BIOFLUX SRL

Identity: Research organization, CAEN 7219, CUI: 23753059 from 18.04.2008

Address: 54 Ceahlau street, Cluj-Napoca 400488, Romania,

European Union, Europe.



Aquaculture, Aquarium, Conservation & Legislation

About us

You are here > Home

AACL Bioflux

Instructions to authors

Submission letter

Model of paper

Reviewer information pack

Editorial Board Expanded

Coverage / databases

Volume 14(6)/2021 (December, 30)

Volume 14(5)/2021 (October, 30)

Volume 14(4)/2021 (August, 30)

Volume 14(3)/2021 (June, 30)

Volume 14(2)/2021 (April, 30)

Volume 14(1)/2021 (February, 28)

Volume 13(6)/2020 (December, 30)

Volume 13(5)/2020 (October, 30)

Volume 13(4)/2020 (August, 30)

Volume 13(3)/2020 (June, 30)

Volume 13(2)/2020 (April, 30)

Volume 13(1)/2020 (February, 28)

Volume 12(6)/2019 (December, 30)

Volume 12(4)/2019 (August, 30)

Volume 12(3)/2019 (June, 30)

Volume 12(2)/2019 (April, 30)

Volume 12(1)/2019 (February, 28)





Aquaculture, Aquarium, Conservation & Legislation

You are here > Home · Journal

AACL Bioflux

Instructions to authors Submission letter Model of paper **Reviewer information pack Editorial Board Expanded** Coverage / databases Volume 14(6)/2021 (December, 30) Volume 14(5)/2021 (October, 30) Volume 14(4)/2021 (August, 30) Volume 14(3)/2021 (June, 30) Volume 14(2)/2021 (April, 30) Volume 14(1)/2021 (February, 28) Volume 13(6)/2020 (December, 30) Volume 13(5)/2020 (October, 30) Volume 13(4)/2020 (August, 30) Volume 13(3)/2020 (June, 30) Volume 13(2)/2020 (April, 30) Volume 13(1)/2020 (February, 28) Volume 12(6)/2019 (December, 30) Volume 12(5)/2019 (October, 30) Volume 12(4)/2019 (August, 30) Volume 12(3)/2019 (June, 30) Volume 12(2)/2019 (April, 30) Volume 12(1)/2019 (February, 28)

Journal information

Our journal is a good opportunity for you to publish your papers on time, color, both printed and online, open access, unlimited pages. The journal allows the author(s) to hold the copyright without restrictions. This is an open-access journal distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License CC-BY, which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

AACL Bioflux is an international peer-reviewed journal. Each published article was independently seen before by two Scientific Reviewers and at least one lingvist. Peer-review policy in AACL Bioflux: double blind peer-review. The editors use a soft for screening the plagiarism. Acceptance rate: about 50%. Electronic submission is required.

Because many authors withdrew their manuscript in final form just before the payment of the publication fee, our policy has changed (20 February 2019). The publication fee was replaced by a processing fee (250 USD), which is paid after a preliminary evaluation (not at the end). Our evaluation has two steps. 1)A preliminary evaluation by the editor (the author gets a preliminary acceptance or rejection); 2)An external double blind peer-review (at this point the author gets a final decision: acceptance or rejection). Please note that if the manuscript will not be published, the author or his/her institution gets the money back (except the cases of poor feedback from authors or withdrawal/rejection due to multiple submissions). We inform the authors about our final decision (acceptance or rejection) in 3-8 weeks after their submission. The average overall time from submission of the manuscript to publication is 10 weeks. Faster processing involves a tax of priority (50 USD).

Manuscript processing fee: 250 USD (or equivalent in EURO or RON);

Manuscript processing fee with priority: 300 USD (or equivalent in EURO or RON);

Publication fee: 0 USD.

The journal has a waiver policy for developing country authors (only for cases of very good quality manuscripts). When the manuscript's first author is a member of the Editorial Board Expanded (AACL Bioflux), there is no processing fee. Please attach a scanned payment document and email to zoobiomag2004@yahoo.com



Journal - Bioflux - Aquaculture, Aquarium, Conservation & Legislation

A scientific journal is not a website. Corrections, clarifications and apologies written by the authors are allowed by separate Note or Erratum. Retracting of a manuscript is made by publisher in the case when plagiarism or other particular issues are reported.

- This is an open-access journal distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

- In the case that our journal is no longer published, Bioflux Publishing House has agreements with several databases which are allowed to conserve and republish the old content at any time and unlimited number of copies, both as electronic and hardcopies. Bioflux Publishing House is archived by The Legal Deposit Bucharest (National Library) and by The County Legal Deposit in Cluj-Napoca (Octavian Goga Library).

Important: The printed version of the journal has another ISSN: 1844-8143

AACL Bioflux is indexed, abstracted or fulltext reproduced by/in the following academic/scholar/scientific/bibliographic/bibliometric databases, engines, libraries:

Thomson Reuters Scientific - ISI Web of Knowledge

Thomson Reuters Scientific - Zoological Record (direct submission/coverage)

Scopus - Elsevier; Sciverse

Scimago - Journal Rank

CAB International - CAB Abstracts

China Educational Publications Import & Export Corporation - SOCOLAR

Ulrich's Periodicals Directory

EBSCO – EBSCOhost Online Research Databases

CAB Direct (as part of CABI)

Wolters Kluwer - Ovid LinkSolver

CNCSIS Romania (Rank: B+)

CABELL'S

ProQuest

The National Science Digital Library - NSDL

The University of Hong Kong Libraries – HKUL Database

Deutsche Nationalbibliothek - ZDB Database



Aquaculture, Aquarium, Conservation & Legislation

You are here > Home · AACL

AACL Bioflux

Instructions to authors

Submission letter

Model of paper

Reviewer information pack

Editorial Board Expanded

Coverage / databases

Volume 14(6)/2021 (December, 30)

Volume 14(5)/2021 (October, 30)

Volume 14(4)/2021 (August, 30)

Volume 14(3)/2021 (June, 30)

Volume 14(2)/2021 (April, 30)

Volume 14(1)/2021 (February, 28)

Volume 13(6)/2020 (December, 30)

Volume 13(5)/2020 (October, 30)

Volume 13(4)/2020 (August, 30)

Volume 13(3)/2020 (June, 30)

Volume 13(2)/2020 (April, 30)

Volume 13(1)/2020 (February, 28)

Volume 12(6)/2019 (December, 30)

Volume 12(5)/2019 (October, 30)

Volume 12(4)/2019 (August, 30)

Volume 12(3)/2019 (June, 30)

Volume 12(2)/2019 (April, 30)

Volume 12(1)/2019 (February, 28)

Aquaculture, Aquarium, Conservation & Legislation - International Journal of the Bioflux Society

AACL

News

Human Resources

Search Keywords

Other Journals

Search

ISSN 1844-9166 (online)

ISSN 1844-8143 (print)

Published by Bioflux - bimonthly -

in cooperation with The Natural Sciences Museum Complex (Constanta, Romania)

Peer-reviewed (each article was independently evaluated before publication by two specialists)

The journal includes original papers, short communications, and reviews on Aquaculture (Biology, Technology, Economics, Marketing), Fish Genetics and Improvement, Aquarium Sciences, Fisheries, Ichthyology, Aquatic Ecology, Conservation of Aquatic Resources and Legislation (in connection with aquatic issues) from wide world.

The manuscripts should be submitted to zoobiomag2004@yahoo.com

Editor-in-Chief:

Petrescu-Mag I. Valentin: USAMV Cluj, Cluj-Napoca, University of Oradea (Romania); IBFF (Moldova)

Gavriloaie Ionel-Claudiu (reserve): SC Bioflux SRL, Cluj-Napoca (Romania).

Editors:

Abdel-Rahim Mohamed M.: National Institute of Oceanography and Fisheries, Alexandria (Egypt)

Adascalitei Oana: Maritime University of Constanta, Constanta (Romania)

Amira Aicha Beya: Badji Mokhtar Annaba University, Annaba (Algeria)

Arockiaraj A. Jesu: SRM University, Chennai (India)

