Early warning signs and intervention thresholds

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

***Abstract*—Early warning in aquaponics requires more than recognising an abnormal measurement or a visible symptom. Water conditions can affect fish before obvious deterioration, while plant disease may develop before symptoms become apparent. This paper synthesises evidence on fish responses to dissolved oxygen, nitrogen compounds, pH and temperature; pathogen-related plant health; and hazards associated with settled organic waste. It distinguishes three concepts: an environmental change that may precede harm, an observable biological response, and an intervention threshold that justifies action. The available evidence explains several causal pathways, including respiratory responses to poor water quality and the interaction of pathogen exposure, environment and host response in plant disease. It also places important limits on prediction. A study linking sensor readings to visually labelled fish condition does not establish prospective warning time or a transferable action threshold, while experimental observations in settled waste do not determine system-level exposure. Consequently, intervention thresholds should be interpreted in relation to the organisms, conditions and hazard being assessed rather than treated as universal numbers. The principal evidence gap is prospective validation of which observations reliably precede adverse outcomes and when intervention changes those outcomes.**

I. Introduction

Early warning signs matter in aquaponics because the conditions shared by fish, plants and microbial communities can change before harm is unmistakable. For fish, dissolved oxygen, ammonia, nitrite, pH and temperature are relevant to welfare through different physiological pathways. Increased opercular ventilation or gasping can be an immediate response to adverse conditions, but a visible response does not by itself identify which water variable has changed. Reported tolerances also differ across species and systems [1]. The central task is therefore to distinguish a potentially informative environmental measurement from an observed effect on an organism, then ask what evidence would justify intervention before further deterioration.

Plant health presents a different warning problem. Pathogen entry and spread, environmental conditions and host responses jointly influence disease development; visible symptoms can occur after infection has begun [2]. An absence of symptoms cannot therefore establish an absence of risk, just as the appearance of symptoms does not reveal a single cause. Preventive and water-treatment measures discussed in the aquaponics literature have context-specific limits [2]. For early warning, this means that observable plant condition and the circumstances favouring disease should not be collapsed into one indicator. An intervention threshold must relate the sign being observed to a plausible hazard and an appropriate response.

Measurements may improve recognition of changing conditions, but recognition is not equivalent to predicting harm in time to prevent it. An aquaponics study associated pH, dissolved oxygen and temperature readings with visually labelled fish-condition classes and reported classification performance [3]. Those results do not establish that a particular reading causes the labelled condition, how far in advance it signals deterioration, or the value at which intervention becomes necessary. This paper examines early warning signs and intervention thresholds as related but distinct concepts. It first establishes the relevant biological and system context, then compares causal evidence with observational indicators before considering what can, and cannot, be translated into action.

II. Background and Scope

Nitrogen-related water conditions illustrate why an early warning sign needs a causal interpretation. Fish excrete ammonia, and nitrogen metabolism research describes effects of ammonia and nitrite on fish, including mechanisms involving the gills [4]. An adverse water measurement can therefore indicate a biologically relevant exposure rather than merely a departure from a preferred reading. Nevertheless, the reviewed evidence does not provide a general exposure threshold suitable for every fish or aquaponic system [4]. This distinction matters when interpreting a rising concentration: its direction may warrant attention, but the evidence supplied here cannot convert that trend into a universal numerical instruction to intervene.

Settled organic waste offers a second, more localised example. Experiments with layers of fish waste from recirculating aquaculture systems observed oxygen depletion followed by hydrogen-sulfide accumulation, with sulfide released when the material was mixed [5]. The sequence makes accumulated waste a plausible warning context even when a routine measurement elsewhere in the water does not characterise conditions inside the deposit. Its relevance to an aquaponic system depends on whether comparable material and conditions are present. Because the reported observations came from experimental waste layers, they neither predict exposure throughout an operating system nor establish a concentration or disturbance level at which intervention should occur [5].

The meaning of any measured departure also depends on the system in which it occurs. An aquaponics review describes context-dependent relationships involving pH, nutrient conditions and operational choices, and cautions against assuming that one configuration is advantageous in all circumstances

[6]. Fish-welfare evidence similarly identifies differences in tolerance across species and systems [1]. These reviews help explain why a single threshold cannot be transferred without examining the organism and setting, but they do not supply a validated early-warning rule. The scope of this paper is accordingly explanatory: it examines which observations have a defensible connection to harm and where evidence stops short of specifying an actionable numerical boundary.

III. Core Concepts and Mechanisms

An early warning sign is useful only insofar as its timing and causal relationship to harm are understood. A fall in dissolved oxygen may precede, accompany or be recognised through a fish respiratory response; increased ventilation and gasping are observable responses rather than measurements of oxygen itself [1]. Ammonia and nitrite introduce different nitrogen-related effects, including gill-associated mechanisms, so similar outward distress should not be assigned one cause without considering water conditions [4]. This distinction separates an environmental precursor from a biological sign. It also explains why intervention thresholds cannot be derived from the appearance of distress alone: the visible response may indicate that exposure is already affecting the fish.

A threshold is not simply the first value outside a preferred range. Scientifically, it must specify what observation is being used, what adverse outcome it is intended to avert and the setting in which their relationship holds. Aquaponic fish tolerances vary by species and system, while pH and nutrient conditions interact with operational choices [1], [6]. Consequently, a threshold derived under one set of conditions might not represent the same level of concern elsewhere. The evidence supports interpreting a change against its biological context, but it does not supply a common calculation that combines oxygen, nitrogen compounds, pH and temperature into a validated intervention point.

