1992). Also, growth performance and nutrients utilization of the experimental fish were followed after Jobling (1983).

The statistical analysis of data was carried out by applying the computer program of Harvey (1990). Differences among means were tested for significance according to Duncan's multiple range test (1955).

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

**Water quality:**

Water quality parameters are shown in Table (1). The averages of temperature ranged from 26.5 to 27C° during the experimented period. In general, water temperature was adequate for grey mullet growth during the experimental period. The overall mean temperature for all treatments during the experiment was 26.83C°. This temperature is suitable for all chemical, physical and biological processes in ponds water as cited by Boyd (1992).

The overall average of Secchi disk reading was slightly lower for the lower stocking density (19cm) which mean that there was blooming in the pond water due to lower density compared to the other treatments. The range of Secchi disk visibility was 19-28 cm for all experimental ponds and was within the acceptable limits (Boyd, 1992). which reported that water quality parameters of fish ponds are in good conditions when Secchi disk visibility is between 30-45 cm and when turbidity is in form of phytoplankton (Boyd, 1992).

Field observation during early morning revealed that dissolved oxygen (DO) was closely related to the best growth and survival of cultured fish. The average of DO concentration ranged between 6.8 and 7.3 mg/l. The previous results agree with NACA(1989) These values are beneficial to fish cultivation and indicate that water dissolved oxygen slightly decreased in ponds with higher density and fish size compared to the other ponds. This may be attributed to the increase in fish size and density of these ponds, which may lead to decrease the dissolved oxygen. In this connection, Anand and Mukherjee (2000) demonstrated that high stocking ponds require more

dissolved oxygen concentration in water bodies.

The average value of pH ranged from 7.6 to 8.0 in all treatments. Generally, the pH levels were suitable for well being of mullet fish. Boyd and Lichkoppler (1979) demonstrated that water with pH value of about 6.5 is considered the best for fish production.

Average of salinity was 12 ppt. This value showed no variation and lays in the desirable range for mullet cultured in ponds (Oren, 1981).

The average value of unionized ammonia (NH<sub>3</sub>) did not exceed 0.14 mg/l at different treatments. Averages of phosphorus had ranged between 0.13 and 0.44 mg/l in all ponds. Generally, these values showed no nutrients limitation in grey mullet experimental ponds. similar trend was cited by Abdelhamid (2003).

*Phyto – and Zooplankton standing crop:*

As shown in Table (2), the average total numbers of phytoplankton and zooplankton organisms per litter were higher in water samples collected from ponds with lower density and fish size, comparing with those collected from ponds of higher density and fish size. This may be due to the high consumption rate of these organisms by high total fish biomass. In general, numbers of plankton communities in fish ponds were affected greatly by the experimental treatments, densities and fish sizes. These results are in agreement with the findings of Eid (2006) and Abdel-Gawad and Salem (2007).

#### **Fish growth performance:**

Table (3) shows the effects of fish size and density and their interactions on the different body measurements studied. Regardless of stocking density, the increasing of fish size (from 10 to 20 g) increased the body weight from 485.16 to 620.60g, body length from 25.30 to 27.10cm. These results indicate that final body weight and length of grey mullet (*M.cephalus*) increased significantly ( $P<0.05$ ) with the increase in fish size at stocking from 10 to 20g. These results were similar to those reported by Bakeer(2006), Eid (2006) and Abdel-Gawad and Salem (2007).

It could be concluded that big fish size (20g/fish) used in this study gave the best growth performance in form of body weight and body length.

These growth parameters were increased significantly with increasing fish size from 10 to 20g, but concerning the three stocking densities used in this study, these growth parameters were lower with high stocking density than with low stocking density and the differences due to fish sizes and stocking densities were significant (Table3).

Regardless of fish size, body weight and length were negatively correlated with the stocking density of fish (Table 3), However, net total fish yield at harvest increased with increasing the stocking density (Table 4). These results indicated that final body weights and lengths of grey mullet (*M.cephalus*) increased significantly ( $P<0.05$ ) with the increase in size from 10 to 20g but significantly decreased by increasing the stocking density from 10000, 12000 to 14000 fish/Fed.

