



## RESEARCH ARTICLE

### COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE PROXIMATE COMPOSITION OF *PYXICEPHALUS ADSPERSUS* AND *OREOCHROMIS NILOTICUS* FROM NIGERIAN WETLAND

<sup>1,\*</sup>Daniel, U. I., <sup>1</sup>Vincent-Akpu, I. F., <sup>2</sup>Umesi, N. and <sup>1</sup>Togi, P. D.

<sup>1</sup>Department of Animal and Environmental Biology, University of Port Harcourt, Nigeria

<sup>2</sup>School of Science Education, Federal College of Education (Technical) Omoku, Nigeria

#### ARTICLE INFO

##### Article History:

Received 15<sup>th</sup> September, 2016  
Received in revised form  
04<sup>th</sup> October, 2016  
Accepted 17<sup>th</sup> November, 2016  
Published online 30<sup>th</sup> December, 2016

##### Key words:

Proximate Composition,  
Tilapia,  
Bullfrog.

#### ABSTRACT

A study was conducted to evaluate the carbohydrate, lipid, ash, protein, moisture and fiber contents of samples of African bullfrog (*Pyxicephalus adspersus*) and tilapia (*Oreochromis niloticus*) collected from ARAC, Aluu, Port Harcourt, Nigeria from November 2013 – February 2014. Slight variations in chemical compositions of both species, some of which were statistically significant, were observed in the study. The range of mean values of carbohydrate ( $0.54 \pm 0.01 - 1.29 \pm 0.10\%$ ), lipid ( $0.99 \pm 0.33 - 4.54 \pm 2.13\%$ ), ash ( $4.02 \pm 0.51 - 7.20 \pm 1.67\%$ ), protein ( $6.41 \pm 0.46 - 13.53 \pm 0.74\%$ ), moisture ( $71.86 \pm 0.51 - 78.95 \pm 3.44\%$ ) and fiber ( $2.31 \pm 0.54 - 14.67 \pm 2.31\%$ ) recorded were consistent with values reported in previous studies. *P. adspersus* and *O. niloticus* both represent an attractive and important source of animal protein, providing approximately some 10 – 13% of animal protein for human consumption. Animals with lipid content < 5% are classified to have low-oil content. Lipid contents of *P. adspersus* and *O. niloticus* recorded in this study were all below 5%, and therefore falls within the low-oil category that is nutritionally fit for human consumption.

Copyright©2016, Daniel et al. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Citation: Daniel, U. I., Vincent-Akpu, I.F., Umesi, N. and Togi, P. D. 2016. "Comparative study of the proximate composition of *pyxicephalus adspersus* and *oreochromis niloticus* from nigerian wetland", *International Journal of Current Research*, 8, (12), 42680-42685.

## INTRODUCTION

All through the globe, geometric rise in human populations has been observed to impose varying degrees of threats to the availability and distribution of food. This problem is more pronounced in the third world countries in which exponential rise in human populations have come with corresponding increase in the quest for alternative sources of animal protein in order to meet the increasing need for protein. Fish is a major source of animal protein across the world and the demand for it has risen over the years. Edible frogs have been found to be proteinous and represent an alternative source of animal protein particularly in areas where fish and other protein sources are either in short supply or relatively more expensive. Therefore, providing adequate supply of protein to meet the world's teeming populations of humans is probably one of the greatest challenges facing the human race today. It is currently estimated that more than 925 million people across the globe are chronically malnourished and are targets of kwashiorkor occasioned by insufficient protein supply (FAO, 2011). Edible frogs are eaten in many parts of the world. Recently there has been an increasing trend in the exportation of frogs from developing to developed countries. Frog leg is a popular delicacy in Europe (Ashton et al., 1988).

These edible frogs resemble chicken in terms of taste. Apart from having high protein content, studies have shown they also have characteristically low fats and calorie content. In many countries, including Nigeria, frogs are collected on a local scale as an essential source of animal protein (Angulo, 2008; Mohneke et al., 2009). Within the past decade, frogs have become international trade items involving more than 30 countries, accounting for approximately USD 48.7 million in 1998 (Teixeira et al., 2001). On the other hand, tilapia is one of the most commercially important aquaculture species. Despite the high dependence on fish as a source of animal protein, fish consumption in Sub-Saharan Africa is the world's lowest. The African continent is projected to be in need of additional 1.6 million tons by the year 2015 just to maintain current consumption.

