

Nutrient solution estimates in Hydrobuddy

People who use Hydrobuddy can be confused by its conductivity estimates, especially because its values can often mismatch the readings of conductivity meters in real life. This confusion can stem from a lack of understanding of how these values are calculated and the approximations and assumptions that are made in the process. In this post I want to talk about theoretically calculating conductivity, what the meters read and why Hydrobuddy's estimations can deviate from actual measurements.

HydroBuddy v1.62 - Programmed and Designed by Dr. Daniel Fernandez Ph.D at <http://scienceinhydroponics.com>

Welcome Main Page Results About

Substance Name	Formula	Mass (g) [Edit to fine-tune]	Preparation Cost
Yara Calcium Nitrate	Yara_Ca(NO3)2	1028.04	102.8
Potassium Nitrate	KNO3	491.68	49.2
Potassium Monobasic Phosphate	KH2PO4	148.47	14.8
Magnesium Sulfate (Heptahydrate)	MgSO4.7H2O	486.815	48.7
Boric Acid	H3BO3	2.86	0.3
Iron EDTA	Fe(EDTA)	19.231	1.9
Copper Sulfate (pentahydrate)	CuSO4.5H2O	0.079	0
Zinc Sulfate (Dihydrate)	ZnSO4.2H2O	0.151	0
Sodium Molybdate (Dihydrate)	Na2MoO4.2H2O	0.025	0
Manganese Sulfate (Monohydrate)	MnSO4.H2O	1.538	0.2

Element	Result (ppm)	Gross Error	Instrumental Error
N (NO3-)	216.165	2.9%	+/- 0%
K	232.791	-0.9%	+/- 0%
P	33.789	9%	+/- 0%
Mg	48	0%	+/- 0%
Ca	195.328	-2.3%	+/- 0%
S	63.661	-0.5%	+/- 0%
Fe	2.5	0%	+/- 0.1%
Zn	0.05	0%	+/- 6.6%
B	0.5	0%	+/- 0.4%
Cu	0.02	0%	+/- 12.7%
Mo	0.01	0%	+/- 39.7%
Na	0.005	0%	+/- 0%
Si	0	0%	+/- 0%
Cl	0	0%	+/- 0%
Mn	0.5	0%	+/- 0.7%
N (NH4+)	11.308	0%	+/- 0%

Total Cost is 217.9

Values calculated for the preparation of 1000 liters

Predicted EC Value: EC=1.8 mS/cm

Buttons: Stock Solution Analysis, Nutrient Ratio Analysis, Detailed Per Substance Contribution Analysis


Export To Csv

Standard Hoagland solution calculation using HydroBuddy with a set of basic chemicals.

The images above show the use of HydroBuddy for the calculation of a standard Hoagland solution for a 1000L

reservoir. The Hoagland solution's recipe is expressed as a series of elemental concentrations, all of them in parts per million (ppm) units. The results show that the final conductivity of this solution should be 1.8 mS/cm but in reality the conductivity of a freshly prepared full strength Hoagland solution will be closed to 2.5mS/cm. You will notice that HydroBuddy failed to properly calculate this value by an important margin, missing the mark by almost 30%. But how does HydroBuddy calculate this value in the first place?

Conductivity cannot be calculated by using the amount of dissolved solids in terms of mass because charges are transported per ion and not per gram of substance. To perform a conductivity calculation we first need to convert our elemental values to molar quantities and then associate these values with the limiting molar conductivity of each ion, because each ion can transport charge differently (you can find the values HydroBuddy uses in the table available in [this article](#)). This basically means we're finding out how many ions we have of each kind and multiplying that amount by the amount each ion can usually transport if it were by itself in solution. The sum is the first estimate in the calculation of conductivity.



Conductivity calculations carried out by HydroBuddy, also

showing conductivity contributions per ion. This is done by converting ppm quantities to moles, then multiplying by limiting molar conductivity values here.

The image above shows the result of these calculations for an example with a perfectly prepared Hoagland solution. You can see that the estimate from limiting molar conductivity is initially 2.7 ms/cm – much closer to the expected 2.5 mS/cm – but then HydroBuddy makes an additional adjustment that lowers this down to 1.8 mS/cm. This is done because limiting molar conductivity values make the assumption of infinite dilution – what the ion conducts if it were all by itself in solution – but in reality the presence of other ions can decrease the actual conductivity things have in solution. HydroBuddy accounts for this very bluntly, by multiplying the result by 0.66, in effect assuming that the measured value of conductivity will be 66% of the value calculated from the limiting molar conductivity values. This is of course wrong in many cases, because the reduction in activity due to the presence of other ions is not as strong. However it can also be correct in many cases, primarily depending on the substances that are used to prepare the formulations and the ratios between the different nutrients.

In my experience HydroBuddy tends to heavily underestimate the conductivity of solutions that receive most of their conductivity from nitrates, as this example, but it tends to do much better when there are large contributions from sulfate ions. When I first coded HydroBuddy all my experiments were being done with much more sulfate heavy solutions, so the correction parameter value I ended up using for the program ended up being a bad compromise for solutions that deviated significantly from this composition. With enough data it might be possible to come up with a more advanced solution to conductivity estimations in the future that can adjust for non-linear relationships in the conductivity and activity relationships of different ions in solution.

If your measured conductivity deviates from the conductivity calculated in HydroBuddy you should not worry about it, as HydroBuddy's values is meant to be only a rough estimate to give you an idea of what the conductivity might be like but, because of its simplicity, cannot provide a more accurate value at the moment. The most important thing is to ensure that all the salts, weights and volumes were adequately measured in order to arrive at the desired solution.

