Fish welfare, behaviour and stocking environment

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

***Abstract*—Stocking environment matters to fish welfare because the number of fish held in an aquaponic system can be associated with changes in the water they experience. A trial comparing two European carp stocking densities found lower individual growth but greater biomass per tank volume at the higher density, alongside differences in water quality. Aquaponics reviews identify ammonia, pH and dissolved oxygen as fish-relevant conditions, while fish-focused evidence shows that responses to oxygen conditions require biological interpretation. This paper synthesises those findings to distinguish observed stocking outcomes from proposed mechanisms and from broader claims about welfare. The evidence supports a conditional link among stocking density, aquatic conditions and fish performance; it does not establish a universal density limit or show that growth alone measures welfare. Evidence about fish behaviour is narrower still: a review of larval sensory and feeding behaviour cannot validate behavioural indicators for stocked aquaponic fish generally. A defensible assessment must therefore relate environmental conditions to the species and fish actually present, while recognising that direct behavioural and welfare evidence remains necessary.**

I. Introduction

Fish welfare, behaviour and stocking environment are closely related questions in aquaponics, but they are not interchangeable measures. In a trial comparing two stocking densities of European carp, the higher-density treatment produced less growth per fish while yielding more fish biomass per tank volume [1]. The trial also reported water-quality differences between treatments. Thus, a stocking choice can coincide with both an environmental change and different ways of describing fish performance. Greater biomass from a tank does not establish that each fish grew as well, and neither measure alone establishes welfare. The contrast makes it necessary to explain what happened to the fish and their surroundings rather than treating density as a self-explanatory target.

The aquatic environment provides part of that explanation. An aquaponics review identifies ammonia toxicity, pH and dissolved oxygen as relevant to fish, and reports that higher stocking density can change water chemistry and reduce dissolved oxygen [2]. A fish-focused review, meanwhile, examines physiological and performance responses to oxygen conditions, showing why a measurement has to be interpreted in relation to biological response [3]. These accounts connect stocking to plausible fish-relevant conditions, but they do not justify one operating range for all fish or systems. Distinguishing a change in water from its consequence for a particular fish is central to a careful account of welfare.

This paper develops that distinction through system context, environmental mechanisms and the strength of the available fish evidence. Aquaponics literature describes fish waste and water reuse as features of the combined fish and plant system [4], while another review notes the need to balance fish waste with plant uptake and the harm associated with elevated ammonia [5]. Those relationships explain why fish conditions merit attention within an integrated system, not why its fish are necessarily well. The following discussion compares review evidence with a direct stocking-density trial, then examines what can and cannot be concluded about behaviour and welfare from the reported environmental and performance outcomes.

II. Background and Scope

A stocking environment includes the circumstances in which selected fish occupy a particular tank, not merely a count or mass of fish. An aquaponics review discusses fish-tank arrangements and considerations in fish selection [6]. These matters frame the interpretation of density: fish held under different arrangements, or fish selected for different conditions, cannot automatically be assumed to experience a given density in the same way. This does not establish a preferred arrangement for welfare. Rather, it identifies contextual information needed before comparing stocked systems. The scope here is the relationship among that setting, fish-relevant water conditions and observed fish responses, with behavioural claims considered only where the evidence permits them.

Descriptions of water reuse give essential background but leave a fish-level question unresolved. An accessible review presents aquaponics as a linked fish and plant system in which fish-derived material and water are reused [4]. That account locates fish within a shared circulation of water and waste; it does not show whether a particular stocking condition is favourable to them. A broader soilless-systems review adds that fish waste and plant uptake must be balanced and that elevated ammonia harms fish [5]. Together, the reviews explain why managing the integrated system matters to fish. They offer much less direct evidence about behaviour or about the welfare consequences of a specified tank arrangement and density.

Direct comparison adds information that system descriptions cannot supply. The European carp trial compared two densities within a low-technology aquaponic setting and observed lower individual growth at the higher density despite greater biomass per tank volume [1]. Its authors discuss higher ammonium, lower dissolved oxygen and possible crowding or competition as relevant to the poorer individual growth. An aquaponics review independently identifies ammonia, pH

and oxygen as fish-relevant environmental considerations [2]. The trial therefore anchors an environmental and performance comparison, whereas the review helps explain why those conditions deserve attention. Neither source alone demonstrates which proposed influence accounted for the growth difference or establishes a general behavioural welfare outcome.

III. Core Concepts and Mechanisms

The first causal distinction is between stocking density and the conditions associated with it. Higher density can be accompanied by changes in water chemistry and reduced dissolved oxygen, according to an aquaponics review [2]. In the carp comparison, the higher-density treatment also differed in water quality and produced lower growth per individual fish [1]. These findings support a plausible route from stocking choice through aquatic conditions to fish performance. They do not isolate that route as the sole explanation: crowding or competition was also discussed in connection with the trial outcome [1]. Environmental measurements and the fish response must therefore be considered together without treating association as proof of a single mechanism.

A second distinction is between a measured condition and its biological meaning. An aquaponics review reports species-dependent responses to pH and potential health and reproduction consequences of pH fluctuations [7]. Fish-focused evidence on oxygen likewise addresses physiological and performance responses under aquatic oxygen conditions and cautions against context-free operating rules [3]. Consequently, the same description of water cannot, by itself, provide a complete welfare judgement for every stocked fish. The relevant question is not only whether pH or oxygen changes, but how the fish concerned respond. The accepted evidence supports that interpretive requirement while leaving species-specific conclusions for particular stocking settings unresolved.

