Ammonia speciation and toxicity

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

***Abstract*—Ammonia speciation determines why a measure of ammonia in aquaponic water cannot, by itself, convey the potential for toxicity to fish. An aquaponics review identifies non-ionised ammonia as the toxic fraction of total ammonia and reports that its proportion increases as pH and water temperature rise. This relationship makes the conditions accompanying an ammonia measurement essential to its interpretation. Evidence from an aquaponics trial adds system context: ammonium concentrations were reported alongside lower dissolved oxygen and near-zero nitrate at higher fish density, conditions the investigators associated with less favourable nitrification. The trial did not measure ammonia speciation or test toxicity, however, and cannot establish a toxic exposure. A further review notes interactions between pH effects on fish and nitrogenous compounds without directly explaining the toxic ammonia fraction. This paper distinguishes the direct evidence for speciation from these contextual observations. It concludes that the strongest supported explanation is a conditional one: higher pH and temperature increase the non-ionised fraction, but the available evidence does not establish a universal toxicity threshold or demonstrate a particular toxic outcome in the reported aquaponic trial.**

I. Introduction

Ammonia speciation is central to interpreting ammonia in aquaponic water because the reported quantity and the fraction described as toxic are not necessarily the same thing. An aquaponics review identifies non-ionised ammonia as the toxic fraction of total ammonia and reports that increasing either pH or water temperature increases its proportion [1]. The implication is not that any one ammonia measurement proves harm. Rather, a measurement needs its water conditions to have a clear toxicological meaning. This paper examines that distinction, then considers what aquaponic observations add to it and where those observations stop short of demonstrating toxicity.

Aquaponic water quality also reflects processes that affect the amount of nitrogenous material present. In a fish-density trial, investigators reported ammonium concentrations and associated lower dissolved oxygen and near-zero nitrate at higher fish density with less favourable conditions for nitrification [2]. These observations make nitrogen transformation relevant background for an account of ammonia in an operating system. They do not identify how much of the measured ammonia was non-ionised, however, and the trial did not test ammonia toxicity. Keeping these questions separate prevents an observation about nitrification conditions from being mistaken for evidence of a particular toxic exposure.

The relevance of pH extends beyond a calculation of the non-ionised fraction: a separate aquaponics review notes that pH effects on fish interact with nitrogenous compounds [3]. That observation supports considering pH when discussing fish exposure, but it does not independently specify the direction or magnitude of ammonia speciation. The discussion therefore proceeds from the direct account of the toxic fraction, uses the trial and broader review only for the aspects they address, and identifies the measurements that would be needed to connect system conditions to an observed toxic outcome [1], [2], [3].

II. Background and Scope

The three sources answer different questions about ammonia in aquaponics. The account of biological and technological parameters directly links pH and temperature to the proportion of total ammonia present as non-ionised ammonia [1]. The fish-density trial instead documents ammonium and other water-quality observations under two stocking conditions [2]. The review of aquaponic configurations places pH and nitrogenous compounds in a wider discussion of fish responses, without directly characterising the toxic fraction [3]. Read together, they support an explanation of why ammonia measurements require interpretation, but not a reconstruction of toxic exposure in the trial.

A useful distinction is between an observation about nitrogen processing and an observation about speciation. The trial's association of lower dissolved oxygen and near-zero nitrate with less favourable nitrification conditions concerns the conversion of nitrogenous material within its tested system [2]. The speciation account concerns the proportion of total ammonia that is non-ionised under particular pH and temperature conditions [1]. Both questions matter to an interpretation of ammonia, but one cannot answer the other. In particular, the trial's ammonium observations should not be treated as measurements of the non-ionised fraction or as evidence that its fish experienced ammonia toxicity.

This distinction also defines the limits of the present synthesis. The direct review evidence supports the direction of the pH and temperature relationship and identifies which fraction is toxic; it does not, in the supplied claim support, establish a general concentration at which harm begins [1]. The trial provides relevant operating context but no speciation or toxicity test [2]. The additional review reinforces the need to consider pH and nitrogenous compounds together without filling that measurement gap [3]. The central question is consequently what can be inferred about potential toxicity from these sources, not what happened to fish in an untested exposure.

III. Core Concepts and Mechanisms

The central concept is a difference between total ammonia and its non-ionised component. In the aquaponics review, the non-ionised component is identified as toxic, and a rise in pH or water temperature is reported to increase its share of total ammonia [1]. Thus, an unchanged total ammonia amount would not necessarily imply an unchanged proportion in the form of toxicological concern if the accompanying water conditions differed. This is a statement about the composition of the measured total, not a prediction of a specific injury. The available evidence supports the direction of the relationship, while any numerical exposure assessment would require information for the water being assessed.

