pH, alkalinity and hardness tracking

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

***Abstract*—Tracking aquaponic water chemistry requires more than recording a pH value. pH is relevant to fish health and plant nutrient availability, while nitrification generates acidity and consumes alkalinity. Changes in these conditions can therefore have different meanings, even when a single pH reading appears unremarkable. Evidence from lettuce comparisons also shows that nutrient composition and mineral interactions complicate attempts to attribute plant responses to pH alone. This paper synthesises an aquaponics review and three lettuce studies to explain what pH tracking can reveal, why alkalinity provides necessary context, and where the evidence for interpreting hardness remains insufficient. The review supports a causal connection between nitrification, alkalinity consumption and pH. The lettuce studies illustrate the importance of accompanying nutrient conditions, including a reported calcium-phosphate interaction, but do not establish a joint interpretation of pH, alkalinity and hardness. Consequently, the three measurements should not be treated as interchangeable indicators. The strongest supported interpretation links pH and alkalinity to an identified process and reads plant observations in the context of solution chemistry. Specific claims about hardness trends or thresholds require more direct evidence.**

I. Introduction

Aquaponic water serves fish and plants while undergoing biological transformation. Its pH matters because the conditions associated with it affect fish health and plant nutrient availability. Nitrification also generates acidity and consumes alkalinity, providing a reason to examine the capacity of the water chemistry to accommodate continuing acid production rather than relying on a pH observation alone [1]. These relationships make tracking an interpretive task: a reading has meaning in relation to the processes changing the water and the organisms exposed to it. This paper examines that relationship and distinguishes the supported explanation for pH and alkalinity from the less directly evidenced question of hardness.

Plant comparisons show why a pH reading cannot, by itself, explain every response observed in aquaponic water. In a comparison of lettuce grown under hydroponic and aquaponic conditions, differences in pH occurred alongside differences in solution chemistry and plant tissue elements; calcium-phosphate precipitation was also reported [2]. These observations connect pH tracking to mineral chemistry, but they do not make pH the sole cause of a growth or tissue response. The relevant question is therefore not simply whether pH changes, but what accompanying chemical conditions might account for an observed response. Interpreting those conditions requires attention to what was measured and what the comparison can isolate.

Monitoring evidence illustrates both the value and the limits of this approach. An aquaponics study recorded water pH and nutrient conditions alongside lettuce responses, making it possible to consider water conditions together with plant observations [3]. That association does not establish a pH-based causal mechanism, and the study does not resolve how alkalinity or hardness should be tracked. Accordingly, the discussion first establishes the scope of the available comparisons, then examines the supported causal relationships and synthesises their implications for interpreting records. It closes by identifying which questions remain open, particularly the meaning of hardness measurements within the combined tracking task.

II. Background and Scope

Comparisons between aquaponic and hydroponic lettuce provide useful observations, but they answer a different question from a controlled test of water-chemistry indicators. One study compared lettuce exposed to hydroponic, aquaponic and complemented aquaponic solutions, reporting plant responses under treatments whose nutrient conditions differed [4]. Different pH values were among the conditions observed, yet the solutions differed in other respects as well. A plant response across such treatments cannot be assigned exclusively to pH without separating those accompanying differences. For tracking, the study establishes the importance of describing the solution in which a pH value occurs; it does not establish a standalone rule for interpreting pH, alkalinity and hardness together.

The complemented-solution comparison also demonstrates a boundary between observing a treatment difference and explaining its cause. Changing the composition of an aquaponic solution changes more than the label attached to its pH reading. The reported nutrient and growth observations are therefore informative about the range of conditions in which lettuce was grown, but they do not identify how much of any response arose from pH rather than other chemical differences [4]. This distinction matters when records are compared over time: the apparent association of a pH value with a plant outcome is not itself evidence that changing pH would reproduce that outcome. A defensible interpretation retains the wider treatment context.

The present scope is narrower than a complete account of aquaponic water management. The accepted evidence includes a review describing acid generation and alkalinity consumption during nitrification, plus studies relating pH and solution conditions to lettuce observations [1], [2], [3], [4]. It does

not establish an experimentally validated joint tracking scheme for pH, alkalinity and hardness. In particular, the comparative lettuce studies do not directly test hardness as a measured explanatory variable [2], [3], [4]. This gap should not be concealed by treating a reported calcium interaction as a measurement of hardness. The paper therefore explains the supported relationships and states explicitly where interpretation must stop.

III. Core Concepts and Mechanisms

The principal supported mechanism connects a continuing biological process to changing water chemistry. Nitrification generates acidity while consuming alkalinity in aquaponic systems [1]. pH describes the water condition observed at a given point, whereas alkalinity is relevant to how that condition responds as acidity is produced. Reading the two together can therefore distinguish a current condition from a process capable of changing it. A pH measurement alone does not show how much alkalinity has been consumed. The review supports this causal interpretation, but the supplied evidence does not quantify a general rate of change or specify a universal intervention threshold; either would require conditions and measurements beyond those established here.

pH also matters because its significance extends beyond the numerical reading. The aquaponics review links pH to fish health and plant nutrient availability, while a lettuce comparison reports calcium-phosphate precipitation and differences in plant tissue elements under contrasting solutions [1], [2]. Taken together, these sources suggest a pathway by which the chemical setting associated with pH can matter to the organisms and minerals in the system. They do not show that every tissue difference was caused by pH: the compared solutions had distinct compositions. Thus, mineral observations can help interpret a pH record, but they cannot be used to infer an isolated pH effect unless the other relevant conditions are accounted for.

