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## РНОТО

## $\mathrm{CtrI} \wedge Q U \wedge$

- Objective: To examine the effects of different photoperiod regimes on the quality and robustness of Atlantic salmon post-smolts raised to $1,000 \mathrm{~g}$, and to market size, in freshwater RAS
- There is significant industry interest in raising larger smolts (up to 1 kg ) in land-based freshwater RAS
- This new variation on smolt production is largely untested, and optimum environmental conditions need to be established to ensure salmon quality prior to sea cage transfer
- Photoperiod regimes need assessment for their influence on growth performance, maturation, smoltification, and immunocompetence.
PHASE I: TREATMENT SUMMARY




## PHOTO - PHASE I



GROWTH PERFORMANCE

|  | LDN |  | LD24:0 |  | LD12:12 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mature $\widehat{0}$ at $\sim 2 \mathrm{~kg}$ | 364 | (22.0\%) | 462 | (23.8\%) | 637 | (32.6\%) |
| Mature $q$ at $\sim \mathbf{2 k g}$ | 59 | (3.6\%) | 45 | (2.3\%) | 49 | (2.5\%) |
| Mature $\hat{0}$ at harvest | 168 | (10.2\%) | 56 | (2.9\%) | 115 | (5.9\%) |
| Mature $q$ at harvest | 194 | (11.7\%) | 107 | (5.5\%) | 287 | (14.7\%) |
| Mortalities, culls, and other fish removed | 145 | (8.8\%) | 230 | (11.9\%) | 194 | (9.9\%) |
| Premium salmon harvested | 724 | (43.8\%) | 1,039 | (53.6\%) | 670 | (34.3\%) |

MATURATION DURING GROWOUT

## Gill Enzyme Activity



PHOTO - PHASE II: examing the effects of photoperiod \&

## feeding rate



2x2 factorial study design incorporating:
(i) photoperiod (constant, i.e. LD24:0 vs. natural, i.e. LDN) and
(ii) feeding regime (full ration vs. 60\% ration)
from smolt to $1,000 \mathrm{~g}$ in freshwater aquaculture systems
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## $\operatorname{Ctrl} \wedge Q U \wedge$

Current status: Recent completion of 500 g sampling event (September 25, 2017)



Condition Factor (K)


## Performance

- Best growth performance in the full ration treatment groups
- Best condition factor in LD24:0 / full ration group
- Poor condition factor in 60\% ration groups
***No observable signs of maturation in any treatment group***
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## Welfare



Cataracts (Right Eye)


Cataract and fin damage scores (0-3; 3 = most severe) indicate:

- Generally worse cataracts in full ration groups (density?)
- No clear pattern in overall fin damage
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Incoming data: Gene expression (NKAa1a and 1b, NKCC, DIO2a); Plasma 11-KT; Brain DIO2b mRNA;
Pituitary gene expression (ROBUST); SIQ microarray to assess immunocompetence
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6-week artificial winter

8-week post-winter smoltification window
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## Gill Enzyme Activity
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Gill Enzyme Activity
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Gill Enzyme Activity


## PHOTO - PHASE II: examing the effects of photoperiod \& feeding rate

## $\operatorname{Ctrl}$ ^QU^

## Next Steps:

- Mark salmon by treatment group and comingle in a single partial reuse system up to market size ( $\sim 4 \mathrm{~kg}$ )
- Additional tissues analyses for immunocompetence and maturation
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