

# Field Crops Research

## The roots of the rotation effect run deep

--Manuscript Draft--

<b>Manuscript Number:</b>	FIELD-D-22-01859R1
<b>Article Type:</b>	Research Paper
<b>Keywords:</b>	Maize; crop rotation, roots, penetration resistance; Alfalfa
<b>Corresponding Author:</b>	Gina Nichols, PhD Aarhus University UNITED STATES
<b>First Author:</b>	Gina Nichols, PhD
<b>Order of Authors:</b>	Gina Nichols, PhD William Osterholz, PhD Sotirios V Archontoulis, PhD Matt Liebman, PhD
<b>Abstract:</b>	<p>Context or problem</p> <p>It is well-established that maize (<i>Zea mays L.</i>) grown in extended rotations produces higher grain yields compared to maize grown in one- or two-phase rotations, even when nitrogen (N) is not limiting. Understanding the mechanisms driving this phenomenon, commonly referred to as 'the rotation effect', is important for designing cropping systems that use land and resources efficiently. Differences in root systems can influence resource acquisition and therefore yield, but it is unknown if such differences play a role in the rotation effect.</p> <p>Research question</p> <p>We hypothesized that maize grown in an extended rotation system exhibits a deeper root structure with less biomass investment compared to maize grown in a short rotation, and that these characteristics would be correlated with differences in grain production.</p> <p>Methods</p> <p>Using a long-term experiment established in 2001, we measured maize rooting depth across the growing season, root biomass in 15 cm increments from 0-60 cm, and grain yields in the maize phase of two contrasting rotations: a 2-year rotation of maize/soybean (<i>Glycine max [L.] Merr</i>) using inorganic sources of nitrogen (N) and maximum tillage depths of 15 cm (hereafter the 'short rotation'), and a 4-year rotation of maize/soybean/oat (<i>Avena sativa L.</i>)-alfalfa (<i>Medicago sativa L.</i>)/alfalfa using a mix of organic and inorganic N sources and inversion tillage to 25 cm (hereafter the 'extended rotation'). Additionally, we measured soil penetration resistance and soil moisture, and performed a growth analysis on aboveground maize biomass.</p> <p>Results</p> <p>From 2013-2020, maize grain yields in the extended rotation were equal to or significantly higher than in the short rotation, averaging 8% higher across eight years (11.0 and 10.2 dry Mg ha<sup>-1</sup>, respectively). In three seasons (2019-2021), the maximum rooting depth of maize in the extended rotation was significantly deeper than in the short rotation by an average of 11% (82 versus 76 cm, respectively), although the timing (e.g., early season, late season) of the extended rotation's maize growth advantage was not consistent across years. At physiological maturity, the two systems had similar amounts of root biomass from 0-60 cm soil depth, but maize grown in the extended rotation invested significantly less of that biomass (30% compared to 47%) into the soil surface layer (0-15 cm). The soil penetration resistances of the two systems differed in a manner consistent with the differing tillage regimes of the two rotations, however the patterns did not align with root differences.</p> <p>Conclusions</p> <p>We posit that the extended rotation's 'deeper and steeper' maize roots did not guarantee higher maize yields, but rather bestowed the plant with more flexibility in resource acquisition which, in certain conditions, resulted in higher grain yields compared to maize grown in the short rotation.</p> <p>Implications</p>

	To our knowledge, this is the first report attempting to mechanistically link rooting patterns with plant growth in the context of the 'rotation effect.' This study enhances our understanding of how cropping system histories impact yields, and provides new data on yields and roots, both of which are highly relevant for sustainable intensification. While the present study focused on physical measurements, it suggests that more detailed exploration of how biological drivers impact root architecture is needed to gain a mechanistic understanding of the 'rotation effect.'
<b>Suggested Reviewers:</b>	<p>Amelie Gaudin, PhD  Associate Professor, University of California Davis  agaudin@ucdavis.edu  Dr. Gaudin has worked with maize and diverse crop rotations throughout her career.</p> <p>Michel Cavigelli, PhD  Soil Scientist, United States Department of Agriculture Baltimore Field Station  michel.cavigelli@usda.gov  Dr. Cavigelli has worked on crop rotations for much of his career.</p> <p>Gregg Sanford, PhD  Associate Scientist, University of Wisconsin-Madison  gsanford@wisc.edu  Dr. Sanford has worked with a long-term cropping systems study in Wisconsin and would have good perspectives to offer regarding this study.</p>
<b>Response to Reviewers:</b>	<p>Reviewer #1: Summary: Maize can be grown in a continuous maize system, in a simple rotated maize system, or in an extended maize rotation. Previous research has shown an increase in yield in the extended maize rotation compared to a simple rotated maize system. Differences in resource distribution, microbial communities, and nutrient cycling have also been observed between these two systems. The authors investigate how the extended rotation influences maize root growth and its implications on yield. Over the investigated time period, maize yield is shown to be on average higher in the complex/extended rotation system compared to the simple rotation. This increase in yield also corresponds to an increase in rooting depth, less root biomass reported in the top 15 cm, lower soil penetration resistance, and lower soil moisture in the complex system compared to the simple rotation. The authors claim that the complex rotation system results in a cheaper and steeper root system which helps increase the likelihood the plant can withstand unfavorable growing conditions. They suggest the changes in soil physical, chemical, and biological properties contribute to this resilience.</p> <p>Major comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The paper claims that the difference in root growth is due to the increased complexity of the extended rotation. However, it's unclear how the difference in fertilization method (inorganic vs manure) and differences in tillage practices (moldboard plowing after alfalfa and before corn) influence soil physical, chemical, and biological properties. Past studies on the same field acknowledge the possibility that fertilization by manure and moldboard plowing can contribute to differences in soil properties. These factors are mentioned at the end of the discussion, but it would be helpful to mention this in the introduction and in the results when discussing root growth and soil physicochemical properties.  We agree, we reworked the introduction and added text to explicitly acknowledge these complexities.</li> <li>2. Due to the presence of significant root biomass at maize planting, the authors use the difference in root biomass from the beginning and end of the growing season to compare the two systems. This method leads to a negative root biomass in the 0-15 cm soil depth. While I acknowledge roots from a previous growing season could lead to an overestimate of the maize root biomass, the negative value suggests that a significant amount of the alfalfa roots decomposed by maize maturity. It does not seem accurate to take the difference in this case. Also, given that alfalfa has a favorable C:N ratio and the application of composted manure, the alfalfa roots are in very favorable conditions for rapid decomposition.  This is a good point, and prompted us to rework our root biomass analyses. We instead look at extreme cases of assumed background root decomposition. In all but the most extreme case (no background root decomposition in the short rotation and 100% background decomposition in the extended rotation) the statistics show the short</li> </ol>

rotation maize produced more root biomass than the extended rotation maize in the 0-15 cm depth. In other words, the conclusion does not change, only the magnitude of the difference. This lends confidence that our results are robust.

3. In addition, the negative root mass in the top 15 cm is ~125 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> which accounts for a majority of the difference in total root biomass (~180 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) between the two systems. Factoring in that there must be root growth in the top 15 cm that connect the root biomass at 15-30 cm soil depth, I would guess there isn't a significant difference in total root biomass.

Indeed, using our new analytical approach we found there was no conclusive evidence that there was a difference in total root biomass between the two cropping systems, only the way it was distributed in the soil. We added text to clarify this finding in the redrafted manuscript.

4. The root biomass addition method is also confounded by the fact that microbial activity decreases with soil depth. The deeper alfalfa roots may not decompose as readily as those in the top 15 cm. So, subtracting out the root biomass at planting at all soil depths may be accurate at deeper depths but not accurate for shallower soil depths.

By using the 'extreme assumptions' ranges noted above, we addressed this issue. The differences at the deeper soil depths were sensitive to the assumed decomposition, so we do not claim differences between the cropping systems in root production at those depths (>15 cm).

5. The method for collecting root biomass described by the authors likely has significant error and likely contributes the large error bars in Figure 3. Root biomass is collected from 4 samples collected from 32 mm diameter (1.26 inch) soil corers. This is roughly 32 cm<sup>2</sup> (5 square inches) area in total. There is likely an extremely high variability in root biomass especially at lower depths where roots are much sparser and would depend on the ability to capture a root in that segment. Thus, it's hard to compare the systems at depths below 15 cm.

We agree with the reviewer that there may have been true differences between cropping systems at depths below 15 cm that we were unable to detect due to our sampling scheme. We added text to the manuscript to acknowledge this possibility. We note that the coefficients of variation of the measurements showed no pattern with regard to depth, so taking more subsamples in each plot may not have reduced the variation at lower depths, and therefore may not have resulted in more statistical power – it's difficult to say.

6. Authors suggest the complex system is more resilient to extreme weather events which increases yield. The authors provide broad characterization of the average weather conditions for the measured years (hot vs cold and wet vs. dry). It would be nice to include some measure of the extreme weather events from those years (heavy rainfall, heat waves, droughts, frost, etc.) as these events and their timing may contribute to differences in yield.

We initially tried to parse out relationships between the yield differentials between the two rotations and more nuanced growing condition events, however it very quickly became complicated because 'extreme' events may only be extreme relative to the crop stage, and many do not impact fields uniformly (e.g. hail, extreme wind). It was therefore difficult to quantify how 'favorable' or 'unfavorable' a given year was without coupling the study with a crop model that can express drought, heat, or excess water stress in a quantitative way. In the re-drafted manuscript, we softened our language to avoid suggesting extended crop rotations can buffer against all types of extreme events.

7. The differences in root biomass are only reported for 2019 and 2020 when there is not significant difference in yield. It's unclear whether in a year where there is a greater difference in yield results in root biomass trends still hold true.

This is a good point - we added text and additional data demonstrating these patterns in a year with a significant difference in yield to address this concern.

8. In line 162, the authors describe the complex rotation maize roots as "more functional." And, in line 245, the authors claim the complex rotation achieved a more efficient root system with less resource investment. However, roots respond to

resource availability as noted by the authors in a separate part of the discussion. Previous publications from the same field experiment note differences in POC, microbial activity, and soil physical properties. It would be more appropriate to frame the difference in root system architecture to be a result of differences in soil properties rather than the maize plant investing in steeper and cheaper roots especially since the maize genotype is the same. In the Lazicki et al., they note that differences in root length density seem to correlate with POC content.

This is a good point. In the re-drafting of the manuscript we frame the changes in soil physical, chemical, and biological properties due to cropping systems as creating opportunities for dynamic responses by maize roots, which may be linked to yield enhancement under certain conditions.

Minor comments:

1. Degradation of the alfalfa root biomass will impact N and P availability and likely influences rooting. In addition, the weather conditions will influence microbial activity and litter decomposition rates.

Yes, that's true. To accommodate differences in nutrient addition between cropping systems, N fertilization followed protocols associated with the Late Spring Nitrate Test, and P fertilization followed recommendations based on soil samples drawn from individual plots.

2. In table 3, it's unclear how the timing of maize growth advantage is determined/calculated.

We added a superscript to clarify this – early refers to time periods before the maximum growth rate occurred, and late to time periods after the maximum growth rate occurred.

Also, are the p-value based significances comparing values (ratios and timing) between years? I was confused by how p values were determined for this table.

We added references within the table caption to clarify where the values and significances came from and added text to clarify that the ratios of absolute values are presented only to aid in visual comparisons of the values/patterns.

3. In table 3, please include the values for 2020 and 2019. Even though it is not significant, the root information is mainly for those two years and would help put into context how root growth may impact yield.

We reworked the entire table to include the root data and simplify its visual message.

4. The authors note that soil from the complex system resulted in plants with finer roots when grown in the greenhouse. It would be nice to add in a small discussion about how microbiome composition can influence the plant allocation to coarse vs fine roots. For example, root order has been shown to impact microbiome composition, and AMF have been shown to induce lateral root growth in plants. This may be especially important given that a previous publication focused on these fields (King and Hofmockel) observed higher microbial biomass in the more complex rotation.

We did not quantify differences in coarse versus fine roots in our study, so we chose not to include this in our discussion.

5. Inorganic N is highly mobile in soils, and increased wetness/soil moisture may result in more leaching and less N taken up by the plant in the simple system versus the complex system which has more sustained release through the organic N source (manure).

Yes, see Figure 2 in Tomer and Liebman (2014, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2014.01.025>).

6. There is a difference in the inorganic N applied at V6 between the simple and complex systems. Is this due to differences in soil nitrate measurements at that time? If so, this could point to differences in soil N over the growing season that may influence yield as mentioned in the previous comment.

The difference in applied N at V6 was due to differences in soil NO<sub>3</sub>-N concentrations and recommendations for side-dressing from the Late-Spring Nitrate Test protocol that were cropping system-specific. We added this to the management table to clarify this.

7. At line 98, the authors note that the difference between system additions was not statistically significant. Even if it is not statistically significant, there is a noticeable

difference as shown in Figure 3, and this trend is consistent with previous root data (root length density measurements from Lazicki et al.) from the same fields. Lazicki et al observe a more even distribution of roots throughout the soil column in the complex system versus the simple system.

We reworked the statistical analysis and in the process addressed this issue. Additionally, we referenced Lazicki et al.'s work more explicitly, adding a supplemental figure summarizing their findings.

8. The higher penetration resistance at depths below 30 cm in the complex system may suggest that the biopores created from deeper alfalfa roots contribute to the differences in rooting depth and the more even distribution of root biomass along the soil profile.

We added this to the discussion. We are unsure whether the biopores would show up in the resistance measurements, so changed the terminology to refer to the penetration resistance of the bulk soil, as we believe that is what is being measured.

Reviewer #2: This study enhances understanding of the 'rotation effect' in agricultural production systems, and provides new data on yields and roots by long term positioning experiment. However, it is unclear what the physiological and ecological mechanisms are, and further supplementary data is needed to support the Conclusions.

Reviewer #3:

This manuscript sets out to show whether changes in root systems explain the rotation effect. It reports many measurements and concludes that chemical and/or biological factors are responsible but physical factors are not. These conclusions at the end of the

Discussion are hard to justify because neither chemical nor biological factors were measured.

We rewrote the results and discussion to clarify the evidence that supports our conclusions.

The strength of the manuscript is the extensive data collection, the mostly complete statistical analysis and clear expression. The weakness is that the control of the rooting depth and its connection with yield are not clearly explained. This comes about because the long-term experiment was not designed to clarify the topics discussed in this manuscript. The authors should make revisions that more closely link these data to yield. The catchy title deserves retention; it is a little deceptive because cause and effect are unclear and this should be clarified in the abstract and conclusions.

We hope the redrafting of the discussion section has led to a clearer proposed link between our data and yield. Additionally we adjusted the language in the abstract to clarify our evidence and the conclusions we draw from it.

The manuscript implies that the reported 'complex rotation system' is representative of complex rotation systems in the Midwest US. Clear evidence for such equivalence should be reported but if it is not available the manuscript should address only the particular four-course rotation system that was studied and not extrapolate the results to other, undefined, 'complex' rotations. This is a valid concern. We believe we address this in the introduction where we define 'general' extended rotations for the Midwestern region of the US as those including a small grain and/or forage:

Midwestern maize-based systems fall into three main categories: (1) continuous maize systems, wherein maize is grown for two or more consecutive seasons; (2) simple rotated maize systems, wherein maize is rotated with soybean; and (3) extended maize rotations, wherein maize is grown in a rotation with two or more years between maize crops, often including a small grain such as oats (*Avena sativa*) and/or a forage crop such as alfalfa (*Medicago sativa*).

This applies strongly to references to papers where it is not clear if the complex rotation is identical to the one reported here.

All citations extend from this definition presented in the manuscript:

The maize yield advantage accrued from extending short rotations to include small grains and forage legumes has received less attention compared to the continuous

maize penalty, but has likewise been well-documented (Lieberman et al., 2008; Stanger and Lauer, 2008; Coulter et al., 2011).

While it is almost impossible for a rotation to be identical due to regional differences in markets, soils, etc. all of our 'extended' rotation references refer to maize rotations that include a small grain and/or forage.

Value-neutral names of the systems would be two-course and four-course rotations. We changed the terminology to 'short' and 'extended'.

Attributing maize yield to a system is less convincing than to a particular part of the system such as crop species or management operation. It is difficult to unscramble such effects from the data but the authors are in the best position to do so.

We rewrote the introduction and parts of the discussion to make it clear why it is difficult to attribute such a complex characteristic such as yield to a single change, when extending rotations involves a slew of changes that cannot be controlled for individually. We try to present the factors that may be contributing, and in reality is unlikely it is one factor.

The emphasis on nitrogen is unbalanced. It appears on the second line of the abstract and in many parts of the manuscript but there are no reported measurements of soil mineral N. This is a matter of concern since there is much published evidence that crops growing after alfalfa benefit from residual N arising from biological N fixation. If there are no such data available for this experiment, are there published or unpublished data from other studies to fill the gap? The N supply to maize in the four-course rotation also includes a large amount of N in manure, as reported in Table 1 but N-supply is not discussed as a possible reason for the higher yield.

We added citations and text to demonstrate these yield enhancements are observed even when nitrogen is not limiting. We also added text to Table 1 to demonstrate how the amounts of N applied to the two systems were balanced by the side-dressing which was based on a late-spring nitrate test. While the forms of nitrogen supply differed, the absolute amounts did not.

Please provide as much information as possible about the oats and alfalfa; were they cut or grazed and is it possible to report the amount of N contained in alfalfa, both above-ground and below-ground.

We added information indicating the management of the oat straw and alfalfa (oat straw and alfalfa hay were harvested, baled, and removed from the research site, no grazing occurred on these plots). We do not have data on the N content of the below-ground alfalfa biomass. Osterholz et al. 2018 does an in-depth exploration of nitrogen pools in these systems and found they could not explain the differences in maize nitrogen dynamics/yield – we added a more explicit citation of that work.

At L107 there is mention of biological and physical effects on root systems but less prominence is given to chemical factors. The nearest that the manuscript comes to reporting chemical effects is the large amount of manure-N. This should be strengthened.

We added mention of ethylene build up and its potential role in root growth. See above comment concerning N.

The shallow rooting depths (Figs 2 and S2) in some seasons is explained by excess soil water. Could the deeper maize roots in the four-course rotation be due to dewatering of the soil profile by the previous alfalfa crop?

The shallow rooting depth in 2018 was due to high water tables. Our soil moisture sensors at 45 cm depths indicate no difference in soil water contents at that depth between the two rotations, and indicates the soil was fully recharged with water following the alfalfa crop termination the previous fall(s). In general, in this region the entire soil profile goes through a resaturation event before spring's maize planting activities.

The discussion of the effect of alfalfa should include mention of hydrogen fertilisation. Presumably there was hydrogen fertilisation by the alfalfa rhizobia but any contribution by soybean rhizobia would depend on whether they were HUP-plus or HUP-minus.

We considered mentioning this in the original manuscript draft, but in the end felt it was a distraction. The soybean inoculant was HUP-minus, so any differences would be a result of the different quantity of roots releasing H<sub>2</sub>, and we have no data on the

soybean nor alfalfa roots in these plots. While certainly an interesting area of research, we opted to omit it in this manuscript.

The end of the Discussion suggests that roots in 'more complex' rotations are better buffered against unfavorable growing environments. In Fig. 1 the four-year rotation seems to perform best in the wet seasons of 2016-2018. This apparent inconsistency should be discussed.

While the absolute yields of the four-year rotation were highest in 2016 and 2018 as the reviewer points out, we were interested in how the four-year rotation performed RELATIVE to the two-year system. The size of the points on the right panel represents this RELATIVE difference, and it shows that this relative performance was higher in a range of weather conditions (for example in 2013, a hot and dry year, and in 2018 (a hot and wet year).

#### Detail

Report the statistical significance of the higher yield, rooting depth, root biomass and penetration resistance in the Abstract and Highlights.

Word limits precluded the inclusion of statistical significances in all instances, but we added the significance in several places within the abstract. We hoped that the context would convey that any results reported as being different can be assumed to be significantly so.

The Conclusions (L258) that the result is 'novel' is inconsistent with many papers referred to in the manuscript.

We adjusted that language to better articulate the exact component of our study we feel is novel.

The renumbering of lines makes it difficult to review the manuscript. Please stick to one system in any resubmission.

Yes, we apologize, the line numbers restarted after the landscape table which required a section break. We have corrected this issue.

The references are reported in several different formats and should be standardised. We corrected the references, switching between citation systems is always a challenge.

February 6, 2024

To the Editorial Board of Field Crops Research:

On behalf of all co-authors, herewith I am submitting a revised manuscript entitled “The roots of the rotation effect run deep” to be considered for publication in Field Crops Research.

Based on the constructive feedback provided by the reviewers, we have made substantial changes to the manuscript, resulting in significant improvements in clarity and quality. We have addressed each reviewer’s comments in a detailed document; major improvements include:

- New analyses of our root biomass data that accounts for uncertainties in ‘background’ root biomass
- Rewriting of the introduction and discussion sections to clarify aims and results of the study
- Inclusion of additional data to further support findings

Thank you for considering our resubmission, we look forward to further discussion and feedback on the revised manuscript.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Virginia (Gina) Nichols".

Virginia (Gina) Nichols  
Assistant Professor  
Department of Agroecology  
Aarhus University, Denmark

Reviewer #1: Summary: Maize can be grown in a continuous maize system, in a simple rotated maize system, or in an extended maize rotation. Previous research has shown an increase in yield in the extended maize rotation compared to a simple rotated maize system. Differences in resource distribution, microbial communities, and nutrient cycling have also been observed between these two systems. The authors investigate how the extended rotation influences maize root growth and its implications on yield. Over the investigated time period, maize yield is shown to be on average higher in the complex/extended rotation system compared to the simple rotation. This increase in yield also corresponds to an increase in rooting depth, less root biomass reported in the top 15 cm, lower soil penetration resistance, and lower soil moisture in the complex system compared to the simple rotation. The authors claim that the complex rotation system results in a cheaper and steeper root system which helps increase the likelihood the plant can withstand unfavorable growing conditions. They suggest the changes in soil physical, chemical, and biological properties contribute to this resilience.

