

Five tips to successfully manage your nutrient solution in a recirculating hydroponic setup

Although a significant portion of hydroponic growers use run-to-waste setups – where the nutrient solution is ran through plants and then lost – the industry is now moving towards the implementation of recirculating hydroponic systems in order to reduce both water usage and the unnecessary dumping of fertilizers into sewage systems. A recirculating setup has many advantages and can provide better yields than run-to-waste setups, provided the solution is properly managed and changed through the growing cycle. In this post I'm going to talk about five tips that will help you successfully manage your nutrient solution when using this type of system.

Ensure the volume of the reservoir is at least 10x the volume necessary for a single irrigation. The total volume of a reservoir is key in a recirculating setup because you want the bulk of the solution to be unaffected by whatever nutritional changes are caused by the plants during each feeding. This means that you want most of the solution to be inside your tanks and not inside the media when every irrigation is done. A simple rule of thumb is to make the volume of your initial reservoir at least 10x the volume that it would take to carry out a single irrigation of your entire crop. If you do this the water and nutrient absorption effects will happen slowly and will give you time to manage your solution without any harm coming to the plants.



A recirculating hydroponic tomato system using dutch buckets

Circulate your solution until your pH and EC are constant.

After an irrigation cycle starts, the solution will first mix with the remnants of the last irrigation cycle within the media, which will make the pH and EC of the return different from those of the main tank. In order to ensure that the plant's root system is being subjected to the desired nutrient concentrations, make sure you carry out the recirculating process until the EC and pH of the tank remains constant and matches the return pH and EC. Once this happens you know that the conditions within the media have now been equalized with the larger body of solution and you can stop the irrigation process. Constant monitoring of the pH and EC within the tank are therefore necessary within this type of setup.

Add water and *not* nutrients when the EC increases with every irrigation. In a normal recirculating setup the EC of the solution in the main tank will tend to increase with every irrigation while the total volume of the solution will decrease. This happens because healthy plants *always* absorb more water than nutrients, which means any measure that's proportional to concentration – such as the EC – will tend to increase as the amount of water goes down. You want to add enough water to bring the EC down to the desired EC but you do not want to add nutrients with this water and this would increase the EC or contribute to nutrient imbalances within the solution. Note that you will need to add *less* water than the amount that was absorbed by the plants, because the plants also take some nutrients with them, meaning that the amount of water needed to reestablish the EC to what it was before will be lower. If an initial solution has 1000 gallons, the volume might go down to 950 gallons on the first irrigation but you might only need to add 20 gallons to bring it back to the original EC, making the total in the end around 970 gallons. *Make sure the pH of the tank is also corrected after every irrigation and water addition.*

Replenish water with nutrients when volume is down 40%, use this as an opportunity to shift the solution. As discussed in

the last tip, the volume of solution will go down with time, even if some water is added to return to the original EC. At some point more than 40% of the volume will have been spent and it is at this point where you should fill the tank back to its full volume with water plus nutrients. You can also use this opportunity to change the nutrient ratios and skew them in the direction that you want your plants to follow nutritionally. For example in a flowering crop it is common to increase the amount of potassium during the blooming stages of the plant, so this can be done as nutrient solution is replenished after it's consumed by the plants. *Note that this process cannot be carried out indefinitely because both nutrient imbalances and plant exudates will accumulate within the main solution.* Most recirculating crops will fully change the solution every 3-4 weeks to avoid these problems although the life of the solution can be extended further when chemical analysis is done – to customize nutrient replenishing – and adequate filtering is implemented to remove substances contributed by plants.


Add in-line UV filters and carbon filters. It is fundamental to ensure no microorganisms contaminate your nutrient solution. For this reason, online UV-filters are necessary to keep the nutrient solution as sterile as possible. Carbon filters are also very useful as they remove plant exudates that can contaminate the solution and cause problems within the crop itself. Many of these exudates are food for microorganisms, others are plant hormones that might cause unwanted responses in the plants. However both carbon filtration and UV filters can cause some issues – such as the destruction and adsorption of heavy metal chelates – so it is important to use chelates that are more resistant to UV and have less affinity for carbon filters to alleviate these problems.

There is certainly a lot more to the management of recirculating hydroponic solution than what I have detailed

above, *it is important to note that some of these tips are simplifications and much better tailor-made solutions are possible with a proper analysis of each situation.* These are just some simple tips to hopefully make your change towards the use of recirculating systems a lot easier and should greatly increase your chances of success in the world of recirculating hydroponic setups.

About the default fertilizer database in HydroBuddy

Hydrobuddy is an open source calculator that seeks to help growers create their own hydroponic nutrient solutions. In order to do this, the program includes a database with a list of curated fertilizers that should be a good starting point for those interested in making their own nutrients. However, why these salts are included might not be clear to most growers, so I wanted to create a blog post to explain my reasoning behind this particular repository and the purpose each one of these different salts might serve. It is also worth noting that the default list of nutrients is not by any means definitive – for example no silicon containing substances are included – so users are welcome to add their own substances using the “Add Custom” option and entering the composition of the fertilizer they want to add.



The HydroBuddy “Substance Selection” screen (v1.8) showing some of the nutrients in the default database

The idea of the database that comes with HydroBuddy is to allow you to create several types of nutritional tools, using different types of approaches. The table below shows you what each one of the substances contributes in terms of nutrition, as well as its qualitative effect on the pH of the solution and what its most popular use is. While some of these substances – such as Potassium Sulfate – are mainly intended to be used as part of the main nutrient solution, others such as Potassium Carbonate, are not intended to be used in this manner but they are intended to be used as buffering agents when doing pH adjustments or creating concentrated pH up/down buffering solutions. There are also substances like – like Ammonium Chloride – that are not intended to be used for either of these purposes but mainly for supplementing a nutritional component, in this particular case, N as ammonium.

