Plant immune responses in soil-free systems

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

***Abstract*—Plant disease in soil free cultivation reflects pathogen pressure, plant capacity for innate defence, and root zone conditions that shape both processes. This paper explains how hydroponic plants recognise and respond to pathogen attack without reducing the topic to molecular detail. Plants detect conserved microbial signals through pattern recognition receptors and activate local responses that can include transcriptional reprogramming, barrier reinforcement and antimicrobial activity. Protection may also extend systemically, but its expression depends on host condition and pathogen strategy. Evidence from hydroponic, bioponic and root environment research shows that oxygen status, temperature, nutrient balance, pH, electrical conductivity and microbial conditions can influence disease outcomes. These factors do not create a simple immune on off state. Instead, they affect the physiological and ecological context in which a pathogen encounters a crop and in which defence can be mounted. Recirculation can also facilitate pathogen dissemination, while the performance of pathogen control measures depends on operating conditions. Plant immunity is therefore a useful framework for interpreting disease in soil free systems, but it cannot by itself justify universal disease control claims.**

I. Introduction

Plant innate immunity provides the biological basis by which hydroponic plants recognise microbial challenge and begin to respond to pathogen attack. Pattern recognition receptors detect conserved microbial features and participate in receptor complexes that initiate defensive signalling. The resulting response can include transcriptional reprogramming, stomatal closure, cell wall strengthening and antimicrobial production [1]. This broad architecture establishes that disease outcome is not determined solely by the presence of a pathogen in water, substrate or plant tissue. The crop actively detects signals and alters its biology in response. In soil free cultivation, this remains relevant despite intensive management of nutrient solution and root conditions. Recognition is only the beginning of defence, however, because later outcome depends on host, pathogen and environmental context [2].

Plant defence also has local and systemic dimensions. Local pattern recognition mediated responses can limit early bacterial entry, whereas protection beyond the challenged tissue depends on the capacity of the plant to coordinate wider processes and on the behaviour of the invading pathogen [1]. This distinction explains why visible symptoms at one location cannot provide a complete account of plant immune status. A root, stem or leaf may initiate local protection while other tissues experience different exposure or response conditions. Equally, early restriction does not guarantee that disease will be prevented after entry. The practical value of the distinction is that it frames immunity as layered protection rather than a single response that applies uniformly throughout the crop.

Environmental stress changes the conditions in which these layers operate. Hypoxia limits respiration and energy generation, while re oxygenation can increase reactive oxygen species and add metabolic stress. These changes interact with hormonal signalling, damage and recovery, influencing pathogen related susceptibility through context dependent mechanisms [3]. Consequently, immune activation should not be described as a simple on off state. This paper first defines the hydroponic disease setting, then explains key recognition and defence mechanisms, synthesises evidence on microbial and nutritional context, and identifies the limits of translating basic immunity findings into universal disease control claims.

II. Background and Scope

Recirculating hydroponic systems create a disease setting in which pathogen movement can extend beyond the initially infected plant. Hydroponic pathogens may spread rapidly through shared solution, while sterilisation performance depends on turbidity, organic load, pathogen identity and operating conditions [4]. This evidence distinguishes reduction of inoculum from guaranteed prevention of disease. A system treatment can lower pathogen pressure under particular conditions, but plant condition, residual inoculum and infection route may still shape the subsequent outcome. Plant immunity must therefore be interpreted alongside solution management. No general sterilisation method establishes that all crops will respond in the same way to a given pathogen challenge.

Studies of soil free cultivation identify nutrient strength, electrical conductivity, pH, substrate moisture, oxygen balance and microbial communities as factors associated with contrasting stress, pathogen suppression and disease outcomes [5]. These variables are not independent switches for plant immunity. They may influence root physiology, nutrient availability, microbial composition and pathogen opportunity simultaneously. Their importance lies in shaping the environment in which host and pathogen interact. The evidence supports environmental management as a contribution to crop condition and disease outcome, but it does not establish one universal combination of settings that produces disease resistance. Such a conclusion would overlook differences in crop susceptibility, pathogen behaviour and system design.

Dissolved oxygen and temperature provide a specific example of this complexity. In strawberry nutrient film technique systems, these conditions have been linked with altered root physiology and exudates, weakened defence and increased

Pythium infection severity [6]. The evidence also identifies interacting mechanisms and unresolved thresholds. It therefore supports the view that root zone stress can influence vulnerability in a defined setting, rather than proving a fixed oxygen target for hydroponic production generally. The remaining analytical task is to connect these environmental effects to the biological capacity of plants to recognise and respond to pathogens.

III. Core Concepts and Mechanisms

The core mechanism of innate immunity is perception followed by defensive adjustment. Pattern recognition receptors allow plants to perceive conserved microbial signals and initiate responses that can modify transcription, reinforce barriers and support antimicrobial activity [1]. In a soil free system, this mechanism explains why plant biology remains central even when nutrient composition and water movement are tightly managed. The crop is not merely exposed to a pathogen concentration. It detects microbial cues and can mount a response whose effectiveness depends on the interaction. This explanation is deliberately broad, because the available evidence establishes the architecture of defence without requiring a detailed account of every receptor or signalling component.

Root zone oxygen status affects the capacity of this architecture to function. Hydroponic nutrient film technique evidence links dissolved oxygen limitation with root physiology, plant defence capacity and Pythium disease, while noting absent strawberry specific thresholds and unvalidated interventions [6]. Low oxygen can constrain respiration and thereby change the physiological conditions under which roots respond to microbial challenge. The appropriate inference is not that aeration is an immune treatment. Rather, adequate oxygen may help preserve root function and defensive capacity in a crop specific context. Evidence from other crops or systems cannot automatically be transferred to a new hydroponic configuration.

