Recirculation, nutrient cycling, inputs and losses

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

***Abstract*—Aquaponics connects fish and plant production through recirculating water, yet water reuse and nutrient recycling are not the same process. This paper explains how nutrient inputs from feed and fish waste enter a circulating pathway, how microbial conversion changes nitrogen from ammonia through nitrite to nitrate, and how plant uptake and losses affect what remains available. Aquaponics reviews provide the primary evidence for this causal account. Research on hydroponics and other soilless systems supplies bounded comparisons concerning drainage recovery, nutrient retention, depletion and discharge, without being treated as direct evidence of aquaponic performance. The synthesis distinguishes the physical return of nutrient-bearing water from the biological transformations needed for nutrient availability. It also shows why retaining water cannot guarantee that feed-derived nutrients meet crop demand or that all nutrients remain in circulation. Inputs, transformed nutrient forms, plant uptake and outflows must be considered together to interpret a particular system. The available evidence supports this explanatory framework, but does not supply a universal nutrient balance or loss rate for aquaponics.**

I. Introduction

Water recirculation connects fish and plants in aquaponics, but the movement of water is only part of the explanation for plant nutrition. Feed introduces nutrients, fish waste contributes to the circulating nutrient stream, microorganisms convert ammonia through nitrite to nitrate, and plants take up available nutrients [1]. These steps create a relationship between nutrient loading and crop demand that cannot be established by observing water flow alone. A returned volume of water may carry nutrients, yet its return does not show whether their forms or amounts correspond to plant requirements. Recirculation is therefore best understood as a pathway connecting nutrient processes, while nutrient cycling describes how material within that pathway changes and moves.

The distinction between nutrient input and nutrient availability is particularly important when nutrients originate in organic material. Research on organic nutrient solutions for hydroponics examines microbial mineralisation, the release of nutrients from waste-derived material, and the possibility of imbalances or losses [2]. That research is not a direct measurement of feed conversion in aquaponics, but it explains why the presence of nutrient-bearing material cannot be equated with immediate plant supply. Aquaponic evidence adds the specific pathway from feed and fish waste through microbial nitrogen conversion to uptake [1], [3]. Together, these accounts make availability, rather than circulation alone, the central issue when considering whether inputs can satisfy crop demand.

This paper distinguishes recirculation, nutrient cycling, inputs and losses, then relates them through a causal account of aquaponics. Soilless cultivation research considers both microbial functions affecting plant uptake and the collection of drainage for reuse [4]. That combination helps identify two questions that must remain separate: whether nutrient-bearing water is retained, and whether its nutrients become available in suitable amounts. The discussion compares relevant soilless systems with aquaponics, explains the aquaponic nutrient pathway, and examines the limits of claims about retention and loss. Its central argument is that reuse can preserve opportunities for nutrient uptake, but the adequacy of supply depends on continuing inputs, biological transformation, crop demand and material leaving the circulating pathway [1], [3].

II. Background and Scope

Hydroponic nutrient-solution research establishes the physical distinction between reuse and discharge. Solution recovered after passing through a growing area can be returned for another passage; solution released from the system can carry residual nutrients away with the water [5]. The implication for aquaponics is limited but important: collecting a nutrient-bearing stream can prevent its immediate export, whereas releasing it removes a possible source of subsequent uptake. Hydroponic comparisons cannot, however, explain where aquaponic nutrients originate. In aquaponics, feed and fish waste contribute inputs that undergo microbial transformation before plant uptake [1]. The mechanism of water return should therefore not be mistaken for the mechanism that produces plant-available nutrients from those inputs.

Research across soilless cultivation describes a contrast between systems that release drainage and those that capture and reuse it to reduce water and nutrient losses [6]. This comparison gives losses a clear boundary: material crossing out of the circulating pathway is no longer present for another passage through it. Retention alone is less informative about nutrient availability. Evidence from recirculating nutrient film technique systems discusses nutrient depletion and accumulation, although that work is chiefly concerned with other aspects of those systems [7]. It illustrates why returning a solution does not imply that its composition remains unchanged. Neither source provides a transferable aquaponic loss rate or a universal rule for balancing its nutrient inputs against crop demand.

