



# Physical properties of extruded fish feed with inclusion of different plant (legumes, oilseeds, or cereals) meals

Olav Fjeld Kraugerud<sup>a,\*</sup>, Håvard Y. Jørgensen<sup>b</sup>, Birger Svihus<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Aquaculture Protein Centre, CoE, Department of Animal and Aquacultural Sciences, Norwegian University of Life Sciences, P.O. Box 5003, N-1432 Ås, Norway

<sup>b</sup> BioMar AS, N-7484 Trondheim, Norway

## ARTICLE INFO

### Article history:

Received 14 April 2008

Received in revised form

24 November 2010

Accepted 24 November 2010

### Keywords:

Extrusion

Specific mechanical energy

Non-starch polysaccharides

Plant meal

Sunflower

Rapeseed

Field pea

Faba bean

## ABSTRACT

A study was undertaken to evaluate the effect of various ingredients on the physical quality of fish feeds. Eleven fish meal-based diets, formulated to have the same levels of macronutrients, differing in either starch or protein source, were processed in a five section twin-screw extruder. The purified starch, added to reach the nutritional specifications of the diets, was significantly correlated to expansion ( $r = 0.405$ ,  $P < 0.001$ ), durability ( $r = 0.276$ ,  $P = 0.012$ ), and hardness ( $r = 0.494$ ,  $P < 0.001$ ), while such correlations were not seen for the total starch level in the diets. Cellulose, added as filler to reach the same level of NSP in the diets, was negatively correlated to the expansion ( $r = -0.603$ ,  $P < 0.001$ ). The specific mechanical energy of the extrusion process was weakly correlated to starch gelatinisation ( $r = 0.220$ ,  $P < 0.019$ ). The present study showed that traditional parameters and classifications such as chemical composition of plant ingredients are inadequate indicators of processing effects when used in fish diets. The overall conclusion is that processing parameters needed to achieve the desired physical properties of diets, should be based on specific knowledge of each ingredient in the feed.

© 2010 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

## 1. Introduction

The use of plant meals in feed for carnivorous fish has increased in recent years (Carter and Hauler, 2000; Aslaksen et al., 2007). Most studies have focused on the nutritional properties (Francis et al., 2001; Drew et al., 2007; Gatlin et al., 2007; Glencross et al., 2007), but effects on physical quality of feed have also been reported (Baeverfjord et al., 2006; Glencross et al., 2010). In food science, the nutritional and physical properties of extruded or cooked plant meals have been studied by a number of authors (Parmer et al., 2004; Rocha-Guzmán et al., 2006; González-Pérez and Vereijken, 2007; Hernandez-Diaz et al., 2007).

When attempting to reduce the fish meal levels in fish feed, both typical high-protein meals and combined starch–protein sources should be considered. It is known that globular proteins in plant meals may have a structuring capacity (Areas, 1992; Li and Lee, 1996). The NSP fraction present in plants may result in less expansion (Ainsworth et al., 2007) which is important for how much lipid can be added through the coating process and the sinking velocity of the pellet (Sørensen et al., 2010). NSP might also contribute to harder pellets, which is crucial to ensure that the pellets are not being crushed during handling before it is being distributed to the fish. Legume starch is known to be harder to gelatinise, than cereal starch (Singh et al.,

**Abbreviations:** DG, degree of gelatinisation; DM, dry matter; DSC, differential scanning calorimetry; NSP, non-starch polysaccharides; st.dev., standard deviation; SME, specific mechanical energy; WAI, water absorption index.

\* Corresponding author. Tel.: +47 6496 5121; fax: +47 6496 5101.

E-mail addresses: [olav.kraugerud@umb.no](mailto:olav.kraugerud@umb.no), [olav.kraugerud@gmail.com](mailto:olav.kraugerud@gmail.com) (O.F. Kraugerud).

**Table 1**

Formulation and chemical composition of the diets (g/kg).

