Media influence on root-zone microbiology

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

***Abstract*—Growing media influence root-zone microbiology by creating the physical habitat in which roots, water, air and microorganisms interact. This paper synthesises evidence on how particle structure, porosity, capillarity, moisture retention, aeration and drainage alter the local conditions that can favour or constrain microbial colonisation. It argues that media should not be classified as biologically beneficial or diseased merely because microorganisms are present. Biological outcomes depend on microbial function, community balance, root condition and the wider operating environment. Evidence from soilless cultivation, substrate culture and related root-zone systems indicates that water-air balance is a central connection between media properties and microbiological conditions. Organic inputs and changing media stability can further alter biological activity, including nutrient immobilisation and other root-zone effects. The evidence also shows that pathogen presence, disease expression and system risk are related but distinct phenomena. Therefore, media selection and management should focus on maintaining suitable physical conditions while avoiding simplistic biological interpretations. The paper concludes by defining the boundary between media-mediated habitat and broader disease ecology, which requires whole-system consideration of water movement, sanitation, pathogen dispersal and crop susceptibility.**

I. Introduction

Growing media are not biologically neutral spaces around hydroponic roots. Their physical properties determine how water and air occupy the root zone, and these conditions influence the habitat available for microbial communities. In substrate-based soilless cultivation, moisture status and oxygenation are linked to microbial diversity and activity, making the water-air balance a relevant biological as well as physical design consideration [1]. A medium with different particle arrangement or water retention can therefore alter local conditions without necessarily determining which organisms will colonise it. The important implication is that media choice should be understood as habitat design: it shapes environmental opportunity for microorganisms, but it does not by itself prescribe a favourable or unfavourable microbiological outcome [2].

The relationship between physical habitat and biological activity is well established in soil-root research, where porosity, moisture and rhizosphere conditions affect the environment in which microorganisms interact with roots [3]. However, the transfer of this reasoning to hydroponic media requires care because soilless substrates differ in composition, nutrient delivery and water management. Soil evidence is useful for recognising that root-associated biology responds to physical conditions, but it does not justify treating all media as equivalent to soil. This distinction matters because microbial presence may coexist with beneficial symbioses, nutrient transformations, ecological risks or undesirable organisms, depending on the specific system and organisms involved [3], [4].

The issue becomes more complex where organic nutrient inputs or organic materials are involved. Microbial processing can be associated with nutrient transformations, root conditions and pathogen suppression, yet it can also introduce variability and biological risks that are not resolved by describing a medium as organic or biologically active [5]. This paper examines how media structure, moisture and surfaces influence microbial habitat around hydroponic roots. It then distinguishes habitat formation from demonstrated microbial benefit or disease, before locating disease ecology within the broader interactions of plant, water, sanitation and system operation [6].

II. Background and Scope

Microbial activity in soilless systems can contribute to several different processes, including mineralisation, nutrient-related functions, plant-growth promotion and pathogen suppression. These functions should not be assumed from the presence of organic matter or microorganisms alone, because microbial processing may also be associated with phytotoxic effects or unstable root-zone conditions [5]. Consequently, the relevant question is not whether a medium contains life, but whether the physical and chemical setting supports functions compatible with plant growth. This framing avoids the false contrast between sterile inert media and biologically active media, since both can become part of a dynamic root-zone environment under cultivation [7].

Contemporary soilless-cultivation literature similarly differentiates microbial diversity from functional benefit. A community may contain taxa associated with useful functions, yet imbalance within the community or the presence of pathogenic organisms can lead to materially different outcomes [1]. The distinction is essential for interpreting observations of colonisation on media particles or root surfaces. Colonisation indicates that a habitat is available, not that the resulting community is protective, nutritionally valuable or harmful. Functional assessment must therefore consider root condition, environmental context and evidence of biological effect rather than relying on microbial detection as a proxy for performance [8].

This paper is a focused synthesis of media-mediated microbial habitat rather than a general review of hydroponic microbiology. Substrate properties can influence rhizosphere communities and are connected with microbial activity, pathogen

suppression and broader management concerns [1]. Nevertheless, media are only one component of a coupled root-zone system. Nutrient solution, irrigation practice, crop characteristics and sanitation influence the biological environment alongside material properties. The analytical gap addressed here is the need to explain what media can reasonably be said to influence, while avoiding claims that assign whole-system biological outcomes to substrate choice alone [9].

III. Core Concepts and Mechanisms

Texture, porosity, moisture, aeration and drainage jointly establish the physical setting around roots. Particle arrangement affects pore space, while water retention and drainage influence the proportion of those pores occupied by water or air. This creates local variation in oxygen availability and water continuity that is relevant to microbial habitat [10]. The mechanism is not a simple relationship in which more water or more air is universally desirable. Instead, the balance affects root-zone conditions that can support different biological processes. Media management must therefore account for the combined behaviour of structure and irrigation, because the same material can present different habitats under different moisture regimes [11].

Capillarity and water retention further explain why media structure matters biologically. A substrate can distribute solution through small pores while retaining larger pores for gas exchange, although these relationships depend on material properties and operating conditions. Porosity, capillarity, oxygenation and water retention are recognised root-zone design factors in hydroponic systems [12]. Their relevance to microbiology is indirect but consequential: they influence the physical continuity of moisture and the availability of oxygen at root-adjacent surfaces. A medium described as biologically inert may still provide substantial surface area and moisture conditions for colonisation once it is placed in an operating system [13].

