

SUSTAINABLE AQUACULTURE PRACTICES FOR FOOD PRODUCTION

Dr. Arvind Nair

Assistant Professor

Department of Fisheries Science and Aquaculture

School of Agricultural and Marine Sciences

Coastal Institute of Science and Technology

Kochi, Kerala, India

Abstract

Aquaculture has become an increasingly important source of fish, shellfish, and aquatic plants for human diets, rural employment, and local food markets. Its contribution to food production, however, depends on production systems that protect water resources, maintain animal health, use feed responsibly, and remain economically feasible for farmers. Sustainable aquaculture is therefore not limited to increasing harvest volume. It concerns the way aquatic food is produced, the resources consumed, the wastes released, the risks managed, and the benefits shared across producers, workers, consumers, and surrounding communities. Production methods must respond to ecological limits while helping farms supply safe, nutritious, and affordable food on a reliable basis.

This study examines sustainable aquaculture practices that strengthen food production without creating avoidable environmental, social, or economic costs. It considers pond, cage, raceway, recirculating, integrated, and coastal farming systems, with attention to site selection, stocking density, water-quality management, responsible feed use, seed quality, disease prevention, energy efficiency, effluent control, harvest handling, and market access. The discussion also addresses the importance of farmer training, traceability, biosecurity, welfare, community participation, and compliance with food-safety and environmental requirements.

The paper uses a descriptive, analytical, and comparative approach based on academic literature, technical guidance, fisheries reports, and documented aquaculture practices. It evaluates how practical management choices influence productivity, ecological resilience, farm profitability, and the quality of food reaching consumers. The analysis indicates that sustainability is strongest when farmers match production intensity to local carrying capacity, monitor water and animal health regularly, diversify risk, reduce feed and nutrient losses, and maintain transparent relationships with input suppliers, buyers, regulators, and nearby communities.

The study concludes that sustainable aquaculture can support food security when it is developed as a carefully managed food system rather than as a short-term extraction activity. Long-term progress requires locally appropriate technologies, credible extension services, affordable finance, reliable seed and feed supply, disease surveillance, market infrastructure, and governance that rewards responsible production. By integrating ecological care with farm management and food-quality assurance, aquaculture can contribute to stable livelihoods and resilient supplies of aquatic foods.

Keywords: Sustainable aquaculture; Food production; Aquatic foods; Water quality; Responsible feeds; Fish health; Biosecurity; Resource efficiency; Food security; Blue economy

1. INTRODUCTION

Aquatic foods occupy an important place in diets because they provide high-quality protein, essential fatty acids, vitamins, minerals, and other nutrients. For many households, fish and shellfish are also culturally familiar and comparatively accessible sources of animal-source food. Wild capture fisheries remain vital, but growing demand, pressure on natural stocks, changing consumer preferences, and the need for dependable supply have increased the

importance of farmed aquatic products. Aquaculture can reduce seasonal gaps in availability and create income opportunities in inland, coastal, and peri-urban areas when it is planned and managed responsibly.

The expansion of aquaculture also brings difficult questions. A farm that produces more fish in the short term may still create long-term problems if it depends on poorly managed water exchange, excessive stocking, unreliable seed, inefficient feed conversion, routine antibiotic use, or unsuitable land and coastal

sites. Nutrient discharge, disease outbreaks, habitat conversion, escaped farmed fish, conflict over water access, and weak food-safety practices can damage local ecosystems and undermine public confidence. These concerns do not make aquaculture undesirable; rather, they show why production decisions must be evaluated through their cumulative effects on ecosystems, people, and food systems.

Sustainable aquaculture brings together environmental integrity, farm viability, social responsibility, and food quality. It asks whether a production system can maintain output over time without degrading the water, soil, biodiversity, or community relationships on which it depends. It also asks whether farmers can earn a reasonable return, whether workers are treated fairly, whether consumers receive safe food, and whether benefits are available to small-scale producers as well as larger enterprises. The concept is practical because many sustainability measures, such as accurate feeding, regular water testing, preventive health care, and good harvest handling, also reduce avoidable losses.