Major comments:

1. The paper claims that the difference in root growth is due to the increased complexity of the extended rotation. However, it's unclear how the difference in fertilization method (inorganic vs manure) and differences in tillage practices (moldboard plowing after alfalfa and before corn) influence soil physical, chemical, and biological properties. Past studies on the same field acknowledge the possibility that fertilization by manure and moldboard plowing can contribute to differences in soil properties. These factors are mentioned at the end of the discussion, but it would be helpful to mention this in the introduction and in the results when discussing root growth and soil physicochemical properties.

We agree, we reworked the introduction and added text to explicitly acknowledge these complexities.

2. Due to the presence of significant root biomass at maize planting, the authors use the difference in root biomass from the beginning and end of the growing season to compare the two systems. This method leads to a negative root biomass in the 0-15 cm soil depth. While I acknowledge roots from a previous growing season could lead to an overestimate of the maize root biomass, the negative value suggests that a significant amount of the alfalfa roots decomposed by maize maturity. It does not seem accurate to take the difference in this case. Also, given that alfalfa has a favorable C:N ratio and the application of composted manure, the alfalfa roots are in very favorable conditions for rapid decomposition.

This is a good point, and prompted us to rework our root biomass analyses. We instead look at extreme cases of assumed background root decomposition. In all but the most extreme case (no background root decomposition in the short rotation and 100% background decomposition in the extended rotation) the statistics show the short rotation maize produced more root biomass than the extended rotation maize in the 0-15 cm depth. In other words, the conclusion does not change, only the magnitude of the difference. This lends confidence that our results are robust.

3. In addition, the negative root mass in the top 15 cm is ~125 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> which accounts for a majority of the difference in total root biomass (~180 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) between the two systems. Factoring in that there must be root growth in the top 15 cm that connect the root biomass at 15-30 cm soil depth, I would guess there isn't a significant difference in total root biomass.

Indeed, using our new analytical approach we found there was no conclusive evidence that there was a difference in total root biomass between the two cropping systems, only the way it was distributed in the soil. We added text to clarify this finding in the redrafted manuscript.

4. The root biomass addition method is also confounded by the fact that microbial activity decreases with soil depth. The deeper alfalfa roots may not decompose as readily as those in the top 15 cm. So, subtracting out the root biomass at planting at all soil depths may be accurate at deeper depths but not accurate for shallower soil depths.

By using the ‘extreme assumptions’ ranges noted above, we addressed this issue. The differences at the deeper soil depths were sensitive to the assumed decomposition, so we do not claim differences between the cropping systems in root production at those depths (>15 cm).

5. The method for collecting root biomass described by the authors likely has significant error and likely contributes the large error bars in Figure 3. Root biomass is collected from 4 samples collected from 32 mm diameter (1.26 inch) soil corers. This is roughly 32 cm<sup>2</sup> (5 square inches) area in total. There is likely an extremely high variability in root biomass especially at lower depths where roots are much sparser and would depend on the ability to capture a root in that segment. Thus, it's hard to compare the systems at depths below 15 cm.

We agree with the reviewer that there may have been true differences between cropping systems at depths below 15 cm that we were unable to detect due to our sampling scheme. We added text to the manuscript to acknowledge this possibility. We note that the coefficients of variation of the measurements showed no pattern with regard to depth, so taking more subsamples in each plot may not have reduced the variation at lower depths, and therefore may not have resulted in more statistical power – it's difficult to say.

6. Authors suggest the complex system is more resilient to extreme weather events which increases yield. The authors provide broad characterization of the average weather conditions for the measured years (hot vs cold and wet vs. dry). It would be nice to include some measure of the extreme weather events from those years (heavy rainfall, heat waves, droughts, frost, etc.) as these events and their timing may contribute to differences in yield.

We initially tried to parse out relationships between the yield differentials between the two rotations and more nuanced growing condition events, however it very quickly became complicated because ‘extreme’ events may only be extreme relative to the crop stage, and many do not impact fields uniformly (e.g. hail, extreme wind). It was therefore difficult to quantify how ‘favorable’ or ‘unfavorable’ a given year was without coupling the study with a crop model

that can express drought, heat, or excess water stress in a quantitative way. In the re-drafted manuscript, we softened our language to avoid suggesting extended crop rotations can buffer against all types of extreme events.

7. The differences in root biomass are only reported for 2019 and 2020 when there is not significant difference in yield. It's unclear whether in a year where there is a greater difference in yield results in root biomass trends still hold true.

This is a good point - we added text and additional data demonstrating these patterns in a year with a significant difference in yield to address this concern.

8. In line 162, the authors describe the complex rotation maize roots as "more functional." And, in line 245, the authors claim the complex rotation achieved a more efficient root system with less resource investment. However, roots respond to resource availability as noted by the authors in a separate part of the discussion. Previous publications from the same field experiment note differences in POC, microbial activity, and soil physical properties. It would be more appropriate to frame the difference in root system architecture to be a result of differences in soil properties rather than the maize plant investing in steeper and cheaper roots especially since the maize genotype is the same. In the Lazicki et al., they note that differences in root length density seem to correlate with POC content.

This is a good point. In the re-drafting of the manuscript we frame the changes in soil physical, chemical, and biological properties due to cropping systems as creating opportunities for dynamic responses by maize roots, which may be linked to yield enhancement under certain conditions.

Minor comments:

1. Degradation of the alfalfa root biomass will impact N and P availability and likely influences rooting. In addition, the weather conditions will influence microbial activity and litter decomposition rates.

Yes, that's true. To accommodate differences in nutrient addition between cropping systems, N fertilization followed protocols associated with the Late Spring Nitrate Test, and P fertilization followed recommendations based on soil samples drawn from individual plots.

2. In table 3, it's unclear how the timing of maize growth advantage is determined/calculated.

We added a superscript to clarify this – early refers to time periods before the maximum growth rate occurred, and late to time periods after the maximum growth rate occurred.

Also, are the p-value based significances comparing values (ratios and timing) between years? I was confused by how p values were determined for this table.

We added references within the table caption to clarify where the values and significances came from and added text to clarify that the ratios of absolute values are presented only to aid in visual comparisons of the values/patterns.

3. In table 3, please include the values for 2020 and 2019. Even though it is not significant, the root information is mainly for those two years and would help put into context how root growth may impact yield.

We reworked the entire table to include the root data and simplify its visual message.

4. The authors note that soil from the complex system resulted in plants with finer roots when grown in the greenhouse. It would be nice to add in a small discussion about how microbiome composition can influence the plant allocation to coarse vs fine roots. For example, root order has been shown to impact microbiome composition, and AMF have been shown to induce lateral root growth in plants. This may be especially important given that a previous publication focused on these fields (King and Hofmockel) observed higher microbial biomass in the more complex rotation.

We did not quantify differences in coarse versus fine roots in our study, so we chose not to include this in our discussion.

5. Inorganic N is highly mobile in soils, and increased wetness/soil moisture may result in more leaching and less N taken up by the plant in the simple system versus the complex system which has more sustained release through the organic N source (manure).

Yes, see Figure 2 in Tomer and Liebman (2014, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2014.01.025>).

6. There is a difference in the inorganic N applied at V6 between the simple and complex systems. Is this due to differences in soil nitrate measurements at that time? If so, this could point to differences in soil N over the growing season that may influence yield as mentioned in the previous comment.

The difference in applied N at V6 was due to differences in soil NO<sub>3</sub>-N concentrations and recommendations for side-dressing from the Late-Spring Nitrate Test protocol that were cropping system-specific. We added this to the management table to clarify this.

7. At line 98, the authors note that the difference between system additions was not statistically significant. Even if it is not statistically significant, there is a noticeable difference as shown in Figure 3, and this trend is consistent with previous root data (root length density measurements from Lazicki et al.) from the same fields. Lazicki et al observe a more even distribution of roots throughout the soil column in the complex system versus the simple system.

We reworked the statistical analysis and in the process addressed this issue. Additionally, we referenced Lazicki et al.'s work more explicitly, adding a supplemental figure summarizing their findings.

8. The higher penetration resistance at depths below 30 cm in the complex system may suggest that the biopores created from deeper alfalfa roots contribute to the differences in rooting depth and the more even distribution of root biomass along the soil profile.

We added this to the discussion. We are unsure whether the biopores would show up in the resistance measurements, so changed the terminology to refer to the penetration resistance of the bulk soil, as we believe that is what is being measured.

Reviewer #2: This study enhances understanding of the 'rotation effect' in agricultural production systems, and provides new data on yields and roots by long term positioning experiment. However, it is unclear what the physiological and ecological mechanisms are, and further supplementary data is needed to support the Conclusions.

Reviewer #3:

This manuscript sets out to show whether changes in root systems explain the rotation effect. It reports many measurements and concludes that chemical and/or biological factors are responsible but physical factors are not. These conclusions at the end of the Discussion are hard to justify because neither chemical nor biological factors were measured.

We rewrote the results and discussion to clarify the evidence that supports our conclusions.

The strength of the manuscript is the extensive data collection, the mostly complete statistical analysis and clear expression. The weakness is that the control of the rooting depth and its connection with yield are not clearly explained. This comes about because the long-term experiment was not designed to clarify the topics discussed in this manuscript. The authors should make revisions that more closely link these data to yield. The catchy title deserves retention; it is a little deceptive because cause and effect are unclear and this should be clarified in the abstract and conclusions.

We hope the redrafting of the discussion section has led to a clearer proposed link between our data and yield. Additionally we adjusted the language in the abstract to clarify our evidence and the conclusions we draw from it.

The manuscript implies that the reported 'complex rotation system' is representative of complex rotation systems in the Midwest US. Clear evidence for such equivalence should be reported but if it is not available the

manuscript should address only the particular four-course rotation system that was studied and not extrapolate the results to other, undefined, 'complex' rotations.

This is a valid concern. We believe we address this in the introduction where we define 'general' extended rotations for the Midwestern region of the US as those including a small grain and/or forage:

*Midwestern maize-based systems fall into three main categories: (1) continuous maize systems, wherein maize is grown for two or more consecutive seasons; (2) simple rotated maize systems, wherein maize is rotated with soybean; and (3) extended maize rotations, wherein maize is grown in a rotation with two or more years between maize crops, often including a small grain such as oats (*Avena sativa*) and/or a forage crop such as alfalfa (*Medicago sativa*).*

This applies strongly to references to papers where it is not clear if the complex rotation is identical to the one reported here.

All citations extend from this definition presented in the manuscript:

*The maize yield advantage accrued from extending short rotations to include small grains and forage legumes has received less attention compared to the continuous maize penalty, but has likewise been well-documented (Liebman et al., 2008; Stanger and Lauer, 2008; Coulter et al., 2011).*

While it is almost impossible for a rotation to be identical due to regional differences in markets, soils, etc. all of our 'extended' rotation references refer to maize rotations that include a small grain and/or forage.

Value-neutral names of the systems would be two-course and four-course rotations.

We changed the terminology to 'short' and 'extended'.

Attributing maize yield to a system is less convincing than to a particular part of the system such as crop species or management operation. It is difficult to unscramble such effects from the data but the authors are in the best position to do so.

We rewrote the introduction and parts of the discussion to make it clear why it is difficult to attribute such a complex characteristic such as yield to a single change, when extending rotations involves a slew of changes that cannot be controlled for individually. We try to present the factors that may be contributing, and in reality is unlikely it is one factor.

The emphasis on nitrogen is unbalanced. It appears on the second line of the abstract and in many parts of the manuscript but there are no reported measurements of soil mineral N. This is a matter of concern since there is much published evidence that crops growing after alfalfa benefit from residual N arising from biological N fixation. If there are no such data available for this experiment, are there published or unpublished data from other studies to fill the gap? The N supply to maize in the four-course rotation also includes a large amount of N in manure, as reported in Table 1 but N-supply is not discussed as a possible reason for the higher yield.

We added citations and text to demonstrate these yield enhancements are observed even when nitrogen is not limiting. We also added text to Table 1 to demonstrate how the amounts of N applied to the two systems were balanced by the side-dressing which was based on a late-spring nitrate test. While the forms of nitrogen supply differed, the absolute amounts did not.

Please provide as much information as possible about the oats and alfalfa; were they cut or grazed and is it possible to report the amount of N contained in alfalfa, both above-ground and below-ground.

We added information indicating the management of the oat straw and alfalfa (oat straw and alfalfa hay were harvested, baled, and removed from the research site, no grazing occurred on these plots). We do not have data on the N content of the below-ground alfalfa biomass. Osterholz et al. 2018 does an in-depth exploration of nitrogen pools in these systems and found they could not explain the differences in maize nitrogen dynamics/yield – we added a more explicit citation of that work.

At L107 there is mention of biological and physical effects on root systems but less prominence is given to chemical factors. The nearest that the manuscript comes to reporting chemical effects is the large amount of manure-N. This should be strengthened.

We added mention of ethylene build up and its potential role in root growth. See above comment concerning N.

The shallow rooting depths (Figs 2 and S2) in some seasons is explained by excess soil water. Could the deeper maize roots in the four-course rotation be due to dewatering of the soil profile by the previous alfalfa crop?

The shallow rooting depth in 2018 was due to high water tables. Our soil moisture sensors at 45 cm depths indicate no difference in soil water contents at that depth between the two rotations, and indicates the soil was fully recharged with water following the alfalfa crop termination the previous fall(s). In general, in this region the entire soil profile goes through a resaturation event before spring's maize planting activities.

The discussion of the effect of alfalfa should include mention of hydrogen fertilisation. Presumably there was hydrogen fertilisation by the alfalfa rhizobia but any contribution by soybean rhizobia would depend on whether they were HUP-plus or HUP-minus.

We considered mentioning this in the original manuscript draft, but in the end felt it was a distraction. The soybean inoculant was HUP-minus, so any differences would be a result of the different quantity of roots releasing H<sub>2</sub>, and we have no data on the soybean nor alfalfa roots in these plots. While certainly an interesting area of research, we opted to omit it in this manuscript.

The end of the Discussion suggests that roots in 'more complex' rotations are better buffered against unfavorable growing environments. In Fig. 1 the four-year rotation seems to perform best in the wet seasons of 2016-2018. This apparent inconsistency should be discussed.

While the absolute yields of the four-year rotation were highest in 2016 and 2018 as the reviewer points out, we were interested in how the four-year rotation performed RELATIVE to the two-year system. The size of the points on the right panel represents this RELATIVE difference, and it shows that this relative performance was higher in a range of weather conditions (for example in 2013, a hot and dry year, and in 2018 (a hot and wet year).

#### Detail

Report the statistical significance of the higher yield, rooting depth, root biomass and penetration resistance in the Abstract and Highlights.

Word limits precluded the inclusion of statistical significances in all instances, but we added the significance in several places within the abstract. We hoped that the context would convey that any results reported as being different can be assumed to be significantly so.

The Conclusions (L258) that the result is 'novel' is inconsistent with many papers referred to in the manuscript.

We adjusted that language to better articulate the exact component of our study we feel is novel.

The renumbering of lines makes it difficult to review the manuscript. Please stick to one system in any resubmission.

Yes, we apologize, the line numbers restarted after the landscape table which required a section break. We have corrected this issue.

The references are reported in several different formats and should be standardised.

We corrected the references, switching between citation systems is always a challenge.

**Declaration of interests**

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

The authors declare the following financial interests/personal relationships which may be considered as potential competing interests:

Matt Liebman reports financial support was provided by Iowa State University Iowa Nutrient Research Center. Matt Liebman reports was provided by Iowa State University Plant Sciences Institute. Sotirios Archontoulis reports was provided by Foundation for Food and Agriculture Research. Sotirios Archontoulis reports financial support was provided by US Department of Agriculture.

# The roots of the rotation effect run deep

1   **Gina A. Nichols<sup>1,2\*</sup>, William Osterholz<sup>1,3</sup>, Sotirios V. Archontoulis<sup>1</sup>, Matt Liebman<sup>1</sup>**

2   <sup>1</sup>Department of Agronomy, Iowa State University, Ames Iowa, USA

3   <sup>2</sup>Department of Agroecology, Aarhus University, Slagelse Denmark

4   <sup>3</sup>Soil Drainage Research Unit, USDA ARS, Columbus Ohio, USA

5   **\* Correspondence:**

6   Corresponding Author

7   [virginia.nichols@gmail.com](mailto:virginia.nichols@gmail.com)

8   (Present address) 514 Harrison Ave, Canon City CO 81212

9   **Highlights:**

- 10   • Over eight years, maize grown in a four-year (extended) rotation yielded an average of  
11       8% higher than maize grown in a two-year (short) rotation
- 12   • Maximum rooting depth of maize grown in the extended rotation averaged 11% deeper  
13       compared with maize in the short rotation
- 14   • Maize grown in the extended rotation invested less root biomass in the 0-15 cm soil  
15       stratum than did maize in the short rotation
- 16   • Maize grown in the extended rotation had a ‘steeper and deeper’ root structure compared  
17       with maize in the short rotation

18

19   **Abstract**

20   Context or problem

21   It is well-established that maize (*Zea mays* L.) grown in extended rotations produces higher grain  
22   yields compared to maize grown in one- or two-phase rotations, even when nitrogen (N) is not  
23   limiting. Understanding the mechanisms driving this phenomenon, commonly referred to as ‘the

24 rotation effect', is important for designing cropping systems that use land and resources  
25 efficiently. Differences in root systems can influence resource acquisition and therefore yield,  
26 but it is unknown if such differences play a role in the rotation effect.

27 Research question

28 We hypothesized that maize grown in an extended rotation system exhibits a deeper root  
29 structure with less biomass investment compared to maize grown in a short rotation, and that  
30 these characteristics would be correlated with differences in grain production.

31 Methods

32 Using a long-term experiment established in 2001, we measured maize rooting depth across the  
33 growing season, root biomass in 15 cm increments from 0-60 cm, and grain yields in the maize  
34 phase of two contrasting rotations: a 2-year rotation of maize/soybean (*Glycine max* [L.] Merr)  
35 using inorganic sources of nitrogen (N) and maximum tillage depths of 15 cm (hereafter the  
36 'short rotation'), and a 4-year rotation of maize/soybean/oat (*Avena sativa* L.)-alfalfa (*Medicago*  
37 *sativa* L.)/alfalfa using a mix of organic and inorganic N sources and inversion tillage to 25 cm  
38 (hereafter the 'extended rotation'). Additionally, we measured soil penetration resistance and soil  
39 moisture, and performed a growth analysis on aboveground maize biomass.

40 Results

41 From 2013-2020, maize grain yields in the extended rotation were equal to or significantly  
42 higher than in the short rotation, averaging 8% higher across eight years (11.0 and 10.2 dry Mg  
43 ha<sup>-1</sup>, respectively). In three seasons (2019-2021), the maximum rooting depth of maize in the  
44 extended rotation was significantly deeper than in the short rotation by an average of 11% (82  
45 versus 76 cm, respectively), although the timing (e.g., early season, late season) of the extended  
46 rotation's maize growth advantage was not consistent across years. At physiological maturity,

47 the two systems had similar amounts of root biomass from 0-60 cm soil depth, but maize grown  
48 in the extended rotation invested significantly less of that biomass (30% compared to 47%) into  
49 the soil surface layer (0-15 cm). The soil penetration resistances of the two systems differed in a  
50 manner consistent with the differing tillage regimes of the two rotations, however the patterns  
51 did not align with root differences.

52 **Conclusions**

53 We posit that the extended rotation's 'deeper and steeper' maize roots did not guarantee higher  
54 maize yields, but rather bestowed the plant with more flexibility in resource acquisition which, in  
55 certain conditions, resulted in higher grain yields compared to maize grown in the short rotation.

56 **Implications**

57 To our knowledge, this is the first report attempting to mechanistically link rooting patterns with  
58 plant growth in the context of the 'rotation effect.' This study enhances our understanding of  
59 how cropping system histories impact yields, and provides new data on yields and roots, both of  
60 which are highly relevant for sustainable intensification. While the present study focused on  
61 physical measurements, it suggests that more detailed exploration of how biological drivers  
62 impact root architecture is needed to gain a mechanistic understanding of the 'rotation effect.'

63 **Keywords**

64 Maize; crop rotation, roots, penetration resistance; alfalfa

65 **1 Introduction**

66 Over the past 60 years, the diversity of maize (*Zea mays* L.) production systems in the  
67 Midwestern United States (US) has been reduced, moving from multi-species rotations that  
68 included small grains and forage legumes to maize monocultures or simple alternations of maize  
69 and soybean (*Glycine max* [L.] Merr) (Aguilar et al., 2015; Hijmans et al., 2016; Crossley et al.,

70 2021). Presently, five states in the Midwestern US produce approximately one-sixth of the  
71 world's maize and soybean grain (FAO, 2020; USDA National Agricultural Statistics Service  
72 2021), and it follows that in the Midwestern US a significant amount of agricultural land is  
73 dedicated to a simplified maize/soybean system (Boryan et al., 2011; USDA National  
74 Agricultural Statistics Service Cropland Data Layer, 2021). Several unintended, but nonetheless  
75 undesirable outcomes have accompanied this simplification including but not limited to  
76 increased rates of soil erosion, increased risk of flooding, and increased risks of nitrate pollution  
77 (Hatfield et al., 2009, 2013; Schilling et al., 2010; Jones et al., 2018; Pasley et al., 2021). While  
78 cropping system re-diversification may offer avenues for ameliorating many of these issues  
79 (Tamburini et al. 2020), there are numerous barriers that currently exist to re-diversifying  
80 Midwestern systems (Mortensen and Smith, 2020; Weisberger et al., 2021). Regardless, there is  
81 value in understanding the mechanisms that may enable cropping system diversification to  
82 contribute to better agricultural outcomes.

