Int. j. adv. multidisc. res. stud. 2023; 3(3):1146-1157

Received: 11-05-2023
Accepted: 21-06-2023

International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Research and Studies

ISSN: 2583-049X

Role of Quality Control Systems in Enhancing Aquaculture Product Safety and Market Competitiveness

[1] Olasumbo Olagoke-Komolafe, [2] Joshua Oyeboade
[1] Sweet Sensation Confectionery Limited, Lagos, Nigeria
[2] Western Illinois University (WIU), Macomb, Illinois, USA

DOI: https://doi.org/10.62225/2583049X.2023.3.3.4851
Corresponding Author: **Olasumbo Olagoke-Komolafe**

Abstract
The aquaculture industry has emerged as one of the fastest-growing food production sectors globally, driven by increasing consumer demand for high-quality protein sources and the need to meet both local and export market requirements. However, concerns over product safety, environmental sustainability, and market competitiveness have placed quality control systems at the forefront of industry discourse. This study examines the role of quality control mechanisms in enhancing aquaculture product safety and strengthening market access. Adopting a qualitative and quantitative research design, data were gathered through structured interviews, industry surveys, and a review of relevant regulatory documents, while statistical and thematic analyses were employed to ensure validity and reliability. The findings reveal that aquaculture enterprises implementing robust quality control frameworks experience a marked reduction in contamination risks, higher compliance with national and international standards, and improved consumer confidence. Furthermore, a strong correlation was observed between certification status and expanded market opportunities, particularly in premium export segments. Nevertheless, challenges persist, including high certification costs, inadequate technical expertise, and gaps in policy enforcement, which collectively hinder the sector's potential. The study concludes that quality control systems should be considered not merely as regulatory obligations but as strategic investments that safeguard public health and confer competitive advantages in the global marketplace. It is recommended that policymakers strengthen enforcement mechanisms, provide targeted financial support, and promote industry capacity-building initiatives, while stakeholders adopt integrated certification and monitoring systems to ensure sustained growth and global market relevance.

Keywords: Aquaculture, Quality Control Systems, Product Safety, Certification, Market Competitiveness, Regulatory Compliance

1. Background of Study

1.1 Growth and Globalization of Aquaculture Industry

The expansion of aquaculture over recent decades has been nothing short of extraordinary, transforming into one of the world's fastest growing food production sectors. According to the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), marked a historic turning point in which aquaculture production of aquatic animals—94.4 million tonnes—surpassed capture fisheries for the first time, accounting for 51 percent of global aquatic animal production and contributing markedly to the overall figure of 130.9 million tonnes of aquaculture-derived aquatic food (FAO, 2022) [8]. This paradigm shift underscores aquaculture's rising prominence in meeting growing global demand for protein and nutrition (FAO, 2022) [8].

Such growth is both quantitative and geographic. Aquaculture has become deeply integrated into global food systems, especially across Asia, where production dominates in both volume and value. Asia's share in aquaculture output exceeds 70 percent, with top producers including China, Indonesia, India, Vietnam, Bangladesh, the Philippines, the Republic of Korea, Egypt, and Chile—together accounting for nearly 90 percent of global output (FAO, 2022) [8]. The concentration of production in a handful of nations reflects both favourable environmental conditions and intensifying opportunities tied to globalization of markets and trade (FAO, 2022) [8].

Historical context further illustrates how aquaculture has surged. Naylor *et al.* (2000) [18] coined the term Blue Revolution to capture the rapid escalation of aquaculture that owed much too increasing global demand and favourable trade economics.

They observed that production of high-value carnivorous species—such as salmon, shrimp, and catfish—accelerated under intensive farming regimes and the advent of trade networks that enabled wider distribution (Naylor *et al.,* 2000) [18].

1.2 Rising Demand for Safe Aquaculture Products

A pivotal driver of this trend lies in consumers' broader environmental, social, and ethical concerns, which increasingly influence their purchasing decisions. Peiró-Signes *et al.* (2022) [21] demonstrate how modern consumers are not passively accepting aquaculture outputs—they actively seek greater transparency regarding how seafood is produced. Their study reveals a pronounced shift: consumers expect clear labelling and communication about environmental impact, social responsibility, and the ethical dimensions of aquaculture operations, including farm management practices and animal welfare. This heightened scrutiny naturally extends to consumer health, incorporating apprehension around antibiotic residues, contaminants, and the integrity of the food supply chain.

This gap between awareness and safe consumption is further underscored in context-specific studies. Leng *et al.* (2020) [16] investigates consumer perceptions in Penang, Malaysia, and finds that while many respondents acknowledge the potential health and environmental liabilities associated with aquaculture products—such as pollution or chemical contamination—they still purchase these products, often due to affordability relative to wild-caught alternatives. Significantly, only a small proportion of consumers fully reject aquaculture products; rather, their decision-making reflects a discomfort with limited choices, paired with recognition that informed purchasing could drive improvements.

This transformation carries direct implications for supply chain actors and policymakers: it suggests that investments in food safety systems, certification programmes, and transparent communication strategies are not merely regulatory boxes to tick, but economically strategic imperatives. Firms that proactively address antimicrobial use, implement rigorous monitoring for heavy metals and chemical residues, and certify their products using recognised standards may gain competitive advantage and rebuild consumer trust. As Leng *et al.* (2020) [16] highlights, consumer understanding mobilises pressure that can catalyse meaningful improvements in production practices.

Moreover, the emphasis on health concerns—from resistance to contaminants—reinforces the importance of interdisciplinary approaches, blending food safety, public policy, and risk management. Peiró-Signes *et al.* (2022) [21] show that transparency in these efforts amplifies consumer assurance, thereby reinforcing a virtuous cycle wherein consumer demand for safety drives industry-wide commitments, which in turn further satisfy consumer expectations.

1.2.1 Consumer Health Concerns and Foodborne Risks

Consumers' apprehensions about health and safety in aquaculture are deeply rooted in long-standing concerns over chemical contaminants, antibiotic residues, and foodborne pathogens—issues that persist due to the intensive nature of aquaculture and gaps in regulatory enforcement. The infiltration of antibiotic substances into the food chain, the prevalence of bacterial pathogens, and the potential for disease outbreaks all compound to challenge consumer confidence and necessitate stringent quality control systems in the aquaculture industry.

A foremost concern relates to antibiotic residues in cultured fish. Ljubojević Pelić *et al.* (2023) [17] identify that these residues are widespread, particularly in regions with less stringent oversight, and are associated with adverse effects including antimicrobial resistance, carcinogenicity, immunological hypersensitivity, and disruption of intestinal flora (Ljubojević Pelić*et al.,* 2023) [17]. Their analysis underscores that antibiotic residues are not mere chemical contaminants but markers of systemic risk—both to human health and to the integrity of aquaculture as a food system. The authors emphasise that effective regulatory frameworks and comprehensive residue monitoring are not optional but foundational for protecting consumer health.

Complementing this, the Okocha *et al.* (2018) [19] comprehensive synthesis offers a sobering portrait of the public health implications tied to antimicrobial use in aquaculture. It documents outcomes such as antimicrobial drug resistance, mutagenicity, teratogenicity, and bone marrow suppression—all linked to indiscriminate antibiotic use. Crucially, this review highlights that many low- and middle-income countries face challenges in enforcing prudent veterinary drug use, thereby amplifying residue-related hazards. The findings point to a pressing need for global harmonization in drug use guidelines and enhanced capacities for surveillance and enforcement across production landscapes.

Corroborating the significance of microbial threats, Scallan *et al*. (2011) [29] estimate that major foodborne pathogens—including Norovirus, Salmonella, and Vibrio species—cause millions of illnesses annually in the United States alone. While their study focuses on the U.S. context, its implications resonate globally: seafood, including aquaculture-derived products, remains a known vehicle for a diverse array of pathogens. The scale of this public health burden reinforces the argument that consumer health concerns in aquaculture are not anecdotal, but systematic and widespread.

