# YIELD COMPARISON OF LETTUCE (Lactuca sativa L.) GROWN IN HYDROPONICS USING FISH EFFLUENTS AND INORGANIC FERTILIZER

BY

R.M.U. RATHNAYAKA

BRARY 10 MAR 2016

-





# FACULTUY OF AGRICULTURE

### EASTERN UNIVERSITY

## SRI LANKA

2016



#### ABSTRACT

Aquaponics, the integration of aquaculture and hydroponic crop production represents a more environmental friendly and energy efficient method of production than each method practiced in isolation. The food insecurity situation with respect to Sri Lanka is illustrated by the fact that, worst malnutrition status is observed. Aquaponics, as a closed loop system consisting of hydroponics and aquaculture elements, can contribute towards these problems. But Sri Lankan Agricultural sector has not yet initiated Aquaponics. Therefore this experiment was conducted to compare yield of lettuce grown in hydroponics using fish effluents and inorganic fertilizer. The experiment was arranged in a Complete Randomized Design (CRD) with five treatments (Water, Albert's solution, Catla waste water, Common carp waste water and Tilapia waste water) and four replications. Plant height, Canopy diameter, Number of leaves ,Root length ,Leaf fresh weight , Leaf dry weight ,Root fresh weight, Root dry weight and Total yield were measured as plant growth measurements. Initial biomass/Fish, Final biomass/Fish, Initial stocking density and Final stocking density were measured as fish growth measurements. The result demonstrated that Albert's solution treated plants showed "highest yield performance compared to the other nutrient solutions treated plants followed by higher yield obtained from waste water from Tilapia tank. Fish water solution did not fulfill the nutrient requirement due to fingerling stage of fish. Therefore, it could be concluded that higher yield was obtained in Albert's solution. While, selecting suitable age stage of fish and quality of feed can be expect to get higher yield like as in Albert's solution.

# TABLE OF CONTENT

ABSTRACTi
ACKNOWLEGEMENT
TABLE OF CONTENT iv
LIST OF TABLES
LIST OF FIGURES
LIST OF PLATEix
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS
CHAPTER ONE 1
INTRODUCTION
OBJECTIVE;
CHAPTER TWO
REVIEW OF LITERATURE
2.1 Soil less culture
2.1.1 Hydroponic systems
2.1.1.1. Strength and weaknesses of Hydroponic plant growing systems 7
2.2 Hydroponic for lettuce production
2.2.1. Nutritional requirements
2.2.2. Advantages Associated With Hydroponics in the lettuce Production 11
2.3. Nutrient solutions
2.4. Aquaculture
2.4.1. Nutrient content of aquaculture waste
2.5. Aquaponics
2.5.1. Action of nitrifying bacteria and tank 'cycling'15
2.5.2. Plant species
2.5.3. Fish species

2.5.3.1. Feeding
2.5.4. Water Quality
2.5.5. Advantages of Aquaponics
CHAPTER THREE
MATERIALS AND METHOD
3.1. Experimental Location
3.2. Treatments
3.3. Experimental design
3.4. The Aquaponic system
3.5. Crop establishment
3.6. Nutrient circulating system
3.7. Albert's solution
3.8. Rearing of fish
3.9. Data collection
3.9.1. Plant Growth Measurements
3.9.1.1. Plant height (cm)
3.9.1.2. Canopy diameter (cm)
3.9.1.3. Number of leaves
3.9.1.4. Root length (cm)
3.9.2. Harvesting parameters
3.9.2.1. Fresh weight of plants (g)
3.9.2.2. Fresh weight of leaves (g)
3.9.2.3. Fresh weight of roots (g)
3.9.2.4. Leaf dry weight per plant (g)
3.9.2.5. Root dry weight per plant (g)
3.9.2.6. Total yield (ton/ha)
3.9.3. Fish Growth Measurements
3.9.3.1. Body Weight
3.9.3.2. Initial stocking density [kg m-3]
3.9.3.3 Final stocking density [kg m-3]
3.9.3.4. Mortality
3.9.4. Nutrient solution parameter

3.9.5. Nutrient composition in Rice bran	
3.10. Data analysis	
CHAPTER FOUR	
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	
4.1. Nutrient solution	
4.1.1. Nutrient solution composition	
4.1.2. Nutrient increment in fish waste water	
4.1.2. Temperature in nutrient solutions	
4.1.3. pH of nutrient solutions	
4.1.4. Electric Conductivity in nutrient solutions	
4.2. Plant growth measurements	
4.2.1. Plant height	
4.2.3. Number of leaves	
4.2.4. Root length	
4.3. Harvesting parameters	
4.3.1. Plant, leaf and root fresh weight per plant	
4.3.2. Dry matter content	
4.4.2. Initial stocking density and final stocking density	
4.4,3. Mortality percentage	
CHAPTER FIVE	
, CONCLUSION	
SUGESSTIONS FOR IMPROVENTS	
SUGESSTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENTS	
REFERENCES	