Water movement and transport between subsystems

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

***Abstract*—Water movement connects fish production and plant cultivation in aquaponics, but the direction of that movement determines whether the two subsystems share a circulating water body or exchange water in only one direction. This paper synthesises review evidence to explain the pathways and scientific meaning of transport between subsystems. In coupled aquaponics, water passing through the plant unit returns to the fish-production loop. In decoupled aquaponics, water and associated nutrients move from fish production to plants without a return path. Filtration, plant uptake and recirculation affect what the moving water carries and how it can be reused, although these processes should not be confused with the existence of a return flow. Evidence from hydroponic recirculation and channel flow clarifies transport within plant systems but does not, by itself, establish an aquaponic connection between fish and plants. The central conclusion is that a subsystem diagram must distinguish the direction of water transfer from the processes occurring along its route. The available review evidence supports this qualitative explanation, while offering limited basis for claims about transfer rates, comparative performance or outcomes in a particular installation.**

I. Introduction

Water movement and transport between subsystems give aquaponics its physical connection between fish production and plant cultivation. That connection is not defined merely by the presence of both activities: its direction matters. In a coupled arrangement, water that reaches the hydroponic unit returns to the fish-production loop; in a decoupled arrangement, transfer from fish production to plants occurs without that return path [1]. The distinction changes the meaning of recirculation. Water may circulate within a subsystem even when it does not circulate through the entire aquaponic arrangement. Any explanation of transport must therefore identify where water goes after leaving the plant unit, rather than treating all reuse as the same flow pattern.

The movement of water is also the means by which material carried in that water can pass between production units. Reviews of hydroponics describe both recirculating nutrient solution and the recycling of water between fish and plants in aquaponics [2]. These descriptions connect a physical pathway to its biological significance, but they do not imply that every dissolved constituent follows the same fate as the water itself. Plant uptake and treatment can change what remains in the circulating stream [3]. The resulting question is not only whether water is reused, but which subsystems share it and what occurs before it reaches a possible return point.

Flow within a plant unit provides useful context without answering the whole aquaponic question. In nutrient film technique, or NFT, water moves through channels as a shared nutrient solution and can recirculate within the hydroponic system [4]. That example shows how movement through a growing area exposes plants to transported solution. It cannot, on its own, show whether the solution returns to fish production. This paper first defines the relevant subsystem boundaries, then explains the water paths and associated transport processes. It finally compares the scope of the available evidence and identifies what cannot be inferred about a particular system without tracing its actual connections.

II. Background and Scope

Aquaponic reviews describe water moving between fish and plant production, placing recirculation at the centre of their account of an integrated system [5]. For the present purpose, fish production and plant cultivation are distinct subsystems, while a water path is the physical connection that permits transfer between them. This framing is deliberately narrower than a general description of soilless agriculture. A hydroponic unit can circulate solution among its own growing channels, yet that internal circuit says nothing about a connection back to fish production [4]. The relevant boundary is therefore the point at which water crosses from one production subsystem to the other, and whether it later crosses back.

The clearest comparison is between coupled and decoupled aquaponics. Reviews distinguish a coupled path, in which water from the hydroponic unit returns to aquaculture, from a decoupled path, in which water and nutrients pass from fish production to the plant unit without returning [1], [6]. Both arrangements convey water to plants, so observing a fish-to-plant transfer alone does not identify the arrangement. The decisive difference is the downstream destination of plant-unit water. This comparison supplies a more precise vocabulary for describing transport than the unqualified statement that an aquaponic system recirculates, which could refer either to a local circuit or to a shared path through both subsystems.

Descriptions of aquaponics also place filtration, plant uptake and water reuse along the movement of water through a system [3]. These processes make the route consequential: water arriving at a plant unit need not have the same contents as water at another point along the path. Nevertheless, the existence of filtration or uptake does not establish the direction of the next transfer. A process account and a flow-path account answer different questions, respectively what happens to water and its contents, and where that water goes. The remaining explanatory task is to bring those accounts together without assuming a return connection, a particular treatment sequence

or a measured degree of nutrient removal that the accepted evidence does not establish.

III. Core Concepts and Mechanisms

A useful first distinction is between circulation and inter-subsystem transfer. Closed hydroponic recirculation returns nutrient solution for reuse within a plant-production system, and integrated treatment may form part of that reuse [7]. Aquaponic transfer, by contrast, is specifically movement across the boundary between fish and plant production. A plant unit can have a circulating solution while receiving water from fish production through a one-way connection; conversely, a coupled arrangement includes a path back to the fish loop [6]. Calling both arrangements recirculating without stating the boundary obscures the mechanism. The boundary must be named before the direction and significance of a water path can be interpreted.

In a coupled arrangement, the return path makes the two production subsystems participants in a shared water circuit. Water moves towards plant cultivation and subsequently rejoins the fish-production loop, so changes occurring along the plant-side path can be relevant to the returning water [1], [6]. Aquaponic reviews identify filtration and plant uptake among the processes associated with recirculation and reuse [3]. These accounts support a qualitative causal explanation: transport connects the locations where water is used or treated, while those processes can alter what the moving water carries. They do not establish a universal sequence of components or quantify how much any constituent changes before return.

