



# The effects of dietary protein level on the growth, protein efficiency ratio and body composition of juvenile kelabau (*Osteochilus melanopleurus*)

<sup>1</sup>Adi Susanto, <sup>2</sup>Johannes Hutabarat, <sup>3</sup>Sutrisno Anggoro, <sup>2</sup>Subandiyono

<sup>1</sup> Department of Aquaculture, Faculty of Fisheries and Marine Science, Mulawarman University, Samarinda, East Kalimantan, Indonesia; <sup>2</sup> Department of Aquaculture, Faculty of Fisheries and Marine Science, Diponegoro University, Tembalang Semarang, Central Java, Indonesia; <sup>3</sup> Department of Aquatic Resources Management, Faculty of Fisheries and Marine Science, Diponegoro University, Tembalang Semarang, Central Java, Indonesia. Corresponding author: A. Susanto, adi\_susanto@fpik.unmul.ac.id; adisusanto73@gmail.com

**Abstract.** This study was conducted to evaluate the effect of feeding with different protein levels on growth performance and body composition of kelabau fish (*Osteochilus melanopleurus*). Four experimental feeds with different protein levels but same fat content were formulated. The experimental variants were A, B, C and D containing protein levels of 25.14, 28.26, 31.88 and 34.73% respectively. *O. melanopleurus* was obtained from breeding unit of the Freshwater Aquaculture Center (BBAT) Mandiangin within an average weight of  $2.09 \pm 0.16$  g with a density of 20 fish maintained in plastic box sized 54.3 x 38 x 31.5 cm and filled with 40 L of water. *O. melanopleurus* were given experimental feed 2 times a day at satiation for 60 days. *O. melanopleurus* feed C (31% protein) showed higher growth rate, relative growth rate, total feed consumed, feed utilization efficiency were higher compared to other treatments ( $P < 0.05$ ). The highest mean growth rate was in the C feed treatment (31%) with an average of  $4.14 \pm 0.54\%$ , while the lowest relative growth in the feed treatment A (25%) with an average of  $2.92 \pm 0.54\%$ . Protein efficiency ratio (PER) of fish group which consumed feed formulation C =  $1.50 \pm 0.06\%$ , feed A =  $1.45 \pm 0.13\%$ , feed B =  $1.40 \pm 0.04\%$  and significantly different from fish group fish that consumed feed D =  $1.16 \pm 0.07\%$ .

**Key Words:** relative growth rate, feed consumption level, feed efficiency, at satiation.

**Introduction.** Kelabau fish (*Osteochilus melanopleurus*) is a freshwater fish belonging to the order Cypriniformes, sub-order Cyprinoidea, Cyprinidae family, genus *Osteochilus* (Kottelat et al 1993). As a local fish with high economic value, lives in public waters found in Kalimantan and Sumatera unfortunately is still not cultured and the production is still limited depending on the fishing seasons. However, *O. melanopleurus* should be cultured like other species of Cyprinid fishes, and the culture should be improved by optimizing the maintenance of both the maintenance of culture system and the quality of the feed provided. Some researches of concerning feed formulation for marine species are in progress, but still only a limited scale. Mardani (2014) conducted a study of different food sources for the growth of *O. melanopleurus*. *O. melanopleurus* that consumed feed with a composition of 29.3% protein content provided the best relative growth (RGR) of 49.45% compared to other treatments.

Each fish species needs different levels of protein for its growth and it is influenced by fish size, but generally fish need is around 35-50% protein in their feed (Hepher 1990). Research on the need for protein in omnivorous fish has been widely carried out as in Nile tilapia (*Oreochromis niloticus*) by Teshima et al (1985) in Merola and Cantelmo (1987), in cachama (*Colossoma macropomum*) by Eckmann (1987), and in common carp (*Cyprinus carpio*) (Shimeno et al 1995), and also in herbivorous fish such as giant gourami (*Osphronemus goramy*) (Mokoginta et al 1995), putitor mahseer (*Tor putitora* (Hemilton, 1822)) (Hossain et al 2002), roho labeo (*Labeo rohita* (Hemilton, 1822)) (Satpathy et al 2003), silver barb (*Barbonymus gonionatus*) (Mohanta et al

2008); furthermore Mansour et al (2017) and Dewantoro et al (2018), on tinfoil barb (*Barbonymus schwanenfeldii* (Bleeker, 1854)).

