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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 ≥ 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 (≤ 10 mg L⁻¹) of hydrogen peroxide (H₂O₂) 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 H₂O₂ 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 H₂O₂ (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$_2$O$_2$ 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$_2$O$_2$ 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$_2$O$_2$ 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 µg 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$_2$O$_2$ dosing, 
fish grown from fingerlings to harvest at 240 day was investigated. This was to observe an 
entire production cycle. Results from a H$_2$O$_2$ ‘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$_2$O$_2$ 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, µg kg$^{-1}$), especially below the consumer rejection threshold (~ 0.7 µg kg$^{-1}$). However, a minor anomaly was an over-prediction for greater concentrations (2 to 11, µg 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.
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**Fig. 4.18** The correlation between either GSM or MIB concentration (µg L⁻¹) and GSM/TCA (■ ■) or MIB/TCA (■ ■■■) for water samples extraction. (R² for GSM/TCA = 0.996 and MIB/TCA = 0.989)

**Fig. 4.19** The correlation between either GSM and MIB concentration (µg kg⁻¹) and GSM/TCA (■ ■) or MIB/TCA (■ ■■■) for fish samples extraction. (R² for GSM/TCA = 0.990 and for MIB/TCA= 0.980)

**Fig. 4.20** Controlled H₂O₂ dosing apparatus featuring its main components. (R = DLC display; S = transducer/controller; T = metering pump; X = place for H₂O₂ container; W = sensor holder; Z = water flow meter; Y = H₂O₂ sensor)

**Fig. 4.21** Correlation between sensor readings and the experimental values (R² = 0.997). Error bars indicate standard deviation on triplicates

**Fig. 5.1** Nursery tanks used for the pilot-scale experiments. These were set up adjacent commercial RAS growth tanks
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$_2$O$_2$ dosing apparatus; $P =$ a pump for water to the dosing apparatus)

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 μg L$^{-1}$) in the growth water is shown with the dashed line.

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 μg L$^{-1}$) of the growth water is shown with the dashed line.

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 $ μg kg$^{-1}$) for GSM and MIB is shown with the dashed line.

Fig. 5.6 Variation of $CO_X$ and pH in the control tank ($T_0$) and treated tank ($T_1$) over 18 day.

Fig. 5.7 Appearance of fish from control, $T_0$ and treated, $T_1$, tanks after 35 day.

Fig. 5.8 Particle size distributions in the control tank (■) and treated tank (●) growth waters.

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$_2$O$_2$. Results presented are the average of ($n = 3$) replicates. Error bars indicate standard deviation on the triplicates.

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$_2$O$_2$. Results presented are the average of ($n = 3$) replicates. Error bars indicate standard deviation on the triplicates.

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, mg L$^{-1}$ of H$_2$O$_2$. Results presented are the average of ($n = 3$) replicates. Error bars indicate standard deviation on the triplicates.

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, mg L$^{-1}$ of H$_2$O$_2$. Results presented are the average of ($n = 3$) replicates. Error bars indicate standard deviation on the triplicates.

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, mg L$^{-1}$ dosing with H$_2$O$_2$, 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 $ μg kg$^{-1}$) for GSM and MIB is shown with the dashed line.
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$_2$O$_2$, respectively over 35 day growth period.

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$_2$O$_2$, respectively over 35 day growth period.

Fig. 6.8 Concentration of GSM (■) and MIB (■) 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$_2$O$_2$, respectively. Results presented are the average of (n = 3) replicates. Error bars indicate standard deviation on the triplicates. The consumer rejection threshold concentration (~ 0.70 µg kg$^{-1}$) for GSM and MIB is shown with the dashed line.

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.

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 µg L$^{-1}$ and truncated concentrations at a minimum of 0.00126 and maximum 0.00154, µg L$^{-1}$, respectively.

Fig. 7.2 Fr 13 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 ($p > 0$).

Fig. 7.3 Fr 13 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 ($p > 0$).

