What Hydroponics Does and Does Not Promise

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

***Abstract*—Hydroponics is often presented as proof that soil is unnecessary, that plant production can be simplified into a purely technical process, or that soilless systems are inherently more sustainable and productive than conventional agriculture. The evidence base supports a narrower and more useful conclusion. Plants require access to water, mineral nutrients, oxygen in the root zone, and suitable environmental conditions, and hydroponic systems can meet these requirements by regulating the root environment directly rather than relying on soil processes. Evidence from plant nutrition, soilless cultivation, and controlled root zone management shows that hydroponics is a scientifically valid production method, especially where soil quality, water scarcity, or spatial constraints limit open-field cultivation. However, the same evidence also shows that benefits are conditional. Performance depends on crop type, substrate, nutrient formulation, aeration, monitoring, and wider system boundaries, including energy and material inputs. Reported gains in yield and water efficiency are therefore real but not universal, and claims of automatic sustainability, ease, or superiority require qualification. This paper synthesises authoritative sources to distinguish robust conclusions from context-dependent claims. It argues that hydroponics should be understood as a controllable soilless production strategy that can be highly effective, but only when careful management and appropriate comparison boundaries are made explicit.**

I. Introduction

Discussions of hydroponics often begin from a false contrast between productive soil and an apparently artificial soilless alternative. In practice, the comparison is more subtle. Productive soil works because it helps regulate nutrient exchange, water availability, and biologically active root environments. Soil organic matter is widely treated as a proxy for soil health because it improves cation exchange capacity, water retention, and microbial diversity, all of which influence nutrient bioavailability and plant uptake [1]. This matters for interpreting hydroponics: the promise of hydroponics is not that plants no longer need the functions associated with healthy soil, but that some of those functions can be replaced or managed through an engineered root zone. The key implication is that hydroponics can work scientifically, yet only by reproducing essential plant requirements in another form, not by bypassing them.

Evidence from plant physiological research reinforces this point by showing that plant performance depends strongly on nutrient availability rather than on soil as a medium in itself. Experimental work comparing sand and natural soils found that increasing nutrient availability raised photosynthetic capacity and reduced carbon costs of nitrogen acquisition, even though some measures of leaf resource use remained stable across treatments [2]. The foundational conclusion is therefore robust: when roots can access the required resources under suitable physical conditions, plants can sustain productive growth. What hydroponics does not promise is a universal productivity advantage detached from management. If nutrient concentration, oxygenation, or monitoring are inadequate, the absence of soil does not protect the crop from stress. This paper therefore examines which broad claims about hydroponics are scientifically justified, and which require explicit qualification.

The same caution appears in evidence on highly controlled plant systems. Research on four plant species grown in vitro showed species-specific patterns of mineral accumulation, net nutrient utilisation, and chemical speciation, even when grown on a standardised medium with apparently high initial bioavailability for most nutrients [3]. This demonstrates that successful nutrient delivery is not simply a matter of adding minerals to water. Uptake depends on the interaction between species, nutrient form, and root level conditions. For hydroponics, the implication is decisive: if the technology works, it does so because plant requirements are being met with precision, not because plant biology has become simpler. The paper therefore argues that hydroponics supports strong conclusions about the validity of soilless cultivation, but much weaker conclusions about effortlessness, universal superiority, and automatic sustainability.

II. Background and Scope

The literature also shows why hydroponics should not be treated as a single uniform practice. Even closely related soilless approaches differ substantially in nutrient sourcing and system behaviour. A review of bioponics identifies four broad methods for producing organic nutrient solutions: tea-type extraction, aerobic microbial degradation, anaerobic digestion, and combined anaerobic-aerobic degradation [4]. This diversity matters because public claims about what hydroponics promises often assume that all systems share the same environmental profile, technical demands, or nutrient dynamics. They do not. A mineral fertiliser based recirculating system, an organically derived nutrient solution, and a hybrid substrate system may all be described as hydroponic or soilless, yet they differ in controllability, consistency, and likely trade-offs. Any high-level judgement about superiority or sustainability must therefore specify which class of system is under discussion.

A broader review of soilless cultivation helps define the legitimate scope of the topic. Soilless systems are described as production methods that create favourable crop growth conditions by regulating the root environment, including nutrient supply, gas exchange, and microbial communities [5].

This framing is valuable because it shifts the question away from whether hydroponics is natural or artificial, and towards whether it can maintain the conditions required for plant growth. The promise that follows is clear but limited. Hydroponics can offer control over variables that are often heterogeneous in field soils, and that control may support yield, uniformity, or resource efficiency in some settings. The limitation is equally clear: because performance depends on deliberate regulation, hydroponics is not inherently simple. It is a management intensive approach in which success depends on how well the regulated environment matches crop needs.

