Control, Buffering and Management Responsibility

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

***Abstract*—Hydroponics is often presented as a cultivation method that increases control over the plant root zone by replacing soil with a deliberately managed nutrient solution and, in some systems, an inert or organic substrate. That promise of control is real, but it also changes the grower's responsibilities. In soil, nutrient availability, water retention, cation exchange and microbial activity are partly mediated by the properties of the soil environment itself, which can provide forms of passive buffering against short-term variation [1], [2]. In hydroponic and broader soilless systems, those same functions are reconfigured through designed media, nutrient recipes, irrigation strategies and environmental regulation [3], [4], [5]. This paper develops an evidence-based explanation of the trade-off between control and buffering, with particular attention to the distinction between controllability and ease of operation. The review shows that hydroponics can make nutrient delivery and water use more direct and adjustable, and can support strong productivity under suitable management [6], [7], [8]. However, the evidence also indicates that direct management does not eliminate complexity. Rather, it relocates complexity from the intrinsic properties of soil to the grower, the system design and the ongoing management regime [8], [9], [10]. The practical implication is that greater direct control also creates greater direct responsibility, especially where buffering capacity is reduced or must be engineered deliberately.**

I. Introduction

The central question in this paper is what changes when a grower replaces a complex soil environment with a more directly managed hydroponic root zone. Soil is not simply a physical anchor for roots. It is a chemically and biologically active environment in which soil organic matter contributes to cation exchange capacity, water retention and microbial diversity, all of which can influence nutrient bioavailability and plant uptake [1]. These properties matter because they can moderate fluctuations in the root environment rather than exposing plants immediately to every variation in water supply or nutrient addition. For that reason, any comparison between soil and hydroponics must begin by recognising that soil can provide forms of passive buffering, even though that buffering is neither uniform nor automatically optimal across all soils or crops [1].

A second part of the problem concerns how plants respond when nutrient conditions are managed more directly. Experimental evidence shows that nutrient availability can raise photosynthetic capacity while lowering the carbon costs of nitrogen acquisition, and that these responses were observed across sand and natural soils in a controlled comparison [11]. This matters for hydroponic thinking because it confirms that root-zone nutrient conditions are not peripheral variables. They directly shape plant performance. However, improved controllability of nutrient availability should not be confused with simplicity. If the grower is now the agent establishing nutrient conditions more explicitly, then responsibility for maintaining suitable conditions also becomes more explicit. The issue is therefore not whether control matters, but how control changes the locus of management responsibility [11].

A further reason for careful analysis is that controlled plant systems often reveal species-specific responses that cannot be reduced to a single universal rule. Evidence from in vitro mineral nutrition shows that tissue accumulation, nutrient use efficiency and chemical speciation can differ substantially among plant species even under shared medium conditions [9]. That finding warns against treating hydroponics as an inherently easy or self-regulating technology. It may offer direct adjustment of supply, but plant demand, uptake patterns and chemical behaviour remain dynamic. Accordingly, this paper argues that hydroponics increases direct controllability of important root-zone inputs while reducing some of the passive reserve capacity associated with soil, and it develops that argument through sections on background, mechanisms, evidence synthesis, and practical implications [9].

II. Background and Scope

The literature on soilless systems shows that replacing soil does not remove the need for root-zone mediation. It changes the way that mediation is achieved. In bioponic work, for example, multiple methods have been developed to produce organic nutrient solutions, including tea-type extraction, aerobic microbial degradation, anaerobic digestion and combined anaerobic-aerobic degradation [12]. The relevance of this evidence is not confined to organic systems. It shows more broadly that once soil is removed, the production, conditioning and stability of the nutrient solution become deliberate technical tasks. In a buffered soil environment, many interacting processes occur within the soil matrix itself. In a deliberately managed soil-free environment, those processes are more exposed to design choices, preparation methods and operational discipline [12].

Review evidence on soilless cultivation frames the field as an effort to create favourable growth conditions through artificial regulation of the root environment, including nutrient supply, gas exchange and microbial communities [3]. That framing is helpful for this paper because it identifies the true object of comparison. Hydroponics is not simply soil farming without dirt. It is an engineered approach to root-zone management. This difference clarifies the scope of the present paper. The aim is not to argue that hydroponics is universally

superior or inferior to soil, nor to generalise across every crop and every production context. Instead, the aim is to explain the management trade-off involved when controllability is increased by transferring more root-zone functions from a naturally complex medium to an intentionally regulated system [3].