Across these dimensions—chemical residues and microbial contamination—consumer health concerns converge around a common theme: the potential for direct exposure to harmful agents through seafood consumption. Unlike other food categories, aquaculture products face dual threats from both added chemical inputs (e.g., antibiotics) and environmental or handling-borne pathogens. This duality elevates the stakes: operations must manage chemical usage, ensure residue testing, and uphold sanitary practices throughout production and logistics.

Importantly, these risks are not uniformly distributed. Regulatory disparities, unequal enforcement mechanisms, and variable uptake of good aquaculture practices (GAPs) render some products significantly riskier than others. Regions lacking robust inspection regimes may permit antibiotic use that generates hazardous residues; similarly, processing systems without adequate hygiene or cold chain management may allow pathogen survival or proliferation. Consumers' concerns are thus rooted not in abstract possibilities but in demonstrated vulnerabilities across geographies and value chain segments.

This intricate risk landscape underscores the critical role of quality control systems in aquaculture. Effective systems must integrate residue monitoring, antibiotic stewardship, pathogen surveillance, and comprehensive hygiene controls.

Standards such as HACCP (Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Points), coupled with third-party audits, traceability frameworks, and transparent disclosure of production practices, can bridge the trust gap. Embedding such measures enables firms to proactively address consumer health concerns and align with emerging market expectations related to safety and accountability.

Consumer health concerns intersect with larger dynamics in global trade and regulation. Export-oriented firms face higher scrutiny and often deploy more rigorous quality systems than those serving local markets. Yet consumer awareness in domestic contexts is rising fast; demand for safer, certified seafood is becoming a lever for improving public health outcomes even in lower-regulated environments. This study's findings around certification impact and compliance will thus be particularly relevant: they will show whether firms are adapting internal systems sufficiently to address evolving consumer health concerns and what barriers remain.

1.2.2 Market Pressures and Regulatory Expectations

The globalization of aquaculture trade has amplified pressure to harmonize regulatory frameworks and adopt preventive safety systems. As FAO (2022) [8] details, approximately 40 percent of aquaculture products enter international trade channels. This scale of cross-border commerce necessitates aligned quality management approaches, prompting a shift from traditional end-point inspection toward preventive mechanisms such as Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Points (HACCP) systems (FAO, 2022) [8]. Market operators, particularly those targeting export markets, are compelled to comply with such standards—non-compliance carries the risk of product rejection, financial losses, or reputational damage.

At the same time, intensification of production, especially in species like salmon, has increased reliance on antimicrobials, triggering regulatory scrutiny. Fernández-Polanco and Llorente (2019) [11] illustrate how the widespread use of antimicrobials, combined with infections such as Piscirickettsia salmonis, creates a dangerous synergy impacting both fish welfare and human health via antibiotic residues and resistance. Regulatory bodies are responding with stricter residue limits, mandatory withdrawal periods, and enforcement through measures including import alerts. These requirements elevate operational costs and enforce robust compliance mechanisms, but they also incentivize producers to adopt alternative disease management strategies, such as vaccination or improved biosecurity.

Meanwhile, smaller-scale producers—especially in developing regions—face unique dilemmas. Tran (2018) [32] explores seafood supply chains in Vietnam, uncovering three categories of compliance risk: internal business challenges, regulatory ambiguities, and contextual market environment. For firms within fragmented markets, limited resources, inadequate infrastructure, and unfamiliarity with formal standards hamper their ability to meet regulatory demands. Irregular enforcement further exacerbates this challenge, leading to inconsistent application of quality systems. Market pressures—particularly from demanding buyers seeking certified or traceable products—become pivotal levers to drive compliance in such contexts. Retailers or exporters may offer premium prices, but only to producers who adhere to recognized standards, effectively nudging systemic improvements in quality control.

More broadly, the evolving regulatory landscape reflects a shift toward sustainable aquaculture as part of global environmental and food security goals. Schøning *et al.* (2023) [30] analyse how modern regulation in the sector is increasingly embedded within sustainability transitions, incorporating environmental protection, social responsibility, and economic resilience. They argue that regulatory expectations are expanding beyond food safety—now encompassing ecosystem impacts, equitable livelihoods, and alignment with Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Policymakers are integrating instruments such as environmental impact assessments, zoning regulations, and certification schemes to manage aquaculture growth responsibly. These broadened requirements reinforce that compliance is no longer solely about safeguarding public health—it also signals long-term licence to operate, both domestically and in export sectors.

The interplay of these influences—market dynamics and regulatory systems—creates a multi-layered environment for aquaculture firms. On one level, export-driven market pressures enforce HACCP, residue monitoring, and traceability as baseline expectations. Simultaneously, heightened antimicrobial regulation propels industry to reassess disease control paradigms. At the same time, smaller producers respond unevenly, constrained by resource gaps and fragmented business models, with market incentives sometimes the only viable route to quality system adoption. Overlaying all is the concept of sustainability, elevating the phrase "regulatory expectations" to encompass broader societal values.

This complex environment shapes how aquaculture firms structure and deploy quality control mechanisms. Companies in export chains often internalise HACCP systems, invest in monitoring technologies, and align with environmental certifications to access premium markets. Emerging markets may partially adapt, implementing compliance only when required by buyers, and often without systemic quality assurance frameworks—highlighting a potential gap in consistency and consumer protection. The integration of sustainability regulations further triggers the need for cross-functional systems addressing not just product safety, but environmental stewardship and social accountability.

For the current study, these dynamics are central when assessing quality control prevalence, effectiveness, and barriers. Findings that demonstrate stronger adoption of HACCP and certification in export-oriented firms align with expectations rooted in market pressure narratives. Conversely, lower compliance among producers focused on domestic markets may reflect regulatory weaknesses or resource constraints documented in Tran's (2018) [32] analysis. Additionally, exploration of how disease management practices evolve in response to antimicrobial regulation and sustainability-driven policy shifts will link closely to Fernández-Polanco and Llorente's (2019) [11] insights.

1.3 Health Risks Linked to Poor Aquaculture Practices

Poor aquaculture practices are intimately tied to a range of health risks that directly impact both consumers and ecosystems, stemming from chemical residues, environmental contamination, and the emergence and rapid spread of pathogens. These risks arise when management lapses coalesce with high-density production, insufficient monitoring, and weak regulatory control—creating

vulnerabilities across the farm-to-fork continuum.

Heavy metal contamination further exemplifies the complex interplay between poor practices and health risks. In a study of cultured shrimp and aquaculture sludge in Bangladesh, Sultana *et al.* (2022) [31] identified elevated concentrations of lead (Pb) and chromium (Cr) in shrimp samples, exceeding recommended limits. Although estimated daily intake and hazard indices suggested mainly the potential for non-carcinogenic effects, the presence of these heavy metals underscores the latent risks farmed seafood may pose for human health. These findings reflect broader trends in aquaculture areas where industrial or agricultural effluent accumulates in production zones, compounding risks through bioaccumulation and biomagnification.

A third dimension of risk involves the proliferation and transmission of viral pathogens in aquaculture systems. Intensive stocking densities, compromised biosecurity, and frequent transfers of live organisms contribute to the emergence of infectious agents. The review Emerging viral diseases of fish and shrimp highlights how high-density farming, global trade in live animals, and ecosystem stress have facilitated the rise and spread of novel pathogens. These diseases result in mass mortality, economic collapse for producers, and potential spillover risks to wild populations and interconnected food webs (Okocha *et al.,* 2018) [19].

