

RESEARCH PAPER

OPEN ACCESS

Morphological, meristic characteristics and mtDNA analysis of *Hampala* Fish (*Hampala macrolepidota* Kuhl & Van Hasselt 1823) from ranau lake, Indonesia

Safran Makmur^{1,2*}, Diana Arfiati³, Gatut Bintoro³ and Arning Wilujeng Ekawati³

¹Research Institute for Inland Fisheries, Palembang, Indonesia

^aDoctoral Program of Fisheries Marine Science, University of Brawijaya, Malang, Indonesia ^sFaculty of Fisheries and Marine Science, University of Brawijaya, Jl. Veteran Malang, Indonesia

Article published on August 24, 2014

Key words: Hampala macrolepidota, Meristic, Morphometric, mtDNA, Ranau Lake.

Abstract

Hampala (Hampala macrolepidota) in Ranau Lake is locally known by three size-based names: small size as *Kemencut*, medium as *Arongan* and large as *Sebarau*. To know whether these local names are the same or different species, morphometric measurements, meristic counts and mtDNA analysis were carried out. Five individuals of each size, 157-172 mm total length for *Kemencut*, 264-295 mm for *Arongan* and 374-445 mm for *Sebarau* were taken. Morphometric measurements showed significant correlation (p > 0.01). The strongest correlation between body part and percent of total length was predorsal length (PL) with r = 0.980. Meristic character counts fit to the identification of Weber and Beaufort (1916). Number of scales along the lateral line and total number of pectoral fin were 27-28 and 15-16, respectively. Nucleotide base composition of *H. macrolepidota* did not show any variation in nucleotide situs. Intraspecific *COI* (Cytochrome Oxidase Subunit I) gene nucleotide-based phylogram of *Hampala* created a genetic relationship supported by boostrap value of 100%. No haplotypic variation was formed. All *Hampala* samples were included in *H. macrolepidota* (Kuhl & Van Hasselt 1823).

*Corresponding Author: Safran Makmur 🖂 frans_makmur@yahoo.com

Introduction

Ranau Lake located in South Ogan Komering Ulu (South OKU) Regency, South Sumatera Province and

West Lampung Regency, Lampung Province. It possesses water surface of $\pm 12,590$ km² and maximum depth of ± 229 m. It is located on 540 m above sea level with water volume $\pm 21,950 \times 10^6 \text{ m}^3$ (Sulastri *et al.*, 1999). In Ranau Lake waters, *Hampala* (*Hampala* macrolepidota, Kuhl & Van Hasselt 1823) is recognized with three different local names, *Kemencut* (small size), *Arongan* (medium) and *Sebarau* (large). This name difference is based on the fish size and the fishing gear used. *Kemencut* is caught using *kebang* (gill net) of 1 inch, 1¹/₂ inch and maximum 1³/₄ inch mesh size. *Arongan* is caught using 2¹/₂ inch-gill-nets, while *Sebarau* is caught using lance or speargun.

The presence of three different local names of hampala in Ranau Lake often results in mistakes in species identification or species determination since the identificationhas been mere done by comparing the photographs from various literatures. A comprehensive identification is firstly carried out by looking at the morphological characteristics and mtDNA for determining whether the three local names of hampala belong to the same species.

Main characteristic of adult Hampala is having linelike black spots between dorsal fins and ventral fins which then become vague in larger fish, but the color patterns of the adults and the juveniles are distinct in different rivers (Kottelat et al., 1993). Genus Hampala of Family Cyprinidae is widely distributed almost all regions of Southeast Asia, such as Thailand, Malaysia, Vietnam, Philippine and Indonesia. It has five species, H. macrolepidota including H. m. Sabana as sub-species, H. ampalong, H. bimaculata, H. lopezi and H. dispar. Disimilarity of these five species is shown in the external morphological characteristics, especially in color patterns. The last new species of Hampala that successfully identified by Japanese scientist was Hampala salweenensis found in Mae Surin River, Mae Pae Valley Salween Tribury, Thailand (Doi and Taki, 1994). Hampala (H. macrolepidota) distribution in Indonesia includes river, lake, swamp and reservoir in Sumatera, Kalimantan and Java. Other species, *H. ampalong* are only recorded in Sumatera and Kalimantan, and even *H. bimaculata* is only found in Kalimantan.

