

1 **Physiological and yield response in maize in cohesive tropical soil is**  
2 **improved through the addition of gypsum and leguminous mulch**

3

4 **Physiological and yield response in maize in cohesive tropical soil**

5

6 E. G. Moura<sup>1,\*</sup>, P. D. Hallett<sup>2</sup>, S. J. Mooney<sup>3</sup>, F. R. Silva<sup>1</sup>, V. R. A. Macedo<sup>4</sup> and A. C. F.  
7 Aguiar<sup>5</sup>

8

9 <sup>1</sup> *State University of Maranhao, Agroecology Program, Sao Luis, Maranhao, 65054-970,*  
10 *Brazil;* <sup>2</sup> *School of Biological Sciences, University of Aberdeen, Aberdeen, AB24 3UU, UK;*  
11 <sup>3</sup> *School of Biosciences, University of Nottingham, Sutton Bonington Campus, Loughborough,*  
12 *Leics, LE12 5RD, UK;* <sup>4</sup> *Instituto Federal de Educação, Ciência e Tecnologia do Piauí,*  
13 *Campus Uruçuí—Rodovia PI 247, Km 7, S/N, Portal do Cerrado, Uruçuí 64860-000, Brazil;*  
14 <sup>5</sup> *Federal University of Maranhao, Biology Department, Sao Luis, Maranhao, 65080-805,*  
15 *Brazil.*

16 \* **Author for correspondence:** E. G. Moura, E-mail: [egmoura@elointernet.com.br](mailto:egmoura@elointernet.com.br)

# 1 **Physiological and yield response in maize in cohesive tropical soil is** 2 **improved through the addition of gypsum and leguminous mulch**

3

## 4 **Abstract**

5       Tropical soils tend to harden during drying due to the generally low content of free-iron  
6 and organic carbon, combined with high fine sand and silt proportions. It was hypothesized  
7 that change in soil physical condition induced by the addition of a leguminous mulch in  
8 cohesive tropical soil enriched with calcium may mitigate soil hardening through wetting and  
9 drying cycles by rain or irrigation, thereby improving the soil rootability. A leguminous mulch  
10 was added in different concentrations to a structurally fragile tropical soil enriched with  
11 calcium, which then had different irrigation intervals. The treatments were with or without  
12 mulch (10 Mg ha<sup>-1</sup>), with or without added nitrogen (100 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> at 2 intervals) and two  
13 irrigation intervals. In 2015 the irrigation intervals were either 4 or 8 days, and in 2016 they  
14 were either 6 or 9 days. Two years was used in the attempt to achieve greater differences, as  
15 for tested variables, between treatments. Maize planted in these soil treatments was measured  
16 for physiological performance, water use efficiency and yield. Mulch used on structurally  
17 fragile tropical soil enriched with calcium was found to delay increased penetration resistance  
18 from hardening by wet/dry cycles. In this context, an improved soil rootability led to  
19 enlargement of the leaf area index, greater nitrogen uptake and increased CO<sub>2</sub> assimilation.  
20 This had important physiological consequences due to the positive effect on increased dry  
21 matter production and maize yield. In addition, these results suggested that mulch, used with  
22 urea, can delay the water supply for 3 or 4 days due to improvements in soil rootability caused  
23 by calcium and organic matter interactions. This may be crucial to a region where small  
24 intervals without rain are increasingly common due to global climate change. Therefore, due

25 to a greater water use efficiency, this strategy may be a profitable way to increase crop  
26 productivity in tropical conditions rather than increasing water and nutrient application alone.

27

28 **Key words:** soil strength; leguminous; nitrogen; *Zea mays* L.; water stress; irrigation intervals

29

30

### 31 **Introduction**

32 The productivity of crops is directly related to their capture of resources such as water and  
33 nutrients and the efficiency with which they convert them into biological products (Yi *et al.*,  
34 2010). In efforts to reduce resource inputs and create more sustainable soil use, assessing the  
35 performance of crop systems is increasingly important to retain agricultural productivity  
36 (Levidow *et al.*, 2014). Crop yields are mainly co-limited by availability of both water and  
37 nitrogen (N), which are the most essential resources for crop production. Mueller *et al.* (2012)  
38 estimated that global crop production may be increased by 45 to 70% for most crops by  
39 improving water and N availability and exploitation simultaneously. Achieving such increases  
40 requires a quantitative understanding of how soil constrains water and N uptake by crops,  
41 including often overlooked physical processes that may constrain root growth, N cycling, and  
42 water availability.

43 In tropical regions, available water capacity and nitrogen availability in most soils are limited.

44 The quality of these soils are further limited by generally low contents of free-iron and organic  
45 carbon, combined with high fine sand and silt proportions, that cause these soils to harden  
46 during drying cycles (Daniells, 2012). This process harms soil rootability, reduces the soil  
47 volume accessed by roots, impairs water and nitrogen uptake, and decreases nitrogen and water  
48 use efficiency (Moura *et al.*, 2010). Under tropical meteorological conditions, the high  
49 atmospheric evaporative demand can produce an actual transpiration rate that may be less than

50 the potential transpiration rate, even though the soil moisture supply might be considered  
51 sufficient. Crops may have a loss of turgidity, decreased carbon uptake, cessation of growth  
52 and lower productivity (Denmead and Shaw, 1962). According to Becher *et al.* (1997), in soil  
53 that hardens, diminished root growth can be observed when the water potential approaches -  
54 100 kPa, which according to Moura *et al.* (2017) may occur in the fourth day after rain or  
55 irrigation in tropical conditions.

