White Rose Research Online

eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk
Universities of Leeds, Sheffield and York

Deposited via The University of Sheffield.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/id/eprint/139217/

Version: Accepted Version

**Article:**
Menon, M., Tatari, A. and Smith, C.C. (2018) Mechanical properties of freshly amended soils with miscanthus biochar. Soil Use and Management, 34 (4). pp. 563-574. ISSN: 0266-0032

https://doi.org/10.1111/sum.12464

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: Menon, M. , Tatari, A. and Smith, C. C. (2018), Mechanical Properties of Freshly Amended Soils with Miscanthus Biochar. Soil Use Manage, which has been published in final form at https://doi.org/10.1111/sum.12464. This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Self-Archiving.

**Reuse**
Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

**Takedown**
If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS
University of Sheffield
UNIVERSITY of York

# Mechanical Properties of Freshly Amended Soils with Miscanthus Biochar

Menon, M.[1]*, Tatari, A.[2, 3] and Smith C.C[2].

[1]Department of Geography, Winter Street, Sheffield, United Kingdom. S10 2TN.

[2]Department of Civil and Structural Engineering, University of Sheffield, United Kingdom. S1 3JD

[3]School of Civil Engineering and Surveying, University of Portsmouth, United Kingdom. PO1 3AH

* Corresponding Author

Address: Department of Geography, Winter Street, Sheffield, United Kingdom. S10 2TN.

Email: m.menon@sheffield.ac.uk

Phone: +44 114 222 7993

**Running title:** Properties of Biochar Amended soils

**Abstract**

Biochar has been shown to have multiple, positive benefits on soil physico-chemical and biological properties. However, mechanical behaviour of biochar-amended soils has been given relatively less attention. Therefore, in this study, we aimed to describe these properties of freshly amended soil with Miscanthus biochar in the context of compaction mitigation through a comprehensive laboratory study. In particular, for the first time, we evaluated the short-term loading and unloading responses of replicated biochar-amended soils using a modified oedometer, using different rates of application of biochar (2, 6 and 10% w/w, dry weight basis), in two types of soil (humus free loam and field loam) prepared at two different (10 and 22% w/w) soil moisture contents. From the experiment, dry density ($\rho_d$), void ratio (e), compression index ($C_c$) and relaxation ratio (R) were derived and statistically analysed. The addition of biochar was shown to reduce $\rho_d$ while e increased with the amount of added biochar. The addition of biochar increased $C_c$ and R. The effect of soil moisture content and soil types were also found to be statistically significant on the above parameters. However, field studies are needed to understand the long-term mechanical behaviour of biochar-amended soils and further studies are required to examine the performance of different biochar types and soil types.

**Keywords:** Compaction, Soil Moisture, Loam, Biochar, Void ratio, Compression index, Relaxation ratio, Dry density

## Introduction

Soil compaction is increase in density of soils through collapse of pores, resulting in increased bulk density. It modifies the soil structure and distorts the pore geometry, resulting in poor drainage (Hamza & Anderson, 2005; Batey, 2009; Keller *et al.*, 2013). Compaction alters intrinsic pore size and distribution, creating complex pore tortuosity and connectivity, disrupting the diffusion of air and water (Menon *et al.*, 2015). These physical changes have implications on soil biogeochemical processes, greenhouse gas emissions (e.g. $N_2O$) and crop production (Beare *et al.*, 2009; Liu *et al.*, 2017).

The problem of compaction is widespread in cultivated soils involving heavy machinery. Globally, compacted areas cover 68 Mha (million hectares) out of which 33 Mha is in Europe and 4 Mha in the Australian wheat belt (Flowers & Lal, 1998; Hamza & Anderson, 2005; Keller *et al.*, 2017). Therefore, more research is needed in mitigating compaction or alleviating compacted soil (i.e. reducing the bulk density) using various soil management options. Such management options may include the addition of organic matter (OM), controlled traffic, mechanical loosening such as deep ripping and crop rotation utilising plants with strong tap roots (Hamza & Anderson, 2005). In particular, the addition of OM is particularly interesting due to its multiple positive impacts on soil properties and soil functions (Victoria *et al.*, 2012).

