Potassium, calcium and magnesium balance

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

***Abstract*—Potassium, calcium and magnesium balance concerns more than the measured concentration of any one mineral in a nutrient solution. In lettuce, controlled hydroponic variation of their supplied proportions changed mineral content relative to fresh yield and dry biomass produced per unit of plant mineral. Those observations establish that the combined supply regime matters to measured plant responses, but they do not isolate the effect of changing one cation independently. Aquaponic studies add evidence from fish-associated growing systems: they report solution concentrations, lettuce nutrient removal, leaf mineral composition and responses to supplementation. Their treatments, however, do not directly test potassium, calcium and magnesium interactions. This paper distinguishes supplied proportions, plant mineral accumulation and biomass-based utilisation efficiency, then compares what controlled hydroponic and aquaponic observations can support. The central conclusion is that mineral balance must be interpreted through both supply and plant response. A specific causal account of interactions among the three minerals in aquaponics remains unverified by the studies considered. Direct tests that separate individual mineral effects from changes in the overall supply regime are needed before prescribing an optimal balance.**

I. Introduction

Potassium, calcium and magnesium balance is a question about their combined supply and the plant responses associated with that supply, not simply whether each mineral can be detected in solution. In a controlled lettuce study, nutrient solutions favoured potassium, calcium or magnesium using respective K:Ca:Mg cationic proportions of 0.68:0.16:0.16, 0.16:0.68:0.16 and 0.16:0.16:0.68 [1]. Comparing these regimes makes balance experimentally visible as a change in proportions. It does not, however, reveal what would happen if only one mineral changed while the others remained fixed. That distinction matters when interpreting the study for aquaponics: evidence that different mixtures produce different plant measurements is not yet an explanation of every interaction within those mixtures.

The strength and boundary of the controlled comparison follow from its design. It examined two lettuce cultivars in three nutrient solutions, with three replicate nutrient film technique gullies for each cultivar and solution combination and 12 plants per unit; harvest occurred 19 days after transplanting [1]. This arrangement permits comparison of short-term lettuce responses to deliberately different supply regimes. It does not establish whether the same responses persist over a longer growing period or occur when the nutrient solution is associated with fish production. Aquaponic experiments provide that latter context, but their broader treatments leave the three minerals' separate contributions unresolved [2], [3]. The two kinds of evidence therefore answer related, but different, questions.

The measured responses illustrate why the distinction between mineral accumulation and plant production is necessary. Across the two cultivars, the potassium-rich solution yielded 11.71 g of above-ground dry biomass per g of plant potassium, compared with 24.12 in the calcium-rich treatment and 21.69 in the magnesium-rich treatment [1]. Calcium and magnesium utilisation efficiencies were likewise lowest in their respective enriched treatments; the reported solution effects on all three efficiencies had p ¡ 0.001 [1]. These results warrant examination of how supplied proportions relate to mineral content and biomass, but not a claim that one independently varied cation caused the differences. This paper first defines those measurements, then brings the controlled comparison into dialogue with aquaponic evidence and identifies the remaining causal uncertainty.

II. Background and Scope

A supplied mineral ratio and a plant mineral measurement describe different parts of the same comparison. In the controlled hydroponic study, the reported mineral utilisation index expresses micromoles of a mineral per gram of fresh yield. Across cultivars, each enriched treatment had the highest index for its dominant cation: 94.61 for potassium in the potassium-rich solution, 15.30 for calcium in the calcium-rich solution and 15.32 for magnesium in the magnesium-rich solution; solution effects on all three indices had p ¡ 0.001 [1]. These measurements show that changing the supply regime was accompanied by differences in mineral content relative to harvested fresh mass. They should not be read as proof that the corresponding treatment produced more biomass or achieved a universally preferable mineral balance.

An especially informative comparison concerns magnesium, which was supplied at 0.97 mM in both the potassium-rich and calcium-rich solutions. Its mean index nevertheless differed, at 3.43 and 5.83 micromoles per gram of fresh yield respectively [1]. Equal supply of that one mineral did not coincide with equal measured magnesium content relative to yield across these two regimes. The other cation concentrations also changed, so the difference is consistent with a response to the overall solution composition rather than evidence for a separately identified effect of potassium or calcium. For the present topic, the observation discourages treating a single solution concentration as a sufficient description of plant mineral status; it cannot specify the biological route by which the difference arose.

