Ammonia, nitrite and nitrate testing

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

***Abstract*—Ammonia, nitrite and nitrate tests measure related nitrogen forms, but each result has a different scientific meaning in an aquaponic system. Fish nitrogen metabolism provides a source of excreted ammonia, while microbial nitrification can convert ammonia to nitrite and subsequently to nitrate. Evidence from nitrification research establishes this causal sequence and shows that its response can vary with pH and a preceding period without ammonia. Aquaponic studies add an important qualification: nitrogen measurements differ among compartments and system stages, so a concentration is not, by itself, a measurement of a transformation rate. This paper synthesises the accepted evidence to explain what the three tests can reveal about nitrogen processing and what they cannot establish without further context. Ammonia testing concerns a nitrogen input and its persistence; nitrite testing concerns an intermediate in nitrification; and nitrate testing concerns a product that may also be measured in plant-growing solutions. Interpreting the results together is more informative than treating any one concentration as a complete account of system behaviour. The available studies support that conceptual interpretation, but do not establish universal testing schedules, concentration thresholds or diagnostic rules for aquaponic systems.**

I. Introduction

Ammonia, nitrite and nitrate testing is most useful when the three measurements are understood as observations of connected nitrogen forms rather than interchangeable indicators of water quality. In a study that measured these forms during nitrification, ammonia-oxidising bacteria converted ammonia to nitrite, followed by nitrate production; the responses also differed with pH and preceding ammonia starvation [1]. The causal sequence gives the tests their distinct meanings: each observes a different point in nitrogen processing. It does not, however, make one sample a direct measure of how quickly conversion is occurring, or establish that the same response will occur under every aquaponic condition.

Aquaponic water passes through compartments with differing biological and chemical conditions. In one aquaponic study, measured nitrogen chemistry and microbial profiles varied with compartment conditions: nitrate predominated in aerobic compartments, whereas ammonium predominated in the digester [2]. That contrast illustrates why a result needs a sampling location before it can be interpreted. The compartment study supports a connection between local conditions and nitrogen form, but its observations do not supply transformation rates or a general testing protocol. This paper therefore treats measurements as evidence about system state, while distinguishing that evidence from a demonstrated explanation of every change between locations.

Fish provide a biological starting point for interpreting ammonia in aquaponics. A review of fish nitrogen metabolism supports the origin and excretion of ammonia and discusses nitrite and nitrate in fish physiology [3]. That account explains why ammonia merits attention before considering its microbial transformation, but it does not establish how aquaponic test readings should be classified. The analysis below connects this biological source to nitrification, compares measurements made in aquaponic systems, and identifies the limits of drawing causal conclusions from concentrations alone. Its purpose is scientific interpretation of ammonia, nitrite and nitrate testing, not the specification of operational thresholds.

II. Background and Scope

Studies of aquaponic stages show both the value and the limits of measuring nitrogen forms across a system. An experiment involving sequential filtration and hydroponic stages reported ammonia concentrations and calculated nitrogen retention [4]. Such measurements can place ammonia within a broader account of nitrogen processing, rather than treating a reading as an isolated property of a tank. They do not, on their own, establish which transformation caused a difference between stages or provide a rule for interpreting every test result. Ambiguities noted in some water-quality labels in that study further caution against assuming that measurements named similarly across reports necessarily describe identical quantities [4].

Nitrate is also an explicitly measured quantity in studies of plant-growing solutions. One comparison reported nitrate-N concentrations in aquaponic, complemented-aquaponic and hydroponic solutions [5]. This makes nitrate testing relevant beyond the observation of microbial conversion: the measured form is present in solutions being compared across cultivation arrangements. Nevertheless, the presence or concentration of nitrate-N in those solutions cannot by itself identify the rate of prior ammonia oxidation, the amount of nitrite formed, or the cause of a difference between treatments. The comparison establishes the relevance of nitrate as a measurement, not a complete interpretive framework for the three tests.

The gap between measurement and interpretation becomes clearer when system studies are compared with direct nitrification research. The staged aquaponic experiment describes ammonia measurements and nitrogen retention [4], while the nitrification study follows ammonium, nitrite and nitrate during a documented transformation and examines how its response changes with pH and starvation [1]. These are complementary forms of evidence, not equivalent demonstrations. One locates measurements in an aquaponic arrangement; the other supports a causal account of conversion under its studied conditions. A

sound interpretation uses that mechanism to frame possible relationships among readings without presenting the experimental response as a universal aquaponic diagnostic rule.

III. Core Concepts and Mechanisms

The principal causal link among the three tests is nitrification. In the accepted nitrification study, ammonia oxidation produced nitrite and was followed by nitrate production, with all three nitrogen forms measured during the investigation [1]. Ammonia testing can therefore be understood as observing a form associated with the input to this sequence, nitrite testing as observing an intermediate, and nitrate testing as observing a subsequent product. These descriptions identify what each test measures in relation to the mechanism; they do not mean that concentrations must rise and fall in a fixed pattern in every aquaponic system. Measurements from staged aquaponic arrangements and plant-growing solutions show that sampling context matters as well [4], [5].

A concentration is a record of what was present in a sampled place at a sampled time, whereas conversion describes a process. The distinction matters because a measured nitrate concentration in a cultivation solution [5] and measured ammonia across filtration stages [4] each reflect a particular sampling arrangement. Neither observation alone resolves how much of an earlier nitrogen form was converted between observations. Direct measurements during nitrification provide stronger support for the order of ammonia, nitrite and nitrate formation [1], but transferring that mechanism to a specific aquaponic reading still requires attention to where and when the sample was taken. Testing supplies evidence for an interpretation, not a complete account of causation by itself.