The consumer implications are significant. Exposure to antibiotic-resistant bacteria and toxic residues may escalate public health burdens, while recurrent disease outbreaks can lead to seafood supply disruptions and intensify market volatility. Moreover, weak surveillance and inconsistent enforcement magnify risks—especially in domestic markets where regulatory barriers are lower. These realities reinforce the importance of robust quality control systems that encompass chemical testing, residue monitoring, pathogen diagnostics, and biosecurity protocols.

For studies assessing the prevalence and effectiveness of quality assurance in aquaculture, these health risks provide critical context. They underscore the essential role of certification, compliance with safety standards, and sustained investment in infrastructure. Moreover, the asymmetric distribution of risks—where small-scale producers experience higher vulnerability—highlights the need for targeted support mechanisms, capacity-building, and scaled enforcement models.

1.4 Importance of Quality Control in Food Chains

Quality control is the backbone of food chains, serving as an integrated mechanism that safeguards public health, ensures product integrity, and underpins market viability. In aquaculture, quality control ensures that the harvested products—often subject to complex and globalized value chains—meet rigorous safety, regulatory, and consumer expectations. Its significance is magnified due to the inherent vulnerabilities of seafood systems, where chemical residues, microbial contamination, traceability gaps, and regional disparities can undermine both safety and trust.

A core function of quality control lies in risk mitigation within the supply chain. In Vietnam's seafood industry, Tran (2018) [32] emphasises how risks arise from factors such as ambiguous regulations, limited infrastructure, and supply chain fragmentation—all of which weaken quality assurance and safety governance (Tran, 2018) [32]. Quality control systems, notably Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Points (HACCP), provide structured, preventive frameworks that proactively identify hazards at critical junctures—from farming through processing to distribution. Proper implementation of such systems ensures consistent quality outputs, reduces instances of non-compliance, and enhances supply chain resilience.

Beyond mere compliance, quality control fosters consumer confidence and trust. In aquaculture, where concerns about antibiotic residues, pathogens, and environmental contamination persist, systematic controls act as tangible proof of commitment to safety. As highlighted in the review published in Okocha *et al.* (2018) [19], unchecked antimicrobial use in aquaculture can lead to public health hazards, including resistant pathogens and toxic residues. A robust quality control framework—featuring residue testing, withdrawal period enforcement, and surveillance—serves not only to prevent these hazards but also to signal proactive stewardship to consumers and regulators alike.

The cumulative impact of quality control manifests in supply chain efficiency and sustainability. By preventing spoilage, minimizing recalls, and ensuring compliance, firms reduce waste, transaction costs, and risk exposures. These efficiencies are especially crucial in export-oriented sectors, where penalties for failure—or loss of access to high-value markets—can be severe. This highlights quality control's dual role: a protective measure for public health and a strategic instrument for economic competitiveness.

In aquaculture settings marked by disparities—where small-scale producers often lack infrastructure and formal quality systems—the absence of quality control amplifies vulnerabilities. The Vietnamese case study illustrates how enterprises serving domestic markets may default to informal practices, bypassing standardized controls due to resource constraints (Tran, 2018) [32]. Such gaps not only elevate health risks but also limit market access where certification is required. Scaling quality control practices via training, infrastructure, and accessible certification thus holds the potential for broad-based sectoral improvements and equitable market participation.

Embedding quality control in food chains also has broader ecosystem and health co-benefits. By minimizing antibiotic misuse and pathogen emergence (Okocha *et al.,* 2018) [19], aquaculture systems not only protect consumers but also help limit antimicrobial resistance—a global health priority. Controlled processing and handling independently reduce environmental contamination and biohazard risks. Through these mechanisms, quality control operates on multiple axes: food safety, environmental protection, and public health stewardship.

1.5 Regulatory Frameworks Governing Aquaculture Standards

One foundational pillar is the FAO's broader legal context for aquaculture, which encompasses both national legislation and alignment with international norms for trade and quality control. FAO (2022) [8] outlines how aquaculture legislation at both levels should incorporate benchmark standards such as traceability, hygiene protocols, and antimicrobial use controls, ultimately ensuring product safety and consumer protection. Such laws underscore the expectation that aquaculture producers actively integrate best practices into operational governance, not merely observe them retrospectively. By embedding quality control requirements into law, the stage is set for structured

oversight, inspections, and compliance-based accountability—essential ingredients for ensuring that aquaculture products meet evolving domestic and global expectations.

Complementing these legal foundations is the FAO's Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries (CCRF), dating from 1995. Although originally crafted to address capture fisheries, the CCRF extends relevant principles into the realm of aquaculture, particularly through its article on responsible aquaculture development. The CCRF promotes prudent planning, ecosystem integrity, public health, and sustainable resource use—all of which contribute indirectly—but meaningfully—to a standards-based approach for farmed seafood (FAO, 1995) [7]. Countries that voluntarily adopt the CCRF signal a policy orientation toward sustainable aquaculture, building a platform for integrating regulatory expectations with fisheries governance, environmental protection, and food safety.

Collectively, these frameworks—national law aligned with FAO standards, CCRF principles, and private certification—form a multi-layered regulatory web. At the base, statutory requirements ensure baseline safety and governance within jurisdictional boundaries. Layered above are voluntary, internationally accepted codes like the CCRF, fostering policy coherence across borders. The topmost tier, represented by certification bodies like ASC, introduces distinct benchmarking and enforcement mechanisms. Firms that succeed in navigating this regulatory architecture not only ensure compliance but also establish legitimacy in both domestic and export markets.

The regulatory interface also affects trade and market dynamics. Export-oriented producers must navigate various regulatory demands from importing countries—often rooted in Codex guidelines, CCRF principles, or product-specific standards enforced through certification. Therefore, aligning with ASC or complying with national law is not solely a matter of domestic compliance; it is a necessity for cross-border access. This reality essentially transforms private certification into a de facto regulatory requirement for exporters.

1.6 Market Requirements for Export and Local Consumption

The international trade of aquaculture products is structured by global value chains (GVCs), wherein much of the production occurs in developing countries while a majority of demand is concentrated in markets such as Europe, North America, and Japan. Ababouch *et al.* (2023) [1] present a comprehensive analysis of these dynamics, noting that small-scale producers often struggle to comply with rising product safety, social, and environmental standards. As a result, these operators face marginalization unless supported by institutional upgrading, finance, training, and coordination within the value chain. The implication is clear: market entry is increasingly contingent upon systemic quality control, with certification or credible verification mechanisms serving as entry gates.

Export-oriented requirements often converge around established frameworks such as HACCP, traceability protocols, residue limits, and hygienic handling. The FAO (2022) [8] review offers historical insights, noting that the introduction of mandatory HACCP requirements by the United States and European Union in the late 1990s marked a turning point in product safety regulation for aquaculture exports. Governments and industry actors responded by developing national HACCP plans—for example, for catfish and crustaceans in the United States—and by engaging voluntary certification schemes. This regulatory evolution underscores how adherence to safety systems is no longer optional for export markets; it is a baseline expectation that shapes institutional behaviors and internal control measures.

The confluence of these demands—regulatory systems like HACCP, traceability expectations, and surveillance tools—produces what is effectively a market-driven regulatory environment. Exporters must not only produce safe product, but also document and demonstrate control throughout the supply chain. Non-compliance risks not only rejection at the border but also reputational damage and exclusion from key markets.

In contrast, domestic market requirements may vary significantly, often reflecting weaker enforcement mechanisms. While local consumers increasingly expect safety and quality, many domestic markets lack the infrastructure or regulation to enforce major standards consistently. Producers oriented toward local markets may therefore rely on informal quality assurances, such as reputation or local oversight, rather than formal systems. Consequently, these products may face barriers if standards evolve or if trade shifts toward certification-sensitive channels.

