


Initial biochar effects on plant productivity derive from N fertilization

by Jeffery, S., Memelink, I., Hodgson, E., Jones, S., van de Voorde, T.F.J., Bezemers, M., Mommer, L. and van Groenigen, J.W.

Copyright, Publisher and Additional Information: This is the author accepted manuscript. The final published version (version of record) is available online via Springer Please refer to any applicable terms of use of the publisher.

DOI: 10.1007/s11104-016-3171-z



Jeffery, S., Memelink, I., Hodgson, E., Jones, S., van de Voorde, T.F.J., Bezemers, M., Mommer, L. and van Groenigen, J.W. 2017. Initial biochar effects on plant productivity derive from N fertilization. *Plant and Soil*.

13 January 2017

Number of text pages: 27

Number of Tables: 2

Number of Figures: 5

Short running title: Biochar increases plant productivity by N fertilization

Corresponding Author:

Dr. Simon Jeffery

Crop and Environment Sciences Department

Newport

Shropshire

TF10 8NB

Email: sjeffery@harper-adams.ac.uk

Initial biochar effects on plant productivity derive from N fertilization

Simon Jeffery^{1*}, Ilse Memelink², Edward Hodgson³, Sian Jones³, Tess F.J. van de Voorde⁴, T. Martijn Bezemer^{5,6}, Liesje Mommer⁴, Jan Willem van Groenigen².

1 Department of Crop and Environment Sciences, Harper Adams University, Newport, TF10 8NB, United Kingdom.

2 Department of Soil Quality, Wageningen University, Wageningen, 6700AA, The Netherlands.

3 Low Carbon Energy and Environment Network, Institute of Biological Environmental and Rural Sciences, Aberystwyth University, Gogerddan, Aberystwyth, Ceredigion, SY23 3EB, Wales.

4 Plant Ecology and Nature Conservation Group, Wageningen University, P.O. Box 47, 6700AA Wageningen, The Netherlands .

5 Department of Terrestrial Ecology, Netherlands Institute of Ecology (NIOO-KNAW), P.O. Box 50, 6700AB Wageningen, The Netherlands.

6 Institute of Biology, Section Plant Ecology and Phytochemistry, Leiden University, PO Box 9505, 2300 RA Leiden, The Netherlands.

Key words:

Pyrolysis; Organic amendment; Stable isotopes; C dynamics; N immobilisation; greenhouse gases

1 Abstract

2 *Background and Aim* Biochar application to soil is widely claimed to increase plant productivity.
3 However, the underlying mechanisms are still not conclusively described. Here, we aim to elucidate
4 these mechanisms using stable isotope probing.

5 *Methods* We conducted two experiments with uniquely double-labelled (^{15}N and ^{13}C) biochar and its
6 feedstock (residue), applied separately at 15 Mg ha^{-1} . Both experiments contained three treatments:
7 biochar amendment (Biochar), unpyrolysed residue amendment (Residue) and a no addition control
8 (Control). Experiment I was a 119 day pot experiment seeded with *Lolium perenne*. Experiment II was
9 a 71 day incubation experiment without plants in which CO_2 and N_2O fluxes were measured.

10 *Results* Both Biochar and Residue significantly increased aboveground productivity compared to
11 Control (140 % and 160 %, respectively). Initial N immobilisation was stimulated in Residue, whereas
12 not in Biochar. $^{13}\text{C}\text{-CO}_2$ analysis confirmed that biochar was significantly more recalcitrant than
13 residue. ^{15}N analysis showed that 2 % and 0.3 % of grass N was derived from the amended material in
14 Residue and Biochar, respectively.

15 *Conclusions* Our results suggest that biochar-induced yield increases derive from a combination of
16 reduced N immobilization and a moderate N fertilization effect. Although in the short term biochar
17 might offer benefits compared to residue incorporation, it is unlikely that biochar yield gains will be
18 sustainable for the decades to centuries that biochar C can be expected to reside in soil.

19

20 Introduction

21 Interest in biochar has grown considerably since the term was first coined in 2000 (Karaosmanoğlu et
22 al. 2000) and subsequently recognized as a soil conditioner (Lehmann et al. 2006). Biochar is
23 produced through the heating of biomass (feedstock) to temperatures generally exceeding 350 °C, in
24 low to zero oxygen environments (Shackley et al. 2013). It has been repeatedly demonstrated that
25 biochar application to soil can bring benefits in terms of crop yield increases (Jeffery et al. 2011; Liu
26 et al. 2013; Jeffery et al. 2015a). Other studies have shown that it can reduce greenhouse gas (GHG)
27 emissions (Cayuela et al. 2014; Maestrini et al. 2014; Sagrilo et al. 2015), and increase carbon (C)
28 storage in soils (Gurwick et al. 2013), thereby potentially mitigating climate change (Woolf et al.
29 2010). However, negative effects have also been reported (Mukherjee and Lal 2014), including
30 negative effects on crop yields (Singla et al. 2014; Nelissen et al. 2015).

31 Despite the growing body of research, the mechanisms behind observed effects following biochar
32 application to soil remain poorly understood. This is largely due to a lack of appropriate experimental
33 controls, as well as the systems-level research approach generally adopted (Jeffery et al. 2015b). A
34 mechanistic understanding of biochar impacts is vital to allow effective predictions regarding biochar
35 soil amendment and its consequences for soil-based ecosystem services including crop productivity.
36 This will aid maximisation of the potential benefits of biochar application to soil while concurrently
37 minimising trade-offs (Crombie et al. 2015; Jeffery et al. 2015b)

38 One potential mechanism underlying crop yield increases following biochar application is a
39 fertilization effect. This has been shown for potassium (K) which is present in the ash component of
40 biochar (Mia et al. 2014; Oram et al. 2014). Besides providing nutrients, biochar may also affect
41 nutrient cycling and leaching of nutrients in indirect ways (Spokas et al. 2012; Clough et al. 2013).
42 Two extensive reviews on the effects of biochar application to soil on N dynamics (Clough et al. 2013;
43 Cayuela et al. 2014) suggest that one of the main mechanisms is adsorption leading to reduced N

44 leaching. This is particularly true for high temperature (>600 °C) biochars and for NO₃. Conversely,
45 NH₄⁺ retention appears more dependent on the type of feedstock than on pyrolysis temperature
46 (Karaosmanoğlu et al. 2000). Biochar has also been shown to interact with denitrification through its
47 function as an electron shuttle during redox reactions (Cayuela et al. 2013).

