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ABSTRACT

This study evaluated the effects of different processed brown seaweed on the growth, nonspecific immune responses, and resistance to *Vibrio alginolyticus* of white shrimp (*Litopenaeus vannamei*). A basal diet was supplemented with 0.25 and 0.5 g kg⁻¹ of a seaweed hot-water extract (HWE), 2.5 g kg⁻¹ of a heat-treated seaweed meal (HSM), and an untreated seaweed meal (USM). A basal diet without seaweed product supplementation served as the control. In total, five experimental diets were each fed to triplicate groups of white shrimp (initial wt: 5.58 ± 0.03 g) in an indoor static rearing system for 16 wks. After the 16-wk feeding trial, the shrimp were challenged with the pathogen *V. alginolyticus*. Weight gain and feed efficiency were higher (P < 0.05) in shrimp that were fed diets containing 0.25 and 0.5 g kg⁻¹ of the HWE and HSM than in shrimp that were fed other diets. Shrimp that were fed the HSM diet showed higher phenoloxidase activity than did shrimp that were fed the diets with 0.25 g kg⁻¹ of the HWE and USM and the control diet. Superoxide anion production was higher in shrimp that were fed the HSM diet than in shrimp that were fed the control diet. From 96 to 168 h after the *V. alginolyticus* challenge, the survival of shrimp that were fed the HSM diet was significantly higher than that of the shrimp that were fed other diets. The results indicate that the HSM can enhance the growth, nonspecific immune responses, and resistance to *V. alginolyticus* of white shrimp.

I. INTRODUCTION

White shrimp, *Litopenaeus vannamei*, is the most crucial cultured shrimp species in the world. The annual aquaculture production of white shrimp increased from 8,286 MT in 1980 to 3,314,447 MT in 2013 (FAO, 2015). However, commercial white shrimp farming has been severely hit by epidemics associated with viruses and *Vibrio* infections, which have caused serious economic losses worldwide. The emergence of new diseases caused by *Vibrio* spp., such as acute hepatopancreatic necrosis syndrome, is causing high mortalities in commercial crops and consequently large economic losses in cariniculture (da Silva et al., 2013).

Conventional strategies for disease control in pond culture rely on the use of antibiotics and chemical disinfectants. However, because of the induction of bacterial resistance and environment pollution, in recent years, the use of immunostimulants has been proposed as a potential method for activating protection against microbial infections in aquatic culture animals (Anderson, 1992; Sakai, 1999; Bricknell and Dalmo, 2005; Huynh et al., 2011).

Some polysaccharides isolated from brown and red seaweeds have shown antiviral activities against viruses responsible for fish and shrimp diseases (Cheng et al., 2004; Cheng et al., 2005; Hou and Chen, 2005; Yeh et al., 2006; Cheng et al., 2007; Fu et al., 2007; Siiriustananun et al., 2011). Among them, algal polysaccharides, such as carrageenan, alginates, fucoidan, and laminaran, have been discussed as prominent compounds (Cheng et al., 2005; Deachamag et al., 2006; Liu et al., 2006; Cheng et al., 2007; Kitikiew et al., 2013). Our previous study demonstrated that administering a hot-water extract (HWE) of brown seaweed, *Sargassum cristaefolium*, at 2 g kg⁻¹ to the shrimp diet induced immune modulation and enhanced the immune ability of *L. vannamei*, in addition to increasing its resistance to *V. alginolyticus* infection (Chang et al., 2013).
Table 1. Feed formulation and proximate composition of the experimental diets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ingredients (g kg⁻¹)</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>0.25 g/kg Hot-water seaweed extract</th>
<th>0.5 g/kg Hot-water seaweed extract</th>
<th>2.5 g/kg Heat-treated seaweed meal</th>
<th>2.5 g/kg Untreated seaweed meal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fish meal¹</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>α-starch¹</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squid cream¹</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defatted soybean meal¹</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrimp shell meal¹</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cellulose¹</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hot-water seaweed extract (HWE)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heat-treated seaweed meal (HSM)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untreated seaweed meal (USM)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mineral mixture²</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitamin mixture²</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proximate composition (g kg⁻¹)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Moisture</th>
<th>Crude protein</th>
<th>Ether extract</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25 g/kg Hot-water seaweed extract</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5 g/kg Hot-water seaweed extract</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 g/kg Heat-treated seaweed meal</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 g/kg Untreated seaweed meal</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Fish meal, Pesquera Diamante, Peru; α-starch, Trust River Trading Co., Ltd., Taiwan; squid cream, Power Omega, Korea; defatted soybean meal, TTET Union, Taiwan; and shrimp shell meal, Shye Yih Feeding Co., Taiwan; cellulose, Sigma Chemical, USA.

