Integrating solids capture, biofiltration and mineralisation

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

***Abstract*—Solids capture, biofiltration and mineralisation address different parts of the material flow in aquaponics, yet their effects cannot be understood independently. Capturing suspended fish waste can limit its accumulation in the circulating water and biological filter, while treatment of the captured fraction may make some retained nutrients available for return to the system. Biological filtration operates under conditions that differ from those in a solids digester. This paper synthesises an aquaponics compartment study, an aquaponics review, an aquaponics production study and experiments on settled fish waste to explain how these processes interact. The evidence supports a causal account based on where solids accumulate, how organic loading affects filtration, and how treatment compartments differ in oxygen and nutrient conditions. It also identifies important limits: compartment profiles do not directly measure process rates, observations from particular aquaponics systems do not establish a universal configuration, and fish-waste experiments do not test an integrated aquaponics process. Integration is therefore best understood as coordinating distinct treatment functions and material pathways, rather than assuming that removing or retaining more solids is beneficial in every location.**

I. Introduction

Aquaponic water can carry both dissolved constituents and fish-derived solids, so the location and treatment of those solids matter to the behaviour of the wider system. In one studied configuration, a drum filter directed captured material to a settler and digester, while supernatant was routed back towards the main loop. The investigators found different oxygen, organic-carbon and nitrogen conditions in the aerobic biofilter and anaerobic treatment compartments [1]. The arrangement illustrates the central issue addressed here: solids capture, biofiltration and mineralisation are connected by material flows, but they do not provide the same treatment function or operate under identical conditions.

Physical removal can reduce the solids entering biological filtration, whereas mineralisation concerns the subsequent treatment and potential recovery of nutrients from retained material. These functions create a tension rather than a simple choice between keeping and discarding waste. An aquaponics review describes physical solids removal alongside biological filtration, identifies high organic loading as a constraint on nitrifiers, and discusses mineralisation as a route to nutrient recovery [2]. Understanding integration therefore requires attention to where organic matter is directed and what conditions prevail after separation, not merely whether a filter is present.

Evidence from operated aquaponics systems makes this distinction consequential. In a study that included a media-filled bed, solids accumulated alongside recurrent pH decline; washing and improved solids removal were described as mitigation, and biofilter establishment was also reported [3]. Those observations do not prove that solids alone caused every change, but they show why the placement of solids treatment matters. This paper first defines the boundaries of the three functions, then explains their interactions, compares the available observations and identifies what must be measured before an integrated design can be judged effective.

II. Background and Scope

Solids capture separates particulate material from circulating water; it does not, by itself, establish what happens to nutrients in the captured fraction. The distinction matters because an approach that removes solids from the main flow can still retain them for treatment elsewhere. The reported drum-filter, settler and digester arrangement provides an example of this separation between capture and subsequent processing [1]. By contrast, accumulation within a media bed places retained material in a compartment also used for water treatment, and the aquaponics production study associated that condition with a need for washing and better solids removal [3]. Neither configuration alone establishes a generally optimal route.

Biofiltration and mineralisation likewise require separate descriptions. The aquaponics review links biological filtration to the treatment of water containing nitrogen compounds and warns that high organic loading can constrain nitrifiers; it treats mineralisation and nutrient recovery as related but distinct considerations [2]. Measurements from an operated aquaponics system further distinguish an aerobic biofilter from anaerobic solids-treatment compartments through their oxygen, organic-carbon and nitrogen conditions [1]. These sources support an explanation based on compartment roles. They do not justify treating every retained solid as immediately available plant nutrition or every measured compartment difference as a measured conversion rate.

Uncontrolled solids accumulation introduces another boundary to the discussion. Experiments with settled freshwater and marine fish organic waste found that waste layers could become oxygen-depleted and accumulate hydrogen sulfide [4]. This is evidence about what can occur within settled waste, not a demonstration that a particular aquaponic filter or digester will develop the same conditions or concentrations. Its relevance is to distinguish deliberate treatment of a captured solids stream from allowing deposits to build up

without understanding their local conditions. The remaining gap is evidence that directly quantifies the combined effects of capture, biofiltration and mineralisation across an entire operating aquaponic system.

III. Core Concepts and Mechanisms

The first connection among the three functions is the allocation of organic material. Physical capture changes how much particulate waste continues through the water-treatment path and how much enters a separate solids path. This matters because the review identifies high organic loading as a potential constraint on nitrifiers, while the media-bed study reports operational difficulties where solids accumulated [2], [3]. Routing captured material to a settler and digester offers a way to process it outside the aerobic biofilter, as illustrated by the compartment study [1]. The evidence supports separation of functions as a design rationale, but not a universal solids-removal threshold.

The second connection is the difference between the environments in which treatment occurs. The compartment study measured contrasting oxygen, organic-carbon and nitrogen conditions in its aerobic biofilter and anaerobic digester compartments and used microbial-community profiles to interpret possible activities [1]. These observations help explain why directing solids away from an aerobic filtration path can change the conditions under which retained material is processed. They should not be read as direct measurements of mineralisation or biofiltration rates: the proposed microbial activities were inferred from profiles and environmental measurements. Integration must therefore distinguish an observed compartment condition from a demonstrated quantity of nutrient conversion.

