Nutrient solution formulation principles

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

***Abstract*—Hydroponic crop performance depends on a nutrient solution whose chemistry is designed rather than assumed. The central formulation problem is not simply to dissolve fertilisers until a target electrical conductivity is reached; it is to assemble a balanced ionic solution in which each source contributes multiple ions, the source water already contains dissolved minerals, and pH dependent compatibility limits constrain what can remain soluble. This paper synthesises recent hydroponic and related water chemistry literature to explain how nutrient solution formulation should be understood as a constrained balancing task. The review shows that electrical conductivity is only a composite signal of dissolved charge and cannot identify the concentrations of individual nutrients or reveal shifts that occur during recirculation. It also shows that source water chemistry, especially bicarbonate, calcium, magnesium, sodium, and related dissolved solids, must be counted before fertiliser additions are specified. Further, precipitation risk and pH dependent solubility mean that calcium, magnesium, phosphate, iron, and nitrogen form cannot be treated as independent design variables. The resulting implication is that balanced formulation requires ion specific accounting, water analysis, and compatibility aware selection of nutrient sources. Evidence remains stronger for general formulation principles than for universal source by source recipes, so the most defensible outcome is a chemically reasoned framework rather than a single prescriptive formula.**

I. Introduction

Hydroponic nutrient solution formulation is often discussed as if nutrient concentration could be managed through a small set of routine indicators, yet the chemistry of a functioning solution is fundamentally ion specific. A fertiliser source does not contribute an isolated element in abstraction; once dissolved, it contributes a set of ions that collectively determine charge balance, nutrient availability, and the chemical environment surrounding the root system. Recent hydroponic management literature therefore argues that successful control depends on understanding the composition of the nutrient solution as the sum of individual ionic contributions rather than as a single bulk property [1]. This matters because formulation decisions made at the stock solution stage determine not only how much nitrogen, potassium, calcium, or magnesium is supplied, but also which accompanying ions are introduced and how those ions may interact once mixed [2].

A second reason the topic deserves careful treatment is that electrical conductivity, despite its operational convenience, cannot describe nutrient composition with sufficient precision for formulation. Evidence from a recirculating nutrient film technique system under lettuce cultivation showed that concentrations of calcium, potassium, manganese, iron, and other ions changed over time even when conductivity based management was maintained, demonstrating that a stable EC can conceal substantial compositional drift [3]. This directly supports the view that nutrient solution design cannot begin from the assumption that water is chemically blank or that a target EC uniquely defines a balanced solution. Instead, the formulator must ask which ions are already present, which ions each fertiliser will add, and how those ions will behave in solution [4].

The formulation problem becomes still more important when recirculation, repeated top up, or imperfect source water are involved. In hydroponic recirculation, calcium may accumulate while other ions decline, and cation competition can intensify nutritional imbalance even though the overall solution still appears acceptable by coarse monitoring criteria [3]. Accordingly, this paper explains nutrient solution formulation principles as a constrained chemical balancing problem. It focuses on four questions: how common nutrient sources contribute multiple ions, why source water mineral contribution must be counted, how compatibility and precipitation shape feasible formulations, and why matching a single EC value is insufficient. The paper does not propose crop specific recipes; rather, it develops a general scientific framework for designing balanced hydroponic solutions [5].

II. Background and Scope

Existing hydroponic practice often uses EC as a rapid proxy for nutrient status because conductivity is easy to measure continuously. However, direct hydroponic evidence shows that constant EC management does not preserve balanced concentrations of individual nutrients during recirculation, and that nutrient imbalances can compound over time [3]. This creates a gap between what growers can monitor simply and what formulation chemistry actually requires. A solution may satisfy an operational EC band while still drifting away from the intended balance of cations, anions, and micronutrients. The relevant scientific issue is therefore not whether EC has value, but where its explanatory power stops. This paper takes that limit seriously and treats conductivity as one descriptor among several, not as a substitute for formulation logic [6].

A second body of prior work sharpens the distinction between nutrient presence and nutrient usability. Review work on organic nutrient solutions shows that roots absorb nutrients in mineral ionic forms, and that systems relying on organic inputs face additional complications from mineralisation, ammonium toxicity, incomplete nitrification, and precipitation driven depletion of phosphorus, magnesium, and calcium [7]. Although that literature is not a direct guide to mineral salt formulation, it clarifies an important principle: nutrient solution design

depends on the chemical forms that exist in solution, not merely on the nominal nutrient content of the original input. The implication for conventional hydroponics is that nutrient sources should be evaluated by the ions they release and the equilibria they create, rather than by label claims alone.