² Mineral and vitamin mixtures were provided by Shinta Feed Company, Pingtung, Taiwan.

Notably, the extraction of seaweeds is associated with increased costs such as the costs associated with the electricity used for heating and drying. Cost reduction for feed ingredients is a critical issue for the shrimp industry. Simplifying seaweed processing is meaningful as an incentive for the shrimp feed industry.

*S. cristaefolium* is distributed extensively along the coasts of the South China Sea and Taiwan. However, little information is available concerning its biological activity. Therefore, this study evaluated the effects of dietary heat-processed brown seaweed (*S. cristaefolium*) on the growth of *L. vannamei* and its immune responses and resistance to *V. alginolyticus*.

II. MATERIALS AND METHODS

1. Processing of *S. cristaefolium*

*S. cristaefolium* was obtained from Pingtung, Taiwan. Fresh samples were thoroughly washed with tap water, rinsed twice with distilled water to remove other suspended particles, and then air dried in an oven at 50°C. The dried seaweed was frozen in liquid nitrogen and ground to a powder (serving as an untreated seaweed meal [USM]). The seaweed meal was boiled in hot water (4.0 g in 100 mL distilled water at 100°C) for 10 min. It was lyophilized using a freeze dryer (Eyela, FDU-1100, Tokyo, Japan). Three varieties of the seaweed products, namely the USM, HSM, and HWE, were stored at -20°C until use.

2. Diet Preparation

The diet formulation and proximate composition (AOAC, 1995) are shown in Table 1. A basal diet was supplemented with 0.25 and 0.5 g kg⁻¹ of the HWE and 2.5 g kg⁻¹ of the HSM and USM. A basal diet without seaweed product supplementation served as the control. The ingredients of the experimental diet were mixed, after which cold water was added to the mixture; subsequently, the mixture was further mixed until a stiff dough resulted. The dough was then passed through a mincer with die, and the resulting strands were dried using an electrical fan at 20°C. After drying, the strands were broken down, sieved into pellets (2.0 mm in diameter), and stored at -20°C until use.

3. Experimental Procedure

White shrimp, *L. vannamei*, obtained from brackish water (20%-23‰) ponds at the Department of Aquaculture, National Pingtung University of Science and Technology, were acclimated to room temperature (27°C ± 1°C) and a salinity of 20% in an indoor cement pond (6 × 2 × 1.5 m) for 2 wks before experimentation. During the acclimation period, shrimp were fed the control diet twice daily, and 50% of the water was changed weekly to maintain water quality. Only shrimp in the intermolt stage (stage C) were used for the subsequent tests. The molt
stage was determined by the examination of the uropoda in which partial retraction of the epidermis could be distinguished (Robertson et al., 1987). At the beginning of the experiment, 15 fiber-reinforced plastic tanks (500 L) were each stocked with 40 shrimp with an average weight of 5.58 ± 0.03 g. Each experimental diet was fed to three groups of shrimp. Each tank received continuous aeration. In each tank, waste from uneaten feed and fecal pellets were removed through siphoning every day; 10% of the water was changed every day to maintain water quality. During the experiments, the water temperature was maintained at 27°C ± 1°C, pH at 7.8-8.2, and salinity at 20‰. Shrimp were fed their respective diets at a rate of 30 g kg⁻¹ body weight per day. This daily ration was subdivided into two equally sized feedings provided at 0900 and 1600 h. Shrimp were weighed every two weeks, and the daily ration was adjusted accordingly (3% body weight). The duration of the study was 16 wks.

At the end of the feeding trial, the shrimp were weighed. The percentages of body weight gain (WG) in each aquarium [100 × (final body weight − initial body weight)/initial body weight], feed efficiency (FE) [(final body weight − initial body weight)/feed intake], and survival [100 × (final shrimp number/initial shrimp number)] were calculated.

