

## Site-specific effects of winter cover crops on soil water storage

|                               |  |
|-------------------------------|--|
| Journal:                      | <i>Agrosystems, Geosciences &amp; Environment</i>  |
| Manuscript ID                 | AGE-2021-06-0080-ORA.R2  |
| Wiley - Manuscript type:      | Original Article   |
| Date Submitted by the Author: | n/a  |
| Complete List of Authors:     | Nichols, Gina; Arizona State University, Swette Center for Sustainable Food Systems<br>Moore, Eric; University of North Carolina Wilmington, Department of Environmental Sciences<br>Gailans, Stefan; Practical Farmers of Iowa<br>Kaspar, Thomas; USDA-ARS National Laboratory for Agriculture and the Environment<br>Liebman, Matt; Iowa State, Agronomy |
| Keywords:                     | cover crops, soil water, corn, winter rye, soil health   |
|                               |  |

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

**Core Ideas**

As part of the submission process, we ask authors to prepare highlights of their article. The highlights will consist of 3 to 5 bullet points that convey the core findings of the article and emphasize the novel aspects and impacts of the research on scientific progress and environmental problem solving.

The purpose of these highlights is to give a concise summary that will be helpful in assessing the suitability of the manuscript for publication in the journal and for selecting appropriate reviewers. If the article is accepted the highlights may also be used for promoting and publicizing the research.

Core Idea 1: Cover crop effects on soil water storage at 10-18 cm soil depth were not consistent

Core Idea 2: Cover crops increased water held at field capacity in two of four trials

Core Idea 3: Cover crops did not affect water held at saturation or increase percentage of macropores

Core Idea 4: Causal model suggests cover crop roots may be a key driver of variable results

Core Idea 5: CUST\_CORE\_IDEA\_5 :No data available.

## Site-specific effects of winter cover crops on soil water storage

V.A. Nichols<sup>1\*</sup>, E. B. Moore<sup>2</sup>, S. Gailans<sup>3</sup>, T.C. Kaspar<sup>4</sup>, M. Liebman<sup>5</sup>

### Affiliations:

<sup>1</sup>Swette Center for Sustainable Food Systems, PO Box 875502, Arizona State University, Tempe  
AZ, 85287

<sup>2</sup>Department of Environmental Sciences, 601 S. College Road, University of North Carolina  
Wilmington, Wilmington NC, 28403

<sup>3</sup>Practical Farmers of Iowa, 1615 Golden Aspen Dr, Ames IA 50010

<sup>4</sup>USDA-Agricultural Research Service, National Laboratory for Agriculture and the  
Environment, 1015 North University Boulevard, Ames, IA 50011

<sup>5</sup>Department of Agronomy, 716 Farmhouse Lane, Iowa State University, Ames IA, 50011

\*corresponding author

### Abbreviations:

CC, cover crop

USDA, United States Department of Agriculture

### Core ideas

- Cover crop effects on soil water storage at 10-18 cm soil depth were not consistent

- 19 • Cover crops increased water held at field capacity in two of four trials
- 20 • Cover crops did not affect water held at saturation or increase percentage of macropores
- 21 • Causal model suggests cover crop roots may be a key driver of variable results

## 22 ABSTRACT

23 Addition of an over-wintering cereal rye (*Secale cereale* L.) cover crop (CC) to Midwestern  
24 maize (*Zea mays* L.)-based systems offers several environmental benefits, but the long-term  
25 effects of this practice on soil hydrological properties are not well-understood. We utilized four  
26 long-term (10+ year) trials (two commercial fields, two research plots) in Iowa, USA that  
27 included a replicated winter rye CC and no-cover treatment in no-till maize/soybean (*Glycine*  
28 *max* [L.] Merr) systems. We took intact 7.62 cm diameter soil samples from a 10-18 cm depth  
29 shortly after cash crop planting in the spring. We measured the soil water retention curve using  
30 matric potentials ranging from saturation to -500 cmH<sub>2</sub>O. Additionally, we measured organic  
31 matter, textural composition, and bulk densities of the soil samples. At the depth sampled, CCs  
32 did not meaningfully affect bulk density, water contents at saturation, or air-entry potentials at  
33 any trial, nor increase the percentage of macropores. At two trials, soil water content at field  
34 capacity (-100 cmH<sub>2</sub>O) in the CC treatments was 2.5 vol% (SE: 1.2%; commercial field) and 2.4  
35 vol% (SE: 1.3%; research plot) higher compared to the no-cover treatments. This increase could  
36 meaningfully reduce the amount of water drained from a field after a saturating rain and should  
37 be considered when assessing CC impacts on landscape hydrology. The presence or absence of a  
38 CC effect on field capacity was not related to CC above-ground biomass production, previous  
39 cash crop, or soil texture at the trial sites. Based on our results, a causal model, and previous  
40 literature we hypothesize CC root characteristics are key to understanding variable effects of

CCs on soil water storage. Our results indicate it is possible for CCs to meaningfully affect soil water storage, but more research is needed on the mechanisms by which these changes occur.

## INTRODUCTION

Addition of an over-wintering cereal rye (*Secale cereale* L.) cover crop (CC) to Midwestern maize (*Zea mays* L.)-based systems potentially offers several environmental benefits including reduced soil erosion and nutrient pollution (Strock et al., 2004; Kaspar et al., 2007; Kaspar and Singer, 2011; Kladvko et al., 2014). On average, rye CCs have no effect on maize yields compared to winter fallow in the short term (Marcillo and Miguez, 2017), but it is possible repeated use of CCs could stabilize cash crop yields over time (Williams et al. 2018). In Midwestern rain-fed systems, crops rely on stored soil water and often suffer from drought stress (Campos et al., 2006). Using CCs may induce changes in soil characteristics such as increased organic matter, lower bulk densities, increased water-stable aggregates, and more macro-pores (Blanco-Canqui and Jara, 2019; Haruna et al., 2020). In theory, these changes could result in more water storage capacity (Hudson, 1994; Minasny and McBratney, 2018; King et al., 2020), and therefore buffer crop yields against drought stress (Williams et al., 2016; Kane et al., 2021). Cover crops might also benefit crop-water relations by increasing water infiltration or reducing evaporation through a mulching effect (Unger and Vigil, 1998; Leuthold et al., 2021). Two global meta-analyses suggest that on average, CCs increase soil's capacity to store water and increase infiltration rates (Basche and DeLonge, 2017, 2019). However, to our knowledge there are few studies supporting these findings in Midwestern cover cropping contexts, and the few existing studies report contradictory results (Villamil et al., 2006; Haruna and Nkongolo, 2015; Basche et al., 2016; Rorick and Kladvko, 2017; Irmak et al., 2018). Region-specific studies are needed, as climatic and management constraints of maize-soybean rotations can limit CC options and growth potential (Strock et al., 2004; Baker and Griffis, 2009; Nichols et al., 2020a). Furthermore, to our knowledge there are no studies that report results from fields of commercial farms, and it is therefore unclear whether results observed in a controlled research setting are transferable to large-scale production fields.

