What aquaponics combines and why integration matters

Grant Kinkead
Independent Researcher, Melbourne, VIC, Australia
grant@kinkead.au

***Abstract*—Aquaponics combines aquatic animal production with soilless plant cultivation through the movement of water and nutrients between them. Its defining feature is not simply that fish and plants are grown together. Aquaculture water carries animal-derived material towards plants, microorganisms convert some fish-derived material into nutrients that plants can use, and plant uptake contributes to water recycling. This paper synthesises reviews of these relationships to explain both what aquaponics combines and why integration matters. The evidence supports a causal account in which water provides the physical connection and microbial activity makes the nutrient connection biologically useful. Plant uptake completes the pathway described in the reviews, but the existence of that pathway does not establish that nutrient supply always meets plant demand or that a particular amount of water is saved. Aquaponics is consequently understood here as a coupled biological system rather than two independent cultivation methods placed side by side. Assessing its performance in a particular setting requires evidence about the connected processes, not an inference from the system's name.**

I. Introduction

Aquaponics is a coupling of aquatic animal culture and hydroponic plant cultivation mediated by water. Aquaculture water can carry animal metabolic outputs towards plants while also supplying irrigation; microbiological processes contribute to the nutrient relationship [1]. These functions, rather than the mere presence of animals and plants in one place, distinguish integration from coexistence. The central question is how material associated with aquatic production becomes relevant to plant cultivation, and why the connection affects the interpretation of both activities. Answering it requires attention to the route taken by water and the changes undergone by nutrients. A description that names only the two production methods leaves their causal relationship unexplained.

The relationship is biological as well as physical. An account of aquaponics within bioponics describes microbes processing fish effluent so that nutrients become available to plants [2]. The fish-derived material is therefore not adequately described as a ready-made plant nutrient solution. Its potential value to plants depends on transformation before uptake. This distinction matters because simply transferring water from fish production to a planting area cannot, by itself, explain the nutritional basis of the combined system. It also prevents a stronger conclusion than the evidence warrants: identifying a conversion pathway does not establish that every nutrient entering the pathway is converted or subsequently absorbed by plants.

Reviews of soilless cultivation identify the conversion of fish-derived waste into plant-available nitrogen as an important part of aquaponics [3]. That account gives the combined system an explanatory sequence: aquatic production contributes material, microorganisms alter its nutrient form, and plants may use the result. The present paper develops that sequence, then examines how plant uptake relates to circulating water and why the exchange constitutes integration. It also separates the supported principle from claims about how efficiently any particular system operates. The objective is a scientifically bounded answer to what aquaponics combines and why the combination matters, without presuming a specified yield, complete nutrient supply or measured water saving.

II. Background and Scope

A description of aquaponics as a relationship between fish and plants highlights two linked functions. Fish-derived waste can support plant nutrition, while uptake by plants contributes to the recycling of water [4]. These functions give each production activity a role in a shared pathway. By contrast, fish and plants grown independently would not necessarily exchange water or nutrients, even if both were produced without soil-based cultivation. The distinction is functional, not merely spatial. It directs analysis towards what material moves, what happens to it and which organism uses it. It does not imply that all material originating in fish production becomes useful to plants or that uptake alone accounts for every aspect of water reuse.

Aquaponics also has a narrower meaning than soilless cultivation considered generally. A review of soilless systems describes the integration of hydroponic cultivation with recirculating aquaculture and the biological conversion of fish waste into nitrogen available to plants [5]. Hydroponic cultivation supplies the plant-production side of the comparison, but the aquatic source and conversion of nutrients make the integrated arrangement distinctive. Recirculation establishes a pathway for water; it does not substitute for explaining the transformation of its contents. This comparison clarifies the scope of the paper: the subject is not every way to grow plants without soil, but the particular causal relationship between aquatic production and plant nutrition in aquaponics.

An aquaponics review explicitly brings aquaculture, hydroponics and beneficial bacteria into one account, connecting fish feed and waste to microbial conversion and plant nutrient demand [6]. This framing avoids treating microorganisms as

incidental inhabitants of a system composed only of fish and plants. It also reveals a distinction between a pathway and a balanced pathway. The reviews identify how fish-derived inputs can reach plants in a useful form, but the existence of that route does not establish that its nutrient output matches plant demand under all circumstances. Explaining the combination therefore requires both the connection among components and a clear limit on what can be inferred from that connection.