Water quality literature provides the third part of the background needed to define scope. Irrigation water can contain measurable EC, total dissolved solids, bicarbonate, calcium, magnesium, sodium, and related chemical characteristics that affect subsequent fertiliser additions [8]. In formulation terms, this means source water already occupies part of the chemical design space before any salt is added. A water source rich in bicarbonate or hardness is not simply a carrier fluid; it is an active chemical input that can alter pH behaviour, scaling tendency, and the balance of supplied elements. The present paper therefore focuses on nutrient solution formulation as an explanatory synthesis of ion contribution, source water accounting, and compatibility constraints, while deliberately avoiding crop specific nutrient targets or operational recipes beyond what the accepted evidence can support.

III. Core Concepts and Mechanisms

The first core principle is that nutrient availability depends on solution chemistry, especially pH, because solubility and ionic form change across the useful operating range. Hydroponic review literature notes that outside roughly pH 5 to 7, nutrient availability is compromised; at higher pH, iron and phosphate solubility decline, and calcium and magnesium precipitates may form [9]. For formulation, the significance is immediate. Selecting a calcium source, a phosphate source, and an alkaline water source cannot be treated as independent acts, because the combined mixture may drive the system towards conditions where intended nutrients become less available or leave solution altogether. A balanced formula is therefore not only an elemental target sheet, but also a chemically compatible state that remains soluble within the operating pH window.

The second principle is that EC is an aggregate physical signal rather than a unique description of composition. Hydroponic systems literature explicitly states that EC estimates only total ion concentration and does not identify concentrations of individual elements [9]. More general electrolyte research reinforces this interpretation by showing that conductivity depends on concentration, temperature, ion association, and solvent composition, so different ionic mixtures can produce similar conductivity readings [10]. This has a direct consequence for formulation. Two nutrient solutions may share the same EC but differ materially in calcium to potassium balance, micronutrient sufficiency, or bicarbonate load. Therefore, matching a target EC cannot by itself establish that the solution is balanced, chemically compatible, or nutritionally equivalent to another solution with the same reading.

The third principle is that formulation must begin with ion specific accounting of both intended additions and pre existing dissolved minerals. A current hydroponic review argues that management should go beyond total EC and attend to individual ions because overall conductivity does not reveal actual nutrient distribution [1]. This logic applies directly at the design stage. When source water already contains calcium, magnesium, sodium, or bicarbonate, those ions affect the amount and type of fertiliser salts that should be added. In practical terms, a fertiliser source cannot be chosen solely for delivering one desired nutrient, because it also imports companion ions that may help, displace, or constrain other targets. Formulation is thus a balancing exercise across ionic forms, charge, source water contribution, and compatibility, not a one variable adjustment.

IV. Evidence Synthesis

Across the accepted sources, the strongest synthesis is that nutrient solution composition is dynamic and must be interpreted as chemistry rather than as a static recipe. A recent overview of soilless cultivation emphasises that recirculating solutions change during use, that pH remains central to nutrient performance, and that precipitation related chemistry can alter the solution actually presented to roots [11]. This aligns with the hydroponic recirculation evidence showing that calcium can accumulate while other nutrients decline under constant EC management [3]. Together, these sources support a robust formulation principle: the relevant object is not the theoretical composition intended at mixing, but the soluble ionic composition that persists after water chemistry, pH adjustment, plant uptake, and recirculating system behaviour have acted on the solution.

A broader chemical perspective also helps explain why hydroponic formulation should not be reduced to a recipe mentality. Soil and plant nutrition literature shows that nutrient availability is shaped by pH, cation exchange, metal binding, and surrounding solution chemistry [12]. Although those mechanisms arise in a soil context, the transferable lesson is that nutrient supply always operates through chemical environment, not simply through elemental presence. Hydroponic systems remove soil, but they do not remove chemistry. Instead, they concentrate chemical responsibility in the water phase, where the formulator must define the entire nutrient environment deliberately. This supports the paper's central argument that formulating from individual nutrient sources requires attention to interactions among ions rather than separate, linear decisions for each element.