The main nutritional use of substances is also dependent on what the end-user has in mind. For example when a user wants to create a concentrated stock solution, substances such as

Calcium Sulfate or Zinc Sulfate might not be very useful – due to their limited solubility or stability – while for users who want to create final solutions by direct addition of salts, these substances might be the best potential choice. Several different substances are provided for some nutrients to allow for this type of flexibility.

Another important factor can be cost, sometimes this is a more important factor than other considerations, such as which nutrient is the absolute best from a botanical perspective. This is part of the reason why – for example – 4 different forms of iron are present within the default database, this way users can see how much iron they would require from different sources and – depending on their particular application and cost range – make a decision about which iron source might be optimal. This also allows a user to consider using a cheaper source of iron – like Iron II Sulfate Heptahydrate – and then preparing their own chelates using a chelating agent, such as disodium EDTA.

| Name | N1 | N2 | P | K | Mg | Ca | S | Fe | Mn | B | Zn | Cu | Mo | Cl | Na | Use | pH effect |
|----------------------------------|----|----|---|---|----|----|---|----|----|---|----|----|----|----|----|-----|-----------|
| Ammonium Chloride | ■ | | | | | | | | | | | | | ■ | | S | ↓ |
| Ammonium Dibasic Phosphate | ■ | | ■ | | | | | | | | | | | | | MN | ↑ |
| Ammonium Monobasic Phosphate | ■ | | ■ | | | | | | | | | | | | | MN | ↓↓ |
| Ammonium Sulfate | ■ | | | | | | ■ | | | | | | | | | MN | ↓ |
| Boric Acid | | | | | | | | | | ■ | | | | | | MN | ↓ |
| Calcium Carbonate | | | | | | ■ | | | | | | | | | | B | ↑↑ |
| Calcium Sulfate (Dihydrate) | | | | | | ■ | ■ | | | | | | | | | MN | |
| Calcium Nitrate (ag grade) | | ■ | | | | ■ | | | | | | | | | | MN | ↓ |
| Copper EDTA | | | | | | | | | | | | ■ | | | ■ | MN | |
| Copper Nitrate | | ■ | | | | | | | | | | ■ | | | | MN | |
| Copper sulfate | | | | | | | ■ | | | | | ■ | | | | MN | |
| Iron DTPA | | | | | | | | ■ | | | | | | | ■ | MN | |
| Iron EDDHA | | | | | | | | ■ | | | | | | | ■ | MN | |
| Iron EDTA | | | | | | | | ■ | | | | | | | ■ | MN | |
| Iron II sulfate (heptahydrate) | | | | | | | ■ | ■ | | | | | | | | MN | |
| Magnesium Carbonate | | | | | ■ | | | | | | | | | | | B | ↑↑ |
| Magnesium Sulfate (heptahydrate) | | | | | ■ | | ■ | | | | | | | | | MN | |
| Mn EDTA | | | | | | | | | ■ | | | | | | ■ | MN | |
| Phosphoric Acid (75%) | | | ■ | | | | | | | | | | | | | B | ↓↓↓ |
| Potassium Carbonate | | | | ■ | | | | | | | | | | | | B | ↑↑ |
| Potassium Chloride | | | | ■ | | | | | | | | | | ■ | | S | |
| Potassium Citrate | | | | ■ | | | | | | | | | | | | B | ↑↑ |
| Potassium Dibasic Phosphate | | | ■ | ■ | | | | | | | | | | | | MN | ↑ |
| Potassium Monobasic Phosphate | | | ■ | ■ | | | | | | | | | | | | MN | ↓↓ |
| Potassium Nitrate | | ■ | | ■ | | | | | | | | | | | | MN | |
| Potassium Sulfate | | | | ■ | | | ■ | | | | | | | | | MN | |
| Sodium Borate | | | | | | | | | | ■ | | | | | ■ | MN | |
| Sodium Molybdate | | | | | | | | | | | | | ■ | | ■ | MN | |
| Sodium Nitrate | | ■ | | | | | | | | | | | | | ■ | S | |
| Zinc Nitrate (Hexahydrate) | | ■ | | | | | | | | | | ■ | | | | MN | |
| Zinc Sulfate (Monohydrate) | | | | | | | ■ | | | | | ■ | | | | MN | |
| Zn EDTA | | | | | | | | | | | | ■ | | | ■ | MN | |

This table shows all the salts included in the default HydroBuddy database (v1.8). N1 is N as Ammonium, N2 is N as nitrate. MN = Main nutrition, B = Buffering, S = Supplementation

For those with experience in hydroponic nutrient solutions it will be clear that many commonly used substances are missing – such as Magnesium Nitrate, Potassium Silicate, Nitric acid, Sulfuric acid, etc – these were present in previous versions of the software, but the abundance of choices was confusing to newer users, especially when they couldn't easily get their hands on many of these fertilizers from a practical perspective. Some nutrients, like urea, were specifically removed because of the larger potential to cause more harm

than good when used in hydroponics. The modifications to the database seek to solve these issues by providing a more condensed, yet very flexible list, that users can more effectively leverage to create their own solutions. *However, remember that you can add any substance you want by using the "Add Custom" button in the substance selection screen.*


As you can see many considerations go into creating nutrient solutions and this database is a very generic attempt to provide you with the best tools to get you started in this world. However, if you find this task difficult or you would simply like to have additional help and guidance, feel free to book an hour of consultation time by using the booking function on the website or contacting me directly through the [contact page](#).

A new conductivity model in HydroBuddy

On my [previous post](#) you can read about how I ran experiments to develop a conductivity model using empirical data in order to improve our ability to predict EC values from the concentration of individual nutrients in a hydroponic nutrient solution. In this post I will now talk about how this was finally implemented in HydroBuddy, what form it took and what kind of result can be expected from it. The implementation discussed in this post has already been updated to the [HydroBuddy github](#) along with all the experimental data used to derive this empirical EC model.