Chemical composition of animals varies greatly from one species to another and even among the individuals within the same species (Alkobaby et al., 2008). Some studies on proximate composition of tilapia (Bombata-Fashina et al., 2013) and edible frogs (Cagiltay et al., 2011; Cagiltay et al., 2014; Ozugul et al., 2008) have been conducted around the globe in the last two decades. In Nigeria, edible frogs are important delicacies and feature prominently in the diets of many local communities. Unfortunately, very limited studies have been conducted to evaluate the chemical composition of edible frogs in Nigeria.

\*Corresponding author: Daniel, U. I.

Department of Animal and Environmental Biology, University of Port Harcourt, Nigeria.

This study, therefore, was designed to investigate carbohydrate, lipid, ash, protein, moisture and fiber contents of African bullfrog (*Pyxicephalus adspersus*) and tilapia (*Oreochromis niloticus*) collected from the African Regional Aquaculture Center (ARAC) in Aluu, Port Harcourt, Rivers State, Nigeria.

### Sampling

Fresh specimens of edible frogs (*Pyxicephalus adspersus*) and tilapia (*Oreochromis niloticus*) were collected from African Regional Aquaculture Center (ARAC) in Aluu Port Harcourt, Rivers State with the aid of fishing nets. The nets were thrown in a targeted area where frogs have been seen and after a few minutes the net was dragged with the animals caught in it. Samples of *O. niloticus* were collected from earthen ponds in a similar manner. The animals were transferred to plastic tanks containing water and later transported to the laboratory proximate composition analyses.

### Laboratory Methods

Animals were immobilized by a blow on the head and thereafter cleaned with water and white handkerchief. In the laboratory, proximate analyses were carried out on replicate samples ( $n = 2$ ) of *P. adspersus* and *O. niloticus* respectively over a period of four (4) months from November 2013-February 2014, in order to determine carbohydrate, lipid, ash, protein, moisture, and fiber content of the animals.

### Carbohydrate Content

Carbohydrate was determined using Cleg Anthrone Method (AOAC, 1994) and carbohydrate as glucose calculated using the formula below:

$$\% \text{CHO as glucose} = \frac{25 \times \text{absorbance of sample}}{\text{absorbance of standard glucose}}$$

### Lipid Content

Lipid was determined by the Soxhlet Extraction Method. Lipid was extracted with a non-polar solvent, ethyl ether using the modified Bligh and Dyer procedure (AOAC, 1994), in which the solvent was first evaporated and the extracted materials weighed from which % lipid content was calculated as shown below:

$$\% \text{lipid} = (\text{weight of extract} / \text{weight of sample}) \times 100$$

### Ash Content

The ash content was determined by loss on ignition. Samples were ignited at a temperature of about 630°C for 3 h in an electric muffle furnace until samples were completely free of carbon particles (residue becomes white). After ignition, % ash content was calculated as follows:

$$\% \text{ash} = (\text{weight of ash} / \text{weight of sample}) \times 100$$

### Protein Content

Protein was determined by the kjeldahl method. In this method, organic nitrogen is converted to  $(\text{NH}_4)_2\text{SO}_4$  by digestion with conc.  $\text{H}_2\text{SO}_4$  in a Kjeldahl flask. The digest was then diluted, made alkaline with 40 ml of 40% NaOH and

thereafter distilled. The liberated  $\text{NH}_3$  which was collected in a solution of  $\text{H}_3\text{BO}_3$  was then determined titrimetrically, and the percentage of protein in sample calculated as follows:

$$\% \text{protein} = (c - b) \times 14 \times d \times 6.25 / a \times 1000 \times 100$$

where  $a$  = sample weight (g),  $b$  = vol. of NaOH required for back titration & neutralization of 25 ml 0.1 N  $\text{H}_2\text{SO}_4$  (for sample),  $c$  = vol. of NaOH required for back titration & neutralization of 25 ml 0.1 N  $\text{H}_2\text{SO}_4$  (for blank),  $d$  = normality of NaOH, 6.25 = conversion factor of N to protein & 14 = atomic weight of N.

