Ionic nutrient forms and plant availability

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

***Abstract*—Hydroponic crops do not encounter nutrients as abstract elemental labels. They encounter dissolved ions and related chemical species whose charge, solubility, and interactions with surrounding solution chemistry determine whether uptake is feasible. This paper explains the principal nutrient forms discussed in the supplied hydroponic and related literature, and examines why chemical form matters for plant availability. Across the evidence base, hydroponic nutrients are presented mainly as dissolved ionic species, including nitrate and ammonium for nitrogen, phosphate species for phosphorus, cationic forms of potassium, calcium and magnesium, sulfate for sulphur, molybdate for molybdenum, and micronutrients that may occur as free ions or as complexes such as chelated iron [1], [2]. The reviewed evidence shows that availability depends not only on total concentration but also on pH-sensitive solubility, precipitation behaviour, mobility, and complexation reactions, especially for iron, manganese, calcium, magnesium, and phosphate [1], [2], [3]. The paper argues that understanding nutrient form is essential for interpreting hydroponic nutrition, because conductivity and nominal nutrient recipes alone cannot show which species remain dissolved and biologically accessible. It also notes that the present evidence supports an introductory treatment of chelation and complexation, but not an exhaustive nutrient-by-nutrient speciation model for all hydroponic conditions.**

I. Introduction

Hydroponics depends on the direct delivery of mineral nutrients through water, so plants meet nutrients as dissolved chemical species rather than as general fertiliser names. The reviewed hydroponic literature explicitly describes essential nutrients as supplied in solution and identifies absorbed ionic forms for major elements, while also noting the special handling often required for iron through chelation [2]. This distinction matters because plant roots cannot absorb a label such as nitrogen or phosphorus in the abstract. They interact with nitrate, ammonium, phosphate species, potassium ions, calcium ions, magnesium ions, sulfate, molybdate, and dissolved micronutrient species whose charge and reactivity shape transport to the root surface and entry into the plant. An adequate explanation of hydroponic nutrition therefore begins with chemistry in solution, not merely with recipe composition [2], [4].

Chemical form matters because solution chemistry governs whether nutrients remain mobile, dissolved, and accessible. The supplied evidence shows that pH alters nutrient solubility and mobility, and that acidic or alkaline conditions can shift micronutrient availability through changes in speciation and precipitation tendency [1]. This means that the same nominal nutrient concentration can have different nutritional consequences depending on the surrounding chemical environment. A solution may contain a fertiliser-derived element in total terms, yet a portion may be converted into a less available form by precipitation or other equilibria. For hydroponic interpretation, this creates an important limitation in purely concentration-based thinking: availability is a chemical state, not just a quantity [1], [3].

Complexation further shows why nutrient form should be treated cautiously rather than simplistically. The evidence indicates that binding interactions can reduce bioavailability for some metals under some conditions, but can also improve solubility and uptake for elements such as iron and zinc [1]. Accordingly, an authoritative explanation should not claim that all complexes are beneficial or that chelation universally increases plant access. Instead, the relevant point is narrower and better supported: nutrient ions exist within a surrounding chemical matrix, and those interactions can either stabilise a useful dissolved form or shift an element into a less accessible state. This paper therefore examines ionic nutrient forms and plant availability through a synthesis focused on principal dissolved species, pH-sensitive solubility, and the introductory role of chelation or complexation in hydroponic solutions [1], [2].

II. Background and Scope

Existing hydroponic reviews consistently show that nutrient availability is chemically conditioned rather than mechanically guaranteed. One important synthesis explains that nutrient solubility and uptake are strongly pH dependent, with elevated pH reducing the solubility of iron and phosphate and encouraging precipitation involving calcium and magnesium, while low pH can inhibit the uptake of major nutrients [2]. This establishes the central background condition for the present paper: nutrient form is dynamic in solution, and the transition between dissolved and precipitated states can alter what the plant can actually access. The implication is that hydroponic management must be interpreted through aqueous chemistry, but this paper stays within explanatory scope and does not attempt a detailed operational treatment of pH control.

Broader soilless reviews reinforce that nutrient solution is the primary delivery medium for standard macronutrients and micronutrients, and that pH is especially important for micronutrient availability [5]. However, those sources often provide a system-level overview rather than a detailed account of the principal dissolved forms of each nutrient. They are useful for establishing that hydroponic nutrition occurs through controlled solution chemistry, yet they leave a gap between naming nutrient elements and explaining the specific ionic or complexed species plants encounter. The present paper

addresses that gap by organising the evidence around forms in solution and the mechanisms that connect those forms to mobility, solubility, and uptake, while avoiding unsupported claims about exhaustive nutrient-by-nutrient speciation under all conditions [4], [5].

