

**A peer-reviewed version of this preprint was published in PeerJ on 25 August 2016.**

[View the peer-reviewed version](https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.2385) (peerj.com/articles/2385), which is the preferred citable publication unless you specifically need to cite this preprint.

Gale NV, Sackett TE, Thomas SC. 2016. Thermal treatment and leaching of biochar alleviates plant growth inhibition from mobile organic compounds. PeerJ 4:e2385 <https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.2385>

# Thermal treatment and leaching biochar alleviates plant growth inhibition from mobile organic compounds

Nigel V Gale <sup>Corresp., 1</sup>, Tara E Sackett <sup>1</sup>, Sean C Thomas <sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Faculty of Forestry, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada

Corresponding Author: Nigel V Gale

Email address: nigel.gale@mail.utoronto.ca

Recent meta-analyses of plant responses to biochar boast positive average effects of between 10 and 40 %. Plant responses, however, vary greatly across systems, and null or negative biochar effects are increasingly reported. The mechanisms responsible for such responses remain unclear. In a glasshouse experiment we tested the effects of three forestry residue wood biochars, applied at five dosages (0, 5, 10, 20, 50 t/ha) to a temperate forest drystic cambisol as direct surface applications and as complete soil mixes on the herbaceous pioneers *Lolium multiflorum* and *Trifolium repens*. Null and negative effects of biochar on growth were found in most cases. One potential cause for null and negative plant responses to biochar is plant exposure to mobile compounds produced during pyrolysis that leach or evolve following additions of biochars to soil. In a second glasshouse experiment we examined the effects of simple leaching and heating techniques to ameliorate potentially phytotoxic effects of volatile and leachable compounds released from biochar. We used Solid Phase Microextraction (SPME) – gas chromatography – mass spectrometry (GC-MS) to qualitatively describe organic compounds in both biochar (through headspace extraction), and in the water leachates (through direct injection). Convection heating and water leaching of biochar prior to application alleviated growth inhibition. Additionally, growth was inhibited when filtrate from water-leached biochar was applied following germination. SPME-GC-MS detected primarily short-chained carboxylic acids and phenolics in both the leachates and solid chars, with relatively high concentrations of several known phytotoxic compounds including acetic acid, butyric acid, bisphenol and benzoic acid. We speculate that variable plant responses to phytotoxic organic compounds leached from biochars may largely explain negative plant growth responses and also account for strongly species-specific patterns plant responses to biochar amendments in short-term experiments.

# 1 Thermal treatment and leaching biochar alleviates plant 2 growth inhibition from mobile organic compounds

3  
4 NIGEL V. GALE\*<sup>1</sup>, TARA E. SACKETT<sup>1</sup>, and SEAN C. THOMAS<sup>1</sup>

5  
6 <sup>1</sup>*Faculty of Forestry, University of Toronto, 33 Willcocks St., Toronto, ON, Canada*

7  
8 \*Corresponding author: [nigel.gale@mail.utoronto.ca](mailto:nigel.gale@mail.utoronto.ca)

## 9 10 Abstract

11  
12 Recent meta-analyses of plant responses to biochar boast positive average effects of between 10  
13 and 40 %. Plant responses, however, vary greatly across systems, and null or negative biochar  
14 effects are increasingly reported. The mechanisms responsible for such responses remain  
15 unclear. In a glasshouse experiment we tested the effects of three forestry residue wood biochars,  
16 applied at five dosages (0, 5, 10, 20, 50 t/ha) to a temperate forest drystic cambisol as direct  
17 surface applications and as complete soil mixes on the herbaceous pioneers *Lolium multiflorum*  
18 and *Trifolium repens*. Null and negative effects of biochar on growth were found in most cases.  
19 One potential cause for null and negative plant responses to biochar is plant exposure to mobile  
20 compounds produced during pyrolysis that leach or evolve following additions of biochars to  
21 soil. In a second glasshouse experiment we examined the effects of simple leaching and heating  
22 techniques to ameliorate potentially phytotoxic effects of volatile and leachable compounds  
23 released from biochar. We used Solid Phase Microextraction (SPME) – gas chromatography –

mass spectrometry (GC-MS) to qualitatively describe organic compounds in both biochar (through headspace extraction), and in the water leachates (through direct injection). Convection heating and water leaching of biochar prior to application alleviated growth inhibition. Additionally, growth was inhibited when filtrate from water-leached biochar was applied following germination. SPME-GC-MS detected primarily short-chained carboxylic acids and phenolics in both the leachates and solid chars, with relatively high concentrations of several known phytotoxic compounds including acetic acid, butyric acid, bisphenol and benzoic acid. We speculate that variable plant responses to phytotoxic organic compounds leached from biochars may largely explain negative plant growth responses and also account for strongly species-specific patterns plant responses to biochar amendments in short-term experiments.

## Introduction

47

48 “Biochar” is the term given to charcoal intended for use as a soil amendment, commonly  
49 derived from pyrolysis of biomass residues from forestry and agriculture. Biochar has been  
50 recently heralded for its ability to increase productivity and ameliorate poor soil conditions,  
51 while mitigating anthropogenic climate change by enhancing soil carbon sequestration  
52 (Lehmann, 2007; Biederman & Harpole, 2013). Many biochars exhibit high surface areas, pH,  
53 and cation exchange capacity (CEC), properties that can increase soil fertility, nutrient  
54 availability, and water retention (Major et al., 2010; Atkinson, Fitzgerald & Hipps, 2010). Meta-  
55 analyses of field and greenhouse studies suggest average increases of 10-30% in aboveground  
56 biomass in response to applications of biochar for agricultural crops (Jeffery et al., 2011; Liu et  
57 al., 2013; Biederman & Harpole, 2013), and larger increases averaging ~ 40% for trees (Thomas  
58 & Gale, 2015). Plant responses, however, vary greatly across species and ecosystems, and null or  
59 negative biochar effects are common (Jeffery et al., 2011; Spokas et al., 2012). Thus, null and  
60 negative responses of plants to biochar have received recent research attention ( Buss & Mašek,  
61 2014; Kołtowski & Oleszczuk, 2015; Domene et al., 2015; Buss et al., 2015).

62

63 Large positive plant responses to biochar are commonly observed in tropical and boreal  
64 soils, with much lower responses commonly reported in temperate soils (Jeffery et al., 2011;  
65 Thomas & Gale, 2015). Strong positive plant responses to biochar in infertile, acidic tropical  
66 soils are likely mainly due to a combination of soluble P from biochar and P retention by biochar  
67 (Mukherjee & Zimmerman, 2013), sorption of salts or metals by biochar (Park et al., 2011;  
68 Lashari et al., 2013), and soil liming effects (Major et al., 2010). Recent results by Pluchon et al.,  
69 (2014) suggest a positive relationship between P in wood-derived biochar and growth responses

of tree seedlings, indicating possible P limitation in boreal soils. The sorption of phenolic compounds by biochar has also been suggested to contribute to high plant responses to biochar in some boreal soils (Wardle, Zackrisson & Nilsson, 1998). Increased soil basicity from strongly basic biochars can limit the availability of Ca, Mg, P and other nutrients (Major et al., 2010; Makoto et al., 2011; Marks, Alcañiz & Domene, 2014), and such responses are expected to be most pronounced on soils that are already neutral to basic (Kloss et al., 2014). Biochar's affinity for cations and sorption of anions can also 'lock up' certain soil nutrients, in particular, mineralized N (Glaser, Lehmann & Zech, 2002; Asai et al., 2009).

A rather unexplored explanation for null and negative plant responses to biochar is related to plant exposure to volatile compounds generated during pyrolysis and re-condensed as liquids on biochar's surface or trapped as gases within pore spaces (Spokas, Baker & Reicosky, 2010; Spokas et al., 2011; Hale et al., 2012). Pyrolysis converts the polymeric constituents lignin, cellulose, and hemicellulose (as well as starches, lipids, and "extractives" such as terpenoid and phenolic compounds) into liquid bio-oil, charcoal, and non-condensable gases (Shafizadeh, 1982). Many of the compounds generated are "mobile" (Buss & Mašek, 2014; Buss et al., 2015): they are either water soluble or volatile, i.e., have high vapor pressures under ambient conditions temperatures and pressure conditions (Yu et al., 2007). Such compounds include low molecular weight alcohols, ketones, aliphatic acids, and phenols (Buss et al., 2015; Lievens et al., 2015), as well as larger polyaromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) (Hale et al., 2012; Kołtowski & Oleszczuk, 2015; Domene et al., 2015). Other mobile and potentially toxic compounds produced during pyrolysis such as salts and heavy metals are generally detected at only low levels in biochars derived from non-contaminated feedstocks (Domene et al., 2015), are

strongly sorbed by biochar (Thomas et al., 2013; Lucchini et al., 2014), and are therefore less likely to be an important component of toxicity responses to biochars (Buss & Mašek, 2014; Kołtowski & Oleszczuk, 2015; Domene et al., 2015; Lievens et al., 2015).