Species identification can be done by looking at morphometric and meristic characteristics or DNA analysis. Morphometric characteristic is the character illustrating the body shape, while meristic character counted number, series or structure. Both morphometric and meristic characters are mostly used to identify variety of fish species (Turan et al., 2006). Morphometric and meristic studies are strong tools to measure the discreteness of the same species (Gharaei, 2012). Moreover, mtDNA (Mitochondrial DNA) analysis uses the DNA found in the mitochondria. The output of mtDNA analysis in this study will be registered new barcode or registered in the GenBank. Therefore, these identification methods were used to identify three groups of Hampala (Kemencut, Arongan and Sebarau) in Ranau Lake, Indonesia. This study determined whether the three groups of Hampala are distinct species or not.

Materials and method

Sample used in this study was *Hampala* caught by fishermen in 2013 in Banding Agung waters, Ranau Lake, Indonesia (Fig. 1). Fishing gears used were 1¹/₂ inch and 1³/₄ inch mesh-sized gill net for *Kemencut*, 2¹/₂ inch mesh-sized gill net for *Arongan* and lance or spear for *Sebarau*. Fifteen fish samples were grouped based on total length into three groups, each consists of five individuals with the following length ranges: 157–172 mm for *Kemencut* (A), 264–295 mm for *Arongan* (B), and 374–445 mm for *Sebarau* (C). The samples were preserved in 10% formaldehyde, dorsal fins were tagged and separated with size group (for morphological observations). The mtDNA analysis used the caudal fin stored in 95% ethanol-containing labelled vial tube and kept in room temperature. J. Bio. & Env. Sci. 2014



Fig. 1. Sampling site of Hampala in Ranau Lake.

Morphometric and meristic observations were carried out in Fisheries Biology Laboratory, Freshwater Fisheries Research Office (BP3U), Palembang. The genetic diversity of *Hampala macrolepidota* was analyzed based on *COI* (Cytochrome Oxidase Subunit I) gene in Ecology Molecular Laboratory, BP3U Palembang and First Base DNA Sequencing Service, Singapura (<u>http://www.base-asia.com</u>).

Morphometric and Meristic Characteristics

Morphometric measurements of the specimen were done using a digital caliper with 0.1 mm accuracy, while meristic characteristics were conducted by manual counts assisted with an enlargement glass, with parts measured and counted shown in Fig. 2, 3 and Table 1. The morphometric and meristic measurements of *Hampala* were done for 32 morphological characters, on left side of the fish body (Cailet *et al.*, 1986). The morphological characters were compared with percent total length and the eye diameter was compared with the head length. Some major morphometric characters analysed for regression and correlation significance (Zafar *et al.*, 2002; Turan *et al.*, 2006; Hossain *et al.*, 2009; Krishan and Tarana, 2010; Hazarika *et al.*, 2011 and Abbaspour *et al.*, 2013). Various morphological characters (morpometric and meristic) were also campared with those of identification book of Weber and Beaufort (1916) and Kottelat *et al.* (1993).



Fig. 2. Morphometric character (A) of Hampala.



Fig. 3. Meristic character of Hampala.

Table 1. Information on Fig. 2 and 3, Morphologicaland meristic characters.

