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: Supplemental Material

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

Table Captions

Table 1. Results obtained from the Tukey multiple comparisons for dry bulk density (ρ_d)

Table 2. Results obtained from the Tukey multiple comparisons for compression index (C_c)

Table 3. Results obtained from the Tukey multiple comparisons for relaxation ratio (R)

Table 1. Results obtained from the Tukey multiple comparisons for dry bulk density (ρ_d)

	Mean difference	95.% Confidence interval of difference	Adjusted P Value
Comparison between soil types			
S1W1			
0% vs. 2%	0.1167	0.003224 to 0.2301	0.0428
0% vs. 6%	0.28	0.1666 to 0.3934	<0.0001
0% vs. 10%	0.5333	0.4199 to 0.6468	<0.0001
2% vs. 6%	0.1633	0.04989 to 0.2768	0.0040
2% vs. 10%	0.4167	0.3032 to 0.5301	<0.0001
6% vs. 10%	0.2533	0.1399 to 0.3668	<0.0001
S2W1			
0% vs. 2%	0.2167	0.1032 to 0.3301	0.0003
0% vs. 6%	0.4	0.2866 to 0.5134	<0.0001
0% vs. 10%	0.4667	0.3532 to 0.5801	<0.0001
2% vs. 6%	0.1833	0.06989 to 0.2968	0.0014
2% vs. 10%	0.25	0.1366 to 0.3634	<0.0001
6% vs. 10%	0.06667	-0.04678 to 0.1801	0.3648
Comparison between soil types			
S2W1			
0% vs. 2%	0.2167	0.04308 to 0.3902	0.0153
0% vs. 10%	0.4667	0.2931 to 0.6402	<0.0001
2% vs. 10%	0.25	0.07642 to 0.4236	0.0061
S2W2			
0% vs. 2%	0.1133	-0.06025 to 0.2869	0.2303
0% vs. 10%	0.5033	0.3298 to 0.6769	<0.0001
2% vs. 10%	0.39	0.2164 to 0.5636	0.0002

Table 2. Results obtained from the Tukey multiple comparisons for compression index (C_c)

	Mean difference	95 % Confidence interval of difference	Adjusted P Value
Comparison between soil types			
S1W1			
0% vs. 2%	-0.01367	-0.02812 to 0.0007886	0.0672
0% vs. 6%	-0.02733	-0.04179 to -0.01288	0.0003
0% vs. 10%	-0.07467	-0.08912 to -0.06021	<0.0001
2% vs. 6%	-0.01367	-0.02812 to 0.0007886	0.0672
2% vs. 10%	-0.061	-0.07546 to -0.04654	<0.0001
6% vs. 10%	-0.04733	-0.06179 to -0.03288	<0.0001
S2W1			
0% vs. 2%	-0.002	-0.01646 to 0.01246	0.9782
0% vs. 6%	-0.02367	-0.03812 to -0.009211	0.0013
0% vs. 10%	-0.04733	-0.06179 to -0.03288	<0.0001
2% vs. 6%	-0.02167	-0.03612 to -0.007211	0.0028
2% vs. 10%	-0.04533	-0.05979 to -0.03088	<0.0001
6% vs. 10%	-0.02367	-0.03812 to -0.009211	0.0013
Comparison between soil moisture levels			
S2W1			
0% vs. 2%	-0.002	-0.02025 to 0.01625	0.9542
0% vs. 10%	-0.04733	-0.06559 to -0.02908	<0.0001
2% vs. 10%	-0.04533	-0.06359 to -0.02708	<0.0001
S2W2			
0% vs. 2%	-0.024	-0.04225 to -0.005746	0.0111
0% vs. 10%	-0.05867	-0.07692 to -0.04041	<0.0001
2% vs. 10%	-0.03467	-0.05292 to -0.01641	0.0007

Table 3. Results obtained from the Tukey multiple comparisons for relaxation ratio (R)

		95 % Confidence interval of	
	Mean difference	difference	Adjusted P Value
Comparison between soil types			
S1W1			
0% vs. 2%	-0.008238	-0.01733 to 0.0008508	0.0772
0% vs. 10%	-0.03488	-0.04397 to -0.02579	<0.0001
2% vs. 10%	-0.02664	-0.03573 to -0.01756	<0.0001
S2W1			
0% vs. 2%	-0.01001	-0.0191 to -0.0009215	0.0310
0% vs. 10%	-0.03463	-0.04372 to -0.02554	<0.0001
2% vs. 10%	-0.02462	-0.03371 to -0.01553	<0.0001
Comparison between soil moisture levels			
S2W1			
0% vs. 2%	-0.01001	-0.0196 to -0.0004246	0.0406
0% vs. 10%	-0.03463	-0.04421 to -0.02504	<0.0001
2% vs. 10%	-0.02462	-0.0342 to -0.01503	<0.0001
S2W2			
0% vs. 2%	-0.01476	-0.02435 to -0.005177	0.0038
0% vs. 10%	-0.03255	-0.04213 to -0.02296	<0.0001
2% vs. 10%	-0.01778	-0.02737 to -0.008199	0.0009