Given the amount of data and the nature of the problem at hand, the easiest and most accurate way to build a model was

to use a simple linear regression algorithm. As previously shown this model was able to give great results within the data, even when performing random training and testing splits. I have added a [jupyter notebook](#) to the github repository, along with all the data we measured in order to allow you to see how all the calculations were done, how the model was created and the sort of accuracy the model got within the set of experimental results. You can also play with this notebook to develop your own models or analyse the data any further if you wish. You can also try to reproduce our experiments and help verify our results. The linear model was translated into FreePascal and added to HydroBuddy although the program still retains the ability to estimate conductivity using the previously available LMC based model.



New hydrobuddy implementation now including the ability to choose between LMC and empirical EC models.

The fact that we were able to create a model to accurately determine conductivity within this experimental space does not mean that this model will work to magically determine the

conductivity of any hydroponic formulation. These experiments were designed using five salts – calcium ammonium nitrate, ammonium sulfate, potassium sulfate, magnesium sulfate and monopotassium phosphate – which means that although our model is able to greatly describe conductivity in this space, the model is likely to run into trouble when attempting to describe a space that deviates too strongly from the one described above. This will be most evident whenever there are some cations or anions that are not present at all within these experiments. For example when silicates, chlorides or other such salts are used or when strong acids or bases are added to the solution.


Another important issue is the way these ions are paired. In our experimental process the concentration of Ca and N as nitrate always increased at the same time, meaning that the linear model implicitly carries this assumption. A setup where magnesium nitrate or potassium nitrate are used as well, will contain deviations from the current model that it is likely not very well prepared to deal with. A similar problem might happen when salts such as ammonium monobasic phosphate are used, since our model only contained a single example of a phosphate salt (monopotassium phosphate). While it is not easy to predict how much accuracy will be lost in these cases, we do expect the model to be significantly more inaccurate as other salts are used.

Additionally, our experimental setup did not contain any corrections of pH values, so the conductivity values described include a pH drift related with the amount of acid contributed by the potassium monobasic phosphate, which was not neutralized by a base. This will also cause differences with conductivity, if the conductivity is measured after the pH of the solution is corrected to the proper range used within the hydroponic process. Although at the concentration values used in hydroponics this should not be a big issue, it is still something worth considering.

As I mentioned above, the model is already implemented within the github repository – if you want to compile the program yourself – but the binaries won't be updated to v1.8 until later this week. I look forward to your feedback about the model and hope it can help – at least some of you – to dramatically improve the estimations of conductivity of your hydroponic nutrient solutions.

Building a model to predict EC in hydroponic nutrient solutions

Electrical conductivity (EC) is one of the most useful parameters in the practical preparation of hydroponic nutrient solutions. This is because knowing the expected conductivity of a nutrient solution can allow you to prepare solutions without having to measure the total volume exactly, a parameter that is often hard to accurately determine in practice. Although determining the target conductivity is easy to do using small preparation volumes – which can be done accurately – it is often impractical to do so routinely, which is necessary if the actual composition of the nutrient solution is being changed as a function of time. Due to all the above, it is important to come up with accurate models to estimate the EC of nutrient solutions with only information about their mineral composition, without having to measure the value experimentally. In this post I am going to talk about how I created a model to do exactly this, taking advantage of multi-variable experimentation and simple modeling techniques.




Mineral nutrient concentrations (ppm) of all the samples measured

The problem with conductivity modeling is that not all salts contribute the same to the conductivity of a nutrient solution. For example potassium sulfate can contribute significantly more to conductivity per gram compared to a salt like monopotassium phosphate. Furthermore, the addition of some salts can affect the conductivity of others (see my previous post on conductivity modeling in Hydrobuddy for more details). In the regime we use in hydroponics, the determination of electrical conductivity using data from limiting molar conductivity can lead to very skewed results, which makes these estimations of little usage in practice.

To solve this issue, I designed an experiment where 50 different EC measurements were made for different hydroponic nutrient solutions within the range of concentrations of nutrients that are reasonably expected in hydroponic culture, with some values being above these in order to ensure that all values encountered in practice will be within the measured ranges. The image above shows you all the concentrations that were measured within the experiment. To prepare the solutions I used calcium ammonium nitrate, potassium sulfate, magnesium sulfate heptahydrate, monopotassium phosphate and ammonium sulfate. All of these were agricultural grade salts in order to reflect the same impurities expected in a normal hydroponic setup. Note that no heavy metal salts were used since their contribution to the EC of a hydroponic nutrient solution is negligible.

Concentrated solutions of all the salts were prepared in 250mL volumetric flasks using a $\pm 0.001\text{g}$ scale and aliquots of these solutions were drawn using 5mL plastic syringes ($\pm 5\%$) in order to prepare final 250mL solutions using volumetric flasks. Conductivity measurements were done using an Apera EC60 conductivity meter that was previously calibrated using a 2 point calibration method. All the solutions were prepared using distilled water. The target concentrations for the solutions were determined using a pseudo random number generator in order to try to ensure a random distribution of samples within the concentration space of interest.




A sample modeling results for a random split with training (33 data points) and testing sets (17 data points)


Using this data we constructed a linear model to attempt to predict conductivity. In order to evaluate the model we randomly split the results to get 33 data points used for model construction and 17 points left for model validation. Performing this process 100 times shows that the mean R^2 of the model on the training set is 0.995 while the average on the testing set is 0.994. This shows that the model is able to properly generalize the conductivity data in order to

properly predict the conductivity of the solution across the space studied. **The mean absolute error in the testing set was 0.036 mS/cm. This shows the high certainty with which we can make conductivity predictions.**

Exploring the model coefficients can also show us how different the contributions of the different elements to the conductivity of the nutrient solution can actually be. These results are surprising if you compare them to the conductivity contributions per gram that are expected from the limiting molar conductivity values, which are the conductivity values the ions exhibit on their own under very high dilutions (this is also the method used in HydroBuddy $\leq v1.65$). We can clearly see here that in reality we are getting way more conductivity out of sulfate compared to the other elements and significantly less from magnesium. This means that at the makeup and concentration values used in hydroponics the Mg ions are not being able to contribute as much as they can when they are alone because their activity is being lowered by the other ions in solution, while the opposite case applies to sulfate.