48 Few studies have aimed to investigate the bioavailability of N from biochars beyond quantifying
49 hydrolysable organic N (Clough et al. 2013). Meta-analyses have not found significant differences in
50 yield effects with biochar applied alone or in combinations with fertilizers, either organic or inorganic
51 (Jeffery et al. 2011; Liu et al. 2013). On an individual study level there is some evidence that biochar
52 application to soil can decrease the apparent nitrogen recovery (ANR) of plants (Nelissen et al. 2015).
53 The suggested mechanism for this effect was N immobilisation. However, this effect is dependent on
54 pyrolysis conditions and type of feedstock, as they lead to different propensities for labile
55 compounds to remain on the surface of biochar particles post production (Cornelissen et al. 2005).
56 The application of stable isotope ¹⁵N probing provides a means of quantifying the relative and
57 absolute uptake of N from materials amended to soil (Bedard-Haughn et al. 2003), such as biochar,
58 and so quantifying bioavailability of this key plant nutrient.

59 Besides interactions with mineral N, biochar application to soil has also been shown to interact with
60 soil organic matter (SOM). These interactions include accelerated turnover of SOM (i.e. positive
61 priming; Wardle et al. 1999), reduced turnover of SOM (i.e. negative priming; Zimmerman et al.
62 2010) and no effect (Sagrilo et al. 2015). The application of ¹³C labelled biochar can provide insights
63 into the contribution of C pools to CO₂ fluxes as well as into immobilization / decomposition effects
64 related to N availability (Boschker et al. 1998). Further, through combination with ¹³C phospholipid
65 fatty acid (PLFA) analysis, the main microbial groups able to utilise substrates can be identified,
66 potentially providing insights into microbial-based mechanisms (Boschker et al. 1998).

67 Here, we utilise a double-labelled (^{13}C and ^{15}N) biochar and its feedstock to investigate the effects of
68 biochar application to soil on N availability and relate C and GHG dynamics. Work conducted here
69 was focussed on grasslands, which have been largely overlooked in biochar research despite
70 suggestions that application to grassland will be required to maximise the GHG offsetting capabilities
71 of biochar (Woolf et al. 2010). Through the use of unpyrolysed feedstock as a positive control we aim
72 to elucidate biochar effects *per se*, i.e. those that are beyond what would have been observed with
73 the application of the feedstock alone. To do so we will test the hypothesis that plant productivity
74 increases following biochar application to soil derive from a fertility effect. If accepted, this suggests
75 that yield effects may not last for as long as the residence time of C in soil, often estimated to be in
76 the range of decades to centuries (Lehmann et al. 2006). Rather, they will last until available
77 nutrients are utilised and become limiting locally once more.

78

79 **Materials and Methods**

80 This project was focussed on grasslands and so grassland species were used both for the feedstock
81 and for the plants grown. *Plantago lanceolate* is a common plant in grasslands and is fast growing
82 with broad leaves meaning it produces biomass relatively quickly. It was also applied in unpyrolysed
83 form as a positive control (hereafter Residue). The feedstock was isotopically enriched with ^{13}C and
84 ^{15}N as described below. These materials were used in two experiments that used the same
85 homogenised soil: a greenhouse experiment with *Lolium perenne* grown in pots (Experiment I) and
86 an incubation experiment without plants in a climate controlled room to quantify GHG fluxes
87 (Experiment II).

88 ***Isotopically labelling biomass***

89 Biomass (*Plantago lanceolata*) was grown in a growth chamber in a vermiculite substrate. Key
90 characteristics can be found in Table 1. During the growth period it was pulse-labelled with $^{13}\text{C}\text{-CO}_2$,
91 following the method of Bromand et al. (2001). Biomass was labelled with ^{15}N through fertilization
92 with $\text{Ca}(^{15}\text{NO}_3)_2$ added to a fertilizer solution applied to the vermiculite daily to achieve an
93 enrichment approx. 58 % atom. Aboveground biomass of *Plantago lanceolata* was harvested twice,
94 at pre-flowering stage. This was done to ensure only leaves were included and no stems or flowers,
95 thereby reducing the heterogeneity of the feedstock. Harvests were performed by cutting plants
96 back to approx. 2 cm above the surface of the vermiculite, after 5 weeks for the first harvest and 7
97 weeks for the second. After harvest, biomass was oven-dried at 60 °C for 24 hours. The dried
98 biomass of both harvests was ground to 2 mm, combined and mixed. A sub-sample of approximately
99 70 % of the biomass was pyrolysed to produce biochar (pyrolysis under N_2 , max temp 400 °C,
100 residence time 30 min; Aberystwyth University, Wales). The remaining 30 % of the biomass was used
101 for the Residue treatments described below. Analyses of biochar and residue from which it was
102 produced were performed using a Pyris 1 thermogravimetric analyser (TGA) (Perkin–Elmer,
103 Massachusetts, USA; Hodgson et al. 2011). In short, samples were pyrolysed under nitrogen at a flow
104 rate of 20 mL min⁻¹ using the following temperature program: Heated from 40 to 105 °C at 10
105 °C min⁻¹; held at 105 °C for 10 min; heated from 105 to 905 °C at 10, 25, and 100 °C min⁻¹; held at 905
106 °C for 15 min; cooled from 905 to 105 °C at 25 °C min⁻¹. A proximate analysis was performed on the
107 TGA data to calculate the relative proportions volatiles, fixed carbon and ash (wt. %). Volatiles were
108 calculated from mass loss occurring between 105 and 550 °C, fixed carbon from 550 °C to 900 °C and
109 ash as the remaining material after heating. An elemental analysis was used for analysis of H:C_{org}
110 which is reported as a molar mass ratio.

111 For the C:N ratio, ^{13}C and ^{15}N content analysis, three replicates (2 mg) of both residue and biochar
112 were placed into individual tin capsules and analysed using a PDZ Europa ANCA-GSL elemental
113 analyser interfaced to a PDZ Europa 20-20 isotope ratio mass spectrometer (Sercon Ltd.; Cheshire,

114 UK) at The Stable Isotope Facility of UC Davis, USA. Key characteristics of both the residue and the
115 biochar can be found in Table 1.

116 ***Soil***

117 Topsoil (top 10 cm) was collected from a nature restoration grassland area on the Veluwe, in
118 Gelderland, Netherlands (52.059826N, 5.751354E) on 11th March 2014. The site is located on an ice
119 pushed ridge formed during the Saalien Ice Age. The soil is characterised as a “holtpodzol” on coarse
120 sand (gY30; Stiboka, 1975: map 40 W). The area was used as arable field until 1995 and had last been
121 used to grow maize in 1995. Previous to that cropping had included cycles of sugar beet, potatoes
122 and oats. Collected soil was sieved to pass 4 mm and thoroughly mixed to ensure homogenisation.
123 After homogenisation the soil was split into two parts to be used for Experiments I and II. Soil
124 characteristics were determined in Mia et al. (2014) and Oram et al. (2014). Further information on
125 methods for soil analysis can be found in those studies. Key soil characteristics are presented in Table
126 2.

