

1 **The use of probiotics to control prawn diseases:**
2 **administration methods, antagonistic effects and immune**
3 **response**

4 Mirja Kaizer Ahmmed^{1,2}, Shuva Bhowmik^{3,4,5}, Fatema Ahmmed^{2,6}, Stephen G. Giteru^{4,7},
5 Shikder Saiful Islam^{8,9}, Mayssa Hachem¹⁰, Md. Ashraf Hussain¹¹, Osman N. Kanwugu¹²,
6 Dominic Agyei⁴, Tom Defoirdt^{13*}

7
8 ¹*Department of Fishing and Post-harvest Technology, Chittagong Veterinary and Animal Sciences University,*
9 *Chittagong, Bangladesh, kaizer@cvasu.ac.bd*

10 ²*Riddet Institute, Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand*

11 ³*Centre for Bioengineering and Nanomedicine, Division of Health Sciences, University of Otago, Dunedin, New*
12 *Zealand*

13 ⁴*Department of Food Science, University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand*

14 ⁵*Department of Fisheries and Marine Science, Noakhali Science and Technology University, Noakhali,*
15 *Bangladesh*

16 ⁶*Department of Chemistry, University of Otago, New Zealand*

17 ⁷*Alliance Group Limited, Invercargill 9840, New Zealand, gitongastephen@gmail.com*

18 ⁸*Fisheries and Marine Resource Technology Discipline, Life Science School, Khulna University, Khulna,*
19 *Bangladesh*

20 ⁹*Institute for Marine and Antarctic Studies, University of Tasmania, Launceston, Tasmania, Australia,*
21 *Shikersaiful.islam@utas.edu.au*

22 ¹⁰*Department of Chemistry and Healthcare Engineering Innovation Center, Khalifa University, Abu Dhabi P.O.*
23 *Box 127788, United Arab Emirates, mayssa.hachem@ku.ac.ae*

24 ¹¹*Department of Fisheries Technology and Quality Control, Agricultural University Sylhet, Bangladesh,*
25 *ashraf.ftqc@sau.ac.bd*

26 ¹²*Institute of Chemical Engineering, Ural Federal University, Mira Street 28, 620002 Yekaterinburg, Russia,*
27 *nabayire@gmail.com*

28 ¹³*Center for Microbial Ecology and Technology, Ghent University, Coupure Links 653, 9000 Gent, Belgium*

29

30 *Corresponding author:

31 Tom Defoirdt, Center for Microbial Ecology and Technology, Ghent University, Coupure
32 Links 653, 9000 Gent, Belgium, Email: Tom.Defoirdt@ugent.be, Phone: +3292645976

33

34 Journal: Journal of Fish Diseases

35

36 **Abstract**

37 The giant freshwater prawn (*Macrobrachium rosenbergii*) is a high-yielding prawn variety
38 well-received worldwide due to its ability to adapt to freshwater culture systems. *M.*
39 *rosenbergii* is an alternative to shrimp typically obtained from marine and brackish aquaculture
40 systems. However, the use of intensive culture systems can lead to disease outbreaks,
41 particularly in larval and post-larval stages, caused by pathogenic agents such as viruses,
42 bacteria, fungi, yeasts, and protozoans. White tail disease (viral), white spot syndrome (viral),
43 and bacterial necrosis are examples of economically significant diseases. Given the increasing
44 antibiotic resistance of disease-causing microorganisms, probiotics have emerged as promising
45 alternatives for disease control. Probiotics are live active microbes that are introduced into a
46 target host in an adequate number or dose to promote its health. In the present paper, we first
47 discuss the diseases that occur in *M. rosenbergii* production, followed by an in-depth
48 discussion on probiotics. We elaborate on the common methods of probiotics administration
49 and explain the beneficial health effects of probiotics as immunity enhancers. Moreover, we
50 discuss the antagonistic effects of probiotics on pathogenic microorganisms. Altogether, this
51 paper provides a comprehensive overview of disease control in *M. rosenbergii* aquaculture
52 through the use of probiotics, which could enhance the sustainability of prawn culture.

53

54 Keywords: *Macrobrachium rosenbergii*; innate immunity; disease management; prawn;
55 microorganisms; probiotic administration; host-derived probiotics

56

57

58

59

60

61

62

63

64

65

66

67 **1 Introduction**

68 The global seafood market was valued at US\$ 113 billion in 2020 and is projected to grow at
69 an annual rate of 2.9%, reaching US\$ 139 billion by 2027 (Research and Markets, 2022).
70 Shrimp and prawn are commonly consumed, around 20% of the global market (Research and
71 Markets, 2021). *Penaeus vannamei* (Pacific white shrimp or King prawn), *Penaeus monodon*
72 (giant tiger shrimp), and *Macrobrachium rosenbergii* (giant freshwater prawn) are the most
73 widely cultured species (Stankus, 2021).

74 *Macrobrachium rosenbergii* is a freshwater decapod crustacean belonging to the
75 *Palaemonidae* family. It is cultured as a freshwater prawn offering an alternative to shrimp
76 grown in brackish and marine aquaculture systems. Major countries producing prawn include
77 India, China, Thailand, Bangladesh, and Malaysia (Kader et al., 2021). *M. rosenbergii*'s
78 aquaculture has attracted significant attention due to its high production yield, disease
79 resistance, and ease of management in controlled freshwater systems such as rivers, lakes,
80 canals, reservoirs, and ponds. Nevertheless, the intensification of culture practices driven by
81 the increasing demand for prawn has also increased the susceptibility of *M. rosenbergii* to
82 diseases, resulting in a substantial decline in the production (Chen-Fei, Chou-Min, & Jiun-Yan,
83 2020; Lee et al., 2022; Pillai & Bonami, 2012b). Diseases affecting the larval and post-larval
84 stages of *M. rosenbergii* are primarily caused by viruses, bacteria, fungi, yeasts, and protists.
85 Some of these diseases are exclusive to the giant freshwater prawn, such as *Macrobrachium*
86 hepatopancreatic parvovirus (HPV) disease, rickettsia-like disease, white tail disease (WTD),
87 as well as idiopathic diseases including idiopathic muscle necrosis, balloon disease, and
88 appendage deformity syndrome (Pillai & Bonami, 2012b). White tail disease (WTD) caused
89 by *M. rosenbergii* nodavirus (MrNV) is known to have a mortality rate of 100% (Sahul Hameed
90 & Bonami, 2012).

91 Typical methods for disease control in aquaculture include implementing rigorous biosecurity
92 protocols, adopting appropriate husbandry practices, administering antibiotics, vaccination,
93 and using immunostimulants (Chen-Fei et al., 2020). Vaccination is not an effective method
94 for invertebrates like prawns because they do not have adaptive immunity (Rowley & Pope,
95 2012). The rapid growth in demand for aquaculture products has decreased the efficiency of
96 disease control measures and led to a substantial increase in antibiotics use (Henriksson et al.,
97 2018). While antibiotics yield to quick recovery from diseases, their effects on the ecosystem
98 and the emergence of antibiotic-resistant disease-causing agents have led to the investigation

99 of alternative disease control remedies (Henriksson et al., 2018; Zorriehzahra et al., 2016). One
100 of these approaches is the application of probiotics.

101 The aim of this review was to provide an in-depth analysis of disease etiology in giant
102 freshwater prawn and explore the potential of probiotics as a sustainable substitute for disease
103 control. We highlight various features that contribute to susceptibility of *M. rosenbergii* to
104 diseases, including the rapid growth of aquaculture and the consequent increase in antibiotic
105 use. Following this, we discuss the concept of probiotics and their significance in aquaculture,
106 with a particular focus on their potential benefits for giant freshwater prawn.

107

108 **2 Diseases affecting *M. rosenbergii* in aquaculture systems**

109 Freshwater prawn diseases are influenced by environmental, nutritional, and physiological
110 factors. These diseases can be caused by pathogenic or parasitic agents (Lane, Brosnahan, &
111 Poulin, 2022). Pathogens, including viruses, bacteria, fungi, yeasts, and protists, are
112 responsible for disease incidences with a significant impact on the economic viability of
113 freshwater prawn production. Viral infections, in particular, are a major concern due to their
114 high mortality rates. Viruses that affect freshwater prawns include Baculoviridae and
115 Nimaviridae with dsDNA, Parvoviridae with ssDNA, Reoviridae with dsRNA, and
116 Nodaviridae with +ssRNA (Pillai & Bonami, 2012b).

117 Several studies have investigated the diseases affecting *M. rosenbergii* in aquaculture systems,
118 and recent reviews have focused on this topic (Lee et al., 2022; Pillai & Bonami, 2012b). **Table**
119 **1** summarizes common diseases affecting *M. rosenbergii* along with the agent, type, syndrome,
120 and current control measures.

121 Among the diseases caused by viruses, white tail disease (WTD) caused by *Macrobrachium*
122 *rosenbergii* nodavirus (MrNV) and extra small virus (XSV) are the most common and
123 detrimental viral agents, leading to a significant reduction in prawn production. The virus
124 responsible for WTD is a small (27 nm in diameter) non-enveloped icosahedral virus, MrNV,
125 with a genome consisting of two linear positive-sense single-stranded RNA fragments, RNA-
126 1 (3202 bp) and RNA-2 (1175 bp) (Sahul Hameed & Bonami, 2012). *M. rosenbergii* is more
127 vulnerable to WTD compared to other prawn species, particularly in the larval, post-larval, and
128 juvenile stages of development, with a mortality rate estimated at 100% in post-larval prawn
129 within 2-3 days of infection (Pillai & Bonami, 2012b). WTD mostly affects the striated muscles
130 of the cephalothorax, abdomen, and tail. Infected adults act as carriers of the disease without
131 displaying any symptoms (Sahul Hameed & Bonami, 2012). Histological characteristics of

132 WTD in infected muscles of the abdomen and cephalothorax, and intratubular connective
133 tissues of the hepatopancreas frequently appear as large oval or irregular basophilic
134 cytoplasmic inclusions (Lee et al., 2022).

135 Besides WTD, other serious infections specific to *M. rosenbergii* include *Macrobrachium*
136 *hepatopancreatic* parvovirus (MHPV) and *Macrobrachium nipponensis* reovirus (MnRV),
137 which have a unique onset in the digestive tract. MHPV is caused by a parvo-like virus resulting
138 in hepatopancreatic nuclear lesions in R and E-cells in hepatopancreas' and midgut's epithelial
139 cells (Kumaresan, Palanisamy, Pasupuleti, & Arockiaraj, 2017). On the other hand, MnRV is
140 caused by Reoviridae cardero-like virus exhibiting hepatopancreatic cytoplasmic lesions with
141 large and round eosinophilic to pale basophilic inclusions in the connective tissues (K. F. Chen
142 et al., 2021; Pillai & Bonami, 2012a). These viral infections are challenging due to ineffective
143 treatment options and cause a mortality rate of 15 to 60% (Farook, H. M. Mohamed, N. Tariq,
144 K. M. Shariq, & I. A. Ahmed, 2019a). These diseases can potentially be controlled by
145 implementing biosecurity approaches, high-quality nutrition and high water quality standards,
146 as well as adaptable stocking density (Pillai & Bonami, 2012b). Effective control measures for
147 viral infections are lacking, making them difficult to manage.

148 In addition to viruses, certain bacteria such as *Vibrio* spp. and *Pseudomonas* spp. are causes of
149 black spots, brown spot, shell diseases, bacterial necrosis, luminescent larval syndrome, white
150 post-larval disease, and rickettsia (H. Ali et al., 2018; Muthukrishnan, Hoong, Chen, & Natrah,
151 2021; Pillai & Bonami, 2012b; Sasmita Julyantoro, 2015). Additionally, *Vibrio* spp. bacteria
152 can invade body fluids, causing discoloration of body tissues, impaired wound repair, and
153 blood clotting (Lu et al., 2022). The digestive tract in larval, post-larval, and adult prawns is
154 highly vulnerable to bacterial invasion, especially rickettsias, which can disable the tubular
155 structures of the digestive system leading to darkening and eventual death (M. Farook, H. M.
156 Mohamed, N. M. Tariq, K. M. Shariq, & I. A. Ahmed, 2019b; Rowley, 2022). Other bacteria
157 can invade the shell and use it for nutrition, resulting in eroded areas and black spots originating
158 from the edges and tips of the exoskeleton (Farook et al., 2019b; Rowley, 2022).

159 Besides viruses and bacteria, oomycetes, such as *Lagenidium* sp., can enter the prawns through
160 cracks or eroded areas of the cuticle, causing larval mycosis characterized by an extensive
161 mycelial network visible throughout the exoskeleton of affected larvae (Farook et al., 2019b;
162 Rowley, 2022). *Fusarium* spp., on the other hand, can result in fusariosis, burn spots, or black
163 gill disease in *M. rosenbergii* (Johnson, 1995; Yao et al., 2022).

