



**UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA**

**THE EFFECT OF IMMUNE ENHANCER ON THE NON-SPECIFIC  
DEFENSE MECHANISM OF RED TILAPIA HYBRID (*OREOCHROMIS  
NILOTICUS X OREOCHROMIS MOSSAMBICUS*) CHALLENGED  
WITH *AEROMONAS HYDROPHILLA***

**JOSELITO R. SOMGA**

**FPSS 1995 5**



**THE EFFECT OF IMMUNE ENHANCER ON THE NON-SPECIFIC  
DEFENSE MECHANISM OF RED TILAPIA HYBRID (*OREOCHROMIS  
NILOTICUS X OREOCHROMIS MOSSAMBICUS*) CHALLENGED  
WITH *AEROMONAS HYDROPHILA***

**BY**

**JOSELITO R. SOMGA**

**Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of  
the Requirement for the Degree of Master of Science  
in the Faculty of Fisheries and Marine Science  
Universiti Pertanian Malaysia**

**December 1995**



## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful to my chairman Prof. Mohammed Shariff Din, for his valuable advice, support, guidance and motivation. My gratitude is extended to my committee members, Dr. Hassan Hj. Mohd Daud and Dr. Abdul Manan Mat Jais for their kind assistance and wise counsel throughout this study.

My appreciation goes to the International Development Research Center (IDRC) Canada for providing the fellowship and research fund for my study.

I express my appreciation and thanks to Dr. Lim of GHF PTE Technologies Ltd. for providing the immune enhancer used in this study. Special thanks is due to P.A.H.L. Jayawardena and Wang Yin Geng for their generous help during the collection of samples. Thanks are also due to the Faculty of Fisheries and Marine Science staff particularly Abdul Gani, Zainan, Rosdi, Zairina Raden Zainal, Mahamud Yusoh and those who have helped me in many ways to accomplish this study.



I am also thankful to Mr. Paul Manalo and family for their kindness and concern during my stay in Malaysia. I also cherish the companionship of John, Ging, Bhebot, Aiza, Ate Da and Ate Dina. Also, I appreciate the moral support extended by my colleague in BFAR. The camaraderie with fellow students at UPM is memorable.

This study is dedicated to my wife Sonia, who patiently assisted me throughout my study, and my family, for their love and support. Above all, to ALMIGHTY GOD for all HIS blessings.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</b> . . . . .	ii
<b>LIST OF TABLES</b> . . . . .	vii
<b>LIST OF FIGURES</b> . . . . .	xi
<b>LIST OF PLATES</b> . . . . .	xii
<b>LIST OF FISH SPECIES</b> . . . . .	xiv
<b>LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS</b> . . . . .	xvi
<b>ABSTRACT</b> . . . . .	xvii
<b>ABSTRAK</b> . . . . .	xix

### CHAPTER

<b>I</b>	<b>GENERAL INTRODUCTION</b> . . . . .	1
<b>II</b>	<b>LITERATURE REVIEW</b> . . . . .	7
	The Defense Mechanism . . . . .	7
	Non-Specific Defense in Fish . . . . .	8
	Protective Barriers . . . . .	8
	Humoral Factors . . . . .	9
	Cellular Factors . . . . .	14
	Assessment of the Non-Specific Response . . . . .	15
	Immune Enhancers and Effects on Defense Mechanisms . . . . .	19



<b>III THE NON-SPECIFIC RESPONSE OF RED TILAPIA HYBRID FED WITH ENCAP AND CHALLENGED WITH AEROMONAS HYDROPHILA . . . . .</b>	<b>24</b>
Introduction . . . . .	24
Materials and Methods . . . . .	27
Maintenance of Stock Fish . . . . .	27
Experimental Fish . . . . .	27
Culture and Maintenance of <i>Aeromonas hydrophila</i> . . . . .	28
Preparation of the Standard Curve of <i>Aeromonas hydrophila</i> . . . . .	29
Determination of Median Lethal Dose (LD <sub>50</sub> ) of <i>A. hydrophila</i> in Red Tilapia Hybrid . . . . .	29
Preparation of Formalin Killed <i>Aeromonas hydrophila</i> . . . . .	30
Incorporation of Immune Enhancer to the Feed . . . . .	30
Experiment Proper . . . . .	30
Determination of the Non-Specific Response . . . . .	32
Hematocrit . . . . .	32
Total White Blood Cell (WBC) Counts .	32
Nitroblue Tetrazolium (NBT) Assay - Potential Killing Activity of Neutrophils, Monocytes and Macrophages . . . . .	33
Lysozyme Assay . . . . .	34
Total Plasma Protein . . . . .	34
Statistical Analysis . . . . .	35
Results . . . . .	35