These result are in agreement with Eid (2006) and Abdel-Gawad and Salem (2007) who found that final mean weight and length of grey mullet decreased with increasing stocking rate but the net yield was increased.



With regard to the interaction between the fish size and stocking density, result revealed that the treatment (SD<sub>2</sub>x DS<sub>2</sub>) produced the heaviest and longest fish compared to the other treatments (Table 4). The significance of variations due to the effect of interaction between fish size and stocking density on body weight and length showed that these two factors are dependently on each other and also each of them had its own significant effect. As shown in Table (4), SGR values were 1.09; 0.93; 1.08; 0.96; 1.05 and 0.95 %/d for the treatments SD<sub>1</sub>x FS<sub>1</sub>; SD<sub>1</sub>x FS<sub>2</sub>; SD<sub>2</sub>x FS<sub>1</sub>; SD<sub>2</sub>x FS<sub>2</sub>; SD<sub>3</sub>x FS<sub>1</sub>; SD<sub>3</sub>x FS<sub>2</sub>; respectively.

Data in Table (4) indicated that small fish (10g) showed the highest SGR records compared with the large fish. On the other hand, daily weight gains recorded values indicating that large fish (20g) showed the high weight gain records compared with those of the small fish (10g). These results are in agreement with the findings of Mahmoud *et al.* (2003) and Bakeer *et al.* (2007) who studied the effect of stocking rate on the growth performance of fish and the interaction between fish size at stocking and growth parameters.

The FCR values increased (generally) as fish size increases, However, El-Sayed (2002) and Bakeer *et al.* (2007) reported that FCR decreased with each increase in fish size and this means that FCR was improved significantly.

Results presented in Table (4) illustrated the effects of grey mullet fish size and density at stocking on survival rates. The results indicated that survival rate ranged between 80.0 and 95.0% which indicated that grey mullet fish size and density had remarkable effects on survival rate. These results are in accordance with those reported by Eid (2006), Abdel-Gawad and Salem (2007) and Bakeer *et al.* (2007) who found that the survival rate improved in fish ponds applied lower total biomass (lower fish size and density at stocking).

#### **Economical evaluation:**

Costs of feed and profit index per one Kg fish (in LE) at different treatments are given in Table (5). Costs of feed intake per one Kg fish gain (in LE) at different treatments were 5.214, 5.280, 5.340, 5.115, 6.300 and 6.930 for the treatments SD<sub>1</sub>x FS<sub>1</sub>; SD<sub>1</sub>x FS<sub>2</sub>; SD<sub>2</sub>x FS<sub>1</sub>; SD<sub>2</sub>x FS<sub>2</sub>; SD<sub>3</sub>x FS<sub>1</sub> and SD<sub>3</sub>x FS<sub>2</sub>, respectively. These results indicated that lower fish size and density at stocking decreased the feed intakes. The best fish size and density possessed lowest feed cost and high profit index was for the treatment (SD<sub>2</sub>x FS<sub>2</sub>) followed by the treatment (SD<sub>1</sub>x FS<sub>2</sub>). These results are in partly agreement with Mahmoud *et al.* (2003), Eid (2006) and Abdel-Gawad and Salem (2007) who studied the effect of stocking density on growth and yield of grey mullet. Also, Mahmoud *et al.* (2003) and Bakeer *et al.* (2007) working on Nile tilapia, recorded the same results and trends.