164 Protists, including *Zoothamnium*, *Epistylis*, *Vorticella*, *Opercularia*, *Vaginicola*, *Acineta*, and
165 *Podophyra*, are considered external parasites that inhibit *M. rosenbergii*'s swimming, feeding,
166 and moulting in different life stages (Pillai and Bonami, 2012b; Ballester et al., 2017).

167

168 **3 Probiotics**

169 Probiotics are live active microbes that are introduced into a target host in an adequate number
170 or dose to promote its health (Hill et al., 2014; Knipe, Temperton, Lange, Bass, & Tyler, 2021).
171 They have increasingly been adopted as an eco-friendly substitute for enhancing aquaculture
172 animals' well-being, given the growing concern with respect to antibiotic use and the desire to
173 support disease resistance, growth performance, feed efficiency, and safety of aquatic products
174 (Zorriehzahra et al., 2016). Probiotic *Bacillus licheniformis* was shown to significantly increase
175 the survival of prawn challenged with pathogenic *Vibrio alginolyticus* (Nadella et al., 2018).
176 Balasundaram et al. (2012) reported that inclusion of a commercial probiotic into the feed (3%)
177 decreased the mortality of prawns injected with pathogenic *Vibrio parahaemolyticus* from 59%
178 to 13%. Hindu et al. (2018a,b) reported that *Bacillus vireti*, isolated from the intestine of *M.*
179 *rosenbergii* increased the survival of prawns challenged with pathogenic *Aeromonas*
180 *hydrophila* and *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*. In addition to protecting from disease, probiotics
181 offer several advantages, such as boosting digestive enzymes (amylase and protease activity),
182 promoting growth performance, preventing the adhesion and colonization of harmful bacteria
183 in the digestive tract, and regulating gut microbiota, in addition to elevating hematological
184 parameters and the immune response (Sumon et al., 2018). Numerous mechanisms are
185 involved in the health-promoting effect of probiotics, including the enhancement of innate
186 immunity, provoking disease resistance, and competition with disease-causing microbes
187 resulting in their elimination. Probiotics can also be used post-antibiotic treatment to restore
188 the natural gut microflora.

189 Potential probiotic candidates can be classified into host and non-host associated
190 microorganisms (Lazado, Caipang, & Estante, 2015). Commercial shellfish production
191 commonly uses non-host derived microbes as probiotics (Lakshmi, Viswanath, & Sai Gopal,
192 2013). However, host-associated probiotics are preferred as they lead to improved growth
193 performance, higher feed efficiency, and enzymatic contribution to digestion (Ahmmed et al.,
194 2020a; Khushi et al., 2020; Sumon et al., 2018). They also inhibit the adherence and
195 colonization of pathogenic microorganisms in the gastrointestinal tract, increase
196 haematological parameters, and boost the immune response (Adorian et al., 2019; Lazado et

197 al., 2015). For prawn aquaculture, the probiotic candidates consist of the genera *Lactobacillus*,
198 *Enterococcus*, *Bacillus*, *Aeromonas*, *Alteromonas*, *Arthrobacter*, *Bifidobacterium*,
199 *Clostridium*, *Paenibacillus*, *Phaeobacter*, *Pseudoalteromonas*, *Pseudomonas*,
200 *Rhodospiridium*, *Roseobacter*, *Streptomyces*, and *Vibrio* (Luis Balcázar, Decamp, Vendrell,
201 De Blas, & Ruiz-Zarzuela, 2009).

202

203 **4 Methods of probiotic administration**

204 Probiotics can be administrated through several methods such as immersion, oral
205 administration, direct administration into the body, administration in the environment, or a
206 combination of these methods (Einar Ringø, 2020). Each method of administration has its
207 advantages and disadvantages. For instance, the immersion method is a quick and effective
208 approach to delivering probiotics, but it is not practical for large-scale aquaculture operations
209 due to its high cost. Oral administration is more useful for large-scale operations but requires
210 higher doses of probiotics to achieve similar results as the immersion method.

211 Oral administration is widely used for probiotic delivery in aquaculture through the diet or
212 rearing water. In the early 1990s, single strains of probiotics were administered *via* feed.
213 However, due to the diverse range of conditions and aquaculture species, multi-strain
214 probiotics have gained interest for growth, immune enhancement, and environmental
215 improvement of aquaculture species (Md Abul Kalam Azad et al., 2021; Md Abul Kalam Azad
216 et al., 2019; Decamp, Moriarty, & Lavens, 2008; Fdhila et al., 2017; Ghosh et al., 2016;
217 Hostins, Lara, Decamp, Cesar, & Wasielesky Jr, 2017; Sipra Mohapatra, Chakraborty, Prusty,
218 PaniPrasad, & Mohanta, 2014; Vargas-Albores et al., 2017). Some of the commonly used
219 probiotic strains in pelleted diets include *Bacillus* strain S11 (Rengpipat, Phianphak,
220 Piyatiratitivorakul, & Menasveta, 1998), *Lactobacillus plantarum* (Gatesoupe, 1991), and
221 *Carnobacterium divergens* (Gildberg, Johansen, & Bøggwald, 1995; Gildberg & Mikkelsen,
222 1998; Gildberg, Mikkelsen, Sandaker, & Ringø, 1997). In addition, non-pathogenic *Vibrio*
223 spp., *Bacillus* spp., *Pseudomonas fluorescens*, *Aeromonas media* A 199, *Flavobacterium* sp.,
224 and *Lactobacillus lactis* are directly added to pond water to act as probiotics (Verschuere,
225 Rombaut, Sorgeloos, & Verstraete, 2000).

226 Maintaining probiotic activity during oral administration can be challenging due to conditions
227 in the gastrointestinal tract, such as acidity. To improve delivery efficiency, encapsulation
228 methods have been developed, and live feed such as brine shrimp, rotifers, and copepods are
229 used as encapsulation media (Gao et al., 2022). For instance, a shrimp larval feed was recently

230 developed by enriching *Artemia franciscana* with *Bacillus* sp. B2, *Lactobacillus johnsonii* C4,
231 *Bifidobacterium animalis subsp. lactis* strain BB-12, and *Streptomyces* sp. RL8 (Garcia-Bernal
232 et al., 2020; Vázquez-Silva et al., 2017).

233 Encapsulation can protect probiotics from environmental conditions and improve their viability
234 during storage, transportation, and delivery. Additionally, it can prevent the loss of probiotics
235 by increasing their adhesion to the gut wall of the host organism. However, the cost and
236 feasibility of encapsulation methods should be considered while selecting probiotics'
237 administration method.

238

239 **5 Antagonistic effect of probiotics against pathogenic microorganisms**

240 **5.1 Antibacterial activity**

241 The use of probiotics is widespread in giant freshwater prawn aquaculture due to their potential
242 to combat pathogenic bacteria (Miao et al., 2020; Xue, Liu, Liu, Wang, & Xu, 2021). Probiotics
243 play a crucial role in enhancing the essential gut microflora of prawns by producing
244 bacteriocins and organic acids that counteract harmful microbes (Chauhan & Singh, 2019; E
245 Ringø, Olsen, Vecino, Wadsworth, & Song, 2012). **Table 2** summarizes the antagonistic
246 effects of probiotics on pathogenic microbes in freshwater giant prawn culture.

247 Lactic acid bacteria are amongst the most commonly used probiotics in prawn culture,
248 primarily due to their exceptional ability to inhibit the proliferation of pathogenic microbes by
249 producing antibacterial components such as hydrogen peroxide and organic acids
250 (Zorriehzaha et al., 2016; Zoumpopoulou et al., 2013). Additionally, some lactic acid bacteria,
251 including *Streptococcus* spp. and *Lactobacillus* spp., produced antibiotics and decreased pH to
252 suboptimal levels for pathogenic bacteria. For instance, *Lactobacillus* spp. isolated from the
253 gut of prawns demonstrated inhibitory activity against *V. harveyi* (Ahmmed et al., 2020b).
254 Moreover, *B. cereus*, isolated from the intestine of adult giant freshwater prawn, showed
255 antibacterial activity towards *A. hydrophila* and could be used as a probiotic in *M. rosenbergii*
256 aquaculture (Wee, Mok, Romano, Ebrahimi, & Natrah, 2018). In a modern biofloc culture
257 system, *B. licheniformis* and *B. subtilis* showed an antagonistic effect against *Vibrio* sp. when
258 used as probiotics in the rearing of *M. rosenbergii* (Frezza et al., 2021). Furthermore, *B. vireti*
259 *01*, isolated from the gut of healthy prawns, can be considered as an alternative to antibiotics
260 in freshwater prawn cultures since it inhibits the growth of *P. aeruginosa* growth (Vidhya
261 Hindu, Chandrasekaran, Mukherjee, & Thomas, 2018). Finally, *B. licheniformis* exhibited

262 antibacterial activity against *V. alginolyticus* (Nadella et al., 2018), and *P. acidilactici* GY2 and
263 *S. cerevisiae* promoted the growth and survival of giant freshwater prawns (Miao et al., 2020).

264

265 **5.2 Antiviral activity**

266 In aquaculture including the culture of giant freshwater prawns, probiotics have been applied
267 to combat viral disease. However, the actual antiviral mechanism in prawn farming is not yet
268 fully understood (Lakshmi et al., 2013; S Mohapatra et al., 2012). As discussed in section 2,
269 one of the most common viral diseases affecting freshwater prawns is white tail disease, caused
270 by *M. rosenbergii nodavirus* (*MrNV*) with significant production losses in prawn farms
271 (Lakshmi et al., 2013). Despite the lack of a complete understanding of the mechanism of
272 action, certain strains of bacteria, such as *Vibrio* spp., *Pseudomonas* spp., *Coryneforms* and
273 *Aeromonas* spp. groups, have been identified as potential probiotics for the treatment of viral
274 diseases in shellfish (Chauhan & Singh, 2019; Zorriehzahra et al., 2016). For instance, *B.*
275 *megaterium* and *Vibrio* species have been shown to exhibit antiviral activity against white-spot
276 syndrome virus in various shellfish species (Li, Tan, & Mai, 2009). In addition, studies have
277 shown that certain strains of *Lactobacillus* spp. can be used as probiotics in a single strain or
278 combined with commercial probiotic products like Sporolac[®] to provide resistance against
279 lymphocystis viral disease (Harikrishnan, Balasundaram, & Heo, 2010). Furthermore, lactic
280 acid bacteria, including *L. paracasei* A14, *L. plantarum* YU, *L. pantarum* L-137 and *L. casei*
281 *Shirota*, have also shown promise in the remediation of viral diseases (Al Kassaa, Hober,
282 Hamze, Chihib, & Drider, 2014).

283

284 **5.3 Antifungal activity**

285 In the aquaculture of shellfish and finfish species, even though the antifungal activity of
286 probiotics was reported, there is currently no research on the potential of using probiotics for
287 their antifungal properties. However, there have been studies on the antifungal effects of certain
288 probiotic strains that could be applicable in freshwater prawn culture. *Aeromonas* A199,
289 isolated from eel rearing water, as well as *Lactobacillus plantarum* FNCC 226,
290 *Janthinobacterium* M169, and *Pseudomonas* M174, have been documented to decrease the
291 growth of *Saprolegnia* species (Lategan, Torpy, & Gibson, 2004; Nurhajati, Aryantha, &
292 Kadek Indah, 2012; Zorriehzahra et al., 2016). Additionally, certain probiotic strains isolated
293 from commercial fermented cheese products, such as *RC4b2*, *RC2b4*, *RC4a3*, *RC1b8*, *FCb1*,
294 *RC2b3*, *SCa4*, *SCb2*, *LZb8*, *LZa7*, *S2a3*, *S4b1*, *Kb2*, and *Y2a5*, have demonstrated antifungal
295 activity against *Fusarium oxysporum* and *Rhizoctonia solani* (F. S. Ali, O., & Hussein, 2013).

296 Lactic acid bacteria strains, including *Lactobacillus fermentum* L23 and *Lactobacillus*
297 *rhamnosus* L60, have been found to decrease the production of aflatoxin B1 and the growth of
298 *Aspergillus* section Flavi, while strains such as KCC-28, KCC-27, KCC-26, and KCC-25 have
299 shown strong antifungal activity against *Fusarium oxysporum*, *Botrytis elliptica*, *Penicillium*
300 *roqueforti*, *Penicillium chrysogenum*, and *Aspergillus fumigatus* (Gerbardo, Barberis, Pascual,
301 Dalcerro, & Barberis, 2012) (Ilavenil et al., 2015). Further research is needed to determine the
302 potential use of these probiotic strains in the aquaculture of giant freshwater prawns for their
303 antifungal activity.

