



THE UNIVERSITY
of ADELAIDE

Predictive modelling and experimental studies on taste-taint as
geosmin (GSM) and 2-methylisoborneol (MIB) in
farmed barramundi (*Lates calcarifer*)

by

Priyantha Indrajith Hathurusingha Arachchige

Thesis submitted for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

in

School of Chemical Engineering
The University of Adelaide

October 2015

DECLARATION

I certify that this work contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in my name, in any university or other tertiary institution and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference has made in the text. In addition, I certify that no part of this work will, in the future, be used in a submission in my name for any other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution without the prior approval of the University of Adelaide and where applicable, any partner institution responsible for the joint-award of this degree.

I give consent to this copy of my thesis, when deposited in the University Library, being made available for loan and photocopying, subject to the provisions of the Copyright Act 1968.

I also give permission for the digital version of my thesis to be made available on the web, via the University’s digital research repository, the Library Search and also through web search engines, unless permission has been granted by the University to restrict access for a period of time.

Mr Priyantha Indrajith Hathurusingha Arachchige
Date

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Fish farming with Recirculating Aquaculture Systems (RAS) is becoming widespread to fill the demand gap due to diminishing wild caught sea foods. Barramundi fish has a high demand as a premium Australian seafood, and is grown as an RAS farmed-fish. However, the accumulation of ‘earthy’ or ‘muddy’ off-flavours due to taint accumulation as geosmin (**GSM**) or 2-methylisoborneol (**MIB**) in the fish-flesh of is a major concern. Inconsistent quality of farmed barramundi has been identified as a major issue in buyer resistance.

Established predictive models for chemical taint in fish-flesh have been based on steady-state assumptions. However, it was thought debatable as to whether a steady-state assumption could be upheld i.e. there was no evidence that the net chemicals exchange is zero across the fish body and RAS water phase.

Against this background, an original, new and quantitative model that predicts the time dependent concentration of taste-taint chemicals as **GSM** and **MIB** in harvested fish-flesh was developed ([Hathurusingha & Davey, 2013](#); [Hathurusingha & Davey, 2014](#); [Davey & Hathurusingha, 2014](#)). This model is based on conservation of mass and energy, and thermodynamic processes established in (bio)chemical engineering with chemical uptake and elimination routes into and from the fish considered.

The model was simulated for two RAS species, barramundi (*Lates calcarifer*) and rainbow trout (*Onchorhynchus mykiss*) with independent data ($n \geq 14$) and showed good agreement with experimental observations. A major benefit of this new model is that simulations can be used to investigate a range of growth protocols in RAS farming to minimize taint in fish-flesh. An advantage is that it can readily be simulated in standard spread-sheeting tools by users with a range of sophistication.

Extensive experimental testing of the new model was carried out in both pilot- and commercial-scale plants using low concentrations ($\leq 10 \text{ mg L}^{-1}$) of hydrogen peroxide (H_2O_2) as a benign biocide to limit natural occurring taste-taint chemicals in the RAS growth water, and subsequently into the fish-flesh. A dedicated methodology and new dosing apparatus (*ProMinent Fluid Control Pty Ltd*, Germany) for controlled H_2O_2 dosing was developed. The analyses of taste-taint chemicals as **GSM** and **MIB** in water and fish-flesh was carried out with Solid-Phase Micro-Extraction (SPME) followed by Gas Chromatography Mass spectroscopy (GC-MS) (skills training was obtained at both the University of Laval and University of Waterloo, Canada).

Preliminary investigations with a low concentration of H_2O_2 (5 mg L^{-1}) in pilot-scale (2,500 L) studies with barramundi fish demonstrated its potential to mitigate development of

GSM and **MIB** in RAS water. It was found that controlled dosing of low concentrations of H_2O_2 did not impact the pH level in growth waters and was not detrimental to the health and well-being of the fish as fingerlings (0.01 kg) and until harvest at 240 days (0.8 kg). Additional benefits of H_2O_2 as benign biocide include a fish product of whiter colour, an increased dissolved oxygen concentration (C_{OX}) in the growth water, a reduction in the number of gill flukes, and improved particles distribution with increased C:N ratio, and; improved availability of organic carbon in the growth water.

Based on these preliminary investigations H_2O_2 was 'optimised' at a (low) concentration of 2.5 mg L^{-1} as a benign biocide. This was investigated in commercial-scale studies (conducted at *Barra Fresh Farm*, South Australia) for a typical growth of 240 day for barramundi as the selected RAS fish.

The emerging risk methodology of Davey and co-workers (e.g. [Chandrakash et al., 2015](#)) was applied for the first time to investigate quantitatively the impact of naturally occurring fluctuations in taste-taint chemicals in the RAS water and their accumulation in the fish-flesh. This predictive approach was justified because of the prohibitively expensive time and analytical costs that experimental studies would have necessitated. A Refined Monte Carlo (with Latin Hypercube) simulation of **GSM** and **MIB** in the growth water (C_w), water temperature (T) and growth time (t) was used to simulate typical RAS farmed barramundi. It was found in RAS farming of barramundi it would be expected some 10.10 % of all 240 day harvests, averaged over the long term, would result in fish with taste-taint as **GSM** above the desired consumer rejection threshold concentration ($0.74 \mu\text{g kg}^{-1}$) due to natural fluctuations in an uncontrolled RAS environment. For **MIB** this predicted failure rate was 10.56 % ([Hathurusingha & Davey, 2016](#)). The vulnerability to taste-taint failure as **GSM** and **MIB** was shown to be principally controlled by the time to fish harvest, and to a lesser extent by concentration and fluctuation of these taint chemicals in the RAS water. This work was of practical benefit because growth time can be readily controlled by farmers. The methodology appears generalizable and therefore is applicable to a range of RAS farmed fish (and possible crustaceans e.g. prawns- *Macrobrachium sp.*).

In extensive commercial-scale RAS studies with barramundi and controlled H_2O_2 dosing, fish grown from fingerlings to harvest at 240 day was investigated. This was to observe an entire production cycle. Results from a H_2O_2 'treated' growth tank (30,000 L) were compared directly with those obtained from an identical 'control' tank (30,000 L). Increased organic matter (three (3) to four (4) times pilot-scale findings) reduced H_2O_2 efficacy through inhibiting generation of reactive oxygen species (ROSs). This is thought to be a consequence of the need to scale (48 times volume) the pilot-scale studies for in-tank mixing.