The transformation is also responsive to conditions rather than mechanically constant. In the nitrification study, a period of ammonia starvation affected subsequent nitrogen uptake and the timing of nitrate production, while pH affected the ammonia oxidisers' response [1]. These observations explain why an apparent mismatch among ammonia, nitrite and nitrate readings need not disprove the underlying sequence. At the same time, they were obtained under the conditions of that study, not as a validated set of aquaponic decision thresholds. Interpreting a series of tests therefore involves separating the established order of conversion from any unsupported assumption about how rapidly each form should appear in a particular system.

IV. Evidence Synthesis

The strongest evidence for the causal relationship among the tests comes from directly observed nitrification; aquaponic compartment observations provide a different kind of support. The nitrification study measured the nitrogen forms during conversion and investigated variation in the response [1]. The aquaponic compartment study instead associated oxygen conditions and microbial profiles with differing nitrogen chemistry, including nitrate predominance in aerobic compartments and ammonium predominance in the digester [2]. Read together, these findings make biological transformation a scientifically grounded explanation to consider when nitrogen forms differ. They do not prove that the same measured difference, in another system, was caused solely by a particular conversion step.

Nitrate measurements demonstrate why the identity of a nitrogen form is necessary but insufficient for interpretation. Nitrate-N was reported in aquaponic and other plant-growing solutions [5], while the compartment study found nitrate predominance in aerobic parts of an aquaponic system [2]. The nitrification study supplies a mechanism by which nitrate can follow ammonia and nitrite [1]. Together, these observations support reading nitrate as part of a connected nitrogen account. They do not permit a nitrate concentration in a plant-growing solution to be treated as a direct measurement of current nitrification activity elsewhere, because the cited studies examine different arrangements and questions.

The same distinction applies to ammonia and nitrite. Fish nitrogen metabolism supports ammonia excretion as a biological source [3]; a staged aquaponic experiment reports measured ammonia in the course of system assessment [4]; and nitrification research directly places nitrite between ammonia oxidation and nitrate production [1]. This combined evidence gives each test a reason to be considered alongside the others. It does not establish that any single concentration uniquely identifies an upstream source, a microbial condition or a conversion rate. The defensible synthesis is a causal framework for asking what a reading might represent, coupled with restraint about conclusions that require additional measurements.

V. Practical Implications and Limitations

An interpretation of test results should first distinguish the three measured forms and then account for the sampled part of the system. Fish ammonia excretion supplies a reason to consider ammonia as an input to the nitrogen account [3]. Observed differences between aerobic compartments and a digester show why location can alter the meaning of a nitrogen reading [2], while direct nitrification measurements establish why nitrite and nitrate are relevant alongside ammonia [1]. Taken together, the evidence favours interpreting the three results in relation to one another and to their sampling context. It does not justify assigning a universal diagnosis to an isolated result.

Changes between tests also warrant careful treatment. The nitrification study showed that prior ammonia starvation and pH affected the observed transformation response [1]; the aquaponic compartment study associated differing local conditions with differing nitrogen chemistry [2]. Accordingly, a difference between readings can be consistent with a change in processing without proving precisely which condition produced it. Repeated, clearly located measurements would provide more context than an unlocated value, but the accepted sources do not validate a particular testing interval or prescribe a calculation that converts a short sequence of concentrations into an aquaponic transformation rate. That distinction preserves the usefulness of testing without overstating its precision.

Several requested aspects of practical test interpretation remain outside what these sources establish. The fish physiology review does not validate aquaponic biofiltration testing rules [3], the compartment study does not establish transformation rates [2], and the nitrification experiment does not provide system-wide aquaponic thresholds [1]. The accepted evidence is therefore insufficient to specify concentration cut-offs, a preferred testing method or a schedule for making operational decisions. The most valuable validation would connect clearly identified sampling points and repeated ammonia, nitrite and nitrate measurements with independently assessed changes in the system. Until such work is available, the causal sequence should guide questions about readings rather than substitute for system-specific evidence.

VI. Conclusion

Ammonia, nitrite and nitrate tests have distinct meanings because they observe nitrogen forms connected by a supported biological sequence. Fish metabolism explains a source of excreted ammonia [3], direct nitrification measurements establish the progression through nitrite towards nitrate [1], and aquaponic observations show that measured nitrogen chemistry differs among system compartments [2]. The central interpretive lesson is therefore to read the results together, with attention to sampling location and conditions, rather than regard any one value as a complete measure of nitrogen processing. The evidence supports that explanation more strongly than it supports operational rules.

Further work should establish how paired, clearly located measurements of ammonia, nitrite and nitrate relate to independently assessed transformations in aquaponic systems. This need follows from the difference between direct evidence of nitrification [1] and the concentration measurements reported across aquaponic stages and solutions [4], [5]. Without that validation, testing remains informative about the forms present, but a reading alone cannot establish a conversion rate or a universally applicable response. A scientifically defensible interpretation retains both parts of the conclusion: the three tests are causally connected, and their particular results remain context dependent.

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] L. Abbaszadeh, E. Koutra, K. Tsigkou, M. Gaspari, and P. G. Kougias, "Nitrification upon nitrogen starvation and recovery: Effect of stress period, substrate concentration and ph on ammonia oxidizers' performance," *Fermentation*, 2022.

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

[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] A. M. A.-S. Goda, A. M. Aboseif, M. K. S. Taha, E. Y. Mohammady, N. M. Aboushabana, H. M. Nazmi, M. M. Zaher, and H. A. Aly, "Optimizing nutrient utilization, hydraulic loading rate, and feed conversion ratios through freshwater imta-aquaponic and hydroponic systems as an environmentally sustainable aquaculture concept," *Scientific Reports*, 2024.

[5] 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.