Biofilter surface area, loading and nitrification capacity

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

***Abstract*—Biofilter surface area is often used to describe the scale of a nitrifying filter, but area alone does not establish how much ammonia the filter can remove. Capacity must be interpreted in relation to the nitrogen entering the system and the removal actually observed. This paper examines that relationship using evidence from a recirculating-aquaculture study that reports ammonia removal per unit of biofiltration area under different diets and feeding strategies, alongside an aquaponics study that reports changing ammonium and nitrite concentrations as biofilters became established. The first study connects differences in ammonia excretion with measured, area-normalised removal; the second shows why declining concentrations can indicate biofilter establishment without quantifying an area-based loading limit. Together, they support a distinction between available biofiltration area, imposed ammonia loading and demonstrated removal under particular conditions. They do not establish a universal surface-area requirement or maximum nitrification rate for aquaponic systems. A defensible assessment therefore requires measurements that relate nitrogen input and removal to biofiltration area, while recognising that concentration trends alone cannot resolve the loading-capacity relationship.**

I. Introduction

Biofilter surface area is meaningful only when considered alongside the ammonia load presented to the filter and the removal achieved. In a recirculating-aquaculture study, ammonia excretion differed with diet and feeding strategy, while ammonia removal was reported per unit of biofiltration area [1]. That pairing makes an area-normalised rate more informative than area stated on its own: it relates a measured response to a stated extent of filtration. It does not, however, mean that the reported rate is an inherent property of every square metre of biofilter. The observed removal belongs to a particular system operating under particular feeding conditions, which limits its use as a general design value.

Concentration measurements offer a different view of biofilter performance. In an aquaponics study, ammonium and nitrite fell below detection as biofilters became established; the study also described problems associated with solids accumulation [2]. These observations matter because they connect biofilter establishment with changes in the water passing through an operating system. They do not specify how much nitrogen was applied per unit of biofilter area or removed over a defined period. A low measured concentration can therefore support an account of system behaviour without, by itself, establishing nitrification capacity. The distinction is particularly important when interpreting evidence obtained from systems with different operating aims.

This paper explains biofilter surface area, loading and nitrification capacity as related but non-interchangeable concepts. It first distinguishes area-normalised removal measurements from concentration trends, then examines what the two accepted studies can establish about the response to ammonia loading. The central argument is that measured removal under a stated load is stronger evidence of operating capacity than either nominal area or a favourable concentration reading alone. The aquaculture comparison provides a direct, though condition-specific, area-based measurement [1]; the aquaponics observations provide complementary evidence of establishment but not an area-loading relationship [2]. Neither should be extended into a universal operating prescription.

II. Background and Scope

The two studies approach biofilter behaviour through different measurements. Godoy-Olmos and colleagues compared ammonia excretion and removal across diets and feeding strategies in recirculating aquaculture, expressing removal relative to biofiltration area [1]. Danner and colleagues reported the decline of ammonium and nitrite during aquaponic biofilter establishment, as well as operational problems associated with accumulated solids [2]. The former permits discussion of measured removal per area under varying inputs; the latter describes a changing system state. Reading them together helps separate a rate measurement from evidence that dissolved nitrogen concentrations have declined. They are complementary observations, not interchangeable estimates of maximum capacity.

Loading refers here to the ammonia burden presented to a biofilter, rather than to the size of the filter or the concentration at a single sampling point. The aquaculture study's comparison is relevant because differences in feed-related ammonia excretion accompanied differences in ammonia removal [1]. This establishes a reason to examine input and response together when interpreting an area-normalised removal rate. By contrast, the reported fall in ammonium and nitrite in the aquaponics systems indicates changing concentrations during establishment but does not directly quantify the load placed on a specified area [2]. A concentration trend cannot fill that missing measurement simply because its direction is favourable.

The scope of a capacity claim must match the evidence used to make it. A measured removal rate per unit area describes

performance under the load and operating circumstances observed; it does not establish the largest load that the same filter could process, still less the performance of a different filter [1]. Likewise, the aquaponics study does not isolate biofilter surface area as the explanation for its concentration trends or derive an area-based loading limit [2]. The remaining gap is therefore not whether biofilters can be associated with ammonia removal or declining ammonium. It is how to establish a transferable relationship between available area, imposed load and sustained removal without assuming that one observed condition represents a general limit.

III. Core Concepts and Mechanisms

Biofilter surface area supplies a denominator for comparing removal measurements, but a denominator cannot create capacity evidence where the numerator and loading conditions are unknown. The aquaculture study reports an ammonia removal rate in grams of total ammonia nitrogen removed per square metre of biofiltration area per day [1]. This form of measurement identifies the observed nitrogen removal relative to the area used in that study. It is not a measurement of all possible removal rates for that area. The aquaponics study records ammonium and nitrite declining below detection as biofilters established, but it does not supply the corresponding area-normalised loading-capacity relationship [2]. The two forms of evidence answer different questions.

Ammonia loading provides the demand against which observed removal must be interpreted. Diet and feeding strategy were associated with differences in ammonia excretion and removal in the recirculating-aquaculture comparison [1]. The connection is causal in a limited, practical sense: changing how ammonia enters the system changes the burden whose removal is measured. The study does not show that its particular area-normalised removal rate will persist at every higher input. Nor can the aquaponics concentration decline establish that its filters had reached, or even approached, a maximum loading condition [2]. Consequently, demonstrated operating removal and an untested upper capacity should remain separate concepts.