III. Core Concepts and Mechanisms

The water connection gives the two cultivation methods a shared physical pathway. Aquaponics reviews describe hydroponic plant production integrated with recirculating aquaculture [7], while an account of the coupling principle specifies that aquaculture water carries animal-derived material towards plants and serves as irrigation [1]. Water thus does more than supply separate production areas: it links their activities and transports a potential nutrient source. This is why proximity alone is insufficient to define aquaponics. The implication is not that any transfer of aquaculture water produces a successful integrated system. Rather, movement of water creates the route along which the biologically significant exchange can occur.

Microbial transformation supplies the next step in that exchange. A review of bioponics describes microbes mineralising fish effluent to provide nutrients for plants [2]; a review of soilless cultivation also identifies conversion of fish waste into plant-available nitrogen [3]. These accounts clarify the different roles involved. Fish production contributes material, microbial activity changes its nutrient availability, and plant cultivation provides a use for the transformed nutrients. Compressing this sequence into the statement that plants feed directly on fish waste would obscure the intervening process. The distinction is essential to explaining why aquaponics combines more than two organisms and why a shared water supply acquires nutritional significance.

Plant uptake closes the nutrient pathway described in the reviewed material. Fish-derived nutrients can support plants, and their uptake contributes to the account of water recycling [4]. The broader aquaponics review relates that uptake to fish feed, waste, microbial conversion and plant nutrient demand [6]. Plants are consequently participants in the coupled process, not simply crops irrigated with water from another activity. Their role does not establish that they absorb every available nutrient or remove every substance present in the water. The supported mechanism is narrower: transformed material originating in aquatic production can become available to plants, whose uptake is relevant to continued use of the connected water pathway.

IV. Evidence Synthesis

The reviewed accounts approach integration from complementary directions. The coupling account foregrounds the passage of aquaculture water and animal-derived material towards hydroponic plants, with microbiological processes contributing to the exchange [1]. Reviews of soilless cultivation and aquaponic systems foreground biologically converted fish waste, beneficial bacteria and plant nutrient demand [5], [6]. Together, they support a causal sequence rather than a mere list of components. Water carries material between activities; microorganisms change the availability of nutrients; plants can then use part of the resulting supply. No single component independently accounts for the combined system. The scientific significance of aquaponics lies in the relationship among their functions.

Nutrient recycling and water recycling are related but distinct ideas in this evidence. Microbial conversion makes fish-derived material potentially useful for plant nutrition [2], [5]. Plant uptake, in turn, contributes to the use of water within a connected fish and plant system [4]. The first proposition concerns what happens to nutrients; the second concerns a role of plants in the continuing water pathway. Treating them as separate, connected processes avoids implying that nutrient transformation alone measures water saving. It also avoids assuming that recirculation proves substantial nutrient uptake. The evidence establishes why both processes belong in an explanation of integration, without supplying a universal measure of either outcome.

The difference between availability and adequacy is especially important. The conversion of fish-derived waste into plant-available nitrogen is described in the reviewed literature [3], [5]. Plant nutrient demand is also explicitly part of the integrated account [6]. A pathway from waste to an available nutrient form does not, however, demonstrate that the amount produced equals the amount plants require. That conclusion would need evidence about the specific relationship between inputs, transformation and demand. Retaining this distinction makes the causal explanation more precise. Aquaponics can connect nutrient generation to plant cultivation without the general definition proving complete nutrient provision in each instance.

V. Practical Implications and Limitations

The first practical implication concerns how integration is recognised. A system described as aquaponic should be understood through the functions linking recirculating aquaculture with hydroponic plant production [7]. Aquaculture water carrying material towards plants establishes a route [1]; microbial conversion and plant nutrient demand explain why that route can have biological significance [6]. The point is not to prescribe one physical arrangement, which these claims do not establish. It is to distinguish an operational connection from two production activities that merely share a location. Without an account of transformation and uptake, the nutritional significance of moving water between them remains unclear.

