Nutrient retention, transformation and loss pathways

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

***Abstract*—In aquaponics, the presence of fish-derived nutrients does not establish that those nutrients will become available to plants or remain within the production system. This paper synthesises review evidence on fish nitrogen metabolism and aquaponic nutrient management to explain nutrient retention, transformation and loss as distinct, connected pathways. Feed and fish waste provide nutrient inputs, while fish excretion contributes ammonia to the water. Microbial conversion changes nitrogen forms; waste handling and system configuration influence which nutrient-bearing material remains available, is separated from circulation or leaves through discharge. Plant nutrient supply must therefore be interpreted in relation to both waste-derived loading and crop demand. The reviewed evidence supports this causal account, but it does not provide a general quantitative allocation of nutrients among fish, water, separated waste, plants and discharged material. Nor does evidence about fish metabolism alone establish system-level retention or loss. A scientifically useful pathway description should identify the nutrient-bearing material, the transformation under consideration and the boundary across which a loss is claimed. This distinction prevents retention from being mistaken for plant availability and allows nutrient deficits and discharge to be considered without assuming that all fish waste follows the same fate.**

I. Introduction

Aquaponic production links a fish-derived waste stream to a crop nutrient supply, but the link is not a direct equivalence. Feed and fish waste introduce nutrients, and microbial conversion of nitrogen compounds affects the forms available in the system [1]. Material must also pass through waste handling and the relationship between nutrient loading and crop demand before its significance for plants can be assessed [1]. Nutrient retention, transformation and loss pathways describe these intervening fates. The question is not simply whether fish waste contains nutrients, but which material remains within the system, which forms change and which fractions may cease to be available or leave it.

An account based only on the quantity of waste produced would obscure two important possibilities: a retained nutrient supply may still be inadequate for plants, and nutrients may leave through discharge. Aquaponics evidence addresses waste-derived nutrient loading, nutrient deficits, discharge and differences associated with system configuration [2]. These observations make nutrient fate conditional on how fish and plant components are connected and operated, rather than an automatic benefit of combining them. This paper explains the pathways as a causal sequence, then compares the evidence for each link and identifies what cannot be concluded without following nutrient-bearing material across the relevant boundaries.

II. Background and Scope

Fish physiology explains one origin of dissolved nitrogen but not its complete fate in aquaponics. A review of nitrogen metabolism in fishes describes ammonia production and excretion through the gills, and discusses nitrite and nitrate in relation to fish metabolism [3]. That account establishes why nitrogenous material can enter the surrounding water from fish. It does not establish how much of that material remains in a production system, changes form after excretion or reaches a crop. The distinction matters because a physiological input is only the beginning of a pathway: system-level retention and loss depend on subsequent processes outside the fish.

Aquaponics reviews extend the explanation beyond the fish. One connects feed and fish waste to nutrient inputs, microbial conversion, waste handling and the balance between nutrient loading and plant requirements [1]. Another considers the influence of configuration on waste-derived supply, nutrient deficits and discharge [2]. These perspectives are complementary rather than interchangeable. The first identifies a sequence of processes through which waste may become relevant to plants; the second cautions that the sequence does not have an identical outcome in every arrangement. Together they motivate an account that distinguishes the existence of nutrients from their eventual availability or departure.

The relevant scope is the fate of nutrients entering through feed and fish waste, particularly the nitrogen pathway supported by the fish-metabolism and aquaponics reviews [1], [3]. Retention means that nutrient-bearing material remains within a specified system boundary. Transformation means its chemical or biological form changes. Loss means it crosses that boundary, for example in a discharged stream considered by aquaponics evidence [2]. These are analytical distinctions, not claims that every fate has been measured or that all nutrients behave alike. Their value is to prevent a change in form or location from being incorrectly described as plant uptake or permanent loss.

III. Core Concepts and Mechanisms

The input pathway begins with feed and the waste associated with fish production [1]. Fish nitrogen metabolism adds a more specific mechanism: ammonia production followed by excretion at the gills provides a route for nitrogenous material to enter the water [3]. These inputs should not be treated as a single immediately usable nutrient pool. Fish waste also enters a system in forms that require handling, and an aquaponics review places microbial conversion between waste inputs and nutrient availability [1]. Consequently, identifying an input

establishes the source of a potential plant nutrient, but not its concentration, its eventual form or whether it remains accessible to the crop.

Transformation is most clearly supported for nitrogen. The fish-metabolism evidence establishes a physiological route for ammonia entering the water [3], while aquaponics evidence describes microbial conversion of nitrogen compounds as part of the path towards nutrient availability [1]. Conversion changes the form in which nitrogen is present; it should not be conflated with either its retention in the system or its uptake by plants. This separation is essential to the causal explanation. A nutrient can undergo transformation and still remain within the production system, while its usefulness to a crop remains contingent on the resulting nutrient supply relative to plant demand [1].