Soane (1990) suggested a few possible mechanisms by which OM would influence the compressive behaviour of soils. These include i. Enhancing the binding forces (cohesion) between particles and within soil aggregates; ii. Enhancing elasticity (organic materials have a high degree of elasticity or relaxation ratio, R); iii. Dilution effect (reduces bulk density, ρ, of soil, depending on the amount added); iv. Filament effect (related to roots, fungal hyphae and other biological filaments); v. Effect of electrical charge, and vi. Reduction of friction due to the organic coating on mineral particles. These mechanisms operate on different time scales (fresh vs decomposed OM) and also will depend on the type of organic matter (animal or plant origin) and soil conditions (ibid). Also, decomposition of OM will help build

water stable aggregates (Tisdall & Oades, 1982; Elliott, 1986; Bronick & Lal, 2005), enhancing the structural stability of soils. Based on this it can be hypothesised that when OM is fresh, dominant mechanisms are likely to be (ii) and (iii) whereas when it is decomposed (humus), other mechanisms (i, iv, v and vi) are likely to contribute to the overall mechanical response. However, other factors, such as the amount of OM and soil moisture (Keller *et al.*, 2013; Menon *et al.*, 2015), are also important parameters to consider to maximise the benefit of OM amendments in managing compacted soils.

Although there are many types of OM available as amendments, biochar and its multiple benefits have gained much attention among researchers across the world. Biochar is produced by pyrolysis of biomass and with this process; approximately 50% of the carbon contained in the original biomass can be retained. Addition of biochar has been shown to have a positive effect on soil hydrophysical, mechanical, chemical, and biological properties (Sohi *et al.*, 2009; Atkinson *et al.*, 2010; Jeffery *et al.*, 2011; Lehmann *et al.*, 2011; Ippolito *et al.*, 2012; Castellini *et al.*, 2015; Ajayi *et al.*, 2016; Burrell *et al.*, 2016; Ajayi & Horn, 2016).

Specifically, Castellini *et al.* (2015) demonstrated the impact of biochar (a feedstock made of mixed fruit trees prunings) on physical and hydraulic properties of clay soil, and they suggested a significant increase in water retention close to saturation for the highest level of biochar (30g/ kg), but no corresponding significant difference in ρ, saturated hydraulic or unsaturated conductivity. In another long-term pot experiment using four types of biochars (woodchip biochar, straw biochar, and two vineyard-pruning biochars) in three soil types (Chernozem, Cambisol and a coarse-textured Planosol), Burrell *et al.* (2016) showed that coarse-textured Planosol soil benefitted the most through the addition of these biochars by reduced bulk density particularly by the woodchip biochar and both improved aggregate stability and plant-available water by the addition of straw biochar. Similarly, in a simulated compaction experiment, Liu *et al.* (2017) found that addition of maize straw biochar significantly reduced ρ, increased porosity and water holding capacity. However, an earlier field study showed no significant effects of biochar on hydrophysical soil properties 30

months after biochar incorporation (Hardie *et al.*, 2013). These studies show that any improvement in soil physical conditions will depend on the type of biochar, the amount added, time of application and when the observations have been taken. In particular, the hydrophysical effects of biochar tend to change over time (Hardie *et al.*, 2013; Castellini *et al.*, 2015; Burrell *et al.*, 2016) while data on the mechanical behaviour of biochar-amended soil is sparse. A notable exception is a recent study by Ajayi and Horn (2017) which reported an improvement in the mechanical resilience of aggregates 100 days after amending a sandy soil with woodchip biochar. However, biochar is usually added through broadcasting and incorporation before other agricultural operations involving heavy machines. A long waiting period after incorporation is, therefore often not being practised in a typical intensive farming scenario.

To use biochar to alleviate the compaction in soils, we need to describe the mechanical behaviour of biochar-amended soil under simulated traffic loading and unloading regimes. Therefore, the overarching aim of this laboratory study was to describe the mechanical behaviour of freshly amended soils with biochar under two soil moisture contents. The mechanical behaviour of biochar-amended soils can be expressed using changes in ρ (total mass to the total volume), and dry density ($\rho_d$; dry mass to the total volume), void ratio (e*;* volume of void to the total volume of solids), compression index ($C_c$; changes in e in response to the applied vertical load, $\sigma_v$) and relaxation ratio (R; ratio of ρ in presence and absence of $\sigma_v$).

In particular, for a given soil type, we tested the following hypotheses:

1. The effect of biochar on $\rho_d$ and e will depend on the rate of biochar application. Thus, a higher rate of biochar application will produce a lower $\rho_d$ (or higher e) due to the porous nature of biochar and the dilution effect.
2. Biochar-amended soils will have a high value of $C_c$ and R as most organic amendments have a high degree of elasticity.

123 To this end, the following objectives were formulated:

124 1. Quantify the variation of $\rho_d$, and $e$ with vertical compressive stress $\sigma_v$ in response to
125 soil types, soil moisture contents and rate of biochar application.
126 2. Determine $C_c$ and R and evaluate the data in response to the rate of application of
127 biochar under varying soil and soil moisture contents.

128 The vertical stress will be applied under one-dimensional conditions. Since all soils tested
129 will be partially saturated, total stresses only will be quoted as the soil was partially
130 saturated, and the compression index is defined in this context. Interpretation of suction
131 effects and effective stresses are beyond the scope of this paper.

