

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

# **Can Biochar Ameliorate Phosphorus Deficiency and Aluminium Phytotoxicity in Acid Soils?**

**A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the  
requirements for the degree of**

**Doctor of Philosophy of Applied Science**

**in**

**Soil Science**

**at Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand.**

**QINHUA SHEN**

**2015**



**MASSEY  
UNIVERSITY**  
TE KUNENGA KI PŪREHUROA

---

**UNIVERSITY OF NEW ZEALAND**







# ABSTRACT

The use of biochar as soil amendment to enhance soil functionality is being increasingly investigated, with particular attention given to its effects on the sustainable increase of crop production and carbon (C) sequestration. To date, however, limited research has attempted to unravel the effect of biochar on either the chemical and/or biological mobilization of the residual fraction of phosphorus (P) in soil. This fraction tends to accumulate as a result of long-term P fertilization in soils rich in aluminium (Al) and iron (Fe) oxy-hydroxides and short-range ordered aluminosilicates (i.e. allophane). There is also scant information on (i) how the speciation of soluble Al changes when biochar is applied to acid soils, and (ii) whether this application alleviates Al toxicity on plant roots. My objective in this study is therefore to determine the effect of different biochars with contrasting fertilizer and liming values on the chemistry, biology and nutrient fertility of acid mineral soils.

Before studying the effect of different biochars on soil properties, several methodologies for measuring the liming properties and available nitrogen (N) in biochar were evaluated and modified where needed. For this, 19 biochars produced by pyrolysing a wide range of feedstocks under various production temperatures were used. Different pH-buffering capacity (pH-BC) methodologies – originally developed for soils (single vs multiple acid additions, short vs long equilibration times) – were tested, along with the methodology used to measure the liming equivalence. The methodologies were then validated by incubating over 10 d two acid soils (an Haplic Cambisol and an Andic Umbrisol) to which separated amendments of the 19 biochars were made at the rates estimated using both methodologies to target a final pH of 6.5.

The results indicated that the relationship established between the pH-BC of the 19 biochars under study after 30-min equilibration (pH-BC<sub>30min</sub>) with a single addition of acid and that obtained after a 5-d equilibration (pH-BC<sub>5d</sub>) (predicted pH-BC<sub>5d</sub> = 2.2 × pH-BC<sub>30min</sub> + 20.4) allowed an adequate estimate of the liming potential of biochars. Similar results were found with the liming equivalent, and both methods were considered suitable to make the recommendation of the application rate. Acid hydrolysis using 6 M HCl has been proved adequate to determine available N in biochar. For this, hydrolysates of biochar are oxidized using potassium peroxodisulfate with a dilution factor of 600 so that chloride interferences are overcome and nitrate-N is then measured. This methodology, originally developed using biochars rich in N, proved not suitable for biochars with low N concentrations. Results obtained in this study have shown that a smaller dilution factor (242) is sufficiently adequate to overcome the chloride interferences while avoiding over-diluting the sample.

In this study, we hypothesized that biochar can increase P availability to plant by stimulating the growth of arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi (AMF) hyphae. Therefore, methodologies to (i) estimate the length of fungal hyphae in soil and (ii) evaluate the transfer of P by AMF hyphae needed to be tested and modified where necessary. In this part of the study, three different biochars and two soil types were used. Two biochars were produced from chipped pine (*Pinus radiata* D. Don) branches at 450°C and 550°C (referred to as BP450 and BP550, respectively); and a third one from chipped weeping willow (*Salix matsudana* L.) branches at 550°C (referred to as BW550). The soils were two sil-andic Andosols of contrasting P status (Olsen P of 4.3 vs 33.3 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>, referred to as LP and HP soil, respectively).

The traditional visual gridline intersection (VGI) method commonly used to measure the length of AMF hyphae distribution in soil was modified by (i) using a

digital photomicrography technique (referred to as “digital gridline intersection” (DGI) method), and (ii) processing the images using ImageJ software (referred to as the “photomicrography–ImageJ processing” (PIP) method). These methods were first tested with known lengths of possum fur and then applied to measuring the hyphal length in the LP and HP soils after a 32 wk experiment growing *Lotus pedunculatus cv barsille*. The study confirmed that the use of digital photomicrography in conjunction with either the grid–line intersection principle or image processing (with ImageJ software) is a suitable method for the measurement of AMF hyphal lengths in soils.