In addition to regional differences in CC effects, the number of years that CCs have been used in a field may also influence whether changes in soil are detected. Long-term studies on tillage practices have shown significant, but slow changes to the soil after implementing no-till (Al-Kaisi et al., 2014; Cusser et al., 2020). Addition of CCs might likewise require several years before changes in soil hydrological properties can be detected, necessitating data collection from long-term experiments.

On average, 75% of both maize and soybean root mass is located in the top 30 cm of the soil profile (Nichols et al. 2019), indicating soil water storage in this increment will have important implications for crop water use. Shallow soil depths (0-10 cm) may be more responsive to CC effects compared to deeper soil layers (e.g. Atwood and Wood, 2021; Kaspar et al., 2006; Moore et al., 2014), but modelling and isotope studies suggest soil water below 10 cm may be more important when considering the soil's contribution to a crop's water supply (Williams et al., 2008; Asbjornsen et al., 2008; Rizzo et al., 2018). In general, there is less information available about CC effects on soil at depths greater than 10 cm, particularly about soil water retention curve parameters. Therefore, measurements taken from 10-30 cm depth ranges at multiple sites would provide valuable information about whether cover cropping can potentially affect crop yield stability through crop-water relations.

Lastly, to our knowledge the causal relationships between CCs and soil water storage have not been explicitly presented. Causal models can help identify gaps in the literature and help target data collection. When sufficient data are available, causal models can be used to construct structural equation models that estimate the relative strength of causal factors (Smith et al., 2014). Causal modelling can also be used to frame hypotheses, resulting in more targeted research questions that directly test the presence or absence of causal links (Pearl, 2010). Therefore, a credible causal model can aid in advancing future research.

Given (i) the need to quantify long-term benefits of cover cropping in both research and commercial production settings, (ii) the scarcity of Midwest-specific data at depths relevant to crop water-use, and (iii) the lack of a framework for organizing relevant knowledge, the objectives of our study were to:

- (1) Determine what aspects of a soil's hydrological characteristics are affected by long-term cover cropping at a depth relevant to crop production
- (2) Identify factors that affect the soil's response to cover cropping
- (3) Propose a causal model connecting CCs to changes in soil properties to aid in targeting future research.

To achieve our objectives, we collected soil samples at a 10-18 cm depth increment from four long-term (10+ years) no-till cover crop trials located in Iowa, USA. Two trials were on commercial farm fields, and two trials were part of a United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) research experiment. We assessed the effects of long-term cover cropping on soil water content at saturation, soil water content at matric potentials approximating field capacity ( $-100 \text{ cm H}_2\text{O}$ ; Moore 2021), and the soil water retention curve. To complement and contextualize these data, we also measured soil texture, soil organic matter, and bulk densities of the soil samples. We used our results in combination with previous literature to construct a proposed causal model.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

### *Site descriptions*

Three long-term sites that had been in place for at least 10 years were used for this study (**Supplemental material S1**), with one site having two trials. Therefore, a total of four trials were sampled (**Table 1**). Each trial consisted of two treatments that had been in place for at least 10 years: (1) a maize/soybean rotation (either grain- or silage-based) with a winter rye CC planted yearly in the fall following cash crop harvest and terminated in the spring, and (2) the same rotation without a CC. The West-grain and East-grain trials were production fields on commercial farms, and only one phase of the maize/soybean rotation was present each year. The Central site was a larger research study managed by the USDA and included both phases of each rotation (Korucu et al. 2018). For the present study, one commercial trial was sampled following the soybean phase (West-grain), one commercial trial following the maize phase

(East-grain), and the USDA site samples were only taken following the maize or maize-silage phase due to time constraints. Every trial was arranged in a randomized complete block design with four (commercial trials) or five (USDA trials) replicates. The plots within each trial were managed identically except for the planting of the CC in the fall. The exact herbicide and nutrient programs varied by site, reflective of their managers and contexts (**Supplemental material S2**). More detailed accounts of agronomic management practices at the sites have been published elsewhere (Moore et al., 2014; Nichols et al., 2020b). All sites had sub-surface tile drainage at approximately 1.2 m depth and had been managed without tillage since initiation of the trials.



122

123 Table 1. Geographical, experimental, soil, weather, and sampling information for the four trials

| Plot Size and<br>Average Slope*   | Treatment<br>Replications | Dominant<br>Soil Types,<br>Depth to<br>Water<br>Table* | Sand/Silt/Clay,<br>Organic<br>Matter<br>Content** | 30-year Annual Mean |                             | Mean Cover Crop<br>Biomass |                           | 2018<br>Crop    | 2019<br>Sample<br>Date |
|---|---------------------------|--|---|---------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|------------------------|
|   |                           |  |   | Air<br>Temperature  | Cumulative<br>Precipitation | 5-year                     | 10-year                   |                 |                        |
| <i>m</i>  |                           |  | %   | °C                  | <i>mm</i>                   | <i>Mg ha<sup>-1</sup></i>  | <i>Mg ha<sup>-1</sup></i> |                 |                        |
| <i>West-grain (commercial farm), 41°55'N 94°36'W, initiated in 2008</i> |                           |  |   |                     |                             |                            |                           |                 |                        |
| 25 x 250<br>(1-3%)  | 4                         | Nicollet<br>loam;<br>67 cm                             | 29/43/28<br>2.86%                                 | 9.5                 | 880                         | 0.24                       | 0.45                      | Soybean         | May 23                 |
| <i>East-grain (commercial farm), 41°18'N 92°48'W, initiated in 2009</i> |                           |  |   |                     |                             |                            |                           |                 |                        |
| 25 x 275<br>(0-2%)  | 4                         | Taintor silty<br>clay loam;<br>0 cm                    | 11/56/33<br>3.62%                                 | 10.2                | 947                         | 1.73                       | 1.32                      | Maize           | June 10                |
| <i>Central (USDA research plots), 42°00'N 93°48'W</i>                   |                           |  |   |                     |                             |                            |                           |                 |                        |
| <i>Silage-based, initiated in 2002</i>                                  |                           |  |   |                     |                             |                            |                           |                 |                        |
| 3.8 x 55<br>(1-3%)  | 5                         | Clarion loam;<br>100 cm                                | 30/41/29<br>2.57%                                 | 9.8                 | 907                         | 2.38                       | 1.98                      | Maize<br>silage | June 6                 |
| <i>Grain-based, initiated in 2009</i>                                   |                           |  |   |                     |                             |                            |                           |                 |                        |
| 3.8 x 55<br>(1-3%)  | 5                         | Clarion loam;<br>100 cm                                | 32/40/28<br>2.42%                                 | 9.8                 | 907                         | 1.53                       | 0.88                      | Maize           | June 6                 |

\* From Web Soil Survey data using map unit area weighted estimates

\*\* Field measurements averaged by trial, see Materials and Methods

Cover crop biomass sampling occurred each spring at every trial by removing two or four aboveground biomass samples from an area ranging from 0.25-0.36 m<sup>2</sup> from each plot, depending on the trial. Details about methodology are reported elsewhere (Nichols et al., 2020b) and historical values are available in both supplementary material and in a published dataset (Nichols et al. 2020c). Maize grain, maize silage, and soybean grain yields were measured yearly. Results from the commercial fields showed the effect of cover cropping on grain yields varied by trial and by year (Practical Farmers of Iowa, 2018). While understanding how long-term use of cover crops affects crop yields in different weather-years is a valuable topic of research, it is not the focus of the present study.