The quantities and types of mobile organic compounds present in biochar will depend on the composition of the feedstock and the conditions of pyrolysis. Biomass feedstocks differ greatly in the composition of cellulose, hemicellulose, and lignin and generate a diversity of volatile compounds. Woody biomass generally has higher concentrations of lignin and cellulose (20-25% and ~45%, respectively) than non-woody grasses (which typically have lignin concentrations of 3-12%; Morrison 1972). There is, however, remarkably high variation in these constituents among woody species (Pettersen, 1984). Thermal decomposition of cellulose occurs around 400° C and releases the highest proportion of labile, aliphatic compounds. Higher pyrolysis temperatures (> 400° C), where decomposition of lignin dominates, produce syn-gases containing higher concentrations of carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>), ethylene (C<sub>2</sub>H<sub>4</sub>), and ethane (C<sub>2</sub>H<sub>6</sub>) (Bilbao, Millera & Arauzo, 1989; Kloss et al., 2012). Re-condensation of these volatiles from cold spots due to poor insulation and blockage of syn- or pyrolysis gases, and their capture within biochar pores, has been suggested in a number of studies (Spokas et al., 2011; Buss & Mašek, 2014). Mobile organic compounds have been characterized in a number of wood-derived biochar's produced at moderate pyrolysis temperatures 350-600 °C (Spokas et al., 2011; Buss et al., 2015; Lievens et al., 2015) and have demonstrated toxicity in a variety of organisms (Buss & Mašek, 2014; Kołtowski & Oleszczuk, 2015). Fast pyrolysis and gasification biochars have been suggested to exhibit the greatest phytotoxic effects (Rogovska et al., 2012).

Some mobile organic compounds released from biochar in soils are hormetic, i.e. stimulating plant growth at low dosages but inhibiting growth at high dosages (Baldwin et al., 2006; Calabrese, Iavicoli & Calabrese, 2012). The aqueous fraction of the bio-oil, commonly referred to as “wood vinegar”, contains primarily acetic acid and phenolic compounds. When diluted ( $10^3$ -  $10^7$  times), wood vinegars commonly stimulate plant growth (Mu, Uehara & Furuno, 2003; 2004), but remain potent insecticides and fungicides (Yatagai et al., 2002; Velmurugan, Han & Lee, 2009). At higher concentrations these compounds can be herbicidal. Buss and Masek (2014) found germination inhibition in cress from leached compounds from acidic chars (pH = 3.64), attributed to low molecular weight organic acids and phenols (Buss et al., 2015). Because ethylene is a gaseous plant hormone involved in growth regulation, plant stress signalling, and tissue senescence (Abeles, Morgan & Saltveit, 1992; Ortega-Martínez et al., 2007), its evolution from freshly produced biochars (Fulton et al., 2013) is another plausible mechanism for reduced growth responses. Ethylene evolution from biochars would also be expected to result in pronounced changes in plant growth form and reproduction (Abeles, Morgan & Saltveit, 1992). To our knowledge phytotoxicity from mobile organic compounds released by biochar has not been specifically tested in plant growth beyond the germination stage, or in plants grown in soil media other than pure sand.

To test the effects of biochar derived from forestry residues on temperate plant performance in a managed system, we grew *Lolium multiflorum* and *Trifolium repens* in a factorial greenhouse experiment. We examined effects of addition rate (0-50 t/ha), biochar type (three different biocharss produced from sawdust), and application method (top-dressing vs. complete soil mixes). We hypothesized that plant growth would increase overall, and would vary



with biochar type, dosage, and application method. Because of exclusively negative and null effects observed in the first experiment, in a second greenhouse experiment, we examined the effects of simple post-treatment biochar processing techniques to ameliorate potentially toxic effects of mobile organic compounds released by biochars. Because volatiles sorbed by biochars during pyrolysis exist in liquid (re-condensed) and gaseous phases (Spokas, Baker & Reicosky, 2010; Spokas et al., 2011; Hale et al., 2012), and can be water-leached (Jonker & Koelmans, 2002; Hale et al., 2012; Buss et al., 2015; Lievens et al., 2015), we tested both biochar leaching and heating treatments on the growth responses of *Lolium multiflorum*. We hypothesized that water leaching and convection heating would significantly improve plant responses by reducing volatile and leachable compounds. We predicted more pronounced growth enhancement with biochars that were leached longer and heated at higher temperatures. We also hypothesized that application of biochar leachate would significantly inhibit plant growth. To identify candidate molecules involved in toxicity responses, we examined volatile and leachable organic compounds using semi-quantitative Solid-Phase-Micro-Extraction (SPME)- gas chromatography – mass spectrometry (GC-MS) of solid chars and water leachates.

## Materials and Methods:

### Study Species

The herbaceous species *Lolium multiflorum* Lam. (annual ryegrass: hereafter ryegrass) and *Trifolium repens* L. (white clover: hereafter clover) are commonly used as temperate forage crops, for erosion control (Ledgard & Steele, 1992), and are early colonizers of temperate sites

following fire events (Keeley et al., 1981; Milberg, 1995). Ryegrass is a fast growing, nutrient-demanding annual dicot that can tolerate a range of soil conditions. Clover is a slow-growing perennial monocot that has low nutrient requirements as its associated root symbionts can biologically fix atmospheric nitrogen (Ledgard & Steele, 1992). Clover in previous studies has shown increased nitrogen fixation in soils amended with biochar (Quilliam, DeLuca & Jones, 2012). Because of this contrast in life histories, resource use, and growth forms, we expected that changes to soil properties would have differential effects on growth and performance in these two species. Because larger effects of biochar on growth have been reported for annuals over perennials (Biederman & Harpole, 2013), and since the strongest negative effects in experiment 1 were detected in *L. multiflorum*, it was selected to test if biochar post-treatments could enhance plant responses in experiment 2.

#### **Experiment 1: Effects of amount, type, and application method:**

Plants were grown in 11.33 cm<sup>2</sup> surface area growth containers (Ray Leach SC-10 cone-tainers (Stuewe and Sons, Tangent, OR, USA) 21cm depth, 164 ml volume, with fiberglass screen placed at the base of the container to reduce soil loss in soil amended with three sawdust-derived biochars (Table 1): 1) sugar maple sawdust pyrolyzed in a batch unit at 475°C (MB) (~1.5 h total pyrolysis time), 2) spruce sawdust pyrolyzed in a batch unit at 422°C (SB) (~1.5 h total pyrolysis time), and 3) 80% sugar maple, 20% yellow birch sawdust pyrolyzed in a flow-through pyrolysis unit at 575°C (MFT) (~0.5 h total pyrolysis time). The batch unit was purged with nitrogen gas, and the flow-through unit consisted of a long feed-screw that resulted in tight packing of feedstock to limit oxygen access during pyrolysis. Biochars were applied at 5, 10, 20,

and 50 t/ha either mixed into the soil or applied to the surface; the control treatment consisted of soil without biochar. These biochars were selected for the present study as they are expected to be used in industrial scale applications and their effects on temperate plant and soil functioning have been the subject of recent study (Sackett et al. 2015, Noyce et al., 2015, 2016, Mitchell et al. 2015). Five replicates were used for the biochar treatments and 10 replicates for were used for the control treatments (to increase statistical power for control vs. treatment contrasts). In total, 4 addition rates (5, 10, 20, 50 t/ha) x 3 biochars (MB, SB, MFT) x 2 application methods (mixed, top-dressed) x 5 replicates, + (10 control plants (no biochar, field soil) x 2 species (clover, ryegrass), resulted in n = 260 plants. Biochar use is expected to target acidic, coarse-textured soils of low nutrient status. Accordingly, the soil used in the experiment was a drystric cambisolic field soil (or drystric brunisol based on the Canadian System of Soil Classification (1998)), that was sandy-loam in texture (Table 2), collected in the summer of 2011 from the uppermost mineral layer (<10 cm) of a managed forest at Haliburton Forest and Wildlife Reserve, Haliburton, ON, Canada (45°15' N, 78°34' W), and re-used from control treatments in a previous experiment. All plants were supplemented with 0.082 g of slow-release NPK fertilizer representing relatively high inputs found in disturbed temperate herbaceous systems (Garbutt & Bazzaz 1987): addition rates are 130 kg/ha (N), 5 kg/ha (P), 48 (K) kg/ha, respectively. Germination was initiated by placing seeds on greenhouse benches in water-saturated vermiculite. One seedling was transplanted into each prepared treatment pot 5 days after germination. Fertilizer was applied following planting. A randomized block design was employed using 5 blocks in which plants were randomly placed, with each treatment combination was represented once in each block. Supplemental lighting was applied to maintain a 16-h photoperiod. The experimental growth period was 28 days (Dec. 20, 2012 – January 17,

208 2013) and 41 days (Dec. 20, 2012 – January 30, 2013) for ryegrass and clover, respectively.  
 209 Average daily greenhouse temperature throughout the experiment was 16.5°C with average daily  
 210 maximums and minimums were 20°C and 16°C, respectively. All plants were top watered semi-  
 211 daily (daily to every other day) to saturation and allowed to drain.

