Agri Articles
(e-Magazine for Agricultural Articles)
Volume: 06, Issue: 04 (JULY-AUG, 2026)
Available online at http://www.agriarticles.com

Microbial Feed Additives as Functional Nutritional Strategies for Sustainable Aquaculture

Shivm Saroj, *Dinesh Kumar, C.P. Singh and Rahul Kumar
College of Fisheries, ANDUAT, Kumarganj, Ayodhya 224229, (U.P.)
*Corresponding Author's email: dineshfish@reddifmail.com

The rapid global expansion and intensification of the aquaculture sector have placed unprecedented pressure on traditional feed ingredients, aquatic ecosystem health, and disease management practices. Historically, the industry relied heavily on prophylactic antibiotics to combat disease outbreaks; however, rising antimicrobial resistance (AMR) and environmental residue concerns have driven global regulatory bans. Functional feed additives, specifically microbial-based strategies including probiotics, prebiotics, synbiotics, and paraprobiotics, have emerged as pivotal tools to ensure ecological and economic sustainability in modern aquaculture. These bioactive microbial interventions operate through multiple physiological axes: modulating host intestinal microbiota, enhancing gut mucosal integrity, boosting non-specific innate immune responses, improving feed utilization via endogenous enzyme production, and contributing to water quality remediation through nitrogenous waste assimilation.

Keywords: Microbial feed additives, sustainable aquaculture, probiotics, gut health, feed efficiency.

Introduction

Aquaculture is the fastest-growing food production sector globally, contributing over 50% of the aquatic animal food production consumed worldwide (FAO, 2024). To keep pace with human population growth and increasing protein demand, commercial aquaculture operations have shifted from low-density extensive systems to high-density intensive and super-intensive systems (FAO, 2024; Boyd et al., 2020). While this transition has maximized production per unit area, it has simultaneously introduced physiological stress, deteriorated water quality, and increased susceptibility to infectious pathogens such as *Vibrio*, *Aeromonas*, *Streptococcus*, and *Yersinia* species (Ringø et al., 2020; Hai, 2015).

- **Antimicrobial Resistance (AMR):** Horizontal transfer of antibiotic resistance genes (ARGs) from aquatic microorganisms to human pathogens (Cabello et al., 2013; WHO, 2023).
- **Dysbiosis:** Disruption of the host's beneficial intestinal microbiota, reducing digestive and immune efficiency (Ringø et al., 2020).
- **Ecotoxicity:** Accumulation and persistence of antimicrobial residues in aquatic environments, sediments, and non-target organisms (Cabello et al., 2013).

Categorization of Microbial Feed Additives

Microbial feed additives encompass live microorganisms, non-digestible substrates, synergistic combinations of probiotics and prebiotics, as well as inactivated microbial cells and their metabolites. These functional additives exhibit distinct biochemical characteristics and mechanisms of action that improve host health, growth performance, nutrient utilization, and disease resistance (Dawood et al., 2018; Hoseinifar et al., 2018).

Probiotics

Probiotics are defined as live microorganisms that, when administered in adequate amounts, confer a health benefit on the host (Hill et al., 2014). In aquaculture, probiotics function both within the gastrointestinal tract and in the surrounding aquatic environment by improving microbial balance and suppressing pathogenic microorganisms (Hai, 2015; Ringø et al., 2020).

Common probiotic microorganisms include:

- **Bacterial strains:** *Bacillus subtilis*, *B. licheniformis*, *B. velezensis*, *Lactobacillus* spp., *Pediococcus* spp., *Enterococcus* spp., *Pseudomonas* spp., and *Shewanella* spp. (Banerjee & Ray, 2017; Ringø et al., 2020).
- **Yeasts and fungi:** *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*, *Debaryomyces hansenii*, and *Pichia pastoris* (Merrifield & Rodiles, 2015).

Prebiotics

Prebiotics are selectively utilized non-digestible feed ingredients that stimulate the growth and activity of beneficial intestinal microorganisms, thereby improving host health (Gibson et al., 2017).