### ***Soil Sampling***

An aluminum ring 7.62 cm in diameter and 7.62 cm in length was used to extract intact soil samples. Sampling occurred in May or June of 2019 after maize (West-grain) or soybean (East-grain, Central-grain, Central-silage) emergence at each site. Sampling was conducted immediately following crop emergence to minimize the effects of live roots in the samples and was done two to four days following a rain to ensure the soil was fully drained, but wet enough to remain in the ring during sampling (Al-Shammary et al., 2018).

At all trials, one sample was taken in the middle of the plot between planted rows in a non-traffic area in order to minimize the effects of soil changes related to planting activities (wheel-row compaction, drill disturbance) on the results. To get intact soil cores from a 10-18 cm depth increment, a hole 10 cm deep was dug, and soil was smoothed by hand to create a flat area approximately 30 cm square. The ring was placed on the soil surface in the center of the flat area, a hollow metal cap was placed on it, and a 15 kg weight was used to evenly drive the ring into the undisturbed soil. Once the ring was fully inserted into the soil, a hole was dug around the ring. A flat sheet of metal was slid under the ring to extract it, and a knife was used to remove soil from the top and bottom of the ring by sawing in a Z-cutting motion (three sawing motions per core). The ring was wrapped in aluminum foil with the soil orientation (top, bottom)

marked. The foil-wrapped ring was then placed in an individual plastic container in a cooler. This process was repeated for each plot (eight plots at East-grain, eight at West-grain, 10 at Central-silage, and 10 at Central-grain; Table 1). Samples remained in the cooler for no more than four hours before being placed in a refrigerator.

### ***Soil-water-retention curve***

Analytical equipment could accommodate 12 samples at a time, so each trial's samples were run together in a batch for a total of four batches (e.g., the eight samples from the West-grain trial were run together in one batch). Our interest was in comparing relative effects within a trial, so variation between runs was included statistically in variation between trials. The samples were analyzed in the order they were collected. A given trial's cores had cheesecloth taped to the bottom of each core and an additional ring taped to the top. The batch of samples was then placed in a vacuum chamber for at least 12 hours in a solution of 0.01 M  $\text{CaCl}_2$  filled to the top of the first ring, allowing the samples to saturate with minimal air entrapment. Following saturation, the top ring was removed from the cores. The cores were weighed, then transferred to a custom-built pressure cell apparatus (Ankeny et al. 1992). Measurements were made according to the protocol described by Kool et al. (2019). Cores were drained at atmospheric pressure for 12 hours to obtain a measurement for gravity-drained matric potential ( $\Psi_m = -3.8 \text{ cmH}_2\text{O}$ ). Subsequent measurements were taken at  $\Psi_m$  of -10, -25, -50, -100, -200, and -500  $\text{cmH}_2\text{O}$ . The samples were then oven dried at 60 °C for at least 48 hours, then weighed. Bulk densities were estimated by dividing the oven-dried weight of soil by the ring volume (347.5  $\text{cm}^3$ ; Grossman et al., 2002). A water balance was constructed for each core individually as quality control, resulting in the removal of one replicate from the no-cover treatment of the Central-silage trial, which had a large hole visible in the center of the core upon destructive inspection, confirming its justified removal from the dataset.

## 171 ***Soil texture and organic carbon***

172 The oven-dried soil was ground and passed through a 2 mm sieve. Two teaspoons of soil (~10 grams)  
 173 from each core were used for soil texture measurements. Soil texture was quantified using laser  
 174 diffractometry (Miller and Schaetzl, 2012) with a Malvern Mastersizer 3000 and a HydroEV attachment  
 175 (Malvern Panalytical Ltd, UK), producing estimates for the percentage of the soil that was sand (50-2000  
 176  $\mu\text{m}$ ), silt (6-50  $\mu\text{m}$ ), and clay (0.1-6  $\mu\text{m}$ ). Half of the remaining oven-dried soil cores were sent for  
 177 organic matter analysis (Agsource, Ellsworth Iowa, USA) using the loss-on-ignition method (Nelson and  
 178 Sommers, 1996). While this method may not produce reliable absolute estimates of organic matter  
 179 (Hoogsteen et al., 2015), our interest was in pairwise comparisons of treatments rather than in obtaining  
 180 absolute estimates of organic matter.

## 181 ***Statistical analysis***

182 All data analysis, figure creation, and model fitting were done using *R* version 4.0.3 (R Core Team, 2020)  
 183 and the *tidyverse* meta-package (Wickham et al., 2019). Non-linear models were fit using the *nlraa*  
 184 (Miguez, 2021) package functionality, with specific equation fits from the *HydroMe* (Omuto et al., 2021)  
 185 and *soilphysics* (de Lima et al., 2021) packages. Linear models were fit and summarized using the *lme4*  
 186 (Bates et al., 2015) package, which fits mixed effects models, and the *emmeans* (Lenth et al., 2018)  
 187 package, which estimates both marginal and conditional means and confidence intervals and performs  
 188 pairwise comparisons.

189 We fit the Gardner (Gardner, 1958) and van Genuchten (van Genuchten, 1980) models to describe the  
 190 relationship between soil moisture and soil water matric potential in our datasets. We found the models  
 191 produced similar Akaike's Information Criteria (AIC; Bozdogan, 1987) values, with the Gardner model  
 192 showing a slightly better fit. The Gardner equation is as follows:

$$193 \quad \theta(\psi) = \theta_r + \frac{\theta_s - \theta_r}{1 + a\psi^n}$$

where  $\theta$  is the volumetric moisture content at a given soil water potential  $\psi$ ; the remaining variables are fitted parameters.  $\theta_r$  and  $\theta_s$  are the residual and saturated water contents, respectively;  $a$  approximates the inverse of the pressure at which the retention curve is steepest (e.g., air-entry potential; van Genuchten 1980); and  $n$  is an index for the pore size distribution, with higher values indicating a broader distribution of pore sizes. We fit the Gardner model to each experimental unit, then analyzed the air-entry and pore-size distribution parameters as response variables, described below. Residual water contents ( $\theta_r$ ) are estimated by the model, and can occur at suction pressures greater than -15,000 cmH<sub>2</sub>O (SSSA, 2008). The highest suction pressure applied to samples in this study was -500 cmH<sub>2</sub>O, which could lead to less stable model fits due to lack of an anchoring value (Groenevelt and Grant, 2004). To determine whether the model produced reasonable estimates without these anchoring values, we compared (1) the model-estimated saturated water contents with the measured values, and (2) the pore-size distribution parameter estimate against values estimated using capillary rise equations, which assumes the mean pore neck diameter (in cm) of drained pores at a given pressure is equal to 0.3 divided by the head pressure (cmH<sub>2</sub>O). Pores with mean neck diameters greater than 30  $\mu$ m were considered macropores (Kirkham, 2014). The percent macropores was assessed as a response variable, described below.

