pH and nutrient solubility

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

***Abstract*—Hydroponic nutrient management often treats pH as a master variable, yet pH does not control plant nutrition through a single universal threshold. Its principal chemical role is to shift equilibria among dissolved species and solid phases, which can alter nutrient speciation, solubility, and precipitation risk. Evidence from soilless and related water chemistry literature shows that these effects are nutrient specific and strongly conditioned by substrate composition, lime source, fertiliser formulation, alkalinity, hardness, and operating context rather than by pH alone. In particular, recent work in soilless substrates demonstrates that soluble nitrogen, phosphorus, potassium, calcium, magnesium, and sulfur do not respond uniformly to pH, and that simple pH solubility charts can misrepresent actual behaviour when composition changes. Related hydroponic and irrigation studies further show that carbonate chemistry and bicarbonate management matter because they can promote scale formation and reduce the persistence of dissolved calcium and phosphorus species. This paper synthesises the available evidence to explain why pH changes the chemical availability of nutrients in hydroponic solution, why responses differ among nutrients and chemical forms, and why reader-facing guidance should avoid implying universal cut-offs. The practical implication is that pH should be interpreted as one interacting control variable within a broader chemical and biological system.**

I. Introduction

In hydroponic solution, pH matters because it changes the balance among dissolved ionic forms and between dissolved and solid phases, rather than because it acts as a simple switch that turns nutrients on or off. The strongest direct evidence in the supplied package comes from work showing that pH interacted with lime source, substrate composition, and fertiliser formulation to alter soluble concentrations of nitrogen, phosphorus, potassium, calcium, magnesium, and sulfur, with equilibrium modelling used to interpret the observed changes [1]. This matters for hydroponics because plants encounter nutrients as chemically specific species in solution, and those species are shaped by the surrounding matrix. A practical implication is that the same measured pH can correspond to different nutrient conditions when composition differs, so pH interpretation must remain chemically contextual rather than universal [1].

A second reason this topic deserves careful treatment is that widely used pH availability charts invite overconfidence. The supplied evidence indicates that such charts can be misleading because nutrient responses are nutrient specific, lime-source specific, and substrate dependent, even within soilless systems [1]. A chart may be convenient as a teaching aid, but it compresses a multidimensional chemical system into a single axis and can therefore suggest false cut-offs where gradual, conditional, or composition-dependent responses are more accurate. For hydroponic readers, the key implication is not that pH charts are useless, but that they should be read as simplified heuristics. Actual nutrient availability emerges from interacting equilibria, concentrations, competing ions, and plant uptake processes, not from pH in isolation [1].

Broader plant nutrition literature supports the core principle that acidity and alkalinity alter nutrient behaviour, even though much of that evidence comes from soil-root systems rather than from recirculating nutrient solution alone. In particular, higher pH has been associated with reduced availability of iron, zinc, and manganese, while phosphate behaviour also changes with pH-dependent chemistry [2]. That broader pattern helps frame the hydroponic question, but it does not justify simply transferring soil rules into all soilless settings. This paper therefore focuses narrowly on explaining why pH changes the chemical availability of nutrients in hydroponic solution, why effects differ among nutrients and chemical forms, and why precipitation risk and biological uptake cannot be reduced to a universal availability chart [2].

II. Background and Scope

The background literature shows that nutrient management in soilless culture is inherently context dependent. A recent review of soilless cultivation emphasises that nutrient-solution requirements vary with crop, cultivar, substrate, and growing conditions, which is already enough to caution against universal pH thresholds [3]. This matters because any claim about nutrient availability presumes a particular chemical and biological setting. If the crop changes, if the root zone differs, or if the substrate modifies ion exchange and retention, then the practical meaning of a given pH also changes. The implication for the present paper is that pH must be explained as part of a variable system, not as a stand-alone target number that predicts nutrient sufficiency under all hydroponic conditions [3].

A related body of evidence comes from irrigation water chemistry, where pH interacts with carbonate species and contributes to scaling and precipitation behaviour [4]. Although that literature is not primarily about plant nutrient speciation, it is highly relevant to the chemistry of hydroponic solution because precipitation removes ions from the dissolved phase and can therefore change what remains chemically available. Carbonate-associated scale formation illustrates an important background principle: solubility depends not only on the nutrient ion itself, but also on counter-ions, alkalinity, and saturation conditions. The limitation is that engineering-focused water quality studies do not directly establish plant

uptake outcomes, so they support the chemical side of the argument more strongly than the biological side [4].

