Crop selection, growth stage and nutrient demand

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

***Abstract*—Crop selection in aquaponics requires an understanding of whether the nutrient conditions available to plants can support growth throughout cultivation. Evidence from lettuce systems shows that nutrient supply and solution conditions affect plant performance, but it provides a narrower basis for decisions about crop choice or stage-specific demand. In a replicated lettuce and tilapia study, plants without nutrient supplementation developed reduced photosynthetic and photosystem II performance from day 14, whereas supplemented plants maintained function and produced more biomass. Other lettuce studies report differences in nutrient removal, biomass and tissue elemental composition under contrasting supply or solution conditions. Together, these observations support a causal account in which the conditions experienced by a crop influence its physiological function and growth over time. They do not establish nutrient-demand schedules for successive growth stages or demonstrate that one crop is better suited to aquaponics than another. Crop selection and growth-stage decisions should therefore distinguish measured plant responses from untested comparisons, while recognising that a satisfactory response at one point in cultivation does not establish adequate nutrition throughout growth.**

I. Introduction

Nutrient demand matters to crop selection because a plant must sustain growth under the nutrient conditions it experiences, not merely encounter an apparently suitable solution at the start of cultivation. In a replicated lettuce and tilapia study, lettuce without added nutrients showed declines in photosynthesis and photosystem II performance from day 14, while supplemented plants maintained these functions and produced more biomass [1]. The result demonstrates a time-dependent plant response to the tested nutrient treatments. It does not, however, measure a separate nutrient requirement for each growth stage. The distinction is important: a change observed during growth may reveal a developing limitation without identifying whether demand itself changed, nutrient availability changed, or both.

The production context also affects how nutrient demand can be interpreted. A lettuce and Nile tilapia study measured lettuce nutrient removal and growth under different nutrient-supply and flow treatments [2]. Such measurements connect the conditions supplied by an integrated system with plant uptake and performance, making them relevant to whether a particular planting can be supported. They cannot, on their own, rank alternative crops or define stage-specific requirements, because the study examined lettuce rather than a comparison among crops. Crop selection is consequently a question about the fit between a crop and available conditions, but the cited production evidence directly establishes only responses within the crop and treatments investigated.

Comparisons of lettuce grown in different nutrient solutions further show why nutrient provision cannot be treated as a fixed property of aquaponic water. Trials comparing aquaponic, supplemented aquaponic and hydroponic solutions reported differences in shoot and root biomass [3]. These results support the proposition that the solution supplied to plants can affect their growth, while differences among treatments restrict attribution to any one nutrient. This paper examines the supported links among nutrient conditions, responses observed during growth and crop performance. It then separates those links from two questions that remain unresolved by the available studies: how different crops compare under common conditions, and how their nutrient demand varies by developmental stage.

II. Background and Scope

Studies of plant nutrition in aquaponics have approached nutrient conditions through different comparisons. One lettuce investigation contrasted hydroponic solutions at different pH values with recirculated aquaponic water and measured both biomass and tissue elemental composition [4]. This design shows that plant performance must be interpreted alongside the conditions of the solution in which the plant grew. Tissue composition provides a different observation from biomass: it describes elements present in the harvested plant rather than growth alone. Neither measure, however, establishes an independent requirement for a particular developmental stage. The aquaponic treatment also differed from the hydroponic treatments in more than one respect, so a difference between them cannot be assigned to a single nutrient-related cause.

Supplementation studies address a related but distinct question: whether plant responses differ when the nutrients provided to a tested system change. In lettuce grown with tilapia, treatments with iron or iron and potassium supplementation were compared with no nutrient addition, and plant function was followed during growth [1]. In another lettuce comparison, an aquaponic solution complemented with mineral nutrients was assessed against aquaponic and hydroponic solutions using shoot and root biomass [3]. The first approach supplies evidence about the timing of a response to the tested additions; the second supplies evidence about growth under contrasting solution treatments. Neither is a direct test of which crop should be selected, and neither yields a general schedule of nutrient demand by growth stage.

The appropriate scope for interpreting these studies is therefore narrower than the full set of decisions implied by crop selection. Evidence of nutrient removal under supply and

flow treatments shows that lettuce interacts with the nutrient conditions of an integrated system [2]. Evidence from the pH and solution comparisons shows that growth and tissue composition also depend on treatment context [4]. Read together, these studies establish that the observed performance of a crop is conditional on how it is grown and assessed. They leave a comparative gap: without other crops tested against lettuce under interpretable common conditions, differences among lettuce treatments cannot identify the most suitable crop for a given aquaponic system.

III. Core Concepts and Mechanisms

The central nutritional relationship is between the conditions supplied to a plant, the nutrients it takes up and the growth it achieves. In the lettuce and tilapia study, nutrient removal and growth were measured under different supply and flow treatments [2]. The complemented-solution lettuce trials likewise associated contrasting nutrient-solution treatments with differences in shoot and root biomass [3]. Together, these observations make nutrient availability relevant to crop performance, but they describe different parts of the relationship. Removal measures an outcome under a particular treatment; biomass measures a growth outcome. Neither measurement alone specifies the amount of each nutrient a crop would require to sustain a desired response at every point in its development.

A plant response can reveal a nutritional limitation before the final biomass comparison is made. In the monitored lettuce and tilapia study, declining photosynthesis and photosystem II performance appeared in unsupplemented plants from day 14, whereas supplemented plants maintained function and subsequently produced more biomass [1]. The temporal ordering connects impaired physiological function with poorer growth under the tested treatments. It supports attention to plant responses throughout cultivation rather than reliance on an endpoint alone. It does not demonstrate that day 14 represents a universal transition in lettuce demand: the observation belongs to that experiment, and the available evidence does not separate a change in developmental requirement from the evolving nutrient conditions experienced by the plants.