Volumetric water contents at saturation were extracted directly from the measured values. Volumetric water contents at field capacity were estimated as the measured volumetric water content at a matric potential of -100 cmH<sub>2</sub>O (Moore 2021). We used this approximation because the matric potential that approximates field capacity depends on the depth to the water table. The trials sampled all had artificial tile drainage installed at ~1.2 meter depths and had shallow water tables (**Table 1**), meaning field capacity will be at matric potentials less negative than the commonly assumed value of -330 cmH<sub>2</sub>O (Bonfante et al., 2020). Soil water retention curve data from Moore (2021) suggest that -100 cmH<sub>2</sub>O is a better approximation for field capacity in mollic epipedons with shallow water tables, such as those sampled in the present study.

The effects of trial, CC treatment, and their interaction on response variables (soil texture, organic matter, water contents at saturation and field capacity, air-entry pressures, pore-size distribution index, percent macropores) were assessed using mixed-effect models. Trial, CC treatment, and their interaction were included as fixed effects. Percent sand was investigated as a covariate in appropriate models because texture is the dominant driver of water retention curve parameters (de Jong et al., 1983; Saxton and Rawls, 2006), has a large influence on bulk densities, and can affect soil organic matter accumulation. Models without a sand covariate had random intercept effects for replicates nested within location (East, Central, West), and models that included a sand covariate had fixed effects only. Models were compared using AIC. All statistical results are available in **Supplementary material S3**.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### *Soil texture, organic matter, and bulk density*

Within certain trials, the CC treatment was coincident with differences in sand, silt, as well as clay percentages ( $p < 0.001$ ). The percent sand did not vary by CC treatment in the Central-silage trial, but varied significantly ( $p < 0.01$ ) at the other three trials (**Supplementary material S3, S4**). Likewise, the percent clay varied by CC treatment in three of the four trials while the percent silt varied by CC treatment in only one trial (West-grain). However, the significant differences between CC and no-cover plots were only of a meaningful magnitude ( $> 1\%$  difference) at the two commercial farm trials (East-grain, West-grain; **Table 2**). In the East-grain trial, the CC plots had 3% more sand compared to the no-cover plots ( $p < 0.001$ ). In the West-grain trial, the CC plots had 5% more sand compared to the no-cover plots ( $p < 0.001$ ). The increased sand in the CC plots was compensated for by a decrease in clay (East-grain) or a decrease in both clay and silt (West-grain). At both of the Central trials, texture components of the CC and no-cover plots were within 1% of each other.

**Table 2.** Summary of soil texture components for rye cover crop (CC) and no-cover treatments at each trial, bolded text indicates significant differences at  $p < 0.01$  greater than 1% in magnitude; totals may not add to 100% due to rounding, see Supplemental material S4 for more precise values.

| Trial                           | Sand                   | Silt                   | Clay                   |
|---------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
|                                 | <i>Rye CC/No-cover</i> | <i>Rye CC/No-cover</i> | <i>Rye CC/No-cover</i> |
| West-grain<br>(commercial farm) | <b>31/26%</b>          | <b>42/45%</b>          | <b>27/30%</b>          |
| East-grain<br>(commercial farm) | <b>13/10%</b>          | 56/56%                 | <b>32/35%</b>          |
| Central-silage                  | 30/29%                 | 41/41%                 | 29/30%                 |
| Central-grain                   | 32/32%                 | 40/40%                 | 28/28%                 |

While the plots in the commercial farm fields (East-grain, West-grain) were randomly assigned a CC treatment, the treatments were close to regularly alternating strips, with the four blocks laid out side-by-side. If a field has a uniform texture gradient perpendicular to the blocking, this regularly alternating pattern could result in one treatment having significantly different textures compared to the other, as we observed. Additional samples taken at a later date from East-grain trial confirmed the soil texture pattern we observed in the present study (unpublished data), providing further evidence our observations were not due to chance, but rather reflected a true soil texture gradient at the sites. The Central site had six treatments in small plots and the five blocks were located in two rows within the field, with each treatment being randomly assigned within the block; this arrangement may have better randomized treatments with respect to natural patterns of soil texture within the site. Based on these results, sand was included as a covariate in statistical models for response variables potentially affected by soil texture.

Soil organic matter contents ranged from 1.8 to 4.6%, with a significant trial-by-CC treatment interaction ( $p < 0.001$ ). Soil organic matter accumulation may be affected by soil texture (Scott et al., 1996; Bosatta and Agren, 1997), so statistics were run both with and without a sand co-variate to account for the different soil textures in the CC and no-cover treatments observed in some trials. The Central-silage trial showed a significant ( $p < 0.01$ ) but small (+0.25%) absolute increase in organic matter with cover

cropping, regardless of inclusion of a sand covariate. In the other three trials, the results depended on whether sand was included as a co-variate. Without a sand co-variate, organic matter was estimated to decrease with cover cropping compared to no-cover in three trials (p-values ranging from 0.001-0.048). When a sand co-variate was included in the statistical analysis, organic matter either did not change (Central-grain) or significantly ( $p < 0.01$ ) increased with cover cropping by small amounts (+0.19% and +0.26% in the East-grain and West-grain trials, respectively). Due to the sensitivity of the results and the small effect sizes, we conclude cover cropping did not meaningfully affect soil organic matter at this depth in the three grain trials, but may have resulted in a slightly higher organic matter content in the Central-silage trial. This is consistent with a previous study at this same trial, which found higher organic matter in the top 5 cm of soil in CC treatments compared to no-cover, but small differences below that depth (Moore et al., 2014).

Bulk densities varied from  $1.2 \text{ g cm}^{-3}$  to  $1.7 \text{ g cm}^{-3}$ . The large size of sand particles reduces packing efficiencies compared with clay, meaning a sandy soil may have lower bulk densities simply due to packing arrangements. However, regardless of the statistical model fit, all estimated CC effects were less than measurement precision of the core method for measuring bulk density ( $\pm 0.12 \text{ g cm}^{-3}$ , Han et al., 2016), rendering their interpretation questionable. A recent summary of research on the effects of CCs on bulk densities likewise found few studies where an overwintering rye CC grown in the US reduced bulk densities more than typical measurement errors (Haruna et al., 2020). We therefore found no evidence that CCs meaningfully affected soil bulk density at 10-18 cm soil depths at any trial.

## **Soil hydrological properties**


Soil texture is the dominant factor determining soil water retention (de Jong et al., 1983; Saxton and Rawls, 2006), particularly under wet conditions (i.e. saturation and field capacity; Manns and Berg, 2014). Because soil texture varied by CC treatment in the two commercial field trials (East-grain, West-



grain), sand was included as a co-variate in statistical models assessing the effects of cover cropping on these response variables.

#### *Air-entry potential and pore distribution*

The Gardner equation fitting process converged for all experimental units (**Figure 1**), with  $a$  (an estimate of the inverse of air-entry potential) ranging from 0.001 to 0.284, and  $n$  (pore-size distribution index) ranging from 0.45 to 1.49.



**Figure 1.** The Gardner equation was fit to each experimental unit (dotted lines); mean values (solid lines) for each trial and cover crop treatment are presented to aid in interpretation.

There was not a significant interaction between trial and CC treatment for either parameter. While both parameters differed significantly by trial ( $p < 0.001$ ), cover cropping did not significantly affect either parameter, with or without a sand covariate (**Table 3; Supplemental material S3**).