AACL - Bioflux - Aquaculture, Aquarium, Conservation & Legislation

| Volume 11(6)/2018 (December, 30) | Appelbaum Samuel: Ben-Gurion University of the Negev (Israel) |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Volume 11(5)/2018 (October, 30) | Baharuddin Nursalwa: Universiti Malaysia Terengganu, Terengganu (Malaysia) |
| Volume 11(4)/2018 (August, 30) | Boaru Anca: USAMV Cluj, Cluj-Napoca (Romania) |
| Volume 11(3)/2018 (June, 30) | Bora Florin D.: Research Station for Viticulture & Enology Tg.Bujor, Galați (Romania) |
| Volume 11(2)/2018 (April, 30) | Breden Felix: Simon Fraser University (Canada) |
| Volume 11(1)/2018 (February, 28) | Dieden i eix. Simon i raser Oniversity (Canada) |
| Volume 10(6)/2017 (December, 30) | Burny Philippe: Universite de Liege, Gembloux (Belgium) |
| Volume 10(5)/2017 (October, 30) | Caipang Cristopher M.A.: Temasek Polytechnic (Singapore) |
| Volume 10(4)/2017 (August, 30) | Chapman Frank: University of Florida, Gainesville (USA) |
| Volume 10(3)/2017 (June, 30) | Creanga Steofil: USAMV Iasi, Iasi (Romania) |
| Volume 10(2)/2017 (April, 30) | Cristea Victor: Dunarea de Jos University of Galati, Galati (Romania) |
| Volume 10(1)/2017 (February, 28) | Das Simon Kumar: Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Bangi, Selangor (Malaysia) |
| Volume 9(6)/2016 (December, 30) | Dimaggio Matthew A.: University of Florida (USA) |
| Volume 9(5)/2016 (October, 30) | Georgescu Bogdan: USAMV Cluj, Cluj-Napoca (Romania) |
| Volume 9(4)/2016 (August, 30) | Ionescu Tudor: University of Oradea, Oradea (Romania) |
| Volume 9(3)/2016 (June, 30) | Karawaal lamihan: University of Sinon Sinon (Turkay) |
| Volume 9(2)/2016 (April, 30) | Karayucer Isminan. University of Sinop, Sinop (Turkey) |
| Volume 9(1)/2016 (February, 28) | Khamesipour Faham: Shiraz University, Shiraz (Iran) |
| Volume 8(6)/2015 (December, 30) | Kosco Jan: Presov University, Presov (Slovakia) |
| Volume 8(5)/2015 (October, 30) | Kovacs Eniko: USAMV Cluj, Cluj-Napoca (Romania) |
| Volume 8(4)/2015 (August, 30) | Kucska Balázs: Hungarian University of Agriculture and Life Sciences, Kaposvár |
| Volume 8(3)/2015 (June, 30) | (Hungary) |
| Volume 8(2)/2015 (April, 30) | Mehrad Bahar: Gorgan University of Agricultural Sciences and Nat. Res. (Iran) |
| Volume 8(1)/2015 (February, 28) | Miclaus Viorel: USAMV Cluj, Cluj-Napoca (Romania) |
| Volume 7(6)/2014 (December, 30) | Molnar Kalman: Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Budapest (Hungary) |
| Volume 7(5)/2014 (October, 30) | Muchlisin Zainal Abidin: Universiti Sains (Malaysia), Syiah Kuala University (Indonesia) |
| Volume 7(4)/2014 (August, 30) | Muntean George Catalin [,] USAMV Clui, Clui-Napoca (Romania) |
| Volume 7(3)/2014 (June, 30) | Newsk Michely Liniversity of Agriculture in Krekew (Deland) |
| Volume 7(2)/2014 (April, 15) | Nowak Michai. University of Agriculture in Krakow (Poland) |
| Volume 7(1)/2014 (February, 15) | Nyanti Lee: Universiti Malaysia Sarawak, Sarawak (Malaysia) |
| Volume 6(6)/2013 (November, 15) | Olivotto Ike: Universita Politecnica delle Marche, Ancona (Italy) |

| 6/13/202 | 1 |
|----------|---|
|----------|---|

| AACL - Bioflux - Aquaculture | , Aquarium, | Conservation & Legislation |
|------------------------------|-------------|----------------------------|
|------------------------------|-------------|----------------------------|

| Volume 6(5)/2013 (September, 15) | Oroian Firuta Camelia: USAMV Cluj, Cluj-Napoca (Romania) |
|---|--|
| Volume 6(4)/2013 (July, 25) | Papuc Tudor: USAMV Cluj, Cluj-Napoca (Romania) |
| Volume 6(3)/2013 (May, 15) | Parvulescu Lucian: West University of Timisoara (Romania) |
| Volume 6(2)/2013 (March, 15) | Pasarin Benone: USAMV Iasi, Iasi (Romania) |
| Volume 6(1)/2013 (January, 15) | Pattikawa Jesaja Ajub: Pattimura University, Ambon (Indonesia) |
| Volume 5(5)/2012 (December, 30) Volume 5(4)/2012 (September, 30) | Petrescu Dacinia Crina: Babes-Bolyai University, Cluj-Napoca (Romania), Universite de Liege, Gembloux (Belgium) |
| Volume 5(3)/2012 (July, 30) Volume 5(2)/2012 (June, 30) | Petrescu-Mag Ruxandra Malina: Babes-Bolyai University, Cluj-Napoca (Romania), Universite de Liege, Gembloux (Belgium) |
| Volume 5(1)/2012 (March, 15) | Petrovici Milca: West University of Timisoara (Romania) |
| Volume 4(5)/2011 (December, 30) | Pratasik Silvester Benny: Sam Ratulangi University, Manado (Indonesia) |
| Volume 4(4)/2011 (October, 30) | Proorocu Marian: USAMV Cluj, Cluj-Napoca (Romania) |
| Volume 4(3)/2011 (July, 30) Volume 4(2)/2011 (April, 30) | Putri A. R. Sahni: Hasanuddin University, Makassar (Indonesia) |
| Volume 4(1)/2011 (January, 30) | Ray Sunuram: Khulna University (Bangladesh) |
| Volume 3(5)/2010 (December, 5) | Rhyne Andrew: Roger Williams University; New England Aquarium, Boston (USA) |
| Volume 3(4)/2010 (December, 1) | Ruchin Alexander B.: Joint Directorate of the Mordovia State Nature Reserve and |
| Volume 3(3)/2010 (November, 15) | National Park «Smolny», Saransk (Russia) |
| Volume 3(2)/2010 (July, 30) | Safirescu Calin: USAMV Cluj, Cluj-Napoca (Romania) |
| Volume 3(1)/2010 (February, 28) | Sándor Zsuzsanna J.: National Agriculture Research and Innovation Center, Gödöllő |
| Volume 2(4)/2009 (October, 30) | Correspondent Augusta E : University of the Dhilippings Viscoves (Dhilippings) |
| Volume 2(3)/2009 (July, 30) | Serrano Jr. Augusto E.: University of the Philippines Visayas (Philippines) |
| Volume 2(2)/2009 (April, 30) | Tlusty Michael F.: New England Aquarium, Boston (USA) |
| Volume 2(1)/2009 (January, 30) | Vesa Stefan Cristian: Iuliu Hatieganu UMF, Cluj-Napoca (Romania) |
| Volume 1(2)/2008 (December, 30) | Vintila Iuliana: Dunarea de Jos University of Galati, Galati (Romania) |
| Volume 1(1)/2008 (September, 30) | Wariaghli Fatima: University Mohammed V in Rabat, Rabat (Morocco) |
| Volume Pilot/2007 (December, 30) - available printed only | Yusli Wardiatno: Bogor Agricultural University, Bogor (Indonesia). |

Pontus Euxinus, Volume 1 (1980) -Parent Journal



Aquaculture, Aquarium, Conservation & Legislation

You are here > Home · Volume 13(5)/2020

| AACL Bioflux | Volume 13(5)/2020 |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Instructions to authors | First pages, 2020 AACL Bioflux 13(5):i-x. |
| Submission letter | Koniyo Y., Juliana, Pasisingi N., Kalalu D., 2020 The level of parasitic infection |
| Model of paper | and growth of red tilapia (<i>Oreochromis</i> sp.) fed with vegetable fern (<i>Diplazium</i> |
| Reviewer information pack | esculentum) flour. AACL Bioflux 13(5):2421-2430. |
| Editorial Board Expanded | Efendi D. S., Adrianto L., Yonvitner, Wardiatno Y., Agustina S., 2020 The performance of stock indicators of grouper (Serranidae) and snapper (Lutjanidae) |
| Coverage / databases | fisheries in Saleh Bay, Indonesia. AACL Bioflux 13(5):2431-2444. |
| Volume 14(6)/2021 (December, 30) | Sari L. D., Fadjar M., Widodo M. S., Lutfiatunnisa, Valen F. S., 2020 Growth |
| Volume 14(5)/2021 (October, 30) | analysis of Asian seabass (<i>Lates calcarifer</i> Bloch 1790) based on Morphometrics |
| Volume 14(4)/2021 (August, 30) | in BPBAP Situbondo, East Java. AACL Bioflux 13(5):2445-2451. |
| Volume 14(3)/2021 (June, 30) | Ndobe S., Yasir I., Salanggon A. I. M., Wahyudi D., Ederyan, Muslihudin, Renol, |
| Volume 14(2)/2021 (April, 30) | Adel Y. S., Moore A. M., 2020 Eucheumatoid seaweed farming under global |
| Volume 14(1)/2021 (February, 28) | change - Tomini Bay seaweed trial indicates <i>Eucheuma denticulatum</i> (<i>spinosum</i>) could contribute to climate adaptation. AACL Bioflux 13(5):2452-2467. |
| Volume 13(6)/2020 (December, 30) | Subandiyono S., Hastuti S., 2020 Dietary protein levels affected on the growth |
| Volume 13(5)/2020 (October, 30) | and body composition of tilapia (<i>Oreochromis niloticus</i>). AACL Bioflux |
| Volume 13(4)/2020 (August, 30) | 13(5):2468-2476. |
| Volume 13(3)/2020 (June, 30) | Longdong F. V., Mantjoro E., Kepel R. C., Budiman J., 2020 Adaptation strategy of |
| Volume 13(2)/2020 (April, 30) | Bitung fishermen to the impact of fisheries Moratorium policy in Indonesia. AACL Bioflux 13(5):2477-2496. |
| Volume 13(1)/2020 (February, 28) | Zainuddin, Aslamvah S., Nur K., Hadijah, 2020 Substitution of sweet potato flour |
| Volume 12(6)/2019 (December, 30) | and corn starch to the growth, survival rate, feed conversion ratio and body |
| Volume 12(5)/2019 (October, 30) | chemical composition of juvenile <i>Litopenaeus vannamei</i> . AACL Bioflux |
| Volume 12(4)/2019 (August, 30) | 13(5):2497-2508. |
| Volume 12(3)/2019 (June, 30) | Leilani A., Restuwati I., 2020 Analysis of the benefits of information and communication technology in extension activities in the District and City of |
| Volume 12(2)/2019 (April, 30) | Cirebon, West Java Province, Indonesia. AACL Bioflux 13(5):2509-2521. |
| Volume 12(1)/2019 (February, 28) | |

Volume 11(6)/2018 (December, 30) Volume 11(5)/2018 (October, 30) Volume 11(4)/2018 (August, 30) Volume 11(3)/2018 (June, 30) Volume 11(2)/2018 (April, 30) Volume 11(1)/2018 (February, 28) Volume 10(6)/2017 (December, 30) Volume 10(5)/2017 (October, 30) Volume 10(4)/2017 (August, 30) Volume 10(3)/2017 (June, 30) Volume 10(2)/2017 (April, 30) Volume 10(1)/2017 (February, 28) Volume 9(6)/2016 (December, 30) Volume 9(5)/2016 (October, 30) Volume 9(4)/2016 (August, 30) Volume 9(3)/2016 (June, 30) Volume 9(2)/2016 (April, 30) Volume 9(1)/2016 (February, 28) Volume 8(6)/2015 (December, 30) Volume 8(5)/2015 (October, 30) Volume 8(4)/2015 (August, 30) Volume 8(3)/2015 (June, 30) Volume 8(2)/2015 (April, 30) Volume 8(1)/2015 (February, 28) Volume 7(6)/2014 (December, 30) Volume 7(5)/2014 (October, 30) Volume 7(4)/2014 (August, 30) Volume 7(3)/2014 (June, 30) Volume 7(2)/2014 (April, 15) Volume 7(1)/2014 (February, 15) Volume 6(6)/2013 (November, 15)

Volume 13(5)/2020 - Bioflux - Aquaculture, Aquarium, Conservation & Legislation

Suherman A., Santosa M. A., Ihsan Y. N., Wijayanto D., Juwana S., 2020 The eradication of IUU fishing in Indonesia for fisheries resources sustainability by the Task Force 115. AACL Bioflux 13(5):2522-2537.