## 213 **Experiment 2: Modulation of effects through leaching and heating treatments:**

214  
 215 To test the effect of pre-application biochar heating and leaching on plant performance,  
 216 ryegrass was grown in pots (as above) with additions of MFT biochar processed to remove  
 217 mobile compounds before additions. Because there was no difference in plant performance  
 218 between biochars in experiment 1, suggesting similar compounds responsible for the observed  
 219 phytotoxicity, only MFT was selected for experiment 2 since it was most available at the time of  
 220 experimental set-up. Two leaching treatments and 3 heating treatments were applied to biochars  
 221 before being applied as both mixed and top-dressings at a dose of 10 t/ha (n=8). We leached  
 222 biochar with 1:1 (v:v) mixture of biochar to de-ionized water for either 0.5 h (WW-0.5) or 24 h  
 223 (WW-24) on an oscillating table. Biochar-water slurries were then suction filtered using  
 224 Whatman #4 filter paper, and the filtrate captured. Filtrate from the leachings was collected and  
 225 5.0 mL of filtrate was applied as a separate treatment to plants (n=8) one day following planting  
 226 (Leach-0.5, Leach-24). Leached biochars were then rinsed with 400 mL of de-ionized water,  
 227 suction filtered, and applied to their respective treatments. Biochars were placed in a convection  
 228 oven to be heat treated for 24 h at 50 (Heat-50), 100 (Heat-100), and 150 °C (Heat-150), cooled,  
 229 and added to soil. To assess the effect of leaching and heating, un-processed biochar treatments  
 230 (mixed and top-dressing) were also established (n=8), as well as a control treatment containing

no biochar (n=10). In total, 2 leaching treatments + 3 heating treatments + 1 unprocessed biochar x 2 application methods x 8 replicates + 2 leachate additions x 8 replicates + 10 controls, resulted in n = 122 plants. Soil used in the experiment was the same field soil as used in experiment 1 (Table 2). Experimental growth period was 28 days (Jan. 28 – Feb 26, 2013). Average daily greenhouse temperature was 18°C, with daily average maximum and minimum temperatures of 21°C and 15°C, respectively. All plants were top watered daily to saturation.

## Biochar and soil characterization

Biochar was characterized (Table 1) as follows: electrical conductivity (EC) and pH were measured in a 1:20 (w:v) biochar to H<sub>2</sub>O solution using pH and EC probes (Rajkovich et al., 2012). Particle size distribution was determined from dry sieving following the ASTM D2862 method (ASTM, 1999). Total moisture content, ash content, and organic matter content were determined by oven drying at 105°C, by muffle furnace combustion at 750°C, and through loss on ignition for 0.5 hours in a muffle furnace at 500 °C by following ASTM D1762-84 (ASTM, 2007). Total carbon and nitrogen were quantified using combustion analysis using an Elementar VarioMax (Elementar Analysensysteme GmbH, Hanau, Germany). Total P and cations (K<sup>+</sup>, Ca<sup>+</sup>, and Mg<sup>2+</sup>) for MB and SB were obtained using a sulphuric acid digest and Mehlich III extraction, respectively, then analyzed by ICP-OES (SPECTRO Analytical Instruments GmbH, Kleve, Germany) (see (Sackett et al., 2015)).

Soil characterization (Table 2) was conducted at the Agriculture and Food Laboratory, University of Guelph, Guelph, ON.

## 2.4. Plant growth measurements

For both experiments, above- and below-ground plant biomass and leaf area were measured at the end of the experiments. Because leaf area indicates plant carbon gain, nutrient uptake, and physiological performance, and has demonstrated responsiveness to biochar additions (Graber et al., 2010), we measured leaf area using a Li-3100C leaf area scanner with a resolution of 1 mm<sup>2</sup> (LiCor biosciences, Lincoln, Nebraska, USA). Below-ground biomass was separated from soil and biochar media by dry sieving followed by gentle washing of roots with water. Above-ground and below-ground biomass, including scanned leaves, was dried for 48h at 65°C and weighed. Since increased nutrient uptake, nitrogenase activity, and nodulation has been reported in legumes amended with biochar (Rondon et al., 2007; Quilliam, DeLuca & Jones, 2012), before drying we counted nodules on clover roots under a dissection microscope. Only nodules with leghemoglobin were scored (visible red colour).

#### **SPME – GC-MS of volatile and leachable compounds**

We followed Rombola et al. (2015) for qualitative analysis of SB and MB solid char and their water leachates, with minor modifications. Briefly, for headspace (HS)-SPME of solid biochars, 0.5 grams of sample was placed in a 10 mL headspace vial and spiked with 2.0 mL of 1ppm *O*-eugenol as an internal standard. HS vials were placed on a heating plate at 150°C for 30 min while a Carboxen-PDMS fiber was inserted into the top 1mL of the headspace vial on a Agilent 7890A GC system. Following heating the fiber was inserted into the injector and analytes thermally desorbed at 250°C for 10 min prior to direct injection. GC analysis was carried out using a DB-WAX column (20m length, 0.20 μm width, 0.10 mm i.d) following the

thermal program in Rombolà et al. (2015): 80 °C for 5 min, then 10°C/min to 250°C for a total run time of 28 min. MS analysis was carried out on a 5975C Agilent MS with peak identification conducted using the NIST reference spectral library. Detection was made under electron ionization at 60 m/z and an acquisition of 1 scan/s. Hits with over 70% probability and relative match factors higher than 800 were considered; peaks of internal standards were confirmed.

Direct injection (DI)-SPME of leachates was performed on 3mL of dionized water leachates (following washing method used for MFT) with 1.0 mL of 2M KH<sub>2</sub>PO<sub>4</sub> buffer. This sample was spiked with 2.5 mL of 1 ppm *O*-eugenol, and 2.5 mL of 2-ethyl butyric acid as internal standards, and then placed into 10 mL headspace vials. The Carboxen-PDMS fiber was directly inserted into the solution under magnetic stirring for 30 min at 250°C. GC-MS analysis was performed as above. Quantification of analytes was not attempted due to the un-reliability of SPME in producing accurate calibration curves with internal standards, a problem also noted in Spokas et al. (2011). All GC-MS analysis were conducted at the Teaching and Research in Analytical Chemistry and Environmental Sciences (TRACES) Centre, University of Toronto, Scarborough (1065 Military Trail, Toronto, ON, M1C 1A4). SPME-GC-MS was conducted on SB and MB only since MFT was no longer available at the time of quantification.

## Statistical analysis

Both experiments had treatment structures that consist partially of a full set of factorial combinations, have multiple controls, and test other treatments of interest (i.e. have an augmented factorial design); we therefore used multiple contrasts to test our hypotheses

(following Schaarshmidt & Vaas, 2009). This allows the pair-wise comparison of both individual treatments (e.g., MFT biochars vs control) and groups of treatments (e.g, all biochars at 5 t/ha vs control). The test statistic for each contrast was calculated from:

$$T = (\sum c_i \hat{u}_i) / (\sigma \sqrt{\sum c_i^2 / n_i})$$

Where  $\hat{u}_i$  is the mean estimate derived from the linear model described in Bretz, Hothorn & Westfall (2002), and  $c_i$  is the contrast coefficient, and  $\sigma$  represents the residual error. Contrast coefficients are shown in supplementary tables S1, S2, and S3. Simultaneous confidence intervals (95%) were derived from:

$$[\sum c_i \hat{u}_i \pm (q_1 - \alpha, M, R) \sigma \sqrt{\sum c_i^2 / n_i}]$$

Where the critical value,  $(q_1 - \alpha, M, R)$ , is calculated from the multivariate t-distribution with dimension  $M$  and correlation matrix  $R$  (see Bretz, Genz & Hothorn, 2001) for critical value determination. Simultaneous confidence intervals were used to display the magnitude and direction of mean comparisons. Analyses were done using the ‘multcomp’ package (Bretz, Hothorn & Westfall, 2002; Hothorn et al., 2008) in the statistical software R version 3.1.0 (R Core Team, 2012). Many biochar studies have complex treatment structures and treatments of interest: we expect wide use of multiple contrast tests in future biochar research as an effective and informative analysis tool, we have therefore included the R script as a supplementary file for use as a reference.