In a decoupled arrangement, water and associated nutrients can move from fish production to the plant unit without the plant-unit water returning to fish production [6]. The same transfer can therefore supply plants while leaving the fish-production loop outside the plant unit's return path. This is a directional distinction, not proof that water never circulates locally in either subsystem. Hydroponic literature on solution reuse and treatment helps explain such local circulation, but does not principally describe transport between fish and plant subsystems [7]. Interpreting a decoupled system consequently requires two separate observations: the direction of transfer across the fish-to-plant boundary and the movement of water within the plant unit after that transfer.

IV. Evidence Synthesis

The accepted aquaponic reviews converge on the most important pathway distinction. One account describes the return of hydroponic water to the fish loop in coupled systems and transfer to plants as needed in decoupled systems; another characterises decoupling by the absence of plant-to-fish return flow [1], [6]. Together, these accounts support the interpretation of coupling as a property of the complete water path rather than of any single treatment or growing unit. A review that discusses filtration, uptake and reuse adds processes that may occur along that path [3]. The evidence is strongest where it describes direction and subsystem relationships, and less specific about the magnitude or timing of transfers.

The broader hydroponic evidence clarifies why movement and transport should not be treated as synonyms for simple water replacement. Reviews discuss recirculating nutrient solution, water movement through plant-growing channels, and nutrient-solution reuse [2], [4], [7]. These accounts establish that water can act as a continuing carrier within plant production rather than passing through a growing area only once. Aquaponic accounts then locate that plant-side movement in relation to fish production and describe filtration and uptake as relevant to water reuse [3], [5]. The synthesis is a nested picture of transport: flow occurs within units as well as across their boundaries, but only a specified boundary crossing establishes exchange between subsystems.

The sources have different explanatory reach. Reviews directed at aquaponics identify whether plant-unit water returns to aquaculture, so they directly support a comparison of coupled and decoupled paths [1], [6]. Reviews centred on hydroponics illuminate channel flow, recirculating solution and treatment within plant production, but cannot by themselves establish the fish-side route [4], [7]. This difference matters when interpreting statements about water reuse. Reuse observed or described in a plant unit should not be taken as evidence of reuse by fish production. Conversely, an aquaponic return path identifies a possible route back to fish production without demonstrating a particular degree of filtration or uptake along that route [3].

V. Practical Implications and Limitations

The principal practical implication is that a description of an aquaponic arrangement should trace water through both subsystem boundaries. It should indicate where fish-production water enters plant cultivation and whether water leaving the plant unit returns to the fish loop. Those observations distinguish coupled from decoupled arrangements more reliably than the general label of recirculation [1], [6]. A description should also identify circulation that remains within a plant unit, since closed hydroponic reuse is a different claim from return to fish production [7]. This is an interpretive requirement rather than a prescription for one preferred arrangement: the reviewed pathways establish distinct forms of connection, not a universal ranking of their performance.

Tracing the route also clarifies what can and cannot be inferred about transported contents. Aquaponic reviews discuss filtration, plant uptake and reuse alongside water movement [3]; the coupled and decoupled distinction establishes whether plant-side water has a route back to fish production [6]. Together, these points indicate where changes to carried material could matter to another subsystem. They do not show that a particular filtration stage removes a specified amount, that plants take up all available nutrients, or that return water has a defined composition. Those conclusions would require evidence about the processes and water at the relevant points, rather than an inference drawn solely from the existence of a connection.

The principal evidence limitation is scale of inference. The accepted reviews support a qualitative account of subsystem

paths, local recirculation and processes encountered during reuse [3], [6], [7]. They do not provide, within the mapped claims used here, a common measured basis for comparing transfer rates or the resulting water composition in particular coupled and decoupled installations. For any specific arrangement, validation would begin by establishing the actual direction of each boundary crossing and distinguishing it from circulation inside a unit. Assessment of transported constituents would then need observations at relevant points along that established route. Without those steps, a pathway diagram remains an explanation of possible connectivity, not a measured account of system behaviour.

VI. Conclusion

Water movement and transport between aquaponic subsystems are best understood through direction and boundary crossing. Coupled systems return water from plant cultivation to fish production, whereas decoupled systems transfer fish-side water and nutrients to plants without that return flow [1], [6]. Filtration, uptake and reuse give the moving water scientific significance, but none of these processes alone identifies its destination [3]. Hydroponic recirculation supplies useful context for movement within the plant unit while remaining distinct from evidence of a complete fish-to-plant-to-fish circuit [7].

The highest-value next step for understanding any particular system is therefore to verify its water path before making claims about exchange between its subsystems. Once the crossings and any return flow are established, observations along that path can test how filtration and plant uptake affect what the water carries [3], [6]. The reviewed evidence supports the causal distinction between coupled and one-way transfer, but not an unmeasured claim about comparative performance or the composition of water at a specific point. Keeping those limits visible makes the explanation both useful and scientifically proportionate.

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] 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.

[4] 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.

[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] V. Lobanov, H. Monsees, F. Latrille, G. Pate, and A. Joyce, "Coupled vs. decoupled aquaponics: Evidence, mechanisms, and methodological gaps in the productivity hypothesis," *Aquacultural Engineering*, 2026.

[7] S. Wang, Y. Kleiner, S. M. Clark, V. Raghavan, and B. Tartakovsky, "Review of current hydroponic food production practices and the potential role of bioelectrochemical systems," *Reviews in Environmental Science and Bio/Technology*, 2024.