Mustikasari D., Nuryanto A., Suryaningsih S., 2020 The existence of blue panchax (*Aplocheilus panchax*) in the abandoned tin mining pits water with different age contaminated by heavy metals. AACL Bioflux 13(5):2538-2550.

Wijayanto D., Bambang A. N., Nugroho R. A., Kurohman F., 2020 The growth model of *Eucheuma cottonii* cultivated in Karimunjawa Islands, Indonesia. AACL Bioflux 13(5):2551-2557.

Hadijah, Zainuddin, Aqmal A., Banin D. K., 2020 The effect of marine algae (*Gracilaria verrucosa*) formulated feed on the growth rate, survival rate and chemical composition of abalone (*Haliotis squamata*) reared in marine submersible cages. AACL Bioflux 13(5):2558-2566.

Huda M. A., Sunarno M. T. D., Nurhudah M., 2020 Potential addition of black soldier fly carcass meal in sangkuriang catfish (*Clarias gariepinus*) feed formulation. AACL Bioflux 13(5):2567-2576.

Haeruddin, Supriharyono, Rahman A., Ghofar A., Iryanthony S. B., 2020 Spatial distribution and heavy metal pollution analysis in the sediments of Garang watershed, Semarang, Central Java, Indonesia. AACL Bioflux 13(5):2577-2587.

El Fajri N., Sukendi, Syafriadiman, Windarti, Yusuf M., 2020 Sustainability assessment of swamp ecosystem management in Sawah village, Kampar Regency, Riau. AACL Bioflux 13(5):2588-2598.

Mojumder N., Saha D., Utsa S. S., Maruf M. K. K., Paul S. K., 2020 Biology of the endangered queen loach (*Botia dario*) collected from wild sources in Bangladesh. Bioflux 13(5):2599-2609.

Setiyono J., Azhar M., Solechan, Trihastuti N., Hakim A. R., 2020 Justification of the ship-sinking policy in the territorial jurisdiction of Indonesia. AACL Bioflux 13(5):2610-2618.

Tyas D. E., Haeruddin, Purnomo P. W., 2020 Isolation and identification of biofilm bacteria from bamboo in traditional vannamei shrimp ponds as an ammonia degradation factor. AACL Bioflux 13(5):2619-2629.

Riyadi P. H., Romadhon R., Anggo A. D., Herawati V. E., Setyastuti A. I., 2020 PASS and ADMET analyses for eight compounds from Nile tilapia (*Oreochromis niloticus*) viscera waste hydrolysate as anti-inflammatory nutraceutical. AACL Bioflux 13(5):2630-2638.

Pangemanan N. P. L., Kepel R. C., Bataragoa N. E., Tumbol R. A., Sahami F. M., Lumenta C., Salaki M. S., Boneka F. B., Mantiri D. M. H., 2020 Morphometric and

Volume 6(5)/2013 (September, 15) Volume 6(4)/2013 (July, 25) Volume 6(3)/2013 (May, 15) Volume 6(2)/2013 (March, 15) Volume 6(1)/2013 (January, 15) Volume 5(5)/2012 (December, 30) Volume 5(4)/2012 (September, 30) Volume 5(3)/2012 (July, 30) Volume 5(2)/2012 (June, 30) Volume 5(1)/2012 (March, 15) Volume 4(5)/2011 (December, 30) Volume 4(4)/2011 (October, 30) Volume 4(3)/2011 (July, 30) Volume 4(2)/2011 (April, 30) Volume 4(1)/2011 (January, 30) Volume 3(5)/2010 (December, 5) Volume 3(4)/2010 (December, 1) Volume 3(3)/2010 (November, 15) Volume 3(2)/2010 (July, 30) Volume 3(1)/2010 (February, 28) Volume 2(4)/2009 (October, 30) Volume 2(3)/2009 (July, 30) Volume 2(2)/2009 (April, 30) Volume 2(1)/2009 (January, 30) Volume 1(2)/2008 (December, 30) Volume 1(1)/2008 (September, 30) Volume Pilot/2007 (December, 30) available printed only Pontus Euxinus, Volume 1 (1980) -Parent Journal

Volume 13(5)/2020 - Bioflux - Aquaculture, Aquarium, Conservation & Legislation

molecular analysis for identification of the early stages of gobioid fishes in the Poigar River estuary, North Sulawesi, Indonesia. AACL Bioflux 13(5):2639-2646.

Muhtadi A., Leidonald R., Rahmadya A., Lukman, 2020 Bathymetry and morphometry of Siais Lake, South Tapanuli, North Sumatra Province, Indonesia. AACL Bioflux 13(5):2647-2656.

Ratunil V. B. Jr., Gamboa G. Z. Jr., Ebarsabal G. A., 2020 Does the peak spawning activity of *Glossogobius giuris* in Lake Mainit occur in the early months of a year? AACL Bioflux 13(5):2657-2663.

Fahmy A. F., El-Greisy Z. A., Moharram S. G., 2020 Impact of hormonal manipulation on egg quality of *Diplodus sargus*: comparative ultrastructural changes. AACL Bioflux 13(5):2664-2675.

Rundupadang S. S., Mallawa A., Kurnia M., 2020 Effectiveness of milkfish (*Chanos chanos*) live bait from aquaculture versus live bait from nature in pole and line fisheries. AACL Bioflux 13(5):2676-2686.

Pandelaki L., Rompas R. M., Rembet U. N. W. J., Wantasen A. S., Gerung G. S., Ngangi E. L. A., 2020 Economic value of seagrass ecosystem in Nain Island, South Minahasa Regency, North Sulawesi, Indonesia. AACL Bioflux 13(5):2687-2693.

Harbach H., Palm H. W., 2020 Fully controlled experimental recirculating aquaculture system (RAS) for experimental studies with mussels (*Mytilus edulis*like), focusing on temperature and salinity regimes. AACL Bioflux 13(5):2694-2704.

Priyambada A., Fitri A. D. P., Ghofar A., 2020 Potential fishing grounds for *Portunus pelagicus* based on oceanographic factors of the Tukak Sadai waters, Bangka Belitung, Indonesia. AACL Bioflux 13(5):2705-2716.

Mulia D. S., Isnansetyo A., Pratiwi R., Asmara W., 2020 Molecular characterization of *Aeromonas caviae* isolated from catfish (*Clarias* sp.). AACL Bioflux 13(5):2717-2732.

Jalil J., Makkatenni M., Juhardi J., 2020 Diversity index, similarity index and dominance index of macrozoobenthos in Pangkajene River estuary, Pangkep Regency, Indonesia. AACL Bioflux 13(5):2733-2737.

Rachmawati D., Hutabarat J., Samidjan I., Windarto S., 2020 Utilization of papain as feed additive in the fish feed on activity of digestive enzymes, contents of nutrient and minerals of Sangkuriang catfish (*Clarias gariepinus* var. *Sangkuriang*). AACL Bioflux 13(5):2738-2744.

Muskananfola M. R., Purnomo P. W., Sulardiono B., 2020 Impacts of environmental factors on macrobenthos distribution and abundance in mangrove



ecosystems on the Northern Coast of Java. AACL Bioflux 13(5):2745-2756.

Rifqi M., Widigdo B., Mashar A., Nazar F., Wardiatno Y., 2020 Strategy to gain the target of shrimp production on Karawang District coastal area. AACL Bioflux 13(5):2757-2769.

Ramadhani D. A., Nugraha M. F. I., Novita H., Rajamuddin M. A. L., Elya B., 2020 Chemical compounds screening of leaves extract from *Eleocharis dulcis* (Burm.f.) Trin. ex Hensch and *in vitro* antibacterial pathogenic test for fish. AACL Bioflux 13(5):2770-2778.

Achmad M. J., Subur R., Supyan, Akbar N., 2020 DNA barcode and phylogenetics of green humphead parrotfish (*Bolbometopon muricatum*) in North Maluku waters. AACL Bioflux 13(5):2779-2787.

Paransa D. J., Mantiri D. M. H., Kepel R. C., Rumengan A., 2020 Pigment concentration of red algae, *Kappaphycus alvarezii* (Doty) Doty ex Silva during the cultivation in the coastal waters of Nain Island, North Sulawesi, Indonesia. AACL Bioflux 13(5):2788-2797.

Purnomo A. H., Subaryono, Utomo B. S. B., Paul N., 2020 Institutional arrangement for quality improvement of the Indonesian *Gracilaria* seaweed. AACL Bioflux 13(5):2798-2806.

