Species selection, life history and production traits

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

***Abstract*—Selecting fish for aquaponics requires an account of how species characteristics relate to the intended production setting. This paper synthesises evidence on species selection, life history and production traits without assuming that the performance of a familiar species applies to every fish and plant combination. An aquaponics review links the frequent use of tilapia to omnivory, rapid reproduction and growth, and tolerance of varied water conditions. Comparative fish research identifies differences in metabolic, thermal-tolerance and growth responses, while evidence on larval fish shows that characteristics also vary with developmental stage. These findings explain why neither a species name nor a single physiological measure establishes suitability throughout production. The evidence has limits: an observed association between gill area and oxygen consumption does not demonstrate a causal selection mechanism, and studies concentrated on tilapia and lettuce offer a restricted basis for generalisation. Species selection is therefore most defensible when the relevant trait, developmental stage and fish and plant context are stated together. Direct comparisons remain necessary before recommending an alternative combination or ranking candidate species.**

I. Introduction

Species selection in aquaponics is a question of biological fit rather than familiarity alone. An aquaponics review links tilapia's frequent use to omnivory, rapid reproduction and growth, and tolerance of a range of water conditions [1]. These attributes describe different reasons a fish might be considered: they concern what it can eat, how it reproduces, how it grows and how it responds to its surroundings. Together they provide a plausible account of tilapia's prominence, but they do not establish that it is preferable for every production setting. A sound selection argument must identify which traits matter to the intended use and distinguish an explanation of frequent use from a demonstrated comparison with other species.

Production traits are not necessarily constant across fish species or conditions. A comparative review reports species-dependent metabolic, thermal-tolerance and growth responses, although its principal investigation concerns hyperoxia [2]. The relevant lesson for selection is that fish can differ in responses associated with production, not that observations from the review's particular conditions can be converted into a general ranking of aquaponic species. A second difficulty is that life history introduces variation within a species over time. Selection therefore cannot be reduced to naming a species with an attractive trait; it also requires attention to the stage and circumstances in which that trait has been observed.

The setting in which fish are produced further shapes the selection question. An aquaponics review discusses fish and plant selection alongside nutrient tolerance, available space and the potential for year-round production [3]. Those considerations do not make every fish characteristic a predictor of plant performance. They do, however, show why a judgement about fish belongs within a specified fish and plant context. This paper examines how life history and production traits contribute to that judgement. It first distinguishes physiological observations from evidence of suitability, then synthesises aquaponics and fish research before identifying the comparisons needed to support claims about other species combinations.

II. Background and Scope

Physiological comparisons can identify differences between fish without explaining their consequences for aquaponic production. An analysis of teleost fishes reports an association between species-level standardised gill area and oxygen consumption [4]. The association is relevant to metabolic variation, but the analysis is observational and explicitly does not establish a causal mechanism. It cannot show that choosing a species because of its gill area would yield a particular production result. This distinction prevents a measured biological relationship from becoming an unsupported selection rule. For the present purpose, the comparison indicates that species-level traits warrant attention while leaving their practical significance for a particular fish and plant combination unresolved.

Body size adds a further qualification to claims about metabolic production traits. The same teleost study considers species-level metabolic variation in relation to body mass and gill area [4]. This matters because an apparent difference between species should not be interpreted without considering the characteristics involved in the comparison. Even where a relationship remains visible in a comparative analysis, it is not equivalent to a direct test of growth or suitability in aquaponics. Metabolic evidence can help define a question about fish traits, but cannot independently answer which fish to select. Detailed oxygen-related implications also lie beyond the selection question addressed here.

Aquaponics studies contribute a more direct production context, although their coverage is uneven. A review reports that tilapia and lettuce predominate in the studies it examines, identifies fish and plant sizing as relevant to nutrient availability, and cautions against extrapolating across species combinations [5]. This evidence shows why the identity and relative scale of the organisms under consideration matter to the interpretation of production studies. It does not directly explain the life-history traits underlying fish selection. Thus, fish physiology

describes potentially relevant biological variation, whereas aquaponics research describes particular combinations. The gap between them is the absence of a demonstrated route from an individual trait to suitability across combinations.

III. Core Concepts and Mechanisms

Life history makes species selection a time-dependent judgement. A review of larval fish describes variation associated with both species and developmental stage, primarily through evidence about feeding behaviour and digestive physiology [6]. Its significance here is the developmental variation, not a prescription about feeding larvae in aquaponics. A characteristic observed in larvae cannot automatically be taken to describe fish at another stage, just as a general species description need not apply uniformly throughout development. Selection claims should therefore indicate the stage to which their evidence pertains. Without that qualification, apparently conflicting observations may reflect differences in developmental timing rather than a simple disagreement about the species.

Reproduction and growth provide distinct links between life history and production. Rapid reproduction and rapid growth are both cited among the characteristics associated with tilapia's frequent use in aquaponics [1]. Reproduction concerns the generation of fish over a life cycle, whereas growth concerns change in fish being raised. A review of larval variation reinforces the need to specify the stage at which any such characteristic is assessed [6]. Separating these concepts prevents evidence for one characteristic from being treated as evidence for the other. The available account explains why both may enter a selection judgement, but does not measure their separate contributions to suitability in a particular fish and plant combination.