Linear model coefficients for the different elements (proxy for their contribution to conductivity)



Expected conductivity values per gram using data from limiting molar conductivity values (taken from [here](#))

The above shows us why conductivity in hydroponics is so complicated, it shows how ions do not contribute equally to conductivity and how they behave very differently in real hydroponic solutions. Thankfully the above also shows how we can create a model using experimental data that is actually able to predict conductivity, since the relationships – although different than expected – are still highly predictable when enough experimental data is available. All the above experimentation took 4 hours to do – with the help of my lovely wife, who is also a chemist – and should allow me to add a very powerful model to predict hydroponic nutrient solution EC values to HydroBuddy.

All the above experimentation data will be open source and available in a github repository soon. We also hope to show you how all of this was done in a youtube video in the near future.

Keeping plants short: Using day/night temperature differences (DIF)

In this article series about “keeping plants short”, we have explored the reasons why short plants are desirable and how this can be achieved using gibberellin inhibitors. However this is not the only effective way to control plant height and several other ways – some using no chemical means – can be used to keep plants short. In this article I will be talking about the use of day/night temperature differences in order to control plant height, what the research about this says and how it can be effectively applied by growers to achieve shorter plants.

The idea of using day/night temperature differences to control plant height can be traced back to the late eighties and some research done by people at Michigan State University ([1](#)). This research in easter lilies showed how plants grown at a constant night temperature (68F, 20C) but subjected to even lower day temperatures or simply drops in early morning temperature could grow drastically shorter. The results surprisingly showed that a 14F temperature drop during the beginning of the day – first two hours – could actually cause the plants to receive the same effect as if the day temperature was lower during the entire day, yet the plants remained highly productive. This technique of reducing temperature during a few hours during the way was referred from this point on as “DIF”.



Taken from [this 1986 article](#).

Experimenters then began testing across other plant species and found the results to be mixed. In this paper (2) chrysanthemum, poinsettia, begonia and kalanchoe were all tested in a -6 C DIF experiment and while chrysanthemum and begonia both responded in the expected manner, the kalanchoe actually responded in the opposite way and showed stronger elongation of the flower stems. In all of these cases the use of growth regulators – gibberellin inhibitors – was still needed to ensure plants stayed at the required height. This was one of the first studies that pointed to the fact that the DIF technique is tremendously crop dependent.

During the nineties it was established that DIF did work for several common crops, for example cucumber and tomatoes showed to be sensitive to the DIF effect, particularly when the first two hours of the day showed a temperature drop. In this case the effect reduced both the inter-node distance and was directly proportional to the difference in temperature. It was also established that some plants prefer pulses of cold temperature during the end of the day, while others might prefer this pulses even in the middle of the night. It was also showed that strong negative DIF treatments caused

negative effect related with a reduction in chlorophyll production, resulting sometimes in even plants showing signs of chlorosis. Plants grown in negative DIF were also shown to have lower total dry weights although depending on the magnitude of the DIF, limited or sometimes even positive effects on weight and yields could be seen. You can read more about the above in this review from the late nineties which also contains a lot of literature references for early DIF research ([3](#)).



Stem elongation effects of DIF in peas, taken from [this article](#)

More recent research from 2013 on tomatoes, eggplant and sweet pepper ([4](#)) has shown that a variety of different day/night temperature treatments can be effective in minimizing vegetative growth while having a limited effect on yields. In this case the strongest effect was seen for a 15C/25C day/night temperature cycle. This paper also looked at nutrient absorption and noticed that Ca/Mg/K concentrations were actually highest in the 15C/25C temperature treatment, which suggests that changing the day/night temperature did not adversely affect nutrient absorption. The conclusions of this research were then reproduced and matched when looking at cucumber, melon and watermelon ([5](#)). However other research using positive as well as negative differences in temperatures has shown that for tomatoes, the ideal day/night temperature difference is positive and in the order of +6C if yields and plant growth are given the highest priority ([6](#)).

The DIF method has shown to be a reliable way to control the height and vegetative growth of many different plant species, although for some it does not work very well. In general the researchers who apply negative DIF methods for reducing stretch tend to have the most success with a -10C (-18F) increase in night over day temperatures. If testing on a new plant the recommendation would be to start with a 2 hour

temperature drop in the day temperature of this magnitude for the first 2 hours of light – starting the drop 30 minutes before sunrise – and see which results you can get. This is likely going to be the cheapest in terms of both climate control and potential disruptions in yields caused by this technique.

Monitoring the quality of fertilizer stock solutions

Hydroponic concentrated nutrient fertilizer manufacturers are not held to any routine quality standards by regulatory authorities in most countries. Although fertilizers need to be properly registered and their intended minimum compositions are shared with the public, the manufacturer never guarantees that each batch of the product will comply with any sort of quality standard and it's therefore possible for hydroponic nutrients to come out of a factory with compositions that significantly deviate between batches. People who make their own fertilizers are also not free from problems either, as issues further down the chain – with the fertilizer raw inputs – or issues related with human error, can and will still happen.

Because of these problems, a very important part of every hydroponic grower's process should be to establish some quality guidelines to evaluate whether a given batch of nutrients – either bought or self-made – complies with what is expected and can therefore be used in the hydroponic crop. In today's post I will talk about the properties that you can measure in order to ensure that the quality of your inputs is sustained through time and how these measurements should be

done.