Aquaponics requires an additional account of feed-derived supply. An aquaponics review identifies feed as a nutrient input, describes biofiltration converting ammonia through nitrite to nitrate, and notes that feed-derived nutrients may still fall short of plant requirements [3]. The explanatory

problem is consequently not solved by choosing between water recovery and discharge. One must also ask what enters, which forms become available, what plants remove, and what is lost from the circulating pathway. This paper addresses those relationships as a synthesis rather than claiming that the cited reviews measured a common balance across all aquaponic systems. Keeping that scope explicit allows evidence from other soilless settings to clarify physical processes without replacing aquaponic evidence for the biological pathway [1], [6].

III. Core Concepts and Mechanisms

Recirculation is the return of water for further use; nutrient cycling includes the movement and transformation of nutrients within and beyond that water. In aquaponics, feed and fish waste contribute nutrient inputs, microorganisms convert ammonia through nitrite to nitrate, and plants take up nutrients [1]. The stages have different consequences for the circulating pool. Feed adds material, microbial activity changes the form of part of that material, and uptake transfers available nutrients to plants. Repeating the water route does not repeat an input or guarantee a conversion. This separation explains why the scientific meaning of recirculation depends on the nutrient pathway it connects, rather than on the fact that water returns to its starting point.

Biofiltration makes the distinction between physical circulation and biological conversion concrete. Aquaponic evidence describes ammonia passing through nitrite to nitrate and identifies possible shortages in the nutrient supply available to plants from feed-derived inputs [3]. Conversion of nitrogen is thus an essential part of the causal explanation, but it is not proof that every plant nutrient requirement is met. Research on organic nutrient solutions likewise distinguishes the nutrient content of waste-derived material from the nutrients released through microbial processing [2]. The implication is that nutrient inputs must be considered in relation to their accessible forms and crop uptake, not simply counted as material present in a recirculating system. The reviews do not establish how much conversion occurs in every configuration.

Retention introduces another distinction: material can remain within a cultivation system without remaining dissolved and immediately available to plants. Research on soilless growing media discusses nutrient retention, immobilisation and leaching, although recirculation is not its main subject [8]. This is a bounded comparison rather than a claim that every aquaponic system has the same media-related pathways. In hydroponic closed-loop irrigation, recovered solution may also require consideration before reuse, including filtration and disinfection [9]. Those observations show why the return of water and the suitability of what returns are separate questions. For aquaponics, the supported central relationship remains between feed-derived loading, microbial transformation, plant demand and losses [1], [3].

IV. Evidence Synthesis

The strongest direct support for aquaponic nutrient cycling links an identifiable input to a biological conversion pathway and subsequent plant uptake. Aquaponic reviews describe feed and fish waste as contributors to nutrient flow and biofiltration as a route from ammonia through nitrite to nitrate [1], [3]. Reviews of hydroponics and soilless cultivation support a complementary proposition: recovering nutrient-bearing water can avoid the immediate export associated with its discharge [5], [6]. These propositions are mutually relevant but not interchangeable. Recovery concerns whether material remains available for another passage; conversion concerns its chemical form; uptake concerns its removal by plants. Their combination explains why a recirculating system can reduce one route of loss without necessarily matching crop demand.

Comparative evidence further cautions against assuming that a returned stream retains a fixed nutrient composition. Work on recirculating nutrient film technique systems considers depletion and accumulation of nutrients, although its principal research focus lies elsewhere [7]. A review of soilless media discusses retention, immobilisation and leaching rather than establishing recirculation as its central mechanism [8]. These sources indicate distinct ways in which nutrient distribution or availability can differ from an initial input, but neither establishes their magnitude in aquaponics. Aquaponic reviews provide the appropriate basis for the central inference: feed-derived loading must be considered against plant needs after microbial transformation [1], [3]. The comparative studies clarify why a water circuit is an incomplete description of a nutrient balance.

A closed pathway may also return material whose effect has not been adequately characterised. An aeroponics viewpoint discusses nutrient delivery by aerosol and the possible recycling of root exudates, while explicitly noting uncertainty about the effects of those exudates [10]. This does not establish an aquaponic input or an aquaponic loss mechanism. Its analytical value is narrower: the word 'recycled' describes a route taken by material, not necessarily a demonstrated nutritional benefit. Hydroponic reviews likewise separate solution recovery from considerations associated with returning that solution for use [9]. These comparisons reinforce the need to distinguish physical retention from established nutrient availability, while leaving the aquaponic feed, biofiltration and plant-uptake pathway as the direct evidential foundation [1], [3].