Dangeubun J. L., Letsoin P. P., Syahailatua D. Y., 2020 Growth of *Nannochloropsis* sp. in culture media enriched with shrub-like annual *Clerodendrum minahassae* leaf extract. AACL Bioflux 13(5):2807-2815.

Kurohman F., Wijayanto D., Jayanto B. B., 2020 The strategy of capture fisheries development in Pamekasan Regency, Madura Island. AACL Bioflux 13(5):2816-2827.

Lutfiatunnisa, Widodo M. S., Faqih A. R., Sari L. D., Valen F. S., 2020 Molecular approach for identification of Asian seabass (*Lates calcarifer* Bloch 1790) based on COI gene sequence from Java, Indonesia. AACL Bioflux 13(5):2828-2834.

Picaulima S. M., Wiyono E. S., Baskoro M. S., Riyanto M., 2020 Fleets dynamics of small-scale fisheries in eastern Kei Kecil Island, Maluku Province, Indonesia. AACL Bioflux 13(5):2835-2851.

Parvez I., Mahajebin T., Barman T. R., Khan N., Chhanda M. S., Alam M. A., 2020 Evaluation of body shape variation of indigenous and exotic *Anabas testudineus* (Bloch, 1792) in Bangladesh by geometric morphometric analyses. AACL Bioflux 13(5):2852-2858.

Sahami F. M., Habibie S. A., 2020 Exploration of adult phase of Nike fish to maintain its sustainability in Gorontalo Bay waters, Indonesia. AACL Bioflux 13(5):2859-2867.

Nur M., Rifa'i M. A., Yunita R., Sofia L. A., 2020 Feasibility of floating cage culture based on business scale in Riam Kanan Reservoir, South Kalimantan Province. AACL Bioflux 13(5):2868-2877.

Arsad S., Sari L. A., Suherman S. P., Cahyani D., Nadhira T., Yulinda E. N., Musa M., Lusiana E. D., Prasetiya F. S., 2020 Utilization of tofu wastewater as *Chlorella pyrenoidosa* growth medium. AACL Bioflux 13(5):2878-2885.

Ardiansyah, Amrullah, Dahlia, Jaya A. A., Indrayani, Wahidah S., Hamal R., Jabbar F. B. A., 2020 The selected facultative mixotrophic sulphur-oxidizing bacteria from intensive shrimp ponds. AACL Bioflux 13(5):2886-2896.

Paulus C. A., Soewarlan L. C., Ayubi A. A., 2020 Distribution of marine debris in mangrove ecotourism area in Kupang, East Nusa Tenggara, Indonesia. AACL Bioflux 13(5):2897-2909.

Turisno B. E., Mahmudah S., Yunanto, 2020 The regulaiton and policy models of Pekalongan Local Government toward mangrove conservation. AACL Bioflux 13(5):2910-2920.

Trisyani N., Yusan L. Y., 2020 Proximate analysis and amino acid profile in fresh meat, meat meal, and shell meal of bamboo clam *Solen* sp. from Kwanyar Coast, Bangkalan-Madura, Indonesia. AACL Bioflux 13(5):2921-2927.

Vahira A. D., Riadin A. H., Sarida M., Utomo D. S. C., Setiawan W. A., 2020 Growth performance and sex ratio of *Channa striata* through immersion and bioencapsulaiton of *Artemia* with recombinant growth hormone. AACL Bioflux 13(5):2928-2936.

Zuraida I., Pamungkas B. F., 2020 Effects of acid pretreatment and extraction temperature on the properties of gelatin from striped snakehead (*Channa striata*) scales. AACL Bioflux 13(5):2937-2945.

Taridala S. A. A., Nursavista R., Kurnia A., Purbaningsih Y., Alzarliani W. O., Rayuddin, Hartati, 2020 Abalone marketing and its performance during Covid-19 pandemic. AACL Bioflux 13(5):2946-2955.

Thovyan A. I., Tapilatu R. F., Sabariah V., Venables S. K., 2020 Plankton abundance and community structure in reef manta ray (*Mobula alfredi*) feeding habitat in the Dampier Strait, Raja Ampat, West Papua, Indonesia. AACL Bioflux 13(5):2956-2969.

Sandor Z. J., Biro J. N., Revesz N., Ronyai A., 2020 Comparison of carp filet quality produced in semi-intensive pond system using different type of feeds. AACL Bioflux 13(5):2970-2981.

Kurniawan A., 2020 The metal oxides of abandoned tin mining pit waters as an indicator for bacterial diversity. AACL Bioflux 13(5):2982-2992.

Latiu C., Cocan D., Uiuiu P., Matei M. C., Constantinescu R., Heghedus C., Ihut A., Raducu C., Nicula A. S., Miresan V., 2020 Prespawning and postspawning hematological parameters and oxidative stress biomarkers of brown trout (*Salmo trutta*) (Pisces: Salmonidae), from Somesul Cald River. AACL Bioflux 13(5):2993-3003.

Pronina G. I., Mannapov A. G., 2020 Some aspects of fish breeding for immune resistance as shown through a study of common carp. AACL Bioflux 13(5):3004-3014.

Wakiah A., Mallawa A., Amir F., 2020 Population dynamics of snakehead fish (*Channa striata*) in Tempe Lake, South Sulawesi, Indonesia. AACL Bioflux 13(5):3015-3027.

Ueno-Fukura M., Aya-Baquero E., Collazos-Lasso L. F., 2020 Biofloc application in larviculture of *Pterophyllum scalare* at different stocking densities. AACL Bioflux 13(5):3028-3036.

Danial, Syahrul, Hamsiah, Ernaningsih, Yusuf M., 2020 Evaluation and development strategy of PPI Beba (Fish Landing Port) in Takalar District, Indonesia. AACL Bioflux 13(5):3037-3045.

Nas J. S., 2020 Screening of flavonoids from *Muntingia calabura* aqueous leaf extract and its potential influence on different metabolic enzymes in *Danio rerio*. AACL Bioflux 13(5):3046-3055.

Suratip N., Klahan R., Charoenwattanasak S., Yuangsoi B., 2020 Dietary methionine optimization for the growth performance, nitrogen utilization and proteolytic enzymes activities of snakehead (*Channa striata*) fingerlings. AACL Bioflux 13(5):3056-3067.

Putra D. F., Ulfa M., Zahara S., Abbas M. A., Nasir M., Othman N., 2020 Biological aspects of shrimps *Penaeus merguiensis* and *Exopalaemon styliferus* in Nagan Raya coast, Aceh Province, Indonesia. AACL Bioflux 13(5):3068-3077.

Alfiah H., Tri N., Manikya P., Raden J. K. S., Adamu A. M., 2020 Potential of probiotics and vitamin C on metallothionein and hematological parameters in tilapia (*Oreochromis niloticus*) affected by cadmium exposure. AACL Bioflux 13(5):3078-3085.

Dahlan A., Zahidah, Andriani Y., Herawati H., 2020 Plankton community structure as a bioindicator in Jatigede Reservoir, West Java, Indonesia. AACL Bioflux 13(5):3086-3095.

Hidayatullah W., Kismiyati, Mahasri G., 2020 Prevalence of ectoparasites in milkfish (*Chanos chanos*) from nursery and rearing ponds. AACL Bioflux 13(5):3096-3104.

Juliandri M. R., Radjawane I. M., Tarya A., 2020 Modeling the distribution of floating marine debris movement in tourism area in Pelabuhan Ratu Bay, West Java. AACL Bioflux 13(5):3105-3116.

Harwanto D., Saputro P., Susilowati T., Haditomo A. H. C., Windarto S., 2020 Effect of different N:P ratios application on the cultivation media for the growth and fiber content of *Caulerpa racemosa* reared in tarpaulin ponds. AACL Bioflux 13(5):3117-3125.

Purnomo P. W., Afiati N., Jati O. E., 2020 Abundance and diversity of fish larvae and juveniles in mangrove, estuary, and erosion zone on the west coast of Demak Regency. AACL Bioflux 13(5):3126-3134.

Rijal M., Rosmawati, 2020 The population dynamics of *Enhalus acoroides* in the coastal waters of Waai Village, Central Maluku District, Indonesia. AACL Bioflux 13(5):3135-3143.

Sumandiarsa I. K., Bengen D. G., Santoso J., Januar H. I., 2020 The relationship between trace elements and the abundance and nutrient contents of *Sargassum polycystum* in different morphogenesis of islands and seasonal variations in western Indonesian waters. AACL Bioflux 13(5):3144-3154.

Sayuti M., Kadarusman, Hismayasari I. B., Suhermanto A., Sofian A., Abadi A. S., Ernawati, Saidin, 2020 Chemical composition of Sentani gudgeon (*Oxyeleotris heterodon*). AACL Bioflux 13(5):3155-3162.

Muslimin B., Rustadi, Hardaningsih, Retnoaji B., 2020 Polymorphism in exon 4 of snakehead fish (*Channa striata*) growth hormone gene from Sumatra (Indonesia) and its association with growth traits. AACL Bioflux 13(5):3163-3174.

Karnila R., Edison, Pratiwi N., Sidauruk S. W., 2020 The natural antioxidant potential of astaxanthin extracted from the whiteleg shrimp (*Litopenaeus vannamei*) carapace. AACL Bioflux 13(5):3175-3181.

Rauf A., Wamnebo M. I., Yusuf K., 2020 Application of satellite remote sensing technology in monitoring sediment distribution in the coastal waters of Pangkep Regency, South Sulawesi, Indonesia. AACL Bioflux 13(5):3182-3187.

Rahman M. M., Hossain M. F., Mamun M., Shaha D. C., Sheikh A. H., 2020 Minimizing feed ration of *Oreochromis niloticus* in pond culture using vermicompost. AACL Bioflux 13(5):3188-3202.

Rizal S., Hutabarat J., Anggoro S., Prayitno S. B., 2020 The distribution of pyrite (FeS2) in brackish water ponds and its mitigation efforts in the Mahakam Delta, Indonesia. AACL Bioflux 13(5):3203-3211.

