Aquaponics as a managed ecosystem

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

***Abstract*—Aquaponics combines fish culture and soilless plant production, but its scientific meaning lies in the relationships among organisms and circulating water rather than in their physical proximity. This paper synthesises review evidence to explain aquaponics as a managed ecosystem. Fish-derived waste contributes to plant nutrition through biological transformations, while plant uptake and recirculation help connect nutrient use with water reuse. Beneficial bacteria are consequently part of the causal explanation, not an incidental addition to fish and plants. The reviewed literature supports this integrated account and identifies the need to consider nutrient supply and plant demand together. It also shows a difference in emphasis: aquaponics-specific reviews describe the connected system, whereas broader soilless-cultivation literature provides narrower examples of aquaponic practice. The existence of a recycling pathway does not establish that any particular arrangement is balanced or effective. Aquaponics should therefore be understood as a set of biological interactions that require management, with claims about an individual system depending on evidence about how its components function together.**

I. Introduction

Aquaponics integrates fish culture, soilless plant production and beneficial bacteria through a shared water system. Water reuse and nutrient recycling are central to this integration, but neither can be explained adequately by saying that fish and plants occupy the same installation [1]. Fish-derived material must become relevant to plant nutrition, and the plants must be considered in relation to the water that connects them with fish culture. The description of aquaponics as a managed ecosystem captures this interdependence. It also signals a limit: connecting the components creates the possibility of a productive relationship, not evidence that the relationship will remain balanced without attention to its biological processes.

The fish and plant relationship is sometimes described as symbiotic. That description becomes scientifically useful when it includes the transformations between waste production and nutrient uptake. A hydroponics review describes fish waste as contributing to plant nutrition and identifies both microbial transformations and plant uptake in the recycling of water [2]. These processes make fish, microbes and plants participants in a connected pathway, rather than separate occupants of a shared space. They also explain why neither fish waste alone nor plant uptake alone defines aquaponics. The important question is how these contributions relate to one another while water circulates through the system.

An integrated account must explain not only the pathway but also why it requires management. A review of soilless systems describes biological conversion of fish waste, plant nutrient uptake and recirculation in aquaponics, while recognising that balance depends on context [3]. This paper therefore asks what it means for these processes to function together, without treating recirculation as proof of an effective outcome. It first establishes the scope of the aquaponic relationship, then examines the mechanisms joining its components, synthesises the review evidence and considers the limits of generalisation. Its central argument is that aquaponics works through managed biological coupling, not through the mere addition of plants to fish culture.

II. Background and Scope

Aquaponics-specific literature presents fish culture and plant production as activities joined by nutrient recycling. It also recognises that aquaponic systems can take different forms [4]. These observations help define the scope of a causal explanation: no single physical arrangement is necessary to convey the principle, but some connection between fish-derived nutrients and plant use must be explained. A definition based only on equipment would obscure that relationship. A definition based only on recycled nutrients would omit the living components through which the nutrients become relevant. The present account therefore focuses on the interaction among fish inputs, biological transformation, plant uptake and the water connecting these processes.

Broader soilless-cultivation literature offers a different perspective. One review includes an aquaponic example involving lettuce, water originating from tilapia culture and coconut coir, but aquaponics is a small part of its wider discussion [5]. The example makes the connection between fish-culture water and soilless plant production concrete; it does not, on its own, establish the performance of aquaponics generally or explain every biological step in the relationship. Its value here is to show why a plant-growing perspective is relevant while also marking its limit. Understanding a growing medium and a water source is not the same as understanding the whole managed ecosystem.

The wider plant-growing perspective must consequently be joined with an aquaponics-specific account. A review devoted to aquaponic production considers the integration of fish and plants, nutrient recycling, differences among systems and constraints on adoption [4]. A review of aquaponic biological parameters identifies beneficial bacteria alongside aquaculture and hydroponics as part of the integrated system [1]. Together, these sources show why the issue is not choosing a fish-centred or plant-centred description. The explanatory gap between those descriptions is the relationship itself: how material from fish culture becomes part of plant nutrition, and why that

connection remains dependent on the conditions of the shared system.

III. Core Concepts and Mechanisms

The first mechanism begins with material generated by fish culture. Fish-derived waste can contribute to plant nutrition, but its biological conversion is part of the explanation rather than an optional detail [3]. Beneficial bacteria are accordingly integral to the combination of aquaculture and hydroponics described in aquaponics-focused literature [1]. Plant production is linked to fish culture through this transformed nutrient pathway, not simply through contact with water previously used by fish. The distinction has an important implication: observing that waste is present does not establish what plants can take up. The nutrient relationship has to be understood across its successive contributions, from input to transformation to uptake.

Plant uptake is the complementary mechanism. It gives the fish-derived nutrient pathway a biological destination, while recirculation connects plant production with the continuing use of water in the integrated system [3]. Aquaponics reviews identify nutrient recycling as a defining relationship between fish and plant production [4]. This does not mean that plants alone determine the condition of circulating water. Their role must be interpreted alongside the fish inputs and microbial transformations that affect what the shared water carries. In this sense, recirculation is more than movement through connected components: it allows changes associated with one living component to matter to the others.

