

1 **A photonic sensor system for real-time monitoring of turbidity changes in**
2 **aquaculture**

3
4

5 Mustafa Tolga Tolon^{1*}, Adnan Tokaç², Enis N. Kostak³, Christoph Strehse⁴

6
7

8 Corresponding author: Mustafa Tolga Tolon, Ege University, Faculty of Fisheries,
9 Aquaculture Department, 35100 Bornova, İzmir, Türkiye; e-mail: tolga.tolon@ege.edu.tr

10

11 ^{1*}Ege University, Faculty of Fisheries, Aquaculture Department, 35100 Bornova, İzmir,
12 Türkiye; e-mail: tolga.tolon@ege.edu.tr , ORCID ID: 0000-0002-2233-0663

13 ²Ege University, Faculty of Fisheries, Fish Capture and Seafood Processing Department,
14 35100 Bornova, İzmir, Türkiye, ORCID ID: 0000-0002-2968-7315

15 ³UiT the Arctic University of Norway, Norwegian College of Fishery and Aquatic Science,
16 Breivika, 9037, Tromsø, Norway

17 ⁴Rostock University, Chair of Ocean Engineering, 18059 Rostock, Germany, ORCID
18 ID: 0009-0007-5479-4722

19 **ABSTRACT**

20 **Objective**

21 The objective of this study was to test the compatibility and performance of the
22 developed photonic sensor system, which can serve as a dependable and practical device for
23 continuous monitoring of turbidity changes in aquaculture tanks.

24

25 **Methods**

26 The fabricated photonic sensor system consisted of an integrated data logger and sensor
27 probe. The sensor probe exhibited a precise emission of infrared (IR) light at a wavelength of
28 850 nm. Moreover, the sensor evaluates the ambient light across the red-green-blue (RGB)
29 spectrum. To ensure accuracy and reliability, the entire system underwent a thorough
30 calibration process, referencing nephelometric turbidity unit (NTU) values acquired through a
31 specialized handheld turbidimeter. Rigorous trials were systematically conducted in 600 L
32 seawater tanks featuring Sea Cucumber and Gilthead Seabream to ensure the sensitivity and
33 robustness of the photonic sensor system to the aquaculture environment.

34

35 **Results**

36 A calibration curve revealed a significant correlation between the IR channel values of the
37 sensor (photon counts) and the turbidity values measured by the turbidimeter. The photonic
38 sensor effectively captured turbidity changes in the aquaculture tanks, with significant
39 differences observed between the tanks. The sensor performance was evaluated in trials with
40 Gilthead Seabream, which showed sensitivity to high turbidity changes. The photonic sensor
41 system accurately reflects turbidity changes continuously using its own active light source,
42 independent of ambient light intensity, which is essential for turbid water conditions or for
43 taking measurements in total darkness.

44 **Conclusion**

45 The photonic sensor is a reliable tool for the continuous and accurate monitoring of turbidity
46 changes in aquaculture systems. However, there are specific usage limitations under low-
47 turbidity conditions that can be improved in further studies.

48

49 **Keywords:** Photonic Sensing, Water Quality, Turbidity Monitoring, Aquaculture, Infrared
50 Light

51 **Impact statement**

52 The photonic sensor system, as designed for this study, is capable of accurately measuring
53 turbidity changes using its own active light source independent of ambient light intensity,
54 allowing 24 h monitoring of turbid water conditions or to make measurements in total darkness.
55 Moreover, this system may be useful to detect turbidity changes associated with algal blooms in
56 sea cages, and the poor water treatment performance of filtration systems in recirculating
57 aquaculture.

58 **INTRODUCTION**

59 Turbidity is a measure of cloudiness resulting from the presence of suspended organic and
60 inorganic particles in the water column that are typically invisible to the naked eye (Baniya et
61 al., 2021). Turbidity is an important parameter for assessing overall water quality in
62 aquaculture systems (Lopez-Betancur, 2022). Algal blooms due to nutrient enrichment and
63 soil erosion in extensive and semi-intensive aquaculture systems, uneaten feed, and waste
64 from cultured organisms in intensive aquaculture systems are sources of turbidity. High levels
65 of turbidity can be indicative of various contaminants, including suspended solids, organic
66 matter potentially carrying antibiotics and antibiotic resistance genes, and microplastics,
67 which can transport chemical pollutants and pathogens (Lin et al., 2023; Souza et al., 2016;
68 Xie et al., 2024). These contaminants can negatively affect aquatic organisms by reducing
69 light penetration, leading to reduced oxygen levels, habitat degradation, and disease

70 outbreaks. Moreover, high turbidity results in more intensive water treatment and a higher
71 percentage of makeup water in the RAS. Another reverse effect of turbidity in RAS is the
72 reduced inactivation rate of heterotrophic bacteria by ultraviolet disinfection systems (Gullian
73 et al. 2011). Monitoring turbidity levels and critical changes in turbidity are crucial for
74 maintaining sustainable aquaculture practices (Wang et al. 2018a; Kathyayani et al. 2019).