To test the effect of biochar addition rate on plant performance traits we performed linear regressions with above- and below-ground biomass and leaf area as response variables and with biochar dosage as the independent variable. We log-transformed response variables to represent effect sizes metrics reported in recent meta-analyses of plant growth responses to biochar (Liu et al., 2013; Biederman & Harpole, 2013; Thomas and Gale 2015) following:  $RR = \ln(B/C)$ , where RR is the response ratio metric, B is the mean biomass of biochar treated plants, and C is the mean biomass of control plants without biochar. Regressions were performed for each of the three biochars used in the experiment and were not separated by application method (top-dressing vs complete mixtures). Analyses were conducted in the statistical software R version 3.1.0 (R Core Team, 2012).

## Results

### **Experiment 1: Negative and null effects on plant growth regardless of biochar type, dosage, or application method**

Application of biochar resulted in null or negative biomass responses in ryegrass and clover regardless of biochar type, dosage, or application method. The average of the three mean responses of all treatments using MFT, SB, and MB revealed decreased ryegrass aboveground biomass relative to controls by 25%, leaf area by 17%, and belowground biomass by 35% (Fig 1, Table 3). All three individual biochar types negatively impacted all growth traits examined in ryegrass (Fig 1), but had no significant effect on clover growth traits (Table 3). Nodulation in clover did not differ across treatments (Table S2). All performance traits in ryegrass, but not

clover, were inhibited by biochar at all dosages and this inhibition decreased with biochar addition rate. Linear regressions detected significant negative relationships of above- and below-ground biomass and leaf area with increasing biochar addition rate for all three biochars used in almost all comparisons (Fig. 2). The mean of all the biochar treatments at 50 t/ha showed reduced ryegrass aboveground biomass by 34%, leaf area by 28%, and belowground biomass by 43% (Fig 1, Table 3). Mixing biochar directly into the soil was significantly less inhibiting than direct surface applications for all growth parameters in ryegrass (Fig 1, Table 3).

## **Experiment 2: Heating and leaching biochar prior to application alleviates growth inhibition in ryegrass**

Ryegrass grown in biochar either water leached or convection heated prior to application performed significantly better than ryegrass grown in un-processed biochar (Fig 3). Unprocessed biochar reduced ryegrass aboveground biomass by 24% (Fig 3,a), leaf area by 22%, and belowground biomass by 28% (Fig 3,b) (Table 4). There was no difference between mixed and top-dressed applications of the un-processed biochar. Post-treating the biochar by water leaching for 24 hours or heat treatment  $\geq 100$  °C significantly increased aboveground biomass as compared to un-processed biochar (Fig. 3a). Biochar that was water-leached for 24 hours increased aboveground biomass by 34%, and belowground biomass by 22% compared to un-processed biochar (Table 4). Convection heating of biochar for 24 hours at 100 °C and at 150 °C increased leaf area by 20%, and 23%, respectively (Fig 3, Table 4). However, aboveground biomass and leaf-area of ryegrass grown with any processed biochars did not differ significantly from ryegrass grown in control (without biochar) soil (Table 4).

The water-based filtrate from biochar leaching applied immediately following transplantation significantly decreased growth of ryegrass as compared to plants grown in control soil (Table 4). Filtrate applied from the 24 hour leaching most strongly inhibited growth, decreasing aboveground biomass by 40%, leaf area by 27%, and belowground biomass by 36% (Fig 4, Table 4). Filtrate from the 30-minute water leaching was less inhibiting, decreasing leaf area by 18%. The significant decrease in ryegrass growth traits due to the application of filtrate was similar in magnitude to the application of un-processed biochar (Fig 4, Table 3).

#### **Mobile organic compounds detected with SPME-GC-MS**

SPME-GC-MS of solid chars and leachates revealed primarily short-chained carboxylic acids, phenols, hydrocarbons; with notable differences between chars (Fig. 5). HS-SPME of MB qualified acetone, acetonitrile, acetic acid, pentanone, and butyric acid (Fig. 5A). HS-SPME of SB revealed acetic acid, benzene, decane, methyl-isocyanide, ethyl-benzene, dodecane, and a methoxy-benzofuran (Fig 5B). DI-SPME of MB leachates revealed acetic acid, butyric acid, valeric acid, phenol, bisphenol and benzoic acid (Fig. 5C). DI-SPME of SB leachates similarly detected acetic acid, butyric acid, bisphenol and benzoic acid; however, oxime, and benzofuran were also detected (Fig. 5D).

#### **Discussion**

The negative effects of three sawdust biochars on ryegrass growth and the null response of clover growth observed in these experiments are contradictory to average plant growth trends described in recent meta-analyses (Jeffery et al., 2011; Liu et al., 2013; Biederman & Harpole, 2013; Thomas & Gale, 2015); however, these results are similar to the null to negative responses noted qualitatively in ~20% of prior studies (Spokas et al., 2012). High dosage (50 t/ha) and direct soil-surface applications of biochar (as opposed to mixing into the soil) were most inhibitory. Similar to Biederman & Harpole (2013), who report negative (but not significant) biomass response slopes to increasing biochar additions in almost half of 20 studies of plant responses to biochar in their meta-analysis, we detect a strongly negative linear relationship of performance traits to increasing biochar additions in ryegrass. Convection heating and water-based leaching of biochar prior to application alleviated growth inhibition of ryegrass. SPME-GC-MS suggests a number of common compounds which are volatile and leachable, and which we infer are generated by the pyrolysis process and re-condensed on or trapped within biochar (similar to Hale et al., 2012; Spokas, 2013; Buss & Mašek, 2014; Kołtowski & Oleszczuk, 2015; Domene et al., 2015; Buss et al., 2015; Lievens et al., 2015). The inhibition of ryegrass growth resulting from application of biochar leachate generated by water leaching was similar to that of un-processed biochar applied to soils (Table 4), suggesting the water soluble organic compounds qualified are very likely responsible for the growth inhibition observed.

Large differences in growth responses to biochar were observed between ryegrass (negative) and clover (null) to the three biochars applied (Table 3). This result is consistent with a nitrogen immobilization mechanism (Glaser, Lehmann & Zech, 2002; Asai et al., 2009; Deenik et al., 2010), to which clover, as a legume, is more resistant. Nitrogen immobilization from

biochar has been observed in temperate soils (see Kloss et al., 2014; Rajkovich et al., 2012), and can further be depleted by microorganisms that readily use other biochar derived leachates, such as high volatile matter and labile carbon (Deenik et al., 2010; Marks, Alcañiz & Domene, 2014). However, recent published work using two of these biochars (MB and SB) at the field site where our experimental soils were obtained (Haliburton, ON), showed that biochar caused no change to mineralized nitrogen, when applied at 5 t/ha as a top-dressing in a temperate forest stand (Sackett et al., 2015).

We suggest that species-specific phytotoxicity responses to volatile and leachable compounds from fresh biochar at least partially explains null and negative growth responses to biochar addition, and also contributes to the variation in plant responses to biochar. Several studies have now demonstrated phytotoxicity to fresh biochar, but there is little information regarding the source and chemistry of toxics involved (Buss & Mašek, 2014; Kołtowski & Oleszczuk, 2015). Hajaligol et al. (2001) show rapid thermal decomposition of cellulosic materials at low to moderate ( $< 300^{\circ}\text{C}$ ) pyrolysis temperatures forming a primary char that is capable of a second chemical transformation at moderate to high temperatures ( $> 400^{\circ}\text{C}$ ). This first decomposition typically produces aldehydes, alcohols, and ketones, while the secondary transformation is likely to produce hydrocarbons and aromatics (Hajaligol et al. 2001). We found evidence of both decompositions from moderate temperature pyrolysis of woody feedstocks used to produce the biochars in our study. Low to moderate temperature pyrolysis of woody-feedstocks are thus likely to produce a high concentration of primary decomposition derived low molecular weight compounds due to the high cellulose and lignin concentrations.

Therefore, careful selection of feedstocks is necessary when creating biochars since trade-offs for restoration goals like high sorptive properties vs potential phytotoxicity are likely.