Sugars in hydroponic nutrient solutions

Carbohydrates are an integral part of plants. They produce them from carbon dioxide, requiring no additional external carbon inputs for the process. However, since plants can absorb molecules through their leaves and roots, it is perhaps natural to wonder whether they could also get carbohydrates through the roots and avoid some of the stress they go through in order to produce these molecules from scratch. If plants can uptake sugar and we feed them sugars then will we get fruits with more sugars and bigger plants? It's an interesting question that I will try to answer within this post, looking at the potential use of simple sugars within hydroponic nutrient solutions.



Simple table sucrose

Although the above idea sounds straightforward, it hardly has any interest in the scientific literature or the commercial hydroponic industry. You will find no significant number of research papers studying the use of sugars – simple or complex – in hydroponic nutrient solutions and very few studies looking at sugar uptake and the interactions of *in-vitro* plant tissue with simple sugars. *This lack of interest and use is no accident, it comes from an already established understanding of plant physiology and the realization that it is not cost effective, useful or needed to add sugars to nutrient solutions.*

Let us start with what we know about the subject. We know that plants exude very significant amount of sugars through their root systems and we also know that they can re-uptake some of these sugars through their roots ([see here](#)). From this paper it seems that maize plants could uptake up to 10% of the sugars they exude back into their root systems, which implies that some exogenous sugar application could find its way into plant roots. Even worse, transporting this sugar up to the shoots is extremely inefficient, with only 0.6% of the sugar making it up the plant. This tells us that most of the sugar is wasted in terms of plant usage, a large majority never makes it into the plant and the little amount that makes it actually never goes up the plant. *Plants are simply not built to transport sugars in this manner, they evolved to transport*

sugars down to roots and to fruits.

But what about the roots? Given that the plant tissue that would be in direct contact with the sugar is the roots, it is logical to think about positive effects affecting them primarily. We have some studies about the influence of sugar solutions in seedlings (like [this one](#)) which does show that sugars can stimulate the growth of new root tissue in very small plants. However in large plants most of the sugar content in the roots will come from transport from the higher parts of the plant and the local sugar concentration will be low. Seedlings can likely benefit from sugars in the roots because leaves are producing very little at this time but larger plants are unlikely to benefit from this effect.

There is however one effect that sugars have that is very clear, they feed the rhizosphere around the plant's roots. Although plants try to care about this themselves – by exuding an important amount of sugars and organic acids – an exogenous sugar addition would most likely boost the amount of microbes around plant roots (both good and bad ones). The profile of sugars and acids exuded by plants is most likely tuned by evolution to match the microbes that are most beneficial to it and an unintended and negative effect of sugars is to boost all microbe populations at the same time, regardless of whether they are good or bad for the plant. This also increases oxygen demand around roots – because aerobic microbes will want to oxidize these sugars – reducing the amount of oxygen available to plant roots. For this reason, any application of a sugar to a nutrient solution requires the inoculation of the desired microbes beforehand, to ensure no bad actors take hold. It also requires the use of a media with very high aeration, to prevent problems caused by oxygen deprivation.

Sadly there aren't any peer reviewed papers – at least that I could find – investigating the effect of exogenous sugars on the yields of any plant specie in a hydroponic environment.

Given our understanding of plant physiology, any positive effects related with anecdotal use of sugars are most likely related with positive effects in the rhizosphere that are linked with improved production of substances that elicit plant growth in the root zone by favorable microbes. This is mainly because it is already well established that transport of sugars within plants from the roots to the shoots is incredibly inefficient, so any contribution of the roots to sugar uptake will be completely dwarfed by the actual production of sugars from carbon dioxide in the upper parts of the plant. It is not surprising that no one seems to want to do a peer reviewed study of a phenomenon whose outcome is already largely predictable from the accepted scientific literature.

If you're interested in the use of sugars in hydroponics, it is probably more fruitful to focus on microbe inoculations instead. Sugars themselves are bound to provide no benefit if they are not coupled with a proper microbe population and, even then, you might actually have all the benefits without any sugar applications as the microbes can be selected and fed by plant root exudates themselves in mature plants although sugars might provide some benefits in jump starting these populations, particularly in younger plants. Also, bear in mind that there is also a very high risk of stimulating bad microbes with the use of sugars, especially if oxygenation is not very high.

Controlling pH in hydroponics

using only electricity

The ability of plants to assimilate nutrients changes as a function of pH. This makes maintaining the pH of nutrient solutions within an acceptable range – most commonly 5.8 to 6.2 – one of the most important tasks in a hydroponic crop. This is commonly done with the addition of strong acids or bases to decrease or increase the pH when it drifts away from the intended value. This requires either manual monitoring with careful addition of these substances or automated processes using pumps to ensure the pH always remains at the correct value. However both of these methods lack fine control, require a lot of maintenance and monitoring and can lead to costly mistakes. Today I want to discuss an alternative method that relies on a completely different idea to control pH, the idea that we can oxidize or reduce water using electricity to achieve changes in pH. **Yes, you can change pH using literally only electricity.**




A modern anion exchange membrane. Fundamental to the idea of an electricity-only pH control system

Let's start by discussing pH and talking about how it is changes. The pH of a solution is calculated as $-\text{Log}(|\text{H}^+|)$ where $|\text{H}^+|$ is the molar concentration of H^+ ions in solution. In water, the dissociation constant 1×10^{-14} (at 25C), always needs to be respected, so we always know that the product of $|\text{H}^+|$ and

$[\text{OH}^-]$ needs to give us this number. When you add acids you increase $[\text{H}^+]$ conversely $[\text{OH}^-]$ decreases and the pH goes down, when you add bases $[\text{OH}^-]$ increases, $[\text{H}^+]$ decreases and the pH goes up. *In simpler terms everything you need to decrease pH is a source of H^+ and everything you need to increase pH is a source of OH^- .*

This is where electrochemistry gives us the simplest solution we could hope for. Water can be oxidized or reduced. When you run a current through water – above the minimum required voltage – water splits into hydrogen and oxygen molecules. In the image below you can see how the water oxidation reaction generates H^+ ions while the reaction on the right generates OH^- ions. When you do this in a single cell – as shown below – the H^+ ions generated at the anode react with the OH^- ions generated at the cathode and the pH of the solution remains neutral while oxygen is produced at the anode and hydrogen is produced at the cathode.