	Discussion . . . . .	43
<b>IV</b>	<b>SURVIVABILITY OF RED TILAPIA HYBRID FED WITH ENCAP AND CHALLENGED WITH <i>AEROMONAS HYDROPHILA</i></b> . . . . .	<b>50</b>
	Introduction . . . . .	50
	Materials and Methods . . . . .	51
	Statistical Analysis . . . . .	52
	Results . . . . .	52
	Discussion . . . . .	54
<b>V</b>	<b>HISTOPATHOLOGY OF RED TILAPIA HYBRID FED WITH ENCAP AND CHALLENGED WITH <i>AEROMONAS HYDROPHILA</i></b> . . . . .	<b>58</b>
	Introduction . . . . .	58
	Materials and Methods . . . . .	60
	Results . . . . .	60
	Discussion . . . . .	70
<b>VI</b>	<b>GENERAL DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE STUDY</b> . . . . .	<b>74</b>
	<b>REFERENCES</b> . . . . .	<b>79</b>
	<b>APPENDIX</b> . . . . .	<b>92</b>
	<b>BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH</b> . . . . .	<b>105</b>



## LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Hematocrit Values, White Blood Cell Counts and NBT/Potential Killing Activity in Tilapia Hybrid Fed with Different Concentrations of ENCAP and Challenged with <i>A. hydrophila</i> . . . . .	92
2	Lysozyme Activity and Total Plasma Protein in Tilapia Hybrid Fed with Different Concentrations of ENCAP and Challenged with <i>A. hydrophila</i> . . . . .	93
3	Summary of Water Quality Parameters Taken in the Duration of the Experiment . . . . .	94
4	LD <sub>50</sub> of <i>Aeromonas hydrophila</i> to Red Tilapia Hybrid . . . . .	94
5	Median Lethal Concentration (LD <sub>50</sub> ) of <i>A. hydrophila</i> in Red Tilapia Hybrid Analyzed Using Spearman-Karber . . . . .	95
6	ANOVA for Hematocrit Values Between Treatment Groups in Red Tilapia Hybrid Before Injection of <i>A. hydrophila</i> . . . . .	96
7	ANOVA for Hematocrit Values Between Treatment Groups in Red Tilapia Hybrid at Day One Post Injection of <i>A. hydrophila</i> . . . . .	96
8	ANOVA for Hematocrit Values Between Treatment Groups in Red Tilapia Hybrid at Day Two Post Injection of <i>A. hydrophila</i> . . . . .	96
9	ANOVA for Hematocrit Values Between Treatments in Red Tilapia Hybrid at Day Four Post Injection of <i>A. hydrophila</i> . . . . .	97





10	ANOVA for Hematocrit Values Between Treatment Groups in Red Tilapia Hybrid at Day Seven Post Injection of <i>A. hydrophila</i> . . . . .	97
11	ANOVA for WBC Counts Between Treatment Groups of Red Tilapia Hybrid Before Injection of <i>A. hydrophila</i> . . . . .	97
12	ANOVA for WBC Counts Between Treatment Groups in Red Tilapia Hybrid At Day One Post Injection of <i>A. hydrophila</i> . . . . .	98
13	ANOVA for WBC Counts Between Treatment Groups in Red Tilapia Hybrid at Day Two Post Injection of <i>A. hydrophila</i> . . . . .	98
14	ANOVA for WBC Counts Between Treatment Groups in Red Tilapia Hybrid at Day Four Post Injection of <i>A. hydrophila</i> . . . . .	98
15	ANOVA for WBC Counts Between Treatment Groups in Red Tilapia Hybrid at Day Seven Post injection of <i>A. hydrophila</i> . . . . .	99
16	ANOVA for NBT/Potential Killing Activity Between Treatment Groups in Red Tilapia Hybrid Before Injection of <i>A. hydrophila</i> . . . . .	99
17	ANOVA for NBT/Potential Killing Activity Between Treatment Groups in Red Tilapia Hybrid at Day One Post Injection of <i>A. hydrophila</i> . . . . .	99
18	ANOVA for NBT/Potential Killing Activity Between Treatment Groups in Red Tilapia Hybrid at Day Two Post Injection of <i>A. hydrophila</i> . . . . .	100
19	ANOVA for NBT/Potential Killing Activity Between Treatment Groups in Red Tilapia Hybrid at Day Four Post Injection of <i>A. hydrophila</i> . . . . .	100
20	ANOVA for NBT/Potential Killing Activity Between Treatment Groups in Red Tilapia Hybrid at Day Seven Post Injection of <i>A. hydrophila</i> . . . . .	100