Wijayanti L. A. S., Fitriya N., Firdaus M. R., Satriyo T. B., Djumanto, Setiawan R. Y., Nurdin N., Helmi M., Zainuddin M., 2020 Deep sea phytoplankton community of

the Sangihe-Talaud Islands waters. AACL Bioflux 13(5):3212-3223.

Suwarni, Tresnati J., Omar S. B. A., Tuwo A., 2020 Population dynamics of whitespotted spinefoot *Siganus canaliculatus* in the coastal waters of Flores Sea. AACL Bioflux 13(5):3224-3235.

Putra R. D., Apriadi T., Pratama G., Suryanti A., 2020 Herbivore fish diversity patterns in an Indonesian outer island. AACL Bioflux 13(5):3236-3249.

design: www.simple-webdesign.com

Home | Archive | Volume 1 (1) / 2008 | CEEX 140 | Volume 1 (2) / 2008 | Volume 2 (1) / 2009 | Volume 2 (2) / 2009 | Volume 2 (3) / 2009 | Volume 2 (4) / 2009 | Pilot | Volume 3 (1) / 2010 | Volume 3 (2)/2010 | Volume 3 (3)/2010 | Volume 3 (3)/2010 | Volume 3 (3)/2010 | Volume 3 (5)/2011 | Volume 4 (2)/2011 | Volume 4 (2)/2011 | Volume 4 (2)/2011 | Volume 4 (2)/2011 | Volume 4 (3)/2011 | Volume 4 (4)/2011 | Volume 4 (2)/2011 | Volume 4 (2)/2011 | Volume 4 (3)/2012 | Volume 5 (2)/2012 | Volume 5 (4)/2012 | Volume 5 (5)/2012 | December, 30) | Volume 6 (1)/2013 | ACVAPEDIA 5th edn., Hungary, Szarvas (HAKI), 27-29th of November, 2012 | Volume 6 (2)/2013 - ACVAPEDIA 5th edn., Hungary, Szarvas (HAKI), 27-29th of November, 2012 | Volume 7 (1)/2014 | Volume 7 (2)/2014 | Volume 7 (3)/2014 | Volume 7 (4)/2014 | Volume 7 (4)/2014 | Volume 7 (4)/2015 | Volume 8 (4)/2017 | Volume 1 (3)/2017 | Volume 9 (4)/2016 | Volume 9 (2)/2016 | Volume 9 (4)/2016 | Volume 9 (4)/2016 | Volume 9 (4)/2016 | Volume 9 (4)/2016 | Volume 9 (4)/2017 | Volume 10 (3)/2017 | Volume 10 (4)/2017 | Volume 10 (4)/2017 | Volume 10 (5)/2017 | Volume 10 (5)/2017 | Volume 10 (5)/2017 | Volume 10 (6)/2017 | Volume 11 (5)/2018 | Volume 11 (4)/2018 | Volume 11 (4)/2018 | Volume 11 (5)/2019 | Volume 11 (5)/2019 | Volume 11 (5)/2019 | Volume 12 (4)/2019 | Volume 12 (4)/2020 | Volume 13 (3)/2020 | Volume 13 (6)/2020 | Volume 13 (6)/2020 | Volume 14 (4)/2021 | Volume 14 (3)/2021 | Colume 13 (3)/2020 | Volume 13 (6)/2020 | Volume 13 (6)/2020 | Volume 14 (4)/2021 | Volum



Feasibility of floating cage culture based on business scale in Riam Kanan Reservoir, South Kalimantan Province

¹Muhammad Nur, ²Muhammad A. Rifa'i, ²Rizmi Yunita, ²Leila A. Sofia

¹ Doctorate Program of Agricultural Science, Lambung Mangkurat University, Banjarbaru, South Kalimantan, Indonesia, ² Faculty of Fisheries and Marine Science, Lambung Mangkurat University, Banjarbaru, South Kalimantan, Indonesia. Corresponding author: M. Nur, nur@mhs.ulm.ac.id

Abstract. Floating cage fish culture has highly developed in Riam Kanan Reservoir, South Kalimantan and gives positive contribution to the community social economic conditions. These culture activities experienced production decline in 2017 in relation with the environmental conditions and unoptimal management. Recently the production of floating cage fish culture has gradually been increasing even though it has not still reached the previous maximum production. The production decline can influence the feasibility of the floating cage fish culture business based upon different business scale due to dissimilar expenditures and revenue at each level. This study used field survey method through interviews with the fish farmers. Number of respondents was determined using disproportionate stratified random sampling method as many as 56 people consisting of 36 respondents of small-scaled business, 11 respondents of medium-scaled business, 9 respondents of large-scale business. The primary data were analyzed using descriptive analysis and business feasibility analysis. The business feasibility analysis components comprise fixed costs, variable costs, and revenue. Data collected are one-year data containing 1 to 3 culture cycles. Results showed that the floating cage fish culture business in Riam Kanan Resevoir was categorized as feasible at all levels of business scale with mean R/C ratio of 1.12. The highest feasibility was recorded in large-scale business, followed by the medium one, and the lowest in small-scaled business, 1.17, 1.12, and 1.11, respectively. Based on the cultured fish species, the feasibility of Nile tilapia culture is higher than carp culture business at all business scales, whereas carp culture is recommended for large and medium scale business only due to being potentially harmful.

Key Words: fish production, interviews, R/C ratio, Nile tilapia, carp.

Introduction. With human population growth, food need has been increasing worldwide, including fish. This can be seen from increased fish consumption from 130 million tons in 2011 to 151.2 million tons in 2016 (FAO 2018). During this period, fisheries production from fishing has been stagnant and even tends to decline, while fish production from aquaculture rises averagely 5.9% year⁻¹ (FAO 2018), so that aquaculture becomes one of the alternatives to meet the food need.

Indonesia is one of the world major fish producers from aquaculture. FAO recorded that Indonesia is on the third rank of aquaculture-based fish-producing countries after China and India (FAO 2017). The cultured fish production of Indonesia reached 16.1 tons in 2017 (MMAF 2018), that is total fish production from fish culture in fish ponds, running water system, mix culture of fish-padi, seaweed, pen system, set fish cage, and floating fish cages (MMAF 2017).

In line with aquaculture development in Indonesia, floating fish cage aquaculture has also been developing fast in South Kalimantan Province, one of which occurs in Riam Kanan Reservoir. This culture system has existed in Riam Reservoir since 1994 and highly developed since 2006 (Nadiyah 2010). Floating fish cage aquaculture has positively contributed to social economic conditions through the availability of job opportunity for local communities (Statistic Center of Banjar Regency 2016; Soendjoto et al 2009). The development of floating fish cage aquaculture in this area can appear from

fish production development in Aranio district from 320 tons in 2006 to 10,831 tons in 2016 (Statistic Center of Banjar Regency 2007, 2017). The fish production from this culture system has declined since 2017 with only 1,058 tons (Statistic Center of Banjar Regency 2018). Although the fish production was gradually increasing in 2018, it could not reach the previous maximum production. Aranio district could only reach 4,699 tons in 2018 (Statistic Center of Banjar Regency 2019a). Fish production decline in Riam Kanan Reservoir is believed due to high mortality from water quality degradation and poor seed conditions (Muhamat & Hidayaturrahmah 2017). Declined fish production can also impact on the feasibility of the floating fish cage culture business.

Several previous studies mention that floating fish cage aquaculture is economically feasibly done as in Limboto Lake, Gorontalo (Zakaria et al 2017), Tondano Lake, North Sulawesi (Pangemanan et al 2014), Batur Lake, Bali (Budiasa et al 2018), Maninjau Lake, West Sumatera (Putri et al 2020), Koto Panjang Reservoir, Riau (Wahyudy et al 2019), Melawi River, West Kalimantan (Mulyadi et al 2015), and Cirata Reservoir, West Java (Rahmani et al 2011). These references indicate that the floating fish cage aquaculture belongs to feasible business category, but declined fish production in Riam Kanan Reservoir is believed to be able to affect the feasibility, especially at different business scales, due to difference in production costs and revenue at each business level. This study was aimed at analyzing the feasibility of floating fish cage aquaculture in Riam Kanan Reservoir based on business scale levels.

Method

Research period and place. This study was conducted for 3 months, from October to December, 2019, in Riam Kanan Reservoir, Aranio District, Banjar Regency, South Kalimantan. The reservoir is located in Barito watershed with an area of 1,043 km², built in 1963 and officially used in 1973. It has an elevation of 52-60 m above sea level, water surface of 3,200 ha, water volume of 1,200 million m³, and water debt of 340 m³ sec⁻¹ (RDBPW 1995).

Riam Kanan Reservoir administratively belongs to Aranio District, Banjar Regency (Figure 1), that is the widest area in Banjar Regency, 1,166.35 km², covering 12 villages, namely Aranio, Tiwingan Lama, Tiwingan Baru, Belangian, Paau, Kalaan, Artain, Benua Riam, Bunglai, Apuai, Rantau Bujur, and Rantau Balai (Statistic Center of Banjar Regency 2019a). Most regions of this district are located in the forests, either national forests or public forests (Statistic Center of Banjar Regency 2019b).

Data collection. The study used field survey method through interviews in the form of semi-closed questioners. Respondents were taken from fisheries households who ran the floating fish cage culture activity in Riam Kanan Reservoir. Number of respondents was determined as many as 56 people using disproportionate stratified random sampling method, consisting of 36 small-scaled fish farmers, 11 medium-scaled fish farmers, and 9 large-scaled ones. The determination of business scale criteria referred to the regulation of the Indonesia Ministry of Marine Affair and Fisheries numbered 5/2009 (MMAF 2009), in which < 2 units are categorized as micro-scaled business, 2-10 units as small-scaled business, 11-20 units as medium-scaled business, > 20 units as large-scaled one. The respondents are distributed in 6 villages, Apuai, Bunglai, Benua Riam, Kalaan, Tiwingan Baru, and Tiwingan Lama (Table 1).