The third connection is the return pathway. In the studied arrangement, supernatant from solids treatment was directed towards the main loop [1]. Together with the review's discussion of mineralisation and nutrient recovery, this shows why capturing solids need not mean treating all of their nutrient content as permanently lost [2]. At the same time, a return pathway is not evidence that every constituent has become useful or that returning more liquid always improves the system. The defensible mechanism is narrower: separation permits different treatment conditions, and any subsequent return reconnects those compartments. The actual nutrient contribution requires measurements that the cited compartment profile does not provide.

IV. Evidence Synthesis

The strongest combined support for integration comes from comparing the operated systems rather than assuming that one study demonstrates the whole process. The compartment study shows a captured-solids route and distinct conditions across biological filtration and digestion, while the media-bed study documents solids accumulation, corrective washing and improved removal in its tested systems [1], [3]. Read together, they support the proposition that the destination of captured or retained solids affects which treatment compartment bears their organic load. Their designs and observations differ, however, so they cannot establish a numerical advantage for one routing arrangement over another.

The review provides the interpretive link between these observations: physical solids removal, biological filtration and mineralisation interact because organic loading can interfere with nitrifying filtration while retained material may be treated for nutrient recovery [2]. This account is consistent with the distinct compartment conditions reported in the aquaponics study and with the media-bed study's reported response to accumulated solids [1], [3]. Consistency across these sources strengthens the causal explanation, but it is not a substitute for direct comparison of integrated treatment pathways under matched conditions. In particular, neither a microbial profile nor an account of washing establishes how much recovered nutrient was returned.

The settled-waste experiments add a caution that is specific to deposits rather than to aquaponic integration as a whole. Oxygen depletion and hydrogen sulfide accumulation within fish-waste layers show that a retained solids mass can develop conditions unlike those of the surrounding water [4]. That observation is compatible with the broader need to distinguish an aerobic biofilter from a separate solids-treatment environment [1], but the experiments were not an aquaponic test of capture, biofiltration and mineralisation together. Consequently, the evidence supports attention to the conditions of accumulated solids; it does not support assigning a particular hydrogen sulfide outcome to the integrated arrangements discussed here.

V. Practical Implications and Limitations

A practical implication is to specify the intended destination of solids when describing a filtration arrangement. Removing particles from a circulating stream, allowing them to remain in a media bed, and directing them to a settler and digester are materially different pathways in the cited aquaponics systems [1], [3]. The review's account of organic loading and nitrifier constraints explains why that distinction can matter to biological filtration [2]. This is a basis for evaluating the functions separately, not a prescription for a particular device, washing interval or proportion of solids to retain. The supplied studies do not establish those choices across different aquaponic configurations.

Assessment of mineralisation should likewise distinguish the presence of a treatment compartment from evidence of nutrient recovery. The compartment study demonstrates different environmental conditions and describes a route for returning supernatant, but its microbial activities and rates were inferred rather than directly measured [1]. The review discusses mineralisation and recovery while recognising that effects depend on context [2]. For an integrated arrangement to be evaluated more decisively, measurements would need to connect the captured solids, their treatment and the constituents returned to the main flow. Without that connection, neither nutrient recovery nor improved biofilter performance can be quantified from these sources.

Limits on generalisation are especially important where evidence concerns different kinds of waste accumulation. The media-bed study reports solids accumulation with recurrent pH decline and describes changes made in response, but it does not isolate a universal causal contribution of solids to pH [3]. The settled fish-waste experiments establish the possibility of oxygen depletion and hydrogen sulfide accumulation within waste layers, not their occurrence in every aquaponic solids-treatment compartment [4]. The review and compartment study help explain why organic loading and local conditions warrant attention [1], [2]. Together, these findings favour validation within the arrangement being assessed over extrapolation from a single observed outcome.

VI. Conclusion

Integrating solids capture, biofiltration and mineralisation means coordinating where particulate waste is separated, where circulating water receives biological treatment, and where retained material is processed. The aquaponics review explains the potential conflict between organic loading and nitrifying filtration, while operated systems illustrate both separate solids treatment and the difficulties associated with accumulation in a media bed [1], [2], [3]. Settled-waste experiments reinforce the importance of local conditions within deposits, although they do not test an integrated aquaponic process [4]. The central conclusion is therefore about distinct but connected functions, not a claim that any one configuration has been proved best.

The most useful next evidence would link measured solids capture to treatment conditions, nutrient return and biofilter response within the same operating arrangement. That need follows from the gap between observed compartment conditions and inferred microbial activities in one system, and between observed media-bed problems and their proposed mitigation in another [1], [3]. Until those links are measured directly, the supported explanation is conditional: separating solids can change the loading and environment of subsequent treatment, while the value of mineralisation depends on what treatment actually makes available for return [2].

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] Z. Schmautz, "Environmental parameters and microbial community profiles as indication towards microbial activities and diversity in aquaponic system compartments," *BMC Microbiology*, 2020.

[2] 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.

[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] A. M. Nguyen-tiêt, C. O. Letelier-Gordo, and S. L. Aalto, "Rapid h2s production in layers of freshwater and marine fish organic waste from recirculating aquaculture systems," *Aquacultural Engineering*, 2025.