The image above shows the half reactions involved in the oxidation (left) and reduction (right) of water.

However, we can take advantage of ion exchange membranes to

separate these two processes, allowing us to control where each reaction happens and where the acid or base is generated (preventing them from just mixing and neutralizing). As a matter of fact, all we need is to have an electrode in our nutrient solution and another electrode in an auxiliary cell, separated from our nutrient solution by an ion exchange membrane. This concept is actually not new and was already proposed in a [1998 paper to control pH in hydroponic systems](#). Although it was never tried in a production system, all the concepts were validated and were shown to perform adequately in test solutions.




Image taken from [this paper](#), which discussed the topic of electrochemical pH control in hydroponic systems at length.

One of the big challenges of this setup is that the cathode side involves hydrogen gas evolution – which could be dangerous – but can be completely avoided by replacing the cathode's half reaction with much more benign chemistry. As an example – also suggested in the paper above – you can replace the cathode half-cell with a copper sulfate solution with a copper electrode, with an anion exchange membrane. This would allow you to have your reduction reaction be the reduction of copper onto a copper plate, which is a very tame reaction. Since the membrane only exchanges anions you would only have

sulfate go to your nutrient solution, which is a benign anion in hydroponic culture. This of course means that your half-cell electrode and solution would need to be replaced with time, but this is completely independent from the control process (much more like refilling a tank of gas). The anode would only evolve oxygen in your nutrient solution, which is a potentially beneficial side effect.

Using a copper sulfate half-cell would however limit the control system to lower pH but this is not a problem since this is the most commonly used operation in hydroponics (very rarely do people have to increase the pH of their solutions). If a proper venting system or catalytic recombination system is used on the cathode side you could also go with the simple water oxidation/reduction route and be able to increase or decrease the pH using basically, pure electricity.

I am definitely planning to build one of this setups in the future. Coupled with modern sensors and micro controllers this could make it extremely easy to maintain very fine control over the pH of the solution, compensating – in real time – all the changes in pH carried out by plants without the risk of heavily over or under compensating (as it happens when you use acid/base additions).

Cheap DIY high power LED grow lights: Introducing the Zip-tie lamp

Make sure you also read [this post](#), where I studied the PAR of these lamps and realized they are not as good as I thought!

Several months ago [I wrote a post](#) about using high power LED cobs that do not require an external driver in order to build a high power DIY LED lamp. However I hadn't built a practical lamp using these cobs at that particular point in time so I just gave a general idea of why I would use these diodes and how the particular lamp setup would work. Today I want to talk about how to build one of these lamps in practice using an aluminum heat sink, a 150W warm white LED cob, a fan and some zip ties. The setup lacks the use of any adhesives and should provide you with roughly a 40-50% equivalent of a 1000W HPS. With two of these lamps you should be able to run the equivalent setup to 80-100% of a 1000W HPS in terms of PAR with around 60% less power consumption.





The idea of this post is to help you build a very affordable DIY lamp. However please note that this lamp involves work with mains voltages which are dangerous. Please familiarize yourself with all the precautions needed when working with high voltages. **All the information herein in is provided as-is for educational purposes with absolutely no guarantee, either expressed or implied.**

To build this lamp – showed above – you will need these materials (note that if your country uses another voltage you will need to buy the appropriate pieces for the voltage in your country):

- [Warm white 150W LED cob](#)
- [200x60x30mm aluminium heat sink \(2 needed\)](#)
- [110V-120V AC fan](#)
- [Nylon zip ties 30cm](#)
- Cable and wall connector
- Thermal compound (optional)

Initially I wanted to build a lamp using a high power warm white LED cob by gluing the cob to the heatsinks using a thermally conductive glue. However the problem with this is that these glues very permanently bind the cob to the heatsink so if for any reason the cob fails you would lose the heatsinks because the cob would be bound to them. For this reason I decided to use zip ties instead, which provide an easy way to secure the entire ensemble and allow you to easily replace any failing part rather quickly. I used nylon zip ties but you can also use stainless steel ones if you want the setup to be more resilient (although things will be harder to cut if you make a mistake).

To assemble the lamp I basically used 4 zip tie lines two horizontal and two vertical. For the lines that go the width of the heat sink I just had to use one zip tie but for the other two lines – that also go above the fan – I had to use two zip ties for each line (you can connect one zip tie to another to have a larger zip tie). You need to tighten the zip tie very hard to ensure the cob is in direct contact with the aluminum along all its length, you can also use some thermal compound (like the one you use for CPUs) between the cob and the aluminum heat sink for maximum heat transfer. The pictures below show you a bit better how I performed the entire assembly. *When putting the fan on top of the heat sinks make sure the airflow is towards the heatsink (flow arrow in the case pointing down) and that the fan can spin freely).*



Finally I connected the cob directly to the AC line by soldering the appropriate live/neutral cables to the connectors at the left side of the cob (in the above picture). I then covered the soldered spots with silicon glue to ensure that the connections were as electrically isolated as possible. Make sure you solder as small portion of wire as possible and make sure the wire makes absolutely no contact with the aluminum heat sink or you will have a short. I also soldered the fan cables to the live/neutral as well since the fan can be driven directly by AC as well.

