Biological interdependence and feedback loops

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

***Abstract*—Aquaponics links organisms through shared water, nutrient transformations and changing environmental conditions. Understanding biological interdependence therefore requires more than identifying the organisms present: it requires tracing how an activity in one part of the system changes the conditions experienced elsewhere. This paper synthesises review evidence on the relationships among fish-derived inputs, microbial nutrient conversion, plant demand and water quality. It distinguishes these directional dependencies from feedback loops, in which a resulting change influences a process that contributed to it. Nitrification provides a central example because its links with acidity, alkalinity and pH connect microbial activity to the conditions for plant nutrient availability. Evidence from root environments and recirculating hydroponics illustrates additional pathways through which biological activity can modify shared conditions. Plant circadian regulation provides a distinct, well-described example of negative feedback, but does not establish an equivalent regulatory loop across an entire aquaponic system. The synthesis shows why causal pathways must be specified before describing a relationship as feedback. It also identifies the need to test proposed system-level loops under defined operating conditions rather than assuming that biological interdependence necessarily produces self-regulation.**

I. Introduction

Aquaponic organisms are biologically interdependent because processes associated with one group affect the conditions available to another. Fish feed and waste contribute material to shared water; microbial conversion changes the form of nutrients; and plant demand interacts with the resulting nutrient supply and water quality. A review of aquaponic systems describes these linked processes as requiring balance rather than functioning independently [1]. The central explanatory task is therefore to follow a change through the system: which process produces it, which organisms experience it, and what subsequent response might alter the original conditions. Such a chain establishes interdependence, although it does not by itself prove that a closed feedback loop exists.

The importance of the shared environment becomes clearer at the root surface. In aeroponic cultivation, droplet capture, films of water on roots, root-zone conditions and root-associated communities jointly shape the setting in which roots function [2]. This example does not establish that an aeroponic root zone behaves identically to an aquaponic one. It does show why a plant's immediate environment cannot be treated as a passive conduit for water and nutrients. Biological activity and local physical conditions meet at an interface, so an account of interdependence must identify both the organisms involved and the environmental pathway connecting them.

This paper distinguishes causal coupling from feedback and then examines the evidence for each in aquatic cultivation. In aquaponics, reported links among nitrification, acidity, alkalinity, pH and plant nutrient availability provide a more specific pathway than a general claim that all organisms benefit one another [3]. The discussion first defines the relevant scope, then traces mechanisms across shared water and root environments, compares them with established biological feedback, and considers limits on generalisation. Its argument is deliberately conditional: interconnected processes can transmit change, but their direction and consequences depend on the particular processes and system conditions under examination.

II. Background and Scope

Biological interdependence and a feedback loop are related but different ideas. Interdependence describes a causal relationship between processes or organisms; feedback requires an additional return pathway through which an effect influences a process that helped produce it. The plant circadian clock offers an explicit biological example: interconnected negative feedback loops participate in clock regulation, while light signalling and flowering pathways interact with that regulation [4]. This example establishes what a documented regulatory loop can look like, not that an aquaponic system possesses the same form of regulation. In aquaponics, the appropriate question is whether a proposed return pathway has been identified, rather than whether several processes merely coexist.

Recirculating water provides one way for biological effects to extend beyond their point of origin. A review of closed hydroponic systems reports that recirculation can allow root exudates and pathogens to accumulate; it also describes algae changing oxygen, pH and nutrient composition, with consequences for plant growth [5]. These pathways show how an organism can alter a shared environment that subsequently affects other organisms. They remain evidence from closed hydroponics, however, and should be treated as illustrations of possible causal structures rather than universal outcomes in aquaponics. Neither accumulation nor an environmental response alone establishes that an effect returns to modify its initiating process.

The root environment adds a second, more local scale of interaction. A review of soilless cultivation discusses how regulation of that environment intersects with plant, microbe relationships [6]. Growing-media research further describes how microbial decomposition can change a medium's air, water properties and nutrient availability [7]. Together, these accounts show that biological processes can modify the material conditions on which plant activity depends, even when the

immediate research focus is not aquaponics. The present synthesis concentrates on that causal principle and on pathways directly described for aquaponic water, rather than assuming that detailed findings about a particular medium, crop or cultivation arrangement transfer unchanged.

III. Core Concepts and Mechanisms

The clearest aquaponic dependency begins with material flow through shared water. Fish-derived waste provides inputs to microbial nutrient conversion, while plant nutrient demand and water quality are linked to the resulting conditions [1]. This is not a claim that each process automatically compensates for the others. If an input or conversion process changes, its effects may be transmitted to organisms that rely on the water, and their responses may differ according to the conditions produced. A broad hydroponics review also places plant, fish relationships within aquaponics, although its treatment is not a detailed account of every causal step [8]. Specifying the steps prevents the phrase biological interdependence from becoming an unsupported claim of mutual benefit.

Chemical change gives this material relationship a more precise causal form. A review of coupled and decoupled aquaponics links nitrification with acidity and alkalinity, and relates pH to plant nutrient availability [3]. Microbial conversion can thus be considered alongside the chemical conditions experienced by plants, rather than as an isolated biological service. The same review qualifies conclusions about configuration and microbial maturation, so the existence of these links should not be recast as proof that one arrangement consistently produces a preferable outcome. For feedback analysis, the remaining question is whether a change in plant or microbial activity alters the conditions that govern the earlier conversion process; that complete return pathway must be demonstrated, not presumed.

