Environmental sensors for plant growth

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

***Abstract*—Environmental sensors support plant-growth assessment by converting local temperature, humidity, carbon-dioxide and photosynthetic-light conditions into data. Yet a correct instrument output may still fail to represent the conditions experienced by a crop. This paper examines environmental sensing as a spatial and temporal sampling problem, with emphasis on placement, shielding, response time, calibration and sensor design. Evidence from controlled and soilless environments indicates that environmental conditions can vary across canopies, root zones and illuminated areas. Consequently, the meaning of a measurement depends on where it is taken, how rapidly the sensor responds, whether its sensing characteristics suit the measured variable, and whether the location corresponds to the plant environment. Photosynthetic-light measurement illustrates these concerns through spectral-response mismatch, cosine-response error, calibration drift and uneven irradiance. Evidence also supports complementary or multi-location measurement strategies where local gradients make single-point observations unreliable. However, the supplied literature does not establish universal installation rules for shielding, response time or sensor density across all variables. Representative monitoring should therefore be designed and validated as a measurement strategy, rather than inferred from sensor specifications alone.**

I. Introduction

Controlled plant-production environments rely on temperature, humidity, carbon dioxide and light measurements to describe conditions relevant to crop growth. Reviews of soilless systems identify these variables as important monitoring and control targets, alongside the sensors and management arrangements through which data are interpreted [1]. The practical difficulty is that an environmental reading is always a sample, rather than a complete account of the crop environment. It records a variable at one location and time through a particular sensing mechanism. A representative measurement must therefore relate meaningfully to the conditions experienced by plants, not merely satisfy an instrument accuracy specification.

The distinction between accuracy and representativeness is especially clear for photosynthetic light. Quantum sensors and spectroradiometers can convert incident radiation into measurements relevant to photosynthetically active radiation, but the resulting value can be affected by spectral-response mismatch, cosine-response error, optical design, environmental degradation and calibration drift [2]. Similar concerns arise when a temperature, humidity or carbon-dioxide sensor is exposed to airflow, radiant loading or mixing conditions that differ from those around the canopy. Sensor design and placement jointly shape the information available for crop interpretation.

Environmental heterogeneity makes this problem more consequential. Aeroponic production can contain spatially and temporally variable droplet deposition, root-surface films and root interactions, despite operating within one production system [3]. This example shows why nominal system conditions need not be plant conditions at every location. The paper explains the measurement principles relevant to temperature, humidity, carbon-dioxide and photosynthetic-light sensors, then considers placement, shielding, response time, local gradients and complementary measurement strategies as determinants of representative environmental data.

II. Background and Scope

Variation within a crop can make a system-level observation difficult to interpret. In hydroponically grown cannabis, nutrient concentrations and symptoms differed between upper and lower canopy positions. The study recommended integrating solution, leachate, symptom and strategically timed tissue measurements when diagnosing deficiency [4]. Although this evidence is not a direct test of air-sensor placement, it demonstrates that crop-relevant conditions and responses may differ with position. Environmental monitoring should similarly avoid assuming that a convenient observation point represents every plant or canopy layer.

Photosynthetic-light measurement provides defined concepts for evaluating this issue. Photosynthetically active radiation can be measured with quantum sensors and spectroradiometers, but the appropriate choice depends on whether the objective is a practical photon-flux estimate or a more detailed assessment of spectral composition [2]. Calibration, spectral response and angular response mediate the relationship between physical radiation and recorded data. Consequently, a sensor can be operating correctly yet produce a value that does not adequately describe the light environment relevant to a particular canopy position or measurement purpose.

Precision-agriculture literature recognises sensing of temperature, humidity, carbon dioxide and light, as well as the importance of reliability and calibration [5]. However, reliability does not by itself resolve representativeness. Local in situ sensors provide direct observations at selected points, whereas remote approaches offer broader coverage but have their own location, calibration, spectral-response and heterogeneity constraints [2]. The analytical gap is therefore not whether these variables can be sensed, but how a sensing arrangement can support defensible claims about the environment that plants experience.

III. Core Concepts and Mechanisms

Environmental sensors convert a local physical condition into a data record, so their output is inseparable from the conditions surrounding the sensing element. A hydroponic monitoring architecture demonstrates temperature and humidity sensing with explicit attention to calibration, accuracy and placement, while identifying carbon-dioxide and light sensing as relevant environmental extensions [6]. This supports a systems interpretation of sensor performance. The relevant question is not only whether an instrument works within specification, but also whether the installed sensor observes the environmental location and time scale required by the crop-management question.

The need for representative location is reinforced by evidence from the root zone. Reviews of closed soilless horticulture describe roots as experiencing spatial microenvironments rather than a single system-average state, and caution that a single-point root-zone measurement can be misleading [7]. This does not establish that every system requires a fixed number of instruments. It does show that sensor location, calibration and measurement frequency are necessary contextual information. Without them, a recorded value cannot be confidently interpreted as representative of the wider production environment.