75 Aquaculture operations often employ various methods to measure turbidity, including
76 secchi disks, turbidity tubes, nephelometers, turbidimeters, and visual observations, each of
77 which has its own weaknesses. The most economical and energy-efficient option is optical
78 turbidimeters, which use basic optical principles, such as light absorption or reflection, to
79 estimate suspended solid concentrations, that indicate the level of turbidity. However,
80 Kitchener et al. (2017) reported that the relationship between turbidity and suspended solid
81 concentration can be confounded by variations in the particle size, composition, and color of
82 the water. Moreover, the presence of phytoplankton or other turbidity sources can produce
83 density gradients that affect the penetration of irradiance into the water column (Bright et al.
84 2018). Accuracy of models for turbid waters may be low due to large absorption effect of particulates
85 at short wavelengths (Viegas et al. 2018) and current measurement devices don't allow continuous
86 or frequent measurements. However, monitoring the change in turbidity in an aquaculture
87 setting in the short term is as crucial as accurately measuring the turbidity level to properly
88 manage turbidity, maintain optimal conditions for aquaculture operations, and guarantee the
89 health of aquatic organisms. Although there are some devices that can continuously measure
90 turbidity using two near-infrared (NIR) digital cameras, which provide high accuracy for the
91 determination of standard solutions and real samples (Zhu et al. 2020), such systems are not
92 practical or applicable in aquaculture conditions. The difficult and limited use of conventional
93 turbidimeters due to these disadvantages has questioned the feasibility of using photonic
94 technology for turbidity sensing, where more efficient and miniaturized sensors are available.

95 The field of photonic technology commonly refers to devices that utilize the principles of
96 photonics, that is, the application of light particles (photons) for various purposes. Photonic
97 sensors frequently employ advanced methods, such as laser light scattering or interferometry,
98 to gauge the number of light photons scattered or absorbed by particles. These sensors are
99 known for their high accuracies and sensitivities. Furthermore, they are adaptable and can be
100 integrated into intelligent wireless mesh networks for continuous monitoring, thereby
101 providing real-time data on environmental conditions (Parra et al, 2018).

102 The sensor system developed in this study transforms theoretical concepts into dependable,
103 repeatable, and practical configurations that meet the market and user requirements. The
104 biggest technical challenge addressed thus far is the preparation of the system and its optical
105 components to withstand the environmental conditions expected in practical use. The
106 developed sensor system is applicable to a wide range of aquatic environments, including
107 both indoor and outdoor aquaculture tanks, and is structurally capable. Another distinctive
108 feature of the system is its use of an active light source in addition to ambient light, which is
109 essential for turbid water conditions or measurements in total darkness. The sensor system can
110 perform continuous IR light measurements to assess turbidity in the red-green-blue (RGB)
111 range of the light spectrum. Thus, the primary objective of this study was to evaluate the
112 functionality and practicality of the designed photonic sensor system, as it has the potential to
113 serve as a dependable device for regularly monitoring turbidity levels in aquaculture tanks.

114 **METHODS**

115 **Photonic Sensor System**

116 The developed photonic sensor system consisted of two major components: an integrated data
117 logger and a sensor probe. For turbidity measurements, the sensor probe emitted IR light at a
118 wavelength of 850 nm, which allowed the detection of the amount of transmitted light. This amount of
119 transmitted IR light correlates with the particle concentration, and thus, the turbidity of the water

120 (Lambrou et al. 2010). In addition, the sensor can detect light within the RGB range of the spectrum
121 between 350 and 670 nm. The main and auxiliary components of the controller unit include an
122 Arduino Mega 2560 microcontroller that runs the firmware, a MicroSD card module to log the data,
123 and a power bank for the power supply (Figure 1a). To emit IR light with a wavelength of 850 nm for
124 turbidity measurement, the sensor probe included an SFH 4651 IR-LED whose brightness could be
125 adjusted using an LP55231 LED driver. A TSL2572 IR light detector was used to detect the
126 transmitted IR light. The sensor also includes a TCS3472 RGB light detector to assess the influence of
127 light outside the IR range. These light detectors count the number of photons that hit their surfaces
128 during a preadjusted integration time, where each detector is selective for certain wavelengths. The
129 casing for the sensor and optical window were 3D printed using a transparent polyethylene
130 terephthalate glycol filament and waterproofed by casting with polyurethane resin (Figure 1b).