132 **Materials and Methods**

133 *Soils and sample preparation*

134 Two types of soil were used in the study. The first soil (S1) was made in the laboratory using
135 a pure form of medium size sand (150-700μm), silt (5-75μm) and kaolin (<2μm) clay
136 (50:25:25 w/w), representing a humus free loam soil. This material was chosen to eliminate
137 the influence of organic matter (OM) and the presence of pre-existing natural soil
138 aggregates. A second soil (S2) was a 2 mm sieved loam topsoil (sand: silt: clay = 40: 44: 16)
139 collected from 0-20 cm from the Leeds University farm, U.K. Both plastic and liquid limits
140 were determined according to British Standards (BS 1377-2:1990) protocols as 11% and
141 22% for S1, and 25% and 37% for S2.

142 *Amendment with biochar at different soil moisture contents*

143 The biochar used in the study was produced from *Miscanthus x giganteus*, subjected to fast
144 pyrolysis at 450$^{o}$C (BTG, Enschede, Netherlands) with a moisture content of 0.57% (i.e.
145 before amending to soil) and a water holding capacity of 461.40% (w/w). The reported
146 average skeletal density for Miscanthus is 1.68 (range =1.39-1.96 ) g/cm$^3$ whereas the
147 average envelope density is 0.28 (range 0.26-0.29) g/cm$^3$ (Brewer *et al.*, 2014; Brewer &
148 Levine, 2015). The average envelope density obtained in our laboratory testing was

149 0.23±0.11 g/cm$^3$. The average internal biochar porosity may therefore be estimated as (1.68-
150 0.23)/1.68 = 86%.

151 The rate of application of biochar depends on climatic and soil texture, and different rates
152 can be found in the literature. However, a recommended rate is 2 % (w/w) while higher rates
153 are also common (Filiberto & Gaunt, 2013; Peake *et al.*, 2014).

154 The experiment was started with preliminary load tests on S1 with different moisture levels
155 (5, 10, 20 and 40% w/w) to find out optimum moisture content for the subsequent
156 experiments. Based on the data obtained it was decided to use 10% w/w as soil strength
157 was found to be maximum at this moisture content (also the plastic limit is 11%) for further
158 experimentation with different biochar rates, i.e. (0, 2, 6 and 10 % soil dry weight basis) .
159 These rates will be equivalent to 30, 90 and 150 t/ha (based on a soil bulk density of 1500
160 kg/m$^3$ and 0.1m soil depth) for 2, 6 and 10% rates. However, the dry density (as shown in
161 Figure 2 later) data showed no significant difference between 6 and 10% biochar rates for
162 S2 at 10% w/w soil moisture content and hence discontinued the 6% rate in the subsequent
163 experiments using S2. However, for S2, we used 10% as well as 22% soil moisture content
164 (average field moisture content at the time of collection and due to higher plastic and liquid
165 limits compared with S1) with 0, 2 and 10% biochar rates. Note that the soil samples and
166 biochar were dried first to remove any moisture (gravimetric method), followed by elevating
167 the moisture levels to required levels adding the required amount of water incrementally after
168 mixing the soil with biochar with a spatula and kept in sealed container for 24 hours as
169 incubation period to achieve a uniform moisture content distribution. To the best of our
170 knowledge, there is no recommended incubation period, and a recent review suggested this
171 can vary from 0-6 months (O'Connor *et al.*, 2018). Three replicates were used for all tests.

172 *Mechanical Loading Tests*

173 A conventional oedometer one-dimensional consolidation test apparatus (BS 1377-5:1990)
174 was adapted for the determination of the magnitude and the rate of compression in the

process of loading and unloading. In the apparatus, a cylindrical specimen (h= 20 mm, d = 75 mm) contained within a steel ring was subjected to a dead load applied using a lever system and the change in the height of the specimen was monitored using a micrometre dial gauge as a function of time. A conventional test using this apparatus for the investigation of consolidation behaviour of soils, involved drainage of water from the specimen. However, in the current tests compression took place by the expulsion of air, allowing acceleration of the test process. Therefore, the standard porous discs normally used in the apparatus were replaced with perspex discs to avoid absorption of water from the samples by the discs. However, this also meant that if the water were squeezed out of the matrix into the larger pore spaces, it could not drain away.

A load sequence of 12.5, 25, 50,100, 200, 400 and 800 kPa was used, and also at each step of loading, the sample was unloaded to zero and then loaded up to the next increment of the load. At the last increment of loading (800 kPa), the load was unloaded in two steps, 800 to 400 kPa, and then 400 to 0 kPa. The time step between loading stages was 15 minutes as little change was observed after this period after application of a load. This also simulated the real world situation where the loading time is very short (e.g., slow moving agricultural machinery).

