Waterborne plant pathogens in hydroponics

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

***Abstract*—Recirculating hydroponic systems link individual root zones through a common nutrient solution. This hydraulic connection can also become a biological connection when viable plant pathogens or propagules enter the system, persist within water or infrastructure, and reach susceptible roots. This paper synthesises evidence on representative waterborne pathogens, their routes of entry, persistence and spread, and the conditions that determine whether exposure develops into disease. Pythium, Phytophthora and Fusarium are important examples, but microbial communities also include organisms with beneficial or suppressive functions. Shared reservoirs, channels, water flow, root contact and surface-associated biofilms can facilitate the distribution or retention of inoculum. However, pathogen presence alone cannot predict disease. Host susceptibility, infection route, pathogen load, dissolved oxygen, temperature, root stress, solution chemistry and microbial interactions alter disease expression. Recirculation can therefore permit rapid pathogen spread because it repeatedly links sources of inoculum to multiple root systems, while disease emerges only where pathogen, host and environmental conditions permit infection.**

I. Introduction

Hydroponic root zones are biologically active environments rather than sterile nutrient-delivery spaces. Soilless cultivation evidence identifies Pythium aphanidermatum as a relevant pathogen while also recognising Trichoderma and other microbial interactions associated with pathogen antagonism and disease suppression. This evidence establishes a necessary distinction for waterborne plant pathogens in hydroponics: microbial presence is not equivalent to pathogenicity, and pathogen detection is not by itself evidence of disease. A biologically meaningful assessment must consider whether an organism can remain viable, reach susceptible root tissue and act within conditions that permit infection [1], [2].

The main consequence of recirculation is connectivity. High root density and circulating nutrient solution can enable disease to spread rapidly among hydroponic plants because a shared solution repeatedly joins otherwise separate root zones. The concern is not only contamination at the original entry point. Water movement may carry propagules towards multiple plants, allowing root-to-root exposure through a common pathway. This paper explains that pathway, identifies representative pathogen groups, and examines why the potential for shared-solution spread does not make disease inevitable [3], [4].

Disease-related outcomes depend on crop sensitivity, nutrient balance, ammonium toxicity, pH, oxygenation, microbial processing and pathogen suppression. Consequently, a single microbial observation cannot provide a complete account of plant health. This paper treats disease as the outcome of interactions among pathogen, host and root-zone environment. It first defines the biological scope of waterborne transmission, then examines entry, persistence and root contact, before synthesising the factors that distinguish pathogen exposure from disease development [5], [6].

II. Background and Scope

The relevant scope is narrower than the whole hydroponic microbiome. Evidence from soilless cultivation reports beneficial, harmful and context-dependent microbial effects, including disease suppression, pathogen antagonism and competition between inoculants. A shared nutrient solution should therefore not be described as hazardous merely because it contains microorganisms. The more useful question is whether a particular organism or propagule has pathogenic potential, can survive within the system, and can meet compatible root tissue under circumstances favourable to infection. This distinction avoids treating every microorganism as pathogenic [2], [7].

Hydroponic disease risk is shaped by root-zone conditions, substrate biological properties, pathogen spread, sanitation, water chemistry and combined sterilisation controls. This systems perspective is important because it rejects a single-cause explanation of disease. Its limitation is that a broad description of management conditions does not fully explain how hydraulic connection becomes biological transmission. The missing link is the mechanism by which a shared solution, reservoir or channel transfers viable propagules from an inoculum source to other root zones [3], [8].

Pythium provides a clear example of that missing link. Waterborne Pythium species are relevant hydroponic pathogens, and nutrient film technique systems can support shared-solution dispersal, zoospore movement, inoculum reservoirs and root-rot transmission. The evidence does not imply that all root disorders follow this route, or that every system will permit equivalent spread. It does explain why a common solution can connect roots biologically as well as hydraulically, because it can repeatedly transport pathogen propagules from a source to susceptible root surfaces [9].

III. Core Concepts and Mechanisms

Waterborne transmission begins when inoculum enters a connected root-zone environment. Once present, shared nutrient solution can act as a dispersal route, while channels and reservoirs may function as persistent inoculum reservoirs. Pythium infection at root surfaces illustrates the resulting sequence: propagules persist or enter the system, water distributes them through connected pathways, and contact with

roots provides an opportunity for infection. Infrastructure designed to convey nutrient solution may therefore also form part of the biological transmission pathway. Its relevance depends on whether viable inoculum is retained or redistributed rather than on water circulation alone [9].

Persistence does not necessarily produce visible disease. Pythium disease depends on inoculum, pathogen load, host susceptibility, dissolved oxygen, temperature, root stress and available transmission pathways. Symptomless or subclinical infection further indicates that pathogen association with roots can precede overt symptoms. This creates an interpretive limitation: visually healthy plants may have experienced exposure, whereas a positive pathogen observation may not predict disease severity. The practical implication is that disease assessment must consider root-zone conditions and host response, not simply whether a pathogen has been detected in water [9].

The relevant pathogen groups extend beyond Pythium. Irrigation-water evidence identifies Pythium ultimum, Fusarium oxysporum and Phytophthora cinnamomi as plant pathogens whose propagules can be applied through water. Their inclusion supports the broader proposition that water can introduce or distribute distinct pathogen groups in plant-production systems. However, the evidence is principally focused on water treatment and does not establish identical persistence or infection behaviour across every hydroponic design. Pathogen identity must therefore be interpreted together with water movement, reservoir conditions and the characteristics of the receiving root zone [10].

