Visual diagnosis and its scientific limits

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

***Abstract*—Visual diagnosis is a practical starting point for identifying nutrient disorders in hydroponic crops, because leaf colour, necrosis, tissue position and altered growth can be observed quickly. Its scientific limitation is that these signs are non-specific. Nutrient deficiency, root-zone oxygen limitation, disease, senescence and environmental conditions can produce overlapping visible symptoms. This paper examines how symptom distribution, tissue age, colour, necrosis and growth pattern can support a differential diagnosis without proving cause. Evidence indicates that visual observations are most useful when they narrow hypotheses and direct subsequent inspection. Reliable diagnosis requires comparison of the visible pattern with nutrient-solution conditions, root-zone evidence, environmental records and, where warranted, tissue information. The analysis also identifies why photograph-led diagnosis and symptom charts can fail: both commonly exclude timing, root condition, solution history and local environmental context. Visual inspection should therefore be treated as hypothesis-generating evidence, rather than as a conclusive test of nutrient status.**

I. Introduction

Visual symptoms are often the first indication that a hydroponic crop requires attention. Chlorosis, necrosis, poor vigour, altered leaf form and uneven canopy growth can be recognised quickly, allowing an observer to identify affected plants and document the progression of a disorder. However, visible symptoms are plant responses to stress rather than unique signatures of its source. Dissolved oxygen limitation, root disease and nutrient deficiency can produce similar appearances because each can impair root function and disrupt normal plant performance [1]. This overlap is important because a rapid visual diagnosis may identify a consequence of stress while incorrectly identifying the underlying cause. Nutrient correction based only on leaf appearance may therefore leave a root-zone or environmental constraint unresolved [2].

Visual patterns retain diagnostic value when they are used to narrow a differential diagnosis. Symptom distribution, tissue age, colour, necrosis and growth pattern can reveal whether a disorder is concentrated in old or young leaves, spreads through the canopy, appears in local clusters, or follows a recognisable sequence. These details make an observation more informative than a general statement that a crop is unhealthy. Nevertheless, similar patterns can arise from different stresses, so visual evidence cannot prove causation [1]. A disciplined diagnosis treats an observed pattern as compatible with several explanations until contextual evidence has reduced uncertainty [3].

The purpose of this paper is to assess the scientific usefulness and limits of visual diagnosis in hydroponic crop nutrition. It considers why nutritional and non-nutritional stresses overlap visibly, identifies which visual features can legitimately guide a differential diagnosis, and explains why independent evidence is needed before corrective action is selected. The argument is that photographs and symptom charts should initiate investigation, not end it. Solution measurements, root-zone observations, environmental records and tissue information can test whether a visually plausible explanation is consistent with the crop and its growing conditions [4], [5].

II. Background and Scope

The central problem in visual diagnosis is causal convergence. Root-zone hypoxia can constrain respiration and plant performance, while disease can compromise roots and nutrient disorders can independently impair growth. Although their initiating mechanisms differ, their effects may converge in chlorosis, stunting or loss of canopy uniformity [1], [6]. A foliage image rarely reveals whether a crop is experiencing insufficient nutrient supply, impaired nutrient uptake, root injury or a combination of these conditions. The visible symptom is therefore valuable as an indication that a system has changed, but insufficient as proof of the mechanism responsible for that change [7].

Environmental conditions add another source of uncertainty. Artificial lighting affects plant responses and visible traits, while changes in light conditions can influence morphology and appearance [8]. Consequently, altered colour or leaf form should not automatically be interpreted as a nutrient disorder merely because it resembles a chart image. Environmental measurement offers complementary evidence by establishing whether changes in lighting or other growing conditions coincide with symptom development. This does not convert environmental monitoring into a direct diagnostic test, but it prevents a visual explanation from excluding a credible environmental alternative without examination.

The root zone is equally relevant to interpretation. Research on soilless production identifies physical, chemical and biological features of the growing environment as relevant to crop condition [9], [10]. In aeroponic systems, oxygen, carbon dioxide, exudates and microbial conditions are among the root-zone factors that can inform interpretation of shoot symptoms [11]. The scope of visual diagnosis must therefore include the relationship between shoot appearance and root context. An assessment that observes leaves while ignoring roots, solution conditions and system operation is necessarily incomplete.

III. Core Concepts and Mechanisms

Symptom distribution is useful because it describes where injury is expressed and how it develops. A systematic observation records whether symptoms occur first in older or younger tissue, whether they are concentrated at leaf margins or between veins, whether affected plants are scattered or grouped, and whether the condition advances gradually or abruptly. Such distributions can narrow hypotheses by identifying the form and location of the response [4]. Their limitation is that distribution is not causation. A pattern consistent with a nutrient disorder may also be consistent with a root-zone or environmental limitation that affects nutrient acquisition or plant function.

Tissue age, colour and necrosis should be interpreted together rather than as isolated labels. Colour change may precede necrosis, while reduced growth can occur with many forms of nutritional and non-nutritional stress. The timing and sequence of these observations can help distinguish an acute change from a developing condition, but they cannot establish the source of injury alone. Nutrient management in soilless cultivation involves a regulated growing environment in which multiple conditions affect plant response [9]. The visual diagnosis should therefore explain why the symptom is occurring in the observed context, rather than rely only on the resemblance between a plant and an illustrative deficiency image.