83 Midwestern maize-based systems fall into three main categories: (1) continuous maize  
84 systems, wherein maize is grown for two or more consecutive seasons; (2) simple rotated maize  
85 systems, wherein maize is rotated with soybean; and (3) extended maize rotations, wherein  
86 maize is grown in a rotation with two or more years between maize crops, often including a  
87 small grain such as oats (*Avena sativa*) and/or a forage crop such as alfalfa (*Medicago sativa*).  
88 Using these definitions, as maize cropping systems move from monocultures to short rotations or  
89 from short to extended rotations, maize yields in the Midwest increase by approximately 10 and  
90 5%, respectively (Crookston et al. 1991; Gentry et al. 2013; Liebman et al., 2008; Davis et al.,  
91 2012), and occur even when nitrogen is not limiting (Osterholz et al. 2018; Baum et al. 2023).  
92 The former phenomenon is commonly referred to as the 'continuous maize penalty', and the

93 latter ‘the rotation effect’. To our knowledge it is unclear whether they are distinct expressions of  
94 unique mechanisms, or if they represent a continuum of the same mechanistic underpinnings.

95 There have been numerous studies in the US Midwest exploring the continuous maize  
96 penalty (Dick and Doren, 1985; Peterson et al., 1990; Meese et al., 1991; Crookston et al., 1991;  
97 Porter et al., 1997; Varvel, 2000; Stanger and Lauer, 2008; Gentry et al., 2013; Al-Kaisi et al.,  
98 2015; Farmaha et al., 2016; Seifert et al., 2017; Vogel and Below, 2018; Bowles et al., 2020).

99 There is evidence it is due, at least in part, to yield suppressive mechanisms in the monoculture  
100 system, potentially due to soil biological conditions that may constrain root development and  
101 therefore resource capture (Crookston et al., 1988; Johnson et al., 1992; Nickel et al., 1995;  
102 Goldstein, 2000). The maize yield advantage accrued from extending short rotations to include  
103 small grains and forage legumes has received less attention compared to the continuous maize  
104 penalty, but has likewise been well-documented (Lieberman et al., 2008; Stanger and Lauer, 2008;  
105 Coulter et al., 2011). To our knowledge the mechanisms driving the rotation effect in  
106 Midwestern maize systems remain uncertain, partially due to the complex changes in  
107 management attendant to extended rotations, rendering it difficult to attribute yield increases to a  
108 particular driver.

109 When above-ground crop products are valued, it is desirable for plants to optimize  
110 investments in belowground growth. In nitrogen- or water-limited environments, ‘steep, cheap  
111 and deep’ root ideotypes have been identified as the most efficient use of root investments  
112 (Lynch, 2013; Tron et al., 2015; Thorup-Kristensen and Kirkegaard 2016; Thorup-Kristensen et  
113 al. 2020). It is therefore feasible that maize grown in extended rotations could also benefit from  
114 this root architecture ideotype. Many characteristics of extended rotations may promote deeper  
115 crop roots. In a long-term cropping systems research experiment in Iowa (Lieberman et al., 2008;

116 Davis et al., 2012) researchers have found differences in the vertical distributions of resources,  
117 microbial communities, and nutrient cycling activity in soil profiles of simple and complex  
118 maize systems (Lazicki et al., 2016; King and Hofmockel, 2017; Osterholz et al., 2018;  
119 Poffenbarger et al., 2020; Baldwin-Kordick et al., 2022), all of which might impact, or be  
120 impacted by, root architectures. Indeed, Lazicki et al. (2016) found differences in maize root  
121 distributions in plots with varying rotation histories, but the data were limited to shallow depths  
122 (0-20 cm) and did not control for previous crop root carryover, which may impact interpretations  
123 (Hirte et al. 2017).

124 We hypothesized that maize grown in extended rotations develops a deeper root structure  
125 with less biomass investment compared to maize in a short rotation, and that these differences  
126 would be correlated with differences in grain production. To test this hypothesis, we made the  
127 following measurements in the maize phase of short (maize/soybean) and extended  
128 (maize/soybean/oats-alfalfa/alfalfa) rotations:

- 129 1. Maize grain yields from eight growing seasons (2013-2020)
- 130 2. Maize root biomass from 0-60 cm soil depths as a proxy for the resources invested by the
- 131 maize crop into roots in two growing seasons (2019-2020)
- 132 3. Maximum maize rooting depth as a proxy for the soil space made available for resource
- 133 capture by that investment in three growing seasons (2018-2020)

134 Additionally, we complemented these measurements with detailed aboveground maize  
135 growth analysis throughout five seasons (2013, 2014, 2018, 2019, 2020); soil penetration  
136 resistance measurements in three seasons (2018-2020); and soil moisture and temperature  
137 measurements in two seasons (2018-2019).

138 **2 Methods and Materials**

139    **2.1 Study location**

140        The experimental site was located at the Iowa State University Marsden Farm, in Boone  
141        County, Iowa, USA ( $42^{\circ}01' N$ ;  $93^{\circ}47' W$ ; 333 m above sea level). Dominant soil series were  
142        Clarion loam, Nicollet loam, and Webster clay loam, all of which are Mollisols. Before the  
143        initiation of the experiment, the site had been managed for at least 20 years with a maize-  
144        soybean rotation receiving conventional fertilizer and herbicide inputs. Baseline soil samples (0-  
145        20 cm) showed a mean buffer pH of 6.8 and mean organic matter concentration of  $51 \text{ g kg}^{-1}$   
146        (Liebman et al., 2008). The experiment was arranged as a randomized complete block design  
147        with each crop phase of each rotation system present every year in four replicate blocks (Payne,  
148        2015). Plots were 18 m by 84 m, with the entire experiment comprising ~9 hectares. Weather  
149        data were collected from a weather station approximately one kilometer from the field site (Iowa  
150        Environmental Mesonet, 2021).

151    **2.2 Sampling**

152        This study utilized two of the three maize-based rotations present in the larger study: a 2-year  
153        rotation of maize/soybean (hereafter the short rotation), and a 4-year rotation of  
154        maize/soybean/oat-alfalfa/alfalfa that periodically received composted cattle manure (hereafter  
155        the extended rotation). Oat straw and alfalfa were harvested and removed from the research site;  
156        no grazing occurred on the plots. Detailed accounts of plot management are reported elsewhere  
157        (Liebman et al., 2008; Hunt et al., 2020) and a summary is presented in **Table 1**. Maize grain  
158        yield was measured in 2013-2020, and additional measurements were taken in select years  
159        during that period (**Table 2**).

160

161

162

163

164

165 *Table 1. Summary of agronomic management of the two rotation treatments housing the maize*

166 *phase (bolded) sampled in this study; for more details see Liebman et al. 2008 and Hunt et al.*

167 2020

<b>Rotation</b>	<b>Crop sequence</b>	<b>Nitrogen sources</b>	<b>Tillage regime</b>
Short 2-year	Soybean/ <b>Maize</b>	Mean total of 180 kg ha <sup>-1</sup> inorganic nitrogen applied to maize phase, with 112 kg ha <sup>-1</sup> applied at planting and the remaining at V6 side-dressing based on soil nitrate sampling (Sawyer and Mallarino 2017)	Fall chisel plowing and spring field cultivation preceding soybean planting, spring surface cultivation preceding maize planting
Extended 4-year	Soybean/ Oat-Alfalfa/ Alfalfa/ <b>Maize</b>	Mean of 140 kg ha <sup>-1</sup> organic nitrogen applied as composted cattle manure the fall preceding the maize phase, and 32 kg ha <sup>-1</sup> inorganic N applied at V6 side-dressing based on soil nitrate sampling (Sawyer and Mallarino 2017)	Fall chisel plowing and spring surface cultivation preceding soybean planting, no tillage events preceding oat/alfalfa planting, fall moldboard plowing of the alfalfa crop followed by spring disking and surface cultivation preceding maize planting

168

169

170 **2.3 Statistical analysis**

171 Statistical analyses were conducted using *R version 4.0.2* (R Core Team, 2020) with the

172 *tidyverse* suite of packages (Wickham et al., 2019) or JMP Pro 17.0 (SAS Institute, Cary, North

173 Carolina, USA). Additional R packages were used for specific analyses as described below.  
174 Significance thresholds for statistical tests was set at  $p=0.05$  unless noted otherwise. In all cases  
175 several statistical models were fit and compared using Akaike's Information Criteria (AIC;  
176 Kuha, 2004) and residual plots, but only the model chosen as providing the best fit is reported.  
177 All data used in this manuscript are available in csv format and as an R package available for  
178 download (<https://github.com/vanichols/maRsden>). The R code used to perform these analyses  
179 and create manuscript figures is available in a public Github repository (will be made public  
180 once manuscript is accepted for publication).

181 **2.4 Grain yields, harvest indices, grain weights, and root-to-shoot ratios**

182 The effect of rotation treatment (short, extended) on maize grain yields was assessed  
183 using a linear mixed effects model with rotation, year-factor, and their interaction as fixed  
184 effects, and block nested within a year-factor as a random intercept using R package *lme4* (Bates  
185 et al., 2015). The R packages *emmeans* (Lenth et al., 2018) and *lmerTest* (Kuznetsova et al.,  
186 2017) were used for comparisons and statistical summaries of the model, using a Tukey  
187 adjustment for multiple comparisons.

188 Differences in harvest indices, 500-grain weights, and the root-to-shoot ratios were  
189 assessed using a linear mixed effects model with rotation, a year-factor, and their interaction as  
190 fixed effects and a random block intercept, with a Tukey adjustment for multiple comparisons.

191 **2.5 Rooting depth**

192 We modeled rooting depth as a function of the cumulative maize growing-degree-days  
193 (GDDs) accrued since planting (base temperature  $10^{\circ}$  C, maximum temperature  $30^{\circ}$  C) to  
194 facilitate comparisons between years. Non-linear models were fit using the R package *nlraa*  
195 package (Miguez, 2021). We tried several non-linear models fit to both the raw data and the data

196 filtered to remove measurements taken after the season's maximum depth had been reached  
197 (**Figure S1**). We found a three-parameter logistic curve (Archontoulis et al., 2015) fit to the  
198 filtered data produced the best fit according to AIC and inspection of residuals:

199 Eqn. 1 
$$rootdepth(GDD) = \frac{A_{sym}}{(1+\exp(\frac{(x_{mid}-GDD)}{scal}))}$$

200 where  $rootdepth(GDD)$  is the maximum rooting depth at a given cumulative GDD after planting  
201 and  $A_{sym}$ ,  $x_{mid}$ , and  $scal$  are estimated parameters.  $A_{sym}$  represents the maximum rooting depth  
202 achieved,  $x_{mid}$  represents the cumulative GDD value at which half of the maximum rooting depth  
203 was achieved, and  $scal$  describes the steepness of the curve (Miguez et al., 2018). We found the  
204 best model fit incorporated a fixed effect of rotation on  $A_{sym}$ ,  $scal$ , and  $x_{mid}$ ; a random effect of a  
205 year-factor on  $A_{sym}$ ,  $x_{mid}$ , and  $scal$ ; a random effect of block on  $A_{sym}$ ; and a power variance  
206 structure (Pinheiro and Bates 2022).

*Table 2. Summary of measurements used for this study*

<b>Measurement</b>	<b>Years</b>	<b>Description</b>
Maize grain yield	2013-2020	Maize grain yield was determined using a 6-row combine equipped with a yield monitor and moisture meter. Sampling areas for yield were approximately 4.6 m x 84 m and were six rows away from plot edges. All yields are reported on a dry weight basis.
Maize above-ground biomass	2013, 2014, 2018, 2019, 2020	Maize above-ground biomass was measured approximately every two weeks throughout the season. Eight plants were cut at ground level, separated into leaf, stem, and reproductive components, dried at 60° C for at least 72 hours, then weighed.
Maize maximum rooting depth	2018, 2019, 2020	Maximum maize rooting depth was measured starting at 20, 23, and 41 days after planting in 2018, 2019, and 2020, respectively. Sampling was repeated approximately every 2 weeks until 84, 106, and 151 days after planting in 2018, 2019, and 2020, respectively. Maximum rooting depth was determined visually using the protocol of Ordóñez et al. (2018). A soil core was drawn with a 19-mm-diameter soil probe, white roots were identified, and their depth recorded to the nearest cm using a meter stick. At a given date, samples were taken repeatedly from the same core location until no white roots were identified in the core. Four cores were taken per plot at each sampling date.
Soil moisture and temperature at 15 and 45 cm depths	2018, 2019	STM soil moisture and temperature sensors (METER Group Inc., Pullman, WA, USA) were installed at two depths (15 and 45 cm) in each plot. Data were recorded hourly during the growing season using EMSO data loggers.
Penetration resistance	2018, 2019	Penetration resistance was measured using a FieldScout 900 Soil Compaction Meter (Spectrum Technologies, Inc., Aurora, IL, USA). Values were recorded every 2.54 cm to 45 cm depth immediately following planting and/or approximately 60 days after planting. Ten measurements were taken randomly throughout each plot. Measurements were taken within two days after a saturating rain to avoid capturing differences due to soil moisture.
Maize root mass 0-60 cm	2019, 2020	Maize root mass to a soil depth of 60 cm was measured at 3 and 105 days after planting in 2019, and at 4 and 117 days after planting in 2020. Four soil samples per plot were drawn at a location 10 cm from maize rows in 15 cm depth increments using a 32-mm-diameter soil probe. Soil from each depth increment within a plot was composited and roots were recovered using a sequence of elutriation (washing), flotation, recovery from organic debris using tweezers and a stereo microscope, drying, and weighing (Dietzel et al., 2017).

209     **2.6 Root mass**

210         Distinguishing newly added root biomass from the previous year's crop and weed root

211         biomass is difficult using visual sorting, and failure to address these background levels of roots

212         can lead to overestimates of new root mass, with the overestimate varying by cropping history

213         (Hirte et al. 2017). To address this issue, the three main options currently available to field

214         researchers include the use of isotopes, correction for background levels of root material by

215         using a baseline measurement or root growth cores, or maintaining a crop- and weed-free area to

216         track background levels throughout the season. We chose to take a background sample shortly

217         after the maize crop was planted. Additional details of sampling protocols are presented in **Table**

218         **2.** When interpreting the data, we used the two extreme assumption cases concerning the

219         percentage of the sampled background roots that decayed between the start of the maize growing

220         season (**Table 2**) and the last sampling date near maize physiological maturity: 0% background

221         root decay, and 100% background root decay. The true amount of background roots present at

222         the time of sampling falls between the extreme assumptions, and we therefore report the

223         production of new crop root biomass as a range of possible values.

224         The Restricted Maximum Likelihood (REML) method for linear mixed effect models in

225         JMP Pro 17.0 was used to evaluate the effects of rotation treatment on maize root mass

226         production within four soil depth increments (0-15 cm, 15-30 cm, 30-45 cm, and 45-60 cm) for

227         each of the extreme assumption cases. Year, rotation system, soil depth, and date were treated as

228         fixed factors, and block and its interactions with the fixed factors were treated as random effects.

229         Sampling depth was nested within year and rotation. Due to the inherently high variability of

230         root measurements, for these analyses the threshold for investigating contrasts (as allowed by

231         degrees of freedom) was set at  $p < 0.10$ .

232    **2.7 Growth analysis**

233        We modeled above-ground biomass as a function of day-of-year using a three-parameter  
234 logistic curve (Eqn. 1), as it provided the best fit of all the non-linear models assessed (logistic,  
235 Richards, Gompertz, Weibull, Beta; Miguez et al. 2018) based on AIC criteria. A model using  
236 GDDs produced similar results, but we chose to report the model using calendar days because it  
237 was conceptually easier to compare systems. A separate model was fit for each rotation in each  
238 year to allow for derivatives to be taken for each rotation in each year. For visualization  
239 purposes, the first- and second-order derivatives of the fitted equation were used to visualize the  
240 absolute and relative growth rates over time, allowing for visualization of when differences in  
241 growth rates occurred rather than relying on parameter interpretations alone. The effect of  
242 rotation on fitted parameters was assessed using the *confint* function of base R.

243    **2.8 Root-to-shoot ratios**

244        A root-to-shoot ratio for each experimental unit was estimated using the range in possible  
245 root additions in the 0-60 cm soil profile and the maximum above-ground biomass as predicted  
246 by the growth analysis (see Section 2.7). In Iowa, maize roots in the 0-60 cm depth increment  
247 account for more than 90% of total root mass (Nichols et al. 2019) but will nonetheless provide  
248 an underestimate of the root-to-shoot ratio (Ordóñez et al. 2020). We therefore calculated the  
249 ratio to be interpreted as relative, rather than absolute, values.

250    **2.9 Penetration resistance**

251        Penetration resistance was statistically modelled separately for each year and date of  
252 sampling using a generalized additive mixed model with a fixed intercept effect of rotation

253 treatment, a fixed ‘wiggle’ component of rotation treatment, five knots, and a random ‘wiggle’  
254 effect of block. Generalized additive models can model highly non-linear relationships and are  
255 useful when the goal is to compare treatments rather than to create predictions. The *gamm*  
256 function of the R package *mgcv* (McCulloch and Neuhaus, 2005; Wood, 2011) was used, and the  
257 *emmeans* package was used to assess pairwise comparison significance. Models were fit using  
258 both the raw and square-root-transformed data. Although the model on the transformed data  
259 produced a better fit according to inspection of residuals, statistical conclusions were not  
260 different in the two models so the results from the untransformed data are presented for ease in  
261 interpretation.

## 262 **2.10 Soil moisture and temperature**


263 The hourly soil moisture and temperature data were averaged over 24-hour periods  
264 (12:00 am to 11:59 pm) for analysis. The daily means were modelled statistically as a function of  
265 day-of-year separately for each year and depth using a generalized additive mixed model with a  
266 fixed intercept effect of rotation treatment, a fixed ‘wiggle’ component of rotation treatment, 35  
267 knots, and a random ‘wiggle’ effect of block using the R package *mgcv*.

## 268 **3 Results**

### 269 **3.1 Grain yields and weather**

270 Maize yields ranged from 7.0 to 12.7 dry Mg ha<sup>-1</sup> over the 2013-2020 study period. The  
271 effect of rotation depended on year ( $p < 0.001$ ; **Figure 1**), with the maize grown in the extended  
272 rotation producing significantly higher ( $p < 0.01$ ) grain yields in five (2013, 2014, 2016, 2017,  
273 and 2018) of the eight years. Averaged over all years, maize grown in the short rotation yielded a  
274 mean of 10.2 dry Mg ha<sup>-1</sup>, while maize grown in the extended rotation yielded 8% higher with a  
275 mean grain yield of 11.0 dry Mg ha<sup>-1</sup>.

276 Over the past 30 years, from 15-April through 15-October the research site averaged 597  
 277 mm of precipitation with a mean air temperature of 19<sup>o</sup> C. From 2013-2020, growing season  
 278 weather conditions varied considerably compared to these long-term averages, with the grain  
 279 yield dataset capturing conditions in all four temperature/precipitation combinations (**Figure 1**).  
 280 Years that included growth analyses were likewise represented in all four quadrants, and the  
 281 three years with full datasets (grain yields, growth analysis, root data) represented all but cool  
 282 and wet conditions.




283

284 *Figure 1. Maize yields and growing season weather; (left) mean maize grain yields (n = 4) in the*  
285 *extended (dark blue, solid, triangles) and short (pink, dashed, squares) rotations from 2013-2020*  
286 *(lines connecting points for ease in viewing), years with significantly different yields (p<0.01)*  
287 *indicated with asterisks and bolded year font; (right) growing season precipitation and mean air*  
288 *temperatures of each measurement year as compared to 30-year means (dotted lines) with size of*  
289 *points proportional to the extended rotation's maize mean yield advantage over the short*  
290 *rotation, and point color representing the measurement set for that year.*

291 **3.2 Rooting depth**

292 The rooting depth of the maize grown in the extended rotation trended consistently  
293 deeper in the majority of sampling times in all three growing seasons (**Figure 2**). The maximum  
294 rooting depths in 2018 were shallow (~50 cm) due to an extremely wet year (**Figure 1**) that  
295 caused consistently shallow water tables as documented at a nearby experimental site (Ebrahimi  
296 et al. 2019). Rotation affected maize maximum rooting depth ( $A_{sym}$ ; p<0.01; **Table S1**),  
297 estimated at 11% deeper in the extended rotation compared to the short (82 cm and 76 cm,  
298 respectively). While the extended rotation roots also descended faster, the effect was not  
299 statistically significant ( $x_{mid}$ ; p=0.19).

