Mechanical solids capture and suspended-solids removal

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

***Abstract*—Mechanical solids capture removes particles from circulating water by physically separating them from the flow. Its scientific significance is not adequately described by a single measure of water clarity: suspended particles also have measurable abundance, size-related characteristics and particulate organic content. This paper explains those distinctions using a peer-reviewed trial that compared drum filtration with an unfiltered control and examined different filter mesh sizes. The trial reported reductions in turbidity, particle counts, particle surface area and volume, and particulate biochemical oxygen demand and chemical oxygen demand under the tested conditions. Together, these outcomes support a causal interpretation in which physical particle removal changes both the visible and organic particulate fractions of circulating water. They do not, by themselves, establish equivalent performance in aquaponic systems or determine a universally appropriate mesh size. The central practical implication is to assess suspended-solids removal through several complementary measurements and to validate filtration choices in the system where they will be used.**

I. Introduction

Mechanical solids capture concerns the physical removal of particles carried in water. In a recirculating aquatic system, that purpose can be obscured if removal is judged solely by whether the water looks clearer. A controlled drum-filtration trial measured not only turbidity but also particle counts, particle surface area and volume, and particulate measures of organic matter. Relative to its control, filtration reduced each of those reported outcomes under the tested conditions [1]. The significance of mechanical capture is therefore broader than a change in appearance: it concerns a measurable reduction in suspended particulate material. That interpretation is useful for aquaponics, although the cited trial was conducted in a recirculating aquaculture system rather than an aquaponic one.

Suspended-solids removal is a process claim, whereas a measurement such as turbidity is an observation about water after that process. The distinction matters because different measurements describe different aspects of the remaining particles. The drum-filter study examined mesh size alongside particle and particulate-organic outcomes, providing a basis for asking what the filter retained and how the circulating water changed [1]. It does not provide evidence that one measurement alone captures every consequence of filtration. A defensible explanation must connect the physical separation of particles to observed water-quality changes while keeping the measured outcomes distinct from broader, untested system effects.

This paper develops that explanation in three steps. It first defines the scope of mechanical capture and the comparison supported by the available trial. It then relates filtration to particle measurements and particulate-organic indicators before considering what the evidence permits in practice. The central argument is deliberately bounded: drum filtration can reduce measured suspended-particle and particulate-organic outcomes relative to a control, but its observed effects depend on the tested filtration conditions [1]. Evidence from that setting clarifies the scientific meaning of solids removal; it does not establish a general performance specification for every recirculating system.

II. Background and Scope

The relevant comparison is between water circulated under the trial's drum-filtration conditions and water in its control condition. This design makes it possible to associate differences in measured particle outcomes with the tested filtration intervention, without treating every feature of a recirculating system as an effect of the filter. The reported reductions in turbidity and particle counts indicate that the intervention affected both an optical measure and the abundance of suspended particles [1]. Those observations support the narrower conclusion that mechanical capture removed or reduced measured suspended material in that setting. They do not establish how another filter design, another water source or an aquaponic installation would perform.

Mesh size provides a second comparison within the available evidence. Examining different drum-filter meshes is pertinent because the filter's physical separation condition is part of the intervention, not merely a label attached to it. The trial reports mesh-specific particle and water-quality outcomes, so its conclusions should remain tied to the meshes and operating conditions studied [1]. Without importing performance figures or assuming an optimal mesh, the useful distinction is between demonstrating that filtration can change suspended-solids measures and deciding which filtration condition is appropriate elsewhere. The former is supported by the trial; the latter requires evidence from the proposed application.

This paper uses suspended solids to refer to the particulate material represented by the trial's particle measurements, and mechanical capture to refer to its physical separation by drum filtration. Particulate biochemical oxygen demand and chemical oxygen demand are considered measured characteristics of the particulate organic fraction, rather than interchangeable

names for particle counts or turbidity [1]. These boundaries prevent a reduction in one indicator from being mistaken for proof of every possible water-quality benefit. The available evidence directly concerns a recirculating aquaculture trial. Direct aquaponic measurements are not supplied, leaving a specific gap between explaining the capture mechanism and asserting its magnitude in aquaponics.

III. Core Concepts and Mechanisms

The causal idea behind mechanical solids capture is physical separation: a filter presents a barrier through which circulating water passes while some suspended particles are retained. In the cited drum-filter trial, lower particle counts under filtration than in the control are consistent with that mechanism, while the accompanying reduction in turbidity shows that the change was also detectable through an optical water measure [1]. Neither observation should be treated as a complete description of the particles remaining in the water. Counts describe abundance, whereas turbidity reflects the measured optical response; reading them together gives a more discriminating account of suspended-solids removal than relying on either outcome alone.