We suggest two causes for contamination of biochar from these volatile and mobile compounds: First, that pyrolysis retention times for biochar production is too short for sufficient evolution and diffusion through the pyrolysis system without being sorbed by biochar or trapped within its porous structure. This is especially likely in fast pyrolysis, although “slow” pyrolysis retention times of 0.5-2 hours (or less) may also be too short (such as the biochar used here or in Novak et al. 2014). The second cause for contamination of biochar may be due to re-condensation of volatiles during pyrolysis either from poor insulation or blockage in pyrolysis systems, and/or can occur as biochar cools (Spokas et al., 2011; Buss & Mašek, 2014). We suspect that one or both of these issues is common since mobile and volatile compounds are discovered in most biochars (Spokas et al. 2011), and since null and neutral plant responses are widely observed to biochar (Spokas et al. 2012). Much further investigation is necessary to resolve contamination of biochars, and particular focus should be given on to identifying causal pyrolysis practices (e.g. retention times, cooling rates, flow rates, temperature uniformity, etc.,).

The large variation in plant responses to biochar between tropical, temperate, and boreal systems may be partially due to phytotoxicity. Low growth responses to biochar in temperate systems in particular may be further hindered by nutrient immobilization by biochar (Kloss et al. 2014). We speculate that phytotoxicity responses in tropical systems treated with biochar may be reduced due to high soil turnover, rainfall, and/or microbial activity, partially explaining comparatively higher growth responses in these systems. In boreal systems, with low soil

turnover and frequent fires, plants have likely adapted to mobile organic compounds associated with biochar (Jefferey et al. 2011; Thomas & Gale 2015).

Convection heating and water leaching biochars mitigated the negative effects of applying biochar to a cambisolic soil (Table 4). Recent studies demonstrate similar effectiveness of leaching and thermal treatment to alleviate inhibition from hardwood, corn, and switchgrass biochars in Rogovska et al., (2012), and in elephant grass and willow biochars in Koltowski & Oleszczuk, (2015). We used high lignin-cellulose wood biochars produced at moderate pyrolysis temperatures (400-545 °C) at which peak volatilization occurs, likely producing high concentrations of volatile and leachable compounds found here: especially re- condensed bio-oils with a significant aqueous fraction containing phenols and carboxylic acids (Yu et al., 2007; Hale et al., 2012). Higher temperature pyrolysis may generate similar and even greater concentrations of VOCs but may be less prone to re-condensation since cold-spot temperatures are possibly above condensation point.

Several prior studies have degassed (at > 100 ° C) and water-leached compounds (including ethylene, acetone, benzene, propanol, K, Na, Mg, Zn, etc.) from similar wood biochars (Wu et al., 2011; Novak et al., 2009; Spokas et al., 2011). Indeed, low molecular weight compounds produced during natural fires are volatilized or leached relatively quickly from natural charcoals (Ice, Neary & Adams, 2004), which may contribute to rapid regeneration following fires (DeLuca, MacKenzie & Gundale, 2009). Gundale & Deluca (2007) found positive growth responses in *K. macrantha* when wildfire-produced Douglas Fir and ponderosa pine biochar was applied, in contrast to growth suppression in un-processed biochar, suggesting

weathering of chars alleviates phytotoxic effects of volatile and leachable compounds. It is thus possible that longer heating and leaching times prior to application might have resulted in positive growth responses to biochar in our experiment. Additionally, our biochar was stored in a sealed container prior to the experiment. Strong ventilation or aeration of chars while in storage may have prevented phytotoxicity.

### **Leached compounds from biochar inhibit plant growth**

Effluent from biochars leached with de-ionized water decreased ryegrass growth by up to 40% (Table 4), similar to the decreases in growth shown by treatments with the un-processed biochar. This result confirms the growth-inhibitory nature of the aqueous fraction of pyrolysis-produced bio-oils and is consistent with others that have found inhibitory effects from biochar-leached chemical compounds on plant germination (Rogovska et al., 2012; Buss & Mašek, 2014; Kołtowski & Oleszczuk, 2015) and microbial communities (Lehmann et al. 2011). Here we report inhibition in a variety of performance traits, rather than germination, from less intense leachings than in (Rogovska et al., 2012), and from more typical neutral to basic chars (pH = 6.5 - 7.4) than the acidic char studied by Buss & Mašek (2014) (pH = 3.64). Since we observed a positive relationship between leaching duration and compound concentration, we recommend that future applications of biochar use pyrolysis post-treatments that leach for longer durations. We watered our plants semi-daily to saturation, potentially leaching compounds quicker than would occur naturally. Phytotoxicity to biochar in areas of low rainfall, or otherwise under growth conditions with low watering frequency might indeed be greater.



# Qualification of phytotoxic compounds and the potential for hormesis

The increasingly reported null and neutral responses to biochar necessitates quick and reliable analysis of the compounds responsible. SPME-GC-MS promises to serve this role and is becoming the standard for qualification and even semi-quantification of volatile and leachable organic compounds in biochar (Spokas et al., 2011; Buss et al., 2015; Rombolà et al., 2015). We detected similar low molecular weight compounds to Rombolà et al., (2015) and Buss et al., (2015) with slight differences in GC-MS phases and procedures. However, we were unable to analyze the other maple biochar produced in a different pyrolysis unit and slightly different feedstock composition for mobile compounds, which potentially limits the array of compounds detected, as well as inference on the influence of pyrolysis conditions on the formation of mobile organic compounds. Buss et al., (2015) report concentrations of phenols and organic acids from moderate temperature pyrolysis of softwood chars in concentrations slightly lower ( $\sim 22.4 \text{ mgL}^{-1}$  and  $\sim 52.2 \text{ mgL}^{-1}$ , respectively) than concentrations that have inhibited root elongation in prior studies (Lynch, 1980; Feng et al., 1996). Acetic acid is the primary component of the chemical fraction in wood vinegars which have a long history of use as plant growth stimulators (Mu, Uehara & Furuno, 2004; Mungkunkamchao et al., 2013). Mu, Uehara & Furuno (2003) showed strong hormetic responses in seed germination of four species: *Lactuca sativa*, *Rorippa nasturtium-aquaticum*, *Cryptotaenia japonica*, *Chrysanthemum coronarium*. Strong inhibition of germination and radical growth was observed at high concentrations, while dilutions stimulated germination and growth, with obvious species-specific responses. Accurate quantification of volatile and leachable organic compounds in biochar is necessary to determine

the type of hormetic plant responses; however, current SPME-GC-MS techniques offer only semi-quantification with noted difficulties (Spokas et al., 2011).

## Conclusions

In summary, the negative and null responses of two common forage crop species, ryegrass and clover, to biochar additions were contrary to overall trend of positive plant growth responses presented in recent meta-analyses (Jeffery et al., 2011; Liu et al., 2013; Biederman & Harpole, 2013; Thomas & Gale, 2015). Our results strongly suggest that mobile organic compounds from biochar were responsible for this growth inhibition (primarily organic acids and phenols), as heating and leaching biochar before application alleviated this negative response, and addition of leachates alone replicated the negative responses observed. Chemical analysis of chars and leachates suggest possible specific molecules involved, including acetic acid, butyric acid, bisphenol and benzoic acid.

Our results suggest that negative responses to mobile compounds (in plants and soil biota) leached or evolved from biochars are an important mechanism accounting in part for the wide variation in plant growth responses to biochar described in the literature. Progressive volatilization and leaching almost certainly occurs in the field through weathering, both for charcoal produced during forest fires, and biochar applied as a soil amendment. Weathering of biochar will likely lead to rapid reductions in toxicity under field conditions. Additionally, soil flora and fauna likely metabolize mobile organic compounds rapidly further reducing toxicity in field soils with high soil floral and faunal diversity and abundance. Whether pre-weathering of

biochars before application is beneficial (in terms of cost and reduction of negative effects on biota), or if natural weathering is sufficient to quickly remove toxic compounds, are important considerations for future studies and applied use of biochars. Investigations into production and storage methods that remove or decrease concentrations of compounds - such as heating and retention times, and ventilation, respectively – are needed. Efforts to identify the source of contamination of biochar, to accurately quantify toxic volatile and leachable compounds from biochars, and to test their potential toxicity to biota in a variety of systems and applications (i.e. temperate/ tropical agricultural, forestry, environmental remediation, etc.,) are also fundamental to optimize the use of chars as a soil amendment.

# **Acknowledgements:**

We thank Haliburton Forest and Wildlife Reserve Ltd, Haliburton, ON for research support and provision of biochars and soil. Special thanks are also due to Chihiro Ikeda, Sossina Gezahegn, Aruna Kumari, Kathleen Manson, Janise Herridge, Carolyn Winsborough, Gowthaman Rajakumar and Katie Ungard for assistance with the experiments, and to Tony Adamo and Robert T. Gale for help with analytic work.