127 ***Experiment I – Plant growth***

128 Soil for each treatment was amended with biochar and residue each at a rate equivalent to 15 t ha⁻¹,
129 incorporated into the top 10 cm of soil produced with five replicates. Soil was packed into 9.5 cm
130 diameter 0.5 L polypropylene pots (505 g dry weight (dw) of soil, packed to a dry bulk density of 1.2 g
131 cm⁻³). The control consisted of unamended soil packed to the same bulk density. A 1-cm deep layer
132 consisting of 94 g of soil (i.e. without biochar or feedstock) was added to the surface of pots to
133 function as a germination layer as biochar has previously been shown to occasionally inhibit
134 germination. All treatments were replicated five times, totalling 15 pots, set up in a completely
135 randomised design. The experiment was performed in a greenhouse (average 60 % relative humidity;
136 average temperature 21 °C) of Wageningen University, The Netherlands.

137 In each pot, 10 wild type *Lolium perenne* (diploid) seeds were sown at a seeding rate equivalent to 27
138 kg ha⁻¹. Owing to reduced germination in some pots, pots were reseeded after a week in order to
139 achieve 10 plants per pot.

140 After germination, pots were fertilized at rates equivalent to 30 kg P ha⁻¹ and 140 kg K ha⁻¹ (KH₂PO₄
141 and K₂SO₄). Applications of fertilizer were spread over four days to minimise the risk of burning the
142 seedlings. No N fertilizer was added to any of the pots. Water was added following fertilisation to
143 bring all the pots to 60 % water-filled pore space (WFPS) and to ensure that the fertilizer moved
144 deeper into the soil. The pots were then watered daily and maintained gravimetrically at 60 % WFPS.

145 Aboveground biomass was harvested at Day 35 by cutting the plants back to approximately 2 cm
146 above the soil surface. The second, third and fourth harvest of biomass were respectively on Day 63,
147 91 and 119. Biomass was oven dried at 60 °C for at least 48 h and weighed. Subsequently, all biomass
148 from each pot was combined, ground and ball milled. A representative subsample (approx. 2 mg) of
149 aboveground biomass was then isotopically analysed for ¹³C and ¹⁵N content as described below.
150 Belowground biomass was collected by washing roots over a 2 mm sieve to remove soil particles.
151 Roots were then oven-dried and weighed as described above.

152 ***Experiment II – Soil gas fluxes***

153 Experiment II consisted of the same three treatments as Experiment I but without plants. Pots
154 (polypropylene 0.5 L – 6.6 cm diameter) were packed with 200 g soil dry weight (dw) to a dry bulk
155 density of 1.2 g cm⁻³. All treatments were replicated 5 times, totalling 15 pots. The pots were placed
156 on a table in a completely randomized design in a climate-controlled room at 20 °C and maintained
157 at 60 % WFPS.

158 On days 1, 2, 5, 8, 16, 22, 29, 36, 43, 50, 57, 64, and 71, CO₂ and N₂O gas samples were taken and
159 fluxes were measured. This was done one hour after closing the pot with a lid containing two septa.

160 Two separate gas samples (7 ml each) were taken with a syringe and injected into pre-evacuated
161 4.5ml borosilicate vials for analysis of ^{13}C - CO_2 and ^{15}N - N_2O content. Soil gas fluxes were then
162 quantified following a standard procedure with photoacoustic gas monitor (Brüel & Kjær, Monitor
163 Type 1302; Nærum, Denmark; Velthof et al. 2002). Daily fluxes (ppm) were converted to $\text{mg CO}_2\text{-C h}^{-1}$
164 m^{-2} and $\mu\text{g N}_2\text{O-N h}^{-1} \text{m}^{-2}$ and to cumulative fluxes in $\text{g CO}_2\text{-C m}^{-2}$ and $\text{mg N}_2\text{O-N m}^{-2}$ assuming linearity
165 of flux rate between each measurement day.

166 ***Stable Isotope analyses***

167 All isotope analyses were performed at The Stable Isotope Facility of University California, Davis. The
168 ^{13}C content analyses were performed using a ThermoScientific PreCon-GasBench system interfaced
169 to a ThermoScientific Delta V Plus isotope ratio mass spectrometer (ThermoScientific, Bremen,
170 Germany). The ^{15}N content analyses were performed using a ThermoFinnigan GasBench + PreCon
171 trace gas concentration system interfaced to a ThermoScientific Delta V Plus isotope-ratio mass
172 spectrometer (Bremen, Germany). Percentage C and N derived from the biochar and feedstock were
173 calculated using ^{13}C and ^{15}N gas values and applying the equation of Bedard-Haughn et al. (2003).
174 These percentage values were then used to calculate the $\text{g CO}_2\text{-C m}^{-2}$ and $\text{mg N}_2\text{O-N m}^{-2}$, as a
175 proportion of the total flux, derived from the Biochar and Residue.

176 On Day 71, the soil from each pot was sieved to pass 4 mm, homogenised by thorough mixing and
177 split into sub-samples for analysis. A representative subsample (50 mg) of the soil was analysed (^{13}C
178 and ^{15}N content) as described below. The pH and EC was determined after shaking each sample (5 g)
179 for 1 h with demi-water (1:5 w/v).

180 ***Microbial biomass ^{15}N***

181 Determination of microbial biomass N (MBN) was undertaken via an extension of the chloroform
182 fumigation extraction (Vance et al. 1996). In short, soil (20 g) was shaken for 1 hour with 80 ml 0.5 M

183 KCl following 24 hours of fumigation. After shaking, extracts were filtered to pass 0.45 μm . The
184 difference in total soluble N content (TSN) between the fumigated and non-fumigated soil in the KCl
185 extract was used to calculate the MBN. Microdiffusion was used to quantify the ^{15}N content of MBN
186 (Stark and Hart 1996) through the analysis of ^{15}N that was obtained on the filter. Each glass
187 microfiber filter used for the microdiffusion was put in tin capsules and analysed for ^{15}N content as
188 described above.

189 ^{13}C PLFA

190 The phospholipid fatty acid (PLFA) extraction and analysis as outlined by Bligh and Dyer (1959) and
191 extended upon by Zelles (1999) was utilised to determine microbial community level phenotypes.
192 Extractions were performed using 5-g aliquots of soil for each sample. Extracted PLFAs were analysed
193 by gas chromatography using an HP 5 column on a G2070AA Chemstation, Model 6890N, gas
194 chromatography appliance (Agilent Technologies, Santa Clara, California, USA). Peaks were compared
195 with known retention times on the basis of a Supelco 26 peak standard to identify individual PLFAs
196 (Sigma-Aldrich Ltd, Poole, Dorset, UK). The fungal:bacterial ratio was calculated using 18:2 ω 6 (fungal
197 biomarker) divided by the summed % mol of biomarkers i15:0, ai15:0, 15:0, i16:0, 16:1 ω 7t, i17:0,
198 ai17:0, 17:0, 18:1 ω 7 and cy19:0 as an expression of total bacterial abundance (Frostegård & Bååth,
199 1996). $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ values were measured on a Finnigan Delta-S gas chromatograph–isotope ratio monitoring
200 mass spectrometer (GC-IRMS) as described in Boschker (2004). The increase in $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ values of PLFAs
201 in the treatments compared to the control indicates microbial uptake of labelled C from the
202 amended material.