Food production must remain the central purpose of sustainable aquaculture. This means that farms should be assessed not only by the amount harvested but also by feed efficiency, survival rate, nutrient value, affordability, post-harvest loss, and reliability of supply. A system that produces a lower volume of fish but uses fewer scarce resources, maintains better fish health, and achieves stronger market acceptance may contribute more effectively to food security than a high-output system with repeated disease losses and environmental damage. Attention to quality, resilience, and equity is therefore essential.

This paper examines the practices that can help aquaculture contribute responsibly to food production. It discusses the evidence on resource use, production systems, seed and feed management, health protection, water quality, market organization, and governance. The objective is to identify management approaches that are technically credible, economically realistic, and adaptable to diverse farming contexts.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Research on aquaculture has moved beyond a narrow focus on production growth to consider

how farming interacts with ecosystems, food systems, and rural development. Earlier studies often emphasized species performance, pond fertilization, feed conversion, and hatchery output. More recent work gives greater attention to life-cycle impacts, ecosystem services, climate resilience, animal health, labour conditions, and market accountability. This broadening of perspective is important because aquaculture is highly diverse: a small freshwater pond, a coastal shrimp farm, a cage culture operation, and a recirculating system have different risks, technologies, and opportunities.

The literature commonly identifies water, feed, seed, energy, land, labour, capital, and technical knowledge as major determinants of sustainable performance. Water quality is especially important because dissolved oxygen, temperature, pH, ammonia, suspended solids, and microbial conditions directly affect feeding, stress, growth, disease resistance, and survival. The ability to observe and respond to these indicators is often more important than the purchase of expensive equipment. Good management begins with appropriate site selection and production design, followed by routine monitoring and clear response protocols.

Feed is another central topic because it can be the largest operating cost on many farms and a significant source of nutrient discharge. Studies on responsible aquafeeds emphasize the importance of digestibility, species-appropriate formulation, efficient feeding methods, and responsible sourcing of fishmeal, fish oil, crops, processing by-products, and emerging ingredients. Poor feeding schedules and overfeeding increase costs while allowing unused nutrients to enter water bodies. In contrast, feed planning that is matched to biomass, temperature, size class, and observed appetite can improve growth and reduce waste. The literature also identifies health management as a sustainability issue rather than a purely veterinary concern. Disease outbreaks can reduce production, increase financial pressure, and lead to emergency use of medicines that may not be effective or well controlled. Preventive approaches are therefore widely encouraged. These include quality seed, quarantine procedures, sanitation, vaccination where suitable, water

management, stress reduction, stocking control, rapid diagnosis, record keeping, and coordinated reporting. Health protection is strongest when farms do not treat disease as an isolated event but as a result of interactions among animals, water, feed, infrastructure, and management practices.

2.1 ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY, RESOURCE EFFICIENCY, AND CARRYING CAPACITY

Environmental sustainability depends on matching the farm to the ecological capacity of the site. A suitable site has water of an appropriate quality and quantity, a safe distance from sources of pollution, access to services, and a setting in which production will not obstruct other legitimate uses of land, waterways, wetlands, or coastal habitats. Site assessment should consider seasonal changes, flood risk, salinity variation, drainage, exposure to storms, and the presence of sensitive ecosystems. Decisions made before stocking often determine whether a farm can manage risks later.

Carrying capacity refers to the level of production that a water body or farm system can support without unacceptable decline in environmental quality or animal welfare. In ponds, cages, and coastal systems, this requires attention to nutrient loading, oxygen demand, sediment accumulation, water exchange, and the combined effects of nearby farms. Stocking density must therefore be treated as a management decision, not simply a production target. A density that is profitable under ideal conditions may become unsafe when temperature rises, water exchange slows, or feed quality changes.

Resource-efficient systems reduce losses at every stage. Simple measures can include preventing leaks, maintaining pumps and aerators, using feed trays or observation, collecting mortalities promptly, separating clean and contaminated water flows, composting suitable organic residues, and using settling areas where appropriate. Integrated systems may also make productive use of nutrients through combinations of fish, shellfish, seaweed, crops, or livestock, provided that food-safety and disease safeguards are maintained. The objective is not to impose one model on every farm but to

select resource pathways that fit local conditions.

