Pumps and passive driving forces

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

***Abstract*—Hydroponic nutrient solution movement depends on a force that can overcome resistance in the delivery pathway. This paper explains how pumps add hydraulic energy to solution and how gravity, capillary action and changing liquid levels can drive movement without active pumping. It synthesises evidence on centrifugal-pump head, pressure rise, pumped circulation, wick delivery, gravity-driven nutrient films and passive root-zone movement. Pumps create controlled pressure or elevation differences, whereas passive mechanisms depend on physical gradients and compatible fluid pathways. These mechanisms can occur sequentially in the same delivery process because solution actively pumped or atomised may later move, drain, deposit or be retained through passive processes. In every case, pathway resistance determines whether the available driving force produces useful nutrient delivery. The evidence supports a force-centred distinction between active and passive movement but provides limited direct comparison of hydraulic requirements across hydroponic arrangements. This limitation makes installation-specific validation necessary when selecting or assessing a delivery mechanism.**

I. Introduction

Hydroponic nutrient delivery requires more than a reservoir and a route to plant roots. Solution must be given, or must already possess, a driving force capable of overcoming resistance along the delivery path. Centrifugal-pump evidence shows that rotational input produces pump head, pressure rise, mechanical-energy increase and flow, while energy loss and changing flow response remain relevant during operation [1]. Conceptually, a pump adds hydraulic energy to solution, creating a pressure or elevation difference that can initiate controlled movement. The resulting flow depends on the path after the pump. Restrictions in pipes, emitters, channels or root-zone interfaces can consume the available driving force and alter the delivery outcome [2].

Capillary action provides a contrasting passive mechanism. Capillary irrigation literature explicitly describes water delivery through wicks and growing media, including capillary mats and related passive arrangements [3]. Solution movement in these pathways arises from interactions between liquid and compatible porous material rather than from continuous mechanical pumping. Gravity can similarly create movement where connected liquid locations have different elevations. Neither mechanism is unrestricted: capillary delivery requires an effective liquid connection through a suitable medium, while gravity delivery requires a maintained elevation difference. Passive delivery therefore relies on physical pathway conditions rather than on the absence of engineering constraints.

Evidence from nutrient-film cultivation directly contrasts pumped circulation and aeration with gravity-driven film flow and passive aeration [4]. This distinction frames the paper's central argument. Active systems use pumps to establish pressure or elevation differences, while passive systems rely on gravity, capillary action or changing liquid levels. Both forms of transport remain dependent on the resistance of the pathway they must overcome. The discussion focuses on those driving forces rather than on a taxonomy of hydroponic system types.

II. Background and Scope

Hydroponic evidence identifies pumped drip irrigation and other active fluid-delivery arrangements, demonstrating that pumps are commonly used where solution movement is deliberately initiated or controlled [5]. The important explanatory point is not merely that a pump is present, but that its action establishes a force within the solution. Pump-added energy can create a pressure difference, raise liquid to a higher elevation or sustain circulation through a defined route. The practical implication is that active delivery can be adapted to specific movement tasks, but it must still be assessed against the resistance imposed by the downstream pathway.

The same hydroponic literature includes wick and capillary-based methods among the described approaches [5]. These arrangements illustrate that nutrient solution can be delivered without active pumping at the delivery point. A wick offers a capillary route, while a growing medium may distribute solution through its own porous structure. The relevant distinction is the source of the force, not whether a particular configuration appears simple or complex. Passive pathways can be effective where their capillary or gravitational conditions are sustained, but their operation may change if the medium, liquid contact or elevation relationship changes.

Nutrient-film evidence identifies a submersible pump circulating solution through the system while also describing gravity-driven film flow and passive aeration [4]. This combination shows why active and passive descriptions can both apply within one operational sequence. A pump may establish movement or raise solution, and gravity may then guide solution along a channel. The evidence supports distinguishing the origin of hydraulic energy from subsequent movement under physical gradients. It does not support assuming that either force is sufficient in every pathway, because channel and delivery conditions remain consequential.

III. Core Concepts and Mechanisms

Gravity-driven nutrient-film flow demonstrates passive hydraulic movement in a defined solution path. The available force arises from a difference in elevation, allowing solution to move along a suitably arranged channel, while passive aeration occurs through processes distinct from the liquid movement itself [4]. This distinction is important because successful solution flow does not establish that every root-zone process is driven by the same mechanism. Gravity is relevant to fluid movement where an elevation difference is available; it does not remove the requirement to consider the resistance presented by the channel and its interfaces.

Pumps are active components of controlled nutrient delivery in soilless cultivation [6]. Their conceptual role is to add energy to solution so that movement can occur against pathway resistance or toward a required delivery point. Pump action may therefore be understood as the creation of a controlled pressure or elevation difference, rather than as a generic label for all solution movement. This distinction matters when evaluating delivery problems. If solution is not reaching its destination, the issue may concern the available pump-generated force, the resistance in the route, or both. The literature supports this conceptual relationship without supplying universal force requirements for all hydroponic pathways.