# References

- Asai H, Samson BK, Stephan HM, Songyikhangsuthor K, Homma K, Kiyono Y, Inoue Y, Shiraiwa T, Horie T 2009. Biochar amendment techniques for upland rice production in Northern Laos. *Field Crops Research* 111:81–84.
- ASTM, 1999. Standard Test Method for Particle Size Distribution of Granular Activated Carbon. ASTM Standard D2862-97. *Annual Book of ASTM Standards* 15: 723 -725.
- ASTM, 2007. Standard Test Method for Chemical Analysis of Wood Charcoal. ASTM D1762-84. *ASTM International*.
- Atkinson CJ, Fitzgerald JD, Hipps NA 2010. Potential mechanisms for achieving agricultural benefits from biochar application to temperate soils: a review. *Plant and soil* 337:1–18.
- Baldwin IT, Halitschke R, Paschold A, Dahl von CC, Preston CA 2006. Volatile Signaling in Plant-Plant Interactions: “Talking Trees” in the Genomics Era. *Science* 311:812–815.
- Biederman LA, Harpole WS 2013. Biochar and its effects on plant productivity and nutrient cycling: a meta-analysis. *GCB Bioenergy* 5:202–214.
- Bilbao R, Millera A, Arauzo J 1989. Thermal decomposition of lignocellulosic materials: influence of the chemical composition. *Thermochimica acta* 143:149–159.

592

593 Bretz F, Hothorn T, Westfall P 2002. On multiple comparisons in R. *R News* 2: 14-17.

594

595 Bretz F, Genz A, Hothorn L 2001. On the numerical availability of multiple comparison  
596 procedures. *Biometrical Journal* 43.5: 645-656.

597

598 Buss W, Mašek O 2014. Mobile organic compounds in biochar – A potential source  
599 of contamination – Phytotoxic effects on cress seed (*Lepidium sativum*) germination.  
600 *Journal of Environmental Management* 137:111–119.

601

602 Buss W, Mašek O, Graham M, Wüst D 2015. Inherent organic compounds in biochar–Their  
603 content, composition and potential toxic effects. *Journal of Environmental Management*  
604 156:150–157.

605

606 Calabrese EJ, Iavicoli I, Calabrese V 2012. Hormesis: why it is important to biogerontologists.  
607 *Biogerontology* 13:215–235.

608

609 Deenik JL, McClellan T, Uehara G, Antal MJ, Campbell S 2010. Charcoal volatile matter  
610 content influences plant growth and soil nitrogen transformations. *Soil Science Society of*  
611 *America Journal* 74: 1259-1270.

612

613 DeLuca TH, MacKenzie MD, Gundale MJ 2009. Biochar effects on soil nutrient  
614 transformations. *Biochar for environmental management: Science and Technology* 251-270.

- Domene X, Enders A, Hanley K, Lehmann J 2015. Ecotoxicological characterization of biochars: Role of feedstock and pyrolysis temperature. *Science of The Total Environment* 512-513:552–561.
- Feng L, Wang L-S, Zhao Y-H, Song B 1996. Effects of substituted anilines and phenols on root elongation of cabbage seed. *Chemosphere* 32:1575–1583.
- Fulton W, Gray M, Prah F, Kleber M 2013. A simple technique to eliminate ethylene emissions from biochar amendment in agriculture. *Agronomy for sustainable development* 33:469–474.
- Garbutt K, Bazzaz FA 1987. Population niche structure: Differential response of *Abutilon theophrasti* progeny to resource gradients. *Oecologia* 72: 291-296.
- Glaser B, Lehmann J, Zech W 2002. Ameliorating physical and chemical properties of highly weathered soils in the tropics with charcoal - a review. *Biology and Fertility of Soils* 35:219–230.
- Graber ER, Harel YM, Kolton M, Cytryn E, et al 2010. Biochar impact on development and productivity of pepper and tomato grown in fertigated soilless media. *Plant and Soil* 337: 481-496.

- Gundale MJ, DeLuca TH 2007. Charcoal effects on soil solution chemistry and growth of  
Koeleria macrantha in the ponderosa pine/Douglas-fir ecosystem. *Biology and Fertility of  
Soils* 43: 303-311.
- Hale SE, Lehmann J, Rutherford D, Zimmerman AR, Bachmann RT, Shitumbanuma V, O'Toole  
A, Sundqvist KL, Arp HPH, Cornelissen G 2012. Quantifying the Total and Bioavailable  
Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons and Dioxins in Biochars. *Environmental Science &  
Technology* 46:2830–2838.
- Hajaligol M, Waymack B, Kellogg D 2001. Low temperature formation of aromatic hydrocarbon  
from pyrolysis of cellulosic materials. *Fuel* 80:1799–1807.
- Hothorn T, Bretz F, Westfall P, Heiberger RM, Schuetzenmeister A 2008. Multcomp:  
simultaneous inference in general parametric models. *R package* version 1-3
- Ice G, Neary D, Adams PW 2004. Effects of wildfire on soils and watershed processes. *Journal  
of Forestry* 102.6: 16-20.
- Jeffery S, Verheijen FGA, Van Der Velde M, Bastos AC 2011. A quantitative review of the  
effects of biochar application to soils on crop productivity using meta-analysis. *Agriculture,  
Ecosystems & Environment* 144:175–187.

Jonker MT, Koelmans AA 2002. Extraction of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons from soot and sediment: Solvent evaluation and implications for sorption mechanism. *Environmental Science and Technology* 36: 4107- 4113.

Keeley SC, Keeley JE, Hutchinson SM, Johnson AW 1981. Postfire succession of the herbaceous flora in southern California chaparral. *Ecology* 62: 1608-1621.

Kloss S, Zehetner F, Dellantonio A, Hamid R, Ottner F, Liedtke V, Schwanninger M, Gerzabek MH, Soja G 2012. Characterization of Slow Pyrolysis Biochars: Effects of Feedstocks and Pyrolysis Temperature on Biochar Properties. *Journal of Environmental Quality* 41:990–1000.

Kloss S, Zehetner F, Wimmer B, Buecker J, Rempt F, Soja G 2014b. Biochar application to temperate soils: Effects on soil fertility and crop growth under greenhouse conditions. *Journal of Plant Nutrition and Soil Science* 177:3–15.

Kołtowski M, Oleszczuk P 2015. Toxicity of biochars after polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons removal by thermal treatment. *Ecological Engineering* 75:79–85.

Lashari MS, Liu Y, Li L, Pan W, Fu J, Pan G, Zheng J, Zheng J, Zhang X, Yu X 2013. Effects of amendment of biochar-manure compost in conjunction with pyroligneous solution on soil quality and wheat yield of a salt-stressed cropland from Central China Great Plain. *Field Crops Research* 144:113–118.



682

683 Ledgard SF, Steele KW 1992. Biological nitrogen fixation in mixed legume/grass pastures. In:

684 *Biological Nitrogen Fixation for Sustainable Agriculture*. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands,

685 137–153.

686

687 Lehmann J 2007. A handful of carbon. *Nature* 447:143–144.

688

689 Lehmann J, Rillig MC, Thies J, Masiello CA, Hockaday WC, Crowley D 2011. Biochar effects

690 on soil biota—a review. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry* 43: 1812-1836.

691

692 Lievens C, Mourant D, Gunawan R, Hu X, Wang Y 2015. Organic compounds leached from fast

693 pyrolysis mallee leaf and bark biochars. *Chemosphere* 139:659–664.

694

695 Liu X, Zhang A, Ji C, Joseph S, Bian R, Li L, Pan G, Paz-Ferreiro J 2013. Biochar’s effect on

696 crop productivity and the dependence on experimental conditions—a meta-analysis of

697 literature data. *Plant and soil* 373:583–594.

698

699 Lucchini P, Quilliam RS, DeLuca TH, Vamerali T, Jones DL 2014. Does biochar application

700 alter heavy metal dynamics in agricultural soil? *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*

701 184:149–157.

702

703 Lynch JM 1980. Effects of organic acids on the germination of seeds and growth of seedlings.

704 *Plant, Cell, & Environment* 3: 255-259.

705

706 Major J, Rondon M, Molina D, Riha SJ, Lehmann J 2010. Maize yield and nutrition during  
707 4 years after biochar application to a Colombian savanna oxisol. *Plant and soil* 333:117–  
708 128.

709

710 Makoto K, Choi D, Hashidoko Y, Koike T 2011. The growth of *Larix gmelinii* seedlings as  
711 affected by charcoal produced at two different temperatures. *Biology and Fertility of Soils*  
712 47:467–472.

713

714 Marks EAN, Alcañiz JM, Domene X 2014. Unintended effects of biochars on short-term plant  
715 growth in a calcareous soil. *Plant and soil* 385:87–105.

716

717 Milberg P 1995. Soil Seed Bank after Eighteen Years of Succession from Grassland to Forest.  
718 *Oikos* 72:3.

719

720 Morrison IM 1972. A semi-micro method for the determination of lignin and its use in predicting  
721 the digestibility of forage crops. *Journal of the Science of Food and Agriculture* 23: 455-463.

