Feed rate, nutrient loading and system input

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

***Abstract*—Feed rate is a controllable input to an aquaponic system, but the relationship between feed supplied and nutrients available to plants is not a fixed conversion. Fish metabolism provides pathways from dietary nutrients to excreted nitrogen, while accumulated organic waste represents a distinct material load. An aquaponics experiment comparing feed-input regimes reports associated changes in nutrient concentrations, water quality, and fish and lettuce production, although its sequential phases and concurrent changes in feeding frequency restrict causal attribution. Experiments involving mineral supplementation and nutrient-solution composition show that plant responses also depend on inputs other than fish feed. This paper distinguishes feed rate, nutrient loading and observed nutrient concentration, then synthesises the evidence connecting those concepts. The evidence supports a causal account in which feeding contributes to system inputs through fish-derived wastes, while the observed state of the system reflects more than feed quantity alone. It does not support a universal feed-rate rule or a quantified conversion from feed to plant-available nutrients. Establishing such a relationship would require direct, comparable measurements of feed inputs, resulting waste and nutrient loads, and system responses.**

I. Introduction

Feed rate concerns the amount of feed supplied over time, whereas nutrient loading concerns the material entering or accumulating in the system. The distinction matters because changing a feed-input regime can coincide with changes in nutrient concentrations, water quality, and the production of both fish and plants. An aquaponics experiment comparing three regimes reports these outcomes together, providing direct evidence that feeding conditions and system responses are related [1]. Its regimes were examined in sequential phases, however, and feeding frequency changed alongside the feed input. The comparison therefore helps explain why feed is a consequential system input without establishing an effect that can be assigned to feed quantity alone or applied unchanged to every aquaponic system.

The route from feed to nutrient loading begins with what fish consume and metabolise, not simply with what is placed into a tank. A review of fish nutrition reports that dietary arginine affects metabolism and that surplus arginine is associated with greater urea excretion [2]. This identifies one way in which dietary composition can influence a waste output. It also shows why feed mass by itself cannot fully describe the nutrient consequences of feeding: the material supplied and its metabolic handling both matter. The arginine finding is specific, however. It neither quantifies total waste from a given feeding rate nor establishes the resulting nutrient load across an aquaponic system.

Fish nitrogen metabolism supplies a second part of the explanation. Amino-acid deamination produces ammonia, and fish excrete ammonia through their gills [3]. Feed-derived nitrogen can therefore contribute to the system without first appearing as accumulated solid waste. Together, this pathway and the evidence on dietary arginine indicate that nutrient loading has more than one fish-derived form [2], [3]. This paper examines those limited mechanisms alongside aquaponic observations of feed inputs, nutrient concentrations, and plant responses. Its central question is not what single feeding rate to prescribe, but what can reliably be inferred when feed rate is treated as a system input.

II. Background and Scope

Studies that alter nutrient inputs offer useful comparisons with studies that alter feeding. In a lettuce and tilapia aquaponics experiment, treatments with no added nutrients, added iron, or added iron and potassium produced different plant and fish responses [4]. This demonstrates that the observed performance of a system need not be explained by fish feed alone: an additional input can change outcomes under the conditions studied. It does not demonstrate that feeding caused the nutrient differences in those treatments, because feed rate was not the tested variable. For interpreting feed rate, the study is therefore evidence about the importance of distinguishing inputs, not a substitute for a measured relationship between feed supplied and feed-derived nutrient loading.

The fate of accumulated material presents a different concern from the concentration of nutrients measured in water. A recirculating-aquaculture study measured oxygen depletion and hydrogen-sulfide production in layers of accumulated fish organic waste [5]. Those observations make organic waste relevant when considering the consequences of material loading: material retained in the system can have effects that are not adequately represented by a nutrient-concentration measurement alone. The study did not manipulate feeding rates to determine how much waste a given amount of feed produced. Its contribution is consequently to identify a consequence of accumulated fish waste, not to supply a conversion factor linking feed input, waste accumulation, and aquaponic nutrient availability.

