





www.naturalleva.it

Effect of fish oil replacement with algae oil on fillet quality: a new approach for a sustainable aquaculture.

Fabio Brambilla

Fish Nutritionist <u>fabio brambilla@naturalleva.it</u>

http://linkedin.com/in/fabio-brambilla-049b4363

Seafood and Consumer 4.0 Pordenone, 19/02/2020







VRM guarantee a complete control of the productive cycle, from fish feed production up to final fish product.

Through feeding program and experience in fish farming, VRM ensure high quality of fish, satisfying the consumer demands.









Shortening the natural food chain





BENEFIT

- Highest EPA and DHA concentrations (≈40% DHA, ≈10% EPA)
- No feed process modification
- Naturally pure
- Non-GMO product
- Reliable supply
- Stable high quality
- Flexibility in feed formulation (liquid product)
- Free from Ocean contaminants (e.g. dioxins, PCB's, mercury)





Effect of **TOTAL** fish oil replacement with algae oil on Sea bream (*S. aurata*) growth and fillet quality







natur Ileva Trial Design: Diets

INGREDIENTS (%)		PC	V1	NC	V2
Fish meal, wheat, wheat gluten, guar meal, soybean meal, corn gluten, pea, vitamins and minerals		83.3	83.3	83.3	83.3
Fish oil		13.79	-	2.10	-
	Algae oil	-	3.50	-	0.70
Camelina oil Rapeseed oil		-	4.20	3.22	5.60
		-	6.09	8.47	7.49
С	EPA	1.81	0.83	0.30	0.20
ori	DHA	<mark>1.56</mark>	<mark>1.54</mark>	<mark>0.36</mark>	<mark>0.40</mark>
The	Omega 3	4.33	4.44	2.83	3.45
	Omega 6	4.16	1.70	0.99	1.11





Omega 3 content (EPA+DHA) (g/100g feed)



naturalleva Trial Design: VRM Facility



Trial condition

- Sea bream (i.w. 60g)
- Feeding *ad libitum*
- 3 replicate for each diet
- 90 days of feeding
- Water T (°C): 20.0±2.8
- Oxygen (mg/L): 8.5±0.8



Protein	Fat	NFE	Ash	Fiber
43.0%	18.0%	22.0%	6.5%	2.0%

natur Ileva Trial Results: Growth performance



No difference in growth and conversion



	FCR	SGR
PC	1.43±0.05	0.73±0.02
V1	1.43 ± 0.04	0.74 ± 0.01
NC	1.44 ± 0.04	0.74 ± 0.02
V2	1.44 ± 0.04	0.74 ± 0.01

	Mortality (%)
PC	0.41±0.06
V1	0.42±0.03
NC	0.42±0.05
V2	0.42±0.06



EPA+DHA content in the flesh (the higher the better)

	Τ0	PC	V1	NC	V2
Total Fat g/100g	4.6	4.8	5.0	5.0	4.0
EPA+DHA (mg/100kcal edible protion)	371.5±39.9	665.3±113.5	470.5±85.3	293.0±49.2	224.6±46.1
EPA+DHA (mg/100g edible portion)	460.2±49.5	892.3±152.2	617.0 _{±111.8}	387.3 _{±65.5}	269.0±55.3
Nutritional Contribution (NC %) weekly	19.7 _{±2.1}	38.2 _{±6.5}	26.4±4.8	16.6±2.8	11.5±2.4
Weekly portion (EPA + DHA 3.5g/week WHO)	5.1±0.6	2.7±0.4	3.9±0.6	6.2±1.1	8.9±1.4
Weekly portion (EPA e DHA 1.75g/week EFSA e FAO 2010)	2.6±0.3	1.3±0.2	1.9±0.3	3.1±0.5	4.5±0.7

Different colours P<0.05 (ANOVA)





Different letters P<0.05 (ANOVA)

Trial Results: Panel Test



DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS:

- **Olfactory descriptors:** Overall odor, Typical fish odor and Freshness (Metadescrittore);
- **Texture descriptors:** Firmness, Fibrosity, Adhesiveness, Moisture and Greasiness;
- Taste/Flavor descriptors: Sweet, Bitter, Sour, Salty, Umami, Astringent, Overall Flavor and Typical fish flavor.









No difference in taste

ATTRIBUTES		S	ea brea	ım	STATISTICAL ANALYSIS		NALYSIS
		P/C	V1	V2			Sign Lovel (n.c.
		mean	mean	mean	Fisher (F value)	Pr> F (p≤0,05)	significant, *95%, **99%, ***99,9%)
cooked	Overall odor	6.0	5.7	6.1	1.4	0.25	n.s.
	Typical fish odor	6.3	6.1	6.2	0.94	0.39	n.s.
	Freshness	5.6	5.6	5.7	0.01	0.99	n.s.
	Firmness	4.3	4.2	4.2	0.25	0.78	n.s.
	Fibrosity	4.5	4.4	4.3	0.26	0.77	n.s.
	Adhesiveness	3.4	3.4	3.3	0.99	0.38	n.s.
	Moisture	4.3	4.3	4.4	1.02	0.36	n.s.
	Greasiness	3.7	3.7	3.5	0.24	0.79	n.s.
	Sweet	2.9	3.0	3.0	0.52	0.59	n.s.
	Salty	3.3	3.3	3.1	0.81	0.45	n.s.
	Sour	1.6	1.7	1.5	1.46	0.24	n.s.
	Bitter	2.0	2.1	2.0	0.22	0.81	n.s.
	Umami	2.6	2.7	2.8	0.66	0.52	n.s.
	Astringent	2.1	2.4	2.3	2	0.14	n.s.
	Overall Flavor	5.8	5.7	5.7	0.7	0.5	n.s.
	Typical fish flavor	6.1	5.9	6.2	1.3	0.28	n.s.
	Overall judgment	6.0	6.2	6.0	0.56	0.57	n.s.









Feed, Growth and Fish health

- **Lower variability** in the feed using algal oil
- Lower contaminants in the feed using algal oil
- No differences in **growth**
- No difference in **mortality**

 \bigcirc

Nutritional value of fish

e Chef

Organoleptics

- No difference in taste profile
- Fatty acid profile in the feed is reflected in the flesh
- Capacity to produce fish with some specific **EPA and DHA requirements**
- Lower contaminants in the fish using algal oil
- **Higher nutritional value** of the fillet in terms of heart/cardiovascular protection





Thanks for your attention!



