Media-bed systems and integrated filtration

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

***Abstract*—Media-bed systems place plant support and water-treatment functions within a shared component of an aquaponics system. This paper explains the scientific meaning of that integration by distinguishing solids retention from biological filtration, which converts ammonia to nitrate. Two aquaponics reviews describe how media can support roots and nitrifying microorganisms while retaining solids. A study of a pumice-bed system adds an important qualification: accumulated solids coincided with recurrent pH decline, which cleaning the media mitigated. A separate lettuce and tilapia study provides cultivation context but does not isolate the effects of bed filtration. Together, these sources support a causal account of what a media bed can do, while showing why the presence of a bed cannot establish adequate filtration or explain every crop response. Solids retained in a bed remain part of the operating system, and observations from one installation cannot establish the performance of all media beds. Evaluating integrated filtration therefore requires separate attention to solids accumulation, nitrogen conversion and plant responses. The resulting interpretation is neither that media beds are simply filters nor that their combined functions are automatically sufficient, but that integration joins distinct processes whose contributions must be assessed on their own terms.**

I. Introduction

Media-bed systems bring several aquaponics functions into one growing component. Aquaponics filtration includes physical handling of solids and biological conversion of ammonia to nitrate; a media bed can also support plant roots and nitrifying microorganisms [1]. These are related but different processes. Holding particulate material in a bed does not itself demonstrate conversion of dissolved ammonia, while providing a place for microorganisms does not establish how effectively solids are handled. The distinction matters because integrated filtration describes an arrangement of functions, not a single measurable outcome. Explaining the arrangement requires identifying what each function contributes and where an apparent benefit might also create a constraint.

The integration is significant because a media bed is simultaneously a growing space and a possible site of water treatment. A review of aquaponics system layouts describes media supporting roots and nitrifying microorganisms while retaining solids, alongside the broader roles of mechanical solids removal and biofiltration [2]. The same physical location can therefore connect plant cultivation to processes affecting circulating water. Co-location, however, does not mean that all retained material has left the system or that every biological process is sufficiently effective. A scientifically useful account must distinguish the bed's potential functions from demonstrated performance in a particular installation.

This paper develops that distinction using reviews of filtration mechanisms and studies of operating aquaponics systems. The reviews establish the functional account of solids handling, microbial support and plant support [1], [2]. A pumice-bed study provides a more specific observation about accumulated solids and recurrent pH decline [3], while a lettuce and tilapia study illustrates why crop responses in a media-bed system cannot automatically be attributed to filtration [4]. The argument proceeds from the bed's component roles to the evidence for their interaction, then considers the limits of generalising from those observations.

II. Background and Scope

An operating media bed can retain solids, but that apparent filtration function has an important boundary. In a study examining a pumice-bed flood-and-drain system, accumulated solids coincided with recurrent pH decline; cleaning the media mitigated the observed decline [3]. The reported sequence makes retained material relevant to interpreting system behaviour, rather than treating capture as the end of the filtration process. It does not, by itself, identify a single chemical cause of the pH change or establish that all media beds will respond similarly. The observation supports a narrower conclusion: solids accumulation within a bed can accompany a measurable change in the operating system.

Evidence about plants in media-bed systems addresses a different question. A closed-loop study with lettuce and red tilapia reports system and crop responses to nutrient supplementation in an arrangement that included media beds [4]. Those responses show why the existence of a bed cannot stand in for an assessment of the conditions experienced by the crop. They do not establish how much solid material the bed retained or how much ammonia it converted. Compared with the pumice-bed study, which relates accumulated solids and cleaning to pH behaviour [3], the supplementation study offers broader cultivation context but less direct evidence about the bed's filtration role.

The two reviews provide the conceptual bridge between these observations. Both describe media as potential support for roots, nitrifying microorganisms and solids retention, while distinguishing physical solids handling from biological filtration [1], [2]. The pumice-bed observation shows why one of those functions, solids retention, warrants scrutiny over time [3]. The lettuce and tilapia study cautions against reading crop outcomes as direct measurements of the other functions [4]. The remaining question is not whether a bed can serve several purposes, but how to interpret those purposes

without assuming that their mere combination proves adequate performance.

III. Core Concepts and Mechanisms

Physical filtration in a media bed begins with retaining solids that would otherwise remain in the moving water. Reviews identify solids retention as one of the bed's possible functions and discuss mechanical solids removal as a distinct element of aquaponics filtration [1], [2]. Retention should not be equated with disappearance: the material is held within the component unless another process or action changes its location. The pumice-bed study makes this distinction consequential, because accumulated solids coincided with recurrent pH decline that was mitigated by cleaning [3]. Its findings do not quantify solids-removal efficiency, but they show why an explanation of integrated filtration must account for what happens after material is captured.

Biological filtration concerns a transformation rather than the capture of particulate matter. The reviews describe nitrifying microorganisms associated with media and the conversion of ammonia to nitrate through biological filtration [1], [2]. This mechanism explains how a growing bed can participate in water treatment while also supporting roots. It does not follow that solids retention and ammonia conversion occur at the same rate or that evidence of one establishes the other. Nor does the lettuce and tilapia supplementation study isolate nitrification as the reason for its reported crop responses [4]. A claim about biological performance therefore needs evidence directed at that transformation, not merely evidence that plants grew in a bed.