**Table (5): Cost of feed and profit index per one kg fish (in LE) at different treatments.**

Items	Treatments					
	1000 fish/ Fed.(SD1)		12000 fish/ Fed.(SD2)		14000 fish/ Fed.(SD3)	
	10g/fish (FS1)	20g/fish (FS2)	10g/fish (FS1)	20g/fish (FS2)	10g/fish (FS1)	20g/fish (FS2)
Feed intake per one kg gain (kg)	1.58	1.60	1.62	1.55	1.91	2.10
Feed intake cost (LE)	5.214	5.280	5.340	5.115	6.300	6.930
% of the smallest value	101.93	103.22	104.39	100	123.16	135.48
Profit index	1.49	1.46	1.43	1.54	1.06	0.87
% of the smallest value	171.26	167.81	164.36	177.01	121.83	100

The economical evaluation carried out according to the local market price in 2008 in LE.

1- Price of one ton of feed equal 3300L.E.

2- LE means Egyptian pound (0.18 US\$)

3- Profit index = income of one kg gain of fish/feed intake cost (price of fish was calculated as 13. L.E per kg ).

### Conclusion:

Based on the obtained results from this study, it could be concluded that fish size of 20 g / fish and stocking density of 12000 fish / Fed. were the optimum size and density and were recommended to be used in monoculture system for grey mullet, to give the best marketable size and highest yield at harvest, under pond farm management conditions.

### Acknowledgement

Appreciation is extended to Eng. Nossier, M. I. the Head Department of Aquaculture, Behira Rural Development Project for providing help and assistance during this study.

## REFERENCES

- Abdel – Gawad, A.S. and Salme, A. A. (2007). Effect of stocking densified grey mullet (*Mugil cephalua*) reared on natural food in monoculture ponds on growth performance, total production with economical evaluation . Egypt. J. Aqu. Biol. & Fish, II(3):4156 .
- Abdelhamid, A. M. (2003) Scientific Fundamentals of Fish Production and Husbandry. 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition, Faculty of Agriculture, Mansoura Universtiy, Deposit No. 15733/2003 .
- Abramo, L. R., Cortney, L. O. and Hanson. T. R. (2006). Effect of stocking weight and stocking density on production of hybrid striped bass (sunshine) in earthen ponds in the second phase of a 2-phase system. J. of World Aquaculture Soc., 35(1): 33-45
- Anand, G. and Mukherjee, C. K.( 2000 ). Agriculture , Design of mini – paddle wheel aerator. The Fifth Indian Fisheries Furom, 17-20 Januray, CIFA. Kausalyange , Bhumbaneseswar, 751002 , India .



- A.O. A.C. (2000). Official Methods of Analysis of the Association of Official Analytical Chemists, 16<sup>th</sup> ed, AOAC, Arlington, USA. -3. Barbosa, 3. M., S. S.
- APHA, American Public Health Association (1985). Standard Methods for the Examination of Water and Wastewater ,16- edition, Washington, D.C.
- Bakeer, M. N. (2006). Performance of grey mullet (*Mugil cephalus* L.) reared in monoculture in the new desert areas. Journal of Arabian Aquaculture Society, 1(2): 44-56.
- Bakeer, M. N; Mostafa, M. A. A and Higaze , A. Z. (2007) . Effect at initial stocking on growth performance and fish marketable size . J.Agric . Sci . Mansoura Univ., 23(3):1803-1813.
- Boyd, C. E. (1992). Water Quality in Warmwater Fish. Alabama Agric. Experiment Station, Auburn Univ., Alabama, p: 359.
- Boyd , C. E. and Lichkoppler, F. (1979 ) . Water Quality Management in Ponds . Trans. Am . Fish Culture . Aubura Univ . Exp . St. Res, and Def., Series No. 22, 30pp .
- Duncan, D. B. (1955). Multiple ranges and multiple (F) tests. Biometrics,11: 1-42.
- Eid, A. M. (2006). Effect of stocking density on growth performance and production of grey mullet (*Mugil cephalus*). Egypt. J. Aqua., 84 (1A) .
- El- Sayed, A. M. (2002). Effect of stocking and feeding levels on growth and feed efficiency of Nile tilapia (*Oreochromis niloticus* L.) fry. Aquaculture- Research, 33 (8): 621-626.
- Frzebiatowski, R., Filipiak, J. and Lakunbowski, R. (1981). Effect of stock density on growth and survival of rainbow trout (*Salmo gairdneri rich*). Aquaculture, 22: 289-295
- Harvey, W. R. (1990). User's guide for LSMLMW. Mixed model least-squares and maximum likelihood computer program. Ohaio State Univ., Columbus, USA.
- Herbert, B., Graham, P. and Foster, S. (2006). Effects of added shelter and stocking density on growth of sleepy Cod *O. niloticus* in ponds. J. of World Aquaculture Soc., 34(4): 433-440.
- Islam, M. S., Rahman, M. M. and Tanaka, M. (2006). Stocking density positively influences the yield and farm profitability in cage aquaculture of Sushi catfish, *P. sutchi*. J. Appl. Tchthyology, 22:441
- Jobling, M. (1983). Towards and explanation of specific dynamic action (SDA). Journal of Fish Biology, 23: 549 - 555.
- Mahmoud, A..A., Kamal, S.M., Abdel-All, M.M. and Salama, A.A. (2003). Effect of fish size at stocking on growth performance and final yield in monoculture system. Egypt. J. Agric. Res., NRC., 1(2): 443-456.
- Menghe, H. L., Manning, B. B., Robinson, E. H. and Bosworth. B. G. (2006). Effect of dietary protein concentration and stocking density on production characteristics of pond-raised channel catfish, *Punctatus*. J. World Aquaculture Soc., 34 (2): 147- 155.
- Mostafa, M. A. A, (2008) . Efect of protein level and stocking density on growth performance of grey mullet (*Mugil cephalus*) reared in monoculture in the new desert areas Abbassa Int. J. Aqua, (1A) 2008 .