Biological inertness should not be confused with permanent biological absence. Inert media may reduce biological inputs associated with the material itself, whereas biological activity can still arise from roots, nutrient solution, introduced organisms and system contact surfaces. Hydroponic practice must distinguish this material characteristic from beneficial microbial activity, pathogen spread, sanitation and crop-specific disease risk [12]. The design implication is that medium selection can help define starting conditions, but it cannot replace observation of root health or system hygiene. A biologically active root zone is not automatically beneficial, and a biologically inert substrate is not automatically protected from colonisation or disease-related processes [14].

IV. Evidence Synthesis

Across the available evidence, media function most clearly as a modifier of root-zone habitat rather than as an independent biological treatment. Substrate porosity, water retention and oxygenation can influence local conditions, while biological inertness affects the extent to which the material itself contributes to those conditions [12]. These factors can interact with sanitation and pathogen movement, but they do not establish disease causation on their own. This distinction provides a practical bridge between media management and disease risk: physical conditions may alter opportunities for microbial persistence or transport, whereas disease requires consideration of host susceptibility, causal organisms and system-level exposure [15].

Evidence from strawberry nutrient-film systems illustrates the importance of separating oxygen conditions from pathogen presence and disease expression. Root-zone oxygen limitation, microbial or pathogen occurrence and Pythium disease risk are coupled conditions, but they are not interchangeable descriptions of the same event [16]. Although this evidence concerns a substrate-free system and cannot be directly generalised to all growing media, it supports a broader interpretive principle. Root-zone physical conditions can shape biological risk pathways, yet a diagnosis of disease requires evidence beyond oxygen status or observed microorganisms. Media discussions should retain this causal caution.

The same nutrient-film evidence also links root-mat conditions, oxygen gradients and pathogen dispersal to infection and disease severity at the system scale [16]. Its relevance here is bounded: it demonstrates that local root-zone habitat can be connected to wider circulation and management processes, not that all media reproduce nutrient-film dynamics. In media-based systems, surfaces and moisture distribution may affect local habitat, while irrigation pathways and operational conditions influence how any biological concern extends beyond an individual root zone. This separation keeps the paper focused on media-mediated conditions while recognising the need for broader disease analysis when symptoms, pathogen transport or recurring system problems are present.

V. Practical Implications and Limitations

Media selection should be approached as a choice about physical, chemical and biological conditions rather than as a single indicator of microbiological quality. Reviews of soilless systems identify substrate properties and moisture-aeration balance as relevant to rhizosphere microbial activity [17]. In practice, this means that a material's water retention, structure and stability should be considered together with its management under irrigation. The evidence does not support assigning a universal biological value to a particular medium. Validation should instead examine whether the maintained root-zone conditions are consistent with healthy roots and stable operation in the specific crop and system context.

Microbial diversity, functional taxa, plant-growth promotion and pathogen or food-safety risk are distinct categories of evidence. Their separation is particularly important when evaluating media that support visible colonisation or receive biological inputs [17]. Diversity alone does not demonstrate a plant benefit, and the detection of a potentially harmful organism does not alone demonstrate disease. A robust assessment would require functionally relevant indicators and attention to

root condition, rather than a binary classification of a medium as good or bad. This is a significant limitation of broad claims about biological media, because community composition and outcomes may vary with conditions that are not captured by material type alone.

Water movement and operational conditions also constrain conclusions drawn from the medium itself. Research in container production distinguishes pathogen presence, treatment efficacy, disease risk and operational conditions, showing that these are related but analytically separate concerns [18]. Although container systems are not identical to hydroponic media systems, the distinction is applicable as a caution. Where irrigation water, recirculation, treatment or sanitation are implicated, interpretation must move beyond media surfaces and local moisture. The evidence base supports treating media as one contributor to root-zone habitat, while comprehensive disease assessment requires system-level investigation.

VI. Conclusion

Growing media influence root-zone microbiology principally by shaping surfaces, moisture distribution, aeration and drainage around roots. These physical conditions can alter the habitat available for microbial colonisation and activity, but they do not determine whether a community is beneficial, neutral or disease-associated [1], [10], [12]. The most defensible interpretation is therefore conditional: media influence biological opportunity through root-zone conditions, while biological outcomes depend on microbial function, plant condition and the operating system. This approach avoids equating microbial presence with either plant benefit or disease.

The highest-value next work is to assess media performance through integrated observation of root-zone physical conditions, root health and relevant biological outcomes, rather than through material labels alone. Where concerns extend to pathogen dispersal, sanitation, recirculation or infection, the analysis must address whole-system disease ecology rather than attributing the issue solely to the medium [16], [18].

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] 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.

[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] 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.

[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] 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.

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

[8] B. M. Eldridge, L. R. Manzoni, C. A. Graham, B. Rodgers, J. R. Farmer, and A. N. Dodd, "Getting to the roots of aeroponic indoor farming," *New Phytologist*, 2020.

[9] 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.

[10] 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.

[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] 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.

[13] S. Wang, Y. Kleiner, S. M. Clark, V. Raghavan, and B. Tartakovsky, "Review of current hydroponic food production practices and the potential role of bioelectrochemical systems," *Reviews in Environmental Science and Bio/Technology*, 2024.

[14] 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.

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

[16] S. Scott and C. Villouta, "Dissolved oxygen limitation and pythium root rot in strawberry nft systems: Mechanisms, research gaps, and prospects for substrate-free production," *Frontiers in Plant Science*, 2026.

[17] 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.

[18] 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.