| Diet                           | Control  | Protein-rich plant ingredients <sup>a</sup> |          |           |          |          | Starch-rich plant ingredients <sup>a</sup> |            |               |          |          |
|--------------------------------|----------|---|----------|-----------|----------|----------|--|------------|---------------|----------|----------|
|                                |          | Corn gluten                                 | Soybean  | Sunflower | Lupin    | Rapeseed | Pea  | Whole bean | Dehulled bean | Wheat    | Oat      |
| Macro ingredients              |          |   |          |           |          |          |  |            |               |          |          |
| Fish meal                      | 712      | 481   | 532      | 539       | 529      | 582      | 631  | 603        | 614           | 669      | 666      |
| Plant ingredient               |          | 278   | 283      | 313       | 326      | 250      | 247  | 301        | 256           | 196      | 196      |
| Wheat starch                   | 128      | 85  | 106      | 128       | 126      | 120      |  |            |               |          |          |
| Cellulose                      | 149      | 132   | 62       |           |          | 30       | 107  | 79         | 114           | 121      | 126      |
| Micro ingredients <sup>b</sup> | 11.62    | 23.37                                       | 18.02    | 19.89     | 19.94    | 17.95    | 15.20                                      | 16.61      | 16.39         | 13.10    | 12.96    |
| Chemical composition           |          |   |          |           |          |          |  |            |               |          |          |
| DM                             | 964      | 960   | 937      | 930       | 944      | 959      | 951  | 946        | 945           | 938      | 944      |
| In DM                          |          |   |          |           |          |          |  |            |               |          |          |
| Crude protein                  | 519      | 551   | 576      | 567       | 566      | 542      | 541  | 547        | 558           | 530      | 521      |
| Starch                         | 147      | 127   | 112      | 121       | 133      | 149      | 122  | 112        | 133           | 125      | 119      |
| Dietary fibre                  | 167      | 173   | 148      | 132       | 129      | 134      | 162  | 173        | 140           | 168      | 181      |
| Lipid                          | 49       | 51  | 40       | 45        | 56       | 50       | 53   | 47         | 47            | 56       | 60       |
| Ash                            | 118      | 98  | 123      | 134       | 116      | 12       | 121  | 122        | 123           | 120      | 120      |
| Org. matter                    | 882      | 902   | 877      | 866       | 884      | 874      | 879  | 878        | 877           | 880      | 880      |
| Gelatinisation                 |          |   |          |           |          |          |  |            |               |          |          |
| $T_f$ (°C) <sup>c</sup>        | 71 ± 0.4 | 70 ± 0.6                                    | 71 ± 0.6 | 69 ± 1    | 72 ± 0.4 | 72 ± 0.6 | 72 ± 0.4                                   | 74 ± 0.6   | 75 ± 0.3      | 74 ± 0.4 | 70 ± 0.5 |
| $\Delta T$ (°C) <sup>d</sup>   | 11 ± 1.5 | 9 ± 1.4                                     | 11 ± 2.2 | 13 ± 0.9  | 14 ± 2.1 | 15 ± 0.1 | 14 ± 2.1                                   | 18 ± 2.6   | 18 ± 1.2      | 13 ± 0.3 | 12 ± 4.1 |

<sup>a</sup> See Table 2 for details on macro ingredients.<sup>b</sup> Vitamin and mineral premix, monocalciumphosphate and yttrium oxide. See Aslaksen et al. (2007) for details.<sup>c</sup>  $T_p$  shows the peak temperature of gelatinisation ± standard deviation.<sup>d</sup>  $\Delta T$  shows the temperature interval of gelatinisation ± standard deviation, calculated by subtracting onset temperature of gelatinisation ( $T_i$ ) from final temperature of gelatinisation ( $T_f$ ).  $T_i$  and  $T_f$  are not shown.

2003; Betancur-Ancona et al., 2004). This may be due to different starch microstructure and other components associated with the starch granule (Gallant et al., 1992; Tester et al., 2004). Thus, NSP may protect starch from gelatinisation (Brennan and Samyue, 2004; Tester et al., 2004).

The extrusion process is composed of both adjustable and non-adjustable variables, and may be characterized as a multiple-input, multiple-output system (Cayot et al., 1995; Nabar and Narayan, 2006; Lee et al., 2009). There are numerous ways to describe the extrusion process (Ganjyal et al., 2006). In the present study, we have used the terms operating variables and process variables, as described by Lu et al. (1992). The adjustable operating variables include retention time in the conditioner, screw speed, feed moisture content, and throughput (Lu et al., 1992). The process variables include observable parameters such as barrel and product temperatures in conditioner and extruder, torque, SME, and die pressure. The parameters temperature, pressure, moisture, and shear are regularly utilised in the studies of physicochemical changes of nutrients under extrusion processing (Akdogan, 1999; Douzals et al., 2001; Singh et al., 2007).

The overall aim of this study was to investigate the effect of plant ingredients on physical quality of extruded fish feed as assessed by a set of physicochemical measurements. The plant meals used were chosen among ingredients with nutritional profiles, suitable for use in fish feeds, and with a low degree of up-front processing (Aslaksen et al., 2007).

## 2. Materials and methods

### 2.1. Feed ingredients and production

Eleven diets were extruded (Table 1): a control diet with fish meal as the single protein source and ten diets containing a protein-rich or starch-rich plant ingredient, partly replacing fish meal and/or wheat starch. The chemical composition of the experimental ingredients is shown in Table 2. Diets with starch-rich plant ingredients were formulated, so that the plant ingredient provided all starch in the diet. The protein-rich plant ingredients were included at a level to replace ~200 g/kg of the crude protein from high-quality fish meal. The extruded diets were formulated to contain equal amounts of crude protein, starch, and total dietary fibre by balancing the diets with purified wheat starch (Raisio Plc, Raisio, Finland) and/or cellulose (commercial cellulose MN 100, Macherey-Nagel GmbH & Co. KG, Düren, Germany). Balancing of the diets with starch and cellulose was done using values for starch and NSP in the different ingredients reported by Bach Knudsen (1997). However, the chemical analysis showed that an unintended variation in the level of dietary fibre and starch occurred (Table 1).

The diets were made at Center for Feed Technology, Norwegian University of Life Sciences, Ås, Norway. Dry ingredients were mixed in a Dinnissen twin shaft mixer (Pegasus Menger 400 l, Sevenum, Holland) and milled in a Münch hammer mill (HM 21.115, Wuppertal, Germany) with a 1-mm screen. Then the diets were preconditioned in a double conditioner (BCTC 10, Bühler, Uzwil, Switzerland), extruded with a throughput of 200 kg/h in a co-rotating twin-screw extruder (Bühler BCTG 62/20 D, 5 sections, length/diameter = 20,  $T = 105$ – $130$  °C in 3rd section, 4 mm die), and subsequently dried in a batch dryer (70–90 °C, 40 min). Extruder parameters are shown in Tables 3–5.

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/8492887>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/8492887>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)