4. Susceptibility of Shrimp to *V. alginolyticus*

A known pathogenic strain, *V. alginolyticus*, isolated from diseased *L. vannamei*, which displayed symptoms of anorexia, inactivity, poor growth, and necrotic musculature, was used for the study. The pathogen was cultured according to the method described by Chang et al. (2013).

Challenge trials were conducted on shrimp following the 16-wk feeding trial by injecting them with 20 μL of a bacterial suspension (1.0 × 10⁸ cfu mL⁻¹); thus, each shrimp received an injection of 1.0 × 10⁵ cfu into the ventral sinus of the cephalothorax. Moreover, 10 shrimp were randomly collected from the control group and then injected with 20 μL saline as the unchallenged control. Experimental shrimp (10 shrimp in each aquarium) were kept in 60-L glass aquaria containing 40 L of water at 20°C and 27°C ± 1°C. Each test involved three treatments. In addition, 20% of the water was renewed daily, and the experiment lasted 168 h. Shrimp were fed twice daily with the experimental diets after challenge.

5. Immune Parameters of the Shrimp

After the shrimp were fed different diets, their immune parameters were determined. Hemolymph (100 μL) was withdrawn from the ventral sinus of each shrimp into a 1-mL sterile syringe (25-gauge) containing 0.9 mL anticoagulant solution (30 mM trisodium citrate, 0.34 M sodium chloride, and 10 mM EDTA, at a pH of 7.55 and with the osmolality adjusted with glucose to 780 mOsm kg⁻¹). They were divided into two parts. A drop of the anticoagulant-hemolymph mixture (100 μL) was placed on a hemocytometer to measure the total hemocyte count by using an inverted phasecontrast microscope (Leica DMIL, Leica Microsystems, Wetzlar, Germany). The remainder of the hemolymph mixture was used for subsequent tests. Hemocyte phenoloxidase (PO) activity was measured spectrophotometrically by recording the formation of dopachrome, according to the procedures of a previous study (Herńandez-López et al., 1996). L-3,4-dihydroxy-phenylalanine and trypsin served as a substrate and an elicitor, respectively. The details of the measurement were described previously (Liu and Chen, 2004). The optical density of the shrimp PO activity is expressed as dopachrome formation in 50 μL of hemolymph.

The respiratory bursts of the hemocytes were quantified using the reduction of nitroblue tetrazolium (NBT) to formazan as a measure of superoxide anion (O₂⁻) formation. The optical density at 630 nm was measured using a microplate reader (Model VERSAmax, Molecular Devices, Sunnyvale, CA, USA). The quantified respiratory bursts are expressed as NBT-reduction per 10 μL of hemolymph. Moreover, hemocyte superoxide dismutase (SOD) activity was measured by its ability to inhibit superoxide radical-dependent reactions by using the Ransod kit (Randox, Crumlin, UK) on the basis of the methods described in the instructions. Total protein was quantified using a Bio-Rad Protein Assay Kit (no. 500-0006, Bio-Rad Laboratories, USA) with bovine serum albumin (Sigma Chemical, USA) as a standard.

For the phagocytic activity and clearance efficiency tests, 20 μL of a bacterial suspension (1 × 10⁶ cfu mL⁻¹), resulting in 2 × 10⁵ cfu shrimp⁻¹, was injected into the ventral sinus of two shrimp from each treatment. After injection, the shrimp were kept for 3 h in separate tanks containing 40 L of seawater (20%) at 27°C ± 1°C. Subsequently, 200 μL of hemolymph was collected from the ventral sinus and mixed with 200 μL of sterile anticoagulant. This mixture was divided into two equal subsamples: one to measure phagocytic activity and the other to measure clearance efficiency. The methods for the measurements of phagocytic activity and clearance efficiency were described previously (Liu and Chen, 2004). Two hundred hemocytes were counted. Phagocytic activity, defined as the phagocytic rate (PR), can be expressed as follows:

\[ \text{PR} = \left( \frac{\text{phagocytic hemocytes}}{\text{total hemocytes}} \right) \times 100 \]

The clearance efficiency, defined as percentage inhibition (PI) of *V. alginolyticus*, can be calculated as follows:

\[ \text{PI} = 100 - \left( \frac{\text{cfu in the test group}}{\text{cfu in the control group}} \right) \times 100 \]

6. Statistical Analysis

Each experimental diet was fed to the three shrimp groups in accordance with a completely randomized design. The results were analyzed through one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). When the ANOVA identified differences among the groups, multiple comparisons were performed among the means by using the Student-Newman-Keuls test. Statistical significance was determined by setting the aggregate type I error at \( P < 0.05 \).
III. RESULTS

The final weight, WG, and FE were higher \((P < 0.05)\) in shrimp that were fed diets containing 0.25, 0.5 g kg\(^{-1}\) of the HWE and HSM than in shrimp that were fed other diets (Table 2). Moreover, survival outcomes did not differ among the treatments \((P > 0.05)\).

