pH measurement and calibration

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

***Abstract*—A pH reading is the reported output of an electrochemical measurement system, rather than a direct observation of solution chemistry. Its reliability depends on the relationship between electrode potential and the pH scale, the quality of calibration, electrode condition, temperature context and the stability of the broader measurement arrangement. This paper synthesises the available evidence on pH measurement and calibration for nutrient solutions. A hydroponic pH sensing study reports an isopotential point at pH 7.00, a response of 59.16 mV per pH unit, and calibration with pH 4, 7 and 10 buffers. Related electrochemical studies show that calibration standards, response characteristics, polarisation and instrument effects can influence the accuracy of electrical measurements. The evidence also requires a distinction between compensation for sensor response and actual temperature-related changes in solution chemistry. The synthesis finds that calibration, cleaning, placement and measurement frequency support confidence in reported pH values. However, the supplied evidence does not establish a complete quantitative account of pH-electrode slope drift, offset drift or reference-electrode behaviour. Reliable interpretation therefore requires pH values to be treated as context-dependent calibrated measurements.**

I. Introduction

A pH meter reports a number after interpreting an electrode potential through a calibrated response relationship. In a hydroponic pH monitoring system, the stated electrode isopotential point is pH 7.00 and the reported potential relationship is 59.16 mV per pH unit; the system uses buffers at pH 4, 7 and 10 for calibration [1]. These features establish that the pH value depends on matching an electrical response to defined reference conditions. The measurement is therefore not self-validating merely because an instrument presents a stable display. Confidence depends on whether the electrode response at the time of measurement remains consistent with the response represented by the calibration buffers.

Electrical measurement error can arise from the measurement system as well as from variation in the sample. A conductivity-meter study found that cell constants could diverge at high conductivity, cable resistance could become material, and electrode polarisation could generate frequency-dependent error; standards matched to sample conductivity improved accuracy [2]. These findings do not describe pH electrodes directly, but they demonstrate an important electrochemical measurement principle: an instrument reading must be assessed against the response conditions under which it was calibrated. For pH measurement, the implication is that calibration quality and electrode condition are integral to the meaning of the reported number, rather than optional procedural details.

Temperature complicates interpretation because it can affect both the sensing process and the solution being measured. Research on dissolved-oxygen sensing distinguishes temperature-aware calibration and compensation from genuine changes in dissolved-oxygen chemistry [3]. This distinction is relevant to pH measurement: compensation may alter how the meter translates an electrical response into a displayed value, but it does not establish that temperature has left solution chemistry unchanged. This paper examines the available evidence on electrode response, calibration, maintenance and temperature context, while explicitly identifying aspects of reference behaviour and electrode drift that the evidence does not resolve.

II. Background and Scope

The central challenge in electrochemical monitoring is separating the target property from artefacts introduced by the instrument, electrode and measurement arrangement. Under controlled temperature conditions, conductivity-meter evaluation identified calibration, frequency, polarisation and instrument effects that could be separated from solution conductivity [2]. The study provides a useful interpretive framework for pH monitoring because a numerical output can be influenced by factors beyond the intended solution property. It does not justify treating conductivity and pH sensors as identical devices. Rather, it supports the narrower proposition that reliable electrochemical measurements require attention to the chain that links a sample, electrode signal, calibration standard and reported value.

Direct pH evidence supports this interpretation through an automated hydroponic arrangement that periodically calibrates and cleans its pH probe [1]. Calibration with pH 4, 7 and 10 buffers provides multiple defined points against which the instrument can relate observed potential to the pH scale. Cleaning is also relevant because the study treats controlled electrode condition as part of reliable pH measurement and control. Together, these practices indicate that electrode maintenance and calibration are connected processes: maintenance preserves conditions under which calibration remains meaningful. The evidence does not provide a full model of how reference behaviour, offset or slope changes develop over time, so those mechanisms cannot be quantified here.

Evidence from related ion-selective electrodes further illustrates why response characteristics matter. A review of nutrient-solution monitoring reports slope-dependent bias, including potassium overestimation and calcium underestimation, while contrasting this limitation with the restricted ion-specific information available from electrical-conductivity

monitoring [4]. This evidence cannot be transferred as a numerical error estimate for pH electrodes. It does, however, support the general conclusion that a measured electrochemical response can yield biased chemical information when response characteristics depart from their expected behaviour. Calibration is thus needed to test the relationship between sensor response and the scale used to report the result.

III. Core Concepts and Mechanisms

Within the supplied evidence, the measurement principle can be stated at an appropriate level as follows: a pH electrode produces an electrical potential that is related to the pH scale through a stated response of 59.16 mV per pH unit, referenced to an isopotential point at pH 7.00 [1]. The meter converts this potential into a displayed number by using calibration information obtained from buffers of known pH. This explains how chemical activity is turned into a reported pH value without overstating the evidence. The available sources do not directly describe the detailed molecular operation of a standard glass membrane, the composition of the reference electrode or the origin of liquid-junction potentials. Those details therefore remain outside the supported explanatory scope.