131 **Calibration Process**

132 Sensitivity of the IR channel, reflecting the turbidity changes in the trial tanks was tested
133 by a calibration curve prior to the trials. A calibration chart was prepared by comparing the
134 number of photons detected by the sensor with nephelometric turbidity unit (NTU) values
135 measured using a handheld turbidimeter (WTW Turb 355 IR/T) in samples with different
136 turbidities. To create the turbidity levels in the calibration curve, 0, 0.1, 0.2, 0.3, 0.4, 0.5, 0.6,
137 0.7, 0.8, 0.9, 1, 2, 3, 3.5, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 12, 20, 30, and 50 ml of low-fat milk was added to the
138 water to create samples with turbidity values up to 1000 NTU, which is the maximum value
139 that the turbidity meter can measure. NTU values were measured 10 times for each sample
140 (Figure 2).

141 **Experimental Design**

142 A 600 L seawater tank (200 × 50 × 60 cm; length × width × depth) containing the Sea
143 Cucumber *Holothuria tubulosa* (SC), Gilthead Seabream *Sparus aurata* (GS), or no
144 organisms (CN) was used to conduct sensor tests at the Aquaculture Laboratories of the
145 Faculty of Fisheries of Ege University in Urla, İzmir, Türkiye. The tank was filled once with

146 1µm filtered and UV-sterilized seawater at a salinity of 37.9 ppt, with no water change or
147 filtration during each trial to measure turbidity variations. A digital salinity tester and an
148 integrated thermometer (Hanna HI98319) were used to measure the salinity and water
149 temperature. The average temperature was maintained within the optimal range of
150 22.8 ± 0.63 °C (min. 20.9, max. 23.6) and 13.4 ± 0.6 °C (min. 12.5, max. 14.5). The mean
151 seawater temperature in the control tank was 17.4 ± 0.9 °C (min. 15.4, max. 19.5).
152 Temperature adjustment was not utilized in this study due to the small temperature
153 discrepancy observed during the sampling period. This decision was made following
154 preliminary examination, which indicated that temperature variations of less than 10 °C
155 had no substantial effect on the photonic sensor measurements. A low stocking density
156 was adopted for the species in the trials to prevent the possible mortality caused by unfiltered
157 or exchanged water. Thus, 20 GS (100 ± 13.4 g, \pm SD) and 15 HC (120 ± 18.6 g, \pm SD) placed at
158 a stocking density of 3 kg/m³ and 500 g/m² in relevant trials, respectively. To minimize the
159 measurement bias, trials were carried out sequentially using the same photonic sensor unit.
160 GS and SC were provided with daily rations of commercial fish feed, with GS receiving 1.3%
161 of its biomass and SC receiving 1% of its biomass in tanks. A 12 h light: 12 h dark ambient
162 light schedule was applied to the trial tanks by daylight fluorescent bulbs, and the ambient
163 light intensity inside the tank was recorded by the RGB channel of the photonic sensor.

164 The photonic sensor probe was placed approximately 20 cm above the bottom of the tank
165 to take advantage of the water circulation caused by the diffused air from the 120 cm (4 × 30
166 cm) long air stone placed at the bottom. Photonic sensor measurements were initialized after
167 one hour, when the temperature of the sensor probe was equilibrated with the water. The
168 photon count reliability of the photonic sensor in reflecting the turbidity changes in trial
169 tanks was tested by taking 21 water samples from the vicinity (10-15 cm) of the sensor probe
170 and measuring them with a handheld turbidimeter at random times during the 52-hour trial
171 period.

172 The time interval between photonic sensor measurements was set to 15 min in all trials.
173 The brightness of the IR LED was adjusted by the current flowing through the LED and the
174 duty cycle (pulse-width modulation, PWM) via the LED driver. These variables can be set in
175 the firmware to values between 0 and 255 (1 byte), with one step corresponding to 0.1mA. The
176 integration time of the light detectors can also be adjusted. An additional ambient light
177 measurement was performed at each time interval with the RGB detector, which enabled the
178 capture of the applied light schedule that did not emit light in the IR spectral range. The
179 photonic sensor's parameters were set to PWM90, Current 9.0 mA, IR detector integration
180 time 609 ms, and RGB detector integration time 609 ms. For each measurement, the
181 sensor readings were converted to Java Script Object Notation (JSON) format and logged on
182 the SD Card located in the top unit.