Nutrient demand must also be distinguished from the concentration or composition of a solution. Lettuce grown under contrasting pH and nutrient-solution conditions differed in biomass and in some tissue-element measurements [4]. Lettuce grown in aquaponic solutions with and without mineral complementation also differed in growth responses [3]. These observations are consistent with plant performance depending on the conditions under which nutrients are supplied, but the comparisons cannot isolate every contributing difference between treatments. For crop selection, the implication is conceptual rather than prescriptive: an observed solution composition, an amount removed from water and a crop's requirement are related quantities, not interchangeable measurements.

IV. Evidence Synthesis

Across the accepted studies, the strongest direct evidence about growth over time comes from monitored plant function. The replicated lettuce study observed a deterioration in unsupplemented plants from day 14 and better maintained function and biomass under the tested nutrient additions [1]. The nutrient-removal study contributes a complementary production-system observation by measuring what lettuce removed and how it grew under differing supply and flow treatments [2]. The pH and solution study adds evidence that biomass and tissue elemental responses vary with the growing conditions [4]. These findings converge on the significance of nutrient conditions for lettuce performance, while answering different questions about function, removal and accumulated growth.

The studies should not be read as independent measurements of the same nutrient-demand curve. A decline in photosynthetic performance under no supplementation identifies a response to that treatment over time, not a quantified stage requirement [1]. Measured removal under particular supply and flow conditions describes uptake in those conditions, not necessarily the supply that would be needed under other conditions [2]. Biomass and tissue-element comparisons describe outcomes under different solutions, but the aquaponic and hydroponic treatments differ in ways that complicate single-cause attribution [4]. Their combined value lies in showing several observable consequences of nutrient conditions, not in supplying a universal numerical rule for planting or supplementation.

The complemented aquaponic solution trials provide a useful check on overly simple interpretations of crop performance. Differences in lettuce shoot and root biomass across aquaponic, complemented aquaponic and hydroponic solutions show that a growth comparison depends on the solution being compared [3]. The pH and tissue-element comparisons reinforce that differences in plant outcomes arise in treatment contexts that include more than a single isolated variable [4]. Meanwhile, the monitored lettuce study demonstrates that outcomes can diverge during cultivation rather than only at harvest [1]. Collectively, the evidence supports a conditional explanation of nutrient demand: the adequacy of supply must be judged through plant responses in a specified crop and setting.

V. Practical Implications and Limitations

For crop selection, the available evidence supports asking whether a prospective crop can maintain function and growth under the intended nutrient conditions, but it does not answer that question comparatively for different crops. All four accepted investigations report lettuce responses, whether through nutrient removal, physiological monitoring, biomass or tissue composition [1], [2], [3], [4]. They therefore provide a basis for understanding lettuce within the studied conditions, not for ranking lettuce against other crop species. An inference that another crop would perform similarly would require evidence

not supplied here. The practical constraint is to keep a crop-specific observation attached to the crop and treatment in which it was obtained.

For growth stage, the most informative observation is the emergence of a functional difference during cultivation. In the monitored study, photosynthetic and photosystem II responses distinguished unsupplemented lettuce from supplemented lettuce from day 14, before the final biomass comparison [1]. This supports evaluating nutrient adequacy as an ongoing condition rather than assuming that an initially viable planting remains adequately supplied. It does not support prescribing an addition at a particular day or assigning a distinct nutrient quantity to a named stage. Establishing such a schedule would require measurements designed to distinguish changing plant requirements from changes in the nutrient conditions available to plants.

Interpretation is further constrained by the designs of the solution comparisons. The complemented aquaponic solution trials show differences in lettuce biomass, but treatment differences and limits on treatment-level replication restrict how precisely a particular cause can be identified [3]. The pH and aquaponic-water comparisons report biomass and tissue-element responses, yet the aquaponic treatment includes multiple differences from the hydroponic treatments [4]. Nutrient-removal and flow comparisons provide relevant system observations without resolving stage-specific demand [2]. Stronger guidance on crop selection and stage-dependent demand would require direct crop comparisons and repeated, stage-resolved measurements under conditions that permit the effects of nutrient supply to be interpreted separately.

VI. Conclusion

The evidence establishes a clear but bounded causal account: nutrient conditions can affect lettuce function and growth in aquaponic settings. Physiological impairment developed during cultivation without the tested nutrient additions, while supplemented lettuce maintained function and produced more biomass [1]. Other studies measured nutrient removal under different supply and flow treatments or found different growth responses across solution conditions [2], [3]. These observations explain why nutrient demand must be considered in relation to both the crop and the conditions it experiences. They do not turn a measured treatment response into a general requirement for every crop or developmental stage.

The highest-value next evidence would compare candidate crops under interpretable common conditions and track nutrient conditions and plant responses across defined growth stages. That need follows from the present studies' focus on lettuce, the absence of direct crop comparisons and the difficulty of attributing outcomes to a single factor in some solution treatments [2], [3], [4]. Until such evidence is available, crop selection should be framed as a question of demonstrated suitability under specified conditions, while stage-specific nutrient demand remains an important unresolved question rather than a schedule that can be inferred from these studies.

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] 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.

[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] 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.

[4] T. S. Anderson, D. de Villiers, and M. B. Timmons, "Growth and tissue elemental composition response of butterhead lettuce (lactuca sativa, cv. flandria) to hydroponic and aquaponic conditions," *Horticulturae*, 2017.