A further limitation in the literature is the tendency to treat overall solution indicators as if they adequately represented nutrient accessibility. The supplied evidence directly warns against that simplification by noting that pH changes the precipitation and solubility behaviour of calcium, magnesium, iron, and phosphate, and that electrical conductivity alone cannot reveal which nutrient species remain available [3]. This is the specific explanatory gap addressed here. Rather than proposing new experiments, the paper synthesises accepted evidence to answer a focused question: in what chemical forms do plant nutrients exist in hydroponic solution, and why does that form matter for plant availability? The scope is therefore interpretive and evidence-based, centred on dissolved ionic species, chemical equilibria, and restrained discussion of complexation [2], [3].

III. Core Concepts and Mechanisms

The most basic mechanism is that nutrient uptake begins from dissolved species moving through solution toward the root, not from elements as abstract categories. The supplied review on root nutrient uptake refers to nitrate, phosphate, cationic nutrients, molybdate, and micronutrients as chemically distinct participants in transport and acquisition processes, and also discusses pH and chelation effects [1]. For hydroponic interpretation, this supports an introductory classification of principal forms. Nitrogen is encountered mainly as nitrate or ammonium, phosphorus as phosphate species, potassium, calcium, and magnesium as cations, sulphur as sulfate, molybdenum as molybdate, and several micronutrients as dissolved ions or complexes [1], [2]. The implication is that charge and molecular identity influence mobility and uptake pathways, while the limitation is that the evidence base does not provide a full speciation map for every essential element across all hydroponic conditions.

Evidence from a recirculating nutrient film technique system illustrates that these forms are not merely theoretical. A lettuce study tracked dissolved nitrogen, phosphorus, potassium, calcium, magnesium, iron, and manganese in operating nutrient solution, and distinguished ammonium nitrogen from nitrate explicitly [6]. That practical distinction matters because two nitrogen forms can coexist while differing in behaviour within the solution and in plant interaction. More generally, the study shows that hydroponic nutrient solutions contain a changing mixture of dissolved species whose concentrations shift during cultivation [6]. This supports the reader-facing point that plant availability depends on what remains present in soluble form at a given time, but it also highlights a limitation: operational nutrient monitoring does not by itself establish a universal list of principal species for every essential nutrient.

A second mechanism concerns the difference between naming a plant nutrient and identifying the form in which it can be supplied or absorbed. The definitional literature on plant nutrients is useful for distinguishing essential from merely beneficial elements, but it does not itself explain how solubility or speciation governs availability in hydroponic solution [7]. That limitation is important because it prevents overextension from taxonomy to chemistry. The paper therefore treats essentiality as necessary background but not as sufficient explanation. Knowing that an element is nutritionally important does not reveal whether it is present as a soluble ion, part of a precipitate, or stabilised within a complex. For hydroponic systems, the actionable scientific question is not only what element is needed, but in what dissolved form it persists and reaches the root interface [2], [7].

IV. Evidence Synthesis

Across the accepted hydroponic evidence, iron is the clearest example of why chemical form must be treated explicitly. The literature states that iron is commonly supplied as a chelate to improve availability [2]. This does not mean that chelation is a universal remedy for every nutrient, but it does show that some elements require chemical stabilisation to remain usefully dissolved in hydroponic solution. Iron therefore illustrates a broader principle: when a nutrient is prone to becoming less soluble or less mobile in a given solution environment, a complexed form may preserve access better than the unassisted ion alone [1], [2]. The implication is that plant availability depends on the persistence of an appropriate dissolved species, while the limitation is that the present evidence supports this point most directly for iron, not for a comprehensive range of micronutrients.

The same evidence base also shows that pH-sensitive availability is especially important for micronutrients such as iron and manganese. A systematic review of soilless agriculture identifies pH as a control variable that affects nutrient solubility and availability, with particular relevance for micronutrients [5]. When read alongside the more chemically explicit hydroponic reviews, this supports a consistent synthesis: form matters because the solution environment can shift a nutrient between a more available dissolved state and a less available precipitated or otherwise constrained state [2], [3], [5]. The practical implication is that apparent sufficiency in a nutrient recipe does not guarantee biological sufficiency at the root. The limitation is that broad reviews often identify the dependency without resolving the exact dominant species under each hydroponic formulation.

