

**Bath sponge aquaculture:
Aspects of culture and quality.**

Thesis submitted by

Daniel James Loudon

BSc (Zoology), G. Dip. Res. Meth. (Aquaculture)

in March 2006

for the research degree of Master of Science in Aquaculture
within the School of Marine Biology and Aquaculture

James Cook University

ELECTRONIC COPY

I, the undersigned, the author of this work, declare that the electronic copy of this thesis provided to the James Cook University Library, is an accurate copy of the print thesis submitted, within the limits of the technology available.

Signature

Date

Statement of Access

I, the undersigned, the author of this thesis, understand that James Cook University will make it available for use within the University Library and, by microfilm or other means, allow access to users in other approved libraries. All users consulting this thesis will have to sign the following statement:

In consulting this thesis I agree not to copy or closely paraphrase it in whole or in part without written consent of the author; and to make proper public written acknowledgment for any assistance which I have obtained from it.

Beyond this, I do not wish to place any restriction on access to this thesis.

(Signature)

(Date)

Statement on Sources

I declare that this thesis is my own work and has not been submitted in any form for another degree or diploma at any university or other institution of tertiary education. Information derived from the published or unpublished work of others has been acknowledged in the text and a list of references is given.

I acknowledge that Stefanie Inderbitzin, a fourth year mechanical engineering student, determined the initial sponge size and shape for the compression and tensile testing of *Spongia graminea* and also conducted these tests for this species.

(Signature)

(Date)

Acknowledgements

Firstly, I'd like to thank my supervisor, Professor Rocky de Nys, for his seemingly endless effort he put into helping me produce this thesis through his guidance, constructive criticism and encouragement. Thanks also goes out to my supervisors Dr Chris Battershill and Dr. Zhongxiao Peng for their input and support as well as to Professor Pat Bergquist, Dr Libby Evans-Illidge, and Dr Carsten Wolff for their input and support throughout my project.

Thank-you to my university associates and lab colleagues, namely Sue Reilly, Stuart Petersen, Stefanie Inderbitzin, Stephen Whalan, Raymond Bannister and Piers Ettinger-Epstein, and my numerous volunteers for their help in teaching me new scientific techniques or helping with sample collection.

Finally, thanks to God and all my friends and family for their support throughout my studies to help me achieve all that I have so far.

Table of Contents

Statement of Access	i
Statement on Sources	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
Table of Contents	iv
List of Figures	vi
Abstract	x
Chapter 1: General Introduction.....	1
1.1 Sponge Biology.....	1
1.2 Morphological Responses to Environmental Conditions	2
1.2.1 Water Flow	3
1.2.2 Food Availability	6
1.2.3 Sedimentation	7
1.2.4 Light Intensity	9
1.2.5 Predation.....	10
1.2.6 Other environmental and biological factors	10
1.3 Sponge Supply and Demand.....	11
1.4 Production Methods and Limitations.....	13
1.5 Project Aims.....	15
Chapter 2: Explant survival, growth and recovery for <i>Rhopaloeides odorabile</i> and <i>Coscinoderma</i> n. sp.	17
2.1 Introduction	17
2.2 Materials and Methods	21
2.2.1 Sponge Collection	21
2.2.2 Explant Survival	21
2.2.3 Explant Growth	23
2.2.4 Explant Recovery	23
2.2.4.1 Macroscopic Surface Examination	23
2.2.4.2 Microscopic Surface Examination.....	24
2.2.4.3 Cross-sectional Examination	24
2.2.5 Statistical Analysis	25
2.3 Results	26
2.3.1 Explant Survival	26
2.3.2 Explant Growth	29
2.3.3 Explant Recovery	34
2.3.3.1 Macroscopic Surface Examination	34
<i>Rhopaloeides odorabile</i>	34
<i>Coscinoderma</i> sp.	35
2.3.3.2 Microscopic Surface Examination.....	37
<i>Rhopaloeides odorabile</i>	37
<i>Coscinoderma</i> sp.	37
2.3.3.3 Cross-section Examination	39
<i>Rhopaloeides odorabile</i>	39
<i>Coscinoderma</i> sp.	44
2.4 Discussion	49
2.4.1 Explant Survival	49