Shrimp that were fed the HSM diet exhibited higher PO activity than did shrimp that were fed diets containing 0.25 g kg\(^{-1}\) of the HWE and USM and the control diet (Table 3). Superoxide anion production was higher in shrimp that were fed the HSM diet than in shrimp that were fed the USM diet or the control diet. Hemolymph superoxide dismutase activity was higher in shrimp that were fed the HSM diet than in shrimp that were fed the USM diet or the control diet. Shrimp that were fed the HSM diet exhibited higher phagocytic activity and clearance efficiency than did shrimp that were fed other dietary treatments.

Table 2. Initial body weight, final body weight, weight gain, feed efficiency and survival of white shrimp fed different diets for 16 weeks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diet code</th>
<th>0.25 g kg(^{-1}) HWE(^1)</th>
<th>0.5 g kg(^{-1}) HWE</th>
<th>2.5 g kg(^{-1}) HSM</th>
<th>2.5 g kg(^{-1}) USM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial body weight (g/shrimp)</td>
<td>5.66 ± 0.06</td>
<td>5.58 ± 0.02</td>
<td>5.50 ± 0.09</td>
<td>5.56 ± 0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final body weight (g/shrimp)</td>
<td>10.58 ± 0.23(^a)</td>
<td>12.05 ± 0.37(^b)</td>
<td>11.85 ± 0.15(^b)</td>
<td>11.82 ± 0.56(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight gain (g)</td>
<td>4.92 ± 0.26(^a)</td>
<td>6.47 ± 0.39(^b)</td>
<td>6.35 ± 0.19(^b)</td>
<td>6.27 ± 0.49(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FE</td>
<td>0.56 ± 0.04(^a)</td>
<td>0.80 ± 0.01(^b)</td>
<td>0.75 ± 0.02(^b)</td>
<td>0.78 ± 0.01(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survival</td>
<td>71.4 ± 2.9</td>
<td>70.5 ± 1.6</td>
<td>71.4 ± 2.9</td>
<td>72.4 ± 4.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data in the same column with different letters are significantly \((p < 0.05)\) among different treatments. Values are means ± S.E. from three groups of shrimp fed on a same experimental diet \((n = 3\text{ tanks})\).

\(^1\) HWE: hot water extract of seaweed meal; HSM: heat-treated seaweed meal; USM: untreated seaweed meal.

Table 3. Hemolytic phenoloxidase (PO), superoxide anion \((O_2^-)\) production, superoxide dismutase (SOD), phagocytic activity and clearance efficiency of white shrimp fed different diets for 16 weeks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diet code</th>
<th>0.25 g kg(^{-1}) HWE(^1)</th>
<th>0.5 g kg(^{-1}) HWE</th>
<th>2.5 g kg(^{-1}) HSM</th>
<th>2.5 g kg(^{-1}) USM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PO (O.D. 490 nm per 10(^7) cell)</td>
<td>0.78 ± 0.47(^a)</td>
<td>0.81 ± 0.33(^a)</td>
<td>1.06 ± 0.86(^a)</td>
<td>1.89 ± 0.62(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O_2^- production (per 10(^7) cell)</td>
<td>1.96 ± 0.34(^a)</td>
<td>2.11 ± 0.73(^a)</td>
<td>2.25 ± 0.25(^a)</td>
<td>2.70 ± 0.32(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOD (unit mg(^{-1}) protein)</td>
<td>2.28 ± 0.80(^a)</td>
<td>3.18 ± 0.37(^a)</td>
<td>3.00 ± 0.26(^a)</td>
<td>4.79 ± 0.82(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phagocytic activity (%)</td>
<td>8.72 ± 1.70(^a)</td>
<td>12.17 ± 3.00(^b)</td>
<td>11.56 ± 1.50(^b)</td>
<td>21.11 ± 3.30(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearance efficiency (%)</td>
<td>0.00 ± 0.00(^a)</td>
<td>-1.95 ± 1.57(^a)</td>
<td>7.80 ± 5.76(^b)</td>
<td>40.98 ± 9.68(^b)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data in the same column with different letters are significantly \((p < 0.05)\) among different treatments. Values are means ± S.E. from three groups of shrimp fed on a same experimental diet \((n = 3\text{ tanks})\).