2.2 FEED, SEED, AND HEALTH MANAGEMENT

Reliable seed is the foundation of productive aquaculture. Hatchery-produced fingerlings, post-larvae, spat, or juveniles should be obtained from sources that follow basic quality and health controls. Farmers need information about the species, strain, size, age, vaccination status where relevant, transport history, and expected performance of stock. Introducing poor-quality or infected seed can create losses that cannot be corrected through feeding alone. Acclimation, quarantine, and careful stocking procedures help reduce stress during the most vulnerable period of the production cycle.

Responsible feed management connects nutritional science with daily observation. Feed should be stored in dry, clean, pest-protected conditions and used within its intended shelf life. Rations should be adjusted as biomass changes, while feeding should be reduced during low oxygen, disease signs, unusual weather, or weak appetite. A farm should track the quantity and cost of feed used, estimate feed conversion, and compare actual results with expected growth. Such records help farmers identify waste, evaluate suppliers, and make decisions based on evidence rather than assumption.

Health management is most effective when it prevents problems before they become outbreaks. Farms should maintain clean equipment, restrict unnecessary visitor movement, disinfect vehicles and nets where required, dispose of mortalities safely, and avoid transferring water or animals from affected units to healthy units. Farmers should seek qualified advice when mortality increases or unusual behaviour appears. Medicines should be used only under appropriate guidance, with proper records and withdrawal periods. This protects consumers, reduces antimicrobial resistance risks, and supports the credibility of aquaculture products in local and export markets.

3. OBJECT OF STUDY

The primary object of this study is to examine how sustainable aquaculture practices can strengthen food production while protecting the ecological and social conditions necessary for long-term farming. The study understands

food production as a broader process that includes planning, input management, cultivation, health protection, harvesting, processing, distribution, and consumer confidence. It does not assume that a single technology or species is appropriate everywhere. Instead, it considers how farmers can combine practical management with local knowledge, scientific guidance, and responsible governance.

The study specifically investigates the relationship between production intensity and sustainability. This includes the choice of farm system, species, stocking density, water source, feed, seed, labour arrangement, energy use, waste pathway, and market destination. Each choice affects both farm performance and the wider food system. A production method can be considered sustainable only when its biological, environmental, financial, and social requirements are understood and realistically managed.

A further objective is to identify practices that reduce preventable losses. Disease, poor survival, feed waste, water deterioration, storm damage, spoilage, and weak market planning can make a farm unprofitable and reduce the availability of food. The analysis considers measures that address these risks through better design, routine observation, record keeping, training, collaboration, and timely technical support. These measures are relevant to small and medium producers as well as commercial enterprises, although the form of implementation may differ.

The study also examines the role of institutions. Farmers need access to extension services, diagnostic laboratories, quality seed and feed suppliers, credit, insurance, cold chains, processing facilities, buyer information, and fair regulation. Sustainable production cannot rely solely on individual farmer effort when disease, water quality, climate events, and market prices are shaped by wider systems. The research therefore considers the partnerships and support structures that help responsible practices become routine rather than exceptional.

3.1 PRODUCTION SYSTEMS AND ECOLOGICAL CONTEXT

- Assessment of freshwater, brackish-water, marine, pond, cage, raceway, integrated,

and recirculating systems in relation to local ecological conditions.

- Evaluation of site suitability, water availability, drainage, flood exposure, salinity variation, habitat sensitivity, and competing uses of land or water.
- Identification of species combinations that are compatible with local climate, market demand, farmer capacity, and disease-risk conditions.
- Analysis of stocking density, aeration, water exchange, sediment management, and production scheduling in relation to carrying capacity.
- Consideration of climate-related risks such as heat stress, irregular rainfall, storms, salinity shifts, and seasonal disease pressure.

3.2 RESOURCE EFFICIENCY, WELFARE, AND FOOD-SAFETY OUTCOMES

- Assessment of feed sourcing, feed-storage practices, feeding schedules, feed conversion, and opportunities to reduce nutrient loss.
- Evaluation of seed quality, acclimation, quarantine, fish welfare, handling stress, and mortality management.
- Study of water-quality monitoring, preventive health measures, biosecurity controls, disease reporting, and responsible medicine use.
- Examination of harvest, icing, transport, processing, hygiene, traceability, and product-quality practices that protect consumers.
- Analysis of labour safety, community relations, access for small producers, and fair distribution of benefits across the value chain.