2.4.2 Explant Growth	52
2.4.3 Explant Recovery	55
2.5 Conclusion.....	57
Chapter 3: Development of a New Protocol for Testing Bath Sponge Quality ..	59
3.1 Introduction	59
3.2 Materials and Methods	61
3.2.1 Sponge Collection and Preparation	61
3.2.2 Physical Properties	61
3.2.2.1 Density	62
3.2.2.2 Fibre Dimensions.....	62
3.2.3 Quality Tests.....	63
3.2.3.1 Compression Tests.....	63
3.2.3.2 Tensile Tests	64
3.2.3.3 Water Absorption Tests	67
3.2.10 Statistical Analysis	68
3.3 Results	70
3.3.1 Physical Properties	70
3.3.2 Quality Tests.....	73
3.3.2.1 Compression Tests.....	73
3.3.2.2 Tensile Tests	75
3.3.2.3 Water Absorption Tests	79
3.3.3 Inter-variable Relationships.....	80
3.3.3.1 Quality Variables versus Quality Variables	80
3.3.3.2 Independent Variables versus Quality Variables.....	83
3.4 Discussion	87
3.5 Conclusion.....	91
Chapter 4: General Discussion	92
References	97

List of Figures

Chapter 1

Fig. 1.1 Schematic representation of the aquiferous system within a sponge
..... 2

Chapter 2

Fig. 2.1 The sponge species investigated in this study. Photos were taken *in situ* within the Palm Island Group. **A.** *R. odorabile* **B.** *Coscinoderma* n. sp..... 20

Fig. 2.2 Percentage survival of *R. odorabile* and *Coscinoderma* sp. in *in vitro* (**A**) and *in situ* (**B**) cultures over time..... 27

Fig. 2.3 Survival of *R. odorabile* (**A**) and *Coscinoderma* sp. (**B**) in *in vitro* and *in situ* cultures grouped according to parentage. 28

Fig. 2.4 Total percentage growth of *R. odorabile* and *Coscinoderma* sp. cultured *in situ* \pm standard error. 29

Fig. 2.5 Seasonal changes in daily growth rate of *R. odorabile* (**A**) and *Coscinoderma* sp. (**B**) cultured *in situ* \pm standard error..... 30

Fig. 2.6 The effect of size dependent growth rates demonstrated through correlations between initial growth and initial explant size and the effect of this differential growth rate on final sponge size for *R. odorabile* (**A** and **B**) and *Coscinoderma* sp. (**C** and **D**)..... 31

Fig. 2.7 Total percentage growth for each individual explant of *R. odorabile* (**A**) and *Coscinoderma* sp. (**B**) 32

Fig. 2.8 Average daily growth rate (\pm standard error) grouped according to parentage for *R. odorabile* (**A**) and *Coscinoderma* sp. (**B**)..... 33

Fig. 2.9 The newly exposed sponge surface immediately after cutting for *R. odorabile* (**A**) and *Coscinoderma* sp. (**B**)..... 35

Fig. 2.10 Explants healing over a cut surface; **A to C.** *R. odorabile*; **A.** Day 1. All small canals have been covered by a protective layer, although a number of large exposed canals remain uncovered (*eg.* arrow); **B.** Day 2. Most large canals have been covered (*eg.* arrow); **C.** Day 7. Exposed spongin fibres have begun to fall away revealing the new protective layer beneath; **D to F.** *Coscinoderma* sp.; **D.** Day 1. Exposed canals have been covered; **E.** Day 7. The exposed fibres have begun to darken; **F.** Day 14. Most of the new surface remains obscured from view. 36

