Supplementation within fish and biofilter safety constraints

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

***Abstract*—Plant nutrient supplementation in aquaponics must be understood as an intervention in a shared production system, not solely as a means of correcting crop deficiencies. Evidence from an aquaponics experiment shows that iron and iron-plus-potassium additions can alter plant and fish outcomes without changing measured ammonia or dissolved oxygen across the tested treatments. Those measurements, however, do not establish the capacity or safety of the biofilter under other conditions. A broader aquaponics review identifies interacting constraints: fish-specific treatment needs, the influence of pH and alkalinity on nitrification, and possible restrictions on nitrifiers under high organic loading. Evidence on fish nitrogen metabolism further explains why ammonia production and harmful nitrite exposure matter when interpreting water-quality responses. This paper synthesises these sources to distinguish a demonstrated response to particular supplements from a general claim of fish and biofilter safety. It argues for supplementation directed at measured nutrient deficits while interpreting crop benefits alongside fish condition and the operating conditions relevant to nitrification. The available evidence supports a system-specific assessment, not a universal supplement dose or safety threshold.**

I. Introduction

Supplementation can address a plant nutrient deficit in aquaponics, but the intervention occurs in water shared with fish and the processes that support nitrogen conversion. An aquaponics review describes supplementation of measured deficits while identifying fish-specific pH and treatment needs, the influence of pH and alkalinity on nitrification, and possible constraints on nitrifiers under high organic loading [1]. The central question is therefore not simply whether an addition improves plant performance. It is whether that benefit can be interpreted alongside conditions relevant to fish and the biofilter. Because these relationships vary with system context, the review does not provide a universal rule for safe supplementation [1].

Fish-side nitrogen evidence gives this question a concrete basis without resolving it on its own. A review of fish nitrogen metabolism describes ammonia production and excretion and reports harmful effects of nitrite exposure [2]. These observations explain why nitrogen-related water quality remains relevant when nutrients are added for plants. They do not show that a particular plant supplement raises ammonia or nitrite, nor do they test an aquaponic biofilter [2]. Treating fish physiology as a reason to examine system responses, rather than as proof of an effect from supplementation, keeps the safety argument proportionate to the evidence.

Direct experimental evidence offers a narrower view of what supplementation can achieve. In one aquaponics study, iron and iron-plus-potassium additions were tested against no nutrient addition, with crop, fish, and water-quality outcomes reported; measured ammonia and dissolved oxygen did not differ across treatments [3]. That result is informative for the tested system, but unchanged measurements are not a direct test of biofilter capacity. This paper first defines the relevant evidence boundaries, then explains the interacting plant, fish, and nitrification constraints, synthesises what the available studies establish, and identifies what remains necessary before a broader safety claim can be made.

II. Background and Scope

The available sources approach supplementation within fish and biofilter safety constraints from different directions. The aquaponics experiment examines the response to specific iron and iron-plus-potassium additions, making it useful for interpreting observed outcomes under defined treatments [3]. The aquaponics review instead discusses why measured nutrient deficits, fish needs, pH, alkalinity, and organic loading must be considered together [1]. The fish physiology review supplies context for ammonia excretion and nitrite harm, but does not investigate supplement additions [2]. None of these contributions should be mistaken for a complete, general demonstration that a given supplement is safe for every fish and biofilter combination.

The distinction between a nutrient need and a permissible intervention defines the paper's scope. A plant response can indicate that an addition addressed a limitation: the tested iron and iron-plus-potassium treatments produced different crop outcomes in the aquaponics experiment [3]. Yet the broader review describes fish-specific treatment needs and conditions affecting nitrification, so the plant response alone cannot establish how widely that treatment can be applied [1]. Fish ammonia excretion and the consequences of nitrite exposure add a reason to examine nitrogen-related outcomes, without implying that the particular iron or potassium additions caused those hazards [2].

A further gap lies between observing selected water-quality variables and establishing biofilter safety. The supplementation experiment reports unchanged measured ammonia and dissolved oxygen across its treatments, which is evidence about those measurements in that setting [3]. It does not isolate biofilter capacity or test its response across the pH,

alkalinity, and organic-loading conditions identified as relevant to nitrification by the aquaponics review [1]. Nor can the fish physiology review fill that experimental gap, since its account of ammonia and nitrite concerns fish biology rather than the performance of a supplemented aquaponic system [2]. The synthesis therefore separates observed outcomes, mechanistic constraints, and unanswered safety questions.

III. Core Concepts and Mechanisms

The first concept is targeted supplementation: an addition is justified by an identified nutrient deficit, not by an assumption that more nutrients necessarily improve the whole system. The aquaponics review describes supplementing measured deficits while cautioning that system context governs the response [1]. Experimental comparison gives this principle practical meaning: iron and iron-plus-potassium additions were associated with different plant outcomes relative to no addition in one aquaponic setting [3]. Such a comparison can indicate which limitation mattered under the tested conditions. It cannot by itself establish that the same addition, or the same amount, is appropriate where fish needs and water conditions differ [1].

The second concept is that fish-related constraints and nitrification-related constraints are connected but not interchangeable. Fish produce and excrete ammonia, while nitrite exposure can harm them, according to the fish physiology review [2]. Separately, the aquaponics review identifies pH and alkalinity as relevant to nitrification and notes that high organic loading can constrain nitrifiers [1]. These findings explain why conditions associated with fish and nitrogen conversion belong in the interpretation of a supplementation decision. They do not establish a single causal route by which every nutrient addition changes nitrification. A defensible assessment must distinguish a plausible system constraint from a demonstrated effect of the supplement being considered.