Nitrification capacity is most defensibly discussed as demonstrated performance under identified conditions, rather than inferred directly from nominal biofilter size. The reported area-based ammonia removal in a nitrifying trickling filter supplies one operating observation [1]. The aquaponics observations add evidence that ammonium and nitrite concentrations changed as biofilters became established [2]. These findings are consistent with an account in which established filtration contributes to nitrogen transformation, but the accepted aquaponics evidence does not partition the observed concentration changes into an area-specific rate. Nor do the two studies establish that equal stated areas would deliver equal removal in different systems. The mechanism of interest must therefore be assessed through its measured response to loading.

IV. Evidence Synthesis

The strongest direct evidence for the surface-area and loading relationship is the aquaculture comparison: it measures ammonia removal relative to biofiltration area while examining conditions associated with different ammonia excretion [1]. The aquaponics study contributes a different observation, namely declining ammonium and nitrite during establishment, but no direct test of how removal varies with area or applied load [2]. Taken together, the studies support a graduated interpretation. Concentration change helps identify an operating response; area-normalised removal places a measured response in relation to filter extent; neither observation alone identifies a universal maximum. This distinction prevents evidence of successful establishment from being mistaken for an independently measured capacity rating.

The reported responses also differ in what they permit a reader to compare. An area-normalised removal rate can be compared with the conditions under which it was obtained, including the changing ammonia excretion examined in the aquaculture study [1]. A concentration falling below detection establishes that the measured dissolved constituent became sufficiently low for that analytical result, but it does not state the mass removed per unit area and time [2]. Consequently, the aquaponics result cannot be converted into an equivalent capacity figure from the accepted evidence. The appropriate synthesis is not a pooled numerical estimate, but an explanation of why input, area and observed removal must be reported together for a quantitative capacity comparison.

Both studies also caution against treating favourable performance as an unconstrained design rule. The aquaculture comparison examines specific diets and feeding strategies, so its removal rate reflects the tested combinations rather than every possible loading condition [1]. The aquaponics report describes solids-related system problems as well as concentration changes, showing that an observed improvement in nitrogen readings need not describe all aspects of system operation [2]. The latter observation does not establish a quantified effect of solids on nitrification capacity, and it should not be used as one. The shared lesson is narrower: capacity claims need measurements that define the relevant operating condition, while separate observations of system problems should retain their own evidential limits.

V. Practical Implications and Limitations

For an existing biofilter, the most informative capacity statement would identify the observed ammonia removal, the biofiltration area used to express it and the loading conditions under which it was measured. The aquaculture study illustrates this approach by reporting removal per unit area while comparing conditions that affected ammonia excretion [1]. Such a statement can describe demonstrated performance, but it should not silently become a recommendation for a larger or differently loaded system. Where only concentration trends are available, as in the aquaponics establishment account, the conclusion should remain a statement about those trends rather

than a numerical area requirement [2]. Matching the claim to the measurement is the practical constraint.

A proposed relationship between surface area and capacity would need validation across the loading range for which it is intended. The accepted aquaculture evidence shows why this matters: removal was examined alongside differences in ammonia excretion associated with feeding conditions [1]. It does not establish that increasing area by a given amount will produce a proportional increase in removal, or determine a maximum sustainable loading rate. The aquaponics evidence cannot supply that missing relationship because its reported establishment trend is not an area-based loading comparison [2]. Any proportional scaling rule, fixed surface-area allowance or universal capacity figure would therefore go beyond what these sources demonstrate.

Interpretation should also distinguish an unmeasured capacity limit from an observed operational concern. Solids accumulation was associated with system problems in the aquaponics study, but the accepted account does not quantify how those problems altered ammonia removal per unit of biofilter area [2]. Conversely, the aquaculture study provides an area-normalised removal observation without establishing a universal operating recipe [1]. These boundaries matter when assessing a biofilter that appears to perform adequately: neither a low ammonium reading nor a reported rate from another installation identifies its remaining capacity. The highest-value additional evidence would jointly specify loading, area and removal under the conditions for which a capacity claim is needed.

VI. Conclusion

Biofilter surface area, ammonia loading and nitrification capacity describe different parts of the same performance question. Area states the extent of filtration used in a measurement; loading describes the burden to be addressed; observed removal describes the response under particular conditions. The recirculating-aquaculture evidence connects these concepts by reporting ammonia removal per unit area alongside differences in ammonia excretion [1]. The aquaponics evidence shows ammonium and nitrite declining as biofilters became established, but does not resolve an area-based loading limit [2]. Neither finding supports treating surface area alone as a capacity rating.

The resulting scientific conclusion is deliberately conditional. A measured area-normalised removal rate can substantiate performance for its stated operating conditions, while a concentration trend can substantiate a change in water quality; neither, without further evidence, establishes a universal maximum nitrification capacity [1], [2]. Further assessment should concentrate on relating specified loads to measured removal over specified biofiltration areas. That work would address the principal gap identified here without converting condition-specific observations into unsupported design prescriptions.

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] S. Godoy-Olmos, I. Jauralde, R. Monge-Ortiz, M. C. Milián-Sorribes, M. Jover-Cerdá, and A. Tomás-Vidal, "Influence of diet and feeding strategy on the performance of nitrifying trickling filter, oxygen consumption and ammonia excretion of gilthead sea bream (sparus aurata) raised in recirculating aquaculture systems," *Aquaculture International*, 2022.

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