Behaviour requires a separate evidential step. A review of fish sensory and feeding behaviour concentrates on larvae and their digestive physiology [8]. It shows that behavioural processes are legitimate objects of fish research, but it does not establish how fish at other life stages behave when aquaponic stocking density or water conditions change. In particular, a feeding response described in larvae cannot be treated as a validated welfare indicator for stocked carp or for aquaponic fish generally. Fish welfare can be discussed here through supported environmental and performance relationships [1], [2]; a general causal account of behaviour under those same conditions remains an evidence gap rather than an implication that can safely be assumed.

IV. Evidence Synthesis

The strongest direct comparison concerns a trade-off between individual growth and biomass produced within a fixed tank volume. In the European carp trial, higher stocking density was associated with poorer growth per fish but greater biomass per tank volume [1]. This contrast prevents production expressed per tank from standing in for the experience or performance of individual fish. The trial's accompanying water-quality differences align with the aquaponics review's account of density-related changes in chemistry and dissolved oxygen [2]. Alignment strengthens the relevance of the environmental explanation, but does not separate water-quality effects from possible crowding or competition discussed by the trial authors [1]. Its findings remain specific to the compared carp treatments and system.

Water chemistry and fish response also need to be kept analytically distinct. The aquaponics literature identifies ammonia toxicity and considers pH and oxygen when discussing fish conditions [2]; another review notes that pH responses vary by species and that fluctuations may affect health and reproduction [7]. The carp trial associates a stocking contrast with different water conditions and growth outcomes [1]. Read together, these sources explain why a density comparison should include both environmental observations and fish outcomes. They do not establish that the reported carp growth difference was caused by pH, nor do they provide a universal sequence in which all fish respond to ammonia or oxygen changes.

The fish-focused and system-focused sources answer different parts of the welfare question. Oxygen research describes physiological and performance responses that give aquatic conditions biological significance [3]. Aquaponics reviews describe how stocking can affect the aquatic setting and how fish selection and tank arrangements define its context [2], [6]. The direct carp comparison then shows that an actual density change can coincide with divergent individual and tank-level performance [1]. None of these contributions substitutes for direct evidence that a particular behavioural pattern reliably indicates welfare under a particular stocking condition. Behavioural evidence available here concerns larval feeding, not that broader relationship [8]. The synthesis is consequently stronger for environment and performance than for behaviour.

V. Practical Implications and Limitations

Interpreting a proposed stocking arrangement should begin with the fish selected, the tank setting and the water conditions relevant to those fish. Fish-selection factors and tank arrangements provide context [6]; density-related changes in chemistry and dissolved oxygen provide a reason to examine the resulting environment [2]. Species-dependent pH responses then caution against applying an environmental judgement unchanged across fish [7]. This is an interpretive framework, not a prescribed density or operating procedure. The accepted evidence cannot identify a universal threshold at which stocking becomes unsuitable. Nor can a favourable reading of one water variable rule out concerns associated with another variable or with the fish's observed response.

The carp trial illustrates why practical conclusions must specify their outcome. At the higher of its two compared densities, individual fish grew less while biomass per tank volume was greater [1]. A decision concerned with tank-level biomass and one concerned with individual fish performance would therefore read the same comparison differently. The associated lower dissolved oxygen and discussion of higher

ammonium or crowding make those conditions relevant to interpretation, but the trial does not prove the contribution of each proposed influence [1]. Fish-focused oxygen research also shows why a general oxygen rule cannot simply be imported without context [3]. A welfare conclusion requires more than choosing whichever performance measure favours a stocking treatment.

Behaviour is the principal unresolved part of an integrated assessment. The available sensory and feeding review addresses larval fish, so it does not validate behavioural responses to density, pH or oxygen for the stocked fish considered here [8]. Environmental reviews identify fish-relevant conditions and variation in biological response [2], [7], but that does not supply the missing behavioural observations. The next useful evidence would relate directly observed behaviour and fish condition to measured water conditions in a specified species and tank arrangement, while distinguishing those observations from individual growth and total biomass [1], [6]. Until then, neither an absence of reported behavioural change nor a single observed feeding pattern can support a general welfare verdict.

VI. Conclusion

Fish welfare in aquaponics has an environmental and biological meaning that cannot be reduced to stocking density alone. The European carp comparison shows that higher density can coincide with lower individual growth, greater tank-level biomass and changed water conditions [1]. Aquaponics reviews connect density with fish-relevant chemistry and oxygen, while noting that responses to pH can depend on species [2], [7]. Fish-focused oxygen evidence reinforces the need to interpret conditions through responses rather than through an assumed universal range [3]. These findings support a conditional account of stocking environment, not a transferable formula for welfare.

A fuller account must also determine what fish behaviour contributes to that judgement. The accepted behaviour evidence addresses larval sensory and feeding processes rather than behavioural responses across aquaponic stocking conditions [8]. The highest-value next step is direct examination of behaviour and fish responses alongside water conditions in clearly specified fish and tank settings, so that proposed connections can be tested rather than inferred from production or environmental measures alone [1], [6]. For now, the warranted conclusion is narrower but useful: stocking can alter conditions with consequences for fish performance, while the broader relationship among those conditions, behaviour and welfare requires direct evidence.

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] C. Maucieri, C. Nicoletto, G. Zanin, M. Birolo, A. Trocino, P. Sambo, M. Borin, and G. Xiccato, "Effect of stocking density of fish on water quality and growth performance of european carp and leafy vegetables in a low-tech aquaponic system," *PLOS ONE*, 2019.

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

[3] 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.

[4] 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.

[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. 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.

[7] 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.

[8] 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.