Dissolved oxygen, temperature and conductivity monitoring

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

***Abstract*—Dissolved oxygen, temperature and electrical conductivity are commonly recorded together in aquaponic water, but the three measurements do not answer the same question. This paper synthesises evidence from studies of aquaponic compartments, nutrient treatments and monitoring arrangements to distinguish what each measurement can establish. Oxygen measurements reveal marked differences between compartments and can document conditions maintained during aeration. Conductivity varies between compartments and solution treatments, but nutrient concentrations require separate assays. The available studies record or maintain temperature without isolating its effects on oxygen or conductivity, so they cannot support a causal interpretation of temperature changes. Continuous recording offers a way to observe distinct variables over time, although the evidence supplied does not validate sensor accuracy or show that monitoring itself caused changes in system outcomes. The central interpretive requirement is therefore to retain the identity, location and experimental context of each measurement. Taken together, the studies support a bounded account of oxygen availability and ionic condition, while leaving the effects of temperature and the translation of measurements into specific biological processes or nutrient concentrations unresolved.**

I. Introduction

Aquaponic water does not have a single, uniform condition across all parts of a system. In one study, mean oxygen saturation was 107.7 ± 3.4% in a fish tank, 80.7 ± 6.6% at a hydroponic table and 1.8 ± 0.2% in a digester [1]. Conductivity was also higher in the digester than in the other measured compartments [1]. These observations make location essential to interpretation: an oxygen or conductivity reading describes the water where it was taken, not necessarily the water throughout the system. They do not, by themselves, establish the rates of biological processes responsible for the differences.

Dissolved oxygen and conductivity can also respond differently within a treatment comparison. In an aquaponic lettuce trial, the iron-plus-potassium treatment had higher measured conductivity and potassium than the control, while dissolved oxygen remained at approximately 8 mg/L without a significant difference between treatments [2]. Water temperature was held at 23 °C rather than varied as an experimental factor [2]. The comparison illustrates why one reading cannot stand in for the others: the recorded change in ionic condition was not accompanied by a reported between-treatment change in dissolved oxygen, and the study offers no test of temperature effects.

This paper examines what dissolved oxygen, temperature and conductivity monitoring can mean when interpreted within the evidence available for aquaponics. A comparison of aquaponic, complemented aquaponic and hydroponic solutions recorded different conductivities and measured nitrate and phosphate separately [3]. That distinction provides a starting point for considering which questions a general water measurement can answer and which require a specific assay. The discussion first establishes the scope of the measurements, then synthesises compartment and treatment observations, and finally identifies where causal interpretation remains unsupported.

II. Background and Scope

Existing studies use water measurements for different purposes. In one aquaponic system, aeration maintained dissolved oxygen above 7 mg/L, while weekly samples from the fish tank, biofilter, beds and sump were analysed separately for ammonia, nitrite, nitrate and phosphate [4]. This arrangement distinguishes recording an oxygen condition from determining the concentrations of named nutrients or nitrogen compounds. The reported oxygen value describes what was maintained in that system; it is not, on its own, an experimentally established optimum. The separate sampling locations also matter because a measurement taken in one component need not characterise every component.

Another study recorded dissolved oxygen, oxygen saturation, conductivity, and water and air temperature through eleven sensor nodes at 30-second intervals [5]. Its monitoring arrangement shows that these variables can be recorded as separate time series rather than collapsed into a single water-quality score. A frequent record may show when readings change, but recording frequency alone does not explain why they change. The supplied findings do not establish sensor accuracy, quantify an individual sensor's contribution to an outcome, or isolate the effects of temperature. These limits distinguish the ability to observe a variable from the ability to validate a causal explanation.

Solution comparisons provide a complementary, less time-focused view. In two lettuce trials, complemented aquaponic and hydroponic solutions had higher recorded conductivity than the aquaponic solution, while nitrate-N and phosphate-P were determined by separate assays [3]. The measurements allow ionic condition to be considered alongside particular nutrients, not substituted for them. Across these studies, the remaining gap is not whether the three requested variables can be measured. It is how far their readings can be interpreted

causally without additional tests: the available observations distinguish water conditions, but do not establish a general nutrient conversion, a temperature effect or a complete account of biological process rates [1], [2], [3].

III. Core Concepts and Mechanisms

Dissolved oxygen monitoring addresses oxygen availability in sampled water, while oxygen saturation expresses a related observation on a different reporting basis. The compartment study found substantially different oxygen saturation in the fish tank, hydroponic table and digester [1]; a separate system reported maintaining dissolved oxygen above 7 mg/L during aeration [4]. These findings must not be treated as interchangeable numerical readings: one reports percentage saturation across compartments and the other reports a dissolved oxygen concentration in a particular system. Both can describe an oxygen condition, but neither observation alone measures a microbial process rate or establishes that a reported concentration is suitable for every aquaponic system.

Conductivity monitoring concerns the collective electrical conductance of a solution rather than the concentration of one named nutrient. In a lettuce trial, the iron-plus-potassium treatment had higher conductivity and higher measured potassium than the control, but sulphate was also higher because potassium was supplied as potassium sulphate [2]. In another comparison, conductivity differed among aquaponic and supplemented solutions while nitrate-N and phosphate-P were assayed independently [3]. These paired observations explain the interpretive boundary: a conductivity change is consistent with a changed ionic condition, yet the reading cannot identify which constituent changed or assign the change to potassium alone.