1.Total Length (mm)TL2.Standard Length (mm)SL3.Body Depth (mm)BD4.Caudal Peduncle Depth (mm)CPD5.Caudal Peduncle Length (mm)CPL6.Pre-dorsal Length (mm)PL7.Length of Dorsal Base (mm)LDB8.Length of Anal Base (mm)HDF10.Height of Dorsal Fin (mm)HDF11.Length of Pectoral FinsLPF12.Length of Pelvic Fins (mm)LDDS14.Head Length (mm)HL15.Head Width (mm)HW16.Snout Length (mm)SWL17.Suborbital Width (mm)SWL18.Orbit to Preopercle Angle (mm)DPA19.Eye Diameter (mm)UJL20.Upper Jaw Length (mm)GW	
2.Standard Length (mm)SL3.Body Depth (mm)BD4.Caudal Peduncle Depth (mm)CPD5.Caudal Peduncle Length (mm)CPL6.Pre-dorsal Length (mm)PL7.Length of Dorsal Base (mm)LDB8.Length of Anal Base (mm)LAB9.Height of Dorsal Fin (mm)HDF10.Height of Pectoral FinsLPF11.Length of Pectoral Fins (mm)LDS13.Length of Longest Dorsal Spine (mm)LLDS14.Head Length (mm)HL15.Head Width (mm)HW16.Snout Length (mm)SW17.Suborbital Width (mm)SW18.Orbit to Preopercle Angle (mm)OPA19.Eye Diameter (mm)ED20.Upper Jaw Length (mm)UJL21.Gape Width (mm)GW	_
3.Body Depth (mm)BD4.Caudal Peduncle Depth (mm)CPD5.Caudal Peduncle Length (mm)CPL6.Pre-dorsal Length (mm)PL7.Length of Dorsal Base (mm)LDB8.Length of Anal Base (mm)LAB9.Height of Dorsal Fin (mm)HDF10.Height of Petvic Fins (mm)LPF12.Length of Pelvic Fins (mm)LDVF13.Length of Longest Dorsal Spine (mm)LLDS14.Head Length (mm)HL15.Head Width (mm)SNL17.Suborbital Width (mm)SW18.Orbit to Preopercle Angle (mm)OPA19.Eye Diameter (mm)UJL20.Upper Jaw Length (mm)UJL21.Gape Width (mm)GW	
4.Caudal Peduncle Depth (mm)CPD5.Caudal Peduncle Length (mm)CPL6.Pre-dorsal Length (mm)PL7.Length of Dorsal Base (mm)LDB8.Length of Anal Base (mm)LAB9.Height of Dorsal Fin (mm)HDF10.Height of Anal Fin (mm)HAF11.Length of Pedvic Fins (mm)LPF12.Length of Pelvic Fins (mm)LLPF13.Length of Longest Dorsal Spine (mm)HLL14.Head Length (mm)HL15.Head Width (mm)SNL17.Suborbital Width (mm)SW18.Orbit to Preopercle Angle (mm)OPA19.Eye Diameter (mm)ED20.Upper Jaw Length (mm)UJL21.Gape Width (mm)GW	
5.Caudal Peduncle Length (mm)CPL6.Pre-dorsal Length (mm)PL7.Length of Dorsal Base (mm)LDB8.Length of Anal Base (mm)LAB9.Height of Dorsal Fin (mm)HDF10.Height of Anal Fin (mm)HAF11.Length of Pectoral FinsLPF12.Length of Pelvic Fins (mm)LLDS13.Length of Longest Dorsal Spine (mm)HL15.Head Length (mm)HU16.Snout Length (mm)SNL17.Suborbital Width (mm)SW18.Orbit to Preopercle Angle (mm)CPA19.Eye Diameter (mm)ED20.Upper Jaw Length (mm)UJL21.Gape Width (mm)GW	
6.Pre-dorsal Length (mm)PL7.Length of Dorsal Base (mm)LDB8.Length of Anal Base (mm)LAB9.Height of Dorsal Fin (mm)HDF10.Height of Anal Fin (mm)HAF11.Length of Pectoral FinsLPF12.Length of Pelvic Fins (mm)LLDS13.Length of Longest Dorsal Spine (mm)HL15.Head Length (mm)HL15.Head Width (mm)SNL17.Suborbital Width (mm)SW18.Orbit to Preopercle Angle (mm)OPA19.Eye Diameter (mm)ED20.Upper Jaw Length (mm)GW	
7.Length of Dorsal Base (mm)LDB8.Length of Anal Base (mm)LAB9.Height of Dorsal Fin (mm)HDF10.Height of Anal Fin (mm)HAF11.Length of Pectoral FinsLPF12.Length of Pelvic Fins (mm)LPVF13.Length of Longest Dorsal Spine (mm)HL14.Head Length (mm)HL15.Head Width (mm)SNL17.Suborbital Width (mm)SW18.Orbit to Preopercle Angle (mm)OPA19.Eye Diameter (mm)ED20.Upper Jaw Length (mm)GW	
8.Length of Anal Base (mm)LAB9.Height of Dorsal Fin (mm)HDF10.Height of Anal Fin (mm)HAF11.Length of Pectoral FinsLPF12.Length of Pelvic Fins (mm)LPVF13.Length of Longest Dorsal Spine (mm)LLDS14.Head Length (mm)HL15.Head Width (mm)HW16.Snout Length (mm)SNL17.Suborbital Width (mm)SW18.Orbit to Preopercle Angle (mm)OPA19.Eye Diameter (mm)ED20.Upper Jaw Length (mm)UJL21.Gape Width (mm)GW	
9.Height of Dorsal Fin (mm)HDF10.Height of Anal Fin (mm)HAF11.Length of Pectoral FinsLPF12.Length of Pelvic Fins (mm)LPVF13.Length of Longest Dorsal Spine (mm)LLDS14.Head Length (mm)HL15.Head Width (mm)HW16.Snout Length (mm)SNL17.Suborbital Width (mm)SW18.Orbit to Preopercle Angle (mm)OPA19.Eye Diameter (mm)ED20.Upper Jaw Length (mm)UJL21.Gape Width (mm)GW	
10.Height of Anal Fin (mm)HAF11.Length of Pectoral FinsLPF12.Length of Pelvic Fins (mm)LPVF13.Length of Longest Dorsal Spine (mm)LLDS14.Head Length (mm)HL15.Head Width (mm)HW16.Snout Length (mm)SNL17.Suborbital Width (mm)SW18.Orbit to Preopercle Angle (mm)OPA19.Eye Diameter (mm)ED20.Upper Jaw Length (mm)GW	
11.Length of Pectoral FinsLPF12.Length of Pelvic Fins (mm)LPVF13.Length of Longest Dorsal Spine (mm)LLDS14.Head Length (mm)HL15.Head Width (mm)HW16.Snout Length (mm)SNL17.Suborbital Width (mm)SW18.Orbit to Preopercle Angle (mm)OPA19.Eye Diameter (mm)ED20.Upper Jaw Length (mm)UJL21.Gape Width (mm)GW	
12.Length of Pelvic Fins (mm)LPVF13.Length of Longest Dorsal Spine (mm)LLDS14.Head Length (mm)HL15.Head Width (mm)HW16.Snout Length (mm)SNL17.Suborbital Width (mm)SW18.Orbit to Preopercle Angle (mm)OPA19.Eye Diameter (mm)ED20.Upper Jaw Length (mm)UJL21.Gape Width (mm)GW	
13.Length of Longest Dorsal Spine (mm)LLDS14.Head Length (mm)HL15.Head Width (mm)HW16.Snout Length (mm)SNL17.Suborbital Width (mm)SW18.Orbit to Preopercle Angle (mm)OPA19.Eye Diameter (mm)ED20.Upper Jaw Length (mm)UJL21.Gape Width (mm)GW	
14.Head Length (mm)HL15.Head Width (mm)HW16.Snout Length (mm)SNL17.Suborbital Width (mm)SW18.Orbit to Preopercle Angle (mm)OPA19.Eye Diameter (mm)ED20.Upper Jaw Length (mm)UJL21.Gape Width (mm)GW	•
15.Head Width (mm)HW16.Snout Length (mm)SNL17.Suborbital Width (mm)SW18.Orbit to Preopercle Angle (mm)OPA19.Eye Diameter (mm)ED20.Upper Jaw Length (mm)UJL21.Gape Width (mm)GW	
16.Snout Length (mm)SNL17.Suborbital Width (mm)SW18.Orbit to Preopercle Angle (mm)OPA19.Eye Diameter (mm)ED20.Upper Jaw Length (mm)UJL21.Gape Width (mm)GW	
17.Suborbital Width (mm)SW18.Orbit to Preopercle Angle (mm)OPA19.Eye Diameter (mm)ED20.Upper Jaw Length (mm)UJL21.Gape Width (mm)GW	
18.Orbit to Preopercle Angle (mm)OPA19.Eye Diameter (mm)ED20.Upper Jaw Length (mm)UJL21.Gape Width (mm)GW	
19.Eye Diameter (mm)ED20.Upper Jaw Length (mm)UJL21.Gape Width (mm)GW	
20.Upper Jaw Length (mm)UJL21.Gape Width (mm)GW	
21. Gape Width (mm) GW	
22. Adifose Fins Length (mm) LAF	
23. Dorsal Fin Spines DFS	
24. Dorsal Soft Ray DSR	
25. Anal Spines AS	
26. Anal Soft Rays ASR	
27. Total Pectoral Rays TPR	
28. Scales Along LL SALL	,
29. Scales Above LL SABL	4
30. Scales Below LL SBLL	
31. Scales Before Dorsal Fin SBDF	7
32. Scales Around Caudal Peduncle SACE	1

