# Plant growth stages and changing nutrient demand

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

***Abstract*—Plant nutrient demand is not biologically constant across the life of a crop. As plants move from establishment to vegetative expansion and then to reproductive development, biomass allocation, organ function, and metabolic priorities shift, altering the relative demands placed on roots, shoots, and the surrounding growing environment. This paper synthesises accepted evidence on why developmental stage changes the balance of growth, resource allocation, and nutrient demand in plants, with emphasis on soilless and controlled cultivation contexts. The evidence shows that allocation across organs changes through growth phases, that nutrient availability influences nitrogen biomass, photosynthetic capacity, and the carbon cost of acquisition, and that nutrient solution management often needs to respond to stage-dependent plant needs [1], [2], [3], [4], [5]. At the same time, the literature consistently warns that these patterns cannot be generalised into universal feeding rules because species, cultivar, environment, substrate, and production system modify both uptake and response [6], [7], [8], [9], [10]. The central implication is that developmental stage matters because it changes where assimilates and mineral resources are invested, but stage-based interpretation must remain biological and comparative rather than prescriptive. More reliable stage-aware nutrient management will require evidence that integrates growth phase, organ allocation, and crop-specific response under defined production conditions.**

## I. Introduction

Plants do not grow as uniform demand systems from germination to maturity. Development changes which organs are expanding, which tissues act as sources or sinks, and how carbon and minerals are partitioned across the whole plant. Analyses of biomass allocation show that biologically meaningful shifts occur across growth phases and under contrasting nutrient conditions, and that these shifts are better understood through time-resolved patterns than through static ratios alone [5]. This matters because nutrient demand is expressed through developing structure: a plant establishing roots, expanding leaves, or supporting reproductive tissues is investing in different functions. The implication is that nutrient management must be interpreted against developmental allocation, not against the false assumption of a constant whole-plant requirement [11].

Nutrient demand also changes because acquisition and use are coupled to growth rate and physiological capacity. Experimental evidence shows that greater nutrient availability can increase whole-plant nitrogen biomass, reduce the carbon cost of nitrogen acquisition, and raise photosynthetic capacity, indicating that uptake-related demand is linked to both nutrient status and the pace of growth [1]. A rapidly expanding canopy therefore does not simply need more nutrients because it is larger; it also changes how efficiently acquired nutrients support assimilation and further growth. The practical implication is that stage transitions alter both the amount of nutrient required and the biological return on nutrient acquisition, especially when plants move from establishment into vigorous vegetative expansion [12].

Any explanation of stage-dependent nutrient demand must also recognise that not all plants reorganise resources in the same way. Comparative evidence from four plant species grown under comparable conditions shows strong differences in nutrient accumulation, tissue allocation, and nutrient utilisation efficiency [6]. These results caution against translating broad developmental ideas into universal crop rules. The purpose of this paper is therefore not to prescribe feeding programmes, diagnostic thresholds, or crop-specific recipes. Instead, it explains why biological demands change from establishment through vegetative and reproductive growth, and why those changes should be interpreted as shifts in allocation logic that are real, but context-dependent [5], [6], [13].

## II. Background and Scope

Relevant literature often approaches changing plant demand indirectly, through environmental response rather than through a unified developmental theory. Reviews of artificial lighting in controlled environments show that plant responses are shaped by species, cultivar, and interacting conditions, so even when light alters growth form, biomass, or productivity, the resulting nutrient implications cannot be transferred cleanly between crops [7]. This is important background because developmental stage never operates alone. A plant at a given stage expresses that stage through the local environment, and the same nominal phase, such as vegetative growth, can therefore entail different uptake dynamics under different lighting and cultivation settings [14].

A similar limitation appears in literature on bioponic and alternative nutrient systems. Reviews describe clear differences among crop types, including contrasts between short-cycle leafy crops and ammonium-sensitive fruiting crops, and they show that agronomic performance varies with feedstock quality, crop sensitivity, and system design [15]. These findings are useful because they confirm that nutrient demand is not only a function of supply concentration. However, they do not directly resolve how demand changes within a plant across development. The gap is therefore not whether crops differ, that is well established, but how changing developmental priorities alter the balance of nutrient need inside a crop as growth proceeds [16].