These are two measurements that should always be done whenever you receive or prepare a new batch of hydroponic nutrient stock solution:

Density of the stock solution: The density of a hydroponic stock solution should always be measured and recorded. The density needs to be measured accurately, using a pycnometer and an accurate enough balance (+/- 0.01g). A 5 or 10mL pycnometer would be recommended and the balance should be able to measure up to at least 50g, to ensure that the measurement of the final weight of the pycnometer will be in range. You should first weight the empty and dry pycnometer, then fill it with liquid to the brim, place the stopper – some liquid will spill, this is how it's intended to work – then wipe any spilled liquid and weight the full pycnometer. The difference in weight divided by the pycnometer volume will give you the density. Make sure you also record the ambient temperature when the measurement is made.

pH of the stock solution: You can use a pH meter to determine the pH of a sample of the stock solution. You can use the regular pH tester you use to measure the pH of your hydroponic

nutrient solutions, however make sure the pH meter does not remain for too long in the stock solution – more than what's necessary to make the measurement – and wash it with distilled water and store it in pH meter storage solution as soon as the measurement is done. Also make sure the pH meter is calibrated right before making this measurement.

If any compounds are added incorrectly or the composition of the raw inputs was in anyway wrong, the above two parameters – pH and density – will tend to change, as they depend very strongly on the composition of inputs being the same. Of course, there are mistakes that can go undetected in these two domains but a stock solution that always records the same across batches will tend to be the same chemically. Every time you receive or prepare new solution record the above and ensure you never use any solution that deviates more than $\pm 5\%$ from the median you have on your record. The deviation of the above two parameters also serves as a way to control how reproducible the manufacturing process of the stock solution actually is.

If there is a strong mismatch in these measurements when compared with the median of all past values, then you need to continue to actual chemical analysis of the nutrients to figure out what's wrong.

If you prepared the fertilizer yourself then it becomes important to check notes – always keep records of weights that are added when preparing solutions – and see if there were any changes in the chemical suppliers of any of the used inputs. Sometimes the quality and composition of certain chemicals can change dramatically between suppliers, so making changes from one to another can often require chemical analysis to ensure that the composition stays the same. A good example can be potassium silicate, where the exact grade and potassium to silicon ratio of the raw material can change a lot depending on the exact fabrication process used by the company making it.

Another important point is the accuracy of the instruments used for the preparation of solutions. Sometimes the problem is that a scale or a volume measuring device lost calibration and generated errors in a previously unseen range. This can be particularly problematic if different instruments are used to measure different inputs, which can make some inputs subject to bigger errors than others and can therefore change the ratio between different nutrients in the hydroponic solution.

Why red and blue LED grow lights never took off

Anyone who has been growing plants for a while has probably seen a chart showing the absorption profile of chlorophylls A and B, as shown in the image below. From this it seems that most of the light absorbed by plants has a wavelength below 500 nm or above 650nm so it seems incredibly straightforward to hypothesize that plants can be effectively grown just using light in these regions. The commercial answer to this hypothesis came in the form of the red/blue growing LED light, which give the plant energy that it is “best suited” to absorb and avoids “wasting” any energy in the generation of light that will not be absorbed anyway (but just reflected away by the plants). However these grow lights have been an overall failure so far – with the vast majority of the industry now shifting onto full spectrum LED lights – why has this been the case?




Image showing the absorption spectra of Chlorophyll A, B and carotenoids

When the cost of red/blue lights dropped enough, there was a significant move to evaluate them in the scientific community to figure out how they affected plant growth. It quickly became clear that plants could be grown with these new lights and that the products could be as healthy as those produced under normal full spectrum lights. However some issues started to become noticeable when these red/blue lights started to move onto larger commercial applications. Although the commercial application of these lights in large fruiting plants is practically non-existent due to the high cost of supplemental lighting, their use was feasible for some small leafy crops – for example lettuce and spinach – which could be grown under high density conditions in urban settings. Their main use however, was in the cannabis growing space, which is one of the only high-cost crops that is grown largely under supplemental lighting when far from the equator.

Most people who tried this soon realized that the growing of plants wasn't equal to that obtained when using fuller spectrum lights, such as HPS or even metal halide lamps, even at equivalent photon flux values. Although scientific publication in cannabis are scarce, this 2016 report ([1](#)) shows

that white lights in general did a better job at growing the plants compared to the blue/red lights. Other research (2) shows that the blue/red lights can also affect the chemical composition of secondary metabolites, which makes the decision to move to red/blue LED grow lights affect the quality of the end-product.

It has also been shown that green light is not entirely unused by plants, but can actually have important functions. This review (3) goes into many of the important signaling functions of green light and why it can be important for healthy plant growth. Some researchers also started doing experiments with red/blue/green grow lights, showing the positive effects of including some green light in the composition (4). It has also been shown that other regions of the spectrum, such as the far-red (5) can also contribute substantially to photosynthesis and the regulation of plant biological processes. Ultra-violet light can also contribute substantially to the expression of certain molecules in plants. A paper evaluating cannabis under several different light regimes shows how the composition of the light spectrum can manipulate the secondary metabolite makeup of the plants (6).




Fig. 2. Dry weight of leaves, stems, and roots of 42-day-old pepper plants grown for 21 days under metal halide (MH) lamps then transplanted under red light-emitting diodes (LEDs) plus blue fluorescent lamps (660/BF), red LEDs (660), and red plus far-red LEDs (660/735), or maintained under MH lamps for an additional 21 days. Similarly shaded portions containing different letters are significantly different based on ANOVA and protected least-squares mean separation tests ($P \leq 0.05$). The letters above the bars indicates the significance for the combined plant dry weight.

Image taken from this study (7) showing the effect of far-red light in the growth of pepper plants.

