Nitrogen-cycle failure and nitrogen-loss pathways

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

***Abstract*—Aquaponic systems depend on a continuing relationship between nitrogen supplied through fish feed and waste, its conversion within the water, and its use by plants. Nitrogen-cycle failure is therefore more than an interruption of nitrification: it can also describe a mismatch between nitrogen input, conversion and plant demand. This paper synthesises two aquaponics reviews to explain those causal relationships and distinguish impaired conversion from nitrogen leaving the productive system. The supported conversion sequence is ammonia to nitrite to nitrate. Its oxygen and alkalinity requirements make its performance dependent on operating conditions, while waste removal and water discharge provide routes by which nitrogen can leave the circulating system. Conversely, inadequate plant demand relative to nitrogen loading can permit accumulation rather than useful uptake. These outcomes cannot be inferred from a single nitrogen concentration without considering inputs and removals. The available evidence establishes these relationships but does not quantify their relative contributions in a particular installation or substantiate attribution to specific gaseous loss pathways. A defensible assessment must therefore distinguish conversion, accumulation, plant use and physical removal before assigning a cause to an observed nitrogen imbalance.**

I. Introduction

In aquaponics, fish waste supplies nitrogen to water that also supports plant production. Its useful circulation depends in part on the conversion of ammonia through nitrite to nitrate, followed by a relationship between available nitrogen and plant demand. A disruption at one point can change what is available at another: nitrogen may enter the water without undergoing the expected conversion, or converted nitrogen may remain when demand is insufficient. The term nitrogen-cycle failure should therefore identify a causal imbalance rather than serve as a label for any unfavourable measurement. Understanding where nitrogen enters, changes form and leaves the system is the necessary starting point [1].

Nitrogen loss raises a related but different question: whether nitrogen remains available within the productive system at all. Reviews of aquaponics describe waste handling and discharge alongside changes in nitrogen availability, while also identifying oxygen and alkalinity consequences of nitrification. These processes connect biological conversion to operating conditions and to decisions that remove water or waste. A fall in one measured nitrogen form could consequently reflect conversion, plant use or removal, rather than recovery of an impaired cycle. Conversely, accumulation can indicate that input and demand are poorly matched even when conversion continues. Interpretation requires attention to both nitrogen form and system boundary [2].

This paper explains nitrogen-cycle failure and nitrogen-loss pathways through three linked questions: what conversion is expected, how the relationship between input and plant demand can fail, and which supported routes take nitrogen out of circulation. It then considers what the available reviews permit an observer to infer about apparent losses. The emphasis is causal rather than quantitative. The evidence supports an account of nitrification, fish-waste inputs, waste removal and the need to match loading with demand, but it does not supply a transferable partition of every nitrogen pathway. That distinction keeps an explanation of failure from becoming an unsupported estimate of loss [1], [2].

II. Background and Scope

Two complementary ways of describing nitrogen behaviour are useful. A conversion account follows ammonia, nitrite and nitrate, asking whether nitrogen supplied through fish waste reaches forms relevant to plant use. A balance account compares nitrogen loading with plant demand and recognises that waste removal or discharge can take material beyond the circulating system. Neither account is sufficient alone. Conversion can continue while nitrogen accumulates if demand does not keep pace, whereas a change in circulating nitrogen may result from removal without demonstrating successful conversion. Read together, the aquaponics reviews support an interpretation that keeps transformation and system losses analytically distinct [1], [2].

The scope of nitrogen-cycle failure here is a failure to sustain the expected relationship among input, conversion and use, not a claim that every nitrogen transformation has ceased. This definition matters because fish-waste inputs, nitrification and plant demand can change relative to one another. Nitrogen entering faster than plants can use it need not imply an absent conversion process; equally, continuing input cannot establish that ammonia is being converted through the expected sequence. The reviews provide the components of this reasoning but do not establish a universal threshold at which an observed imbalance becomes failure. Diagnosis must retain the distinction between a process and the concentration that results from several processes [1], [2].

For nitrogen-loss pathways, the defensible boundary is similarly specific. Removing nitrogen-bearing waste or discharging water can remove nitrogen from the circulating aquaponic system; that statement does not, by itself, identify the nitrogen form removed or its eventual environmental fate. Plant use also reduces nitrogen remaining in water, but it is a productive destination rather than automatically a system loss. These distinctions prevent all decreases in measured nitrogen from being described as losses. The supplied reviews support waste

removal and discharge-related changes, yet do not establish a complete allocation among plant use, retained material and other possible destinations for any particular system [1], [2].

III. Core Concepts and Mechanisms

The central conversion mechanism is nitrification: ammonia is converted to nitrite and then to nitrate. In an aquaponic system receiving fish-waste nitrogen, that sequence links an input to a different distribution of nitrogen forms in the water. Failure of the expected sequence is causally different from an excess of nitrate after conversion. The former concerns whether transformation proceeds; the latter can concern how converted nitrogen compares with plant demand. Because both conditions may follow nitrogen input, their interpretation requires attention to the sequence rather than treating a single concentration as a direct measure of overall cycle performance [1], [2].

Nitrification also has oxygen and alkalinity consequences, which connect nitrogen conversion to conditions in the circulating water. A system cannot be understood solely by counting the nitrogen introduced through feed and waste if conditions relevant to conversion are changing at the same time. The causal implication is not that any observed oxygen or alkalinity change proves nitrification failure; these observations require interpretation alongside nitrogen forms and loading. Rather, conversion imposes demands that can constrain how steadily the expected sequence operates. This makes a purely input-based explanation incomplete and cautions against assuming that a mismatch between supply and plant use has only one cause [2].