3.3 MANAGEMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION SCOPE

- Development of farm plans that connect species, stocking, feed, water, labour, equipment, finance, and market requirements before the production cycle begins.
- Use of routine records for stocking, feed use, water measurements, growth, mortality, treatments, harvest volume, and sales.
- Establishment of farm-level biosecurity, visitor controls, equipment sanitation,

emergency contacts, and outbreak-response procedures.

- Application of efficient aeration, water-use, waste-control, and energy-management practices that fit the scale of the farm.
- Creation of producer groups, cooperatives, or local networks that improve access to inputs, technical advice, insurance, cold storage, and buyers.
- Consideration of environmental permits, food-safety obligations, worker protection, animal welfare, and transparent communication with surrounding communities.

4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The present study adopts a descriptive, analytical, and comparative methodology to examine sustainable aquaculture practices for food production. The methodology is designed to connect farm-level decisions with wider outcomes related to environmental quality, productivity, food safety, livelihoods, and resilience. Secondary information is drawn from peer-reviewed research, fisheries and

aquaculture reports, technical manuals, policy documents, and documented examples of farming practice. The analysis does not seek to rank all aquaculture systems universally; rather, it considers the conditions under which different practices are likely to support responsible food production.

A structured framework is used to compare farming approaches according to site suitability, water and energy requirements, stocking and feed practices, seed quality, biosecurity, disease risk, waste management, harvest handling, market accessibility, financial feasibility, and governance. Special attention is given to trade-offs. For example, a highly intensive system may increase output per unit area but require stronger monitoring, energy reliability, skilled labour, and disease control. A lower-input system may reduce some risks but depend on larger areas, longer production cycles, or different market arrangements. Sustainable management requires that these trade-offs be identified openly.

4.1 RESEARCH DESIGN

Component	Description
Research Type	Descriptive, analytical, and comparative
Approach	Sustainable aquaculture and food-system analysis
Data Source	Journal articles, technical guidance, policy reports, and practice documents
Analysis Method	Comparative assessment of production practices, risks, and food-production outcomes
Focus Area	Resource efficiency, fish health, food safety, livelihoods, and environmental sustainability

4.2 STUDY DIMENSIONS AND PRACTICE SELECTION

- Site and system design, including water source, ecological carrying capacity, climate exposure, and farm infrastructure.
- Feed, seed, and stocking decisions that influence growth, survival, nutrient efficiency, and farm cost.
- Water-quality management, biosecurity, fish health, welfare, medicine controls, and disease-response capacity.
- Harvest, post-harvest handling, traceability, market access, product quality, and consumer protection.
- Financial feasibility, producer skills, extension support, community relations,

regulatory compliance, and resilience to shocks.

Each practice is assessed in relation to its capacity to improve reliable food production, reduce waste and avoidable risk, protect environmental quality, maintain safe working conditions, and support the economic viability of farms. The study recognizes that sustainability indicators must be interpreted in context. A good practice is one that can be implemented consistently, monitored properly, and adapted when conditions change.

5. DATA ANALYSIS

The analysis indicates that sustainable aquaculture begins with a realistic match between farming ambition and site capacity.

Productivity gains are more durable when they are based on water availability, seasonal conditions, infrastructure, species suitability, and farmer skill rather than on excessive stocking. In pond and cage systems, problems often emerge when biomass grows beyond the oxygen, waste assimilation, or management capacity of the unit. Regular observation of water colour, odour, feeding response, dissolved oxygen, temperature, and mortality enables earlier action than waiting for visible disease or major losses.

Feed management emerges as one of the most influential areas for improving both economic and environmental performance. Feed represents a substantial cost, and inefficient use directly increases nutrient loading. The evidence supports practices such as using quality feed, storing it correctly, feeding at species-appropriate times, observing consumption, adjusting rations to biomass, and documenting feed use. These actions are not merely technical details; they provide the information required to identify poor conversion, reduce expenditure, and improve planning for the next cycle. Where alternative ingredients are used, their nutritional adequacy, safety, availability, and price stability require careful evaluation.

