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**SUMMARY.** Maintaining medium pH and nutrient concentrations at levels acceptable for growth are important for producing vigorous transplants in the shortest time. Medium chemical properties, such as cation-exchange capacity, aeration, liming materials, preplant fertilizer, irrigation-water sources, water-soluble fertilizers, and plant species, interact to affect medium pH and nutrient management. However, these chemical properties do not affect medium pH or the nutrient supply simultaneously or with equal intensity. The objective of this review is to consider key chemical properties of container media and their affects on pH and nutrient management initially and over time.

A plug or small containerized transplant is the primary method of producing ornamental and vegetable transplants in the United States. Styer and Koranski (1997) estimated that ≈25 billion ornamental and vegetable plug transplants were produced in the United States in 1996. The advantage of growing plug transplants include greater transplant uniformity, a reduction in labor when transplanting, and increased production per unit area of bench space in the greenhouse (Nelson, 1991; Styer and Koranski, 1997).

In plug production, the most common component of a plug medium is sphagnum peat (Adams, 1992; Fonteno et al., 1996; Koranski and Kessler, 1991; Styer and Koranski, 1997). In peat-based media, a number of factors interact to affect the nutrient supply in container root media throughout crop production. These factors can include cation-exchange capacity (CEC), lime, preplant fertilizers, irrigation-water sources (IWS), and water-soluble fertilizer (WSF) (Argo, 1996). Nutritional management in container root media also is affected by pH management because of the direct effects that many nutrient sources (lime, IWS, WSF) have on media pH and the indirect effects that pH has on nutrient solubility (Lindsay, 1979) and plant availability (Lucus and Davis, 1961; Peterson, 1981). Finally, plant growth may directly affect medium pH as well as nutrient uptake (Argo, 1996; Argo et al., 1997b; Bailey et al., 1996). However, the nutrient supply is not affected by all factors simultaneously or with equal intensity. The objective of this review is to consider the key chemical properties that affect pH and nutrient management of plants grown in peat-based root media.
Medium pH, nutrient availability, and plant uptake

The pH of the soil solution affects nutrient solubility (Lindsay, 1979) and plant availability (Fig. 1) (Lucas and Davis, 1961; Peterson, 1981). However, mineral soils are affected differently than organic soils and soilless root media. For example, in mineral soils fertilized with P, dicalcium phosphate initially control PO₄-P solubility at high pH (>7.0) and Al and Fe phosphates control PO₄-P solubility at lower pH (<7.0) (Lindsay and Moreno, 1960). Recommendations to lime soils to a pH of 7.0 are based on the fact that maximum P solubility occurs at ≈7.0 (Lindsay and Moreno, 1960; Lucas and Davis, 1961). In organic soils and soilless root media, which tend to contain naturally low amounts of Al and Fe, P does not precipitate at low pH but does at high pH (Lucas and Davis, 1961; Peterson, 1981; Yeager and Barrett, 1985). Lucas and Davis (1961) and Peterson (1981) concluded that the optimal pH for PO₄-P nutrition was 5.5 in media without soil, because above this pH, water-soluble PO₄-P concentrations began to decrease. In mineral soils, Ca availability also is reduced at low pH because of the presence of Fe and Al. Soluble Fe and Al readily replace Ca on the soil colloid and on the root surface, both of which reduces Ca uptake (Marschner, 1986). In peat-based media, Peterson (1981) and Syer and Koranski (1997) indicate a reduction in Ca availability at low pH (Fig. 1). Lucas and Davis (1961) in organic soils and Argo and Biernbaum (1996a) in peat-based root media both concluded that low pH did not reduce Ca availability. Instead, the low pH was an indication of a lack of Ca sources applied to the soil or media.

Decreasing nutrient solubility does not necessarily affect plant uptake. For example, Peterson (1981) concludes that P availability decreases rapidly at a media pH > 5.5 (Fig. 1). However, Adams et al. (1978) found that the tissue P concentration measured in lettuce (Lactuca sativa L.) leaves was unaffected by medium pH up to 6.5, even though the concentration of water-soluble PO₄-P measured in the medium was 38% of that measured at pH 5.5. Argo and Biernbaum (1996a) found that the tissue P concentration measured in hybrid impatiens (Impatiens wallerina Hook F.) was minimally affected by medium pH < 7.6. However, at medium pH > 7.6, tissue P concentrations decreased rapidly.