Within soilless cultivation, the most direct support for the topic comes from reviews stating that nutrient solution success

depends on matching formula and concentration to plant needs across growth stages [2]. This literature recognises stage dependence as a practical reality, but often treats it operationally rather than mechanistically. The present paper addresses that explanatory gap. Its scope is restricted to the biological reason demands change, namely shifting allocation, growth rate, and organ function. It does not propose crop-specific feeding schedules, and it avoids diagnostic rules. Instead, it synthesises evidence on stage-related allocation change, changing uptake patterns, and the limits of generalising those patterns across species and cultivars [2], [17].

## III. Core Concepts and Mechanisms

The first core mechanism is that nutrient demand follows the developmental distribution of sinks. During establishment, plants invest heavily in structures that secure resource capture, especially roots and young shoots; during vegetative growth, demand is increasingly shaped by rapid leaf area expansion and the support of photosynthetic machinery; during reproductive development, assimilates and minerals are redirected toward flowers, fruits, or seeds. Reviews of soilless cultivation emphasise that nutrient-solution needs differ by crop species and cultivar and that responses to electrical conductivity, pH, and supplementation are crop-specific [2]. The implication is that stage-based demand must be interpreted through sink strength and organ priority, but any practical expression of that principle remains biologically contingent rather than universal [18].

The second mechanism is that development changes the functional role of tissues and therefore the relative demand for different nutrient environments. Hydroponic reviews explicitly state that nutrient-solution composition depends on crop type and plant developmental stage, with differing formulations associated with vegetative growth, root development, and fruit ripening [3]. This pattern implies that the managed root zone is responding to a moving target. When the plant is establishing or expanding its canopy, nutrient demand is linked to building new tissue and supporting active metabolism; when reproductive structures dominate, demand shifts toward sustaining those new sinks. The key implication is not that every stage has a fixed formula, but that developmental progression reorganises where nutrients are used and what kind of growth the plant is trying to sustain [19].

The third mechanism is interaction between developmental stage and environment. Reviews of soilless agricultural systems state that nutrient formulations must account for plant species, growth stage, and environmental conditions, and they associate leafy and fruiting phases with differing nutrient priorities [4]. This means that stage-dependent demand is not an internal clock acting in isolation. It is an emergent property of developmental programme, growth rate, and the surrounding physical environment. A vegetative plant under one set of climatic and root-zone conditions may not exhibit the same nutrient demand profile as a similar plant at the same nominal stage under different conditions. Thus, developmental stage provides the biological direction of change, while environment modulates its magnitude and expression [4], [20].

## IV. Evidence Synthesis

Across the accepted literature, the strongest synthesis point is that there is no single best growing system, medium, or nutrient regime that can stand apart from crop context. Reviews explicitly state that suitability depends on crop type, location, cost, and production system [4]. This supports the reader-facing conclusion that plants change biologically across development, but it also limits how far stage-based advice can travel. A developmental explanation is therefore stronger than a prescriptive schedule: establishment, vegetative growth, and reproductive growth do differ in resource allocation, yet the actual nutrient manifestation of those differences depends on how the cultivation system shapes root aeration, water availability, and ion access [21].

Evidence from hydroponic solution research further strengthens the caution against universal rules. Reviews note that nutrient ratios, amendment effects, and uptake interactions are species- and condition-dependent, meaning that even well-established nutrient principles can shift when solution chemistry, salinity, antagonism, or nutrient form changes [8]. This helps explain why developmental stage changes demand without yielding a simple recipe. A stage may raise demand for particular functions, such as root growth or reproductive support, but the observed uptake pattern still depends on chemical context and on interaction among ions. The implication is that developmental biology explains direction, while chemistry and system conditions shape the realised pattern of uptake.

Broader soilless farming reviews add another layer by showing that crop performance depends on climate, facility design, and local context, and that system benefits and constraints are not broadly transferable across species or settings [22]. Taken together with the more stage-aware sources, the evidence suggests a coherent interpretation. Development changes resource allocation within the plant, and that change alters nutrient demand; however, observed demand is always filtered through cultivation context. This is why stage-based thinking is scientifically useful for explanation, but scientifically weak when converted into blanket prescriptions. The evidence base supports a stage-sensitive synthesis, not a universalised production rule [2], [4], [8], [22].

## V. Practical Implications and Limitations

The most practical implication is that nutrient management should track changing crop demand rather than assume static requirements across a production cycle. Reviews of recirculating hydroponic systems directly argue that different crops and growth stages require different ions and nutrient adjustments, and they link management outcomes to changing demand through time [9]. Biologically, this follows from shifting sink priorities and growth rates. In practice, it means that a plant moving from establishment into active vegetative expansion should not be interpreted as merely a larger version of its younger self. Its changing allocation pattern alters the relative

pressure placed on nutrient supply, water relations, and root-zone management.