Research on protein requirements in *O. melanopleurus* has never been done. Therefore research to find the right protein content to produce the best growth of *O. melanopleurus* is needed.

## Material and Method

**Diets.** The present study used 4 types of artificial feed with different protein content, namely feed A (25%), feed B (28%), feed C (31%) and feed D (34%) ) with a E/P ratio ranging from 8 to 10 Kcal. Feed formulations are presented in Table 1.

Table 1  
Treatment feed composition (g) and feed nutrient content\*

Ingredients	Ingredient percentage in the trial feed (% dry matter)			
	A (25 %)	B (28 %)	C (31 %)	D (34 g %)
Fish meal	29.0	34.0	37.0	39.3
Soybean meal	15.5	15.0	17.0	20.2
Wheat flour	6.5	10.0	12.3	13.0
Bran meal	15.0	12.0	10.0	10.2
Fish oil	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5
Corn oil	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5
Vitamin mix <sup>2)</sup>	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Mineral mix <sup>3)</sup>	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Choline chloride	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
CMC <sup>1)</sup>	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
Filler	19.0	14.0	8.7	2.3
Proximate analysis results				
Protein (%)	25.14	28.26	31.88	34.73
NFE (%)	34.34	31.75	30.53	31.84
FAT (%)	11.55	11.37	11.59	11.55
Fiber (%)	2.35	2.00	1.85	1.99
Total Energy (Kcal g <sup>-1</sup> ) <sup>4)</sup>	267.40	270.38	281.78	294.71
E/P (Kcal g <sup>-1</sup> Protein)	10.64	9.57	8.84	8.49

\* - Calculation based on dry weight.

<sup>1</sup> - Carboxymethyl cellulose.

<sup>2</sup> - In mg kg<sup>-1</sup> : vit. B<sub>1</sub> 60; vit. B<sub>2</sub> 100; vit. B<sub>12</sub> 100; vit. C 2000; vit. K<sub>3</sub> 50; vit. A/D<sub>3</sub> 400; vit. E 200; Ca pantotenat 100; inositol 2000; biotin 300; asam folat 15; niasin 400.

<sup>3</sup> - in mg kg<sup>-1</sup> : MgSO<sub>4</sub>.7H<sub>2</sub>O 7.5; NaCl 0.5; NaH<sub>2</sub>PO<sub>4</sub>.2H<sub>2</sub>O 12.5; KH<sub>2</sub>PO<sub>4</sub> 16.0; CaHPO<sub>4</sub>.2H<sub>2</sub>O 6.53; Fe sitrat 1.25; ZnSO<sub>4</sub>.7H<sub>2</sub>O 0.1765; MnSO<sub>4</sub>.4H<sub>2</sub>O 0.081; CuSO<sub>4</sub>.5H<sub>2</sub>O 0.0155; KIO<sub>3</sub> 0.0015; CoSO<sub>4</sub> 0.0003.

<sup>4</sup> - Protein = 3.5 Kcal g<sup>-1</sup>; NFE = 2.5 Kcal g<sup>-1</sup>; Fat = 8.1 Kcal g<sup>-1</sup>.

