Aquaponics compared with recirculating aquaculture and hydroponics

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

***Abstract*—Aquaponics combines fish production with soilless plant cultivation, but listing those components does not explain the scientific relationship between them. This paper compares aquaponics with recirculating aquaculture and hydroponics by examining where plant nutrients originate, how fish-derived material becomes useful to plants, and how water connects the growing units. The reviewed evidence identifies microbial processing of fish effluent as part of the nutrient pathway. It also distinguishes permanent from on-demand coupling and recognises coupled and decoupled water flows. Aquaponics is therefore not defined by a single circulation pattern: its distinguishing feature is a functional connection between aquaculture and hydroponic cultivation through water and nutrients. That connection introduces a need to consider fish, plants and microbial processes together, rather than assuming that conditions suitable for one component automatically suit another. The reviews support this causal explanation but do not establish a universal performance advantage over separate recirculating aquaculture or hydroponics. Comparisons of particular arrangements must specify their nutrient pathways and circulation before drawing conclusions about outcomes.**

I. Introduction

Aquaponics is often described as aquaculture combined with hydroponics, yet the word combined leaves the relationship between the growing activities unclear. A review of aquaponic coupling defines that relationship through water-mediated connections and distinguishes permanently connected systems from those connected on demand [1]. Circulation and operational interdependence consequently vary even among systems called aquaponic. This matters when comparing aquaponics with recirculating aquaculture and hydroponics: the mere presence of fish and plants establishes less than an account of how their growing units exchange water and nutrients. Coupling provides an explanatory framework, although it is not a validated numerical threshold for ranking systems or deciding every borderline case.

The nutrient pathway supplies the biological part of the explanation. A review of organic nutrient production for soilless cultivation discusses aquaponics as an approach in which microbial communities mineralise fish effluent, making fish-derived material relevant to plant nutrition [2]. Thus, water travelling from a fish unit towards plants is not the whole mechanism. Material within that water undergoes biological processing, and the resulting nutrient contribution must be distinguished from the simple transfer of liquid. This distinction makes aquaponics more than the physical combination of two installations, while cautioning against the assumption that fish effluent alone will necessarily meet the needs of any chosen plant.

Aquaponics also needs to be situated within soilless cultivation rather than treated as wholly separate from it. A review of soilless production discusses aquaponic systems and includes an example involving fish-derived inputs and lettuce cultivation [3]. That example illustrates the relevance of the nutrient source without establishing a general performance result for aquaponics. This paper therefore asks what changes scientifically when a recirculating fish-growing activity and a hydroponic plant-growing activity are connected. It first distinguishes the activities, then explains nutrient conversion and coupling, and finally examines what the review evidence permits one to conclude about the combined system.

II. Background and Scope

Hydroponics concerns plant cultivation without soil; aquaponics retains a soilless plant-growing unit but links it to fish production. A review describes aquaponics as a relationship between fish and plants in which fish-derived waste contributes to plant nutrition and water is reused [4]. The relationship is functional, not merely spatial. Plants beside a fish tank do not demonstrate aquaponics unless there is a meaningful pathway between the growing activities. Equally, a plant-growing unit does not make the fish component incidental: fish production remains a distinct activity. Comparing the systems therefore requires attention to both what each unit does and what fish-derived material contributes after the units are connected.

Recirculating aquaculture contributes the fish-growing and water-reuse context, whereas hydroponics contributes a method of growing plants without soil. A review of soilless systems explicitly presents aquaponics as their integration and discusses both fish-waste conversion and the need to balance conditions for fish and plants [5]. Those points identify the limit of a simple two-part definition. The units can share a resource pathway without having identical requirements, and waste produced by one unit does not become useful to the other merely because the two are connected. The central explanatory question is how a fish-derived input can support plant cultivation while both growing activities remain viable.

Biology and flow must be considered together to answer that question. A review of aquaponic systems describes beneficial bacteria alongside aquaculture, hydroponics, water reuse and

nutrient recycling; it also distinguishes coupled from decoupled flows [6]. Fish feed and waste contribute to the plant nutrient pathway, but bacterial activity and the arrangement of water movement affect how that relationship is understood. These distinctions expose a gap in comparisons that only inventory equipment or call all installations with fish and plants equivalent. The present comparison is consequently about causal organisation. It does not infer that any configuration has a particular yield or efficiency advantage without comparable evidence for that claim.

III. Core Concepts and Mechanisms

A useful starting point is to keep the production functions distinct. Recirculating aquaculture is organised around a fish-growing unit, and hydroponics around a soilless plant-growing unit. A review addressing aquaponics together with recirculating aquaculture and hydroponic growing units provides a basis for comparing those functions before considering their connection [7]. Aquaponics does not turn fish production into plant production or remove the separate needs of either activity. Instead, it creates a route by which material arising from the fish side can become an input on the plant side. Identifying that route is more informative than identifying shared premises, because it states what the combined system does differently.