183 **Statistical Analysis**

184 The raw data collected by the detectors were transferred from the JSON format to SPSS
185 version 25 for statistical analysis. Descriptive statistics used for interpretation of the data
186 within trials. The paired t-test was employed to assess the differences in sensor measurement
187 data collected at 15-minute intervals within a single treatment group. Each measurement was
188 paired with the subsequent measurement, allowing for the comparison of mean differences
189 between consecutive measurements. Assumptions of normality and independence of paired
190 differences were verified prior to conducting the analysis by Shapiro-Wilk and Durbin-
191 Watson tests. In each trial, Pearson's correlation or Spearman's rho coefficients were used to
192 examine the degree of correlation between photonic sensor values and turbidimeter NTU
193 values. Results were considered statistically significant at $\alpha < 0.05$.

194 **RESULTS**

195 In calibration process, average turbidity measurements ranged from 0.88 to 966.83 NTU
196 (n=240). Correspondingly, the standard deviations varied from 0.08 to 14.87 NTU, reflecting

197 the precision and reliability of calibration measurements across a wide range of turbidities. IR
198 photon counts corresponding to NTU values were measured between 19955.67 and 36371.03
199 (n=530). The third-degree polynomial exactly fits the calibration data, highlighting the robust
200 relationship between photon counts and turbidity levels ($P < 0.001$). The high correlation
201 coefficient ($r = 0.99$) indicates an excellent fit of the third-degree polynomial to the data,
202 demonstrating that the polynomial model can accurately predict turbidity based on IR photon
203 counts across the measured range. Furthermore, the polynomial fit's precision is validated by
204 the low standard deviations of turbidity measurements at various points, ensuring that the
205 calibration curve can be reliably used in practical applications. However, it can be seen that
206 the first two measurement points at 0.88 NTU and 3.35 NTU do not match the rest of the
207 calibration curve obtained. Because this deviation from the calibration curve makes the
208 interpretation of the measured sensor data in the low-turbidity range considerably more
209 difficult, the conversion of the measured IR photon counts into the corresponding NTU value
210 is omitted (Figure 2).

211 The photonic sensor conducted 210 measurements of the IR channel during the 52-hour
212 period of each trial. The IR signal averaged $38,655.70 \pm 562.10$, $35,843.87 \pm 1,507.01$, and
213 $34,486.79 \pm 217.41$ photon counts, in the SC, GS, and CN tanks, respectively. Turbidity
214 measurements were not affected by the applied ambient light intensity ($P = 0.98$) when
215 comparing the differences between the average photon counts during the ambient light and
216 dark periods within tanks (Figure 3).

217 In the GS tank, the number of photons decreased from 37,443 to 30,048 counts during the
218 trial period. The seawater in the tank became noticeably turbid, and the most dramatic change
219 was recorded between the 190th and 210th measurements compared with the previous
220 measurements ($P = 0.02$). The photon counts obtained from the photonic sensor IR channel and
221 the NTU levels measured by the turbidimeter were strongly negatively correlated ($r = -0.783$,

222 $P < 0.001$). The NTU level in the GS tank exhibited a linearly increasing trend between the
223 26th and 40th measurements. Similarly, a synchronous decreasing trend in the photon counts
224 of the IR channel was observed (Figure 4).

225 The low turbidity change reflected by both the IR photons and handheld turbidimeter NTU was
226 negligible in the SC tank. The number of IR photons measured by the IR channel of the
227 photonic sensor exhibited a steady change from 36,844 to 39,969 photons. No significant
228 changes in IR photon counts were observed between measurements ($P = 0.09$). The mean
229 NTU level measured by the turbidimeter was 1.77 ± 0.51 (min 1.25, max 3.74) without any
230 significant change among the measurements. An inverse and significant correlation
231 (Spearman rank) was found between IR photon counts and NTU levels ($r = -0.323$, $P = 0.04$).

232 In the control tank, where no aquatic organisms were present in the filtered seawater, the
233 mean photon number for the IR channel was $34,486.79 \pm 217.41$ (min 33,424, max 35,125)
234 photons. The photon counts followed a steady horizontal course throughout the trial, without
235 any significant change between the light and dark periods ($P = 0.75$). The NTU level in tank CN
236 remained constant throughout the trial, as indicated by the mean turbidity measured using the
237 handheld turbidimeter. The mean NTU level was 1.17 ± 0.07 (min 1.02, max 1.28), and there
238 was no significant difference between the measurements ($P = 0.10$). Although the IR photon
239 counts of the photonic sensor were more variable than the NTU levels, the turbidity change
240 reflected by both the IR photon counts and handheld turbidimeter was negligible in the CN
241 tank.

