BIODIVERSITAS
Volume 23, Number 11, November 2022
Pages: 5854-5861

ISSN: 1412-033X
E-ISSN: 2085-4722
DOI: 10.13057/biodiv/d231139

Honey quality from the bee *Apis cerana*, honey potency produced by coconut and sugar palm saps

ERWAN[1,♥], AGUSSALIM[2]

[1]Faculty of Animal Science, Universitas Mataram. Jl. Majapahit No. 62, Mataram 83125, West Nusa Tenggara, Indonesia.
Tel.: +62-370-633603, Fax.: +62-370-640592, ♥email: apiserwan@gmail.com
[2]Faculty of Animal Science, Universitas Gadjah Mada. Jl. Fauna 3, Bulaksumur, Sleman 55281, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

Manuscript received: 6 September 2022. Revision accepted: 9 November 2022.

Abstract. *Erwan, Agussalim. 2022. Honey quality from the bee* Apis cerana, *honey potency produced by coconut and sugar palm saps. Biodiversitas 23: 5854-5861.* One of the big problems when keeping honeybees is the limited sustainable feed, especially in the rainy season. The objectives of this study were to evaluate the honey quality from the bee *Apis cerana* based on the chemical composition and honey potency produced by the coconut and sugar palm saps. This study using thirty colonies of the bee *A. cerana* was divided into six treatments consisting of sugar palm sap without sugar palm pollen, coconut sap without sugar palm pollen, coconut sap of 50% + sugar palm sap of 50% without sugar palm pollen, sugar palm sap was added by sugar palm pollen; coconut sap was added by sugar palm pollen; coconut sap of 50% + sugar palm sap of 50% was added by sugar palm pollen. The chemical composition of honey from the *A. cerana* was moisture (20.76 to 21.80%), reducing sugar (62.78 to 68.37%), sucrose (1.44 to 3.42%), diastase enzyme activity (5.17 to 9.04 DN), hydroxymethylfurfural (2.24 to 5.81 mg/kg), and acidity (26.00 to 36.33 mL NaOH/kg). Honey potency produced by the coconut and sugar palm saps in 100 hectares area produces honey was 1542.857 tons/year and 1150 tons/year, respectively. It can be concluded that the quality of *A. cerana* honey, produced by the sugar palm and coconut saps, is acceptable by the Indonesian national and international standards. The sugar palm and coconut saps have big potential as bee feed, especially for the bee *A. cerana*.

Keywords: *Apis cerana*, coconut, honey, sugar palm pollen

INTRODUCTION

The honeybee of *Apis cerana* is one of the bees from the *Apis* genus, which includes the local bee which is spread in some regions in Indonesia, including Kalimantan, Sumatera, Java, Bali, Lombok, Sumbawa, Sulawesi, Papua, and Seram (Hepburn and Radloff 2011; Radloff et al. 2011). In Indonesia, beekeeping of the bee *A. cerana* has been practiced by beekeepers using traditional hives (for example, using a coconut log hive) and semi-modern hives (box hives without nest frames) to produce honey. Furthermore, several regions have been practicing the beekeeping of the bee *A. cerana*, has been reported by Schouten et al. (2019) are Riau, North Sumatera, Lampung, Banten, Java, Yogyakarta region, Bali, and Lombok. However, the beekeeping of *A. cerana* is mostly using traditional hives or use box hives but is not completed by the honey frame like the beekeeping of *A. mellifera*. The bee *A. cerana* can produce honey, bee bread, royal jelly, and propolis. However, their production is lower compared to the bee *A. mellifera* (Schouten et al. 2019; Agussalim and Agus 2022).

One of the problems faced by the beekeepers in Indonesia is the limited of feed sustainability as the raw material to produce honey, bee bread, and royal jelly. The limitation of feed is a very serious problem that has been faced by beekeepers because they have no area used to plant several plants which are used as the feed source to produce the honeybees' products. Honeybee feeds are divided into two types, namely nectar and pollen, where nectar is obtained by the foragers from the plant flowers (nectar floral) and nectar extrafloral, which is obtained by the foragers from stalk and leaf of plants (Agussalim et al. 2018, 2017). Pollen is obtained by the foragers from plant flowers which are collected by using all body parts and then deposited in the corbicula (Agussalim et al. 2017, 2018; Erwan et al. 2021a). When collecting nectar and pollen from the plant flowers, the forager's role as the pollinator agent by transporting pollen from the anther to the pistil so that the pollination process occurs, this process is continuously done by the foragers until their honey stomach is full of nectar and their corbicula has been deposited by the pollen. This pollination impacts the increase of the plant's productivity (Pohorecka et al. 2014; Supeno et al. 2021).