Temperature is the least causally resolved of the three variables in the accepted studies. One trial maintained water at 23 °C [2], and the compartment study maintained fish-tank temperature at 27 ± 2 °C [1]. The time-series study included water temperature among the recorded variables, but the supplied findings do not report readings that isolate its effect on dissolved oxygen or conductivity [5]. A maintained or recorded temperature is therefore useful context for comparing observations made under those conditions. It is not evidence that temperature caused the reported differences between compartments or treatments, nor does this evidence support a quantitative correction or response rule.

IV. Evidence Synthesis

The compartment and treatment studies show why oxygen and conductivity must be read together without being conflated. The digester had very low oxygen saturation and higher conductivity than the other reported compartments [1]. By contrast, the nutrient-supplementation trial recorded higher conductivity in its iron-plus-potassium treatment without a significant dissolved oxygen difference between treatments [2]. Thus, the two readings need not show the same pattern across different comparisons. Their joint value lies in describing different features of the sampled water. These studies do not establish that the conductivity difference caused the oxygen difference in the first system, or that supplementation could never affect oxygen in another.

Conductivity gains meaning when considered beside constituent-specific measurements. In the compartment study, the digester's higher conductivity was reported alongside separately measured ammonium-N and nitrate-N [1]. In the lettuce solution trials, supplemented solutions also differed in conductivity, while nitrate-N and phosphate-P were determined separately [3]. The studies differ in system design and comparison, yet both retain a distinction between an aggregate electrical reading and assays for named compounds. A reader can use conductivity to recognise a difference in ionic condition within a defined comparison, but cannot derive a particular nutrient concentration from these observations by applying a universal conversion.

Monitoring designs likewise determine what can be observed, not what has been explained. The eleven-node study recorded oxygen variables, conductivity and temperature every 30 seconds [5]; another aquaponic study paired a maintained dissolved oxygen condition with weekly, compartment-specific nutrient sampling [4]. These approaches supply different kinds of evidence: one establishes that separate variables were logged frequently, while the other documents oxygen conditions alongside periodic assays for named compounds. Neither demonstrates that the recording arrangement caused improved outcomes. Nor do the supplied results permit temperature to be identified as the driver of observed conductivity or oxygen patterns [4], [5].

V. Practical Implications and Limitations

The first interpretive safeguard is to preserve the measurement's location and form. Oxygen saturation varied sharply among the fish tank, hydroponic table and digester in one system [1]. A dissolved oxygen concentration maintained during aeration in another system answers a narrower question about the reported conditions there [4]. Comparing either value with an unlabelled reading from elsewhere would obscure both the sampling location and whether the value represents saturation or concentration. The evidence supports describing these measured conditions precisely; it does not support treating any one compartment reading or maintained value as a system-wide target.

The second safeguard is to avoid treating conductivity as a nutrient assay. The iron-plus-potassium comparison changed potassium and sulphate alongside conductivity, preventing attribution of the conductivity difference to potassium alone [2]. The separate nitrate-N and phosphate-P assays in the solution comparison illustrate what was required to report those particular concentrations [3]. Consequently, a conductivity reading may prompt a question about solution composition, but it does not answer which nutrient is present at a given concentration. The available trials also varied in formulation and pH, limiting any attempt to generalise a single conductivity-to-nutrient relationship from their results [3].

Temperature records should be interpreted with comparable restraint. The studies that report maintained water temperatures do not vary temperature to test its effects [1], [2]. The sensor-node study demonstrates that water temperature can be recorded alongside dissolved oxygen and conductivity, but supplies no validation of a causal relationship among their readings [5]. A defensible next test would compare these measurements under explicitly varied temperatures while retaining location-specific oxygen observations and independent assays of named constituents. That proposal responds to the identified evidential gap; it is not a claim that the present studies have established a temperature mechanism, sensor accuracy or a general operating threshold.

VI. Conclusion

Dissolved oxygen, temperature and conductivity monitoring offer three distinct descriptions of aquaponic water rather than three interchangeable measures of overall condition. Reported oxygen readings distinguish compartments and document conditions maintained under aeration [1], [4]. Conductivity distinguishes ionic conditions across compartments and solution treatments, but the studies determine particular nutrients through separate assays [1], [2], [3]. Temperature was maintained or recorded, not experimentally established as the cause of the reported oxygen or conductivity differences [1], [2], [5]. Interpreting the measurements together therefore requires attention to where, how and under what comparison each was obtained.

The strongest supported conclusion is bounded: these measurements can reveal differences worth investigating, while their causal meaning depends on evidence beyond the readings alone. The available comparisons do not provide a universal conductivity-to-nutrient conversion, an optimal dissolved oxygen threshold or an isolated temperature effect [2], [3], [4]. Further work that varies temperature deliberately, retains measurements by compartment and checks conductivity against constituent-specific assays would address the principal gaps identified here. Until such evidence is available, oxygen availability, thermal context and ionic condition should be reported distinctly rather than combined into an unsupported diagnosis.

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] 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.

[3] 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.

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

[5] A. M. A.-S. Goda, E. Y. Mohammady, A. M. Aboseif, N. M. Aboushabana, A. M. Helal, B. S. Abdelaty, M. Ashour, and E. El-Haroun, "Comparative socioeconomic, environmental and technical analysis of conventional versus smart sustainable integrated multi-trophic aquaponics systems," 2025. [Online]. Available: https://www.nature.com/articles/s41598-025-23039-2