242 NTU values measured by the handheld turbidimeter ($n = 21$) in each trial tank revealed a
243 turbidity fluctuation pattern similar to that of the IR channel of the photonic sensor. The most
244 extensive range of turbidity fluctuations was in the GS tank with a 3.23 NTU difference
245 between the minimum and maximum turbidity levels (min 3.78, max 7.01 NTU). The
246 SC tank was rated second by a difference of 2.49 NTU (min 1.25, max 3.74 NTU), and

247 the CN tank had the least turbidity fluctuation with 0.26 NTU ranged from 1.02 to 1.28
248 NTU. The GS tank with the highest range of turbidity fluctuations offered more dependable
249 outcomes for assessing the sensitivity of the IR channel within the photonic sensor to
250 turbidity changes (Figure 5).

251 **DISCUSSION**

252 This study demonstrated that IR counts measured using a photonic sensor can be used to
253 assess turbidity changes in seawater. This finding is consistent with previous studies that
254 reported a negative correlation between transmitted IR light and turbidity using IR turbidity
255 sensors (Postolache et al. 2002; Omar and MatJafri 2009; Wang et al. 2018b). However,
256 measurement accuracy depends on the measurement method used. The sensitivity of the
257 sensor decreased with decreasing turbidity, as shown by the flattened curve for low turbidity
258 values. Moreover, the data points measured for a turbidity of 3.35 NTU and below do not
259 match the rest of the calibration curve, indicating that the transmission method is not as
260 accurate for low turbidity values as for higher ones. To overcome this issue, the
261 developed sensor could include an additional IR detector mounted at a 90° angle to the IR
262 emitter to enable additional scattered light measurements. This approach improves the
263 sensitivity of measurements at low turbidity and compensates for the current deficit of the
264 sensor. However, turbidity changes in the SC tank were also detected by the sensor, which
265 were probably caused by the high metabolic waste that sea cucumbers excreted during their
266 movement and feeding cycles in dark periods. Hence, the developed photonic sensor possesses
267 the ability to detect and measure hazardous and lethal conditions specifically for aquaculture
268 species, particularly those with elevated metabolic waste levels, such as GS. The photonic
269 sensor performed better in the GS trials with high turbidity levels. Considering that high
270 turbidity or sudden changes in turbidity are important indicators of a problem in aquaculture,
271 the developed sensor can fully and precisely detect turbidity fluctuations after 3.35 NTU and

272 reduce the turbidity measurement frequency to 3 seconds and operate under the most
273 challenging conditions. This emerges as a significant advantage of this system over its
274 commercial counterparts in the market.

275 Many studies on the effects of ambient light cycle and intensity on cultured organisms
276 have revealed that light has significant effects on stress, growth, nutrition, and reproduction
277 (Tandler and Helps 1985; Karakatsouli et al. 2007; Dong et al. 2010; Bögner et al. 2018; Sun
278 et al. 2020;). The interaction of ambient light with the photonic sensor used, as well as the
279 potential deviations in the measured values, are critical for the reliability of photonic sensors.
280 Putra et al. (2022) proposed integrating IR-based turbidity sensors with an RGB sensor, a
281 light sensor, a charged coupled device sensor, or a combination of these to improve the
282 performance of IR light sensors and the accuracy of the obtained data. In the current study,
283 the applied ambient light schedule did not emit light in the IR spectral region, and therefore,
284 had no effect on the IR-based turbidity measurements of the sensor; however, it was detected
285 and measured by the RGB detector. Constant IR channel photon measurements in the dark
286 and light periods in CN confirmed the ineffectiveness of ambient light on IR-based photonic
287 sensors. The inclusion of RGB sensors in a system integrated with IR sensors would be
288 efficient in determining and measuring the ambient light level scattered in the tanks where it
289 is needed, however we did not determine any change in the accuracy of obtained IR channel
290 data.

291 Biofouling is a major problem in sensor probes used for seawater monitoring. This limits
292 long-term monitoring studies and affects the reliability of data obtained from sensors (Matos et
293 al. 2023). Since the 52-hour period of our study was quite less time for mass biofilm
294 development in filtered seawater, no biofilm formation was observed on the probe surfaces of
295 the photonic sensor, and no bias due to biofilm was expected. However, the time required for
296 biofilm development may vary depending on the specific surface and environmental conditions.