Common prebiotics include:

- Mannan-oligosaccharides (MOS)
- Fructo-oligosaccharides (FOS)
- Galacto-oligosaccharides (GOS)
- Isomalto-oligosaccharides (IMOS)
- β-glucans
- Inulin
- Arabinoxylan oligosaccharides (AXOS)
- Microalgal polysaccharides

(Hoseinifar et al., 2018; Ringø et al., 2020).

Synbiotics

Synbiotics are combinations of probiotics and prebiotics that act synergistically by enhancing the survival, colonization, and metabolic activity of beneficial microorganisms within the gastrointestinal tract (Swanson et al., 2020).

Typical combinations include:

- *Bacillus subtilis* + MOS
- *Lactobacillus plantarum* + FOS
- *Pediococcus acidilactici* + β-glucan

(Hoseinifar et al., 2018; Dawood et al., 2018).

Paraprobiotics and Postbiotics

Paraprobiotics are non-viable microbial cells or cell fragments that confer health benefits despite lacking metabolic activity, offering improved thermal stability and longer shelf life than live probiotics (Zendeboodi et al., 2020).

Postbiotics consist of soluble bioactive metabolites produced during microbial fermentation, including:

- Short-chain fatty acids (SCFAs)
- Organic acids
- Bacteriocins
- Vitamins
- Exopolysaccharides

which enhance intestinal health and immune function (Aguilar-Toalá et al., 2018).

Gut Microbiota Modulation and Competitive Exclusion

Probiotic microorganisms colonize the intestinal mucosa and competitively exclude pathogenic bacteria by occupying adhesion sites and competing for available nutrients (Ringø et al., 2020). They produce antimicrobial substances including bacteriocins, hydrogen peroxide, lactic acid, acetic acid, and propionic acid, thereby lowering intestinal pH and inhibiting pathogenic bacteria such as *Vibrio* and *Aeromonas* species (Hai, 2015; Banerjee &

Ray, 2017). Certain *Bacillus* species additionally produce lactonase enzymes capable of degrading N-acyl homoserine lactones (AHLs), interrupting quorum sensing and reducing pathogen virulence and biofilm formation (Defoirdt et al., 2011).

Enhancement of Gut Epithelial Integrity

Microbial metabolites, particularly short-chain fatty acids produced through prebiotic fermentation, strengthen intestinal barrier function by:

- Upregulating tight-junction proteins including claudin, occludin, and zonula occludens-1 (ZO-1).
- Increasing intestinal villus height and absorptive surface area.
- Stimulating goblet cell mucin secretion.

These changes improve nutrient absorption while reducing pathogen invasion (Pérez et al., 2010; Ringø et al., 2020).

Immunomodulation and Stress Resilience

Microbial feed additives activate innate immunity by interacting with Pattern Recognition Receptors (PRRs), particularly Toll-like receptors (TLRs), located on intestinal epithelial and immune cells (Dawood et al., 2018).

They enhance:

- Lysozyme activity
- Myeloperoxidase (MPO)
- Superoxide dismutase (SOD)
- Catalase (CAT)
- Phagocytic activity
- Respiratory burst
- Complement activity (ACH50)

while regulating cytokines including TNF-α, IL-1β, IL-8, IL-10 and TGF-β, thereby improving disease resistance and reducing inflammatory damage (Esteban, 2012; Dawood et al., 2018).

Digestibility and Endogenous Enzyme Production

Several probiotic bacteria, particularly *Bacillus* and *Lactobacillus* species, secrete extracellular digestive enzymes including:

- Amylases
- Proteases
- Lipases
- Cellulases
- Phytases

These enzymes improve digestion of carbohydrates, proteins and lipids, increase Apparent Digestibility Coefficients (ADC), and reduce Feed Conversion Ratio (FCR), thereby enhancing growth performance (Nayak, 2010; Banerjee & Ray, 2017).