304

305 **6 Probiotics as immunity enhancers in prawn**

306 **6.1 Impact of probiotics on immunological parameters of *M. rosenbergii***

307 The cultivation of fish and shellfish is highly dependent on maintaining a fully functional and
308 well-balanced immune system in order to protect and sustain their health. Accordingly, there
309 has been much interest in identifying compounds or agents capable of enhancing the
310 performance of the host's immune system (Dawood, Koshio, Abdel-Daim, & Van Doan, 2019;
311 Lazado et al., 2015). To this end, numerous studies have investigated the impact of probiotics
312 on the immune response of aquatic animals, particularly finfish, with extensive research being
313 conducted in this area (Dawood & Koshio, 2016; Hasan et al., 2019; Jamal et al., 2020;
314 Merrifield et al., 2010; Van Doan et al., 2020). **Table 3** summarizes the effects of probiotics
315 on immunological parameters of giant freshwater prawn. The studies summarized in the table
316 highlight the various probiotics used, their sources, mode of use, doses, trial durations, and the
317 resulting effects on immunological parameters.

318 Most immunomodulatory investigations in prawns have employed probiotic mixes and culture
319 collections from commercial sources (Md Abul Kalam Azad et al., 2019; Dash et al., 2016;
320 Gupta, Verma, & Gupta, 2016; Zhao et al., 2019). Invertebrates like giant freshwater prawns
321 rely solely on innate or non-specific immunity composed of cellular and humoral elements to
322 detect and suppress the proliferation of pathogenic microbes. Indeed, the immunity of *M.*
323 *rosenbergii* relies on the clearance efficiency of haemocytes and the activities of
324 prophenoloxidase, superoxide dismutase as well as phagocytic activity (Amparyup,
325 Charoensapsri, & Tassanakajon, 2013; Md Abul Kalam Azad et al., 2019; Kader et al., 2021;
326 Wei, Tian, Wang, Yu, & Zhu, 2021).

327 Supplementing diets with host-associated microbiota, such as *Enterococcus faecalis*, *L. lactis*
328 *I*, and *L. lactis II*, isolated from the intestine of giant freshwater prawns, enhanced the innate

329 immunity of prawns with a significant increase in total haemocyte counts and phenoloxidase
330 activity when compared to the control group (Kader et al., 2021). Similarly, supplementing
331 diets with potential probiotic bacteria, *Lactobacillus sp.* and *Enterococcus faecalis*, isolated
332 from *M. rosenbergii*'s digestive tract, improved cellular immunity with significantly higher
333 levels of small granular haemocytes and non-granular haemocyte counts than prawns fed with
334 non-supplemented diets (Ahmmed et al., 2020b; Kader et al., 2021; Sumon et al., 2018; Vidhya
335 Hindu et al., 2018). *Bacillus NL110* and *Vibrio NE17* applied as probiotics in the feed and
336 rearing water of freshwater prawns resulted in significant improvements in immune indices,
337 including total haemocyte counts, phenoloxidase activity and respiratory burst (2021).
338 Additionally, *B. vireti 01*, a putative probiotic isolated from the gastrointestinal tract of
339 freshwater prawns, has increased several immunological parameters, including superoxide
340 dismutase, catalase and serum glutathione of freshwater prawns (Vidhya Hindu et al., 2018).
341 Similarly, *B. cereus* isolated from the gut has boosted superoxide dismutase activity in the
342 haemolymph of freshwater prawns (Wee et al., 2018). In addition to this, *B. cereus* increased
343 the level of intestinal short-chain fatty acids, which ameliorate the gut epithelium of shrimp by
344 maintaining structural stability and reducing the intestinal pH, thereby inhibiting the growth of
345 harmful bacteria (Duan et al., 2017).
346 Non-host-derived probiotics, such as *L. plantarum* from a culture collection, have also
347 increased phenoloxidase activity, respiratory burst, total haemocyte counts, and clearance
348 efficiency in a dose-dependent manner (Dash et al., 2014; Dash et al., 2016). Similarly, *B.*
349 *pumilus* improved immune enzymes such as catalase, acid phosphatase, nitric oxide synthase
350 and phenoloxidase as well as elevated respiratory burst and phagocytosis of *M. rosenbergii*
351 (Zhao et al., 2019). Additionally, the commercial probiotic Zymetin[®] also exhibited
352 immunomodulating effects on freshwater prawns with a significant increase of total haemocyte
353 counts, phagocytic activity, and clearance efficiency (Md Abul Kalam Azad et al., 2019).
354 While investigating the immunomodulatory effects of probiotics on prawn species, probiotics
355 were applied as feed additives (Alavandi et al., 2004; Liu, Chiu, Shiu, Cheng, & Liu, 2010;
356 Zokaeifar et al., 2014). On the other side, probiotics applied to the rearing water have also
357 revealed efficiency in enhancing the immune response in shrimp species. Therefore, future
358 research is needed to evaluate the effectiveness of water-supplemented probiotics in
359 modulating the immune system of prawns.
360

361 **6.2 Effects of host-derived probiotics on the expression of immune genes**

362 Recently, there has been an increased interest in the immunomodulation of aquatic animals
363 through regulating immune-related genes. Indeed, gene alteration for immune and antioxidant
364 activities is considered as a reliable indicator for improved immunity in aquaculture species
365 following probiotic treatment (Van Doan et al., 2020). In *M. rosenbergii*, various immune and
366 antioxidant genes have been identified in protection against numerous infectious pathogens and
367 foreign compounds. The functionalities of these genes have been comprehensively reviewed
368 by (Kumaresan et al., 2017). Hepatopancreas, haemocytes, and gills have been considered as
369 main tissues expressing immune-related proteins (X. Zhang et al., 2014). Lipopolysaccharide
370 and β -1,3-glucan binding protein, anti-lipopolysaccharide factors, prophenoloxidase,
371 peroxinectin, penaeidin, heat shock protein, superoxide dismutase, and catalase are some of the
372 immune genes of crustacean shellfish reported to be upregulated upon probiotic
373 supplementation. This field of research regarding the modulation of gene transcription *via*
374 probiotics in freshwater prawn aquaculture is still in its early stages. Kader et al. (2021)
375 reported that freshwater prawn treated with three probiotics collected from the host's intestine,
376 *E. faecalis*, *Lac. lactis* I, and *Lac. lactis* II. The study showed a significant upregulation of
377 expression of both immune and antioxidant genes, including β -1,3-glucan binding protein,
378 superoxide dismutase, prophenoloxidase, peroxinectin, acid phosphatase and alkaline
379 phosphatase.

380 Various probiotics exhibit distinct impacts on the transcription of similar or varying immune-
381 related genes in shellfish (Yarahmadi, Miandare, Fayaz, & Caipang, 2016). These
382 discrepancies could be attributed to variations in experimental circumstances and shellfish
383 species employed. However, previous research suggested that evidence involving gene
384 expression in other aquatic animals caused by probiotics could allow to understand their mode
385 of action in disease prevention and control (Hao et al., 2014; Wu et al., 2014). For instance, the
386 diet of whiteleg shrimp was supplemented with three putative host microbiota, *Shewanella*
387 *haliotis*, *B. cereus*, and *A. bivalvium* for 28 days. The shrimps fed a probiotic-supplemented
388 diet exhibited significantly elevated expression of prophenoloxidase, β -1,3-glucan binding
389 protein, and penaeidin 3 genes compared to the shrimp fed the non-probiotic diet (Hao et al.,
390 2014). Similarly, three *Bacillus* strains, including *B. subtilis*, *B. pumilus*, and *B. cereus*
391 collected from the intestinal tract of mud crab *Scylla paramamosain* were evaluated as
392 probiotics for the host animals. In addition to protecting against *V. parahaemolyticus*, probiotic
393 strains significantly upregulated the transcription of several antioxidant genes of mud crab,
394 including prophenoloxidase, superoxide dismutase and catalase (Wu et al., 2014).

395 In summary, probiotics supplementation, using bacteria such as *Bacillus* spp., *Lactobacillus*
396 spp., *Limosilactobacillus fermentum*, *Clostridium* spp., *Lactococcus* spp., and commercial
397 probiotics such as Zymetin[®], have been shown to increase immune parameters such as total
398 haemocyte counts and differential haemocyte counts, enhance phagocytic activity and
399 clearance efficiency in addition to increasing prophenoloxidase and superoxide dismutase
400 activities, and the expression of immune-related genes (Amparyup et al., 2013; Md Abul Kalam
401 Azad et al., 2019; Kader et al., 2021; Wei et al., 2021). It should be mentioned, however, that
402 it is not clear whether increasing these parameters in the absence of pathogens really is
403 beneficial for the prawns. Indeed, the immune system should only be enhanced in case of an
404 infection, and an increase of immune parameters in the absence of a pathogen might not be
405 advantageous after all. Therefore, further research is needed in order to determine the optimal
406 levels of these immune parameters in healthy and diseased prawns.

407

408 **7 Conclusions and future directions**

409 In the production of aquaculture shellfish species, probiotics' application has emerged instead
410 of harmful chemicals and antibiotics (Jahangiri & Esteban, 2018). However, the use of
411 probiotics in giant freshwater prawn culture is still in its early stages and only a limited number
412 of commercial probiotic products are available in local and international markets (Adel &
413 Dawood, 2021). Consequently, more studies are needed for profiling a wide range of probiotic
414 strains for application in the culture of various aquaculture shellfish species. Moreover, most
415 of the probiotics currently used in shellfish culture are based on lactic acid bacteria and *Bacillus*
416 spp. Hence, further studies are required to identify other potential probiotics that can offer
417 benefits such as physiological responses, improved growth performance, and infection
418 resistance (Einar Ringø et al., 2020).

419 Choosing the right probiotics and determining the effective dosage can be challenging due to
420 the species-specific nature of probiotics (Hoseinifar, Sun, Wang, & Zhou, 2018). Therefore,
421 further researches are compulsory to increase the effectiveness of feed- and water-administered
422 probiotics. In shellfish aquaculture, the antagonistic effects of probiotics on microbes,
423 especially bacteria, have been reported. However, research on the antiviral and antifungal
424 activity of probiotics in shellfish aquaculture is still limited. Hence, additional investigations
425 are vital to understand the mechanism of antifungal and antiviral activity and to identify
426 suitable probiotics. Recent advances in high-throughput sequencing techniques enable
427 studying the impact of probiotics on prawn-associated microbiomes. Some recent studies

428 reported shifts in the prawn-associated microbiota after probiotic treatment (Cienfuegos-
429 Martinez et al., 2022; Zheng et al., 2022; Qiu et al., 2023). However, in order to determine
430 whether probiotics have a beneficial impact on the prawn microbiome, we first need to obtain
431 a better understanding of what can be considered a healthy prawn microbiome (by analysing
432 microbiomes of healthy and diseased prawns grown in different culture systems).

433

434 **Acknowledgements**

435 Fatema Ahmmed would like to acknowledge the support of University of Otago for library
436 access and doctoral scholarship. Osman N. Kanwugu is grateful to the “Priority 2030” program
437 of the Ural Federal University for support. This study was supported by special Research Fund
438 of Ghent University (BOF-UGent).

439

440 **Author contributions**

441 **Mirja Kaizer Ahmmed:** Conceptualization, project administration, methodology; writing –
442 Original draft preparation, data curation, visualization; writing – review & editing. **Shuva**
443 **Bhowmik:** Data curation, visualization; writing- original draft preparation. **Fatema Ahmmed:**
444 Data curation, validation; writing- original draft preparation. **Stephen G. Giteru:** validation,
445 visualization; writing – Original draft preparation, writing – review & editing. **Shikder Saiful**
446 **Islam:** Data curation, visualization; writing- original draft preparation. **Mayssa Hachem:**
447 validation; writing – review & editing. **Md. Ashraf Hussain:** Data curation, visualization;
448 writing- original draft preparation. **Osman N. Kanwugu:** Validation; writing – review &
449 editing. **Dominic Agyei:** Validation; writing – review & editing. **Tom Defoirdt:** Supervision,
450 funding acquisition; writing – review & editing. All authors approved the final version of the
451 manuscript.

452

453 **Conflict of interest statement**

454 The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

455

456 **Data availability statement**

457 No data were generated for this paper.

458

459

460 **Orcid**

461 *Mirja Kaizer Ahmmed*: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4467-0615>

462 *Shuva Bhowmik*: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3858-7359>

463 *Fatema Ahmmed*: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9008-4137>

464 *Stephen G. Giteru*: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5278-8424>

465 *Shikder Saiful Islam*: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7134-6736>

466 *Mayssa Hachem*: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1986-8304>

467 *Md. Ashraf Hussain*: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4769-3401>

468 *Osman N. Kanwugu*: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3887-1058>

469 *Dominic Agyei*: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2280-4096>

470 *Tom Defoirdt*: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7446-2246>

471

472 **References**

473 Abdel-Latif, H. M., Yilmaz, E., Dawood, M. A., Ringø, E., Ahmadifar, E., & Yilmaz, S.

474 (2022). Shrimp vibriosis and possible control measures using probiotics, postbiotics,

475 prebiotics, and synbiotics: A review. *Aquaculture*, 737951.