General hydroponic reviews commonly state that nutrient availability is pH dependent and that precipitation can occur outside an operational range near pH 5 to 7, but they usually stop short of a deeper explanation of nutrient-specific speciation [5]. That pattern is useful because it shows where practical advice and scientific explanation diverge. Grower guidance often needs manageable rules, whereas scientific interpretation must account for composition, concentration, and competing equilibria. The gap motivating this paper is therefore not whether pH matters, because the literature broadly agrees that it does, but how to explain its effects without implying that all nutrients respond identically or that one chart can define universal chemical availability in hydroponic systems [5].

III. Core Concepts and Mechanisms

The central mechanism is that pH shifts chemical equilibria, thereby changing the forms in which nutrients and associated ions exist in solution. Reviews of soilless agricultural systems consistently note that pH affects nutrient solubility and that successful management requires crop-specific control rather than generic set points [6]. In chemical terms, a change in hydrogen ion activity can alter dissociation states, the balance between dissolved species, and the tendency of some ions to remain in solution or participate in less soluble compounds. This does not mean every nutrient becomes more or less available in the same direction as pH changes. Instead, each nutrient responds through its own chemistry, and the practical implication is that pH control should be interpreted as steering a network of equilibria rather than pursuing a single universal optimum [6].

A second mechanism is interaction with system context. The same review evidence indicates that nutrient management in soilless systems is crop and condition specific, which supports the broader claim that pH effects differ among nutrients and chemical forms because the surrounding matrix also differs [6]. Substrate properties, solution formulation, and the presence of competing cations or anions can change how strongly a pH shift affects apparent solubility. For example, a response dominated by cation exchange, by carbonate chemistry, or by calcium-phosphate association will not behave like a response governed mainly by simple ionic dilution. The implication is that pH does not act independently of composition, and this is one reason reader-facing guidance should avoid turning a complex multivariable system into a universal chart with hard cut-offs [6].

Water treatment literature adds an important mechanistic bridge by showing that pH interacts with alkalinity, hardness, and precipitation chemistry in ways that can influence dissolved nutrient persistence [7]. When carbonate-rich water is present, pH affects whether the system tends towards corrosive or encrusting behaviour, and this can encourage solid formation that removes ions from solution. For hydroponics, that matters because dissolved concentration is a precondition for immediate chemical availability, even if dissolved presence alone does not guarantee plant uptake. The limitation of this evidence is that it is not centred on plant nutrition speciation, yet it still clarifies why pH control cannot be separated from source-water chemistry. In operational terms, pH management without attention to alkalinity and hardness can misread precipitation risk and therefore misread nutrient availability [7].

IV. Evidence Synthesis

The evidence base becomes clearer when carbonate chemistry is considered explicitly. A review on alkalinity and hardness explains that pH changes the distribution of dissolved inorganic carbon species, especially among bicarbonate, carbonate, and related forms [8]. Although this source comes from aquaculture rather than hydroponic nutrition, the chemical principle is transferable: when pH rises, carbonate-related species can become more influential in determining whether calcium remains dissolved or participates in scale-forming reactions. This helps explain why pH can change precipitation risk without implying that the effect is identical for all nutrients. The implication is that pH-driven shifts in associated anions can be just as important as changes in the nutrient ion itself, yet the limitation remains that this evidence supports chemical reasoning more directly than plant uptake outcomes [8].

Hydroponic nutrient-solution management literature reinforces the connection between pH, solubility, and uptake while also exposing the limits of oversimplification. Reviews state that pH affects the solubility and uptake of both macro- and micronutrients in hydroponics, but they frame this mainly as a management and monitoring problem rather than as a resolved map of exact species behaviour [9]. This distinction matters. Solubility is a chemical condition, whereas uptake is a biological outcome influenced by roots, transpiration, and nutrient interactions. Therefore, a pH shift may change dissolved forms or concentrations without producing a proportionate plant response. The synthesis point is that plant availability cannot be inferred from pH alone because composition, monitoring quality, and biological uptake processes moderate the link between solution chemistry and nutrition [9].

The most direct evidence in the package comes from recent work on macronutrient solubility in soilless substrates and from narrower hydroponic engineering evidence on bicarbonate control. The bicarbonate study shows that pH control and bicarbonate neutralisation are used to prevent calcium carbonate precipitation in hydroponic irrigation systems, confirming that pH management can be necessary to keep important ions in dissolved form [10]. More decisively, the soilless substrate study found that soluble nitrate and ammonium declined at higher pH, phosphorus declined especially with calcium hydroxide, potassium depended on substrate type and cation exchange capacity, calcium and magnesium responded differently depending on the lime source, and sulfate remained comparatively stable; modelling also indicated formation of low-solubility calcium-phosphate and magnesium-phosphate phases [1]. Together, these results directly support the argument that pH changes chemical equilibria and solubility

in nutrient systems, but that the direction and magnitude of response are nutrient specific and composition dependent rather than universal [1], [10].