The controlled study also distinguished mineral accumulation from biomass produced per unit of mineral present in the plant. Under its non-limiting nutrient conditions, the authors interpreted higher mineral content relative to fresh yield as generally accompanying lower dry-biomass production per unit of the same mineral [1]. This is an observed relationship between two measures with different denominators, not a recommendation to minimise plant mineral content. Aquaponic evidence asks a different question: one comparison reports solution potassium, calcium and magnesium alongside lettuce nutrient removal across supply treatments [2]. Taken together, these approaches offer complementary observations of supply and plant response. Neither the hydroponic relationship nor the aquaponic measurements alone establish an optimal three-mineral balance in a fish-associated growing system.

III. Core Concepts and Mechanisms

The clearest supported causal proposition is deliberately limited: in the controlled lettuce experiment, changing the combined K:Ca:Mg supply regime changed measured mineral indices and utilisation efficiencies [1]. Because the treatments altered cationic proportions together, this is a treatment-level effect, not a measured antagonism between any specified pair of minerals. Its scientific meaning lies in separating the manipulated condition, the composition of the nutrient solution, from the outcomes, mineral content relative to fresh yield and biomass relative to plant mineral content. The magnesium comparison at equal supplied magnesium concentration further shows why these outcomes cannot be inferred from one concentration alone [1]. The evidence supports attention to the mixture, while leaving the individual causal pathways unresolved.

In aquaponics, measurements of mineral supply and lettuce removal help connect the growing solution to plant uptake at a system level. A comparison spanning aquaponic and hydroponic supply treatments reported potassium, calcium and magnesium concentrations and lettuce nutrient-removal values [2]. Such paired observations can identify whether the measured solution and crop respond differently across treatments. They do not by themselves distinguish whether a particular lettuce response arose from potassium, calcium, magnesium or another difference between the treatments. Consequently, a nutrient-removal value should not be mistaken for evidence that one of these minerals inhibited or promoted uptake of another. The study contributes relevant system context, but its treatment structure does not provide the specific interaction test needed for that conclusion.

Supplementation studies sharpen the same interpretive problem. In one aquaponic comparison, lettuce potassium content and growth were measured under treatments that included iron plus potassium, iron alone and no added nutrients [3]. This makes potassium supply relevant to the observed crop response, but it does not make the response a potassium-only effect: iron differed between some treatments, calcium was supplied to every group, and no potassium-only treatment or direct three-mineral interaction test was included [3]. The scientifically defensible distinction is between a response observed under a combined supplementation regime and a mechanism attributed specifically to potassium relative to calcium or magnesium. Establishing the latter would require a comparison designed to distinguish those possibilities, rather than an interpretation based solely on the supplemented group.

IV. Evidence Synthesis

The controlled and aquaponic studies are most informative when their measurements are kept distinct. Hydroponic variation of K:Ca:Mg proportions was accompanied by significant differences in mineral content per fresh yield and biomass per unit of plant mineral [1]. An aquaponic and hydroponic supply comparison, in contrast, measured solution concentrations and lettuce nutrient removal without isolating the minerals' interactions [2]. A separate aquaponic supplementation comparison measured potassium content and growth, but its iron-plus-potassium treatment cannot isolate potassium from the accompanying treatment differences [3]. Together, these observations make a case that both the supplied mixture and the crop response deserve measurement. They do not permit a quantitative transfer of the controlled hydroponic results to an aquaponic system.

A second aquaponic comparison measured leaf potassium, calcium and magnesium across aquaponic and hydroponic treatments and proposed that less favourable nutrient ratios might account for a difference in growth allocation [4]. The proposal is compatible with the controlled finding that different cationic mixtures accompany different lettuce mineral measurements [1]. Compatibility, however, is weaker than confirmation: the aquaponic comparison did not isolate the proposed ratio mechanism, while the hydroponic treatments changed several cation proportions simultaneously. The studies therefore converge on the relevance of comparing mineral supply with plant composition, but not on a demonstrated explanation for a particular growth-allocation difference. Preserving that distinction prevents a plausible interpretation from being reported as an established aquaponic mechanism.