Medium pH can affect assimilation because of changes in the form of the nutrient in the soil solution. Between a pH of 4.5 to 8.5, there are two forms of P in the soil solution (H₂PO₄⁻ and HPO₄²⁻) with an equilibrium constant of 7.2. The H₂PO₄⁻ form of water-soluble P is 10 times more available to the plant than the HPO₄²⁻ form (Bunt, 1988). Argo and Biernbaum (1996a) concluded that while the concentration of water-soluble PO₄-P in the root medium decreased with increasing pH, the effect on tissue P was minimal until the form of the water-soluble PO₄-P changed to a less-available form. Nitrogen uptake can be influenced by the N form (Barker and Mills, 1980; Marschner, 1986), which in turn is affected by nitrification rate. The critical pH for the inhibition of nitrification in soilless media was found to be in a range from 5.4 to 5.7 (Argo and Biernbaum, 1997a; Lang and Elliott, 1991; Niemiera and Wright, 1986). Argo and Biernbaum (1997a) and Niemiera and Wright (1986) found that above this critical pH range, minimal NH₄-N concentrations were measured in the medium, even when applying up to a 100% NH₄-N WSF, while below the critical pH range, NH₄-N began to accumulate in the medium with a corresponding decrease in the NO₃-N concentration. Argo and Biernbaum (1997a) found an increase in shoot-tissue N concentrations of hybrid impatiens with decreasing medium pH, but concluded that medium pH in itself did not affect N uptake, but rather medium pH affected the nitrification rate.

Plant species differ in their ability to take up nutrients at a given pH. Nelson (1994) concludes that geraniums (Pelargonium × hortorum Bailey) and African marigolds (Tagetes erecta L.) are very efficient accumulators of Fe and Mn, and require a higher pH media (6.5) to prevent toxicity problems. Biernbaum et al. (1988) found that below a medium pH of 5.8, geraniums were susceptible to Fe and Mn toxicity, while at a pH > 5.8, Fe and Mn did not accumulate in the tissue. In comparison, Nelson (1994) concludes that pansies (Viola × wittrockiana Gams), petunias (Petunia × hibrida Vilm), snapdragons (Antirrhinum majus L.), and vinca [Catharanthus roseus (L.) G. Don] have difficulty taking up Fe, and require a lower pH media (5.5) to prevent deficiency problems.

Cation exchange capacity

It has been suggested that an adequate CEC is desired in soilless media to buffer it from sudden changes in pH and nutrient concentrations (Biernbaum, 1992; Bunt, 1988; Nelson, 1991; Syer and Koranski, 1997). The CEC of organic materials such as peat or bark often are associated with pH and nutrient buffering capacity. The CEC of organic materials are due to the pH-dependent exchange of cations with H⁺ from organic acid functional groups on the particles. Hellinger et al. (1964) found that the CEC of a sphagnum peat increased by 140 meq-L⁻¹ as the pH increased from 3.5 to 8.0. The ratio of H⁺ to cations bound to the peat also changes with increasing pH. For example, one type of acid sphagnum peat was 100%, 50%, 30%, or 0% H⁺ saturated at a pH of 3.7, 4.5, 5.5, or 7.8, respectively (Lucas et al., 1975; Puustjarvi and Robertson, 1975). Bunt (1988) reported that the CEC of peat indicates the potential for divalent ions adsorption (primarily Ca
and Mg), with most monovalent cations (NH₄, K, Na) remaining water-soluble.