Analyses of fish-flesh ($n \geq 167$) showed (moderate) predicted exponential correlation between taste-taint concentrations in the fish-flesh and the growth-mass of the fish for both **GSM** and **MIB** as predicted. In addition, the research findings highlighted that accumulation of taste-taint compounds was mainly governed by the combined effect of mass of the fish (m_f) and taste-taint concentrations in the growth water (C_w).

Comparisons between the model predictions and experimental observations showed good agreement over the range of low taste-taint concentration (0 to 2, $\mu\text{g kg}^{-1}$), especially below the consumer rejection threshold ($\sim 0.7 \mu\text{g kg}^{-1}$). However, a minor anomaly was an over-prediction for greater concentrations (2 to 11, $\mu\text{g kg}^{-1}$). Current predictions are therefore conservative or 'safe' by about 20 %. Possible reasons for over prediction might be attributed to rapid fluctuation of taste-taint concentration in growth water with growth time and different (exponential) growth constants shown by larger and smaller fish, and; errors in obtaining representative samples from fish-flesh.

Model predictions and experiments further highlighted that the new model could be meaningfully applied to RAS systems with lower variations and/or lower taste-taint concentrations in RAS growth water.

These theoretical and experimental results are the first for RAS farmed fish covering an entire production period to harvest.

Approval for this research was gained from both *The University of Adelaide Animal Ethics Committee Science* and, *Australian Pesticides and Veterinary Medicines Authority* (see Appendices F and G).

Research findings will be of immediate benefit to RAS farmers, fish processors and risk analysts in foods processing.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I thank my principal supervisor Dr K R (Ken) Davey (FIChemE), School of Chemical Engineering for his patience, instructions, encouragement and time for guiding me throughout this research. I especially acknowledge his immense help and support in resolving various issues that arose. I thank my co-supervisor A/Prof. David Lewis (FIChemE), School of Chemical Engineering, and industry supervisor Ms Sue Poole for advice.

I thank Mr Steven Mawer, proprietor of *Southern Barramundi Farm*, South Australia, for the use of his RAS facility for the pilot-scale studies, and Mr and Mrs Adrian Mathews proprietors of *Barra Fresh Farm*, South Australia, for use of their RAS facility for the commercial-scale studies.

I acknowledge gratefully the Cooperative Research Centre (CRC) *Seafood Australia* (Grant 757/2012) for a scholarship and travel grants, and; Adelaide Graduate Research Scholarship (AGRS), The University of Adelaide. These permitted me to undertake training for analyses of taste-taint chemicals at the University of Laval Quebec, Canada, and practical applications of SPME technology at the University of Waterloo, Ontario, Canada. I would like to thank Prof. Grant Vandenberg and Prof. Janusz Pawliszyn, respectively of these Universities.

I am grateful to two companies: *ProMinent Fluid Control Pty Ltd*, Germany, and *Global Pumps Pty Ltd*, South Australia, for commissioning a special hydrogen peroxide (H₂O₂) dosing sensor. I wish to thank Dr Tony Hall, School of Earth and Environmental Sciences, The University of Adelaide for technical advice with GC/MS analyses. I am grateful to my research colleagues, especially, James Chu for help on the written work. Finally, I am indebted to my only brother Mr Indika Sanjeewa Hathurusingha for his encouragement and all-round support throughout the years when I was away from my home.

I hope that the results of my efforts justify the expectations and confidence of the people concerned, and the interest, help, and encouragement of my family, friends and colleagues.

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated my mother Mrs Kusumawathie Hathurusingha who passed away one year after starting my PhD research work. She was my inspiration in all my life and unfortunately she is not with us to see the success of my studies. I wish her attainment of supreme '*Nibbana*' according to the Buddhist philosophy.

PUBLICATIONS FROM THIS RESEARCH

REFEREED SCIENTIFIC JOURNALS

- Hathurusingha P.I., Davey K.R., 2016. Chemical taste-taint accumulation in RAS farmed fish - a *Fr 13* risk assessment demonstrated with geosmin (**GSM**) and 2-methylisoborneol (**MIB**) in barramundi (*Lates calcarifer*). Food Control 60, 309-319. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.foodcont.2015.08.014>
- Hathurusingha P.I., Davey, K.R., 2014. A predictive model for taste-taint accumulation in Recirculating Aquaculture Systems (RAS) farmed-fish – demonstrated with geosmin (**GSM**) and 2-methylisoborneol (**MIB**). Ecological Modelling 214, 242-249. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2014.08.009>

REFEREED CONFERENCE PROCEEDING(S)

- Davey, K.R., Hathurusingha, P.I., 2014. A new transient predictive model to quantify taint as either geosmin (**GSM**) and 2-methylisoborneol (**MIB**) in Rainbow Trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*) farmed in Recirculating Aquaculture Systems (RAS). In: Proc. 26th European Modeling and Simulation Symposium (EMSS), Bordeaux, France Sept. 10-12, pp. 490-497. ISBN 978-88-9799-38-6
- Hathurusingha, P.I., Davey, K.R., 2013. A new transient-state model for quantitative prediction of taint in farmed barramundi fish (*Lates calcarifer*). In: Proc. 34th International Conference on Marine Science & Aquaculture–ICMSA 2013, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, May 15-16, pp. 380-382. eISBN 2010-3778