Evidence on root zone aeration further clarifies why a misconception-based treatment is needed. Research on pasture soil profiles examined the combined behaviour of soil water status and diffusion-controlled aeration across root zones extending to substantial depth [6]. Although this study is soil based, its relevance to hydroponics is direct. It highlights that roots require both water and oxygen, and that productive root environments are defined by physical balance rather than by the mere presence of moisture. Hydroponic systems therefore do not promise immunity from root stress. Poorly designed or poorly managed systems can restrict oxygen supply just as severely as waterlogged soils can. The remaining gap in public understanding is not whether hydroponics can grow plants, but how to distinguish the scientifically valid claim that hydroponics can control the root environment from unsupported claims that such control is automatic, universal, or easy.

III. Core Concepts and Mechanisms

At the most basic level, hydroponics works because plants require access to suitable mineral nutrients, not necessarily contact with soil particles. A modern definition of plant nutrients includes elements that are essential or beneficial for growth, development, or harvested product quality in a given species and environment [7]. This definition is important because it makes the hydroponic claim more precise. Hydroponics does not promise a magical shortcut to plant growth. It promises a means of supplying the required chemical inputs in a form and setting that can be measured and adjusted. The limitation is that nutrient adequacy is species and environment dependent. A nutrient regime that is sufficient for one crop, developmental stage, or production objective may be inadequate for another. Precision is therefore a requirement, not an optional enhancement.

The physical definition of hydroponics is equally relevant to what it does and does not promise. Hydroponics is commonly described as a soilless horticultural method in which plants grow on natural or manufactured substrates, or directly in water-based systems, while roots obtain nutrients from a prepared solution [8]. This means that hydroponics is better understood as a family of root-zone management strategies than as a single device or recipe. Its scientifically supported promise is that nutrient delivery, water supply, and some aspects of the root environment can be decoupled from local soil constraints. What it does not promise is independence from materials, infrastructure, or operator judgement. The prepared solution must be formulated, the substrate or circulation system must function physically, and the crop must still be matched to climate and production goals. The mechanism of success is controllability, which also creates technical dependence.

Claims that hydroponics will automatically improve agricultural resilience also require careful qualification. Climate resilience in agriculture has been defined as the capacity of food systems to anticipate, absorb, adapt to, and recover from shocks while maintaining productivity, resource efficiency, and ecological balance [9]. Hydroponics may contribute to that capacity when it allows production in degraded soils, non-arable spaces, or tightly managed environments. However, resilience is a systems property rather than a trait of any single technology. A hydroponic installation that depends on uninterrupted energy, specialised inputs, or high technical oversight may reduce one vulnerability while increasing another. The robust conclusion is that hydroponics can be part of resilience strategies in some contexts. The unsupported conclusion is that hydroponics is inherently resilient in every socioeconomic or environmental setting.

IV. Evidence Synthesis

Across the literature, the strongest common finding is definitional rather than promotional. Soilless plant culture is generally understood as plant production without soil as the rooting medium, typically using a porous substrate or another engineered support structure [10]. This definition supports a foundational conclusion: hydroponics is a legitimate way to meet plant requirements outside soil. It also helps identify the first misconception. If hydroponics works, that does not prove that soil is unimportant in agriculture generally. Rather, it shows that the critical functions associated with root support, nutrient availability, water management, and aeration can sometimes be delivered by alternative means. The implication is that hydroponics validates plant physiological principles, not a simplistic claim that all soil based agriculture is obsolete or scientifically inferior.

Evidence on substrates shows why high-level claims about performance must be bounded by design details. Comparative work on lettuce grown in greenhouse soilless cultivation evaluated dried sphagnum moss, wood chips, and hemp fibres against rockwool [11]. The relevance of this study is not simply that different substrates can be used, but that substrate properties change chemical and physical root conditions and thereby influence plant phenotype. This qualifies the common promise that hydroponics is a standardised high-performance system. Even within soilless production, the rooting medium matters because it shapes water holding behaviour, aeration, and nutrient dynamics. A hydroponic system may therefore outperform another not because hydroponics is universally superior, but because one specific configuration better matches the crop. General claims about simplicity or guaranteed results are inconsistent with this evidence.