722

723

724 Mu J, Uehara T, Furuno T 2003. Effect of bamboo vinegar on regulation of germination and  
725 radicle growth of seed plants. *Journal of Wood Science* 49:262–270.

726

727 Mu J, Uehara T, Furuno T 2004. Effect of bamboo vinegar on regulation of germination and

radicle growth of seed plants II: composition of moso bamboo vinegar at different collection temperature and its effects. *Journal of Wood Science* 50:470–476.

Mukherjee A, Zimmerman AR 2013. Organic carbon and nutrient release from a range of laboratory-produced biochars and biochar–soil mixtures. *Geoderma* 193-194:122–130.

Mungkunkamchao T, Kesmala T, Pimratch S, Toomsan B, Jothityangkoon D 2013. Wood vinegar and fermented bioextracts: Natural products to enhance growth and yield of tomato (*Solanum lycopersicum* L.). *Scientia Horticulturae* 154:66–72.

Novak JM, Busscher WJ, Laird DL, Ahmedna M, Watts DW, Niandou MAS 2009. Impact of Biochar Amendment on Fertility of a Southeastern Coastal Plain Soil. *Soil Science* 174:105–112.

Novak JM, Cantrell KB, Watts DW, Busscher WJ, Johnson MG 2014. Designing relevant biochars as soil amendments using lignocellulosic-based and manure-based feedstocks. *Journal of Soils and Sediments* 14:330–343.

Ortega-Martínez O, Pernas M, Carol RJ, Dolan L 2007. Ethylene Modulates Stem Cell Division in the *Arabidopsis thaliana* Root. *Science* 317:507–510.

Park JH, Choppala GK, Bolan NS, Chung JW, Chuasavathi T 2011. Biochar reduces the bioavailability and phytotoxicity of heavy metals. *Plant and soil* 348:439–451.

751

752 Pettersen RC 1984. The chemical composition of wood. Rowell RM (ed.), *The chemistry of solid*  
753 *wood*, pp 57-126. American Chemical Society, Washington, DC, USA.

754

755

756 Pluchon N, Gundale MJ, Nilsson M-C, Kardol P, Wardle DA 2014. Stimulation of boreal tree  
757 seedling growth by wood-derived charcoal: effects of charcoal properties, seedling species  
758 and soil fertility. *Functional Ecology* 28:766–775.

759

760 Quilliam RS, DeLuca TH, Jones DL 2012. Biochar application reduces nodulation but increases  
761 nitrogenase activity in clover. *Plant and soil* 366:83–92.

762 R Core Team (2012) R: A language and environment for statistical computing. Vienna, Austria.

763

764 Rajkovich S, Enders A, Hanley K, Hyland C, Zimmerman AR, Lehmann J 2012. Corn growth  
765 and nitrogen nutrition after additions of biochars with varying properties to a temperate soil.  
766 *Biology and Fertility of Soils* 48: 271-284.

767

768 Rogovska N, Laird D, Cruse RM, Trabue S, Heaton E 2012. Germination Tests for Assessing  
769 Biochar Quality. *Journal of Environmental Quality* 41:1014–1022.

770

771 Rombolà AG, Marisi G, Torri C, Fabbri D, Buscaroli A, Ghidotti M, Hornung A 2015.  
772 Relationships between Chemical Characteristics and Phytotoxicity of Biochar from Poultry  
773 Litter Pyrolysis. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry* 63:6660–6667.

774

775 Rondon MA, Lehmann J, Ramírez J, Hurtado M 2007. Biological nitrogen fixation by common  
776 beans (*Phaseolus vulgaris* L.) increases with bio-char additions. *Biology and Fertility of Soils*  
777 43:699–708.

778

779 Sackett TE, Basiliko N, Noyce GL, Winsborough C, Schurman J, Ikeda C, Thomas SC 2015.  
780 Soil and greenhouse gas responses to biochar additions in a temperate hardwood forest. *GCB*  
781 *Bioenergy* 7:1062–1074.

782

783 Schaarschmidt F, Vaas L 2009. Analysis of trials with complex treatment structure using  
784 multiple contrast tests. *Horticultural Science* 44.1: 188-195.

785

786 Shafizadeh F 1982. Introduction to pyrolysis of biomass. *Journal of Analytical and Applied*  
787 *Pyrolysis* 3:283–305.

788

789 Soil Classification Working Group. 1998. The Canadian System of Soil Classification, 3rd ed.  
790 *Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada Publication* 1646: 187 pp. ISBN 0-660-17404-9

791

792 Spokas KA 2013. Impact of biochar field aging on laboratory greenhouse gas production  
793 potentials. *GCB Bioenergy* 5:165–176.

794

795 Spokas KA, Baker JM, Reicosky DC 2010. Ethylene: potential key for biochar amendment  
796 impacts. *Plant and soil* 333:443–452.

797

798 Spokas KA, Cantrell KB, Novak JM, Archer DW, Ippolito JA, Collins HP, Boateng AA, Lima  
799 IM, Lamb MC, McAloon AJ, Lentz RD, Nichols KA 2012. Biochar: A Synthesis of Its  
800 Agronomic Impact beyond Carbon Sequestration. *Journal of Environmental Quality* 41:973–  
801 989.

802

803 Spokas KA, Novak JM, Stewart CE, Cantrell KB, Uchimiya M, DuSaire MG, Ro KS 2011.  
804 Qualitative analysis of volatile organic compounds on biochar. *Chemosphere* 85:869–882.

805

806 Thomas SC, Gale N 2015. Biochar and forest restoration: a review and meta-analysis of tree  
807 growth responses. *New Forests* 46:931–946.

808

809 Thomas SC, Frye S, Gale N, Garmon M, Launchbury R, Machado N, Melamed S, Murray J,  
810 Petroff A, Winsborough C 2013. Biochar mitigates negative effects of salt additions on two  
811 herbaceous plant species. *Journal of Environmental Management* 129:62–68.

812

813 Velmurugan N, Han SS, Lee YS 2009. Antifungal Activity of Neutralized Wood Vinegar with  
814 Water Extracts of *Pinus densiflora* and *Quercus serrata* Saw Dusts. *International*  
815 *Journal of Environmental Resources* 3: 167 - 176.

816

817 Wardle DA, Zackrisson O, Nilsson MC 1998. The charcoal effect in Boreal forests: mechanisms  
818 and ecological consequences. *Oecologia* 115:419–426.

819

Welsch-Pausch K, McLachlan MS, Umlauf G 2002. Determination of the Principal Pathways of Polychlorinated Dibenzo-p-dioxins and Dibenzofurans to Lolium multiflorum (Welsh Ray Grass). *Environmental Science & Technology* 29:1090–1098.

Wu H, Yip K, Kong Z, Li CZ, Liu D, Yu Y, Gao X 2011. Removal and recycling of inherent inorganic nutrient species in mallee biomass and derived biochars by water leaching. *Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research* 50: 12143-12151.


Yatagai M, Nishimoto M, Hori K, Ohira T, Shibata A 2002. Termiticidal activity of wood vinegar, its components and their homologues. *Journal of Wood Science* 48:338–342.

Yu F, Deng S, Chen P, Liu Y, Wan Y, Olson A, Kittelson D, Ruan R 2007. Physical and chemical properties of bio-oils from microwave pyrolysis of corn stover. *Applied Biochemistry and Biotechnology* 137-140:957–970.

# Figure 1

Ryegrass growth responses to fresh biochars: contrasts between treatments

Fig 1 Simultaneous confidence intervals (95%) for aboveground biomass (a), belowground biomass (b), leaf area (c) of ryegrass to biochar type (MB, SB, MFT), addition rate (5, 10, 20 t/ha), and application method (Mixed or Top dressing (Top)) (Experiment 1). Significant differences between treatment means are denoted with asterisks ( $P = < 0.05$  \*,  $< 0.01$  \*\*,  $0.001$  \*\*\*).






# Figure 2

Ryegrass growth response effect size as a function of biochar addition rate


Fig 2 The relative effect size (response ratio - RR) of biochar treatment for aboveground biomass (a), belowground biomass (b), and leaf area (c) of ryegrass, as a function of biochar addition rate. Effect size is calculated as  $RR = \ln(B/C)$ , where B is mean response of the biochar treated plants, and C is the mean response of the non-biochar treated control plants. Regressions were performed for each biochar type (MB, SB, MFT); significant linear relationships are denoted with asterisks ( $P = < 0.05$  \*,  $< 0.01$  \*\*,  $0.001$  \*\*\*).