297 The developed sensor has a 3D rough-surface optical window that requires periodic manual
298 cleaning. Long-term monitoring can cause the accumulation of biofilm on the optical window;
299 however, ongoing developments include replacement of the 3d printed optical window with
300 glass and integration of ultraviolet light to prevent biofilm organism growth on the optical
301 window.

302 High turbidity changes caused by the growth of phytoplankton or pathogenic
303 microorganisms in water (Zhang et al. 2021), can harm aquatic ecosystems. The early
304 detection of increasing turbidity is essential to prevent minor issues from escalating and
305 causing fish mortality. Current commercial turbidimeters require significant time and effort
306 for the continuous or regular monitoring of turbidity in aquatic environments. However, the
307 photonic sensor developed in this study performed well in aquaculture tanks with different
308 turbidity levels, and with minimal time and labor for system setup and usage. Moreover, the
309 developed system offers the possibility of easy customization for the intended application by
310 adjusting emitter brightness, detector integration time, and firmware sampling rate. The
311 integration of the system is simplified by the compact design of the sensor and the possibility
312 of wireless data transmission from the top unit to a personal computer (PC) or smartphone. In
313 addition to the customizability of the developed open-source-based system, one of the greatest
314 advantages over commercial systems is the cost. Considering that the average price of a
315 reliable turbidimeter is approximately 2000 euros, the hardware and material assembly costs of
316 the developed sensor are less than 150 euros, making it affordable even for small businesses,
317 research institutions, and private users.

318 **CONCLUSION**

319 Overall, the continuous monitoring of turbidity levels is essential for effective water
320 quality management, disease prevention, feed management, and environmental protection in
321 aquaculture. Through early detection of major changes in turbidity levels, aquaculturists can

322 take proactive measures to maintain a healthy and sustainable aquatic environment for
323 cultured organisms. Although this sensor has not yet reached the commercial level, this study
324 demonstrates the potential of the developed photonic sensor to accurately assess turbidity
325 levels above 3.5 NTU or even slightly lower and can successfully capture turbidity changes in
326 its current form. However, owing to its robust structure, practical usage, ease of integration,
327 extensibility, and low cost, the sensor is suitable for real-time sensing of turbidity changes in
328 indoor and outdoor aquaculture tanks, recirculating aquaculture systems, marine cage sites,
329 and environmental monitoring in both marine and freshwater environments.

330 **ACKNOWLEDGMENT**

331 The study documented in this paper was supported by the EU's Horizon 2020 ERANET –
332 ERA LEARN Cofound Action Photonic-based Sensing Joint Call Project (grant no. PS-
333 2016_02), and the Scientific and Technological Research Council of Türkiye (TÜBİTAK)
334 under the Grant Number 117F236. The authors thank to EU and TUBITAK for their support.
335 The authors declare no financial or commercial conflicts of interest.

336 **DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT**

337 Data supporting the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon
338 reasonable request.

339 **REFERENCES**

340
341 Baniya, H. B., Guragain, R. P., Panta, G. P., Dhungana, S., Chhetri, G. K., Joshi, U., ... &
342 Subedi, D. P. (2021). Experimental studies on physicochemical parameters of water
343 samples before and after treatment with a cold atmospheric plasma jet and its optical
344 characterization. *Journal of Chemistry*, 2021, 1-12.

345 <https://doi.org/10.1155/2021/6638939>

346 Bögner, M., Schwenke, C., Gürtzgen, T., Bögner, D., & Slater, M. J. (2018). Effect of

347 ambient light intensity on growth performance and diurnal stress response of juvenile
348 starry flounder (*platichthys stellatus*) in recirculating aquaculture systems (ras).
349 *Aquacultural Engineering*, 83, 20-26. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aquaeng.2018.08.001>

350 Bright, C., Mager, S., & Horton, S. (2018). Predicting suspended sediment concentration from
351 nephelometric turbidity in organic-rich waters. *River Research and Applications*,
352 34(7), 640-648. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rra.3305>

353 Dong, G., Dong, S., Wang, F., & Tian, X. (2010). Effects of light intensity on daily activity
354 rhythm of juvenile sea cucumber, *apostichopus japonicus* (selenka). *Aquaculture*
355 *Research*, 41(11), 1640-1647. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2109.2010.02534.x>