The CEC of organic materials such as peat on a weight basis is much higher than that of mineral soils. For example, Lucas (1982) reported that the CEC of a sphagnum peat was 1000 meq-kg⁻¹ while that of a loam mineral soil was 120 meq-kg⁻¹. However, because of the low bulk density of the sphagnum peat, the effective CEC measured on a volume basis was 40% less than that of the mineral soil (80 for the peat vs. 140 meq-kg⁻¹ for the mineral soil). Puustjarvi (1982) reported a linear increase in the CEC of sphagnum peat from 45 to 130 meq-kg⁻¹ as the degree of decomposition increased from H1 to H5 as measured with the von Post scale (Puustjarvi and Robertson, 1975). The overall increase in CEC was associated with both a higher CEC of the more degraded peat itself (H1 peat was 1000 meq-kg⁻¹, H5 peat was 1240 meq-kg⁻¹) and an increase in the bulk density with greater decomposition (H1 peat was 45 kg-m⁻³, H5 peat was 105 kg-m⁻³).

Other materials such as perlite, polystyrene, or rockwool (RW) have minimal CEC and are included in container media to increase aeration or water-holding capacity (Argo and Biernbaum, 1994; Nelson, 1991). Bark, calcined clay, coconut coir, and expanded vermiculite are added to soilless media for aeration and water-holding capacity, but each also has significant CEC (Argo and Biernbaum, 1997b; Bunt, 1988; Nelson, 1991).

**Root medium aeration**

Root-medium aeration is important when plants are produced in containers (Bunt, 1988; Deboo and Verdonck, 1971; Fonteno, 1996; Milks et al., 1989). From a chemical property standpoint, O₂ partial pressure is important because it affects the redox potential of the medium, which directly affects nitrification and denitrification rates and the solubility and availability of micronutrients (Lindsay, 1979; Marschner, 1986). Hanan (1964) measured O₂ partial pressures (PP) in cut flower beds ranging in depths from 8 to 60 cm and containing media with various percentages of leaf mold, loam, peat, perlite, sand, and silt. At the 5 to 7 cm depth within the beds, O₂ partial pressure ranged from 9.8 to 21 kPa (ambient O₂ partial pressure was 21 kPa), with the highest O₂ partial pressure (21 kPa) measured in the beds containing a soilless root media (1 peat : 1 perlite [v:v]). Paul and Lee (1976) found that the oxygen diffusion rate correlated well with the growth of chrysanthemums (Dendranthema grandiflora) in 13 root media. Fifteen percent air-filled porosity at container capacity was suggested for optimum oxygen diffusion rates and plant growth in 12-cm-tall pots. Argo et al. (1996) found that the O₂ partial pressure in three soilless medium in 12-cm-tall pots with chrysanthemum was 21 kPa. Irrigating the pots using either drip irrigation or subirrigation had minimal effect on O₂ partial pressure measured at three levels in the pot.

Medium CO₂ partial pressure is also important because of its effect on solution pH and nutrient solubility. Lindsay (1979) reported that for soils at equilibrium with CaCO₃ (calcaceous), the measured pH varied from 7.3 to 8.5, depending on the CO₂ partial pressure. Soil pH values of 8.5 in calcareous soils can be obtained only when the partial pressure of CO₂ in the soil is similar to that measured in the ambient atmosphere (30 to 40 Pa). Because of factors such as root respiration, microbial activity, and organic matter degradation, average CO₂ partial pressure in the soil atmosphere are commonly reported at 300 Pa, or 10 times higher than that measured in the air (Lindsay, 1979).

In container-grown plants, root respiration is thought to be higher than that of plants grown in mineral soils because of faster plant growth rates (Paul and Lee, 1976) and higher microbial respiration because of the ideal organic matter content of most soilless container media (Bunt, 1988). Argo et al. (1996) found that the CO₂ partial pressure of three soilless medium in 12-cm-tall pots with chrysanthemum was 63 Pa (ambient CO₂ partial pressure was 46 Pa). Irrigating the pots with water containing alkalinity at 320 mg CaCO₃/L caused an increase in medium CO₂ partial pressure up to 1600 Pa. The high medium CO₂ partial pressure measured after the irrigation was not persistent, and within 180 min, returned to levels averaging 45% higher (100 Pa) than that measured before the irrigation. In comparison, when reverse osmosis purified water (alkalinity of <20 mg CaCO₃/L) was used instead of well water, the large increase in medium CO₂ did not occur. This indicated that the alkalinity in the irrigation water was the source of the CO₂.