Figure 1. Aranio District map.

Table 1

Distribution of floating cage fish farmer respondents

| Villages | Business | | | |
|---------------|----------|--------|-------|----|
| Villages | Small | Medium | Large | |
| Apuai | 9 | 2 | - | 11 |
| Bunglai | 5 | 3 | 2 | 10 |
| Benua Riam | 3 | - | 2 | 5 |
| Kalaan | 5 | 2 | 1 | 8 |
| Tiwingan Baru | 5 | 1 | 2 | 8 |
| Tiwingan Lama | 9 | 3 | 2 | 14 |
| | 36 | 11 | 9 | 56 |

Data analyses. The primary data were descriptively analyzed, whereas business feasibility analysis applied income analysis and revenue/cost (R/C) ratio following Suratiyah (2015):

$$I = TR - TC$$

R/C ratio = TR/TC

where: I = income;

TR = total revenue (production x price);

TC = total costs (fixed costs + variable costs);

in which:

Income criteria: > 0 - profitable; = 0 - break event point; < 0 - unprofitable; R/C ratio criteria: > 1 - profitable; = 1 - break event point; < 1 - unprofitable.

Several previous studies on economic feasibility have used R/C ratio analysis (Olaoye et al 2013; Djumanto et al 2016; Jia et al 2016; Hasnidar 2017; Phiri & Yuan 2018; Ariadi et al 2019; Basuki et al 2019; Cahyono et al 2019; Pancawati 2019).

The components utilized for the feasibility of the floating fish cage culture business are fixed costs, variable costs, and revenue. The fixed costs cover the investment assets, such as fish cages, control house, and boat, while the variable costs consist of seeds, feed, labors, and others (drugs, other production facilities, and harvest costs). Revenue was obtained from the multiplication of total production and selling price. Cost and revenue components calculated for feasibility analysis were those of 1-3 culture cycles.

Results. Respondents had age range of 19-66 years. Twenty-six respondents ran Nile tilapia (*Oreochromis niloticus*) culture, one did carp (*Cyprinus carpio*) culture, and 29 others did both (Table 2). Number of floating fish cages were 997 plots, 843 plots for tilapia culture and 154 plots for carp culture (Table 3).

Table 2

Number of respondents based on business scale and cultured fish species (person)

| Business scale levels | | Totals | | |
|-----------------------|--------------|--------|---------------------|--------|
| | Nile tilapia | Carp | Nile tilapia & Carp | Totais |
| Small | 21 | 1 | 14 | 36 |
| Medium | 4 | - | 7 | 11 |
| Large | 1 | - | 8 | 9 |
| AIĪ | 26 | 1 | 29 | 56 |

Table 3

Number of floating fish cages based on business scale and cultured fish species (plot)

| Business scale levels | Species | Totals | |
|-----------------------|--------------|--------|-----|
| Dusiness scale levels | Nile tilapia | Carp | |
| Small | 175 | 21 | 196 |
| Medium | 143 | 12 | 155 |
| Large | 525 | 121 | 646 |
| All | 843 | 154 | 997 |

Mean production respondent⁻¹ yr⁻¹ was 11,447 kg for small scale culture, 24.716 kg for medium scale, and 172,527 kg for large scale one, respectively. The highest mean production plot⁻¹ was recorded in large scale culture, 2,644 kg and the lowest in the medium scale, 1,702 kg. The production plot⁻¹ with species revealed that carp production was higher than that of nile tilapia, 2,313 kg and 2,086 kg, respectively (Table 4).

Table 4

Production of floating fish cage culture

| Production | Bu | | | |
|---|--------|--------|---------|--------|
| FIOUUCION | Small | Medium | Large | - All |
| Total production per respondent (kg yr ⁻¹) | 11.447 | 24.716 | 172.527 | 39.941 |
| Total production per plot (kg yr ⁻¹) | 2.129 | 1.702 | 2.644 | 2.128 |
| Nile tilapia production per plot (kg yr ⁻¹) | 2.136 | 1.702 | 2.364 | 2.086 |
| Carp production per plot (kg yr ⁻¹) | 1.965 | 1.589 | 3.598 | 2.313 |

The selling price of Nile tilapia was higher than that of carp. The former had selling price of IDR 27,400 kg⁻¹ and the later had selling price of IDR 23,800 kg⁻¹ (Table 5). Similar or higher selling price of carp than tilapia occurred only in spawner size, IDR 32,500 kg⁻¹.

Table 5

Selling price of nile tilapia and common carp (IDR 1.000 kg⁻¹)

| Description | Nile tilapia | | | | Carp | | | |
|-------------|--------------|--------|-------|------|-------|--------|-------|------|
| Description | Small | Medium | Large | All | Small | Medium | Large | All |
| Average | 27.4 | 26.9 | 27.6 | 27.4 | 23.4 | 23.7 | 24.8 | 23.8 |
| Minimum | 24.0 | 25.0 | 25.0 | 24.0 | 22.0 | 22.0 | 23.0 | 22.0 |
| Maximum | 31.0 | 28.0 | 31.5 | 31.5 | 25.0 | 25.0 | 32.5 | 32.5 |

Cost-benefit analysis showed that mean investment was IDR 54,600,000 for small scale culture, IDR 121,600,000 for medium scale culture, and IDR 541,500,000 for large scale one, with total costs of IDR 273,300,000 yr⁻¹, IDR 573,300,000 yr⁻¹, and IDR 4,050,300,000 yr⁻¹ and the revenue of IDR 310,100,000 yr⁻¹, IDR 655,300,000 yr⁻¹, and IDR 4,861,800,000 yr⁻¹ respectively (Table 6). The investment per plot ranged from IDR 8,500,000 to IDR 10,300,000, in which the highest was in the small-scaled culture and the lowest in the medium-scaled culture. Total costs per plot ranged from IDR 39,800,000 yr⁻¹ to IDR 62,300,000 yr⁻¹ with the average cost of IDR 23,560 kg⁻¹ to IDR 24,310 kg⁻¹ (Table 8). The highest total cost per plot was found in the large-scaled culture and the lowest in the medium-scaled culture, whereas the highest average cost occurred in small-scaled culture and the lowest in the large-scaled culture. The revenue plot⁻¹ yr⁻¹ ranged from IDR 45,200,000 to IDR 73,700,000 with average revenue of IDR 26,670 kg⁻¹ to IDR 27,520 kg⁻¹. The highest revenue plot⁻¹ yr⁻¹ and average revenue were recorded in the large-scaled culture and the lowest in the medium-scaled culture and the lowest in the medium-scaled culture.

Table 6

| Component | Per respondent | | | | Per plot | | | |
|------------------|----------------|--------|---------|---------|----------|--------|-------|------|
| Component | Small | Medium | Large | All | Small | Medium | Large | All |
| Investment costs | 54.6 | 121.6 | 541.5 | 146.0 | 10.3 | 8.5 | 8.6 | 9.7 |
| Fixed costs | 5.9 | 14.3 | 52.0 | 15.0 | 1.1 | 1.0 | 0.9 | 1.1 |
| Variable costs | 267.4 | 559.0 | 3.998.2 | 924.3 | 49.6 | 38.8 | 61.4 | 49.4 |
| - seed | 32.1 | 66.5 | 388.6 | 96.1 | 6.0 | 4.6 | 6.1 | 5.7 |
| - feed | 200.2 | 418.5 | 2.920.8 | 680.3 | 37.2 | 29.2 | 45.7 | 37.0 |
| - labour | 28.6 | 64.3 | 575.8 | 123.5 | 5.3 | 4.3 | 8.2 | 5.6 |
| - other | 6.5 | 9.7 | 113.1 | 24.3 | 1.2 | 0,7 | 1.3 | 1.1 |
| Total costs | 273.3 | 573.3 | 4.050.3 | 939.2 | 50.8 | 39.8 | 62.3 | 50.4 |
| Total revenue | 310.1 | 655.3 | 4.861.8 | 1.109.4 | 57.5 | 45.2 | 73.7 | 57.7 |
| Income | 36.8 | 82.0 | 811.6 | 170.2 | 6.8 | 5.7 | 11.5 | 7.3 |

Total cost and revenue per respondent and per culture plot at small, medium, large business scales (IDR 1.000.000 year⁻¹)

Cost-benefit analysis based on fish species indicated that total cost per plot in Nile fish culture ranged from IDR 40,000,000 to IDR 56,000,000 with average cost of IDR 23,760-24,500 kg⁻¹, whereas total cost per plot in carp culture ranged from IDR 34,300,000 to IDR 81,400,000 with average cost of IDR 22,220-23,500 kg⁻¹ (Table 7 and Table 8). The highest total cost per plot in Nile tilapia and carp culture was recorded in the large-scale culture and the lowest in medium-scaled culture, while the highest average cost was found in the small-scaled culture and the lowest in the large-scaled culture. The revenue per plot in Nile tilapia culture ranged from IDR 45,600,000 to IDR 65,500,000 with average revenue of IDR 26,910-IDR 27,610 kg⁻¹. In carp culture, the revenue per plot ranged from IDR 37,100,000 to IDR 95,600,000 with average revenue of IDR 23,400-IDR 24,750 kg⁻¹. The highest revenue per plot for Nile tilapia and carp culture occurred in the large-scaled culture and the lowest in the medium-scaled one, whereas the highest average revenue was recorded in the large scaled culture and the lowest in the medium-scaled one, whereas the highest average revenue was recorded in the large scaled culture and the lowest in the medium-scaled one for Nile tilapia and in small-scaled culture for carp.