21	ANOVA for Lysozyme Activity Between Treatment Groups in Red Tilapia Hybrid Before Injection of <i>A. hydrophila</i> . . . . .	101
22	ANOVA for Lysozyme Activity Between Treatment Groups in Red Tilapia Hybrid at Day One Post Injection of <i>A. hydrophila</i> . . . . .	101
23	ANOVA for Lysozyme Activity Between Treatment Groups in Red Tilapia Hybrid at Day Two Post Injection of <i>A. hydrophila</i> . . . . .	101
24	ANOVA for Lysozyme Activity Between Treatment Groups in Red Tilapia Hybrid at Day Four Post Injection of <i>A. hydrophila</i> . . . . .	102
25	ANOVA for Lysozyme Activity Between Treatment Groups in Red Tilapia Hybrid at Day Seven Post Injection of <i>A. hydrophila</i> . . . . .	102
26	ANOVA for Total Plasma Protein Between Treatment Groups in Red Tilapia Hybrid Before Injection of <i>A. hydrophila</i> . . . . .	102
27	ANOVA for Total Plasma Protein Between Treatment Groups in Red Tilapia Hybrid at Day One Post Injection of <i>A. hydrophila</i> . . . . .	103
28	ANOVA for Total Plasma Protein Between Treatment Groups in Red Tilapia Hybrid at Day Two Post Injection of <i>A. hydrophila</i> . . . . .	103
29	ANOVA for Total Plasma Protein Between Treatment Groups in Red Tilapia Hybrid at Day Four Post Injection of <i>A. hydrophila</i> . . . . .	103
30	ANOVA for Total Plasma Protein Between Treatment Groups in Red Tilapia Hybrid at Day Seven Post Injection of <i>A. hydrophila</i> . . . . .	104



31	Multiple Range Test of Survivability for 21 Days Post Bacterial Challenged Between Treatment Groups of Red Tilapia Hybrid. . . . .	104
32	ANOVA for The Survivability Between Treatment Groups Post Bacterial Challenged. . . . .	104



## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		Page
1	Hematocrit Value in Red Tilapia Hybrid Fed with ENCAP and Challenged with <i>A. hydrophila</i> . . . . .	36
2	Total WBC Count in Red Tilapia Hybrid Fed with ENCAP and Challenged with <i>A. hydrophila</i> . . . . .	37
3	NBT/ Potential Killing Activities of Neutrophils and Other Phagocytic Cells in Red Tilapia Hybrid Fed with ENCAP and Challenged with <i>A. hydrophila</i> . . . . .	39
4	Lysozyme Activity in Red Tilapia Hybrid Fed with ENCAP and Challenged with <i>A. hydrophila</i> . . . . .	41
5	Total Plasma Protein in Red Tilapia Hybrid Fed with ENCAP and Challenged with <i>A. hydrophila</i> . . . . .	42
6	Percent Survivability of Red Tilapia Hybrid Fed with ENCAP and Challenged with <i>A. hydrophila</i> . . . . .	53



## LIST OF PLATES

Plate		Page
1	Red Tilapia Hybrid Before Challenge of <i>A. hydrophila</i> . . . . .	61
2	Red Tilapia Hybrid with Exposed Epidermal Surface and Necrotic Fins After 2-3 Days Post Bacterial Challenged (PBC). . . . .	61
3	Tissue Section Showing the Sloughed Epidermal Layer After 7 Days PBC . . . . .	62
4	Congestion of RBC's in Blood Vessels and Surrounding Muscle Tissue After 7 Days PBC. . . . .	62
5	Tissue Section of the Liver Showing Vacuolation After 2 Days PBC. . . . .	64
6	Bacteria in the Liver Section Undergoing Necrosis After 7 Days PBC . . . . .	64
7	Liver Section Showing Severe Necrosis After 7 Days PBC. The Structural Integrity was Lost . . . . .	65
8	Intrahepatic Pancreatic Tissue Undergoing Disintegration of the Acinar Cells and Marked Proliferation of Mononuclear Cells After 2 Days PBC. . . . .	65
9	Congestion of the Portal Vessel After 2 Days PBC. Pancreatic Tissue Undergoing Necrosis . . . . .	66
10	Tissue Section of the Spleen Showing Vacuolated Areas, Enlarged Melanomacrophages Centers (MMC) and Scattered Melanin Pigments After 2 Days PBC . . . . .	66