A second implication is caution: the same literature emphasises that nutrient-management outcomes are crop-, system-, substrate-, and season-specific [9]. This sharply limits the reliability of generic stage-based rules across species and cultivars. The evidence supports the proposition that developmental stage changes demand, but it does not support one fixed developmental schedule for all crops. This is especially important because the request concerns biological explanation rather than feeding programmes. The strongest evidence-based statement is therefore comparative and conditional: stage matters, but the size, direction, and operational significance of the change depend on the crop and the production context in which stage is expressed.

A final limitation is that soilless suitability itself is uneven across plants, systems, substrates, and locations. Reviews explicitly state that not all species or cultivation arrangements perform equally well and that yield and performance comparisons are crop- and context-dependent [10]. This limits any attempt to treat observed stage-based demand in one system as a universal model of plant biology. The evidence base is sufficient to explain why biological demands change through development, and why resource allocation is central to that change. It is less sufficient for deriving broad predictive rules across all crops and cultivars. More robust generalisation would require developmental measurements linked directly to organ allocation and nutrient uptake under clearly specified conditions [9], [10].

## VI. Conclusion

A plant's biological demands change through development because development changes where the plant invests its resources. Establishment prioritises capture capacity, vegetative growth prioritises rapid structural and photosynthetic expansion, and reproductive growth redirects assimilates and minerals toward new sink tissues. The accepted evidence supports this allocation-centred explanation and also shows that nutrient demand and uptake patterns shift with nutrient availability, growth rate, and changing plant needs across growth stages [1], [2], [3], [4], [5]. The central message is therefore clear: plants are not constant-demand organisms, and stage matters because allocation changes the relative demands placed on the managed root and shoot environment.

At the same time, the literature consistently rejects overgeneralisation. Species, cultivar, environment, substrate, chemistry, and production system all influence how developmental demand is expressed [6], [7], [8], [9], [10]. The highest-value next work is not broader prescription, but stronger integration of developmental stage, organ allocation, and nutrient uptake in comparative experiments across defined cultivation conditions. Until such evidence is more complete, the most defensible interpretation is explanatory rather than formulaic: stage-based nutrient demand is biologically real, but its practical expression remains crop- and context-dependent.


## 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] 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.

[2] 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.

[3] 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.

[4] 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.

[5] H. Poorter and L. Sack, "Pitfalls and possibilities in the analysis of biomass allocation patterns in plants," *Frontiers in Plant Science*, 2012. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2012.00259

[6] 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

[7] S. Azizi, S. Aliniaeifard, S. Zarbakhsh, S. Esmaeili, K. Baghalian, and N. S. Gruda, "Photobiology, photosynthesis, and plant responses under artificial lighting in controlled environment agriculture," *Scientia Horticulturae*, 2025.

[8] 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

[9] 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.

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

[11] 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.

[12] 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.

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

[14] J. B. V. Brenk, S. Courbier, C. L. Kleijweg, J. C. Verdonk, and L. F. M. Marcelis, "Paradise by the far-red light: Far-red and red:blue ratios independently affect yield, pigments, and carbohydrate production in lettuce, lactuca sativa," *Frontiers in Plant Science*, 2024. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2024.1383100

[15] 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," *Water*, 2022.

[16] M. Barberon and N. Geldner, "Radial transport of nutrients: The plant root as a polarized epithelium," *Plant Physiology*, 2014. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1104/pp.114.246124

[17] S. Zhen and B. Bugbee, "Substituting far-red for traditionally defined photosynthetic photons results in equal canopy quantum yield for co2 fixation and increased photon capture during long-term studies: Implications for re-defining par," *Frontiers in Plant Science*, 2020. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2020.581156

[18] P. Kusuma and B. Bugbee, "Improving the predictive value of phytochrome photoequilibrium: Consideration of spectral distortion within a leaf," *Frontiers in Plant Science*, 2021. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2021.596943

[19] 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

[20] A. Ali, S. J. Jeong, S. Zhen, G. Cocetta, J. Masabni, and G. Niu, "Blue light modulates the interactive effects of far-red light and day-night temperature difference on the growth, morphology and physiology of arugula and lettuce," *Frontiers in Plant Science*, 2025.

[21] S. Shameer, R. G. Ratcliffe, and L. J. Sweetlove, "Leaf energy balance requires mitochondrial respiration and export of chloroplast nadph in the light," *Plant Physiology*, 2019. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1104/pp.19.00624

[22] 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.