476 Adel, M., & Dawood, M. A. (2021). Probiotics application: Implications for sustainable

477 aquaculture. *Probiotic bacteria and postbiotic metabolites: Role in animal and human*

478 *health*, 191-219.

479 Adorian, T. J., Jamali, H., Farsani, H. G., Darvishi, P., Hasanpour, S., Bagheri, T., & Roozbehfar,

480 R. (2019). Effects of Probiotic Bacteria *Bacillus* on Growth Performance, Digestive

481 Enzyme Activity, and Hematological Parameters of Asian Sea Bass, *Lates calcarifer*

482 (Bloch). *Probiotics and Antimicrobial Proteins*, 11(1), 248-255. doi:10.1007/s12602-

483 018-9393-z

484 Ahmmed, F., Ahmmed, M. K., Khushi, S. S., Sumon, M. S., Karamcheti, S. S., & Sarower, M.

485 (2020a). Host gut-derived probiotic *Lactobacillus* sp. improves resistance of giant

486 freshwater prawn *Macrobrachium rosenbergii* against *Vibrio harveyi*. *Aquaculture*

487 *International*, 28(4), 1709-1724.

488 Ahmmed, F., Ahmmed, M. K., Khushi, S. S., Sumon, M. S., Karamcheti, S. S., & Sarower, M. G.

489 (2020b). Host gut-derived probiotic *Lactobacillus* sp. improves resistance of giant

490 freshwater prawn *Macrobrachium rosenbergii* against *Vibrio harveyi*. *Aquaculture*

491 *International*, 28(4), 1709-1724. doi:10.1007/s10499-020-00551-y

492 Al Kassaa, I., Hober, D., Hamze, M., Chihib, N. E., & Drider, D. (2014). Antiviral potential of

493 lactic acid bacteria and their bacteriocins. *Probiotics and Antimicrobial Proteins*, 6(3),

494 177-185.

495 Alavandi, S., Vijayan, K., Santiago, T., Poornima, M., Jithendran, K., Ali, S., & Rajan, J. (2004).

496 Evaluation of *Pseudomonas* sp. PM 11 and *Vibrio fluvialis* PM 17 on immune indices

497 of tiger shrimp, *Penaeus monodon*. *Fish & Shellfish Immunology*, 17(2), 115-120.

498 Ali, F. S., O., S. O. A., & Hussein, S. A. (2013). Antimicrobial activity of probiotic bacteria.

499 *Egyptian Academic Journal of Biological Sciences, G. Microbiology*, 5(2), 21-34.

- 500 Ali, H., Rahman, M. M., Rico, A., Jaman, A., Basak, S. K., Islam, M. M., . . . Mohan, C. V. (2018).
501 An assessment of health management practices and occupational health hazards in
502 tiger shrimp (*Penaeus monodon*) and freshwater prawn (*Macrobrachium rosenbergii*)
503 aquaculture in Bangladesh. *Veterinary and animal science*, 5, 10-19.
- 504 Amparyup, P., Charoensapsri, W., & Tassanakajon, A. (2013). Prophenoloxidase system and
505 its role in shrimp immune responses against major pathogens. *Fish & Shellfish*
506 *Immunology*, 34(4), 990-1001.
- 507 Arockiaraj, J., Chaurasia, M. K., Kumaresan, V., Palanisamy, R., Harikrishnan, R., Pasupuleti,
508 M., & Kasi, M. (2015). *Macrobrachium rosenbergii* mannose binding lectin: synthesis
509 of MrMBL-N20 and MrMBL-C16 peptides and their antimicrobial characterization,
510 bioinformatics and relative gene expression analysis. *Fish & Shellfish Immunology*,
511 43(2), 364-374.
- 512 Arockiaraj, J., Gnanam, A. J., Muthukrishnan, D., Thirumalai, M. K., Pasupuleti, M., Milton, J.,
513 & Kasi, M. (2013). *Macrobrachium rosenbergii* cathepsin L: Molecular characterization
514 and gene expression in response to viral and bacterial infections. *Microbiological*
515 *Research*, 168(9), 569-579. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.micres.2013.04.007>
- 516 Azad, M. A. K., Islam, S. S., Amin, M. N., Ghosh, A. K., Hasan, K. R., Bir, J., . . . Huq, K. A. (2021).
517 Production and economics of probiotics treated *Macrobrachium rosenbergii* at
518 different stocking densities. *Animal Feed Science and Technology*, 282, 115125.
519 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anifeedsci.2021.115125>
- 520 Azad, M. A. K., Islam, S. S., Ghosh, A. K., Hasanuzzaman, A. F. M., Smith, A. J., Bir, J., . . . Huq,
521 K. A. (2023). Application of zymetin and super PS probiotics in hatchery, nursery, and
522 grow-out phases of *Macrobrachium rosenbergii* and their impact on culture
523 environment, production, and economics. *Journal of the World Aquaculture Society*.
- 524 Azad, M. A. K., Islam, S. S., Sithi, I. N., Ghosh, A. K., Banu, G. R., Bir, J., & Huq, K. A. (2019).
525 Effect of probiotics on immune competence of giant freshwater prawn
526 *Macrobrachium rosenbergii*. *Aquaculture Research*, 50(2), 644-657.
- 527 Balasundaram, A., Rathna Kumari, P., Stalin, A., Masilamani, V., & John, G. (2012). Effect of a
528 commercial probiotic and *Cassia auriculata* leaf powder on vibriosis induced
529 freshwater prawn, *Macrobrachium rosenbergii*. *Asian Journal of Animal and*
530 *Veterinary Advances*, 7, 542-555.
- 531 Ballester, E. L. C., Marzarotto, S. A., Silva de Castro, C., Frozza, A., Pastore, I., & Abreu, P. C.
532 (2017). Productive performance of juvenile freshwater prawns *Macrobrachium*
533 *rosenbergii* in biofloc system. *Aquaculture Research*, 48(9), 4748-4755.
- 534 Cantrell, S. A., & Betancourt, C. (1995). *Fusarium* spp. in rearing ponds of the prawn
535 *Macrobrachium rosenbergii* in Puerto Rico: Water and Air Sampling. *Caribbean Journal*
536 *of Science*, 31, 230-236.
- 537 Chauhan, A., & Singh, R. (2019). Probiotics in aquaculture: a promising emerging alternative
538 approach. *Symbiosis*, 77(2), 99-113.
- 539 Chen-Fei, L., Chou-Min, C., & Jiun-Yan, L. (2020). Feasibility of vaccination against
540 *Macrobrachium rosenbergii* nodavirus infection in giant freshwater prawn. *Fish &*
541 *Shellfish Immunology*, 104, 431-438. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fsi.2020.06.039>
- 542 Chen, K. F., Tan, W. S., Ong, L. K., Zainal Abidin, S. A., Othman, I., Tey, B. T., & Lee, R. F. S.
543 (2021). The *Macrobrachium rosenbergii* nodavirus: A detailed review of structure,
544 infectivity, host immunity, diagnosis and prevention. *Reviews in Aquaculture*, 13(4),
545 2117-2141.

- 546 Chen, S.-C., Chen, T.-H., Wang, P.-C., Chen, Y.-C., Huang, J.-P., Lin, Y.-D., . . . Liaw, L.-L. (2003).
547 *Metschnikowia bicuspidata* and *Enterococcus faecium* co-infection in the giant
548 freshwater prawn *Macrobrachium rosenbergii*. *Diseases of aquatic organisms*, 55(2),
549 161-167.
- 550 Chen, S.-C., Chen, Y.-C., Kwang, J., Manopo, I., Wang, P.-C., Chaung, H.-C., . . . Chiu, S.-H.
551 (2007). *Metschnikowia bicuspidata* dominates in Taiwanese cold-weather yeast
552 infections of *Macrobrachium rosenbergii*. *Diseases of aquatic organisms*, 75(3), 191-
553 199.
- 554 Chen, S.-C., Lin, Y.-D., Liaw, L.-L., & Wang, P.-C. (2001). *Lactococcus garvieae* infection in the
555 giant freshwater prawn *Macrobrachium rosenbergii* confirmed by polymerase chain
556 reaction and 16S rDNA sequencing. *Diseases of aquatic organisms*, 45(1), 45-52.
- 557 Chiew, I., Salter, A. M., & Lim, Y. S. (2019). The significance of major viral and bacterial diseases
558 in Malaysian aquaculture industry. *Pertanika Journal of Tropical Agricultural Science*,
559 42(3).
- 560 Cienfuegos-Martínez, K., Monroy-Dosta, M. d. C., Hamdan-Partida, A., Hernández-Vergara,
561 M. P., Aguirre-Garrido, J. F., & Bustos-Martínez, J. (2022). Effect of the probiotic
562 *Lactococcus lactis* on the microbial composition in the water and the gut of freshwater
563 prawn (*Macrobrachium rosenbergii*) cultivate in biofloc. *Aquaculture Research*,
564 53(11), 3877-3889.
- 565 Das, D., Baruah, R., & Goyal, A. (2014). A food additive with prebiotic properties of an α -d-
566 glucan from *Lactobacillus plantarum* DM5. *International journal of biological*
567 *macromolecules*, 69, 20-26.
- 568 Das, P., Khowala, S., & Biswas, S. (2016). In vitro probiotic characterization of *Lactobacillus*
569 *casei* isolated from marine samples. *Lwt*, 73, 383-390.
- 570 Dash, G., Raman, R. P., Prasad, K. P., Makesh, M., Pradeep, M., & Sen, S. (2014). Evaluation of
571 *Lactobacillus plantarum* as feed supplement on host associated microflora, growth,
572 feed efficiency, carcass biochemical composition and immune response of giant
573 freshwater prawn, *Macrobrachium rosenbergii* (de Man, 1879). *Aquaculture*, 432,
574 225-236.
- 575 Dash, G., Raman, R. P., Prasad, K. P., Makesh, M., Pradeep, M., & Sen, S. (2015). Evaluation of
576 paraprobiotic applicability of *Lactobacillus plantarum* in improving the immune
577 response and disease protection in giant freshwater prawn, *Macrobrachium*
578 *rosenbergii* (de Man, 1879). *Fish & Shellfish Immunology*, 43(1), 167-174.
- 579 Dash, G., Raman, R. P., Prasad, K. P., Marappan, M., Pradeep, M. A., & Sen, S. (2016).
580 Evaluation of *Lactobacillus plantarum* as a water additive on host associated
581 microflora, growth, feed efficiency and immune response of giant freshwater prawn,
582 *Macrobrachium rosenbergii* (de Man, 1879). *Aquaculture Research*, 47(3), 804-818.
- 583 Dawood, M. A., & Koshio, S. (2016). Recent advances in the role of probiotics and prebiotics
584 in carp aquaculture: a review. *Aquaculture*, 454, 243-251.
- 585 Dawood, M. A., Koshio, S., Abdel-Daim, M. M., & Van Doan, H. (2019). Probiotic application
586 for sustainable aquaculture. *Reviews in Aquaculture*, 11(3), 907-924.
- 587 Decamp, O., Moriarty, D. J., & Lavens, P. (2008). Probiotics for shrimp larviculture: review of
588 field data from Asia and Latin America. *Aquaculture Research*, 39(4), 334-338.
- 589 Duan, Y., Zhang, Y., Dong, H., Wang, Y., Zheng, X., & Zhang, J. (2017). Effect of dietary
590 *Clostridium butyricum* on growth, intestine health status and resistance to ammonia
591 stress in Pacific white shrimp *Litopenaeus vannamei*. *Fish & Shellfish Immunology*, 65,
592 25-33.

593 Farook, M., Mohamed, H. M., Tariq, N., Shariq, K. M., & Ahmed, I. A. (2019a). Giant freshwater
594 prawn, *Macrobrachium rosenbergii* (De Man 1879): A review. *Int J Res Anal Rev*, 6,
595 571-584.

596 Farook, M., Mohamed, H. M., Tariq, N. M., Shariq, K. M., & Ahmed, I. A. (2019b). Giant
597 freshwater prawn, *Macrobrachium rosenbergii* (DE MAN 1879): a review.
598 *International Journal of Research and Analytical Reviews*, 6(1), 571-584.

599 Fdhila, K., Haddaji, N., Chakroun, I., Dhiyf, A., Macherki, M. E. E., Khouildi, B., . . . Missaoui, H.
600 (2017). Culture conditions improvement of *Crassostrea gigas* using a potential
601 probiotic *Bacillus* sp strain. *Microbial Pathogenesis*, 110, 654-658.
602 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.micpath.2017.07.017>

603 Frozza, A., Fiorini, A., Vendruscolo, E. C. G., Rosado, F. R., Konrad, D., Rodrigues, M. C. G., &
604 Ballester, E. L. C. (2021). Probiotics in the rearing of freshwater prawn *Macrobrachium*
605 *rosenbergii* (de Man, 1879) in a biofloc system. *Aquaculture Research*.