In addition, the traditional root study container that divides the plant growth medium into two sections – (i) a *root zone* to which both root and AMF hyphae have access and (ii) an *hyphal zone* to which only AMF hyphae have access – by a layer of nylon mesh was further modified by including a 3–mm thickness of tephra under the nylon mesh between two sections. This layer of tephra was found to be adequate to halt P diffusion from the HP soil to the LP soil for a plant growth period of 32 wk. Under such circumstances, the increase in P uptake by plant growth in a combination of a *root zone* of LP soil and a *hyphal zone* of HP soil compared with that in which both *root* and *hyphal zones* were filled with LP soil was only ascribed to the transfer of P from HP soil to LP soil by AMF hyphae. This novel root study container allows the biochar to be added to either the *root zone* or the *hyphal zone* and separates the effect of biochar on AMF hyphae development and P uptake from that on P content and availability (i.e., biochar rich in P; changes in soil pH). This device can contribute to discern whether biochar can influence AMF development and enhance P bioavailability.

In order to investigate the feasibility of adding biochar to soils with high residual P so that this can become bioavailable, *Lotus pedunculatus cv barsille* was grown in LP and HP soils separately amended with BP450, BP550 and BW550 biochars



at an application rate of  $10 \text{ t ha}^{-1}$  using the novel root study container for 32 wk without any further P and N fertilization. We found that (i) none of the tested biochars conferred any specific advantage to the HP soil; (ii) the addition of BW550 biochar to the LP soil increased plant growth by 59% and P uptake by 73%, while the pine-based biochar (e.g., BP450 and BP550) provided no extra nutrient uptake and no plant growth increase. This was ascribed to supplemental nutrients (especially P) from the BW550 biochar along with its liming effect and associated increase in P availability; (iii) biochar produced from BP450 biochar caused a 70% P uptake increase (and 40% plant growth increase) by stimulating AMF growth and accessing a high-P area (HP soil) to which the plant root had no access. More research is needed to discern the underlying mechanism.

The liming effects of BW550 and BP550 biochars were further compared with those of lime chemicals (e.g.,  $\text{Ca(OH)}_2$  and  $\text{NaOH}$ ) in a short-term (10-d) incubation using two soils with contrasting pH-BC (an Haplic Cambisol and an Andic Umbrisol) to which these amendments were added. The two soils were first amended with BW550, BP550,  $\text{Ca(OH)}_2$  or  $\text{NaOH}$  at specific rates so that pH values of 5.4, 5.6, 5.8 and 6.4 were targeted and incubated at room temperature ( $25 \text{ }^\circ\text{C}$ ) for 10 d. At the end of the incubation, a radical elongation bioassay using alfalfa (*Medicago sativa* L.) was carried out. Thereafter, soils were characterized with special attention to the Al chemistry, i.e. aqueous reactive Al fractionation and inorganic monomeric Al speciation. The final objective was to reveal the mechanisms through which these biochars alleviate Al toxicity on roots. Results showed that, for a specific soil, a smaller amount of BW550 biochar was required to increase the same unit of pH and reduce a similar amount of exchangeable Al compared with the amount required of BP550 biochar. The addition of BW550 biochar (at application rates  $< 9.1 \%$ ) and  $\text{Ca(OH)}_2$  stimulated alfalfa (*Medicago sativa* L.) seedling growth, whereas that of BP550 (at application rates  $>$

2.4 %) and NaOH caused inhibition. The distinct responses of the root growth to the presence of  $\text{Ca}(\text{OH})_2$  and BW550 biochar and to that of NaOH and BP550 biochar were explained by (i) a decrease in both inorganic monomeric Al (mainly in  $\text{AlF}^{2+}$  and  $\text{Al}^{3+}$ ) and colloidal Al, and (ii) an increase in aqueous  $\text{Ca}^{2+}$ , in the former, as expected. In the latter there was (i) an increase in aqueous colloidal Al and  $\text{Na}^+$ , and (ii) a decrease in soluble  $\text{Ca}^{2+}$ . Thus, BW550 biochar was shown to be a more effective liming agent than was BP550 biochar.

The information obtained in this thesis supports the use of biochar to manage high P affinity Andosols and acid soils, which are abundant in New Zealand. The technology of producing biochar from willow woodchips or feedstock alike with resultant solid products of high nutrient status and liming potential may contribute to the recycle of nutrients while increasing soil pH. Pine woodchips produced at relatively low temperature (e.g.,  $450^\circ\text{C}$ ) have been shown to enhance AMF abundance and functionality. Thus, biochar with specific environmental and agricultural purposes should be tailored accordingly. The root study container with a layer of “P diffusion break” and the measurement of AMF hyphal length using the photomicrography in conjunction with image software analysis (e.g., ImageJ) will advance studies of the responses of AMF to soil additives (e.g., biochar or green waste) and their associated enhancement of soil functions.



# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I had never thought of writing a Ph.D thesis in a second language, in English, but now I did it!!! I am feeling thrilled! This dissertation is the result of three years of the lab works under the guidance of my GREAT supervisors, the discussion with colleagues and friends. I would like to take this opportunity to express my immense gratitude to all of them.