Role in Sustainable Resource Utilization

As aquaculture increasingly replaces finite fish meal and fish oil with sustainable alternatives such as soybean meal, canola meal, insect meal, and single-cell proteins, microbial feed additives play an essential role in maintaining feed efficiency, gut health, and nutrient digestibility (Gatlin et al., 2007; FAO, 2024).

Plant protein concentrates, widely used as sustainable alternatives to fish meal, contain several antinutritional factors (ANFs), including phytate, saponins, lectins, trypsin inhibitors, and non-starch polysaccharides (NSPs). These compounds can impair nutrient digestion, bind essential minerals, alter intestinal morphology, and induce enteritis, thereby reducing growth performance and feed utilization in cultured fish (Gatlin et al., 2007; Glencross et al., 2020). Microbial feed additives play a significant role in mitigating these adverse effects through enzymatic degradation and modulation of gut microbiota (Hoseinifar et al., 2018).

Figure 1. Microbial Feed Additives in Sustainable Diets

- Phytate Degradation: Microbial phytase-producing strains such as *Aspergillus niger* and *Bacillus subtilis* hydrolyze myo-inositol hexakisphosphate (phytate) into lower inositol phosphates and inorganic phosphate, thereby increasing the bioavailability of phosphorus and releasing bound minerals including calcium (Ca^{2+}), magnesium (Mg^{2+}), and zinc (Zn^{2+}) (Selle & Ravindran, 2007; Adeola & Cowieson, 2011).
- Alleviation of Soybean Meal-Induced Enteritis (SBMIE): Dietary supplementation with mannan-oligosaccharides (MOS) or probiotic strains such as *Pediococcus acidilactici* helps maintain intestinal morphology, reduces inflammatory responses, and prevents soybean meal-induced enteritis commonly observed in salmonids and marine fish fed high levels of plant proteins (Refstie et al., 2010; Ringø et al., 2020).

Environmental Remediation and Bioremediation

Microbial feed additives contribute not only to host nutrition but also to environmental sustainability by improving water quality and reducing organic pollution in aquaculture systems. Beneficial microorganisms excreted through feces remain metabolically active within the water column and sediment, where they participate in nutrient cycling and biodegradation processes (Banerjee & Ray, 2017; Hai, 2015).

- Nitrogenous Waste Assimilation: Species of *Bacillus* assimilate toxic unionized ammonia (NH_3) and nitrite (NO_2^-) into microbial biomass, thereby lowering nitrogen accumulation in Recirculating Aquaculture Systems (RAS), biofloc systems, and zero-water-exchange ponds (De Schryver et al., 2008; Ringø et al., 2020).
- Organic Sludge Reduction: Extracellular enzymes produced by beneficial microorganisms degrade uneaten feed residues and fecal organic matter, resulting in lower biochemical oxygen demand (BOD), chemical oxygen demand (COD), and sludge accumulation, thereby improving pond ecology and water quality (Crab et al., 2012; Hai, 2015).

Comparative Efficacy Across Key Species

The effectiveness of microbial feed additives varies among aquaculture species because of differences in digestive physiology, gastrointestinal morphology, feeding habits, environmental conditions, and immune responses. Species-specific differences in gut microbiota composition also influence probiotic colonization and functional efficacy (Ringø et al., 2020; Hoseinifar et al., 2018). Numerous studies have demonstrated improved growth performance, feed conversion efficiency, immune competence, and disease resistance in finfish, shrimp, and mollusks following dietary supplementation with probiotics, prebiotics, and synbiotics (Dawood et al., 2018; Banerjee & Ray, 2017).

Industrial Challenges, Processing Bottlenecks, and Solutions

Despite extensive laboratory and field evidence supporting the benefits of microbial feed additives, several technical challenges limit their large-scale commercial application. Maintaining microbial viability during feed manufacturing, storage, and transportation remains one of the principal constraints affecting product efficacy (Merrifield & Rodiles, 2015; Dawood et al., 2018).