In general, soilless container root media maintain high air-filled porosities in pots (Deboo and Verdonck, 1971; Fonteno, 1996; Milks et al., 1989). This high porosity after the irrigation allows for rapid CO₂ dispersion and reestablishment of O₂ partial pressures to near pre-irrigation levels. In small containers such as pots, air-filled porosity is less than in pots (Fonteno, 1996; Milks et al., 1989). However, small containers tend to dry out quickly, which would also lead to a high air-filled porosity and O₂ and CO₂ partial pressures similar to that of ambient levels.

**Liming materials**

Liming materials (CaCO₃, MgCO₃, Ca(OH)₂, and Mg(OH)₂) are added to a soilless root medium to neutralize acidity, increase pH to a level acceptable for plant growth, and provide a source of Ca (and Mg if dolomite lime). Incorporating sufficient lime into a soilless root medium to obtain an initial pH range of 5.5 to 6.4 is recommended (Nelson, 1991; Peterson, 1981; Warncke and Krauskopf, 1983). The amount of liming material required to obtain an equilibrium pH of 6 in the root medium depends not only on the components used to produce the medium, but also on the liming material’s reactivity and particle size (Argo and Biernbaum, 1996b; Chapin, 1980; Gibaly and Axley, 1955; Schollenger and Salter, 1943; Sheldrake, 1980; Williams et al., 1988) as well as the surface area of the liming material (Parfitt and Ellis, 1966).

Argo and Biernbaum (1996b) found that the lime that reacted initially to increase the medium’s pH had minimal effect on root-medium Ca (or Mg if dolomite lime) concentrations measured with the saturated media extract (Warncke, 1986). Water-soluble Ca and Mg concentrations remained below levels considered acceptable for plant growth (Warncke and Krauskopf, 1983) even though the pH of the peat increased, indicating that the lime was still reacting. Argo and Biernbaum (1996a) proposed that not all the liming material incorporated into a soilless root me-
Table 1. Recommended types and incorporation rates for lime and preplant fertilizers. The nutrient content of the individual fertilizer salts was estimated from Hawkes et al. (1985) and Young and Johnson (1982).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lime rate (kg m⁻³)</th>
<th>3.0 ground limestone</th>
<th>4.9 dolomitic limestone</th>
<th>3.0 dolomitic limestone</th>
<th>6.0 dolomitic limestone</th>
<th>2.25 each ground and dolomitic limestone</th>
<th>2.25 each ground and dolomitic limestone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total N</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO₄-P</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ca</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mg</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO₄-S</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All incorporation rates in kg m⁻³ of root media

- 0.9 KNO₃
- 0.6 KNO₃
- 1.6 10-4-8
- 0.5 20-8-15
- 2.7 0-8-6
- 0.9 gypsum
- 1.5 0-8-6

Lime may have reacted once an equilibrium pH is reached. Instead, it was found that a portion of the liming material remained unreacted in the medium after the equilibrium pH was reached. The residual lime fraction was found to have an important role in pH, Ca, and Mg buffering under acidic conditions (Argo and Biernbaum, 1996a, 1997b). It can be speculated that the ratio of reacted : residual lime contained in the medium depends on the reactivity of the liming material.

**Preplant fertilizers**

In general, unamended acidic peat-based root media do not contain sufficient nutrients for sustained plant growth (Bunt, 1988; Nelson, 1991). Current recommendations for the incorporation of fertilizers materials other than liming materials into a soilless root media before planting include sources of N, PO₄-P, K, Ca, Mg, SO₄-S, and trace elements (Table 1). These guidelines come from the early soilless container media recommendations, including the Cornell peat-lite media (Boodley and Sheldrake, 1972), the Pennsylvania State University media (White, 1974), Glasshouse Crops Research Institute media (Bunt, 1988), and floriculture textbooks (Nelson, 1991). The most commonly recommended macronutrient preplant fertilizers include Ca(NO₃)₂, KNO₃, superphosphate or triple superphosphate, and gypsum (Bunt, 1988; Nelson, 1991; Werncke and Krauskopf, 1983).