One of the strategies to produce sustainable honey from the bee *A. cerana* is by using sap from the plants such as sugar palm and coconut. Several studies have been conducted by using sugar palm and coconut saps as the *A. cerana* feed. Erwan et al. (2021b) reported that the feed combination of coconut sap and sugar palm pollen as the *A. cerana* feed could enhance the production of honey cells and bee bread cells. However, using sap from coconut and sugar palms can increase the honey and bee bread cells compared to the control group without sap as the feed (multi-floral nectar). Furthermore, Erwan et al. (2022) also reported using sugar palm and coconut saps which are each added with sugar palm pollen, can improve the bee *A.*

cerana productivity, such as increasing honey production, brood cell number, and colony weight. In addition, another study showed that the use of extrafloral nectar namely sugar palm (*Arenga pinnata*) and coconut (*Cocos nucifera*) saps as the *A. mellifera* bee feed which is resulting the honey chemical composition (reducing sugar, sucrose, acidity, moisture, and diastase enzyme activity) which are acceptable by Indonesian national standard and the international standard has been regulated by Codex Alimentarius (Erwan et al. 2020). However, studies about the chemical composition of honey from the bee *A. cerana* produced from the sugar palm sap, coconut sap, and their honey potency production from both sap sugar palm and coconut have yet to be studied. Therefore, the objectives of this study were to evaluate the honey quality based on the chemical composition of the bee *A. cerana* honey potency produced by the coconut and sugar palm saps.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Study area

This research has been conducted in the North Duman Village (8°32'10" S 116°09'32" E), Lingsar Sub-district, West Lombok, West Nusa Tenggara Province, Indonesia. In this research, we used thirty *A. cerana* colonies divided into six treatments and every five colonies per treatment as the replication. The saps used in our study were obtained from the stalk of coconut (*Cocos nucifera*) and sugar palm (*Arenga pinnata*) and the pollen source from the sugar palm (Figure 1). The stalks of coconut and sugar palm were cut and then put in a plastic bottle which was used to store the sap secreted by their stalks. The treatments in our study were sugar palm sap without added by sugar palm pollen (SP0), coconut sap without added sugar palm pollen (CP0), coconut sap of 50% + sugar palm sap of 50% without added sugar palm pollen (SCP0); sugar palm sap was added by sugar palm pollen (SP1); coconut sap was added by sugar palm pollen (CP1); coconut sap of 50% + sugar palm sap of 50% was added sugar palm pollen (SCP1).

The technique used to give sugar palm and coconut saps and sugar palm pollen (Figure 2) was according to the previous method has been reported by Erwan et al. (2021b, 2022) briefly as follows: fresh coconut and sugar palm saps were given to the bee *A. cerana* by using a plastic plate and split bamboo was completed by 4 to 5 twigs for foragers perch. The plastic plate and split bamboo was placed one meter from the box hives, while the sugar palm pollen was hung beside and above the box hives. The distance of 600 meters to place the colony to avoid the foragers collecting pollen and sap from the other treatments.

Figure 1. Coconut sap (*left*), sugar palm sap (*center*), and sugar palm pollen (*right*)

Figure 2. Technique to given the sugar palm and coconut saps (*left*) and sugar palm pollen (*right*) (Erwan et al. 2021b, 2022)



Figure 3. Honey from *Apis cerana* was produced from the sugar palm and coconut saps

Procedures

Honey quality

Honey from the *A. cerana* (Figure 3) was harvested after beekeeping for three months using coconut and sugar palm saps. Honey from the five hives in one treatment group was composited into one honey sample and then used to analysis of their chemical composition. Honey quality from the *A. cerana* was evaluated based on the chemical composition consisting of moisture, reducing sugar, sucrose, diastase enzyme activity, hydroxymethylfurfural (HMF), and acidity. The moisture content was analyzed by using a proximate analysis based on the method from the Association of Official Agricultural Chemists (AOAC) (AOAC 2005). Reducing sugar was analyzed using a Layne-Enyon method and sucrose content was analyzed by a Luff Schoorl method, described by AOAC (2005). Diastase enzyme activity, HMF, and free acidity were analyzed based on the harmonized methods of the international honey commission (Machado et al. 2022).

Honey production from sugar palm and coconut saps

Sugar palm and coconut saps every ten liters were used to measure the honey production from the bee *A. cerana* for three months of beekeeping. The sugar palm and coconut saps were placed on the plastic plate in front of the box hives at a distance of one meter. In addition, the honey production without using sugar palm and coconut saps was measured for one year of beekeeping, which calculates the contribution of sugar palm and coconut saps in honey production. Honey from *A. cerana* was harvested with cut the honey cells (Figure 3) and squeezed to separate wax and honey. Afterward, honey was measured production by using a digital scale and stored in the refrigerator.

Production of saps from coconut and sugar palm

The production of sap from coconut was measured for a year and also based on dept interviews with farmers, while the sugar palm sap based on the previously studied was used to calculate the production per hectare area and was also obtained from the deep interview with the farmers. The production of coconut and sugar palm saps per hectare was calculated from the sap production per tree multiplied by the number of trees in a one-hectare area. After three months of beekeeping, honey from both treatments, sugar palm and coconut saps, were harvested to measure the honey production from the use of ten litters sap, and then honey production was measured by cylinder glass

Data analysis

The data on honey quality, production potency of honey from sugar palm and coconut saps, honey production, and production of saps were analyzed by using descriptive analysis (Steel et al. 1997).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Moisture content of honey

Honey is composed of water as the second largest of honey constituents, ranging from 15 to 21g/100 g, depending on the plant species as the nectar source, which is affected by the botanical origin. Furthermore, honey moisture is also affected by honey maturity level, processing postharvest, and storage conditions (Da Silva et al. 2016). The honey moisture affects the physical properties such as crystallization, viscosity, flavor, color, taste, solubility, specific gravity, and conservation (Escuredo et al. 2013; Da Silva et al. 2016). In addition, honey moisture is also affected by the temperature and humidity depending on the season (rainy and dry seasons). Honey moisture can increase during postharvest processing, such as storage conditions because honey is hygroscopic that can absorb the moisture in the air (Karabagias et al. 2014; Da Silva et al. 2016).

