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ABSTRACT

Using standard equations, we have concluded that the light intensities which have been used by investigators attempting to induce maturation and spawning are up to 4000 times higher than would occur over the spawning grounds of *Penaeus setiferus*, a species for which successful controlled spawning has yet to be achieved. We recommend that future attempts at captive maturation and spawning with that species be conducted at light levels of no more than 12 µW cm\(^{-2}\) and that the intensity at which other species of shrimp are matured and spawned be examined relative to natural light levels on their spawning grounds. It is further recommended that the need for light of blue or green color be evaluated for its role as a promotor of maturation and spawning. The intent of these modifications in current spawning procedures is to eliminate the need for eyestalk ablation in captively spawning penaeid shrimp.

Viable spawns from unablated white shrimp, *Penaeus setiferus*, matured in the laboratory, have not been reported. Current methods for inducing maturation and spawning in other species of penaeid shrimp depend heavily on the technique of unilateral eyestalk ablation (Aquacop, 1975; Wear and Santiago, 1976; Santiago, 1977; Halder, 1978; Primavera, 1978; Beard and Wickins, 1980; Lawrence et al., 1980; Brown et al., 1980; Emmerson, 1980, 1983). Eyestalk ablation should be considered a stop-gap measure until less traumatic methods can be developed. Utilization of environmental rather than surgical stimulation of maturation may overcome the problems of reduced fecundity and poor egg viability which frequently follow use of the ablation technique.

Many of the problems which have led to difficulty in spawning penaeid
shrimp in the laboratory appear to relate to the fact that researchers have not faithfully reproduced natural conditions with respect to light intensity and color. To date, primary environmental control has been in terms of temperature and photoperiod.

The importance of light in controlling phytoplankton blooms in aquatic environments is widely recognized, as is the tendency of some planktonic species to key their reproductive peaks to correspond with phytoplankton blooms (Heinrich, 1962). While it has not been firmly demonstrated experimentally, there is circumstantial evidence to indicate that many marine animals, particularly those with herbivorous or omnivorous planktonic larvae, synchronize their hormonal cycles and gonadal maturation periods with those portions of the annual light cycle which promote the highest levels of primary productivity. In addition, the presence of an eyestalk mediated reproductive mechanism in shrimp emphasizes the importance of light on maturation. It is our purpose in this paper to present support for the contention that light intensity and color are keys to the induction of gonadal spawning of unablated white shrimp (*Penaeus setiferus*) may not readily occur.

Light is attenuated as it passes through sea water and it is only wavelengths in the blue and green which penetrate to appreciable depth, even in clear water. Turbidity affects light penetration as does angle of incidence. The amount of surface light reaching a given depth can be determined from the equation

\[ I_z = I_0 e^{-kz} \]

where, \( I_0 \) is surface light intensity; \( I_z \) is the light intensity at depth \( z \) (in meters); \( e \) is the natural logarithm; and \( k \) is the extinction coefficient. Light intensities are reported in \( \mu \text{W cm}^{-2} \).

The extinction coefficient is related to wavelength and the level of suspended particulate matter. In clear coastal waters, \( k \) is about 0.15, while in turbid coastal waters it is around 0.46. In the highly turbid waters of many harbors and estuaries, values of \( k \) may be as high as 1.5 (Clark and Denton, 1962). In coastal waters, light in the green or yellow-green range (500--600 nm wavelength) is the least attenuated (Clark and Denton, 1962; Gross, 1972).

*P. setiferus* occur in highest concentrations at a depth of about 20 m off the Texas coast (Darnell et al., 1983), so it was that depth which was selected for evaluation of light intensity. We calculated the maximum possible light intensity at the ocean bottom in 20 m of water on a clear day at latitudes of 25°N and 30°N at solar noon on 22 June, 21 March and 22 December. Since *P. setiferus* is found close to shore, an extinction coefficient of 0.46 was adopted. We find that coefficient to be consistent with an actual value (\( k = 0.47 \)) calculated from a set of light readings obtained at 28°59.3′N and 90°0.5′W in the Gulf of Mexico (T.J. Bright, personal communication, 1983).
Surface light intensity was calculated for the time and dates of interest from tables presented by List (1951). The data are presented in Table I for 20 m. Of particular importance is the fact that at each latitude and date the maximum light intensity at depth $I_z$ is less than 12 $\mu$W cm$^{-2}$. If maturation actually occurs in shallow water where mature shrimp are most often taken along the Texas coast (Gallaway and Reitsema, 1981), the calculated value for 20 m may still be high due to the increased nearshore values of the extinction coefficient. It is our hypothesis that the values presented in Table I are maximum light intensities to which maturing white shrimp would be exposed. Our calculations may lead to values which are actually higher than those present over shrimp spawning grounds since the calculations assumed cloudless skies and the absence of a turbidity layer near the bottom of the water column. The calculations were also made at solar noon, when light penetration is maximum for the day. The actual value from the Gulf of Mexico obtained on 12 February 1983 at between 14.25 and 14.30 h at 15.8 m depth under 30% cloud cover was 2.25 $\mu$W cm$^{-2}$ (T.J. Bright, personal communication, 1983).