**Fish culture management.** The *O. melanopleurus* were obtained from hatchery of Freshwater Aquaculture Center (BBAT), Mandiangin, South Kalimantan. *O. melanopleurus* were reared in plastic tank containing 40 L water with a density of 20 fish per tank with an average weight of 2.09±0.16 g. Fish were reared for 60 days by feeding twice a day in the morning and in the afternoon at satiation. The experiment was carried out in semi-closed circulation system. Faeces were removed by siphoning every morning. The water filter was washed every day and the filter tub was washed and replaced with new water every 1 week. During the study, the water temperature averaged 30.0±1.0°C, dissolved oxygen between 4.60 and 6.20 mg L<sup>-1</sup>, pH between 6.70 and 6.80, TAN between 0.398 and 0.721 mg L<sup>-1</sup>. This shows that the condition of the water during the study was at optimum conditions (Tebbut 1992; Effendie 1997).

**Data collection and chemical analysis.** Body weight was measured at the beginning and at the end of the study upon anesthetized fish. The fish were anesthetized using

MS222. Weighing was performed in order to determine the relative growth rate (De Silva & Anderson 1995). Feed consumed during the study was recorded to determine Total Feed Consumption (TFC) (Pereira et al 2007), and Feed Utilization Efficiency (FUE) (NRC 1993), and Protein Efficiency Ratio (PER) (Bake et al 2014). Proximate body analysis was carried out at the beginning and end of the study used to determine nutrient composition in fish (Takeuchi 1988).

**Statistical analysis.** The design of the present study is a laboratory experimental model, using a completely randomized design (CRD) consisting of 4 treatments and 4 replications. Data of Feed Utilization Efficiency (FUE), Weight Growth Rate, Specific Growth Rate (SGR), Relative Growth Rate (RGR) and Protein Efficiency Ratio (PER), were analyzed for diversity with ANOVA and continued with the Tukey test at a 95% confidence interval using the SPSS program version 11.5.

## Results and Discussion

**Weight growth, relative growth, total feed consumption and feed utilization efficiency.** The values of various parameters of feed use which include weight growth rate, specific growth rate, relative growth rate, and protein efficiency ratio as well as feed efficiency of the fish after being kept for 60 days by feeding different proteins are presented in Table 2.

Table 2

The average value of the initial weight, final weight, weight growth, relative growth rate (RGR), specific growth rate (SGR), total feed consumption (TFC), protein efficiency ratio (PER) and feed utilization efficiency (FUE), of *Osteochilus melanopleurus* kept for 60 days fed different protein levels

Parameters	Diet protein level			
	A (25.0%)	B (28.0%)	C (31.0%)	D (34.0%)
Initial weight(g)	2.02±0.21	2.02±0.12	2.10±0.12	2.21±0.16
Final weight (g)	5.42±0.06	5.73±0.06	7.23±0.13	6.39±0.02
Weight growth (g)	68.00±4.52 <sup>a</sup>	74.30±1.81 <sup>a</sup>	102.48±3.78 <sup>c</sup>	83.77±2.93 <sup>b</sup>
RGR (%)	2.92±0.54 <sup>a</sup>	3.11±0.30 <sup>a</sup>	4.14±0.54 <sup>b</sup>	3.37±0.25 <sup>a</sup>
SGR (%)	1.68±0.20 <sup>a</sup>	1.75±0.10 <sup>a</sup>	2.07±0.15 <sup>b</sup>	1.84±0.08 <sup>a</sup>
TFC (%)	191.13±9.66 <sup>a</sup>	189.79±4.38 <sup>a</sup>	217.20±13.73 <sup>b</sup>	220.57±10.91 <sup>b</sup>
PER (%)	1.45±0.13 <sup>b</sup>	1.40±0.04 <sup>b</sup>	1.50±0.06 <sup>b</sup>	1.16±0.07 <sup>a</sup>
FUE (%)	34.36±7.68 <sup>a</sup>	34.86±3.57 <sup>a</sup>	54.44±5.64 <sup>b</sup>	43.77±3.68 <sup>a</sup>

Values followed by the same letters on the same row show no significant difference ( $P > 0.05$ ).