300



301

302 *Figure 2. Maize rooting depth across three growing seasons (2018, 2019, 2020; refer to Figure*

303 *1 for weather conditions) in short (pink, dashed, squares) and extended (dark blue, solid,*

304 *triangles) rotations; points represent individual measurements, lines represent the non-linear*

305 *model fits, italic text is the maize stage; model uncertainty is omitted for visual simplicity but can*

306 *be viewed in supplemental material (**Figure S1**); first points at 0 depth indicate maize planting*

307 *date.*

308 **3.3 Root mass**


309 Root mass present at maize planting (hereafter ‘background’ root mass) ranged from 68

310 to 2753 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>, with the extended rotation tending to have higher amounts (**Table S2**). Year

311 interactions were not significant, (**Table S2**), so results are presented as marginal estimates over

312 years. At the 0-15 cm depth increment, the root mass added in the two systems differed  
313 significantly ( $p = 0.02$ ; **Table S3**), regardless of background root decomposition assumptions;  
314 the short rotation added between 314 (standard error of the mean [SE]:110) and 506 (SE:56) kg  
315  $\text{ha}^{-1}$ , while maize grown in the extended rotation added between 101 (SE:110) and 321 (SE:55)  
316 kg  $\text{ha}^{-1}$  of root mass (**Figure 3**). The extended rotation's lower maize biomass relative to the  
317 short rotation in the top 15 cm was counterbalanced by higher biomass relative to the short  
318 rotation in soil layers deeper than 15 cm (**Figure 3**). Although these differences were not  
319 significant (**Table S3**), this pattern resulted in the total root biomass of the two rotations being  
320 statistically equivalent. Dietzel et al. (2017) studied maize root growth using in-growth cores and  
321 found maize added 480-560 kg  $\text{ha}^{-1}$  in root material over the growing season in the top 30 cm of  
322 soil, suggesting the ranges found in our study are reasonable (**Figure 3**).

323



324

325 *Figure 3. (Left) Possible ranges in mean maize root mass production (n=8) depending on  
326 assumed rate of decomposition of root mass present at planting ('background' roots) for maize  
327 grown in the short (pink) and extended (dark blue) rotations separated by depth and (right)  
328 range in total possible root biomass for 0-60 cm. Data are averages from two growing seasons.*

### 329 3.4 Growth analysis

330 The maximum aboveground maize biomass ( $A_{sym}$ ; Eqn. 1) as estimated from the growth  
331 analysis was significantly higher in the extended rotation in the years when the extended rotation  
332 yielded significantly higher grain yields, but were not different in years without significant  
333 differences in grain yields (Table 3; Figure S2; Table S1). The date at which the maize

334 achieved half of its maximum biomass ( $xmid$ ; Eqn. 1) was significantly earlier in the extended  
335 rotation in 2013 ( $p = 0.05$ ) and exhibited higher absolute growth rates compared to the short  
336 rotation before maximum growth rates were achieved (e.g. early in the season; **Figure S2**).  
337 Conversely,  $xmid$  for the extended rotation occurred significantly later than for the short rotation  
338 in 2018 ( $p < 0.01$ ) and had higher absolute growth rates after maximum growth rates were  
339 achieved (e.g. later in the season). The timings of growth were not significantly different in the  
340 other three years with growth data. The maximum growth rates in the two rotations ( $scal$ ; Eqn. 1)  
341 were not significantly different in any of the five years. The harvest index and 500-kernel  
342 weights were consistently higher in years with large rotation effects on grain yield but did not  
343 differ in years that lacked a strong rotation effect (**Table 3**).

344 The root-to-shoot ratios ranged from 0.002 to 0.015 depending on the assumed  
345 background root decomposition (**Figure S3**). Trends were inconclusive due to the variation  
346 produced by the assumptions leading to calculation of the ratios. While these root-to-shoot ratios  
347 are lower than those reported in literature for maize (e.g., 0.09 from Ordóñez et al. 2020), our  
348 root measurement methodology and driving questions differed, and our total root biomasses are  
349 consistent with other studies that control for background root amounts (e.g. Dietzel et al. 2017).

350 *Table 3. Summary of characteristics of maize in the extended rotation relative to maize in the*  
351 *short rotation, including grain yields (Figure 1), root characteristics (Figures 2, 3) growth*  
352 *analysis (Figure S2, Table S4), and yield components (Figure S2) for years with growth analysis*  
353 *data, ordered by magnitude of grain yield differentials; ratios of values are presented to simplify*  
354 *visual comparisons of rotations*

Year	Ratio of extended:short	Extended rotation's maize maximum	Timing of extended rotation's	Ratio of extended:short	Ratio of extended:short
------	-------------------------	-----------------------------------	-------------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------

	<b>rotation maize grain yield<sup>†</sup></b>	<b>rooting depth/surface roots relative to short rotation</b>	<b>maize growth advantage<sup>‡</sup></b>	<b>rotation harvest index</b>	<b>rotation 500- kernal weight</b>
2018	1.20	Deeper/-	Late season	1.08	1.13
2013	1.10	-	Early season	1.04	-
2014	1.06	-	ns	ns	-
2020	ns	Deeper/steeper	ns	ns	ns
2019	ns	Deeper/steeper	ns	ns	ns

<sup>†</sup>Ordered by largest to smallest estimated rotation effect on maize grain yield

<sup>‡</sup>Early season refers to periods before the maximum maize growth rate occurred, late season to periods after

\* ns: not significant at p=0.05

- indicates those data were not collected that year

355

### 356 3.5 Penetration resistance

357 Penetration resistance above 30 cm soil depth was consistently lower in the extended  
 358 rotation compared with the short rotation, regardless of year or sampling period (planting, late  
 359 season; **Figure S4**). From 0-30 cm, the extended and short rotations had mean penetration  
 360 resistances of 0.6 and 0.7 MPa at planting, and 1.1 and 1.5 MPa at late season sampling,  
 361 respectively, corresponding to a 20% lower penetration resistance in the top 30 cm. From 30 to  
 362 45 cm, on average the extended rotation had higher penetration resistance compared to the short

363 by an average of 22% (1.1 MPa/0.9 MPa at planting, and 1.7/1.4 MPa in the late season,  
364 respectively).

365 **3.6 Soil moisture and temperature**

366 In both years of measurement, soil moisture at 15 cm depth in the extended rotation was  
367 significantly lower than in the short rotation for the first month following planting (**Figure S5**).  
368 After that period, the effects of rotation on soil moisture were not consistent across years; in  
369 2018 the short rotation soil was consistently wetter than the extended rotation at both 15 cm and  
370 45 cm depths, but in 2019 there was no difference. In 2018, the extended rotation's lower soil  
371 moisture at 15 cm was concomitant with a significantly higher soil temperature compared to the  
372 short rotation by ~0.5 deg Celsius, but otherwise showed no consistent trends (**Figure S5**).

373 **4 Discussion**

374 Compared to maize grown in a short rotation, we found maize grown in an extended  
375 rotation had consistently deeper maximum rooting depths during three years of measurement in  
376 widely varying weather conditions (**Figures 1 and 2**), and a root system that was more evenly  
377 distributed from 0-60 cm in two years of measurements (**Figure 3**), corroborating evidence from  
378 Lazicki et al. (2016) (**Figure S6**).

379 The hypothesis that these 'steeper and deeper' root characteristics are a consistent feature  
380 of the extended rotation requires further testing, but the data collected in the present study  
381 provide support for such a hypothesis. These potentially consistent differences in root  
382 characteristics did not, however, significantly enhance grain yields in every year (**Figure 1**). We  
383 posit that through changes in physical, chemical, and biological soil properties, the extended  
384 rotation provides opportunities for maize roots to grow 'deeper and steeper,' possibly positioning  
385 the plant to access resources (i.e., water and nutrients) that may be, or may become, available in

386 deeper soil layers. The feasibility of these interactions is supported by a simulation model that  
387 varied root front velocities in maize (and therefore maximum rooting depths); the simulation  
388 showed that the impact of deeper rooting on maize yields depended heavily on the year, and that  
389 the magnitude of yield impact was comparable to that which we observed (unpublished data;  
390 **Figure S7**).

391 The reasons for the ‘steeper and deeper’ root architecture are not clear. In a previous  
392 study, in which Bay et al. (2021) drew soil from the top 20 cm of plots in each rotation system,  
393 sieved and homogenized the soil, packed it into rhizotrons at the same bulk density, and grew  
394 maize for 21 days, the investigators found that even in the homogenized soil, maize grown in soil  
395 from the extended rotation had a maximum rooting depth ~30% deeper compared to the maize  
396 grown in the short rotation soil, as well as significantly thinner but more numerous roots.

397 Working with the same plots as in our study, King and Hofmockel (2017) found microbial  
398 biomass was both higher and more evenly distributed in the top 20 cm of the extended rotation  
399 soil compared to the short rotation, which, if biological drivers are realized in the field, could be  
400 contributing to the differences in root distributions seen in the present study. Results from Bay et  
401 al. (2021) and King and Hofmockel (2017), combined with the lack of correlation between root  
402 distribution patterns and physical measurements (soil penetration resistance, soil temperature,  
403 soil moisture) seen in our field study, provide support for the hypothesis that biological and/or  
404 chemical drivers in the soil contributed to root differences between maize in the extended- and  
405 short rotations.

406 Nonetheless, while biological and chemical drivers likely play a role, physical drivers  
407 may still be contributing to the ‘steeper and deeper’ maize roots in the extended rotation in the

408 field. The root legacy of the crop preceding maize (alfalfa in the extended rotation, soybean in  
409 the short rotation) might have affected the maize root distributions. One study using mini-  
410 rhizotrons observed that when a maize crop followed alfalfa, the maize root distribution closely  
411 mimicked the alfalfa root distribution, with 41% of the maize roots following old alfalfa root  
412 channels (Rasse et al. 1998). Alfalfa root systems tend to be deeper than those of annual crops  
413 (Fan et al. 2016), and even with moldboard plowing (20-25 cm depth) used in our study, there  
414 would be intact decaying alfalfa root channels that the maize roots may have followed.

415 The extended rotation had higher penetration resistances from 30-45 cm depths compared  
416 to the short rotation, indicating differences in penetration resistance in bulk soil cannot explain  
417 the deeper rooting depths in the extended rotation. Previous work has shown that depth to the  
418 water table is associated with differences in maize roots (Nichols et al. 2019), and measured  
419 water table heights at this site in 2019 (unpublished data) showed the rotation treatment had no  
420 discernible effect on water table dynamics, indicating the differences in root distributions  
421 between the treatments were not due to differences in the depth to the water table.

422 Previous studies have found lower bulk densities and higher particulate organic matter in  
423 the extended rotation, which likely reflect the moldboard plowing of the alfalfa crop during the  
424 fall prior to maize planting as well as greater particulate organic matter from manure additions  
425 (Lazicki et al. 2016; Poffenbarger et al. 2020; Baldwin-Kordick et al., 2022). This is consistent  
426 with the lower penetration resistances observed in the present study in the top 30 cm, and likely  
427 explains the lower soil moisture observed in the extended rotation at planting. While neither  
428 system had absolute resistances high enough to meaningfully impede root penetration, the  
429 observed differences in penetration resistance in the surface layers (0.1-0.4 MPa) were of a  
430 magnitude that could potentially affect root elongation; a study done with intact soil cores found

431 resistances of only 0.3-0.5 MPa reduced maize seeding root elongation by 50-60% in a sandy  
432 loam soil (Bengough and Mullins, 1991).

433 While the rotation benefit observed in the present study was realized in a range of  
434 weather conditions (**Figure 1**), it was large in both the wettest (2018) and driest (2013) years.  
435 Many climate change scenarios project increased occurrences of precipitation extremes (Zhang  
436 et al. 2013), suggesting extended rotations may play an important role in building cropping  
437 system resilience to climate change, and that resilience may be due in part to differences in root  
438 architecture.

439 **5 Conclusion**

440 This study provides novel evidence that growing maize in extended rotations can result in  
441 changes to maize root structure including maximum rooting depths and vertical distributions.  
442 The observed changes in root structure may have affected below-ground resource acquisition by  
443 the crop, which may in turn have resulted in higher maize grain yields under certain conditions.  
444 Differences in penetration resistance and previous crop root legacies may contribute to altered  
445 maize root patterns, but there are likely additional biological and/or chemical drivers that are not  
446 well understood in field settings, and would benefit from targeted research. Potential impacts of  
447 this research include fine-tuning of crop models to account for cropping history-induced  
448 differences in maize rooting depth, investigating if/how genetics interact with extended rotations  
449 to further augment the benefits of deeper/steeper rooting in the Midwest, and investigating  
450 whether the patterns observed in this study hold in other crops.

451

452 6 Funding

453 This work was sponsored by the Foundation for Food and Agricultural Research (Grant  
454 #534264), the U.S. Department of Agriculture (Hatch project IOW10480), Iowa State  
455 University's Plant Sciences Institute and Department of Agronomy, and the Iowa Nutrient  
456 Research Center (Grant 2019-09). Pursuant to all requirements for public sharing of data and  
457 analyses, both can be found in an R package and Github repository (to be made public upon  
458 manuscript acceptance).

459 7 Acknowledgements

460 The authors thank David Sundberg, Matt Woods, and Emily Wright for managing the research  
461 site and equipment installation, and Mickala Stallman and Wyatt Westfall who contributed to  
462 data collection. We also thank Philip Dixon, Katherine Goode, Miranda Tilton and Fernando  
463 Miguez for advice and guidance on statistical analyses.

464 8 Author contributions

465 All authors contributed to data collection, GN and ML performed data analyses, GN wrote the  
466 initial draft of the manuscript, all authors contributed to editing of the final manuscript.

467 9 References

468 Aguilar, J., G.G. Gramig, J.R. Hendrickson, D.W. Archer, F. Forcella, et al. 2015. Crop species  
469 diversity changes in the United States: 1978–2012. PLoS ONE 10(8): e0136580. doi:  
470 10.1371/JOURNAL.PONE.0136580.

471 Al-Kaisi, M.M., S.V. Archontoulis, D. Kwaw-Mensah, and F. Miguez. 2015. Tillage and crop  
472 rotation effects on corn agronomic response and economic return at seven Iowa locations.  
473 Agronomy Journal 107(4): 1411–1424. doi: 10.2134/AGRONJ14.0470.

474 Archontoulis, S.V. and F.E. Miguez. 2015. Nonlinear regression models and applications in  
475 agricultural research. *Agronomy Journal* 107(2): 786–798. doi:  
476 10.2134/agronj2012.0506.

- 477 Baldwin-Kordick, R., M. De, M.D. Lopez, M. Liebman, N. Lauter, J. Marino and M.D.  
478 McDaniel. 2022. Comprehensive impacts of diversified cropping on soil health and  
479 sustainability. *Agroecology and Sustainable Food Systems* 46: 331–363,  
480 doi:10.1080/21683565.2021.2019167.
- 481 Ball, B.C., I. Bingham, R.M. Rees, C.A. Watson, and A. Litterick. 2005. The role of crop  
482 rotations in determining soil structure and crop growth conditions. *Canadian Journal of  
483 Soil Science*, 85(5): 557-577. <https://doi.org/10.4141/S04-078>
- 484 Bates, D., M. Mächler, B. Bolker, and S. Walker. 2015. Fitting linear mixed-effects models using  
485 lme4. *Journal of Statistical Software* 67(1): 1–48. doi: 10.18637/jss.v067.i01.
- 486 Baum, M.E, J.E. Sawyer, E.D. Nafziger, I. Huber, P.J. Thorburn, M.J. Castellano, and S.V.  
487 Archontoulis. 2023. Evaluating and improving APSIM's capacity in simulating long-term  
488 corn yield response to nitrogen in continuous-and rotated-corn systems. *Agricultural  
489 Systems* 207: 103629.
- 490 Bay, G., C. Lee, C. Chen, N.K. Mahal, M.J. Castellano, K.S. Hofmockel, L.J. Halverson 2021.  
491 Agricultural management affects the active rhizosphere bacterial community composition  
492 and nitrification. *mSystems*, 6(5):e00651-21. <https://doi.org/10.1128/mSystems.00651-21>
- 493 Bengough, A.G., and C.E. Mullins. 1991. Penetrometer resistance, root penetration resistance  
494 and root elongation rate in two sandy loam soils. *Plant and Soil*. 131(1): 59–66. doi:  
495 10.1007/BF00010420.

- 496 Boryan, C., Z. Yang, R. Mueller, and M. Craig. 2011. Monitoring US agriculture: the US  
497 Department of Agriculture, National Agricultural Statistics Service, Cropland Data Layer  
498 Program. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10106049.2011.562309> 26(5): 341–358. doi:  
499 10.1080/10106049.2011.562309.
- 500 Bowles, T.M., M. Mooshammer, Y. Socolar, F. Calderón, M.A. Cavigelli, et al. 2020. Long-term  
501 evidence shows that crop-rotation diversification increases agricultural resilience to  
502 adverse growing conditions in North America. *One Earth* 2(3): 284–293. doi:  
503 10.1016/j.oneear.2020.02.007.
- 504 Coulter, J.A., C.C. Sheaffer, D.L. Wyse, M.J. Haar, P.M. Porter, et al. 2011. Agronomic  
505 performance of cropping systems with contrasting crop rotations and external inputs.  
506 *Agronomy Journal* 103(1): 182–192. doi: 10.2134/AGRONJ2010.0211.
- 507 Crookston, R.K., J.E. Kurle, P.J. Copeland, J.H. Ford, and W.E. Lueschen. 1991. Rotational  
508 cropping sequence affects yield of corn and soybean. *Agronomy Journal* 83(1): 108–113.  
509 doi: 10.2134/AGRONJ1991.00021962008300010026X.
- 510 Crookston, K.R., J.E. Kurle, and E. Lueschen. 1988. Relative ability of soybean, fallow, and  
511 triacontanol to alleviate yield reductions associated with growing corn continuously.  
512 *Crop Science* 28(1): 145–147. doi: 10.2135/CROPSCI1988.0011183X002800010031X.
- 513 Crossley, M.S., K.D. Burke, S.D. Schoville, and V.C. Radeloff. 2021. Recent collapse of crop  
514 belts and declining diversity of US agriculture since 1840. *Global Change Biology* 27(1):  
515 151–164. doi: 10.1111/GCB.15396.

- 516 Davis, A.S., J.D. Hill, C.A. Chase, A.M. Johanns, and M. Liebman. 2012. Increasing cropping  
517 system diversity balances productivity, profitability, and environmental health. PLoS  
518 ONE 7(10): e47149. doi: 10.1371/JOURNAL.PONE.0047149.
- 519 Dick, W.A., and D.M. van Doren. 1985. Continuous tillage and rotation combinations effects on  
520 corn, soybean, and oat yields. Agronomy Journal 77(3): 459–465. doi:  
521 10.2134/AGRONJ1985.00021962007700030023X.
- 522 Dietzel, R., M. Liebman, and S. Archontoulis. 2017. A deeper look at the relationship between  
523 root carbon pools and the vertical distribution of the soil carbon pool. SOIL 3(3): 139–  
524 152. doi: 10.5194/soil-3-139-2017.
- 525 Ebrahimi-Mollabashi, E., N.I. Huth, D.P. Holzwoth, R.A. Ordóñez, J.L. Hatfield, I. Huber, M.J.  
526 Castellano, and S.V. Archontoulis. 2019. Enhancing APSIM to simulate excessive  
527 moisture effects on root growth. Field Crops Research, 236: 58-67.  
528 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fcr.2019.03.014>
- 529 Fan, J., B. McConkey, H. Wang, and H. Janzen. 2016. Root distribution by depth for temperate  
530 agricultural crops. Field Crops Research, 189: 68-74. doi: 10.1016/j.fcr.2016.02.013.
- 531 Farmaha, B.S., K.M. Eskridge, K.G. Cassman, J.E. Specht, H. Yang, et al. 2016. Rotation impact  
532 on on-farm yield and input-use efficiency in high-yield irrigated maize–soybean systems.  
533 Agronomy Journal 108(6): 2313–2321. doi: 10.2134/AGRONJ2016.01.0046.

- 534 Gentry, L.F., M.L. Ruffo, and F.E. Below. 2013. Identifying factors controlling the continuous  
535 corn yield penalty. *Agronomy Journal* 105(2): 295–303. doi: 10.2134/agronj2012.0246.
- 536 Goldstein, W.A. 2000. The effect of farming systems on the relationship of corn root growth to  
537 grain yields. *American Journal of Alternative Agriculture* 15(3): 101–109. doi:  
538 10.1017/S0889189300008602.
- 539 Guo, L., Y. Liu, G.L. Wu, Z. Huang, Z. Cui, Z. Cheng, R.Q. Zhang, F.P. Tian, and H. He. 2019.  
540 Preferential water flow: Influence of alfalfa (*Medicago sativa* L.) decayed root channels  
541 on soil water infiltration. *Journal of Hydrology*, 578: 124019. doi:  
542 10.1016/j.jhydrol.2019.124019.
- 543 Hatfield, J.L., R.M. Cruse, and M.D. Tomer. 2013. Convergence of agricultural intensification  
544 and climate change in the Midwestern United States: implications for soil and water  
545 conservation. *Marine and Freshwater Research* 64(5): 423. doi: 10.1071/MF12164.
- 546 Hatfield, J.L., L.D. McMullen, and C.S. Jones. 2009. Nitrate-nitrogen patterns in the Raccoon  
547 River Basin related to agricultural practices. *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation*  
548 64(3): 190–199. doi: 10.2489/JSWC.64.3.190.
- 549 Hijmans, R.J., H. Choe, and J. Perlman. 2016. Spatiotemporal patterns of field crop diversity in  
550 the United States, 1870–2012. *Agricultural & Environmental Letters* 1(1): 160022. doi:  
551 10.2134/AEL2016.05.0022.
- 552 Hirte, J., J. Leifeld, S. Abiven, H.R. Oberholzer, A. Hammelehle, and J. Mayer. 2017.  
553 Overestimation of crop root biomass in field experiments due to extraneous organic  
554 matter. *Frontiers in Plant Science* 8:284. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2017.00284>

- 555 Hunt, N., M. Liebman, S. Thakrar, and J. Hill. 2020. Fossil energy use, climate change impacts,  
556 and air quality-related human health damages of conventional and diversified cropping  
557 systems in Iowa, USA. *Environmental Science & Technology* 54(18): 11002–11014. doi:  
558 10.1021/ACS.EST.9B06929.
- 559 Iowa Environmental Mesonet. 2021. National Weather Service Cooperative Observer Program  
560 (COOP). Iowa State University. <https://mesonet.agron.iastate.edu/> (accessed August  
561 2021).
- 562 Johnson, N.C., P.J. Copeland, R.K. Crookston, and F.L. Pfleger. 1992. Mycorrhizae: Possible  
563 explanation for yield decline with continuous corn and soybean. *Agronomy Journal*  
564 84(3): 387. doi: 10.2134/agronj1992.00021962008400030007x.
- 565 Jones, C.S., J.K. Nielsen, K.E. Schilling, and L.J. Weber. 2018. Iowa stream nitrate and the Gulf  
566 of Mexico. *PLoS ONE* 13(4): 1–17. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0195930.
- 567
- 568 King, A.E., and K.S. Hofmockel. 2017. Diversified cropping systems support greater microbial  
569 cycling and retention of carbon and nitrogen. *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment*  
570 240: 66–76. doi: 10.1016/j.agee.2017.01.040.
- 571 Kuha, J. 2004. AIC and BIC: Comparisons of assumptions and performance. *Sociological  
572 Methods and Research* 33(2): 188–229. doi: 10.1177/0049124103262065.