The N and K content of preplant fertilizers is small compared to the total amount applied to a crop. For example, Yelenich (1991) found that a minimum of 1.0 to 1.5 g mineral N/pot was required to produce a poinsettia in a 15- x 12-cm-wide (1.3-L) pot in 16 weeks. An initial incorporation of 0.17 kg mineral N/m² would supply 0.22 g mineral N to the 1.3-L pot, or 15% to 22% of the total N requirement. In comparison, Ca, Mg, PO₄-P, and SO₄-S content of the preplant fertilizers may represent a large percentage, in some cases up to 100%, of the total amount applied to the crop.

A number of studies have tested the persistence of preplant fertilizer in peat-based root media. Yeager and Barrett (1985) found that soilless media have a limited ability to retain PO₄-P against leaching. Biernbaum et al. (1995) demonstrated that all macronutrients (N, P, K, Ca, Mg, S) supplied from one blended preplant fertilizer leached very quickly from peat-based medium when placed in pots under mist irrigation. The rate of nutrient loss could be predicted by quantifying the volume of water leached from the pot. While there were minor differences in rate of loss between the individual nutrients, The concentration of all nutrients were below acceptable levels for plant growth by the time two container capacities were leached from the pot. Argo and Biernbaum (1996a, 1996b) concluded that the nutrients from preplant fertilizer (such as gypsum and 0-46-0) were soluble and easily leachable.

Fertilizer salt stratification within the pot also affects the availability of nutrients from preplant fertilizers. Fertilizer salt stratification within the pot is thought to be caused by evaporation from the root-medium surface (Argo and Biernbaum, 1994, 1995) or a water front moving into the root medium with each irrigation (Yelenich, 1995) and occurs with all methods of irrigation. Argo and Biernbaum (1994, 1995 1996a, 1996b) found that preplant fertilizer moved rapidly from the root zone (lower 2/3 of media in the pot) and into the top layer (top 2-cm of media in the pot) within a few days after planting. With flood subirrigation, the nutrients in the top layer were unavailable to the plant, and the salt concentration in the top layer continued to increase even when the nutrient levels in the root zone were below levels considered acceptable for growth (Argo and Biernbaum, 1994, 1995 1996a, 1996b). With top watering, the fertilizer salts contained in the top layer were found to gradually moved down into the root zone, buffering the
Table 2. Suggested minimum (Min) and maximum (Max) acceptable pH, electrical conductivity (EC), alkalinity, nutrient concentration and sodium adsorption ratio (SAR) for irrigation water used for greenhouse plant production. Units of measure are EC, dS·m⁻¹; alkalinity, mg CaCO₃/L; Ca, Mg, SO₄-S, Na, Cl, B, and F, mg L⁻¹.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>Min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pH</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alkalinity</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>160*</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ca</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mg</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO₄-S</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Na</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.75*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAR</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Not available

1 Suggested target values from water analysis. A broader range of acceptable values was also presented.
2 Fafard Analytical Services, Athens, Ga.
3 Suggested concentrations at which no nutritional problem should occur.
4 Scotts Analytical Services, Allentown, Pa.
5 Sun Gro Analytical Services, Warwick, N.Y.
6 Average suggested alkalinity concentration. The actual acceptable suggested alkalinity concentrations are dependent on the container size. With plugs (in mg CaCO₃/L), 40 to 80; while with 15-cm pots, 120 to 180.
7 Average suggested alkalinity concentration. The actual acceptable suggested alkalinity concentrations are dependent on the container size. With plugs (in mg CaCO₃/L), 40 to 120; bedding flats, 40 to 140; 10- to 12-cm pots and large bedding flats, 40 to 160; and 15-cm pots or larger, 60 to 200.
8 If plugs are grown, alkalinity values on the lower end of the range are suggested.
9 The concentration that can cause toxicity in certain crops may be much lower.

