Resource efficiency and sustainability

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

***Abstract*—Hydroponic production is frequently presented as a resource-efficient alternative to soil-based cultivation because it can recirculate water and nutrients, increase production per unit footprint, and operate in locations with limited arable land. These advantages, however, do not establish sustainability without a clearly defined comparison system, functional denominator, and assessment boundary. This paper synthesises evidence on water, nutrient, land, energy, material, and waste trade-offs in hydroponic and controlled-environment systems. The evidence indicates that direct operational indicators can demonstrate lower irrigation losses, controlled nutrient delivery, and intensive use of growing area, but their interpretation depends on crop, facility configuration, climate, electricity source, substrates, and management practices. Energy demand, infrastructure, growing-media supply, nutrient discharge, and end-of-life material treatment may alter conclusions when the boundary extends beyond on-site operation. Hydroponic production is therefore genuinely resource-efficient when measured improvements are defined per relevant output and assessed against an appropriate comparator under stated operating conditions. More comparable reporting of resource inputs, yields, waste streams, and life-cycle assumptions is needed to distinguish local operational efficiency from broader sustainability performance.**

I. Introduction

Resource efficiency in horticulture cannot be inferred from a production method alone. It requires a stated denominator, such as marketable yield, cultivated area, or production cycle, and a comparison system with equivalent crop and service conditions. Capillary irrigation studies illustrate this point: reduced water application and lower runoff relative to overhead irrigation can represent a direct operational benefit, but the result depends on container scale, crop context, hydraulic design, and the boundary used to count inputs and losses [1]. Hydroponic systems may similarly reduce irrigation losses through controlled delivery and recirculation, yet the sustainability significance of that reduction remains uncertain if electricity, equipment, nutrient manufacture, or waste management are excluded from the comparison [2].

Soilless cultivation encompasses materially different systems, including substrate culture, water-based hydroponics, aeroponics, and other root-zone configurations. Their resource profiles cannot be treated as interchangeable because nutrient management, environmental control, material inputs, energy demand, and production constraints differ across designs [3]. A narrow claim that a system is water-efficient may therefore be correct while still being insufficient to establish its overall sustainability. The central problem is not whether hydroponics can improve particular operational metrics, but when those improvements remain meaningful after relevant trade-offs are included [4].

This paper evaluates resource efficiency and sustainability claims through explicit system boundaries across water, nutrients, energy, land, materials, and waste. It first defines the distinction between operational efficiency and broader sustainability, then examines the mechanisms that shape resource use and synthesises evidence on contextual variation. The analysis argues that hydroponic production is most credibly described as resource-efficient when the comparator, denominator, facility conditions, and included life-cycle stages are visible to the reader [3], [5].

II. Background and Scope

Operational irrigation evidence is useful but has limited transferability to whole-system sustainability. Reviews of capillary systems report water, fertiliser, runoff, and leachate outcomes that may improve on conventional overhead delivery, while also identifying substantial uncertainty about the design and expected performance of broader wicking-bed applications [1]. Such evidence supports a bounded claim about water delivery and local losses. It does not, by itself, determine the impacts of construction materials, maintenance, nutrient replacement, pumping, or disposal. The distinction matters because sustainability claims often extend farther than the measurements on which they are based [6].

Comparison with soil-based irrigation also requires attention to water quality and hydraulic boundaries. Micro-irrigation literature contrasts water use and productivity under drip and surface or furrow systems, while identifying water-quality constraints that influence system performance and management outcomes [7]. Accordingly, a hydroponic comparison should not assume that all field production has identical water losses or that all supplied water has equivalent quality and treatment requirements. A defensible water-efficiency assessment specifies whether it measures water delivered, water consumed, water discharged, or water embodied in upstream processes [8].

Hydroponic reviews identify potential advantages from nutrient-solution recycling and intensive use of land or vertical space, alongside energy and equipment costs, operational complexity, discharge concerns, and system-specific constraints [9]. This paper consequently uses a synthesis scope rather than a single universal benchmark. Direct resource indicators are interpreted as performance measures within an operating system, whereas sustainability is treated as a broader judgement that may include upstream inputs, facility materials, energy supply, and waste pathways [10].

III. Core Concepts and Mechanisms

Hydroponic resource efficiency arises principally from the capacity to regulate the root zone. Controlled solution delivery can reduce unintended water loss, recirculation can retain nutrients within the production system, and cultivation without field soil can concentrate output within a limited footprint [9]. These mechanisms can improve operational water, nutrient, and land indicators, particularly where external losses are significant. Their benefits are conditional, however, because pumps, treatment equipment, climate control, lighting, monitoring, and replacement components may add energy and material burdens. Resource-use performance must therefore be reported alongside the inputs required to sustain the control that produces it.