203 **Data analysis**

204 For statistical analyses, SPSS Statistics 19 (IBM) was used with the exception of Principal Component
205 Analysis used to analyse PLFA profiles, which was performed using R Studio (version 0.99.903) with
206 the Vegan package. The effects of the treatments (Biochar, Reside and Control) on cumulative fluxes

207 of CO₂ and N₂O, the ¹³C and ¹⁵N content, pH and EC of the incubation soil, N content of the incubation
208 soil and the microbial biomass N were compared using a one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA).
209 Individual comparisons were performed using a Tukey's HSD *post hoc* test. The effects of the
210 treatments on plant performance and ¹³C and ¹⁵N uptake by plants were compared using ANCOVA
211 with the number of plants per pot included as a covariate. The treatment effects on daily CO₂ and
212 N₂O fluxes and the ¹³C and ¹⁵N content were tested with a repeated measures ANOVA.

213 **Results**

214 ***Experiment 1: Plant growth***

215 Despite the germination layer an average of 5.3 (S.E. 1.16), 5.2 (S.E. 1.2) and 8.4 (S.E. 0.68) plants
216 germinated in Biochar, Residue and Control, respectively. Aboveground biomass production of *L.*
217 *perenne* (dry weight) was significantly reduced by 89 % in the first harvest of Residue compared to
218 Control (Fig. 1). However, biomass production in Residue was significantly higher than Control over
219 the next three harvests. On average, biomass production was approx. 40 % and approx. 60 % higher
220 than Control for Biochar and Residue, (P = 0.001 and P = 0.01, resp.). Belowground biomass increased
221 significantly in Biochar by 115 % compared to Control; no significant difference was observed in
222 belowground biomass production in Residue compared to Control. (Fig. 1). Differences in the
223 shoot:root ratio between treatments were close to significant (P = 0.064).

224 Significant differences in N uptake were observed between Biochar and Residue (P < 0.001). Overall,
225 more N was taken up by plants from the amended material in Residue than in Biochar (Fig. 2 a & b). At
226 first harvest, significantly more N was taken up from the amended material in Biochar than in
227 Residue in absolute terms (P < 0.001; Figure 2a). However, as a proportion of total N taken up over
228 all harvests, significantly more plant N was derived from the amended material in Residue than in
229 Biochar (P<0.001; Fig. 2b). After the first harvest, approximately 2 to 2.5 % of N taken up by plants in

230 Residue was derived from the amended material. For Biochar, this was less than 0.5 % for all harvests
231 (Figure 2b). After four harvests, biochar N accounted for approx. 0.4 % of total plant N whereas for
232 residue N this was approx. 2 %.

233 ***Experiment 2: Soil gas fluxes***

234 Cumulative N₂O fluxes from Biochar did not vary significantly from Control throughout the timeframe
235 of the experiment (P = 0.9; Fig. 3a). Residue resulted in a significantly greater release of N₂O than
236 either Control or Biochar up to Day 5 (P < 0.001; Figure 3a). The N₂O flux from Residue was reduced
237 greatly after this initial flush but increased again at Day 64 until the end of the experiment.

238 After 71 days, at the end of the incubation experiment, approximately 0.3 % of amended N had been
239 lost as N₂O from the amendment in Residue, compared to 0.05 % from Biochar (Fig. 3). N-loss from
240 the amended material in Biochar as N₂O was significantly lower than from Residue (P < 0.01)
241 suggesting decreased availability of N from biochar than residue. However, N₂O did not represent a
242 significant source of N loss from either experimental treatment.

243 % %By Day 2, significantly higher cumulative CO₂ fluxes were measured in Residue compared to
244 Biochar and Control (P = 0.001); this difference increased throughout the incubation period. There
245 was no significant difference in total cumulative fluxes between Biochar and Control (P = 0.96; Fig.
246 3b). Significantly more C was lost from Residue by Day 5 (Fig 3d; P = 0.008); by the end of the
247 experiment approx. 20 % of the applied C was lost from Residue as CO₂ compared to approx. 2 % loss
248 from Biochar (Fig. 3d). However, the rate of C loss from biochar reduced greatly after the initial flush.

249 By the end of the experiment, microbial biomass nitrogen (MBN) was four times higher in Residue
250 than in Biochar or Control (P < 0.001; Fig. 4a). There was no significant difference in MBN between
251 Biochar and Control (P = 0.78; Fig. 4a). Stable isotope analysis showed that for the Residue treatment

252 approximately 25 % of total MBN was derived from the amended material, while this was only
253 approximately 0.3 % for the Biochar treatment (Fig. 4a).

254 The CO₂-C derived from SOM did not differ significantly from Control in either treatment (P > 0.05;
255 Fig. 4b). However, significantly more CO₂-C was derived from the amended material in Residue than
256 Biochar (56 % compared to 39 %; P<0.001; Fig. 4b). Further, significantly more C was mineralised
257 from SOM in Residue than Biochar (Fig. 4b; P = 0.03) showing that both C pools had increased
258 turnover in Residue.

259 PLFA profile analysis of the community level microbial phenotype showed strong discrimination
260 between Residue compared to Biochar and Control where little discrimination was evident (Fig. 5a).
261 Discrimination between treatments occurred mainly in PC1, which accounted for 86 % of variation.
262 The PLFAs most responsible for the observed discrimination between treatments were C16:0
263 (general biomarker for microbial biomass), C18:2 ω 6c and C18:1 ω 9c /2 ω 6t/3 ω (saprotrophic fungal
264 biomarkers – note that with the methodology used it was not possible to discriminate between these
265 PLFAs; Fig 5b). The bacterial: fungal ratios were significantly lower in Control (0.03) and Biochar
266 (0.04) compared to Residue (0.3) (P < 0.01).

267 The stable isotope enrichment increased significantly from -30.4‰, -32.1‰ and -29.4‰ in Control to
268 8.3‰, 5.5‰ and -0.5‰ in Biochar and 140‰, 87.8‰ and 154.4‰ in Residue for the PLFAs C16:0,
269 C18:2 ω 6c and C18:1 ω 9c/2 ω 6t/3 ω respectively (Figure 5c; P < 0.01).