Comparatively, export markets offer both challenge and opportunity: while they demand higher compliance and system maturity, they also often provide premium pricing or stable demand to compliant producers. Domestic markets, while more accessible in some contexts, may offer lower margins and reduced incentives for systemic quality control investment.

1.7 Challenges Facing Aquaculture Quality Management Systems

Effective quality management systems are critical for safety, sustainability, and market access in aquaculture. Yet, across diverse contexts, aquaculture operations face entrenched challenges—ranging from environmental constraints and resource limitations to regulatory fragmentation and supply chain inefficiencies—that complicate implementation and consistent adherence to standards.

A fundamental obstacle is water quality management. Aquaculture systems, ranging from earthen ponds to recirculating facilities, must contend with variables such as ammonia, nitrate, dissolved oxygen levels, organic loads, and pathogen build-up. Yusoff *et al.* (2023) [34] highlights that poor water quality undermines fish health, reduces productivity, and escalates disease risks, thereby demanding robust monitoring and treatment infrastructure. However, the authors document that many producers, particularly in resource-limited settings, encounter high capital and operational costs for wastewater treatment, lack incentives for waste mitigation, and face weak legislative enforcement regarding discharge control. These gaps impede the operationalization of preventive quality controls like real-time monitoring systems or automated feedback loops.

Beyond technical limitations, socioeconomic and organizational hurdles persist. According to the Resonance Global (2022) [24], small-scale farmers frequently struggle to justify investment in quality systems: there are high costs associated with certification, extensive record-keeping demands, and time-consuming audit processes, often with

no discernible premium in return. Moreover, local market structures rarely reward compliance unless buyers explicitly demand it. This mismatch between the burden of implementation and economic returns dissuades widespread adoption of formal systems like HACCP or ISO-based quality assurance.

Market access and value chain dynamics introduce another layer of complexity. Ababouch *et al.* (2023) [1] examine how smallholders in many regions remain marginalized from global markets because they cannot meet escalating safety, environmental, and social standards. Despite producing sizable volumes, these producers lack the institutional support, training, finance, or coordination to retrofit operations to meet value chain demands—creating a structural barrier to certification, traceability, and consistent quality control. Accordingly, even when plants have the will to upgrade, systemic mismatches in supply networks stall real improvements.

Moreover, regulatory fragmentation and weak enforcement exacerbate these challenges. In many developing contexts, rules governing water discharge, antibiotic usage, and processing hygiene exist on paper but lack coherent inspection systems or punitive mechanisms. Without credible pressure, compliance becomes discretionary and uneven. Combined with limited technical capacity and managerial know-how, this undermines the effectiveness of even well-designed quality systems.

1.8 Aim, Objectives, Scope and Limitation of the Study

The aim of this study is to explore the qualitative dimensions of quality control in aquaculture systems, with a focus on understanding stakeholder perceptions, practices, and institutional influences that shape the implementation of quality assurance measures in the industry.

1. To examine the perceptions and experiences of key stakeholders—including fish farmers, regulators, and distributors—regarding quality control practices in aquaculture.
2. To investigate the institutional and regulatory frameworks guiding quality control in aquaculture and their effectiveness at the grassroots level.
3. To identify the challenges and barriers that hinder effective quality control in aquaculture from a qualitative and practice-based perspective.
4. To provide evidence-based recommendations for enhancing quality assurance systems in aquaculture based on stakeholder input and thematic analysis.

This study focuses exclusively on the qualitative assessment of quality control practices in aquaculture, examining perceptions, institutional frameworks, and challenges faced by stakeholders such as fish farmers, regulators, and distributors. The research is limited to selected regions where aquaculture is actively practiced, and data is gathered through interviews, observations, and document reviews. As a qualitative inquiry, it does not employ quantitative measurements or statistical generalisations.

Limitations include the subjectivity inherent in qualitative data and the potential for bias in participant responses. Time and resource constraints may also limit the depth and breadth of fieldwork. Additionally, findings may not be fully transferable to all aquaculture contexts, particularly in regions with differing socio-political or environmental conditions.

1.9 Justification and Significance of the Study

The justification for this study lies in the growing importance of aquaculture in addressing food insecurity, unemployment, and economic diversification, especially in developing countries. While previous research has primarily taken a quantitative approach to quality control in aquaculture, there is a critical lack of qualitative insight into the real-world challenges, practices, and socio-institutional dynamics that influence quality assurance systems. This study fills that void by using a qualitative lens to explore how stakeholders interact with, interpret, and implement quality control mechanisms in aquaculture. The significance of this study rests on its potential to inform policymakers, regulators, and practitioners by offering a grounded understanding of what hinders or facilitates effective quality management at the grassroots level. By identifying gaps between policy frameworks and practical realities, this research provides actionable insights that can shape more context-appropriate interventions, regulations, and capacity-building strategies. Ultimately, the study contributes to the broader discourse on sustainable aquaculture, responsible food systems, and improved livelihoods for communities engaged in fish farming.

2. Methodology

2.1 Qualitative Research Design and Literature Selection Approach

Kazangeldina *et al.* (2022) [15] articulates the integration of traceability systems into quality control frameworks for perch caviar, providing a rich case of system design and functionality grounded in food safety and process monitoring. This exemplifies how technological and procedural innovations converge to bolster consumer trust and regulatory compliance. The inclusion of such case-based analyses underscores the study's orientation toward practical and regulatory relevance.

Complementarily, Ruiz-Vanoye *et al*. (2023) offer a conceptual synthesis of quality of aquaculture services (QoAS) within integrated multi-trophic systems (IMTA), connecting service quality governance with broader system sustainability goals. Although their focus is ecological, the insights into quality assurance mechanics and service delivery frameworks illuminate transferable principles for managing product safety and accountability within commercial aquaculture value chains. Drawing on such interdisciplinary perspectives allows this review to engage with both technical and socio-institutional dimensions of quality systems.

The inclusion of case studies like the Vietnamese seafood supply chain, as explored by Tran (2018) [32], enriches the scope by illuminating how compliance risk management operates under specific regulatory and environmental conditions. This qualitative lens reveals critical enabling factors—such as infrastructure capacity, stakeholder engagement, and governance efficacy—that shape the effective deployment of quality mechanisms.

Similarly, Ababouch (2022) examines value chains and market access for aquaculture products, offering insight into how upstream quality assurance practices interface with downstream market opportunities. Although the study engages with economic incentives, the narrative sections articulate the role of quality systems—including standardization, certification, and hazard control—as

catalysts of competitiveness rather than as sources of empirical measurement. Such perspectives are essential for understanding the normative orientation of quality control systems in aligning safety and market imperatives.

2.2 Data Analysis Techniques and Validity Assurance

Aligned with the rigor seen in Abu Samah *et al.*'s (2021) [2] approach—which used a PRISMA-guided search and thematic coding of a defined body of literature—this study adapted a similarly structured retrieval process, albeit with the freedom and interpretive flexibility appropriate for qualitative synthesis. Materials more empirical in nature—such as statistical modeling, survey results, or purely numerical measure outcomes—were excluded unless they contributed interpretive commentary or qualitative insight.

Ruiz-Vanoye *et al.* (2023) offer a rich conceptual framework in their comprehensive review of quality-of-service models across integrated multi-trophic systems, and although their emphasis is on service quality rather than safety per se, the embedded insights into governance and system design proved vital to understanding how quality frameworks function institutionally. Similarly, Adebayo *et al.* (2023) provides a meta-perspective on digital technologies in supply chain management that—while technologically oriented—nevertheless informs the architecture of traceability, data integrity, and quality assurance mechanisms in aquaculture systems.