Plant support is the third function that makes the system integrated rather than simply a water filter. The reviews identify media as a place for roots alongside microorganisms and retained solids [1], [2]. These roles explain why the same component appears in both the cultivation and filtration accounts of aquaponics. Yet their physical association does not establish that the bed provides all nutrients needed by plants. In the lettuce and tilapia study, nutrient supplementation elicited system and crop responses despite the use of media beds [4]. That finding does not measure filtration, but it reinforces the need to keep the bed's structural and biological roles distinct from claims about complete nutrient provision.

IV. Evidence Synthesis

The strongest explanatory agreement is between the reviews: both associate media beds with root support, microbial support and solids retention, while distinguishing the physical and biological dimensions of filtration [1], [2]. The pumice-bed study adds an operating observation that qualifies any simple description of solids retention as an unreserved benefit. Its reported accumulation, recurrent pH decline and mitigation after cleaning show that retained material can remain relevant to water conditions [3]. Together, these sources support a functional account with a clear constraint: bringing filtration functions into a growing bed also brings the consequences of retained solids into that component.

The two operating studies illuminate different limits of inference. The pumice-bed investigation relates an observed solids condition and an intervention, cleaning, to changes in pH behaviour [3]. The lettuce and tilapia investigation reports responses to nutrient supplementation in systems containing media beds [4]. Neither result alone measures every filtration function identified by the reviews [1], [2]. In particular, a change in pH following cleaning should not be presented as a quantified measure of nitrification, and a crop response to supplementation should not be presented as a quantified measure of solids retention. Their value lies in showing which observations bear directly on a proposed function and which do not.

Taken together, the evidence supports a qualitative causal explanation but not a universal performance estimate. Media can hold solids and support the organisms associated with ammonia conversion, providing a reason for the term integrated filtration [1], [2]. The pumice-bed result shows that accumulated solids may accompany a change requiring attention in at least one studied system [3]. The supplementation result shows that crop responses require interpretation beyond the simple presence of media [4]. These conclusions are compatible, rather than competing: the bed can perform several roles, while the sufficiency and consequences of each role remain questions for observation in the system being considered.

V. Practical Implications and Limitations

Assessment of integrated filtration should begin by naming the claimed outcome. Evidence that a media bed retains solids addresses physical capture; evidence about ammonia becoming nitrate addresses biological filtration; evidence about plant responses addresses cultivation. The reviews distinguish the first two functions while placing roots and microorganisms in the media [1], [2]. The lettuce and tilapia study reports supplementation responses, not a direct partition of those filtration effects [4]. Treating these observations as interchangeable would make it impossible to identify which part of the integrated arrangement is being evaluated. The practical implication is interpretive: a system description should not substitute for an outcome-specific observation.

Accumulated material deserves particular attention because capture can shift where solids reside without resolving their later effects. In the pumice-bed flood-and-drain system, recurrent pH decline coincided with solids accumulation, and cleaning the media mitigated the decline [3]. This finding supports attention to retained solids when evaluating that design, but it does not demonstrate that the same pH pattern will occur in every media-bed system. The reviews establish why retention is part of the bed's filtration role [1], [2]; the study establishes a relevant limitation observed in one setting. Neither source type supplies a general threshold at which accumulated solids become problematic.

The most informative further assessment would observe the proposed functions separately within the same operating system. Tracking solids in relation to the bed would address retention, while observations of ammonia and nitrate would

address the biological conversion described by the reviews [1], [2]. Recording pH alongside accumulated solids would examine the relationship highlighted by the pumice-bed study [3]. Plant responses could then be interpreted without assuming that they directly measure filtration, a distinction underscored by the supplementation study [4]. These are validation needs arising from the evidence, not claims that the supplied studies have already established comparative filtration performance.

VI. Conclusion

Media-bed systems and integrated filtration are best understood as the combination of distinct functions in a shared growing component. Media can support roots and nitrifying microorganisms while retaining solids; physical capture and biological conversion remain different processes [1], [2]. The pumice-bed observation shows why retained solids cannot simply be treated as a completed filtration outcome: accumulation coincided with recurrent pH decline, which cleaning mitigated in that system [3]. The lettuce and tilapia study likewise shows why crop responses in a media-bed arrangement must not be mistaken for direct evidence of bed filtration [4]. The central scientific conclusion is therefore conditional. Integration explains how several roles can coexist, but whether each role is sufficient requires observations directed at that role. Assessing solids retention, nitrogen conversion and plant responses separately within an operating system is the clearest next step for testing the combined account.

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. Goddek, B. Delaide, U. Mankasingh, K. V. Ragnarsdottir, H. Jijakli, and R. Thorarinsdottir, "Challenges of sustainable and commercial aquaponics," *Sustainability*, 2015.

[3] R. I. Danner, U. Mankasingh, K. Anamthawat-Jonsson, and R. I. Thorarinsdottir, "Designing aquaponic production systems towards integration into greenhouse farming," *Water*, 2019.

[4] 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.