The soil side of that comparison must also be stated carefully. Soil buffering should not be romanticised as if all soils are stable, fertile and well aerated by default. Research on pasture soils demonstrates that root-zone performance depends on combined soil-water and diffusion-controlled aeration behaviour across soil profiles [2]. In other words, soil itself presents management challenges, and its buffering functions operate within physical limits. This paper therefore uses soil as a comparatively buffered reference environment, not as an ideal benchmark. The explanatory gap addressed here is narrower and more precise: existing literature describes hydroponic control and soilless advantages, but the reader still needs a clear account of how greater direct control differs from ease of operation, and why reduced passive buffering shifts more responsibility onto the grower [2], [3].

III. Core Concepts and Mechanisms

A useful starting point is the meaning of a plant nutrient within managed systems. Brown, Zhao and Dobermann argue that a mineral plant nutrient should be understood in relation to what is essential or beneficial for plant growth, development or harvested-product quality in a given species and environment [13]. This definition matters because it makes nutrient management explicitly contextual rather than merely formulaic. In soil, the availability of nutrients is shaped by interactions among minerals, organic matter, water and biology. In hydroponics, those contextual interactions are not eliminated, but many are recast into the design of the nutrient solution and the choice of system conditions. The mechanism of control therefore depends on matching supplied ions and conditions to plant needs with sufficient precision, rather than relying on a broad soil reservoir to mediate mismatches [13].

Hydroponics, as described in the review literature, is a soilless horticultural method in which plants grow on natural or manufactured substrates and obtain nutrients from a prepared solution [4]. This definition captures the source of increased controllability. When nutrient delivery occurs through a prepared solution, concentrations, timing and recirculation can in principle be adjusted more directly than in conventional soil cultivation. Yet the same mechanism also explains the rise in management responsibility. Because the nutrient pathway is more explicit, departures from suitable composition or delivery are also less likely to be masked by a large heterogeneous soil environment. What soil might buffer through adsorption, storage or biological turnover must in hydroponics be supplied, monitored or designed into the system more intentionally [4], [5].

The language of resilience helps clarify why controllability and ease of operation are not identical. One review defines climate resilience in agriculture as the capacity of food systems to anticipate, absorb, adapt to and recover from shocks while maintaining productivity, resource efficiency and ecological balance [14]. Applied to the present topic, a system can be highly controllable while still requiring high management competence to remain resilient. A hydroponic setup may permit fast correction of nutrient concentrations, water delivery or environmental conditions, but that does not mean it is easy to operate under disturbance. If resilience depends on the ability to absorb and recover from shocks, then reduced passive buffering implies a stronger need for active monitoring, sound design margins and competent intervention. The evidence therefore supports a distinction between control as a capability and ease as an operational experience, which may be much less forgiving [14].

IV. Evidence Synthesis

Evidence across the soilless literature consistently shows that the defining characteristic of these systems is not merely the absence of soil, but the substitution of designed growing conditions for naturally variable soil conditions. Soilless plant culture has been defined as plant growth without soil as the rooting medium, usually with roots held in a porous substrate or other growing medium [5]. This definition supports the paper's central argument because it draws attention to the intermediate layer between roots and management decisions. Even where hydroponics is discussed as direct feeding through water, many systems still depend on media, container structure and irrigation routines. Buffering is therefore not abolished, but redistributed. The critical difference is that buffering capacity is less inherited from a complex soil matrix and more dependent on selected materials and operating settings [4], [5].

Substrate evidence strengthens this point by showing that material choice can alter the chemical and physical conditions experienced by roots. In lettuce cultivation, dried sphagnum moss, wood chips and hemp fibres were compared with rockwool as substrates in a soilless greenhouse system [10]. The significance of that comparison is that even within soilless cultivation, the root environment is not uniform. Different substrates can change water retention, aeration and chemical behaviour over time, thereby affecting plant phenotype and management demands [10]. This observation is directly relevant to the theme of buffering. If a system uses a substrate with dynamic properties, then some buffering may be reintroduced, but it becomes contingent on substrate behaviour rather than on the broader complexity of soil. The grower is therefore responsible not only for nutrient solution composition, but also for how the chosen medium modifies that composition in practice [10].

