Integrated climate control in hydroponic production

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

***Abstract*—Hydroponic production allows close management of the aerial environment, yet effective climate control cannot be achieved by treating temperature, humidity, vapour pressure deficit, airflow, carbon dioxide and light as independent setpoints. These variables interact through plant water relations, gas exchange, photosynthetic demand and developmental responses. This paper synthesises available evidence to explain how the major aerial environmental variables should be interpreted together in controlled hydroponic environments. Temperature and humidity jointly establish vapour pressure deficit, while airflow affects the local exchange conditions around leaves and the spatial consistency of the canopy climate. Light and carbon dioxide alter the potential demand for photosynthesis, but their value depends on compatible thermal and moisture conditions. Evidence also indicates that species, cultivar, developmental stage and production objective limit the transferability of fixed climate recipes. The paper argues that integrated climate management is a constraint-balancing task in which environmental variables, canopy uniformity and biological objectives must be assessed together. Climate mechanisms should consequently guide the selection and interpretation of measurements, providing a foundation for later development of sensing, data integration and feedback-control systems.[1], [2], [3], [4]**

I. Introduction

Hydroponic production separates crop growth from soil while enabling substantial adjustment of the surrounding aerial environment. Within this environment, water availability, temperature, light, carbon dioxide and humidity are related to controlled-production outcomes, rather than acting as isolated influences.[1] Temperature affects the thermal context of plant processes, humidity contributes to atmospheric drying demand, light establishes an energy context, and carbon dioxide is associated with carbon assimilation. Airflow influences the exchange environment surrounding leaves. Their combined effect is more important than the nominal value of any individual variable because the crop experiences them simultaneously. Integrated climate control is therefore concerned with the coherence of environmental conditions and their suitability for a stated biological objective [2].

The problem with isolated control indicators is illustrated by nutrient solution management. Electrical conductivity can provide a useful aggregate indication of solution concentration, yet it can mask imbalances among individual nutrients and obscure cultivar-dependent responses.[5] An analogous limitation arises when temperature, relative humidity or light intensity is interpreted without its associated variables. A satisfactory room-level reading may not describe the climate at the leaf surface, the transpiration demand placed on the crop, or the capacity of the crop to use supplied light and carbon dioxide. Management must consequently interpret measurements as connected evidence rather than as independent confirmations of acceptable operation [6].

This paper develops an evidence-based framework for interpreting the principal aerial variables together. Plant resource research connects physiological processes with sensing, remote observation and data-driven management, demonstrating that useful measurement depends on identifying biologically meaningful relationships.[7] The discussion first establishes the scope of integrated climate control, then examines core mechanisms involving vapour pressure deficit, airflow, light context and carbon dioxide. It subsequently considers why fixed climate recipes are unreliable across crops and production objectives, before identifying the measurement implications of a coordinated approach [8].

II. Background and Scope

Integrated climate interpretation must recognise that plant response is conditional rather than uniform. Research on oxygen limitation shows that responses can vary with species, tissue and developmental stage.[9] Although oxygen is primarily a root-zone concern in hydroponics, this evidence demonstrates a general principle relevant to aerial climate management: identical physical conditions do not necessarily produce identical biological outcomes. Temperature, humidity and light settings should therefore be assessed against crop identity and developmental state, rather than assumed to have the same meaning across all hydroponic crops. Root-zone and aerial conditions also require coordinated interpretation because plant response connects water uptake, respiration and canopy gas exchange [10].

Light management provides a second example of conditional response. Artificial lighting influences photosynthesis, morphology and development, but the suitable spectral composition, duration and intensity depend on crop-specific production objectives.[11] Photoperiod and temperature can also interact with stress and developmental responses, particularly in flowering regulation.[12] Light context should consequently include timing and spectrum as well as intensity. A lighting regime cannot be evaluated solely by photon delivery because its effect depends on whether the accompanying temperature, humidity, carbon dioxide and airflow conditions allow the crop to respond in the intended manner [13].

Soilless-cultivation research identifies interactions among nutrient provision, root-zone conditions and the wider growth environment.[14] This supports a coordinated interpretation of hydroponic production while also defining the scope of the present paper. The objective is not to prescribe fixed settings,

design an automated system or evaluate a particular sensor platform. Instead, the paper explains the climate mechanisms that make integrated interpretation necessary. The central gap addressed is the tendency to treat environmental variables as separate operational targets despite evidence that their consequences depend on interactions, spatial conditions and biological context [15].

III. Core Concepts and Mechanisms

Temperature and humidity should be considered jointly through vapour pressure deficit, which represents the atmospheric demand for water relative to a leaf. A change in temperature can alter this demand even if relative humidity is held constant, while a humidity adjustment can change the effect of temperature on plant water relations. Plant responses to rising vapour pressure deficit include changes in stomatal behaviour and photosynthetic response, with variation among species and functional groups.[3] Vapour pressure deficit is therefore more informative than humidity alone for interpreting the moisture component of climate. It remains a contextual indicator, however, because a suitable condition for one crop or growth stage cannot automatically be transferred to another [16].