Seed and health management are closely connected. Healthy, well-acclimated stock is more likely to survive transport, adapt to culture conditions, and use feed effectively. Farms that rely on unknown or poorly screened seed may experience repeated losses regardless of later management. Preventive health systems therefore require communication among hatcheries, farmers, veterinarians, laboratories, and regulators. Record keeping is particularly valuable because it allows patterns in mortality, water conditions, feed use, and treatment to be traced over time. Without records, farmers may repeat the same mistakes or depend on anecdotal explanations for complex problems. The analysis also shows that water-quality management is a food-production practice. When water deteriorates, animals experience stress, appetite falls, disease susceptibility rises, and harvest quality may be affected. Good practice includes monitoring key parameters at suitable intervals, maintaining aeration and pumping equipment, controlling

organic loading, managing sediments, and responding quickly to weather changes. In systems with water exchange, incoming water should be considered a possible disease and pollution pathway rather than an unlimited solution. In recirculating systems, filtration, biofiltration, solids removal, backup power, and operator skill are especially important.

Post-harvest practices influence whether farm output becomes usable food. Delays in harvesting, rough handling, insufficient icing, poor washing water, damaged packaging, or weak transport arrangements can reduce quality and price. Small producers may face particular barriers when they lack access to ice, insulated containers, storage, testing services, or reliable buyers. Producer associations, local collection centres, cold-chain partnerships, and transparent grading systems can help prevent spoilage and improve bargaining power. Food safety is therefore not an activity added after production; it begins with the conditions under which animals are raised and continues through the value chain.

Finally, the analysis highlights the importance of social and institutional support. Individual farms can improve internal management, but many risks are shared. Disease can spread across farms, water quality can be affected by neighbouring activities, and market prices can fall at harvest time. Coordinated extension, disease surveillance, cooperative marketing, access to credit and insurance, and fair regulation can reduce these vulnerabilities. Sustainable food production is more likely when responsible farmers are not disadvantaged by competitors who ignore environmental or safety standards.

6. DISCUSSION

The findings suggest that sustainability should be treated as an operating principle rather than as a label attached to a farm after it is built. A farm becomes more sustainable when its daily decisions - including feeding, water exchange, health observation, labour scheduling, and harvest planning - are guided by reliable information and long-term consequences. This perspective helps avoid the false choice between production and environmental care. In many situations, the same measures that protect water quality and animal health also reduce waste, improve survival, and stabilize income.

Technology can support sustainable aquaculture, but it is not automatically the answer. Sensors, automatic feeders, remote monitoring, improved aeration, diagnostic tools, traceability systems, and recirculating technologies can be useful where farmers have the required skills, maintenance capacity, energy reliability, and finance. However, technology that cannot be repaired locally or interpreted properly may create dependency and cost without solving the main production constraint. Low-cost tools such as feed records, water-measurement kits, screens, settling units, shade, improved storage, and simple biosecurity barriers can have substantial value when applied consistently.

The discussion also shows that food production must be evaluated through nutrition and accessibility as well as harvest weight. Species selection should consider local dietary preferences, nutritional contribution, affordability, processing potential, and suitability for small-scale distribution. Farming high-value products for distant markets can create income, yet it may not improve local food availability unless benefits circulate through wages, local purchases, and community access. Conversely, production of locally preferred fish can support household diets when market channels, storage, and prices are managed fairly. Policymakers should therefore distinguish between export earnings, farm revenue, and broader food-security outcomes.

Climate variability adds urgency to sustainable management. Rising temperatures, rainfall shifts, drought, floods, sea-level change, and stronger storms can alter water quality, pathogen dynamics, feed supply, and farm infrastructure. Adaptation measures include selecting resilient species and strains where appropriate, improving drainage and water storage, maintaining emergency aeration or power backup, planning for seasonal risk, protecting pond embankments, and using early-warning information. Diversification across species, production cycles, or markets can also reduce exposure to a single shock. Climate adaptation should be integrated into farm planning rather than treated as a separate activity.

Governance is essential because many sustainability challenges occur beyond the

boundary of an individual farm. Licensing and zoning can help reduce conflict and prevent farms from clustering beyond the carrying capacity of a water body. Health regulations can encourage safe movement of stock and responsible medicine use. Food-safety systems can improve consumer confidence, while extension and finance can make compliance feasible for small producers. Effective governance should combine clear standards with practical support, transparent enforcement, and channels through which farmers and communities can report concerns. The strongest path forward is a learning-based approach. Farmers, researchers, extension officers, processors, buyers, and local authorities should use production data and community feedback to improve practices over time. Demonstration farms, participatory trials, farmer field schools, and producer networks can translate technical guidance into locally workable methods. Sustainable aquaculture is not achieved through a fixed checklist; it develops through continual adjustment, evidence-based decision-making, and shared responsibility across the aquatic-food value chain.