**Calculation of $\rho_d$, e, $C_c$ and R**

Fig. 1 presents the phase relationship diagram, which was used in this study to calculate the value of $\rho_d$ and e of the specimen. The initial height of the sample was the same for all tests and was set by loosely filling the material to the top of the oedometer sample ring. This will have led to some variation in initial density due to operator error. However, this is expected to have a minor effect on the densities achieved under loading. The change in sample height, recorded from the oedometer readings, enabled calculation of sample volume (before and after compaction). After the oedometer test, the samples were oven-dried to obtain the dry weight gravimetrically.

For sample S1, the specific gravity of the coarse sand, silt and clay were taken as 2.65 based on the supplier data sheets. For sample S2 the same value of 2.65 was adopted as this is generally representative for soils. However, biochar is a highly porous material, and its density may be attributed to variations in the source material and internal porosity. Since the choice of its specific gravity has a significant effect on the value of *e* calculated, and the biochar itself may swell on absorption of water, it was decided to adopt the simple approach of computing a 'biochar inclusive void ratio', $e_b$, (i.e. assuming both its skeleton and internal porosity constitute beneficial void space). In the context of the biological functioning of the soil, this may be justified as the biochar will provide space for biota and water, considering its gravimetric water holding capacity of 461.4%, and internal porosity of around 85%.

The biochar inclusive $e_b$ was calculated using the equation below.

$$e_b = \frac{H - H_s}{H_s} \quad (1)$$

where; $H$ = total height of sample and $H_s$ = height of soil mineral solids, given by:

$$H_s = \frac{1}{A\gamma_w}\left(\frac{m_{sand}}{G_{s_{sand}}} + \frac{m_{silt}}{G_{s_{silt}}} + \frac{m_{clay}}{G_{s_{clay}}}\right) \quad (2)$$

where; $m_{sand}$, $m_{silt}$, $m_{clay}$ are the dry mass of sand, silt and clay; $G_{s_{sand}}$, $G_{s_{silt}}$, $G_{s_{clay}}$ are the specific gravity of sand, silt and clay; $A$ is area of specimen/oedometer's ring; and $\gamma_w$ is the weight density of water.

The value of $C_c$ was determined by changes in $e_b$ with the changes in total vertical stress (load) applied to a sample. It describes the relationship (i.e. slope of the line) between $e_b$ and log ($\sigma_v$). In addition to this, the relaxation ratio (R) was also derived, which is the bulk density (ρ) of the test material under specified stress to the ρ after the stress has been removed (Soane, 1990). The R value is an effective way to check the recovery of soils under various loading regimes. Thus, a soil that recovers would be better for combating compaction from agricultural machinery.

## Statistical analysis

The data were found to be normally distributed and based on that two-way ANOVA was used to compare soil or moisture (factor 1) under different biochar application rates (factor 2) and along with Tukey HSD (Honest Significant Difference) to compare different rates of applications within each group (S1W1, S2W1 and S2W2) of data. GraphPad Prism (ver. 7) was used to perform the statistical analyses and create some figures.

## Results

*Dry density ($\rho_d$)*

The addition of biochar decreased $\rho_d$ (after maximum loading), in both soils, S1 and S2 at all soil moisture levels (Fig. 2) and the reduction in $\rho_d$ was proportional to the amount of biochar added. While comparing the dry density of S1 and S2 for the same moisture content, it was clear that the dry density reduced gradually but linearly with the amount of biochar for both soils. The dry density for S1 was larger than the dry density of S2 throughout (Fig. 2a). Two-way ANOVA showed statistically greater significant effects ($P < 0.0001$) for both soil and biochar treatments. The comparison of $\rho_d$ from different biochar treatments revealed the statistically significant difference between rates of biochar in S1W1 (Table 1) whereas, for S2W1, this was true except for the 6% vs 10% rate of biochar.

Fig. 2b compares two different moisture content levels (W1 and W2) within the same soil type (i.e. S2) in which there was a similar gradual decrease in $\rho_d$ with increase in biochar rate. The ANOVA showed significant effects of biochar ($P<0.0001$) and soil moisture ($P = 0.0442$). When different rates of biochar were compared within S2W1, the 10% rate of biochar differed significantly from both 0 and 2% rates. For the S2W2, the results were similar except there was no difference between 0 and 2% biochar.

*Biochar inclusive void ratio ($e_b$)*

Fig. 3 (a-f) shows the changes in $e_b$ in the process of loading and unloading. For simplicity, pairwise comparison of 0 (e) and 10% biochar additions ($e_b$) are described here. Fig. 3a & b, thus, show the responses in e and $e_b$ for S1 with 10% moisture content, Fig. 3 c & d for S2 with 10% moisture content and, finally Fig. 3 e & f for S2 with 22% moisture content. All additions of biochar nearly doubled the value of $e_b$ in all cases.