56 In these circumstances, water and nutrient uptake relies heavily on the volume of soil  
57 explored by the plant roots. Therefore, enhancing soil rootability is crucial to increase crop  
58 growth, and water and nutrient use efficiency and to become more productive the crop systems.  
59 In these soils the mechanical constraints from hardening need to be overcome, which is feasible  
60 through use of mulching, gypsum application and increased humified organic matter (Mulumba  
61 and Lal, 2008; Sumner, 2009; Carrizo *et al.*, 2015). Unfortunately, in tropical regions,  
62 achieving the required amount of humified organic matter is limited by conditions that favour  
63 rapid decay of applied biomass (Christensen, 2000).

64 Mulching with surface residues provides soil cover and decreases the water evaporation  
65 rate, so that soil moisture loss and the hard-setting process is diminished (Moura *et al.*, 2014).  
66 In addition, in soil enriched with polyvalent cations the new organic matter derived from mulch  
67 interacts with calcium and magnesium, enhancing soil structure in the root zone further  
68 (Wuddivira and Camps-Roach, 2007). However, the relation between the improved soil  
69 rootability possibly caused by mulching and by interactions between organic matter and  
70 polyvalent cations on plant physiological factors that sustain plant growth has yet to be  
71 confirmed. Such understanding would support efforts to avoid wasting water and nutrients in  
72 tropical agricultural systems.

73 The hypotheses of this paper is that the addition of leguminous mulch to a cohesive tropical  
74 soil with gypsum may improve maize performance by enhanced rootability as hardening by

75 wetting and drying cycles will diminish. This was measured in a controlled field experiments  
76 over two seasons, with a further treatment of different irrigation intensity. Through this  
77 combined understanding of plant physiological response to potential decreases in the hardening  
78 of tropical soils, the benefits of using mulch and gypsum simultaneously will be better  
79 understood. This will provide reliable to data to guide agronomic practice to improve nitrogen  
80 and water use efficiency. Therefore, the aim of this study was to evaluate how the use of the  
81 mulch can affect soil-rootability, reducing penetration resistance of structurally fragile tropical  
82 soil enriched with calcium. The crop properties of nutrient uptake, growth, productivity and  
83 water use efficiency in maize were also compared to soil physical measurements of strength  
84 and water content.

85

## 86 **Materials and methods**

### 87 *Experimental site*

88 The experiment was conducted at Maranhão State University, Brazil (2°30' S, 44°18' W),  
89 which has a hot, semi-humid, equatorial climate with a mean precipitation of 2,100 mm/year  
90 and two well-defined seasons, a rainy season that extends from January to June and a dry season  
91 with a pronounced water deficit that extends from July to December. The average temperature  
92 is approximately 27 °C, the maximum temperature is 37 °C, and the minimum temperature is  
93 23 °C. The average potential evapotranspiration rate of the experimental period is 6.5 mm/day.

94 The local soils display hardsetting characteristics (determined by the relationship  
95 between penetration resistance and volumetric water content) and are classified as Arenic  
96 Hapludults (Soil Survey Staff, 2014; Moura *et al.*, 2012). The A (0-20 cm layer) horizon has  
97 the properties in the Table 1. These soil characteristics were obtained according to the standard  
98 methods of Carter and Gregorich (2008). The area was limed in September 2014, with 1 Mg/ha  
99 of surface-applied lime, corresponding to 390 and 130 kg/ha of Ca and Mg, respectively. In

100 this same period, natural gypsum was applied at a rate of 6 Mg/ ha, which corresponds to 1,020  
101 kg/ha of Ca. The gypsum grain size was such that 95% by weight passed through a 0.25-mm  
102 screen mesh.

103

#### 104 *Experimental trial*

105 The experiment was conducted during two dry seasons of the years 2015 and 2016. However,  
106 the plots with mulch received 10 Mg/ha of leaves and branches of *Acacia mangium* legume in  
107 2013 and 2014. The experimental layout was established with mulching or bare soil, with or  
108 without nitrogen and with 4 and 8-day irrigation intervals in 2015. In 2016, the irrigation  
109 intervals were extended to 6 and 9-day in the attempt to achieve greater differences, as for  
110 tested variables, between treatments. Four replicates were distributed in a completely  
111 randomized block design, including the treatments described in Table 2. Plot size was 8 x 5 m  
112 and maize (cultivar AG 1055) was sown at the beginning of October 2015 and 2016 in a 1.0 x  
113 0.25-m spacing resulting in four plants/m<sup>2</sup>. The soil was manually fertilized with 120 kg/ha  
114 P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>, 100 kg/ha K<sub>2</sub>O and 5 kg/ha Zn, according to Tropical Soil Fertilizer Manual. In addition,  
115 the following treatment was applied: 100 kg/ha of nitrogen as urea divided into two applications  
116 and 10 Mg/ha of leaves and branches of *Acacia mangium* legume, five days after germination  
117 of the maize, which was also applied in 2013 and 2014. Water was supplied by drip tape  
118 irrigation, using one tape by row with emitters spaced 25 cm apart, each delivering 1.25 L/h  
119 over 4 h to deliver a total of 20 mm of water per irrigation.