### Moisture Content

Moisture was determined by drying the sample to a constant weight in a hotbox oven using the oven-dry method (AOAC, 1994), and percentage moisture content calculated as shown below:

$$\% \text{moisture} = (\text{weight loss} / \text{original weight of sample}) \times 100$$

### Data Analysis

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was carried out to evaluate significant differences in mean proximate compositions (carbohydrate, lipid, ash, protein, moisture and fiber content) of samples of *P. adspersus* and *O. niloticus* at the 95% significance level using the Data Analysis ToolPak of the Microsoft Excel. Samples were collected in two replicates (male and female,  $n = 2$ ) for each species. Where ANOVA indicated a significant difference, pairwise comparisons were conducted using the Tukey test (Fowler & Cohen, 1990) to determine pairs of significant means. A trellis was constructed for pairwise comparison of all sample means. The  $T$  test statistic was computed to provide a standard against which the mean differences in the trellis were tested as shown below:

$$T = (q) \times \sqrt{\frac{\text{within variance}}{n}}$$

where  $n = 2$  (no of sampling units in each sample). The within variance was obtained from each ANOVA summary table, while  $q$  was extrapolated from the Tukey table for the appropriate number of means ( $a$ ) and degrees of freedom ( $v$ ) at  $p = 0.05$  level of significance.

## RESULTS

The means and standard deviations of carbohydrate content of *Pyxicephalus adspersus* and *Oreochromis niloticus* are as presented in Table 1. Mean carbohydrate content generally ranged from a minimum in *P. adspersus* ( $0.54 \pm 0.01\%$ ) to a maximum in *O. niloticus* ( $1.29 \pm 0.10\%$ ). Carbohydrate was not recorded in tissue samples of animals during the months of November and December. However, in January comparatively higher values were observed in both species, with a peak value ( $1.29 \pm 0.10\%$ ) in *O. niloticus*. The ANOVA on carbohydrate content was significant between species ( $F_{1,8} = 34.82$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ) and periods ( $F_{3,8} = 99.44$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ) (Table 2). ANOVA also showed a significant interaction between species and periods. Significantly higher values of carbohydrate content were recorded in *O. niloticus* in January and February compared to those of *P. adspersus* in the preceding months (Tukey,  $p < 0.05$ ).

**Table 1. Carbohydrate Content ( $\bar{x} \pm SD, n=2$ ) of *Pyxicephalus adspersus* and *Oreochromis niloticus* from ARAC, Aluu Port Harcourt (Nov 2013-Feb 2014)**

| Species                       | Carbohydrate Content (%) |                 |                 |                 |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|                               | Nov 2013                 | Dec 2013        | Jan 2014        | Feb 2014        |
| <i>Pyxicephalus adspersus</i> | 0.00 $\pm$ 0.00          | 0.00 $\pm$ 0.00 | 0.64 $\pm$ 0.26 | 0.54 $\pm$ 0.01 |
| <i>Oreochromis niloticus</i>  | 0.00 $\pm$ 0.00          | 0.00 $\pm$ 0.00 | 1.29 $\pm$ 0.10 | 1.12 $\pm$ 0.09 |

**Table 2. ANOVA on Carbohydrate Content (%) of *Pyxicephalus adspersus* and *Oreochromis niloticus* from ARAC, Aluu Port Harcourt (Nov 2013-Feb 2014)**

| Source of Variation | SS   | df | MS   | F     | P-value |
|---------------------|------|----|------|-------|---------|
| Species             | 0.38 | 1  | 0.38 | 34.82 | < 0.05* |
| Periods             | 3.24 | 3  | 1.08 | 99.44 | < 0.05* |
| Interaction         | 0.38 | 3  | 0.13 | 11.70 | < 0.05* |
| Within              | 0.09 | 8  | 0.01 |       |         |
| Total               | 4.09 | 15 |      |       |         |

\* Significant at  $p < 0.05$ **Table 3. Lipid Content ( $\bar{x} \pm SD, n=2$ ) of *Pyxicephalus adspersus* and *Oreochromis niloticus* from ARAC, Aluu Port Harcourt (Nov 2013-Feb 2014)**

| Species                       | Lipid Content (%) |                 |                 |                 |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|                               | Nov 2013          | Dec 2013        | Jan 2014        | Feb 2014        |
| <i>Pyxicephalus adspersus</i> | 1.66 $\pm$ 0.76   | 2.73 $\pm$ 0.67 | 3.69 $\pm$ 0.93 | 2.88 $\pm$ 0.17 |
| <i>Oreochromis niloticus</i>  | 4.33 $\pm$ 1.28   | 4.54 $\pm$ 2.13 | 2.33 $\pm$ 0.54 | 0.99 $\pm$ 0.33 |

