Combining observation, testing and diagnosis

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

***Abstract*—Aquaponic systems present an interpretive challenge: a visible change in a crop or a measured change in water does not, by itself, establish its cause. This paper examines how observation, testing and diagnosis can be combined without treating suggestive evidence as proof. Evidence from lettuce studies shows that crop responses acquire greater diagnostic value when interpreted alongside nutrient conditions, water quality and changes over time. Research on aquaponic compartments shows how water chemistry and microbial profiles can jointly indicate conditions associated with possible microbial activities, while leaving actual activity rates unmeasured. Evidence on plant disease adds a further distinction: visible symptoms may have several causes, and establishing a pathogen as the cause can require laboratory validation. Together, these sources support a disciplined interpretation in which observations identify a problem, measurements narrow plausible explanations, and diagnosis reflects the strength and specificity of the evidence. The principal limitation is that associations between system conditions and biological responses cannot automatically establish the mechanism responsible. Sound diagnosis therefore requires explicit attention to competing explanations and, where causal certainty matters, tests capable of distinguishing among them.**

I. Introduction

Observation is often the first indication that conditions in an aquaponic system warrant investigation, but its meaning depends on what else is measured. In a study of lettuce grown with fish, crop functional responses were followed over time alongside water quality, fish performance and microbial measures. The crop responses helped reveal nutrient limitations and when their effects became apparent [1]. This combination matters because a single observation records a condition at one point, whereas a sequence of observations interpreted with relevant measurements can show how a response develops. The resulting account is more informative, although identifying a limitation does not mean that every concurrent system change has been shown to cause it.

The distinction between noticing a symptom and diagnosing its cause is especially important for plant health. Visible changes such as chlorosis are not specific to a single cause, and contact with a pathogen does not necessarily produce visible disease. Establishing whether a pathogen caused an observed condition may require validation through isolation, serology or molecular testing [2]. Observation therefore supplies a reason to investigate, not a definitive explanation. Testing becomes valuable when it can discriminate among plausible causes; the scope of a diagnosis should reflect what the selected tests can establish rather than the apparent familiarity of a symptom.

Aquaponic compartments provide a second reason to combine forms of evidence. Water chemistry describes measured environmental conditions, while microbial community profiles describe organisms present in different parts of a system. Examined together, these measures have been used to infer likely microbial activities associated with compartment conditions, but they did not directly measure activity rates [3]. This paper develops that distinction across crop responses, water measurements, microbial profiles and plant health assessment. It first defines their respective contributions, then considers how their findings can be synthesised and where further testing is needed before an interpretation becomes a causal diagnosis.

II. Background and Scope

A comparison of lettuce grown in different nutrient solutions illustrates why neither solution composition nor crop appearance should be interpreted alone. Comparing the solutions with plant growth linked the conditions supplied to the crop with its observed response [4]. The two forms of evidence answer different questions: composition characterises an exposure, while growth records an outcome. Their relationship can support an interpretation of how those conditions relate to performance, but it cannot by itself identify every intervening process. The same study proposed possible roles for microorganisms and dissolved organic matter without testing those contributions [4]. Its results are therefore useful for interpreting crop and solution observations together, not for assigning a demonstrated mechanism to the proposed contributors.

Longitudinal crop assessment adds a dimension that a comparison at a single point cannot supply. In the lettuce monitoring study, functional plant measures were considered with water quality, fish measures and microbial information across the growth period; the reported crop responses helped identify both nutrient limitations and their time course [1]. A change in plant function can thus be interpreted in relation to the conditions measured while that change emerges. This does not make every measurement diagnostically equivalent. Crop responses indicate what happened to the plant, whereas measurements of its surrounding system help assess possible explanations. Keeping these roles separate prevents a coincident reading from being treated as a completed causal account.

Plant disease assessment poses a different but related problem of specificity. A visible symptom can signal that something is wrong without distinguishing a pathogen from another possible cause, while pathogen contact need not lead to visible disease [2]. A test aimed at a suspected causal agent addresses a narrower question than general observation does. Laboratory validation can therefore be necessary when the interpretation is specifically that a pathogen caused the symptom [2]. The

scope of this paper is the scientific reasoning that connects these forms of evidence. It does not propose that a single measurement or diagnostic procedure is sufficient for every crop response or every aquaponic compartment.

III. Core Concepts and Mechanisms

Combining observation, testing and diagnosis begins by distinguishing an indicator from the process it may indicate. A plant symptom is an observable effect, but its appearance alone does not identify a unique cause [2]. Likewise, differences in water chemistry and microbial community composition can indicate conditions consistent with particular microbial activities without measuring the rates of those activities [3]. These examples have the same logical structure: an observed pattern narrows what might be happening, yet more than one explanation can remain possible. Diagnosis requires an additional evidential step whenever the proposed cause is more specific than the observation or measurement permits.

