Selection for larval weight in the Black Soldier Fly – empirical evidence

Kriti Shrestha^{1*}, Elena Facchini², Estelle van den Boer¹, Petra Junes¹, Gaya Sader¹, Katrijn Peeters², Eric Schmitt¹

¹ Protix Biosystems B.V., Industriestraat 3, 5107 NC Dongen, The Netherlands ² Hendrix Genetics Research, Technology & Services B.V., Spoorstraat 69, 5831 CK <u>Boxmeer</u>, The Netherlands

Kriti Shrestha |Protix B.V. 30 Aug 2023





Agenda

- 01. Protix Who we are and what we do
- 02. Black Soldier fly Lifecycle, Industrial cycle
- 03. Selective breeding in insect Genetic improvement project on Black soldier fly
- 04. Research and outcomes Goal, Material & method, Results, Conclusion



Growing population

10 billion people to be fed in 2050



Empty oceans

¹/₃ of world fish stocks are subject to overfishing

Deforestation 80% caused by agriculture

Food waste

1.3 billion tonnes per year globally





Insects **naturally eat waste** and can solve our food waste problem!



Insect feed!



Insects are a natural **food** to many **animals** and also **humans**.

Combining nature with high-tech, we can create proteins and lipids very efficiently and sustainably.







Protix at a glance

Leading insect company in Black soldier fly (*Hermetia illucens*) production and technology

Founded in 2009, The Netherlands



17,5%

25

4

R&D investment of revenues

nationalities

continent exports

* 2020-2022



Black soldier fly

Hermetia illucens

Family: Stratiomyidae

Origin: Neotropics

Now cosmopolitan in distribution One of the most farmed insect species in the world

5 reasons why the black soldier fly is superior

01. Nature's solution

02. Highly nutritious

03. Upcycles low-grade waste

04. Proven low footprint

05.

Reliable yield





Industrial cycle and products





Methodology

Variables measured on Harvested Larvae:

- 1. Average larval weight
- 2. Crate yield (wet and DM)
- 3. Protein yield
- 4. Fat yield
- 5. Feed conversion ratio (FCR)
- 6. Protein conversion ratio(PCR)

Repeated for 6 rounds , minimum 6 crates/treatment



5 day old larvae of know density



Harvest clean larvae by mechanical separation





Blind refeeding according to need



system

Experimental setup

Table 1 Summary of the experimental setup.

	Round	Feed type	Environment	Line	Pattern code	Δ Density	Δ Feed ration	
Selected for _ 10 gen	1 Mov 20	A	1	BW BP	1-BW-D4 1-BP-D4	-15% -15%	21% 4%	 Blind feeding
Selected for _ 13 gen	2 Sep-20	A	2	BW BP	2-BW-D1 2-BP-D1	-55% -55%	135% 135%	 Same feeding
Selected for 16 gen	3 Jan-21	В	2	BW BP	3-BW-D2 3-BP-D2	-27% -27%	58% 12%	Feed as needed
	4 Mar-21	В	2	BW BW BW	4-BW-D3 4-BW-D5 4-BW-D6	-18% 0% 18%	49% 30% 10%	
	5 May-21	B	3 3	BP BW BP	4-BP-D5* 5-BW-D5 5-BP-D5*	0% 0% 0%	-2% 30% 0%	
	6 Jun-21	В	3	BW BP	6-BW-D5 6-BP-D5*	0% 0%	22% 0%	

Note: Density and feed ration (grams of feed per larva) are represented as deviations (Δ) in percentage from a common benchmark set at BP industrial production conditions. Pattern code indicates round-line-density, where density is coded in ascending order from D1 to D6. Asterisks (*) indicate BP comparison groups that were extracted from production batches parallel in time.

Results: Ad-libitum feed test

✓ Different feeding requirements for BW

Table 2 Average larval weight during rearing period; Larva weightsare expressed as deviation (%) from the BP line at standard feed

	Feed regime	Rearing days						
Line	(gr per larva)	1	3	6	7			
BP	1.67	0	0	0	0			
BW	1.82	-7.2%	8.6%	25.7%	26.3%			
AL-BP	2.5	-0.7%	7.1%	0.4%	2.6%			
AL-BW	2.5	-7.2%	-10.5%	22.3%	26.7%			

AL-BP: ad-libitum Base population line; AL-BW: ad-libitum Body weight line; BW: Body weight at standard feed).





		Rou	und Feed rati	on Larval density	Larval weight	Wet Yield	DM Yield	Crude Protein	Crude Fat	FCR	PCR
:	sults	1	+17%	D4	22%	33%	29%	27%	34%	-10%	-8%
Re		2	0%	D1	23%	11%	13%	3%	10%	-11%	-3%
•		3	+46%	D2	40%	29%	35%	30%	33%	4%	8%
Larval density Conversion efficiency	Yield	Av. Larva	+52%	D3	53%	13%	11%	21%	6%	13%	3%
		4	+32%	D5	37%	23%	16%	35%	11%	15%	-1%
		Feeding ration	+12%	D6	18%	24%	14%	26%	8%	17%	5%
		5	+30%	D5	43%	30%	24%	31%	20%	4%	-1%
		6	+17%	D5	35%	38%	27%	33%	22%	-4%	-8%

Table 3 Summary of results per round for variables measured



✓ Significant yield improvements

✓ Non-significant conversion ratio





Results: 49% variance explained by Line



Average larval weight data was analysed fitting a linear model:

Yijk= μ + Li + Fk + Rj + ϵ ijk

Where

 μ = the overall average larval weight,

L = the fixed effect of the line (i = BW, BP),

F = covariate for the adjusted feed ration (feed amount/estimated larvae density),

R = the fixed effect of the round (j = 1, 6),

 ϵ = the random error term.

Variable	Df	Sum Sq	Mean Sq	F value	Pr(>F)
Line	1	127391	127391	1347.21	P<0.001
Adj. Feed ration	1	88661	88661	937.63	P<0.001
Round	5	15777	3155	33.37	P<0.001
Residual	314	29692	95		

Conclusions

- Improvement through selective breeding for body weight in BSF was demonstrated successfully in an industrial setting.
- Annual improvement of 17-20% as opposed to traditional livestock species
- Results provide an indication on potential value of selective breeding in cultivation of BSF.





Elena Facchini, Hendrix Genetics Estelle v.d Boer, Protix Anas Soureh, Protix Gaya Sader, Protix Petra Junes, Protix







Protix



Anne Jacobs, Protix

Provincie Noord-Brabant



Europees Landbouwfonds voor Plattelandsontwikkeling; Europa investeert in zijn platteland

Acknowledgements





Stay tuned for

EAAP - Lyon - 30th August 2023 "insect genetics and reproduction"



Effects of artificial selection in the black soldier fly – a Pool-seq approach

Elena Facchini¹, Addie Vereijken¹, Derek Bickhart¹, Alexis Michenet¹, Kriti Shrestha², Katrijn Peeters¹

¹Hendrix Genetics Research Technology & Services B.V., Boxmeer, Netherlands. ²Protix Biosystems B.V., Dongen, Netherlands.

Join THE FUTURE OF FOOD TODAY