120

#### 121 *Soil and plant measurements*

122 All the field measurements of soil and plants were done at V-18 stage of the maize, immediately  
123 before irrigation of each treatment. The penetration resistance was measured in 2016 with 10-

124 cm gradations, at layers of 0-10 cm and 10-20 cm, using a digital penetrometer (Falker, Porto  
125 Alegre, Brazil) with three replicates per plot.

126 In December 2016, when irrigation experiment had been finished, soil samples were  
127 collected using a heavy-duty auger to evaluate interactions between organic matter and base  
128 cations. The samples consisted of five sub-samples collected at two depth increments (0–10  
129 and 10–20 cm) and were used for chemical analyses. Samples were taken after the 2016 harvest  
130 and therefore, the treatments were: CN = soil covered by mulch and with nitrogen; C = soil  
131 covered by mulch; BN = bare soil and with nitrogen; and B = bare soil. Each sample was air-  
132 drier, homogenized and immediately analysed for exchangeable K, Ca, and Mg (using an  
133 ‘exchangeable ion resin’) and potential acidity (H + Al using a SMP (Shoemaker, McLean  
134 and Platt) buffer solution at pH 7.0)). All analysis were made according to Raij *et*  
135 *al.*, (2001). The cation exchange capacity (CEC) was calculated as  $K + Ca + Mg + (H + Al)$ ,  
136 and the sum of bases (SB) was calculated as  $K + Ca + Mg$ . The base saturation percentage  
137 (BSP) was calculated as  $SB/CEC \times 100$ . Furthermore, Ca, Mg, and K measurements were  
138 obtained using a Varian 720-ES ICP Optical Emission matter analysis Spectrometer.

139 For the SOM physical fractionation, a granulometric method was used as described by  
140 Cambardella and Elliot (1992). Air-dried soil samples of 20g were sieved through 2-mm mesh  
141 and weighed in 250 mL polyethylene cups, in which 80 mL of 5 g/L sodium  
142 hexametaphosphate was added. The samples were stirred for 15h on a horizontal stirrer, sieved  
143 through 53  $\mu\text{m}$  mesh, and rinsed until the clay was completely removed. The particulate  
144 material remaining on the sieve was transferred to aluminium pots and dried to a constant mass  
145 in a forced-air oven at 50 °C. After drying, the material was weighed, ground in a porcelain  
146 mortar, homogenized with the aid of a glass rod, and C was determined using an elemental  
147 analyzer. Then, the soil particulate organic carbon (POC) was calculated. The soil mineral

148 organic carbon (MOC) was obtained by the difference between soil total organic carbon (TOC)  
149 and POC.

150

### 151 *Evaluation of gas exchange*

152 The following gas exchange parameters were evaluated in 2015: the photosynthetic CO<sub>2</sub>  
153 assimilation (Pn), stomatal conductance (g<sub>s</sub>) and transpiration rate (E). This used a Portable  
154 Measurement System for Gaseous Exchanges (IRGA), LI-6400® model, LI-COR, Lincoln,  
155 NE, USA. In the evaluation phase of the plants, an artificial light (system coupled with IRGA  
156 with blue and red LEDs) was used with an intensity of 1500 µmol/m<sup>2</sup>/s. During the evaluations,  
157 the initial concentration of CO<sub>2</sub> in the chamber was maintained at around 380 µmol/mol. These  
158 physiological parameters were measured on two new fully expanded leaves, for three plants  
159 chosen at random in each plot, in the upper part of the canopy exposed to full sunlight, between  
160 8:00 and 10:00am in the morning. Three measurements were recorded automatically every 2  
161 min for each leaf to ensure a steady-state condition for the gas exchange flow. The light units  
162 (the diode array contained blue and red LEDs), with the upper jaw enclosing the leaf, were  
163 used to ensure constant irradiance that replicated the sunlight (1600 µmol/m<sup>2</sup>/s). The  
164 measurements were carried out four days after the irrigation.