Soilless-farming reviews also include wick systems and other passive delivery arrangements [6]. In these cases, the pathway itself is integral to the transport mechanism. A wick must remain connected to the solution and capable of supporting capillary movement; a gravity-fed route must retain a suitable elevation difference; and a medium must permit the relevant redistribution of water. These conditions show that passive mechanisms should be evaluated as force-pathway relationships. Their practical value is not that they eliminate design requirements, but that they create movement without a continuously operating pump at the point of delivery.

IV. Evidence Synthesis

Comparison of passive wick delivery with pumped and aerated arrangements supports a force-centred distinction without requiring a classification of complete systems [6]. Pumped delivery depends on externally supplied hydraulic energy, whereas wick delivery depends on capillary action within a suitable pathway. These approaches differ in the origin of their driving force, but both must overcome resistance before solution can reach the root environment. This shared constraint prevents a simplistic interpretation in which active delivery is inherently reliable or passive delivery is inherently limited. Adequacy depends on the relation between available force, route properties and the intended delivery result.

Hydroponic evidence explicitly discusses capillary action and passive delivery in relevant system descriptions [7]. Capillary action is therefore a supported mechanism for explaining movement through wicks and growing media. It is especially useful analytically because it directs attention to the fluid path rather than to a broad system label. A capillary route can transfer solution only while the material and liquid conditions support that transfer. The evidence does not define a universal capillary performance threshold, so the appropriate conclusion is conditional: passive delivery must be judged by the continuity and resistance of the particular wick or medium involved.

Aeroponic research provides a further example of mixed active and passive stages. High-pressure atomisation is an active process, whereas subsequent droplet deposition is passive [8]. This evidence shows that the active-passive distinction can be applied to stages within a delivery sequence. An external device can create droplets and impart motion, but later retention or deposition is governed by local physical conditions. The example strengthens the broader argument that identifying the initial energy source is necessary but insufficient. A complete explanation must also consider how the solution behaves after it reaches the downstream environment.

V. Practical Implications and Limitations

Hydroponic systems can employ pumps and peristaltic dosing pumps as active fluid-system components [9]. These devices illustrate that active hydraulic energy can be used for both bulk solution movement and targeted additions. The design implication is that delivery should be evaluated at the destination rather than solely at the device. A dosing pump can move solution from a source, but restrictions and conditions after injection influence whether the intended result is achieved. Active delivery therefore benefits from clear identification of the relevant pathway, the required movement and the resistance that could prevent or modify it.

Micropumps used for sampling, calibration and acid dosing provide another example of controlled active fluid movement [10]. Their use demonstrates that pump-added energy can be directed to a specific fluid-management task rather than only to recirculation. It also highlights a validation requirement: a pump command or dose event does not by itself confirm the downstream state of the nutrient solution. The evidence supports checking the condition produced after delivery, particularly where pumping is used as part of a controlled adjustment. This requirement follows from the general principle that pathway effects may separate pump operation from the actual result at the destination.

Reviews of soilless systems cover passive wick systems and gravity-dependent hydroponic arrangements, and support comparison of those arrangements with active systems [11]. However, the evidence base provides limited direct comparative measurement of pressure, elevation difference, capillary performance and pathway resistance across hydroponic applications. Reviews of hydroponic flow and recirculation similarly provide limited direct evidence for passive gravity or capillary delivery [12]. These gaps preclude universal design thresholds. Installation-specific validation is therefore required to determine whether passive forces are adequate or whether a pump is required to create the necessary driving difference.

VI. Conclusion

Hydroponic nutrient solution movement can be explained by asking what creates the driving force and whether that force can overcome pathway resistance. Pumps add hydraulic energy, producing controlled pressure or elevation differences that can support delivery and circulation [1], [5]. Passive systems use gravity, capillary action or changing liquid levels, provided that the channel, wick or growing medium maintains conditions that permit movement [3], [4], [7]. The distinction concerns the origin of the force, not a rigid separation of entire systems, because active and passive stages can occur within the same solution-delivery sequence [8].

The available evidence supports the required conceptual distinction but does not establish universal comparative limits for active and passive pathways [6], [11], [12]. The highest-value next work is direct validation of how pump-generated pressure, elevation differences, capillary connections and route resistance jointly affect solution arrival at the root environment. Such evidence would clarify when passive movement is adequate, when pumping is required and how mixed delivery processes should be assessed.

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] X. Chen, X. Zhang, and X. Li, "Evolution characteristics of energy change field in a centrifugal pump during rapid starting period," *Energies*, 2022.

[2] M. T. Naseem and W. Zaman, "Root-zone engineering in closed soilless horticulture: From plant physiology to sensor-guided control," *Horticulturae*, 2026.

[3] N. P. K. Semananda, J. D. Ward, and B. R. Myers, "A semi-systematic review of capillary irrigation: The benefits, limitations, and opportunities," *Horticulturae*, 2018.

[4] 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.

[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] 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.

[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] 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.

[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.

[12] 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.