11	Tissue Section of the Spleen Showing Marked Reduction of RBC's and Vacuolated Areas After 7 Days PBC . . . . .	67
12	Tissue Section of the Kidney Showing Massive Infiltration of RBC's and other Inflammatory Cells in the Intertubular Spaces After 7 Days PBC. Melanomacrophage Centers (MMC) . . . . .	68
13	Kidney Section Showing Extensive Tubular and Glomerular Necrosis After 7 Days PBC . . . . .	69
14	Higher Magnification Showing Mononuclear and Polymorphonuclear Cells in the Intertubular Spaces . . . . .	69



## LIST OF FISH SPECIES

African catfish . . . . .	<i>Clarias gariepinus</i>
American eel . . . . .	<i>Anguilla rostrata</i>
Atlantic salmon . . . . .	<i>Salmo salar</i>
Ayu . . . . .	<i>Plecoglossus altevelis</i>
Brook trout . . . . .	<i>Salvelinus fontinalis</i>
Channel catfish . . . . .	<i>Ictalurus punctatus</i>
Chinook salmon . . . . .	<i>Onchorynchus tshawytscha</i>
Coho salmon . . . . .	<i>Onchorynchus kisutch</i>
Common carp . . . . .	<i>Cyprinus carpio</i>
Dabs . . . . .	<i>Limanda limanda</i>
Eel . . . . .	<i>Anguilla japonica</i>
European eel . . . . .	<i>Anguilla anguilla</i>
Fathead minnow . . . . .	<i>Pimephales promelas</i>
Flatfish . . . . .	<i>Paralichthys olivaceus</i>
Goldfish . . . . .	<i>Carassius auratus</i>
Largemouth bass . . . . .	<i>Micropterus salmoides</i>
Plaice . . . . .	<i>Pleuronectes platessa</i>
Porgy . . . . .	<i>Pagrus major</i>
Rainbow trout . . . . .	<i>Onchorynchus mykiss</i>
Rainbow trout . . . . .	<i>Salmo gairdneri</i>
Red seabream . . . . .	<i>Pagrus major</i>
Sea bass . . . . .	<i>Dicentrarchus labrax</i>
Steelhead trout . . . . .	<i>Salmo gairdneri</i>



Tilapia . . . . .	<i>Tilapia nilotica</i>
Turbot . . . . .	<i>Scophthalmus maximus</i>
Walleye. . . . .	<i>Stizostedion vitreum vitreum</i>
Winter flounder . . . . .	<i>Psedopleuronectes americanus</i>
Yellowtail . . . . .	<i>Seriola quinqueradiata</i>





## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CFU	Colony Forming Unit
CP	Crude Protein
DMSO	Dimethyl sulfoxide
EDTA	Ethylene Diamine Tetraacetic Acid
EUS	Epizootic Ulcerative Syndrome
LD <sub>50</sub>	Median Lethal Dose
MMC	Melanomacrophages Center
MS-222	Tricane Methanesulfonate
NBT	Nitroblue Tetrazolium
PBC	Post Bacterial Challenge
PBS	Physiological Buffered Saline
RBC	Red Blood Cells
RS	Reimlers Schott
SD	Standard Deviation
TSA	Trypticase Soy Agar
WBC	White Blood Cells



Abstract of the thesis submitted to the Senate of the  
Universiti Pertanian Malaysia in partial fulfillment of  
the requirement for the degree of Master of Science

**THE EFFECT OF IMMUNE ENHANCER ON THE NON-SPECIFIC  
DEFENSE MECHANISM OF RED TILAPIA HYBRID (*OREOCHROMIS  
NILOTICUS X OREOCHROMIS MOSSAMBICUS*) CHALLENGED  
WITH *AEROMONAS HYDROPHILA***

by

Joselito R. Somga

December 1995

Chairman: Prof. Mohd. Shariff Mohd. Din, Ph.D

Faculty : Fisheries and Marine Science

Immunomodulation of ENCAP in red tilapia hybrid against *Aeromonas hydrophila* was studied. Different concentrations of ENCAP (0, 500, 750 and 1000 mg/kg of feed) were fed to different groups of fish and later challenged by intraperitoneal injection of  $8 \times 10^8$  CFU/ml *A. hydrophila*. The non-specific immune response was determined after one, two, four and seven days post bacterial challenge using haematological and serological assays such as haematocrit, WBC counts, potential killing activity of neutrophils and other phagocytic cells by NBT, lysozyme activity and total plasma protein. Different concentrations of ENCAP showed different levels of immunopotentiality.