- 573 Kuznetsova, A., P.B. Brockhoff, and R.H.B. Christensen. 2017. lmerTest Package: Tests in  
574 linear mixed effects models. *Journal of Statistical Software* 82(13). doi:  
575 10.18637/jss.v082.i13.
- 576 Lazicki, P.A., M. Liebman, and M.M. Wander. 2016. Root parameters show how management  
577 alters resource distribution and soil quality in conventional and low-input cropping  
578 systems in central Iowa. *PLoS ONE* 11(10): 1–19. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0164209.
- 579 Lenth, R., H. Singmann, and J. Love. 2018. Emmeans: Estimated marginal means, aka least-  
580 squares means. Comprehensive R Archive Network (CRAN). [https://cran.r-  
581 project.org/web/packages/emmeans/index.html](https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/emmeans/index.html)
- 582 Liebman, M., L.R. Gibson, D.N. Sundberg, A.H. Heggenstaller, P.R. Westerman, et al. 2008.  
583 Agronomic and economic performance characteristics of conventional and low-external-  
584 input cropping systems in the central Corn Belt. *Agronomy Journal* 100(3): 600–610. doi:  
585 10.2134/AGRONJ2007.0222.
- 586 Lynch, J.P. 2013. Steep, cheap and deep: An ideotype to optimize water and N acquisition by  
587 maize root systems. *Annals of Botany* 112(2): 347–357. doi: 10.1093/aob/mcs293.
- 588 McCulloch, C.E., and J.M. Neuhaus. 2005. Generalized linear mixed models. *Encyclopedia of  
589 Biostatistics*. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, Chichester, UK
- 590 Meese, B.G., P.R. Carter, E.S. Oplinger, and J.W. Pendleton. 1991. Corn/soybean rotation effect  
591 as influenced by tillage, nitrogen, and hybrid/cultivar. *Journal of Production Agriculture*  
592 4(1): 74. doi: 10.2134/jpa1991.0074.

- 593 Miguez, F. 2021. nlraa: Nonlinear Regression for Agricultural Applications. Comprehensive R  
594 Archive Network (CRAN). <https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/nlraa/index.html>
- 595 Miguez, F., S. Archontoulis, H. Dokooohaki, B. Glaz, and K.M. Yeater. 2018. Chapter 15:  
596 Nonlinear Regression Models and Applications. Applied Statistics in Agricultural,  
597 Biological, and Environmental Sciences. American Society of Agronomy, Crop Science  
598 Society of America, and Soil Science Society of America, Inc. p. 401–448
- 599 Mortensen, D.A., and R.G. Smith. 2020. Confronting barriers to cropping system diversification.  
600 Frontiers in Sustainable Food Systems 4. doi: 10.3389/FSUFS.2020.564197/PDF.
- 601 Moss, G.I., K.C. Hall, and M.B. Jackson. (1988). Ethylene and the responses of roots of maize  
602 (*Zea mays* L.) to physical impedance. New Phytologist, 109(3): 303-  
603 311. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-8137.1988.tb04199.x>
- 604 Nichols, V.A., R.A. Ordóñez, E.E. Wright, M.J. Castellano, M. Liebman, J.L Hatfield, M.  
605 Helmers, and S.V. Archontoulis. 2019. Maize root distributions strongly associated with  
606 water tables in Iowa, USA. Plant and Soil, 444(1): 225-238.  
607 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11104-019-04269-6>
- 608 Nickel, S.E., R.K. Crookston, and M.P. Russelle. 1995. Root growth and distribution are affected  
609 by corn-soybean cropping sequence. Agronomy Journal 87(5): 895–902. doi:  
610 10.2134/agronj1995.00021962008700050020x.

- 611 Ordóñez, R.A., M.J. Castellano, J.L. Hatfield, M.J. Helmers, M.A. Licht, et al. 2018. Maize and  
612 soybean root front velocity and maximum depth in Iowa, USA. *Field Crops Research*  
613 215(September 2017): 122–131. doi: 10.1016/j.fcr.2017.09.003.
- 614 Ordóñez, R.A., S.V. Archontoulis, R. Martinez-Feria, J.L. Hatfield, E.E. Wright, E.E. and M.J.  
615 Castellano. 2020. Root to shoot and carbon to nitrogen ratios of maize and soybean crops  
616 in the US Midwest. *European Journal of Agronomy*, 120: 126130. doi:  
617 10.1016/j.eja.2020.126130.
- 618 Osterholz, W.R., M. Liebman, and M.J. Castellano. 2018. Can soil nitrogen dynamics explain  
619 the yield benefit of crop diversification? *Field Crops Research* 219: 33–42. doi:  
620 10.1016/J.FCR.2018.01.026.
- 621 Pasley, H., V. Nichols, M. Castellano, M. Baum, E. Kladivko, et al. 2021. Rotating maize  
622 reduces the risk and rate of nitrate leaching. *Environmental Research Letters* 16(6):  
623 064063. doi: 10.1088/1748-9326/ABEF8F.
- 624 Payne, R.W. 2015. The design and analysis of long-term rotation experiments. *Agronomy*  
625 *Journal* 107: 772-785, doi:10.2134/agronj2012.0411.
- 626 Peterson, T.A., C.A. Shapiro, and A.D. Flowerday. 1990. Rainfall and previous crop effects on  
627 crop yields. *American Journal of Alternative Agriculture* 5(1): 33–37. doi:  
628 10.1017/S0889189300003209.
- 629 Pinheiro J and D Bates, R Core Team. 2022. nlme: Linear and Nonlinear Mixed Effects Models.  
630 R package version 3.1-157, <<https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=nlme>>.

- 631 Poffenbarger, H.J., D.C. Olk, C. Cambardella, J. Kersey, M. Liebman, et al. 2020. Whole-profile  
632 soil organic matter content, composition, and stability under cropping systems that differ  
633 in belowground inputs. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment* 291: 106810. doi:  
634 10.1016/J.AGEE.2019.106810.
- 635 Porter, P.M., J.G. Lauer, W.E. Lueschen, J.H. Ford, T.R. Hoverstad, et al. 1997. Environment  
636 affects the corn and soybean rotation effect. *Agronomy Journal* 89(3): 441–448. doi:  
637 10.2134/agronj1997.00021962008900030012x.
- 638 Rasse, D.P. and A.J. Smucker. 1998. Root recolonization of previous root channels in corn and  
639 alfalfa rotations. *Plant and Soil*, 204(2): 203-212.  
640 <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1004343122448>
- 641 R Core Team. 2020. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R foundation for  
642 Statistical Computing. <http://www.r-project.org/>.
- 643 Sawyer, J. and A. Mallarino. 2017. Use of the late-spring soil nitrate test in Iowa corn  
644 production, see:<https://store.extension.iastate.edu/product/Use-of-the-Late-Spring-Soil->  
645 Nitrate-Test-in-Iowa-Corn-Production.
- 646 Schilling, K.E., K.S. Chan, H. Liu, and Y.K. Zhang. 2010. Quantifying the effect of land use  
647 land cover change on increasing discharge in the Upper Mississippi River. *Journal of  
648 Hydrology* 387(3–4): 343–345. doi: 10.1016/j.jhydrol.2010.04.019.

- 649 Seifert, C.A., M.J. Roberts, and D.B. Lobell. 2017. Continuous corn and soybean yield penalties  
650 across hundreds of thousands of fields. *Agronomy Journal* 109(2): 541–548. doi:  
651 10.2134/agronj2016.03.0134.
- 652 Stanger, T.F., and J.G. Lauer. 2008. Corn grain yield response to crop rotation and nitrogen over  
653 35 years. *Agronomy Journal* 100(3): 643–650. doi: 10.2134/AGRONJ2007.0280.
- 654 Tamburini, G., R. Bommarco, T.C. Wanger, C. Kremen, M.G. Van Der Heijden, M. Liebman,  
655 and S. Hallin. 2020. Agricultural diversification promotes multiple ecosystem services  
656 without compromising yield. *Science advances*, 6(45), p.eaba1715.
- 657 Thorup-Kristensen, K., and J. Kirkegaard. 2016. Root system-based limits to agricultural  
658 productivity and efficiency: the farming systems context. *Annals of Botany*, 118(4):573–  
659 592.
- 660 Thorup-Kristensen, K., N. Halberg, M. Nicolaisen, J.E. Olesen, T.E. Crews, P. Hinsinger,  
661 J.Kirkegaard, A. Pierret, D.B. Dresbøll. 2020. Digging deeper for agricultural resources,  
662 the value of deep rooting. *Trends in Plant Science* 25(4):406-417.
- 663 Tron, S., G. Bodner, F. Laio, L. Ridolfi, and D. Leitner. 2015. Can diversity in root architecture  
664 explain plant water use efficiency? A modeling study. *Ecological Modelling* 312: 200–  
665 210. doi: 10.1016/J.ECOLMODEL.2015.05.028.
- 666 USDA National Agricultural Statistics Service Cropland Data Layer. 2021. Published corn data  
667 layer [Online]. USDA-NASS, Washington, DC. <https://nassgeodata.gmu.edu/CropScape/>  
668 (accessed 10 August 2021).

- 669 USDA National Agricultural Statistics Service. 2021. Quick Stats [Online]. USDA-NASS,  
670 Washington, DC. <https://quickstats.nass.usda.gov/> (accessed 10 August 2021).
- 671 Varvel, G.E. 2000. Crop rotation and nitrogen effects on normalized grain yields in a long-term  
672 study. *Agronomy Journal* 92(5): 938–941. doi: 10.2134/AGRONJ2000.925938X.
- 673 Vogel, A.M., and F.E. Below. 2018. Hybrid selection and agronomic management to lessen the  
674 continuous corn yield penalty. *Agronomy* 8(10): 228. doi:  
675 10.3390/AGRONOMY8100228.
- 676 Weisberger, D.A., M.D. McDaniel, J.G. Arbuckle, and M. Lieberman. 2021. Farmer perspectives  
677 on benefits of and barriers to extended crop rotations in Iowa, USA. *Agricultural &*  
678 *Environmental Letters* 6(2): e20049. doi: 10.1002/AEL2.20049.
- 679 Wickham, H., M. Averick, J. Bryan, W. Chang, L. McGowan, et al. 2019. Welcome to the  
680 Tidyverse. *Journal of Open Source Software* 4(43): 1686. doi: 10.21105/joss.01686.
- 681 Wood, S.N. 2011. Fast stable restricted maximum likelihood and marginal likelihood estimation  
682 of semiparametric generalized linear models. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society.*  
683 *Series B: Statistical Methodology* 73(1): 3–36. doi: 10.1111/J.1467-9868.2010.00749.X.
- 684 Zhang, X., H. Wan, F.W. Zwiers, G.C. Hegerl, and S.K. Min. 2013. Attributing intensification of  
685 precipitation extremes to human influence. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 40(19),  
686 pp.5252-5257. <https://doi.org/10.1002/grl.51010>

688    **10    Appendix. Supplementary Material**

689    The following figures are included as supplementary material:

690    **Figure S1** – Maximum rooting depth over time, raw dataset and unsmoothed fitted values

691    **Figure S2** - Yields, biomass over time, growth rate over time, harvest index, 500-kernal grain  
692    weight

693    **Figure S3** – Root to shoot ratios for 2019 and 2020

694    **Figure S4** - Soil penetration resistance by depth at various sampling points, approximate depths  
695    of tillage operations are provided for reference

696    **Figure S5** - Soil moisture and temperature at 30 and 45 cm depths in the maize phase of the  
697    short and extended rotations

698    **Figure S6** – Data from Lazicki et al. 2016

699    **Figure S7** – Simulated impact of changes in root front velocity on maize yield

700    The following tables are included as supplementary material:

701    **Table S1** – Summary of above-ground growth-analysis and rooting depth non-linear parameter  
702    fits


703    **Table S2** - Summary of ‘background’ root samples taken shortly after maize planting

704    **Table S3** - Summary of fixed effect tests on root mass

705    **Table S4** - Summary of contrasts for the complex versus short rotation for root mass added at  
706    each depth

707

708




709

710 **Figure S1 – Maximum rooting depth over time, raw dataset and unsmoothed fitted values**

711


712



713

714 **Figure S2.** Yields, biomass over time, growth rate over time, harvest index, 500-kernal grain


715 weight



716

717 *Figure S3. Root to shoot ratios for 2019 and 2020, with different background root decomposition  
 718 assumptions*


719



720


721 *Figure S4. Soil penetration resistance by depth at various sampling points, approximate depths*  
 722 *of tillage operations are provided for reference*

723



725 *Figure S5. Soil moisture at 30 and 45 cm depths in the maize phase of the complex (dark blue)*  
726 *and simple (pink) rotations; points represent individual sensor values, lines the estimated values,*  
727 *and ribbons the 95% confidence interval around the estimates FIGURE 5 ALSO SHOWS*  
728 *TEMPERATURE DATA*


729



730

731 **Figure S6 – Data from Lazicki et al. 2016 shows differences in maize root structures coinciding**  
732 *with maize yield differences in short and extended maize rotations in 2009*

733



734

735 **Figure S7** – Simulated impact of changes in root front velocity on maize yield. Simulations are  
 736 derived from results supporting the publication of Archontoulis et al. (2020), and the reader is  
 737 directed to that publication for more details

738 Archontoulis SV, Castellano MJ, Licht MA, Nichols V, Baum M, Huber I, Martinez- Feria R, Puntel  
 739 L, Ordóñez RA, Iqbal J, Wright EE. Predicting crop yields and soil- plant nitrogen dynamics  
 740 in the US Corn Belt. Crop Science. 2020 Mar;60(2):721-38.

741 Keating BA, Carberry PS, Hammer GL, Probert ME, Robertson MJ, Holzworth D, Huth NI,  
 742 Hargreaves JN, Meinke H, Hochman Z, McLean G. An overview of APSIM, a model  
 743 designed for farming systems simulation. European journal of agronomy. 2003 Jan 1;18(3-  
 744 4):267-88.

745 **Table S1.** Summary of 3-parameter logistic curve fits for rooting depth analyses and above-ground  
 746 growth-analyses, parameters that differed significantly by rotation ( $p < 0.05$ ) are bolded.

<b>Year</b>	<b>Rotation</b>	<b>Asym</b> (cm)	<b>xmid</b> (GDDs)	<b>scal</b>
<i>Rooting depth analysis</i>				
	Short	<b>74 (CI:50-98)</b>	455 (CI:357-553)	109 (CI:65-152)
	Extended	<b>82 (CI:59-106)</b>	436 (CI:338-534)	109 (CI:65-153)
<i>Above-ground growth analysis</i>				
2013	Short	<b>201 (CI:197-205)</b>	<b>210 (CI:209-211)</b>	10.9 (CI:9.9-11.9)
	Extended	<b>253 (CI:244-264)</b>	<b>207 (CI:205-210)</b>	13.3 (CI:11.5-15.3)
2014	Short	<b>326 (CI:316-336)</b>	204 (CI:203-206)	16.3 (CI:15-17.6)
	Extended	<b>351 (CI:341-363)</b>	205 (CI:203-207)	17.1 (CI:15.8-18.6)
2018	Short	<b>237 (CI:231-244)</b>	<b>191 (CI:190-193)</b>	12.6 (CI:11.6-13.7)
	Extended	<b>286 (CI:280-292)</b>	<b>196 (CI:195-197)</b>	13.7 (CI:12.8-14.8)
2019	Short	316 (CI:307-325)	218 (CI:216-219)	14.6 (CI:13.3-15.9)
	Extended	312 (CI:299-324)	219 (CI:217-222)	15.9 (CI:14.2-17.8)
2020	Short	289 (CI:283-295)	205 (CI:204-207)	12.4 (CI:9.7-14.7)
	Extended	299 (CI:292-307)	206 (CI:205-208)	12.7 (CI:9.5-15.2)

747

748

749

750 **Table S2.** Summary of 'background' root samples taken shortly before maize planting

Year	Replicate	Short rotation	Extended rotation
		Root Material ( $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ )	
2019	1	542	740
	2	158	1028
	3	119	248
	4	68	441
	<i>Mean</i>	222	614
2020	1	2753	281
	2	136	483
	3	182	982
	4	159	2048
	<i>Mean</i>	807	949

751

752 **Table S3.** Summary of fixed effect tests on root mass assuming no background root decomposition

Source	Assuming 0% background root decomposition	Assuming 100% background root decomposition
	p-value	p-value
Year	0.12	0.05
Rotation	0.76	0.87
Year x Rotation	0.91	0.15
Depth	0.58	<0.01
Year x Depth	0.31	0.92
<b>Rotation x Depth</b>	<b>0.01</b>	<b>0.07</b>
Year x Rotation x Depth	0.25	0.76

\*DF = Degrees of freedom

753

754 **Table S4.** Summary of root mass added contrasts for the extended versus short rotation at each  
755 depth; denominator degrees of freedom differ by depth due to missing data

Depth	Numerator	Denominator DF	F Ratio	p-value
	DF*			

---

Assuming no background root decomposition

0-15 cm	1	14.77	6.69	0.02
15-30 cm	1	16.07	0.08	0.78
30-45 cm	1	16.07	0.14	0.71
45-60 cm	1	16.07	0.56	0.47

---

## Assuming 100% background root decomposition

0-15 cm	1	36.72	5.60	0.02
15-30 cm	1	37.64	1.59	0.21
30-45 cm	1	37.64	0.25	0.62
45-60 cm	1	37.64	0.68	0.41

---

\*DF = Degrees of freedom

756

757

758

759

# The roots of the rotation effect run deep

1   **Gina A. Nichols<sup>1,2\*</sup>, William Osterholz<sup>1,3</sup>, Sotirios V. Archontoulis<sup>1</sup>, Matt Liebman<sup>1</sup>**

2   <sup>1</sup>Department of Agronomy, Iowa State University, Ames Iowa, USA

3   <sup>2</sup>Department of Agroecology, Aarhus University, Slagelse Denmark

4   <sup>3</sup>Soil Drainage Research Unit, USDA ARS, Columbus Ohio, USA

5   **\* Correspondence:**

6   Corresponding Author

7   [virginia.nichols@gmail.com](mailto:virginia.nichols@gmail.com)

8   (Present address) 514 Harrison Ave, Canon City CO 81212

9   **Highlights:**

- 10   • Over eight years, maize grown in a four-year (extended) rotation yielded an average of  
11       8% higher than maize grown in a two-year (short) rotation
- 12   • Maximum rooting depth of maize grown in the extended rotation averaged 11% deeper  
13       compared with maize in the short rotation
- 14   • Maize grown in the extended rotation invested less root biomass in the 0-15 cm soil  
15       stratum than did maize in the short rotation
- 16   • Maize grown in the extended rotation had a ‘steeper and deeper’ root structure compared  
17       with maize in the short rotation

18

19   **Abstract**

20   Context or problem

21   It is well-established that maize (*Zea mays* L.) grown in extended rotations produces higher grain  
22   yields compared to maize grown in one- or two-phase rotations, even when nitrogen (N) is not  
23   limiting. Understanding the mechanisms driving this phenomenon, commonly referred to as ‘the

24 rotation effect', is important for designing cropping systems that use land and resources  
25 efficiently. Differences in root systems can influence resource acquisition and therefore yield,  
26 but it is unknown if such differences play a role in the rotation effect.

27 Research question

28 We hypothesized that maize grown in an extended rotation system exhibits a deeper root  
29 structure with less biomass investment compared to maize grown in a short rotation, and that  
30 these characteristics would be correlated with differences in grain production.

31 Methods

32 Using a long-term experiment established in 2001, we measured maize rooting depth across the  
33 growing season, root biomass in 15 cm increments from 0-60 cm, and grain yields in the maize  
34 phase of two contrasting rotations: a 2-year rotation of maize/soybean (*Glycine max* [L.] Merr)  
35 using inorganic sources of nitrogen (N) and maximum tillage depths of 15 cm (hereafter the  
36 'short rotation'), and a 4-year rotation of maize/soybean/oat (*Avena sativa* L.)-alfalfa (*Medicago*  
37 *sativa* L.)/alfalfa using a mix of organic and inorganic N sources and inversion tillage to 25 cm  
38 (hereafter the 'extended rotation'). Additionally, we measured soil penetration resistance and soil  
39 moisture, and performed a growth analysis on aboveground maize biomass.