Particle surface area and particle volume add information that counts cannot supply by themselves. The trial reported reductions in both measures alongside lower particle counts under filtration [1]. Taken together, these outcomes indicate that the observed response involved more than a change in the number of particles detected: measures related to the particles' aggregate physical characteristics also changed. This matters when interpreting mechanical capture because two water samples could have different particulate characteristics even if attention were restricted to a single indicator. The evidence supports a multidimensional description of the tested response, but the supplied results do not justify an unreported particle-size distribution or a universal account of which individual particles were retained.

The particulate-organic measurements connect physical capture to a further property of the removed material. The trial reported lower particulate biochemical oxygen demand and particulate chemical oxygen demand under filtration than in its control [1]. In conjunction with the particle measurements, that finding supports the interpretation that the filtration intervention reduced measured particulate material with associated organic-demand indicators. It does not mean that mechanical filtration itself performed a biological treatment process, nor does it quantify any downstream biological response. Keeping those distinctions clear makes the mechanism precise: the supported claim is removal of particles and a reduction in measured particulate-organic outcomes under the tested conditions.

IV. Evidence Synthesis

The strongest inference arises from agreement among several types of measurement within the same controlled trial. Lower turbidity alone might establish that the measured optical condition changed, but it would offer a narrower account of solids removal. Here, reductions in turbidity occurred alongside reductions in particle counts, surface area and volume [1]. Those convergent observations strengthen the explanation that drum filtration altered the suspended-particle fraction of the circulating water. They remain observations from one trial, not independent replications across filter designs or applications. The appropriate synthesis is therefore a coherent, condition-specific causal account rather than an unrestricted claim about mechanical filtration in every system.

The particulate-organic outcomes extend that account without replacing the particle evidence. Lower particulate biochemical oxygen demand and chemical oxygen demand occurred alongside lower particle-related measures in the filtered conditions [1]. This relationship is consistent with removal of particles that contributed to the measured organic particulate fraction. It is analytically important because a clearer sample and a lower particulate-organic measurement describe related but different observations. The trial supports considering both when assessing suspended-solids removal; it does not show that the magnitude of change in one indicator can be calculated from another, or that unmeasured water-quality outcomes necessarily changed.

Mesh-specific results establish a limit on how broadly the trial can be applied. Because the research examined different meshes, the intervention cannot be reduced to an abstract statement that a drum filter is either present or absent [1]. The physical filtration condition is relevant to the resulting particle measurements, yet the supplied evidence does not warrant naming a universally best mesh or predicting performance in an untested system. This distinction reconciles the main findings with their limits: the comparison with a control supports mechanical capture as the explanation for the reported reductions, while the mesh comparisons show why filtration performance must be interpreted in relation to its particular configuration.

V. Practical Implications and Limitations

Assessment of suspended-solids removal should match the question being asked. If the question is whether circulating water became less turbid, turbidity addresses it directly; if the question concerns suspended particles, the trial's particle counts and surface-area and volume measures provide additional evidence. Particulate biochemical oxygen demand and chemical oxygen demand address another aspect of the measured material [1]. Considering these indicators together helps avoid using a visible change as a substitute for all other outcomes. This is an interpretive implication of the tested measurements, not a claim that every application must reproduce the trial's full measurement programme.

Filter selection cannot be settled by the observation that filtration improved measured outcomes against a control. The trial examined drum-filter mesh sizes and reported results specific to those tested conditions [1]. A proposed aquaponic application would need its own assessment of whether a chosen filtration condition achieves the intended suspended-particle outcomes in that system. The available evidence

supports the relevance of mesh choice and the value of measuring outcomes, but it does not supply a transferable mesh recommendation, an expected removal percentage or a demonstrated aquaponic performance result. Presenting such values would exceed the evidence on which this paper relies.

The principal evidence gap is one of transfer, not of whether the cited intervention had a measured effect. The recirculating aquaculture trial supports a comparison between filtered and control conditions for several suspended-particle and particulate-organic indicators [1]. It does not directly test those outcomes in an aquaponic system. The most useful validation would therefore repeat the relevant comparisons under the intended conditions, recording both particle-related and particulate-organic outcomes rather than assuming that turbidity alone represents the entire response. Until such evidence is available, the general mechanism is informative, but application-specific performance remains an open question.

VI. Conclusion

Mechanical solids capture is best understood as physical separation of suspended particulate material, with effects that can be examined through complementary water measurements. In the available controlled drum-filter trial, filtration reduced turbidity, particle counts, particle surface area and volume, and particulate biochemical oxygen demand and chemical oxygen demand relative to a control [1]. Their agreement supports a condition-specific explanation of suspended-solids removal that is stronger than an appeal to water clarity alone. Mesh-specific results also caution against turning that explanation into a universal design prescription. Direct testing in the intended aquaponic setting, using particle and particulate-organic measures, is the clearest next step for establishing how far these findings transfer.

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] K. J. de Jesus Gregersen, P. Olsson, C. Pellicer-Nàcher, and P. B. Pedersen, “Effect of drum filter mesh size on ras water quality,” *Aquacultural Engineering*, 2025.