Fig. 2.11 *R. odorabile* surface; **A.** 0hrs after exposure. Spongin fibres and tissue are exposed; **B.** 12hrs after exposure. A new protective layer covers much of the underlying tissue; **C.** 24hrs after exposure. A protective layer completely covers the underlying tissue and most fibres; **D.** 23 days after exposure. Ostia are found with scattered and grouped distributions. A new fibre ending is seen protruding from the surface..... 38

Fig. 2.12 *Coscinoderma* sp. surface; **A.** 0hrs after exposure. Tissue and fibres are exposed; **B.** 5 days after exposure. A gap in the exposed fibres allows view of the new protective layer below. 38

Fig. 2.13 *R. odorabile*; **A to C.** Natural variation of the subsurface cellular make-up; **D.** Spicules incorporated into the surface crust; **E.** Subsurface skeletal support structure; **F.** Spongin distribution 41

Fig. 2.14 *R. odorabile*; **A.** Day 0. No surface layer; **B.** Day 1. Newly formed surface; **C.** Day 2. Cell transformation is in progress; **D.** Day 2. Collagen coat lifting off the new surface; **E.** Day 3. Ostia development is obvious; **F.** Day 10. Cellular composition is approaching that of an undamaged sponge..... 42

Fig. 2.15 *R. odorabile*; **A.** Day 10. Cells are largely absent here leaving only layers of collagen behind; **B.** Day 41. Pigment cells are again common and the surface

resembles that of an undamaged surface; C. Day 41. Development of ostia is complete	43
Fig. 2.16 <i>Coscinoderma</i> sp.; A to C. Natural variation of the subsurface cellular make-up; D. Natural regression of the sponge surface; E. Spicules incorporated into the surface crust; F. Subsurface skeletal support structure.....	46
Fig. 2.17 <i>Coscinoderma</i> sp.; A. Distribution of spongin in an undamaged sponge; B. Day 0. No surface layer; C. Day 1. Cellular debris and spongin fibres above the newly formed surface; D. Day 1. Cells in a state of transformation and rearrangement below a clearly defined surface; E. Day 2. Lower cell density with a collagen layer being shed; F. Day 2. Collencytes are common and are used to form pinococytes at the surface	47
Fig. 2.18 <i>Coscinoderma</i> sp.; A. Day 3. Organised cell structure with choanoderm below; B. Magnified image of Fig. 3A. Hanging pinococytes are visible below the surface; C. Day 10. Subsurface region largely consisting of collagen layers; D. Day 41. Pigment cells are again numerous amongst the many collagen layers; E. Day 41. The collagen structure and cell density and organisation resembles that of an undamaged sponge.....	48

Chapter 3

Fig. 3.1 Photo of internal secondary fibres (<i>R. odorabile</i>) showing the method for measuring fibre width and fibre length.	63
Fig. 3.2 Stress-strain curve produced from a compression test (for a silk sponge) showing the calculation for firmness and the compression modulus (65% strain / 25% strain).	64
Fig. 3.3 Stress-strain curve produced from the tensile test (for a <i>Coscinoderma</i> sp. individual) showing the calculation for the tensile strength, elastic limit, elastic strain, modulus of elasticity, and modulus of resilience	67

Fig. 3.4 Sponge density, measured as the weight of the sponge over its entire volume including spaces between the fibres. Different letters indicate a significant difference ($p < 0.05$).....	71
Fig. 3.5 Fibre width, including only secondary fibres.....	71
Fig. 3.6 Fibre length, measured as the length between fibre nodes or branches	72
Fig. 3.7 Firmness, measuring the resistance to pressure, with lower values indicating a softer sponge	74
Fig. 3.8 Compression modulus, measuring the ability of a sponge to cushion a load with larger numbers indicating greater cushioning ability.....	75
Fig. 3.9 Compressive strength, measuring the point at which a sponge is no longer easily compressed	75
Fig. 3.10 Tensile strength, measuring the maximum strength of the sponge	77
Fig. 3.11 Elastic limit, measuring the maximum stress prior to permanent damage occurring through tearing or breaking.....	77
Fig. 3.12 Elastic strain, demonstrating the amount of stretch within elastic limits ...	78
Fig. 3.13 Modulus of elasticity, measuring the resistance to stretching.....	78
Fig. 3.14 Modulus of resilience, measuring elastic energy.....	79
Fig. 3.15 Absorbency.....	80
Fig. 3.16 Water retention efficiency	80
Fig. 3.17 A. Scatter plot of firmness and compressive strength; B. Scatter plot of the elastic limit and tensile strength; C. Scatter plot of the elastic limit and the modulus of elasticity; and D. Scatter plot of the elastic limit and the modulus of resilience	831
Fig. 3.18 A. Scatter plot of density and firmness; B. Scatter plot of density and compressive strength; and C. Scatter plot of density and absorbency.....	83

