Automation and sensor-driven hydroponics

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

***Abstract*—Automation in hydroponics is progressing from isolated feedback loops towards systems that coordinate environmental, nutrient and crop-state information across connected sensors, actuators and supervisory software. Existing implementations demonstrate automatic regulation of temperature, humidity, pH and nutrient concentration, alongside networked monitoring and actuator control. However, greater connectivity also concentrates dependence on measurement quality, power, communications, calibration and operator competence. This paper synthesises evidence on demonstrated sensor-driven hydroponic automation, distinguishes conventional closed-loop control from genuinely AI-based decision systems, and evaluates the operational benefits and risks of integrated architectures. Conventional automation applies explicit rules or controllers to measured variables, whereas AI-based systems use data-driven models for prediction, diagnosis or adaptive adjustment. Integrated platforms can combine sensing, local inference, digital representations and actuator control, but their value depends on reliable sensing, explicit objectives and safe degraded modes. The evidence indicates that sensor-rich hydroponics can support more coordinated management, yet technical complexity, sensor drift, energy demand, equipment reliability and limited validation across operating conditions remain material constraints. Future progress requires robust calibration, transparent control logic, local fallback capability and evaluation beyond narrow prototype conditions.**

I. Introduction

Hydroponic production depends on the managed interaction of nutrient solution, root-zone conditions and aerial environment. Sensor-driven hydroponics extends this management by measuring variables such as temperature, humidity, pH and nutrient concentration, then connecting measurements to pumps, dosing equipment or environmental actuators. Automated control of these variables has already been documented in deep-flow systems, showing that hydroponic operation can be organised around feedback rather than periodic manual inspection [1]. The central opportunity is not merely faster adjustment of individual variables. It is the potential to coordinate several interacting conditions so that a change in one subsystem is interpreted in relation to the wider production environment [2].

Increasing the number of connected measurements and devices does not automatically create dependable system management. Reviews of intelligent environmental control identify potential improvements in operational stability and nutrient management, while also noting high automation cost, energy demand, technical complexity and data-security concerns [1]. These constraints matter because an integrated system can propagate an erroneous measurement or unsuitable objective through multiple actuators. The relevant engineering question is therefore how sensors, control objectives and interventions should be coordinated without making the production system unnecessarily opaque or fragile [3].

This paper examines automation and sensor-driven hydroponics as an evidence-based technical synthesis. It first defines the boundary between conventional automation and AI-based decision systems, then considers how sensing, actuation and supervisory layers can be combined for coordinated management. Conventional systems may employ timers, microcontrollers, fuzzy logic or proportional-integral-derivative control, whereas AI-oriented approaches can incorporate connected data platforms, image analysis and decision support [4]. The paper argues that the transition to more integrated operation must preserve trustworthy measurements, explicit control objectives and safe fallback behaviour [5].

II. Background and Scope

Networked sensing and automatic irrigation provide a useful starting point for understanding integration. Wireless sensor networks can support real-time monitoring, automated sampling and precision control, allowing operators to observe conditions across a distributed system rather than at a single inspection point [6]. Yet the value of sensing remains conditional on the physical delivery system. Emitter clogging, incomplete monitoring coverage and system-specific management requirements can prevent measured information from producing the intended response [6]. Integration must consequently include the condition and limitations of the equipment that applies water or nutrients, not only the sensors that report process variables [7].

Hydroponic automation has been demonstrated through relatively accessible components, including Arduino and Raspberry Pi controllers, Internet-connected platforms, sensors, actuators and mobile monitoring interfaces [4]. These components can support rule-based control of pH, electrical conductivity, temperature, lighting or irrigation. Fuzzy logic and proportional-integral-derivative controllers can also structure responses to measured deviations without requiring a predictive model. Such systems remain valuable because their decision rules can be specified in advance and inspected by an operator. Their limitation is that they may treat each control loop as separate, even where changes in nutrient solution, climate and root-zone conditions interact [8].

More extensive architectures connect sensors and automated actuators to cloud platforms and dashboards for real-time monitoring and control in soilless agriculture [9]. This arrangement can provide supervisory visibility across environmental and

root-zone variables, but connectivity alone is not a decision method. A dashboard may display data without resolving competing objectives, while a cloud service may introduce dependencies that do not exist in a local controller. The scope of integrated automation should therefore include the entire chain from observation and interpretation to action and recovery, rather than treating remote access as evidence of coordinated management [10].

III. Core Concepts and Mechanisms

A coordinated hydroponic system can be understood as a layered feedback architecture. Sensors produce observations of environmental and root-zone states; a control layer compares those observations with defined targets; actuators alter solution dosing, pumping or environmental conditions; and a supervisory layer records outcomes and detects departures from expected operation. IoT and AI-oriented systems extend this architecture through connected sensing, dashboards and automated control, and they may support predictive maintenance as well as immediate regulation [9]. However, each additional layer introduces requirements for reliable power, equipment operation and data handling. High cost, energy demand, unreliable electricity and technical complexity can limit whether an apparently capable architecture remains dependable in operation [9].

Conventional automation and AI-based decision systems should be distinguished by the basis on which action is selected. Conventional closed-loop control uses a defined threshold, schedule or controller to regulate pH, electrical conductivity, climate or irrigation from current measurements. AI systems instead process real-time data to generate predictions, identify faults, estimate future needs or support dynamic optimisation [9]. This distinction does not imply that AI is inherently superior. Rule-based control may be preferable when objectives are clear, measurements are well understood and a transparent response is required. AI becomes technically meaningful only when the model contributes a validated predictive or diagnostic capability beyond the explicit control rule.