7. CONCLUSION

This study concludes that sustainable aquaculture can make a meaningful contribution to food production when farming practices are designed around ecological limits, animal health, resource efficiency, food safety, and economic realism. Aquaculture has the potential to supply diverse aquatic foods, create livelihoods, and strengthen local markets, but these benefits are not automatic. They depend on responsible choices about sites, species, stocking, feed, seed, water, waste, labour, harvesting, and market organization.

The analysis demonstrates that practical farm management is central to sustainability. Regular monitoring of water and animal condition, careful feeding, quality seed, preventive biosecurity, appropriate stocking density, and accurate records can reduce preventable losses and protect the quality of harvested food. These measures become more effective when supported by infrastructure, veterinary and diagnostic services, extension, reliable input suppliers, and fair market access.

The study further concludes that sustainable food production requires attention to the value chain beyond the farm. Safe handling, cold storage, traceability, processing, transport, and transparent marketing determine whether harvested fish and shellfish reach consumers in good condition. Producer organizations and community partnerships can help small-scale farmers access these services and negotiate more equitable terms. Environmental safeguards and food-safety requirements should be framed as essential conditions for

long-term market participation rather than as barriers to production.

Future aquaculture strategies should encourage locally appropriate systems, strengthen farmer capabilities, improve disease and climate resilience, and reward farms that protect shared water resources. Sustainable practices must be measurable, affordable, and adaptable to different scales of operation. Through this integrated approach, aquaculture can support dependable, safe, and nutritious food supplies while maintaining the ecological foundations on which future production depends.

8. REFERENCES

1. Ahmed, N., Thompson, S., & Glaser, M. (2019). Global aquaculture productivity, environmental sustainability, and climate change adaptability. *Environmental Management*, 63(2), 159-172.
2. Béné, C., Barange, M., Subasinghe, R., Pinstrup-Andersen, P., Merino, G., Hemre, G.-I., & Williams, M. (2015). Feeding 9 billion by 2050 - Putting fish back on the menu. *Food Security*, 7, 261-274.
3. Beveridge, M. C. M., Thilsted, S. H., Phillips, M. J., Metian, M., Troell, M., & Hall, S. J. (2013). Meeting the food and nutrition needs of the poor: The role of fish and the opportunities and challenges emerging from the rise of aquaculture. *Journal of Fish Biology*, 83(4), 1067-1084.
4. Boyd, C. E., & Tucker, C. S. (1998). *Pond Aquaculture Water Quality Management*. Springer.
5. Boyd, C. E., McNevin, A. A., Davis, R. P., & others. (2020). Resource use and sustainability in aquaculture production systems. *Reviews in Aquaculture*, 12, 1-20.
6. Costa-Pierce, B. A. (2010). Sustainable ecological aquaculture systems: The need for a new social contract for aquaculture development. *Marine Technology Society Journal*, 44(3), 88-112.
7. Edwards, P. (2015). Aquaculture environment interactions: Past, present and likely future trends. *Aquaculture*, 447, 2-14.
8. FAO. (2020). *The State of World Fisheries and Aquaculture 2020: Sustainability in Action*. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.
9. FAO. (2022). *The State of World Fisheries and Aquaculture 2022: Towards Blue Transformation*. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.
10. FAO. (2024). *The State of World Fisheries and Aquaculture 2024: Blue Transformation in Action*. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.
11. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. (2021). *Aquaculture Development: Ecosystem Approach to Aquaculture*. FAO Technical Guidelines for Responsible Fisheries.
12. Froehlich, H. E., Gentry, R. R., & Halpern, B. S. (2018). Global change in marine aquaculture production potential under climate change. *Global Change Biology*, 24(6), 2594-2604.
13. Garlock, T., Asche, F., Anderson, J., Bjørndal, T., Kumar, G., Lorenzen, K., Ropicki, A., Smith, M. D., & Tveterås, R. (2020). A global blue revolution: Aquaculture growth across regions, species, and countries. *Reviews in Fisheries Science & Aquaculture*, 28(1), 107-116.
14. Hall, S. J., Delaporte, A., Phillips, M. J., Beveridge, M., & O'Keefe, M. (2011). *Blue Frontiers: Managing the Environmental Costs of Aquaculture*. The WorldFish Center.
15. Hasan, M. R., & New, M. B. (2013). *On-farm Feeding and Feed Management in Aquaculture*. FAO Fisheries and Aquaculture Technical Paper No. 583.
16. Henriksson, P. J. G., Belton, B., Jahan, K. M.-E., & Rico, A. (2018). Measuring the potential for sustainable intensification of aquaculture in Bangladesh using life cycle assessment. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 115(12), 2958-2963.
17. Jennings, S., Stentiford, G. D., Leocadio, A. M., Jeffs, A. G., Metcalfe, J. D., Katsiadaki, I., Auchterlonie, N. A., Mangi, S. C., Pinnegar, J. K., & Ellis, T. (2016). Aquatic food security: Insights into challenges and solutions from an analysis of interactions between fisheries,