165 In 2015 and 2016, at physiological maturity, harvest was manually made, and the grain  
166 yield components were separately assessed in a 10 m<sup>2</sup> area. The grain yields (GY) were  
167 determined, and all of the values were adjusted according to a moisture level of 145 g/kg. The  
168 water efficiency indices were calculated using the following formulae: (1) Biological water use  
169 efficiency (BWUE); (2) Agronomic water use efficiency (AWUE).

$$170 \quad (1) BWUE = \frac{\text{dry matter (Mg ha}^{-1}\text{)}}{\text{water depth applied (mm)}}$$

$$171 \quad (2) AWUE = \frac{\text{grain yield (Mg ha}^{-1}\text{)}}{\text{water depth applied (mm)}}$$



172 *Statistical analyses*

173 The data were analyzed via analysis of variance (ANOVA), and the means were  
174 compared using Tukey's post hoc test at a  $P = 0.05$  significance level. The data were analyzed  
175 using InfoStat software (InfoStat Group, College of Agricultural Sciences, National University  
176 of Córdoba, Argentina). Correlations between the calcium and soil organic matter fractions  
177 were investigated through canonical redundancy analysis (RDA). These analyses were  
178 performed using the R software (R Development Core Team, 2009). According to Legendre  
179 and Gallagher (2001), after meaningful transformation of the data, RDA is the best suited  
180 method to study the relations between environmental variables.

181

182 **Results**

183 *Changes in soil attributes*

184 Mulching with nitrogen increased significantly contents of Ca at the 0 - 20 cm layer ( $P < 0.05$ ),  
185 but without nitrogen, calcium only increased in the 0 – 10 cm layer. Meanwhile, Mg content  
186 was also significantly increased by mulching in the 10 cm layer ( $P < 0.05$ ) (Fig. 1A and 1B).  
187 In the same way, the fraction of particulate organic carbon (POC) was increased by the mulch  
188 in the 0 - 10 cm layer (Fig. 1C). In the 10 – 20 cm layer, the organic matter fraction was  
189 increased by nitrogen with and without mulching ( $P < 0.05$ ). Meanwhile mineral organic  
190 carbon (MOC) was more than twice as greater in the 0 – 20 cm layer in the plots with mulch  
191 (Fig. 1D), but MOC was increased by nitrogen only in treatments with mulch ( $P < 0.05$ ).

192 The canonical redundancy analyses showed strong association between Ca, Mg and  
193 mineral organic carbon (MOC) fractions and weak association with particulate organic matter  
194 (POC), in the plots with mulch, in the 0 – 10 cm layer (Fig. 2). However, in the 10 – 20 cm  
195 layer only MOC was associated to Ca and Mg. In contrast, plots without mulch were only  
196 associated with soil penetration resistance in the 0 – 20 cm layer.

197 Results in 2016 showed that mulch decreased significantly soil penetration resistance  
198 (PR) directly measured at the 0 – 20 cm layer always when nitrogen was used ( $P < 0.05$ ) (Fig.  
199 3). However, in plots without nitrogen, the mulch effect did not decrease PR when it was not  
200 significantly different in the treatments 6 and 6C, in 5 – 10 cm layer and 9 and 9C in 0 – 10 cm  
201 layer. In contrast, from 10 cm depth, all plots with mulch showed PR more than 70% lower  
202 those without mulch. From an agronomic point of view, these results suggest that for the 10 –  
203 20 cm layer, all treatments without mulch could be considered as having dense soil, which will  
204 harm nutrient and water uptake.

205

### 206 *Water physiological parameters and nitrogen uptake*

207 The mulch combined with nitrogen and the narrower interval between irrigation affected the  
208 transpiration rate (E) (Table 3), such that the 4CN treatment was greater than all other  
209 treatments and three times higher than in 8B and 8BN. There was no significant differences  
210 among the other treatments. In the same way, the stomatal conductance ( $g_s$ ) was more than two  
211 times lower in the treatments 8BN and 8B ( $0.05 \text{ mol m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ ), higher in 4CN ( $0.19 \text{ mol m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ )  
212 and intermediate in the other treatments. The interval between irrigation affected  
213 photosynthetic  $\text{CO}_2$  assimilation, which was greater in the 4-day interval treatments. However,  
214 for 8CN and 8C it was around three times greater than in the 8BN and 8B treatments. In the  
215 treatments without nitrogen, the mulch significantly increased the leaf area index in all intervals  
216 between irrigation. Thus,  $4C > 4B$  and  $8C > 8B$ . In contrast, the application of nitrogen and the  
217 irrigation intervals had no effect on the leaf size and for the treatments without mulch and  
218 nitrogen, 4B and 8B produced foliar index without significant differences between them and  
219 narrower than 8CN, 8C, 4CN, 4C.

220 The mulch significantly increased N accumulation by maize (Fig. 4), in 2015 and in  
221 2016 in the two-irrigation intervals, with and without urea ( $P < 0.05$ ). The positive effect of

222 mulch on N accumulation can be seen between the different irrigation intervals, 8CN = 4BN,  
223 9CN = 6BN and 8C = 4B, 9C = 6B. The use of urea without mulch was equivalent to use of  
224 mulch alone in terms of N accumulation in maize. The irrigation interval also increased N  
225 accumulation, therefore the higher quantities of N accumulated were in 4CN and 6CN.