356 Gullian, M., Espinosa-Faller, F. J., Núñez, A. R., & López-Barahona, N. (2011). Effect of
357 turbidity on the ultraviolet disinfection performance in recirculating aquaculture
358 systems with low water exchange. *Aquaculture Research*, 43(4), 595-606.
359 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2109.2011.02866.x>

360 Karakatsouli, N., Papoutsoglou, S. E., Pizzonia, G., Tsatsos, G., Tsopelakos, A., Chadio, S.,
361 ... & Papadopoulou-Daifoti, Z. (2007). Effects of light spectrum on growth and
362 physiological status of gilthead seabream *Sparus aurata* and rainbow trout
363 *Oncorhynchus mykiss* reared under recirculating system conditions. *Aquacultural*
364 *Engineering*, 36(3), 302-309. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aquaeng.2007.01.005>

365 Kathyayani, S. A., Muralidhar, M., Kumar, T. S., & Alavandi, S. (2019). Stress quantification
366 in *Penaeus vannamei* exposed to varying levels of turbidity. *Journal of Coastal*
367 *Research*, 86(sp1), 177. <https://doi.org/10.2112/si86-027.1>

368 Kitchener, B., Wainwright, J., & Parsons, A. J. (2017). A review of the principles of turbidity
369 measurement. *Progress in Physical Geography: Earth and Environment*, 41(5), 620-
370 642. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0309133317726540>

371 Lambrou, T. P., Anastasiou, C. C., & Panayiotou, C. G. (2010). A nephelometric turbidity
372 system for monitoring residential drinking water quality. Lecture Notes of the
373 Institute for Computer Sciences, Social Informatics and Telecommunications
374 Engineering, 43-55. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-11870-8_4

375 Lin, X., Tan, A., Deng, Y., Liu, W., Zhao, F., & Huang, Z. (2023). High occurrence of
376 antibiotic resistance genes in intensive aquaculture of hybrid snakehead fish.
377 *Frontiers in Marine Science*, 9, 1088176.

378 Lopez-Betancur, D., Moreno, I., Guerrero-Mendez, C., Saucedo-Anaya, T., González, E.,
379 Bautista-Capetillo, C., & González-Trinidad, J. (2022). Convolutional neural network
380 for measurement of suspended solids and turbidity. *Applied Sciences*, 12(12), 6079.
381 <https://doi.org/10.3390/app12126079>

382 Matos, T., Pinto, V. C., Sousa, P. J., Martins, M. S., Fernández, E. M., Henriques, R. F., ... &
383 Gonçalves, L. M. (2023). Design and in situ validation of low-cost and easy to apply
384 anti-biofouling techniques for oceanographic continuous monitoring with optical
385 instruments. *Sensors*, 23(2), 605. <https://doi.org/10.3390/s23020605>

386 Omar, A. F. B., & MatJafri, M. Z. B. (2009). Turbidimeter design and analysis: a review on
387 optical fiber sensors for the measurement of water turbidity. *Sensors*, 9(10), 8311-
388 8335. <https://doi.org/10.3390/s91008311>

389 Parra, L., Sendra, S., García, L., & Lloret, J. (2018). Design and deployment of low-cost
390 sensors for monitoring the water quality and fish behavior in aquaculture tanks
391 during the feeding process. *Sensors*, 18(3), 750. <https://doi.org/10.3390/s18030750>

392 Postolache, O., Girão, P. S., Pereira, M., & Ramos, H. G. An ir turbidity sensor: design and
393 application [virtual instrument]. IMTC/2002. Proceedings of the 19th IEEE
394 Instrumentation and Measurement Technology Conference (IEEE Cat.
395 No.00CH37276). <https://doi.org/10.1109/imtc.2002.1006899>

396 Putra, B. T. W., Rocelline, L. A., & Syahputra, W. N. H. (2022). Embedded system in
397 handheld water turbidity meter for smallholders. *Microprocessors and Microsystems*,
398 93, 104603. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.micpro.2022.104603>

399 Souza, C. D. F., Pereira, W., Garcia, L. D. O., Santos, F. C. D., & Baldisserotto, B. (2016).
400 Freshwater parameters in the state of Rio Grande do Sul, southern Brazil, and their
401 influence on fish distribution and aquaculture. *Neotropical Ichthyology*, 14(03),
402 e150163.