- aquaculture, food safety, human health, fish and animal health, nutrition, ecology, and the environment. *Fish and Fisheries*, 17(4), 893-938.
18. Little, D. C., Newton, R. W., & Beveridge, M. C. M. (2016). Aquaculture: A rapidly growing and significant source of sustainable food? Status, transitions and potential. *Proceedings of the Nutrition Society*, 75(3), 274-286.
 19. Naylor, R. L., Goldburg, R. J., Primavera, J. H., Kautsky, N., Beveridge, M. C. M., Clay, J., Folke, C., Lubchenco, J., Mooney, H., & Troell, M. (2000). Effect of aquaculture on world fish supplies. *Nature*, 405, 1017-1024.
 20. Naylor, R. L., Hardy, R. W., Buschmann, A. H., Bush, S. R., Cao, L., Klinger, D. H., Little, D. C., Lubchenco, J., Shumway, S. E., & Troell, M. (2021). A 20-year retrospective review of global aquaculture. *Nature*, 591, 551-563.
 21. Oyinlola, M. A., Reygondeau, G., Wabnitz, C. C. C., & Cheung, W. W. L. (2018). Global estimation of areas with suitable environmental conditions for mariculture. *PLoS ONE*, 13(1), e0191086.
 22. Phillips, M. J., Henriksson, P. J. G., Tran, N., Chan, C. Y., Mohan, C. V., Rodriguez, U.-P., Suri, S., Hall, S., & Koeshendrajana, S. (2016). Exploring Indonesian Aquaculture Futures. *WorldFish*.
 23. Rico, A., & Van den Brink, P. J. (2014). Probabilistic risk assessment of veterinary medicines applied to four major aquaculture species produced in Asia. *Science of the Total Environment*, 468-469, 630-641.
 24. Subasinghe, R., Soto, D., & Jia, J. (2009). Global aquaculture and its role in sustainable development. *Reviews in Aquaculture*, 1(1), 2-9.
 25. Tacon, A. G. J., & Metian, M. (2008). Global overview on the use of fish meal and fish oil in industrially compounded aquafeeds: Trends and future prospects. *Aquaculture*, 285(1-4), 146-158.
 26. Tacon, A. G. J., Hasan, M. R., & Metian, M. (2011). Demand and supply of feed ingredients for farmed fish and crustaceans: Trends and prospects. *FAO Fisheries and Aquaculture Technical Paper No. 564*.
 27. Troell, M., Naylor, R. L., Metian, M., Beveridge, M., Tyedmers, P. H., Folke, C., Arrow, K. J., Barrett, S., Crépin, A.-S., Ehrlich, P. R., Gren, Å., Kautsky, N., Levin, S. A., Nyborg, K., Österblom, H., Polasky, S., Scheffer, M., Walker, B. H., Xepapadeas, T., & de Zeeuw, A. (2014). Does aquaculture add resilience to the global food system? *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 111(37), 13257-13263.
 28. United Nations. (2015). *Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*. United Nations.
 29. World Bank. (2013). *Fish to 2030: Prospects for Fisheries and Aquaculture*. World Bank Report No. 83177-GLB.
 30. Zhang, X., Li, L., & others. (2021). Sustainable intensification in aquaculture: Balancing productivity, environmental performance, and social outcomes. *Aquaculture*, 533, 736188.