The reported temperature and pH relationship explains why these variables belong in the interpretation of ammonia rather than being treated as unrelated background readings [1]. The review provides illustrative values for two combinations of conditions, but isolated examples cannot substitute for the conditions of another system or establish that its fish were harmed. Moreover, the separate account of interactions between pH effects on fish and nitrogenous compounds cautions against attributing every possible fish response to ammonia speciation alone [3]. The supported mechanism therefore concerns a changing toxic fraction; the supplied evidence does not resolve all influences on a fish response.

Nitrification conditions address a different part of the causal account. In the fish-density trial, lower dissolved oxygen and near-zero nitrate at higher density were interpreted as less favourable to nitrification, while ammonium concentrations were reported as water-quality observations [2]. Those measurements help describe conditions under which nitrogen processing may differ. They do not determine how the ammonia present was divided between its forms. Combining them with the review's speciation relationship is useful for identifying two distinct questions, how much ammonia is present and what proportion is non-ionised, but does not supply the missing speciation measurements [1].

IV. Evidence Synthesis

The strongest direct evidence in this set concerns the direction of change in the toxic fraction. The aquaponics review explicitly connects increases in pH and temperature with an increased non-ionised share of total ammonia [1]. The trial's observations make that distinction consequential in an aquaponic setting where ammonium and nitrification-related indicators were recorded, yet they cannot verify the review's relationship within the trial because speciation was not tested there [2]. This is a complementary, not confirmatory, relationship between the sources: one explains the interpretation of ammonia under changing conditions, while the other illustrates why nitrogen measurements arise in system assessment.

The broader review adds a further qualification. Its discussion of interactions between pH effects on fish and nitrogenous compounds supports attention to pH when interpreting a possible fish response, but it does not measure or explain the non-ionised fraction in the evidence supplied here [3]. Accordingly, neither that discussion nor the fish-density trial independently demonstrates ammonia toxicity [2]. The sources can be synthesised into a bounded causal account: pH and temperature affect the toxic fraction identified in the direct review, while aquaponic operating observations describe context that might prompt closer examination. A demonstrated toxic outcome would require evidence beyond these contextual observations [1].

V. Practical Implications and Limitations

For interpretation, the supported principle is to distinguish a reported ammonia quantity from an estimate of its non-ionised portion. Because the review reports that pH and temperature increase that portion, the meaning of an ammonia reading depends on the conditions accompanying it [1]. This does not authorise a universal conversion, threshold, or claim of harm from the evidence presented here. It instead identifies the information needed before a reading can be discussed specifically as a potential toxic exposure. The separate observation that pH effects on fish interact with nitrogenous compounds reinforces the need for restraint when interpreting a fish response from one water-quality variable alone [3].

The trial shows why care is needed when moving from operating conditions to toxicity claims. Its ammonium, dissolved-oxygen and nitrate observations inform an assessment of nitrogen processing at different fish densities, but the investigators did not test ammonia speciation or toxicity [2]. Consequently, the observed water-quality differences cannot establish whether the non-ionised fraction differed enough to matter to fish. The most valuable validation would pair ammonia measurements with their pH and temperature conditions and directly assess the non-ionised fraction and relevant fish outcomes. That need follows from the gap between the review's speciation relationship and the trial's measurements, rather than from a toxicity result reported by either source [1], [2].

VI. Conclusion

Ammonia speciation gives a precise reason not to equate an ammonia reading with a toxic exposure. The accepted review evidence identifies non-ionised ammonia as the toxic fraction and reports that its proportion rises with pH and temperature [1]. Aquaponic evidence on ammonium and less favourable nitrification conditions establishes relevant system context, while evidence concerning pH interactions with nitrogenous compounds adds a reason to interpret possible fish responses cautiously [2], [3]. Neither contextual source directly establishes the non-ionised fraction or a toxic outcome in the systems it discusses.

The resulting conclusion is conditional rather than numerical: pH and temperature matter to the toxicological meaning of total ammonia, but the supplied evidence does not justify a universal harm threshold or a claim that the reported aquaponic trial demonstrated ammonia toxicity [1], [2]. Directly linking measurements of ammonia and its non-ionised fraction to water conditions and fish outcomes would close the most

important gap identified by this synthesis. Until such a link is available for a particular case, observations about nitrogen processing and pH should inform investigation, not stand in for evidence of toxicity [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] 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.

[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.