Finally, the last problem in the grow light phenomenon, especially in the case of plants like cannabis, came from the fact that plants look black under this red/blue light. This meant that growers were completely unaware of any potential problems that developed, as the plants were virtually invisible to them through their entire lifetimes. This was one of the main reasons why these lights were never widely adopted, as they made the diagnosing of nutrient issues and insect issues – which are relatively easy to diagnose under full spectrum lights for an experienced grower – almost impossible to do with these red/blue growing panels. In practice a large commercial operation relies heavily on the experience and on-going evaluation of the crop by the on-site personnel and failure to have this useful check in the process


is a recipe for disaster.

The LED industry learned from these problems and has since gone into the development of full spectrum high efficiency growing panels for the hydroponic industry. These will certainly become the future and standard in the in-door hydroponic industry, especially if prices continue to come down as a consequence of mass adoption. Having full spectrum lights that are way more power efficient than HPS and MH lamps will offer growers the chance to save a lot on costs while maintaining, or even improving, the quality and yield of their crops.

In-depth books to learn about hydroponics at an advanced level

Growing plants without soil requires a lot of knowledge. As a hydroponic grower, it is now your duty to provide the plant with the needed chemical and environmental conditions that nature used to provide. Acquiring this knowledge can be difficult, as there are few well structured programs that attempt to teach in-depth hydroponics to students and many of these programs are graduate level programs that are inaccessible to the commercial or novice hydroponic grower. Although there are many hydroponic books catering to the novice – as this is the most accessible market – a lot of growers want to get to the next level by digesting books that can help them become true experts in the subject of hydroponic culture. While novice books help people get around the basics of hydroponics, true higher level books are required to

understand the causes and solutions to many problems found in this field.



In this post I am going to summarize some of my favorite books in the more advanced hydroponic domain. Going from nutrition to actual commercial and practical growing setups. I will go through some of the reasons why I believe these books are fundamental, as well as what the necessary prior knowledge to understand the books would be.

[The mineral nutrition of higher plants](#). This classic book is used in almost all university level classes that teach mineral nutrition in plants. It covers how the different minerals are absorbed into plants, how this absorption works from a metabolic perspective and how the toxicity and deficiency of each one of these substances works from a chemical and biological perspective plus a ton of information about nutrient interactions. *This is however not a book you want to read "from start to finish"*, it is meant to be a reference book, that you can go through when you have specific doubts or want to have a better understanding about a certain element and how the plant interacts with it. It also requires a strong chemistry and biochemistry background, so it is not a book that you want to get if you don't find these domains interesting. Ideally you would go to this book to answer a question like "Why does ammonium compete with potassium

absorption but potassium rarely competes with ammonium absorption?”.

[Soilless Culture: Theory and Practice](#). This book covers a lot of important topics in practical hydroponics. It talks about root systems, physical and chemical characteristics of growing media, irrigation, technical equipment, nutrient solutions, etc. It is one of my favorite “well rounded” hydroponic books as it covers almost all topics you could be interested in at significant technical and scientific depth, giving the user a ton of additional references for study at the end of each one of its chapters. It also focuses on giving the user a grasp of fundamental concepts that affect a given topic before going deeper into it. It will for example attempt to give you a very good explanation of why and how certain properties of media are measured before it even starts to explain the different types of media available in hydroponic culture. This book requires a good understanding of basic chemistry and physics but is way lighter in biochemistry and botany. This is a perfect book to answer questions like: “what different types of irrigation systems exist? What are their advantages and disadvantages?”.

[Hydroponic Food Production: A Definitive Guidebook for the Advanced Home Gardener and the Commercial Hydroponic Grower](#). Howard Resh was one of the first people who produced a book for hydroponics that put together the combined experience of a lot of actual, commercial, hydroponic growers. The book is written in an easier way to read and gathers a lot of experience from the commercial growing space, with useful references placed at the end of every chapter. It can be especially useful to those who are within actual commercial production operations, as the book goes into commercial crop production in a way that none of the other books here does. This makes this book more pragmatic, specifically addressing some concerns of larger scale applications of hydroponic technology. High school level chemistry and physics should be

enough to understand what this book has to offer. A question this book might help answer is: “How do I adjust the conductivity of a hydroponic solution in a commercial setting?”.


[Controlled Environment Horticulture: Improving Quality of Vegetables and Medicinal Plants](#): This book goes more onto the botany side and explores how a grower can manipulate a plant’s growing environment in order to guide its production of secondary metabolites. The book goes into some of the basics of horticulture but goes deeper into drought stress, thermal stress, wounding, biostimulants, biofortification, carbon dioxide and other such manipulation techniques available to modern growers. As all the ones before, this book also gives you a lot of useful literature references at the end of every chapter, allowing you to continue to explore all these topics on your own, by going to the academic literature. A question this book might help you answer is: “Which plant hormones can I use to increment the production of oil in spearmint plants?”.

The above are some of the books I will go to when I want to answer a question in hydroponics. These books will often provide me with a solid starting point for the topic I’m interested in – like some clear scientific references I can go to – or can even show me some interesting paths to explore. Usually I’ll go into the scientific literature to get an updated view of the subject, but going into the literature with a base view has proved to be invaluable almost every time.

Six things you need to know before using plant hormones

Plant hormones are small molecules with no nutritional value that are used as chemical signalers within plants. A hormone will trigger a chemical signaling cascade that will cause the plant to carry out certain specific behavior. This fact has made them one of the most useful tools to manipulate plant growth and improve the yields and quality of many crops, especially flowering plants. This has also made them a key target for hype, with many products promising significant gains without much talk about interactions with other hormones or other fundamental aspects. In this post I want to talk about six things you should know about plant hormones, both to use them more effectively and to adequately manage your expectations when you use them. Note that although plant hormones are considered plant growth regulators (PGRs), this broad class includes other molecules – such as gibberellin synthesis inhibitors – that are not being considered in this post.

Know specifically what you want. A hormone will affect a plant in a very specific way, to achieve a specific purpose. Hormones can help you manipulate plant growth but which one you use depends fundamentally on what you want to achieve. Do you want the plant to be bigger or shorter? Do you want to have more water content in your product? More solid content? More terpenes? Do you want to fight drought conditions? Excess salinity? Insects? The specifics of what you want will guide you into choosing an appropriate hormone for your specific needs.