Income per respondent in small, medium, and large-scaled culture is presented in Table 6, IDR 36,800 yr⁻¹, IDR 82,000,000 yr⁻¹, and IDR 811,600,000 yr⁻¹, respectively. The income per plot and average income revealed that the large-scaled culture gave the highest income at all business levels, IDR 11,500,000 plot⁻¹ yr⁻¹ and average income of IDR 3,960 kg⁻¹. The lowest income per plot occurred in the medium-scaled culture, IDR 5,700,000 and the lowest average income in the small-scaled culture, IDR 2,650.kg⁻¹ (Table 8).

The income per culture plot and average income with fish species indicated that Nile tilapia culture gave higher income than carp culture. The income per culture plot of Nile tilapia was IDR 7,400,000.yr⁻¹ with average income of IDR 3,070.kg⁻¹, whereas the income culture plot of carp was IDR 5,300,000.yr⁻¹ with average income of IDR 870.kg⁻¹

(Table 7 and Table 8). Based on the income per plot and average income at all business levels, the highest profit of Nile tilapia and carp culture was found in large-scaled business and the lowest in medium-scaled Nile tilapia culture and small-scaled carp culture.

Table 7

| Description | Nile tilapia | | | | Carp | | | |
|----------------|--------------|--------|-------|------|-------|--------|-------|------|
| Description | Small | Medium | Large | All | Small | Medium | Large | All |
| Fixed costs | 1.1 | 1.0 | 0.9 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.0 | 0.9 | 1.0 |
| Variable costs | 50.2 | 39.0 | 55.1 | 48.7 | 43.4 | 33.2 | 80.5 | 50.9 |
| - seeds | 5.9 | 4.6 | 6.3 | 5.7 | 6.3 | 3.8 | 5.5 | 5.5 |
| - feed | 37.4 | 29.2 | 40.5 | 36.3 | 33.8 | 26.2 | 63.7 | 40.0 |
| - labour | 5.6 | 4.6 | 7.0 | 5.6 | 2.1 | 2.6 | 10.1 | 4.4 |
| - other | 1.2 | 0.7 | 1.3 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 0.6 | 1.3 | 1.1 |
| Total costs | 51.3 | 40.0 | 56.0 | 49.8 | 44.4 | 34.3 | 81.4 | 51.9 |
| Total revenue | 58.6 | 45.6 | 65.5 | 57.1 | 46.2 | 37.1 | 95.6 | 57.2 |
| Income | 7.3 | 5.7 | 9.6 | 7.4 | 1.8 | 2.9 | 14.2 | 5.3 |

Total cost and revenue based on fish species per floating fish cage plot in small, medium, and large scaled culture (IDR 1.000.000 year⁻¹)

Table 8

Average cost, revenue, and profit of floating fish cage culture (IDR 1,000 kg⁻¹)

| Species culture | | Business scale level | | | |
|---------------------|-----------------|----------------------|--------|-------|-------|
| | | Small | Medium | Large | All |
| Nile tilapia & carp | Average cost | 24.31 | 23.93 | 23.56 | 24.12 |
| | Average revenue | 26.96 | 26.67 | 27.52 | 26.99 |
| | Average income | 2.65 | 2.74 | 3.96 | 2.88 |
| Nile tilapia | Average cost | 24.50 | 24.03 | 23.76 | 24.29 |
| | Average revenue | 27.43 | 26.91 | 27.61 | 27.35 |
| | Average income | 2.93 | 2.88 | 3.85 | 3.07 |
| Carp | Average cost | 23.50 | 22.69 | 22.22 | 22.97 |
| | Average revenue | 23.40 | 23.71 | 24.75 | 23.83 |
| | Average income | -0.10 | 1.02 | 2.53 | 0.87 |

Mean R/C ratio of the floating fish cage culture of all respondents was 1.12, the highest in the large-scaled culture, 1.17, and the lowest in the small-scaled one, 1.11. Based on the cultured fish species, it was found that mean R/C ratio of Nile tilapia was higher than that of carp, 1.13 and 1.05, respectively, whereas based on the business scale, the large-scaled culture had the highest business feasibility, followed by the medium-scaled culture business, and small-scaled one (Table 9).

Table 9

| Species culture | | Small | Medium | Large | All |
|---------------------|---------|-------|--------|-------|------|
| Nile tilapia & carp | Mean | 1.11 | 1.12 | 1.17 | 1.12 |
| | Minimum | 0.91 | 1.01 | 1.05 | 0.91 |
| | Maximum | 1.31 | 1.28 | 1.28 | 1.31 |
| Nile tilapia | Average | 1.12 | 1.12 | 1.17 | 1.13 |
| | Minimum | 0.94 | 1.02 | 1.03 | 0.94 |
| | Maximum | 1.33 | 1.29 | 1.24 | 1.33 |
| Carp | Mean | 1.01 | 1.05 | 1.11 | 1.05 |
| | Minimum | 0.78 | 0.91 | 1.00 | 0.78 |
| | Maximum | 1.14 | 1.21 | 1.33 | 1.33 |

R/C ratio of floating fish cage culture

R/C ratio analysis shows that all levels of culture business scale belong to feasible category, even though there are several respondents having unfeasible business in small-scaled-culture with R/C ratio < 1. Figure 2 demonstrates that 54 of 56 respodents or 96.43% have feasible culture business criteria.



Figure 2. Number of respondents based on business feasibility criteria.

Discussion. Present study shows that the feasibility of floating fish cage culture business in Riam Kanan Reservoir is categorized as feasible at all levels of business scales with the highest in the large-scaled culture, followed by the medium-scaled culture, and then small-scaled one. This finding supports the previous studies on the same culture business (Rahmani et al 2011; Pangemanan et al 2014; Mulyadi et al 2015; Zakaria et al 2017; Budiasa et al 2018; Wahyudy et al 2019).

The feasibility of Nile tilapia culture is better than that of carp culture. Nile tilapia is feasibly run at all business levels, while carp culture is recommended only in large-scaled and medium-scaled levels. Carp culture business approaches to Break Event Point in small-scaled culture and it is potentially unprofitable.

Factors affecting the different feasibility were cost efficiency, productability, and fish selling price. The cost efficiency could be seen from mean costs, the cost per unit of produced goods. The lower the costs are, the more efficient the production cost will be. Large-scaled culture was the most efficient business scale level with an average cost of IDR 23,560 kg⁻¹, whereas the others had the cost range of IDR 23,930 to 24.310 kg⁻¹. The cost efficiency in the large-scaled culture is supported by low fixed costs and efficient cost for the expenditures of fish seed and feed, so that these could reduce the whole costs.

Productability can be seen from the ability to produce a number of fish plot⁻¹ yr⁻¹. The higher the production plot⁻¹, the higher the revenue gained. The large-scaled culture has a fish productability of 2,644 kg plot⁻¹ yr⁻¹, while other culture scales have productability of 1,702 to 2,129 kg plot⁻¹ yr⁻¹ meaning that the large-scaled culture has the highest productability. Chumnanka et al (2014) claimed that the survival rate of the cultured fish are positively correlated with fish production. In the present study, the highest survival rate was found in the large-scaled culture, 27.41% for Nile tilapia and 61.13% for carp. Other culture scales had lower survival rate, 21.55 to 21.70% for Nile tilapia and 48.76 to 55.54% for carp.

Selling price is one of the factors influencing the amount of revenue (Faiq et al 2012; Fauziah et al 2016). The higher the selling price is, the higher the revenue will be. The present study revealed that the selling price of Nile tilapia was generally higher than that of carp with mean IDR 27,400 kg⁻¹ for Nile tilapia and IDR 23,800 kg⁻¹ for carp, respectively. The selling price difference between both species is related with the preference of people in South Kalimantan. They like the Nile tilapia more, because, unlike carp, Nile tilapia has no fine spine in the body that could be stuck in the throat.

Several factors affecting the feasibility of fish culture business were production capacity, selling price, target species, feed conversion ratio (FCR), fixed cost, and variable costs (Arikani & Aral 2019; Islam et al 2017; Jia et al 2016; Kee 1988). Febrianty et al (2018) mentioned that business feasibility is also influenced by investment ability and management, while Sofia and Nurlianti (2019) stated that it is

affected by capital efficiency and operational costs. Target species influences the selling price-related business feasibility (Jia et al 2016). Besides selling price, target species is also related with the suitability of culture locality. In suitable environment, target species will grow optimally (Rifa'i 2016).

Conclusions. Floating fish cage culture in Riam Kanan Reservoir was categorized as feasible business at all levels of business scale with mean of R/C ratio of 1.12. The highest feasibility was recorded in the large-scaled business, followed by the medium scale, and the lowest in small-scaled business. Based on the cultured fish species, Nile tilapia was better fish species for the floating fish cage cultivation than carp at all business scale levels, whereas the carp culture approached to the break even point at the small scale business. Factor affecting the business feasibility is cost efficiency, production capability per plot, and fish selling price. Thus, Nile tilapia could be recommended for cultured species, but carp culture is recommended only at large-scaled and medium-scaled businesses, while the small scale is potentially unprofitable.

Acknowledgements. We would like to thank the Government of South Kalimantan Province for the research grant. Our gratitute is also addressed to the Head of Fisheries Services of Banjar regency for providing the fisheries data and Mrs. Noorain and Mr. Muhammad Alfiani Noor who gave field mentoring.