The degree of change in $e_b$ was always greater for S1W1 compared to S2W1 under 10% biochar (compare Fig. 3b & d) at the end of the test, and both achieved very similar values of $e_b$. The results showed that, in general, the soils with biochar had a larger initial value of $e_b$ but were more compressible both in terms of recoverable and unrecoverable deformations, when compared to the soils without biochar.

*Biochar Inclusive Void Ratio* ($e_b$) *and Compression index* ($C_c$*)*

At each loading step, the value of $e_b$ was calculated and plotted (Fig. 4 a-c) for all treatment combinations. The relationship between $e_b$ and the logarithm of pressure followed was closely linear in all cases. This is a typical pattern that can be expected for many soil types. For all cases, as expected, the biochar inclusive void ratio was lowest in the absence of biochar and highest at 10% rate of application and in between for the other two treatments (2 vs 6%).

The $C_c$ for the soil was calculated based on the slope of the lines and is given in Fig. 5. It was found that $C_c$ increased with the increase in biochar content in all cases. The effect of soil types and biochar rates on $C_c$ was statistically significant ($P < 0.0001$ for both), including their interactions ($p = 0.0072$). Tukey multiple pairwise comparisons also (Table 2) also showed the statistically significant difference between different levels of biochar additions except 0 vs 2%, and 2 vs 6%. For S2W2, all except 0 vs 2% addition of biochar treatments was significant.

The ANOVA showed a significant effect of biochar ($P < 0.0001$) and soil moisture content ($P < 0.0001$). However, the interaction between the two variables was not significant. Here also,

pairwise comparisons were significant except 0 vs.2% in S1W1 (Table 2). Also, the $C_c$ was very similar for S2W1 with 10% biochar and S2W2 with 2% biochar.

*Relaxation ratio* (R*)*

The relaxation ratio is the ability of soil to restore its bulk density after the external pressure is removed. The R values obtained under each load are provided in Fig. 6 (a-c), which showed that the R values increased with the applied load, following an approximately logarithmic relationship. It consistently showed that as the biochar rate increased, the relaxation ratio increased. At the maximum load of 800kPa, the relaxation ratio for 10% biochar treatment was >1.08, whereas it was 1.04 and 1.02 for 2% and control (without biochar).

For convenience, to compare the performance of different samples, average R values for all treatments were computed across the loading range under different biochar application rates, as visualised in Fig. 7. In general, R values increased with the rate of biochar. The ANOVA showed the statistically significant effect of biochar ($P<0.0001$) and soil ($P<0.0001$) was found under the same moisture content (W1). For the same soil type (i.e. S2), effects of biochar ($P<0.0001$) and moisture content ($P<0.0001$) on R were statistically significant.

When comparing different rates of biochar within the two soil types on R (Table 3), it was found that at 10% biochar, R differed significantly from both 0 and 2% rates of biochar application. The difference in R between 0 and 2% was significant for S1W1, but not significant for S2W1. Comparisons of R within the same moisture levels were similar. At 10% biochar, R was significantly different from those at 0 and 2% rates of biochar application when compared within the same soil type under two different moisture contents (Table 3). It also suggested the difference in R between 0 and 2% was also significantly different.

**Discussion**

Biochar is regarded highly as a soil amendment, and several benefits have been reported in the literature, however little attention has been given to mechanical behaviour (Atkinson *et*

301 *al.*, 2010) of biochar-amended soils, except in a few recent studies (Peake *et al.*, 2014;
302 Castellini *et al.*, 2015; Burrell *et al.*, 2016; Ajayi & Horn, 2016, 2017; Liu *et al.*, 2017). An
303 important difference between the current study and the previous studies is how samples
304 were prepared. In some studies, measurements were taken after several days to months
305 using pre-incubated samples whereas others measured physical properties several months
306 after biochar incorporation under field conditions. For instance, Ajayi and Horn (2017)
307 amended biochar with soil and incubated for 100 days. In their previous study (Ajayi & Horn,
308 2016) samples were incubated for 30 days. Our investigation, in contrast, considered the
309 mechanical behaviour of soil 24 hours after amendment with biochar. This short period was
310 chosen mainly to equilibrate moisture within the samples, and there is no recommended
311 incubation period (anytime within 0-6 months) (O'Connor *et al.*, 2018). Furthermore, time of
312 observation is also important as some studies reported no significant change in hydro-
313 physical properties several months after incorporation (Hardie *et al.*, 2013; Castellini *et al.*,
314 2015; Burrell *et al.*, 2016), indicating that temporal dynamics in these properties depend on
315 biochar type, soil and environmental conditions.