Thermal Stability During Pelleting and Extrusion

Commercial aquafeed production generally involves extrusion and pelleting processes at temperatures ranging from 90 to 140°C under high pressure (30–50 bar). Such processing conditions substantially reduce the viability of non-spore-forming probiotic bacteria, particularly lactic acid bacteria (LAB) (Bajagai et al., 2016).

Potential solutions include:

- Utilization of heat-resistant endospore-forming *Bacillus* species.
- Application of Post-Pelleting Vacuum Coating (PPVC) to introduce probiotics after thermal processing.
- Increasing use of paraprobiotics, which retain biological activity despite heat inactivation (Zendeboodi et al., 2020; Dawood et al., 2018).

Next-Generation Probiotics (NGPs)

Advances in high-throughput 16S rRNA sequencing, metagenomics, metatranscriptomics, and metabolomics have enabled identification of host-specific core microbiomes. These technologies facilitate the isolation of autochthonous probiotics, which are better adapted to the host intestinal environment than terrestrial bacterial strains, resulting in improved colonization efficiency and health benefits (Ringø et al., 2020; Pérez-Sánchez et al., 2018).

Synbiotic Nano-Delivery Systems

Nanotechnology is emerging as a promising platform for targeted delivery of probiotics, prebiotics, and postbiotic compounds. Nano-encapsulation enhances the stability of sensitive bioactive molecules, protects them from degradation during digestion, and enables controlled release in the distal intestine or gut-associated lymphoid tissue (GALT), thereby improving biological efficacy (Dawood et al., 2022; Hosseini et al., 2021).

Artificial Intelligence in Custom Feed Formulations

Artificial intelligence (AI) and machine learning are increasingly being integrated into aquaculture nutrition to predict interactions among host genetics, dietary composition, gut microbiota, and environmental variables such as water temperature and salinity. AI-driven precision nutrition has the potential to optimize microbial feed additive formulations in real time, thereby improving productivity, disease prevention, and sustainability in commercial aquaculture systems (Abdel-Latif et al., 2023; FAO, 2024).

Conclusions

Microbial feed additives encompassing probiotics, prebiotics, synbiotics, and paraprobiotics represent an essential biological strategy for modern, sustainable aquaculture. By systematically improving host growth performance, gut health, nutrient digestibility, innate immune defense, and environmental water quality, these functional additives offer a viable, non-chemical alternative to prophylactic antibiotics. Integrating these microbial strategies into sustainable, alternative protein diets is essential to ensuring the long-term resilience and profitability of global aquaculture.

References

1. Abdel-Latif, H. M. R., Dawood, M. A. O., & Hoseinifar, S. H. (2023). Artificial intelligence and precision nutrition in sustainable aquaculture. *Reviews in Aquaculture, 15*(4), 1801–1822.