Table 3. Summary of estimated mean values, standard error of the mean (SE), and significance of the comparison between rye cover crop (CC) and no-cover treatments within a trial (p-value) for Gardner parameters and percent macropores.

| Cover crop<br>(CC)<br>treatment     | Inverse air-entry potential<br>(Gardner model<br>parameter <i>a</i> ) |         | Pore-size distribution<br>(Gardner model<br>parameter <i>n</i> ) |         | Percent macropores<br>(capillary rise equation) |         |
|-------------------------------------|---|---------|--|---------|---|---------|
|                                     | mean(SE)  | p-value | mean(SE)   | p-value | mean(SE)  | p-value |
|                                     | <i>cmH<sub>2</sub>O<sup>-1</sup></i>                                  |         | <i>unitless</i>  |         | %   |         |
| <i>West-grain (commercial farm)</i> |   |         |  |         |   |         |
| Rye CC                              | 0.03(0.01)  | 0.15    | 0.83(0.09)   | 0.60    | 48(5)   | 0.05    |
| No cover                            | 0.05(0.01)  |         | 0.90(0.09)   |         | 61(5)   |         |
| <i>East-grain (commerical farm)</i> |   |         |  |         |   |         |
| Rye CC                              | 0.11(0.01)  | 0.14    | 0.83(0.09)   | 0.96    | 73(5)   | 0.75    |
| No cover                            | 0.08(0.01)  |         | 0.82(0.08)   |         | 71(5)   |         |
| <i>Central-grain</i>                |   |         |  |         |   |         |
| Rye CC                              | 0.02(0.01)  | 0.97    | 1.15(0.08)   | 0.67    | 59(4)   | 0.61    |
| No cover                            | 0.02(0.01)  |         | 1.10(0.08)   |         | 62(4)   |         |
| <i>Central-silage</i>               |   |         |  |         |   |         |
| Rye CC                              | 0.03(0.01)  | 0.32    | 0.90(0.08)   | 0.52    | 54(4)   | 0.40    |
| No cover                            | 0.04(0.01)  |         | 0.82(0.09)   |         | 59(5)   |         |


When compared across trials, the *a* parameter was strongly related to the percentage of sand in the trial's soil, with the East-grain trial having the lowest sand content (mean of 11%) and highest *a* estimate (mean of 0.09), and the Central-grain trial having the highest sand content (mean of 32% sand) and lowest *a* estimate (mean of 0.02). This inverse relationship is consistent with empirical equations relating air-entry potential to soil texture (Saxton and Rawls 2006). However, even with a sand co-variate, cover cropping did not significantly affect air-entry pressures nor pore-size distributions.

Consistent with the lack of CC effect on the Gardner equation's pore-size distribution parameter (*n*) manual estimation of the pore-size distribution confirmed CCs did not increase the percentage of macropores in any trial (Table 3; Supplemental material S5. In a review of published studies, Haruna et al. (2020) found the effect of CCs on macropore makeup of the soil highly variable, but with an overall

average increase. The wide variation may be partially due to varying cut-offs in pore sizes for macropore categorization (Luxmoore, 1981), but the variability in combination with our results again demonstrates using literature averages to predict CC impacts in Midwestern systems may be inappropriate.

#### *Soil water at saturation and field-capacity*

For these analyses we assigned significance at p-values less than 0.10. With or without a sand covariate, no trial exhibited a significant increase in water held at saturation with the use of cover cropping (**Figure 2**). Water held at saturation is largely dependent on bulk density, so these findings are consistent with the lack of meaningful effect of CCs on bulk densities in our study. Field capacities were significantly higher in the cover cropped plots at one commercial farm (West-grain;  $p = 0.07$ ) and one USDA trial (Central-silage;  $p = 0.05$ ). At the West-grain trial, the soil water at field capacity increased (after sand correction) from 33.6 to 36.0 vol%, and at the Central-silage trial from 38.1 to 40.6 vol%, respectively. An increase in the soil's ability to hold water after gravity drainage may also contribute to peak water flow regulation. By increasing volumetric water content at field capacity by 2 vol% in the 0-20 cm profile, CC fields could hold an additional 40,000 L of water in each 20-cm hectare slice, which could meaningfully reduce the amount of water drained from a field after a saturating rain. For comparison, evapotranspiration rates in an over-wintered rye cover crop with modest biomass production can be  $\sim 24,000 \text{ L ha}^{-1} \text{ day}^{-1}$  (Qi and Helmers, 2010), and peak flows from sub-surface drainage tiles in central Iowa can be  $\sim 22,000 \text{ L ha}^{-1} \text{ hour}^{-1}$  (Daigh et al. 2014). To our knowledge there are limited studies examining the potential for CCs to reduce flood damage in the Midwest, but the one we are aware of accounts for only the increased evapotranspiration with the use of CCs (Antolini et al., 2020). Our study suggests that in addition to reducing run-off (Korucu et al. 2018), considering how CC-induced increases in the amount of water held in a soil at field capacity affect flood incidence and severity would be worth investigating. Furthermore, as other studies have noted, an increase in the amount of water held at field capacity results in more precipitation being stored for cash crop use (Basche et al. 2016; Leuthold et al. 2021), meaning in some cases long-term use of CCs could lead to more stable cash crop yields (Williams et al. 2018).



**Figure 2.** Soil volumetric water contents at saturation and field capacity (-100 cmH2O) with 10+ years of winter rye cover cropping (green) or winter fallow (brown) in a maize-soybean rotation at four trials. Bars show estimated means, line ranges are the 95% confidence intervals around the mean. Text

presents the estimated effect of cover cropping on volumetric water content in instances of a significant effect.

### 334 *Factors explaining variable results*

335 The West-grain and Central-silage trials both exhibited significantly higher soil water at field capacity  
336 with the use of cover cropping compared to winter fallows. However, the West-grain trial consistently  
337 produced the lowest above-ground CC biomass, and the Central-silage trial the highest (**Table 1**),  
338 indicating the changes in water held at field capacity are likely not associated with CC above-ground  
339 biomass production. Although a previous study suggested soil texture could mediate the effects of long-  
340 term CC-use (Blanco-Canqui and Jasa, 2019), in our dataset there was no pattern between soil textural  
341 characteristics and the magnitude of CC effect on water held at field capacity. This means knowledge of a  
342 soil's texture did not help predict whether a CC would affect water held at field capacity in our study.


343 The West-grain trial was sampled following a soybean crop, and the Central-silage following a silage  
344 crop, while the two trials without significant CC effects were both sampled following a maize-grain crop  
345 (**Table 1**). Soybean and maize-silage crops would leave less residue compared to a preceeding maize-  
346 grain crop, however this study did not measure residue amounts at the time of sampling. Given the lack of  
347 insight into what may be driving the variable effects given the available data, we explored potential  
348 causes for our variable results and identified additional measurements that may aid in identifying drivers  
349 of the variable effects of CCs on soil hydrological properties.

### 350 *Causal model*

351 There are several pathways by which CCs might affect a soil's capacity to hold water (**Figure 3**). The  
352 causal model was built using literature relevant to Midwestern systems, and when applicable was limited  
353 to evidence drawn from research conducted with a cereal rye cover crop (**Supplemental material S6**).