IV. Evidence Synthesis

Shared hydroponic nutrient solution is repeatedly identified as a pathway for dissemination of several plant pathogens. Fusarium oxysporum, Fusarium solani, Pythium aphanidermatum and Phytophthora capsici have been identified as pathogens that can disseminate rapidly through common solution. Together with the evidence for Pythium reservoirs and root-surface infection, these findings support the central explanation for rapid spread: recirculation can distribute viable propagules among interconnected root systems. Dissemination is nevertheless only one stage in the transition from inoculum to disease, and its biological consequence depends on the conditions encountered by the receiving plants [11].

The evidence also explains why pathogen presence does not automatically mean disease will develop. Shared-solution conditions, sanitation, stagnation, host-system balance, environmental parameters and management influence pathogen dissemination and disease risk. Thus, recirculation may amplify exposure without ensuring crop damage. A pathogen detected in a stagnant or poorly managed part of a system may have a different significance from the same organism in a root zone where environmental and biological conditions restrict infection. Pathogen detection should therefore be interpreted alongside system state rather than treated as a complete diagnosis [11].

Independent hydroponic evidence similarly associates shared solution with rapid pathogen spread and identifies Fusarium oxysporum, Fusarium solani, Pythium aphanidermatum and Phytophthora capsici as relevant organisms. The convergence of these findings strengthens the conclusion that shared water can distribute important plant pathogens between connected plants. However, the available evidence is more decisive about the possibility of dissemination than about universal thresholds for outbreak development. System-specific assessment remains necessary because pathogen viability, root condition and root-zone environment mediate the consequences of exposure [12].

V. Practical Implications and Limitations

Plant responses provide a biological explanation for the difference between exposure and disease. Disease resistance depends on receptor expression, ligand abundance, infection route, host tissue, immune activation and pathogen immune-evasion strategies. In hydroponics, a propagule reaching a root zone does not necessarily establish damaging infection. Evidence concerning beneficial rhizobacteria likewise shows that shared microbial patterns can produce defence, priming, local immune suppression, beneficial colonisation or pathogen resistance. These outcomes reinforce the need to distinguish pathogen exposure, colonisation and disease rather than treating microbial detection as an outcome in itself [13], [14].

Recirculating water should also be understood as a shared microbial habitat with persistent wetted surfaces. Evidence links pathogen spread and disease effects to pathogen concentration, dissolved oxygen, temperature, root-zone microenvironments, microbial activity, biofilms and system architecture. Pathogen attachment to PVC biofilms indicates that inoculum need not remain freely suspended to remain relevant to later exposure. This limits water-only interpretations of disease risk because channels and other wet surfaces may influence persistence. The evidence does not provide one threshold applicable across crops, pathogens and system designs, so interpretation must remain system-specific [15].

Water treatment evidence further indicates that pathogen load, water movement, reservoir design, retention time and operating conditions affect disease risk. These considerations identify the principal constraints on generalisation: a finding about a water pathway cannot independently predict infection without knowledge of the pathogen, receiving host and operating environment. Further validation should therefore relate viable propagules, movement through solution and surfaces, root exposure and measured disease outcomes under defined system conditions [10], [15].

VI. Conclusion

Recirculating hydroponic water can permit rapid pathogen spread because it joins inoculum sources, reservoirs, channels and multiple root systems through a common solution. Pythium, Phytophthora and Fusarium provide representative examples of plant pathogens relevant to this route. Yet shared water is not inherently pathogenic, and microbial presence

is not equivalent to disease. Infection depends on pathogen survival and load, host susceptibility, infection route, root-zone conditions, dissolved oxygen, temperature, microbial interactions and system management. The strongest conclusion is therefore conditional: recirculation can amplify biologically meaningful exposure, while disease develops only where the connected root-zone environment permits infection [9], [11], [15].

The highest-value next work is system-specific validation that relates pathogen detection to propagule viability, movement through water and wetted surfaces, root exposure, host response and measured disease development. Such evidence would better distinguish routine microbial presence from biologically consequential transmission and would improve interpretation of waterborne disease risk in recirculating hydroponic systems [10], [15].

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] 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.

[2] 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.

[3] R. S. Velazquez-Gonzalez, A. L. Garcia-Garcia, E. Ventura-Zapata, J. D. O. Barceinas-Sanchez, and J. C. Sosa-Savedra, "A review on hydroponics and the technologies associated for medium- and small-scale operations," *Agriculture*, 2022.

[4] 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.

[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] 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.

[7] 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.

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

[9] 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.

[10] 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.

[11] 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*, 2025.

[12] 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.

[13] L. Trdá, F. Boutrot, J. Claverie, D. Brulé, S. Dorey, and B. Poinssot, "Perception of pathogenic or beneficial bacteria and their evasion of host immunity: pattern recognition receptors in the frontline," *Frontiers in Plant Science*, 2015.

[14] L. Zhu, J. Huang, X. Lu, and C. Zhou, "Development of plant systemic resistance by beneficial rhizobacteria: Recognition, initiation, elicitation and regulation," *Frontiers in Plant Science*, 2022.

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