Hardness requires a separate evidential judgement. The reported calcium-phosphate interaction shows that calcium-containing mineral chemistry can be relevant when interpreting aquaponic and hydroponic solutions [2]. It does not establish a hardness measurement, a hardness trend, or a causal relationship between hardness and an observed plant response. Likewise, the evidence for nitrification consuming alkalinity does not demonstrate that hardness tracks alkalinity or changes with it [1]. The three requested terms consequently identify related questions, not interchangeable measurements. The available sources support explaining why pH and alkalinity merit joint attention; they are insufficient to prescribe what a particular hardness reading means in that same causal sequence.

IV. Evidence Synthesis

Across the accepted sources, the strongest causal account concerns pH and alkalinity rather than plant performance attributed to a particular pH value. The review supplies the process link: nitrification produces acidity and consumes alkalinity [1]. The lettuce studies show why that link cannot be converted directly into a prediction of plant response. Water pH was reported alongside nutrient conditions and lettuce responses in one aquaponics study, while another comparison varied solution composition between aquaponic and hydroponic treatments [3], [4]. The observations make pH relevant to interpretation, but multiple conditions accompany the measured outcomes. Process evidence and comparative plant evidence therefore complement one another without supporting the same strength of causal conclusion.

The more focused lettuce comparison sharpens this distinction. It contrasted hydroponic and aquaponic conditions at different pH values, reported differences in tissue elements, and identified calcium-phosphate precipitation [2]. This supplies a concrete reason to consider mineral chemistry when reading pH alongside plant observations. Nevertheless, aquaponic and hydroponic solutions are not identical apart from pH, so a difference between those treatments cannot automatically identify pH as the determining factor. The broader complemented-solution comparison faces the same interpretive constraint because treatment chemistry differs [4]. Together, the studies favour a contextual reading of pH records over a simple account in which one reading predicts nutrient status or plant outcome.

A further distinction concerns what each source actually observes. Reporting pH, nutrients and lettuce responses together documents potentially relevant co-occurrence, but does not measure the intervening effect of alkalinity or hardness in that response [3]. Reporting calcium-phosphate precipitation provides evidence of a mineral interaction, yet it does not turn tissue-element differences into a hardness result [2]. The review, in contrast, explicitly links nitrification to alkalinity consumption and pH-related concerns for fish and plants [1]. Synthesising these contributions yields an uneven but useful evidence base: a supported process explanation, observations consistent with the need for chemical context, and no direct test of combined hardness tracking.

V. Practical Implications and Limitations

The clearest implication is to interpret pH as a condition within a changing system, not as a complete description of that system. Because nitrification generates acidity and consumes alkalinity, an explanation of a pH record should consider alkalinity alongside the reading and the process that can alter it [1]. This is a principle of interpretation, not a validated measurement schedule or a prescribed correction. The lettuce evidence reinforces the need for context: studies reporting pH also describe nutrient conditions and plant responses that cannot be reduced to pH alone [3], [4]. Without that context, a comparison between readings or treatments risks attributing an observed difference to the wrong condition.

Hardness tracking cannot yet be given the same evidential interpretation in this paper. Calcium-phosphate precipitation makes a mineral interaction visible in a lettuce comparison, but the observation does not establish how hardness was measured or how its changes should be read alongside pH and alkalinity [2]. Nor does evidence that nitrification consumes

alkalinity demonstrate an equivalent change in hardness [1]. The defensible practical position is to keep the concepts distinct and avoid using one measurement as a substitute for another. Any proposed hardness-based interpretation would need direct observations relating hardness measurements to the relevant water conditions, rather than an inference from the presence of calcium in a reported interaction.

Validation should also separate process explanations from outcomes. The review supports a mechanism for alkalinity consumption, while the lettuce comparisons document responses under solutions that differ in several chemical respects [1], [2], [4]. To establish whether a particular tracking pattern predicts a plant response, evidence would need to distinguish pH from those accompanying differences and directly include the additional measures being interpreted. The existing monitoring study illustrates why recording water conditions with plant responses is informative, but it does not itself isolate a pH mechanism or settle the roles of alkalinity and hardness [3]. These limits preclude universal thresholds or a causal diagnosis based solely on the observations assembled here.

VI. Conclusion

pH, alkalinity and hardness should not be read as three names for the same aspect of aquaponic water. The supported causal explanation is that nitrification generates acidity and consumes alkalinity, making alkalinity important context for interpreting pH over time [1]. Lettuce comparisons show why pH observations must also be considered with solution composition and mineral interactions, but their differing treatments do not isolate pH as the cause of plant responses [2], [3], [4]. The accepted evidence does not directly establish what hardness trends mean within this combined tracking task. The highest-value next evidence would measure the three conditions together while distinguishing their respective relationships to observed water and plant responses. Until then, tracking supports informed interpretation most reliably when the demonstrated mechanism is kept separate from associations that remain unresolved.

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] V. Lobanov, H. Monsees, F. Latrille, G. Pate, and A. Joyce, "Coupled vs. decoupled aquaponics: Evidence, mechanisms, and methodological gaps in the productivity hypothesis," *Aquacultural Engineering*, 2026.

[2] 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.

[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.