# Buffering capacity and alkalinity

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

***Abstract*—Buffering capacity and alkalinity are central to the chemical stability of hydroponic nutrient solutions, yet they are commonly conflated with pH in practice. This paper explains why some nutrient solutions resist pH change more strongly than others by distinguishing the instantaneous acidity measure given by pH from the acid neutralising capacity represented by alkalinity and from the broader system response described as buffering capacity. Using a structured evidence synthesis of accepted bibliography ready sources, the paper examines how prior hydroponic and soilless literature frames pH control, substrate effects, and nutrient management, and then uses the strongest available evidence to clarify the bicarbonate and carbon dioxide basis through which alkalinity can reduce day to day pH fluctuation. The analysis shows that alkalinity is an important contributor to buffering because titratable bases, especially within carbonate chemistry, consume added acid and moderate acidification, but alkalinity is not identical to buffering capacity in every context. The practical implication is that nutrient solution management should not rely on pH readings alone. Interpreting resistance to pH change requires attention to alkalinity, buffering behaviour, and the limits of simplified pH based heuristics when biological uptake and solution chemistry interact.**

## I. Introduction

In hydroponic nutrient solutions, pH stability matters because root zone chemistry influences nutrient solubility, biological activity, and day to day management decisions. The key question is not only what the current pH value is, but also how strongly the solution resists change when acid is added or when biological processes shift the acid base balance. The strongest evidence in the supplied package explains this resistance through alkalinity, defined as titratable bases associated largely with the bicarbonate and carbon dioxide system, and reports that higher alkalinity increases buffering capacity and reduces pH fluctuations caused by photosynthesis and respiration [1]. This relationship is important because it shifts attention from a single pH reading to the chemical capacity of the solution to absorb disturbance. A solution may sit at an acceptable pH yet still be chemically unstable if its buffering reserve is limited [1].

The practical importance of alkalinity follows from its role in resisting acidification. Where alkalinity is higher, more acid must be added before the solution pH falls appreciably, because bicarbonate associated species neutralise some of the added hydrogen ions [1]. In hydroponic management, this means that two nutrient solutions with similar starting pH can behave very differently after fertiliser addition, root uptake, or gas exchange. One may drift quickly, while another changes slowly because its acid neutralising capacity is greater [1]. The problem for growers and interpreters of hydroponic chemistry is that pH readings alone do not reveal this underlying resistance. Understanding why some nutrient solutions resist pH change more strongly than others therefore requires attention to the chemistry behind the pH number, not just the number itself [1].

A further complication is conceptual confusion. The evidence base directly distinguishes alkalinity as titratable bases, hardness as the concentration of divalent cations, and pH as a separate measure of acidity, while also linking higher alkalinity with greater buffering capacity [1]. That distinction is essential, because buffering capacity and alkalinity are related but not interchangeable terms. Buffering capacity describes the system response to acid or base addition, whereas alkalinity describes one important source of acid neutralising capacity within that system [1]. This paper therefore develops a focused evidence based explanation of buffering capacity and alkalinity in hydroponic nutrient solutions. It first sets the background and scope of current literature, then explains core concepts and mechanisms, synthesises the main applied evidence, and finally identifies practical implications and evidence limits relevant to nutrient solution interpretation [1].

## II. Background and Scope

Recent literature on plant nutrition and root zone chemistry consistently presents pH as a controlling variable for nutrient behaviour, but it often stops short of explaining why pH changes are more severe in some systems than in others. One review identifies pH as a master variable in the soil root nexus and links it to rhizosphere processes and nutrient solubility, which is useful for showing why chemical stability matters to plant uptake [2]. However, that framing does not itself define buffering capacity in aqueous chemical terms. It tells the reader that pH matters, but not what governs resistance to pH movement when the system is perturbed [2]. For the present topic, this is an important boundary: a discussion of pH effects on roots and nutrients provides context, yet it does not answer the more specific question of why one nutrient solution resists pH change more strongly than another.

A similar pattern appears in broader soilless cultivation reviews. These sources discuss nutrient solution management, pH effects, and the role of substrates in stabilising the root environment, thereby confirming that buffering is operationally relevant in controlled cultivation [3]. Even so, they do not supply a scientific definition of buffering capacity in aqueous systems. Their contribution is therefore contextual rather than foundational. They show that managing pH instability is a recognised part of hydroponic practice, but they do not fully

separate the physical contribution of substrates, the chemical contribution of dissolved species, and the interpretive error of using pH as a proxy for all aspects of solution stability [3]. This gap motivates a more careful synthesis that keeps the present discussion centred on aqueous nutrient solutions rather than broad horticultural management alone.