The broader reviews place these design choices in a practical context. Soilless cultivation is presented as useful where soil degradation is severe, water is limited and food security concerns are pressing [15]. Such findings help explain why greater direct control is attractive. In constrained environments, the ability to manage water and nutrients more precisely can be a major advantage. However, this does not overturn the main trade-off. The same evidence base indicates that soilless

systems achieve their promise through intentional management rather than through the spontaneous corrective properties of a healthy soil ecosystem [3], [15]. Thus, comparative claims should be stated carefully: hydroponics can improve control over key inputs and can function well where soil conditions are poor, but its performance depends on a management framework that replaces, rather than escapes, the complexity of root-zone regulation [5], [15].

V. Practical Implications and Limitations

At the practical level, hydroponics is commonly described as a system in which plants receive a nutrient-rich water solution directly, enabling control of nutrient levels, efficient water use and cultivation where soil quality is poor [6]. This evidence clearly supports the claim that direct management can improve control. The grower can influence nutrient concentration, delivery timing and water availability more explicitly than in many soil-based settings. Yet the same directness increases sensitivity to poor management because the system depends more immediately on the adequacy of those inputs. The evidence base used here supports that general interpretation, but it does not provide a direct comparative failure-rate study. Accordingly, the strongest justified conclusion is that hydroponics creates conditions for finer control while making satisfactory performance more dependent on competent and continuous management [6], [8].

Reported performance advantages in soilless systems further illustrate why controllability should not be mistaken for ease. One review reports leafy-vegetable yields often 200 to 300 percent higher than open-field cultivation, together with 80 to 95 percent reductions in water consumption [7]. These are important findings, but they should be read as conditional rather than automatic. High yield and efficient water use do not arise simply because soil has been removed. They arise because water, nutrients and the growth environment are actively managed in a more targeted way. This interpretation aligns with the central thesis of management responsibility. Performance gains point to what deliberate control can achieve, but they do not show that the underlying operational burden is low. Indeed, strong performance may depend on maintaining conditions within relatively tight tolerances [7].

The limitations become clearer when energy and technical demand are considered. Another review states that hydroponics can produce significantly higher yields than conventional agriculture, although it is associated with higher energy consumption [8]. This is an important corrective to simplistic claims about efficiency. A system may be efficient in water or nutrient delivery yet still impose other costs and dependencies. The evidence in this package also notes that human demand already exceeds planetary biocapacity, which adds urgency to resource-conscious agriculture more broadly [16]. Even so, that macro-level sustainability pressure does not justify overclaiming for hydroponics. The practical lesson is narrower: hydroponics can be powerful where direct control is valuable, but its adoption should be evaluated in relation to management skill, system design, energy implications and the limited extent to which buffering is retained or engineered within the root zone [8], [16].

VI. Conclusion

The evidence reviewed in this paper supports a qualified but clear answer to the reader question. When a grower replaces a complex soil environment with a more directly managed hydroponic root zone, important inputs become more explicit, more adjustable and often more measurable, especially with respect to nutrient and water delivery [3], [4], [6]. At the same time, some of the passive buffering and reserve capacity associated with soil organic matter, profile structure and heterogeneous root-zone processes are reduced, relocated or made dependent on chosen substrates and operating rules [1], [2], [5], [10]. The main consequence is that hydroponics increases controllability without necessarily making cultivation easier.

The central management trade-off can therefore be stated plainly: greater direct control also creates greater direct responsibility. The evidence supports careful comparative claims about improved precision and strong performance potential, including higher yields and lower water use in some reported contexts, but it also supports caution about assuming simplicity, resilience or universal superiority [7], [8]. The highest-value next work would be more direct comparative evidence on how buffering, operator skill and system design interact under disturbance or management error, because that would sharpen the distinction between a controllable system and a forgiving one. Until then, the most defensible conclusion is that hydroponics works not by removing complexity, but by shifting more of it into deliberate management [8], [9], [14].

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] N. Joshi, R. Kaur, and T. Nawaz, "The soil-root nexus: how soil health shapes plant nutrient uptake and food nutritional security," *Plant and Soil*, 2026.