NACA ( Network of Aquaculture Center in Asia ) (1989) . Integrated fish farming in China NACA, Technical Manual 7, Bangkok , Thailand .  
Oren, O.H. (1981). Aquaculture of Mullet. International Biological Program No.26.Cambridge; Cambridge University Press, London, 450 pp. ISBN: 0-521-22926-X.

### **تأثير كل من كثافة وحجم أسماك البوري (*M. cephalus*) عند بداية التخزين على أداء النمو والحجم عند الحصاد.**

محمد نجيب بكير، محمد التميمي عبده مصطفى و إبراهيم موسى عبدالرحمن سمرة.  
المعمل المركزي لبحوث الثروة السمكية -العباسة -ابو حماد -محافظة الشرقية - مصر

أجريت هذه الدراسة لفحص تأثير معدل التخزين السمكي وحجم الأسماك عند بداية التخزين على أداء النمو والحجم التسويقي لأسماك البوري (*Mugil cephalus*) عند الحصاد. تمت التجربة في اثني عشر حوضاً ترايبيا مستطيل الشكل ، مساحة كل حوض واحد فدان ممثلة لعدد ست معاملات، ثلاث معدلات للتخزين 14000 - 12000 - 10000 (سمكة /فدان) وفي داخل كل معاملة تم استخدام حجمين من الأسماك ( 10 ، 20 جرام /سمكة)، تم تكرار كل معاملة في حوضين ، حيث استغرقت التجربة 12 شهراً

النتائج المتحصل عليها أوضحت تفوق المعاملة التي استخدم فيها الأسماك بحجم 20 جم للسمكة عند بداية التخزين مع معدل تخزين قدره 12000 سمكة /فدان ، حيث حققت أعلى إنتاجية (6562.58 كجم للفدان ، وكان أقصى دليل ربحي 1.54 جنياً مصرياً ، وبناء على ذلك توصي الدراسة باستخدام معدل تخزين 12000 ألف سمكة /فدان بحجم ابتدائي 20 جرام /سمكة عند التربية بالنظام الأحادي النوع في أحواض ترابية مسمدة جيداً بأسمدة عضوية وكيميائية لزيادة الغذاء الطبيعي (فيتو وزو بلانكتون) لتحقيق أقصى جدوى اقتصادية ممكنة.