316 Particle size distribution is also an important factor when whole plant biomass is used for
317 biochar production, such as the *Miscanthus* biochar we used. This biochar exhibited a large
318 degree of heterogeneity in size, shape and strength; each can significantly impact the
319 mechanical behaviour. Importantly, the biochar was not subjected to any size modification
320 (e.g. by crushing), which is often unnecessary and not being practised widely. However, if
321 the size of the biochar is small enough, it can fill the macropores (>75µm) as suggested by
322 Ajayi and Horn (2017). If provided with sufficient incubation period after mixing the biochar,
323 this would also promote aggregation providing additional mechanical resilience to soils as
324 these authors demonstrated. Ajayi and Horn (2017) found that long-term incubation (100 d)
325 of finely prepared (750µm sieved) biochar led to the formation of more permeable and
326 pliable aggregates, thus less prone to collapse or rupture. They also observed that biochar

327 amendment increased porosity, decreased bulk density and soil's mechanical resilience
328 improved significantly, similar to our results.

329 The underlying rationale for using a soil without any aggregates or organic matter (S1) was
330 an indirect way to identify the contribution of biochar in isolation. Since this study did not use
331 fine-grained biochar, the observed results can be explained by the elasticity and dilution
332 effect exhibited by bulky and porous organic materials. Most organic materials possess
333 elastic behaviour and high relaxation ratio (Soane, 1990). If we assume 10% w/w addition of
334 biochar with an envelope density of 0.23 g/cm$^3$ to the soil, then 1g of soil solids will have a
335 volume of 1/2.65 = 0.38 cm$^3$, while the biochar will have a volume of 0.1/0.23 = 0.43 cm$^3$.
336 Therefore, for the envelope component, biochar will have a value of $e_b$ = 0.43/0.38 or
337 approximately 1.1. Under small loads (Figure 3) $e_b$ increased by ~0.5-1.0 over and above
338 1.1, indicating significant additional interparticle void space. However, at the largest load
339 (800kPa) most of this extra void space appears to be lost leaving the gain in $e_b$ primarily due
340 to the biochar itself (i.e., the internal porosity of biochar), possibly reduced slightly due to
341 some minor crushing of the material. At loads typical of farm vehicles (~100kPa) additional
342 void space remained at approx. 0.3. It is noticeable that samples significantly drier than the
343 plastic limit (S2W1) were less compressible than those with moisture contents closer to the
344 soil plastic limit. This was expected as the soil aggregates should be stronger; however, the
345 initial and final biochar inclusive void ratio of, e.g. S2W1 was smaller than that of S2W2. This
346 may be due to the absorption of water by the biochar, which would swell, but simultaneously
347 reduce the moisture content of the soil mineral phase.

348 The effects may depend on the type of material used in biochar production and soil types
349 used in the experiments, making it challenging to compare studies. In a study where different
350 biochars were compared (woodchip, straw and vine-prunings) under different soil types
351 (Chernozem, Cambisol and coarse textured Planosol), Burrell *et al.* (2016) identified biochar-
352 soil combinations to improve physical properties. They authors found straw biochar to be
353 suitable for improving the aggregate stability of a coarse-textured Planosol, whereas

354 woodchip biochar showed no effect on bulk density on Chernozem (Burrell *et al.*, 2016). In
355 our study addition of biochar decreased bulk density. The reason could be due to the
356 difference in the timing of these observations; the findings of Burrel et al. (2016) were based
357 on measurements carried out after several months after adding the biochar whereas our
358 results were based on biochar-soil mixtures incubated for 24 hours.

359 The rate of application of biochar influences the physical and hydraulic properties, although
360 rates of more than 50 g /kg did not significantly influence soil hydrophysical or mechanical
361 properties (Ajayi & Horn, 2016, 2017). Through pairwise statistical tests we could show the
362 impact of soil moisture and biochar levels for $\rho_d$ , $C_c$ and R. For instance, earlier results from
363 both soils on $\rho_d$ suggested no significant difference between 6 and 10% biochar application
364 under low soil moisture content (W1). This helped eliminate 6% biochar for the following
365 experiments at greater moisture content (W2).

366 Based on the findings, it is safe to conclude that there is a substantial gain in void ratio and
367 compression index when biochar is added to soils. However, it is also important to
368 understand how mechanical behaviour would change after different periods of incorporation
369 under repeated trafficking conditions. It is important to consider biochar characteristics in
370 future studies as it depends on biomass feedstock and pyrolysis temperature (Sohi *et al.*,
371 2009). Also, the effect of biochar may change over time, and it needs to be verified using
372 long-term monitoring studies under a variety of soil and environmental conditions.