Airflow is relevant because it modifies the local exchange environment around leaves and contributes to the spatial distribution of temperature and moisture. Its value cannot be inferred from air movement alone. Instead, airflow must be interpreted with the temperature and humidity conditions that determine heat and water exchange, together with canopy structure and crop condition. Evidence from substrate-free strawberry production links temperature, oxygen, flow and root-mat conditions to system outcomes.[17] This interaction demonstrates that flow-related conditions can modify biological constraints rather than simply providing a separate operational variable. In aerial climate management, uneven airflow may similarly create different local climates within an apparently uniform growing space [18].

Light context and carbon dioxide should be interpreted as drivers of potential photosynthetic activity whose practical significance depends on accompanying climatic conditions. Controlled-production evidence relates water, temperature, light, carbon dioxide and humidity to crop response and emphasises that their outcomes are context dependent.[1] Increasing light or altering carbon dioxide conditions does not independently guarantee a corresponding crop response when thermal conditions, vapour pressure deficit or airflow constrain water exchange and gas exchange. The appropriate question is therefore whether the combined environment supports the intended response, not whether each input separately reaches a nominal target [19].

IV. Evidence Synthesis

The evidence collectively supports a climate framework organised around interacting variables and measurable plant-relevant conditions. Reviews of soilless production connect environmental ranges with sensor-based management, Internet-connected systems and data-supported decision-making.[1] This association does not imply that collecting more measurements automatically produces better management. Rather, temperature, humidity, light and carbon dioxide observations become valuable when they are interpreted in relation to known interactions. Measurements should assist the grower to determine whether the canopy climate is coherent with plant water relations and photosynthetic demand, rather than merely documenting whether isolated setpoints have been attained [20].

Fixed climate recipes are limited because the biological meaning of a climate combination changes across crops, cultivars and developmental stages. Reviews of blue-light responses identify species- and stage-specific differences, while controlled soilless-production literature emphasises crop- and system-specific environmental ranges and decisions.[1], [21] The evidence does not support a universal temperature, humidity or light setting for hydroponic production. Instead, climate targets should be provisional interpretations that are validated against the response sought from the particular crop. This limitation is especially important when changing photoperiod, spectral composition or temperature because developmental responses may alter the relevance of otherwise familiar environmental conditions [22].

Lighting-design evidence demonstrates that climate decisions can involve competing objectives. Optimisation research identifies relationships among crop response, spatial light uniformity and electricity-use efficiency, with trade-offs between these outcomes.[23] This finding reinforces the broader climate-control argument. A setting cannot be called optimal without identifying the objective against which it is judged. A system seeking uniform canopy exposure may make different decisions from one prioritising energy efficiency or a particular developmental outcome. Integrated control should therefore begin with an explicit production objective and evaluate whether the whole climate supports it [24].

V. Practical Implications and Limitations

An integrated climate framework distinguishes physiological interpretation from technical implementation. Soilless-production systems can integrate observations of pH, EC, oxygen, temperature, humidity, light and carbon dioxide.[25] However, the existence of a combined measurement set does not itself establish how each variable should be controlled. Climate mechanisms identify the variables and relationships that require attention, including the interaction of temperature and humidity through vapour pressure deficit and the dependence of light response on accompanying conditions. Detailed decisions about sensor placement, data processing, actuators and feedback rules require separate engineering work, informed by these physiological relationships rather than substituted for them [26].

Evidence on precision approaches supports the integration of sensors, data-driven models and environmental control in soilless cultivation.[25] Yet this evidence should not be interpreted as proof that one automated configuration can be

transferred between hydroponic crops. Crop identity, cultivar, growth stage, system design and production objective remain material constraints. An integrated framework should therefore support repeated validation of climate assumptions against observed crop response. The major practical implication is that measurements and control targets must remain responsive to context. The major limitation is that available evidence supports a systems principle, not a single universally validated operational recipe.

Measurement quality constrains the reliability of any integrated interpretation. Research on photosynthetically active radiation identifies the importance of sensor characteristics, calibration and measurement error when light is used as an input for management.[27] This principle extends to climate observations more generally. A measurement taken at one location or averaged across a space may not adequately represent conditions experienced throughout the canopy, particularly where airflow and lighting are spatially uneven. Measurement should therefore be designed to reveal meaningful canopy conditions and variation. The available evidence supports this requirement for careful interpretation, but does not establish one universal sensing layout or feedback architecture.