*O. melanopleurus* fed with different protein levels exhibited significant effect on weight growth, relative growth rate, specific growth rate, feed consumption level, protein efficiency ratio and feed efficiency ( $P < 0.05$ ). The best weight growth was obtained in the treatment of feed C (31.0%) followed by feed D (34.0%). The lowest weight growth was obtained in the group of fish that consumed feed A (25.0%) and B (28.0%) ( $P < 0.05$ ). The best relative growth rate was obtained in the group of fish fed experimental feed C (31.0%), with 4.07% day<sup>-1</sup> which was significantly different from fish consuming other feed treatments ( $P < 0.05$ ). The same phenomenon was also seen in the specific growth rate, where the group of fish consuming C feed had the highest specific growth rate of 2.06% per day which was significantly different from the group of fish that consumed feed D, B and A ( $P < 0.05$ ).

*O. melanopleurus* which was fed experimental diets C and D showed higher levels of feed consumption compared to fish that were administered diets A and B ( $P < 0.05$ ). Fish, which consumed D feed, has the lowest protein efficiency ratio (PER) compared to fish that consume feed A, B and C ( $P < 0.05$ ). The best feed utilization efficiency (FUE) value was obtained for fish that consumed C feed which was 47.26±2.18% which was different from the group of fish that consumed feed B with a feed utilization efficiency

(FUE) value of  $39.16 \pm 0.91\%$  ( $P < 0.05$ ). Fish which consumed feed A produced a low value of feed utilization efficiency (FUE) with a feed utilization (FUE) efficiency value of  $35.62 \pm 2.51\%$ .

**Initial and final proximate composition.** The proximate composition of *O. melanopleurus* both at baseline and at the end of the study and after the fish reared for 60 days by feeding different protein content are presented in Table 3.

Protein levels of fish body at the end of the study tended to increase with increasing protein feed up to protein content 31.0% but did not significantly affect the protein content of fish bodies ( $P > 0.05$ ). Likewise, the body fat content of fish, ash content and NFE content, showed no significant difference ( $P > 0.05$ ).

Table 3

The initial and final body proximate composition of *Osteochilus melanopleurus* in a 60 days trial by giving feed containing different protein levels (% dry weight)

Diet	Protein level (%)			
	A (25.0)	B (28.0)	C (31.0)	D (34.0)
Initial body composition (%)				
Protein	56.42	56.42	56.42	56.42
Fat	23.75	23.75	23.75	23.75
Ash	13.37	13.37	13.37	13.37
NFE	6.03	6.03	6.03	6.03
Final body composition (%)				
Protein <sup>ns</sup>	$58.62 \pm 2.56$	$59.73 \pm 2.29$	$61.69 \pm 0.87$	$60.89 \pm 1.98$
Fat <sup>ns</sup>	$20.78 \pm 1.41$	$21.51 \pm 2.65$	$21.77 \pm 2.94$	$19.83 \pm 1.03$
Ash <sup>ns</sup>	$14.76 \pm 1.15$	$14.47 \pm 0.54$	$15.15 \pm 1.01$	$13.84 \pm 0.73$
NFE <sup>ns</sup>	$2.19 \pm 0.80$	$2.25 \pm 0.47$	$1.77 \pm 0.32$	$2.51 \pm 1.28$

ns - not significantly different ( $P > 0.05$ ).

**Discussion.** Feeding with increased protein levels up to 31.0% will significantly improve the growth performance of *O. melanopleurus*, and will decrease with increasing protein levels to 34.0%. *O. melanopleurus* that consume feed with a protein content of 31.0% are able to utilize more efficiently the feed protein sources for growth compared to fish that consumed D feed which is higher in protein (34.0%). This shows that the protein consumed is not necessarily used for growth. In general, nutrition must be available first for metabolism, and second for growth and third for reproduction biology (Bray & Lawrence 1992). This means that, once the nutrients or energy needed for metabolism and growth are met, excess nutrients or energy will be stored or used for reproduction.