373 **Conclusions**

374 This study compared different rates (2, 6 and 10% w/w, dry weight basis) of Miscanthus
375 biochar application in two soil types under two moisture content levels. Results showed a
376 positive benefit with improvements the dry density and void ratio, simultaneously increasing
377 the compression index of biochar-amended soils. These effects could be explained by the
378 dilution effect provided by organic materials. Biochar-amended soils had improved relaxation

379 ratios, a property linked to the elasticity of the material. The effect of biochar addition was
380 significantly influenced by the moisture levels and soil types.

381 **Acknowledgements**

382 Funding: The study was carried out as part of a project titled “Evaluating Ecological Impacts
383 of Soil Compaction Using a Multidisciplinary Approach”, funded by The White Rose
384 University Consortium Collaboration Fund (2013–14). The authors are also grateful to Dr
385 Sylvia Toet, University of York, for proving biochar and soil samples and Mr Thabet
386 Alzamzami for carrying out initial preliminary laboratory testing.

387

388 **References**


389 Ajayi, A.E., Holthusen, D. & Horn, R. 2016. Changes in microstructural behaviour and
390 hydraulic functions of biochar amended soils. *Soil and Tillage Research*, **155**, 166–175,
391 (At: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0167198715300052. Accessed:
392 24/3/2018).

393 Ajayi, A.. & Horn, R. 2016. Modification of chemical and hydrophysical properties of two
394 texturally differentiated soils due to varying magnitudes of added biochar. *Soil and*
395 *Tillage Research*, **164**, 34–44, (At:
396 https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0167198716300113. Accessed:
397 24/3/2018).

398 Ajayi, A.E. & Horn, R. 2017. Biochar-Induced Changes in Soil Resilience: Effects of Soil
399 Texture and Biochar Dosage. *Pedosphere*, **27**, 236–247, (At:
400 https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1002016017603138. Accessed:
401 24/3/2018).

402 Atkinson, C.J., Fitzgerald, J.D. & Hipps, N. a. 2010. Potential mechanisms for achieving
403 agricultural benefits from biochar application to temperate soils: A review. *Plant and*
404 *Soil*, **337**, 1–18.

405 Batey, T. 2009. Soil compaction and soil management - A review. *Soil Use and*
406 *Management*, **25**, 335–345.

407 Beare, M.H., Gregorich, E.G. & St-Georges, P. 2009. Compaction effects on CO2 and N2O
408 production during drying and rewetting of soil. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry*, **41**, 611–
409 621, (At: http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0038071708004641. Accessed:
410 20/2/2013).

411 Brewer, C.E., Chuang, V.J., Masiello, C.A., Gonnermann, H., Gao, X., Dugan, B., Driver,
412 L.E., Panzacchi, P., Zygourakis, K. & Davies, C.A. 2014. New approaches to measuring
413 biochar density and porosity. *Biomass and Bioenergy*, **66**, 176–185, (At:

414 http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0961953414001883. Accessed: 22/7/2017).

415 Brewer, C.E. & Levine, J. 2015. Weight or Volume for Handling Biochar and Biomass? *The*
416 *Biochar Journal 2015*, (At: https://www.biochar-journal.org/en/ct/71. Accessed:
417 22/7/2017).

418 Bronick, C.J.J. & Lal, R. 2005. Soil structure and management: a review. *Geoderma*, **124**, 3–
419 22, (At: http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0016706104000898. Accessed:
420 2/11/2012).

421 Burrell, L.D., Zehetner, F., Rampazzo, N., Wimmer, B. & Soja, G. 2016. Long-term effects of
422 biochar on soil physical properties. *Geoderma*, **282**, 96–102, (At:
423 https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0016706116303147. Accessed:
424 24/3/2018).

425 Castellini, M., Giglio, L., Niedda, M., Palumbo, A.D. & Ventrella, D. 2015. Impact of biochar
426 addition on the physical and hydraulic properties of a clay soil. *Soil and Tillage*
427 *Research*, **154**, 1–13, (At:
428 https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0167198715001336. Accessed:
429 24/3/2018).

430 Elliott, E.T. 1986. Aggregate Structure and Carbon, Nitrogen, and Phosphorus in Native and
431 Cultivated Soils. *Soil Science Society of America Journal*, **50**, 627–633, (At:
432 https://dl.sciencesocieties.org/publications/sssaj/pdfs/50/3/SS0500030627. ).

433 Filiberto, D. & Gaunt, J. 2013. Practicality of Biochar Additions to Enhance Soil and Crop
434 Productivity. *Agriculture*, **3**, 715–725, (At: http://www.mdpi.com/2077-0472/3/4/715/. ).

435 Flowers, M.D. & Lal, R. 1998. Axle load and tillage effects on soil physical properties and
436 soybean grain yield on a mollic ochraqualf in northwest Ohio. *Soil and Tillage*
437 *Research*, **48**, 21–35.