VI. Conclusion

Integrated climate control in hydroponic production is a constraint-balancing problem. Temperature, humidity, vapour pressure deficit, airflow, carbon dioxide and light context should be interpreted as connected influences on plant water relations, gas exchange, photosynthetic demand and development.[1], [3], [4] Isolated setpoints can be misleading because they may conceal interactions, spatial non-uniformity and crop-specific responses. Effective climate management therefore requires explicit biological objectives, context-sensitive targets and measurements that represent the canopy environment.

The highest-value next work is the validation of crop- and stage-specific climate combinations using measurement approaches that capture spatial conditions and support plant-relevant interpretation.[21], [27] Such work can provide the evidence required to translate climate mechanisms into reliable sensing, data integration and feedback-control designs. Until then, climate targets should be treated as conditional decisions rather than universal prescriptions.

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] 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.

[2] M.-H. Talbot and D. Monfet, "Analysing the influence of growing conditions on both energy load and crop yield of a controlled environment agriculture space," *Applied Energy*, 2024.

[3] C. Grossiord, T. N. Buckley, L. A. Cernusak, K. A. Novick, B. Poulter, R. T. W. Siegwolf, J. S. Sperry, and N. G. McDowell, "Plant responses to rising vapor pressure deficit," *New Phytologist*, 2020.

[4] C. Vatistas, D. D. Avgoustaki, and T. Bartzanas, "A systematic literature review on controlled-environment agriculture: How vertical farms and greenhouses can influence the sustainability and footprint of urban microclimate with local food production," *Atmosphere*, 2022.

[5] 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.

[6] J. A. Lankhorst, H. J. de Boer, D. C. Behling, P. L. Drake, E. A. Perkowski, and K. T. Rebel, "Nutrient availability increases photosynthetic capacity without altering the cost of resource use for photosynthesis," *AoB PLANTS*, 2025.

[7] 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.

[8] 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.

[9] J. Jethva, R. R. Schmidt, M. Sauter, and J. Selinski, "Try or die: Dynamics of plant respiration and how to survive low oxygen conditions," *Plants*, 2022.

[10] 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.

[11] S. Azizi, S. Aliniaeifard, S. Zarbakhsh, S. Esmaeili, K. Baghalian, and N. S. Gruda, "Photobiology, photosynthesis, and plant responses under artificial lighting in controlled environment agriculture," *Scientia Horticulturae*, 2025.

[12] G. Vicentini, M. Biancucci, L. Mineri, D. Chirivı, F. Giaume, Y. Miao, J. Kyozuka, V. Brambilla, C. Betti, and F. Fornara, "Environmental control of rice flowering time," *Plant Communications*, 2023.

[13] T. Jishi, "Estimation of time course in phytochrome photostationary state under artificial light for controlling plant growth," *Frontiers in Plant Science*, 2024.

[14] 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.

[15] 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.

[16] A. M. Vera-Vives, P. Novel, K. Zheng, S. ling Tan, and M. Schwarzländer, "Mitochondrial respiration is essential for photosynthesis-dependent atp supply of the plant cytosol," *New Phytologist*, 2024.

[17] 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.

[18] J. Arshad, F. Azeem, A. Butt, M. Chaudhary, R. S. Safdar, M. K. Joyo, I. Ahmad, P. Valsalan, and H. M. Ahmed, "Ai-enabled iot-based hydroponic farming with embedded automation and nutrient prediction," *Future Internet*, 2026.

[19] L. Corbesier and G. Coupland, "Photoperiodic flowering of arabidopsis: integrating genetic and physiological approaches to characterization of the floral stimulus," *Plant, Cell & Environment*, 2005.

[20] T. I. Wong and X. Zhou, "Photon efficacy and cost investigation of leds at different wavelengths and color temperatures for horticulture," *Discover Agriculture*, 2024.

[21] Q. Su, Y. G. Park, R. D. Kambale, J. Adelberg, R. Karthikeyan, and B. R. Jeong, "Advancing light-mediated technology in plant growth and development: The role of blue light," *Horticulturae*, 2025.

[22] S. D. Jackson, "Plant responses to photoperiod," *New Phytologist*, 2009.

[23] K. Saito and E. Goto, "Lighting design optimization in a plant factory using an optical simulation and differential evolution," *Horticulturae*, 2025.

[24] C. Grierson, E. Nielsen, T. Ketelaar, and J. Schiefelbein, "Root hairs," *The Arabidopsis Book*, 2014.

[25] 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.

[26] A. Ali, S. J. Jeong, S. Zhen, G. Cocetta, J. Masabni, and G. Niu, "Blue light modulates the interactive effects of far-red light and day-night temperature difference on the growth, morphology and physiology of arugula and lettuce," *Frontiers in Plant Science*, 2025.

[27] J. Liu, Y. Cai, X. Pei, and X. Yu, "Advances in research and application of techniques for measuring photosynthetically active radiation," *Remote Sens*, 2025.