Examples of widely used plant hormones

Plan your hormone applications strategically. Different hormones can stimulate different processes that are needed at different points of a plant's life. If you plan the use of hormones carefully you can stimulate root growth when plants are transplanted, then stimulate flowering or other behavior when you want the plant to express that behavior more strongly. Plants take some time to steer, they react to their environment, hormone applications at the right times can give a plant a strong signal that it should follow certain behavior and you – as a grower – can ensure that the environmental conditions are perfect for the processes the plant will be carrying out next. Hormones are the flares telling the plant where to go, you should ensure you make that a smooth ride.

There is no free lunch. Plant hormones act to cause a certain behavior to happen, but this behavior comes at a specific cost. A plant that is stimulated to produce more flowers will

often grow smaller fruits, a plant that is stimulated to produce more terpenes might produce lower yields because of the additional energy spent in these molecules, a plant that grows more roots, grows less shoots while it's doing that, etc. A plant does not magically get access to more energy because it has been stimulated with a hormone, it simply chooses to act differently with the energy it is receiving.

Hormones interact with each other. A given hormone can behave in a way when it's applied and in a very different way when it's applied with another hormone. As different hormones signal different paths, the net effect is often related with how these different paths are activated. Some are synergistic, the total is more than the sum of the parts, while others are antagonistic, meaning you get less than the sum of the parts. Growers interested in hormones will often make the mistake of applying a lot of things at the same time, but they have no idea what the net effects are going to be like. When dealing with hormones introduce them one at a time and make sure you're getting a measurable positive effect before you venture into using another one with it. Incremental gains is the name of the game not "apply every hormone under the sun that has a peer reviewed paper published where it increases yields in a plant".

Concentration is everything. To make things even more complicated, a hormone might activate one signaling path when it's present at a given concentration but a different one when it's present at a much larger concentration. Using the wrong concentration for the hormone might end up causing a completely different effect or an effect so pronounced that it's negative side effects are going to out-do the positive effects. Furthermore, this can also be genetic dependent, so when using hormones on new varieties or species it is always advisable to do a concentration trial across 2-3 orders of magnitude to see where the "sweet spot" for the desired effect is. Sometimes hormones are most effective at surprisingly low

concentrations – even 0.1 to 1 ppm – while other times they need to be applied in very significant amounts (100-300 ppm).

The application route and vehicle is very important. A hormone might be very effective when applied in a foliar spray, while completely ineffective when applied in a root drench. Sometimes the hormone requires specific additives or solvents to be used in order to ensure its absorption and others it needs to be applied at a very specific pH range or even just by itself. Knowing the particular application conditions of the hormone you want to use is also important to achieve the expected results.

These are some simple guidelines to consider when using plant hormones in your crop. Hormones are no miracle but they can certainly provide amazing improvements in yields and quality if used appropriately. Formulating a good hormonal regime, with adequately formulated foliar/root drenches, applied at the right times, with the right hormones, can provide amazing results. This however requires a lot of testing, a lot of effort and a lot of understanding about the plant being grown and its crop cycle. Every crop has its own genetic and environmental conditions and requires significant experimentation to achieve the best possible results.

Keeping plants short: Synthetic gibberellin inhibitors

Plants grow both vertically and horizontally. A plant will develop branches along its stem – expanding horizontally – and the stem will grow towards the sun, making the plant taller.

This vertical growth is almost always an undesirable quality, both in extensive and intensive crops, which creates an opportunity to improve plant cultures by attempting to reduce the height of plants. You can read more about why making short plants is important in [this post](#). Although there are many potential ways to achieve this – which I will discuss in detail in future posts – this post will deal with the most powerful tools that have been developed for this purpose, a class of plant growth regulators (PGRs) known as gibberellin inhibitors or more commonly as “growth retardants”.




Figure 12.2

[Open in figure viewer](#) | [PowerPoint](#)

Main steps of gibberellin biosynthesis leading to biologically active GA₁ and points of inhibition by plant growth retardants. The cellular locations of the reactions is indicated by different greyscales. (The conversion of GA₁₂ into GA₅₃ can be located in both the endoplasmic reticulum or the cytosol.)

This figure was taken from [this article](#).

Making a plant grow shorter is no trivial task. This is because we do not want to make the plant less productive, but we want the same productivity of a tall plant in a much bushier and compact package. We therefore need to inhibit vegetative growth without affecting the flowering stages of our plant. Scientists figured out around 30 years ago that a set of plant hormones called gibberellins played a critical role in the vegetative growth of plants – especially the elongation of a plant -so these became a prime target to stop

growth. If you can disrupt the gibberellin creation pathway right when the plant is supposed to stretch, then the plant will stop growing vertically without the flowering development of the plant being affected at all.

We have found several different types of compounds that can do this. The figure above shows you the gibberellin synthesis path and the steps where different molecules have been shown to disrupt it. Among the most powerful and commonly used were the ones that disrupted the conversion of kaurene to kaurenoic acid, with the most famous one being paclobutrazol. In the other groups the most commonly used ones were chlormequat and daminozide. These molecules are all part of the first generation of gibberellin inhibitors and they did exactly what they were supposed to, proving to be extremely powerful growth retardants that were able to keep plants compact and strongly increased yields in several different crops.

However it soon became evident that their toxicity and retention in plant tissue is significant. Paclobutrazol has been shown to be toxic, having developmental and reproductive effects in rats ([1](#)) although it has been shown not to be carcinogenic in humans but still very toxic to aquatic life ([2](#)). The use of paclobutrazol on food crops is therefore not recommended, but whether or not it's actually allowed or not depends on the legislation of the country where you're in. Some countries will allow paclobutrazol to be used as long as enough time is given between application and the development of the edible parts of the crop and then again this usually only applies to a limited number of crops where the time between use and harvest can be guaranteed to be long enough. Chlormequat and daminozide follow similar stories, although in the case of daminozide it was discovered that it was carcinogenic and its use in edible crops was completely banned world wide in the late 1980s.