Since you have the zip ties you can also use them to hang the lamp, you can also add screws to the fan screwing ports and use those to hang the lamp from the ceiling. When I turned on this lamp its power consumption was around 220W – measured directly from the wall – meaning that it consumed a bit more power than what was advertised (which is not uncommon for

these cobs). Since my voltage is a bit higher than 110V – which is the minimum rating for this cob – I actually get a slightly higher light/heat output than someone using it at a lower voltage. The fan – which takes around 12-15W on its own, also contributes to this consumption level.



When you power on this lamp – image above (sorry about the camera not being able to handle the light intensity) – you’ll immediately notice how the heat sink starts to heat up. I have tested the lamp through 2 hours of continuous operation up until now and the heat sink reached a stable temperature of around the 120°C (~ 250F), the final temperature you reach will of course depend on your ambient temperature and how well you assemble the components. It is however very important for you to test each one of these lamps for 12/24 hours to ensure that they don’t heat up excessively. *Nylon will melt at around 220°C so you definitely don’t want your lamp to ever reach even close to that temperature (to be safer you can use stainless steel zip ties)*. However it is very likely that the LEDs will burn out way before this happens if your temperature rises too far. You can also add a second fan or use a larger heat sink if your temperature is too high.

In the end the setup is extremely simple to build and you can get roughly 40-50% of a 1000W HPS with one of these lamps. With two of these lamps you will run at around 450W which is

55% less power than an equivalent HPS setup. Although heat generation is no joke here, it is indeed much less than the comparable heat output of a 1000W HPS. With a cost of less than 80 USD per lamp you will be able to build these lamps at a far lower cost than the very expensive grow lights you can get online (which can often go for thousands of dollars for a single 1000W HPS equivalent). *If you read my earlier post you will notice that I previously thought you needed 4 cobs to reach the equivalent of a 1000W HPS, turns out you only need two 110V cobs running at 120V!*

I have made some PAR, lux and temperature measurements but I want to keep those for a future post where we will look at some of the spectral and thermal characteristics of this lamp vs other lamp types.

Potassium concentration and yields in flowering plants

From the different nutrients that are needed by plants we have known for more than 4 decades that potassium is of critical importance to flowering/fruited plants. Potassium is one of the most highly limited nutrients in soil due to its high mobility and great increases in yields have been achieved with both potassium fertilization in soil and the use of properly balanced nutrient solutions containing enough potassium in hydroponics. But how important is potassium and what is its ideal concentration in hydroponic nutrient solutions when growing flowering plants? Today we are going to take a look at the scientific literature about potassium and what the optimum levels of potassium for different flowering plants might be in order to maximize yields.




Fig. 1: Effect of potassium concentrations on quality traits in strawberry cultivars.

There are many studies in the scientific literature dealing with the effect of potassium on various flowering plants. Earlier evidence from the 1980s pointed to optimum concentrations of potassium being close to the 160-200 ppm range. The book “mineral nutrition” by P.Adams ([here](#)) summarizes a lot of the knowledge that was available at the time and shows that for the growing techniques available at the time using greater concentrations of K was probably not going to give a lot of additional benefit.

However newer evidence from experiments carried out within the past 10 years shows that optimum potassium concentration might depend on a significant variety of factors, from which media, other nutrient concentrations and growing system type might play critical roles. For example study on strawberries in 2012 ([here](#)) showed optimum concentrations of K to be around 300 ppm for strawberries and the optimum media to be a mixture of peat+sand+perlite (image from this article included above).

Table 3: Effect of cultivar on yield of tomato and ascorbic acid concentration in fruit.

Cultivar	Yield (kg/plant)	Ascorbic acid (mg/100 g FW)
Avinash-2	2.00a ^a	25.69a
Pant T-3	1.74b	22.80b

^aValues in a column followed by the same letter are not significantly different, $P \leq 0.05$, Fisher's LSD.




Figure 3: Yield, pooled over cultivars as affected by supplied K concentration. The regression was $Y = 0.0024 (X) + 1.1733$ ($R^2, 0.871$).

Evidence from experiments on tomatoes ([link here](#) and image from this article above) also shows that for tomatoes the actual optimum concentration of K might actually be larger under some condition with the optimum in this study in terms of fruit quality and yields being 300 ppm. In this last case the tomatoes were grown using a nutrient film technique (NFT) setup. However there have also been studies under other growing conditions – like [this one](#) on reused pumice – which shows that increasing K concentrations to 300ppm can actually have detrimental consequences. In this case tomatoes fed at 200, 290 and 340ppm of K had very similar results when using new substrate but the old substrate heavily underperformed when high K concentrations were used.

Papers published on the effect of different K concentrations in melons ([here](#)) and cucumbers ([here](#)) also point to optimal concentrations in the 200-300 ppm range and for the optimum N:K ratio to be between 1:2 and 1:3 for these plants. This is probably the reason why you will often find suggested nutritional guidelines for flowering plants – like those below taken from [here](#) – mostly suggesting K concentrations in the 250-350ppm range. However you will often find that they

directly contradict research papers, like this guideline suggesting K of 150 ppm for strawberries while we saw in a recent paper that 300ppm might be better. This is most probably due to differences in the sources used which might have used different growing systems or plant varieties which responded to other conditions better.

CROP	N	P	K	Ca	Mg
Tomato	190	40	310	150	45
Cucumber	200	40	280	140	40
Pepper	190	45	285	130	40
Strawberry	50	25	150	65	20
Melon	200	45	285	115	30
Roses	170	45	285	120	40

Concentration in mg/l (pap)

All in all the subject of K concentration in hydroponics is no simple one. Using low K will limit your yields tremendously but increasing your K very high can also harm your plants, especially depending on the type of media you are using. In general aiming for a K concentration between 200-250 ppm is safest but in many cases increases to the 300-400ppm range can bring significant increases in plant yields. A careful study of the available literature and the actual growing conditions that the plants will be subjected to will be key in determining what the best K concentration to use will be. Alternatively carrying out adequately designed experiments under your precise growing environment will help you carry out an evidence-based decision about what K concentration to use.