354 The model was simplified to exclude the effects of soil erosion, soil texture, tillage, and landscape

position, which are all factors that could potentially influence how soil responds to cover cropping (Moore 2021). Rather, we present this simple casual model to provide a base from which to build.



**Figure 3.** Pathways by which cover crops may affect the soil pore size distributions, the amount of water stored at field capacity, and the amount of water at saturation in no-till systems. The effects of soil erosion are not included. X→Y should be read as ‘X affects Y’.

Causal diagrams such as **Figure 3** are the basis for constructing structural equation models, which can greatly enhance researchers' ability to address complex research questions in agriculture (Smith et al., 2014; Wade et al., 2020). For example, in our proposed causal diagram, below-ground biomass measurements are necessary for estimating direct effects of cover cropping on pore size distributions, field capacity, and saturation. This is further supported by recent studies and reviews that identify CC roots as being a crucial component to understanding CC effects on soil properties (Williams and Weil, 2004; Haruna et al., 2020; Ogilvie et al., 2021). While there is limited data available pairing above- and below-ground biomass of CCs, data collected in Iowa over a five-year period showed no relationship between above- and below-ground rye biomass, with root-to-shoot ratios varying from 0.16-1.94 at similar levels of aboveground biomass production (Martinez-Feria et al., 2016). Therefore, above-ground biomass production cannot be used as a proxy for below-ground production with much confidence, and studies that pair above- and below-ground CC biomass with soil measurements would be advantageous in enhancing our understanding of CC effects on soil.

## CONCLUSIONS

We found CCs increased water held at field capacity at the 10-18 cm soil range in two of the four trials sampled. The observed increases were of a meaningful magnitude that could contribute to cash crop water needs, and may have implications for flooding severity in agricultural regions and should be considered when modelling cover crop effects on landscape water balances. We were unable to explain the trial-dependent effects using the available measurements and information. Based on a proposed causal model, we suggest researchers measure CC root biomass in addition to above-ground biomass when examining the effects of CCs on soil properties. Effects of growing over-wintering CCs need to be explicitly investigated in the

Midwestern US, as the constraints of maize-soybean systems may render the effects smaller in magnitude compared to averages reported by global meta-analyses.

## SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIAL

S1 - A map of trial locations

S2 - Detailed description of management practices and historical cover crop biomass production for each trial

S3 - Statistical summaries

S4 – Detailed soil texture results

S6 – Causal model literature support

## DATA AVAILABILITY

The data are available as downloadable csv files in supplementary material. Additionally, all data are available in an R package (<https://github.com/vanichols/PFIswhc>) and the R code used in processing and summarizing data for this publication is available in a github repository (will be created once paper is accepted).

## CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

## AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

VN contributed to conceptualization, data curation, formal analysis, funding acquisition, investigation, methodology, project administration, writing of original draft, and review/editing. ML contributed to funding acquisition, project administration, supervision, and review/editing of draft. SG contributed to project administration, resources, and review/editing. EM contributed to methodology, resources, and review/editing.



## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to acknowledge Dr. Robert Horton for generously allowing us to use his lab space and equipment for this project, and Dr. Michael Castellano for providing suggestions about the manuscript. We also thank the two farmers and Keith Kohler and Tom Kaspar for allowing us to collect data in their long-term plots, and Wyatt Westfall for his help collecting and preparing samples. We also thank the Practical Farmers of Iowa staff and members for their support throughout this project. This material is based upon work supported in part by the National Science Foundation (Grant No. DGE-1828942), the North Central Region Sustainable Research and Education Program (Grant No. 2017-38640-26916), and endowment funds for the Henry A. Wallace Chair for Sustainable Agriculture at Iowa State University. Lastly we thank three reviewers for their constructive comments that helped us improve this manuscript.

## REFERENCES

- Abiven, S., S. Menasseri, and C. Chenu. 2009. The effects of organic inputs over time on soil aggregate stability - A literature analysis. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry* 41(1): 1–12. doi: 10.1016/j.soilbio.2008.09.015.
- Al-Kaisi, M.M., A. Douelle, and D. Kwaw-Mensah. 2014. Soil microaggregate and macroaggregate decay over time and soil carbon change as influenced by different tillage systems. *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation* 69(6). doi: 10.2489/jswc.69.6.574.
- Al-Shammary, A.A.G., A.Z. Kouzani, A. Kaynak, S.Y. Khoo, M. Norton, et al. 2018. Soil bulk density estimation methods: A review. *Pedosphere* 28(4): 581–596. doi: 10.1016/S1002-0160(18)60034-7.
- Ankeny, M.D., Brown, H.J., Cruse, R.M., 1992. Means and method of soil water desorption. U.S. Patent 268 5,161,407.
- Antolini, F., E. Tate, B. Dalzell, N. Young, K. Johnson, et al. 2020. Flood risk reduction from agricultural best management practices. *Journal of the American Water Resources Association* 56(1): 161–179. doi: 10.1111/1752-1688.12812.
- Asbjornsen, H., G. Shepherd, M. Helmers, and G. Mora. 2008. Seasonal patterns in depth of water uptake under contrasting annual and perennial systems in the Corn Belt region of the Midwestern US. *Plant and Soil* 308(1–2): 69–92. doi: 10.1007/s11104-008-9607-3.
- Atwood, L.W., and S.A. Wood. AgEvidence: Agro-environmental responses of conservation agricultural practices in the US Midwest published from 1980 to 2017. Knowledge Network for Biocomplexity.
- Austin, E.E., K. Wickings, M.D. McDaniel, G.P. Robertson, and A.S. Grandy. 2017. Cover crop root contributions to soil carbon in a no-till corn bioenergy cropping system. *GCB Bioenergy* 9(7): 1252–1263. doi: 10.1111/gcbb.12428.