270 **Discussion**

271 The increased plant productivity following soil biochar amendment that we found in this study is in
272 agreement with previous studies (Jeffery et al.2011; Spokas et al. 2012; Liu et al. 2013). However, the
273 use of stable isotope probing allows us to investigate the mechanisms underlying this effect, rather
274 than reporting results at the systems level. Previous biochar studies using soil from the same site

275 showed that micronutrients in the soil used were not limiting (Oram et al. 2014; van de Voorde et al.
276 2014). In the present study, soils were fertilized with K and P to ensure that only N would be limiting
277 (Table 2). Total plant production in Biochar and Residue was significantly higher than Control.
278 Concurrently, stable isotope analysis demonstrated uptake of N from both Residue and Biochar.
279 Therefore, the data support the hypothesis that observed differences in biomass production resulted
280 from an N fertilisation from the amendment in the Biochar and Residue treatments. Plant N uptake
281 from the amended material Residue was 7.6 times higher than in Biochar. Differences in biomass
282 production were less apparent. Once N limitation has been alleviated, diminishing returns are
283 expected from further increased N availability (Tillman et al. 2002). This effect was reflected in the
284 biomass data.

285 Increased root growth was noted in Biochar compared to Residue and Control (Fig. 1). It has
286 previously been reported that plants grown in biochar-amended soils can have increased
287 “rhizosphere zones” compared to controls (Prendergast-Miller et al. 2014). During harvest, we noted
288 that the rhizosphere contained more biochar particles than the bulk soil suggesting that roots may
289 prefer soil containing biochar particles. This may have consequences beyond investigated effects in
290 this experiment. For example, increased rooting may help alleviate the impact of drought as well as
291 aiding nutrient acquisition beyond those included in the amended material. The trigger that led to
292 increased root growth in the presence of biochar remains unclear and a necessary area for further
293 research.

294 The same amendment application rate was used for Biochar and Residue. As they each contained
295 very similar levels of N (Table 2), similar rates of N were applied to both treatments. However, the
296 C:N of the applied materials differed significantly. It is not yet clear how the C:N stoichiometry
297 interacts with soil processes as it is likely the quality of the C that is important rather than the
298 quantity. In the Residue treatment more than four times as much N was taken up from the
299 amendment than in the Biochar treatment showing enhanced ANR from the amended material in

300 Residue than Biochar. However, initial N immobilisation reduced ANR significantly at the first harvest
301 in Residue. Such immobilisation was not observed in Biochar where ANR was shown to be highest at
302 first harvest (Fig 2a and b) where it then decreased and remained at a consistent level thereafter.
303 Biochar could have been expected to stimulate N immobilisation more than residue when
304 considering only the C:N ratios alone. That this did not occur provides evidence that the C:N ratio of
305 biochar is likely not an effective predictor as to whether that biochar will immobilise N when applied
306 to soil.

307 There are few data on the availability of N from biochar (Clough et al. 2013; Cayuela et al. 2014).
308 Studies that have investigated N dynamics following biochar application have typically focused on co-
309 application of N fertilizer (Spokas et al. 2012; Zheng et al. 2012; Clough et al. 2013), N retention
310 effects of biochar (Spokas et al. 2012; Zheng et al. 2012), or N₂O flux effects (Zheng et al. 2012;
311 Clough et al. 2013). However, no other study to date has quantitatively analysed the bioavailability of
312 N from biochar itself. Our study shows that pyrolysis reduced availability of N for plant uptake in
313 Biochar by >700 % compared to Residue, but that a significant proportion of N remained bioavailable
314 (or mineralisable to available forms). Reduced N bioavailability led to decreased plant productivity in
315 Biochar compared to Residue, while still being greater than Control. Plant biomass productivity was
316 lowest in Control due to N limitation as it received no amendment (i.e. no input of N).

317 The significant decrease in plant biomass in Residue compared to Biochar and Control at the first
318 harvest suggests N immobilisation. This was likely a consequence of the addition of the relatively
319 large amounts of labile C added to this treatment (i.e. plant residue) as reflected in the CO₂ emission
320 rate (Fig. 3). This is also reflected in the fact that very little N was taken up by plants from the
321 amendment in Residue by the first harvest, and that microbial biomass N was significantly larger in
322 the Residue treatment. Isotopic analysis showed that 0.3 % of MBN was derived from the
323 amendment Biochar, compared to 22.5 % in Residue. This agrees with previous work that found little
324 effect of biochar on MBN in contrast to wheat straw (Zhang et al. 2014). This was likely due to the

325 application of labile C (i.e. plant material) provided substrate that functioned as an energy source
326 allowing microbes to scavenge for N from SOM through nitrogen-mining (Craine et al. 2007).

327 There was a significant increase in N₂O production from Residue for the first 5 days of the incubation
328 experiment indicative of increased microbial N cycling in this period. After this time, N₂O fluxes
329 decreased greatly suggesting that readily available N in the soil was immobilised in the microbial
330 community, or denitrification increased due to depletion of O₂ within soil pores driven by respiration
331 of labile C as. By the end of the incubation there was no significant difference in cumulative N₂O
332 emissions between treatments. This result contrasts with numerous studies which have reported a
333 significant decrease (Cayuela et al. 2014; Case et al. 2015), or increase (Clough et al. 2010; Sánchez-
334 García et al. 2014) in N₂O fluxes following biochar application to soil. However, other studies have
335 also reported no effect on N₂O emissions (Suddick et al. 2013), or different effects from the same
336 biochar applied to different soils (Yoo et al. 2012). These contrasting findings emphasise that
337 generalisation of the effects of biochar should be taken with great care and that the results may
338 depend greatly on characteristics of the biochar and soil used. It should be noted that we used a
339 coarse soil (Table 2) and as such our results may differ from experiments that used a fine soils.

340 Utilisation of ¹³C isotopes allowed proportional attribution of CO₂ flux to the different carbon pools in
341 biochar and SOM (Boschker et al. 1998). ¹³C analysis confirmed that a portion of emitted CO₂ was
342 derived from biochar and that the biochar therefore contained a labile component. However, data
343 presented here demonstrate that the C in the biochar was, on the whole, significantly more
344 recalcitrant than the unpyrolysed feedstock with >3 % of amended C lost from Biochar over the
345 course of the experiment compared to 19 % of amended C lost from Residue. We found no evidence
346 of priming of SOM by addition of Biochar and Residue compared to the control. However,
347 mineralisation rates of SOM differed between the Biochar and Residue treatments. This means that
348 while no priming of SOM occurred compared to the control situation with no addition, differential
349 interactions with SOM in terms of priming effects were observed following the application of Biochar

350 versus Residue. This was likely due to the increased microbial biomass (as suggested by the increased
351 MBN in Residue; Fig. 4a) which is generally correlated with increased decomposition of soil organic
352 matter (Balota et al. 2003; Lee et al. 2003). The decay constant (k) of SOM are usually imperfect
353 representations of first order kinetics (Paul et al. 1996). As such linear extrapolation cannot be
354 undertaken with confidence but the evidence suggests the residence time of the biochar C would be
355 at least an order of magnitude greater than that of residue C.