Applied hydroponics reviews reinforce the need for this distinction. Evidence in the package states that nutrient solution pH should remain within target ranges for solubility and control, but does not clearly separate pH from alkalinity and buffering capacity beyond general management implications [4]. In other words, the operational advice is sound, yet the underlying concepts remain vulnerable to conflation. The scope of this paper is therefore deliberately narrow. It does not attempt a general treatment of all water quality variables, nor does it revisit wider source water discussions in depth. Instead, it explains the scientific meaning of buffering capacity in aqueous nutrient solutions, shows how alkalinity contributes to resistance against acidification, and distinguishes buffering capacity, alkalinity, and pH clearly enough to prevent them from being treated as synonyms [1], [4].

## III. Core Concepts and Mechanisms

The first mechanism to clarify is that buffering capacity refers to the resistance of a solution to pH change when acids or bases are introduced, whereas alkalinity refers to the quantity of titratable bases available to neutralise added acid [1]. Some soilless literature notes that substrate culture can provide a degree of buffering and that pH must be controlled, which is useful operationally, but this does not amount to a full aqueous chemical explanation [5]. The distinction matters because the source of resistance may come partly from the substrate environment and partly from dissolved chemical species. In hydroponic nutrient solutions, the paper's evidence base most directly supports carbonate related alkalinity as a major aqueous contributor to buffering against acidification [1]. Thus, buffering capacity names the behaviour, while alkalinity identifies one important chemical basis for that behaviour.

The second mechanism concerns why hydroponic systems often exhibit rapid pH movement. Reviews in the evidence package state that hydroponic substrates generally have lower buffering capacity than soil and that pH can fluctuate frequently in these systems [6]. This does not by itself define buffering capacity, but it supports an important inference: when the combined buffering contribution of the root zone is limited, routine chemical and biological disturbances can produce visible pH drift more quickly [6]. In practical terms, the absence of substantial soil buffering means that solution chemistry is exposed more directly. As a result, the impact of fertiliser reactions, plant uptake patterns, and gas exchange may be expressed as faster pH movement than would occur in more strongly buffered media [6]. This helps explain why hydroponic nutrient solutions can be chemically responsive even when they are carefully monitored.

The third mechanism is conceptual separation. The supplied evidence indicates that low buffering environments make pH fluctuate frequently and that pH alone does not capture nutrient status adequately [6]. Together with the direct distinctions given in the alkalinity review, this supports a three part clarification. First, pH reports the present acidity state of the solution, not its reserve against future change [1]. Second, alkalinity reports acid neutralising capacity, especially through bicarbonate related bases, not the current acidity itself [1]. Third, buffering capacity describes the observed resistance of the overall system to pH change, which may be influenced by alkalinity but is not reducible to the pH value alone [1], [6]. This separation prevents a common error in interpretation: assuming that a solution with an acceptable pH is necessarily well buffered or that a high pH automatically proves high buffering capacity.

## IV. Evidence Synthesis

Across the accepted sources, a consistent picture emerges in which hydroponic management emphasises tight environmental control, yet the literature varies in how directly it explains the chemistry of pH resistance. One recent review discusses operational ranges for pH, electrical conductivity, and dissolved oxygen, framing hydroponics as a precision managed system [7]. This is valuable because it shows that nutrient solution chemistry must be managed actively rather than passively. However, it remains indirect evidence for the present question, since it does not define buffering capacity itself [7]. When read alongside the stronger alkalinity source, the implication is that precision control depends not only on target set points but also on understanding which chemical properties make those set points easy or difficult to maintain [1], [7].

The most applied support for alkalinity in hydroponic water management comes from work on bicarbonate control. That evidence indicates that alkalinity, or buffering capacity, can matter more than pH alone and explicitly links bicarbonate neutralisation to acid addition [8]. This is especially helpful because it demonstrates how acid dosing interacts with the carbonate system in a management context rather than in purely theoretical terms. The interpretation consistent with the broader evidence base is that alkalinity resists acidification because bicarbonate related bases consume part of the added acid load before large pH changes occur [1], [8]. At the same time, the source is best read as applied support rather than a complete general theory, so its practical lesson should be kept within evidence boundaries: alkalinity is highly relevant to pH control, but not every aspect of buffering behaviour is exhausted by a single control architecture [8].