403 Sun, J., Hamel, J., Stuckless, B., Small, T. J., & Mercier, A. (2020). Effect of light,
404 phytoplankton, substrate types and colour on locomotion, feeding behaviour and
405 microhabitat selection in the sea cucumber *Cucumaria frondosa*. *Aquaculture*, 526,
406 735369. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aquaculture.2020.735369>

407 Tandler, A. and Helps, S. (1985). The effects of photoperiod and water exchange rate on
408 growth and survival of gilthead sea bream (*Sparus aurata*, linnaeus; sparidae) from
409 hatching to metamorphosis in mass rearing systems. *Aquaculture*, 48(1), 71-82.
410 [https://doi.org/10.1016/0044-8486\(85\)90053-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0044-8486(85)90053-5)

411 Viegas, V., Pereira, J., Girão, P. S., Postolache, O., & Salgado, R. (2018). IoT applied to
412 environmental monitoring in oysters' farms. 2018 International Symposium in
413 Sensing and Instrumentation in IoT Era (ISSI).
414 <https://doi.org/10.1109/issi.2018.8538136>

415 Wang, R., Zhang, Y., Xia, W., Xiao, Q., Wei, X., Guo, C., ... & Chen, Y. (2018a). Effects of
416 aquaculture on lakes in the central Yangtze river basin, China, I. water quality. *North*
417 *American Journal of Aquaculture*, 80(3), 322-333. <https://doi.org/10.1002/naaq.10038>

418 Wang, Y., Rajib, S. S. M., Collins, C., & Grieve, B. (2018b). Low-cost turbidity sensor for
419 low-power wireless monitoring of fresh-water courses. *IEEE Sensors*
420 *Journal*, 18(11), 4689-4696. <https://doi.org/10.1109/jsen.2018.2826778>

- 421 Xie, S., Hamid, N., Zhang, T., Zhang, Z., & Peng, L. (2024). Unraveling the Nexus:
422 Microplastics, Antibiotics, and ARGs interactions, threats and control in
423 Aquaculture-A Review. *Journal of hazardous materials*, 134324.
- 424 Yang, P. Y., Liao, Y. C., & Chou, F. I. (2023). Artificial Intelligence in Internet of Things
425 System for Predicting Water Quality in Aquaculture Fishponds. *Computer Systems
426 Science & Engineering*, 46(3). <https://doi.org/10.32604/csse.2023.036810>
- 427 Zhang, Y., Yao, X., Wu, Q., Huang, Y., Zhou, Z., Yang, J., ... & Liu, X. (2021). Turbidity
428 prediction of lake-type raw water using random forest model based on
429 meteorological data: a case study of Tai Lake, China. *Journal of Environmental
430 Management*, 290, 112657. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2021.112657>
- 431 Zhu, Y., Cao, P., Liu, S., Zheng, Y., & Huang, C. (2020). Development of a new method for
432 turbidity measurement using two NIR digital cameras. *ACS Omega*, 5(10), 5421-
433 5428. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acsomega.9b04488>

434

435

436

437

438

439

440

441

442

443

444

445

446

447

448

449

450

451

452

453

454

455

456

457

458

459 **Figure Captions**

460 **FIGURE 1.** The photonic sensor used in detecting turbidity changes in seawater. (a) The top
461 unit and its main and auxiliary parts, (b) schematic sensor probe

462 **FIGURE 2.** Polynomial fitting calibration curve (Polynomial IR) prepared by comparing the
463 number of photons detected by the photonic sensor with the nephelometric turbidity unit
464 (NTU) values measured using a handheld turbidimeter in samples with different turbidities
465 to test the sensitivity of the photonic sensor probe's infrared channel (IR).

466 **FIGURE 3.** Photon counts detected by the infrared (IR) and ambient light (C) channels of
467 the photonic sensor at 15-minute intervals for 52 hours in the Gilthead Seabream (a), Sea
468 Cucumber (b) and the control (c) tanks. Zero photons for ambient light channel corresponds
469 to total darkness in the tanks.

470 **FIGURE 4.** Nephelometric turbidity unit (NTU) values measured by a handheld turbidimeter at
471 random times and corresponding photon counts measured by the infrared channel (IR) of the
472 photonic sensor in Gilthead Seabream tank during the trial period. Dotted lines show the linear trends
473 of both measurements.

474 **FIGURE 5.** Box-plot showing the distribution of average NTU values measured by the
475 turbidimeter in 21 random measurements from Sea Cucumber (SC), Gilthead Seabream
476 (GS), and control (CN) tanks. The box extends from the lower to upper quartile values of the
477 data, with the line inside the box representing the median. The whiskers extend to 1.5 times
478 the interquartile range from the edges of the box, and data points beyond this range are
479 considered outliers (represented as individual points).

480