Table 1. The moisture, reducing sugar, and sucrose contents of honey from the bee *Apis cerana*

Treatments	Moisture (%)	Reducing sugar (%)	Sucrose (%)
SP0	21.60	65.24	2.86
CP0	20.76	68.37	1.96
SCP0	21.40	64.55	2.51
SP1	21.80	62.78	3.42
CP1	21.58	65.37	1.72
SCP1	20.98	67.33	1.44

Notes: sugar palm sap without added by sugar palm pollen (SP0); coconut sap without added by sugar palm pollen (CP0); coconut sap of 50% + sugar palm sap of 50% without added by sugar palm pollen (SCP0); sugar palm sap was added by sugar palm pollen (SP1); coconut sap was added by sugar palm pollen (CP1); coconut sap of 50% + sugar palm sap of 50% was added by sugar palm pollen (SCP1)

A recent study showed that the honey moisture from the bee *A. cerana*, produced by sugar palm and coconut saps and their combination ranged from 20.76 to 21.80% (Table 1). This honey moisture content is accepted by the Indonesian national standard (SNI), where the moisture for beekeeping honey, including the bee *A. cerana* and *A. mellifera*, does not exceed 22% (National Standardization Agency of Indonesia 2018) and is higher compared to the international standard which Codex Alimentarius regulated is not exceeded 20% (Thrasyvoulou et al. 2018). The variation of honey moisture of the bee *A. cerana* in our study may be caused by the different moisture content of both saps from sugar palm and coconut, however, our study has not been measured. The higher moisture content requires a long time for the ripening of honey, and the bees start the process of decreasing honey moisture when they take nectar from plant flowers or saps as the raw material to produce honey. Furthermore, a small portion of moisture content has been evaporated in the honey sack before being transferred to the other bee, which is working in the hive. This transfer is rapid depending on the temperature, colony strength, and nectar availability (Da Silva et al. 2016).

The honey production process is started with the foragers collecting nectar from the plant flowers or extrafloral nectar and then stored in the honey stomach. After that, the foragers will transfer the nectar that has been collected to the other bees who are working to process the nectar into honey in their mouth, then put it in the honey stomach and then transfer it to other bees several times until honey is ripening. A considerable amount of water will be evaporated in this process, which continues with the help of wing fans that can regulate the air humidity for about 15 to 20 minutes (Balasubramanyam 2021; Zhang et al. 2021). The honey moisture content in our study differed from Wang et al. (2021), that honey moisture from the bee *A. cerana*, which is collected from 42 different honeycombs from China, ranges from 17.03 to 18.44%, 18.65% for *A. cerana cerana* from Hainan province, China (Wu et al. 2020), and 16.99% for *A. cerana* from Borneo (Malaysian honey) (Moniruzzaman et al. 2013). Furthermore, Erwan et al. (2020) also reported that the honey moisture produced by the *A. mellifera* bee by using sugar palm and coconut saps ranges from 19.34 to 20.94%. The different honey moisture content has been reported to be affected by the different geographical origins, impacts the different plant types that can be grown in each region, different environmental conditions (temperature and humidity), and also different bee species, which impact the different ability to evaporate water in the honey.

Reducing sugar and sucrose contents of honey

Sugars in honey are composed of monosaccharides for about 75%, disaccharides are 10 to 15%, and other sugars in small amounts. Honey sugars are responsible as the energy source, hygroscopic, viscosity, and granulation. Several sugars in honey have been reported such as glucose, fructose, sucrose, trehalose, rhamnose, isomaltose, nigerobiose, maltotriose, maltotetraose, melezitose, melibiose, maltulose, nigerose, raffinose, palatinose, erlose and others (Da Silva et al. 2016).