Tolerance and metabolism are also relevant without being interchangeable. An aquaponics review associates tilapia's use with tolerance of varied water conditions [1], while comparative fish research describes species-dependent metabolic, thermal-tolerance and growth responses [2]. These observations indicate different dimensions along which candidate fish might be considered. They do not establish that a tolerant species will grow better under all conditions, or that a physiological response observed in a review centred on hyperoxia predicts aquaponic performance. The causal question must be framed narrowly: which characteristic has been observed, under what conditions, and what connection to the proposed production setting remains to be demonstrated?

IV. Evidence Synthesis

The case of tilapia illustrates both the explanatory value and the limitation of trait-based selection. Its frequent use has been linked to omnivory, reproduction, growth and tolerance [1]. Yet a review of production research finds a concentration on tilapia and lettuce and warns against carrying conclusions across different species combinations [5]. Familiarity with one pairing can therefore increase the available evidence for that pairing without establishing the relative merits of alternatives. The trait account explains why tilapia merits consideration. To conclude that it is preferable to another fish in a different combination would require a comparison that the concentration of existing studies does not itself provide.

Fish-level and aquaponics-level evidence answer complementary questions. Developmental research demonstrates species- and stage-dependent variation in larval fish [6], while aquaponics reviews address fish and plant selection and the production settings in which combinations are considered [3], [5]. The former cautions against describing a fish as biologically uniform through its life history; the latter cautions against assuming that observations from one pairing transfer to another. Read together, they imply that a selection claim should specify both the developmental period and the intended combination. They do not demonstrate that any particular larval characteristic causes a superior outcome in aquaponics, so the connection remains an issue for direct assessment.

The relationship between fish traits and plant production is likewise conditional rather than automatic. One review identifies fish and plant sizing as relevant to nutrient availability [5]; another discusses selection in relation to nutrient tolerance, space and year-round production potential [3]. These considerations situate fish selection within a combined production system, but they do not supply a universal rule converting a fish's reproduction, growth or metabolism into a suitable plant choice. Moreover, evidence of developmental variation means that a species description need not capture all periods of fish production [6]. The appropriate synthesis is to use fish traits to frame the selection question and assess the proposed combination on its own terms.

V. Practical Implications and Limitations

A defensible assessment begins by specifying which fish, which developmental stage and which fish and plant combination are under consideration. Aquaponics research identifies nutrient tolerance, available space and year-round production potential as relevant selection considerations [3]; research on larval fish shows that characteristics vary with developmental stage [6]. These findings provide questions to ask, not a validated numerical ranking of species. Evidence from one period of development should not silently stand in for evidence from another. Equally, the stated potential for continuing production should not be treated as an observed result for an untested combination. Explicit context makes the boundary between a supported observation and an assumption easier to see.

Comparative physiology should inform inquiry without becoming a shortcut to a production recommendation. A fish review describes species-dependent metabolic, thermal-tolerance and growth responses within work focused on hyperoxia [2]. A separate teleost analysis associates standardised gill area with oxygen consumption but does not establish causation or aquaponic suitability [4]. Both sources demonstrate why fish species may warrant differentiated assessment; neither shows which candidate would perform best in a specified pairing. Invoking a physiological trait in a selection argument

thus requires a statement of its observed context and of the production claim still to be tested. This preserves useful biological evidence without overstating its predictive reach.

The main limit on generalisation is the lack of direct comparison across proposed combinations and relevant life stages. Reviewed aquaponics studies are concentrated on tilapia and lettuce [5], while larval research documents variation between species and developmental stages [6]. A meaningful test of another candidate would need to identify the traits claimed to justify selection, the period of development being assessed and the fish and plant combination in which performance is examined. The accepted evidence does not provide such a comparison or quantify an advantage for an alternative species. It supports an explanation of why selection depends on life history and production traits, but not a universal recommendation.

VI. Conclusion

Species selection in aquaponics is best understood as a context-dependent interpretation of life history and production traits. Tilapia illustrates the approach: its frequent use has been associated with omnivory, rapid reproduction and growth, and tolerance of varied water conditions [1]. Those characteristics give reasons to consider the species, not proof of superiority in every setting. Developmental variation means that a species name alone cannot describe every stage of production [6], while the observed link between gill area and oxygen consumption cannot be treated as a demonstrated selection mechanism [4]. A well-supported judgement therefore states the characteristic, life stage and intended context to which its evidence applies.

The highest-value next work is a direct comparison of candidate fish in specified fish and plant combinations, with developmental stages and the production traits motivating selection made explicit. That need follows from the concentration of reviewed studies on tilapia and lettuce and the caution against extrapolating across pairings [5]. Until such comparisons are available, evidence on species traits can guide the questions asked about a candidate, while aquaponics research can clarify the context in which those questions matter [2], [3]. Neither should be made to support a ranking it has not tested.

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] T. J. McArley, E. Sandblom, and N. A. Herbert, "Fish and hyperoxia-from cardiorespiratory and biochemical adjustments to aquaculture and ecophysiology implications," *Fish and Fisheries*, 2021.

[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] A. Kuparinen, D. Gielewski, and J. A. Hutchings, "Gill area explains deviations from body size-metabolic rate relationship in teleost fishes," *Journal of Fish Biology*, 2022.

[5] 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.

[6] I. Rønnestad, M. Yúfera, B. Ueberschär, L. Ribeiro, Øystein Sæle, and C. Boglione, "Feeding behaviour and digestive physiology in larval fish: current knowledge, and gaps and bottlenecks in research," *Reviews in Aquaculture*, 2013.