Sensor richness can improve representation of the nutrient solution and root zone, but it does not remove uncertainty about what a measurement signifies. Reviews of nutrient management describe ion-selective monitoring, substrate-moisture sensing, programmed nutrient addition, IoT control and machine-learning-supported decisions as available approaches [11]. These approaches broaden the information available to a controller beyond electrical conductivity alone. Their practical implication is that coordinated management may be more physiologically relevant than a single-variable set point. Nevertheless, sensor selection, placement and interpretation must match the production system, because additional signals can add ambiguity if their relation to plant response is not established.

IV. Evidence Synthesis

Evidence across soilless systems indicates that integrated automation already spans sensors, closed-loop controllers, predictive models and automated dosing [12]. The common technical direction is towards systems in which measurements from climate, irrigation and nutrient management inform coordinated interventions. In hydroponics, this may allow a dosing decision to be considered alongside circulation and environmental conditions rather than as an isolated correction. The evidence supports the feasibility of more integrated operation, but it does not establish one universal architecture. Hydroponics, aquaponics and bioponics differ in their biological and operational conditions, so the appropriate degree of integration must remain linked to the specific control problem.

Closed-loop sensor control can improve input management and production outcomes when it supports timely dosing and environmental actuation, yet the same evidence identifies sensor drift, recalibration needs, failure-related losses, energy costs and technical expertise requirements [12]. These findings shift attention from nominal automation capability to operational assurance. A sensor reading should not be treated as unquestionable simply because it arrives continuously. Coordinated systems need calibration procedures, plausibility checks and responses that limit harm when a measurement is missing or inconsistent. The operational benefit of integration is therefore inseparable from the ability to recognise when the underlying information is no longer trustworthy.

The evidence also supports a careful separation between control and intelligence. Closed-loop automation can activate pumps, valves, ventilation or carbon dioxide systems in response to measurements, while AI and machine-learning tools can be used for prediction, stress detection and automatic adjustment [12]. Predictive capability may help a system anticipate conditions rather than react only after a threshold is crossed. However, model interpretability and modelling limits remain important. A decision system should expose the purpose and constraint behind an intervention, especially where its recommendation conflicts with established operating rules. Coordinated management requires intelligible priorities, not merely a larger volume of data.

V. Practical Implications and Limitations

Recent hydroponic work demonstrates a more integrated model in which IoT sensing, edge machine learning, digital-twin synchronisation and closed-loop actuator control are combined within one platform [13]. Such an arrangement can bring together information that would otherwise be managed as separate monitoring, prediction and control functions. Edge inference is particularly relevant to coordinated operation because it allows some decisions to remain close to the production system rather than depend entirely on remote services. Even so, an integrated platform should not be assumed to represent every relevant biological condition. Its utility depends on whether the selected sensors, models and actuators capture the conditions that matter for the intended crop-management objective.

The reported platform evidence includes closed-loop dosing, rapid fault recovery, low-latency updates and continued local operation during cloud failure [13]. These characteristics illustrate why safe fallback behaviour is a central design requirement rather than an optional addition. Local operation can preserve basic control when connectivity is unavailable, while fault recovery can prevent a temporary disruption from becoming a prolonged management failure. At the same time, limitations associated with vision conditions and system scale show that prototype performance cannot automatically be generalised across facilities. Integrated systems should therefore be validated under variable sensing conditions and larger operational configurations before their decision layers are relied upon broadly.

The comparison between rule-based thresholds and machine-learning nutrient prediction further clarifies the limits of AI-based control [13]. A threshold rule provides a direct and inspectable relationship between a measurement and an action. A machine-learning prediction may integrate multiple signals, but it requires evidence that its output improves decisions under the conditions in which it will operate. The appropriate design is often layered rather than substitutive: transparent rules can retain safety boundaries, while a validated model contributes forecasts or diagnostic signals within those boundaries. This approach keeps control objectives explicit and prevents adaptive behaviour from bypassing operational safeguards.

VI. Conclusion

Sensor-rich hydroponics can move beyond isolated control loops by linking environmental, nutrient and root-zone observations to coordinated actuator decisions and supervisory oversight. Demonstrated systems range from threshold-based sensing and dosing to connected platforms that combine local inference, digital representations and automated control [4], [12], [13]. The evidence does not support treating connectivity as a substitute for sound control design. Integration is valuable when it improves the relationship between measured conditions, stated objectives and physical intervention, while preserving an operator's ability to understand and constrain system behaviour.

The highest-value next work is validation of integrated architectures under realistic variation in sensor quality, equipment reliability, communications and operating scale. Calibration, fault detection, explicit fallback modes and transparent distinctions between rule-based control and AI-based prediction should be treated as core performance requirements rather than implementation details [12], [13]. Under those conditions, automation can support more adaptive hydroponic management without sacrificing the measurement integrity and operational safeguards on which dependable control depends.

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] 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.

[2] 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.

[3] 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.

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

[6] G. W. Anyangoa, G. D. Bhowmicka, and N. S. Bhattacharyab, "A critical review of irrigation water quality index and water quality management practices in micro-irrigation for efficient policy making," *Desalination and Water Treatment*, 2024.

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

[8] C. Vatistas, D. D. Avgoustaki, and T. Bartzanas, "A systematic literature review on controlled-environment agriculture: How vertical farms and greenhouses can influence the sustainability and footprint of urban microclimate with local food production," *Atmosphere*, 2022.

[9] 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.

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

[11] 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.

[12] 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.

[13] 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.