226 In 2015, dry matter production and yield were increased by mulch in such a way that  
227 all mulch treatments had greater biomass than in its comparable uncovered treatment (4CN >  
228 4BN, 4C > 4B, 8CN > 8BN, 8C > 8B) (Table 4). In the same way, in 2016, dry matter and yield  
229 were greater in treatments with mulch for most treatments, apart from some treatments with a  
230 9 day irrigation interval. In addition, when comparing treatments with and without mulch but  
231 with smaller and larger irrigation intervals, can be realized that mulch addition increases  
232 biological water use efficiency in the two years: 4CN = 8BN and 8C = 4B, and 9CN = 6CN,  
233 9C = 6B (Table 4).

234 Biological water use efficiency (BWUE) refers to produced biomass per water applied,  
235 while agronomic water use efficiency (AWUE) is maize grain yield per water applied. BWUE  
236 was increased by mulch in almost all treatments in 2015 and 2016, except to those with  
237 narrower irrigation intervals without N (4B = 4C and 6B = 6C). In addition, the treatments with  
238 9-day of irrigation interval with N was not significantly different: 9CN = 9BN (Table 4). The  
239 use of N and the increase of irrigation interval in the plots with mulch almost doubled BWUE,  
240 which can be seen comparing 4BN to 8CN (2.23 to 4.36) or 6BN to 9CN (3.69 to 6.59). The  
241 use of N in 2016 increased the BWUE when mulch was used, but also for 9 days irrigation  
242 interval 9BN > 9B even without mulch. AWUE also was increased by mulch in the two years,  
243 in almost all treatments, except for 9CN and 9BN for which there was no significant difference.  
244 AWUE was increased by N only in 2016, in all treatments.

245

## 246 Discussion

247 Mulch decreased the onset of soil hardening, resulting in improved crop performance. These  
248 effects may have been accentuated by the pre-treatment of the soil with gypsum and lime,  
249 which is a common practice to improve structural stability and increase pH. Calcium and  
250 magnesium added during this pre-treatment interacting with organic carbon provided by the  
251 mulch can form bridges between soil particles that cause aggregation (Whittinghill *et al.*,  
252 2012). With the high levels of rainfall levels found at the study site (1,960 mm/year) and the  
253 high water infiltration rate of the sandy loam soil (70 mm/h) (Moura *et al.*, 2012), cations may  
254 move quickly through the soil profile, although mulch may retard the rate of leaching, as  
255 observed in the greater Ca concentrations observed in the mulch amended plots. In the same  
256 way, variation in exchangeable cation concentrations can affect fluxes of dissolved organic  
257 matter by stabilizing negatively charged organic matter through sorption to positively charged  
258 cations (Moore and Turunen, 2004). The bond between polyvalent cations and negatively  
259 charged organic matter functional groups is not easily reversible and surfaces of organic  
260 materials will be less accessible for microbial activity. This explains the greater POC and MOC  
261 contents in plots with mulch, although accumulation of organic matter could be impaired by  
262 conditions that favour fast decay of incorporated biomass in humid tropical regions  
263 (Christensen, 2000). The increase in SOC in plots with N may be attributed to increased C  
264 sequestered in plant biomass, returned to the soil as crop residue (Aula *et al.*, 2016).  
265 Furthermore, the strong association between cations and the organic matter fraction in the  
266 principal component analysis confirm the effects of the interactions between organic carbon  
267 with calcium and magnesium, which can have a positive effect on soil rootability (Fig. 2). This  
268 is reflected in the smaller PR and greater biomass measured in mulch plots compared to bare  
269 plots.

270            Provided that the differences in PR cannot be explained by small and non-significant  
271 variations in soil moisture (data not shown), biomass and gypsum combined were able to

272 improve the soil root environment by decreasing PR in the 0 - 20 cm layer in the treatments  
273 with biomass (Fig. 3). Increased porosity and in sand loamy soil can be promoted by biomass  
274 application according to Shepherd et al. (2002), by decreasing PR and enhancing aggregation.  
275 In addition, the structural improvements caused by Ca<sup>2+</sup> applied via gypsum will accentuate  
276 soil particle aggregation, thereby creating even better soil conditions for root growth (Anikwe  
277 et al., 2016). Wuddivira and Camps-Roach (2007) studied the interaction between calcium and  
278 organic matter in a sandy-kaolinitic soil similar to the soil we examined. This study supports  
279 our finding of improved rootability, which they attributed to increased aggregate stability from  
280 the formation of strong bonds involving Ca<sup>2+</sup> bridges.

281 Greater water uptake due to physiological processes and stomatal conductance is  
282 directly mediated by the water transpiration rate. As stomatal conductance controls CO<sub>2</sub> flux  
283 in leaves, the similarities of the photosynthetic CO<sub>2</sub> assimilation that we observed in plots 4BN,  
284 4B, 8CN, 8C, may be explained by similar variations in transpiration rate (Table 3). However,  
285 a reduction in gas exchange by a reduction in stomatal conductance depends on the extent to  
286 which vegetation is coupled with its surrounding atmosphere; therefore, stomatal conductance  
287 is less responsive to water deficits than tissue expansion (Graça et al., 2010). Indeed, the  
288 differences in the leaf area index showed that in comparison to nitrogen or the irrigation  
289 interval, mulch had a greater impact on increased leaf expansion, which is one of the most  
290 sensitive processes to water stress. According to Sadras and Milroy (1996), reduced leaf area  
291 is probably the most obvious mechanism crops use to restrict water loss in response to soil-  
292 stress. The mulch increased the accumulation of nitrogen in treatments with urea compared to  
293 bare soil treatments. Therefore, the increased leaf area index in the covered plots may be  
294 explained by modification in the water and nitrogen extraction pattern by plants. Indeed, in this  
295 cohesive soil, enhancement in root growth is associated with a reduction in cohesion due to

296 increased OC derived from the application of gypsum and biomass in previous years (Moura  
297 *et al.*, 2018).