Growth pattern provides additional spatial evidence. A uniform crop-wide response may suggest a system-wide condition, whereas localised symptoms may justify closer inspection of local root-zone, solution-flow or environmental circumstances. This is an inference for investigation, not a rule that proves cause. Hydroponic deficiency research links visible symptomology with tissue nutrient information but shows that symptom onset does not always align directly with foliar elemental analysis [4]. Accordingly, growth pattern should direct the selection of measurements and inspections, while tissue or solution evidence remains necessary where the distinction among alternatives is consequential.

IV. Evidence Synthesis

Evidence on dissolved oxygen limitation and root rot illustrates why visual overlap creates diagnostic risk. Hypoxia, disease and nutrient deficiency can present similar symptoms in hydroponic crops, despite requiring different responses [1]. This means that adding fertiliser because a canopy is chlorotic may be ineffective if the primary limitation is root-zone oxygen or disease. The visual observation remains useful because it identifies a disturbance and may indicate its distribution, but the diagnosis is incomplete until competing root-zone explanations have been considered. The strongest inference is therefore conditional: the symptom is compatible with a nutrient disorder, subject to confirmation by contextual evidence.

Nutrient-solution information is one such source of context. Hydroponic production commonly considers pH, electrical conductivity and temperature when interpreting crop condition, because these variables describe the solution environment in which symptoms emerge [12]. Their diagnostic contribution is not that any single reading establishes nutrient status. Instead, they help test whether a visual hypothesis fits the system conditions or whether a competing explanation remains more plausible. A diagnosis becomes more defensible when symptom observations and relevant system measurements are mutually consistent, and less defensible when they conflict.

Broader evidence supports integration rather than isolated image classification. Soilless systems require attention to nutrient delivery, growing conditions and root-zone processes, while visual classification can be combined with sensor and environmental information [13], [14], [15]. Such integration should be understood as corroboration, not automatic certainty. A visual class can organise observations and identify a possible pattern, yet still require confirmation because similar stress classes can be confused [15]. The scientific benefit of combining evidence is that it allows a diagnosis to account for both appearance and conditions capable of producing that appearance.

V. Practical Implications and Limitations

A practical inspection should begin with careful description rather than immediate attribution. The observer should record symptom distribution, tissue age, colour, necrosis, growth pattern, onset and progression. This record creates a basis for comparing the crop with solution, root-zone and environmental information collected at the same time. It also discourages a common failure mode in which the nearest chart image becomes the presumed diagnosis. Because visually similar hypoxia, disease and nutrient symptoms can be confused, the next step should be to identify alternatives and determine which observation would distinguish them [1]. This transforms visual inspection from image matching into a structured differential process.

Photographs are useful records but incomplete diagnostic evidence. They may omit roots, nutrient-solution history, crop age, changes in environmental conditions and the rate at which injury developed. They can also alter apparent colour through illumination or camera processing. Symptom charts have a related limitation: they describe archetypal appearances but cannot represent all interactions among deficiency, senescence, stress and disease. Controlled hydroponic research directly links such overlap with diagnostic ambiguity [4]. The appropriate use of photographs is to document and communicate observations, then compare them with evidence that the image itself cannot contain.

Solution and root-zone assessment provide essential safeguards. In soilless substrates, pH influences nutrient solubility and availability, meaning that an apparent nutrient deficiency can reflect an availability problem rather than a simple shortage of supplied nutrients [16]. Root and soil research similarly connects root-zone conditions with nutrient uptake and plant symptoms [17]. Relevant follow-up may include review of pH, electrical conductivity, root condition, aeration

and environmental records. No single measurement resolves every diagnosis, but multiple independent observations can exclude unsupported explanations and improve confidence in the remaining hypothesis.

VI. Conclusion

Visual symptoms are useful for identifying crop disturbance and narrowing hypotheses through symptom distribution, tissue age, colour, necrosis and growth pattern. They are inherently non-specific because nutrient disorders, hypoxia, disease, senescence and environmental stress can produce overlapping visible symptoms [1], [4]. Visual inspection should therefore be treated as the beginning of diagnosis, not as proof of a nutrient disorder.

Reliable diagnosis requires visual patterns to be compared with solution conditions, root-zone evidence, environmental measurements and, where appropriate, tissue information [11], [12], [17]. The highest-value improvement is a disciplined practice that documents symptoms, retains plausible alternatives and seeks independent confirmation before corrective action is attributed to a nutrient cause.

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] 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.

[2] C. Cambra, S. Sendra, J. Lloret, and R. Lacuesta, "Smart system for bicarbonate control in irrigation for hydroponic precision farming," *Sensors*, 2018.

[3] 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.

[4] D. Llewellyn, S. Golem, A. M. P. Jones, and Y. Zheng, "Foliar symptomology, nutrient content, yield, and secondary metabolite variability of cannabis grown hydroponically with different single-element nutrient deficiencies," *Plants*, 2023.

[5] 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.

[6] 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.

[7] 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.

[8] 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.

[9] 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.

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

[11] 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.

[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] 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.

[14] 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.

[15] 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.

[16] 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.

[17] 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.