Source: Callet *et al.*, (1986).

mtDNA

DNA analysis includes isolation, extraction and purification steps. DNA extraction used Genomic DNA mini kit for blood (Geneaid) modified (Muladno, 2006). The amplification of mtDNA *COI* fragments used a universal primer. PCR reaction used *ABI* Applied Biosystem machine. The PCR product was tested using PAGE 6% in buffer 1x TBE (10 Mm Tris-HCL, 1 M boric acid, and EDTA 0.1 Mm) run at 200 Mv condition for 50 min. The DNA was then stained with silver sensitive coloration (Tegelstrom, 1986).

Genetic diversity data analysis was carried out through homologous side observation of the nucleotide base trace or amino acid trace of COI gene. The mtDNA of Hampala obtained was then parallelled (multiple alignment) compared with that COI gene from the partial GenBank. The chromatogram sequence was shown and manually edited using BIOEDIT (Applied Biosystems, Foster City, CA, USA). The initial multiple allignment used MAFFT online version (http://mafft.cbrc.jp/alignment/server/) (Katoh et al., 2002). The multiple allignment was redone using MUSCLE (Dereeper et al., 2008) (http://phylogeny.lirmm.fr/ phylo cgi/alacarte.cgi), the alligment curation used GBLOCK (Castresana et al., 2000) and the phylogenetic construction used PhyML maximum likelihood (Guindon et al., 2010; Anisimova et al., 2006).