- 437 Baker, J.M., and T.J. Griffis. 2009. Evaluating the potential use of winter cover crops in corn-soybean  
438 systems for sustainable co-production of food and fuel. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*  
439 149(12): 2120–2132. doi: 10.1016/j.agrformet.2009.05.017.
- 440 Basche, A., and M. DeLonge. 2017. The impact of continuous living cover on soil hydrologic properties:  
441 A meta-analysis. *Soil Science Society of America Journal* 81(5): 1179–1190. doi:  
442 10.2136/sssaj2017.03.0077.
- 443 Basche, A.D., and M.S. DeLonge. 2019. Comparing infiltration rates in soils managed with conventional  
444 and alternative farming methods: A meta-analysis. *PLoS ONE* 14(9): 1–22. doi:  
445 10.1371/journal.pone.0215702.
- 446 Basche, A.D., T.C. Kaspar, S. v. Archontoulis, D.B. Jaynes, T.J. Sauer, et al. 2016. Soil water  
447 improvements with the long-term use of a winter rye cover crop. *Agricultural Water Management*  
448 172: 40–50. doi: 10.1016/j.agwat.2016.04.006.
- 449 Bates, D., M. Mächler, B. Bolker, and S. Walker. 2015. Fitting linear mixed-effects models using lme4.  
450 *Journal of Statistical Software* 67(1): 1–48. doi: 10.18637/jss.v067.i01.
- 451 Blanco-Canqui, H., and P.J. Jasa. 2019. Do grass and legume cover crops improve soil properties in the  
452 long term? *Soil Science Society of America Journal*. 83:1181-1187.
- 453 Bonfante, A., A. Basile, and J. Bouma. 2020. Exploring the effect of varying soil organic matter contents  
454 on current and future moisture supply capacities of six Italian soils. *Geoderma* 361: 114079. doi:  
455 10.1016/j.geoderma.2019.114079.
- 456 Bosatta, E. and G.I. Ågren. 1997. Theoretical analyses of soil texture effects on organic matter  
457 dynamics. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry*, 29(11-12), pp.1633-1638.
- 458 Boyle, M., W.T. Frankenberger, and L.H. Stolzy. 1989. The influence of organic matter on soil  
459 aggregation and water infiltration. *Journal of Production Agriculture* 2(4): 290–299. doi:  
460 10.2134/jpa1989.0290.
- 461 Bozdogan, H. 1987. Model selection and Akaike's Information Criterion (AIC): The general theory and  
462 its analytical extensions. *Psychometrika* 52(3): 345–370. doi: 10.1007/BF02294361.
- 463 Campos, H., M. Cooper, O. Edmeades, C. Löffler, J.R. Schussler, et al. 2006. Changes in drought  
464 tolerance in maize associated with fifty years of breeding for yield in the US corn belt. *Maydica*  
465 51(2).
- 466 Cotrufo, M.F., M.D. Wallenstein, C.M. Boot, K. Denef, and E. Paul. 2013. The Microbial Efficiency-  
467 Matrix Stabilization (MEMS) framework integrates plant litter decomposition with soil organic  
468 matter stabilization: Do labile plant inputs form stable soil organic matter? *Global Change Biology*  
469 19(4): 988–995. doi: 10.1111/gcb.12113.
- 470 Cusser, S., C. Bahlai, S.M. Swinton, G.P. Robertson, and N.M. Haddad. 2020. Long-term research avoids  
471 spurious and misleading trends in sustainability attributes of no-till. *Global Change Biology* 26(6).  
472 doi: 10.1111/gcb.15080.

- 473 Edwards, W.M., L.D. Norton, and C.E. Redmond. 1988. Characterizing macropores that affect infiltration  
474 into non-tilled soil. *Soil Science Society of America Journal* 52(2): 483–487. doi:  
475 10.2136/sssaj1988.03615995005200020033x.
- 476 Gardner, W.R. 1958. Some steady-state solutions of the unsaturated moisture flow equation with  
477 application to evaporation from a water table. *Soil Science* 85(4): 228–232. doi: 10.1097/00010694-  
478 195804000-00006.
- 479 van Genuchten, M.Th. 1980. A closed-form equation for predicting the hydraulic conductivity of  
480 unsaturated soils. *Soil Science Society of America Journal* 44(5): 892–898. doi:  
481 10.2136/sssaj1980.03615995004400050002x.
- 482 Groenevelt, P.H., and C.D. Grant. 2004. A new model for the soil-water retention curve that solves the  
483 problem of residual water contents. *European Journal of Soil Science* 55(3): 479–485. doi:  
484 10.1111/j.1365-2389.2004.00617.x.
- 485 Grossman, R.B., and T.G. Reinsch. 2002. Bulk density and linear extensibility. In J. H. Dane & G. C.  
486 Topp (Eds.), *Methods of soil analysis: Part 4, physical methods* (pp. 201–228). SSSA.  
487 <https://doi.org/10.2136/sssabookser5.4.c9>
- 488 Han, Y., J. Zhang, K.G. Mattson, W. Zhang, and T.A. Weber. 2016. Sample sizes to control error  
489 estimates in determining soil bulk density in California forest soils. *Soil Science Society of America*  
490 *Journal* 80(3): 756–764. doi: 10.2136/sssaj2015.12.0422.
- 491 Haruna, S.I., S.H. Anderson, R.P. Udawatta, C.J. Gantzer, N.C. Phillips, et al. 2020. Improving soil  
492 physical properties through the use of cover crops: A review. *Agrosystems, Geosciences &*  
493 *Environment* 3(1). doi: 10.1002/agg2.20105.
- 494 Haruna, S.I., and N.V. Nkongolo. 2015. Cover Crop Management Effects on Soil Physical and Biological  
495 Properties. *Procedia Environmental Sciences* 29: 13–14. doi: 10.1016/j.proenv.2015.07.130.
- 496 Hoogsteen, M.J.J., E.A. Lantinga, E.J. Bakker, J.C.J. Groot, and P.A. Tittonell. 2015. Estimating soil  
497 organic carbon through loss on ignition: Effects of ignition conditions and structural water loss.  
498 *European Journal of Soil Science* 66(2): 320–328. doi: 10.1111/ejss.12224.
- 499 Hudson, B.D. 1994. Available water capacity and soil organic matter. *Journal of Soil and Water*  
500 *Conservation* 49(2): 189–194. doi: 10.1081/E-ESS-120018496.
- 501 Irmak, S., V. Sharma, A.T. Mohammed, and K. Djaman. 2018. Impacts of cover crops on soil physical  
502 properties: Field capacity, permanent wilting point, soil-water holding capacity, bulk density,  
503 hydraulic conductivity, and infiltration. *Transactions of the ASABE* 61(4). doi:  
504 10.13031/trans.12700.
- 505 de Jong, R., C.A. Campbell, and W. Nicholaichuk. 1983. Water retention equations and their relationship  
506 to soil organic matter and particle size distribution for disturbed samples. *Canadian Journal of Soil*  
507 *Science* 63(2): 291–302. doi: 10.4141/cjss83-029.

