

Comparison of Main Sensor Types for Nitrate vs Phosphate Water Monitoring

Asretdinova L. J,

Teacher at the Department of Automatic Control and Computer Engineering, Turin
Polytechnic University in Tashkent

l.asretdinova@polito.uz

Usmonov M. M,

Teacher at the Department of Automatic Control and Computer Engineering, Turin
Polytechnic University in Tashkent

maksudjon.usmonov@polito.uz

Abstract—Real-time nutrient monitoring in surface water is increasingly important for understanding agricultural runoff, eutrophication risk, and regulatory compliance. Nitrate monitoring is more mature than phosphate monitoring because UV absorbance sensors can provide continuous, reagent-free measurements in the field, while phosphate monitoring still depends largely on wet-chemistry analyzers or surrogate models,. This paper compares the main sensor types used for nitrate and phosphate, highlighting operating principles, field performance, and deployment tradeoffs,.

Keywords—nitrate sensor, phosphate sensor, continuous nutrient monitoring, UV absorbance, wet chemistry, water quality.

I. INTRODUCTION

Excess nitrogen and phosphorus in surface water can drive algal blooms and ecosystem degradation, especially during storm-driven runoff events,. Continuous sensors capture the short-lived concentration changes that discrete grab samples often miss, improving load estimates and early warning capability. Nitrate is generally easier to monitor continuously than phosphate because mature optical sensors are available, while phosphate sensing in natural waters remains more challenging,.

II. MAIN SENSOR CLASSES

The main field sensor types are UV absorbance sensors, wet-chemistry/colorimetric analyzers, electrochemical sensors, and surrogate/model-based approaches. UV absorbance is strongest for nitrate, wet chemistry is strongest for phosphate, and electrochemical sensors are emerging but less field-proven.

Sensor type	Nitrate suitability	Phosphate suitability	Strengths	Limitations
UV absorbance	Strong ,	Weak	Reagent-free, continuous	Turbidity and organic matter interference
Wet chemistry analyzer	Moderate	Strong ,	High specificity	Reagents and maintenance
Electrochemical	Emerging	Emerging	Small size, multi-analyte potential	Fouling and stability
Surrogate model	Common	Common for total P	Low cost for trends	Site-specific calibration

III.NITRATE SENSORS

Nitrate is commonly monitored with UV absorbance sensors because nitrate has a strong optical signature at specific wavelengths, enabling continuous in situ measurements. These sensors are widely used for high-frequency river and stream monitoring. Miniaturized wet-chemistry analyzers provide an alternative for higher precision but require reagents and more maintenance.

IV. PHOSPHATE SENSORS

Phosphate monitoring is less mature because direct optical sensors are not as robust in natural waters, so wet-chemistry analyzers remain the primary choice for orthophosphate measurement,. Surrogate models that estimate total phosphorus from orthophosphate, turbidity, or fluorescence are also common when continuous phosphate data are not feasible. Electrochemical phosphate sensors show promise but require further development for long-term field reliability.

V. FIELD TRADEOFFS

Nitrate sensors excel in low-maintenance continuous monitoring, making them ideal for remote deployments,. Phosphate analyzers offer better accuracy but increase operational costs due to reagent handling and calibration needs,. In fouling-prone or turbid waters, both types benefit from auto-wipers and compensation algorithms, but phosphate systems usually demand more frequent servicing,.

VI. RECOMMENDED STRATEGY

For most surface-water programs, deploy a UV nitrate sensor with periodic lab phosphate validation or a dedicated phosphate analyzer at priority sites,. This balances cost, maintenance, and data quality while capturing key nutrient dynamics.

VII. CONCLUSION

Nitrate monitoring is more field-ready than phosphate monitoring because UV absorbance sensors are commercially mature and operationally simple,. Phosphate monitoring still relies on wet-chemistry or surrogate methods, which are more complex and costly,. Future advances in electrochemical and optical phosphate sensors could close this gap and enable fully continuous dual-nutrient monitoring.

REFERENCES

- [1]B. A. Pellerin *et al.*, "Use of continuous water-quality time-series data to compute total phosphorus loads," U.S. Geological Survey, Reston, VA, USA,

- Scientific Investigations Rep. 2024-5097, 2024. Available:
<https://pubs.usgs.gov/publication/sir20245097/full>
- [2] National Oceanography Centre, "Nitrate sensor," Southampton, U.K., 2025.
Available: <https://noc.ac.uk/technology/technology-development/nitrate-sensor>
- [3] Satlantic, "Water quality monitor," Halifax, NS, Canada. Available:
https://ctandc.co.jp/MBARI-ISUS%20presentation_new/Water%20Quality%20Monitor%20Satlantic.pdf
- [4] USGS, "Continuous monitoring of sediment and nutrients in the Illinois River," U.S. Geological Survey, Scientific Investigations Rep. 2015-5040, 2015.
Available: <https://pubs.usgs.gov/publication/sir20155040>
- [5] P. M. Bradley *et al.*, "Continuous instream monitoring of nutrients and sediment in response to storm events," *Scientific Reports*, vol. 7, 2017. Available:
<https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC5752339/>
- [6] Catchment Based Approach, "In situ nutrient monitoring," U.K., 2023.
Available: <https://catchmentbasedapproach.org/learn/in-situ-nutrient-monitoring/>
- [7] Endress+Hauser, "Nutrient analyzers and sensors for ammonium, nitrate and more," Reinach, Switzerland, 2025. Available:
<https://www.endress.com/en/field-instruments-overview/liquid-analysis-product-overview/nutrient-analyzers-sensors>
- [8] M. Altahan *et al.*, "Phosphate and nitrate electrochemical sensor based on a nanostructured platform," *ACS Omega*, vol. 9, no. 19, pp. 20948-20957, 2024.
Available: <https://pubs.acs.org/doi/10.1021/acsomega.4c00717>
- [9] K. Harnsoongnoen *et al.*, "Water quality assessment using a portable UV optical absorbance nitrate sensor," *Water SA*, vol. 47, no. 1, pp. 92-100, 2021. Available:
<https://www.watersa.net/article/view/9453>