Testing and interpreting hydroponic source water

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

***Abstract*—Hydroponic nutrient formulation begins with water that already contains measurable chemical and physical properties, yet routine source-water testing is often misread as if one value can determine suitability. This paper develops an evidence-based framework for deciding which source-water measurements matter before nutrient solution preparation, and for interpreting those results in context rather than in isolation. The synthesis focuses on measurements that reveal composition or behaviour relevant to hydroponic preparation, especially electrical conductivity, pH, hardness, alkalinity, total dissolved solids, selected ions, salinity-related indicators, and dissolved oxygen where production conditions warrant it. Across the reviewed evidence, conductivity is useful for estimating total ionic load but cannot identify individual ions; pH helps indicate likely effects on solubility and nutrient availability but does not describe total composition; hardness and alkalinity illuminate calcium and magnesium related scaling potential and buffering behaviour, yet neither alone defines hydroponic suitability. Laboratory ion analysis is therefore most useful when read alongside these screening measurements and the intended hydroponic system. The evidence also shows that repeated testing is necessary when composition varies with source changes, evaporation, rainfall, runoff, biological activity, or operational conditions. A scientifically defensible interpretation of source water is thus multi-parameter, context-dependent, and preparatory rather than verdict-based.**

I. Introduction

Hydroponic crop performance depends on nutrient solution composition, and that composition is shaped not only by added fertilisers but also by the chemical starting point of the source water used to prepare the solution. Reviews of hydroponic practice consistently identify pH and electrical conductivity, or EC, as central operating variables, while also noting that suitable ranges differ with crop type and management context [1]. For that reason, source-water testing matters before formulation begins: measurements taken at the water source help reveal whether the water already carries salts, buffering capacity, or other characteristics that will alter later nutrient mixing, precipitation risk, and plant availability. The practical implication is that water testing is not a bureaucratic preliminary step, but part of nutrient design itself [1], [2].

Common source-water measurements are useful precisely because they reveal different kinds of information. Reviews of irrigation water quality show that pH, EC, total dissolved solids, hardness, and alkalinity-related indices can each indicate part of the hydroponic problem, including salinity load, scaling tendency, clogging risk, and general suitability for managed water use [3]. Yet these same measures are incomplete when taken alone. A high or low pH does not identify which ions are present; EC signals dissolved ionic strength but not which salts are causing it; hardness and alkalinity can suggest operational consequences without providing a full compositional profile [3]. The implication is that the meaning of a result lies in what question it can answer, and just as importantly, what question it cannot answer [4].

This paper argues that useful source-water testing for hydroponics is interpretive rather than purely descriptive. Evidence from water-quality assessment shows that no single index captures the whole chemical and operational significance of a water source, because each parameter represents only one dimension of water behaviour [3]. Accordingly, laboratory ion analysis should not be treated as a search for one deciding number, but as a contextual exercise that combines screening measurements, individual ion data where available, and the requirements of the intended hydroponic system. The paper therefore examines which source-water measurements matter, what common measurements can and cannot reveal, how laboratory results should be interpreted before nutrient formulation, and why repeated testing may be necessary when source composition varies over time [3], [5].

II. Background and Scope

Existing water-quality literature makes clear that source-water interpretation cannot assume stable composition across all places and times. Irrigation water quality varies with pollution sources, catchment influences, and local management conditions, and broad single-point monitoring cannot adequately represent every supply context [3]. For hydroponics, this matters because the same nominal water source may not behave consistently across seasons, after rainfall events, or following changes in extraction, storage, or treatment. The scope of this paper is therefore limited to a defensible framework for interpreting source-water tests before nutrient preparation, not to declaring universal pass or fail thresholds. The relevant question is not whether one test result looks acceptable in the abstract, but whether the measured chemistry is sufficiently understood for the next formulation step [3], [6].

Hydroponic reviews support this framing by distinguishing between measurements that are operationally convenient and measurements that are compositionally specific. EC is widely used because it provides a rapid estimate of total dissolved ion concentration, while pH is essential because it affects solubility and nutrient uptake [1]. However, EC cannot identify the individual elements or ions contributing to the reading, and pH cannot by itself describe the total dissolved load or buffering system [1]. This distinction defines a key knowledge gap in practice: growers may measure what is easy to monitor, yet still lack the information needed to understand whether

bicarbonate buffering, calcium and magnesium load, sodium accumulation, or chloride content will complicate nutrient formulation. This paper addresses that gap by interpreting routine metrics in relation to their evidentiary limits [7].