Retention and loss require a boundary as well as a material. Aquaponics evidence discusses waste handling, nutrient availability and discharge [1], [2]. Handling can change where nutrient-bearing material is located, whereas discharge identifies a route by which material leaves the considered system. Neither observation, by itself, demonstrates what fraction of a particular nutrient is incorporated into plants. A statement that nutrients are retained should therefore specify whether it concerns material still within the system rather than material demonstrably available to the crop. A statement that nutrients are lost should identify an exit, rather than infer loss merely because a plant nutrient deficit is observed [2].

IV. Evidence Synthesis

The three reviews support different links in a connected explanation. Fish nitrogen metabolism accounts for ammonia production and excretion but offers only limited leverage on later system-level fate [3]. Aquaponics evidence links feed and waste inputs to microbial conversion, waste handling and crop nutrient requirements [1]. Evidence concerning configuration adds the possibility of nutrient deficits and discharge to that sequence [2]. Read together, these claims show why a pathway cannot be inferred from its first step. The fact that fish produce nitrogenous waste establishes an input; it does not determine how much is retained, transformed into an available form, taken up or lost.

Retention is particularly easy to overinterpret when the endpoint of interest is plant nutrition. The aquaponics review identifies a need to balance nutrient loading against crop demand [1], and the configuration-focused review considers both waste-derived nutrients and possible nutrient deficits [2]. The coexistence of those observations means that retaining a waste-derived nutrient stream cannot automatically be equated with meeting crop requirements. Transformation provides a further distinction: microbial conversion can alter nutrient form without establishing that the amount supplied matches demand [1]. The evidence thus supports a conditional interpretation of resource retention, not a universal claim that recycling fish waste yields a complete plant nutrient supply.

Loss is equally distinct from an observed shortage in the plant component. Discharge is an identified route out of aquaponic production in the configuration-focused review [2]. A nutrient deficit, however, describes a mismatch between supply and demand; it does not specify whether the missing supply was never present in sufficient quantity, remains elsewhere within the system or has exited it. Waste handling and microbial conversion create further points at which availability and location can diverge [1]. This comparison establishes an important limit of the evidence: the reviews justify the principal causal routes but do not, from the supplied claims, quantify how a particular nutrient is divided among them.

V. Practical Implications and Limitations

A useful pathway assessment should name the nutrient-bearing input before judging what happens to it. Feed-derived waste and fish excretion are related sources, but the physiological evidence specifically explains ammonia production and gill excretion [3], whereas the aquaponics evidence addresses the wider combination of feed, waste handling and microbial conversion [1]. Keeping those scales separate prevents a fish-level mechanism from being used as proof of a system-level outcome. It also makes a reported change in nutrient availability easier to interpret: the change may reflect conversion of waste-derived material, a different relationship between loading and demand, or a route by which material no longer remains in the considered system [1], [2].

The system boundary must be stated consistently when describing retention or loss. Discharge is a pathway beyond that boundary [2], while waste handling can affect the location and availability of material without, on the accepted evidence alone, establishing its final fate [1]. If a nutrient-bearing fraction has been separated from the water, calling it lost requires evidence that the fraction has actually left the defined system. Conversely, calling it recovered for crop nutrition requires evidence that it becomes available and is supplied in relation to plant demand. This distinction is an interpretive requirement rather than a claim that a particular handling approach achieves either outcome.

Generalisation across aquaponic arrangements is limited by configuration and operational context. A review assessing fish-to-plant loading, deficits and discharge identifies configuration-related influences on observed nutrient pathways [2]. The review of aquaponic biological processes describes why microbial conversion and waste handling matter, but the accepted evidence does not provide a single quantitative partition of nutrients for all systems [1]. Fish-metabolism evidence likewise cannot fill that system-level gap [3]. The most informative validation would track a specified nutrient from input through its changed forms and retained locations to plant uptake or an identified exit, while documenting the crop demand against which availability is judged.

VI. Conclusion

Nutrient retention, transformation and loss pathways form a causal sequence, not three alternative names for the same outcome. Fish and feed-related processes supply waste-derived material; fish excrete ammonia; microbial activity changes

nitrogen compounds; and waste handling, crop demand and discharge influence what that supply ultimately means in aquaponics [1], [2], [3]. Retention establishes that material remains within a defined boundary, but not that plants can use it. Transformation establishes a change in form, but not uptake. Loss requires an identified route out, rather than an inference from nutrient shortage.

The strongest supported conclusion is therefore conditional: fish waste can contribute to plant nutrient supply, but its contribution cannot be read directly from the presence of waste or presumed to be identical across system configurations [1], [2]. Further validation should distinguish the input, transformed forms, retained fractions and discharged material for a specified system. That would test the connections that the reviews explain without treating fish-level nitrogen metabolism as a measurement of whole-system nutrient fate [1], [2], [3].

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] 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.

[3] S. I. Dolomatov, P. V. Shekk, W. Zukow, and M. I. Kryukova, "Features of nitrogen metabolism in fishes," *Reviews in Fish Biology and Fisheries*, 2011.