Fig. 7.4 Impact of %tolerance on the number of failures with GSM taste-taint accumulation per 10,000 scenarios of RAS farmed barramundi.

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 x ($t$ - 240), 240+ 2 x ($t$ + 240))).

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 x stdev, mean + 2 x stdev))).

Fig. 7.7 Plot of 33 selected Fr 13 failures ($p > 0$) of Table 7-3: 3D scatter plot (a) and 3D surface plot (b).

Fig. 8.1 H$_2$O$_2$ dosing into a cage to avoid the direct contact with fish (A = H$_2$O$_2$ dosing tube; B = sampling line to the dosing apparatus; C = growth water outlet; D = cage; E = treated tank wall).

Fig. 8.2 Schematic of mixing tank showing dosing apparatus, mixing tank and RAS growth tank (not to scale).
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)

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)

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

Fig. 8.6  Fit of growth data determined for barramundi from the control tank at water temperature (actual measured) ~ 27°C ($m_f = 0.0229e^{0.00161t}$, $R^2 = 0.98$). Error bars indicate standard deviation on 20 fish

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 µg L$^{-1}$) in RAS growth water

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 µg L$^{-1}$)

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

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. $R^2 = 0.45$

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. $R^2 = 0.53$

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. $R^2 = 0.50$

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. $R^2 = 0.59$

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. $R^2 = 0.15$
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. \( R^2 = 0.17 \)

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 was 121. \( R^2 = 0.11 \)

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. \( R^2 = 0.01 \)

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 µg kg\(^{-1}\))

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 µg kg\(^{-1}\))

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 µg kg\(^{-1}\))

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 µg kg\(^{-1}\))

Fig. 8.22  Expanded area of Fig. 8.18 for taste-taint concentration (y) (covering 0 to 2, µg 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 µg kg\(^{-1}\))

Fig. 8.23  Expanded area of Fig. 8.19 for taste-taint concentration (y) (covering 0 to 2, µg 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 µg kg\(^{-1}\))

Fig. 8.24  Expanded area of Fig. 8.20 for taste-taint concentrations (y) (covering 0 to 2, µg 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 µg kg\(^{-1}\))
Fig. 8.25  Expanded area of Fig. 8.21 for taste-taint concentration (y) (covering 0 to 2, µg 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 µg kg⁻¹).

Fig. C.1  Process flow-chart of microwave distillation unit for barramundi fish-flesh digestion

Fig. D.1  Overview of the H₂O₂ dosing apparatus. The relevant function and description of the keys are given in Table D.1

Fig. D.2  The continuous display-2 showing the value of main parameters

Fig. D.3  Continuous display-3 showing the measuring range

Fig. D.4  Main display showing the calibration steps

Fig. D.5  Main display showing the steps involved in setting the measured value

Fig. D.6  Main display showing the steps involved in pump setting

Fig. D.7  Main display showing the steps involved in setting the limits

Fig. D.8  Main display showing the steps involved in control setting(s)

Fig. E.1  Continuous dosing of 5 mg L⁻¹ of H₂O₂ to the nursery tank (T₁)

Fig. E.2  Filters used with RAS growth waters

Fig. E.3  Colour of growth water in nursery treated tank (T₁) five (5) days after dosing

Fig. E.4  Pumping RAS growth water to the H₂O₂ dosing apparatus

Fig. E.5  Interox 50 % (w/w) H₂O₂ drum connected to the metering pump

Fig. I.1  H₂O₂ dosing into a cage to avoid direct contact with fish (A = H₂O₂ dosing tube; B = growth water inlet to H₂O₂ dosing apparatus; D = cage; F = H₂O₂ dosing apparatus)

Fig. I.2  H₂O₂ dosing into the mixing tank (A = H₂O₂ dosing tube; B = growth water inlet to the H₂O₂ dosing apparatus; C = growth water outlet; I = mixing tank; L = growth water inlet to the mixing tank)
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