The evidence base is less direct when it comes to naming and comparing specific common fertiliser salts one by one, yet it still supports the governing principle that solution composition is the sum of contributed ions. Soilless cultivation reviews stress formula control and precise nutrient provision, while broader hydroponic reviews note that nutrient solutions provide essential nutrients in ionic forms and must be managed in relation to water quality and pH [9], [13]. These sources do not provide a universal dissociation table for all salts, so caution is needed against over specificity. Even so, the synthesis is clear: common nutrient sources are chemically coupled inputs, source water modifies their effective contribution, and

compatibility determines whether the intended ionic balance remains available after mixing.

V. Practical Implications and Limitations

One practical implication is that formulation should distinguish sharply between nominal nutrient content and immediately available ionic supply. Work on organic nutrient solutions highlights that nutrients must be mineralised before roots can absorb them and that the starting material composition affects what becomes available in solution [7]. Although conventional hydroponic mineral salts usually provide more direct ionic availability than organic inputs, the comparison clarifies why formulation should be expressed in dissolved ionic terms. A bag analysis or source label does not, by itself, demonstrate that the final mixed solution will contain the desired soluble balance. The limitation is that the present evidence base does not provide a definitive source by source catalogue of common mineral salts and their exact contribution patterns, so this paper supports principle level design rather than an exhaustive recipe table.

A second implication concerns source water analysis. The accepted evidence indicates that irrigation water chemistry should be profiled for parameters such as EC, total dissolved solids, bicarbonate, calcium, magnesium, and sodium before nutrient sources are selected [8]. Related hydroponic reviews likewise show that ion specific management must go beyond total EC when balancing nutrient solutions [1]. This means that source water contribution is not a minor correction; it is part of the initial formulation calculation. The limitation is that the evidence is stronger on why water chemistry matters than on universally accepted thresholds for every hydroponic context. Therefore, the defensible recommendation is analytical rather than prescriptive: measure source water first, then formulate additions around the ions already present instead of assuming distilled water conditions.

A third implication is that compatibility and monitoring strategy must be considered together. Organic hydroponic evidence shows that nitrogen form matters, that incomplete nitrification can disturb pH control, and that precipitation can deplete phosphorus, magnesium, and calcium from solution [7]. Hydroponic and soilless reviews similarly indicate that pH effects, nutrient accumulation, and imbalance remain central management concerns [9], [14]. These findings support the claim that formulation cannot be reduced to matching a single EC value, because EC may stay acceptable while incompatible chemistry alters which nutrients remain dissolved and available. The principal limitation is evidential scope: the literature supplied here supports the mechanism strongly, but it does not justify crop independent numerical rules for every source combination. Validation therefore still requires context specific water testing, solution analysis, and compatibility aware stock management.

VI. Conclusion

A balanced hydroponic nutrient solution is best understood as the outcome of constrained chemical balancing rather than as the achievement of a single conductivity target. The accepted evidence shows that each nutrient source contributes a set of ions, that source water already contains dissolved minerals which influence the starting balance, and that pH dependent compatibility determines whether intended nutrients remain soluble and available [1], [3], [8], [9]. It follows that proper formulation must account for elemental supply, ionic form, and water chemistry together. EC remains useful as an operational indicator, but the literature does not support using it as a complete descriptor of nutrient composition or balance.

The most valuable next step, consistent with the evidence reviewed here, is better integration of water analysis and ion specific monitoring into formulation practice [1]. Current evidence supports a strong principles based framework, but it is more limited for universal source specific recipes that would remain valid across differing waters and recirculating conditions. For that reason, the most defensible formulation approach is analytical and compatibility aware: start from the actual chemistry of the water, add nutrient sources with full awareness of their multiple ionic contributions, and judge success by balanced soluble composition rather than by EC alone.

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] 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," *Can. J. Plant Sci*, 2024.

[2] 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.

[3] 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.

[4] 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.

[5] 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.

[6] 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.

[7] 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.

[8] 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.

[9] 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.

[10] W. Zhang, X. Chen, Y. Wang, L. Wu, and Y. Hu, "Experimental and modeling of conductivity for electrolyte solution systems," *ACS Omega*, 2020.

[11] A. Fussy and J. Papenbrock, "An overview of soil and soilless cultivation techniques-chances, challenges and the neglected question of sustainability," *Plants*, 2022.
[12] 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.
[13] 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.
[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.