Related aqueous chemistry from outside strict hydroponic literature helps clarify the underlying mechanism without expanding the paper beyond its evidence. An aquaculture review explains how dissolved carbon dioxide, bicarbonate, carbonate, calcium, and magnesium participate in solubility equilibria and influence water chemistry [8]. Although that source is not centred on plant nutrient availability, it strengthens the mechanistic interpretation that dissolved ionic systems are governed by interacting equilibria rather than isolated concentrations. In hydroponic reasoning, this supports a restrained but valuable conclusion: nutrient availability is inseparable

from the chemistry of the surrounding solution matrix. The implication is that precipitation risk and ion balance must be understood as equilibrium problems, while the limitation is that the source offers general aqueous principles rather than direct hydroponic nutrient-form measurements [3], [8].

V. Practical Implications and Limitations

For practical interpretation, the reviewed evidence suggests that growers and analysts should treat nutrient status as a chemically conditioned property of the root environment. A review of soilless growing media notes that pH and soluble salts affect nutrient status and plant performance [9]. This supports the broad conclusion that chemical conditions shape nutritional outcomes even when a system is designed to be highly controlled. However, the source is not a focused treatment of ionic nutrient forms in hydroponic solution, so its contribution is confirmatory rather than decisive. The practical implication is that solution composition cannot be separated from solution condition, yet the limitation remains that a general association between salts, pH, and performance does not by itself specify which dissolved forms dominate for each nutrient [9].

A second implication concerns the limits of broad hydroponic framing. Comparative reviews of soilless systems list the standard macronutrients and micronutrients supplied through nutrient solution and identify variables such as electrical conductivity and pH as core management parameters [10]. This is useful because it confirms the centrality of nutrient solution chemistry to hydroponic cultivation. Even so, such reviews usually stop short of detailing the principal dissolved ionic or complexed forms for every nutrient. That gap matters scientifically because management variables are proxies, not direct measurements of nutrient species. A recipe and a conductivity value can indicate intended supply, but they cannot on their own show whether phosphate remains soluble, whether iron persists in an available form, or whether calcium and magnesium are approaching precipitation conditions [3], [10].

The strongest practical lesson from the evidence is therefore methodological caution. A review of nutrient solution management distinguishes total electrical conductivity from specific ions such as nitrate, phosphate, potassium, calcium, sulfate, sodium, and chloride, and explicitly notes that pH changes the solubility and precipitation behaviour of several nutritionally important species [3]. For answering the reader question, this means that form matters because plants encounter the species that remain dissolved and chemically accessible, not the total nutrient load inferred from bulk indicators. At the same time, the accepted evidence does not justify a universal ranking of all nutrient forms across all hydroponic systems. The most defensible conclusion is more modest and more useful: interpretation should prioritise identifiable ionic species, pH-sensitive solubility, and the selective role of chelation, while recognising that further speciation work would be needed for complete nutrient-by-nutrient resolution [1], [3].

VI. Conclusion

Plant nutrients in hydroponic solution exist as specific dissolved ions and related chemical species, and this chemical identity determines whether they remain mobile, soluble, and available for uptake. The supplied evidence supports an introductory account in which nitrogen is encountered mainly as nitrate and ammonium, phosphorus as phosphate species, several major nutrients as cations, sulphur as sulfate, molybdenum as molybdate, and some micronutrients as dissolved ions or complexes such as chelated iron [1], [2]. Across the literature, the central reason form matters is consistent: pH and surrounding solution chemistry can alter solubility, drive precipitation, and change whether a nutrient remains biologically accessible [2], [3], [5].

The evidence also supports a clear limit on interpretation. Broad hydroponic indicators such as conductivity, recipe composition, or total dissolved nutrient concentration cannot fully reveal which nutrient forms are present at a given moment [3], [4]. Introductory discussion of chelation and complexation is warranted, especially for iron, but the accepted sources do not justify overgeneralising those concepts as universal guarantees of availability [1], [2]. The highest-value next work, within the logic of this evidence base, would be more direct nutrient-by-nutrient speciation analysis under practical hydroponic conditions. Until then, the sound scientific position is that plants do not absorb nutrient names, they absorb chemically specific dissolved species whose form governs access.

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] 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.

[3] 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.

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

[5] 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.

[6] K. Vought, H. K. Bayabil, J. Pompeo, D. Crawford, Y. Zhang, M. Correll, and A. Martin-Ryals, "Dynamics of micro and macronutrients in a hydroponic nutrient film technique system under lettuce cultivation," *Heliyon*, 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] 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.