Crop physiology and facility design shape whether a technical intervention improves total resource efficiency. In strawberry nutrient-film systems, root architecture, production-cycle duration, hydraulic design, root-zone temperature, dissolved oxygen demand, and pathogen exposure affect both crop response and resource requirements [11]. A reported yield increase of 39% under a defined substrate-input and oxyfertigation setting demonstrates that local productivity can respond strongly to root-zone management, but it does not provide a complete comparison of full-cycle resource inputs and outputs [11]. Results from one crop and configuration should therefore not be transferred automatically to another hydroponic system.

Operational adjustments can also shift burdens rather than remove them. Oxygenation, altered flow conditions, and temperature management may improve root-zone conditions, while substrate choices introduce their own environmental and material implications [11]. The relevant question is whether additional resource inputs produce sufficient yield, quality, nutrient-retention, or loss-reduction benefits under the selected denominator. Commercial viability and full-cycle performance cannot be concluded from a local response alone, especially where the intervention changes electricity demand, material replacement, or waste handling [11].

IV. Evidence Synthesis

Across soilless and controlled-environment systems, the evidence supports a multi-dimensional interpretation of efficiency. Reviews identify potential water savings, land-use efficiency, controlled nutrient delivery, and improved productivity, while also documenting energy demand, capital requirements, crop-system suitability, and sustainability trade-offs [12]. Water and land advantages are therefore credible operational possibilities, not universal environmental outcomes. A system that uses little irrigation water per unit yield may still have a high energy requirement, while an intensive facility may save land at the point of production but require substantial infrastructure.

Climate, crop choice, facility type, urban setting, technical capacity, and system design alter the balance of these trade-offs [12]. A protected greenhouse, a vertically stacked indoor farm, and a simple recirculating installation may all be described as hydroponic, but they do not have equivalent lighting, heating, cooling, pumping, material, or management requirements. Electricity mix is especially consequential when environmental controls are a major operating input, because the same physical energy demand can have different broader implications under different supply conditions. Claims about sustainability should therefore identify facility type and local operating context rather than generalising from the hydroponic label.

The distinction between operational efficiency and life-cycle sustainability is reinforced by evidence that reports water-use and yield advantages while qualifying them by design, management, energy use, upstream inputs, and adoption constraints [12]. A suitable assessment boundary may begin with on-site water and nutrient flows, but a broader conclusion should also account for infrastructure, energy supply, substrate production, nutrient inputs, discharge treatment, and end-of-life materials where these are relevant. Transparent boundaries do not weaken efficiency claims, they make clear what has actually been demonstrated.

V. Practical Implications and Limitations

Growing media demonstrate why material boundaries matter. Their sustainability depends on crop performance, physical properties, commercial production constraints, supply and processing pathways, economics, and the life-cycle stages included in assessment [13]. A medium that supports strong crop performance may still entail material burdens that are invisible in a water-only comparison. Conversely, a material assessment that ignores yield or replacement frequency may misrepresent its practical significance. Resource-efficient hydroponic design should therefore report the role, quantity, service life, and end-of-life route of substrates or other root-zone materials where they materially affect the system.

Aeroponic and closely managed systems further show that resource outcomes cannot be separated from biological and engineering context. Crop type, genotype, platform design, root-zone oxygen, temperature, carbon dioxide conditions, and droplet behaviour can all affect performance, while productivity conclusions may change when assessed jointly with resource consumption [14]. Comparable assessments require sufficient reporting of these conditions to establish whether measured inputs supported a similar production service. Incomplete specification of root-zone and environmental settings limits the ability to determine whether an apparent efficiency gain is reproducible or merely configuration-specific.

Broader comparisons among hydroponics, aquaponics, and bioponics similarly depend on crop, facility, energy, resource, economic, modelling, and life-cycle considerations [15]. No single indicator can resolve these differences. For practice, this means that water recirculation, nutrient retention, land intensity, and waste reduction should be evaluated together with energy demand, infrastructure, material use, and discharge pathways. For research, the highest-value requirement is standardised reporting that links resource inputs and losses to marketable output, stated comparator systems, and clearly defined assessment boundaries.

VI. Conclusion

Hydroponic production can be genuinely resource-efficient when controlled water and nutrient delivery reduce local losses, intensive cultivation improves output per relevant footprint, and the additional inputs required for control are transparently measured [9], [12]. Sustainability conclusions change when the boundary expands from direct operation to include energy, infrastructure, substrates, nutrient inputs, treatment, and waste. The technology should therefore be evaluated as a set of context-specific production systems rather than as a uniformly sustainable category.

Future assessment should prioritise comparable measurements of water, nutrients, energy, land, materials, yield, and waste under explicit crop, facility, climate, and electricity conditions. This approach can distinguish demonstrated operational gains from broader life-cycle claims and support more reliable decisions about where hydroponic systems provide a net resource advantage [13], [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] 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.

[3] 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.

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

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

[6] 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.

[7] 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.

[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] 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.

[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] 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.

[12] 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.

[13] G. Barrett, P. Alexander, J. Robinson, and N. Bragg, "Achieving environmentally sustainable growing media for soilless plant cultivation systems - a review," *Scientia Horticulturae*, 2016.

[14] 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.

[15] 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.