MANUSCRIPTS TO BE SUBMITTED AND IN PREPARATION

- Hathurusingha, P.I., Davey, K.R., Vandenberg, G., 2015. Experimental validation of a time-dependent model for chemical taste-taint accumulation as geosmin (**GSM**) and 2-methylisoborneol (**MIB**) in RAS farmed barramundi (*Lates calcarifer*). Ecological Modelling - to be submitted.
- Hathurusingha, P.I., Davey, K.R., 2015. Evaluation of low concentration of H₂O₂ for controlling the levels of taste-taint compounds in RAS growth water and barramundi fish. Aquaculture - in preparation.
- Hathurusingha, P.I., Davey, K.R., 2015. Optimisation of sample preparation for manual SPME-GC-MS analysis of geosmin (**GSM**) and 2-methylisoborneol (**MIB**) in aquaculture water and barramundi fish-flesh. Journal of Chromatography A - in preparation.
- Hathurusingha, P.I., Davey, K.R., 2015. Modifying and validating the model for predicting the accumulation of geosmin (**GSM**) and 2-methylisoborneol (**MIB**) in RAS farmed barramundi (*Lates calcarifer*) with the von Bertalanffy growth function (VBGF). Ecological Modelling - in preparation.
- Hathurusingha, P.I., Davey, K.R., 2015. Modelling geosmin (**GSM**) and 2-methylisoborneol (**MIB**) accumulation in RAS farmed fish: A review. Ecological Modelling - in preparation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS	PAGE
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	vi
PUBLICATIONS FROM THIS RESEARCH	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	viii
LIST OF FIGURES	xiv
LIST OF TABLES	xxi
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW	4
2.1 Introduction	5
2.1.1 Taste-taint chemicals	6
2.1.2 Taste-taint causing microorganisms	7
2.1.3 Factors influencing taste-taint producing microorganisms and release of taint chemicals	8
2.1.4 Taste-taint problem in RAS farmed fish	10
2.1.5 Bio-concentration of GSM and MIB	11
2.1.6 Taste-taint threshold	12
2.1.7 Taste-taint control methods	13
2.1.8 Recent developments and implications	16
2.1.9 Hydrogen peroxide (H ₂ O ₂) as a potential biocide	16
2.1.10 Chemistry of H ₂ O ₂	17
2.1.11 Recirculating Aquaculture system (RAS)	18
2.2 Barramundi farming and modelling in RAS	19
2.2.1 Taste-taint problem in RAS farmed barramundi	21
2.2.2 Overview of predictive models for chemical congeners in fish-flesh	21
2.2.3 Chronological development of a model for chemical congeners in fish	22
2.3 Models for predicting GSM and MIB in fish-flesh	25
2.3.1 Inadequacies of existing models	26
2.3.2 Development and limitations of predictive models	28
2.3.3 Factors to be considered in developing an adequate model for RAS fish	28
2.3.4 Benefits of the model to the supply chain	29
2.3.5 Risk analysis and predictive models	29
2.4 Concluding remarks	30
CHAPTER 3 SYNTHESIS OF A NEW TIME-DEPENDENT MODEL	32
3.1 Introduction	33
3.2 Synthesis of a new model	34
3.2.1 Background to the model synthesis	34

3.2.2	Uptake of GSM and MIB chemicals	34
3.2.3	Taint distribution in fish-flesh	34
3.2.4	Bio-transformation (metabolism)	35
3.2.5	Elimination of GSM and MIB taste-taint chemicals	35
3.2.6	Model synthesis	35
3.2.7	Rate constants k_1 , k_2 and k_g	37
3.2.8	Illustrative simulations for GSM in barramundi (<i>Lates calcarifer</i>) fish-flesh	39
3.3	Results	41
3.3.1	Predicted GSM taint in barramundi fish-flesh	41
3.4	Discussion	41
3.4.1	Impact of varying GSM in growth water (C_w) on accumulation in fish-flesh	44
3.4.2	Impact of varying water temperature (T) on taint accumulation in fish-flesh	45
3.4.3	Generalized model and simulations for rainbow trout (<i>Onchorhynchus mykiss</i>)	46
3.4.4	Model validation with independent data	47
3.4.5	Applying the model to investigate RAS growth protocols on accumulated taint	49
3.4.6	The model for fish with S-curve growth	49
3.4.7	Benefits of the model to the supply chain	50
3.5	Concluding remarks	50
CHAPTER 4	MATERIALS AND METHODS	52
4.1	Introduction	53
4.1.1	GSM and MIB analysis in water and in fish-flesh	53
4.2	Analyses of GSM and MIB in RAS growth water	53
4.2.1	RAS water samples extraction with SPME (Solid-Phase Micro-Extraction)	54
4.2.2	SPME optimisation	55
4.3	Instrumentation - Gas Chromatography and Mass Spectroscopy (GC-MS) condition	59
4.3.1	Quantification of GSM and MIB in water	61
4.3.2	Computation of actual concentration in the samples	62
4.4	Determination of GSM and MIB concentration in fish-flesh	62
4.4.1	Sample preparation and distillation	63
4.4.2	Taste-taint chemicals extraction with SPME technique	66
4.4.3	Method optimisation for GSM and MIB extraction	67
4.4.4	Quantification of GSM and MIB in fish-flesh	70
4.5	Quality assurance of GSM and MIB analyses	70
4.5.1	Linearity and working range	71
4.5.2	Limit of detection (LOD)	72
4.5.3	Recovery of extraction using optimized condition	73
4.5.4	Intra-day reproducibility and inter-day repeatability	73
4.6	Hydrogen peroxide (H_2O_2) dosing apparatus	74

4.6.1	H ₂ O ₂ controller	74
4.6.2	H ₂ O ₂ sensor	75
4.6.3	H ₂ O ₂ metering pump	76
4.6.4	Calibration of the H ₂ O ₂ sensor	76
4.7	The experimental program	77
CHAPTER 5 PRELIMINARY STUDIES WITH HYDROGEN PEROXIDE		79
5.1	Introduction	80
5.1.1	This study	80
5.2	Materials and methods	80
5.2.1	Experimental site	80
5.2.2	Experimental Design	81
5.2.2.1	Preliminary study	81
5.2.2.2	RAS growth tanks	81
5.2.2.3	H ₂ O ₂ dosing	82
5.2.2.4	H ₂ O ₂ stock solution	82
5.2.2.5	Calibration of H ₂ O ₂ sensor	83
5.2.3	Water and fish-fillet samples collection the analyses of GSM and MIB	83
5.2.4	Quantification of GSM and MIB in RAS water and fish-flesh	84
5.2.5	General water quality	84
5.2.6	Fish health	84
5.3	Results	85
5.3.1	Variation of GSM in growth waters	85
5.3.2	Variation of MIB in growth waters	86
5.3.3	GSM and MIB in fish-flesh	87
5.3.4	Water quality of the two tanks	88
5.4	Discussion	89
5.4.1	Variation of GSM and MIB in RAS growth waters	89
5.4.2	Possible mechanisms for the control of GSM and MIB by H ₂ O ₂	92
5.4.3	Variation of pH and dissolved oxygen (C _{OX}) in the trial RAS tanks	93
5.4.4	Nutrients and water quality	94
5.4.5	Potential benefits and implications observed in H ₂ O ₂ trials	95
5.5	Concluding remarks	99
CHAPTER 6 OPTIMISATION OF HYDROGEN PEROXIDE DOSING FOR COMMERCIAL-SCALE RAS APPLICATION		100
6.1	Introduction	101
6.1.1	This study	101
6.2	Materials and methods	101
6.2.1	Experimental design	101
6.2.2	Dosing apparatus setup	102
6.2.3	Water and fish sampling program	102

