The roles of fish, plants and microbes

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

***Abstract*—Aquaponics connects fish production with soilless plant cultivation through water that carries fish-derived material. Its biological basis cannot be explained simply by placing fish and plants in a connected system: microorganisms process waste, including through mineralisation and nitrogen conversion, before plants can use some of its nutrients. This paper synthesises review evidence to distinguish the roles of fish, plants and microbes and explain their causal relationship. Fish feed and waste provide inputs; microbial communities release nutrients from organic material and nitrifying bacteria transform nitrogen compounds; plants take up available nutrients and can reduce nitrate accumulation. These roles are connected but not interchangeable. In particular, the presence of waste does not establish nutrient availability, and the presence of plants does not establish that uptake matches the input from fish production. The reviewed evidence supports this explanatory sequence while cautioning against treating it as a universally validated balance or operating prescription. The central implication is that aquaponics must be understood through the relationships among waste production, microbial transformation and plant uptake, with their relative contributions assessed in the particular system under consideration.**

I. Introduction

Aquaponics connects fish and plant production by moving water containing fish-derived material into contact with plants. Microorganisms, particularly nitrifying bacteria, participate in transforming compounds carried by that water [1]. The roles of fish, plants and microbes are therefore a causal question, not merely a list of organisms present. Fish supply material, microbes change the availability or form of some of that material, and plants use available nutrients. Distinguishing these contributions matters because the physical connection between fish and plants cannot, on its own, explain how waste contributes to plant nutrition.

Fish effluent is not necessarily a ready-made plant nutrient solution. Microbial communities can mineralise material in the effluent, including in oxygenated biofilters, making nutrients available for plant use [2]. This intervening role changes the meaning of the familiar shorthand that fish feed plants: fish provide an input, whereas microbial processing helps determine what plants can obtain from it. The distinction also prevents every microorganism from being assigned the same function. An explanation of aquaponics needs to identify the relevant transformation before drawing conclusions about the contribution of fish-derived material to plant growth.

Plant uptake adds a further step to the connection. A review describes fish waste as contributing to plant nutrition and places plant uptake alongside microbial processes in the recycling of water [3]. Neither process substitutes for the other: conversion concerns the material available to plants, while uptake concerns what plants remove from the water. This paper develops that distinction by defining the scope of the three-role explanation, examining its principal mechanisms and synthesising the evidence for their interaction. It then considers why the causal sequence should not be mistaken for proof that waste production, nutrient conversion and uptake are balanced in every system.

II. Background and Scope

The relationship between fish waste and plant nutrition depends in part on nitrogen conversion. A review of soilless systems explains microbial nitrification of fish-derived waste into nitrogen that plants can use and relates the waste supplied to plant uptake [4]. This account identifies a limitation of explanations based only on circulating water: water can transport material without making every constituent immediately available to roots. It also distinguishes nutrient supply from nutrient demand. The present discussion is concerned with how fish, plants and microbes contribute to that relationship, rather than with assuming that the presence of one contribution demonstrates the extent of the others.

A broader account begins before conversion, with feed entering fish production. An aquaponics review connects feed and fish waste to microbial decomposition and nitrification, followed by plant use of available nutrients [5]. This sequence explains why waste must be considered both as an output of fish production and as material whose composition changes before plant uptake. Decomposition and nitrification describe different contributions within the microbial role, rather than two names for an identical event. The explanatory gap left by a direct fish-to-plant description is therefore the intervening change in material and the distinction between what enters the water and what plants eventually use.

The nitrogen pathway makes the respective contributions more specific. An aquaponics review describes nitrifying bacteria converting ammonia and nitrite, while plant uptake can reduce nitrate accumulation in an integrated system [6]. Fish production supplies the material entering this pathway, bacteria alter nitrogen compounds, and plants remove some of the resulting available nitrogen. This account does not imply that every nutrient follows the same sequence or that a fixed relation between fish and plant production applies everywhere. Reported production ratios are context-dependent [6], so a general explanation of the roles should not be presented as a universal measure of their balance.

III. Core Concepts and Mechanisms

The fish role is to supply material through feeding and the waste associated with fish production. Reviews of aquaponics connect that material to the water used by plants, but also place microorganisms between fish-derived compounds and plant nutrition [1], [5]. This separates the origin of a potential nutrient from its availability. Fish are essential to the account because their production supplies the input, yet fish alone do not perform the biological conversion described in the evidence. The implication is that a statement such as fish feed plants is scientifically useful only if the microbial steps and the plants' subsequent uptake are made explicit.

Microbes perform related but distinguishable functions. Communities processing fish effluent can release nutrients from organic material, including where oxygenated biofilters provide a setting for that activity [2]. Nitrifying bacteria participate in converting fish-derived nitrogen compounds into forms that plants can use [1], [4]. An aquaponics review likewise places decomposition and nitrification within the pathway from waste to available nutrients [5]. These accounts explain why the microbial role cannot be reduced to the mere presence of bacteria in the water. They do not, however, establish that all waste is converted or that each microbial process contributes equally to plant nutrition.