In particular, I am profoundly indebted to my supervisors, A/Prof. Dr. Marta Camps–Arbestain, Prof. Mike Hedley, and Dr. Miko U.F. Kirschbaum who are very generous with their time and knowledge and assist me in step–by–step to complete the thesis. Special thanks go to A/Prof Dr. Marta Camps–Arbestain, “Thank you for providing me with such a great opportunity to study under such an adorable and relaxed research and living environment. I have not been so enjoying my study before. And thank you for being so considerate and thoughtful, for all your encouragements and communications and kindness, and for culturing my writing skills of course. I know that the draft of my first manuscript was definitely a torture for you. Sorry for that.” Thanks to Prof. Mike Hedley for all your optimistic comments on the results of each experiment and to Dr. Miko U.F. Kirschbaum who makes all this happen at the first step. Simple words cannot express my gratefulness and appreciation to you all!

My sincere appreciations are extended to Dr. Tao Wang, Dr. Roberto Calvelo–Pereira, Dr. Peter Bishop, Dr. James Hanly, A/Prof. Cory Matthew, Dr. Jeya Jeyakumar, and Dr. Saman Herath, Dr. Qianhe Liu etc. for their stimulating discussions and invaluable suggestions to my study and thesis writing.

I am grateful for the technical supports from staffs of soil science group, particularly Ms. Glenys Wallace, Mr. Bob Toes, Mr. Ian Furkert, Mr. Mike Bretherton, Mr. Lance Currie, A/Prof. Bob Stewart, Dr. Anja Moebis, and Mr. Ross Wallace etc..

Thanks also goes to Ms. Liza Haarhoff, Ms. Denise Stewart and Ms. Sandra Dunkinson for all your kind help with paperwork; and whomever help me during my study and stay in New Zealand.

Special thanks go to all my friends: Ainul Mahmud, Aldrin Rivas, Amandine Faury, Ahmed Elwan, Agneta Ghose, Helen Walker, Hamed Khan, Jingli Lu, Khadija Malik, Léa Carlesso, May Sasikunya, Neha Jha, Quang Mai Ngoc, Sue Gifford, Stephen Collins, Wei Zhang, Xiao-tian Li, Yan Li, Yuan-cheng Wang etc. (list in alphabetical order) for sharing happiness and making my life being oversea extremely enjoyable.

I gratefully acknowledge New Zealand Biochar Research Centre, Massey University whose research grant made the greenhouse and lab works possible.

However, I am the only person responsible for errors in the thesis if any.

I love my family, dad Pan-zhi Shen, mum Yan-rong Zhang, brother Jian-xing Shen and sister-in-law Xiu-ling Liu, and sister Jian-hua Shen and brother-in-law Qiu-long Tian, and nephews Bin-wei Tian and Hao Chen, the nieces Shi-ting Shen and Bin-xin Tian, God-parents Yan-kun Yang, and God-sister Xiu-fang Yang, back in China, thanks for all their supports and endless love.

***Thanks you all!***

This thesis is dedicated to—

***Father Pan-zhi Shen***

***Mother Yan-rong Zhang***

***A/Prof. Dr Marta Camps-Arbestain***

***Prof. Mike J Hedley***

***Dr. Miko U.F. Kirschbaum***

# PUBLICATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

## Publication under review/to be submitted

1. **Qinhua Shen**, Miko U.F. Kirschbaum, Mike J. Hedley, Marta Camps–Arbestain (2016). Testing an alternative method for estimating the length of fungal hyphae using photomicrography and image processing. *PLoS ONE* (Accepted)
2. **Qinhua Shen**, Mike J. Hedley, Marta Camps–Arbestain, Miko U.F. Kirschbaum. A novel technique for evaluating the phosphorus transferred by arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi hyphae. *Soil Research* (To be submitted).
3. **Qinhua Shen**, Mike J. Hedley, Marta Camps–Arbestain, Miko U.F. Kirschbaum. Can biochar increase the bioavailability of phosphorus? *Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition* (Accepted)
4. **Qinhua Shen**, Marta Camps–Arbestain, Mike J. Hedley, Miko U.F. Kirschbaum, Peter Bishop. Can Biochar Ameliorate Aluminium Phytotoxicity? *Geoderma* (To be submitted)
5. Huo–Yan Wang, **Qin-Hua Shen**, Jian–Min Zhou et al. (2011). Plants use alternative strategies to utilize non–exchangeable potassium in minerals. *Plant and soil* 343: 209–220

## Book chapters

1. Balwant Singh, Michaela Mei Dolk, **Qinhua Shen**, Marta Camps–Arbestain (2015). Chapter 3 Biochar pH, electrical conductivity and liming potential. In: Balwant Singh, Marta Camps–Arbestain, Johannes Lehmann (Eds.), *Methods of Biochar Analysis for Environmental Applications*. CSIRO Publishing, Melbourne