Irrigation-water sources

The IWS is often considered one of the most important factors in container plant production (Bailey, 1997; Biernbaum, 1994; Bunt, 1988; Lang, 1996; Nelson, 1991; Reed, 1997; Stryer, 1996; Stryer and Koranski, 1997). Recommendations for acceptable levels of pH, alkalinity, electrical conductivity (EC), and nutrients concentrations exist (Table 2). In general, factors used to characterize an IWS are alkalinity, Ca, Mg, SO₄-S, Na, Cl, B, and F concentrations and sodium adsorption ratio (SAR) (Argo et al., 1997a).

Several studies have been conducted to quantify the nutrient content of different sources of irrigation water in the United States. Based on 4300 samples, Argo et al. (1997a) found that the overall median water source in the United States had a pH of 7.1, an EC at 0.4 dS·m⁻¹; an alkalinity of 130 mg CaCO₃/L; (in mg L⁻¹) 40 Ca, 11 Mg, 8 SO₄-S, 13 Na, 14 Cl, 0.02 B, and <0.01 F; a Ca/Mg ratio of 3.2 and a SAR of 0.7. These values were also quantified for the 10 leading states in floriculture production. More limited studies that quantified IWS were conducted by Ludwig and Peterson (1984) (all nutrients) and Reddy et al. (1994) (only SO₄-S).

Different IWS require different types of management in order to maintain an acceptable pH in the root medium (Bunt, 1988; Nelson, 1991; Stryer and Koranski, 1997; Vetanovetz and Hulme, 1991). The suggest range for IWS pH and alkalinity is 5 to 7 and 40 to 100 mg CaCO₃/L, respectively. Argo et al. (1997a) suggest that IWS having pH and alkalinity levels outside these ranges are not detrimental to plant growth as long as the pH of the medium is maintained within an acceptable range. Argo and Biernbaum (1996a) demonstrated that IWS alkalinity, not pH, is the primary factor influencing medium pH management. Irrigation water containing large amounts of alkalinity (>250 mg CaCO₃/L) commonly are treated by adding strong mineral acid (HNO₃, H₂SO₄, or H₃PO₄). Researchers recommend adding sufficient acid to reduce the alkalinity to 40 to 120 mg CaCO₃/L (depending on the crop) or reduce the solution pH to 6.0 to 6.5 (Bunt, 1988; Nelson, 1991; Spurway and Wildon, 1938; Whipker et al., 1996). Alternative sources such as rainwater or reverse osmosis (RO) purified water are gaining popularity because of their low alkalinity (Biernbaum, 1992). However, rainwater and RO water contain minimal nutrients.

Water-soluble fertilizers

The type of WSF applied to a root medium affects pH and nutrient concentrations two ways: directly, by nutrients applied to the root medium, and indirectly, by acidification of the rhizosphere pH. Fertilization with NH₄-N causes the medium pH to decrease because of H⁺ secretion during root uptake and nitrification of the NH₄-N to the NO₃-N form, which also releases H⁺. In comparison, fertilization with NO₃⁻N causes the medium pH to increase because of OH⁻ or HCO₃⁻ secretion associated with balancing ion uptake (Barker and Mills, 1980; Bunt, 1988; Hawkes et al., 1985; Marschner, 1986; Nelson, 1991; Vetanovetz and Hulme, 1991).

Table 3 contains the analysis from several commercially available WSF. Many commercially available WSF contain a high percentage of NH₄-N and PO₄-P but little Mg and no Ca [examples: 21–7–7 Acid Special, 100% NH₄-N, 0.05% Mg, 0% Ca; 20–20–20 General Purpose, 72% NH₄-N, 0.05% Mg, 0% Ca; 20–10–20 Peatlite Special, 40% NH₄-N, 0.05% Mg, 0% Ca]. Because of the high NH₄-N content, the reaction produced by these WSF are acidic [21–7–7 = 0.78 kg acidity/kg, 20–20–20 = 0.30 kg acidity/kg, 20–10–20 = 0.21 kg acidity/kg]. In comparison, WSF that produce neutral or basic reactions in the root medium are typically low in NH₄-N and PO₄-P but high in Ca and NO₃-N and sometimes Mg (examples: 15–5–15, 20% NH₄-N, 3% Ca, 1% Mg, 0 kg acidity/kg; 15–5–15, 28% NH₄-N, 6% Ca, 3% Mg, 0.07 kg basicity/kg; 13–2–13 Plugcareplus,
5% NH₃-N, 6% Ca, 3% Mg, 0.19 kg basicity/kg; 15-0-15 Dark Weather Special, 13% NH₄-N, 11% Ca, 0.21 kg basicity/kg).