\(^1\) HWE: hot water extract of seaweed meal; HSM: heat-treated seaweed meal; USM: untreated seaweed meal.

Table 4. Effects of dietary different treated Sargassum cristaefolium administrations on the survival of shrimp Litopenaeus vannamei challenged with Vibrio alginolyticus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bacterial dose (CFU/shrimp)</th>
<th>Treatments</th>
<th>Survival (%)</th>
<th>time after challenge (h)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saline</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 × 10^6</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>63.7 ± 3.3(^a)</td>
<td>43.3 ± 3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 × 10^6</td>
<td>0.25 g kg(^{-1}) HWE(^1)</td>
<td>66.7 ± 3.3(^b)</td>
<td>50.0 ± 3.3(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 × 10^6</td>
<td>0.5 g kg(^{-1}) HWE</td>
<td>76.7 ± 3.3(^b)</td>
<td>56.7 ± 6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 × 10^6</td>
<td>2.5 g kg(^{-1}) HSM</td>
<td>80.0 ± 0.0(^b)</td>
<td>66.7 ± 6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 × 10^6</td>
<td>2.5 g kg(^{-1}) USM</td>
<td>66.7 ± 3.3(^b)</td>
<td>43.3 ± 3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data in the same column with different letters are significantly \((p < 0.05)\) among different treatments. Values are means ± S.E. from three groups of shrimp fed on a same experimental diet \((n = 3\text{ tanks})\).

\(^1\) HWE: hot water extract of seaweed meal; HSM: heat-treated seaweed meal; USM: untreated seaweed meal.
By contrast, mortalities were recorded after 24 h for the challenged shrimp in all experimental groups. From 96 to 168 h after challenging, the survival of shrimp that were fed the HSM diet was significantly higher than that of the shrimp that were fed other diets.

IV. DISCUSSION

This study determined that supplementing heat-processed seaweed meals (both the HSM and HWE) in diets improved the growth performance of white shrimp, compared with the USM. This clearly demonstrates that subjecting the seaweed meal to the heat process may release some active compounds associated with shrimp growth. Seaweed is typically considered a natural food for shrimp (Lombardi et al., 2006). Shrimp may be able to use the released nutrients from seaweed for growth. However, this differs from results derived from observations of land animals. For example, Gardiner et al. (2008) and Turner et al. (2002) have reported growth depression in pigs that were fed diets with seaweed extracts. This phenomenon might be due to the presence of phenolic acids, chelated minerals, or indigestible polysaccharides. Moreover, in crustaceans, the activities of carbohydrates such as alginase, agarase, inulinase, and xylanase have not been demonstrated (Vonk and Western, 1984). This suggests that nutrients such as proteins, lipids, or some unknown growth factors benefit shrimp growth.

The growth performance levels of white shrimp that were fed the HSM showed a similar trend regarding immune responses and disease resistance (Tables 2-4). Karunasagar et al. (1994) and Song and Sung (1990) have demonstrated the benefits of growth enhancement in immunostimulated shrimp larvae and juveniles. Azad et al. (2005) attributed the growth enhancement effects of dietary seaweed product to the efficient nutrient digestion and assimilation caused by the activation of fixed phagocytes in the hepatopancreas that secrete hydrolytic enzyme in the digestive gland. This may explain why the shrimp that were fed the HSM diet exhibited the best growth performance. However, the HWE seaweed did not engender the same immunostimulant effect for white shrimp during the 16-wk feeding period. Some water-insoluble compounds, such as lipids, aromatic chemicals, ketenes, or carotenoids, were identified in seaweed (Peinadoa et al., 2014). After hot-water extraction, crude protein and lipids decreased from 5.94% and 1.25% to 2.05% and 0.80%, respectively (data not shown) in our study. This suggests that some nutrients were lost during the extraction procedure. However, the compositions of the lost nutrients were not identified. Further research regarding the composition of the lost nutrients is therefore necessary.