A recent study showed that the honey-reducing sugar from the bee *A. cerana* was beekeeping by using sugar palm and coconut saps, and their combination as the nectar source to produce honey ranges from 62.78 to 68.37% (Table 1). This honey-reducing sugar is acceptable by the SNI for treatments SP0, CP0, CP1, and SCP1 but not acceptable for treatments SCP0, and SP1, where the minimum reducing sugar is 65% (National Standardization Agency of Indonesia 2018). This sugar is produced by the mechanism of invertase enzyme activity that changes the sap sucrose into simple sugars. It is known that this enzyme is responsible for converting sucrose into glucose and fructose. These sugars are included in the reducing sugar group and the main component in honey. In the honey maturity process, the sucrose is broken down by the invertase enzyme into simple sugars simultaneously, and water will be evaporated to increase the reduced sugar content. In addition, enzymes secreted by the worker bees can also break down the carbohydrate into simple sugars. Furthermore, another enzyme in honey is the diastase enzyme that breaks down starch into simple sugars (Da Silva et al. 2016). The honey-reducing sugar in our study differed from what was reported by Erwan et al. (2020), that honey-reducing sugar from the bee *A. mellifera* which was produced by extrafloral nectar (sugar palm and coconut saps) ranges from 60.15 to 73.69%. The different reducing sugar may be affected by the different bee species, which impacts their ability to evaporate water in honey, especially when they convert the complex sugars into simple sugars and different seasons when the study is related to temperature and humidity environmental.

The honey sucrose content from the bee *A. cerana* in our study ranges from 1.44 to 3.42% (Table 1) and acceptable by SNI is not exceed 5% for the beekeeping honey including *A. cerana* and *A. mellifera* (National Standardization Agency of Indonesia 2018) and also accepted by the international standard has been regulated by Codex Alimentarius is not exceed 5% for blossom and honeydew honey (Thrasyvoulou et al. 2018). Naturally, sucrose present in honey in our study originated from sugar palm and coconut saps. The low honey sucrose content in our study is caused by the honey harvested in a mature condition characterized by honey cells that have been covered by wax. Furthermore, the invertase enzyme which is produced by the worker bees actively breaks down sucrose from saps into simple sugars. There are two types of invertase enzymes that are produced by the worker bees, namely glucoinvertase, which converts sucrose into glucose and fructoinvertase, which converts sucrose into fructose. These enzymes are mostly derived from the bee's secretion and only a small portion from the nectar, while the honeydew from the insect's secretion mostly contains invertase enzymes (Da Silva et al. 2016). The honey sucrose content in our study differed from Erwan et al. (2020), that honey sucrose content from the bee *A. mellifera* was produced by extrafloral nectar (sugar palm and coconut saps) ranging from 4.21 to 4.40%.

The honey sucrose content is a very important parameter to evaluate the maturity of honey to identify manipulation, where the high levels may indicate

adulterations by adding several sweeteners such as cane sugar or refined beet sugar. In addition, indicating the early harvest, where sucrose is not completely transformed into fructose and glucose, the bees feed artificially for a prolonged time using a sucrose syrup (Escuredo et al. 2013; Puscas et al. 2013; Tornuk et al. 2013; Da Silva et al. 2016). Honey is a sugar solution that is supersaturated and unstable, so it's easy to crystallize. The honey crystallization is affected by the concentration of glucose, fructose, and water. Fructose is the dominant sugar present in honey from *A. mellifera* was produced by several plants as the nectar source that workers use to produce honey, such as eucalyptus, acacia, bramble, lime, chestnut, sunflower, and from honeydew, except in rape honey was produced by *Brassica napus*. Rape honey is higher in glucose and lowers in fructose which impacts its rapid crystallization (Escuredo et al. 2014). The sugars content present in honey is dependent on the geographical origins, which impacts the different plant types that can grow in each region and impacts the different sugars content from the nectar, which is produced by the nectary gland of plant flowers (Tornuk et al. 2013; Escuredo et al. 2014; Da Silva et al. 2016; Agussalim et al. 2019; Agus et al. 2021). Furthermore, the sugar content in honey is influenced by climate (season, temperature, and humidity), processing (heating process), and storage time (Tornuk et al. 2013; Escuredo et al. 2014; Da Silva et al. 2016).

Diastase enzyme activity and hydroxymethylfurfural (HMF) of honey

A recent study showed that the diastase enzyme activity from the bee *A. cerana* honey produced by the sugar palm and coconut saps ranges from 5.17 to 9.04 DN (Table 2). This enzyme activity is acceptable by SNI with a minimum of 3 DN for beekeeping honey, including the bee *A. cerana* and *A. mellifera* (National Standardization Agency of Indonesia 2018), and also acceptable by the international standard has been regulated by Codex Alimentarius with the minimum 3 DN (Thrasyvoulou et al. 2018). One of the honey characteristics is that it contains enzymes originating from the bees, pollen, and nectar from plant flowers, but mostly enzymes are added by the bees when they convert nectar into honey (Da Silva et al. 2016; Thrasyvoulou et al. 2018). The honey diastase enzyme activity in our study differed from what was reported by Erwan et al. (2020) that the diastase enzyme activity of honey from the bee *A. mellifera* was produced by extrafloral nectar (sugar palm and coconut saps) is ranging from 16.48 to 17.12 Schade unit.

Diastases are divided into α- and β-amylases, the natural enzymes present in honey. The α-amylase separates the starch chain randomly in the center to produce dextrin, while the β-amylase separates the maltose in the end chain. The nectar source influences diastase enzyme content in honey (floral and extrafloral nectars) to produce honey and honey geographical origins, which impacts the different chemical compositions of the nectar that can be produced by the plants, which impacts the honey chemical composition, especially diastase enzyme activity. In addition, the bee species are also influencing the activity diastase because it's related to the distance and the flowers plant numbers that can be visited by the foragers when they are collecting nectar and pollen used to produce honey and bee bread (Da Silva et al. 2016).

