Coupled and decoupled aquaponic architectures

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

***Abstract*—Coupled and decoupled aquaponic architectures differ principally in whether water leaving the plant-growing component routinely returns to the fish-rearing component. That distinction determines how closely the two components share a water environment and how independently their conditions can be managed. This paper explains the distinction through water-flow pathways and examines what the available evidence can establish about its consequences. A review of aquaponic configurations identifies a trade-off between direct recirculation and management flexibility, while system studies provide examples of shared-water and partly decoupled operation. Studies of coupled systems also show why the distinction matters: plant nutrient responses and water conditions arise within a system that serves both fish and crops. These observations support a causal explanation of the architectures, but the individual system studies do not provide a controlled comparison of their performance. Architectural labels should therefore describe the actual direction of water movement rather than imply an inherent productivity advantage. The most useful further evidence would compare clearly specified flow arrangements under sufficiently similar conditions to distinguish architectural effects from other influences.**

I. Introduction

In aquaponics, the route taken by water between fish rearing and plant growing is a defining architectural choice. A coupled arrangement returns water from the plant component to the fish component, so both operate within a shared circulating system. A decoupled arrangement separates their water circuits to a greater degree, allowing water or nutrients to pass towards plants without requiring the same water to circulate back to fish. A review of coupled, decoupled and hybrid configurations identifies water reuse and management flexibility as consequences of these different pathways [1]. The important question is therefore not which label sounds more efficient, but how the direction of flow changes the relationship between the two growing environments.

The distinction becomes clearer when expressed as a water-flow pathway rather than as a simple count of tanks or growing units. System examples include arrangements in which fish and plants share circulating water and arrangements in which aquaculture effluent supplies plants without routinely returning to the fish-rearing component [2]. These pathways imply different degrees of dependence between the components, although an example of either pathway cannot by itself establish superior production. This paper first defines the architectural boundary, then explains its causal significance, assesses the evidence from system studies and considers what can reasonably be inferred for design and comparison.

The consequences of shared water are visible even in studies that were not designed to compare architectures. In a closed-loop system containing red tilapia and lettuce, nutrient supplementation was associated with measured plant and fish responses, demonstrating that a coupled growing environment can present nutrient limitations relevant to plant production [3]. Such evidence helps explain why a designer might value some independence between the components. It does not show that decoupling would have improved the studied system, because no decoupled counterpart was tested. Maintaining that distinction between an observed limitation and an architectural solution is central to a sound interpretation of the literature.

II. Background and Scope

A directly coupled system can be recognised by repeated water movement between fish rearing and plant growing. In one experimental arrangement, water circulated between a fish-rearing system and lettuce-growing tubs while the researchers examined lettuce responses under aquaponic and hydroponic conditions [4]. The circulating pathway makes the study a concrete illustration of shared-water operation. Its measured plant responses are informative about conditions within that particular arrangement, but its comparison with hydroponics is not a comparison between coupled and decoupled aquaponics. The distinction matters because evidence that a coupled system can grow plants cannot determine what would happen if its return pathway were removed.

Partly decoupled operation describes a different relationship: water from aquaculture can serve the plant component without routinely making the return journey to fish. Documented aquaponic system designs include both this approach and shared-water arrangements [2]. The qualifier 'partly' is useful because supplying plants with aquaculture-derived water still connects the components through resource transfer, even when their circulation pathways are not fully shared. In contrast, describing every transfer of fish-system water as coupling would obscure the causal feature at issue. The relevant boundary is routine return flow, not merely whether fish and plants participate in the same production system.

These examples establish operational meanings, but they leave a comparative question unresolved. A review distinguishes coupled, decoupled and hybrid loops and cautions that outcomes attributed to configuration also depend on context [1]. Meanwhile, a study of lettuce in recirculated aquaponic water concentrates on plant responses and pH-related comparisons, rather than isolating the effect of aquaponic loop architecture [4]. This paper accordingly treats architectural descriptions and observations within individual systems as

evidence for mechanisms, not as proof of a general performance ranking. Its scope is the causal meaning of shared versus separated water pathways and the limits of the evidence available to compare them.

III. Core Concepts and Mechanisms

The principal mechanism in a coupled architecture is reciprocal exposure to a circulating water environment. Water passes through fish rearing and plant growing and returns, making conditions encountered in one component relevant to the other. The recirculation between fish and lettuce in an experimental system illustrates the pathway itself [4]. A separate closed-loop study observed plant responses to nutrient supplementation while also monitoring fish, showing why shared-water nutrient conditions warrant attention [3]. Neither observation means that every measured response was caused by coupling. Rather, the pathway explains why adjustments to water conditions cannot be assumed to concern only one component when both repeatedly receive the circulating water.