6.2.4	General water quality and fish health study	102
6.3	Results	102
6.3.1	Variation of GSM and MIB in growth water with 2.5 mg L ⁻¹ H ₂ O ₂ dosing	102
6.3.2	Variation of GSM and MIB in growth water with 10.0 mg L ⁻¹ H ₂ O ₂ dosing	105
6.3.3	GSM and MIB in fish-flesh	105
6.3.4	Water quality of the tanks	107
6.3.5	Fish health	108
6.4	Discussion	109
6.4.1	Comparison of the GSM concentrations in water from three (3) pilot-scale studies	109
6.4.2	Comparison of the MIB concentrations in water from three (3) pilot-scale studies	111
6.4.3	Comparison of GSM/MIB concentrations in fish-flesh from three (3) pilot-scale studies	112
6.4.4	Evaluation of the water quality of six (6) tanks	114
6.4.5	Fish health and well-being	115
6.5	Concluding remarks	115
CHAPTER 7 A <i>Fr 13</i> CHEMICAL RISK ASSESSMENT FOR TASTE-TAINT ACCUMULATION AS GSM AND MIB IN BARRAMUNDI		117
7.1	Introduction	118
7.1.1	<i>Fr 13</i> framework	118
7.2	Materials and methods	119
7.2.1	<i>Fr 13</i> simulation of RAS	119
7.2.3	Defining <i>Fr 13</i> taste-taint failure	120
7.2.4	<i>Fr 13</i> computations	120
7.3	Results	121
7.4	Discussion	126
7.4.1	Prevalence of <i>Fr 13</i> taste-taint failures	126
7.4.2	Consumer tolerance and taint failures	126
7.4.3	Probability distributions to define key input parameters	127
7.4.4	Impact of growth time on taint accumulation	129
7.4.5	Second-tier <i>Fr 13</i> simulations and mitigating taint	130
7.4.6	Presenting and picturing <i>Fr 13</i> taint accumulations	132
7.4.7	Results overview	134
7.5	Concluding remarks	135
CHAPTER 8 APPLICATION OF LOW CONCENTRATION HYDROGEN PEROXIDE IN COMMERCIAL-SCALE RAS TANKS AND MODEL VALIDATION		136
8.1	Introduction	137
8.1.1	This study	137
8.2	Materials and methods	137

8.2.1	Experimental site	137
8.2.2	Experimental Design	138
8.2.2.1	Data collection plan	138
8.2.2.2	Water and fish sampling plan	138
8.3	Commercial application of H ₂ O ₂	139
8.3.1	Preliminary study with fingerlings in a nursery tank	139
8.3.2	Introduction of fingerlings to the commercial tanks	140
8.3.3	The dosing point	140
8.3.4	Dosing of H ₂ O ₂ to commercial-scale RAS growth tank (2B)	140
8.3.5	Optimisation of dosing	140
8.3.5.1	Direct immersion of the dosing probe in RAS tank	141
8.3.5.2	Use of a cage to avoid direct contact of H ₂ O ₂ with fish	141
8.3.5.3	Demonstrated benefit of a mixing tank	143
8.3.5.4	Adoption of the protective cage and mixing tank	145
8.4	Results	145
8.4.1	Fish growth curves for treated and control tanks	145
8.4.2	Variations of the GSM and MIB in treated and control tanks	147
8.4.2.1	GSM concentration in the RAS growth water	147
8.4.2.2	MIB concentration in the RAS growth water	147
8.4.2.3	MIB dominant taste-taint chemical in the RAS growth water	147
8.4.3	Variation of lipid concentration in fish-fillets	151
8.4.4	Dissolved oxygen (C _{OX}) and water temperature	151
8.4.5	Water quality in the growth water of treated and control tanks	152
8.4.6	GSM concentration in fish-flesh	155
8.4.7	MIB concentration in fish-flesh	155
8.5	Discussion	158
8.5.1	Fish growth	158
8.5.2	Dissolved oxygen (C _{OX}) concentration and RAS water temperature	159
8.5.3	GSM and MIB in growth water	159
8.5.4	Accumulation of taste-taint with growth of fish	160
8.5.5	Relationship between taste-taint concentration in RAS growth water and their concentration in fish-flesh	161
8.5.6	Fish mortality	164
8.5.7	Impact of H ₂ O ₂ dosing on RAS growth water	165
8.5.8	Impact of scale-up and organic matter on reduced efficacy of low concentration H ₂ O ₂ in commercial-scale RAS	166
8.5.9	Possible improvement in future development and studies	167
8.6	Predictive model validation for taste-taint	168
8.6.1	Pre-exponential and exponential growth constants	168
8.6.2	Lipid concentration	169
8.6.3	Dissolved oxygen concentration	169
8.6.4	Water temperature	169
8.6.5	Computation of rate constant k_1 for fish from treated and control tanks	169

8.6.6	Computation of rate constants k_2 , k_G and k_g for fish from treated and control tanks	170
8.6.7	Example simulation for model validation using the RAS experimental data	170
8.6.8	Taste-taint model validation with commercial-scale RAS experimental data	170
8.6.9	Comparison of model predictions with observed data	170
8.6.10	Evaluating model predictions for GSM and MIB in the fish-flesh	176
8.6.11	Possible reasons for variance in predictions and observations	178
8.6.12	Modifying the model for future applications	179
8.7	Concluding remarks	180
CHAPTER 9 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS		182
9.1	Conclusions	183
9.2	Recommendations for future research	185
APPENDICES		
A	A definition of some important terms used in this study	186
B	Detailed solution to the model synthesis of Chapter 3	192
C	Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) for microwave distillation	194
D	Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) for low concentration H_2O_2 dosing apparatus	198
E	Photographic documentation of the pilot-scale preliminary study with $5 \text{ mg L}^{-1} H_2O_2$	205
F	Approvals from The University of Adelaide Animal Ethics Committee Science to research with barramundi fish	208
G	Permit from Australian Pesticides and Veterinary Medicines Authority (APVMA) to use H_2O_2 in this research	211
H	Fish mortalities in commercial treated- and control- tanks during the first nine (9) week period	212
I	Photographic documentation of commercial-scale application of H_2O_2 to RAS growth water	213
J	Calculated model input parameters: k_1 , k_2 and k_g for GSM and MIB in fish-flesh from commercial control- and treated- tanks	215
K	An example simulation of the new model validation for both GSM and MIB taste-taint chemicals from the commercial-scale RAS studies	231
NOMENCLATURE		233
REFERENCES		235