Balance is the condition that qualifies the relationship. Fish-derived inputs, their conversion and plant uptake cannot be treated as interchangeable processes simply because they occur within one arrangement. The need for context-dependent balancing follows from the integrated account of conversion, uptake and recirculation [3]. The inclusion of beneficial bacteria in that account further shows why a fish and plant pairing alone is incomplete [1]. Aquaponics-specific literature describes several system forms, which cautions against treating one layout as the definition of the biological relationship [4]. The evidence supports a qualitative requirement to consider the processes together; it does not provide a universal balance point for every configuration.

IV. Evidence Synthesis

The accepted reviews converge most strongly on integration, although they approach it from different directions. Aquaponics-focused sources describe aquaculture, plant production and beneficial bacteria as related parts of a nutrient-recycling system [1], [4]. The soilless-cultivation example places fish-culture water within a plant-growing arrangement [5]. Read together, they make the causal sequence clearer than either viewpoint alone: fish culture supplies material relevant to nutrition, biological processes help connect that material to plant use, and plant production participates in the shared system. The soilless example illustrates one connection; the aquaponics-specific accounts explain why the connection belongs to a wider biological relationship.

The sources differ in explanatory reach, not necessarily in their account of what aquaponics is. An example centred on lettuce grown with water from tilapia culture can show that fish and plant production may be joined in a soilless setting [5]. It cannot establish that the same combination represents all aquaponic systems. Aquaponics-specific reviews address the integrated roles of organisms and acknowledge variation in system forms [1], [4]. The distinction prevents an individual example from bearing more weight than it can support. It also prevents a general definition from being mistaken for evidence about a particular arrangement's functioning.

A second distinction is between a supported mechanism and a demonstrated outcome. The reviewed sources support the proposition that aquaponics connects fish-derived inputs with plant production through recycling processes [1], [4]. A plant-growing example demonstrates the relevance of fish-culture water within one reported arrangement [5]. Neither kind of evidence, as represented by the accepted claims here, establishes that every configuration maintains an appropriate match between nutrient supply and demand. The managed-ecosystem interpretation is therefore a causal explanation with a condition attached: biological contributions must remain compatible. It should not be converted into an unsupported claim of universal effectiveness.

V. Practical Implications and Limitations

Understanding aquaponics as a managed ecosystem changes how its components should be interpreted. Fish-culture water used for plants, as in the reported lettuce example, makes the physical connection visible [5]. The wider aquaponic relationship also involves plant nutrient use and recycling between production activities [4]; microbial transformations are part of the explanation of water recycling [2]. An observer who considers only the water source would therefore miss an important causal step. Equally, an observer who considers only the plants would miss the contribution of fish culture. The implication is analytical rather than prescriptive: a claim about the system should identify which connected processes support it.

Water reuse requires similar care. The description of plant uptake and microbial transformation as supporting recycling explains why shared water matters to aquaponics [2]. Nutrient recycling also provides a way to understand the integration of fish and plant production [4]. Yet the existence of a recycling route does not by itself show that the processes contributing to it are balanced in an individual system. The soilless-cultivation example demonstrates a specific use of fish-culture water, not a general result for all water or plant-growing arrangements [5]. General descriptions should therefore remain distinct from claims about particular outcomes.

The main limitation of the evidence used here is not a lack of support for the causal relationship, but a lack of grounds for specifying a universal operating balance. The accepted reviews describe integration and recycling [2], [4], while the soilless

example is narrower in scope [5]. To assess an individual system against the proposed explanation, evidence would need to connect its fish-derived inputs, biological transformations, plant uptake and shared water conditions. Considering only one of these would leave the relationship partly untested. This identifies a validation need without assuming a particular measurement result, preferred configuration or benefit that the reviewed claims do not establish.

VI. Conclusion

Aquaponics is a managed ecosystem because its fish, microbial and plant components contribute to a connected relationship rather than functioning as independent production units. Fish-derived material enters a pathway involving biological conversion, plant uptake and recirculating water [1], [3]. Aquaponics-focused literature places that nutrient relationship within integrated fish and plant production [4]. The connection explains the system's scientific meaning, but it does not guarantee that a particular arrangement is balanced. Management is integral to the concept because the contributions of living components have to be considered together.

The most valuable next step for evaluating any specified aquaponic arrangement is to examine its connected processes rather than infer its functioning from the presence of fish, plants and circulating water. The reviews establish the importance of biological transformation, nutrient uptake and context-dependent balance [2], [3]. Evidence about how those processes coincide in an individual system would test the causal explanation where it matters. Until then, the defensible general conclusion is that aquaponics offers a biologically integrated route for nutrient recycling and water reuse whose outcomes depend on the relationship being maintained.

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] 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.

[3] 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.

[4] 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.

[5] 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.