298 One of the most significant findings of this study is the capacity of mulch to delay the  
299 onset of water stress. With increased irrigation intervals of 4 to 8 days (2015) or 6 to 9 days  
300 (2016), plots amended with mulch at the longer interval had similar crop physiological  
301 response, water use efficiency and yield of maize to plots not amended with mulch at the shorter  
302 interval. These results suggested that mulch, used with urea, can delay the water supply for 3  
303 or 4 days due to improvements in soil rootability caused by calcium and organic matter  
304 interactions. This may be crucial to a region where small intervals without rain are increasingly  
305 common due to global climate change.

306

### 307 **Conclusions**

308 Using two years research in the attempt to achieve greater differences, as for tested variables  
309 between treatments, we concluded that the use of the mulch on structurally fragile tropical soil  
310 enriched with calcium can delay the cohesion process associated with hardsetting, thus  
311 reducing the maximum soil penetration resistance. The improved soil rootability led to an  
312 enhanced leaf area index, greater nitrogen uptake and increased CO<sub>2</sub> assimilation, which had  
313 important physiological consequences including increased dry matter production and maize  
314 yield. Therefore, due to improved water use efficiency, this strategy may be a simple, profitable  
315 way to increase crop productivity in tropical conditions rather than seeking to increase water  
316 and nutrient applications alone.

317

318 **Acknowledgements.** The Brazilian authors thank the Coordination for the Improvement of  
319 Higher Level Personnel (CAPES) and National Council for Scientific and Technological  
320 Development (CNPq) for their support.

321

## 322 **Financial Support**

323 The current work was undertaken as part of NUCLEUS, a virtual joint centre to deliver  
324 enhanced N-use efficiency via an integrated soil–plant systems approach for the United  
325 Kingdom and Brazil. Funded in Brazil by FAPESP—São Paulo Research Foundation [grant  
326 number 2015/50305-8]; FAPEG—Goiás Research Foundation [grant number 2015-  
327 10267001479]; and FAPEMA—Maranhão Research Foundation [grant number RCUK-  
328 02771/16]; and in the United Kingdom by the Biotechnology and Biological Sciences Research  
329 Council [grant number BB/N013201/1] under the Newton Fund scheme.

330

331 **Conflicts of Interest.** The authors declare there are no conflicts of interest.

332

333 **Ethical Standards.** Not applicable.

334

## 335 **References**

336 **Anikwe MAN, Eze JC and Ibudialo AN** (2016). Influence of lime and gypsum application  
337 on soil properties and yield of cassava (*Manihot esculenta* Crantz.) in a degraded Ultisol  
338 in Agbani, Enugu Southeastern Nigeria. *Soil & Tillage Research* **158**, 32–38.

339 **Aula L, Macnack N, Omara P, Mullock J and Raun W** (2016). Effect of fertilizer nitrogen  
340 (N) on soil organic carbon, total N, and soil pH in long-term continuous winter wheat  
341 (*Triticum Aestivum* L.). *Communications in Soil Science and Plant Analysis* **47**, 863–74.

342 **Becher HH, Breuer J and Klingler B** (1997). An index value for characterizing hardsetting  
343 soils by fall-cone penetration. *Soil Technology* **10**, 47–56.

344 **Cambardella CA and Elliott ET** (1992). Particulate Soil Organic-Matter Changes across a  
345 Grassland Cultivation Sequence. *Soil Science Society American Journal* **56**, 777-783.

346 **Carrizo ME, Alesso CA, Cosentino D and Imhoff S** (2015). Aggregation agents and  
347 structural stability in soils with different texture and organic carbon contents. *Scientia*  
348 *Agricola* **72**, 75-82.

349 **Carter MR and Gregorich EG** (2008). Soil Sampling and Methods of Analyses. CRS Press,  
350 New York.

351 **Christensen BT** (2000). Organic matter in soil: structure, function and turnover. Tjele, Dias.

352 **Cottenie A** (1980). Soil and plant testing as a basis of fertilizer recommendations. FAO Soil  
353 Bulletin 38/2, FAO Rome, Italy.

354 **Daniells IG** (2012). Hardsetting soils: a review. *Soil Research* **50**, 349–359.

355 **Denmead OT and Shaw RH** (1962). Availability of soil water to plants as affected by soil  
356 moisture content and meteorological conditions. *Agronomy Journal* **54**, 385-390.

