Nutrient recovery, circularity and waste valorisation

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

***Abstract*—Aquaponics connects fish production with plant cultivation by directing nutrient-bearing aquaculture water towards crops. This arrangement creates an opportunity to recover some nutrients introduced through fish feed, but water recirculation alone does not establish how much nutrient is recovered or whether all crop requirements are met. This paper synthesises four studies of aquaponic systems and lettuce production to distinguish nutrient recovery, circularity and waste valorisation. System observations document feed inputs, nitrogen transformations, nutrient concentrations and plant harvests, while comparative cultivation studies show that recirculated aquaculture water can support lettuce growth. They also reveal limits: crop performance depends on solution composition, iron and potassium supplementation can improve production, and the constituents responsible for some growth responses remain unidentified. Waste valorisation is therefore most clearly demonstrated here as productive use of aquaculture water in plant cultivation, rather than comprehensive conversion of all waste streams into useful products. The central implication is that circular reuse should be assessed through nutrient availability and crop response, with stronger claims about recovery requiring explicit accounting of nutrient inputs, transformations and outputs.**

I. Introduction

Aquaponics offers a direct connection between nutrient-bearing aquaculture water and plant cultivation. When water from fish production supports a crop, material that might otherwise leave the aquaculture unit can contribute to another harvest. In a comparison of hydroponic, aquaponic and mineral-complemented aquaponic solutions, lettuce grew in recirculated aquaculture water, establishing the practical relevance of this reuse pathway [1]. The result does not mean that every dissolved constituent is beneficial or that the water alone has an ideal composition. Nutrient recovery must be understood as a measurable contribution to plant production, not merely as the movement of water between two production units.

Circularity describes the relationship among inputs, transformations, reuse and harvested outputs, rather than a claim that nutrients circulate without loss. In operated aquaponic systems, fish feed and fish biomass were documented alongside plant harvests, nutrient monitoring and nitrogen transformations in biofilters [2]. These observations provide a basis for examining how feed-derived nutrients become available within a coupled system. They do not, by themselves, quantify the fraction of each nutrient ultimately recovered in crops. Accordingly, this paper distinguishes the observed reuse of aquaculture water from stronger claims about complete nutrient recovery or the capacity to support additional plant production.

The quality of the reused nutrient supply matters as much as its existence. An aquaponics study identified limitations in lettuce nutrition and reported improved production when iron and potassium were supplied, showing that internal cycling need not satisfy every crop requirement [3]. This paper first defines the boundaries of recovery, circularity and waste valorisation; it then explains the supported nutrient pathways, compares evidence from cultivation studies, and identifies what remains unverified. Its central argument is that aquaponic circularity is a productive coupling of nutrient flows whose effectiveness must be judged against plant requirements and observed outputs, rather than presumed from recirculation alone.

II. Background and Scope

Recirculated aquaculture water and prepared hydroponic solutions offer different ways of supplying lettuce with nutrients. A direct comparison of these conditions measured both plant biomass and tissue elemental composition, enabling crop response to be considered alongside differences in nutrient supply [4]. The comparison is important because similar growth under two treatments would not show that the solutions have identical composition, while different tissue composition would not, on its own, establish why growth differs. Within this paper, nutrient recovery refers to the productive use of nutrients associated with aquaculture water; the evidence considered here concerns that water-to-crop pathway, not recovery of every material leaving fish production.

The comparison also illustrates why circularity is a system property rather than a label for a nutrient solution. Lettuce grown with recirculated aquaponic water was assessed against hydroponic treatments at different pH values, and biomass and tissue-element outcomes varied across the treatments [4]. Such contrasts help separate the observation that aquaculture water can sustain production from the stronger proposition that its individual constituents explain a particular response. The potential contributors to the aquaponic response were not quantified or causally identified in that study [4]. The remaining explanatory gap is therefore not whether plants can use the water, but how its available nutrient composition relates to plant performance.

Waste valorisation has a similarly specific meaning in the available evidence: aquaculture water was used in plant production, and the resulting crop was harvested in systems where fish feed, fish growth and nutrient concentrations were monitored [2]. This demonstrates a route by which a nutrient-bearing stream gains a productive use. It does not demonstrate

that all feed-derived nutrients become crop biomass, nor does it establish the fate of material outside the monitored water-to-plant pathway. Rising nitrate and phosphate concentrations reported in the systems indicate nutrients remained in the water during operation, but that observation alone cannot determine how much additional crop production the systems could sustain [2].

III. Core Concepts and Mechanisms

The supported causal pathway begins with fish feed as an input and follows nutrients through aquaculture water towards the plant crop. In studied aquaponic systems, monitoring linked feed and fish production with water nutrients, biofilter nitrogen transformations and plant harvest [2]. Nitrogen transformation is consequential because the chemical form of nitrogen in the circulating water affects the nutrient environment encountered by plants. These observations explain how aquaculture and cultivation can be coupled, but they are not a complete nutrient balance. To claim recovery quantitatively, one would need to distinguish nutrient inputs, concentrations remaining in water and nutrient removal in harvested material, rather than treating circulation itself as the recovered output.

Plant uptake places a constraint on the recovery pathway: a nutrient can be present in a system without being supplied to a crop in a composition that meets its requirements. The improved lettuce production following iron and potassium supplementation shows that aquaponic cycling left consequential nutritional limitations under the studied conditions [3]. Comparative lettuce work likewise assessed growth together with nutrient-solution and tissue composition, making crop performance an essential check on assumptions drawn from water reuse alone [4]. The mechanism of productive recovery is thus conditional. Aquaculture-derived nutrients must be available in a suitable mixture, and an observed crop harvest cannot establish that supplementation is unnecessary.