For light, representativeness also depends on spatial and optical factors. Measurements of indoor lighting systems demonstrate that intensity and spectral composition can vary with edge effects, spatial gradients and sensor-grid coverage [8]. A single summary metric may consequently conceal meaningful variation across the cultivation area. Placement of a photosynthetic-light sensor should therefore match the intended canopy region, while sensor selection should account for spectral and angular response. The measurement design, not the sensor reading alone, determines whether the derived data represent crop illumination.

IV. Evidence Synthesis

The available evidence converges on a common principle: environmental values should be treated as observations with bounded spatial and temporal meaning. Reviews of precision sensing identify temperature, humidity, carbon dioxide and light as relevant variables, while also noting sensor reliability and calibration concerns [5]. Light-measurement research further shows that calibration may not remove errors arising from spectral mismatch, angular response or sensor degradation [2]. Thus, calibration is necessary for trustworthy data, but it cannot compensate for a poorly chosen location or an unrepresentative sampling strategy.

Single-point sensing is most vulnerable where plant environments contain gradients or distinct microenvironments. Root-zone evidence specifically reports that spatial conditions can make single-point measurements misleading and recommends reporting sensor location, calibration and measurement frequency [7]. These reporting elements enable others to understand what the measurement represents. The evidence provides limited direct support for universal shielding requirements or response-time thresholds, but it supports the broader conclusion that local conditions and sampling frequency affect interpretation. Decisions about sensor response must therefore be evaluated against the expected dynamics of the measured environment.

Controlled-light evidence supports complementary measurement approaches. Hydroponic lettuce research reports spatial variation in photosynthetic photon flux density and combines repeated canopy imaging with environmental measurements [9]. Separate lighting analysis demonstrates that location, sampling coverage and edge effects affect apparent intensity and spectral representativeness [8]. These findings do not prescribe a universal grid or sensor density. They do establish that a single central light measurement can obscure variation that matters for the crop, making multi-location sampling or complementary observations appropriate when non-uniformity is plausible.

V. Practical Implications and Limitations

A practical monitoring arrangement should first identify the environmental condition that a reading is intended to represent. A temperature sensor used to observe an equipment location does not necessarily characterise the canopy. Likewise, a photosynthetic-light sensor at one point does not automatically represent illumination across the growing area. Reviews of soilless cultivation support monitoring temperature and changing hydroponic conditions, but they do not establish comprehensive representative-measurement principles for temperature, humidity, carbon dioxide and photosynthetic light together [10]. Installation decisions should therefore state the intended plant environment and the rationale for the chosen location.

Shielding requires similarly careful interpretation. The evidence directly supports concern about diffuser and filter design, cosine response, degradation and calibration for photosynthetic-light sensors [2]. It also supports the importance of local sensor context for environmental monitoring more broadly [6]. However, the supplied sources do not establish one validated shielding design for all temperature, humidity and carbon-dioxide installations. Shielding should consequently be considered a potential influence on the sampled environment and sensor response, rather than a generic accessory whose effects can be assumed negligible.

Response time is another evidence-limited but conceptually important consideration. A slowly responding sensor can produce a time-averaged account of changing local conditions, whereas a rapid sensor can capture shorter changes that may or may not be relevant to the measurement purpose. The supplied evidence does not provide universal response-time specifications for the four requested sensor classes. Root-zone literature instead highlights the importance of reporting location, calibration and frequency [7]. The defensible practice is to document sampling frequency and sensor context, then validate whether the resulting data capture the environmental variation that the crop assessment requires.

VI. Conclusion

Environmental sensing for plant growth is most reliable when a measurement is understood as a spatial and temporal sample rather than as an unquestioned system property. Evidence from controlled and soilless environments shows that calibration, sensor design, location and spatial variability jointly affect whether data represent the plant environment [1], [2], [7]. Temperature, humidity, carbon-dioxide and photosynthetic-light sensors therefore require interpretation that connects the measured point to the relevant crop location.

Multiple locations or complementary measurement strategies are justified where canopy position, root-zone conditions or light distribution indicate environmental heterogeneity [4], [8], [9]. The highest-value next work is validation of variable-specific guidance for placement, shielding, response time and spatial coverage. Until that evidence is available, transparent reporting of sensor location, calibration and measurement frequency is necessary for readers to judge what an environmental record does, and does not, represent [7].

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] 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.

[2] J. Liu, Y. Cai, X. Pei, and X. Yu, "Advances in research and application of techniques for measuring photosynthetically active radiation," *Remote Sens*, 2025.

[3] 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.

[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] 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.

[6] 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.

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

[8] L. Balázs, Z. Dombi, L. Csambalik, and L. Sipos, "Characterizing the spatial uniformity of light intensity and spectrum for indoor crop production," *Horticulturae*, 2022.

[9] P. L. Palsha, M. W. van Iersel, R. W. Dickson, L. Seymour, M. Yelton, K. Qin, and R. S. Ferrarezi, "Strategic light use efficiency optimization of hydroponic lettuce exposed to different photosynthetic photon flux densities," *Agronomy*, 2024.

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