357 **Graça JP, Rodrigues FA, Farias JRB, Oliveira MCN, Hoffmann-Campo CB and**  
358 **Zingaretti SM** (2010). Physiological parameters in sugarcane cultivars submitted to  
359 water deficit. *Brazilian Journal of Plant Physiology* **22**, 189-197.

360 **Legendre P and Gallagher ED** (2001). Ecologically meaningful transformations for  
361 ordination of species data. *Oecologia* **129**, 271–280.

362 **Levidow L, Pimbert M and Vanloqueren G** (2014). Agroecological Research:  
363 Conforming—or Transforming the Dominant Agro-Food Regime? *Agroecology and*  
364 *Sustainable Food Systems* **38**, 1127-1155.

365 **Moore TR and J Turunen** (2004). Carbon Accumulation and Storage in Mineral Subsoil  
366 beneath Peat. *Soil Science Society American Journal* **68**, 690-696.

367 **Moura EG, Serpa SS, Santos JGD, Costa Sobrinho, JR and Aguiar ACF** (2010). Nutrient  
368 use efficiency in alley cropping systems in the Amazonian periphery. *Plant and Soil* **335**,  
369 363-371.



370 **Moura EG, Oliveira AK, Coutinho CG, Pinheiro KM and Aguiar ACF** (2012).  
371 Management of a cohesive tropical soil to enhance rootability and increase the efficiency  
372 of nitrogen and potassium use. *Soil and Use Management* **28**, 368-375.

373 **Moura EG, Marques ES, Silva TMB, Piedade AR and Aguiar ACF** (2014). Interactions  
374 among leguminous trees, crops and weeds in a no-till alley cropping system. *International*  
375 *Journal of Plant Production* **8**, 441-456.

376 **Moura EG, Macedo VRA, Sena VGL, Campos LS and Aguiar ACF** (2017). Soil physical  
377 changes and maize growth in a structurally fragile tropical soil due to mulching and  
378 duration between irrigation intervals. *Soil and Use Management* **3**, 631-638.

379 **Moura EG, Portela SB, Macedo VRA, Sena VGL, Sousa CCS and Aguiar ACF** (2018).  
380 Gypsum and Legume Residue as a Strategy to Improve Soil Conditions in Sustainability  
381 of Agrosystems of the Humid Tropics. *Sustainability* **10**, 1006.

382 **Mueller ND, Gerber JS, Johnston M, Ray DK, Ramankutty N and Foley JA** (2012).  
383 Closing yield gaps through nutrient and water management. *Nature* **490**, 254-257.

384 **Mulumba LN and Lal R** (2008). Mulching effects on selected soil physical properties. *Soil &*  
385 *Tillage Research* **98**, 106 – 111.

386 **Raij B van, Andrade JC, Cantarella H and Quaggio JA** (2001). Análise química para  
387 avaliação da fertilidade de solos tropicais. Campinas, Instituto Agronômico.

388 **Sadras VO and Milroy SP** (1996). Soil-water thresholds for the responses of leaf expansion  
389 and gas exchange: a review. *Field Crop Research* **47**, 253-266.

390 **Shepherd MA, Harrison R and Webb J** (2002). Managing soil organic matter-implications  
391 for structure on organic farms. *Soil and Use Management* **18**, 284-292.

392 **Soil Survey Staff** (2014). Keys to Soil Taxonomy. USDA-Natural Resources Conservation  
393 Service, Washington, DC.

394 **Sumner ME** (2009). Gypsum improves subsoil root growth. Proceedings of International  
395 symposium “Root Reseacher and Aplications, sept, 2-4, BOKU, Viena, Austria,1-4.

396 **Whittinghill K, Hobbie and Sarah E** (2012). Effects of pH and calcium on soil organic matter  
397 dynamics in Alaskan tundra. *Biogeochemistry* **111**, 569–581.

398 **Wuddivira MN and Camps-Roach G** (2007). Effects of organic matter and calcium on soil  
399 structural stability. *European Journal of Soil Science* **58**, 722–727.

400 **Yi L, Shenjiao Y, Shiqing L, Xinping C and Fang C** (2010). Growth and development of  
401 maize (*Zea mays* L.) in response to different field water management practices: resource  
402 capture and use efficiency. *Agricultural and Forestry Meteorology* **150**, 606-613.

403

404

405

406

407

408

409

410

411

412

413

414

415

416

417

418

419 **Legends of the figures:**

420 **Fig. 1.** Calcium, magnesium, particulate organic carbon (POC), and mineral organic carbon  
421 (MOC) contents in the soil.

422 CN = soil covered by mulch and with nitrogen; C = soil covered by mulch; BN = bare soil and  
423 with nitrogen; and B = bare soil. Different letters (lowercase for 0-10cm layer and uppercase  
424 for 10-20cm layer) indicate significant difference at the 5% level by the Tukey's test. ns = no  
425 significant

426 **Fig. 2.** Principal components analyses of calcium, magnesium, organic carbon fractions and  
427 soil penetration strength

428 POC=particulate organic carbon; MOC=mineral organic carbon; TOC=total organic carbon;  
429 Ca=calcium; Mg=magnesium; SB=sum of bases; BSP=base saturation percentage

430 **Fig. 3.** Penetration resistance in 2016, at 0-20 cm layer.