LIST OF FIGURES		PAGE
Fig. 2.1	Schematic of GSM and MIB (Tucker, 2000)	6
Fig. 2.2	Atomic structure of H ₂ O ₂	18
Fig. 3.1	Schematic of fish with uptake (k_1C_w) and elimination ($k_2y + k_gy$) of taint chemicals (as GSM or MIB). The term 'y' indicates the taste-taint in fish-flesh (as GSM or MIB)	36
Fig. 3.2	Fit of growth data (♦) of Glenn et al. (2007) for barramundi fish farmed in ponds at a water temperature 28 °C ($m_f = 0.0519 \exp^{0.0133t}$, $R^2 = 0.9623$)	39
Fig. 3.3	Predicted taint as GSM (—) and MIB (—) in barramundi-flesh with RAS growth time at a growth water temperature 28 °C with C_w , respectively, 0.0004 and 0.003, $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$	43
Fig. 3.4	Comparison of predicted taint (y) as GSM in barramundi fish-flesh with growth time with constant (0.0004 $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$) C_w (—) and C_w varying (—) (0.00026 to 0.00068, $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$) with growth time (t)	45
Fig. 3.5	Predicted taint (y) as GSM in barramundi fish-flesh with RAS growth time at two (2) different growth water temperature: 28 °C (—) and 18 °C (—)	46
Fig. 3.6	Comparison between observed and predicted taste-taint (y) as GSM in farmed barramundi (n = 14) supplied by <i>Department of Agriculture Fisheries and Forestry</i> , Australia. S. Poole, pers. comm.	48
Fig. 4.1	RAS water samples extraction with Solid Phase Micro Extraction (SPME) (A = SPME manual holder; B = sealed cap; C = Duran bottle; D = programmable hotplate with stirrer)	55
Fig. 4.2	Effect of salt content of the sample on the extraction efficiencies for GSM (■) and MIB (■) under incubation temperature = 50 °C, extraction time = 30 min, extraction temperature = 50 °C	56
Fig. 4.3	Effect of incubation temperature on the extraction efficiencies for GSM (■) and MIB (■) under extraction time = 30 min, extraction temperature = 50 °C, salt = 25 g	57
Fig. 4.4	Effect of extraction time of the sample on extraction efficiencies for GSM (—) and MIB (—) under incubation temperature = 50 °C, extraction temperature = 50 °C, salt = 25 g	58
Fig. 4.5	Effect of extraction temperature on extraction efficiencies for GSM (■) and MIB (■) under salt = 25 g, incubation temperature = 50 °C, extraction time = 30 min	59
Fig. 4.6	A typical full-scan chromatogram of Agilent GC-MS for a RAS growth water sample from a control tank	60
Fig. 4.7	SIM chromatograms of Agilent GC-MS for TCA (a) GSM (b), and MIB (c), with their retention times of 21.10, 23.27 and 17.88, min respectively. An m/z of 195 for TAC, 112 for GSM , 95 for MIB are also shown in each respective chromatogram	61

Fig. 4.8	Barramundi fish-flesh sample preparation for microwave distillation	63
Fig. 4.9	Microwave assisted distillation device showing main parts without metallic cover (E = microwave oven; F = holding table; G = cooler box; H = 50 mL graduated measuring cylinder; J = N ₂ exiting line; K = N ₂ flow meter; L = N ₂ intake line)	64
Fig. 4.10	Microwave Mediated Distillation with metallic cover (E = Microwave oven; F = holding table; G = Cooler box; K = N ₂ flow meter; M = Metallic cover)	64
Fig. 4.11	After placing the fish sample in the microwave oven (L = N ₂ intake line; N = digestion vessel; J = N ₂ exiting line; O = fish-flesh sample)	65
Fig. 4.12	Schematic of the microwave distillation unit (E = Microwave oven; L = N ₂ supply line; N = Digestion apparatus; F = A stand for the microwave digestion unit; G = Cooler box; H = 50 ml graduated cylinder; J = N ₂ exiting line; M = Metallic cover)	66
Fig. 4.13	Fish-flesh distillation extraction with Solid Phase Micro Extraction (SPME) (A = SPME manual holder; P = 40 mL SPME vial; Q = water bath; D = programmable hotplate with stirrer)	67
Fig. 4.14	Effect of salt content of the sample on extraction efficiencies for GSM (■) and MIB (■) under extraction time = 25 min, extraction temperature = 40 °C, sample volume = 20 mL	68
Fig. 4.15	Effect of extraction time of the sample on extraction efficiencies for GSM (—) and MIB (—) under salt = 2.5 g, extraction temperature = 40 °C, sample volume = 20 mL	68
Fig. 4.16	Effect of extraction temperatures on extraction efficiencies for GSM (■) and MIB (■) under salt = 2.5 g, extraction time = 25 min, sample volume = 20 mL	69
Fig. 4.17	Effect of samples volumes on extraction efficiencies for GSM (■) and MIB (■) under salt = 2.5 g, extraction time = 25 min, temperature = 40 °C	69
Fig. 4.18	The correlation between either GSM or MIB concentration (µg L ⁻¹) and GSM/TCA (— —) or MIB/TCA (....) for water samples extraction. (R ² for GSM/TCA = 0.996 and MIB/TCA = 0.989)	71
Fig. 4.19	The correlation between either GSM and MIB concentration (µg kg ⁻¹) and GSM/TCA (— —) or MIB/TCA (.....) for fish samples extraction. (R ² for GSM/TCA = 0.990 and for MIB/TCA = 0.980)	72
Fig. 4.20	Controlled H ₂ O ₂ dosing apparatus featuring its main components. (R = DLC display; S = transducer/controller; T = metering pump; X = place for H ₂ O ₂ container; W = sensor holder; Z = water flow meter; Y = H ₂ O ₂ sensor)	75
Fig. 4.21	Correlation between sensor readings and the experimental values (R ² = 0.997). Error bars indicate standard deviation on triplicates	77
Fig. 5.1	Nursery tanks used for the pilot-scale experiments. These were set up adjacent commercial RAS growth tanks	81