Generally, the diastase enzyme has the role of breaking down complex sugars into simple sugars. In addition, this enzyme is a role in digesting starch into maltose (disaccharide) and maltotriose (trisaccharide), which are sensitive to heat or thermolabile. Thus, this condition can be used to evaluate the overheating and preservation degree of honey (Da Silva et al. 2016). Furthermore, diastase activity is also used to evaluate honey age-related to storage time and temperature because the diastase activity may be reduced when heating above 60°C and longtime storage (Yücel and Sultanoğlu 2013; Da Silva et al. 2016). The honey diastase activity from the bee *A. cerana* in our study (Table 2) differed from Wu et al. (2020) for multifloral honey produced by the *A. cerana* cerana from the Hainan province (China) was 6.70 Göthe. Furthermore, it also differed from Wang et al. (2021) that the diastase activity of *A. cerana* honey from Qinling Mountains (China) ranged from 22.05 to 35.67 Göthe. The different diastase activities of honey from *A. cerana* were reported by previous researchers and are influenced by the different plant types as the nectar source to produce honey, different sugar content, and different geographical origin.

Table 2. The diastase enzyme activity, hydroxymethylfurfural, and acidity of honey from the bee *Apis cerana*

Treatments	Diastase enzyme activity (DN)	Hydroxymethylfurfural (mg/kg)	Acidity (mL NaOH/kg)
SP0	7.57	5.78	36.33
CP0	5.17	5.04	26.00
SCP0	9.04	4.75	28.60
SP1	6.86	4.77	29.68
CP1	8.51	5.81	28.26
SCP1	6.85	2.24	30.61

Notes: sugar palm sap without added by sugar palm pollen (SP0); coconut sap without added by sugar palm pollen (CP0); coconut sap of 50% + sugar palm sap of 50% without added by sugar palm pollen (SCP0); sugar palm sap was added by sugar palm pollen (SP1); coconut sap was added by sugar palm pollen (CP1); coconut sap of 50% + sugar palm sap of 50% was added by sugar palm pollen (SCP1)

Furthermore, the HMF of *A. cerana* honey produced by the sugar palm and coconut saps in our study ranges from 2.24 to 5.81 mg/kg (Table 2). This HMF indicates that honey from our study in fresh condition and acceptable by SNI for beekeeping honey, including from *A. cerana* and *A. mellifera*, does not exceed 40 mg/kg (National Standardization Agency of Indonesia 2018) and is also acceptable by the international standard regulated by Codex Alimentarius is not to exceed 40 mg/kg for blossom and honeydew honey (Thrasyvoulou et al. 2018). After harvesting, fresh honey generally contains a low HMF ranging from 0 to 4.12 mg/kg honey. Hydroxymethylfurfural is the result of the degradation of honey monosaccharides, especially fructose and glucose, under acid conditions and accelerated by heating. This reaction produces levulinic and formic acids (Da Silva et al. 2016).

Hydroxymethylfurfural is formed after the honey is removed from the comb or when the wax cover is opened and the advanced processing like heating process. The increase of the HMF content occurs in honey with acidity and is accelerated by the heating process. However, the HMF content is also influenced by sugar content, organic acids presence, pH, moisture content, water activity, and the plant types as the nectar source (floral source). In addition, HMF can also be formed at low temperatures, acidic conditions, and sugar dehydration reactions. Therefore, the higher HMF content's impact on the honey color is darker (Tornuk et al. 2013; Da Silva et al. 2016). The HMF of honey from the *A. cerana* in our study (Table 2) was differed to previously reported by Wu et al. (2020) for multifloral honey of *A. cerana cerana* from China is 3.80 mg/kg and 1.69 mg/kg for *A. cerana* honey from Qinling Mountains, China is 1.69 mg/kg. The different HMF content of honey from *A. cerana* reported by previous researchers are influenced by the different plant types as the nectar source to produce honey, different sugar content, and different geographical origin.

Acidity of honey

Free acidity is one of the important parameters to evaluate honey deterioration which is characterized by the presence of the organic acids in equilibrium with internal esters, lactone, and several inorganic ions such as sulfates, chlorides, and phosphates (Da Silva et al. 2016). This study showed that the honey acidity from *A. cerana* produced by the sugar palm and coconut saps ranges from 26.00 to 36.33 mL NaOH/kg (Table 2). The acidity of *A. cerana* honey in our study is acceptable by SNI not to exceed 50 mL NaOH/kg for the beekeeping honey, including *A. cerana* and *A. mellifera*. Furthermore, it is also acceptable by the international standard has been regulated by the Codex Alimentarius is not to exceed 50 meq/kg for blossom and honeydew honey (Thrasyvoulou et al. 2018).