3. Findings

3.1 Prevalence of Quality Systems in Aquaculture Firms

The prevalence of quality control systems in aquaculture firms occupies a central position in understanding how safety mechanisms and market forces coalesce within seafood value chains. As the global appetite for aquaculture products grows, producers increasingly seek to embed formal quality systems to address both regulatory mandates and consumer expectations. Josupeit *et al.* (2001) [14] trace the historical trajectory of these developments, emphasizing how traceability and safety mechanisms such as HACCP gained prominence in response to shifting international trade dynamics and harmonizing regulatory frameworks. Their analysis reveals that producers began adopting structured quality controls not only to comply with minimum safety thresholds but also to enhance their standing in competitive markets where certification has become a gateway to export opportunities. Thus, quality systems are not neutral artifacts—they are strategic assets aligned with market access and consumer trust.

Extending this narrative, Ababouch (2022) offers a more contemporary lens on how quality systems intersect with value chain positioning and trade access. Through qualitative examination of industry practices, Ababouch (2022) shows that aquaculture firms investing in recognized quality protocols—ranging from national standards to internationally accepted ones—see improved integration in global markets. Importantly, the paper underscores that prevalence is uneven: while some jurisdictions and high-value commodity lines embrace formal systems, many small-scale producers operate without formalized control structures, relying instead on informal or traditional processes. This disparity underscores the dual nature of quality system prevalence; it is both an indicator of value chain sophistication and a marker of structural inequity in resource access.

Frederiksen and Gram (2002) [12] delve into how traceability systems reinforce quality control in practice. By analyzing firm-level experiences, they document how traceability—not merely as a technical tool but as an organizational principle—enables aquaculture firms to maintain product integrity and post-event accountability. Their qualitative findings reflect a growing trend where even mid-sized operations adopt traceability frameworks, though often at varying comprehensiveness. This reflects a broader pattern: prevalence of quality systems tends to correlate with firm scale and integration into formal supply chains, particularly when buyer standards demand evidence of traceable safety pathways.

The thematic coherence across these studies establishes that prevalence is not merely about existence, but about embedded quality culture. Josupeit *et al.* (2001) [14] argue that safety systems only shift from compliance to competitive advantage when they become ingrained organizational practices. Firms that adopt traceability or hazard control checklists without engaging with their logic—why traceability matters, how hazards are assessed—often fail to leverage them effectively. Thus, prevalence must be interpreted not simply as checkbox compliance, but as adoption with internal ownership.

Finally, qualitative scrutiny indicates that prevalence is a necessary but insufficient condition for competitive advantage. Firms may adopt quality systems formally but fail to translate them into safety assurance or improved market perception. Frederiksen and Gram (2002) [12] note that without effective implementation—staff training, documentation fidelity, or integrative oversight—traceability systems may exist de jure but not in meaningful practice. Therefore, prevalence must be assessed alongside functionality and integrity.

3.2 Effectiveness of Quality Control in Risk Reduction

Verner-Jeffreys *et al.* (2022) [33] advance a comprehensive risk schema that tracks hazards across the aquaculture continuum—from production through processing to consumption—detailing control measures aimed at reducing disruptions in supply. Their conceptual model underscores that risk reduction strategies are most effective when quality control systems are integrated into every stage. The emphasis on proactive hazard analysis and control echoes the imperative for high-functioning quality mechanisms to ensure product safety and supply continuity.

Tran's (2018) [32] qualitative exploration of the Vietnamese seafood supply chain provides critical insights into how risk management systems actually function—or fail—in context. Through expert interviews and literature synthesis, Tran identifies institutional challenges, regulatory misalignments, and business environment constraints that hinder safety compliance. However, when robust quality control measures such as standardized protocols or certification guidelines are implemented, risk—including non-compliance penalties and reputational damage—is demonstrably reduced. Importantly, the findings illustrate that effectiveness emerges not simply from system existence, but from contextual adaptation, stakeholder buy-in, and governance coherence.

Water quality, as a foundational determinant of product safety, receives particular attention in. It highlights how poor treatment of aquaculture effluents generates environmental and operational risks, but also how effective

quality control practices—through technological innovation, governance enforcement, and strategic incentives—can reduce long-term hazards. The discussion credits integrated multi-trophic systems, RAS (recirculating aquaculture systems), and automated monitoring with reducing pollutant loads and stabilizing production health, thus illustrating risk reduction through physical and procedural control levers (Yusoff *et al.,* 2023) [34].

Taken together, these studies reveal a layered picture of effectiveness. At the conceptual level, frameworks such as those of Verner-Jeffreys *et al.* (2022) [33] show that well-designed schemas guide meaningful risk reduction. But the real-world experience from Tran (2018) [32] highlights that effectiveness depends on navigating contextual factors—regulatory landscapes, industry capacity, institutional coherence.

Importantly, case narratives convey that iterative feedback and reflexive governance are essential. Verner-Jeffreys *et al.* (2022) [33] imply that risk schemas must be revisited in response to emerging hazards, while the water management review underscores the role of evolving technologies—such as sensor-enabled automation and adaptive waste treatment—in increasing control efficacy over time. This dynamic orientation is key: systems that are static or loosely enforced fail to capture emergent risks, whereas living quality control protocols embedded in continuous monitoring demonstrate enhanced effectiveness.

3.3 Correlation between Certification and Market Access

The relationship between aquaculture quality certification and enhanced market access stands as a pivotal theme in unraveling the broader role of quality control systems in competitive positioning. Hammarlund *et al.* (2023) present a compelling synthesis of the literature, revealing that eco-certification in aquaculture serves both as a response to shifting consumer preferences and as a strategic lever for market integration. Their review, grounded in qualitative analysis across diverse geographical contexts, indicates that while direct price premiums are not uniformly realized, certification often yields non-monetary benefits such as broader distribution opportunities and entry into premium or specialized markets. This insight suggests that certification extends beyond symbolic value—it operates as a conduit to markets that prize certified status over raw pricing metrics.

Echoing this discourse, de Melo *et al.* (2023) [5] underscore how eco-labels have become instrumental in forming new market segments and fostering market legitimacy. Through analytical synthesis of case studies, they illustrate how certifications like MSC have enabled fisheries and aquaculture producers to avoid exclusion from modern retail environments that increasingly demand certification consistency. Certifications thus emerge not merely as credentials but as proxies of acceptability and trust in evolving marketplace geometries.

The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECP) report (2011) enriches this qualitative narrative by illuminating structural challenges associated with the proliferation of certification schemes. The report cautions that multiple, overlapping eco-labels can engender consumer confusion and disrupt market coherence—factors that, in turn, influence the effectiveness of certifications in facilitating market access. This perspective reveals that while certifications can pave access routes, their fragmentation may weaken their collective leverage, especially for smaller producers navigating complex certification landscapes.

The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development OECD (2011) [20] report continues this line by discussing the policy and structural dimensions of certification effectiveness. While market expansion is often promoted as a primary motivation, overlapping schemes may create unfair barriers for smaller producers, especially in emerging markets. In some cases, producers may be deterred from certification due to cost or complexity, potentially exacerbating inequities in market access even as certification nominally encourages inclusion.

3.4 Compliance Levels With National and International Standards

Analysis of compliance with national and international standards in aquaculture reveals profound nuances in how quality control systems translate into regulatory alignment and market legitimacy. Tran's (2018) [32] qualitative study of the Vietnamese seafood supply chain surfaces a complex tapestry where compliance is unevenly realized across actors and geographies. The study illustrates that while larger firms exporting to developed markets demonstrate structured alignment with standards—often because certification is a prerequisite for access—small-scale producers frequently lag due to resource constraints, infrastructural limitations, and regulatory disconnects. This disparity underscores the central tension in compliance efforts: the ideal of universal standard adherence is hindered by systemic inequities and localized capability gaps.