2. Adeola, O., & Cowieson, A. J. (2011). Opportunities and challenges in using phytase in animal nutrition. *Journal of Animal Science, 89*, 3189–3218.
3. Aguilar-Toalá, J. E., Garcia-Varela, R., Garcia, H. S., Mata-Haro, V., González-Córdova, A. F., Vallejo-Cordoba, B., & Hernández-Mendoza, A. (2018). Postbiotics: An evolving term within the functional foods field. *Trends in Food Science & Technology, 75*, 105–114.
4. Bajagai, Y. S., Klieve, A. V., Dart, P. J., & Bryden, W. L. (2016). *Probiotics in animal nutrition*. FAO Animal Production and Health Paper No. 179.
5. Banerjee, G., & Ray, A. K. (2017). The advancement of probiotics research and its application in fish farming industries. *Research in Veterinary Science, 115*, 66–77.
6. Boyd, C. E., D'Abramo, L. R., Glencross, B. D., et al. (2020). Achieving sustainable aquaculture: Historical and current perspectives. *Journal of the World Aquaculture Society, 51*(3), 578–633.
7. Cabello, F. C., Godfrey, H. P., Buschmann, A. H., & Dölz, H. J. (2013). Aquaculture as yet another environmental gateway to the development and spread of antimicrobial resistance. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases, 13*(10), e127–e133.
8. Chávarri, M., et al. (2010). Microencapsulation of probiotics using alginate-chitosan capsules. *International Journal of Food Microbiology, 142*, 185–189.
9. Cook, M. T., Tzortzis, G., Charalampopoulos, D., & Khutoryanskiy, V. V. (2012). Microencapsulation of probiotics. *Journal of Controlled Release, 162*, 56–67.
10. Crab, R., Defoirdt, T., Bossier, P., & Verstraete, W. (2012). Biofloc technology in aquaculture. *Aquaculture, 356–357*, 351–356.
11. Dawood, M. A. O., et al. (2018). Beneficial roles of feed additives as immunostimulants in aquaculture. *Reviews in Aquaculture, 10*, 950–974.
12. Dawood, M. A. O., et al. (2022). Nanotechnology applications in aquaculture nutrition. *Aquaculture, 547*, 737486.
13. Dawood, M. A. O., Koshio, S., & Esteban, M. Á. (2018). Beneficial roles of feed additives as immunostimulants in aquaculture. *Reviews in Aquaculture, 10*(4), 950–974.
14. Defoirdt, T., Boon, N., & Bossier, P. (2011). Can bacteria evolve resistance to quorum sensing disruption? *PLoS Pathogens, 7*(7), e1002148.
15. Esteban, M. Á. (2012). An overview of the immunological defenses in fish skin. *ISRN Immunology*, 2012, 853470.
16. FAO. (2024). *The State of World Fisheries and Aquaculture 2024*. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.
17. Gatlin, D. M., (2007). Expanding the utilization of sustainable plant products in aquafeeds. *Aquaculture Research, 38*, 551–579.
18. Gibson, G. R., (2017). The ISAPP consensus statement on prebiotics. *Nature Reviews Gastroenterology & Hepatology, 14*, 491–502.
19. Glencross, B. D., (2020). A review of the nutritional management of plant proteins in aquafeeds. *Reviews in Aquaculture, 12*, 2484–2513.
20. Hai, N. V. (2015). The use of probiotics in aquaculture. *Journal of Applied Microbiology, 119*(4), 917–935.
21. Hill, C., (2014). Expert consensus document: The ISAPP consensus statement on probiotics. *Nature Reviews Gastroenterology & Hepatology, 11*(8), 506–514.
22. Hoseinifar, S. H., (2018). Probiotics as means of diseases control in aquaculture. *Reviews in Aquaculture, 10*, 899–913.
23. Hosseini, S. M., (2021). Nanotechnology-based delivery systems in aquaculture. *Aquaculture Reports, 21*, 100812.
24. Merrifield, D. L., & Rodiles, A. (2015). The fish microbiome and its interactions with mucosal tissues. *Mucosal Health in Aquaculture*, 273–295.
25. Nayak, S. K. (2010). Probiotics and immunity: A fish perspective. *Fish & Shellfish Immunology, 29*(1), 2–14.

26. Pérez-Sánchez, T., et al. (2018). Next-generation probiotics in aquaculture. *Fish & Shellfish Immunology*, *81*, 337–345.
27. Refstie, S., et al. (2010). Soybean meal-induced enteritis in Atlantic salmon. *Aquaculture, 305*, 1–7.
28. Ringø, E., et al. (2020). Lactic acid bacteria in finfish—An update. *Frontiers in Microbiology*, *11*, 532.
29. Selle, P. H., & Ravindran, V. (2007). Microbial phytase in poultry nutrition. *Animal Feed Science and Technology*, *135*, 1–41.
30. Swanson, K. S., et al. (2020). The International Scientific Association for Probiotics and Prebiotics consensus statement on synbiotics. *Nature Reviews Gastroenterology & Hepatology*, *17*, 687–701.
31. WHO. (2023). *Antimicrobial resistance*. World Health Organization.
32. Zendeboodi, F., Khorshidian, N., Mortazavian, A. M., & da Cruz, A. G. (2020). Probiotic: Conceptualization from a new approach. *Current Opinion in Food Science*, *32*, 103–123.