The sour taste of honey originated from several organic and inorganic acids, where the dominant organic acid present in honey is gluconic acid. This organic acid is produced by the enzyme activity of glucose-oxidase, which is added by the bees when they convert nectar into honey so that it can protect the nectar until honey maturity. This protection mechanism is caused by inhibiting of microorganisms' activity in honey (Da Silva et al. 2016). This inhibit mechanism includes the combination of several factors, such as low moisture and the presence of hydrogen peroxide, which is produced by the enzyme glucose-oxidase can inhibit the metabolism activity in the microbe cell through the destruction of the cell wall resulting in a change in cytoplasmic membrane permeability (Pasias et al. 2018; Nainu et al. 2021).

The total acidity content in honey is a small quantity. Still, the presence of honey is very important because it can influence the honey stability on the microorganisms, taste or flavor, and aroma of honey. The high acidity indicates the fermentation process occurs when some reducing sugar is broken down into acetic acid. Honey acidity content is related to the yeast number where they break down some reducing sugar into ethanol, and if the reaction with the oxygen is formed, the acetic acid which is increasing the honey acidity. Therefore, the higher acidity values may indicate the sugars fermentation process into organic acids. Honey acidity is affected by several factors, such as different content of organic acids, different geographical origins, and the season when honey is harvested (Tornuk et al. 2013; Da Silva et al. 2016). The honey acidity from the bee *A. cerana* in our study (Table 2) differed from previous studied by Wu et al. (2020) for *A. cerana cerana* honey is 0.80 mol/kg, and Guerzou et al. (2021) ranges from 11 to 47 meq/kg for Algerian honey. Furthermore, it differed from Erwan et al. (2020) that honey acidity from the bee *A. mellifera* was produced by extrafloral nectar (sugar palm and coconut saps) ranging from 22.00 to 43.00 mL NaOH/kg. The different acidity reported previously with our study is affected by the different plant types as the nectar source to produce honey, honey pH, geographical origin, and organic acids compound; however, our study has not measured the organic acid compound and honey pH.

Honey production potency from the sugar palm and coconut saps

Coconut and sugar palm plants have a good prospect to be developed because almost part of the plants can be utilized, contributing to communities' income. Generally, the main product from the coconut (*Cocos nucifera*) was harvested as coconut fruit to advance the process into coconut oil and copra. These commodities have a high price but producing coconut oil and copra are high risk for the farmers because they are just preparing raw materials. Therefore, the utilizing of the sap can be produced by the coconut and sugar palm was also potency feed for the bees was used as the nectar source to produce honey. Sugar palm and coconut saps are the feed potential studied by Erwan et al. (2021b) that the coconut and sugar palm saps can increase the number of honey and bee bread cells of the bee *A. cerana*. Furthermore, it is also reported that sugar palm and coconut are improving the productivity of the bee *A. cerana*, such as increasing the number of brood cells number, colony weight, and honey production (Erwan et al. 2022). In addition, the saps from coconut and sugar palms are usually used by farmers to produce sugar using a traditional process.

The coconut plants can produce 12 stalks in a year, and one stalk can produce sap of 90 liters. Thus, one coconut plant can produce 1080 liters of sap. Furthermore, if the farmers have one hectare of land planted by 100 coconut plants (distance 10×10 m), so they can produce about 108,000 liters of coconut sap. To produce 1 kg of honey requires coconut sap for about 7 liters and in a year, 84 liters are required to produce 12 kg of honey. Thus, honey potency in a year from 100 hectares of land can be calculated as follows: 10,800,000 liters of sap divided by 84 liters of sap and multiplied by 12 kg of honey and obtained 1,542,857,14 kg/year (1542.857 tons/year) or equivalent with 128.571 tons/month in 100 hectares of the land. Based on the sap production showing that the coconut plants have a big potency to produce honey. This potency was also supported by the harvest area of coconut in West Lombok (Nusa Tenggara Province, Indonesia) was 10,629.36 hectares (Department of Agricultural and Plantations 2021).

Sugar palm plants can be tapped to collect sap for about 5 to 6 months in one stalk but generally can be tapped not to exceed 4 months. Wahyuni et al. (2021) reported that the production of sugar palm sap per plant ranges from 8 to 22 liters/plant or 300 to 400 liters/season (3 to 4 months) or 800 to 1500 liters/plant/year (average is 1150 liters/plant/year). Furthermore, if in one hectare of the plantation we have 100 sugar palm plants, the distance for planting is 10×10 m, so can be obtained of sap for 115,000 liters.

The field investigation showed that producing 1 kg of honey from the sugar palm sap required about 10 liters and, in a year, it required about 120 liters to produce 12 kg of honey. Thus, the honey potency from the sugar palm sap in a year from the 100 hectares of the sugar palm field is 11,500,000 liters which was divided by 120 liters and multiplied by 12 kg, so obtained 1,150,000 kg of honey per year (1150 tons of honey) or equivalent with 95.833 tons/month in 100 hectares area. This potency indicates that the sugar palm sap has a big potency to produce honey which is supported by the report data from the Department of Agricultural and Plantations (2021) that the sap production, sap productivity, and harvest area for sugar palm plants in West Lombok (West Nusa Tenggara Province, Indonesia) are 57.46 tones, 304.80 quintals/hectare, and 188.52, respectively, in the year of 2021. Therefore, it can be concluded that honey is produced by the bee *A. cerana* from sugar palm and coconut saps as the feed have at a quality that is acceptable by Indonesian national standards, and the international standard has been regulated by the Codex Alimentarius. Honey potency production from the coconut sap in 100 hectares area can produce honey of 1542.857 tons/year or equivalent with 128.571 tons/month, while sugar palm can produce honey of 1150 tons/year or equivalent with 95.833 tons/month.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank all beekeepers and farmers who support and permit our teams to conduct this study in North Duman Village, Lingsar Sub-district, West Lombok, Indonesia.