2. Marta Camps–Arbestain, **Qinhua Shen**, Tao Wang (2015). Chapter 24 Biochar Available nutrients. In: Balwant Singh, Marta Camps–Arbestain, Johannes Lehmann (Eds.), *Methods of Biochar Analysis for Environmental Applications*. CSIRO Publishing, Melbourne

#### **Abstracts/proceedings and posters/presentations in Conference/Worshop**

1. **Qinhua Shen**, Marta Camps–Arbestain, Mike J. Hedley (2014). Use of Biochar to Reduce Soil Acidity and Ameliorate Aluminum Phytotoxicity. In “Proceedings of NZ Society of Soil Science Conference "Soil Science for Future Generations" (NZSSS: Halmiton, New Zealand).
2. **Qinhua Shen**, Mike J. Hedley, Marta Camps–Arbestain (2014). Can Biochar be Used to Increase the Bioavailability of Phosphorus Immobilized in Andisols? IDS 5. Biochar Soil Amendment for Environmental and Agronomic Benefits. In ‘Proceedings of the 20th World Congress of Soil Science; Soils Embrace Life & Universe’ (IUSS: Jeju, Korea).
3. **Qinhua Shen**, Mike J. Hedley, Marta Camps–Arbestain (2014). Can Biochar be Used to Increase the Bioavailability of Phosphorus Immobilized in Andisols? Nutrient Management for the Farm, Catchment and Community (Eds. L D Currie and C L Christensen). (FLRC, Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand).
4. **Qinhua Shen**, Marta Camps–Arbestain, Mike J. Hedley (2013). Influence of Biochar Application on the Availability of Phosphorus in Volcanic Ash soils. In “Proceedings of New Zealand 2013 Biochar Workshop of The Final Answer? (New Zealand Biochar Research Center:Palmerston North, New Zealand)

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>ABSTRACT .....</b>	<b>I</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....</b>	<b>VII</b>
<b>PUBLICATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS.....</b>	<b>IX</b>
<b>TABLE OF CONTENT .....</b>	<b>XI</b>
<b>LIST OF TABLES .....</b>	<b>XVII</b>
<b>LIST OF FIGURES .....</b>	<b>XIX</b>
<b>LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS .....</b>	<b>XXV</b>
<b>Chapter 1 .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>GENERAL INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1. General background.....	2
1.2. Research objectives .....	4
1.2.1 Main objective.....	4
1.2.2 Specific objectives .....	5
1.3. Thesis outline.....	6
<b>Chapter 2 .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>LITERATURE REVIEW.....</b>	<b>9</b>
2.1 An overview on acid soils .....	10
2.1.1 Acid soil distribution.....	10
2.1.2 Soil acidification .....	12
2.1.3 Constraints to plant growth in acid soil .....	13
2.2 Management of acid soils.....	18
2.2.1 Chemical liming.....	18
2.2.2 Organic amendments.....	20
2.3 Potential of biochar for alleviating P deficiency and Al toxicity in acid soils .....	21
2.3.1 Liming potential of specific biochars.....	22
2.3.2 Quantitative measurements of acidity and alkalinity of biochar.....	25
2.3.3 Effects of biochar on soil P bioavailability .....	26
2.3.4 Effects of biochar on AMF growth .....	28
2.4 Current research gaps and priorities in biochar application to acid soils .....	30
<b>Chapter 3 .....</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>BIOCHAR CHARACTERIZATION.....</b>	<b>33</b>
3.1 Liming potential .....	34



3.1.1	Materials and methods .....	36
3.1.1.1	<i>Biochar tested</i> .....	36
3.1.1.2	<i>Calcium carbonate equivalence (% CaCO<sub>3</sub>-eq)</i> .....	39
3.1.1.3	<i>pH buffering capacity at pH=7 (pH-BC<sub>pH=7</sub>)</i> .....	40
3.1.1.4	<i>pH buffering capacity determined in 5-d incubation (pH-BC<sub>5d</sub>)</i> .....	41
3.1.1.5	<i>pH buffering capacity determined in 30-min incubation (pH-BC<sub>30min</sub>)</i> .....	42
3.1.1.6	<i>pH buffering capacity predicted from pH-BC<sub>30min</sub> (Predicted pH-BC<sub>5d</sub>)</i> .....	42
3.1.1.7	<i>Validation of the use of predicted pH-BC<sub>5d</sub> and % CaCO<sub>3</sub>-eq values as biochar liming potential index</i> .....	43
3.1.1.8	<i>Statistical analysis</i> .....	44
3.1.2	Results and discussion .....	45
3.1.2.1	<i>Comparison of the different methodologies intended to determine the biochar liming potential</i> .....	45
3.1.2.2	<i>Validation of the use of predicted pH-BC<sub>5d</sub> and % CaCO<sub>3</sub>-eq values as biochar liming potential indexes</i> .....	50
3.1.3	Recommended protocol for measuring the liming potential of biochar ...	54
3.2	Available nitrogen .....	54
3.2.1	Materials and methods .....	57
3.2.1.1	<i>Biochar used</i> .....	57
3.2.1.2	<i>Total N</i> .....	57
3.2.1.3	<i>Method 1-Difference in total N in biochar before and after treated with 6 M HCl</i> .....	57
3.2.1.4	<i>Method 2- Hydrolysable N content in the digestion of the 6 M HCl hydrolysate</i> .....	58
3.2.1.5	<i>Modified method 2 - hydrolysable-N content in the digestion of the 6 M HCl hydrolysate</i> .....	60
3.2.1.6	<i>Statistical analysis</i> .....	61
3.2.2	Results and Discussion.....	61
3.2.3	Recommended protocol for measuring the available N of biochar .....	66