**Nutrient solution (NS)**

The NS is the combination of the IWS and WSF. The term NS should be used whenever discussing fertilization of any crop because whenever WSF is applied, it is in conjunction with an IWS, that also affects the pH and nutrient concentrations in the medium. For example, Argo and Biernbaum (1996a) found that the an acceptable medium pH of 6.0 could be maintained in the medium with a 50% NH₄-N WSF and a IWS alkalinity of 320 mg CaCO₃/L, a 25% NH₄-N WSF and a IWS alkalinity of 120 mg CaCO₃/L, or a 5% NH₄-N WSF and a IWS alkalinity of <20 mg CaCO₃/L. Thus the term acidic, neutral, or basic does not apply to the WSF because in each case, the overall reaction produced by the NS was neutral. Low levels of nutrient in the IWS (particularly Ca, Mg and SO₄-S) are often supplemented with WSF containing those nutrients. Argo and Biernbaum (1996a, 1997a) found that the Ca, Mg, and SO₄-S concentration measured in the root medium and shoot-tissue were better quantified by using the total concentration measured in the NS rather than discussing the concentration of those ions in the IWS or WSF separately.

**Species effects**

The plant may also affect pH management. With agronomic crops, some species are less susceptible to lime-induced iron chlorosis because of the plants ability to lower the rhizosphere pH through root exudation of H⁺ and organic acid (citrate, malate) when grown in calcareous soils (pH > 7.8). In comparison, species that do not lower the rhizosphere pH are much more susceptible to lime-induced iron chlorosis (Marschner, 1986). Among cultivars of the same species, there may be considerable differences in the susceptibility of lime-induced iron chlorosis because of differences in the cultivars ability to lower the rhizosphere pH (Ehlich and Fehr, 1981; Saxena and Sheldrake, 1980). It was not determined if crops that lowered the rhizosphere pH in high pH soils were more susceptible to Fe or Mn toxicity in acid soils.

In vegetable and ornamental plant production, much less is known of species or cultivar effects on medium pH and the resulting differences in nutrient uptake. In laboratory experiments on germinating seeds, Bailey et al. (1996) found that substrate pH varied from 4.5 with tomatoes (Lycopersicon esculentum Mill.) to 7.5 with zinnia (Zinnia elegans Jacq.) under the same conditions. In greenhouse experiments, Argo et al. (1997) found that the average root-medium pH of ten potted plant species given the same WSF (20N-4.3P-16.6K Peatlite Special [Scotts, Marysville, Ohio]) ranged from 5.1 with African violets (Saintpaulia ionantha Wendl.) to 6.5 with gerbera (Gerbera jamesonii H. Bolus ex Hook. f.). Argo (1996) found up to a 1.7 pH unit difference in the media of seven bedding plant species given the same WSF. In general, geraniums had the lowest medium pH while pansies and petunias had the highest medium pH.

**Interactive effects of multiple nutrient sources**

The factors discussed in this review (CEC, limiting materials, preplant fertilizer, NS, and plant species) interact to affect the nutrient supply initially and over time. However, these factors do not affect the nutrient supply simultaneously or with equal intensity. Argo (1996) proposed that the relative importance of the nutrient sources for pH buffering and calcium and magnesium nutrition in peat based media were: nutrient solution (IWS and WSF) > plant species > residual line > preplant fertilizers > root me-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3. Macronutrient information on commercially available water-soluble fertilizers.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elemental Analysis (%)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formula</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-7-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-10-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-10-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-45-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-15-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-2-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-30-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-19-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-5-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-20-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-30-20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- The potential reaction of the water-soluble fertilizer. The type of reaction is either acidic (A) or basic (B) and the strength of the reaction is given in kg of acidity or basictity per kg of fertilizer.
dia. This conclusion is based on a number of experiments testing the interactive effects of nutrient sources on pH and nutrient management in container grown crops.