Results

Morphometric Characteristics

Morphometric character related with TL (total length) showed indifferent percentage for each fish group (Table 2). Measurements of several body parts related with total length of *Hampala* indicated that the highest correlation with total length was PL (predorsal length) with correlation coefficient (r) of 0.980, followed by HL (head length) (r=0.975) and then head width (r=0.959). Linear relationship between total length and several morphometric characters is given in Fig. 2. All correlation coefficients (r) approached to 1 reflecting strong correlation with p >0.01, in which all morphometric characters directly rose their proportion between one to another.

Measurement	A (n=5)			B(n=5)			C(n=5)		
(mm)	MinMax	mean±SD	TL(%)/mear	ımin max	mean±SD	TL(%)/mear	ı Min m	ax mean±SD	TL(%)/mean
Total Length (TL)	157 172	165.60±5.41		264 295	275.80±12.71		374 44	5 412±31.11	
Fork Length (FL)	143 148	145.40±2.30	87.80% TL	222 255	234.40±12.30	084.98% TL	322 40	1 361±35.47	87,62% TL
Standard Length (SL)	124 132	127.80±2.86	77.17% TL	199 229	210.80±11.09	76.46% TL	290 37	7 332.6±39.50	80.72% TL
Body Depth (BD)	36.240.2	37.92±1.97	22.89% TL	62.369.2	66.06±2.97	23.95% TL	81 115	5.293.12±14.75	22.60% TL
Caudal Peduncle Depth (CPD)	15.7 17.8	16.52±0.86	9.97% TL	25.530.6	28.00±1.89	10.15% TL	35.4 44	.1 38.52±3.66	9.35% TL
Caudal Peduncle Length (CPL)	20.121.7	20.82±0.70	12.57% TL	33.640.6	36.14±2.88	13.10% TL	45.9 69	.6 55.44±10.62	13.45% TL
Predorsal Length (PL)	65.867.6	66.88±0.67	40.39% TL	97.1 118.6	106.74±10.32	2 38.70% TL	147.319	6.1169±19.65	41.02% TL
Length of Dorsal Base (LDB)	16.7 19.4	18.38±1.11	11.09% TL	29.635.6	32.02±2.40	11.61% TL	39.1 49	.8 43.68±4.14	10.60% TL
Length of Anal Base (LAB)	10.7 11.8	11.40±0.45	6.88% TL	17.3 20.6	18.56±1.27	6.73% TL	22.6 29	.1 25.58±2.54	6.20% TL
Fin (HDF)	22.426.2	24.50±1.38	14.79% TL	41.248.9	43.06±4.66	15.61% TL	49.5 59	.2 56.12±4.17	13.62% TL
Fin (HAF)	15.8 19.9	18.28±1.52	11.04% TL	29.335.1	33.00±2.46	11.96% TL	41 52	.6 47.40±5.07	11.50% TL
Pectoral Fins (LPF)	22.926.2	24.66±1.19	14.89% TL	35.645.9	42.22±4.42	15.31% TL	53.3 57	.9 54.80±1.80	13.30% TL
Length of Pelvic Fins (LPVF)	20.423.1	21.56±1.10	13.02% TL	33.441.8	37.64±3.45	13.65% TL	42.2 50	.9 47.06±3.14	11.42% TL
Longest Dorsal Spine (LLDS)	25.831.1	29.40±2.14	17.75% TL	38.752.6	45.46±6.34	16.48% TL	47.5 55	.8 51.32±2.96	12.45% TL
Head Length (HL)	32.940.8	37.26±3.66	22,50% TL	55.966.9	60.70±4.44	22.01% TL	87.4 119) 102.46±12.37	724.86% TL
Head Width (HW)	16.4 19.2	17.24±1.11	10.41% TL	23.929.9	28.48±2.57	10.32% TL	43.6 56	.7 49.78±6.52	12.08% TL
Snout Length (SL)	11.2 12.8	11.98±0.70	7.23% TL	15.6 20.5	17.70±1.77	6.41% TL	27.5 40	.9 32.62±5.24	7.91% TL
Width (SW)	5.1 6.6	5.66±0.59	3.41% TL	9.3 12.2	10.70±1.19	3.88% TL	19.6 28	.8 22.96±4.55	5.57% TL
Preopercle Angle (OPA)	10.912.8	12.06±0.69	7.28% TL	17.7 20.3	19.18±1.13	6.95% TL	30.6 48	.9 36.90±7.50	8.95% TL
Eye Diameter (ED)	8.3 9.8	9.18±0.54	5.54% TL	12.3 14.4	13.26±0.86	4.81% TL	14.1 16	.8 15.84±1.11	3.84% TL
Upper Jaw Length (UJL)	12.9 15.4	14.44±1.15	8.71% TL	19.3 23.4	21.94±1.75	7.95% TL	35.7 46	.1 38.80±4.17	9.41% TL
Gape Width (GW)	9.011.9	10.22±1.08	6.17% TL	15.8 19.8	17.12±1.66	6.21% TL	31.2 37	.9 33.62±2.77	8.16% TL