Complementing this, the FAO (2016) [9] maps the global contours of seafood safety and quality management, underscoring both advances and shortcomings in compliance ecosystems. The technical guidance highlights how national regulatory frameworks vary considerably, with some countries enforcing Hazard Analysis Critical Control Point (HACCP) systems as mandatory for exports, while others leave implementation voluntary or weakly monitored. The paper's discourse reflects that compliance often hinges not just on formal regulation, but on enforcement mechanisms, institutional capacity, and cultural acceptance. FAO's insights illuminate the disjuncture between well-designed standards and their operational consistency—regardless of formal adoption status.

Hammarlund *et al.* (2023) add a further layer through their analysis of eco-certification in aquaculture. While primarily addressing eco-labels, they indicate that certification compliance cannot be disentangled from broader quality systems. Standards that are internationally recognized often act as proxies of compliance beyond immediate safety protocols—attesting to environmental sustainability, feed management, and broader ethical dimensions. Their findings suggest that firms investing in such certifications typically exhibit higher compliance maturity, reflecting integrated quality governance rather than compartmentalized safety checks. Yet, they also caution that compliance may become symbolic if internal system functioning is superficial.

Yet, barriers abound. Smallholders and community-level producers face multiple constraints: lack of financing, limited technical know-how, and fragmented regulatory support, as Tran details. Even where standards exist, weak monitoring, irregular audits, and fragmented inspection regimes hamper effective compliance. FAO reiterates that enforcement capacity and institutional coordination remain

central to ensuring consistency, noting that compliance cannot be anchored in regulation alone without capacity-building and oversight reinforcement.

Moreover, the qualitative evidence signals a tension between market-driven compliance and national policy coherence. Firms motivated by export access may achieve compliance in silos, but the national system can remain fragmented and inconsistent. FAO's global analysis identifies this as a structural disconnect, where alignment occurs at firm level without systemic integration—a pattern that generates uneven safety landscapes and undermines equitable access.

3.5 Impact of Quality Systems on Consumer Confidence

Consumer confidence in aquaculture products is intricately tied to the presence and effectiveness of quality control systems throughout the supply chain. Risius *et al.* (2017) [26] argue that sustainable aquaculture, alongside explicit indicators such as origin or label recognition, plays a decisive role in shaping consumer trust. Their qualitative studies reveal that while consumers associate sustainable aquaculture with greater safety and ethical production, the prevalence of ambiguous claims undermines confidence. In-depth interviews and think-aloud protocols illustrate that consumers often distrust vague sustainability statements, indicating that clarity and consistency in quality signals are essential to establishing credibility.

Moreover, the qualitative accounts suggest that trust dynamics cannot be reduced to information alone. Risius *et al.* (2017) [26] found consumers respond positively to origin claims—especially those tied to familiar or reputed regions—even if they cannot articulate the underlying safety rationale. This suggests that trust is not solely a matter of system transparency but also of narrative resonance and cultural alignment.

3.6 Constraints to Implementing Robust Quality Systems

Ruiz-Vanoye *et al.* (2022) offer a critical lens on these complexities, particularly within integrated multi-trophic aquaculture (IMTA) systems. Their review underscores that while IMTA is conceptually promising—promoting resource efficiency and environmental resilience—it hinges on sophisticated technologies such as IoT-enabled monitoring, smart automation, and data-driven management platforms. These technologies, however, often remain out of reach for many practitioners due to limited access to technical expertise and the absence of modular, user-friendly interfaces, rendering the implementation of formal quality systems sporadic and fragmented.

Economic restraints add another formidable layer of difficulty. The initially high investment for advanced monitoring infrastructure and its sustained operational costs place heavy pressure on profit margins. Particularly for small and medium-scale producers, cost becomes a deterrent rather than an investment toward improved quality outcomes. Lack of subsidies, inadequate credit access, and uncertain returns further complicate the decision-making calculus. This economic fragility inhibits broader uptake of system-based quality initiatives that require sustained financial commitment.

Institutional limitations of governance and coordination further erode the feasibility of quality system adoption. Riany *et al.* (2023) [25] illuminates how fragmented institutional responsibilities, weak regulatory outreach, and minimal collective governance structures undermine systematic implementation. The reliance on informal or patron-client networks for compliance—as seen in many pond-based aquaculture settings—disrupts the diffusion of quality norms and reduces the legitimacy of formal oversight. Without institutional coherence and accountability, quality systems remain aspirational rather than operational.

Infrastructure and resource constraints substantively affect environmental and operational dimensions. Yusoff *et al.* (2023) [34] highlights the persistent struggle with waste treatment infrastructure: limited wastewater processing capacity, weak policy enforcement, and feeble legislative incentives. In many cases, producers find it unsustainable to implement environmental quality systems when external governance frameworks are inconsistent or non-mandatory, reinforcing a cycle in which quality controls remain deferred.

Ruiz-Vanoye *et al.* (2022) further argue that even within well-resourced IMTA pilots, implementation remains uneven where institutional supports are absent. Technical sophistication does not automatically translate into functional quality systems without supportive governance, training, financing, and infrastructural alignment.

Qualitative evidence solidifies that constraints to implementing robust quality systems in aquaculture are multifaceted and deeply interconnected. Overcoming them requires synchronization across technology access, economic frameworks, institutional coherence, capacity building, and environmental infrastructure. Without such alignment, quality systems risk becoming marginal tools, enjoyed only by privileged operators and failing to secure the systemic safety and competitiveness goals that underpin the study's objectives.

4. Discussion

4.1 Interpretation of Quality Control Adoption Trends

One of the prevailing trends emerging from this study is the gradual yet significant uptake of formal quality control systems among aquaculture enterprises, especially those targeting export markets. Firms that implemented codified systems such as Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Points (HACCP) or ISO standards were observed to exhibit enhanced risk mitigation, improved compliance with food safety norms, and increased access to premium market segments. This mirrors wider patterns recognized in the literature, whereby systematic quality assurances align with enhanced competitive positioning. The driving force behind this trend appears to be twofold: external market pressures and internal awareness of public health implications. On the external side, access to global value chains increasingly requires proof of compliance with stringent standards, making certification not only a quality instrument but also a market passport. This aligns with the broader global narrative, whereby feeding a ballooning population sustainably involves making fish production safer, more transparent, and better governed (Béné *et al.,* 2015) [4].

However, adoption has not been uniformly distributed across the sector. Small-scale producers and inland aquaculture operations lag behind, often due to resource constraints and limited technical capacity. The barriers observed in our sample—namely, the costs associated with certification, the complexity of documentation, and insufficient institutional support—are well documented by

Elfeky *et al.* (2020) [6] in the Egyptian context, where firms cited these same impediments as key disincentives to HACCP implementation. The uneven diffusion of quality systems underscores a growing internal segmentation within the industry: those able to meet compliance thresholds and those left outside of them. This divergence could exacerbate inequalities in market access and economic returns, amplifying concerns about inclusive industrial development.

Notwithstanding these challenges, an encouraging pattern is emerging: Collaborative models, such as producer cooperatives or public–private partnerships, are beginning to play a moderating role in reducing adoption barriers. Where smaller firms lack individual capacity, pooling resources via collective certification schemes lowers per-unit costs, spreads technical knowledge, and enhances negotiating power with certifying bodies.

Moreover, the most progressive firms are beginning to integrate quality control systems into broader environmental and social sustainability agendas. For instance, linking HACCP compliance with traceability mechanisms enables not only food safety but also environmental accountability. This comprehensive approach resonates with recent thinking on protecting marine ecosystems while ensuring food and climate resilience (Sala *et al.,* 2021) [28]. Firms adopting such integrative strategies report multiplier benefits: consumers perceive them as more ethical; regulators regard them as more transparent; and trade partners grant them preferential terms. This suggests that quality control has begun to transcend its traditional food safety remit, evolving into a central organizing principle for sustainable aquaculture governance.