40 Results

41 From 2013-2020, maize grain yields in the extended rotation were equal to or significantly  
42 higher than in the short rotation, averaging 8% higher across eight years (11.0 and 10.2 dry Mg  
43 ha<sup>-1</sup>, respectively). In three seasons (2019-2021), the maximum rooting depth of maize in the  
44 extended rotation was significantly deeper than in the short rotation by an average of 11% (82  
45 versus 76 cm, respectively), although the timing (e.g., early season, late season) of the extended  
46 rotation's maize growth advantage was not consistent across years. At physiological maturity,

47 the two systems had similar amounts of root biomass from 0-60 cm soil depth, but maize grown  
48 in the extended rotation invested significantly less of that biomass (30% compared to 47%) into  
49 the soil surface layer (0-15 cm). The soil penetration resistances of the two systems differed in a  
50 manner consistent with the differing tillage regimes of the two rotations, however the patterns  
51 did not align with root differences.

52 **Conclusions**

53 We posit that the extended rotation's 'deeper and steeper' maize roots did not guarantee higher  
54 maize yields, but rather bestowed the plant with more flexibility in resource acquisition which, in  
55 certain conditions, resulted in higher grain yields compared to maize grown in the short rotation.

56 **Implications**

57 To our knowledge, this is the first report attempting to mechanistically link rooting patterns with  
58 plant growth in the context of the 'rotation effect.' This study enhances our understanding of  
59 how cropping system histories impact yields, and provides new data on yields and roots, both of  
60 which are highly relevant for sustainable intensification. While the present study focused on  
61 physical measurements, it suggests that more detailed exploration of how biological drivers  
62 impact root architecture is needed to gain a mechanistic understanding of the 'rotation effect.'

63 **Keywords**

64 Maize; crop rotation, roots, penetration resistance; alfalfa

65 **1 Introduction**

66 Over the past 60 years, the diversity of maize (*Zea mays* L.) production systems in the  
67 Midwestern United States (US) has been reduced, moving from multi-species rotations that  
68 included small grains and forage legumes to maize monocultures or simple alternations of maize  
69 and soybean (*Glycine max* [L.] Merr) (Aguilar et al., 2015; Hijmans et al., 2016; Crossley et al.,

70 2021). Presently, five states in the Midwestern US produce approximately one-sixth of the  
71 world's maize and soybean grain (FAO, 2020; USDA National Agricultural Statistics Service  
72 2021), and it follows that in the Midwestern US a significant amount of agricultural land is  
73 dedicated to a simplified maize/soybean system (Boryan et al., 2011; USDA National  
74 Agricultural Statistics Service Cropland Data Layer, 2021). Several unintended, but nonetheless  
75 undesirable outcomes have accompanied this simplification including but not limited to  
76 increased rates of soil erosion, increased risk of flooding, and increased risks of nitrate pollution  
77 (Hatfield et al., 2009, 2013; Schilling et al., 2010; Jones et al., 2018; Pasley et al., 2021). While  
78 cropping system re-diversification may offer avenues for ameliorating many of these issues  
79 (Tamburini et al. 2020), there are numerous barriers that currently exist to re-diversifying  
80 Midwestern systems (Mortensen and Smith, 2020; Weisberger et al., 2021). Regardless, there is  
81 value in understanding the mechanisms that may enable cropping system diversification to  
82 contribute to better agricultural outcomes.

83 Midwestern maize-based systems fall into three main categories: (1) continuous maize  
84 systems, wherein maize is grown for two or more consecutive seasons; (2) simple rotated maize  
85 systems, wherein maize is rotated with soybean; and (3) extended maize rotations, wherein  
86 maize is grown in a rotation with two or more years between maize crops, often including a  
87 small grain such as oats (*Avena sativa*) and/or a forage crop such as alfalfa (*Medicago sativa*).  
88 Using these definitions, as maize cropping systems move from monocultures to short rotations or  
89 from short to extended rotations, maize yields in the Midwest increase by approximately 10 and  
90 5%, respectively (Crookston et al. 1991; Gentry et al. 2013; Liebman et al., 2008; Davis et al.,  
91 2012), and occur even when nitrogen is not limiting (Osterholz et al. 2018; Baum et al. 2023).  
92 The former phenomenon is commonly referred to as the 'continuous maize penalty', and the

93 latter ‘the rotation effect’. To our knowledge it is unclear whether they are distinct expressions of  
94 unique mechanisms, or if they represent a continuum of the same mechanistic underpinnings.

95 There have been numerous studies in the US Midwest exploring the continuous maize  
96 penalty (Dick and Doren, 1985; Peterson et al., 1990; Meese et al., 1991; Crookston et al., 1991;  
97 Porter et al., 1997; Varvel, 2000; Stanger and Lauer, 2008; Gentry et al., 2013; Al-Kaisi et al.,  
98 2015; Farmaha et al., 2016; Seifert et al., 2017; Vogel and Below, 2018; Bowles et al., 2020).  
99 There is evidence it is due, at least in part, to yield suppressive mechanisms in the monoculture  
100 system, potentially due to soil biological conditions that may constrain root development and  
101 therefore resource capture (Crookston et al., 1988; Johnson et al., 1992; Nickel et al., 1995;  
102 Goldstein, 2000). The maize yield advantage accrued from extending short rotations to include  
103 small grains and forage legumes has received less attention compared to the continuous maize  
104 penalty, but has likewise been well-documented (Lieberman et al., 2008; Stanger and Lauer, 2008;  
105 Coulter et al., 2011). To our knowledge the mechanisms driving the rotation effect in  
106 Midwestern maize systems remain uncertain, partially due to the complex changes in  
107 management attendant to extended rotations, rendering it difficult to attribute yield increases to a  
108 particular driver.

109 When above-ground crop products are valued, it is desirable for plants to optimize  
110 investments in belowground growth. In nitrogen- or water-limited environments, ‘steep, cheap  
111 and deep’ root ideotypes have been identified as the most efficient use of root investments  
112 (Lynch, 2013; Tron et al., 2015; Thorup-Kristensen and Kirkegaard 2016; Thorup-Kristensen et  
113 al. 2020). It is therefore feasible that maize grown in extended rotations could also benefit from  
114 this root architecture ideotype. Many characteristics of extended rotations may promote deeper  
115 crop roots. In a long-term cropping systems research experiment in Iowa (Lieberman et al., 2008;

116 Davis et al., 2012) researchers have found differences in the vertical distributions of resources,  
117 microbial communities, and nutrient cycling activity in soil profiles of simple and complex  
118 maize systems (Lazicki et al., 2016; King and Hofmockel, 2017; Osterholz et al., 2018;  
119 Poffenbarger et al., 2020; Baldwin-Kordick et al., 2022), all of which might impact, or be  
120 impacted by, root architectures. Indeed, Lazicki et al. (2016) found differences in maize root  
121 distributions in plots with varying rotation histories, but the data were limited to shallow depths  
122 (0-20 cm) and did not control for previous crop root carryover, which may impact interpretations  
123 (Hirte et al. 2017).

124 We hypothesized that maize grown in extended rotations develops a deeper root structure  
125 with less biomass investment compared to maize in a short rotation, and that these differences  
126 would be correlated with differences in grain production. To test this hypothesis, we made the  
127 following measurements in the maize phase of short (maize/soybean) and extended  
128 (maize/soybean/oats-alfalfa/alfalfa) rotations:

- 129 1. Maize grain yields from eight growing seasons (2013-2020)
- 130 2. Maize root biomass from 0-60 cm soil depths as a proxy for the resources invested by the
- 131 maize crop into roots in two growing seasons (2019-2020)
- 132 3. Maximum maize rooting depth as a proxy for the soil space made available for resource
- 133 capture by that investment in three growing seasons (2018-2020)

134 Additionally, we complemented these measurements with detailed aboveground maize  
135 growth analysis throughout five seasons (2013, 2014, 2018, 2019, 2020); soil penetration  
136 resistance measurements in three seasons (2018-2020); and soil moisture and temperature  
137 measurements in two seasons (2018-2019).

138 **2 Methods and Materials**

139     **2.1 Study location**

140         The experimental site was located at the Iowa State University Marsden Farm, in Boone  
141         County, Iowa, USA ( $42^{\circ}01' N$ ;  $93^{\circ}47' W$ ; 333 m above sea level). Dominant soil series were  
142         Clarion loam, Nicollet loam, and Webster clay loam, all of which are Mollisols. Before the  
143         initiation of the experiment, the site had been managed for at least 20 years with a maize-  
144         soybean rotation receiving conventional fertilizer and herbicide inputs. Baseline soil samples (0-  
145         20 cm) showed a mean buffer pH of 6.8 and mean organic matter concentration of  $51 \text{ g kg}^{-1}$   
146         (Liebman et al., 2008). The experiment was arranged as a randomized complete block design  
147         with each crop phase of each rotation system present every year in four replicate blocks (Payne,  
148         2015). Plots were 18 m by 84 m, with the entire experiment comprising ~9 hectares. Weather  
149         data were collected from a weather station approximately one kilometer from the field site (Iowa  
150         Environmental Mesonet, 2021).

151     **2.2 Sampling**

152         This study utilized two of the three maize-based rotations present in the larger study: a 2-year  
153         rotation of maize/soybean (hereafter the short rotation), and a 4-year rotation of  
154         maize/soybean/oat-alfalfa/alfalfa that periodically received composted cattle manure (hereafter  
155         the extended rotation). Oat straw and alfalfa were harvested and removed from the research site;  
156         no grazing occurred on the plots. Detailed accounts of plot management are reported elsewhere  
157         (Liebman et al., 2008; Hunt et al., 2020) and a summary is presented in **Table 1**. Maize grain  
158         yield was measured in 2013-2020, and additional measurements were taken in select years  
159         during that period (**Table 2**).

160

161

162

163

164

165 *Table 1. Summary of agronomic management of the two rotation treatments housing the maize*

166 *phase (bolded) sampled in this study; for more details see Liebman et al. 2008 and Hunt et al.*

167 *2020*

Rotation	Crop sequence	Nitrogen sources	Tillage regime
Short 2-year	Soybean/ <b>Maize</b>	Mean total of 180 kg ha <sup>-1</sup> inorganic nitrogen applied to maize phase, with 112 kg ha <sup>-1</sup> applied at planting and the remaining at V6 side-dressing based on soil nitrate sampling (Sawyer and Mallarino 2017)	Fall chisel plowing and spring field cultivation preceding soybean planting, spring surface cultivation preceding maize planting
Extended 4-year	Soybean/ Oat-Alfalfa/ Alfalfa/ <b>Maize</b>	Mean of 140 kg ha <sup>-1</sup> organic nitrogen applied as composted cattle manure the fall preceding the maize phase, and 32 kg ha <sup>-1</sup> inorganic N applied at V6 side-dressing based on soil nitrate sampling (Sawyer and Mallarino 2017)	Fall chisel plowing and spring surface cultivation preceding soybean planting, no tillage events preceding oat/alfalfa planting, fall moldboard plowing of the alfalfa crop followed by spring disking and surface cultivation preceding maize planting

168

169

170 **2.3 Statistical analysis**

171 Statistical analyses were conducted using *R* version 4.0.2 (R Core Team, 2020) with the

172 *tidyverse* suite of packages (Wickham et al., 2019) or JMP Pro 17.0 (SAS Institute, Cary, North

173 Carolina, USA). Additional R packages were used for specific analyses as described below.  
174 Significance thresholds for statistical tests was set at  $p=0.05$  unless noted otherwise. In all cases  
175 several statistical models were fit and compared using Akaike's Information Criteria (AIC;  
176 Kuha, 2004) and residual plots, but only the model chosen as providing the best fit is reported.  
177 All data used in this manuscript are available in csv format and as an R package available for  
178 download (<https://github.com/vanichols/maRsden>). The R code used to perform these analyses  
179 and create manuscript figures is available in a public Github repository (will be made public  
180 once manuscript is accepted for publication).

181 **2.4 Grain yields, harvest indices, grain weights, and root-to-shoot ratios**

182 The effect of rotation treatment (short, extended) on maize grain yields was assessed  
183 using a linear mixed effects model with rotation, year-factor, and their interaction as fixed  
184 effects, and block nested within a year-factor as a random intercept using R package *lme4* (Bates  
185 et al., 2015). The R packages *emmeans* (Lenth et al., 2018) and *lmerTest* (Kuznetsova et al.,  
186 2017) were used for comparisons and statistical summaries of the model, using a Tukey  
187 adjustment for multiple comparisons.

188 Differences in harvest indices, 500-grain weights, and the root-to-shoot ratios were  
189 assessed using a linear mixed effects model with rotation, a year-factor, and their interaction as  
190 fixed effects and a random block intercept, with a Tukey adjustment for multiple comparisons.

191 **2.5 Rooting depth**

192 We modeled rooting depth as a function of the cumulative maize growing-degree-days  
193 (GDDs) accrued since planting (base temperature 10° C, maximum temperature 30° C) to  
194 facilitate comparisons between years. Non-linear models were fit using the R package *nlraa*  
195 package (Miguez, 2021). We tried several non-linear models fit to both the raw data and the data

196 filtered to remove measurements taken after the season's maximum depth had been reached  
197 (**Figure S1**). We found a three-parameter logistic curve (Archontoulis et al., 2015) fit to the  
198 filtered data produced the best fit according to AIC and inspection of residuals:

199 Eqn. 1 
$$rootdepth(GDD) = \frac{A_{sym}}{(1+\exp(\frac{(x_{mid}-GDD)}{scal}))}$$

200 where  $rootdepth(GDD)$  is the maximum rooting depth at a given cumulative GDD after planting  
201 and  $A_{sym}$ ,  $x_{mid}$ , and  $scal$  are estimated parameters.  $A_{sym}$  represents the maximum rooting depth  
202 achieved,  $x_{mid}$  represents the cumulative GDD value at which half of the maximum rooting depth  
203 was achieved, and  $scal$  describes the steepness of the curve (Miguez et al., 2018). We found the  
204 best model fit incorporated a fixed effect of rotation on  $A_{sym}$ ,  $scal$ , and  $x_{mid}$ ; a random effect of a  
205 year-factor on  $A_{sym}$ ,  $x_{mid}$ , and  $scal$ ; a random effect of block on  $A_{sym}$ ; and a power variance  
206 structure (Pinheiro and Bates 2022).

*Table 2. Summary of measurements used for this study*

<b>Measurement</b>	<b>Years</b>	<b>Description</b>
Maize grain yield	2013-2020	Maize grain yield was determined using a 6-row combine equipped with a yield monitor and moisture meter. Sampling areas for yield were approximately 4.6 m x 84 m and were six rows away from plot edges. All yields are reported on a dry weight basis.
Maize above-ground biomass	2013, 2014, 2018, 2019, 2020	Maize above-ground biomass was measured approximately every two weeks throughout the season. Eight plants were cut at ground level, separated into leaf, stem, and reproductive components, dried at 60° C for at least 72 hours, then weighed.
Maize maximum rooting depth	2018, 2019, 2020	Maximum maize rooting depth was measured starting at 20, 23, and 41 days after planting in 2018, 2019, and 2020, respectively. Sampling was repeated approximately every 2 weeks until 84, 106, and 151 days after planting in 2018, 2019, and 2020, respectively. Maximum rooting depth was determined visually using the protocol of Ordóñez et al. (2018). A soil core was drawn with a 19-mm-diameter soil probe, white roots were identified, and their depth recorded to the nearest cm using a meter stick. At a given date, samples were taken repeatedly from the same core location until no white roots were identified in the core. Four cores were taken per plot at each sampling date.
Soil moisture and temperature at 15 and 45 cm depths	2018, 2019	STM soil moisture and temperature sensors (METER Group Inc., Pullman, WA, USA) were installed at two depths (15 and 45 cm) in each plot. Data were recorded hourly during the growing season using EMSO data loggers.
Penetration resistance	2018, 2019	Penetration resistance was measured using a FieldScout 900 Soil Compaction Meter (Spectrum Technologies, Inc., Aurora, IL, USA). Values were recorded every 2.54 cm to 45 cm depth immediately following planting and/or approximately 60 days after planting. Ten measurements were taken randomly throughout each plot. Measurements were taken within two days after a saturating rain to avoid capturing differences due to soil moisture.
Maize root mass 0-60 cm	2019, 2020	Maize root mass to a soil depth of 60 cm was measured at 3 and 105 days after planting in 2019, and at 4 and 117 days after planting in 2020. Four soil samples per plot were drawn at a location 10 cm from maize rows in 15 cm depth increments using a 32-mm-diameter soil probe. Soil from each depth increment within a plot was composited and roots were recovered using a sequence of elutriation (washing), flotation, recovery from organic debris using tweezers and a stereo microscope, drying, and weighing (Dietzel et al., 2017).

209    **2.6 Root mass**

210       Distinguishing newly added root biomass from the previous year's crop and weed root  
211       biomass is difficult using visual sorting, and failure to address these background levels of roots  
212       can lead to overestimates of new root mass, with the overestimate varying by cropping history  
213       (Hirte et al. 2017). To address this issue, the three main options currently available to field  
214       researchers include the use of isotopes, correction for background levels of root material by  
215       using a baseline measurement or root growth cores, or maintaining a crop- and weed-free area to  
216       track background levels throughout the season. We chose to take a background sample shortly  
217       after the maize crop was planted. Additional details of sampling protocols are presented in **Table**  
218       **2**. When interpreting the data, we used the two extreme assumption cases concerning the  
219       percentage of the sampled background roots that decayed between the start of the maize growing  
220       season (**Table 2**) and the last sampling date near maize physiological maturity: 0% background  
221       root decay, and 100% background root decay. The true amount of background roots present at  
222       the time of sampling falls between the extreme assumptions, and we therefore report the  
223       production of new crop root biomass as a range of possible values.

224       The Restricted Maximum Likelihood (REML) method for linear mixed effect models in  
225       JMP Pro 17.0 was used to evaluate the effects of rotation treatment on maize root mass  
226       production within four soil depth increments (0-15 cm, 15-30 cm, 30-45 cm, and 45-60 cm) for  
227       each of the extreme assumption cases. Year, rotation system, soil depth, and date were treated as  
228       fixed factors, and block and its interactions with the fixed factors were treated as random effects.  
229       Sampling depth was nested within year and rotation. Due to the inherently high variability of  
230       root measurements, for these analyses the threshold for investigating contrasts (as allowed by  
231       degrees of freedom) was set at  $p < 0.10$ .

232    **2.7 Growth analysis**

233       We modeled above-ground biomass as a function of day-of-year using a three-parameter  
234   logistic curve (Eqn. 1), as it provided the best fit of all the non-linear models assessed (logistic,  
235   Richards, Gompertz, Weibull, Beta; Miguez et al. 2018) based on AIC criteria. A model using  
236   GDDs produced similar results, but we chose to report the model using calendar days because it  
237   was conceptually easier to compare systems. A separate model was fit for each rotation in each  
238   year to allow for derivatives to be taken for each rotation in each year. For visualization  
239   purposes, the first- and second-order derivatives of the fitted equation were used to visualize the  
240   absolute and relative growth rates over time, allowing for visualization of when differences in  
241   growth rates occurred rather than relying on parameter interpretations alone. The effect of  
242   rotation on fitted parameters was assessed using the *confint* function of base R.

243   **2.8 Root-to-shoot ratios**

244       A root-to-shoot ratio for each experimental unit was estimated using the range in possible  
245   root additions in the 0-60 cm soil profile and the maximum above-ground biomass as predicted  
246   by the growth analysis (see Section 2.7). In Iowa, maize roots in the 0-60 cm depth increment  
247   account for more than 90% of total root mass (Nichols et al. 2019) but will nonetheless provide  
248   an underestimate of the root-to-shoot ratio (Ordóñez et al. 2020). We therefore calculated the  
249   ratio to be interpreted as relative, rather than absolute, values.

250   **2.9 Penetration resistance**

251       Penetration resistance was statistically modelled separately for each year and date of  
252   sampling using a generalized additive mixed model with a fixed intercept effect of rotation

253 treatment, a fixed ‘wiggle’ component of rotation treatment, five knots, and a random ‘wiggle’  
254 effect of block. Generalized additive models can model highly non-linear relationships and are  
255 useful when the goal is to compare treatments rather than to create predictions. The *gamm*  
256 function of the R package *mgcv* (McCulloch and Neuhaus, 2005; Wood, 2011) was used, and the  
257 *emmeans* package was used to assess pairwise comparison significance. Models were fit using  
258 both the raw and square-root-transformed data. Although the model on the transformed data  
259 produced a better fit according to inspection of residuals, statistical conclusions were not  
260 different in the two models so the results from the untransformed data are presented for ease in  
261 interpretation.

## 262 **2.10 Soil moisture and temperature**


263 The hourly soil moisture and temperature data were averaged over 24-hour periods  
264 (12:00 am to 11:59 pm) for analysis. The daily means were modelled statistically as a function of  
265 day-of-year separately for each year and depth using a generalized additive mixed model with a  
266 fixed intercept effect of rotation treatment, a fixed ‘wiggle’ component of rotation treatment, 35  
267 knots, and a random ‘wiggle’ effect of block using the R package *mgcv*.

## 268 **3 Results**

### 269 **3.1 Grain yields and weather**

270 Maize yields ranged from 7.0 to 12.7 dry Mg ha<sup>-1</sup> over the 2013-2020 study period. The  
271 effect of rotation depended on year ( $p<0.001$ ; **Figure 1**), with the maize grown in the extended  
272 rotation producing significantly higher ( $p<0.01$ ) grain yields in five (2013, 2014, 2016, 2017,  
273 and 2018) of the eight years. Averaged over all years, maize grown in the short rotation yielded a  
274 mean of 10.2 dry Mg ha<sup>-1</sup>, while maize grown in the extended rotation yielded 8% higher with a  
275 mean grain yield of 11.0 dry Mg ha<sup>-1</sup>.