**Chapter 4 ..... 67**

**TESTING AN ALTERNATIVE METHOD FOR ESTIMATING THE LENGTH OF FUNGAL HYPHAE IN SOIL USING PHOTOMICROGRAPHY AND IMAGE PROCESSING..... 67**

Abstract .....	68
Keywords .....	69
4.1 Introduction .....	69
4.2 Materials and Methods .....	72

4.2.1	Calculations involved in the digital methodologies.....	72
4.2.2	Testing the digital methodologies using possum fur .....	73
4.2.3	Measuring hyphal lengths in soils.....	75
4.2.4	Statistical analysis .....	78
4.3	Results .....	78
4.3.1	Calibration of the proposed methodologies using possum fur.....	78
4.3.2	Measurement of hyphal lengths in soils.....	80
4.4	Discussion.....	82
4.5	Conclusions .....	85
4.6	Acknowledgements .....	85
<b>Chapter 5</b>	<b>.....</b>	<b>87</b>
<b>A NOVEL TECHNIQUE FOR EVALUATING THE PHOSPHORUS</b>		
<b>TRANSFERRED BY ARBUSCULAR MYCORRHIZAL FUNGAL HYPHAE ... 87</b>		
	Abstract .....	88
	Key words: .....	89
5.1	Introduction .....	89
5.2	Materials and Methods .....	91
5.2.1	Soil sampling and characterization .....	91
5.2.2	Tephra soil P absorption experiment.....	94
5.2.3	The concept of the root study container.....	94
5.2.4	Validation of the ‘P diffusion break’ .....	95
5.2.4.1	<i>Bioassay experiment setup</i> .....	95
5.2.4.2	<i>Plant harvests and final harvest</i> .....	97
5.2.4.3	<i>P fractionation in tephra</i> .....	98
5.2.5	Statistical analysis .....	99
5.2	Result and discussion .....	100
5.3.1	Langmuir adsorption – isotherm of tephra soil.....	100
5.3.2	‘P-diffusion break’ thickness calculation .....	101
5.3.3	Validation of the ‘P-diffusion break’ .....	104
5.4	Conclusion.....	108
5.5	Acknowledgements .....	108
<b>Chapter 6</b>	<b>.....</b>	<b>109</b>
<b>CAN BIOCHAR INCREASE THE BIOAVAILABILITY OF PHOSPHORUS? 109</b>		
	Abstract .....	110
	Keywords .....	111

6.1	Introduction .....	111
6.2	Materials and Methods .....	114
6.2.1	Soil sampling and characterization .....	114
6.2.2	Biochar production and characterization .....	118
6.2.3	Bioassay experiment setup.....	120
6.2.4	Plant growth and harvesting.....	122
6.2.5	Measurement of hyphal length.....	123
6.2.6	Statistical analysis .....	123
6.3	Results .....	124
6.3.1	Biochar characteristics .....	124
6.3.2	P status and biochar effects in the root zone.....	124
6.3.3	P status and biochar effects in the hyphal zone .....	126
6.3.4	Effects of biochar on P bioavailability and pH of the root zone soil .....	129
6.3.5	Effects of soil type and biochar type on AMF abundance in the hyphal zone.....	132
6.4	Discussion .....	134
6.4.1	Biochar classification.....	134
6.4.2	P status of soil and biochar in the root zone affects plant growth and P uptake.....	134
6.4.3	P status and biochar in the hyphal zone affects plant growth and P uptake.....	136
6.5	Conclusion.....	138
6.6	Acknowledgements .....	138
<b>Chapter 7</b>	<b>.....</b>	<b>141</b>
<b>CAN BIOCHAR AMELIORATE ALUMINUM PHYTOTOXICITY?</b>	<b>.....</b>	<b>141</b>
	Abstract.....	142
	Key words .....	143
7.1	Introduction .....	143
7.2	Materials and Methods .....	145
7.2.1	Soils.....	145
7.2.2	Biochars .....	147
7.2.3	The use of soil amendments to reach specific pH values .....	148
7.2.4	Germination and radicle elongation bioassay .....	149
7.2.5	Post-harvest soil solution analysis .....	151
7.2.6	Statistical analysis .....	153
7.3	Results .....	153