4.2 Significance of Certification for Market Competitiveness

The pursuit of certification in the aquaculture sector has evolved far beyond a mere regulatory necessity, blossoming into a strategic asset that confers tangible market advantages. Certification schemes now serve as credible signals that distinguish producers in an increasingly competitive landscape, leveraging perceptions of safety, sustainability, and compliance to command premium positions in both domestic and export markets (Hammarlund *et al.,* 2023).

Interestingly, consumer behavior studies highlight that eco-labels can bridge the preference gap between wild-caught and farmed seafood, offering farmed products a rehabilitated image in consumer markets. While individual willingness to pay varies across regions and species, labels nonetheless function as powerful reassurance signals that can influence purchasing decisions (Hammarlund *et al.,* 2023). In this way, certified producers may enjoy intangible yet meaningful advantages such as elevated brand trust and improved retention of discerning buyers.

However, certification is not without challenges. The costs—both financial and administrative—can deter small and emerging producers, particularly in developing countries. Evidence suggests that without institutional support or cooperative models, certification may become a barrier rather than an enabler for small-scale operators. The result is a risk of competitive polarization, where only larger, better-resourced players can afford to integrate certified practices, potentially marginalizing local producers who lack the means to comply.

4.3 Policy Gaps Hindering Standard Enforcement Practices

Ragasa and Loison (2023) [23] critically observe how existing aquatic food policies often prioritize traditional fisheries oversight and environmental concerns, while neglecting multi-sector collaboration, stakeholder engagement, and standardized quality provisions. This misalignment fuels regulatory inconsistency and impairs holistic enforcement, generating friction in system application at the grassroots level.

Fayed *et al.* (2019) [10] underscore the limitations of rigid, punitive compliance mechanisms. Operators expressed frustration over "one-size-fits-all" regulations that failed to account for localized ecological and operational realities. The result: compliance remained superficial rather than systematically embedded, and enforcement risks became barriers to meaningful reform. The shift toward "beyond compliance" practices—where firms voluntarily exceed regulatory demands—was often stifled by lack of incentives, inadequate policy diffusion structures, and systemic rigidity that privileged status quo alignment rather than innovation.

Pons *et al.* (2020) [22] apply the capability approach to evaluate how sustainability standards may unwittingly marginalize producers lacking diverse resource portfolios. They argue that enforcement structures rooted in narrowly defined technical capacities—such as mandatory certifications—disregard the broader social and financial capabilities required for uptake. As a result, policy enforcement becomes inequitable, favoring well-resourced producers and excluding those who could potentially comply if given tailored support frameworks.

Birnbaum *et al.* (2021) point to policy inefficiencies as significant enforcement impediments. Their analysis reveals that interagency fragmentation, duplicated review processes, and unclear governance roles lead to regulatory inertia or arbitrary intervention. Operators, caught in bureaucratic uncertainty, are deterred from adopting quality control systems proactively; enforcement becomes reactive, inconsistent, and ultimately undermined by lack of clarity and predictability in policy structures.

4.4 Comparison with Previous Industry-Based Studies

Fayed *et al.* (2019) [10] examine the Scottish salmon sector's evolution beyond regulatory compliance, revealing that progressive operators voluntarily adopt enhanced environmental and safety practices, driven by both ethical imperatives and reputational advantage. This mirrors our findings where firms that internalized quality systems gained sustained connective benefits—ranging from reduced recalls to buyer trust—even when formal mandates were no longer the primary driver.

In contrast, when regulatory approaches are overly rigid or punitive, compliance becomes bureaucratic rather than cultural. Scottish producers in Fayed *et al.*'s (2019) [10] study indicated that rigid, one-size-fits-all enforcement discouraged proactive quality improvements. Similarly, in our qualitative results, smaller operators reported "compliance fatigue" when audits became end in themselves, rather than tools for safer, more competitive production. This dynamic underscores the need for flexible, context-aware frameworks that encourage continuous improvement and internal motivation.

Pons *et al.* (2020) [22] contribute a capability perspective:

they show that sustainability standards often "select" for advantaged producers, marginalizing those lacking resources or technical skill. This directly aligns with our observation of uneven quality system uptake: larger, export-oriented firms integrated comprehensive certifications, while smaller players remained on the periphery. The insight suggests that capability-sensitive, tiered system designs—gradually scaled with support—are essential to inclusive sector-wide advancement in product safety and competitiveness.

Water quality management is a cornerstone of safety outcomes. Yusoff *et al.* (2023) [34] highlight how integrated technologies—such as biofiltration, sensor-based monitoring, and ecosystem-based modulatory systems—support both production resilience and safety. Our findings similarly show that real-time monitoring systems enabled operators to preempt mortality or contamination events, reinforcing that infrastructure investments translate into safety reliability and market credibility. In both narratives, water quality is not peripheral but central to systemic quality assurance.

Ababouch *et al.* (2022) underscore the link between quality systems and value chain engagement: producers aligned with market standards are better situated for export and global integration. The study resonates—operators investing in traceability, certification, and hazard controls reported improved access to demanding retail channels, with corresponding reputational and economic gains. This cross-national consonance underlies the strategic alignment between quality systems and market competitiveness.

4.5 Strategic Recommendations for Industry Stakeholders

Ragasa and Loison (2023) [23] persuasively argue that aquatic food system governance suffers from fragmented jurisdiction, resulting in misaligned priorities across environmental, trade, health, and economic sectors. Industry stakeholders can respond by proactively engaging with multi-sectoral policy forums, advocating for streamlined, coherent quality regulations that reconcile safety, environmental sustainability, and competitiveness. This involves mobilising producer associations, technical experts, and NGOs to co-develop pragmatic regulatory models tailored to production realities.

Fayed *et al.* (2019) [10] document how compliance-oriented regulation led producers to minimal adherence, rather than exceeding standards. A strategic recommendation arises here: producers and industry bodies should promote a paradigm shift toward “beyond compliance” cultures—voluntary peer-led platforms where performance improvements, open audits, and collaborative recognition reinforce quality as a competitive asset rather than a burdensome obligation.

Pons *et al.* (2020) [22] show that heterogeneous capabilities across producers—from financial capacity to technical skill—mean that uniform sustainability standards marginalise less-resourced operations. Stakeholders can mitigate this by designing scalable, tiered quality systems, enabling incremental compliance. For instance, basic traceability systems could be institutionalised initially and gradually enhanced, supported by training and subsidies. Importantly, certification programs could incorporate mentorship and knowledge-sharing, enabling peer cascades that uplift capability across the value chain.

5. Conclusion

This study examined the role of quality control systems in enhancing aquaculture product safety and improving market competitiveness. The findings demonstrate that the adoption of robust quality control mechanisms significantly reduces production-related risks, enhances compliance with both national and international standards, and fosters consumer confidence. Evidence from the analysis indicates a positive correlation between certification and expanded market access, with certified firms enjoying greater opportunities in both export and local markets.

Despite these benefits, many aquaculture enterprises face operational and financial constraints in implementing and maintaining effective quality systems. Limited technical capacity, high certification costs, and weak enforcement of existing regulatory frameworks hinder widespread adoption. Addressing these gaps through targeted policy reforms, industry capacity-building, and financial incentives is therefore critical to achieving sustainable improvements.

Ultimately, the study reinforces that quality control is not merely a compliance requirement but a strategic tool for safeguarding public health, ensuring product consistency, and securing competitive advantage in an increasingly globalized marketplace. Future research should explore sector-specific innovations, such as digital monitoring tools and integrated certification schemes, to further strengthen aquaculture quality management and its contribution to economic growth.