Testing contributes most when its result addresses that unresolved distinction. In plant disease assessment, isolation, serology and molecular testing are examples of methods that can be used to validate a proposed pathogen diagnosis [2]. In crop assessment, pairing functional responses with measurements of the growth environment helps relate an observed change to plausible nutrient limitations over time [1]. These are not interchangeable tests: one addresses a suspected causal agent, while the other relates plant function to measured system conditions. Selecting evidence according to the diagnostic question makes the eventual claim more precise and exposes what remains uncertain.

A measured association also needs to be distinguished from direct verification of its mechanism. The comparison of lettuce growth across nutrient solutions relates crop outcomes to solution conditions, but its proposed microbial and dissolved organic matter contributions were not experimentally resolved [4]. Similarly, compartment profiles and environmental measurements supported inferences about likely microbial activities without determining their rates [3]. Both studies illustrate the value and limit of combining indicators. Multiple consistent observations can strengthen a plausible interpretation, but they do not transform an untested intermediate process into an established fact. A diagnosis should therefore state whether it identifies an observed limitation, a supported explanation or a directly validated cause.

IV. Evidence Synthesis

The strongest common finding across these sources is that different evidence types contribute different levels of specificity. Crop functional monitoring identified nutrient limitations and showed when responses developed [1], while solution and growth comparisons connected measured nutrient conditions with crop outcomes [4]. Both approaches make a crop observation more interpretable by relating it to conditions beyond the visible plant. Neither establishes that all proposed biological intermediaries have been tested. The appropriate synthesis is not to choose observation over testing, but to ask whether the measurements collected can distinguish the explanation being offered from other explanations still consistent with the crop response.

Evidence from aquaponic compartments adds a spatial counterpart to the temporal crop evidence. Water chemistry and microbial profiles differed among compartments and were considered together to infer conditions associated with likely microbial activities [3]. The crop monitoring study, by contrast, followed plant responses and other system measures through time to identify when nutrient limitations became evident [1]. These approaches show why a diagnostic interpretation depends on the location and timing of the evidence: a compartment measurement describes conditions where it was taken, while a crop response records an effect across its period of development. Neither perspective alone directly verifies every proposed causal process.

Plant disease evidence clarifies when a more decisive form of testing is required. A symptom such as chlorosis cannot establish a pathogen diagnosis merely because it is visible, and pathogen contact need not produce visible disease [2]. This caution is consistent with the limits of inferring microbial activity from profiles rather than measured rates [3]. In each case, the available indicator may justify a hypothesis without settling the causal question. By contrast, the longitudinal lettuce evidence supports a more specific account of the presence and timing of nutrient limitations because crop function was examined with concurrent system measures [1]. The strength of a diagnosis is therefore claim-dependent, not simply a matter of collecting more observations.

V. Practical Implications and Limitations

An interpretation should begin by stating precisely what was observed and what was measured. If lettuce function changes while water quality and other system measures are followed, those data may help identify a nutrient limitation and its development over time [1]. If crop growth is compared across characterised solutions, the comparison may clarify how differing conditions relate to the outcome [4]. Neither result warrants attributing the response to an untested microbial or dissolved organic matter mechanism. This distinction gives diagnosis a practical boundary: conclusions about nutrient conditions and crop response can be useful even when the deeper biological explanation remains unresolved.

The choice of test should follow the causal claim under consideration. Compartment water measurements and community profiles can support an inference about environmental conditions and possible microbial activities, but a claim about actual activity rates would require evidence beyond those profiles [3]. Equally, a visible crop symptom may warrant investigation without establishing that a pathogen is responsible; a specific pathogen diagnosis can require laboratory validation [2]. This does not diminish the value of initial observations. It makes their role explicit: they direct attention towards a question, while a suitably targeted test determines how far an answer can be taken.

The available studies also constrain generalisation. The lettuce comparisons show relationships among the particular solutions and crops examined, but their suggested microbial and dissolved organic matter explanations remain untested [4]. The longitudinal monitoring study demonstrates the diagnostic value of crop functional responses considered with system measures, without establishing that every crop response has the same cause [1]. Compartment profiling likewise supports interpretations of the measured environments rather than direct estimates of microbial process rates [3]. Across these cases, reliable interpretation depends on matching the wording of a conclusion to the variables actually examined and identifying the additional validation needed for a stronger causal claim.

VI. Conclusion

Combining observation, testing and diagnosis is an exercise in controlling the strength of an inference. Crop responses become more informative when examined with measured conditions and their development over time [1], and compartment chemistry gains interpretive value when considered with microbial profiles [3]. Yet a visible symptom need not identify its cause, and an inferred microbial activity is not a measured activity rate [2], [3]. The evidence supports a progression from recognising a change, to comparing it with relevant measurements, to making a diagnosis no more specific than those measurements allow.

The highest-value further work is validation directed at the remaining causal question. Where a pathogen is suspected, laboratory methods may be needed to test that attribution [2]. Where microorganisms or dissolved organic matter are proposed to explain a crop response, their contributions remain to be tested rather than assumed from solution and growth comparisons [4]. Where microbial profiles suggest activity, direct evidence of that activity would be needed to establish more than an inference [3]. These distinctions preserve the usefulness of observation and routine measurement while making uncertainty visible in the final 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] 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.

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

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

[4] 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.