The utilisation measures also resist a simple ranking of treatments. In the controlled study, the dominant supplied cation had its highest mineral index in the corresponding enriched solution, yet biomass produced per unit of that plant mineral was lowest for each cation in its enriched treatment [1]. These are different descriptions of plant response, not contradictory measurements: one relates mineral content to fresh yield, while the other relates dry biomass to mineral present in the plant. Aquaponic studies add solution, removal, tissue and growth observations, but do not establish which combination of these outcomes defines a desirable potassium, calcium and magnesium balance [2], [3], [4]. Interpretation must therefore state the outcome being compared before declaring one supply regime better balanced than another.

V. Practical Implications and Limitations

For interpreting aquaponic lettuce nutrition, the available evidence favours reading solution and plant measurements

together. Reported solution concentrations and lettuce nutrient removal provide one view of the crop's association with the supplied minerals [2]; leaf potassium measurements under supplementation and leaf potassium, calcium and magnesium measurements across growing solutions provide additional views of plant response [3], [4]. None of these measures alone identifies a causal interaction among all three minerals. A difference in solution concentration, tissue content or growth can motivate a balance question, but should not automatically be assigned to competition between potassium, calcium and magnesium. This cautious reading retains the useful observations without giving the aquaponic studies a mechanism their designs did not test.

The controlled hydroponic comparison gives a more direct reason to examine the combined supply regime, but it remains bounded by its setting. Its two cultivars were assessed after 19 days in deliberately contrasting nutrient solutions [1]. The magnesium result shows that equal supplied magnesium across two solutions need not coincide with equal magnesium content per fresh yield when the remaining composition differs [1]. It does not identify which changed component produced that result. Equally, the observed relationship between mineral accumulation and utilisation efficiency was reported under the study's non-limiting nutrient conditions [1]. Applying either observation as a fixed aquaponic target would assume that short-term hydroponic treatment comparisons predict plant responses under fish-associated conditions, an assumption not tested by this evidence.

A direct test of the outstanding explanation would need to distinguish changes in one mineral from changes in the rest of the K:Ca:Mg regime while reporting both supply and plant responses. That requirement follows from the combined cation changes in the controlled treatments [1] and from the non-isolating treatment comparisons in the aquaponic studies [2], [3], [4]. It is a validation need, not an assertion that a particular ratio or interaction has already been established. Until such comparisons are available in aquaponic conditions, claims about which mineral is responsible for a tissue or growth difference should remain tied to the specific treatment and measurement that produced it. The present evidence supports a meaningful balance question, but not a general prescription for its answer.

VI. Conclusion

Potassium, calcium and magnesium balance is scientifically meaningful because deliberately different combined supply regimes produced different mineral-content and biomass-based measurements in lettuce [1]. Aquaponic studies show that solution composition, lettuce nutrient removal, tissue minerals and growth can also be observed in fish-associated growing systems [2], [3], [4]. The distinction is causal: the controlled study identifies responses to changed mixtures, whereas the aquaponic comparisons do not isolate interactions among the three minerals. Nor does the controlled study establish which independently changed cation accounts for each response. The strongest conclusion is therefore that supply proportions and plant outcomes must be interpreted together, with the outcome measure stated explicitly. The highest-value next evidence would directly separate individual mineral effects from combined-regime effects under aquaponic conditions before assigning a specific mechanism or optimal balance.

Acknowledgment

The author used artificial intelligence tools to assist with manuscript drafting and revision, and with LaTeX and bibliography preparation. The author reviewed all AI-assisted output and remains responsible for the final content.

References

[1] S. D. Pascale and Y. Rouphael, "Isosmotic macrocation variation modulates mineral efficiency, morpho-physiological traits, and functional properties in hydroponically grown lettuce varieties (lactuca sativa l.)," 2021. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2021.678799

[2] E.-S. Khater, A. Bahnasawy, H. Mosa, and W. A. . . O. Morsy, "Nutrient supply systems and their effect on the performance of the nile tilapia (oreochromis niloticus) and lettuce (lactuca sativa) plant integration system," *Scientific Reports*, 2024.

[3] E. Tsoumalakou, E. Mente, K. A. Kormas, N. Katsoulas, N. Vlahos, P. Kapsis, and E. Levizou, "Precise monitoring of lettuce functional responses to minimal nutrient supplementation identifies aquaponic system's nutrient limitations and their time-course," *Agriculture*, 2022.

[4] B. Delaide, S. Goddek, J. Gott, H. Soyeurt, and M. H. Jijakli, "Lettuce (lactuca sativa l. var. sucrine) growth performance in complemented aquaponic solution outperforms hydroponics," *Water*, 2016.