Five reasons why a dedicated hydroponic testing room is a great idea

Most commercial hydroponic setups completely lack testing environments. The most common reason for this is that commercial crops are meant to produce revenue and a testing environment means dedicating space, time and money into something that might not be as productive as the rest of the production facility. Furthermore a testing room implies that you will need to create a completely independent setup and hire someone who knows how to do research in order to ensure it is both adequate and fruitful. Although many people believe this not to be worth it today I want to talk about the five most important reasons why I consider that a testing room is something incredibly useful to have as a part of your commercial growing facility and why getting one will probably pay off greatly for you going forward.



Testing product changes. Perhaps the first and most direct benefit to having a testing room is to ensure you can test

product changes. It may be the case that your supplier for some particular fertilizer product or additive has ran out and you now want to test a new product to replace it. It may also be that you want to test how a product does compared to what you generally use but you don't know if it does better or worse. Most growers are afraid of change because making facility-wide changes that won't work could have huge financial consequences. A testing room ensures you can test safely and then roll-out changes slowly without having to risk your entire crop cycle to find out.

Optimizing what you currently have. Change is very rare across commercial facilities because growers understandably want to preserve their current results, even if some better results by making some change would be possible. This constraints growers from making incremental changes that might make their crops significantly more productive. By having a testing room you can optimize the setup you already have by making adequate research into optimizing things such as environmental or nutritional factors.

Trying potentially game-changing modifications from academic research papers. There are many papers published each year on how to increase the yields of hydroponic crops. Some of these papers offer somewhat risky and controversial changes that might not transfer well across species. However if something gives you the potential to increase your yields by say, 50%, it might definitely be worth trying across a testing setup. Obviously these things are too risky to try across an entire facility but a testing room would be perfect to help you try these new and exciting modifications, potentially giving you a huge edge versus all the other people who will never try this.

Try new plant varieties. Usually growers try new plants without having a clear idea of how productive they are going to be under their growing setup. This means that you introduce a new variety with a huge question mark regarding its productivity and potentially financial benefit or cost. A

testing room provides you with a risk-free way to test how a particular plant variety will perform under the exact conditions in your facility, potentially allowing you to make far less risky decisions when it comes to making planting changes in your facility.



Research new ideas. A final benefit you can get from a testing room is that you can research your own new ideas. With adequate experimental design even a small room with just 10 plants can be used to test some ideas to see how they affect plant growth. This means that you can develop your own in-house growing modifications that will make it much harder for others to compete with you. For example if you developed a secret foliar additive in your growing facility it would allow you to only use this for your own crops, without the industrial secret ever being used by your competitors.

Of course there are many other advantages to testing rooms but the above are just some of the wonderful things you'll be able to do if you have a testing room and someone trained in scientific research who can help you design experiments and get the most out of it. A testing room also doesn't need to be huge and even starting out with 10 plants can be a huge step in taking your commercial growing facility to the next level.

The use of phosphites in plant culture

Plants normally get most or all of their phosphorous from inorganic phosphorus sources. Most commonly these sources are

monobasic or dibasic phosphate ions (H_2PO_4^- and HPO_4^{2-}), which are naturally formed from any other phosphate species at the pH values generally used in hydroponics (5.5-6.5). However these are not the only sources of inorganic phosphorous that exist. Phosphite ions – which come from phosphorous acid H_3PO_3 – can also be used in plant culture. Today we are going to talk about what phosphite does when used in hydroponics and why it behaves so differently when compared with regular phosphate sources. In research P from phosphate is generally called Pi, so I will follow this same convention through the rest of this post. A good review on this entire subject can be found [here](#).




Fig. 1. Three-dimensional chemical structures of phosphate (H_2PO_4^- ; Pi) and phosphite (H_2PO_3^- ; Phi) forming tetrahedral structures.

The role that phosphite (Phi) plays in plant nutrition and development has now been well established. Initially several people claimed that Phi was a better P fertilizer than Pi so researchers wanted to look into this to see if Phi could actually be used as an improvement over Pi fertilization. However research was heavily disappointing, studies on lettuce ([here](#)), spinach ([here](#)), komatsuna ([here](#)) as well as several other plants showed that Phi fertilization provides absolutely no value in terms of P nutrition, meaning that although plants do absorb and process the Phi it does not end up being used in

plant tissue to supplement or cover P deficiency in any way. Furthermore there are some negative effects when Phi is used in larger concentrations (as those required for Pi) so it quickly became clear that Phi is not a good fertilizer at all.

Why should anyone use Phi then? Well, research started to show that some of the earlier positive results of Phi fertilization were not because it was covering Pi deficiencies but mainly because it was offering a protective effect against some pathogens. Research on tomatoes and peppers and other plants ([here](#) and [here](#)) showed that phosphites had some ability to protect plants against fungi with plants subjected to Phi applications showing less vulnerability to the pathogens. However the evidence about this is also not terribly strong and a few papers have contested these claims.

Table 1
Beneficial effects of phosphite (Phi) as a biostimulator in vegetable crops.