Growing media and root environment research reinforces the importance of stress context. Root zone aeration, drought, salinity, nutrient immobilisation and biological instability can affect plant performance and pathogen risk, although disease evidence is indirect [7]. This finding does not establish a direct pathway from each stressor to a particular immune response. It does show that plant condition and pathogen risk are influenced by multiple interacting root environment factors. The practical constraint is that general indicators of root stress cannot substitute for direct evidence of immune activity or disease response in a specific hydroponic crop.

IV. Evidence Synthesis

System management and pathogen biology further complicate the relationship between environmental conditions and immunity. Soilless systems can involve pathogen spread through recirculation, complexity arising from biological inputs, and limited standardisation of procedures [8]. These conditions influence exposure and management reliability, but they do not remove the importance of host recognition. A crop may detect pathogen signals and activate defence, yet disease outcome can still differ where the inoculum load, infection route or operating environment changes. This synthesis supports a systems view: environmental management may reduce stress or pathogen opportunity, while innate immunity explains part of the crop's biological response to the remaining challenge.

Plants also interact differently with pathogenic and beneficial microorganisms. Evidence on beneficial rhizobacteria shows that plants can perceive both kinds of microbes and that pattern triggered immunity, systemic resistance, defence priming and hormone mediated signalling contribute to the broader defence architecture [9]. This expands the analysis beyond a simple distinction between harmless and harmful root microorganisms. In soil free systems, microbial conditions may be influenced by nutrient source or biological inputs, but microbial presence alone does not establish a beneficial outcome. The implication is that claims about root associated microbes should be evaluated through plant response and disease outcome, not through presumed identity or intended function.

The local versus systemic distinction is especially important in beneficial root colonisation. Local suppression of pattern triggered immunity can occur during beneficial colonisation, whereas systemic induced resistance and systemic defence priming may develop elsewhere in the plant [9]. These processes demonstrate that local and wider responses can have different biological roles. They do not demonstrate that any microbial input will generate systemic protection in hydroponic crops. The outcome remains dependent on microbial strain, host and challenge context. This limitation is important because it prevents the transfer of general plant immunity concepts into unqualified operational claims.

V. Practical Implications and Limitations

Nutritional and rhizosphere conditions can influence disease outcome without producing a simple immune state. Iron status, rhizosphere resource competition, beneficial microbial colonisation and defence priming have been linked with pathogen resistance, but reported pathways and outcomes vary with strain, host and challenge context [9]. This supports a conditional interpretation of nutrition. Nutrient availability may alter plant condition and microbial interactions, thereby affecting the circumstances in which defence occurs. It does not establish that a nutrient adjustment inherently induces resistance. A defensible hydroponic assessment must therefore distinguish improved crop condition from demonstrated changes in plant defence and from reduced pathogen pressure.

Broader root environment evidence provides the same caution. Soil pH, compaction, organic matter, rhizosphere conditions and degradation are related to nutrient uptake, resilience and plant health, yet offer limited direct analysis of disease outcomes or immune state complexity [10]. The direct variables differ in hydroponic cultivation, but the conceptual implication remains relevant: root conditions influence plant condition through interacting physical, chemical and biological

processes. This evidence cannot support the stronger claim that an apparently favourable root environment automatically produces disease resistance. Claims concerning immunity require direct support from observed plant responses rather than inference from general crop health.

Bioponic systems illustrate why nutrient source and processing should be considered together. Ammonium toxicity, nutrient imbalance, oxygen demand, pH and processing conditions can affect crop health and reported disease suppression [11]. However, disease mechanisms are not the primary focus of this evidence. It would therefore be unwarranted to claim that organic nutrient solutions directly activate immunity. The supported conclusion is narrower: nutrient source and processing can alter the root zone context in which plant physiology and microbial interactions occur. Direct validation is required before a disease outcome is attributed to a particular immune mechanism.

Limits on universal hydroponic disease control claims are substantial. Induced resistance and beneficial microbe interactions vary with strain, host, elicitor, signalling pathway and challenge organism, while distinguishing beneficial organisms from pathogens may remain unresolved [9]. Hydroponic systems also show rapid disease spread, variable pathogen control performance and dependence on system conditions [12]. Together, these constraints mean that plant immunity cannot be converted into a single universal management prescription. The strongest practical use of immune knowledge is interpretive: it explains why plant condition matters, why local defence may not prevent later disease and why similar interventions can produce different outcomes.

VI. Conclusion

Plants in soil free systems recognise microbial signals through layered innate immune responses and can activate both local and systemic protective processes. Pattern recognition, defensive adjustment and wider resistance related responses explain how hydroponic plants respond biologically to pathogen attack [1], [9]. Their effectiveness is shaped by pathogen strategy, plant condition and environmental context. Oxygen limitation, nutrient related stress and microbial conditions can influence disease outcome because they affect the circumstances in which defence and pathogen colonisation occur [3], [6]. Plant immunity is therefore an essential explanatory framework, but not a stand alone method of disease control.

Future work should validate defined root zone conditions, pathogen pressure and measured plant responses for particular crops and systems. It should distinguish reductions in stress or inoculum from direct changes in defensive capacity, and test whether findings transfer across crops and infection routes [8], [9]. Until that evidence is available, universal claims should remain qualified because pathogen spread and pathogen control performance depend on system conditions [4], [12].

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] 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.

[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] 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.

[4] 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.

[5] 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.

[6] 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.

[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] 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.

[9] 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.

[10] 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.

[11] 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.

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