438 Hamza, M. a. & Anderson, W.K. 2005. Soil compaction in cropping systems. *Soil and Tillage*

*Research*, **82**, 121–145, (At: http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0167198704001849. Accessed: 13/11/2012).

Hardie, M., Clothier, B., Bound, S., Oliver, G. & Close, D. 2013. Does biochar influence soil physical properties and soil water availability? *Plant and Soil*, **376**, 1–15, (At: http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s11104-013-1980-x. Accessed: 31/3/2016).

Ippolito, J. a., Laird, D. a. & Busscher, W.J. 2012. Environmental benefits of biochar. *Journal of environmental quality*, **41**, 967, (At: https://dl.sciencesocieties.org/publications/jeq/abstracts/41/4/967. Accessed: 7/1/2015).

Jeffery, S., Verheijen, F.G. a, van der Velde, M. & Bastos, a. C. 2011. A quantitative review of the effects of biochar application to soils on crop productivity using meta-analysis. *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment*, **144**, 175–187, (At: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2011.08.015. ).

Keller, T., Colombi, T., Ruiz, S., Pogs, M., Rek, J., Stadelmann, V., Wunderli, H., Breitenstein, D., Reiser, R., Oberholzer, H., Schymanski, S., Romero-ruiz, A., Weisskopf, P., Walter, A. & Or, D. 2017. Long-Term Soil Structure Observatory for Monitoring Post-Compaction Evolution of Soil Structure. 1-17

Keller, T., Lamand, M., Peth, S., Berli, M., Delenne, J.-Y., Baumgarten, W., Rabbel, W., Radja, F., Rajchenbach, J., Selvadurai, a. P.S. & Or, D. 2013. An interdisciplinary approach towards improved understanding of soil deformation during compaction. *Soil and Tillage Research*, **128**, 61–80, (At: http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0167198712002243. Accessed: 3/6/2013).

Lehmann, J., Rillig, M.C., Thies, J., Masiello, C.A., Hockaday, W.C. & Crowley, D. 2011. Biochar effects on soil biota - A review. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry*, **43**, 1812–1836, (At: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.soilbio.2011.04.022. ).

Liu, Q., Liu, B., Zhang, Y., Lin, Z., Zhu, T., Sun, R., Wang, X., Ma, J., Bei, Q., Liu, G., Lin, X.

& Xie, Z. 2017. Can biochar alleviate soil compaction stress on wheat growth and mitigate soil N2O emissions? *Soil Biology and Biochemistry*, **104**, 8–17.

Menon, M., Jia, X., Lair, G.J., Faraj, P.H. & Blaud, a. 2015. Analysing the impact of compaction of soil aggregates using X-ray microtomography and water flow simulations. *Soil and Tillage Research*, **150**, 147–157, (At: http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0167198715000392. ).

O'Connor, D., Peng, T., Zhang, J., Tsang, D.C.W., Alessi, D.S., Shen, Z., Bolan, N.S. & Hou, D. 2018. Biochar application for the remediation of heavy metal polluted land: A review of in situ field trials. *Science of the Total Environment*, **619–620**, 815–826, (At: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2017.11.132. ).

Peake, L.R., Reid, B.J., Tang, X., Liu, Q., Liu, B., Zhang, Y., Lin, Z., Zhu, T., Sun, R., Filiberto, D. & Gaunt, J. 2014. Quantifying the influence of biochar on the physical and hydrological properties of dissimilar soils. *Geoderma*, **235–236**, 182–190, (At: http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0016706114002651. Accessed: 25/6/2017).

Soane, B.D.D. 1990. The role of organic matter in soil compactibility: A review of some practical aspects. *Soil and Tillage Research*, **16**, 179–201.

Sohi, S., Lopez-Capel, E., Krull, E. & Bol, R. 2009. Biochar, climate change and soil: A review to guide future research. (At: http://s3.amazonaws.com/academia.edu.documents/46053906/Biochar_Climate_Change_and_Soil_A_Review20160529-723-l3ub64.pdf?AWSAccessKeyId=AKIAIWOWYYGZ2Y53UL3A&Expires=1496649776&Signature=LLpNZanj%2F12k%2BaXJcG%2FEjjHdqvY%3D&response-content-disposition=inli. Accessed: 5/6/2017).

Tisdall, J. & Oades, J. 1982. Organic matter and water-stable aggregates in soils. *Journal of soil science*, **33**, 141–163, (At: http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1365-2389.1982.tb01755.x/full. ).

490 Victoria, R., Banwart, S., Black, H., Ingram, J., Joosten, H., Milne, E., Noellemeyer, E. &
491 Baskin, Y. 2012. The benefits of soils carbon. *UNEP Yearbook 2012*, 19–33.

492

493