Crop	Phosphite source (dosage)	Method of application	Improved trait/s	Reference
Celery	Phosphorous acid	Foliar spray	Yield	Rickard (2000)
Lettuce	Phosphorous acid (50% of total P as Phi)	Nutrient solution in hydroponics	Biomass dry weight, foliar area and P content in the whole plant	Bertsch et al. (2009)
Onion	Phosphorous acid	Foliar spray and soil application	Percentage of jumbo size onions	Rickard (2000)
Potato	Phosphorous acid	Foliar spray	Size and yield of US No. 1 grade potatoes	Rickard (2000)
Potato	Potassium phosphite	Foliar application	Phytoalexin and chitinase content, and yield maintenance	Lobato et al. (2011)
Potato	Potassium phosphite	Sprays applied to seed tubers and foliage	Reinforcement of the cell wall and defense response	Olivieri et al. (2012)
Potato	Potassium phosphite	Liquid solution applied to tubers	Emergence, early growth and mycorrhizal colonization	Tambascio et al. (2014)
Potato	Potassium phosphite	Foliar spray	Chlorophyll content, protection against UV-B light and activation of the antioxidant system	Oyarburo et al. (2015)
Sweet pepper	Phosphorous acid	Drip irrigation and foliar spray	Size and yield of US No. 1 grade peppers	Rickard (2000)
Tomato	Phosphorous acid (50% of total P as Phi)	Nutrient solution in hydroponics	Biomass dry weight, foliar area and P content in the whole plant	Bertsch et al. (2009)

Note: Most studies were based on the application of commercial Phi-containing products without clear indication on the labels of their precise Phi content. Therefore, Phi dosage in the table is only indicated when precise data are available in the cited articles.

Table 2
Beneficial effects of phosphite (Phi) as a biostimulator in fruit crops.

Crop	Phosphite source (dosage)	Method of application	Improved trait/s	Reference
Avocado	Phosphorous acid	Foliar spray	Yield of commercially valuable sized fruit	Lovatt (2013)
Banana	Phosphorous acid (50% P as HPO_4^{2-} and 50% as H_2PO_3^-)	Nutrient solution in hydroponics	Biomass dry weight, foliar area and P content in the whole plant	Bertsch et al. (2009)
Citrus	Phosphorous acid	Foliar spray	Yield and acid content in fruits	Lovatt (1998, 1999)
Citrus	Phosphorous acid	Foliar spray	Yield	Albrigo (1999)
Citrus	Phosphorous acid	Foliar spray	Yield	Rickard (2000)
Peach	Phosphorous acid	Foliar spray	Sugar and soluble solids content	Rickard (2000)
Raspberry	Phosphorous acid	Foliar spray	Fruit firmness	Rickard (2000)
Strawberry	Potassium phosphite	Plants soaked and irrigated	Fruit acidity, ascorbic acid and anthocyanin content	Moor et al. (2009)
Strawberry	Potassium phosphite (6.7% of total P as Phi)	Root application through a controlled watering system	Growth of roots and shoots	Glinicki et al. (2010)
Strawberry	Phosphorous acid (30% of total P as Phi)	Nutrient solution applied to the roots	Concentrations of chlorophylls, amino acids and proteins in leaves	Estrada-Ortiz et al. (2011)
Strawberry	Phosphorous acid (20% of total P as Phi)	Nutrient solution applied to the roots	Sugar concentration and firmness of fruits	Estrada-Ortiz et al. (2012)
Strawberry	Phosphorous acid (20–30% of total P as Phi)	Nutrient solution applied to the roots	pH, EC and anthocyanin concentration in fruits	Estrada-Ortiz et al. (2013)

Note: Most studies were based on the application of commercial Phi-containing products without clear indication on the labels of their precise Phi content. Therefore, Phi dosage in the table is only indicated when precise data are available in the cited articles.

Those who say that Phi is not mainly a fungicide claim that positive results are mainly the effect of Phi acting as a biostimulant ([here](#)). These groups have shown through research across several different plant species, including potatoes, onions, lettuce, tomatoes, wheat, oilseed rape, sugar beet and ryegrass that foliar or sometimes root applications of phosphites consistently yield some positive effects, meaning that there is a strong biostimulant effect from the Phi that is not related to either P nutrition or a fungicidal effect. A recent review looking at the overall biostimulant effects of Phi ([here](#)) shows how researchers have obtained evidence of biostimulation in potatoes, sweet peppers, tomatoes and several other species (the images in this post were taken from this review). The different studies mentioned in the review show increases in quality and even yields across these different plant species (see tables above).

While we know that Phi is not a good source of P nutrition and we know it can help as a fungicide in some cases it is clear now that under enough Pi nutrition Phi can provide some important biostimulating effects. Negative effects from Phi seem to be eliminated when enough Pi nutrition is present so rather than be thought of as a way to replace or supplement P nutrition it should be thought of as an additive that has a

biostimulating effect. Phi may become a powerful new tool in the search for higher yields and higher quality, while not serving as a replacement for traditional Pi fertilization.

Five things you should know when mixing your own hydroponic liquid nutrients

Many hydroponic growers – especially large scale ones – can benefit greatly from mixing their own custom nutrients. Not only can this save money in the thousands of dollars per month but it can also give you an unprecedented degree of control when compared with store-bought nutrients. On today's post I am going to write about five important things you should know when mixing your own nutrients so you can avoid many common problems that can arise when you start preparing your own stock solutions.



More concentrated solutions are not always better. When you prepare a concentrated liquid you would usually want to go with the highest possible concentration factor so that you can prepare as much final nutrient solution as possible with as little stock solution as possible. However trying to get into higher concentration factors (1:400-1:500) can cause important issues due to the solubility of the salts used and the temperatures the stock solution will be exposed to. It can also cause high inaccuracies with variable injector setups since the dilutions will be much smaller. For starters go with a 1:100 concentration factor and only start going higher when you get more experience. If you're using injectors I would generally avoid a range higher than 1:250 unless you do more extensive calibration procedures with your injectors.