Table 2. Morphometric measurements of *H. macrolepidota: Kemencut* (A), *Arongan* (B) and *Sebarau* (C) from Ranau Lake of South Sumatera and Lampung.

Min= minimum; Max= maximum; SD= Standard Deviation; TL (%)= Percent total length

Table 3. Meristic counts of Hampala	: Kemencut (A), Arongan	(B) and <i>Sebarau</i> (C)	from Ranau Lak	e, South
Sumatera, Lampung.				

Meristic data		Counts	
	A(n=5)	B(n=5)	C(n=5)
Dorsal Fin Spines (DFS)	IV	IV	IV
Dorsal Soft Ray (DSR)	8	8	8
Anal Spines (AS)	III	III	III
Anal Soft Rays (ASR)	5	5	5
Total Pectoral Rays (TPR)	15-16	15-16	15-16
Scales Along LL (SALL)	28	27-28	27-28
Scales Above LL (SABL)	$5^{1/2}$	51/2	51/2
Scales Below LL (SBLL)	31/2	31/2	31/2
Scales Before Dorsal Fin (SBDF)	10	10	10
Scales Around Caudal Peduncle (SACP)	12	12	12

Meristic Characteristic

Calculation of several meristic characters of *Hampala* (*Kemencut*, *Arongan* and *Sebarau*) (Table 3), i.e. DFS (number of hard spines of dorsal fin), DSR (weak spines of dorsal fin), AS (hard spines of anal fin), ASR (weak spines of anal fin), TPR (total number of pectoral rays), SABL (number of scales on the lateral line), SBLL (number of scales on lower part of lateral line), SBDF (number of scales before dorsal fin), and SACP (number of scales around the tail rod) showed similar number range among three fish groups. The only difference was found on number of scales

(meristic character) along the SALL (lateral line), 27-28 and 15-16 scales, respectively.

mtDNA

Total DNA was isolated from muscle footage of all samples. The output of total DNA isolation was used fingerprints for *COI* gene amplification of mtDNA with PCR technique. *COI* gene amplification resulted in 679-702 pb-sized *COI* gene at the position of 5535-6249 pb based on the *GenBank* category. The DNA profile from amplification is give in Fig. 4.



Fig. 4. DNA profile of *H. macrolepidota* as amplification output using pair of COI F and COI R primers.

From 228 amino acids of 686 nucleotide translation output on partial *COI* gene of *Hampala macrolepidota*, total 223 situs of amino acid was enternal. The analysis of nucleotide base composition for *H. macrolepidota* did not identify the presence of varied nucleotide situs. For the four nucleotide bases, Adenine was evenly the most recorded (29.3%), while the least found was Guanine (17%). Mean composition of Adenine+Thymine in *H. macrolepidota* was totally more (56.1%) than average Guanine+Cytosine (43,9%).

From 686 *COI* gene nukleotides of *H. macrolepidota* compared with those of the *GenBank* data, some nucleotide base could be taken as genetic markers to distinguish Indonesian *H. macrolepidota* from *Hampala* kinship outside Indonesia. *H. macrolepidota* from Indonesia specifically possessed *Cytosine* genetic marker on the nucleotide base position of 276, 519, 558 (5814, 6036, 6074), Adenine of 282, 357, 402, 531, 660 (5820, 5877, 5922, 6047,

6176), Guanine of 290, 312, 381 (5820, 5832, 5901), and Thymine of 327, 393, 577 (5847, 5913, 6093).

From 228 amino acids translated from 686 nucleotides on partial *COI* gene of *H. macrolepidota* compared with *GenBank* data, several amino acids could be taken as genetic markers to distinguish Indonesian *H. macrolepidota* from *Hampala* outside Indonesia. *H. macrolepidota* from Indonesia specifically possesses isoleucine genetic marker on the 94th amino acid position (1941).