With Ca nutrition as an example, Argo and Biernbaum (1996a, 1997a) demonstrated that there was a linear increase in the shoot-tissue Ca concentrations as the concentration of Ca in the nutrient solution (NS) (composed of both the IWS and WSF) increased from 20 to 210 mg L⁻¹ with hybrid impatians. Other ions contained in the NS (NH₄, NO₃, K, SO₄) did not appear to affect Ca. Argo (1996) found a linear increase in shoot-tissue Ca in eight other bedding plant species in addition to impatians. However, there were differences in the shoot-tissue Ca concentrations of the nine species. Given the same NS, impatians were found to contain the highest shoot-tissue Ca, while Nonstop begonia (Begonia ×tuberhybrida Voss), pansies, vinca, and wax begonias (Begonia ×semperflorens-cultorum Hort.) contained the lowest shoot-tissue Ca.

The lime that reacted initially to increase the medium’s pH was found to have a minimal effect on root-medium Ca concentrations (Argo and Biernbaum, 1996b). However, the residual lime did influence long-term Ca management. Both root-medium and shoot tissue Ca concentrations were increased when given an acidic NS containing low Ca and Mg. Reducing the acidity of the NS by reducing the NH₄-N content and increasing the alkalinity concentration in the IWS negated the residual lime as a Ca source (Argo and Biernbaum, 1996a, 1997a).

Preplant fertilizer other than lime (gypsum, triple superphosphate, Ca(NO₃)₂) did increase the initial Ca concentration in the medium. However, the Ca supplied with the preplant fertilizers was found to be very soluble and easily removed from the root zone because of leaching or salt stratification within the pot (Argo and Biernbaum, 1996b; Biernbaum et al., 1995). With subirrigation, the preplant fertilizers had no effect on root-zone nutrient concentrations for longer than one week (Argo and Biernbaum, 1996a, 1996b, 1997a). With top watering, nutrients contained in the top layer would probably buffer root-zone nutrient concentrations (Argo and Biernbaum, 1995). The duration of the buffering would depend on the amount of water leached from the pot.

Historically, root media has been the primary focus of nutrient management and buffering in container grown crops (Biernbaum, 1992; Bunt, 1988; Nelson, 1991; Stryer and Koranski, 1997). Argo and Biernbaum (1997a) found that root media CEC had minimal influence on both short term and long term Ca management. The Ca concentrations in the root medium and shoot tissue of plants grown in a 70% rockwool/30% perlite medium were similar to those of plants grown in a 70% highly degraded peat/30% perlite medium. However, root medium did influence lime incorporation rate which may affect the amount of residual lime remaining in a medium once the equilibrium pH was reached.

**Conclusion**

One key to successful plug transplant growing is pH and nutritional management (Stryer and Koranski, 1997). Optimizing the pH and nutritional management of container grown crops such as plugs requires an understanding of how a variety of factors interact to affect nutrient supply and uptake initially and over time. Changing one factor of a nutritional program requires a reevaluation of all other factors. For example, a new water source may require a reduction in the NH₄-N content of the WSF (which also may affect the Ca and Mg content).

The key to nutritional research is reproducibility. Because of the interactive effect of the various chemical properties, all aspects of nutritional management including media (components and percentages or manufacturer), lime (Ca and Mg content, grind size, incorporation rate, and manufacturer), IWS (pH, alkalinity, and nutrient concentration), WSF (macro- and micronutrient content, NH₄-N percentage, and nutrient salts) and plant species and cultivars should be included in the material and methods to allow for consistent and reproducible result.

Further study is needed to determine the effects that other components, such as vermiculite or bark, have on the pH and nutrient buffering capacity of a soilless root medium. Better quantification of the effects that different plant species have on pH and nutrient management is needed. Finally, little research has been done to characterize the reactivity of different liming materials and their effects on residual lime content or to quantify the acidic–basic reactions of various WSF and their effects on medium pH management. Future experiments should be performed with consideration of the interactive effects that many factors have on medium pH and nutrient management.
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