Fig. 5.2	Schematic of the pilot-scale experiment study (T_1 = treatment tank; T_0 = control tank; M = mechanical filters; B = biological filters; A = H_2O_2 dosing apparatus; P = a pump for water to the dosing apparatus)	83
Fig. 5.3	Variation of GSM concentrations in the control tank, T_0 (—) and treated tank, T_1 (—) over 35 day. Results are presented as mean concentration of ($n = 3$) three samples. Error bars indicate standard deviation on the triplicates. Limiting concentration for GSM ($0.015 \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$) in the growth water is shown with the dashed line	85
Fig. 5.4	Variation of MIB concentration in the control tank, T_0 (—) and treated tank, T_1 (—) over 35 day. Results are presented as the mean concentrations of ($n = 3$) three samples. Error bars indicate standard deviation on the triplicates. Limiting concentration for MIB ($0.018 \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$) of the growth water is shown with the dashed line	86
Fig. 5.5	Concentration of GSM (■) and MIB (■) in fish-flesh from control tank, T_0 and treated tank, T_1 . Results are presented as the mean concentration of ($n = 3$) three samples. Error bars indicate standard deviation on the triplicates. The consumer rejection threshold concentration ($\sim 0.70 \mu\text{g kg}^{-1}$) for GSM and MIB is shown with the dashed line	87
Fig. 5.6	Variation of C_{OX} and pH in the control tank (T_0) and treated tank (T_1) over 18 day	89
Fig. 5.7	Appearance of fish from control, T_0 and treated, T_1 , tanks after 35 day	96
Fig. 5.8	Particle size distributions in the control tank (■) and treated tank (■) growth waters	97
Fig. 6.1	Variation of GSM concentration in control tank, T_2 (—) and treated tank, T_3 (—) over 35 day when treated with 2.5 mg L^{-1} of H_2O_2 . Results presented are the average of ($n = 3$) replicates. Error bars indicate standard deviation on the triplicates	103
Fig. 6.2	Variation of MIB concentration in control tank, T_2 (—) and the treated tank, T_3 (—) over 35 day when treated with 2.5 mg L^{-1} of H_2O_2 . Results presented are the average of ($n = 3$) replicates. Error bars indicate standard deviation on the triplicates	104
Fig. 6.3	Variation of GSM concentration in control tank, T_4 (—) and treated tank, T_5 (—) over 35 day when treated with $10.0, \text{ mg L}^{-1}$ of H_2O_2 . Results presented are the average of ($n = 3$) replicates. Error bars indicate standard deviation on the triplicates	105
Fig. 6.4	Variation of MIB concentration in control tank, T_4 (—) and the treated tank, T_5 (—) over 35 day when treated with $10.0, \text{ mg L}^{-1}$ of H_2O_2 . Results presented are the average of ($n = 3$) replicates. Error bars indicate standard deviation on the triplicates	106
Fig. 6.5	Concentration of GSM (■) and MIB (■) in fish-flesh in control tanks T_2 , T_4 , and treated tanks T_3 and T_5 with 2.5 and $10.0, \text{ mg L}^{-1}$ dosing with H_2O_2 , respectively. Results are presented as the average of ($n = 3$) replicates. Error bars indicate standard deviation on the triplicates. The consumer rejection threshold concentration ($\sim 0.70 \mu\text{g kg}^{-1}$) for GSM and MIB is shown with the dashed line	107

Fig. 6.6	Comparison of variations of GSM concentrations in control tanks, T_0 (---), T_2 (---) and T_4 (---) and treated tanks T_1 (---), T_3 (---) and T_5 (---) with 5.0, 2.5 and 10.0, mg L^{-1} dosing with H_2O_2 , respectively over 35 day growth period	111
Fig. 6.7	Comparison of variation of MIB concentrations in control tanks, T_0 (---), T_2 (---) and T_4 (---) and treated tanks T_1 (---), T_3 (---) and T_5 (---) with 5.0, 2.5 and 10.0, mg L^{-1} dosing with H_2O_2 , respectively over 35 day growth time	112
Fig. 6.8	Concentration of GSM (\blacksquare) and MIB (\blacksquare) of fish-flesh in control tanks T_0 , T_2 and T_4 and treated tanks T_1 , T_3 and T_5 with 5.0, 2.5 and 10.0, mg L^{-1} dosing with H_2O_2 , respectively. Results presented are the average of ($n = 3$) replicates. Error bars indicate standard deviation on the triplicates. The consumer rejection threshold concentration($\sim 0.70 \mu\text{g kg}^{-1}$) for GSM and MIB is shown with the dashed line	113
Fig. 6.9	Variation of NH_3 as N (mg L^{-1}) in T_0 (---), T_1 (---), T_2 (---), T_3 (---), T_4 (---) and T_5 (---) in weekly water sampling. Results presented are the average of ($n = 3$) replicates. Error bars indicate standard deviation on the triplicates	114
Fig. 7.1	Distribution RiskNormal (0.0014, 0.0007, RiskTruncate (0.00126, 0.00154)) for taste-taint chemical GSM in RAS growth water (C_w) with a mean concentration of $0.0014 \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ and truncated concentrations at a minimum of 0.00126 and maximum $0.00154, \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$, respectively	123
Fig. 7.2	<i>Fr 13</i> simulation of the risk factor (p) for taste-taint as GSM in flesh of RAS farmed barramundi with 10,000 scenarios. The figure shows the 10.1% failure rate to the right ($p > 0$)	124
Fig. 7.3	<i>Fr 13</i> simulation of the risk factor (p) for taste-taint as MIB in flesh of RAS farmed barramundi with 10,000 scenarios. The figure shows the 10.5 % failure rate to the right ($p > 0$)	124
Fig. 7.4	Impact of %tolerance on the number of failures with GSM taste-taint accumulation per 10,000 scenarios of RAS farmed barramundi	127
Fig. 7.5	Impact of harvest time (t) greater than 240 day on the number of failures with GSM taste-taint accumulation per 10,000 scenarios of RAS farmed barramundi. The risk function is RiskNormal ($240, (t - 240)$, RiskTruncate ($240 - 2 \times (t - 240)$, $240 + 2 \times (t + 240)$))	131
Fig. 7.6	Impact of stdev (%) in the input distribution for C_w on the number of taste-taint failures as GSM accumulation per 10,000 scenarios of RAS farmed barramundi. The risk function is RiskNormal (0.0014 , stdev, RiskTruncate (mean - $2 \times$ stdev, mean + $2 \times$ stdev))	133
Fig. 7.7	Plot of 33 selected <i>Fr 13</i> failures ($p > 0$) of Table 7-3:3D scatter plot (a) and 3D surface plot (b)	133
Fig. 8.1	H_2O_2 dosing into a cage to avoid the direct contact with fish (A = H_2O_2 dosing tube; B = sampling line to the dosing apparatus; C = growth water outlet; D = cage; E = treated tank wall)	142
Fig. 8.2	Schematic of mixing tank showing dosing apparatus, mixing tank and RAS growth tank (not to scale)	143