Hematocrit levels and WBC counts decreased in all the groups due to migration of erythrocytes and leukocytes to the infected areas. Probably, toxins released by the bacteria also contributed to these lowered levels. Neutrophils and other phagocytic cells demonstrated an increase in the potential killing activity. Lysozyme activity also increased in fish fed with ENCAP, while total plasma protein decreased brought about by the abnormal function of the liver to synthesize protein. Based on these cellular and humoral factors, fish fed with 750 mg/kg ENCAP had a consistently higher immune response. Fish fed with 500 mg/kg and 1000 mg/kg showed a lower immune response which suggests slight immunopotentialiation and mild immunosuppression, respectively.

Histopathology showed that both the control and fish fed with different concentrations of ENCAP exhibited varying lesions in the spleen, liver, pancreatic tissue and kidney. However fish fed with ENCAP showed a significantly higher survivability. Results of this study indicated that ENCAP caused immunomodulation. The enhanced non-specific response contributed to the increased survivability.



Abstrak tesis dikemukakan kepada  
Senat Universiti Pertanian Malaysia sebagai memenuhi  
sebahagian syarat untuk mendapat Ijazah Master Sains

**KESAN PERANGSANG IMMUN KE ATAS MEKANISME PERTAHANAN TIDAK  
SPECIFIK DALAM HIBRID TILAPIA MERAH (*OREOCHROMIS  
NILOTICUS X OREOCHROMIS MOSSAMBICUS*) YANG  
DICABAR DENGAN *AEROMONAS HYDROPHILA***

oleh

Joselito R. Somga

Disember 1995

Pengerusi: Prof. Mohd. Shariff Mohd. Din, Ph.D

Faculti : Perikanan dan Sains Samudera

Immunomodulasi oleh ENCAP pada hibrid tilapia merah terhadap *Aeromonas hydrophila* telah dikaji. Kepekatan ENCAP yang berbeza (0, 500, 750 dan 1000 mg/kg makanan) telah diberi kepada beberapa kumpulan ikan dan kemudian dicabar dengan suntikan intraperitoneal  $8 \times 10^8$  CFU/ml *A. hydrophila*. Tindakbalas tidak spesifik imun telah ditentukan pada hari pertama, kedua, keempat dan ketujuh selepas suntikan bakteria dengan menggunakan hematologikal dan serologikal asej seperti hematokrit, pengiraan sel darah putih, potensi aktiviti membunuh neutrofil dan sel-sel fagositik lain secara NBT, aktiviti lisozim dan jumlah protein plasma. Kepekatan ENCAP yang berbeza menunjukkan tahap immunopotensasi yang berbeza.



Paras hematokrit dan jumlah WBC berkurang dalam semua kumpulan disebabkan oleh migrasi eritosit dan leukosit ke kawasan yang dijangkiti. Mungkin, toksin yang dilepaskan oleh bakteria menyumbang kepada tahap yang rendah tersebut. Neutrofil dan sel-sel fagositik lain menunjukkan peningkatan potensi aktiviti membunuh. Aktiviti lisozim telah juga ditingkatkan pada ikan yang diberi makan ENCAP. Sementara jumlah protein plasma berkurang akibat dari fungsi abnormal hati mensesintesis protein. Berdasarkan faktor-faktor sellular dan humoral, ikan yang diberi makan 750 mg/kg ENCAP mempunyai tindakbalas immunisasi tinggi yang berpanjangan. Ikan yang diberi makan 500 mg/kg menunjukkan tindakbalas immunisasi rendah yang mencadangkan sedikit immunopotensasi dan manakala pada 1000 mg/kg menunjukkan immunosupresi.

Histopatologi menunjukkan kedua-dua kawalan dan ikan yang diberi makan dengan kepekatan ENCAP yang berlainan mempamerkan lesi yang berbeza dalam limpa, hati, tisu pankreatik dan ginjal. Walaubagaimanapun, ikan yang diberi makan dengan ENCAP menunjukkan kemandirian yang jelas tinggi. Keputusan kajian ini menunjukkan bahawa ENCAP menyebabkan immunomodulasi. Tindakbalas tidak spesifik yang dirangsang menyumbang kepada peningkatan kemandirian.