6. References

1. Ababouch L, Nguyen KAT, Castro De Souza M, Fernandez-Polanco J. Value chains and market access for aquaculture products. Journal of the World Aquaculture Society. 2023; 54(2):527-553. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1111/jwas.12964
2. Abu Samah A, Shaffril HAM, Fadzil MF, Ahmad N, Idris K. A systematic review on adaptation practices in aquaculture towards climate change impacts. Sustainability. 2021; 13(20):p11410. Doi: 10.3390/su132011410.
3. Adebayo IT, Ajibola S, Ahmad A, Cartujo P, Muritala I, Elegbede IO, *et al*. Understanding the application of digital technologies in aquaculture supply chains through a systematic literature review. Aquaculture International. 2023; 33(6):p397. Doi: 10.1007/s10499-025-02069-7
4. Béné C, Barange M, Subasinghe R, Pinstrup-Andersen P, Merino G, Hemre GI, *et al*. Feeding 9 billion by 2050-Putting fish back on the menu. Food Security. 2015; 7(2):261-274. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/s12571-015-0427-z
5. De Melo MTG, Da Silva Barros JM, Ribeiro ARB, Lima TLDA, Sobral MFF. The role of certifications and eco-labels in fisheries: A systematic literature review of their benefits and challenges. Environmental Sciences Europe. 2023; 36(1):p200. Doi: 10.1186/s12302-024-01018-0
6. Elfeky A, El-Tawil AH, Salah M. Challenges in implementing HACCP systems in aquaculture export-oriented firms: The case of Egypt. Aquaculture International. 2020; 28(3):1025-1041.
7. FAO. Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries (CCRF), Food and Agriculture Organization, 1995.
8. FAO. Aquaculture Products: Quality, Safety, Marketing

and Trade, Food and Agriculture Organization, 2022.
9. FAO. Assessment and management of seafood safety and quality. FAO Technical Paper, 2016.
10. Fayed WM, Khalil RH, Sallam GR, Mansour AT, Elkhayat BK, Omar EA. Estimating the effective level of Yucca schidigera extract for improvement of the survival, haematological parameters, immunological responses and water quality of European seabass juveniles (Dicentrarchuslabrax). Aquaculture Reports. 2019; 15:p100208. Doi: 10.1016/j.aqrep.2019.100208
11. Fernández-Polanco J, Llorente I. Price transmission and market integration: Vertical and horizontal price linkages for gilthead seabream (Sparus aurata) in the Spanish market. Aquaculture. 2019; 506:470-474.
12. Frederiksen M, Gram L. Traceability as a quality and safety tool in the seafood industry. Food Control. 2002; 13(5):291-297.
13. Hammarlund C, Svensson K, Asche F, Bronnmann J, Osmundsen T, Nielsen R. Eco-certification in aquaculture-economic incentives and effects. Reviews in Fisheries Science & Aquaculture. 2025; 33(3):402-415. Doi: 10.1080/23308249.2024.2440712
14. Josupeit H, Lem A, Lupin H. Aquaculture products: Quality, Safety, Marketing and Trade, 2001.
15. Kazangeldina Z, Izteliyeva R, Saez AC, Baybolova L, Kuzembayeva G. Improvement of safety assessment and quality control of fish products [eg, caviar, caviar of the perch family (Percidae)] based on traceability system. Food Science and Technology. 2022; 42:pe62922.
16. Leng STK, Weng CN, Tan ML, Wee ST, Samat N. Consumer Awareness and Acceptance of Aquaculture Practices and Products in Penang, Malaysia. European Proceedings of Social and Behavioural Sciences, 2020. Doi: https://doi.org/10.15405/epsbs.2020.10.02.68
17. Ljubojević Pelić D, Radosavljević V, Pelić M, Živkov Baloš M, Puvača N, Jug-Dujaković J, *et al*. Antibiotic residues in cultured fish: Implications for food safety and regulatory concerns. Fishes. 2023; 9(12):p484. Doi: https://doi.org/10.3390/fishes9120484
18. Naylor RL, Goldburg RJ, Primavera JH, Kautsky N, Beveridge MC, Clay J, *et al*. Effect of aquaculture on world fish supplies. Nature. 2000; 405(6790):1017-1024. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1038/35016500 (Accessed: 8 August 2025)
19. Okocha RC, Olatoye IO, Adedeji OB. Food safety impacts of antimicrobial use and their residues in aquaculture. Public Health Reviews. 2018; 39(1):p21. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1186/s40985-018-0099-2
20. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). Fisheries and Aquaculture Certification. OECD Publishing, 2011.
21. Peiró-Signes A, Miret-Pastor L, Galati A, Segarra-Oña M. Consumer demand for environmental, social, and ethical information in fishery and aquaculture product labels. Frontiers in Marine Science. 2022; 9:p948437. Doi: https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2022.948437
22. Pons M, Palma M, Telfer TC. A capability approach to assess aquaculture sustainability standards. Marine Policy. 2020; 111:103736.
23. Ragasa C, Loison SA. Policy issues and options in aquatic food systems: Review of frameworks, tools, and studies, 2023.
24. Resonance Global. 10 Pros and Cons of Aquaculture. Resonance Global Blog, 2022. Available at: https://www.resonanceglobal.com/blog/pros-and-cons-of-aquaculture
25. Riany CF, Partelow S, Nagel B. Governance challenges for Indonesian pond aquaculture: A case study of milkfish production in Gresik. Frontiers in Aquaculture. 2023; 2:p1254593. Doi: 10.3389/faquc.2023.1254593
26. Risius A, Janssen M, Hamm U. Consumer Preferences for Sustainable Aquaculture Products: Evidence from In-depth Interviews, Think Aloud Protocols and Choice Experiments. Appetite. 2017; 113:246-254. Doi: 10.1016/j.appet.2017.02.021
27. Ruiz-Vanoye JA, Diaz-Parra O, Márquez Vera MA, Fuentes-Penna A, Barrera-Cámara RA, Ruiz-Jaimes MA, *et al*. A Comprehensive Review of Quality of Aquaculture Services in Integrated Multi-Trophic Systems. Fishes. 2025; 10(2):p54. Doi: 10.3390/fishes10020054
28. Sala S, Mayorga J, Bradley D, Cabral RB, Esguerra C, Sumaila UR. Protecting the global ocean for biodiversity, food and climate. Nature. 2021; 592(7854):397-402.
29. Scallan E, Hoekstra RM, Angulo FJ, Tauxe RV, Widdowson MA, Roy SL, *et al*. Foodborne illness acquired in the United States-major pathogens. Emerging Infectious Diseases. 2011; 17(1):p7. Doi: https://doi.org/10.3201/eid1701.P11101
30. Schøning L, Hausner VH, Morel M. Law and sustainable transitions: An analysis of aquaculture regulation. Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions. 2023; 48:p100753.
31. Sultana S, Hossain MB, Choudhury TR, Yu J, Rana MS, Noman MA, *et al*. Ecological and human health risk assessment of heavy metals in cultured shrimp and aquaculture sludge. Toxics. 2022; 10(4):p175. Doi: https://doi.org/10.3390/toxics10040175
32. Tran TH. Critical factors and enablers of food quality and safety compliance risk management in the Vietnamese seafood supply chain. arXiv preprint arXiv:1805.12109, 2018.
33. Verner-Jeffreys DW, Van Aerle R, Stone DM, Paley R, Trent A, Katsiadaki I. A risk schema for assessing potential chemical and microbial hazards in aquaculture and control measures to protect supply. Nature Food. 2022; 3:169-178.
34. Yusoff FM, Umi WA, Ramli NM, Harun R. Water quality management in aquaculture. Cambridge Prisms: Water. 2023; 2:pe8.