**Table 4. ANOVA on Lipid Content (%) of *Pyxicephalus adspersus* and *Oreochromis niloticus* from ARAC, Aluu Port Harcourt (Nov 2013-Feb 2014)**

| Source of Variation | SS    | df | MS   | F    | P-value |
|---------------------|-------|----|------|------|---------|
| Species             | 0.37  | 1  | 0.37 | 0.35 | > 0.05  |
| Periods             | 5.94  | 3  | 1.98 | 1.86 | > 0.05  |
| Interaction         | 15.44 | 3  | 5.15 | 4.84 | < 0.05* |
| Within              | 8.50  | 8  | 1.06 |      |         |
| Total               | 30.25 | 15 |      |      |         |

\* Significant at  $p < 0.05$ **Table 5. Ash Content ( $\bar{x} \pm SD, n=2$ ) of *Pyxicephalus adspersus* and *Oreochromis niloticus* from ARAC, Aluu Port Harcourt (Nov 2013-Feb 2014)**

| Species                       | Ash Content (%) |                 |                 |                 |
|-------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|                               | Nov 2013        | Dec 2013        | Jan 2014        | Feb 2014        |
| <i>Pyxicephalus adspersus</i> | 4.02 $\pm$ 0.51 | 5.76 $\pm$ 0.66 | 5.96 $\pm$ 0.77 | 5.98 $\pm$ 0.61 |
| <i>Oreochromis niloticus</i>  | 6.51 $\pm$ 1.02 | 7.20 $\pm$ 1.67 | 6.39 $\pm$ 0.33 | 6.17 $\pm$ 0.28 |

**Table 6. ANOVA on Ash Content (%) of *Pyxicephalus adspersus* and *Oreochromis niloticus* from ARAC, Aluu Port Harcourt (Nov 2013-Feb 2014)**

| Source of Variation | SS    | df | MS   | F    | P-value |
|---------------------|-------|----|------|------|---------|
| Species             | 5.18  | 1  | 5.18 | 7.29 | < 0.05* |
| Periods             | 3.22  | 3  | 1.07 | 1.51 | > 0.05  |
| Interaction         | 3.32  | 3  | 1.11 | 1.56 | > 0.05  |
| Within              | 5.68  | 8  | 0.71 |      |         |
| Total               | 17.39 | 15 |      |      |         |

\* Significant at  $p < 0.05$ 

Mean lipid content remained fairly constant in *O. niloticus* between November and December (4.33  $\pm$  1.28% – 4.54  $\pm$  2.13%) but dropped abruptly in January (2.33  $\pm$  0.54%), reaching a minimum value (0.99  $\pm$  0.33%) in February (Table 3). Although lipid content rose to a peak value in *P. adspersus* in January (3.69  $\pm$  0.93%), it fell slightly again in February (2.88  $\pm$  0.17%). The result of ANOVA on lipid content was not found to be significant between species and periods (Table 4).

Ash content showed roughly similar trend in both *P. adspersus* and *O. niloticus*, with mean values ranging from 4.02  $\pm$  0.51% – 5.98  $\pm$  0.61% and 6.17  $\pm$  0.28% – 7.20  $\pm$  1.67% for *P. adspersus* and *O. niloticus* respectively (Table 5). The ANOVA on ash content was significant between species ( $F_{1,8} = 7.29, p < 0.05$ ) but not between periods ( $F_{3,8} = 1.51, p > 0.05$ ) (Table 6). Mean protein content of *P. adspersus* fell progressively from a maximum in November (12.04  $\pm$  0.87%) to a minimum in February (6.41  $\pm$  0.46%).

**Table 7. Protein Content ( $\bar{x} \pm SD, n=2$ ) of *Pyxicephalus adspersus* and *Oreochromis niloticus* from ARAC, Aluu Port Harcourt (Nov 2013-Feb 2014)**

| Species                       | Ash Content (%) |              |              |              |
|-------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
|                               | Nov 2013        | Dec 2013     | Jan 2014     | Feb 2014     |
| <i>Pyxicephalus adspersus</i> | 12.04 ± 0.87    | 10.63 ± 1.48 | 8.58 ± 0.47  | 6.41 ± 0.46  |
| <i>Oreochromis niloticus</i>  | 9.03 ± 2.32     | 13.53 ± 0.74 | 12.72 ± 1.90 | 10.85 ± 1.94 |