Calibration is required because an electrical signal must be related to known conditions before it can be interpreted as a measurement. In a conductivity study, repeated AC-impedance measurements were accompanied by cell-constant calibration before each sample, and the reported measurement uncertainty was 0.5% [5]. That result is not a pH uncertainty specification, but it demonstrates the metrological purpose of recurring calibration in electrochemical work. For pH measurement, buffers at more than one pH value can reveal whether the observed electrode response remains usable across the reporting range [1]. A changed slope or offset would weaken confidence in the converted pH value even if the meter continues to generate repeatable readings.

Electrode response must also be interpreted within an operational monitoring design. A review of closed soilless systems identifies sensor calibration, placement and measurement frequency as necessary reporting and control considerations [6]. Placement influences which part of a system is represented by a measurement, while measurement frequency influences whether transient or evolving conditions are captured. These considerations do not alter the electrochemical potential-to-pH conversion, but they affect whether a reported pH value is representative and decision-useful. The review does not supply specific pH-electrode slope, offset or condition thresholds, so it supports transparent operational reporting rather than universal limits for acceptable electrode performance.

IV. Evidence Synthesis

The combined evidence presents calibration as an ongoing test of measurement confidence rather than a one-time configuration task. The pH monitoring study integrates periodic calibration and cleaning with recurring operation, while the root-zone review identifies calibration as a necessary component of sensor-guided reporting and control [1], [6]. This synthesis indicates that calibration history is part of the evidential basis for interpreting each pH record. A reading without calibration context may still be useful as an observation, but its accuracy cannot be evaluated confidently. The strongest supported conclusion is therefore procedural: pH data should be interpreted alongside information about the calibration reference points and electrode maintenance state.

Temperature-related interpretation requires equal care. Hydroponic monitoring research includes temperature sensing and calibration, but supplies limited evidence for separating sensor compensation from actual temperature-driven changes in solution chemistry [7]. The dissolved-oxygen literature provides a relevant conceptual distinction by treating compensation for sensor behaviour separately from change in the measured chemical condition [3]. Applied to pH measurement, this means that temperature compensation should not be presented as proof that the solution has an invariant chemical state. Instead, temperature is part of the measurement context and should be documented when assessing comparability between readings.

The evidence supports a system-level account of measurement reliability. The pH study connects cleaning and calibration to reliable operation, and the broader review adds placement and measurement frequency as factors affecting control and reporting [1], [6]. These findings imply that an electrode cannot be assessed independently of its calibration process and monitoring context. However, the supplied sources do not isolate the contribution of individual uncertainty sources, such as reference stability, slope change or electrode fouling, to pH error. Consequently, the evidence supports disciplined monitoring practice but does not support a claim that any single maintenance or calibration action guarantees accurate pH measurement.

V. Practical Implications and Limitations

For practical pH monitoring, calibration should be treated as documented evidence that the instrument response has been compared with defined buffer conditions. Calibration at pH 4, 7 and 10, together with cleaning of the probe, is directly described in the automated pH sensing system [1]. Sensor placement and measurement frequency should also be recorded because they influence the representativeness and interpretation of pH data [6]. This approach does not require assuming that every reading is doubtful. Rather, it enables users to distinguish a measurement supported by calibration and operating context from a number whose reliability cannot be readily evaluated.

The available evidence identifies several important limitations. Slope-dependent bias in ion-selective electrodes shows that response characteristics can affect chemical estimates [4], but the evidence does not establish equivalent pH-electrode bias magnitudes. The pH study supports calibration and cleaning but does not provide a detailed quantitative treatment of offset drift, slope deterioration or reference-electrode stability [1]. These gaps prevent defensible universal thresholds for electrode replacement or calibration acceptance. Further

validation should directly compare pH readings with traceable buffers across relevant temperature conditions and document changes in slope, offset and reference behaviour over time. Such work would translate general reliability concerns into measurement-specific acceptance criteria.

VI. Conclusion

A pH reading should be understood as the output of a calibrated electrochemical measurement system. The supplied evidence supports a potential relationship of 59.16 mV per pH unit, an isopotential point at pH 7.00, and calibration using defined buffers [1]. Related electrochemical evidence reinforces that calibration conditions, response characteristics and instrument effects can influence confidence in a numerical result [2], [4], [5]. Temperature requires a separate interpretation because compensation of sensor response is distinct from demonstrating that solution chemistry is unchanged [3], [7].

The most defensible interpretation of pH data therefore combines the displayed value with calibration history, temperature context, electrode cleaning, placement and measurement frequency [1], [6]. The evidence is sufficient to support this measurement-centred account of reliability, but insufficient to quantify standard pH-electrode slope drift, offset drift or reference stability. Direct validation of these factors against traceable buffer measurements is the highest-value next step for improving confidence in pH measurement.

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

[2] Y. Hibino, T. Asakai, T. Suzuki, and M. Ohata, "Applicable measuring range of two-electrode type commercial electrolytic conductivity meter for accurate determination of electrolytic conductivity," *Journal of Chemistry*, 2022.

[3] Y. Wei, Y. Jiao, D. An, D. Li, W. Li, and Q. Wei, "Review of dissolved oxygen detection technology: From laboratory analysis to online intelligent detection," *Sensors*, 2019.

[4] 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," *Canadian Journal of Plant Science*, 2024.

[5] W. Zhang, X. Chen, Y. Wang, L. Wu, and Y. Hu, "Experimental and modeling of conductivity for electrolyte solution systems," *ACS Omega*, 2020.

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

[7] 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.