The kinship relationship reconstruction of nucleotide base trace of *H. macrolepidota* and its kinship is shown in Fig. 5. The *COI* gene nucleotide-based phylogram exhibited that the intraspecific *Hampala* sketchly created a kinship supported by bootsrap value of 100%. Based upon genetic analysis of mtDNA from the kinship relationship, there was no haplotypic variation formed, single haplotype for sample collection. This group possesses the closest

in this study is clearly H. macrolepidota.

kinship with *H. macrolepidota* supported with bootsrap value of 100%. It means that *Hampala* used



0.02

Fig. 5. Phylogram PhyML maximum likelihood (branch length indicates number of substitution per situs) based on COI gene nucleotide 669 pb of *Hampala* and comparative relative from the *Genbank*.

Discussion

Based on the morphological characteristics (morphometric and meristic) and total DNA isolation, *GenBank* analysis and kinship phylogram, *Hampala* (*Kemencut*, *Arongan* and *Sebarau*) from Ranau Lake waters is *H. macrolepidota* (Kuhl & Van Hasselt 1823). *H. macrolepidota* from Ranau Lake possesses genetic distance of 100% or does not have difference.

Based on phylogenetic tree, sample fish (H. macrolepidota) from Ranau Lake and H. macrolepidota from the GenBank registered by Yang et al. (2010) possesses genetic distance (similarity) from 97.4%-100%, meaning that both species belong to single same species, and the presence of genetic distance (not 100%) could result from that the fish does not come from the same location or different geographic position. Two different species (one Genus), H. macrolepidota from Ranau Lake and Hampala dispar from the GenBank, possess 92% simlarity or reach 8% difference. Even to see further genetic distance, it could be seen from the relationship between H. macrolepidota and Chitala lopis (GenBank) having only about 30% similarity.

There are many different local names of *H*. macrolepidota so that it is confusing the actual species name. People-known different local names of Hampala species result from different size groups and fishing gears used and are to easily give information and transaction. To know the species name of the local different names, detail identification was done through morphological characteristics and even mtDNA analysis. Species identification is traditionally done through morphological character observations. According to Straruss and Bond (1990), fish morphology has historically become major information for taxonomic study. The detail and accurate identification could be done through barcoding mtDNA genetic analysis (Meyer and Paulay, 2005; Turan et al., 2006; Alo et al., 2013).

Morphologically, the three fish groups do not show any difference, such as morphometric character measurements in relation to total length (TL). There are only slight differences in number of scale counts along the lateral line (SALL) with a range of 27-28 scales. Based on Weber and Beaufort (1916), number of scales along the lateral line of *H.macrolepidota* was 28-29 scales. Whereas according to Ryan and Esa (2006), *Hampala* in Malaysia waters (peninsular), number of scales along the lateral line ranged from 26-29 scales.

Acknowledgement

1. DR. Arif Wibowo, Researcher from Research Institute for Inland Fisheries, Palembang, South Sumatera, Indonesia

2. Research Team of Ranau Lake, Research Institute for Inland Fisheries, Palembang, South Sumatera, Indonesia, 2012.

References

Abbaspour R, Rahbar M, Karimi JM. 2013. Comparative survey of morphometric-meristic male and female anjak fish (*Schizocypris brucei*, Annandale and Hora, 1920) of Hamoun Wetland in South East Iran. Middle-East Journal of Science Research 14, 620–623. <u>http://dx.doi.org/</u> 10.5829/idosi.mejsr.2013.14.5.73148.

Alo D, Correa C, Arias C, Cordenas L. 2013. Diversity of Aplichiton fishes (Galaxiidae) and taxonomic resurrection of *A. marinus*. Plos One Italy **8** (e71577), 1–11.

Anisimova M, Gascuel O. 2006. Approximate likelihood ratio test for branchs: a fast, accurate and powerful alternative. Systematic Biology **55**, 539–552.

Cailet GM, Love MS, Ebeling AW. 1986. Fishes: a field and laboratory manual on their structure identification and natural history. California: Wadsworth Publishing Company Belmont.

Castresana J. 2000. Selection of conserved blocks from multiple alignments for their use in phylogenetic analysis. Molecular Biology and Evolution **17**, 540–52.

Dereeper A, Guignon V, Blanc G, Audic S, Buffet S, Chevenet F, Dufayard JF, Guindon S, Lefort V, Lescot M, Claverie JM, Gascuel O. 2008. Phylogeny.fr: robust phylogenetic analysis for the non-specialist. Nucleic Acids Research 1, 465–469. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkn180</u>.