606 Gangnonngiw, W., Bunnontae, M., Phiwsaiya, K., Senapin, S., & Dhar, A. K. (2020). In
607 experimental challenge with infectious clones of *Macrobrachium rosenbergii*
608 nodavirus (MrNV) and extra small virus (XSV), MrNV alone can cause mortality in
609 freshwater prawn (*Macrobrachium rosenbergii*). *Virology*, 540, 30-37.

610 Gangnonngiw, W., Laisutisan, K., Sriurairatana, S., Senapin, S., Chuchird, N., Limsuwan, C., . .
611 . Flegel, T. W. (2010). Monodon baculovirus (MBV) infects the freshwater prawn
612 *Macrobrachium rosenbergii* cultivated in Thailand. *Virus Research*, 148(1), 24-30.
613 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.virusres.2009.12.001>

614 Gao, H., Ma, L., Sun, W., McClements, D. J., Cheng, C., Zeng, H., . . . Liu, W. (2022). Impact of
615 encapsulation of probiotics in oil-in-water high internal phase emulsions on their
616 thermostability and gastrointestinal survival. *Food Hydrocolloids*, 126.
617 doi:10.1016/j.foodhyd.2021.107478

618 Garcia-Bernal, M., Ossorio-Álvarezl, P. A., Medina-Marrero, R., Marrero-Chang, O., Casanova-
619 Gonzalez, M., & Mazon-Suastegui, J. M. (2020). Effect of *Streptomyces* sp. RL8 on the
620 survival of *Artemia franciscana* nauplii and resistance to *Vibrio parahaemolyticus*.
621 *Fisheries Science*, 86(1), 137-144.

622 Gatesoupe, F.-J. (1991). The effect of three strains of lactic bacteria on the production rate of
623 rotifers, *Brachionus plicatilis*, and their dietary value for larval turbot, *Scophthalmus*
624 *maximus*. *Aquaculture*, 96(3-4), 335-342.

625 Gerbaldo, G. A., Barberis, C., Pascual, L., Dalcero, A., & Barberis, L. (2012). Antifungal activity
626 of two *Lactobacillus* strains with potential probiotic properties. *FEMS microbiology*
627 *letters*, 332(1), 27-33.

628 Ghosh, A. K., Bir, J., Azad, M. A. K., Hasanuzzaman, A. F. M., Islam, M. S., & Huq, K. A. (2016).
629 Impact of commercial probiotics application on growth and production of giant fresh
630 water prawn (*Macrobrachium Rosenbergi* De Man, 1879). *Aquaculture Reports*, 4,
631 112-117.

632 Gildberg, A., Johansen, A., & Børgwald, J. (1995). Growth and survival of Atlantic salmon
633 (*Salmo salar*) fry given diets supplemented with fish protein hydrolysate and lactic acid
634 bacteria during a challenge trial with *Aeromonas salmonicida*. *Aquaculture*, 138(1-4),
635 23-34.

636 Gildberg, A., & Mikkelsen, H. (1998). Effects of supplementing the feed to Atlantic cod (*Gadus*
637 *morhua*) fry with lactic acid bacteria and immuno-stimulating peptides during a
638 challenge trial with *Vibrio anguillarum*. *Aquaculture*, 167(1-2), 103-113.

639 Gildberg, A., Mikkelsen, H., Sandaker, E., & Ringø, E. (1997). Probiotic effect of lactic acid
640 bacteria in the feed on growth and survival of fry of Atlantic cod (*Gadus morhua*).
641 *Hydrobiologia*, 352(1), 279-285.

642 Gupta, A., Verma, G., & Gupta, P. (2016). Growth performance, feed utilization, digestive
643 enzyme activity, innate immunity and protection against *Vibrio harveyi* of freshwater
644 prawn, *Macrobrachium rosenbergii* fed diets supplemented with *Bacillus coagulans*.
645 *Aquaculture International*, 24(5), 1379-1392. doi:10.1007/s10499-016-9996-x

646 Hameed, A. S., & Bonami, J.-R. (2012). White tail disease of freshwater prawn,
647 *Macrobrachium rosenbergii*. *Indian journal of virology: an official organ of Indian*
648 *Virological Society*, 23(2), 134.

649 Hameed, A. S., Charles, M. X., & Anilkumar, M. (2000). Tolerance of *Macrobrachium*
650 *rosenbergii* to white spot syndrome virus. *Aquaculture*, 183(3-4), 207-213.

651 Hao, K., Liu, J.-Y., Ling, F., Liu, X.-L., Lu, L., Xia, L., & Wang, G.-X. (2014). Effects of dietary
652 administration of *Shewanella haliotis* D4, *Bacillus cereus* D7 and *Aeromonas bivalvium*
653 D15, single or combined, on the growth, innate immunity and disease resistance of
654 shrimp, *Litopenaeus vannamei*. *Aquaculture*, 428, 141-149.

655 Harikrishnan, R., Balasundaram, C., & Heo, M.-S. (2010). Effect of probiotics enriched diet on
656 *Paralichthys olivaceus* infected with lymphocystis disease virus (LCDV). *Fish & Shellfish*
657 *Immunology*, 29(5), 868-874.

658 Hasan, M. T., Je Jang, W., Lee, J. M., Lee, B.-J., Hur, S. W., Gu Lim, S., . . . Kong, I.-S. (2019).
659 Effects of immunostimulants, prebiotics, probiotics, synbiotics, and potentially
660 immunoreactive feed additives on olive flounder (*Paralichthys olivaceus*): a review.
661 *Reviews in Fisheries Science & Aquaculture*, 27(4), 417-437.

662 Henriksson, P. J. G., Rico, A., Troell, M., Klinger, D. H., Buschmann, A. H., Saksida, S., . . . Zhang,
663 W. (2018). Unpacking factors influencing antimicrobial use in global aquaculture and
664 their implication for management: a review from a systems perspective. *Sustainability*
665 *Science*, 13(4), 1105-1120. doi:10.1007/s11625-017-0511-8

666 Hill, C., Guarner, F., Reid, G., Gibson, G. R., Merenstein, D. J., Pot, B., . . . Salminen, S. (2014).
667 The International Scientific Association for Probiotics and Prebiotics consensus
668 statement on the scope and appropriate use of the term probiotic. *Nature reviews*
669 *Gastroenterology & hepatology*, 11(8), 506-514.

670 Hindu, S.V., Chandrasekaran, N., Mukherjee, A., & Thomas, J. (2018a). Effect of dietary
671 supplementation of novel probiotic bacteria *Bacillus vireti* O1 on antioxidant defence
672 system of freshwater prawn challenged with *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*. *Probiotics and*
673 *Antimicrobial Proteins* 10, 356-366.

674 Hindu, S.V., Thanigaivel, S., Vijayakumar, S., Chandrasekaran, N., Mukherjee, A., & Thomas, J.
675 (2018b). Effect of microencapsulated probiotic *Bacillus vireti* O1-polysaccharide
676 extract of *Gracilaria folifera* with alginate-chitosan on immunity, antioxidant activity
677 and disease resistance of *Macrobrachium rosenbergii* against *Aeromonas hydrophila*
678 infection. *Fish & Shellfish Immunology* 73, 112-120.

679 Hoseinifar, S. H., Sun, Y.-Z., Wang, A., & Zhou, Z. (2018). Probiotics as means of diseases
680 control in aquaculture, a review of current knowledge and future perspectives.
681 *Frontiers in microbiology*, 9, 2429.

682 Hostins, B., Lara, G., Decamp, O., Cesar, D. E., & Wasielesky Jr, W. (2017). Efficacy and
683 variations in bacterial density in the gut of *Litopenaeus vannamei* reared in a BFT
684 system and in clear water supplemented with a commercial probiotic mixture.
685 *Aquaculture*, 480, 58-64.

686 Hsieh, C. Y., Chuang, P. C., Chen, L. C., Tu, C., Chien, M. S., Huang, K. C., . . . Tsai, S. S. (2006).
687 Infectious hypodermal and haematopoietic necrosis virus (IHHNV) infections in giant
688 freshwater prawn, *Macrobrachium rosenbergii*. *Aquaculture*, 258(1-4), 73-79.

689 Ilavenil, S., Park, H. S., Vijayakumar, M., Valan Arasu, M., Kim, D. H., Ravikumar, S., & Choi, K.
690 C. (2015). Probiotic potential of Lactobacillus strains with antifungal activity isolated
691 from animal manure. *The Scientific World Journal*, 2015.

692 Jahangiri, L., & Esteban, M. Á. (2018). Administration of probiotics in the water in finfish
693 aquaculture systems: a review. *Fishes*, 3(3), 33.

694 Jamal, M. T., Sumon, A. A., Pugazhendhi, A., Al Harbi, M., Hussain, A., & Haque, F. (2020). Use
695 of Probiotics in Commercially Important Finfish Aquaculture. *International Journal of*
696 *Probiotics & Prebiotics*, 15(1).

697 Johnson, S. K. (1995). Handbook of shrimp diseases.

698 Kader, M. A., Zahidah Azahar, N., Iehata, S., Bulbul, M., Islam, M. M., Sarker, J., . . .
699 Asaduzzaman, M. (2021). Dietary supplementation of host-associated lactic acid
700 bacteria modulates growth, metabolic activities, and immune-related gene expression
701 in giant freshwater prawn, *Macrobrachium rosenbergii*. *Journal of the World*
702 *Aquaculture Society*, 52(1), 216-230.

703 Karthik, M., Bhavan, P., & Manjula, T. (2018). Growth promoting potential and colonization
704 ability of probiotics (*Bacillus coagulans* and *Bacillus subtilis*) on the freshwater prawn
705 *Macrobrachium rosenbergii* post-Larvae. *Insights in Biology and Medicine*, 2, 007-018.

706 Karthik, M., & Bhavan, P. S. (2018). Supplementation of *Lactobacillus brevis* for growth
707 promotion of the freshwater prawn *Macrobrachium rosenbergii* post larvae and
708 identification of gut microflora through 16s rDNA. *Research Journal of Biotechnology*
709 *Vol, 13*, 1.

710 Kawanishi, M., Kojima, A., Ishihara, K., Esaki, H., Kijima, M., Takahashi, T., . . . Tamura, Y.
711 (2005). Drug resistance and pulsed-field gel electrophoresis patterns of *Lactococcus*
712 *garvieae* isolates from cultured *Seriola* (yellowtail, amberjack and kingfish) in Japan.
713 *Lett Appl Microbiol*, 40(5), 322-328. doi:10.1111/j.1472-765X.2005.01690.x

714 Keysami, M. A., & Mohammadpour, M. (2013). Effect of *Bacillus subtilis* on *Aeromonas*
715 *hydrophila* infection resistance in juvenile freshwater prawn, *Macrobrachium*
716 *rosenbergii* (de Man). *Aquaculture International*, 21(3), 553-562.

717 Khan, S., & Mahmud, S. (2021). The impact of probiotic bacterium *Lactobacillus acidophilus*
718 in growth and survival of the juvenile fresh water river prawn (*Macrobrachium*
719 *rosenbergii*) infected with pathogenic *Vibrio* spp. *Journal of Microbiology,*
720 *Biotechnology and Food Sciences*, 2021, 225-229.

721 Khushi, S. S., Sumon, M. S., Ahmmed, M. K., Zilani, M. N. H., Ahmmed, F., Giteru, S. G., &
722 Sarower, M. G. (2020). Potential probiotic and health fostering effect of host gut-
723 derived *Enterococcus faecalis* on freshwater prawn, *Macrobrachium rosenbergii*.
724 *Aquaculture and Fisheries*.

725 Knipe, H., Temperton, B., Lange, A., Bass, D., & Tyler, C. R. (2021). Probiotics and competitive
726 exclusion of pathogens in shrimp aquaculture. *Reviews in Aquaculture*, 13(1), 324-352.

727 Kumar, V., Roy, S., Behera, B. K., Bossier, P., & Das, B. K. (2021). Acute Hepatopancreatic
728 Necrosis Disease (AHPND): Virulence, Pathogenesis and Mitigation Strategies in
729 Shrimp Aquaculture. *Toxins (Basel)*, 13(8). doi:10.3390/toxins13080524

730 Kumaresan, V., Palanisamy, R., Pasupuleti, M., & Arockiaraj, J. (2017). Impacts of
731 environmental and biological stressors on immune system of *Macrobrachium*
732 *rosenbergii*. *Reviews in Aquaculture*, 9(3), 283-307.