Circularity and waste valorisation describe different aspects of this conditional pathway. Circularity concerns the redirection of aquaculture water and its nutrients into cultivation; valorisation concerns the useful plant output associated with that redirection. System records of feed, nutrient monitoring and harvest support both interpretations at the level of an operated aquaponic system [2]. Yet the lettuce response to iron and potassium inputs shows that useful recycling can coexist with an external nutrient requirement [3]. These concepts should therefore not be used as synonyms for a fully self-sufficient nutrient cycle. Their scientific value lies in identifying what is reused and produced while keeping residual nutrient limitations visible.

IV. Evidence Synthesis

Across the studies, the clearest common finding is that aquaculture water can serve as a nutrient-bearing input to crop production, while its adequacy depends on conditions within the coupled system. Operated aquaponic systems documented nutrient concentrations and plant harvests alongside fish production [2]. In a separate lettuce comparison, aquaponic solution supported growth, and mineral complementation produced a different growth response from uncomplemented aquaponic and hydroponic solutions [1]. Together, these results support productive reuse without equating reuse with nutritional completeness. The system observations establish an input-to-crop pathway; the solution comparison shows why the composition delivered along that pathway must also be assessed.

The supplementation evidence sharpens this distinction. Iron and potassium addition improved lettuce production in an aquaponic study that identified crop nutrient limitations [3]. In another study, complementing aquaponic solution with mineral elements improved lettuce shoot growth relative to the compared uncomplemented solutions [1]. The studies differ in treatment and setting, so their outcomes should not be merged into a single performance estimate. Their shared implication is narrower and more useful: nutrients carried by aquaculture water can contribute to cultivation, yet a crop response may remain constrained by elements or concentrations not adequately supplied through that water.

Comparative results also caution against assigning an unexplained plant response to one feature of aquaponic water. Lettuce grown with recirculated aquaponic water was compared with hydroponic treatments, and biomass and tissue-element differences were reported; the aquaponic constituents potentially responsible for the response were not causally identified [4]. The complemented-solution comparison likewise supports an association between treatment composition and growth without isolating every possible contributor within the aquaculture water [1]. Consequently, the evidence establishes that solution conditions and crop outcomes are related, but it does not justify naming a particular unmeasured constituent as the mechanism of improved growth.

V. Practical Implications and Limitations

Assessment of nutrient recovery should keep three observations separate: nutrients present in reused water, nutrients available to the plant and nutrients represented in a harvested crop. The lettuce supplementation result shows why the first observation cannot stand in for the second [3]. Measurements of solution composition, biomass and tissue elements in comparative cultivation studies provide more informative evidence of crop response than the fact of recirculation alone [1], [4]. These measurements still do not constitute a complete accounting of nutrient recovery across the whole aquaponic system. Claims about the amount recovered would require a defined system boundary and matched measurements of the relevant nutrient inputs and outputs.

A practical trade-off follows from using aquaculture water as a crop input: retaining a useful nutrient stream does not guarantee that its composition aligns with plant demand. The observed benefits of supplementing iron and potassium in one system and complementing aquaponic solution in another show that reuse and additional nutrient inputs can occur together [1], [3]. This is not evidence that supplementation is always required, since the studies concern particular crops and operating conditions. It does mean that circularity should

be evaluated alongside crop nutrition, rather than judged solely by whether water remains within the production arrangement.

The evidence is strongest for the productive use of aquaculture water and more limited for broader waste valorisation. Plant harvests and nutrient monitoring demonstrate a useful destination for the water in operated systems [2]; comparative lettuce studies show that the destination can sustain crop growth under the conditions examined [1], [4]. None of these mapped findings establishes comprehensive recovery from all aquaculture waste streams or identifies the causes of every observed growth difference. Further validation should therefore measure nutrient flows and crop responses together, while testing proposed causal contributors separately. Until then, system-level recovery and wider valorisation claims should remain qualified.

VI. Conclusion

Nutrient recovery in aquaponics is best understood as the productive transfer of some aquaculture-associated nutrients towards a plant crop, not as proof that all nutrients are retained or used. Monitoring of fish inputs, water nutrients, nitrogen transformations and plant harvests supports this pathway [2], while lettuce comparisons demonstrate both the utility and the compositional limits of aquaculture water [1], [3]. Circularity names the reuse relationship; waste valorisation names the useful crop production associated with it. Neither term removes the need to establish which nutrients remain available, which require supplementation and which are actually recovered in harvested outputs.

The highest-value next step is to connect nutrient accounting with plant-response measurements under clearly defined system conditions. Comparative evidence already shows that biomass and tissue composition can reveal differences that water reuse alone cannot explain, while leaving some causal contributors unresolved [4]. Coupling those measurements to documented inputs, water concentrations and harvests would make recovery claims more precise than an inference from recirculation or crop growth in isolation [2]. The present evidence supports aquaponic water reuse as a meaningful form of circular production, but warrants restraint about complete nutrient closure, additional crop capacity and valorisation beyond the demonstrated water-to-crop pathway.

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] 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.

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

[3] 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.

[4] T. S. Anderson, D. de Villiers, and M. B. Timmons, "Growth and tissue elemental composition response of butterhead lettuce (lactuca sativa, cv. flandria) to hydroponic and aquaponic conditions," *Horticulturae*, 2017.