Our previous study demonstrated that a brown seaweed (S. cristaeolium) HWE can enhance immunity and resistance to white shrimp pathogens for a short-term (18-d) feeding period (Chang et al., 2013). However, in this long-term (16-wk) study, dietary HWE did not exhibit the same immunostimulant effect as that observed in the previous study. This might be due to the adaption to the immunostimulant by the shrimp over this long duration. However, the fact that the HSM retained the immunostimulant effect even for a 16-wk feeding period is remarkable. The reason for this phenomenon requires further investigation.

The five commonly used immune parameters, namely hemocytic PO, superoxide anion (O2-) production, SOD, phagocytic activity, and clearance efficiency, were used in this study as immune responses of white shrimp that were fed different processed seaweed products. Notably, circulating hemocytes play a central role in the immune response in crustaceans. Hemocytes are generally classified into three morphologically different cell types: hyaline cells, semigranular cells, and granular cells (Tsing et al., 1989). Hemocytes are involved in the production of melanin through the prophenoloxidase (proPO) system; melanin is stored and produced by both semigranular and granular cells (Johansson and Söderhäll, 1989). In addition, hyaline and semigranular cells are involved in phagocytosis (Walton and Smith, 1999; Giulianini et al., 2007). The elimination of phagocytized particles involves the generation of reactive oxygen intermediates (ROIs) such as O2-, hydrogen peroxidase (H2O2), hydroxyl radicals (OH-), and singlet oxygen (1O2). The process by which ROIs are produced is known as the respiratory burst, and it plays a major role in microbialidal activity (Muñoz et al., 2000; Rodríguez and Moullac, 2000). ROIs do not distinguish between self-tissues and microbes; therefore, they are capable of causing tissue injury if they enter the extracellular environment. The harmful effects of ROIs on the host itself are neutralized by antioxidant defense mechanisms, which include antioxidant molecules and enzymes such as SOD (Campa-Córdova et al., 2002). These immune parameters showed the best performance in the shrimp that were fed the HSM diet compared with other dietary treatments. Fish treated with immunostimulants show increased immune response parameters (Sakai, 1999). Several seaweed polysaccharides contain sulfate residues. The sulfated polysaccharides from the brown seaweeds Sargassum wightii and Halophila ovalis (Yuvaraj et al., 2013) and the red seaweeds Gracilaria cornea (Coura et al., 2015) and Caulerpa racemosa (Ribeiro et al., 2014) have been identified to demonstrate immunomodulatory activities.

The shrimp that were fed the HSM diet exhibited increased resistance to the pathogen V. alginolyticus. These results are in agreement with those of previous studies. A study reported that the injection of HWEs from Sargassum duplicatum (brown seaweed) and Gracilaria tenuistipitata (red seaweed) increased the survival of L. vannamei after V. alginolyticus infection (Hou and Chen, 2005). Moreover, oral administration of fucoidan, a polysaccharide extracted from brown seaweeds, has been reported to reduce the impact of white spot syndrome virus in L. vannamei (Cruz-Suárez et al., 2007), Penaeus monodon (Chotigwe et al., 2004), and Marsupenaeus japonicus (Takahashi et al., 1998). Sodium alginate derived from Macrocystis pyrifera and administered orally and by injection has also been reported to increase the resistance of L. vannamei to V. alginolyticus infection (Cheng et al., 2004; Cheng et al., 2005). Litopenaeus indicus juveniles reared in water inoculated with...
V. parahaemolyticus and fed with Artemia enriched with butanol crude extracts from Ulva lactuca and S. wightii showed increased survival rates (Immanuel et al., 2004). In addition, a polysaccharide from S. fusiforme was reported to increase the resistance of Fenneropenaeus chinensis against V. harveyi when administered into the feed (Huang et al., 2006). The use of different compounds derived from seaweeds for increasing immune responses or disease resistance in shrimp is considered an alternative to the prophylactic use of chemicals.

In conclusion, the results indicate that both HWE and HSM diet supplementation can enhance the growth performance of white shrimp. The HSM, but not the HWE, can improve nonspecific immune responses and resistance to V. alginolyticus of the shrimp. Therefore, 2.5 g kg⁻¹ of the HSM is recommended for use in white shrimp diet to enhance growth, nonspecific immune responses, and resistance to V. alginolyticus.
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