356 Biochar application to soil has been shown to stimulate mycorrhizal fungi and their colonisation of
357 plant roots (Warnock et al. 2007). We quantified microbial community effects through phenotypic
358 fingerprinting using ^{13}C PLFA. While PLFA discriminated between the microbial community in Residue
359 compared to Biochar and Control, no strong discrimination between biochar and control was
360 observed. The PLFA 16:1 ω 5 considered a biomarker for mycorrhizal fungi (Olsson 1995) did not vary
361 significantly between treatments suggesting that, at least in our study, observed yield effects should
362 not be attributed to increased mycorrhizal fungi as has been posited previously (Warnock et al.
363 2007). However, the plant used in this experiment, *Lolium perenne*, forms a dense rooting system
364 that may not be conducive to mycorrhizal colonisation. Further, the soil is relatively high in P (Table
365 2), and was fertilised with soluble P, which tends to reduce mycorrhization. As such, different results
366 may have been observed if different plants or different fertilisation regimes were used. The PLFA
367 C16:0, considered a general microbial biomass marker (Bossio et al. 1998) and C18:1 ω 9c/2 ω 6t/3 ω
368 and C18:2 ω 6, all considered saprotrophic fungal biomarkers (Frostegård et al. 1996; von Rein et al.
369 2016), contributed most to the discrimination observed between treatments. The $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ of these PLFAs
370 all increased significantly from Control to Biochar to Residue. This further confirms that some of the
371 C in the biochar was labile and so available for microbial utilisation and incorporation into microbial
372 cell membranes. However, considerably more C was incorporated into microbial cell membranes
373 (and likely microbial cells in general) in Residue, as confirmed by the greatly increased $\delta^{13}\text{C}$. These
374 data are again consistent with the fertilisation hypothesis. This evidence suggests that saprotrophic

375 fungal biomass increased in Biochar, and much more so in Residue, where it decomposed the
376 amended material and mineralised organic N into plant available forms.

377 **Conclusions**

378 Our results demonstrate that the observed increases in plant productivity following biochar addition
379 to soil were due to an N fertilisation effect. Stable isotope analysis using ^{13}C confirmed that the C in
380 biochar is considerably more recalcitrant than the feedstock from which it was produced.

381 Pyrolysis strongly reduced the bioavailability of N from the resulting biochar when compared to the
382 initial feedstock. This means that nutrients in biochar are released slowly when compared to the
383 initial feedstock. Further, due to the increased recalcitrance of the C in biochar, application of
384 biochar to soil did not cause N immobilisation. Therefore, application of biochar rather than crop
385 residues may circumvent the need of co-application of synthetic N fertilisers, which are sometimes
386 applied to compensate for the effects of microbial N immobilisation. This study also highlights the
387 need for rigorous controls in experiments to allow distinguishing fertilisation effects (short-term)
388 from the “true” biochar effects, i.e. those effects associated with biochar C that will occur over the
389 entire residence time of that C in the soil. For sustainable application of biochar it is vital to make
390 informed decisions on where best to apply biochar, compost and/or green manures to maximise the
391 potential benefits and minimise the negative impacts. Our results will help decisions makers such as
392 farmers or policy makers to do so.

393 **Acknowledgements**

394 We gratefully acknowledge funding support from the Marie Curie Career Integration Grant (No.
395 GA526/09/1762) and funding from the Emerging Science fund of the Production Ecology and
396 Resource Conservation (PE&RC) graduate school of Wageningen UR, Netherlands. We are also
397 grateful for the assistance of André Maassen for watering plants, and Jaap Nelemans and Willeke van
398 Tintelen for technical assistance in the laboratory and Ana Prada for assistance with formatting.

399

400 **References**

- 401 Balota E, Colozzi-Filho A, Andrade D and Dick R 2003 Microbial biomass in soils under different tillage
402 and crop rotation systems. *Biology and Fertility of Soils* 38, 15-20 DOI 10.1007/s00374-003-0590-9
- 403 Bedard-Haughn A, van Groenigen J W and van Kessel C 2003 Tracing ¹⁵N through landscapes:
404 potential uses and precautions. *Journal of Hydrology* 272, 175-190 DOI 10.1016/S0022-
405 1694(02)00263-9
- 406 Boschker J T, Nold S C, Wellsbury P, Bos D, de Graaf W, Pel R, Parkes R J and Cappenberg T E 1998
407 Direct linking of microbial populations to specific biogeochemical processes by ¹³C-labelling of
408 biomarkers. *Nature* 392, 801–805 DOI:10.1038/33900
- 409 Bossio D A and Scow K M 1998 Impacts of carbon and flooding on soil microbial communities:
410 Phospholipid fatty acid profiles and substrate utilization patterns. *Microbial Ecology* 35, 265-278
411 DOI:10.1007/s002489900082
- 412 Bromand S, Whalen J, Janzen H H, Schjoerring J and Ellert B H 2001 A pulse-labelling method to
413 generate ¹³C- enriched plant materials. *Plant and Soil* 235, 253-257 DOI:
414 10.1023/A:1011922103323
- 415 Case S D C, McNamara N P, Reay D S, Stott A W, Grant H K and Whitaker J 2015 Biochar suppresses
416 N₂O emissions while maintaining N availability in a sandy loam soil. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry* 81,
417 178-185 DOI: [10.1016/j.soilbio.2014.11.012](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soilbio.2014.11.012)
- 418 Cayuela M L, Sánchez-Monedero M A, Roig A, Hanley K, Enders A and Lehmann J 2013 Biochar and
419 denitrification in soils: when, how much and why does biochar reduce N₂O emissions? *Scientific*
420 *Reports* 3, 1732 doi:10.1038/srep01732
- 421 Cayuela M L, van Zwieten L, Singh B P, Jeffery S, Roig A and Sánchez-Monedero M A 2014 Biochar's

422 role in mitigating soil nitrous oxide emissions: A review and meta-analysis. *Agriculture, Ecosystems*
423 *and Environment* 191, 5-16 doi: [10.1016/j.agee.2013.10.009](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2013.10.009)

424 Clough T J, Bertrama J E, Raya J L, Condrón L M, O'Callaghan M, Sherlock R R and Wells N S 2010
425 Unweathered Wood biochar impact on nitrous oxide emissions from a bovine-urine-amended
426 pasture soil. *Soil Science Society of America Journal* 74, 852-860 doi:10.2136/sssaj2009.0185

427 Clough T, Condrón L, Kammann C and Müller C 2013 A review of biochar and soil nitrogen dynamics.
428 *Agronomy* 3, 275-293 doi:10.3390/agronomy3020275

429 Cornelissen G, Gustafsson O, Bucheli T D, Jonker M T O, Koelmans A A and van Noort P C M 2005
430 Extensive sorption of organic compounds to black carbon, coal, and kerogen in sediments and soils:
431 Mechanisms and consequences for distribution, bioaccumulation, and biodegradation.
432 *Environmental Science and Technology* 39, 6881-6895 DOI: 10.1021/es050191b