733 Lakshmi, B., Viswanath, B., & Sai Gopal, D. V. R. (2013). Probiotics as Antiviral Agents in Shrimp
734 Aquaculture. *Journal of Pathogens*, 2013, 424123. doi:10.1155/2013/424123

735 Lane, H. S., Brosnahan, C. L., & Poulin, R. (2022). Aquatic disease in New Zealand: synthesis
736 and future directions. *New Zealand Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research*, 56(1),
737 1-42.

738 Lategan, M., Torpy, F., & Gibson, L. (2004). Control of saprolegniosis in the eel *Anguilla*
739 *australis* Richardson, by *Aeromonas media* strain A199. *Aquaculture*, 240(1-4), 19-27.

740 Lazado, C. C., Caipang, C. M. A., & Estante, E. G. (2015). Prospects of host-associated
741 microorganisms in fish and penaeids as probiotics with immunomodulatory functions.
742 *Fish & Shellfish Immunology*, 45(1), 2-12.

743 Lee, D., Yu, Y. B., Choi, J. H., Jo, A. H., Hong, S. M., Kang, J. C., & Kim, J. H. (2022). Viral Shrimp
744 Diseases Listed by the OIE: A Review. *Viruses*, 14(3). doi:10.3390/v14030585

745 Li, J., Tan, B., & Mai, K. (2009). Dietary probiotic *Bacillus* OJ and isomaltooligosaccharides
746 influence the intestine microbial populations, immune responses and resistance to
747 white spot syndrome virus in shrimp (*Litopenaeus vannamei*). *Aquaculture*, 291(1-2),
748 35-40.

749 Liu, K.-F., Chiu, C.-H., Shiu, Y.-L., Cheng, W., & Liu, C.-H. (2010). Effects of the probiotic, *Bacillus*
750 *subtilis* E20, on the survival, development, stress tolerance, and immune status of
751 white shrimp, *Litopenaeus vannamei* larvae. *Fish & Shellfish Immunology*, 28(5-6),
752 837-844.

753 Lu, Y., Zhao, M., Peng, Y., He, S., Zhu, X., Hu, C., . . . Yun, Y. (2022). A physicochemical double-
754 cross-linked gelatin hydrogel with enhanced antibacterial and anti-inflammatory
755 capabilities for improving wound healing. *Journal of Nanobiotechnology*, 20(1), 1-26.

756 Luis Balcázar, J., Decamp, O., Vendrell, D., De Blas, I., & Ruiz-Zarzuela, I. (2009). Health and
757 nutritional properties of probiotics in fish and shellfish. *Microbial Ecology in Health*
758 *and Disease*, 18(2), 65-70. doi:10.1080/08910600600799497

759 Merrifield, D. L., Dimitroglou, A., Foey, A., Davies, S. J., Baker, R. T. M., Børgwald, J., . . . Ringø,
760 E. (2010). The current status and future focus of probiotic and prebiotic applications
761 for salmonids. *Aquaculture*, 302(1), 1-18.
762 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aquaculture.2010.02.007>

763 Miao, S., Han, B., Zhao, C., Hu, J., Zhu, J., Zhang, X., & Sun, L. (2020). Effects of dietary
764 *Pediococcus acidilactici* GY2 single or combined with *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* or/and
765 β -glucan on the growth, innate immunity response and disease resistance of
766 *Macrobrachium rosenbergii*. *Fish & Shellfish Immunology*, 98, 68-76.

767 Miao, S., Zhu, J., Zhao, C., Sun, L., Zhang, X., & Chen, G. (2017). Effects of C/N ratio control
768 combined with probiotics on the immune response, disease resistance, intestinal
769 microbiota and morphology of giant freshwater prawn (*Macrobrachium rosenbergii*).
770 *Aquaculture*, 476, 125-133.

771 Mohapatra, S., Chakraborty, T., Prusty, A., Das, P., Paniprasad, K., & Mohanta, K. (2012). Use
772 of different microbial probiotics in the diet of rohu, *Labeo rohita* fingerlings: effects
773 on growth, nutrient digestibility and retention, digestive enzyme activities and
774 intestinal microflora. *Aquaculture Nutrition*, 18(1), 1-11.

775 Mohapatra, S., Chakraborty, T., Prusty, A. K., PaniPrasad, K., & Mohanta, K. N. (2014).
776 Beneficial effects of dietary probiotics mixture on hemato-immunology and cell
777 apoptosis of *Labeo rohita* fingerlings reared at higher water temperatures. *PLoS one*,
778 9(6), e100929.

- 779 Mujeeb Rahiman, K., Jesmi, Y., Thomas, A. P., & Mohamed Hatha, A. (2010). Probiotic effect
780 of Bacillus NL110 and Vibrio NE17 on the survival, growth performance and immune
781 response of Macrobrachium rosenbergii (de Man). *Aquaculture Research*, 41(9), e120-
782 e134.
- 783 Muthukrishnan, S., Hoong, M. C., Chen, W. W., & Natrah, I. (2021). Efficacy of Bacillus cereus
784 strain BP-MBRG/1b and prebiotic fructooligosaccharides dietary supplementation on
785 growth performance and disease resistance of Macrobrachium rosenbergii (De Mann)
786 towards Aeromonas hydrophila AH-1N. *Aquaculture Research*, 52(4), 1657-1665.
- 787 Nadella, R. K., Prakash, R. R., Dash, G., Ramanathan, S. K., Kuttanappilly, L. V., & Mothadaka,
788 M. P. (2018). Histopathological changes in giant freshwater prawn Macrobrachium
789 rosenbergii (de Man 1879) fed with probiotic Bacillus licheniformis upon challenge
790 with Vibrio alginolyticus. *Aquaculture Research*, 49(1), 81-92.
- 791 Nash, G., Chinabut, S., & Limsuwan, C. (1987). Idiopathic muscle necrosis in the freshwater
792 prawn, Macrobrachium rosenbergii de Man, cultured in Thailand. *Journal of Fish*
793 *Diseases*, 10(2), 109-120.
- 794 Nurhajati, J., Aryantha, I., & Kadek Indah, D. (2012). The curative action of Lactobacillus
795 plantarum FNCC 226 to Saprolegnia parasitica A3 on catfish (Pangasius
796 hypophthalmus Sauvage).
- 797 Owens, L., & Hall, M. (1989). *Recent advances in Australian prawns diseases and pathology*.
798 Paper presented at the Advances in Tropical Aquaculture, Workshop at Tahiti, French
799 Polynesia, 20 Feb-4 Mar 1989.
- 800 Parmar, P. V., Murthy, H. S., Tejpal, C., & Naveen Kumar, B. (2012). Effect of brewer's yeast
801 on immune response of giant freshwater prawn, Macrobrachium rosenbergii, and its
802 resistance to white muscle disease. *Aquaculture International*, 20(5), 951-964.
- 803 Phatarpekar, P. V., Kenkre, V. D., Sreepada, R. A., Desai, U. M., & Achuthankutty, C. T. (2002).
804 Bacterial flora associated with larval rearing of the giant freshwater prawn,
805 Macrobrachium rosenbergii. *Aquaculture*, 203(3), 279-291.
806 doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0044-8486\(01\)00705-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0044-8486(01)00705-0)
- 807 Pillai, D., & Bonami, J. R. (2012a). A review on the diseases of freshwater prawns with special
808 focus on white tail disease of Macrobrachium rosenbergii. *Aquaculture Research*,
809 43(7), 1029-1037.
- 810 Pillai, D., & Bonami, J. R. (2012b). A review on the diseases of freshwater prawns with special
811 focus on white tail disease of Macrobrachium rosenbergii. *Aquaculture Research*,
812 43(7), 1029-1037. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2109.2011.03061.x>
- 813 Qiu, Z., Xu, Q., Li, S., Zheng, D., Zhang, R., Zhao, J., & Wang, T. (2023). Effects of Probiotics on
814 the Water Quality, Growth Performance, Immunity, Digestion, and Intestinal Flora of
815 Giant Freshwater Prawn (Macrobrachium rosenbergii) in the Biofloc Culture System.
816 *Water*, 15(6), 1211.
- 817 Ranjit Kumar, N., Raman, R. P., Jadhao, S. B., Brahmchari, R. K., Kumar, K., & Dash, G. (2013).
818 Effect of dietary supplementation of Bacillus licheniformis on gut microbiota, growth
819 and immune response in giant freshwater prawn, Macrobrachium rosenbergii (de
820 Man, 1879). *Aquaculture International*, 21(2), 387-403.
- 821 Rengpipat, S., Phianphak, W., Piyatiratitivorakul, S., & Menasveta, P. (1998). Effects of a
822 probiotic bacterium on black tiger shrimp Penaeus monodon survival and growth.
823 *Aquaculture*, 167(3-4), 301-313.
- 824 Research and Markets. (2021). Global shrimp market by production, export, import,
825 consumption, countries, species, product form, size, value chain analysis & forecast.

826 Retrieved from [https://www.researchandmarkets.com/reports/5317039/global-](https://www.researchandmarkets.com/reports/5317039/global-shrimp-market-by-production-export#rela1-5311968)
827 [shrimp-market-by-production-export#rela1-5311968](https://www.researchandmarkets.com/reports/5317039/global-shrimp-market-by-production-export#rela1-5311968)
828 Research and Markets. (2022). Seafood - global market trajectory & analytics. Retrieved from
829 [https://www.researchandmarkets.com/reports/338675/seafood_global_market_tra-](https://www.researchandmarkets.com/reports/338675/seafood_global_market_trajectory_and_analytics#relc0-5119579)
830 [jectory_and_analytics#relc0-5119579](https://www.researchandmarkets.com/reports/338675/seafood_global_market_trajectory_and_analytics#relc0-5119579)
831 Ringø, E. (2020). Probiotics in shellfish aquaculture. *Aquaculture and Fisheries*, 5(1), 1-27.
832 doi:10.1016/j.aaf.2019.12.001
833 Ringø, E., Olsen, R. E., Vecino, J. G., Wadsworth, S., & Song, S. (2012). Use of
834 immunostimulants and nucleotides in aquaculture: a review. *J Mar Sci Res Dev*, 2(1),
835 104.
836 Ringø, E., Van Doan, H., Lee, S. H., Soltani, M., Hoseinifar, S. H., Harikrishnan, R., & Song, S. K.
837 (2020). Probiotics, lactic acid bacteria and bacilli: interesting supplementation for
838 aquaculture. *Journal of applied microbiology*, 129(1), 116-136.
839 Rowley, A. F. (2022). Bacterial diseases of crustaceans. *Invertebrate Pathology*, 2011, 400.
840 Rowley, A. F., & Pope, E. C. (2012). Vaccines and crustacean aquaculture—A mechanistic
841 exploration. *Aquaculture*, 334, 1-11.
842 Sahul Hameed, A. S., & Bonami, J. R. (2012). White Tail Disease of Freshwater Prawn,
843 *Macrobrachium rosenbergii*. *Indian J Virol*, 23(2), 134-140. doi:10.1007/s13337-012-
844 0087-y
845 Sasmita Julyantoro, P. G. (2015). *The impact of pathogen-pathogen and host-pathogen*
846 *signaling in larviculture of the giant freshwater prawn (Macrobrachium rosenbergii)*.
847 Ghent University,
848 Seenivasan, C., Radhakrishnan, S., Shanthi, R., Muralisankar, T., & Bhavan, P. S. (2014). Effect
849 of *Lactobacillus sporogenes* on survival, growth, biochemical constituents and energy
850 utilization of freshwater prawn *Macrobrachium rosenbergii* post larvae. *The Journal*
851 *of Basic & Applied Zoology*, 67(2), 19-24.
852 Srisala, J., Sanguanrut, P., Laiphrom, S., Siritattano, J., Khudet, J., Thaiue, D., . . .
853 Sritunyalucksana, K. (2020). Infectious myonecrosis virus (IMNV) and decapod
854 iridescent virus 1 (DIV1) detected in *Penaeus monodon* from the Indian Ocean.
855 *bioRxiv*.
856 Stankus, A. (2021). State of world aquaculture 2020 and regional reviews: FAO webinar series.
857 *FAO Aquaculture Newsletter*(63), 17-18.
858 Sudha, A., Bhavan, P. S., Manjula, T., Kalpana, R., & Karthik, M. (2019). *Bacillus licheniformis*
859 as a probiotic bacterium for culture of the prawn *Macrobrachium rosenbergii*.
860 *Research Journal of Life Sciences, Bioinformatics, Pharmaceutical and Chemical*
861 *Sciences*, 5(4), 44-61.
862 Sumon, M. S., Ahmmed, F., Khushi, S. S., Ahmmed, M. K., Rouf, M. A., Chisty, M. A. H., &
863 Sarower, M. G. (2018). Growth performance, digestive enzyme activity and immune
864 response of *Macrobrachium rosenbergii* fed with probiotic *Clostridium butyricum*
865 incorporated diets. *Journal of King Saud University-Science*, 30(1), 21-28.
866 Tadese, D. A., Sun, C., Liu, B., Muritu, R. W., Kevin, N. T., Zhou, Q., . . . Liu, M. (2020). Combined
867 effects of emodin and *Clostridium butyricum* on growth and non-specific immunity of
868 giant freshwater prawns, *Macrobrachium rosenbergii*. *Aquaculture*, 525, 735281.
869 Tang, K. F., Pantoja, C. R., Redman, R. M., Navarro, S. A., & Lightner, D. V. (2011).
870 Ultrastructural and sequence characterization of *Penaeus vannamei* nodavirus (PvNV)
871 from Belize. *Diseases of aquatic organisms*, 94(3), 179-187.