Doi A, Taki Y. 1994. A new Cyprinid fish, *Hampala salweenensis*, from the Mae Pae River System, Salween Basin, Thailand. Japanese Journal of Ichthyology **40**, 405–412.

Gharaei A. 2012. Morphometric and meristic studies of snow trout *Schizothorax zarudnyi* (Nikolskii, 1897) as a threatened endemic fish. World Journal of Fish and Marine Sciences **4**, 426–429. http://dx.doi.org/10.5829/idosi.wjfms.2012.04.04. 63123.

Guindon S, Dufayard JF, Lefort V, Anisimova M, Hordijk W, Gascuel O. 2010. New algorithms and methods to estimate Maximum-Likelihood Phylogenies: assessing the performance of PhyML 3.0. Systematic Biology **59**, 307–21. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/sysbio/syq010.

Hazarika A, Borah U, Bordoloi L. 2011. Studies on morphometric measurements and meristic counts of Hill Trout (*Barilius bendelisis*, Hamilton) from the River Buroi at the boundary areas of Assam and Arunachal Pradesh, India. Indian Journal of Fundamental and Applied Life Science **1**, 194–198.

Hossain MdY, Ohtomi J, Ahmed ZF. 2009. Morphometric, meristic characteristics and conservation of the threatened fish, *Puntius sarana* (Hamilton, 1822) (Cyprinidae) In the Gangges River, Northwestern Bangladesh. Turkish Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Science **9**, 223–225. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.4194/trjfas.2009.0215</u>.

Katoh K, Mizawa K, Kuma K, Miyata T. 2002. Mafft: a novel method for rapid multiple sequence alignment basedon fast furier transform. Nucleic Acid Research **30**, 3059–3066.

Kottelat M, Whitten AJ, Kartikasari SN, Wiroatmodjo S. 1993. Freshwater fishes of Western

Indonesia and Sulawesi. Indonesia: Periplus Editions Ltd.

Krishan NR, Tarana N. 2010. Analysis of morphometric characters of *Schizothorax richardsonii* (Gray, 1832) from the Uttarkashi District of Uttarkhand State, India. Biological Sciences **10**, 536–540.

http://dx.doi.org/10.3923/jbs.2010.536.540.

Meyer CP, Paulay G. 2005. DNA bar coding: Error rates based on comprehensive sampling. PLOS Biology **3**, 2229–2238. http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio. 0030122.

Muladno. 2006. Molecular technological application in animal productivity development effort. In: Molecular diagnostic technical training for livestock and fisheries production development in eastern Indonesia. Bogor: Collaboration of Life Science Study Centre, Research Institution and Community Enpowerment IPB, and Directorate General of Higher Education, Dept. National Education.

Ryan JRJ, Esa YB. 2006. Phylogenetic analysis of *Hampala* fishes (Subfamily Cyprininae) in Malaysia inferred from partial mitochondrial cytochrome b DNA squences. Zoological Sciences **23**, 893–901. http://dx.doi.org/10.2108/zsj.23.893.

Sulastri, Badjoeri M, Sudarso Y, Syawal MS. 1999. Physico-chemical and biological condition of Ranau Lake waters, South Sumatera. Research and Development Centre of Limnology, Indonesia Science Institute. Limnotek **VI**, 25–38. **Tegelstrom H**. 1986. Mitochondrial DNA in natural populations: an improved routine for the screening of genetic variation based on sensitive silver staining. Electrophoresis **7**, 226–229.

http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/elps.1150070508.

Turan C, Oral M, Öztürk B, Düzgüneş E. 2006. Morphometric and meristic variation between socks of Bluefish (*Pomatomus saltatrix*) in the black, Marmara, Aegean and Northeastern Mediterranean Seas. Fisheries Research **79**, 139–147.

Weber M, DeBeaufort LF. 1916. The fishes of Indo-Australian Archipelago III. Ostariophysi: II Cyprinoidea, Apodes, Synbranchi. Leiden: E.J. Brill Ltd., 455.

Yang L, Mayden RL, Sado T, He S, Saitoh K, Miya M. 2010. Molecular phylogeny of the fishes traditionally referred to *Cyprinini sensu scripta* (Teleostei: Cypriniformes). Zoologica Scripta. The Norwegian Academy of Science and Letters **39**, 527– 550. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1463-</u> 6409.2010.00443.x.

Zafar M, Nazir A, Akhtar N, Naqvi SMHM, Rehman M.Z. 2002. Studies on meristic and morphometric of Mehseer (*Tor putitora*) from a spawning ground of Himalayan foot-hill river Korang Islamabad, Pakistan. Pakistan Journal of Biological Sciences **5**, 733–735.