433 Craine J M, Morrow C and Fierer N 2007 Microbial nitrogen limitation increases decomposition.
434 *Ecology* 88, 2105-13 DOI: 10.1890/06-1847.1

435 Crombie K, Mašek O, Cross A and Sohi S 2015 Biochar – synergies and trade-offs between soil
436 enhancing properties and C sequestration potential. *GCB Bioenergy* 7, 1161–1175 DOI:
437 10.1111/gcbb.12213

438 Fang Y, Singh B, Singh B P and Krull E 2014 Biochar carbon stability in four contrasting soils. *Eur J Soil*
439 *Sci* 65, 60-71 DOI: 10.1111/ejss.12094

440 Frostegård A and Bååth E 1996 The use of phospholipid fatty acid analysis to estimate bacterial and
441 fungal biomass in soil. *Biology and Fertility of Soils* 22, 59-65 DOI: 10.1007/BF00384433

442 Gurwick N P, Moore L A, Kelly C and Elias P 2013 A systematic review of biochar research, with a
443 focus on its stability *in situ* and its promise as a climate mitigation strategy. *PLoS ONE* 8, e75932 doi:

444 10.1371/journal.pone.0075932

445 Hodgson E. M. *et al.* 2011 Variation in Miscanthus chemical composition and implications for
446 conversion by pyrolysis and thermo-chemical bio-refining for fuels and chemicals. *Bioresource*
447 *Technology* 102, 3411-3418 DOI: 10.1016/j.biortech.2010.10.017

448 Janzen H H 2006 The soil carbon dilemma: Shall we hoard it or use it? *Soil Biology and Biochemistry*
449 38, 419-424

450 Jeffery S, Abalos D, Spokas K and Verheijen, F G A 2015a Biochar effects on crop yields. In *Biochar for*
451 *Environmental Management: Science, Technology and Implementation*. Eds J Lehmann and S Joseph.
452 pp. 301-326 Earthscan, London

453 Jeffery S, Bezemer T M, Cornelissen G, Kuyper T W, Lehmann J, Mommer L, Sohi S P, van de Voorde T
454 F J, Wardle D A and van Groenigen J W 2015b The way forward in biochar research: targeting trade-
455 offs between the potential wins. *GCB Bioenergy* 7, 1-13

456 Jeffery S, Verheijen F G A, van der Velde M and Bastos A C 2011 A quantitative review of the effects
457 of biochar application to soils on crop productivity using meta-analysis. *Agriculture, Ecosystems and*
458 *Environment* 144, 175-187

459 Karaosmanoğlu F, Işığür-Ergüdenler A and Sever A 2000 Biochar from the straw-stalk of rapeseed
460 plant. *Energy and Fuels* 14, 336-339

461 Kuchenbuch R, Claassen N and Jungk A 1986 Potassium availability in relation to soil moisture. *Plant*
462 *and Soil* 95, 221-231

463 Kuzyakov Y, Friedel J K and Stahr K 2000 Review of mechanisms and quantification of priming effects.
464 *Soil Biology and Biochemistry* 32, 1485-1498

465 Lee K-H and Jose S 2003 Soil respiration, fine root production, and microbial biomass in cottonwood
466 and loblolly pine plantations along a nitrogen fertilization gradient. *Forest Ecology and Management*
467 185, 263-273

468 Lehmann J, Gaunt J and Rondon M 2006 Bio-char sequestration in terrestrial ecosystems – A Review.
469 11, 395-419

470 Lehmann J, Pereira da Silva Jr J, Steiner C, Nehls T, Zech W and Glaser B 2003 Nutrient availability and
471 leaching in an archaeological Anthrosol and a Ferralsol of the Central Amazon basin: fertilizer,
472 manure and charcoal amendments. *Plant and Soil* 249, 343-357

473 Liu X, Zhang A, Ji C, Joseph S, Bian R, Li L, Pan G and Paz-Ferreiro J 2013 Biochar's effect on crop
474 productivity and the dependence on experimental conditions—a meta-analysis of literature data.
475 *Plant and Soil* 373, 583-594

476 Maestrini B, Nannipieri P and Abiven S 2014 A meta-analysis on pyrogenic organic matter induced
477 priming effect. *GCB Bioenergy* 7, 577–590

478 Mia S, van Groenigen J W, van de Voorde T F J, Oram N J, Bezemer T M, Mommer L, and Jeffery S
479 2014 Biochar application rate affects biological nitrogen fixation in red clover conditional on
480 potassium availability. *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment* 191, 83-91

481 Mukherjee A and Lal R 2014 The biochar dilemma. *Soil Research* 52, 217-230

482 Nelissen V, Rütting T, Huygens D, Ruyschaert G and Boeckx P 2015 Temporal evolution of biochar's
483 impact on soil nitrogen processes – a ¹⁵N tracing study. *GCB Bioenergy* 7, 635–645

484 Olsson P A, Bååth E, Jakobsen I and Söderström B 1995 The use of phospholipid and neutral lipid
485 fatty acids to estimate biomass of arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi in soil. *Mycological Research* 99, 623-
486 629

487 Oram N J, van de Voorde T F J, Ouweland G A, Bezemer T M, Mommer L, Jeffery S and Van
488 Groenigen J W 2014 Soil amendment with biochar increases the competitive ability of legumes via
489 increased potassium availability. *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment* 191, 92-98

490 Paul E A, Paustian K H, Elliott E T and Cole C V 1996 *Soil Organic Matter in Temperate*
491 *Agroecosystems - Long Term Experiments in North America*. CRC Press, Taylor Francis Group, USA

492 Prendergast-Miller M T, Duvall M and Sohi S P 2014 Biochar–root interactions are mediated by
493 biochar nutrient content and impacts on soil nutrient availability. *Eur J Soil Sci* 65, 173-185

494 Sagrilo E, Jeffery S, Hoffland E and Kuypers T W 2015 Emission of CO₂ from biochar-amended soils and
495 implications for soil organic carbon. *GCB Bioenergy* 7, 1294–1304

496 Sánchez-García M, Roig A, Sanchez-Monedero M A and Cayuela M L 2014 Biochar increases soil N₂O
497 emissions produced by nitrification-mediated pathways. *Frontiers in Environmental Science* 2

498 Singla A, Iwasa H and Inubushi K 2014 Effect of biogas digested slurry based-biochar and digested
499 liquid on N₂O, CO₂ flux and crop yield for three continuous cropping cycles of komatsuna (*Brassica*
500 *rapa var. perviridis*) *Biological Fertility of Soils* 50, 1201-1209