- 872 Toledo, A., Frizzo, L., Signorini, M., Bossier, P., & Arenal, A. (2019). Impact of probiotics on
873 growth performance and shrimp survival: A meta-analysis. *Aquaculture*, 500, 196-205.
- 874 Tung, C., Wang, C., & Chen, S. (1999). Histological and electron microscopic study on
875 Macrobrachium muscle virus (MMV) infection in the giant freshwater prawn,
876 Macrobrachium rosenbergii (. de Man), cultured in Taiwan. *Journal of Fish Diseases*,
877 22(4), 319-323.
- 878 Van Doan, H., Hoseinifar, S. H., Ringø, E., Ángeles Esteban, M., Dadar, M., Dawood, M. A., &
879 Faggio, C. (2020). Host-associated probiotics: a key factor in sustainable aquaculture.
880 *Reviews in Fisheries Science & Aquaculture*, 28(1), 16-42.
- 881 Vargas-Albores, F., Porchas-Cornejo, M. A., Martínez-Porchas, M., Villalpando-Canchola, E.,
882 Gollas-Galván, T., & Martínez-Córdova, L. R. (2017). Bacterial biota of shrimp intestine
883 is significantly modified by the use of a probiotic mixture: a high throughput
884 sequencing approach. *Helgoland Marine Research*, 71(1), 1-10.
- 885 Vázquez-Silva, G., Ramírez-Saad, H. C., Aguirre-Garrido, J. F., Mayorga-Reyes, L., Azaola-
886 Espinosa, A., & Morales-Jiménez, J. (2017). Effect of bacterial probiotics bio-
887 encapsulated into Artemia franciscana on weight and length of the shortfin silverside
888 (*Chirostoma humboldtianum*), and PCR-DGGE characterization of its intestinal
889 bacterial community. *Latin american journal of aquatic research*, 45(5), 1031-1043.
- 890 Verschuere, L., Rombaut, G., Sorgeloos, P., & Verstraete, W. (2000). Probiotic bacteria as
891 biological control agents in aquaculture. *Microbiology and molecular biology reviews*,
892 64(4), 655-671.
- 893 Vidhya Hindu, S., Chandrasekaran, N., Mukherjee, A., & Thomas, J. (2018). Effect of dietary
894 supplementation of novel probiotic bacteria *Bacillus vireti* 01 on antioxidant defence
895 system of freshwater prawn challenged with *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*. *Probiotics and*
896 *Antimicrobial Proteins*, 10(2), 356-366.
- 897 Wee, W. C., Mok, C. H., Romano, N., Ebrahimi, M., & Natrah, I. (2018). Dietary
898 supplementation use of *Bacillus cereus* as quorum sensing degrader and their effects
899 on growth performance and response of Malaysian giant river prawn *Macrobrachium*
900 *rosenbergii* juvenile towards *Aeromonas hydrophila*. *Aquaculture Nutrition*, 24(6),
901 1804-1812.
- 902 Wei, J., Tian, L., Wang, Y., Yu, L., & Zhu, X. (2021). Effects of salinity, photoperiod, and light
903 spectrum on larval survival, growth, and related enzyme activities in the giant
904 freshwater prawn, *Macrobrachium rosenbergii*. *Aquaculture*, 530, 735794.
905 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aquaculture.2020.735794>
- 906 Wu, H.-J., Sun, L.-B., Li, C.-B., Li, Z.-Z., Zhang, Z., Wen, X.-B., . . . Li, S.-K. (2014). Enhancement
907 of the immune response and protection against *Vibrio parahaemolyticus* by
908 indigenous probiotic *Bacillus* strains in mud crab (*Scylla paramamosain*). *Fish &*
909 *Shellfish Immunology*, 41(2), 156-162.
- 910 Xue, H.-B., Liu, C., Liu, Y., Wang, W.-N., & Xu, B. (2021). Roles of surface layer proteins in the
911 regulation of *Pediococcus pentosaceus* on growth performance, intestinal microbiota,
912 and resistance to *Aeromonas hydrophila* in the freshwater prawn *Macrobrachium*
913 *rosenbergii*. *Aquaculture International*, 29(3), 1373-1391.
- 914 Yao, L., Wang, C., Li, G., Xie, G., Jia, Y., Wang, W., . . . Zhang, Q. (2022). Identification of
915 *Fusarium solani* as a causal agent of black spot disease (BSD) of Pacific white shrimp,
916 *Penaeus vannamei*. *Aquaculture*, 548, 737602.
- 917 Yarahmadi, P., Miandare, H. K., Fayaz, S., & Caipang, C. M. A. (2016). Increased stocking
918 density causes changes in expression of selected stress-and immune-related genes,

919 humoral innate immune parameters and stress responses of rainbow trout
920 (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*). *Fish & Shellfish Immunology*, 48, 43-53.

921 Zhang, S., Shu, X., Zhou, L., & Fu, B. (2016). Isolation and identification of a new reovirus
922 associated with mortalities in farmed oriental river prawn, *Macrobrachium*
923 *nipponense* (de Haan, 1849), in China. *Journal of Fish Diseases*, 39(3), 371-375.

924 Zhang, X., Huang, Y., Cai, X., Zou, Z., Wang, G., Wang, S., . . . Zhang, Z. (2014). Identification
925 and expression analysis of immune-related genes linked to Rel/NF- κ B signaling
926 pathway under stresses and bacterial challenge from the small abalone *Haliotis*
927 *diversicolor*. *Fish & Shellfish Immunology*, 41(2), 200-208.

928 Zhao, C., Zhu, J., Hu, J., Dong, X., Sun, L., Zhang, X., & Miao, S. (2019). Effects of dietary *Bacillus*
929 *pumilus* on growth performance, innate immunity and digestive enzymes of giant
930 freshwater prawns (*Macrobrachium rosenbergii*). *Aquaculture Nutrition*, 25(3), 712-
931 720.

932 Zheng, X., Liu, B., Wang, N., Yang, J., Zhou, Q., Sun, C., & Zhao, Y. (2022). Low fish meal diet
933 supplemented with probiotics ameliorates intestinal barrier and immunological
934 function of *Macrobrachium rosenbergii* via the targeted modulation of gut microbes
935 and derived secondary metabolites. *Frontiers in Immunology*, 13, 1074399.

936 Zokaeifar, H., Babaei, N., Saad, C. R., Kamarudin, M. S., Sijam, K., & Balcazar, J. L. (2014).
937 Administration of *Bacillus subtilis* strains in the rearing water enhances the water
938 quality, growth performance, immune response, and resistance against *Vibrio harveyi*
939 infection in juvenile white shrimp, *Litopenaeus vannamei*. *Fish & Shellfish*
940 *Immunology*, 36(1), 68-74. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fsi.2013.10.007>

941 Zorriehzahra, M. J., Delshad, S. T., Adel, M., Tiwari, R., Karthik, K., Dhama, K., & Lazado, C. C.
942 (2016). Probiotics as beneficial microbes in aquaculture: an update on their multiple
943 modes of action: a review. *Veterinary quarterly*, 36(4), 228-241.

944 Zoumpopoulou, G., Pepelassi, E., Papaioannou, W., Georgalaki, M., Maragkoudakis, P. A.,
945 Tarantilis, P. A., . . . Papadimitriou, K. (2013). Incidence of bacteriocins produced by
946 food-related lactic acid bacteria active towards oral pathogens. *International journal*
947 *of molecular sciences*, 14(3), 4640-4654.

948

949

950

951

952 **Tables**953 **Table 1.** Common diseases affecting *M. rosenbergii* along with the agent, type of agent, symptoms and current control measures.

| Disease | Agent | Type of agent | Symptoms | Current control measures | References |
|---|---|---------------|---|--|---|
| White tail disease (WTD) | <i>Macrobrachium rosenbergii</i> nodavirus (MrNV) and extra small virus (XSV) Nodavirus and satellite | Virus | Lethargy and opaqueness of the abdominal muscle. Whitish tail and muscle. Affects hatchery and nursery stages. Approximately 100 % mortality rate in post-larvae within 2-3 days of infection | Screening of brood stock and postlarvae. Use of specific pathogen free brood stock | (Gangnonngi w, Bunnontae, Phiwsaiya, Senapin, & Dhar, 2020; Hameed & Bonami, 2012; Sahul Hameed & Bonami, 2012) |
| <i>Macrobrachium</i> Muscle Virus (MMV) | Parvo-like virus | Virus | Infected tissue becomes opaque, with progressive necrosis; accompanied by progressive weakening of feeding and swimming ability. Affects juveniles. | Improve prevention methods including nutrition and water quality management. | (Pillai & Bonami, 2012b; Tung, Wang, & Chen, 1999) |
| White spot Syndrome Baculo Virus (WSBV) | Baculovirus | Virus | White spots on the cuticle; affects larvae, juveniles and adults. | | (Arockiaraj et al., 2013; Hameed, Charles, & |