The group of fish that consumed C feed had a relatively high growth compared to other feed groups. Many authors have reported that an increase in protein levels will not support further growth and may even affect lowering growth due to insufficient energy availability (McGoogan & Gatlin 1999). This might explain that the proportion of protein will be degraded, where the carbon skeleton is used as an energy source at high dietary protein levels. Excreted ammonia nitrogen causes damage to water quality, so an increase in food protein levels above a certain level, does not increase production so it must be avoided (El-Sayed & Kawanna 2008).

Based on growth and feed efficiency, the optimum level of feed protein for *O. melanopleurus* was 31.0%. These results are lower than those reported in other fish, such as *Oncorhynchus nerka* (45.0%) (NRC 1993), masu salmon (*Oncorhynchus masou* (Brevoort, 1856)) (40.0%) (Lee & Kim 2001) and Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*) (39.0%) (Hillestad & Johnsen 1994), and Pacific salmon *Oncorhynchus* sp. (55.0%) (NRC 2011). The optimum diet protein level of 31.0% in this study was also lower than the 48.0% protein diet value with 20.0 ~ 25.0% lipids for Manchurian trout larvae (0.15 g) reported by Zhang et al (2009). The difference between the two studies can be explained by different fish sizes. Evidence shows that protein requirements decrease with increasing fish size (NRC 2011).

Higher yields also found in fingerling/juvenile *O. niloticus* requires 35.0% protein (Abdel-Tawwab et al 2010), (*O. goramy*) measuring 0.27 g requires 43.29% protein with an energy protein (C/P) ratio of 8 kcal DE/g (Mokoginta et al 1995). Hossain et al (2002), stating that the *T. putitora* grows well on feed containing 40% protein. *L. rohita* with an average weight of  $4.3 \pm 0.02$  g which consumes feed with a protein content of 45.0% and fat content of 10-15% gives the best growth (Satpathy et al 2003). Similar results were found in *C. carpio* a 121 g individual requires 31.6% protein and 11.9% fat (Shimeno et al 1995). *B. gonionatus* grows well at a protein content of 31.77% with a P/E ratio of 11.32 g of Kcal  $g^{-1}$  protein (Mohanta et al 2008). Furthermore Mansour et al (2017), showed that the best growth of *B. schwanenfeldii* was fed with 32% protein content. Dewantoro et al (2018) obtained lower protein requirements of 30% and C/P ratio of 10 Kcal/g protein which was able to increase specific growth rate (SGR), protein retention and fat retention in the same species.

The value of feed utilization efficiency (FUE) is the ratio between body weight gain and the amount of feed consumed. In the group of fish that consumed C food had the highest efficiency value  $47.26 \pm 2.18\%$ , compared to the group of fish that consumed feed B ( $39.16 \pm 0.91\%$ ), D ( $38.08 \pm 2.18\%$ ) and A ( $35.62 \pm 2.91\%$ ). The group of fish that consumed C food had a higher weight gain while the food consumed was less than the fish in group D (Table 2). Protein efficiency ratio (PER) group of fish that consumed feed C =  $1.50 \pm 0.06\%$ , feed A =  $1.45 \pm 0.13\%$ , feed B =  $1.40 \pm 0.04\%$  and better than in group fish that consumed feed D =  $1.16 \pm 0.07\%$ . This illustrates that the protein consumed by fish in group C can be used efficiently to increase growth compared to other fish group.

Further research should be conducted to determine the optimal carbohydrate levels so that *O. melanopleurus* growth could be maximized.

**Conclusions.** *O. melanopleurus* that consumed 31.88% of protein-containing feed provided an excellent weight growth rate, relative and specific growth rate, protein efficiency ratio, total feed consumption and realized the best feed utilization efficiency compared to other treatments.