[2] B. Pragg, M. M. T. Lakshani, T. K. K. C. Deepagoda, K. Cameron, H. Di, T. J. Clough, S. Carrick, B. Elberling, and K. Smits, "Identification of plant soil water and soil aeration corequisites: A management tool," *Soil Science Soc of Amer J*, 2024.

[3] A. Tuxun, Y. Xiang, Y. Shao, J. E. Son, M. Yamada, S. Yamada, K. Tagawa, B. Baiyin, and Q. Yang, "Soilless cultivation: Precise nutrient provision and growth environment regulation under different substrates," *Plants*, 2025.

[4] R. S. Velazquez-Gonzalez, A. L. Garcia-Garcia, J. O. Barceinas-Sanchez, E. Ventura-Zapata, and J. C. Sosa-Savedra, "A review on hydroponics and the technologies associated for medium- and small-scale operations," *Agriculture*, 2022.

[5] G. Barrett, P. Alexander, J. Robinson, and N. Bragg, "Achieving environmentally sustainable growing media for soilless plant cultivation systems - a review," *Scientia Horticulturae*, 2016.

[6] S. Rajendran, T. Domalachenpa, H. Arora, P. Li, A. Sharma, and G. Rajauria, "Hydroponics: Exploring innovative sustainable technologies and applications across crop production, with emphasis on potato mini-tuber cultivation," *Heliyon*, 2024. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e26823

[7] M. Elakrouch, M. Mohaddab, A. Rachid, and M. H. Jijakli, "Soilless agriculture at a crossroads: Strengths, challenges, and prospects of hydroponics, aquaponics, and bioponics in relation to precision farming," *Sustainability*, 2026.

[8] E. Fathidarehnijeh, M. Nadeem, M. Cheema, R. Thomas, M. Krishnapillai, and L. Galagedara, "Current perspective on nutrient solution management strategies to improve the nutrient and water use efficiency in hydroponic systems," *Canadian Journal of Plant Science*, 2024.

[9] A. Holst, M. Viñas, J. C. Méndez, P. Solórzano-Cascante, E. Guevara, and V. M. Jiménez, "Nutrients uptake and chemical speciation reveal species-specific mineral nutrition patterns in four plant species in vitro," *Plant Cell, Tissue and Organ Culture (PCTOC)*, 2026. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1007/s11240-025-03336-4

[10] A. Nerlich and D. Dannehl, "Soilless cultivation: Dynamically changing chemical properties and physical conditions of organic substrates influence the plant phenotype of lettuce," *Frontiers in Plant Science*, 2021. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2020.601455

[11] J. A. Lankhorst, H. J. de Boer, D. C. Behling, P. L. Drake, E. A. Perkowski, and K. T. Rebel, "Nutrient availability increases photosynthetic capacity without altering the cost of resource use for photosynthesis," *AoB PLANTS*, 2025.

[12] I. Szekely and M. H. Jijakli, "Bioponics as a promising approach to sustainable agriculture: A review of the main methods for producing organic nutrient solution for hydroponics," *Hydroponics. Water*, 2022.

[13] P. H. Brown, F.-J. Zhao, and A. Dobermann, "What is a plant nutrient? changing definitions to advance science and innovation in plant nutrition," *Plant and Soil*, 2022.

[14] I. A. Lakhiar, H. Yan, T. N. Syed, C. Zhang, S. A. Shaikh, M. Rakibuzzaman, and R. B. Vistro, "Soilless agricultural systems: Opportunities, challenges, and applications for enhancing horticultural resilience to climate change and urbanization," *Horticulturae*, 2025.

[15] P. Sambo, C. Nicoletto, A. Giro, Y. Pii, F. Valentinuzzi, T. Mimmo, P. Lugli, G. Orzes, F. Mazzetto, S. Astolfi, R. Terzano, and S. Cesco, "Hydroponic solutions for soilless production systems: Issues and opportunities in a smart agriculture perspective," *Frontiers in Plant Science*, 2019. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2019.00923

[16] A. Fussy and J. Papenbrock, "An overview of soil and soilless cultivation techniques-chances, challenges and the neglected question of sustainability," *Plants*, 2022.