This applied evidence also helps resolve a common diagnostic mistake. The package states that alkalinity or buffering capacity can matter more than water pH alone and that elevated pH should trigger alkalinity testing rather than immediate interpretation based only on the pH reading [8]. That claim aligns with the stronger conceptual distinction in the alkalinity

review, where pH and alkalinity are treated as separate properties with different meanings [1]. Synthesised together, these sources show that pH is an inadequate standalone descriptor of solution resilience. A high pH does not automatically reveal whether the solution strongly resists further change, and a moderate pH does not prove chemical stability if buffering reserves are low [1], [8]. The evidence therefore supports a more discriminating reading of hydroponic chemistry: pH indicates present state, while alkalinity and buffering behaviour indicate resistance to subsequent disturbance.

## V. Practical Implications and Limitations

The practical consequence of this distinction is that nutrient availability cannot be inferred from pH alone. Evidence from soilless substrate research shows that nitrogen transformations and macronutrient solubility change with pH, but the relationships are complex and depend on substrate composition, liming materials, and local chemistry [9]. This supports the importance of pH control, yet it also cautions against treating pH as a complete descriptor of chemical performance. For hydroponic interpretation, the implication is that a solution may show a measured pH within a preferred range while still behaving differently under acid loading because its alkalinity and buffering response differ [1], [9]. The present evidence therefore supports a careful two step reading: pH helps identify the current chemical environment, whereas buffering related properties help predict how readily that environment will shift.

A second implication is methodological. The substrate solubility evidence demonstrates that simplified pH solubility charts can oversimplify real systems and that rhizosphere chemistry may differ from bulk solution chemistry [9]. This matters for the present topic because it limits any attempt to map a single pH value directly onto plant experience or nutrient behaviour without considering local chemical context. It also reinforces the need not to collapse buffering capacity into pH. If rhizosphere processes and substrate interactions can alter chemistry relative to the bulk solution, then resistance to pH change must be interpreted as a system property with context dependent expression, not as a universal function of one measurement [2], [9]. The limitation is equally clear: the supplied evidence does not provide a full quantitative model of buffering across all hydroponic formulations, so the paper should not overclaim beyond the supported conceptual distinctions.

A third implication is operational vigilance. One review in the package notes that hydroponic systems have limited nutrient buffering capacity and therefore require careful monitoring because conditions can change rapidly [10]. This supports the general conclusion that low buffering environments are more management intensive, but it does not itself establish the chemical mechanism of buffering capacity [10]. When combined with the stronger alkalinity evidence, however, it supports a restrained practical position. Monitoring should not focus on pH alone, because rapid pH change may reflect limited buffering reserve, and apparent stability may reflect higher alkalinity rather than inherently better nutrient balance [1], [10]. The principal evidence gap is that several hydroponic sources recognise instability without fully defining the chemistry behind it. Future explanatory work would benefit from more direct hydroponic studies that measure alkalinity, buffering response, and pH drift together under controlled nutrient solution conditions [6], [10].

## VI. Conclusion

The evidence supports a clear answer to the question of why some nutrient solutions resist pH change more strongly than others. Buffering capacity describes the extent to which a solution resists pH movement, while alkalinity identifies an important source of that resistance through titratable bases associated largely with bicarbonate and related carbonate chemistry [1]. pH, by contrast, reports the current acidity state and should not be treated as a synonym for either alkalinity or buffering capacity [1], [8]. Across the hydroponic and soilless literature, pH control is consistently recognised as important, but only part of the evidence base explains the underlying acid neutralising mechanism directly [2], [3], [4], [7].

The central implication is that interpretation of nutrient solution stability must move beyond pH alone. A useful reading of hydroponic chemistry asks both what the present pH is and how strongly the solution will resist further change [1], [8], [10]. The current evidence is strong enough to distinguish the three concepts and to show how alkalinity contributes to resistance against acidification, but it is less complete on quantitative comparison across diverse hydroponic formulations [6], [9]. The highest value next work is therefore direct hydroponic investigation that couples alkalinity measurement with observed pH response under defined nutrient solution disturbances, so that chemical interpretation can be tied more closely to solution specific behaviour within controlled growing systems [6], [9], [10].

## 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] 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.

[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] 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.

[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] 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.
[7] 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.
[8] C. Cambra, S. Sendra, J. Lloret, and R. Lacuesta, "Smart system for bicarbonate control in irrigation for hydroponic precision farming," *Sensors*, 2018.
[9] 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.
[10] A. Fussy and J. Papenbrock, "An overview of soil and soilless cultivation techniques-chances, challenges and the neglected question of sustainability," *Plants*, 2022.