Hardness and alkalinity sharpen that interpretive problem because they are often conflated even though they represent different chemical features. Aquaculture water-chemistry work explains that alkalinity and hardness are indices rather than direct concentrations of single solutes, and that they indicate different aspects of water behaviour, especially buffering chemistry and concentrations associated with calcium and magnesium salts [8]. Their reported values can therefore support important inferences about corrosion, encrustation, buffering response, and ion composition, but they do not substitute for full ion analysis [8]. This paper uses that distinction to define its scope: it synthesises how source-water measurements inform hydroponic preparation, while avoiding the unsupported claim that any one metric alone determines suitability.

III. Core Concepts and Mechanisms

A core mechanism in source-water interpretation is temporal change. Alkalinity and hardness do not remain fixed merely because a source has a stable name; they can change through evaporation, rainfall inputs, runoff, variable source mixing, precipitation and dissolution reactions, and biological activity [8]. In hydroponic preparation, such shifts matter because they alter the starting buffering capacity and the concentration of ions that interact with added nutrients. A water source that once required only modest pH correction may later resist acidification more strongly, or a supply with modest hardness may later contribute more calcium and magnesium than expected. The implication is that a historical result is only conditionally useful. Testing gains meaning when the user understands whether the measured water chemistry is temporally representative [8].

A second mechanism is interaction among properties that are often measured separately but experienced together in use. Work on soilless cultivation media argues that acceptable performance must be judged in practical context because physical, chemical, and biological properties interact rather than acting independently [9]. Applied to source water, this means a conductivity value, a pH value, or a hardness reading should not be interpreted as isolated verdicts. Their significance depends on intended crop management, the recirculating or non-recirculating nature of the system, likely evaporation losses, and whether the water is likely to promote precipitation, salinity stress, or unstable nutrient availability. The limitation is that simplified screening metrics remain helpful, but only as components of a broader judgement rather than as stand-alone proofs of fitness [9].

A third mechanism concerns measurement capability itself. Precision soilless systems commonly monitor pH, temperature, EC, and dissolved oxygen because these variables are operationally important and can be tracked in near real time, but affordable sensing of specific ions such as nitrate, ammonium, and phosphate remains more difficult [10]. This creates a practical asymmetry in source-water testing. The easiest variables to measure are often broad indicators, while the most compositionally informative variables may require laboratory analysis or specialised instrumentation. For hydroponic interpretation, the implication is straightforward: common measurements are valuable first-line tools, but they are incomplete proxies for full chemistry. When the consequences of hidden ion composition are significant, laboratory ion analysis becomes necessary to convert screening data into formulation decisions [10].

IV. Evidence Synthesis

Across the evidence base, the most useful source-water measurements are those that reveal constituents or properties that can materially alter later nutrient chemistry. Review work on wastewater hydroponics is especially informative because it highlights water-quality constraints such as sodium, chloride, overall salinity, and oxygenation, all of which can affect whether a water source is manageable for plant production [11]. Although wastewater systems are not identical to standard hydroponic preparation, the synthesis is transferable at the level of interpretation: source water already contains chemical burdens and functional properties before fertiliser is added. Therefore, measurements that identify salinity-related load, problematic ions, buffering behaviour, and oxygenation conditions matter because they define what the nutrient recipe must accommodate, correct, or avoid [11].

The same logic is reinforced by hydroponic nutrient-management literature, which distinguishes between pH, EC, and individual ion concentrations as different kinds of information rather than interchangeable readings [12]. In practical terms, this means that pre-formulation source-water testing should begin with broad indicators such as pH and EC, but should also include laboratory ion analysis when the grower needs to know which dissolved species are contributing to the measured load. Calcium, magnesium, sodium, chloride, and related ions can each matter differently once nutrients are added, because they change the baseline from which formulation starts [12]. The implication is that the purpose of testing is not merely to describe water quality, but to quantify the chemical starting conditions that determine how nutrient solution should be built.

This evidence also clarifies what common measurements can and cannot reveal. EC is practical because it reflects the total concentration of dissolved ions, but it is insufficient for precise interpretation because different ionic mixtures can yield similar conductivity values [12]. Likewise, pH strongly influences precipitation behaviour and nutrient availability, yet it does not disclose which ions are present or how much buffering capacity the water has [12]. Interpreting laboratory ion analysis therefore requires combining individual ion data with screening metrics rather than replacing one with the other. A report showing specific ions is more informative than EC alone, but even ion concentrations should be read in relation to pH, hardness, alkalinity, and intended management conditions. Suitability is thus not a single-number property, but

a contextual relationship between composition and hydroponic use [12].