Fig. 8.3	Practical H ₂ O ₂ dosing into RAS growth water using the mixing tank (F = H ₂ O ₂ dosing apparatus; G = commercial grade Interox 50 % (w/w) H ₂ O ₂ of 25 kg drum; H = a stand for mixing tank; I = mixing tank)	144
Fig. 8.4	Releasing, treated RAS water with H ₂ O ₂ back to treated tank (F = H ₂ O ₂ dosing apparatus; I = mixing tank; J = treated water with H ₂ O ₂ ; K = submersible pump to pump RAS water to the mixing tank)	144
Fig. 8.5	Fit of growth data determined for barramundi from the treated tank at water temperature (actual measured) ~ 27 °C ($m_f = 0.0226e^{0.0169t}$, $R^2 = 0.92$). Error bars indicate standard deviation on 20 fish	146
Fig. 8.6	Fit of growth data determined for barramundi from the control tank at water temperature (actual measured) ~ 27 °C ($m_f = 0.0229e^{0.0161t}$, $R^2 = 0.98$). Error bars indicate standard deviation on 20 fish	146
Fig. 8.7	Variation of GSM concentration (C_w) in RAS growth water in treated (—) and control (—) tanks over a 35 week period. Results presented are the average of ($n = 3$) replicates. Error bars indicate standard deviation on the triplicates. The down arrow with dashed-line indicates the day dosing started. The horizontal dashed-line indicates the limiting concentration for GSM ($0.015 \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$) in RAS growth water	149
Fig. 8.8	Variation of MIB concentration (C_w) in RAS growth water in treated (—) and control (—) tank over a 35 week period. Results presented are the average of ($n = 3$) replicates. Error bars indicate standard deviation on the triplicates. The down arrow with dashed-line indicates the day of dosing started. The horizontal dashed-line indicates the limiting concentration for MIB ($0.018 \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$)	150
Fig. 8.9	Variability in lipid concentration (w/w %) within the fillet of 0.35 kg barramundi. The lipid concentrations (w/w %) shown were determined from sample taken from the area marked by the respective dashed-lines	151
Fig. 8.10	Relationship between GSM concentration in fish-flesh of the treated tank and mass of the fish. Results are presented for $n = 167$ data. The number of fish used was 121. $R^2 = 0.45$	156
Fig. 8.11	Relationship between GSM concentration in fish-flesh of the control tank and mass of the fish. Results are presented for $n = 186$ data. The number of fish used was 145. $R^2 = 0.53$	156
Fig. 8.12	Relationship between MIB concentration in fish-flesh of the treated tank and mass of the fish. Results are presented for $n = 167$ data. The number of fish used was 121. $R^2 = 0.50$	157
Fig. 8.13	Relationship between MIB concentration in fish-flesh of the control tank and the mass of the fish. Results are presented for $n = 186$ data. The number of fish used was 145. $R^2 = 0.59$	157
Fig. 8.14	GSM concentration in RAS growth water and concentration in fish-flesh from treated tank. Results are presented for $n = 167$ data. The number of fish used was 121. $R^2 = 0.15$	162

Fig. 8.15	GSM concentration in RAS growth water and concentration in fish-flesh from control tank. Results are presented for $n = 186$ data. The number of fish used was 145. $R^2 = 0.17$	163
Fig. 8.16	MIB concentration in RAS growth water and concentration in fish-flesh from treated tank. Results are presented for $n = 167$ data. The number of fish used 121. $R^2 = 0.11$	163
Fig. 8.17	MIB concentration in RAS growth water and concentration in fish-flesh from control tank. Results are presented for $n = 186$ data. The number of fish used was 145. $R^2 = 0.01$	164
Fig. 8.18	Predicted vs observed taste-taint (y) as GSM in fish-flesh from RAS ‘treated’ tank. Results are presented for $n = 167$ data from 121 fish. The number of fish harvested in the 30,000 L was 3,326. The box (LL) indicates those data below the consumer rejection threshold for GSM ($0.74 \mu\text{g kg}^{-1}$)	172
Fig. 8.19	Predicted vs observed taste-taint (y) as GSM in fish-flesh from RAS ‘control’ tank. Results are presented for $n = 186$ data from 145 fish. The number of fish harvested in the 30,000 L was 3,318. The box (LL) indicates those data below the consumer rejection threshold for GSM ($0.74 \mu\text{g kg}^{-1}$)	172
Fig. 8.20	Predicted vs observed taste-taint (y) as MIB in fish-flesh from RAS ‘treated’ tank. Results are presented for $n = 167$ data from 121 fish. The number of fish harvested in 30,000 L was 3,326. The box (LL) indicates those data below the consumer rejection threshold for MIB ($0.7 \mu\text{g kg}^{-1}$)	173
Fig. 8.21	Predicted vs observed taste-taint (y) as MIB in fish-flesh from RAS ‘control’ tank. Results are presented for $n = 186$ data from 145 fish. The number of fish harvested in 30,000 L was 3,318. The box (LL) indicates those data below the consumer rejection threshold for MIB ($0.7 \mu\text{g kg}^{-1}$)	173
Fig. 8.22	Expanded area of Fig. 8.18 for taste-taint concentration (y) (covering 0 to 2, $\mu\text{g kg}^{-1}$) as GSM in fish-flesh from RAS ‘treated’ tank. Results are for $n = 137$ data from 80 fish. The shaded area shows fish-flesh exceeding the consumer rejection threshold for GSM ($0.74 \mu\text{g kg}^{-1}$)	174
Fig. 8.23	Expanded area of Fig. 8.19 for taste-taint concentration (y) (covering 0 to 2, $\mu\text{g kg}^{-1}$) as GSM in fish-flesh from RAS ‘control’ tank. Results are for $n = 160$ data from 121 fish. The shaded area shows fish-flesh exceeding the consumer rejection threshold for GSM ($0.74 \mu\text{g kg}^{-1}$)	175
Fig. 8.24	Expanded area of Fig. 8.20 for taste-taint concentrations (y) (covering 0 to 2, $\mu\text{g kg}^{-1}$) for as MIB in fish-flesh from RAS ‘treated’ tank. Results are for $n = 111$ data from 85 fish. The shaded area shows fish-flesh exceeding the consumer rejection threshold for MIB ($0.7 \mu\text{g kg}^{-1}$)	175