# Figure 3

Ryegrass growth responses to thermally treated and leached chars: contrasts between treatments


Fig 3 Simultaneous confidence intervals (95%) for ryegrass aboveground biomass (a) and belowground biomass (b) responses to water washed (striped bars) and convection heated (grey bars) biochar (Experiment 2). BC = biochar (unwashed); BC (Mix)=biochar, mixed; BC (Top)=biochar, top-dressing. Abbreviations for heating (Heat) and washing (WW) treatments are defined in the methods. Significant differences between treatment means are denoted with asterisks ( $P = < 0.05$  \*,  $< 0.01$  \*\*,  $0.001$  \*\*\*).



# Figure 4

Ryegrass growth responses to leachates from water washed chars


Fig 4 Simultaneous confidence intervals (95%) for ryegrass aboveground biomass (a), belowground biomass (b), and leaf area (c) response in Experiment 2 to dissolved compounds from water-washed biochar leachates (Leach) applied as a 5 mL single dose following germination. Leachate treatments are defined in the methods. Significant differences between treatment means are denoted with asterisks ( $P = < 0.05$  \*,  $< 0.01$  \*\*,  $0.001$  \*\*\*).



# Figure 5

Ion chromatograms of SPME on biochars and leachates

Fig 5 Total ion chromatograms of HS-SPME of maple (A) and spruce (B) biochar, and DI-SPME of maple (C) and spruce (D) water leachates.



## Table 1 (on next page)

Physical and chemical properties of biochars

**Table 1.** Properties of maple and spruce sawdust biochar made in an 80L batch pyrolyzer with highest treatment temperature between 350- 450 °C (from Sackett et al. (2015)), and maple / birch sawdust biochar produced in a flow-through screw fed pyrolyzer with highest treatment temperature of 500-600°C . Three replicates were used for each characterization. Values not determined are abbreviated as n/a (not applicable)

Attribute	Maple Flow Through BC	Maple Batch BC	Spruce Batch BC
Moisture (%)	2.7 (0.0)	2.43 (0.15)	2.4 (0.100)
Ash (%)	2.74 (0.06)	1.67 (0.06)	0.65 (0.06)
pH	7.39 (0.23)	7.7 (.50)	6.5 (0.0)
EC ( $\mu\text{S}/\text{cm}$ )	105 (4)	75 (10)	72 (14)
<i>Elemental composition</i>			
C (%)	85.01 (2.3)	77.3 (3)	77.9
N (%)	0.71	0.10 (0.01)	0.01
S (%)	n/a	0.02 (0.0)	0.01
Phosphorous (mg/kg)	n/a	197 (16)	75
Ca (mg/kg)	n/a	6015 (944)	2419
K (mg/kg)	n/a	3443 (105)	1243
Mg (mg/kg)	n/a	619 (6)	285
<i>Particle size distribution</i>			
> 4000 $\mu\text{m}$ (%)	0.76 (0.95)	0.40 (0.11)	3.09 (1.91)
2000-4000 $\mu\text{m}$ (%)	15.37 (1.52)	5.61 (0.91)	17.39 (0.98)
500-2000 $\mu\text{m}$ (%)	57.25 (2.63)	31.53 (2.54)	59.14 (0.89)
250-500 $\mu\text{m}$ (%)	13.49 (0.84)	27.74 (2.43)	11.44 (.227)
125-250 $\mu\text{m}$ (%)	9.18 (2.42)	25.32 (0.74)	7.05 (0.59)
125-63 $\mu\text{m}$ (%)	3.63 (1.48)	9.02 (0.36)	1.85 (0.31)
< 63 $\mu\text{m}$ (%)	0.30 (0.15)	0.39 (0.16)	0.01 (0.02)

## Table 2 (on next page)

Soil physical and chemical properties

**Table 2.** Properties of the drystic cambisol soil used in both experiments collected from the uppermost mineral layer in a temperate forest, Haliburton ON. Soil analysis was done at the Agriculture and Food Laboratory, University of Guelph, Guelph, ON. Test procedures and units are reported in parenthesis. Three replicates were used for all analyses.



1

Attribute	Value
moisture (%)	2.72
organic matter (%)	12.3
NH <sub>4</sub> (KCl-NH <sub>4</sub> ,mg/kg )	3.8
N <sub>03</sub> - N (KCl-NH <sub>4</sub> , mg/kg)	148
P (NaHCO <sub>3</sub> , mg/L)	32
Mg (NH <sub>4</sub> C <sub>2</sub> H <sub>3</sub> O <sub>2</sub> , mg/L)	140
K (NH <sub>4</sub> C <sub>2</sub> H <sub>3</sub> O <sub>2</sub> , mg/L)	62
pH (CaCl <sub>2</sub> )	6.8

2

3

### Table 3 (on next page)

Mean growth responses values for clover and ryegrass

**Table 3.** Mean values for aboveground biomass (g), belowground biomass (g), and leaf area (cm<sup>2</sup>) for ryegrass and clover grown in treatments with maple and spruce sawdust biochar made in an 80L batch pyrolyzer with highest treatment temperature between 350-450 °C, and in treatments with maple / birch sawdust biochar produced in a flow-through screw fed pyrolyzer with highest treatment temperature of 500-600°C (Experiment 1). “BC (dosage)” is the mean value for all treatments of biochar at that dose, and “BC mixed/ top-dressing” is the mean values for all biochar treatments applied as mixed and top-dressings.

1

Treatment	Aboveground biomass (g)		Belowground biomass (g)		Leaf area (cm <sup>2</sup> )	
	Mean	Std. error	Mean	Std. error	Mean	Std.error
<i>Ryegrass</i>						
1. Control	175.0	7.89	12.8	0.89	63.02	3.07
2. Maple batch BC	136.2	3.45	8.21	0.27	52.70	1.29
3. Spruce batch BC	126.9	6.29	8.32	0.61	51.40	2.4
4. Maple flow through BC	131.3	4.76	8.32	0.30	51.55	1.63
5. BC 5 t/ha	144.5	43.53	8.38	3.08	57.13	17.08
6. BC 10 t/ha	133.8	44.80	8.65	3.34	52.71	16.23
7. BC 20 t/ha	134.76	39.00	8.6	3.11	53.16	11.65
8. BC 50 t/ha	114.93	41.39	7.33	3.62	45.23	14.54
9. BC mixed	142.5	5.50	8.92	0.42	55.65	1.92
10. BC top-dressing	120.32	5.36	7.59	0.43	48.06	1.91
<i>Clover</i>						
1. Control	7.97	1.03	1.98	0.45	13.66	2.91
2. Maple batch BC	5.29	0.40	1.58	0.13	11.11	0.88
3. Spruce batch BC	5.07	0.62	1.65	0.19	11.80	1.32
4. Maple flow through BC	4.72	0.46	1.57	0.11	11.05	0.78
5. BC 5 t/ha	5.15	0.51	1.63	0.14	11.27	1.09
6. BC 10 t/ha	5.89	0.62	1.85	0.18	13.4	1.19
7. BC 20 t/ha	5.15	0.68	1.85	0.19	12.9	1.24
8. BC 50 t/ha	3.40	0.41	1.07	0.10	7.84	0.89
9. BC mixed	4.51	0.34	1.54	0.10	10.62	0.733
10. BC top-dressing	5.54	0.46	1.66	0.13	12.06	0.91

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

## Table 4 (on next page)

Mean values for plant growth responses to treated biochar

**Table 4.** Mean values for aboveground biomass (g), belowground biomass (g), and leaf area (cm<sup>2</sup>) for ryegrass grown in 10 t/ha of fresh or treated (convection heated or water washed) maple and maple / birch sawdust biochar produced in a flow-through screw fed pyrolyzer with highest treatment temperature of 500-600°C (MFT), and values for ryegrass grown with 10 mL of “leachate” from water-washing of fresh biochars (Experiment 2).

1

<b>Treatments</b>	<u>Aboveground biomass (g)</u>		<u>Belowground biomass (g)</u>		<u>Leaf area (cm<sup>2</sup>)</u>	
	Mean	Std. error	Mean	Std. error	Mean	Std. error
1. Control	195.50	10.59	122.20	12.57	63.74	2.50
2. Biochar	150.27	9.07	91.33	6.45	47.65	2.36
3. Water Washed 30 min	157.13	11.13	88.13	7.37	49.10	2.07
4. Water washed 24hrs	202.13	9.46	116.31	8.84	59.19	1.90
5. Heated 50 °C	170.81	9.24	103.31	5.50	53.72	2.36
6. Heated 100 °C	187.18	1.45	101.69	1.02	57.84	0.31
7. Heated 150 °C	193.75	1.48	105.12	0.80	57.20	0.49
8. Leachate 30 min	141.75	7.24	98.88	7.37	56.69	4.37
9. Leachate 24 hrs	116.38	5.35	78.38	7.48	46.53	1.50

2