Decoupling changes this relationship by interrupting routine return flow from the plant component to fish rearing. Supplying aquaculture effluent to plants without routinely sending it back preserves a link between the components, but it need not make the plant-side water conditions part of the fish-side return stream [2]. The resulting scope for separate management is a principal distinction identified in the review of aquaponic configurations [1]. This is a statement about what the water pathway permits, not evidence that every decoupled installation attains better plant or fish outcomes. The degree of separation must be specified before any such outcome can be meaningfully assessed.

The two architectures therefore describe a continuum of connection more accurately than an absolute contrast between integrated and independent production. The review recognises hybrid configurations, while documented systems include arrangements described as partly decoupled [1], [2]. Their common analytical feature is that the direction and extent of water return determine how strongly conditions remain shared. Conversely, the mere presence of distinct physical growing areas does not establish decoupling: fish and lettuce occupied different areas in a system where water still recirculated between them [4]. Architectural descriptions should identify the actual flow relationship before inferring either management flexibility or a constraint.

IV. Evidence Synthesis

The strongest direct support for the architectural distinction comes from evidence that describes both the configurations and their water pathways. System examples distinguish circulating shared water from transfer of aquaculture effluent to plants without routine return [2]; a broader review explains how separation changes the scope for managing the loops independently [1]. Read together, these sources support a causal account: changing the return pathway changes which water conditions must be shared by fish and plants. They do not, merely by defining and observing those pathways, establish the size or consistency of a production benefit. Description of the mechanism and measurement of its comparative effect remain different evidentiary tasks.

Evidence from coupled systems helps explain why that mechanism is consequential. Lettuce grown with red tilapia in a closed-loop arrangement showed responses associated with nutrient supplementation, indicating that the available nutrient conditions in a shared system can matter for crop performance [3]. In another recirculating arrangement, researchers examined lettuce under aquaponic and hydroponic water conditions, providing an example of plant assessment within coupled operation [4]. These studies address different comparisons and cannot be combined into a direct estimate of the effect of decoupling. Their contribution is narrower but useful: they show that plant conditions warrant examination when evaluating an architecture whose water is also serving fish.

A claim that either architecture inherently produces more would require stronger separation of architectural effects from other differences between systems. The configuration review explicitly identifies contextual influences and limits to causal comparisons [1]. The system examples show that aquaponic water pathways can differ, while the nutrient-supplementation study shows that conditions within a coupled pathway can also differ [2], [3]. Thus, an observed difference between two installations would not automatically be attributable to return flow alone. The defensible synthesis is that architecture governs exposure and management options; the supplied evidence does not establish a general productivity ranking for coupled and decoupled systems.

V. Practical Implications and Limitations

For interpreting or specifying a system, the first practical requirement is to describe where water travels after it leaves the plant component. Routine return identifies shared circulation; transfer towards plants without routine return identifies a degree of decoupling [2]. That description is more informative than an unqualified architectural label because hybrid configurations can combine features of both approaches [1]. It also prevents a mistaken inference from physical layout: a fish-rearing unit and separate lettuce tubs can still constitute coupled operation when water circulates between them [4]. A clear flow description establishes the basis for discussing what is shared and what can be managed separately.

The second implication is to treat management flexibility as a possibility created by separation, not as a measured benefit in every case. A decoupled pathway can avoid routinely returning plant-side water to fish, whereas a coupled pathway repeatedly brings the components into the same circulating water environment [1], [2]. Nutrient limitations observed in a coupled lettuce and tilapia system illustrate a reason to examine that constraint closely [3]. They do not establish that changing the pathway alone would resolve it. Any practical claim about improved plant response would need evidence that distinguishes the architectural change from changes in nutrient conditions and other aspects of the system.

The principal limitation of the available empirical examples is their purpose. The recirculating lettuce study evaluates plant responses under aquaponic and hydroponic conditions, not two aquaponic return pathways [4]. The closed-loop nutrient study assesses supplementation and associated responses, not the effect of separating fish and plant circuits [3]. Consequently, the review's caution about context remains important when interpreting apparent differences among configurations [1]. A more decisive comparison would specify the water pathways in both arrangements and assess their responses under sufficiently comparable conditions. Until then, architectural choice can be explained mechanistically, but an across-the-board performance preference cannot be justified from these studies.

VI. Conclusion

Coupled and decoupled aquaponic architectures are distinguished by whether water from plant growing routinely returns to fish rearing. Shared return flow links the components through a circulating water environment; interrupting that return permits a greater degree of separate management while retaining a possible transfer of aquaculture water to plants [1], [2]. Studies of coupled systems demonstrate why plant nutrient conditions within shared circulation deserve attention, but they do not test whether decoupling would improve the same systems [3], [4]. The most valuable next comparison would specify both water pathways and distinguish their effects from other differences in operating conditions. For now, the evidence supports a clear causal distinction between architectures, not a universal ranking of their performance.

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

[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.

[4] T. S. Anderson, D. de Villiers, and M. B. Timmons, "Growth and tissue elemental composition response of butterhead lettuce (lactuca sativa, cv. flandria) to hydroponic and aquaponic conditions," *Horticulturae*, 2017.