Fig. 8.25	Expanded area of Fig. 8.21 for taste-taint concentration (y) (covering 0 to 2, $\mu\text{g kg}^{-1}$) as MIB in fish-flesh from RAS 'control' tank. Results are for n = 107 data from 91 fish. The shaded area shows fish-flesh exceeding the consumer threshold for MIB ($0.7 \mu\text{g kg}^{-1}$)	176
Fig. C.1	Process flow-chart of microwave distillation unit for barramundi fish-flesh digestion	197
Fig. D.1	Overview of the H_2O_2 dosing apparatus. The relevant function and description of the keys are given in Table D-1	199
Fig. D.2	The continuous display-2 showing the value of main parameters	200
Fig. D.3	Continuous display-3 showing the measuring range	201
Fig. D.4	Main display showing the calibration steps	201
Fig. D.5	Main display showing the steps involved in setting the measured value	202
Fig. D.6	Main display showing the steps involved in pump setting	202
Fig. D.7	Main display showing the steps involved in setting the limits	203
Fig. D.8	Main display showing the steps involved in control setting(s)	204
Fig. E.1	Continuous dosing of 5 mg L^{-1} of H_2O_2 to the nursery tank (T_1)	205
Fig. E.2	Filters used with RAS growth waters	206
Fig. E.3	Colour of growth water in nursery treated tank (T_1) five (5) days after dosing	206
Fig. E.4	Pumping RAS growth water to the H_2O_2 dosing apparatus	207
Fig. E.5	Interox 50 % (w/w) H_2O_2 drum connected to the metering pump	213
Fig. I.1	H_2O_2 dosing into a cage to avoid direct contact with fish (A = H_2O_2 dosing tube; B = growth water inlet to H_2O_2 dosing apparatus; D = cage; F = H_2O_2 dosing apparatus)	213
Fig. I.2	H_2O_2 dosing into the mixing tank (A = H_2O_2 dosing tube; B = growth water inlet to the H_2O_2 dosing apparatus; C = growth water outlet; I = mixing tank; L = growth water inlet to the mixing tank)	214

LIST OF TABLES	PAGE
Table 2-1 Selected physical and chemical properties of GSM and MIB	7
Table 3-1 Model simulation showing inputs, calculations and output for predicted taste-taint as both GSM and MIB in barramundi fish-flesh at 150 day growth in RAS tanks	42
Table 3-2 Predicted taste-taint (y) as GSM and MIB in barramundi fish-flesh with growth time (t) in RAS tanks at constant $C_w = 0.0004 \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ for GSM and $C_w = 0.003 \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ for MIB . (The bolded text for 150 day is the detailed illustrative simulation presented in Table 3-1)	42
Table 3-3 Comparison of observed (Petersen et al., 2011) versus predicted taste-taint as GSM in rainbow trout ($n = 15$) grown in RAS at 12°C for 9-months to a typical mass of $308 (\pm 72)$ g	49
Table 4-1 Percentage recoveries for taint extractions from fish-flesh	73
Table 5-1 Variation of NH_3 as N (mg L^{-1}), NO_2^- as N (mg L^{-1}), NO_3^- as N (mg L^{-1}), phosphorus as PO_4^{3-} (mg L^{-1}) and alkalinity as CaCO_3 (mg L^{-1}) of the control tank and treated tank over 35 day. Sampling was weekly and the average concentration of ($n = 3$) triplicates is presented. The standard deviation of the triplicates is shown in parentheses	90
Table 6-1 Variation of NH_3 as N (mg L^{-1}), NO_2^- as N (mg L^{-1}), and NO_3^- as N (mg L^{-1}) of the tanks T_2 (control), T_3 (treated with 2.5 mg L^{-1}), T_4 (control) and T_5 (treated with 10.0 mg L^{-1}). Sampling was weekly and the average concentration of ($n = 3$) replicates is presented. The standard deviation of the triplicates is shown in parentheses	110
Table 6-2 Reported fish mortalities at the end of 35 day period from three (3) pilot-scale studies	115
Table 7-1 Summary comparison of the SVA model of Chapter 3 (see Hathurusingha & Davey, 2014) with <i>Fr 13</i> simulation of taste-taint chemical as GSM in RAS farmed barramundi with 10 % tolerance. Column 2 is the SVA value for each of the RAS parameters. <i>Fr 13</i> values of column 3 are for one-only of 10,000 simulated scenarios. Failure is defined for all $p > 0$	121
Table 7-2 Summary comparison of the SVA model of Chapter 3 (see Hathurusingha & Davey, 2014) with <i>Fr 13</i> simulation of taste-taint chemical as MIB in RAS farmed barramundi with 10 % tolerance. Column 2 is the SVA for each RAS parameter. <i>Fr 13</i> values of column 3 are for one-only of 10,000 simulated scenarios. Failure is defined for all $p > 0$	122
Table 7-3 Thirty three (33) of 1,010 failures in the 10,000 scenarios for taste-taint chemical as GSM in RAS farmed barramundi with 10 % tolerance	125
Table 7-4 Impact of %tolerance on the number of <i>Fr 13</i> failures in taste-taint accumulations per 10,000 scenarios for both GSM and MIB . The bolded text of row-5 denotes the particular failed scenarios of, respectively, Table 7-1 and Table 7-2	128

Table 7-5	Spearman rank correlation coefficient (Snedecor & Cochran, 1989) for key input parameters on GSM taste-taint accumulation in RAS farmed barramundi	129
Table 8-1	Weekly average dissolved oxygen concentration (C_{OX}) and RAS growth water temperature (T) of the treated and control tanks over the 35 week period. Results are the average value of 7-day readings. The standard error is shown in parentheses	153
Table 8-2	Weekly average nitrate (NO_2^- as N), ammonia (NH_3 as N) and Secchi disk value (as m) of the treated and control tanks over 35 week period. Results presented are the average value of the triplicates. The standard error is shown in parentheses	154
Table 8-3	Mass gain determined at 30 day intervals over 240 day period. The number of fish used for the analyses was 20	159
Table 8-4	Variance comparison of data points against $Y = X$ line. The data is presented for both GSM and MIB in treated and control tanks as a percentage of total number of data points (n). The evaluation is based on the data points of Figs. 8.18 to 8.21	177
Table D-1	Main function and description of the keys of the H_2O_2 apparatus	200
Table H-1	Reported fish mortalities in treated and control tanks during the first 9 weeks	212
Table J-1	Calculated model inputs k_1 for GSM and MIB in fish from commercial control tank using m_f , C_{OX} and G_v values	215
Table J-2	Calculated model inputs k_1 for GSM and MIB in fish from commercial treated tank using m_f , C_{OX} and G_v values	219
Table J-3	Calculated model inputs k_2 and k_g for GSM and MIB in fish from commercial control tank	223
Table J-4	Calculated model inputs k_2 and k_g for GSM and MIB in fish from commercial treated tank	227
Table K-1	Example model simulation showing inputs, calculations and output for predicted taste-taint as both GSM and MIB in barramundi fish-flesh from an average fish (0.435 kg) from the commercial-scale RAS studies	232