### TABLE I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Latitude</th>
<th>Angle of sun from horizon</th>
<th>Surface light ($\mu$W cm$^{-2}$)</th>
<th>$I_z$ ($\mu$W cm$^{-2}$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22 December</td>
<td>25°N</td>
<td>36°33'</td>
<td>65171.7</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 December</td>
<td>30°N</td>
<td>41°33'</td>
<td>56597.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 March</td>
<td>25°N</td>
<td>59°55'</td>
<td>98864.1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 March</td>
<td>30°N</td>
<td>64°55'</td>
<td>93513.2</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 June</td>
<td>25°N</td>
<td>83°27'</td>
<td>115968.1</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 June</td>
<td>30°N</td>
<td>88°27'</td>
<td>115119.8</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When compared with light intensities reported by various investigators who have attempted to spawn penaeid shrimp in the laboratory, we find that our value is as much as 4000 times lower (Table II). Support for our value comes from the work by Chamberlain and Lawrence (1981) with *P. stylirostris* which showed that greatest spawning success was at a light level equivalent to 13 $\mu$W cm$^{-2}$. No attempts were made to spawn that species at light levels between 0 and 13 $\mu$W cm$^{-2}$.

If annual seasonal cycles are to be approximated in the laboratory to induce spawning in shrimp, it is important to adjust not only temperature and photoperiod, but also to adjust for seasonal differences in light intensity. As shown in Table I, light intensity is reduced by more than 40% in the winter as compared with the summer.

There is some experimental evidence to support the contention that not
only should shrimp be spawned under low light intensity, but that blue or green light should be used. Emmerson et al. (1983) demonstrated that unablated *P. indicus* grew and spawned continuously when held in a 12 h photoperiod at 45 µW cm$^{-2}$ under green and blue light. However, shrimp of the same species ceased spawning and lost weight when maintained under the same photoperiod in diffuse natural light of 50 µW cm$^{-2}$. Spectral influences on spawning were also examined by Caillouet (1972) and Primavera (1980).

### TABLE II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shrimp species</th>
<th>Light Intensity (µW cm$^{-2}$)</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Penaeus merguiensis</em>, <em>P. japonicus</em>, <em>P. aztecas</em>, <em>P. semisulcatus</em>, <em>P. setiferus</em>, <em>Metapenaeus ensis</em></td>
<td>11597-46 387</td>
<td>Aquacop (1975); Lawrence et al. (1980)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>P. japonicus</em></td>
<td>130- 544</td>
<td>Laubier-Bonichon (1978)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>P. stylirostris</em>, <em>P. vannamei</em></td>
<td>0- 320</td>
<td>Chamberlain and Lawrence (1981)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>P. indicus</em>, <em>P. monodon</em></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Emmerson (1980, 1983)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>P. monodon</em></td>
<td>39- 68</td>
<td>Beard and Wickins (1981)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>P. indicus</em></td>
<td>45- 50</td>
<td>Emmerson et al. (1983)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>P. plebejus</em></td>
<td>3- 17</td>
<td>Kelemec and Smith (1980)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another apparently light-related phenomenon involves the lack of spawning in small tanks. Many researchers feel that only relatively large tanks can be used to spawn shrimp. Emmerson (1983) noted that unablated *P. monodon* would not spawn in tanks 2 m X 1.5 m X 0.5 m deep, even under reduced light intensity. In an earlier study, the same author (Emmerson, 1980) found that *P. indicus* held in tanks with black interiors spawned twice as frequently as those maintained in tanks with white interiors. The difference would appear to relate to the absorbance of light in black tanks as compared with reflectance in white tanks. While some shrimp species may actually require considerable space to affect mating, an argument can be made that small tanks reflect more light internally than large ones and, because of generally shallower water, may also attenuate less light. Thus, under the same surface intensities, the $I_t$ to which the shrimp are exposed may be higher in a small tank, another reason to use tanks with dark colored interiors and to measure light intensities within tanks, rather than at the water surface.
In summary, our evaluation has demonstrated that the levels of light being utilized to spawn penaeid shrimp in the laboratory are excessively high compared with conditions on the natural spawning grounds and that the color of light being used does not simulate natural conditions. Incorporation of light intensities over spawning chambers of no more than 12 µW cm\(^{-2}\) utilizing blue or green light may obviate the need for eyestalk ablation. This theory should, at least, be thoroughly tested by investigators who have the facilities to conduct the studies. The ultimate goal will be to eliminate the need for eyestalk ablation and to spawn shrimp on demand through manipulation of environmental conditions alone. While *P. setiferus* was used as our model, the approach may have merit in conjunction with other penaeids, other crustaceans and finfish as well.
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