431 6 and 9-days irrigation intervals; CN: soil covered by mulch and with nitrogen; BN: bare soil  
432 and with nitrogen; C: soil covered by mulch; B: bare soil.

433 **Fig. 4.** Nitrogen maize accumulation in 2015 and 2016 in the treatments.

434 Different letters (lowercase for 2015 and uppercase for 2016) indicate significant difference at  
435 the 5% level by the Tukey's test. ns = no significant. 4, 6, 8 and 9-days irrigation intervals;  
436 CN: soil covered by mulch and with nitrogen; BN: bare soil and with nitrogen; C: soil covered  
437 by mulch; B: bare soil.

438

**Table 1** - Characteristics of soil of the experimental area before the beginning the experiment. Soil organic matter SOM, sum of base SB, percentage base saturation PBS.

0 – 20 cm	SOM	P	Ca	Mg	K	pH	Al+H	CEC	PBS	Clay	Silt	Coarse Sand	Fine Sand
	----- mg kg <sup>-1</sup> -----					CaCl <sub>2</sub>	mmol <sub>c</sub> kg <sup>-1</sup>		----- % -----				
	20.0	150.0	231.2	84.2	30.1	4.0	25.0	50.0	46.2	9.5	6.5	30.0	54.0

**Table 2** - Treatments used in the study: Irrigation intervals (days), Covered (C) and Bare (B) soil with Nitrogen (N).

Year	Treatments			
	Irrigation Intervals (days)	Soil	Nitrogen	Abbreviations
2015	4	Covered	N	4CN
	4	Covered	—	4C
	4	Bare	N	4BN
	4	Bare	—	4B
	8	Covered	N	8CN
	8	Covered	—	8C
	8	Bare	N	8BN
	8	Bare	—	8B
2016	6	Covered	N	6CN
	6	Covered	—	6C
	6	Bare	N	6BN
	6	Bare	—	6B
	9	Covered	N	9CN
	9	Covered	—	9C
	9	Bare	N	9BN
	9	Bare	—	9B

**Table 3.** Transpiration rate (E), stomatal conductance ( $g_s$ ), photosynthetic CO<sub>2</sub> assimilation (P) and leaf area index (LAI) in the treatments.

	E (mmol m <sup>-2</sup> s <sup>-1</sup> )	$g_s$ (mol m <sup>-2</sup> s <sup>-1</sup> )	P <sub>n</sub> (μmol m <sup>-2</sup> s <sup>-1</sup> )	LAI (m <sup>2</sup> m <sup>-2</sup> )
4CN	6.13 a	0.19 a	33.52 a	3.27 a
4C	4.96 b	0.17 ab	28.55 b	3.19 a
4BN	4.90 b	0.15 b	27.75 b	2.83 ab
4B	4.43 b	0.17 ab	27.79 a	2.66 b
8CN	3.85 b	0.15 b	25.78 b	3.35 a
8C	3.89 b	0.12b	25.26 b	3.14 a
8BN	2.08 c	0.05 c	18.43 c	2.81 ab
8B	1.96 c	0.05 c	17.94 c	2.11 b

Distinct letters in the column indicate significantly differences ( $P < 0.05$ ).

4 and 8-days irrigation intervals; CN: soil covered by mulch and with nitrogen; BN: bare soil and with nitrogen; C: soil covered by mulch; B: bare soil.

**Table 4.** Dry matter, yield, agronomic water use efficiency (AWUE) and biological water use efficiency (BWUE) in the treatments.

Treatments	2015			
	Dry matter	Yield	AWUE	BWUE
	Mg ha <sup>-1</sup>	Mg ha <sup>-1</sup>	Mg ha <sup>-1</sup> mm <sup>-1</sup>	Mg ha <sup>-1</sup> mm <sup>-1</sup>
4CN	12.27a	6.33a	3.07b	1.60b
4BN	8.93c	4.40c	2.23c	1.10c
4C	10.73b	5.75b	2.68bc	1.44b
4B	8.81c	3.81c	2.20c	0.96d
8CN	8.71c	4.68c	4.36a	2.34a
8BN	7.49d	3.34d	3.75b	1.67b
8C	8.48c	4.51c	4.24a	2.25a
8B	7.25d	3.41d	3.63b	1.71b
			2016	
6CN	13.97a	7.21a	5.37a	2.78a
6BN	10.33b	5.67b	3.69bc	2.18b
6C	9.70b	5.04b	3.73c	1.99b
6B	7.96c	3.83c	3.06c	1.47c
9CN	11.87b	6.12b	6.59a	3.40a

9BN	10.76b	5.61b	5.98a	3.12a
9C	8.62c	4.34c	4.79b	2.41b
9B	6.96d	3.44c	3.87c	1.91c

---

Distinct letters in the column indicate significantly differences ( $P < 0.05$ ).

4, 6, 8 and 9-days irrigation intervals; CN: soil covered by mulch and with nitrogen; BN: bare soil and with nitrogen; C: soil covered by mulch; B: bare soil.