**Table 8. ANOVA on Protein Content (%) of *Pyxicephalus adspersus* and *Oreochromis niloticus* from ARAC, Aluu Port Harcourt (Nov 2013-Feb 2014)**

| Source of Variation | SS    | df | MS    | F    | P-value |
|---------------------|-------|----|-------|------|---------|
| Species             | 18.00 | 1  | 18.00 | 8.64 | < 0.05* |
| Periods             | 24.05 | 3  | 8.02  | 3.85 | > 0.05  |
| Interaction         | 36.37 | 3  | 12.12 | 5.82 | < 0.05* |
| Within              | 16.67 | 8  | 2.08  |      |         |
| Total               | 95.09 | 15 |       |      |         |

\* Significant at  $p < 0.05$ **Table 9. Moisture Content ( $\bar{x} \pm SD, n=2$ ) of *Pyxicephalus adspersus* and *Oreochromis niloticus* from ARAC, Aluu Port Harcourt (Nov 2013-Feb 2014)**

| Species                       | Ash Content (%) |              |              |              |
|-------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
|                               | Nov 2013        | Dec 2013     | Jan 2014     | Feb 2014     |
| <i>Pyxicephalus adspersus</i> | 78.47 ± 1.65    | 77.80 ± 0.69 | 72.23 ± 2.67 | 71.86 ± 0.51 |
| <i>Oreochromis niloticus</i>  | 77.03 ± 0.66    | 77.75 ± 3.27 | 78.95 ± 3.44 | 78.72 ± 2.28 |

**Table 10. ANOVA on Moisture Content (%) of *Pyxicephalus adspersus* and *Oreochromis niloticus* from ARAC, Aluu Port Harcourt (Nov 2013-Feb 2014)**

| Source of Variation | SS     | df | MS    | F    | P-value |
|---------------------|--------|----|-------|------|---------|
| Species             | 36.51  | 1  | 36.51 | 7.54 | < 0.05* |
| Periods             | 21.78  | 3  | 7.26  | 1.50 | > 0.05  |
| Interaction         | 57.73  | 3  | 19.24 | 3.97 | > 0.05  |
| Within              | 38.75  | 8  | 4.84  |      |         |
| Total               | 154.77 | 15 |       |      |         |

\* Significant at  $p < 0.05$ **Table 11. Fiber Content ( $\bar{x} \pm SD, n=2$ ) of *Pyxicephalus adspersus* and *Oreochromis niloticus* from ARAC, Aluu Port Harcourt (Nov 2013-Feb 2014)**

| Species                       | Fiber Content (%) |             |              |              |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|
|                               | Nov 2013          | Dec 2013    | Jan 2014     | Feb 2014     |
| <i>Pyxicephalus adspersus</i> | 3.82 ± 1.25       | 2.31 ± 0.54 | 14.67 ± 2.31 | 12.34 ± 0.40 |
| <i>Oreochromis niloticus</i>  | 3.11 ± 1.92       | 4.88 ± 0.27 | 5.61 ± 1.55  | 2.39 ± 0.78  |

**Table 12. ANOVA on Fiber Content (%) of *Pyxicephalus adspersus* and *Oreochromis niloticus* from ARAC, Aluu Port Harcourt (Nov 2013-Feb 2014)**

| Source of Variation | SS     | df | MS    | F     | P-value |
|---------------------|--------|----|-------|-------|---------|
| Species             | 73.53  | 1  | 73.53 | 41.67 | < 0.05* |
| Periods             | 124.46 | 3  | 41.49 | 23.51 | < 0.05* |
| Interaction         | 114.75 | 3  | 38.25 | 21.68 | < 0.05* |
| Within              | 14.12  | 8  | 1.76  |       |         |
| Total               | 326.85 | 15 |       |       |         |

\* Significant at  $p < 0.05$ 

On the other hand, protein content of *O. niloticus* was found to lie in the range  $9.03 \pm 2.32\%$  –  $13.53 \pm 0.74\%$  (Table 7). The result of ANOVA on protein content was found to be significant between species ( $F_{1,8} = 8.64$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ) (Table 8). Moisture content was fairly stable in *O. niloticus* with mean values ranging from  $77.03 \pm 0.66$  –  $78.95 \pm 3.44\%$ . *P. adspersus* showed slight variations in moisture content with means that fell in the interval  $71.86 \pm 0.51$  –  $78.47 \pm 1.65\%$  (Table 9).