Microbial transformation is a key step along that route. Fish-derived effluent can contain material relevant to plant nutrition, and the bioponics review identifies microbial mineralisation as a process through which this material contributes to nutrient supply [2]. The aquaponic-system review likewise places beneficial bacteria within the integration of fish and plant growing and describes contributions from fish feed and waste [6]. These accounts support a causal sequence from fish production to biological processing to a potential plant nutrient input. They do not establish that every constituent of the effluent is useful to plants, or that the sequence provides a complete nutrient supply in every installation.

Circulation determines how closely the two growing activities are connected during that sequence. A coupling framework distinguishes permanent connection from connection on demand, with differences in water movement and operational dependence [1]. Aquaponic-system literature also discusses coupled and decoupled flows [6]. Together, these distinctions show why a single plumbing arrangement cannot stand for all aquaponics. A system may maintain a fish-to-plant nutrient relationship even when the growing units do not share identical circulation at all times. The design consequence is that the strength and form of interaction must be described for each arrangement rather than assumed from the word aquaponics.

IV. Evidence Synthesis

The reviewed accounts agree on the central distinction between a connected aquaponic system and its separate constituent approaches. Aquaponics links aquaculture and hydroponic cultivation through water and fish-derived nutrients, while requiring attention to conversion processes and the conditions of both growing units [1], [5], [6]. The sources contribute different parts of this explanation: coupling clarifies the form of the connection, fish-waste conversion clarifies why a nutrient pathway exists, and system balancing clarifies why connection alone is insufficient. Their convergence supports a scientific definition based on relationships and processes rather than on an equipment checklist. It does not imply that all connected systems function equally well.

Comparison with hydroponics is clearest when the origin of nutrients is separated from their delivery to roots. Soilless cultivation can use a supplied nutrient solution, while aquaponics draws on fish-derived material whose contribution depends in part on microbial processing [2]. A review discussing fish-derived inputs in soilless production places aquaponics within the wider family of plant-growing approaches rather than outside it [3]. A separate account of fish and plant interaction connects that nutrient source with water reuse [4]. The implication is specific: aquaponics shares hydroponics' soilless growing function but adds a nutrient pathway tied to fish production. It is not evidence that fish-derived inputs always replace every other nutrient source.

Comparison with recirculating aquaculture turns on the destination of resources from the fish-growing activity. Reviews of coupling and aquaponic flows then explain why the connection between those units may be permanent, intermittent, coupled or more separated [1], [6]. The additional plant-growing function is therefore defined by a resource relationship, not by one mandatory circulation path. Because the coupling framework lacks a validated numerical boundary, describing actual water and nutrient transfer is more defensible than claiming that a particular degree of connection automatically qualifies or disqualifies every system.

V. Practical Implications and Limitations

The first requirement for interpreting an aquaponic arrangement is to trace its nutrient pathway. An account should identify the fish-growing and hydroponic units, explain how fish-derived material reaches the plants, and recognise the conversion process between waste production and plant nutrition [5], [6], [7]. These questions distinguish a functional system from a description that merely lists its components. They also make the evidence limit visible: establishing a possible pathway does not show how much nutrient becomes available in a particular installation or whether it meets the plants' requirements. Those matters require observations of the arrangement being assessed rather than an inference from its classification.

A second requirement is to identify the form of water connection. Permanent and on-demand coupling imply different circulation and degrees of operational interdependence [1], while coupled and decoupled flows provide another relevant distinction in aquaponic-system descriptions [6]. The arrangement matters because fish and plants have needs that must be balanced in an integrated system [5]. Neither closer circulation nor greater separation can be pronounced universally preferable from the accepted claims alone. For a

particular comparison, the useful question is how the chosen flow maintains the fish-to-plant nutrient relationship while accommodating the two growing activities.

The strongest supported conclusion concerns mechanism rather than comparative performance. Reviews explain aquaponic nutrient recycling and cover the relationship between recirculating aquaculture and hydroponic growing units [6], [7]. They also identify fish-waste conversion and the need to balance the combined system [5]. These points do not establish that aquaponics invariably outperforms separate aquaculture or hydroponics in production or resource use. Testing such a claim would require comparable outcomes for explicitly described configurations, including the direction of water movement and the role of fish-derived nutrients. Until that evidence is available for the systems being compared, a causal explanation is warranted but a universal ranking is not.

VI. Conclusion

Aquaponics differs from recirculating aquaculture and hydroponics by establishing a functional fish-to-plant connection between two otherwise distinct growing activities. Water carries that connection, while microbial processing helps explain how fish-derived material can contribute to plant nutrition [2], [6]. Permanent and on-demand coupling, together with coupled and decoupled flows, show that the relationship need not have one fixed circulation pattern [1], [6]. The defining scientific issue is therefore how nutrients are produced, transformed and transferred, not simply whether fish and plants are present. Because integrated growing also requires the needs of both components to be considered [5], the most valuable next comparison would document the actual nutrient pathway and water connection before measuring outcomes for fish and plants. The existing reviews explain why aquaponics works as a connected system, but they do not justify a universal claim that it performs better than either separate approach.

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.