**قام بتحكيم البحث**

كلية الزراعة - جامعة المنصورة  
كلية الزراعة - جامعة قناة السويس

أ.د / عبد الحميد محمد عبد الحميد  
أ.د / محمد سعد الدين الشريف

**Table (1) : Mean values of different water quality criteria(average of the whole experimental period) in the experimental earthen ponds.**

Parameters	Treatments					
	10000 fish/ Fed.(SD1)		12000 fish/Fed.(SD2)		14000 fish/Fed.(SD3)	
	10g/fish(FS1)	20g/fish(FS2)	10g/fish(FS1)	20g/fish(FS2)	10g/fish(FS1)	20g/fish(FS2)
Temperature(C°)	26.5	27	27	27	26.5	27
Secchi disk (cm)	19	19	25	25	28	28
Dissolved Oxygen (mg/l)	7.1	7.0	7.3	7.2	6.8	6.8
pH value	7.8	7.6	7.9	7.9	7.8	8.0
Salinity(ppt)	12.00	12.00	12.00	12.00	12.00	12.00
NH <sub>3</sub> (mg/l)	0.11	0.11	0.12	0.12	0.13	0.14
O.P (mg/l)	0.44	0.39	0.26	0.25	0.14	0.13

**Table (2): Average numbers of phytoplankton and zooplankton in the ponds water of mullet reared at different densities and fish sizes.**

Organisms	Treatments					
	1000 fish/ Fed.(SD1)		12000 fish/Fed.(SD2)		14000 fish/ Fed.(SD3)	
	10g/fish(FS1)	20g/fish(FS2)	10g/fish(FS1)	20g/fish(FS2)	10g/fish(FS1)	20g/fish(FS2)
<b>Phytoplankton (thousand unit/l)</b>						
Blue green algae	480	485	425	420	389	380
Green algae	690	681	650	555	430	410
Diatoms	235	210	200	189	150	148
Euglena	620	600	510	500	340	310
Total biomass (unit/l)	2025	1976	1695	1664	1309	1248
% of the smallest value	162.25	158.33	135.81	133.33	104.88	100
<b>Zooplankton (organism/l)</b>						
Rotifera	1190	1212	1011	1223	980	1000
Copepoda	810	891	790	870	680	711
Cladocera	612	673	509	658	614	622
Crustacea	1735	1520	1100	1115	950	810
Biomass (Org./l)	4347	4296	3410	3866	3224	3143
% of the smallest value.	138.30	136.68	108.49	123.00	102.57	100

**Table (3) : Means and standard errors for the body measurements of mullet at harvest as affected by initial stocking density and fish size.**

Treatments	No.	Body weight (g)	Body length (cm)	Condition Factor (k)
<b>Stocking density (SD)</b>				
SD1 (10000 fish/fed)	300	654 <sup>a</sup> ± 1.43	27.12 <sup>a</sup> ± 0.07	3.23 <sup>c</sup> ± 0.09
SD2 (12000 fish/fed)	300	613 <sup>b</sup> ± 1.43	26.00 <sup>b</sup> ± 0.07	3.48 <sup>b</sup> ± 0.09
SD3 (14000 fish/fed)	300	498 <sup>c</sup> ± 1.43	24.15 <sup>c</sup> ± 0.07	3.53 <sup>a</sup> ± 0.09
<b>Fish size (FS)</b>				
Low (10g)	450	485.16 <sup>b</sup> ± 1.12	25.30 <sup>b</sup> ± 0.08	2.99 <sup>b</sup> ± 0.09
High (20g)	450	620.60 <sup>a</sup> ± 1.12	27.10 <sup>a</sup> ± 0.08	3.11 <sup>a</sup> ± 0.09
<b>SD × FS</b>				
SD1 × FS1	150	518.60 <sup>d</sup> ± 1.36	25.10 <sup>b</sup> ± 1.12	3.27 <sup>c</sup> ± 0.03
SD2 × FS1	150	510.36 <sup>d</sup> ± 1.36	25.00 <sup>b</sup> ± 1.12	3.26 <sup>c</sup> ± 0.03
SD3 × FS1	150	470.12 <sup>e</sup> ± 1.36	24.00 <sup>c</sup> ± 1.12	3.40 <sup>b</sup> ± 0.03
SD1 × FS2	150	688.53 <sup>a</sup> ± 1.36	27.12 <sup>a</sup> ± 1.12	3.45 <sup>b</sup> ± 0.03
SD2 × FS2	150	648.60 <sup>b</sup> ± 1.36	27.10 <sup>a</sup> ± 1.12	3.25 <sup>c</sup> ± 0.03
SD3 × FS2	150	630.14 <sup>c</sup> ± 1.36	26.00 <sup>b</sup> ± 1.12	3.58 <sup>a</sup> ± 0.03
Overall mean	900	577.75 ± 0.72	25.72 ± 0.05	3.36 ± 0.01