ANOVA showed differences in means which were significant between species ( $F_{1,8} = 7.54$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ) (Table 10). Significantly higher mean values were recorded for *O. niloticus* in January and February compared to *P. adspersus* (Tukey,  $p < 0.05$ ). Mean fiber content of *O. niloticus* varied minimally across sampling period and ranged from a minimum value of  $2.39 \pm 0.78\%$  to a maximum of  $5.61 \pm 1.55\%$ . Comparatively higher values were recorded in *P. adspersus* especially during the months of January and February in which

mean values were recorded as  $14.67 \pm 2.31\%$  and  $12.34 \pm 0.40\%$  respectively (Table 11). The ANOVA on fiber content showed that the observed differences were significant between species ( $F_{1,8} = 41.67$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ) and periods ( $F_{3,8} = 23.51$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ) (Table 12). ANOVA also revealed significant interaction between species and periods ( $F_{3,8} = 21.68$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ). Mean fiber content of both species tended to be higher in January compared to the preceding months.

## DISCUSSION

Frog meat is an attractive food choice in high class restaurants. In Nigeria, it is delicacy in many rural settings especially in the southern part of the country where wetlands and floodplains provide conducive environment for breeding. Frogs are mainly collected from nature. However, with rising human activities involving various degrees of industrial operations, the population of edible frogs has declined considerably. Destruction of wetlands, unsustainable capture operations and declining water resources are some of the factors that have been implicated in the progressive decline of populations of edible frogs (Cagiltay *et al.*, 2014). In Nigeria the African bullfrog, *Ptychocheilus adspersus* is widely consumed and features in the diet of many local communities. This is also true of the American bullfrog (*Rana catesbeiana*), Indian bullfrog (*Rana tigrina*) and the green frog (*Rana esculenta*) which have been reported to be widely consumed in the Middle and Southern American as well as Asian countries (Alvarez & Real, 2006). Trade in frozen frog leg is a flourishing business in Europe, with the highest demand recorded in France. France alone imports 3000-4000 tons of frozen frog legs and 700-800 tons of live frogs annually (Cagiltay *et al.*, 2014). In Europe, Turkey, Bangladesh, Albania, China, Malaysia and Indonesia have been listed as countries with ready markets for trade in edible frogs (Negroni, 1997; Neveu, 2004; Neveu, 2009). In 2008, Nile tilapia (*Oreochromis niloticus*) culture alone was ranked fifth among the most cultured species in the world with a total aquaculture production of 2.3 million. *O. niloticus* represents  $\approx 84\%$  of the total global tilapia production (FAO, 2009), with China reported to be the largest consumer and producer ( $\approx 46\%$  of global production) of tilapia. China alone is estimated to have produced 1.15 million tons of tilapia in 2009. Tilapia has been rated man's most important single source of high quality protein, providing 16% of the animal protein consumed by the world's population (FAO, 1997). Is it any wonder, therefore, that numerous studies have been conducted to evaluate the nutritional potential of edible frogs and tilapia in the last two decades?

Chemical composition of animals varies greatly from one species to another and even among the individuals within the same species (Alkobaby *et al.*, 2008). Mean protein content recorded in this study was found to vary from  $6.41 \pm 0.46\%$  -  $12.04 \pm 0.87\%$  and  $9.03 \pm 2.32\%$  -  $13.53 \pm 0.74\%$  for of *P. adspersus* and *O. niloticus* respectively. Wide ranging variations in protein content was reported by Bombata-Fashina *et al.* (2013) in a study conducted to investigate the proximate composition of some wild tilapiine fishes in Epe Lagoon, Lagos, Nigeria. According to these workers, protein content of tilapia ranged from 18.08 - 21.80%. In a similarly related study, Cagiltay *et al.* (2014) also reported mean values of protein in wild marsh frog (*Rana ridibunda*) that fell within the interval 17.82 - 19.22%. Other related studies include the works of Ozugul *et al.* (2008) who also reported a mean value