| | | | | | |
|---|------------------------------------|-------|---|--|---|
| Infectious hypodermal and hematopoietic necrosis (IHHN) disease | IHHN virus | Virus | Characterized by high mortality rate (approximately 100%). Affects post-larval stage. | Screening the viral infection in shrimp larvae before culture, good water quality management. | Anilkumar, 2000; Li et al., 2009) (Arockiaraj et al., 2015; Hameed & Bonami, 2012; Hsieh et al., 2006) |
| Monodon baculo virus (MBV) | MBV Baculovirus | Virus | Eosinophilic intranuclear inclusions that contain enveloped, bacilliform virions in the hepatopancreas of the larvae. | Improve management in hatchery. | (Gangnonngi w et al., 2010) |
| White spot syndrome virus (WSSV) | WSSV Nimaviridae, Whispovirus | Virus | White spots on the exoskeleton and appendages; accumulation of cuticular substances on the inner surface of the cuticle; pink-red colouration on the cephalothorax cuticle; reduction in feeding and increased lethargy; yellow hypertrophied hepatopancreas. | Improve management in hatchery, particularly water quality. | (Chiew, Salter, & Lim, 2019) |
| <i>Macrobrachium nipponensis</i> Reovirus (MnRV) | MnRV Reoviridae Cardero-like virus | Virus | Develop in the connective tissue of the host. | Improve management in hatchery, optimum water quality management. | (S. Zhang, Shu, Zhou, & Fu, 2016) |
| <i>Macrobrachium</i> hepatopancreatic parvovirus (MHPV) | Parvo-like virus | Virus | Hepatopancreatic nuclear lesions and epithelial cells. Opacity of abdominal muscles. Reduced growth rates, anorexia, reduced preening activity. | No appropriate treatment available, needs prevention methods, screening the viral infection in shrimp larvae | (Pillai & Bonami, 2012b) |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|-----------|--|--|---|
| Decapod iridescent virus 1 (DIV1) | <i>Cherax quadricarinatus</i> iridovirus (CQIV). Shrimp hemocyte iridescent virus (SHIV)) | Virus | “Peppered” appearance | before culture ensuring high standard in nutrition and water quality, low farming density. | Screening the viral infection in shrimp larvae before culture, water quality management. (Srisala et al., 2020) |
| <i>Penaeus vannamei</i> nodavirus (PvNV) (white tail disease-like muscle necrosis) | <i>Penaeus vannamei</i> nodavirus | Virus | Whitish, opaque lesions in the tail; affects larvae, 50 % mortality rate. | Improved management in hatchery. | (Tang, Pantoja, Redman, Navarro, & Lightner, 2011) |
| Acute hepatopancreatic necrosis disease (AHPND) | <i>Vibrio</i> spp. (<i>V. parahaemolyticus</i> , <i>V. punensis</i> , <i>V. harveyi</i> , <i>V. owensii</i> , <i>V. campbelli</i>) and <i>Shewanella</i> sp. that contain pVA1 plasmid | Bacterium | Appearance of empty stomach and gut in tandem with a light-coloured; severe atrophy of hepatopancreas; lethargy; up to 100% mortality with 20-30 days; early life stages are more susceptible. | Screening the viral infection in shrimp larvae before culture, water quality management. | (Chiew et al., 2019; Kumar, Roy, Behera, Bossier, & Das, 2021) |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|-----------|--|--|--|
| Black spot; brown spot; shell disease | <i>Vibrio; Pseudomonas</i> ; <i>Aeromonas</i> | Bacterium | Melanized lesions; affects all life stages, but more frequently observed in juveniles & adults. | Improved hatchery management; oxolinic acid; nifurpurinol | (Pillai & Bonami, 2012b) |
| Bacterial necrosis | <i>Pseudomonas; Leucot</i> <i>hrix</i> | Bacterium | Similar to black spot but only affects larvae, especially Nauplius, Protozoa, Zoea/Mysis | Improved hatchery management; nifurpurinol; erythromycin; penicillin-streptomycin; chloramphenicol | (Pillai & Bonami, 2012b) |
| Luminescent larval syndrome | <i>Vibrio harveyi</i> | Bacterium | Moribund & dead larvae, luminescence | Improved hatchery management; chloramphenicol; furazolidone | (Gupta et al., 2016) |
| White postlarval disease; rickettsia like disease | <i>Rickettsia</i> | Bacterium | White larvae, especially stages IV and V | Improved hatchery management; oxytetracycline; furazolidone; lime prior to stocking | (Pillai & Bonami, 2012b) |
| Mid-Cycle Disease (MCD) | <i>Alcaligenes</i> sp. and <i>Enterobacter</i> sp. | Bacterium | Lethargy; spiralling swimming; reduced feeding and growth; bluish-grey body colour; affects larvae, especially stages VI and VII | Improved hatchery management; hatchery disinfection Improve management in hatchery, particularly water quality | (Phatarpekar, Kenkre, Sreepada, Desai, & Achuthankutt y, 2002) (Pillai & Bonami, 2012b) |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|-----------|--|--|--|
| Lactococcosis | <i>Lactococcus garvieae</i> | Bacterium | Hyperacute haemorrhagic septicaemia | Vaccine, medical herbs, antibiotics (such as lincomycin, oxytetracycline and macrolides) | (S.-C. Chen, Lin, Liaw, & Wang, 2001), (Kawanishi et al., 2005) |
| Larval mycosis | <i>Lagenidium</i> spp. | Oomycete | Extensive mycelial network visible throughout exoskeleton of larvae | Improved hatchery management; trifluralin; merthiolate | (Pillai & Bonami, 2012b), (Owens & Hall, 1989) |
| Burn spot disease, black gill disease, fusariosis. Fungal infection | <i>Fusarium solani</i> | Fungus | Secondary infection; affects adults | Improved management | (Yao et al., 2022), (Pillai & Bonami, 2012b), (Cantrell & Betancourt, 1995), |
| Yeast infections | <i>Debaryomyces hanseii</i> ; <i>Metschnikowia bicuspidate</i> ; <i>Candida albicans</i> ; <i>Candida sake</i> ; <i>Metschnikowia artemisia</i> | Fungus | Yellowish, greyish, or bluish muscle tissues in juveniles (Does not cause significant disease) | Improved hatchery management | (S.-C. Chen et al., 2007), (S.-C. Chen et al., 2003) |
| Black spot disease | <i>Fusarium</i> spp. | Fungus | black spot cuticular lesions | | (Yao et al., 2022), |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|--|--|
| Protozoan infestations | <i>Zoothamnium; Epistylis; Vorticella; Opercularia; Vaginicola; Acineteta; Podophyra; etc.</i> | Protozoan | External parasites that inhibit swimming, feeding, and moulting; affect all life stages | Improved management; formalin; merthiolate; copper-based algicides | (Cantrell & Betancourt, 1995) (Pillai & Bonami, 2012b), (Ballester et al., 2017) |
| Idiopathic Muscle Necrosis (IMN) | Environmental disease | Unknown | Whitish colour in striated tissue of tail and appendages; when advanced, necrotic areas may become reddish; affects all life stages | Improved management; Improve Pond management | (Nash, Chinabut, & Limsuwan, 1987) |
| Exuvia Entrapment Disease (EED), sometimes known as Moulting Death Syndrome (MDS) | undetermined aetiology | Unknown but probably multiple causes, including nutritional deficiency | Localised deformities (rostrum, antennae, legs); failure to complete moulting; affects late larval stages; also seen in post-larvae, juveniles & adults | Dietary enrichment, carotenoid supplementation. Improve management in hatchery, particularly water quality | (Pillai & Bonami, 2012b) |
| Balloon disease | | | Swelling of the branchiostegal region; hypertrophy of some gill filaments | Improve quality of water and pond bottom | (Pillai & Bonami, 2012b) |
| Appendage deformity syndrome | | | Deformities (rostrum, antennae, legs, etc.) and mortalities | Carotenoid supplementation | (Pillai & Bonami, 2012b) |

955

956

957

958

959

960

961

962

963

964

965

966

967

968

969

970

971

972

973

974

975

976

977 **Table 2.** Antagonistic effects of probiotics on pathogenic microbes in the sustainable aquaculture of *M. rosenbergii*.

| Probiotics type | Sources | Doses/duration | Key research findings | References |
|--|------------------------------|---|---|-----------------------------------|
| <i>Pediococcus acidilactici</i> PA-GY2 and or <i>Saccharomyces cerevisiae</i> | Gut of prawn | 60 days | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Inhibits the growth of <i>Aeromonas hydrophila</i> – Decreased the mortality rate of prawn (~50%) | (Miao et al., 2020) |
| <i>Lactobacillus</i> spp. | Gut of prawn | 9 log CFU/g for 8 weeks | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Inhibitory activity against <i>Vibrio harveyi</i> – Improved weight gain (550%) in a short period of culture | (Ahmmed et al., 2020b) |
| <i>Lactobacillus acidophilus</i> 04 | Homemade curd | 10 ⁶ Cells/g for 30days | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Antibacterial activity against <i>Vibrio anguillarum</i>, <i>V. vulnificus</i> and <i>V. harveyi</i> – Improved growth and survival rate (86%) of freshwater prawn | (Khan & Mahmud, 2021) |
| <i>Lactobacillus plantarum</i> DM5 | Culture collection | 10 ⁷ , 10 ⁸ and 10 ⁹ CFU/g | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Inhibitory activity towards <i>Aeromonas hydrophila</i> | (D. Das, Baruah, & Goyal, 2014) |
| <i>Bacillus subtilis</i> | Juvenile of freshwater prawn | 10 ⁸ CFU/g feed for 60 days | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Potential inhibitory activity against <i>Aeromonas hydrophila</i> – Enhanced growth and survival rate | (Keysami & Mohammadpour, 2013) |
| Zymetin (<i>Bacillus mesentericus</i> , <i>Clostridium butyricum</i> and <i>Enterococcus faecalis</i>) | Commercial probiotic | 5 g/kg for 60 days | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Hinders the growth of <i>Vibrio</i> spp. and <i>Aeromonas</i> spp. | (Md Abul Kalam Azad et al., 2019) |
| <i>Lactobacillus plantatum</i> MTCC 1407 | Culture collection | - | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Inhibits the proliferation of <i>Pseudomonas fluorescens</i> and <i>Aeromonas hydrophila</i> | (P. Das, Khowala, & Biswas, 2016) |
| <i>Bacillus cereus</i> | Gut of healthy prawn | 10 ⁴ /g for 28 days | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Inhibits the growth of <i>Aeromonas hydrophila</i> | (Wee et al., 2018) |

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|--------------------------------------|
| | | | | – Probiotic-fed prawns exhibited an overall better hepatopancreatic condition (no hemocyte infiltrations and necrosis) | |
| <i>Bacillus coagulans</i> 2302 | MTCC Culture collection | - | | – Inhibits the growth of <i>Vibrio parahaemolyticus</i> | (M Karthik, Bhavan, & Manjula, 2018) |
| <i>Bacillus licheniformis</i> | Culture collection | 1 x 10 ⁹ /g for 60 days | | – Inhibits the growth of <i>Vibrio alginolyticus</i> , <i>Aeromonas</i> spp. and <i>Pseudomonas</i> spp. | (Ranjit Kumar et al., 2013) |
| | | | | – The growth of experimental group of prawn was 25% – 75% higher than control | |
| <i>Clostridium butyricum</i> | Intestine of prawn | 2 x 10 ⁹ /g for 60 days | | – Inhibits the growth of <i>Vibrio harveyi</i> | (Sumon et al., 2018) |
| | | | | – 28% higher weight gain compared to control group | |
| <i>Bacillus licheniformis</i> | Culture collection | 1 x 10 ⁹ CFU/g for 45 days | | – <i>B. licheniformis</i> in feed help in reducing the growth of <i>Vibrio alginolyticus</i> | (Nadella et al., 2018) |

978

979

980

981

982

983

984

985

986

987

Table 3. Effects of host-associated and non-host-derived probiotics on immunological parameters of giant freshwater prawn (*M. rosenbergii*).

| Probiotics | Source | Mode of use | Dose and trial duration | Effects on immunological parameters | Reference |
|--|--|----------------|---|--|----------------------------------|
| <i>Enterococcus faecalis</i> , <i>Lactococcus lactis</i> I, & <i>Lac.</i> <i>lactis</i> II | Intestine of <i>M. rosenbergii</i> | Diet | 10 ⁸ CFU/g 50 days | THC and PO ↑ α2-M, LGBP, proPO, Cu, Zn- SOD, TG, PE, AKP and ACP ↑ | (Kader et al., 2021) |
| <i>B. cereus</i> | Intestinal tract of prawn | Diet | 10 ⁴ CFU/g 28 days | SOD ↑ MDA → | (Wee et al., 2018) |
| <i>B. vireti</i> 01 | Intestinal tract of prawn | Diet | 10 ⁸ cells/mL 14 days | SOD, CAT and GSH ↑ | (Vidhya Hindu et al., 2018) |
| <i>Bacillus</i> NL110 & <i>Vibrio</i> NE17 | Egg, larvae, and intestine of <i>M. rosenbergii</i> | Diet and water | ~ 10 ⁹ CFU/g (Feed) ~ 10 ⁹ CFU/mL (Water) 60 days | THC, RB and PO ↑ | (Mujeeb Rahiman et al., 2010) |
| <i>Lactobacillus plantarum</i> | Culture collection | Diet | 10 ⁷ , 10 ⁸ & 10 ⁹ CFU/g 90 days | THC, PO, RB, CE ↑ | (Dash et al., 2014) |
| <i>L. plantarum</i> (Heat killed) | Culture collection | Diet | 10 ⁷ , 10 ⁸ & 10 ⁹ CFU/g 90 days | THC, PO, RB, CE ↑ | (Dash et al., 2015) |
| <i>L. plantarum</i> | Culture collection | Water | 10 ⁷ , 10 ⁸ & 10 ⁹ CFU/L 90 days | THC, PO, RB, CE ↑ | (Dash et al., 2016) |
| <i>B. pumilus</i> | Culture collection | Diet | 10 ⁷ , 10 ⁸ , & 10 ⁹ CFU/g 60 days | RB, CAT, PcA, ACP, NOS and PO ↑ SOD → | (Zhao et al., 2019) |
| <i>B. coagulans</i> | Culture collection | Diet | 10 ⁵ , 10 ⁷ & 10 ⁹ CFU/g 60 days | RB and LZ ↑ | (Gupta et al., 2016) |

| | | | | | |
|---|--------------------|------|--|------------------------|--|
| <i>B. licheniformis</i> | Culture collection | Diet | 10 ⁶ , 10 ⁷ , 10 ⁸ & 10 ⁹ CFU/g 60 days | THC, SOD, PO ↑ | (Ranjit Kumar et al., 2013) |
| Zymetin® (<i>Bacillus mesentericus</i> , <i>Clostridium butyricum</i> , <i>Enterococcus faecalis</i>) | Commercial | Diet | 5 g/kg 60 days | THC, DHC, PcA and CE ↑ | (Md Abul Kalam Azad et al., 2019) |
| <i>Saccharomyces cerevisiae</i> | – | Diet | 5, 10 & 20 g/Kg 75 days | THC, RB and PO ↑ | (Parmar, Murthy, Tejpal, & Naveen Kumar, 2012) |

989 Increased (↑); No change (→); Total hemocyte count (THC); Phenoloxidase (PO); α2-Macroglobulin (α2M); Lipopolysaccharide and β-1,3-glucan-binding protein (LGBP);
990 Prophenoloxidase (proPO); Superoxide dismutase (SOD); Transglutaminase (TG); Peroxinectin (PE); Alkaline phosphatase (AKP); Acid phosphatase (ACP); Large granular
991 haemocytes (LGH), Small granular haemocytes (SHG); Non-granular haemocyte (NGH); Malondialdehyde (MDA); Catalase (CAT); Glutathione (GSH); Respiratory burst
992 (RB); Clearance efficiency (CE); Phagocytic activity (PcA); Nitric oxide synthase (NOS); Lysozyme (LZ); Differential haemocyte counts (DHC).
993
994