The second implication is that a causal pathway creates questions for assessment rather than answering every performance question. Fish-derived material must enter the pathway, microbes must convert relevant nutrients, and plants must be able to take up available material for the described relationship to operate [2], [6]. The reviews explain the roles of these

components but do not, in the accepted claims considered here, establish a universal balance among them. Likewise, plant uptake's contribution to water recycling [4] does not quantify how much water is reused. A particular system would need direct assessment of its connected functions before stronger claims about nutrient sufficiency or water-use outcomes could be made.

The strongest interpretation is consequently conditional but substantive. Aquaponics provides a way to couple aquatic production and soilless plants through a shared water pathway and biological conversion of fish-derived material [1], [5], [7]. This gives a scientifically meaningful reason to consider fish inputs, microbial activity and plant demand together [6]. It does not establish that a particular arrangement supplies all nutrients needed by its plants, transforms all fish-derived material or saves a fixed amount of water. Keeping these limits visible prevents the concept of integration from becoming a performance guarantee. At the same time, it preserves the mechanism that makes aquaponics distinct from independent aquaculture and hydroponics.

VI. Conclusion

Aquaponics combines aquatic animal production with hydroponic plant cultivation by connecting them through water and nutrient exchange. Aquaculture water carries animal-derived material towards plants; microbial activity makes some fish-derived material available as plant nutrients; and plant uptake contributes to the account of water recycling [1], [2], [4]. Beneficial bacteria therefore belong alongside aquatic animals and plants in the explanation of the combined system [6]. Integration matters because these functions form a causal relationship, rather than two independent activities conducted near one another. The reviewed evidence supports that relationship, but not a universal claim that nutrient supply always matches plant demand or that a specified water saving follows.

The distinction between the principle and its performance identifies the most useful next assessment. In a particular aquaponic arrangement, it is necessary to establish how aquatic inputs, microbial conversion and plant demand relate, rather than inferring their balance from the presence of a circulating water route [5], [6]. It is likewise necessary to assess plant uptake before assigning a particular water-recycling outcome to the system [4]. These questions follow directly from the explanation of what aquaponics combines. They preserve its scientific meaning as a coupled biological process while leaving the effectiveness of each implementation to be demonstrated.

Acknowledgment

The author used artificial intelligence tools to assist with manuscript drafting and revision, and with LaTeX and bibliography preparation. The author reviewed all AI-assisted output and remains responsible for the final content.

References

[1] G. F. M. Baganz, R. Junge, M. C. Portella, S. Goddek, K. J. Keesman, D. Baganz, G. Staaks, C. Shaw, F. Lohrberg, and W. Kloas, "The aquaponic principle-it is all about coupling," *Reviews in Aquaculture*, 2021.

[2] I. Szekely and M. H. Jijakli, "Bioponics as a promising approach to sustainable agriculture: A review of the main methods for producing organic nutrient solution for hydroponics," *Water*, 2022.

[3] A. Tuxun, Y. Xiang, Y. Shao, J. E. Son, M. Yamada, S. Yamada, K. Tagawa, B. Baiyin, and Q. Yang, "Soilless cultivation: Precise nutrient provision and growth environment regulation under different substrates," *Plants*, 2025.

[4] R. S. Velazquez-Gonzalez, A. L. Garcia-Garcia, E. Ventura-Zapata, J. D. O. Barceinas-Sanchez, and J. C. Sosa-Savedra, "A review on hydroponics and the technologies associated for medium- and small-scale operations," *Agriculture*, 2022.

[5] I. A. Lakhiar, H. Yan, T. N. Syed, C. Zhang, S. A. Shaikh, M. Rakibuzzaman, and R. B. Vistro, "Soilless agricultural systems: Opportunities, challenges, and applications for enhancing horticultural resilience to climate change and urbanization," *Horticulturae*, 2025.

[6] M. Krastanova, I. Sirakov, S. Ivanova-Kirilova, D. Yarkov, and P. Orozova, "Aquaponic systems: biological and technological parameters," *Biotechnology & Biotechnological Equipment*, 2022.

[7] V. T. Okomoda, S. A. Oladimeji, S. G. Solomon, S. O. Olufeagba, S. I. Ogah, and M. Ikhwanuddin, "Aquaponics production system: A review of historical perspective, opportunities, and challenges of its adoption," *Food Science & Nutrition*, 2023.