276 Over the past 30 years, from 15-April through 15-October the research site averaged 597  
 277 mm of precipitation with a mean air temperature of 19° C. From 2013-2020, growing season  
 278 weather conditions varied considerably compared to these long-term averages, with the grain  
 279 yield dataset capturing conditions in all four temperature/precipitation combinations (**Figure 1**).  
 280 Years that included growth analyses were likewise represented in all four quadrants, and the  
 281 three years with full datasets (grain yields, growth analysis, root data) represented all but cool  
 282 and wet conditions.




283

284 *Figure 1. Maize yields and growing season weather; (left) mean maize grain yields (n = 4) in the*  
285 *extended (dark blue, solid, triangles) and short (pink, dashed, squares) rotations from 2013-2020*  
286 *(lines connecting points for ease in viewing), years with significantly different yields (p<0.01)*  
287 *indicated with asterisks and bolded year font; (right) growing season precipitation and mean air*  
288 *temperatures of each measurement year as compared to 30-year means (dotted lines) with size of*  
289 *points proportional to the extended rotation's maize mean yield advantage over the short*  
290 *rotation, and point color representing the measurement set for that year.*

291 **3.2 Rooting depth**

292 The rooting depth of the maize grown in the extended rotation trended consistently  
293 deeper in the majority of sampling times in all three growing seasons (**Figure 2**). The maximum  
294 rooting depths in 2018 were shallow (~50 cm) due to an extremely wet year (**Figure 1**) that  
295 caused consistently shallow water tables as documented at a nearby experimental site (Ebrahimi  
296 et al. 2019). Rotation affected maize maximum rooting depth ( $A_{sym}$ ; p<0.01; **Table S1**),  
297 estimated at 11% deeper in the extended rotation compared to the short (82 cm and 76 cm,  
298 respectively). While the extended rotation roots also descended faster, the effect was not  
299 statistically significant ( $x_{mid}$ ; p=0.19).

300



301


302 *Figure 2. Maize rooting depth across three growing seasons (2018, 2019, 2020; refer to Figure*  
 303 *1 for weather conditions) in short (pink, dashed, squares) and extended (dark blue, solid,*  
 304 *triangles) rotations; points represent individual measurements, lines represent the non-linear*  
 305 *model fits, italic text is the maize stage; model uncertainty is omitted for visual simplicity but can*  
 306 *be viewed in supplemental material (Figure S1); first points at 0 depth indicate maize planting*  
 307 *date.*

308 **3.3 Root mass**

309 Root mass present at maize planting (hereafter ‘background’ root mass) ranged from 68  
 310 to 2753 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>, with the extended rotation tending to have higher amounts (**Table S2**). Year  
 311 interactions were not significant, (**Table S2**), so results are presented as marginal estimates over

312 years. At the 0-15 cm depth increment, the root mass added in the two systems differed  
313 significantly ( $p = 0.02$ ; **Table S3**), regardless of background root decomposition assumptions;  
314 the short rotation added between 314 (standard error of the mean [SE]:110) and 506 (SE:56) kg  
315  $\text{ha}^{-1}$ , while maize grown in the extended rotation added between 101 (SE:110) and 321 (SE:55)  
316 kg  $\text{ha}^{-1}$  of root mass (**Figure 3**). The extended rotation's lower maize biomass relative to the  
317 short rotation in the top 15 cm was counterbalanced by higher biomass relative to the short  
318 rotation in soil layers deeper than 15 cm (**Figure 3**). Although these differences were not  
319 significant (**Table S3**), this pattern resulted in the total root biomass of the two rotations being  
320 statistically equivalent. Dietzel et al. (2017) studied maize root growth using in-growth cores and  
321 found maize added 480-560 kg  $\text{ha}^{-1}$  in root material over the growing season in the top 30 cm of  
322 soil, suggesting the ranges found in our study are reasonable (**Figure 3**).

323



324

325 *Figure 3. (Left) Possible ranges in mean maize root mass production (n=8) depending on*  
 326 *assumed rate of decomposition of root mass present at planting ('background' roots) for maize*  
 327 *grown in the short (pink) and extended (dark blue) rotations separated by depth and (right)*  
 328 *range in total possible root biomass for 0-60 cm. Data are averages from two growing seasons.*

### 329 3.4 Growth analysis

330 The maximum aboveground maize biomass ( $Asym$ ; Eqn. 1) as estimated from the growth  
 331 analysis was significantly higher in the extended rotation in the years when the extended rotation  
 332 yielded significantly higher grain yields, but were not different in years without significant  
 333 differences in grain yields (Table 3; Figure S2; Table S1). The date at which the maize

334 achieved half of its maximum biomass ( $xmid$ ; Eqn. 1) was significantly earlier in the extended  
335 rotation in 2013 ( $p = 0.05$ ) and exhibited higher absolute growth rates compared to the short  
336 rotation before maximum growth rates were achieved (e.g. early in the season; **Figure S2**).  
337 Conversely,  $xmid$  for the extended rotation occurred significantly later than for the short rotation  
338 in 2018 ( $p < 0.01$ ) and had higher absolute growth rates after maximum growth rates were  
339 achieved (e.g. later in the season). The timings of growth were not significantly different in the  
340 other three years with growth data. The maximum growth rates in the two rotations ( $scal$ ; Eqn. 1)  
341 were not significantly different in any of the five years. The harvest index and 500-kernel  
342 weights were consistently higher in years with large rotation effects on grain yield but did not  
343 differ in years that lacked a strong rotation effect (**Table 3**).

344 The root-to-shoot ratios ranged from 0.002 to 0.015 depending on the assumed  
345 background root decomposition (**Figure S3**). Trends were inconclusive due to the variation  
346 produced by the assumptions leading to calculation of the ratios. While these root-to-shoot ratios  
347 are lower than those reported in literature for maize (e.g., 0.09 from Ordóñez et al. 2020), our  
348 root measurement methodology and driving questions differed, and our total root biomasses are  
349 consistent with other studies that control for background root amounts (e.g. Dietzel et al. 2017).

350 *Table 3. Summary of characteristics of maize in the extended rotation relative to maize in the*  
351 *short rotation, including grain yields (Figure 1), root characteristics (Figures 2, 3) growth*  
352 *analysis (Figure S2, Table S4), and yield components (Figure S2) for years with growth analysis*  
353 *data, ordered by magnitude of grain yield differentials; ratios of values are presented to simplify*  
354 *visual comparisons of rotations*

Year	Ratio of extended:short	Extended rotation's maize maximum	Timing of extended rotation's	Ratio of extended:short	Ratio of extended:short
------	-------------------------	-----------------------------------	-------------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------

	<b>rotation maize grain yield<sup>†</sup></b>	<b>rooting depth/surface roots relative to short rotation</b>	<b>maize growth advantage<sup>‡</sup></b>	<b>rotation harvest index</b>	<b>rotation 500- kernal weight</b>
2018	1.20	Deeper/-	Late season	1.08	1.13
2013	1.10	-	Early season	1.04	-
2014	1.06	-	ns	ns	-
2020	ns	Deeper/steeper	ns	ns	ns
2019	ns	Deeper/steeper	ns	ns	ns

<sup>†</sup>Ordered by largest to smallest estimated rotation effect on maize grain yield

<sup>‡</sup>Early season refers to periods before the maximum maize growth rate occurred, late season to periods after

\* ns: not significant at p=0.05

- indicates those data were not collected that year

355

356 **3.5 Penetration resistance**

357 Penetration resistance above 30 cm soil depth was consistently lower in the extended  
 358 rotation compared with the short rotation, regardless of year or sampling period (planting, late  
 359 season; **Figure S4**). From 0-30 cm, the extended and short rotations had mean penetration  
 360 resistances of 0.6 and 0.7 MPa at planting, and 1.1 and 1.5 MPa at late season sampling,  
 361 respectively, corresponding to a 20% lower penetration resistance in the top 30 cm. From 30 to  
 362 45 cm, on average the extended rotation had higher penetration resistance compared to the short

363 by an average of 22% (1.1 MPa/0.9 MPa at planting, and 1.7/1.4 MPa in the late season,  
364 respectively).

365 **3.6 Soil moisture and temperature**

366 In both years of measurement, soil moisture at 15 cm depth in the extended rotation was  
367 significantly lower than in the short rotation for the first month following planting (**Figure S5**).  
368 After that period, the effects of rotation on soil moisture were not consistent across years; in  
369 2018 the short rotation soil was consistently wetter than the extended rotation at both 15 cm and  
370 45 cm depths, but in 2019 there was no difference. In 2018, the extended rotation's lower soil  
371 moisture at 15 cm was concomitant with a significantly higher soil temperature compared to the  
372 short rotation by ~0.5 deg Celsius, but otherwise showed no consistent trends (**Figure S5**).

373 **4 Discussion**

374 Compared to maize grown in a short rotation, we found maize grown in an extended  
375 rotation had consistently deeper maximum rooting depths during three years of measurement in  
376 widely varying weather conditions (**Figures 1 and 2**), and a root system that was more evenly  
377 distributed from 0-60 cm in two years of measurements (**Figure 3**), corroborating evidence from  
378 Lazicki et al. (2016) (**Figure S6**).

379 The hypothesis that these 'steeper and deeper' root characteristics are a consistent feature  
380 of the extended rotation requires further testing, but the data collected in the present study  
381 provide support for such a hypothesis. These potentially consistent differences in root  
382 characteristics did not, however, significantly enhance grain yields in every year (**Figure 1**). We  
383 posit that through changes in physical, chemical, and biological soil properties, the extended  
384 rotation provides opportunities for maize roots to grow 'deeper and steeper,' possibly positioning  
385 the plant to access resources (i.e., water and nutrients) that may be, or may become, available in

386 deeper soil layers. The feasibility of these interactions is supported by a simulation model that  
387 varied root front velocities in maize (and therefore maximum rooting depths); the simulation  
388 showed that the impact of deeper rooting on maize yields depended heavily on the year, and that  
389 the magnitude of yield impact was comparable to that which we observed (unpublished data;  
390 **Figure S7**).

391 The reasons for the ‘steeper and deeper’ root architecture are not clear. In a previous  
392 study, in which Bay et al. (2021) drew soil from the top 20 cm of plots in each rotation system,  
393 sieved and homogenized the soil, packed it into rhizotrons at the same bulk density, and grew  
394 maize for 21 days, the investigators found that even in the homogenized soil, maize grown in soil  
395 from the extended rotation had a maximum rooting depth ~30% deeper compared to the maize  
396 grown in the short rotation soil, as well as significantly thinner but more numerous roots.

397 Working with the same plots as in our study, King and Hofmockel (2017) found microbial  
398 biomass was both higher and more evenly distributed in the top 20 cm of the extended rotation  
399 soil compared to the short rotation, which, if biological drivers are realized in the field, could be  
400 contributing to the differences in root distributions seen in the present study. Results from Bay et  
401 al. (2021) and King and Hofmockel (2017), combined with the lack of correlation between root  
402 distribution patterns and physical measurements (soil penetration resistance, soil temperature,  
403 soil moisture) seen in our field study, provide support for the hypothesis that biological and/or  
404 chemical drivers in the soil contributed to root differences between maize in the extended- and  
405 short rotations.

406 Nonetheless, while biological and chemical drivers likely play a role, physical drivers  
407 may still be contributing to the ‘steeper and deeper’ maize roots in the extended rotation in the

408 field. The root legacy of the crop preceding maize (alfalfa in the extended rotation, soybean in  
409 the short rotation) might have affected the maize root distributions. One study using mini-  
410 rhizotrons observed that when a maize crop followed alfalfa, the maize root distribution closely  
411 mimicked the alfalfa root distribution, with 41% of the maize roots following old alfalfa root  
412 channels (Rasse et al. 1998). Alfalfa root systems tend to be deeper than those of annual crops  
413 (Fan et al. 2016), and even with moldboard plowing (20-25 cm depth) used in our study, there  
414 would be intact decaying alfalfa root channels that the maize roots may have followed.

415 The extended rotation had higher penetration resistances from 30-45 cm depths compared  
416 to the short rotation, indicating differences in penetration resistance in bulk soil cannot explain  
417 the deeper rooting depths in the extended rotation. Previous work has shown that depth to the  
418 water table is associated with differences in maize roots (Nichols et al. 2019), and measured  
419 water table heights at this site in 2019 (unpublished data) showed the rotation treatment had no  
420 discernible effect on water table dynamics, indicating the differences in root distributions  
421 between the treatments were not due to differences in the depth to the water table.

422 Previous studies have found lower bulk densities and higher particulate organic matter in  
423 the extended rotation, which likely reflect the moldboard plowing of the alfalfa crop during the  
424 fall prior to maize planting as well as greater particulate organic matter from manure additions  
425 (Lazicki et al. 2016; Poffenbarger et al. 2020; Baldwin-Kordick et al., 2022). This is consistent  
426 with the lower penetration resistances observed in the present study in the top 30 cm, and likely  
427 explains the lower soil moisture observed in the extended rotation at planting. While neither  
428 system had absolute resistances high enough to meaningfully impede root penetration, the  
429 observed differences in penetration resistance in the surface layers (0.1-0.4 MPa) were of a  
430 magnitude that could potentially affect root elongation; a study done with intact soil cores found

431 resistances of only 0.3-0.5 MPa reduced maize seeding root elongation by 50-60% in a sandy  
432 loam soil (Bengough and Mullins, 1991).

433 While the rotation benefit observed in the present study was realized in a range of  
434 weather conditions (**Figure 1**), it was large in both the wettest (2018) and driest (2013) years.  
435 Many climate change scenarios project increased occurrences of precipitation extremes (Zhang  
436 et al. 2013), suggesting extended rotations may play an important role in building cropping  
437 system resilience to climate change, and that resilience may be due in part to differences in root  
438 architecture.

439 **5 Conclusion**

440 This study provides novel evidence that growing maize in extended rotations can result in  
441 changes to maize root structure including maximum rooting depths and vertical distributions.  
442 The observed changes in root structure may have affected below-ground resource acquisition by  
443 the crop, which may in turn have resulted in higher maize grain yields under certain conditions.  
444 Differences in penetration resistance and previous crop root legacies may contribute to altered  
445 maize root patterns, but there are likely additional biological and/or chemical drivers that are not  
446 well understood in field settings, and would benefit from targeted research. Potential impacts of  
447 this research include fine-tuning of crop models to account for cropping history-induced  
448 differences in maize rooting depth, investigating if/how genetics interact with extended rotations  
449 to further augment the benefits of deeper/steeper rooting in the Midwest, and investigating  
450 whether the patterns observed in this study hold in other crops.

451

452 6 Funding

453 This work was sponsored by the Foundation for Food and Agricultural Research (Grant  
454 #534264), the U.S. Department of Agriculture (Hatch project IOW10480), Iowa State  
455 University's Plant Sciences Institute and Department of Agronomy, and the Iowa Nutrient  
456 Research Center (Grant 2019-09). Pursuant to all requirements for public sharing of data and  
457 analyses, both can be found in an R package and Github repository (to be made public upon  
458 manuscript acceptance).

459 7 Acknowledgements

460 The authors thank David Sundberg, Matt Woods, and Emily Wright for managing the research  
461 site and equipment installation, and Mickala Stallman and Wyatt Westfall who contributed to  
462 data collection. We also thank Philip Dixon, Katherine Goode, Miranda Tilton and Fernando  
463 Miguez for advice and guidance on statistical analyses.

464 8 Author contributions

465 All authors contributed to data collection, GN and ML performed data analyses, GN wrote the  
466 initial draft of the manuscript, all authors contributed to editing of the final manuscript.

467 9 References

468 Aguilar, J., G.G. Gramig, J.R. Hendrickson, D.W. Archer, F. Forcella, et al. 2015. Crop species  
469 diversity changes in the United States: 1978–2012. PLoS ONE 10(8): e0136580. doi:  
470 10.1371/JOURNAL.PONE.0136580.

471 Al-Kaisi, M.M., S.V. Archontoulis, D. Kwaw-Mensah, and F. Miguez. 2015. Tillage and crop  
472 rotation effects on corn agronomic response and economic return at seven Iowa locations.  
473 Agronomy Journal 107(4): 1411–1424. doi: 10.2134/AGRONJ14.0470.

474 Archontoulis, S.V. and F.E. Miguez. 2015. Nonlinear regression models and applications in  
475 agricultural research. *Agronomy Journal* 107(2): 786–798. doi:  
476 10.2134/agronj2012.0506.

- 477 Baldwin-Kordick, R., M. De, M.D. Lopez, M. Liebman, N. Lauter, J. Marino and M.D.  
478 McDaniel. 2022. Comprehensive impacts of diversified cropping on soil health and  
479 sustainability. *Agroecology and Sustainable Food Systems* 46: 331–363,  
480 doi:10.1080/21683565.2021.2019167.
- 481 Ball, B.C., I. Bingham, R.M. Rees, C.A. Watson, and A. Litterick. 2005. The role of crop  
482 rotations in determining soil structure and crop growth conditions. *Canadian Journal of  
483 Soil Science*, 85(5): 557-577. <https://doi.org/10.4141/S04-078>
- 484 Bates, D., M. Mächler, B. Bolker, and S. Walker. 2015. Fitting linear mixed-effects models using  
485 lme4. *Journal of Statistical Software* 67(1): 1–48. doi: 10.18637/jss.v067.i01.
- 486 Baum, M.E, J.E. Sawyer, E.D. Nafziger, I. Huber, P.J. Thorburn, M.J. Castellano, and S.V.  
487 Archontoulis. 2023. Evaluating and improving APSIM's capacity in simulating long-term  
488 corn yield response to nitrogen in continuous-and rotated-corn systems. *Agricultural  
489 Systems* 207: 103629.
- 490 Bay, G., C. Lee, C. Chen, N.K. Mahal, M.J. Castellano, K.S. Hofmockel, L.J. Halverson 2021.  
491 Agricultural management affects the active rhizosphere bacterial community composition  
492 and nitrification. *mSystems*, 6(5):e00651-21. <https://doi.org/10.1128/mSystems.00651-21>
- 493 Bengough, A.G., and C.E. Mullins. 1991. Penetrometer resistance, root penetration resistance  
494 and root elongation rate in two sandy loam soils. *Plant and Soil*. 131(1): 59–66. doi:  
495 10.1007/BF00010420.

- 496 Boryan, C., Z. Yang, R. Mueller, and M. Craig. 2011. Monitoring US agriculture: the US  
497 Department of Agriculture, National Agricultural Statistics Service, Cropland Data Layer  
498 Program. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10106049.2011.562309> 26(5): 341–358. doi:  
499 10.1080/10106049.2011.562309.
- 500 Bowles, T.M., M. Mooshammer, Y. Socular, F. Calderón, M.A. Cavigelli, et al. 2020. Long-term  
501 evidence shows that crop-rotation diversification increases agricultural resilience to  
502 adverse growing conditions in North America. *One Earth* 2(3): 284–293. doi:  
503 10.1016/j.oneear.2020.02.007.
- 504 Coulter, J.A., C.C. Sheaffer, D.L. Wyse, M.J. Haar, P.M. Porter, et al. 2011. Agronomic  
505 performance of cropping systems with contrasting crop rotations and external inputs.  
506 *Agronomy Journal* 103(1): 182–192. doi: 10.2134/AGRONJ2010.0211.
- 507 Crookston, R.K., J.E. Kurle, P.J. Copeland, J.H. Ford, and W.E. Lueschen. 1991. Rotational  
508 cropping sequence affects yield of corn and soybean. *Agronomy Journal* 83(1): 108–113.  
509 doi: 10.2134/AGRONJ1991.00021962008300010026X.
- 510 Crookston, K.R., J.E. Kurle, and E. Lueschen. 1988. Relative ability of soybean, fallow, and  
511 triacontanol to alleviate yield reductions associated with growing corn continuously.  
512 *Crop Science* 28(1): 145–147. doi: 10.2135/CROPSCI1988.0011183X002800010031X.
- 513 Crossley, M.S., K.D. Burke, S.D. Schoville, and V.C. Radeloff. 2021. Recent collapse of crop  
514 belts and declining diversity of US agriculture since 1840. *Global Change Biology* 27(1):  
515 151–164. doi: 10.1111/GCB.15396.

- 516 Davis, A.S., J.D. Hill, C.A. Chase, A.M. Johanns, and M. Liebman. 2012. Increasing cropping  
517 system diversity balances productivity, profitability, and environmental health. PLoS  
518 ONE 7(10): e47149. doi: 10.1371/JOURNAL.PONE.0047149.
- 519 Dick, W.A., and D.M. van Doren. 1985. Continuous tillage and rotation combinations effects on  
520 corn, soybean, and oat yields. Agronomy Journal 77(3): 459–465. doi:  
521 10.2134/AGRONJ1985.00021962007700030023X.
- 522 Dietzel, R., M. Liebman, and S. Archontoulis. 2017. A deeper look at the relationship between  
523 root carbon pools and the vertical distribution of the soil carbon pool. SOIL 3(3): 139–  
524 152. doi: 10.5194/soil-3-139-2017.
- 525 Ebrahimi-Mollabashi, E., N.I. Huth, D.P. Holzwoth, R.A. Ordóñez, J.L. Hatfield, I. Huber, M.J.  
526 Castellano, and S.V. Archontoulis. 2019. Enhancing APSIM to simulate excessive  
527 moisture effects on root growth. Field Crops Research, 236: 58-67.  
528 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fcr.2019.03.014>
- 529 Fan, J., B. McConkey, H. Wang, and H. Janzen. 2016. Root distribution by depth for temperate  
530 agricultural crops. Field Crops Research, 189: 68-74. doi: 10.1016/j.fcr.2016.02.013.
- 531 Farmaha, B.S., K.M. Eskridge, K.G. Cassman, J.E. Specht, H. Yang, et al. 2016. Rotation impact  
532 on on-farm yield and input-use efficiency in high-yield irrigated maize–soybean systems.  
533 Agronomy Journal 108(6): 2313–2321. doi: 10.2134/AGRONJ2016.01.0046.