The third concept concerns the meaning of stable measurements. In the iron and iron-plus-potassium experiment, measured ammonia and dissolved oxygen remained unchanged across treatments while other crop and fish outcomes were evaluated [3]. This supports the limited observation that those additions did not produce a detected difference in those variables under the study conditions. It does not measure how much additional load the biofilter could accommodate or show that its response would remain stable if pH, alkalinity, or organic loading differed [1]. The fish evidence reinforces the importance of interpreting nitrogen-related measurements carefully, but cannot convert an unchanged ammonia result into proof that harmful nitrite exposure is impossible [2].

IV. Evidence Synthesis

Considered together, the sources support a conditional account of supplementation rather than either an unrestricted recommendation or a blanket warning. The aquaponics experiment provides direct evidence that particular nutrient additions can be assessed through crop, fish, and water-quality outcomes in one system [3]. The aquaponics review explains why treatment choices also depend on fish-specific needs and on conditions associated with nitrification [1]. Fish nitrogen physiology clarifies the importance of ammonia production and nitrite exposure, but does not identify an adverse effect from the experimental supplements [2]. The strength of the combined evidence lies in connecting a measured plant intervention to relevant system constraints while retaining each source's limits.

The comparison also shows why apparently reassuring water-quality findings require careful wording. Unchanged measured ammonia and dissolved oxygen across the experimental treatments are meaningful observations, particularly because crop and fish responses were assessed in the same study [3]. They are not equivalent to a direct demonstration that nitrifiers retained spare capacity or that all nitrogen-related risks were absent. The review's account of pH, alkalinity, and organic loading identifies conditions under which nitrification needs separate consideration [1]; the fish review identifies why nitrite exposure matters to the safety interpretation [2]. These sources support further assessment, not an inference that the experiment reported an unmeasured failure.

The evidence is also uneven in what it says about causation. The supplementation experiment links specified treatments to observed outcomes within its design, but its findings remain bounded by that system and its measured variables [3]. The aquaponics review supplies relevant mechanisms and constraints across systems without establishing a universal operating rule for the tested additions [1]. The fish review establishes physiological context, not a supplementation response [2]. Consequently, a claim that adding iron or potassium is generally safe for fish and biofilters would exceed the combined evidence. A narrower claim is justified: nutrient benefits and selected water-quality responses can be evaluated together, provided the limits of those observations are stated.

V. Practical Implications and Limitations

The most defensible approach is to relate an addition to a measured plant nutrient deficit, then interpret its response in the context of the fish and nitrogen-conversion conditions of that system. The aquaponics review supports the deficit-based starting point and identifies fish-specific pH and treatment needs alongside pH, alkalinity, and organic-loading constraints relevant to nitrification [1]. The supplementation experiment illustrates why crop outcomes should be read together with fish and water-quality observations rather than on their own [3]. This is an interpretive principle, not a validated dosing instruction: neither source establishes a single combination of supplement amount and operating conditions that guarantees safety across aquaponic systems.

Fish and biofilter safety require distinct claims because the available indicators answer different questions. The fish physiology review documents ammonia excretion and harm associated with nitrite exposure, but supplies no aquaponic supplementation trial [2]. The iron and iron-plus-potassium study reports unchanged measured ammonia and dissolved oxygen across treatments, but does not directly establish biofilter capacity [3]. The aquaponics review identifies conditions

that can affect nitrification, including pH, alkalinity, and high organic loading, without specifying universal thresholds for supplement use [1]. An observed absence of change in two water-quality variables must therefore not be presented as comprehensive evidence of fish or biofilter safety.

Further validation should be directed at the gap between a successful plant intervention and a supported system-level safety conclusion. The experiment demonstrates that crop, fish, and water-quality outcomes can be examined alongside defined supplementation treatments, but its unchanged ammonia and dissolved oxygen measurements have a limited interpretation [3]. The review indicates which contextual factors warrant attention when interpreting nitrification, while warning against universal rules [1]. Fish nitrogen evidence explains why the resulting assessment should not overlook nitrite-related harm [2]. Work that directly examines biofilter response under stated treatment and operating conditions would address a question that these sources, taken together, leave open.

VI. Conclusion

Supplementation within fish and biofilter safety constraints is best understood as a conditional intervention. A measured plant deficit can motivate an addition, and a controlled aquaponics experiment shows that iron and iron-plus-potassium treatments can be evaluated against crop, fish, and water-quality outcomes [3]. Yet fish ammonia excretion and harmful nitrite exposure make nitrogen-related interpretation consequential [2], while fish-specific needs and conditions affecting nitrification limit the transfer of a treatment between systems [1]. Plant benefit and unchanged measured ammonia or dissolved oxygen in one experiment are useful evidence; they are not, separately or together, universal proof of biofilter safety.

The highest-value next step is direct validation of biofilter response alongside plant and fish outcomes under clearly stated supplementation and operating conditions. That priority follows from the experimental study's limited water-quality findings and the reviewed influence of pH, alkalinity, and organic loading on nitrification [1], [3]. Until such evidence is available, claims should remain specific to the supplements, measurements, and system examined. This preserves the demonstrated possibility of addressing plant nutrient deficits without treating either fish safety or biofilter capacity as an untested assumption [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] 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.

[2] 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.

[3] E. Tsoumalakou, E. Mente, K. A. Kormas, N. Katsoulas, N. Vlahos, P. Kapsis, and E. Levizou, "Precise monitoring of lettuce functional responses to minimal nutrient supplementation identifies aquaponic system's nutrient limitations and their time-course," *Agriculture*, 2022.