REFERENCES

Agus A, Agussalim, Sahlan M, Sabir A. 2021. Honey sugars profile of stingless bee *Tetragonula laeviceps* (Hymenoptera: Meliponinae). Biodiversitas 22: 5205-5210. DOI: 10.13057/biodiv/d221159.

Agussalim, Agus A. 2022. Production of honey, pot-pollen and propolis production from Indonesian stingless bee *Tetragonula laeviceps* and the physicochemical properties of honey: A review. Livest Res Rural Dev 34 (8): 66.

Agussalim, Agus A, Nurliyani, Umami N. 2019. The sugar content profile of honey produced by the Indonesian Stingless bee, *Tetragonula laeviceps*, from different regions. Livest Res Rural Dev 31 (6): 91.

Agussalim, Agus A, Umami N, Budisatria IGS. 2018. The type of honeybees forages in district of Pakem Sleman and Nglipar Gunungkidul Yogyakarta. Bull Anim Sci 42 (1): 50-56. DOI: 10.21059/buletinpeternak.v42i1.28294.

Agussalim, Agus A, Umami N, Budisatria IGS. 2017. Variation of honeybees forages as source of nectar and pollen based on altitude in Yogyakarta. Bull Anim Sci 41 (4): 448-460. DOI: 10.21059/buletinpeternak.v41i4.13593.

AOAC. 2005. Official Method of Association of Official Analytical Chemist. 18th Edition. Association of Official Analytical Chemist. Benjamin Franklin Station, Washington DC.

Balasubramanyam MV. 2021. Factors influencing the transformation of nectar to honey in *Apis cerana indica*. Intl J Biol Innov 3: 271-277. DOI: 10.46505/ijbi.2021.3204.

Da Silva PM, Gauche C, Gonzaga LV, Costa ACO, Fett R. 2016. Honey: Chemical composition, stability and authenticity. Food Chem 196: 309-323. DOI: 10.1016/j.foodchem.2015.09.051.

Department of Agricultural and Plantations. 2021. Rekapitulasi Produksi, Luas Panen, dan Produktivitas Aren Provinsi NTB. Dinas Pertanian dan Perkebunan Provinsi NTB, Mataram. [Indonesian]

Erwan E, Harun M, Muhsinin M. 2020. The honey quality of *Apis mellifera* with extrafloral nectar in Lombok West Nusa Tenggara Indonesia. J Sci Sci Educ 1: 1-7. DOI: 10.29303/jossed.v1i1.482.

Erwan, Franti LD, Purnamasari DK, Muhsinin M, Agussalim A. 2021a. Preliminary study on moisture, fat, and protein contents of bee bread from *Apis cerana* from different regions in North Lombok Regency, Indonesia. J Trop Anim Prod 22: 35-41. DOI: 10.21776/ub.jtapro.2021.022.01.5.

Erwan, Muhsinin M, Agussalim. 2021b. Enhancing honey and bee bread cells number from Indonesian honeybee *Apis cerana* by feeding modification. Livest Res Rural Dev 33: 121.

Erwan, Supeno B, Agussalim. 2022. Improving the productivity of local honeybee (*Apis cerana*) by using feeds coconut sap and sugar palm (sap and pollen) in West Lombok, Indonesia. Livest Res Rural Dev 34: 25.

Escuredo O, Dobre I, Fernández-González M, Seijo MC. 2014. Contribution of botanical origin and sugar composition of honeys on the crystallization phenomenon. Food Chem 149: 84-90. DOI: 10.1016/j.foodchem.2013.10.097.

Escuredo O, Míguez M, Fernández-González M, Seijo MC. 2013. Nutritional value and antioxidant activity of honeys produced in a European Atlantic area. Food Chem 138: 851-856. DOI: 10.1016/j.foodchem.2012.11.015.

Guerzou M, Aouissi HA, Guerzou A, Burlakovs J, Doumandji S, Krauklis AE. 2021. From the beehives: Identification and comparison of physicochemical properties of Alergian honey. Resources 10: 94. DOI: 10.3390/resources10100094.

Hepburn HR, Radloff SE. 2011. Biogeography. In: Hepburn HR, Radloff SE (eds). Honeybees of Asia. Springer, New York.

Karabagias IK, Badeka A, Kontakos S, Karabournioti S, Kontominas MG. 2014. Characterisation and classification of Greek pine honeys according to their geographical origin based on volatiles, physicochemical parameters and chemometrics. Food Chem 146: 548-557. DOI: 10.1016/j.foodchem.2013.09.105.