Abstract

With increased demand on sponges for cosmetic and biomedical purposes, natural sponge fishing grounds are no longer able to cope with the demand. With sufficient research and development, sponge aquaculture is likely to supply demand while allowing the preservation of natural sponge stocks. However, due to the array of different environmental conditions found amongst the habitats of different species, and differences amongst the species themselves, detailed research on the amenability to common culture methods, survival and growth rates, recovery processes, and the environmental requirements for any one species is required before commercial culture may be considered. Furthermore, due to the diverse morphological variation that occurs in sponges due to the environment, quantitative quality testing protocols must be established to experimentally determine the optimal environmental conditions required for production of quality bath sponges.

In this study, survival (*in situ* and *in vitro*), growth rates (*in situ*), and recovery processes (*in vitro*) were measured for two potential sponge aquaculture candidates, *Rhopaloeides odorabile* Thompson *et al* (1987) and *Coscinoderma* n. sp. [Phylum Porifera: Order Dictyoceratida Minchin (1900): Family Spongiidae Gray (1867)], cultured at the Palm Islands, central Great Barrier Reef. Sponge survival was dependent on species, culture method, and time with the highest mortality occurring soon after excision of sponge material from the parent stock. *R. odorabile* had the greatest survival of the two species *in vitro*, and the lowest survival *in situ*. Growth rates of $85.9 \pm 23.7\%$ and $115.2 \pm 23.4\%$ per annum, for *R. odorabile* and *Coscinoderma* n. sp. respectively, were not significantly different over the 21 month experimental period. Both species demonstrated initial size dependent growth rates with smaller explants growing fastest through the first season (78 days). Explant recovery rates were rapid for both species with a protective layer of collagen forming

over the surface within 24hrs. This layer was later replaced by pinacoderm as the subsurface tissue was reorganised to recreate a functional surface including redevelopment of the aquiferous system.

A quantitative testing protocol was developed to assess the quality of sponges using mechanical engineering techniques. Techniques quantified the directly measurable physical properties of sponges (density, fibre width, and fibre length) and the quality characteristics of firmness, compression modulus, compressive strength, tensile strength, elastic limit, elastic strain, modulus of elasticity, modulus of resilience, absorbency, and water retention efficiency. These were measured for *R. odorabile* and *Coscinoderma* n. sp. and three commercial species. There were significant differences between species for all quality parameters creating a unique profile for each species. *R. odorabile* was the firmest ($37.8 \pm 4.3\text{kPa}$), strongest ($157.4 \pm 17.3\text{kPa}$), and most rigid ($838.7 \pm 53.5\text{kPa}$) species tested, while *Coscinoderma* n. sp. was one of the softest sponges ($7.3 \pm 1.1\text{kPa}$) with the highest elastic energy ($30.5 \pm 3.5\text{kJ/m}^3$) and water retention efficiency ($40.1 \pm 1.4\%$) of all species tested. These quality tests enable comparisons of quality between and within species with scientific rigour. Comparisons between species may be used as a marketing tool to promote aquaculture products for specific applications. Within species testing will allow quantification of differences in quality caused by genetic or environmental factors.

This research provides a foundation for the further research necessary to establish sponge aquaculture in Australia.