Means with the same letter in each column are not significantly different (P>0.05).

**Table (4) : Effect of stoking density and fish size at initial stocking on growth performance of grey mullet (M.cephalus) at harvest.**

Parameters	Treatments					
	10000 fish/Fed.(SD1)		12000 fish/Fed.(SD2)		14000 fish/Fed.(SD3)	
	10g/fish(FS1)	20g/fish(FS2)	10g/fish(FS1)	20g/fish(FS2)	10g/fish(FS1)	20g/fish(FS2)
Average initial body weight(g)	10.11b ± 1.12	20.32a ± 1.18	10.31b ± 1.12	20.33a ± 1.18	10.42b ± 1.12	20.14a ± 1.18
Average final body weight (g)	518.60b ± 1.36	688.53 <sup>a</sup> ± 1.36	510.36b ± 1.36	648.60a ± 1.36	470.12c ± 1.36	630.14a ± 1.36
Average weight gain (g)	508.49b ± 1.25	568.21b ± 1.25	500.05b ± 1.25	628.27a ± 1.25	459.70c ± 1.25	610.00a ± 1.25
Daily weight gain(g./day)	1.41d	1.85 <sup>a</sup>	1.38d	1.74 <sup>b</sup>	1.27e	1.69c
Specific growth rate (SGR, %/d)	1.09 <sup>a</sup>	0.93 <sup>d</sup>	1.08 <sup>a</sup>	0.96 <sup>c</sup>	1.05 <sup>b</sup>	0.95 <sup>c</sup>
Average feed intake (g)	803.41c	909.136 <sup>b</sup>	810.08 <sup>c</sup>	973.81 <sup>b</sup>	878.02b	1281.00 <sup>a</sup>
Feed conversion ratio (FCR)	1.58b	1.60 <sup>c</sup>	1.62 <sup>b</sup>	1.55 <sup>b</sup>	1.91 <sup>a</sup>	2.10 <sup>a</sup>
Survival%	95.00a	92.00 <sup>a</sup>	88.00 <sup>b</sup>	87.00 <sup>b</sup>	83.00 <sup>c</sup>	80.00 <sup>c</sup>
No. of fish per Fed.	9500	9200	10560	10440	11620	11200
Gross yield(kg) per Fed.	4926.7	6414.47	5389.40	6771.38	5462.79	7057.68
Net yield (kg) per Fed.	4831.7	6230.47	5283.8	6562.58	5346.59	6833.68
Price of one kg fish (L.E)	13.00	13.00	13.00	13.00	13.00	13.00
Price of net production (L.E)	62812.10	80996.11	68689.4	85313.54	69505.67	88837.84
Price of one kg feed (L.E)	5.214	5.28	5.34	5.115	6.30	6.93
Feed cost / net yield (L.E) per Fed.	25192.48	32896.88	28215.492	33567.59	33683.51	47357.40
Net return (L.E) per Fed.	37619.62	48099.23	40473.90	51745.95	35822.16	41480.344

Means with the same letter in the same row are not significantly different (P>0.05).