of 19.22% in studies conducted on *Rana esculenta* and Cagiltay *et al.* (2011) who recorded values within the range  $16.58 \pm 0.14\%$ ,  $18.94 \pm 0.01\%$  and  $19.37 \pm 0.03\%$  in wild frogs collected from Adana, Bursa and Trakya regions respectively in Turkey. The results of protein content of *P. adspersus* and *O. niloticus* obtained in this study were, therefore, found to be consistent with values reported in previous investigations. Lipid content of *P. adspersus* and *O. niloticus* recorded in this study ranged from  $1.66 \pm 0.76 - 3.69 \pm 0.93\%$  and  $0.99 \pm 0.33 - 4.54 \pm 2.13\%$  respectively and was found to be slightly higher than ranges of 0.40 - 0.90% and 0.59 - 0.89% which were reported for tilapia (Bombata-Fashina *et al.*, 2013) and edible frogs (Cagiltay *et al.*, 2014; Ozugul *et al.*, 2008) respectively. According to Stansby (1982) and Ackman (1989), animals with lipid content  $< 5\%$  are generally classified as lean animals. Mean values obtained in the current study were generally below 5% and fall within the range classified as low-oil by Bombata-Fashina *et al.*, (2013). Ash content of 1.00 - 1.75% and 1.14 - 1.60% reported in previous studies in tilapia (Bombata-Fashina *et al.*, 2013) and edible frogs (Cagiltay *et al.*, 2014) respectively were found to be smaller than the range reported in *P. adspersus* ( $4.02 \pm 0.51 - 5.98 \pm 0.61\%$ ) and *O. niloticus* ( $6.17 \pm 0.28 - 7.20 \pm 1.67\%$ ) in the current study. It is well known and documented that moisture and lipid contents in fish muscles are inversely related and that their sum is  $\approx 80\%$ , with other components accounting for the remaining 20% (FAO, 1999). This finding agrees with the observations made in the current study in which sum of moisture and lipid contents were found to be over 70%, ranging from  $\approx 74 - 81\%$  and 80 - 82% in *P. adspersus* and *O. niloticus* respectively.

## Conclusion

Although chemical composition of animals have been shown to vary greatly from one species to another and even among the individuals within the same species, the variations in protein and lipid contents observed between *P. adspersus* and *O. niloticus* are within normal ranges. This study represents at least an attempt to evaluate the nutritional potential of edible frogs (*P. adspersus*) and tilapia (*O. niloticus*) which have been found to feature prominently in the diets of many local communities in Nigeria, especially within the South-Eastern region of the country. Edible frogs have been found to be proteinous and represent an alternative source of animal protein particularly in areas where fish and other protein sources are either in short supply or relatively more expensive. Frog leg is a popular delicacy and resembles chicken in terms of taste. Apart from having high protein content, studies have shown they also have characteristically low fats and calorie content. Results of this study showed that *P. adspersus* and *O. niloticus* provide approximately some 10 - 13% of protein available for local consumption, and that their lipid contents are considerably low and healthy for human consumption.

## REFERENCES

- Ackman, R. G. 1989. Nutritional Composition of Fats in Sea Foods. *Prog. Food Nutr. Sci.*, 13: 161-289.
- Alkobaby, A. I., Sami, A. S. & Ghada, I. A. 2008. Effect of Protein Sources on Characteristics and Quality Traits of Nile Tilapia (*Oreochromis niloticus*). Proceedings of the 8th International Symposium on Tilapia in Aquaculture, October 12-14, 2008, Egypt, pp: 551-567.