Machado AM, Tomás A, Russo-Almeida P, Duarte A, Antunes M, Vilas-Boas M, Graça MM, Cristina FA. 2022. Quality assessment of Portuguese monofloral honeys: Physicochemical parameters as tools in botanical source differentiation. Food Res Intl 157: 111362. DOI: 10.1016/j.foodres.2022.111362.

Moniruzzaman M, Khalil I, Sulaiman SA, Gan SH. 2013. Physicochemical and antioxidant properties of Malaysian honeys produced by *Apis cerana*, *Apis dorsata* and *Apis mellifera*. BMC Complement Altern Med 13: 43. DOI: 10.1186/1472-6882-13-43.

Nainu F, Masyita A, Bahar MA, Raihan M, Prova SR, Mitra S, Emran TB, Simal-Gandara J. 2021. Pharmaceutical prospects of bee products: Special focus on anticancer, antibacterial, antiviral, and antiparasitic properties. Antibiotics 10: 822. DOI: 10.3390/antibiotics10070822.

National Standardization Agency of Indonesia. 2018. Indonesian National Standard for Honey. Badan Standarisasi Nasional, Jakarta. [Indonesia]

Pasias IN, Kiriakou IK, Kaitatzis A, Koutelidakis AE, Proestos C. 2018. Effect of late harvest and floral origin on honey antibacterial properties and quality parameters. Food Chem 242: 513-518. DOI: 10.1016/j.foodchem.2017.09.083.

Pohorecka K, Bober A, Skubida M, Zdańska D, Torój K. 2014. A comparative study of environmental conditions, bee management and the epidemiological situation in apiaries varying in the level of colony losses. J Apic Sci 58: 107-132. DOI: 10.2478/JAS-2014-0027.

Puscas A, Hosu A, Cimpoiu C. 2013. Application of a newly developed and validated high-performance thin-layer chromatographic method to control honey adulteration. J Chromatogr A 1272: 132-135. DOI: 10.1016/j.chroma.2012.11.064.

Radloff SE, Hepburn HR, Engel MS. 2011. The Asian species of Apis. In: Hepburn HR, Radloff SE (eds). Honeybees of Asia. Springer, New York.

Schouten C, Lloyd D, Lloyd H. 2019. Beekeeping with the Asian honey bee (*Apis cerana javana* Fabr) in the Indonesian islands of Java, Bali, Nusa Penida, and Sumbawa. Bee World 96: 45-49. DOI: 10.1080/0005772x.2018.1564497.

Steel RGD, Torrie JH, Zoberer DA. 1997. Principles and Procedures of Statistics a Biometrical Approach. 3rd Edition. McGraw-Hill Inc., New York.

Supeno B, Erwan, Agussalim. 2021. Enhances production of coffee (*Coffea robusta*): The role of pollinator, forages potency, and honey production from *Tetragonula* sp. (*Meliponinae*) in central Lombok, Indonesia. Biodiversitas 22: 4687-4693. DOI: 10.13057/biodiv/d221062.

Thrasyvoulou A, Tananaki C, Goras G, Karazafiris E, Dimou M, Liolios V, Kanelis D, Gounari S. 2018. Legislation of honey criteria and standards. J Apic Res 57: 88-96. DOI: 10.1080/00218839.2017.1411181.

Tornuk F, Karaman S, Ozturk I, Toker OS, Tastemur B, Sagdic O, Dogan M, Kayacier A. 2013. Quality characterization of artisanal and retail Turkish blossom honeys: Determination of physicochemical, microbiological, bioactive properties and aroma profile. Ind Crops Prod 46: 124-131. DOI: 10.1016/j.indcrop.2012.12.042.

Wahyuni N, Asfar AMIT, Asfar AMIA, Asrina, Isdar. 2021. Vinegar Nira Aren. Media Sains Indonesia, Tangerang.

Wang Y, Gou X, Yue T, Ren R, Zhao H, He L, Liu C, Cao W. 2021. Evaluation of physicochemical properties of Qinling *Apis cerana* honey and the antimicrobial activity of the extract against *Salmonella Typhimurium* LT2 in vitro and in vivo. Food Chem 337: 127774. DOI: 10.1016/j.foodchem.2020.127774.

Wu J, Duan Y, Gao Z, Yang X, Zhao D, Gao J, Han W, Li G, Wang S. 2020. Quality comparison of multifloral honeys produced by *Apis cerana cerana*, *Apis dorsata* and *Lepidotrigona flavibasis*. LWT - Food Sci Technol 134: 110225. DOI: 10.1016/j.lwt.2020.110225.

Yücel Y, Sultanoğlu P. 2013. Characterization of honeys from Hatay Region by their physicochemical properties combined with chemometrics. Food Biosci 1: 16-25. DOI: 10.1016/j.fbio.2013.02.001.

Zhang GZ, Tian J, Zhang YZ, Li SS, Zheng HQ, Hu FL. 2021. Investigation of the maturity evaluation indicator of honey in natural ripening process: The case of rape honey. Foods 10: 2882. DOI: 10.3390/foods10112882.