A separate mechanism concerns the relationship between nitrogen loading and plant demand. When supply exceeds the amount plants use, nitrogen can accumulate even if ammonia continues to be converted. If nitrogen available for plants falls short of demand, a shortfall can arise without establishing which upstream process is responsible. Meanwhile, waste removal or discharge can alter how much nitrogen remains in circulation, potentially changing that relationship independently of biological conversion. These are competing explanations for an observed state, not interchangeable descriptions of one fault. The reviews support their causal relevance but not a universal ranking of which mechanism dominates under different operating conditions [1], [2].

IV. Evidence Synthesis

The evidence is strongest when the reviews are used to explain relationships rather than to assign a single cause from an isolated observation. The ammonia to nitrite to nitrate sequence establishes what a conversion failure would interrupt. Evidence concerning oxygen and alkalinity supplies a reason that conversion cannot be detached from operating context. Evidence concerning feed, waste and plant demand supplies a second explanation for nitrogen accumulation or shortfall. Together, these elements indicate that a nitrogen-cycle failure may involve constrained conversion, mismatched loading and demand, or both. They do not show that the mechanisms occur with equal frequency or severity [1], [2].

The same synthesis clarifies the meaning of nitrogen loss. Waste removal and discharge-related nitrogen changes provide supported routes by which nitrogen can cease to circulate within the system. Plant use changes the nitrogen remaining in water for a different reason, while nitrification changes nitrogen form rather than necessarily removing nitrogen. Thus, a declining concentration of ammonia cannot on its own establish that nitrogen has left: conversion to nitrite and nitrate offers another explanation. Nor can a decline in waterborne nitrogen establish whether removal or plant use was responsible. The source material supports these distinctions, not a numerical balance among the possible destinations [1], [2].

An important limit is that the accepted evidence does not identify or quantify every pathway sometimes grouped under nitrogen loss. In particular, it does not substantiate an attribution of loss in these systems to denitrification or ammonia volatilisation, or a comparison of either pathway with removal through waste and discharge. Naming those possibilities cannot replace evidence that a pathway occurred in a particular installation. The supported explanation should instead state what can be traced conceptually: input through feed and fish waste, conversion among the specified dissolved forms, plant demand, and removal through waste handling or discharge. Any more detailed apportionment remains unestablished here [1], [2].

V. Practical Implications and Limitations

A practical interpretation of suspected nitrogen-cycle failure should separate questions that are often compressed into one judgement. Has the expected ammonia to nitrite to nitrate conversion occurred? Is nitrogen loading aligned with plant demand? Has waste or water removal changed the amount remaining in circulation? Each question corresponds to a different supported causal relationship and could change the interpretation of the others. For example, continuing conversion does not exclude accumulation when demand is insufficient, while removal can alter available nitrogen without repairing an impaired conversion step. The evidence therefore favours an explanation built from inputs, nitrogen forms, demand and removals rather than from one apparent symptom [1], [2].

Such an explanation still has limits. The reviews establish relevant mechanisms and contextual dependencies, but they do not provide a measurement programme or a validated rule that assigns a particular nitrogen imbalance to one cause. Observations capable of distinguishing changing forms from changing total availability would be needed before a confident site-specific account could be made. Likewise, relating changes to feed-derived inputs, plant demand and material leaving through waste or discharge would test whether an apparent loss is a transfer beyond the system boundary. These are requirements for validating an interpretation, not claims that the supplied evidence demonstrates any particular installation's performance [1], [2].

The principal trade-off in interpretation is between a simple account and a defensible one. Calling any elevated nitrogen concentration a failed cycle overlooks the possibility of continuing conversion with inadequate demand. Calling any decrease a loss overlooks conversion and plant use. At the same time, an account confined to nitrification neglects the removal pathways and loading relationship documented in aquaponics reviews. The supported response is to specify the process and boundary whenever the word failure or loss is used. Because outcomes depend on operating context, conclusions drawn for one pattern of inputs, demand and removal should not be transferred to another without checking those relationships [1], [2].

VI. Conclusion

Nitrogen-cycle failure in aquaponics is best understood as a breakdown in the relationship among fish-waste nitrogen inputs, ammonia to nitrite to nitrate conversion, and plant demand. Nitrogen loss is a distinct question about nitrogen leaving the circulating system, for which waste removal and discharge are supported routes. Because nitrification has oxygen and alkalinity consequences, and because loading and demand need not remain matched, no single change in a nitrogen form establishes which process has failed or where nitrogen has gone. The available reviews support this causal account while leaving the relative contribution of individual pathways dependent on operating context [1], [2].

The highest-value next step is a system-specific account that distinguishes nitrogen entering, changing form, being used by plants and leaving with removed material or discharged water. Such an account could test an explanation of an observed imbalance rather than assuming one from a concentration alone. The evidence used here does not justify assigning a rate or causal role to additional loss pathways, including denitrification or ammonia volatilisation. Maintaining that boundary is essential: a scientifically useful explanation identifies supported mechanisms, states what an observation cannot distinguish, and reserves more specific loss claims for evidence that directly establishes them [1], [2].

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.