- Alvarez, R. & Real, M. 2006. Significance of Initial Weight of Post-metamorphosis Frog Lets for Growth and Fattening of *Rana perezii*. Seoane, 1885, Raised in Captivity. *Aquaculture*, 255: 429-435.
- Angulo, A. 2008. Consumption of Andean Frogs of the Genus *Telmatobius* in Cusco, Peru: Recommendation of their Conservation. *Traffic Bull.* 21:95-97.
- AOAC 1994. Official Methods of Analysis of the Association of Official Chemists. 1(2), AOAC Arlington, VA, USA, pp: 129.
- Ashton, R. E. & Ashton, P. S. 1988. Handbook of Reptiles and Amphibians of Florida, Part III, The Amphibians. Windward Publishing, Maini. 78.
- Baygar, T. & Ozgur, N. 2010. Sensory and Chemical Changes in Smoked Frog (*Rana esculenta*) Leg during Cold Storage (4°C±1). *Journal of Animal and Veterinary Advances*, 9(3), pp 588-593.
- Bombata-Fashina, H. A., Megbowon, I., Olumide, O., P. A., Ozor, P. A., Ibrahim, A. O., Adejonwo, O. A. & Kolade, O. Y. 2013. Comparative Study of the Proximate Composition of Some Wild Tilapiine Fishes in Epe Lagoon, Lagos, Nigeria. *Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Science* 8(1): 265-267.
- Cagiltay, F., Erkan, N., Selcuk, A., Ozden, O., Devrim Tosun, D., Ulusoy, S. & Atanasoff, A. 2014. Chemical composition of wild and cultured marsh frog (*Rana ridibunda*). *Bulgarian Journal of Agricultural Science*, 20(5), pp 1250-1254.
- Cagiltay, F., Erkan, N., Tosun, D. & Selcuk, A. 2011. Chemical Composition of the Frog Legs (*Rana ridibunda*). *Fleischwirtschaft International*, 26(5): 78-81.
- FAO 1997. Review of the State of World Aquaculture. FAO Fisheries Circular No. 886. I. Rome, Italy.
- FAO 1999. World Production of Crustaceans and Molluscs by Major Fishing Areas. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Fishery Information, Data and Statistics Unit (FIDI), Rome, Italy, 33.
- FAO 2011. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. The State of Food Insecurity in the World 2011. FAO. Rome, Italy.
- Fashina-Bombata, H. and Megbowon, I. 2012. Proximate composition and breeding description of an unidentified Cichlid of Epe Lagoon, Lagos, Southwest, Nigeria commonly called 'Wesafu'. *International Journal of Nutrition and Metabolism* 4(4), pp 57-63.
- Fitzsimmons, K. 2008. Review-Global Advances in Tilapia Production and Marketing 2008. Proceedings of the 8th International Symposium on Tilapia in Aquaculture, October 12-14, 2008, Caira International Conference Center, Cairo, Egypt.
- Fowler, J. & Cohen, L. 1990. Practical Statistics for Field Biology. John Wiley & Sons. England, 83.89.
- Gallagher, M. L., Harrell, M. L. & Rurilson, R. A. 1991. Variation in Lipid and Fatty Acid Contents of Atlantic Croakers, Striped Mullet and Summer Flounder. *Trans. Am. Fish. Soc.*, 120: 614-619.
- Mohneke, M. & Rodel, M. O. 2009. Declining Amphibian Population and Possible Ecological Consequences. *A Review Salamander* 45:203-207.
- Negrioni, G. 1997. Frog Culture. *World Aquaculture Society Magazine*, 28(1): 16-22.
- Neveu, A. 2009. Suitability of European Green Frogs for Intensive Culture: Comparison between Different Phenotypes of the *Esculenta* Hybridogenetic Complex. *Aquaculture*, 295: 30-37.
- No'Brega, I. C., Atai'De, S.C., Moura, O. M., Livera, A. V. & Menezes, P. H. 2007. Volatile Constituents of Cooked Bullfrog (*Rana catesbeiana*) Legs. *Food Chem.*, 102, pp 186-191.
- Ozogul, F., Ozogul, Y., Olgunoglu, A. I. & Boga, E. K. 2008. Comparison of Fatty Acid, Mineral and Proximate Composition of Body and Legs of Edible Frog (*Rana esculenta*). *Int. J. Food Sci. Nutr.*, 59: 558-565.
- Sallam, K. I., Ahmed, A. M., Elgazzar, M. M. & Eldaly, E. A. 2007. Chemical Quality and Sensory Attributes of Marinated Pacific Saury (*Cololabis saira*) during Vacuum-Packaged Storage at 4°C. *Food Chem.*, 102: 1061-1070.
- Shearer, K. D., Asgard, T., Andorsdottir, G. & Aas, G. H. 1994. Whole Body Elemental and Proximate Composition of Atlantic Salmon (*Salmo salar*) during the Life Cycle. *Journal of Fish Biology*, 44: 785-797.
- Stansby, M. E. 1982. Properties of Fish Oils and their Application to Handling of Fish and to Nutritional and Industrial Use. In: Chemistry and Biochemistry of Marine Food Products, Martin, R. E., Flick, G. J., Hebard, C. E. & Ward, D. R. (Eds.). Avi Publishing Co., Westport, CT., 75-92.
- Teixeira, R. D., Pereira Mello, S. C. R. & Limados Santos, C. A. M. 2001. The World Market of Frog Legs. FAO/Globefish Research Programme. Vol 86. Rome. 44.
- Tokur, B., Gurbuz, R. D. & Ozyurt, G. (2008). Nutritional Composition of Frog (*Rana esculenta*) Waste Meal. *Bioresource Technol.*, 99: 1332-1338.
- Vlieg, P. 1984. Proximate Analysis of Commercial New Zealand Fish Species. 2. *N. Z. J. Sci.*, 27: 427-433.

\*\*\*\*\*