Impurities can cause important problems. Some salts can come with significant levels of impurities – sometimes mainly additives – that can cause substantial issues when preparing your nutrient solutions. Lower quality grade salts – mainly those used for soil fertilization or those that are OMRI listed and come straight from mining with no refining – can generate problems within your mixing process. These problems range from insoluble left-overs in tanks to toxic amounts of some micro elements. To ensure you get the best possible results use greenhouse grade fertilizer salts and try to avoid sources of salts that are OMRI listed. Synthetic sources that have been heavily purified are your best bet in ensuring the best possible results.

Use slightly acidic deionized water to prepare the solutions. Most water sources in Europe and the US are very heavy in carbonates and therefore inappropriate for the preparation of concentrated nutrient solutions as these ions can cause salts to precipitate when preparing concentrated solutions. To fix this issue the best thing would be to use distilled water but – since this is often not an option – the next best thing is to use reverse osmosis water and add a bit of acid (0.5mL/L of

nitric acid, other acids may cause other problems) per gallon of concentrated solution. This will ensure that everything gets dissolved and will eliminate the carbonates that can be naturally present within the water. *Of course never, ever use tap or well water to prepare concentrated hydroponic solutions.*

Salts take up volume, take that into account. A very common mistake when preparing solutions is to just add the salts to the final volume of desired stock solution to prepare. This is a mistake since the salts also take up volume. If you want to prepare 1 liter of concentrated solution and you need to add say, 100 g of potassium nitrate, adding 100g of potassium nitrate to 1L of water would generate a solution with a final volume greater than 1L. To avoid this problem always add the salts to half the volume of water and, after the salts have dissolved, complete to the final volume of desired solution.

Add salts from the smallest to the largest quantities. When you prepare hydroponic solutions it is often better – especially when you're starting – to add salts from the smallest to the highest amounts needed. If you make a mistake at some point then you will minimize the amount of mass of salts that has been wasted due to this fact. If you make a mistake adding a micro nutrient you will only lose a small amount of the other micro nutrients instead of losing a huge amounts of macro nutrients due your order of addition. It is also true that the substances that are added in largest quantities are commonly nitrates and these salts have endothermic dissolutions – meaning they cool solutions upon addition – so it is better to add them last so that they can benefit a bit from the heat generated by the dissolution of the other salts.

The above is not an exhaustive list of pointers but it should save you from some important trouble when preparing your own initial nutrient solutions. Although some of these points may seem obvious to those that have experience preparing their own

solutions they may prove invaluable to those who are just starting their journey in concentrated nutrient preparation.

Humic acids in hydroponics: What is their effect?

Plants and microorganisms affect the substrates in which they grow in many ways. If you start growing plants in an inert substrate – with nutrient applications of course – you will notice that the substrate’s chemical composition will start to change with time and it will start to get enriched in carbon containing substances. As plants and microorganisms grow, thrive and die, some of the chemicals that made up their cells end up enriching the substrate they grow on. This process – whereby organic materials from living organisms become part of a substrate – is what generates the soils around us. One of the most prevalent class of components in this organic material, is what we call humic acids.

Humic substances (pigmented polymers)				
Fulvic acid		Humic acid		Humin
Light yellow	Yellow brown	Dark brown	Grey-black	Black
<p>————— increase in intensity of colour —————></p> <p>————— increase in degree of polymerization —————></p> <p>2 000 ————— increase in molecular weight —————>300 000 ?</p> <p>45% ————— increase in carbon content —————>62%</p> <p>48% ————— decrease in oxygen content —————>30%</p> <p>1 400 ————— decrease in exchange acidity —————>500</p> <p>————— decrease in degree of solubility —————></p>				
Chemical properties of humic substances. (Stevenson 1982)				

Humic substance chemical properties.


Humic acid is not a single substance but a wide range of substances that are created as a product of plant and microorganism decomposition. This is why you often hear people talk about “humic acids” instead of simply “humic acid”. They are called “acids” because the humic substances contain molecules that have groups that resemble those found in phenol and vinegar. They are also differentiated from fulvic acids in the fact that they are only soluble at basic pH values while fulvic acids are generally small enough molecules to be soluble across most of the pH spectrum. Since humic acids are a very important component of enriched soils and can be used in soilless culture, people have started using them as supplements in soilless and pure hydroponic culture.

When talking about the effects of humic acids it is worth mentioning that since we’re talking about a group of molecules – not a single substance – effects are generally dependent on the source of the humic acid used. For example you can find a study on tomatoes [here](#) where two different sources of humic acids – from peat and leonardite – were used to grow tomatoes. The study shows a clear difference between both with the first only stimulating root growth while the second stimulated both roots and shoots. However in both cases there was an increased iron availability to plants, although the mechanism for this was not established.



Tomato plants inoculated with root rot at different humic acid application rates

In plants like gerberas humic acids applied at 1000 ppm can offer increases in harvested flowers of up to 52% (see [here](#)), somewhat positive effects can also be seen in tomatoes across the literature with most studies showing increases in yields and mineral contents (see [here](#)), reports of positive effects on gladiolus have also been published ([here](#)). Since the 1990s there has been a somewhat established understanding of some general beneficial effects for humic acid applications, it is well established that they can prevent and eliminate micro nutrient deficiencies due to their abilities to increase their availability(see [here](#)). The literature is also quite consistent in that the largest effects are often seen on root growth rather than on shoot growth or mass. There are however some types of humic acids that have showed higher increases of shoot mass, for example in [an article](#) studying humic substances derived from municipal waste on barley this was the observed effect. For some plants however – despite these beneficial effects – increases in yields in hydroponic culture are not evident (see [here](#) and [here](#)). A look at the effect of a humic acid source on several different plant species can be found [here](#).



Effect of humic acid, bacteria and lactate applications on tomato plants.