## CHAPTER I

### GENERAL INTRODUCTION

Aquaculture plays a vital role in the production of fish and other fishery products. Aquaculture has expanded around the world due to the increasing demand of protein from the growing human population and the decline of available natural aquatic resources. However, the rapid expansion and intensification of fish farming lead to the occurrence of various economically important diseases. Consideration on the intimate relationship between the fish, pathogen and environment seems to be neglected. The unwise increase of stocking density together with the deterioration of the aquatic environment can cause stress to the cultured fish. Stress lowers the resistance of the fish thereby giving chance to opportunistic pathogens to become invasive. Thus fish in this scenario, will inevitably succumb to diseases cause by either viruses, bacteria, parasites and fungi.

To overcome such problems, fish culturists became more dependent on the use of chemotherapeutic agents. But with the limitation of approved chemotherapeutic products, overused or misused of antibiotics generate the risk of



bacterial resistant pathogens and the problems of drug residues in the environment and fish products (Ellis, 1988; Ghittino *et al.*, 1984; Anderson, 1992; Baticados and Paclibare, 1992; Nikl *et al.*, 1993). Rijkers *et al.* (1981) reported that prolonged used of oxytetracycline cause depression of the humoral and cellular immunity in common carp. Some chemicals such as malachite green, a known parasiticide and pyridylmercuric acetate, an effective fungicide cause cancer and mercury accumulation in tissues respectively (Anderson *et al.*, 1984).

The use of vaccine to stimulate the production of antibody against specific pathogen has been studied. The first experimental vaccination in fish was reported by Duff in 1942 against furunculosis using killed *Aeromonas salmonicida* given orally. But since then only few vaccines have been proven to be effective on commercial scale. Other vaccinations that have been successfully done experimentally were not reliably reproduced even using other techniques of administration and antigen preparation (Ellis, 1988). Although vaccination is a valuable approach for disease prevention (Alderman and Michel, 1991) its usefulness is limited by their specificity, lack of availability and high cost to produce commercially (Ellis, 1988; Yoshida *et al.*, 1993).



The constraints on the use of chemotherapeutic agents and vaccines in fish farming further the development of more effective ways and means to protect the fish from various disease causing organisms. The use and application of immunostimulants for protecting the fish against diseases has been attempted. Immunostimulant elevates the non-specific defense mechanism or the specific immune response (Anderson, 1992). This may be administered alone or in combination with vaccine to activate the non-specific defense mechanism as well as heightening the specific immune response.

The non-specific defense mechanism is the first line of defense which constitutes the protective barriers such as skin and scales, humoral factors in mucus and sera such as lysozymes, C-reactive protein, transferrin and interferon, and the cellular factors such as phagocytic cells, neutrophils and macrophages (Fletcher, 1986; Roberts, 1989; Robertsen *et al.*, 1990; Kaige *et al.*, 1990; Anderson, 1992). On the otherhand, the specific defense mechanism is responsible for initiating and mediating the humoral, cell mediated immunity (CMI) and the memory. The humoral immunity refers to the production of soluble antibody, whereas the CMI refers to responses which are mediated by lymphocytes and macrophages and the memory constitutes an adaptive change in the lymphoid cells causing an enhanced magnitude with subsequent challenge by the same antigen (Roberts, 1989).





The use of immunostimulants is being intensified in the areas of cancer and AIDS (Acquired immunodeficiency syndrome) research (Fudenberg and Whitten, 1984; Azuma and Jolles, 1987; WHO, 1990 as cited by Anderson, 1992). It activates macrophages, T- and B-lymphocytes, and natural killer cells that increase the body's ability to destroy tumour cells (Raa *et al.*, 1992). Immunostimulants were also used for activating early protection against diseases in domestic animals (Kehrli *et al.*, 1990).

Immunostimulants can be obtained from a very diverse natural sources and a large number have been made by chemical synthesis with natural products as structural models (Raa *et al.*, 1992). Different substances have been tested to stimulate immune response in fish. Glucans, a long-chain polysaccharides extracted from yeast given parenterally or orally were evaluated in fish for their ability to enhance protection against different bacterial pathogens (Yano *et al.*, 1989; Robertsen *et al.*, 1990; Raa *et al.*, 1992; Chen and Ainsworth, 1992; Nikl *et al.*, 1993; Jeney and Anderson, 1993).

Some drugs such as levamisole, quaternary ammonium compound (QAC) and short chain polypeptide (ISK) affect the non-specific defense mechanism activities (Jeney and Anderson, 1993). Immunoactive peptide FK 565 (Kitao and