Plant-response experiments also separate the nutrient composition encountered by plants from the feeding history of fish. Trials comparing hydroponic, aquaponic, and mineral-complemented aquaponic solutions report differences in lettuce responses across solution compositions [6]. The comparison shows that the character of a nutrient input matters

to the plant outcome; it does not identify which feeding rate would produce a particular solution. Read alongside the supplementation experiment, it establishes a useful boundary for interpretation: plant performance can inform whether the nutrient environment differs, but cannot by itself identify how much of that difference arose from fish feed [4], [6]. The remaining gap is direct attribution from a defined feed input to measured system loading and response.

III. Core Concepts and Mechanisms

Feed rate, nutrient loading and nutrient concentration describe related but different aspects of a system. Feed rate describes an input made over time. Nutrient loading concerns material contributed to, or retained within, the system, while a measured concentration describes a state at a particular observation point. The need to keep these ideas separate is visible in the evidence: feed-regime comparisons report concentrations and production outcomes [1], while a study of accumulated organic waste examines material with consequences not captured by concentration alone [5]. Neither type of measurement, in isolation, establishes the total amount of nutrients transferred from feed to water, retained as waste, or available to plants. Treating an observed concentration as if it were the feed input would therefore overstate what the measurement shows.

At the biological interface, feeding can contribute nitrogen through fish metabolism. The documented deamination of amino acids and excretion of ammonia provide a route from consumed dietary material to a dissolved waste output [3]. The reported association between surplus dietary arginine and increased urea excretion shows that a change in a particular dietary nutrient may also affect a different nitrogen-containing output [2]. These pathways explain why the nutritional character of a feed input matters to the meaning of nutrient loading. They do not indicate that all supplied feed becomes dissolved plant nutrients, nor do they yield a system-wide nitrogen balance. Such claims would require measurements beyond the specific metabolic relationships established by these reviews.

System input also includes additions that are not feed. In the supplementation experiment, iron and potassium inputs were varied and plant responses were observed [4]. In the solution-comparison trials, plants encountered different nutrient-solution compositions and showed different growth responses [6]. These findings establish a distinction between a feed-driven contribution to the system and the nutrient environment ultimately experienced by plants. Accumulated organic waste adds another distinct form of material whose measured effects include oxygen depletion and hydrogen-sulfide production under the conditions studied [5]. A causal explanation must therefore identify which input and which resulting form of material it addresses; otherwise, a change in plant response or water conditions may be attributed to feeding without sufficient evidence.

IV. Evidence Synthesis

The most direct aquaponic evidence on feeding compares three feed-input regimes and reports associated nutrient concentrations, water-quality changes, and fish and lettuce production [1]. It connects a change in feeding conditions with several observable system responses, rather than relying solely on a proposed metabolic pathway. Yet the comparison cannot isolate a universal effect of feed rate: the regimes occupied sequential phases, and feeding frequency changed with other aspects of input. The metabolic reviews clarify how dietary nitrogen can become excreted nitrogen [2], [3], but do not remove that experimental limitation. Together, these sources support a causal account with identifiable pathways and context-specific observations, not a single transferable numerical relationship between feed supplied and nutrient loading.

Evidence from nutrient-addition and solution-comparison studies explains why an observed plant response cannot serve as a unique indicator of feed-derived nutrients. Lettuce responses changed when mineral additions were compared in an aquaponic system [4]; they also differed across aquaponic and complemented nutrient solutions [6]. Neither investigation tested feed rate as the cause of those differences. Their contribution to the feed-rate question is comparative: they show that the nutrient environment can differ through changes in system input other than feeding. Accordingly, even where altered feeding and plant performance occur together, interpreting the plant response requires attention to what else entered the system. The evidence supports distinguishing sources of input rather than assigning every observed nutrient effect to feed.