Table 2. Pesticide analytes and their action levels

| Analyte | Chemical Abstract Services (CAS) Registry number | Action level ppm | Analyte | Chemical Abstract Services (CAS) Registry number | Action level ppm |
|---------------------|--|------------------|--------------------|--|------------------|
| Abamectin | 71751-41-2 | 0.5 | Imazalil | 35554-44-0 | 0.2 |
| Acephate | 30560-19-1 | 0.4 | Imidacloprid | 138261-41-3 | 0.4 |
| Acequinocyl | 57960-19-7 | 2 | Kresoxim-methyl | 143390-89-0 | 0.4 |
| Acetamiprid | 135410-20-7 | 0.2 | Malathion | 121-75-5 | 0.2 |
| Aldicarb | 116-06-3 | 0.4 | Metalaxyl | 57837-19-1 | 0.2 |
| Azoxystrobin | 131860-33-8 | 0.2 | Methiocarb | 2032-65-7 | 0.2 |
| Bifenazate | 149877-41-8 | 0.2 | Methomyl | 16752-77-5 | 0.4 |
| Bifenthrin | 82657-04-3 | 0.2 | Methyl parathion | 298-00-0 | 0.2 |
| Boscalid | 188425-85-6 | 0.4 | MGK-264 | 113-48-4 | 0.2 |
| Carbaryl | 63-25-2 | 0.2 | Myclobutanil | 88671-89-0 | 0.2 |
| Carbofuran | 1563-66-2 | 0.2 | Naled | 300-76-5 | 0.5 |
| Chlorantraniliprole | 500008-45-7 | 0.2 | Oxamyl | 23135-22-0 | 1 |
| Chlorfenapyr | 122453-73-0 | 1 | Paclobutrazol | 76738-62-0 | 0.4 |
| Chlorpyrifos | 2921-88-2 | 0.2 | Permethrins* | 52645-53-1 | 0.2 |
| Clofentezine | 74115-24-5 | 0.2 | Phosmet | 732-11-6 | 0.2 |
| Cyfluthrin | 68359-37-5 | 1 | Piperonyl butoxide | 51-03-6 | 2 |
| Cypermethrin | 52315-07-8 | 1 | Prallethrin | 23031-36-9 | 0.2 |
| Daminozide | 1596-84-5 | 1 | Propiconazole | 60207-90-1 | 0.4 |
| DDVP (Dichlorvos) | 62-73-7 | 0.1 | Propoxur | 114-26-1 | 0.2 |
| Diazinon | 333-41-5 | 0.2 | Pyrethrins† | 8003-34-7 | 1 |
| Dimethoate | 60-51-5 | 0.2 | Pyridaben | 96489-71-3 | 0.2 |
| Ethoprophos | 13194-48-4 | 0.2 | Spinosad | 168316-95-8 | 0.2 |
| Etofenprox | 80844-07-1 | 0.4 | Spiromesifen | 283594-90-1 | 0.2 |
| Etoxazole | 153233-91-1 | 0.2 | Spirotetramat | 203313-25-1 | 0.2 |
| Fenoxycarb | 72490-01-8 | 0.2 | Spiroxamine | 118134-30-8 | 0.4 |
| Fenpyroximate | 134098-61-6 | 0.4 | Tebuconazole | 80443-41-0 | 0.4 |
| Fipronil | 120068-37-3 | 0.4 | Thiacloprid | 111988-49-9 | 0.2 |
| Fonicamid | 158062-67-0 | 1 | Thiamethoxam | 153719-23-4 | 0.2 |
| Fludioxonil | 131341-86-1 | 0.4 | Trifloxystrobin | 141517-21-7 | 0.2 |
| Hexythiazox | 78587-05-0 | 1 | | | |

Table taken from [here](#), these are substances banned for use in cannabis by the state of Oregon. You can see how several of the above mentioned growth retardants are present.

The above developments caused chemical companies to search for and develop new gibberellin synthesis inhibitors with lower toxicities and lower accumulation in plants that could be approved for use in edible crops. This led to the development of Prohexadione-Ca and Trinexapac-ethyl, which are two of the most commonly used growth retardants right now. These two have considerably lower toxicities and lower half-lives in the environment. For this reason trinexapac-ethyl has been approved for general use in places like New York (3). In this document the toxicity for mammals and aquatic life is discussed and trinexapac-ethyl is not found to be a threat to humans or animals at the maximum suggested application rate.

This is mainly due to the fact that it's quickly bio degraded in the environment. A risk assessment made by the EFSA also reached similar conclusions (4). Another EFSA risk assessment for prohexadione-Ca also points in the same direction (5). Prohexadione-Ca is currently approved by the EPA for use in apples, grass grown for seed, peanuts, pears, strawberries, sweet cherry, turf, watercress, alfalfa and corn (6).

Optimal results with these new growth retardants also require careful consideration of the application formulation, the application time and adequate pairing of the PGR with the plant being grown . For example in apple trees much larger doses of Trinexapac-ethyl are required compared to Prohexadione-Ca to achieve the same results and trees that have been treated with Trinexapac-ethyl can have important reductions of flowers in subsequent crops (7).

With the development of less toxic and still highly active growth retardants, it might seem like a no-brainer to use these in crops to prevent elongation and increase yields. However the introduction of inhibitors in the gibberellin pathway is not without further consequence as this path is also important to guide the production of important phytonutrients and essential oils. When using these growth retardants it's important to evaluate their effect in the quality of the product, as they can also lead to a change in the properties of the end product. For example in apples these PGRs can induce the production of luteoforol, a flavonoid they normally do not produce (8).