Plants contribute through uptake rather than by performing the preceding transformations. Nitrification helps explain the production of plant-available nitrogen from fish-derived waste [4], while plant uptake can limit nitrate accumulation after microbial conversion [6]. These processes give the plant role significance beyond its visible growth: uptake affects the material remaining in the connected water. The connection is nevertheless conditional, because the rate at which fish production supplies waste need not be identical to the rates of microbial conversion and plant use. A causal account can identify these stages without claiming that they are automatically balanced [4], [5].

IV. Evidence Synthesis

The reviewed accounts converge on a sequence of fish inputs, microbial processing and plant use, although they emphasise different parts of it. An aquaponics review traces feed and waste through decomposition and nitrification to available nutrients [5]. A review of soilless systems focuses on nitrification and the relationship between fish waste and plant uptake [4]. Another aquaponics review specifies ammonia and nitrite conversion and the possibility of reducing nitrate accumulation through plant uptake [6]. Together, these accounts support a coherent explanation of the three roles rather than three separate claims about benefits. Their agreement establishes the pathway's scientific meaning, not a uniform outcome for every system.

The distinction between mineralisation and nitrogen conversion improves that explanation. Microbial processing of fish effluent can release nutrients held in organic material [2], whereas nitrification identifies a more specific transformation of nitrogen compounds [4], [6]. Plant uptake then concerns the use of available nutrients, not their initial release from waste [5]. Treating these functions separately avoids implying that waste becomes useful merely by travelling with water or that all microbial activity has the same nutritional consequence. It also clarifies why evidence of fish waste entering a system cannot by itself establish how much nutrient a plant obtains.

The water connection provides the physical route for these biological relationships, but it should not be confused with a guarantee of complete recycling. Aquaculture water can carry fish-derived material towards plant cultivation, and microorganisms are integral to the coupling described in a peer-reviewed review [1]. Reviews also identify conversion and uptake as distinct stages [4], [5], [6]. It follows that observing one stage does not measure the others. The evidence supports the direction of the causal relationship, while the extent of nutrient release, transformation and uptake remains a separate question. This is why the coupling framework is explanatory rather than a universally validated operating prescription.

V. Practical Implications and Limitations

The three-role model directs attention to relationships among processes rather than the mere presence of fish, plants and microbes. Fish-derived waste provides material, microbial decomposition can make nutrients available, and plant uptake uses part of that supply [2], [5]. Nitrogen conversion and nitrate uptake give a more specific account of how the water can change as it passes through the integrated system [6]. These mechanisms identify what must be examined to understand a particular case, but they do not show that every nutrient released is recovered by plants. The availability of material, its transformation and its uptake remain separate questions.

A balance between fish and plants cannot be inferred from a general description of aquaponics. Reviews relate fish waste to plant uptake and identify nitrification as one of the processes connecting them [4], [5]. The observation that production ratios depend on context reinforces the need to avoid assigning one relationship to every system [6]. This constraint is relevant even when the causal pathway is well understood: knowing which organisms perform each role does not establish how extensively they perform it under particular conditions. Claims about a given system should therefore distinguish a demonstrated input from a demonstrated conversion and from nutrient uptake by its plants.

The strongest next validation would examine those stages together. Microbial mineralisation provides one route by which fish effluent can yield plant nutrients [2], while aquaponics reviews identify decomposition, nitrification and plant uptake as linked but distinct processes [5], [6]. Establishing their relationship in a specified system would show whether the waste supplied, the available nutrients produced and the nutrients used by plants correspond. This is a need for evidence about the particular biological connection, not a reason to discard the general causal explanation. The reviewed sources explain why aquaponics can work; they do not replace system-specific evidence of how closely its contributions are matched.

VI. Conclusion

The roles of fish, plants and microbes are connected but not interchangeable. Fish production introduces waste-derived material, microbial communities release nutrients and transform nitrogen compounds, and plants take up nutrients that have become available [2], [5], [6]. Water links these roles physically, while microbial activity helps explain why fish-derived material can support plant nutrition [1]. This account answers the central biological question without treating fish waste as immediately usable by plants or attributing the entire relationship to any one organism.

The evidence establishes a causal pathway more securely than it establishes a universal balance among its stages. Reviews link fish inputs, nitrification and plant uptake, while also indicating that production relationships depend on context [4], [6]. The most valuable further assessment is therefore to examine waste production, microbial transformation and plant uptake together in a specified system. Until their relative contributions are established there, the sound conclusion remains bounded: fish provide material, microbes mediate essential changes in its availability, and plants use available nutrients, but the extent of each contribution cannot be presumed from the presence of the three biological roles alone.

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] 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.

[4] 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.

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

[6] 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.