The broader review literature gives a balanced account of where hydroponics is genuinely promising. Soilless cultivation is framed as a useful production option in areas facing

severe soil degradation and limited water availability, and as a potentially environment-friendly approach connected to food security goals [12]. This supports a strong but conditional conclusion. Hydroponics can expand productive options where soil quality is poor or where local water management must be highly efficient. Yet the same framing warns against overclaiming. Terms such as useful, potential, and option indicate contextual value rather than universal replacement. The evidence therefore supports hydroponics as a strategic complement to other production methods, especially in constrained environments, while leaving open critical questions about material inputs, energy use, and long-term sustainability that depend on specific system boundaries and management practices.

V. Practical Implications and Limitations

At a practical level, hydroponics does promise a high degree of control over nutrient delivery, and that control can support production where soils are poor or unavailable. Reviews describe hydroponics as a soilless cultivation system in which plants receive nutrient-rich water directly, enabling management of nutrient levels, water use, and cultivation in locations with poor soil quality [13]. This is one of the most defensible high-level claims about hydroponics. However, the promise is conditional on competent operation. Direct nutrient delivery does not remove the need to monitor composition, concentration, recirculation, and root zone condition. It also does not establish that every crop or every location will benefit equally. The correct conclusion is that hydroponics can shift production constraints, not eliminate them.

Reported gains in water efficiency and yield are among the most attractive claims in the literature, but they are also among the most easily overstated. One review reports that soilless systems can produce leafy vegetable yields often 200 to 300% higher than open-field cultivation while reducing water consumption by 80 to 95% [14]. These figures indicate that hydroponics can achieve major resource and productivity advantages under some comparison conditions. Yet the comparison itself matters. The evidence refers to particular crops, especially leafy vegetables, and to particular benchmark systems, usually open-field production rather than every protected or irrigated alternative. Such claims therefore support the promise of high performance in appropriate contexts, but not a blanket statement that hydroponics is always more productive or always more water efficient than all soil based systems.

The same pattern appears in assessments of nutrient and water use efficiency. Reviews note that hydroponics can produce significantly higher yields than conventional agriculture, but also emphasise higher energy consumption and the need for more advanced nutrient solution management [15]. This is central to what hydroponics does not promise. It does not promise sustainability by default, because environmental performance depends on electricity demand, materials, infrastructure, and operational strategy as well as water and fertiliser use. More broadly, sustainability claims must be read against a context of ecological overshoot, with human demand reported at 1.56 times what Earth can regenerate [16]. In that context, hydroponics may be valuable, but only if system boundaries are evaluated carefully. The evidence supports qualified optimism, not technological salvation.

A final practical implication concerns labour and expertise. Because hydroponics replaces many soil mediated buffering functions with active management, it can make production more measurable while also making mistakes more immediate [5], [15]. Nutrient imbalance, inadequate aeration, unsuitable substrate behaviour, or poor system calibration may rapidly affect crop performance [6], [11]. This directly counters the misconception that hydroponics is inherently effortless. In some contexts it may reduce dependence on arable land or improve input efficiency, but it generally increases the importance of design discipline, monitoring, and technical knowledge. The robust conclusion is that hydroponics can be highly effective when carefully managed. The unsupported conclusion is that it is a simple plug-and-play solution whose advantages appear automatically once soil is removed.

VI. Conclusion

The evidence supports a clear overall judgement. Hydroponics is a scientifically valid way to meet plant requirements because productive growth depends on access to water, nutrients, oxygen, and appropriate root zone conditions, all of which can be regulated in soilless systems [7], [8]. This justifies strong claims that hydroponics can work, can be useful where soil is degraded or unavailable, and can deliver significant gains in selected contexts [12], [14]. At the same time, the literature does not support broad claims that hydroponics is inherently effortless, universally superior, or automatically sustainable. Performance depends on crop, substrate, climate, nutrient formulation, aeration, monitoring, energy demand, and the system boundary chosen for comparison [11], [15].

The most reasonable conclusion, therefore, is that hydroponics promises controllable soilless production, not unconditional agronomic advantage. Its value is greatest when the comparison is explicit and when claims are tied to particular crops, environments, and management regimes [5], [9]. The highest-value next work is not to repeat whether hydroponics works in principle, but to improve like-for-like evaluation of water, energy, substrate, and productivity trade-offs across clearly defined production settings. Until such boundaries are stated carefully, both advocacy and scepticism will remain less precise than the science allows.

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] 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.

[3] 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

[4] 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.

[5] 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.

[6] 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.

[7] 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.

[8] 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.

[9] 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.

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

[11] 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

[12] 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

[13] 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

[14] 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.

[15] 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.

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