V. Practical Implications and Limitations

For practice, the first implication is that hydroponic pH targets should be treated as operating ranges that require interpretation, not as universal truth statements about nutrient availability. Broad reviews of soilless cultivation note that buffering can be limited and that conditions can change quickly, so careful monitoring is essential [11]. In such systems, a measured pH value is only a partial signal. It may indicate increased precipitation risk, altered speciation, or a need to review source-water alkalinity, but it does not by itself prove plant deficiency or sufficiency. The value of pH monitoring therefore lies in combining it with knowledge of formulation, water chemistry, and crop response. This is especially important when readers are tempted to rely on simplified charts that imply a single cut-off for all nutrients [11].

A second implication concerns interpretation of nutrient-specific behaviour. The strongest direct evidence in the package concerns several macronutrients in peat-based soilless systems, while evidence for hydroponic micronutrient speciation in solution is broader and more indirect [1], [2]. That means the claim that pH affects nutrients differently is well supported, but the exact mechanistic detail is not equally strong for every nutrient class in the supplied sources. For authoritative guidance, this matters because a scientifically careful explanation must acknowledge uneven evidence rather than extend strong claims from one chemical context to all others. In reader-facing terms, it is justified to say that pH can alter nutrient forms and precipitation risk, but not to promise that a universal chart will reliably predict actual plant availability across crops, formulations, and conditions [1], [2], [11].

A third implication is that chemical availability and biological availability should not be conflated. Reviews of soilless systems emphasise rapid change and limited buffering, which means roots encounter a dynamic environment rather than a fixed equilibrium state [11]. The supplied evidence also indicates that tissue nutrient status does not always align neatly with measured solubility in soilless substrate studies, suggesting that uptake biology, root-driven pH modification, and other interacting factors can disturb simple chemical predictions [1]. This does not weaken the importance of chemistry; rather, it defines its limit. pH is a powerful driver of speciation and precipitation, but actual plant availability also depends on concentration, composition, substrate effects, and uptake processes. As a result, universal cut-offs are poor substitutes for integrated interpretation of chemistry and biology [1], [11].

VI. Conclusion

The evidence supports a clear answer to the question of why pH changes the chemical availability of nutrients in hydroponic solution. pH shifts chemical equilibria, changes the forms in which ions exist, and can alter whether nutrients remain dissolved or participate in precipitation reactions [1], [8], [10]. However, the same evidence also shows that these effects are not uniform across nutrients. Responses depend on nutrient identity, associated ions, lime source, substrate composition, alkalinity, hardness, and system context [1], [6], [7]. For that reason, pH should be understood as an interacting control variable within a larger chemical and biological system, not as a universal predictor of nutrient availability.

The most important practical conclusion is that simplified nutrient-availability charts should be used cautiously. They may summarise broad tendencies, but the best available evidence in this package shows that universal cut-offs can be misleading because nutrient behaviour is context dependent and because dissolved chemical status does not map perfectly onto plant uptake [1], [9], [11]. The highest-value next work would be more direct hydroponic solution studies that connect pH-driven speciation and precipitation to crop-specific uptake outcomes across different formulations and water chemistries. Until then, authoritative guidance should explain pH as a driver of speciation and solubility while explicitly preserving the limits imposed by composition, concentration, uptake biology, and other operating conditions [1], [3], [11].

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. Huang, P. R. Fisher, W. R. Argo, K. Y. Jeong, and J. Altland, "Macronutrient solubility in response to the ph of soilless container substrates," *Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition*, 2025.

[2] 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.

[3] 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.

[4] 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.

[5] 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.

[6] 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.

[7] J. C. Majsztrik, R. T. Fernandez, P. R. Fisher, D. R. Hitchcock, J. Lea-Cox, J. S. Owen, Jr., L. R. Oki, and S. A. White, "Water use and treatment in container-grown specialty crop production: A review," *Water, Air, & Soil Pollution*, 2017.

[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] 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.

[10] C. Cambra, S. Sendra, J. Lloret, and R. Lacuesta, “Smart system for bicarbonate control in irrigation for hydroponic precision farming,” *Sensors*, 2018.
[11] A. Fussy and J. Papenbrock, “An overview of soil and soilless cultivation techniques-chances, challenges and the neglected question of sustainability,” *Plants*, 2022.