Root-zone evidence shows why the consequences of a shared-water change may depend on local conditions. In strawberry nutrient-film systems, a review discusses oxygen limitation together with susceptibility to Pythium root rot [9]. This pairing connects a physical condition around roots with a biological vulnerability, but it concerns a particular crop and cultivation system, not a measured aquaponic feedback loop. Similarly, microbial decomposition of growing media can alter air, water properties as well as nutrient availability [7]. These examples make the mechanism of interdependence more concrete: environmental conditions influence organisms, while biological processes can reshape those conditions. Their system-specific character limits how far the examples can be extended.

IV. Evidence Synthesis

Across the aquaponic reviews, the strongest common explanation is a connected sequence, not a claim of automatic stability. Feed and waste, microbial conversion, plant demand and water quality are described as interrelated [1]; nitrification, acidity, alkalinity and pH add a chemical pathway through which one process can affect the conditions for another [3]. Read together, these accounts explain why a change cannot always be interpreted within a single organism group. They do not, however, establish the magnitude, timing or direction of every response under every configuration. Calling the sequence a feedback loop requires evidence that its downstream effects return to influence an earlier step, whereas the documented links alone establish causal interdependence.

Evidence from closed hydroponics and root-focused cultivation broadens the range of plausible connecting pathways without erasing system boundaries. Recirculation can retain biologically relevant material, and algae can change water chemistry and oxygen conditions that affect plants [5]. At the root interface, the capture and distribution of water influence the local setting in which roots and associated communities occur [2]. These accounts concern different arrangements, yet both show how biological effects can be mediated through an environment shared with, or immediately surrounding, another organism. They support a pathway-based interpretation of interdependence. They do not justify treating every reported environmental change as an observed aquaponic feedback loop.

Plant physiology supplies a useful contrast between interacting influences and demonstrated feedback. Photoperiod and temperature interact in their effects on plant phenology [10], while flowering research describes pathways that integrate signals between leaves and the shoot apex [11]. These findings show that a biological response can depend on several connected signals, but neither account establishes a feedback loop across aquaponic organisms. By contrast, the plant circadian clock is described in terms of interconnected negative feedback loops [4]. The distinction matters scientifically: interacting inputs explain dependence of a response on conditions; a documented loop additionally identifies how a response feeds back into the process that generates it.

V. Practical Implications and Limitations

A practical implication of biological interdependence is that an observed change in plants or water may have more than one plausible contributing pathway. Aquaponic evidence connects nutrient conversion with pH-related conditions for plant nutrient availability [3], while closed-hydroponic evidence identifies other ways in which recirculating water can change its biological and chemical character [5]. These are not interchangeable diagnoses: the sources concern different mechanisms and, in part, different systems. A sound interpretation should therefore identify the pathway under consideration and the conditions in which it was observed before assigning a cause. The evidence supports this discipline of causal interpretation, not a universal rule for predicting an individual system's response.

Evidence from other cultivation settings is most useful when its limits remain visible. Aeroponic root-surface films and associated communities illustrate how closely local biological activity and root-zone conditions can be connected [2]. Strawberry nutrient-film evidence links oxygen limitation with pathogen susceptibility [9]; studies of growing media describe

changes in air, water properties associated with decomposition [7]. Each informs the meaning of interdependence, but each also depends on a particular environment or material. Applying any one account to aquaponics would require checking that its relevant pathway is present and that the resulting response has been established in the aquaponic setting.

The principal evidential limitation concerns feedback at the scale of the whole aquaponic system. Reviews document linked aquaponic processes and qualify some claims about configuration and microbial maturation [1], [3]. An explicitly characterised negative feedback mechanism exists in plant circadian regulation [4], but it cannot stand in as evidence that fish-derived inputs, microbial conversion and plant responses form an equivalent regulatory loop. The highest-value validation would follow a proposed change through those processes and determine whether its effects return to influence an earlier process under specified conditions. Until that return is established, causal coupling is the more precise description.

VI. Conclusion

Biological interdependence in aquaponics means that activity associated with one organism group can change the shared conditions experienced by others. The supported causal account links fish-derived inputs, microbial nutrient conversion, plant demand and water quality, with nitrification and pH-related effects providing a more specific connecting mechanism [1], [3]. Root-zone and recirculation evidence illustrates additional ways in which organisms and their environments can influence one another, subject to differences between cultivation systems [2], [5]. Feedback is a narrower claim: it requires a demonstrated return pathway, not simply a chain of effects. Establishing whether a particular aquaponic relationship forms such a loop requires tracing that pathway under defined conditions; without that evidence, interdependence remains the defensible conclusion.

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] 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.

[3] 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.

[4] S. D. Jackson, "Plant responses to photoperiod," *New Phytologist*, 2009.

[5] 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.

[6] 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.

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

[8] 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.

[9] 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.

[10] M. Tarascio, L. Brancaleoni, A. Cazzavillan, M. Cutini, R. Gerdol, and T. Abeli, "Photoperiod-temperature interactions in a changing climate: A review of plant phenological responses," *Journal of Biogeography*, 2026.

[11] L. Corbesier and G. Coupland, "Photoperiodic flowering of arabidopsis: integrating genetic and physiological approaches to characterization of the floral stimulus," *Plant, Cell & Environment*, 2005.