- 534 Gentry, L.F., M.L. Ruffo, and F.E. Below. 2013. Identifying factors controlling the continuous  
535 corn yield penalty. *Agronomy Journal* 105(2): 295–303. doi: 10.2134/agronj2012.0246.
- 536 Goldstein, W.A. 2000. The effect of farming systems on the relationship of corn root growth to  
537 grain yields. *American Journal of Alternative Agriculture* 15(3): 101–109. doi:  
538 10.1017/S0889189300008602.
- 539 Guo, L., Y. Liu, G.L. Wu, Z. Huang, Z. Cui, Z. Cheng, R.Q. Zhang, F.P. Tian, and H. He. 2019.  
540 Preferential water flow: Influence of alfalfa (*Medicago sativa* L.) decayed root channels  
541 on soil water infiltration. *Journal of Hydrology*, 578: 124019. doi:  
542 10.1016/j.jhydrol.2019.124019.
- 543 Hatfield, J.L., R.M. Cruse, and M.D. Tomer. 2013. Convergence of agricultural intensification  
544 and climate change in the Midwestern United States: implications for soil and water  
545 conservation. *Marine and Freshwater Research* 64(5): 423. doi: 10.1071/MF12164.
- 546 Hatfield, J.L., L.D. McMullen, and C.S. Jones. 2009. Nitrate-nitrogen patterns in the Raccoon  
547 River Basin related to agricultural practices. *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation*  
548 64(3): 190–199. doi: 10.2489/JSWC.64.3.190.
- 549 Hijmans, R.J., H. Choe, and J. Perlman. 2016. Spatiotemporal patterns of field crop diversity in  
550 the United States, 1870–2012. *Agricultural & Environmental Letters* 1(1): 160022. doi:  
551 10.2134/AEL2016.05.0022.
- 552 Hirte, J., J. Leifeld, S. Abiven, H.R. Oberholzer, A. Hammelehle, and J. Mayer. 2017.  
553 Overestimation of crop root biomass in field experiments due to extraneous organic  
554 matter. *Frontiers in Plant Science* 8:284. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2017.00284>

- 555 Hunt, N., M. Liebman, S. Thakrar, and J. Hill. 2020. Fossil energy use, climate change impacts,  
556 and air quality-related human health damages of conventional and diversified cropping  
557 systems in Iowa, USA. *Environmental Science & Technology* 54(18): 11002–11014. doi:  
558 10.1021/ACS.EST.9B06929.
- 559 Iowa Environmental Mesonet. 2021. National Weather Service Cooperative Observer Program  
560 (COOP). Iowa State University. <https://mesonet.agron.iastate.edu/> (accessed August  
561 2021).
- 562 Johnson, N.C., P.J. Copeland, R.K. Crookston, and F.L. Pfleger. 1992. Mycorrhizae: Possible  
563 explanation for yield decline with continuous corn and soybean. *Agronomy Journal*  
564 84(3): 387. doi: 10.2134/agronj1992.00021962008400030007x.
- 565 Jones, C.S., J.K. Nielsen, K.E. Schilling, and L.J. Weber. 2018. Iowa stream nitrate and the Gulf  
566 of Mexico. *PLoS ONE* 13(4): 1–17. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0195930.
- 567
- 568 King, A.E., and K.S. Hofmockel. 2017. Diversified cropping systems support greater microbial  
569 cycling and retention of carbon and nitrogen. *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment*  
570 240: 66–76. doi: 10.1016/j.agee.2017.01.040.
- 571 Kuha, J. 2004. AIC and BIC: Comparisons of assumptions and performance. *Sociological  
572 Methods and Research* 33(2): 188–229. doi: 10.1177/0049124103262065.

- 573 Kuznetsova, A., P.B. Brockhoff, and R.H.B. Christensen. 2017. lmerTest Package: Tests in  
574 linear mixed effects models. *Journal of Statistical Software* 82(13). doi:  
575 10.18637/jss.v082.i13.
- 576 Lazicki, P.A., M. Liebman, and M.M. Wander. 2016. Root parameters show how management  
577 alters resource distribution and soil quality in conventional and low-input cropping  
578 systems in central Iowa. *PLoS ONE* 11(10): 1–19. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0164209.
- 579 Lenth, R., H. Singmann, and J. Love. 2018. Emmeans: Estimated marginal means, aka least-  
580 squares means. Comprehensive R Archive Network (CRAN). [https://cran.r-](https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/emmeans/index.html)  
581 project.org/web/packages/emmeans/index.html
- 582 Liebman, M., L.R. Gibson, D.N. Sundberg, A.H. Heggenstaller, P.R. Westerman, et al. 2008.  
583 Agronomic and economic performance characteristics of conventional and low-external-  
584 input cropping systems in the central Corn Belt. *Agronomy Journal* 100(3): 600–610. doi:  
585 10.2134/AGRONJ2007.0222.
- 586 Lynch, J.P. 2013. Steep, cheap and deep: An ideotype to optimize water and N acquisition by  
587 maize root systems. *Annals of Botany* 112(2): 347–357. doi: 10.1093/aob/mcs293.
- 588 McCulloch, C.E., and J.M. Neuhaus. 2005. Generalized linear mixed models. *Encyclopedia of  
589 Biostatistics*. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, Chichester, UK
- 590 Meese, B.G., P.R. Carter, E.S. Oplinger, and J.W. Pendleton. 1991. Corn/soybean rotation effect  
591 as influenced by tillage, nitrogen, and hybrid/cultivar. *Journal of Production Agriculture*  
592 4(1): 74. doi: 10.2134/jpa1991.0074.

- 593 Miguez, F. 2021. nlraa: Nonlinear Regression for Agricultural Applications. Comprehensive R  
594 Archive Network (CRAN). <https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/nlraa/index.html>
- 595 Miguez, F., S. Archontoulis, H. Dokooohaki, B. Glaz, and K.M. Yeater. 2018. Chapter 15:  
596 Nonlinear Regression Models and Applications. Applied Statistics in Agricultural,  
597 Biological, and Environmental Sciences. American Society of Agronomy, Crop Science  
598 Society of America, and Soil Science Society of America, Inc. p. 401–448
- 599 Mortensen, D.A., and R.G. Smith. 2020. Confronting barriers to cropping system diversification.  
600 Frontiers in Sustainable Food Systems 4. doi: 10.3389/FSUFS.2020.564197/PDF.
- 601 Moss, G.I., K.C. Hall, and M.B. Jackson. (1988). Ethylene and the responses of roots of maize  
602 (*Zea mays* L.) to physical impedance. New Phytologist, 109(3): 303-  
603 311. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-8137.1988.tb04199.x>
- 604 Nichols, V.A., R.A. Ordóñez, E.E. Wright, M.J. Castellano, M. Liebman, J.L Hatfield, M.  
605 Helmers, and S.V. Archontoulis. 2019. Maize root distributions strongly associated with  
606 water tables in Iowa, USA. Plant and Soil, 444(1): 225-238.  
607 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11104-019-04269-6>
- 608 Nickel, S.E., R.K. Crookston, and M.P. Russelle. 1995. Root growth and distribution are affected  
609 by corn-soybean cropping sequence. Agronomy Journal 87(5): 895–902. doi:  
610 10.2134/agronj1995.00021962008700050020x.

- 611 Ordóñez, R.A., M.J. Castellano, J.L. Hatfield, M.J. Helmers, M.A. Licht, et al. 2018. Maize and  
612 soybean root front velocity and maximum depth in Iowa, USA. *Field Crops Research*  
613 215(September 2017): 122–131. doi: 10.1016/j.fcr.2017.09.003.
- 614 Ordóñez, R.A., S.V. Archontoulis, R. Martinez-Feria, J.L. Hatfield, E.E. Wright, E.E. and M.J.  
615 Castellano. 2020. Root to shoot and carbon to nitrogen ratios of maize and soybean crops  
616 in the US Midwest. *European Journal of Agronomy*, 120: 126130. doi:  
617 10.1016/j.eja.2020.126130.
- 618 Osterholz, W.R., M. Liebman, and M.J. Castellano. 2018. Can soil nitrogen dynamics explain  
619 the yield benefit of crop diversification? *Field Crops Research* 219: 33–42. doi:  
620 10.1016/J.FCR.2018.01.026.
- 621 Pasley, H., V. Nichols, M. Castellano, M. Baum, E. Kladivko, et al. 2021. Rotating maize  
622 reduces the risk and rate of nitrate leaching. *Environmental Research Letters* 16(6):  
623 064063. doi: 10.1088/1748-9326/ABEF8F.
- 624 Payne, R.W. 2015. The design and analysis of long-term rotation experiments. *Agronomy*  
625 *Journal* 107: 772-785, doi:10.2134/agronj2012.0411.
- 626 Peterson, T.A., C.A. Shapiro, and A.D. Flowerday. 1990. Rainfall and previous crop effects on  
627 crop yields. *American Journal of Alternative Agriculture* 5(1): 33–37. doi:  
628 10.1017/S0889189300003209.
- 629 Pinheiro J and D Bates, R Core Team. 2022. nlme: Linear and Nonlinear Mixed Effects Models.  
630 R package version 3.1-157, <<https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=nlme>>.

- 631 Poffenbarger, H.J., D.C. Olk, C. Cambardella, J. Kersey, M. Liebman, et al. 2020. Whole-profile  
632 soil organic matter content, composition, and stability under cropping systems that differ  
633 in belowground inputs. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment* 291: 106810. doi:  
634 10.1016/J.AGEE.2019.106810.
- 635 Porter, P.M., J.G. Lauer, W.E. Lueschen, J.H. Ford, T.R. Hoverstad, et al. 1997. Environment  
636 affects the corn and soybean rotation effect. *Agronomy Journal* 89(3): 441–448. doi:  
637 10.2134/agronj1997.00021962008900030012x.
- 638 Rasse, D.P. and A.J. Smucker. 1998. Root recolonization of previous root channels in corn and  
639 alfalfa rotations. *Plant and Soil*, 204(2): 203-212.  
640 <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1004343122448>
- 641 R Core Team. 2020. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R foundation for  
642 Statistical Computing. <http://www.r-project.org/>.
- 643 Sawyer, J. and A. Mallarino. 2017. Use of the late-spring soil nitrate test in Iowa corn  
644 production, see:<https://store.extension.iastate.edu/product/Use-of-the-Late-Spring-Soil->  
645 Nitrate-Test-in-Iowa-Corn-Production.
- 646 Schilling, K.E., K.S. Chan, H. Liu, and Y.K. Zhang. 2010. Quantifying the effect of land use  
647 land cover change on increasing discharge in the Upper Mississippi River. *Journal of  
648 Hydrology* 387(3–4): 343–345. doi: 10.1016/j.jhydrol.2010.04.019.

- 649 Seifert, C.A., M.J. Roberts, and D.B. Lobell. 2017. Continuous corn and soybean yield penalties  
650 across hundreds of thousands of fields. *Agronomy Journal* 109(2): 541–548. doi:  
651 10.2134/agronj2016.03.0134.
- 652 Stanger, T.F., and J.G. Lauer. 2008. Corn grain yield response to crop rotation and nitrogen over  
653 35 years. *Agronomy Journal* 100(3): 643–650. doi: 10.2134/AGRONJ2007.0280.
- 654 Tamburini, G., R. Bommarco, T.C. Wanger, C. Kremen, M.G. Van Der Heijden, M. Liebman,  
655 and S. Hallin. 2020. Agricultural diversification promotes multiple ecosystem services  
656 without compromising yield. *Science advances*, 6(45), p.eaba1715.
- 657 Thorup-Kristensen, K., and J. Kirkegaard. 2016. Root system-based limits to agricultural  
658 productivity and efficiency: the farming systems context. *Annals of Botany*, 118(4):573-  
659 592.
- 660 Thorup-Kristensen, K., N. Halberg, M. Nicolaisen, J.E. Olesen, T.E. Crews, P. Hinsinger,  
661 J.Kirkegaard, A. Pierret, D.B. Dresbøll. 2020. Digging deeper for agricultural resources,  
662 the value of deep rooting. *Trends in Plant Science* 25(4):406-417.
- 663 Tron, S., G. Bodner, F. Laio, L. Ridolfi, and D. Leitner. 2015. Can diversity in root architecture  
664 explain plant water use efficiency? A modeling study. *Ecological Modelling* 312: 200–  
665 210. doi: 10.1016/J.ECOLMODEL.2015.05.028.
- 666 USDA National Agricultural Statistics Service Cropland Data Layer. 2021. Published corn data  
667 layer [Online]. USDA-NASS, Washington, DC. <https://nassgeodata.gmu.edu/CropScape/>  
668 (accessed 10 August 2021).

- 669 USDA National Agricultural Statistics Service. 2021. Quick Stats [Online]. USDA-NASS,  
670 Washington, DC. <https://quickstats.nass.usda.gov/> (accessed 10 August 2021).
- 671 Varvel, G.E. 2000. Crop rotation and nitrogen effects on normalized grain yields in a long-term  
672 study. *Agronomy Journal* 92(5): 938–941. doi: 10.2134/AGRONJ2000.925938X.
- 673 Vogel, A.M., and F.E. Below. 2018. Hybrid selection and agronomic management to lessen the  
674 continuous corn yield penalty. *Agronomy* 8(10): 228. doi:  
675 10.3390/AGRONOMY8100228.
- 676 Weisberger, D.A., M.D. McDaniel, J.G. Arbuckle, and M. Lieberman. 2021. Farmer perspectives  
677 on benefits of and barriers to extended crop rotations in Iowa, USA. *Agricultural &*  
678 *Environmental Letters* 6(2): e20049. doi: 10.1002/AEL2.20049.
- 679 Wickham, H., M. Averick, J. Bryan, W. Chang, L. McGowan, et al. 2019. Welcome to the  
680 Tidyverse. *Journal of Open Source Software* 4(43): 1686. doi: 10.21105/joss.01686.
- 681 Wood, S.N. 2011. Fast stable restricted maximum likelihood and marginal likelihood estimation  
682 of semiparametric generalized linear models. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society.*  
683 *Series B: Statistical Methodology* 73(1): 3–36. doi: 10.1111/J.1467-9868.2010.00749.X.
- 684 Zhang, X., H. Wan, F.W. Zwiers, G.C. Hegerl, and S.K. Min. 2013. Attributing intensification of  
685 precipitation extremes to human influence. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 40(19),  
686 pp.5252-5257. <https://doi.org/10.1002/grl.51010>

688    **10    Appendix. Supplementary Material**

689    The following figures are included as supplementary material:

690    **Figure S1** – Maximum rooting depth over time, raw dataset and unsmoothed fitted values

691    **Figure S2** - Yields, biomass over time, growth rate over time, harvest index, 500-kernal grain  
692    weight

693    **Figure S3** – Root to shoot ratios for 2019 and 2020

694    **Figure S4** - Soil penetration resistance by depth at various sampling points, approximate depths  
695    of tillage operations are provided for reference

696    **Figure S5** - Soil moisture and temperature at 30 and 45 cm depths in the maize phase of the  
697    short and extended rotations

698    **Figure S6** – Data from Lazicki et al. 2016

699    **Figure S7** – Simulated impact of changes in root front velocity on maize yield

700    The following tables are included as supplementary material:

701    **Table S1** – Summary of above-ground growth-analysis and rooting depth non-linear parameter  
702    fits


703    **Table S2** - Summary of ‘background’ root samples taken shortly after maize planting

704    **Table S3** - Summary of fixed effect tests on root mass

705    **Table S4** - Summary of contrasts for the complex versus short rotation for root mass added at  
706    each depth

707

708




709

710 **Figure S1 – Maximum rooting depth over time, raw dataset and unsmoothed fitted values**

711


712



713

714 **Figure S2.** Yields, biomass over time, growth rate over time, harvest index, 500-kernal grain


715 weight



716

717 *Figure S3. Root to shoot ratios for 2019 and 2020, with different background root decomposition  
718 assumptions*


719



720


721 *Figure S4. Soil penetration resistance by depth at various sampling points, approximate depths*  
 722 *of tillage operations are provided for reference*

723



725 *Figure S5. Soil moisture at 30 and 45 cm depths in the maize phase of the complex (dark blue)*  
726 *and simple (pink) rotations; points represent individual sensor values, lines the estimated values,*  
727 *and ribbons the 95% confidence interval around the estimates FIGURE 5 ALSO SHOWS*  
728 *TEMPERATURE DATA*


729



730

731 *Figure S6 – Data from Lazicki et al. 2016 shows differences in maize root structures coinciding*  
732 *with maize yield differences in short and extended maize rotations in 2009*

733



734

735 **Figure S7** – Simulated impact of changes in root front velocity on maize yield. Simulations are  
 736 derived from results supporting the publication of Archontoulis et al. (2020), and the reader is  
 737 directed to that publication for more details

738 Archontoulis SV, Castellano MJ, Licht MA, Nichols V, Baum M, Huber I, Martinez- Feria R, Puntel  
 739 L, Ordóñez RA, Iqbal J, Wright EE. Predicting crop yields and soil- plant nitrogen dynamics  
 740 in the US Corn Belt. Crop Science. 2020 Mar;60(2):721-38.

741 Keating BA, Carberry PS, Hammer GL, Probert ME, Robertson MJ, Holzworth D, Huth NI,  
 742 Hargreaves JN, Meinke H, Hochman Z, McLean G. An overview of APSIM, a model  
 743 designed for farming systems simulation. European journal of agronomy. 2003 Jan 1;18(3-  
 744 4):267-88.

745 **Table S1.** Summary of 3-parameter logistic curve fits for rooting depth analyses and above-ground  
 746 growth-analyses, parameters that differed significantly by rotation ( $p < 0.05$ ) are bolded.

<b>Year</b>	<b>Rotation</b>	<b>Asym</b> (cm)	<b>xmid</b> (GDDs)	<b>scal</b>
<i>Rooting depth analysis</i>				
	Short	<b>74 (CI:50-98)</b>	455 (CI:357-553)	109 (CI:65-152)
	Extended	<b>82 (CI:59-106)</b>	436 (CI:338-534)	109 (CI:65-153)
<i>Above-ground growth analysis</i>				
2013	Short	<b>201 (CI:197-205)</b>	<b>210 (CI:209-211)</b>	10.9 (CI:9.9-11.9)
	Extended	<b>253 (CI:244-264)</b>	<b>207 (CI:205-210)</b>	13.3 (CI:11.5-15.3)
2014	Short	<b>326 (CI:316-336)</b>	204 (CI:203-206)	16.3 (CI:15-17.6)
	Extended	<b>351 (CI:341-363)</b>	205 (CI:203-207)	17.1 (CI:15.8-18.6)
2018	Short	<b>237 (CI:231-244)</b>	<b>191 (CI:190-193)</b>	12.6 (CI:11.6-13.7)
	Extended	<b>286 (CI:280-292)</b>	<b>196 (CI:195-197)</b>	13.7 (CI:12.8-14.8)
2019	Short	316 (CI:307-325)	218 (CI:216-219)	14.6 (CI:13.3-15.9)
	Extended	312 (CI:299-234)	219 (CI:217-222)	15.9 (CI:14.2-17.8)
2020	Short	289 (CI:283-295)	205 (CI:204-207)	12.4 (CI:9.7-14.7)
	Extended	299 (CI:292-307)	206 (CI:205-208)	12.7 (CI:9.5-15.2)

747

748

749

750 **Table S2.** Summary of 'background' root samples taken shortly before maize planting

Year	Replicate	Short rotation	Extended rotation
		Root Material ( $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ )	
2019	1	542	740
	2	158	1028
	3	119	248
	4	68	441
	Mean	222	614
2020	1	2753	281
	2	136	483
	3	182	982
	4	159	2048
	Mean	807	949

751

752 **Table S3.** Summary of fixed effect tests on root mass assuming no background root decomposition

Source	Assuming 0% background root decomposition	Assuming 100% background root decomposition
	p-value	p-value
Year	0.12	0.05
Rotation	0.76	0.87
Year x Rotation	0.91	0.15
Depth	0.58	<0.01
Year x Depth	0.31	0.92
<b>Rotation x Depth</b>	<b>0.01</b>	<b>0.07</b>
Year x Rotation x Depth	0.25	0.76

\*DF = Degrees of freedom

753

754 **Table S4.** Summary of root mass added contrasts for the extended versus short rotation at each  
755 depth; denominator degrees of freedom differ by depth due to missing data

Depth	Numerator	Denominator DF	F Ratio	p-value
	DF*			

---

Assuming no background root decomposition

0-15 cm	1	14.77	6.69	0.02
15-30 cm	1	16.07	0.08	0.78
30-45 cm	1	16.07	0.14	0.71
45-60 cm	1	16.07	0.56	0.47

---

## Assuming 100% background root decomposition

0-15 cm	1	36.72	5.60	0.02
15-30 cm	1	37.64	1.59	0.21
30-45 cm	1	37.64	0.25	0.62
45-60 cm	1	37.64	0.68	0.41

---

\*DF = Degrees of freedom

756

757

758

759