**Acknowledgements.** The authors would like to thanks to the General Directorate of Higher Education of the Republic of Indonesia (DIKTI) (cq. The Doctoral Dissertation Research (Grand No. 098/UN17.41/KL/2018) for funding this research; to Fish House Laboratory, Aquaculture Department Faculty of Fisheries and Marine Science, Mulawarman University for facilitating the completion of the present research.

## References

- Abdel-Tawwab M., Ahmad M. H., Khattab Y. A. E., Shalaby A. M. E., 2010 Effect of dietary protein level, initial body weight, and their interaction on the growth, feed utilization, and physiological alterations of Nile tilapia, *Oreochromis niloticus* (L.) Aquaculture 298(3-4):267-274.
- Bake G. G., Martins E. I., Sadiku S. O. E., 2014 Nutritional evaluation of varying levels of cooked flamboyant seed meal (*Delonix regia*) on the growth performance and body composition of Nile tilapia (*Oreochromis niloticus*) fingerlings. Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries 3(4):233-239.
- Bray W. A., Lawrence A. L., 1992 Reproduction of *Penaeus* species in captivity. In: Marine shrimp culture: principle and practices. Fast A. W., Lester J. L. (eds), Elsevier, Amsterdam.
- De Silva S. S., Anderson T., 1995 Fish nutrition in Aquaculture. Springer Science & Business Media. ISBN: 9780412550300.
- Dewantoro E., Dhahiyat Y., Rostika R., Zahidah, Iskandar, 2018 Growth performance of tinfoil barb (*Barbonymus schwanenfeldii*) fed with different protein levels and energy/protein ratios on diet. AACL Bioflux 11(4):1300-1310.
- Eckmann R., 1987 Growth and body composition of juvenile *Colossoma macropomum* Cuvier 1818 (Characoidei) feeding on artificial diets. Aquaculture 64:293-303.