V. Practical Implications and Limitations

An aquaponic nutrient balance should be interpreted through four questions: which nutrients enter, which forms result from transformation, what plants take up, and what leaves the circulating pathway. The reviewed aquaponic pathway connects feed and fish waste to microbial conversion and crop demand [1], [3]. Research on drainage capture in other soilless systems shows why outflow matters for the retention of nutrient-bearing water [6]. Neither line of evidence justifies inferring adequate nutrient supply merely because water is reused. For a

particular aquaponic system, the useful comparison is between feed-derived loading and plant demand after allowing for changes in nutrient form and material exported. The cited reviews support the need for that comparison, not a universal quantity for any of its terms.

Claims about losses need the same attention to system boundaries. Discharging nutrient-rich hydroponic solution provides an established example of water and nutrients leaving together [5]; capturing drainage in soilless cultivation can reduce that route of export [6]. Nutrient retention, immobilisation and leaching discussed for soilless media show that the location and availability of nutrients cannot always be inferred from water movement alone [8]. These observations are not measurements of losses in every aquaponic configuration. They instead identify why a defensible assessment must specify what counts as retained, available or exported. Without those distinctions, 'low loss' could describe captured water while overlooking a mismatch between feed-derived supply and plant requirements [3].

The limits of comparison are most pronounced where evidence concerns a different nutrient-delivery pathway. Possible exudate recycling in closed aeroponics remains poorly characterised and should not be presented as an established benefit or constraint in aquaponics [10]. Evidence from recirculating nutrient film technique systems concerns depletion and accumulation but does not quantify the corresponding changes in aquaponic water [7]. The highest-value validation for aquaponics would instead relate nutrient-bearing inputs and outflows to transformed nutrient forms and plant uptake in the system being examined. This follows from aquaponic reviews that connect loading, biofiltration and demand while recognising possible feed-derived shortfalls [1], [3]. It does not require assuming that results from other soilless systems transfer unchanged.

VI. Conclusion

Recirculation keeps water moving through an aquaponic pathway, while nutrient cycling encompasses feed-derived inputs, microbial changes in nutrient form and plant uptake [1], [3]. Capturing nutrient-bearing water can limit export through discharge, but returning it cannot establish complete nutrient retention or an adequate supply for crops [5], [6]. Evidence from other soilless systems helps explain why nutrients may be depleted, retained or moved beyond a cultivation boundary, yet it cannot provide a universal aquaponic balance [7], [8]. The resulting causal account is conditional: what recirculation achieves depends on the relationship among continuing inputs, transformations, uptake and losses. The most useful next assessment is to relate those terms to crop demand in the particular aquaponic system of interest, rather than infer nutrient sufficiency from the existence of a circulating water route [1], [3].

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

[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. R. A. Tawaha, P. E. M. Wahab, and H. Z. Jaafar, "Optimizing nutrient availability in decoupled recirculating aquaponic systems for enhanced plant productivity: A mini review," *Nitrogen*, 2025.

[4] 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.

[5] 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.

[6] 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.

[7] S. Scott and C. Villouta, "Dissolved oxygen limitation and pythium root rot in strawberry nft systems: Mechanisms, research gaps, and prospects for substrate-free production," *Frontiers in Plant Science*, 2026.

[8] G. Barrett, P. Alexander, J. Robinson, and N. Bragg, "Achieving environmentally sustainable growing media for soilless plant cultivation systems - a review," *Scientia Horticulturae*, 2016.

[9] C. Vatistas, D. D. Avgoustaki, and T. Bartzanas, "A systematic literature review on controlled-environment agriculture: How vertical farms and greenhouses can influence the sustainability and footprint of urban microclimate with local food production," *Atmosphere*, 2022.

[10] B. M. Eldridge, L. R. Manzoni, C. A. Graham, B. Rodgers, J. R. Farmer, and A. N. Dodd, "Getting to the roots of aeroponic indoor farming," *New Phytologist*, 2020.