501 Shackley S, Sohi S P, Ibarrola R, Hammond J, Mašek O, Brownsort P, Cross A, Prendergast-Miller M
502 and Haszeldine S 2012 *Biochar, Tool for Climate Change Mitigation and Soil Management*. In
503 *Geoengineering Responses to Climate Change*. Eds T Lenton and N Vaughan. pp. 73-140 Springer,
504 New York

505 Spokas K A, Cantrell K B, Novak J M, Archer D W, Ippolito J A, Collins H P, Boateng A A, Lima I M, Lamb
506 M C, McAloon A J, Lentz R D and Nichols K A 2012 Biochar: A synthesis of its agronomic impact
507 beyond carbon sequestration. *J. Environ. Qual.* 41, 973-989

508 Stark J M and Hart S C (1996) Diffusion technique for preparing salt solutions, Kjeldahl digests, and
509 persulfate digests for nitrogen-15 analysis. *Soil Science Society of America Journal* 60, 1846-1855

510 Stiboka 1975 Stiboka Bodemkaart van Nederland Stiboka, Wageningen, The Netherlands

511 Suddick E C and Six J 2013 An estimation of annual nitrous oxide emissions and soil quality following
512 the amendment of high temperature walnut shell biochar and compost to a small scale vegetable
513 crop rotation. *Science of The Total Environment* 465, 298-307

514 Vance E. Brookes P and Jenkinson D 1987 An extraction method for measuring soil microbial biomass
515 C. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry* 19, 703-707

516 Van de Voorde T F J, Bezemer T M, Van Groenigen J W, Jeffery S and Mommer L 2014 Soil biochar
517 amendment in a nature restoration area: effects on plant productivity and community composition.
518 *Ecological Applications* 24, 1167-1177


519 von Rein I, Gessler A, Premke K, Keitel C, Ulrich A and Kayler Z E 2016 Forest understory plant and soil
520 microbial response to an experimentally induced drought and heat-pulse event: the importance of
521 maintaining the continuum. *Global Change Biology* 22, 2861–2874


522 Velthof G L, Kuikman P J and Oenema O 2002 Nitrous oxide emissions from soils amended with crop
523 residues. *Nutrient Cycling in Agroecosystems* 62, 249–261





524 Verheijen F G A, Jeffery S, Bastos A C, van der Velde M and Diafas I 2010 Biochar application to soils -
525 A critical scientific review of effects on soil properties, processes and functions. Report No. EUR
526 24099 EN, Luxembourg

527 Warnock D, Lehmann J, Kuyper T and Rillig M 2007 Mycorrhizal responses to biochar in soil –
528 concepts and mechanisms. *Plant and Soil* 300, 9-20



- 529 Woolf D, Amonette J E, Street-Perrott F A, Lehmann J and Joseph S 2010 Sustainable biochar to
530 mitigate global climate change. *Nature Communications* 1, 56
- 531 Yoo G and Kang H 2012 Effects of biochar addition on greenhouse gas emissions and microbial
532 responses in a short-term laboratory experiment. *J. Environ. Qual.* 41, 1193-1202
- 533 Zhang Qz, Dijkstra F A, Liu Xr, Wang Yd, Huang J and Ning Lu 2014 Effects of biochar on soil microbial
534 biomass after four years of consecutive application in the North China Plain. *PLoS ONE* 9, e102062
- 535 Zheng J, Stewart C E and Cortufo M F 2012 Biochar and nitrogen fertilizer alters soil nitrogen
536 dynamics and greenhouse gas fluxes from two temperate soils. *J. Environ. Qual.* 41, 1361-1370
- 537









Day








Figure 1a. *Lolium perenne* biomass (dry weight) produced from each treatment at each of the four harvests after 35, 63, 91 and 119 days; b. total aboveground biomass "Shoot" (i.e. from all harvests combined) and belowground biomass "Roots" (calculated as the average of the belowground biomass produced in each treatment), and the Shoot to Root Ratio after 119 days. Letters show significant differences within each harvest and for plant growth response characteristics. Columns show means, bars show \pm standard error (n=5).

Figure 2. (a) Total amount of N taken up from the amended material and (b) proportion of plant N derived from the amended material. Columns show means. Bars show \pm standard errors (n=5). N uptake from amendment was significantly different between treatments in all cases ($P = 0.05$). Note that no material was amended to Control and so no data are reported for Control.

Figure 3. Cumulative N_2O (a) and CO_2 (b) fluxes from microcosms in Exp. II over a 71 day incubation period and the percent loss of N (c) and C (d) from the amended material as determined by ^{15}N or ^{13}C analysis. Points show means. Bars show \pm standard errors (n=5, apart from Day 2 points where n=4). Note that no material was amended to Control and so no data are reported for Control in (c) or (d).

Figure 4. (a) Microbial biomass N (MBN) as determined by chloroform fumigation extraction with the contribution of each pool of N to microbial biomass N determined by stable isotope ^{15}N 71 days after application of amended material; (b) Cumulative CO_2 emitted from each treatment, derived from each soil C pool using ^{13}C isotope analysis over a 71 day incubation. Columns show means. Shaded columns show the mean contribution of each pool to the total. Bars show \pm standard errors (n=5).

Figure 5 (a) A principal component ordination plot of the first two principal components of PLFAs extracted from each sample. Points show mean coordinates of treatment replicates, bars show standard errors (n=5); (b) loading plot in which the PLFAs which contribute most to the discrimination between treatments are labelled; (c) $\delta^{13}C$ profiles of the three PLFAs that contributed

most to the discrimination observed between treatments. Larger bars represent more uptake of applied enriched ^{13}C material. Columns show means. Bars show \pm standard errors (n=5).

Table 1. Key Biochar and Feedstock characteristics

	Biochar	Residue
Fixed Carbon (%)	36.3	14.1
Volatiles (%)	32.9	71.4
Nitrogen (%)	2.7	2.3
Hydrogen (%)	3.4	NA
C:N ratio	22.0	31.9
Sulphur (%)	0.4	NA
H:C _{org}	0.59	NA
Ash (%)	28.0	9.6
pH	9.2	5.4
¹³ C enrichment	1.38 ±0.0002 at-%	1.40 ±0.003 at-%
¹⁵ N enrichment	58.2 ±0.01 at-%	58.5 ±0.03 at-%

(All values provided on an oven dried (60°C) basis. pH was quantified in demineralised water 1:5 w/v)

Table 2: Key soil characteristics (based on soil dry weight)

Soil Texture	
Sand (%)	93.9
Silt (%)	4.3
Clay (%)	1.8
pH (CaCl ₂)	5.2
SOM (%)	4.6
N-content (mg kg ⁻¹)	
N-NH ₄	1.51 ±0.19
N-NO ₃	0.97 ±0.07
P-content (mg kg ⁻¹)	
P-PO ₄	3.96 ±0.17
K-content (mg kg ⁻¹)	16.49 ±0.92