- Effendie M. I., 1997 [Fisheries biology methods]. Yayasan Pustaka Nusantara, Yogyakarta, Indonesia, 258 p. [In Indonesian].
- El-Sayed A.-F. M., Kawanna M., 2008 Effects of dietary protein and energy levels on spawning performance of Nile tilapia (*Oreochromis niloticus*) broodstock in a recycling system. *Aquaculture* 280:179–184.
- Hepher B., 1990 Nutrition of pond fishes. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, New York, 388 p.
- Hillestad M., Johnsen F., 1994 High-energy/low-protein diets for Atlantic salmon: effects on growth, nutrient retention and slaughter quality. *Aquaculture* 124:109-116.
- Hossain M. A., Hasan N., Shah A. K. M. A., Hussain M. G., 2002 Optimum dietary protein requirement of mahseer, *Tor putitora* (Hamilton) fingerlings. *Asian Fisheries Science* 15:203-214.
- Kottelat M., Whitten A. J., Kartikasari S. N., Wirjoatmodjo S., 1993 Freshwater fishes of Western Indonesia and Sulawesi. Periplus Editions, Hong Kong, 221 p.
- Lee S. M., Kim K.-D., 2001 Effects of dietary protein and energy levels on the growth, protein utilization and body composition of juvenile masu salmon (*Oncorhynchus masou* Brevoort). *Aquaculture Research* 32(Suppl. 1):39-45.
- Mansour O., Idris M., Noor N. M., Das S. K., 2017 Growth performance of tinfoil barb (*Barbonymus schwanenfeldii*) fry feeding with different protein content diets. *AACL Bioflux* 10(3):475-479.
- Mardani, 2014 [The effect of different food sources on the growth of rice crab fish (*Osteochilus melanopleurus*) maintained in Hapa in Ponds]. *Jurnal Ilmu Hewani Tropika* Vol 3. No. 1. [In Indonesian].
- McGoogan B. B., Gatlin D. M., 1999 Dietary manipulations affecting growth and nitrogenous waste production of red drum, *Sciaenops ocellatus*: I. Effects of dietary protein and energy levels. *Aquaculture* 178:333–348.
- Merola N., Cantelmo O. A., 1987 Growth, feed conversion and mortality of cage reared Tambaqui *Colossoma macropomum*, fed various dietary feeding regimes and protein levels. *Aquaculture* 66:223-233.
- Mohanta K. N., Mohanty S. N., Jena J. K., Sahu N. P., 2008 Protein requirement of silver barb, *Puntius gonionotus* fingerlings. *Aquaculture Nutrition* 14:143-152.
- Mokoginta I., Suprayudi M. A., Setiawati M., 1995 [Nutritional Requirements of Gurame (*Osphronemus gouramy* Lac)]. *Jurnal Penelitian Perikanan Indonesia* 4:82-94. [In Indonesian].
- Pereira L., Requelme T., Hosokawa H., 2007 Effect of three photoperiod regimes on the growth and mortality of Javanese abalone *Helios discus* (Hanoino). *Journal of Shellfish Research* 26:763-767.
- Satpathy B. B., Mukherjee D., Ray A. K., 2003 Effect of dietary protein and lipid levels on growth, feed conversion and body composition in Rohu, *Labeo rohita* (Hamilton), Fingerlings. *Aquaculture Nutrition* 9:17–24.
- Shimeno S. D., Kheyyali, Shikata T., 1995 Metabolic response to dietary lipid to protein ratios in common carp. *Fisheries Science* 61(6):977-980.
- Takeuchi T., 1988 Laboratory work chemical evaluation of dietary nutrients. In: Fish nutrition and mariculture. Watanabe T. (ed), pp. 179-225, Department of Aquatic Bioscience, Tokyo University of Fisheries, JICA.
- Tebbut T. H. Y., 1992 Principles of water quality control. Fourth edition, Pergamon Press, Oxford, 251 p.
- Zhang H., Mu Z., Xu L. M., Xu G., Liu M., Shan A., 2009 Dietary lipid level induced antioxidant response in Manchurian trout, *Brachymystax lenok* (Pallas) Larvae. *Lipids* 44(7):643-654.
- \*\*\* NRC (National Research Council), 1993 Nutrient requirements of fish. Washington, 112 p.
- \*\*\* NRC (National Research Council), 2011 Nutrient requirements of fish and shrimp. Animal Nutrition Series, National Research Council of the National Academies, The National Academies Press, Washington, D.C., USA, 376 p.

Received: 11 November 2018. Accepted: 22 February 2019. Published online: 28 February 2019.

Authors:

Adi Susanto, Mulawarman University, Faculty of Fisheries and Marine Science, Department of Aquaculture, Indonesia, East Kalimantan, Samarinda 75123, Gunung Kelua Campus, Jl. Gunung Tabur, e-mail: adisusanto73@gmail.com

Johannes Hutabarat, Diponegoro University, Faculty of Fisheries and Marine Science, Department of Aquaculture, Indonesia, Semarang 50275, Tembalang Campus, Jl. Prof. Sudarto SH, e-mail: johannesfpik@gmail.com

Sutrisno Anggoro, Diponegoro University, Faculty of Fisheries and Marine Science, Department of Marine Science, Indonesia, Semarang 50275, Tembalang Campus, Jl. Prof. Sudarto SH, e-mail: sutrisnoanggoro52@gmail.com

Subandiyono, Diponegoro University, Faculty of Fisheries and Marine Science, Department of Aquaculture, Indonesia, Semarang 50275, Tembalang Campus, Jl. Prof. Sudarto SH, e-mail: s\_subandiyono@yahoo.com, subandiyono@live.undip.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.

How to cite this article:

Susanto A., Hutabarat J., Anggoro S., Subandiyono, 2019 The effects of dietary protein level on the growth, protein efficiency ratio and body composition of juvenile kelabau (*Osteochilus melanopleurus*). AACL Bioflux 12(1):320-326.