7.3.1	Selected properties of soils and biochars .....	153
7.3.2	Contrasting liming effects of BW550 and BP550 biochars on acid soils .....	157
7.3.3	Changes in aqueous soil solution composition amended with various amendments.....	159
7.3.4	Behaviour of reactive Al in aqueous soil solution as a result of the amendments.....	163
7.3.5	Behaviour of labile monomeric Al in aqueous soil solution as a result of the amendments.....	165
7.3.6	Responses of alfalfa seedling to various amendments.....	168
7.4	Discussion.....	170
7.5	Conclusion.....	175
7.6	Acknowledgements .....	175
<b>Chapter 8</b>	.....	<b>177</b>
<b>OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE</b>		
<b>RESEARCH</b>	.....	<b>177</b>
8.1	Overall summary .....	178
8.1.1	Analytical methods for biochar characterization .....	178
8.1.2	Mobilization of P immobilized in high P affinity Andosols using biochar.....	180
8.1.3	Amelioration effect of biochar on acid soil.....	183
8.2	Highlights of the thesis.....	184
8.3	Future research recommendations.....	185
8.3.1	Applying the techniques of photomicrography and image processing to .... determine the AMF root colonization.....	185
8.3.2	The underlying mechanisms through which biochar stimulates AMF hyphal abundance and functionality.....	186
8.3.3	The potential of biochar to reduce cadmium bioavailability in soils (with special interest in soils to which long term phosphate fertilization has been carried out).....	186
<b>Reference</b>	.....	<b>189</b>



# LIST OF TABLES

Table 2-1 Surface distribution of acids soils in the world (left column) and in the region of Australia and New Zealand (right column) by soil group .....	11
Table 3-1 Feedstock and production temperature of the 19 biochar sample .....	37
Table 3-2 Selected properties of the 19 biochar sample .....	38
Table 3-3 Means of pH, liming equivalence (% CaCO <sub>3</sub> – eq) and pH buffering capacity [pH–BC (mmol H <sup>+</sup> kg <sup>-1</sup> biochar (unit pH) <sup>-1</sup> )] of biochar samples measured by different methods.....	49
Table 3-4 The soils (1) Ramiha Silt Loam and (2) Hautere Silty Clay Loam amended with the 19 biochars under study at application rates (g biochar per 100 g soil) calculated based on either (i) the predicted pH–BC <sub>5d</sub> (rate 1) or (ii) liming equivalence – % CaCO <sub>3</sub> –eq (rate 2) intended to target a pH of 6.5 .	52
Table 3-5 Means of available N (g kg <sup>-1</sup> ) analysis carried followed different methods..	65
Table 5-1 Selected characteristics of the studied materials .....	92
Table 5-2 Parameters for calculating the thickness of the tephra P diffusion break.....	103
Table 5-3 The P fractionation (mg kg <sup>-1</sup> ) in the first pure 0.5 mm thick tephra slice adjacent to under the <i>rhizosphere</i> .....	106
Table 6-1 Selected properties of the two Andosols <sup>a</sup> .....	116
Table 6-2 Selected properties of biochars <sup>a</sup> .....	119
Table 6-3 AMF hyphal lengths in hyphal zone soil below the tephra layer (a 1 mm thick soil right below the tephra) in response to biochar addition (m hyphae g <sup>-1</sup> soil g <sup>-1</sup> DM).....	133

Table 7-1 Selected properties of the studied acidic soils <sup>a</sup> .....	154
Table 7-2 Selected properties of the studied biochars <sup>a</sup> .....	156
Table 7-3 Aqueous solution (1:10 solid: deionised water) composition as affected by different amendments.....	160
Table 7-4 Correlation matrix of the compositions of soil solution and relative radicle length (RRL) .....	174

# LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2–1 World acid soils distribution.....	10
Figure 2–2 Different nitrogen fertilizers follow different pathways in the nitrogen cycle causing the release of different amounts of hydrogen ions.....	13
Figure 2–3 Relationship between the availability of elements and soil pH.....	14
Figure 2–4 Relationship between pH and the distribution of soluble aluminium species .....	15
Figure 2–5 Schematic diagram of (a) the pH–dependent surface charge on an amphoteric metal oxide surface (Haynes, 1982) and (b) examples of ligand exchange reactions with phosphate.....	17
Figure 2–6 The reactions occurring as a result of soil liming.....	19
Figure 2–7 The wet–oxidation of activated carbon by adding $\text{KNO}_3/\text{HNO}_3$ to increase carboxylic functional groups.....	24
Figure 3–1 Boxplot of pH–BC ( $\text{mmol H}^+ \text{ kg}^{-1} \text{ biochar (unit pH)}^{-1}$ ) measurements of 19 different biochar samples, grouped by method. Four methods were used (continual acid addition and auto–titrate until $\text{pH} = 7$ , single acid addition and incubation (30 min), single acid addition and incubation (5 d) and the prediction from the 30 min incubation with single acid addition base on the relation exist between the values obtained in methods of single acid addition and incubation (30 min) and single acid addition and incubation (5 d).....	46
Figure 3–2 Relationship between pH, liming equivalence ( $\% \text{ CaCO}_3\text{-eq}$ ) and different pH buffering capacity (pH–BC) ( $\text{mmol H}^+ \text{ kg}^{-1} \text{ biochar (unit pH)}^{-1}$ )	



measurements of 19 biochar samples. Equations of relationships between results of different methods are displayed along with  $r^2$  values..... 47

Figure 3–3 The distribution of pH values of Ramiha Silt Loam and Hautere Silty Clay Loam after 10–days incubation of soils amended with biochar at rate 1 calculated from the predicted pH–BC<sub>5d</sub> (a) and at rate 2 calculated from liming equivalence (% CaCO<sub>3</sub>–eq) to achieve a pH of 6.5 (b). ..... 53

Figure 3–4 Correlation between hydrolysable N determined by calculating the difference in N content of biochar before and after treatment with 6 M HCl (Hydro–N by difference) (*method 1*) and digesting the 6 M HCl hydrolysate of the same biochar (Hydro–N by digestion) (*method 2*) and *modified method 2*. ..... 62

Figure 4–1 The measurement of possum fur on an image taken under a microscopy at  $\times 200$  magnification by using (a) the DGI method – A grid layer ( $12 \times 9$ , grid size  $0.05\text{mm} \times 0.05\text{mm}$ ) was placed on the top of the same image and the horizontal and vertical intersections of possum fur that crossed the edges of each square were counted and recorded (e.g.,  $C = 14$ , the possum fur length calculated using the Tenant equation was  $0.550\text{ mm}$ ) and (b) the PIP method – the possum fur in the same image was traced (yellow line) manually and measured by the ImageJ software (e.g.,  $L = 0.503\ \mu\text{m}$ ) ..... 75

Figure 4–2 AMF hyphae on an image taken under a microscopy at  $\times 100$  magnification measured by using (a) the DGI method – a grid layer ( $12 \times 9$ , grid size  $0.05\text{mm} \times 0.05\text{mm}$ ) was placed on the same image, and the horizontal and vertical intersections of hyphae that crossed the edges of each square were counted and recorded (e.g.,  $C = 23$ , the hyphal length calculated using the

Tenant equation was 0.904 mm ); and (b) the PIP method – the hyphae in the same image were traced (pink line) and measured by the ImageJ software with NeuronJ plugin (e.g., L = 0.931 mm).....	77
Figure 4–3 A scatterplot matrix with linear regressions amongst the lengths of possum fur measured by both the DGI ( $L_{DGI}$ ) and PIP methods ( $L_{PIP}$ ) and the known lengths of possum fur ( $L_{known}$ ).....	79
Figure 4–4 The distribution of the 95% confidence limits (dashed lines) of the mean lengths (solid lines) of possum fur measured by both the DGI ( $L_{DGI}$ ) and PIP methods ( $L_{PIP}$ ) and the known lengths of possum fur ( $L_{known}$ ).....	80
Figure 4–5 The lengths (means $\pm$ 95% confidence intervals) of hyphae in soils with low P fertility (solid circles) and high P fertility (open circles) measured by the digital gridline–intersection (DGI) method plotted against measurements by the photomicrography – ImageJ processing (PIP) method. The 1:1 line is shown as a dashed line. ....	81
Figure 4–6 Illustration of the intersection of gridlines with a stained hypha and the different number of counts that can be obtained with different random arrangements of these structures. A given length of 0.35 mm hyphae if distributed as (a) intersection count recorded $C=7$ , then a estimated length of 0.28 mm was calculated using Tennant equation, and as (b) intersection count as $C= 11$ , its corresponding estimated length was 0.43 mm. ....	84
Figure 5–1 Schematic representation of the root study containers .....	95
Figure 5–2 Identification of abundant indigenous AMF spores in (a) HP and (b) LP soils before plant growth, (c) AMF colonized in plant root and (d) hyphae in tephra layer after plant growth. ....	96