References

- Ariadi H., Fadjar M., Mahmudi M., 2019 Financial feasibility analysis of Vannamei shrimp (*Litopenaeus vannamei*) culture in intensive aquaculture system with low salinity. Journal of Economic and Social of Fisheries and Marine 07(1):81-94.
- Arikani M. S., Aral Y., 2019 Economic analysis of aquaculture enterprises and determination of factors affecting sustainability of the sector in Turkey. Veteriner Fakültesi Dergisi 66:59-66.
- Basuki F., Harwanto D., Yuniarti T., Susilowati T., 2019 Return cost ratio analysis on seed production N1 (Nursery 1) of Sangkuriang catfish variety (*Clarias gariepinus* Burchell) with different stocking density of eggs using filtration system. IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science 246(1):1-6.
- Budiasa I. W., Santosa I. G. N., Agung I. G., Ambarawati A. Y. U., Suada K., Sunarta I. N., Shchegolkova N., 2018 Feasibility study and carrying capacity of Lake Batur ecosystem to preserve tilapia fish farming in Bali, Indonesia. Biodiversitas 19(2):613-620.
- Cahyono R. T., Suryantini A., Mulyo J. H., 2019 The feasibility of developing catfish hatcheries as a business in Minapolitan area of Magelang District. Jurnal Teknosains 8(2):122-134.
- Chumnanka N., Boyd C. E., Viriyatum R., Suriyan T., 2014 Bottom soil characteristics, survival and production of shrimp in low-salinity, inland ponds in Alabama and Florida (USA). Journal of Soils and Sediments 15:671-682.
- Djumanto, Ustadi, Rustadi, Triyatmo B., 2016 Feasibility study on the profitability of vannamei shrimp aquaculture on coastal area of Keburuhan Village, Purworejo Regency. Aquacultura Indonesiana 17(1):7-11.
- Faiq H., Hastuti D., Sasongko L. A., 2012 [Income analysis of milkfish culture in Tugurejo Village, Tugu District, Semarang]. Jurnal Ilmu-Ilmu Pertanian MEDIAGRO 8(1):72-85. [in Indonesian]
- FAO, 2017 Fishery and aquaculture statistics. Yearbook 2017. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Rome, Italy, 109 pp.
- FAO, 2018 The state of world fisheries and aquaculture 2018. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Rome, Italy, 26 pp.
- Fauziah A. F., Agustina T., Hariyati Y., 2016 [Income analysis and marketing of African sharptooth catfish in Mojomulyo Village, Puger District]. JSEP 9(1):20-32. [in Indonesian]

- Febrianty I., Mahreda E. S., Bachri A., Fatmawati, 2018 The economies of scale of catfish pond culture in Banjar Regency, South Kalimantan. Journal of Biodiversity and Environmental Sciences 13(4):101-108.
- Hasnidar, 2017 [Feasibility analysis of ornamental fish business in Gampong Paya Cut, Peusangan District, Bireuen Regency]. Jurnal Sosial Ekonomi Pertanian 1(2):97-105.
- Islam Md. S., Rahman Md. S., Akter F., Moniruzzaman M., 2017 Cost benefit analysis of aquaculture in Northern Part of Bangladesh. International Journal of Applied Research 3(2):105-107.
- Jia B., St-Hilaire S., Singh K., Gardner I. A., 2016 Farm-level returns and costs of yellow catfish (*Pelteobagrus fulvidraco*) aquaculture in Guangdong and Zhejiang Provinces, China. Aquaculture Reports 4:48-56.
- Kee C. C., 1988 Economic and social consideration for aquaculture site selection: an Asian perspective. UN/FAO Workshop on the Geographical Information System (GIS), Application in Aquaculture from 5-23 December, 1988 at the Asian Institute of Technology, Bangkok, Thailand, 17 pp.
- Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries (MMAF), 2009 [Regulations of the Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries of Indonesia Republic numbered PER.05/MEN/2009 concerning business scale in fish culture]. 17 pp. [in Indonesian]
- Ministry of Marine Affair and Fisheries (MMAF), 2017 [Time series of aquaculture fisheries 2014-2017]. Data, Statistic, and Information Center. Available at: http://sidatik.kkp.go.id/publikasi/index/18. Accessed: July, 2020. [in Indonesian]
- Ministry of Marine Affair and Fisheries (MMAF), 2018 [Fisheries and marine production data of 2017]. Data, Statistic, and Information Center. Jakarta, 322 pp. [in Indonesian]
- Muhamat, Hidayaturrahmah, 2017 [Nile tilapia mortality in floating fish cage culture in Aranio village and Tiwingan Lama, Banjar regency, South Kalimantan]. Proseding Seminar Masyarakat Biodiversity Indonesia 3:28-32. [in Indonesian]
- Mulyadi M. Y., Isytar I., Dolorosa E., 2015 [Financial analysis of fish culture in the floating fish cage in Melawi River, North Pinoh District, Melawi Regency]. Jurnal Social Economic of Agriculture 4:37-45. [in Indonesian]
- Nadiyah, 2010 [The use of Riam Kanan reservoir for community-based fish culture]. MSc Thesis, Pascasarjana Program Studi Magister Ilmu Lingkungan, Universitas Padjadjaran Bandung, 121 pp. [in Indonesian]
- Olaoye O. J., Ashley-Dejo S. S., Fakoya E. O., Ikeweinwe N. B., Alegbeleye W. O., Ashaolu F. O., Adelaja O. A., 2013 Assessment of socio-economic analysis of fish farming in Oyo State, Nigeria. Global Journal of Science Frontier Research Agriculture and Veterinary 13(9):45-53.
- Pancawati J., 2019 The potential development of fish farming in Lake Cipondoh. Jurnal Penelitian Agrosamudra 6(2):16-25.
- Pangemanan J. F., Harahap N., Soemarno, Polii B., 2014 Ecological-economic analysis of floating fish cage-aquaculture business in Tondano Lake, Minahasa Regency, North Sulawesi Province. Scholars Journal of Agriculture and Veterinary Sciences 1(4B):269-273.
- Phiri F., Yuan X., 2018 Economic profitability of tilapia production in Malawi and China. Journal of Aquaculture Research and Development 9(5):1-6.
- Putri D. Z., Idris, Anis A., Adry M. R., Sari Y. P., Yeni I., 2020 The potency of fish cultivation's development in Agam Regency of West Sumatera. 4th Padang International Conference on Education, Economics, Business and Accounting (PICEEBA-2 2019) 124:324-329.
- Rahmani U., Syaukat Y., Fauzi A., Hidayat A., 2011 [Internalization of environmental costs in the floating fish cage culture in Cirata Reservoir]. Indonesian Journal of Agricultural Economics (IJAE) 2(2):157-168. [in Indonesian]
- Research and Development Board of Public Works (RDBPW), 1995 Large reservoir in Indonesia. Badan Penerbitan PU, Jakarta, 374 pp.
- Rifa'i M. A., 2016 The abundance and size of giant sea anemones at different depths in the waters of Teluk Tamiang village, South Kalimantan, Indonesia. AACL Bioflux 9(3):704-712.

- Soendjoto M. A., Suyanto, Nuryadin M. R., 2009 [Economic value of Hutan Raya Sultan Adam Park, South Kalimantan based on fisheries]. In: Seminar Nasional Perikanan Indonesia, 3-4 December 2009, Sekolah Tinggi Perikanan, pp. 481-486. [in Indonesian]
- Sofia L. A., Nurlianti S., 2019 The economic value of the resource utilization of wetlands: comparative study of Beje Fisheries in North Hulu Sungai Regency, South Kalimantan. AACL Bioflux 12(1):143-150.
- Statistic Center of Banjar Regency (SCBR), 2007 Banjar regency in figure 2006/2007. BPS Kabupaten Banjar, Martapura, 386 pp.
- Statistic Center of Banjar Regency (SCBR), 2016 Banjar regency in figure 2016. BPS Kabupaten Banjar, Martapura, 442 pp.
- Statistic Center of Banjar Regency (SCBR), 2017 Banjar regency in figure 2017. BPS Kabupaten Banjar, Martapura, 355 pp.
- Statistic Center of Banjar Regency (SCBR), 2018 Banjar regency in figure 2018. BPS Kabupaten Banjar, Martapura, 430 pp.
- Statistic Center of Banjar Regency (SCBR), 2019a Banjar regency in figure 2019. BPS Kabupaten Banjar, Martapura, 410 pp.
- Statistic Center of Banjar Regency (SCBR), 2019b [Aranio district in figure 2019]. BPS Kabupaten Banjar, Martapura, 101 pp. [in Indonesian]
- Suratiyah K., 2015 [Agriculture science]. Penebar Swadaya, Jakarta, 156 pp. [in Indonesian]
- Wahyudy H. A., Bahri S., Tibrani, 2019 [Optimation of freshwater fish culture in the floating fish cage in the reservoir of PLTA Koto Panjang, Kampar Regency, Riau Province]. Jurnal Agribisnis 18(1):12-25. [in Indonesian]
- Zakaria I., Koniyo Y., Baruadi A. S. R., 2017 [Feasibility analysis of Nile tilapia culture business in Limboto Lake]. Jurnal Ilmiah Perikanan dan Kelautan 5(1):25-30. [in Indonesian]

How to cite this article:

Received: 29 September 2020. Accepted: 25 October 2020. Published online: 27 October 2020. Authors:

Muhammad Nur, Doctorate Program of Agricultural Science, Lambung Mangkurat University, Jl. Jend. Ahmad Yani KM 36 Banjarbaru, South Kalimantan, Indonesia, e-mail: nur@mhs.ulm.ac.id

Muhammad Ahsin Rifa'i, Faculty of Fisheries and Marine Science, Lambung Mangkurat University, Jl. Jend. Ahmad Yani KM 36 Banjarbaru, South Kalimantan, Indonesia, e-mail: m.ahsinrifai@ulm.ac.id

Rizmi Yunita, Faculty of Fisheries and Marine Science, Lambung Mangkurat University, Jl. Jend. Ahmad Yani KM 36 Banjarbaru, South Kalimantan, Indonesia, e-mail: rizmiyunita@ulm.ac.id

Leila Ariyani Sofia, Faculty of Fisheries and Marine Science, Lambung Mangkurat University, Jl. Jend. Ahmad Yani KM 36 Banjarbaru, South Kalimantan, Indonesia, e-mail: leila.ariyani@ulm.ac.id

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Nur M., Rifa'i M. A., Yunita R., Sofia L. A., 2020 Feasibility of floating cage culture based on business scale in Riam Kanan Reservoir, South Kalimantan Province. AACL Bioflux 13(5):2868-2877.