Waste observations place an additional limit on interpreting the feed-regime experiment through water measurements alone. Accumulated fish organic waste was associated with measured oxygen depletion and hydrogen-sulfide production in a recirculating-aquaculture study [5], while the aquaponics feed-regime study reported water-quality and production changes alongside nutrient concentrations [1]. These studies examine different systems and interventions, so their outcomes cannot be combined into a measured waste balance for the aquaponics experiment. They do, however, explain why an assessment focused exclusively on dissolved nutrient concentration could miss a relevant form of loading. The synthesis is thus qualitative: feed input, excreted nitrogen, accumulated waste, and plant response are connected questions, but the accepted studies do not quantify every link between them.

V. Practical Implications and Limitations

For interpretation, the clearest practical distinction is between a controlled input and an observed outcome. A change in feed-input regime may be accompanied by changes in nutrient concentrations and fish and lettuce production, as the aquaponics comparison reports [1]. The same result does not demonstrate that a measured concentration represents the total nutrient load caused by feeding, especially when the experimental regimes differ in timing as well as input. Meanwhile, fish metabolism indicates that dietary characteristics can affect

excreted nitrogen [2], [3]. Describing a system only by how much feed it receives would consequently leave important aspects of its nutrient input unspecified. The evidence supports careful interpretation of feeding observations, not a universal operating prescription.

A second implication is that feed-related explanations should not erase other system inputs. Mineral supplementation affected responses in a lettuce and tilapia experiment [4], and differing aquaponic solution compositions were associated with differing lettuce responses in separate trials [6]. These results do not show that supplementation is required in every system or establish how much feed-derived nutrient becomes available to plants. They show why nutrient inputs and resulting plant responses should be attributed to the interventions actually studied. In the same way, findings concerning oxygen depletion and hydrogen-sulfide production in accumulated fish waste describe a consequential material form but do not establish its quantity at a specified feed rate [5]. Each result is informative within its own measured boundary.

The principal validation need is a direct account of the transition from defined feeding conditions to the forms and amounts of material observed in the system. The existing feed-regime comparison supplies relevant joint observations but has limited attribution because of its sequential phases and coupled changes in feeding frequency [1]. Metabolic evidence identifies ammonia and urea-related pathways without measuring a complete aquaponic load [2], [3]. Nutrient-addition and solution trials identify other influences on plant responses without testing feed-derived loading [4], [6]. A stronger test would hold competing inputs and feeding conditions sufficiently distinct, then measure feed supplied, fish-derived outputs, accumulated waste, nutrient concentrations, and responses in comparable periods. This is a proposed validation approach, not a result established by the cited studies.

VI. Conclusion

Feed rate is a meaningful system input, but it is not interchangeable with nutrient loading or with a measured nutrient concentration. Fish metabolism provides documented routes from dietary nutrients to excreted nitrogen [2], [3], and an aquaponic comparison associates differing feed-input regimes with changes in nutrients, water conditions, and production [1]. At the same time, accumulated organic waste has separately measured consequences, while mineral additions and nutrient-solution composition can affect plant responses without testing feed rate [4], [5], [6]. The resulting scientific account is causal but bounded: feeding contributes to system inputs, yet the available evidence does not yield a universal conversion from feed rate to nutrient load or plant outcome. The most valuable next step is direct, comparable measurement of those links under feeding conditions that permit their effects to be distinguished.

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] R. Subramanian, C. S. Nair, R. Manoharan, D. Nishanth, E. El-Haroun, and A. Jaleel, "Integrated nutrient and feeding optimization strategies in aquaponics for sustainable urban food production and water conservation," *Frontiers in Sustainable Food Systems*, 2025.

[2] Q. Wang, Z. Xu, and Q. Ai, "Arginine metabolism and its functions in growth, nutrient utilization, and immunonutrition of fish," *Animal Nutrition*, 2021.

[3] S. I. Dolomatov, P. V. Shekk, W. Zukow, and M. I. Kryukova, "Features of nitrogen metabolism in fishes," *Reviews in Fish Biology and Fisheries*, 2011.

[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.

[5] 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.

[6] B. Delaide, S. Goddek, J. Gott, H. Soyeurt, and M. H. Jijakli, "Lettuce (lactuca sativa l. var. sucrine) growth performance in complemented aquaponic solution outperforms hydroponics," *Water*, 2016.