Figure 5–3 Relationship between equilibrium $\text{H}_2\text{PO}_4^-$ concentration and $\text{H}_2\text{PO}_4^-$ sorbed on tephra.....	101
Figure 5–4 Total P content in the pure tephra slices of different depth (0.5, 1.0, 1.5 mm) away from <i>rhizosphere</i> .....	105
Figure 5–5 Effect of the presence of the HP soil (to which only hyphae had access) below the <i>root zone</i> of LP soil on the plant growth (shoot dry mass) (a), the P uptake (b) and the relative P uptake was expressed relative to the P uptake of plants grown in the treatment LPLP (c). ....	107
Figure 6–1 Experimental treatments design) .....	121
Figure 6–2 Effect of the P status in the root zone soil and biochar on plant growth (shoot DM) (A) and P uptake (B). The data present was the sum of four harvests. The error bars denote 1 SE. Different letters indicate significant differences ( $P < 0.05$ , $n = 4$ ) as determined by one–way ANOVA .....	126
Figure 6–3 Effect of the presence of the HP soil (to which only hyphae had access) below the root zone of LP soil – with and without biochar – on plant growth (shoot DM) (A) and P uptake (B). The data present was the sum of four harvests. The error bars denote 1 SE. Different letters indicate significant differences ( $P < 0.05$ , $n = 4$ ) as determined by one–way ANOVA .....	128
Figure 6–4 The relative plant shoot DM (A) and P uptake (B) were expressed relative to the shoot DM and P uptake of plants grown in the treatment LOLO without any amendments.....	129
Figure 6–5 Effect of biochar on Resin – P (A) and pH (B) of root zone soil after plant growth .....	130
Figure 6–6 The correlation between the plant growth and the decrease of soil pH.....	131

Figure 7–1 Illustration of a short term incubation for increase acidic soils pH to various desired levels and a germination and radicle elongation bioassay to test the response of <i>Alfalfa</i> ( <i>Medicago sativa</i> L.) to acidic soil amended with various ameliorants [BP55, BW550, NaOH and Ca(OH) <sub>2</sub> .] .....	150
Figure 7–2 A diagram representation of aqueous reactive Al fractionation and monomeric Al speciation procedure and composition.....	152
Figure 7–3 Changes in pH and exchangeable Al in (a) Hautere soil and (b) Ramiha soil after amended with NaOH, Ca(OH) <sub>2</sub> , BP550 and BW550 at different application rates (in tables embedded) to target pH levels.....	158
Figure 7–4 Charge balance diagram in aqueous phase (1:10 solid: deionised water) of Hautere soil amended with NaOH (a), Ca(OH) <sub>2</sub> (b), BP550 (c) and BW550 (d).....	162
Figure 7–5 Charge balance diagram in aqueous phase (1:10 solid: deionised water) of Ramiha soil amended with NaOH (a), Ca(OH) <sub>2</sub> (b), BP550 (c) and BW550 (d).....	163
Figure 7–6 Reactive Al (Al <sub>r</sub> ) fractionation in aqueous phase (1:10 solid: deionised water) of Hautere soil (a) and Ramiha soil (b) amended with NaOH, Ca(OH) <sub>2</sub> , BP550 and BW550 at different application rates to various pH levels.....	165
Figure 7–7 Labile monomeric Al (Al <sub>Lm</sub> ) species distribution in aqueous phase (1:10 solid: deionised water) of Hautere soil (a) and Ramiha (b) soils amended with NaOH, Ca(OH) <sub>2</sub> , BP550 and BW550 at different application rates to various pH levels.....	167

Figure 7–8 Response of alfalfa seedling root growth [relative root length (RRL)] to Hautere soil (a) and Ramiha soil (b) amended with NaOH, Ca(OH)<sub>2</sub>, BP550 and BW550 at different application rates to target pH levels ..... 169

# LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Al	Aluminium
Alox	Acid ammonium oxalate extractable aluminium
Alpy	Sodium pyrophosphate extractable aluminium
AMF	Arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi
C	Carbon
Ca	Calcium
Ca(OH) <sub>2</sub>	Calcium hydroxide
CaCO <sub>3</sub>	Calcium carbonate
CEC	Cation exchange capacity
Cl	Chloride
d	days
DGI	digital gridline intersection method
DM	dry matter
EC	Electrical conductivity
Fe	Iron
Feox	Acid ammonium oxalate extractable iron
Fepy	Sodium pyrophosphate extractable iron
FTIR	Fourier–transform infrared spectroscopy
GHG	Greenhouse gas
h	hours
H <sup>+</sup>	Hydrogen ions
HCl	Hydrogen chloride
K	Potassium
Mg	Magnesium
min	minutes
N	Nitrogen
Na	Sodium
NaHCO <sub>3</sub>	Sodium bicarbonate
NaOH	Sodium hydroxide
pH–BC	pH buffering capacity
PIP	photomicrography–ImageJ processing method
P	Phosphorus
RMSE	root mean square errors
VGI	visual gridline intersection method
wk	weeks
XPS	X–ray photoelectron spectroscopy