V. Practical Implications and Limitations

The most immediate practical implication is that pH should be treated as a governing interpretive variable, but not as a complete diagnostic of source-water suitability. Broader plant nutrition literature shows that pH strongly affects nutrient solubility and mobility, making it a master variable for whether dissolved elements remain available or become less accessible in the root environment [13]. For hydroponic source water, this means the initial pH reading matters before nutrient addition because it shapes how the later solution is likely to behave during adjustment and mixing. The limitation is equally important: pH alone does not reveal EC, hardness, alkalinity, or the identity of dissolved ions. It is therefore highly influential, but diagnostically incomplete [13].

Interpretation also has to remain biologically and chemically contextual. Nutrient availability depends on interacting factors rather than on a single chemical number, including transport processes and other features of the root environment that modify how measured chemistry is realised in plant uptake [13]. Even though this evidence is broader than laboratory hydroponic testing, it supports an important practical caution: a source-water analysis should inform formulation decisions, not replace agronomic judgement. Laboratory ion analysis can identify bicarbonate-related buffering or background calcium and magnesium, but those numbers still need to be interpreted in relation to the intended crop, management intensity, and likely solution dynamics. The implication is that analytical precision improves decisions only when paired with system-specific interpretation [13].

Finally, the evidence indicates that repeated testing is not a sign of poor planning, but a rational response to variable inputs. Soilless cultivation reviews note that nutrient management is shaped by climatic conditions, water quality, crop species, and cultivar, and that successful management must match plant needs across stages and contexts [14]. When combined with evidence that source-water composition can shift over time, this means a single laboratory report should not be assumed to define water behaviour indefinitely. Re-testing is especially justified when the source changes seasonally, when storage and evaporation alter chemistry, or when operational observations suggest unexplained drift in pH or EC after formulation. The limitation of the present evidence is that it supports the need for repeated checking in principle more strongly than it specifies universal retesting intervals [14].

VI. Conclusion

Testing hydroponic source water is most useful when it identifies the properties and constituents that can materially shape later nutrient chemistry, and when those measurements are interpreted according to what each can and cannot reveal. The reviewed evidence supports a multi-parameter framework in which pH indicates likely effects on solubility and availability, EC estimates total dissolved ionic load, hardness and alkalinity clarify aspects of buffering and scale-related chemistry, and laboratory ion analysis reveals the specific dissolved species that broad screening metrics cannot identify [1], [3], [8], [12]. Read together, these results answer the central question: the measurements that matter are those that explain the starting chemistry of the water before nutrient formulation, not those that merely provide an isolated number.

The evidence also shows that interpretation must remain contextual and iterative rather than absolute. No single reading determines hydroponic suitability, because water behaviour depends on interacting properties, intended system management, and temporal variation in the source itself [9], [10]. Repeated testing is therefore warranted when composition is likely to shift, and laboratory analysis is most valuable when used to guide formulation decisions rather than to assign an unconditional label of good or bad water [3], [8]. The highest-value next work would be more explicit hydroponic evidence linking pre-formulation source-water profiles to later nutrient-adjustment outcomes, especially for variable supplies where repeated testing may change management decisions [12], [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] 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.

[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] G. W. Anyangoa, G. D. Bhowmicka, and N. S. Bhattacharyab, "A critical review of irrigation water quality index and water quality management practices in micro-irrigation for efficient policy making," *Desalination and Water Treatment*, 2024.

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

[5] A. M. Vera-Vives, P. Novel, K. Zheng, S. ling Tan, and M. Schwarzländer, "Mitochondrial respiration is essential for photosynthesis-dependent atp supply of the plant cytosol," *New Phytologist*, 2024.

[6] O. V. Obayomi, D. C. Olawoyin, O. Oguntimehin, L. S. Mustapha, S. O. Kolade, P. O. Oladoye, S. Oh, and K. S. Obayomi, "Exploring emerging water treatment technologies for the removal of microbial pathogens," *Current Research in Biotechnology*, 2024.

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

[8] C. E. Boyd, C. S. Tucker, and B. Somridhivej, "Alkalinity and hardness: Critical but elusive concepts in aquaculture," *Journal of the World Aquaculture Society*, 2016.

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

[10] 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.

[11] C. Mai, A. Mojiri, S. Palanisami, A. Altaee, Y. Huang, and J. L. Zhou, "Wastewater hydroponics for pollutant removal and food production: Principles, progress and future outlook," *Water*, 2023.
[12] 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.
[13] 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.
[14] 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.