It is worth noting that humic acid applications are also not limited to the root zone. Since humic acids can enhance the absorption of some nutrients they can also be applied in foliar sprays. Experiments on strawberries ([here](#)) showed that an application of 1.5-3ppm of humic acids led to an increase in the quantitative and qualitative properties of the fruits.

Combinations of humic acids with other biostimulants are also common. For example a combinations of lactate, humate and beneficial bacteria was tested on tomatoes ([here](#)) but the experiments showed that the effect could be stimulating or inhibiting depending on the particular conditions, even though most combinations were beneficial.

With the high variability between humic substance origins, application rates and effects it is very hard to say whether humic acid applications will definitely help your crops in terms of yields. For almost all humic acid sources it is probably warranted that micronutrient absorption will be somewhat augmented due to their ability to chelate these nutrients, but only if the nutrients are not efficiently chelated already. This sole ability might lead to crop improvements if deficiencies are present but improvements in yields will strongly depend on humic acid substance origin and particular properties. However humic acids do seem to lead to general product quality improvements and since negative effects are rare there seems to be no harm in carrying out field tests to determine if their use is worth it for your particular crop.

How to prevent problems with

powdery mildew in hydroponic crops

One of the worst problems you can get in a hydroponic crop is mildew. Year after year I see growers lose significant amounts of production due to this disease within a variety of different crops. Powdery mildew reduces yields, stunts plants and – if contracted early on – will possibly cause a complete loss of your crop. It is generally hard to control once it gets in and it will expand like wildfire through any commercial growing operation. Today we will be discussing how to actually prevent mildew from ever appearing – without using toxic fungicide applications – and why prevention can play a huge role in ensuring you never have to face this problem in the first place.



Fungal spores are generally carried by the wind and by insects, making it very hard for a crop to avoid ever coming into contact with the pathogen. Wild plants or plants from other commercial crops close to you will most likely have the disease and millions of spores will get in the air and eventually reach your plants. It is only a matter of time till the powdery mildew reaches your crops – almost impossible to prevent – so you must make sure that your plants are strong

enough to prevent the pathogen from taking hold.

There are two main factors that affect whether powdery mildew will infect your plants. The first is plant strength and the second is the environment. If one of these two is not at its best then your plants will fall prey to this fungal disease. Neither strong plants under bad environmental conditions nor weak plants under ideal environmental conditions will be safe from the disease. So what can we do to ensure our plants are healthy and our environmental conditions are safe?

One of the proven methods to make plants strong against fungi is silicon. Potassium silicate applications – as soil drenches or foliar sprays – have proven to increase disease resistance across several studies (see [here](#) and [here](#) for examples). But other innovative approaches using other forms of silicon – for example nanometer sized silica crystals – have also yielded good results. In [this](#) and [this](#) studies it was clearly shown that other forms of silicon – besides silicate – could also help in preventing fungal disease. This might be preferred in some cases as these forms of silicon can be far more stable and easier to store/apply compared with options like potassium silicate.




Fig. 1. Efficacy of biocontrol agents [*Clonostachys rosea* (EH), *Serratia marcescens* (B15, Y15 and Y41) and *Trichothecium roseum* (H20)] and silicon in reducing the severity of powdery mildew of greenhouse grown zucchini 5 weeks after inoculation with *Podosphaera xanthii* in two experiments.




Fig. 3. Effects of K_2SiO_2 application on the accumulation of silicon (Si) and potassium (K) in leaves of zucchini after 5 weeks of treatment at 100 mg L^{-1} .

However silicate applications are no miracle. If your environmental conditions are not set properly the silicate applications will be useless. This is the reason why some growers say that silicate does nothing against disease, because an environment that's favorable for fungi can basically nullify the protective action of supplemental silicon. This was demonstrated by cucumber growers who had a lot of success with Si supplementation in Canada to prevent fungal diseases, but failed to reproduce this success in Florida. A [study about this](#) difference revealed that the higher temperatures in Florida negated a large part of the benefits from silicon supplementation. If you want silicon to work against disease better stay in the 20-25°C range.

Other microorganisms can also be of great help in preventing powdery mildew. If a leaf is already colonized by beneficial fungi or bacteria it will be much harder for a pathogen to get in. Several species of microorganisms have been studied in this regard. Fungi like *Tilletiopsis* have shown to prevent and control the disease (see [here](#)), other microbes have also been studied in conjunction with silicon (see [here](#) and [here](#)), showing beneficial effects. Fungus like *Trichoderma harzianum* and bacteria like *Bacillus subtilis* have also shown induction of systemic resistance against fungal diseases (see [here](#), [here](#) and [here](#)). The two images above were taken from [this study](#).

Friendly chemical solutions are also available for the prevention of powdery mildew. Plant derived extracts, for example neem seed oil at 1% has shown to be a good agent for powdery mildew prevention in okra (see [here](#)). Substances like salicylic acid have also shown to trigger resistance to powdery mildew in plants like peas (see [here](#)).




Fig 2.3: Relationship of Relative Humidity with Powdery Mildew Disease Severity.

There are also additional alternatives dealing with the environment that can make it difficult for fungi to colonize plants by attempting to make the environment more hostile for fungi. Spraying ozonated water has shown positive results in experiments with tomatoes (see [here](#)) as well as electrolyzed water in strawberries (see [here](#)). Keeping the environment conditions within a proper range is also important, [this paper](#) shows you how environmental conditions affect powdery mildew disease severity in sunflower but the general features are applicable to most higher plants. As you can see in the image above – taken from this paper – disease severity increases with relative humidity. In general you will want to keep your relative humidity below 70% to avoid making the environment extremely friendly for fungi.

In the end there are many things you can do to keep your plants free of foliar fungal disease like powdery mildew. Use lower temperatures, control your relative humidity, do silicate and salicylic acid applications and use beneficial microbes. If you follow these steps you will forget that

powder mildew ever existed!