Some hazards complicate warning further because the measured location may not reflect the location where a harmful process develops. Oxygen depletion and sulfide accumulation within settled fish waste were followed by release after mixing in experimental layers [5]. The mechanism implies that the state of a deposit and the condition of surrounding water are not necessarily interchangeable observations. It does not, however, show how often comparable releases occur in aquaponics or establish the resulting exposure of fish. Taken together with context-dependent aquaponic water conditions [6], this example shows why the choice of what to observe is part of threshold interpretation, not a substitute for validating a threshold.

IV. Evidence Synthesis

The strongest causal explanations in the supplied evidence connect a hazard to a plausible biological response, but they differ in the warning interval they can support. The fish-welfare review links water conditions to effects on fish, including readily visible respiratory responses [1]. The plant-pathogen review distinguishes infection and disease development from the later appearance of symptoms [2]. These accounts both support attention to conditions before obvious illness, yet they do not establish that every change in a monitored condition will produce illness. A useful early warning interpretation must therefore retain the intermediate steps between exposure, organism response and visible outcome rather than treating correlation with an outcome as proof of advance notice.

The comparison is particularly important when assessing apparently predictive evidence. Classification of visually labelled fish-condition classes from pH, dissolved oxygen and temperature demonstrates an association within the studied aquaponic setting [3]. It does not demonstrate that classification occurred sufficiently before a harmful outcome for an intervention to change that outcome. By contrast, observations of oxygen depletion and sulfide formation in settled waste identify an ordered hazard mechanism, but the experimental layers do not establish system-level warning performance [5]. One contribution is an association between measurements and labels; the other is a mechanism observed under constrained conditions. Neither alone supplies a transferable intervention threshold.

Plant disease evidence further limits any attempt to equate one signal with one response. Pathogen entry and spread depend on environmental conditions and host responses, and preventive or water-treatment approaches have context-specific constraints [2]. Aquaponic reviews likewise describe pH and nutrient effects as dependent on operating conditions rather than universally fixed [6]. In combination, these findings favour a conditional interpretation of warning signs: their significance depends on whether a relevant hazard is plausible, whether an organism has been exposed and whether the observed response fits that pathway. The evidence supports this reasoning but does not rank candidate signs by prospective accuracy or identify a common intervention point for fish and plants.

V. Practical Implications and Limitations

A practical distinction is between a condition that merits closer examination and a threshold proven to justify a specific intervention. Changes in oxygen, nitrogen compounds, pH or temperature can be interpreted through established fish-welfare mechanisms, while gasping or increased ventilation indicates an observed fish response [1], [4]. Neither observation automatically supplies a species-independent numerical trigger. Context-dependent pH and nutrient relationships in aquaponics reinforce the need to interpret the sign within the operating system [6]. The supplied evidence supports taking such signs seriously, but not prescribing a universal value, duration or combination of readings at which a particular corrective action must begin.

For plants, a threshold based only on visible symptoms could be too late to mark the start of disease, because infection can precede symptom expression [2]. Conversely, a condition that may favour disease does not prove that a pathogen is

present or that symptoms will follow. Preventive and water-treatment interventions discussed in the literature have limits that depend on context [2]. The implication is not that one unmeasured risk should trigger a fixed treatment. It is that an intervention rule needs to distinguish evidence of exposure, conditions associated with disease development and an established adverse outcome before claiming to prevent plant-health losses.

Validation of an intervention threshold would need evidence that the specified observation precedes a defined adverse outcome in the intended setting and that acting at the proposed point improves that outcome. The cited fish-condition classifier does not establish prospective lead time or causal determinants [3]. Waste-layer experiments do not establish exposure thresholds in an operating aquaponic system [5], and reviews of fish welfare and aquaponic conditions caution against unqualified transfer across species or configurations [1], [6]. These are distinct gaps, not reasons to dismiss the warning signs. They define what further testing must resolve before an explanatory association or laboratory mechanism can be expressed as a reliable action rule.

VI. Conclusion

Early warning signs and intervention thresholds serve different purposes. Environmental changes, fish respiratory responses, the condition of settled waste and plant symptoms can each provide information about a plausible pathway to harm, but none has the same timing or meaning in every setting [1], [2], [5]. The available studies and reviews explain important mechanisms and document associations, while leaving prospective warning intervals and generally transferable action values unresolved [3], [4], [6]. The most useful next work is to test, for defined organisms and operating conditions, whether specific observations consistently precede adverse outcomes and whether intervention at a proposed point changes those outcomes. Until then, a threshold should be presented as context-dependent rather than as a universal scientific boundary.

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] H. Y. Yildiz, L. Robaina, J. Pirhonen, E. Mente, D. Domínguez, and G. Parisi, "Fish welfare in aquaponic systems: Its relation to water quality with an emphasis on feed and faeces-a review," *Water*, 2017.

[2] G. Stouvenakers, P. Dapprich, S. Massart, and M. H. Jijakli, "Plant pathogens and control strategies in aquaponics," *Aquaponics Food Production Systems*, 2019.

[3] J. S. F. Pelayo, L. S. M. Castellanos, R. C. Ortega, and L. G. Hernández-Rojas, "Ai-driven monitoring for fish welfare in aquaponics: A predictive approach," *Sensors*, 2025.

[4] 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.

[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] 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.