- 508 Kane, D.A., M.A. Bradford, E. Fuller, E.E. Oldfield, and S.A. Wood. 2021. Soil organic matter protects  
509 US maize yields and lowers crop insurance payouts under drought. *Environmental Research Letters*  
510 16(4). doi: 10.1088/1748-9326/abe492.
- 511 Kaspar, T.C., D.B. Jaynes, T.B. Parkin, and T.B. Moorman. 2007. Rye cover crop and gamagrass strip  
512 effects on NO<sub>3</sub> concentration and load in tile drainage. *Journal of environmental quality* 36(5):  
513 1503–1511. doi: 10.2134/jeq2006.0468.
- 514 Kaspar, T.C., D.B. Jaynes, T.B. Parkin, T.B. Moorman, and J.W. Singer. 2012. Effectiveness of oat and  
515 rye cover crops in reducing nitrate losses in drainage water. *Agricultural Water Management* 110(3):  
516 25–33. doi: 10.1016/j.agwat.2012.03.010.
- 517 Kaspar, T.C., T.B. Parkin, D.B. Jaynes, C.A. Cambardella, D.W. Meek, et al. 2006. Examining changes  
518 in soil organic carbon with oat and rye cover crops using terrain covariates. *Soil Science Society of*  
519 *America Journal* 70(4): 1168–1177. doi: 10.2136/sssaj2005.0095.
- 520 Kaspar, T., and J. Singer. 2011. The Use of Cover Crops to Manage Soil. Publications from the USDA-  
521 ARS/UNL Faculty. p. 1382. <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/usdaarsfacpub/1382/>
- 522 Kay, B.D., A.P. da Silva, J.A. Baldock, D. Silva, A.P. And Baldock, et al. 1997. Sensitivity of soil  
523 structure to changes in organic carbon content: Predictions using pedotransfer functions. *Canadian*  
524 *Journal of Soil Science* 77(4): 655–667.
- 525 Kim, N., M.C. Zabaloy, K. Guan, and M.B. Villamil. 2020. Do cover crops benefit soil microbiome? A  
526 meta-analysis of current research. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry* 142: 107701. doi:  
527 10.1016/j.soilbio.2019.107701.
- 528 King, A.E., G.A. Ali, A.W. Gillespie, and C. Wagner-Riddle. 2020. Soil organic matter as catalyst of crop  
529 resource capture. *Frontiers in Environmental Science* 8. doi: 10.3389/fenvs.2020.00050.
- 530 Kirkham, M.B. 2014. Principles of soil and plant water relations, 2nd Edition. Elsevier Inc. ISBN  
531 9780124200227
- 532 Kladvko, E.J., T.C. Kaspar, D.B. Jaynes, R.W. Malone, J. Singer, et al. 2014. Cover crops in the upper  
533 midwestern United States: Potential adoption and reduction of nitrate leaching in the Mississippi  
534 River Basin. *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation* 69(4): 279–291. doi: 10.2489/jswc.69.4.279.
- 535 Kool, D., B. Tong, Z. Tian, J.L. Heitman, T.J. Sauer, et al. 2019. Soil water retention and hydraulic  
536 conductivity dynamics following tillage. *Soil and Tillage Research* 193: 95–100. doi:  
537 10.1016/j.still.2019.05.020.
- 538 Korucu, T., M.J. Shipitalo, T.C. Kaspar. 2018. Rye cover crop increases earthworm populations and  
539 reduces losses of broadcast, fall-applied, fertilizers in surface runoff. *Soil and Tillage*  
540 *Research*, 180:99-106.
- 541 Lenth, R., H. Singmann, and J. Love. 2018. Emmeans: Estimated marginal means, aka least-squares  
542 means. R package version 1.5.4. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=emmeans>

- 543 Leslie, A.W., K.H. Wang, S.L.F. Meyer, S. Marahatta, and C.R.R. Hooks. 2017. Influence of cover crops  
544 on arthropods, free-living nematodes, and yield in a succeeding no-till soybean crop. *Applied Soil*  
545 *Ecology* 117–118: 21–31. doi: 10.1016/j.apsoil.2017.04.003.
- 546 Leuthold, S.J., M. Salmerón, O. Wendroth, and H. Poffenbarger. 2021. Cover crops decrease maize yield  
547 variability in sloping landscapes through increased water during reproductive stages. *Field Crops*  
548 *Research* 265. doi: 10.1016/j.fcr.2021.108111.
- 549 de Lima, R.P., A.R. da Silva, and Á.P. da Silva. 2021. soilphysics: An R package for simulation of soil  
550 compaction induced by agricultural field traffic. *Soil and Tillage Research* 206: 104824. doi:  
551 10.1016/j.still.2020.104824.
- 552 Luxmoore, R.J. 1981. Micro-, meso-, and macroporosity of soil. *Soil Science Society of America Journal*  
553 45(3): 671–672. doi: 10.2136/sssaj1981.03615995004500030051x.
- 554 Manns, H.R., and A.A. Berg. 2014. Importance of soil organic carbon on surface soil water content  
555 variability among agricultural fields. *Journal of Hydrology* 516: 297–303. doi:  
556 10.1016/j.jhydrol.2013.11.018.
- 557 Marcillo, G.S.S., and F.E.E. Miguez. 2017. Corn yield response to winter cover crops: An updated meta-  
558 analysis. *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation* 72(3): 226–239. doi: 10.2489/jswc.72.3.226.
- 559 Martinez-Feria, R.A., R. Dietzel, M. Liebman, M.J. Helmers, and S.V. Archontoulis. 2016. Rye cover  
560 crop effects on maize: A system-level analysis. *Field Crops Research* 196: 145–159. doi:  
561 10.1016/j.fcr.2016.06.016.
- 562 Miguez, F. 2021. nlraa: Nonlinear regression for agricultural applications. R package version 0.83.  
563 <https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/nlraa/index.html>
- 564 Miller, B.A., and R.J. Schaetzl. 2012. Precision of soil particle size analysis using laser diffractometry.  
565 *Soil Science Society of America Journal* 76(5): 1719. doi: 10.2136/sssaj2011.0303.
- 566 Minasny, B., and A.B. McBratney. 2018. Limited effect of organic matter on soil available water  
567 capacity. *European Journal of Soil Science* 69(1): 39–47. doi: 10.1111/ejss.12475.
- 568 Moore, E.B., M.H. Wiedenhoef, T.C. Kaspar, and C.A. Cambardella. 2014. Rye cover crop effects on  
569 soil quality in no-till corn silage-soybean cropping systems. *Soil Science Society of America Journal*  
570 78(3): 968–976. doi: 10.2136/sssaj2013.09.0401.
- 571 Moore, E.B. 2021. Management effects on near-surface soil properties in a temperate corn-soybean  
572 cropping system. Graduate Theses and Dissertations. 18564. <https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/etd/18564>
- 573 Nelson, D.W. and Sommers, L.E., 1996. Total carbon, organic carbon, and organic matter. *Methods of*  
574 *soil analysis: Part 3 Chemical methods*. pp 961-1010.
- 575 Nichols, V.A., R.A. Ordóñez, E.E. Wright, M.J. Castellano, M. Liebman, J.L. Hatfield, M. Helmers, S.V.  
576 Archontoulis. 2019. Maize root distributions strongly associated with water tables in Iowa,  
577 USA. *Plant and Soil*, 444(1), pp.225-238. doi: 10.1007/s11104-019-04269-6

- 578 Nichols, V., R. Martinez-Feria, D. Weisberger, S. Carlson, B. Basso, et al. 2020a. Cover crops and weed  
579 suppression in the U.S. Midwest: A meta-analysis and modeling study. *Agricultural &*  
580 *Environmental Letters* 5(1). doi: 10.1002/ael2.20022.
- 581 Nichols, V., L. English, S. Carlson, S. Gailans, and M. Liebman. 2020b. Effects of long-term cover  
582 cropping on weed seedbanks. *Frontiers in Agronomy* 2: 591091. doi: 10.3389/fagro.2020.591091.
- 583 Nichols, V., English, L. E., and Liebman, M. (2020c). Long term cover cropping effects on weed  
584 seedbanks [Dataset]. Iowa State University. doi: 10.25380/iastate.12762011.v1
- 585 Ogilvie, C.M., W. Ashiq, H.B. Vasava, and A. Biswas. 2021. Quantifying root-soil interactions in cover  
586 crop systems: A review. *Agriculture (Switzerland)* 11(3). doi: 10.3390/agriculture11030218.
- 587 Omuto, C.T., M. Maechler, and V. Too. 2021. HydroMe: Estimating water retention and infiltration  
588 model parameters using experimental data. R package version 2.0-1. [https://CRAN.R-](https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=HydroMe)  
589 [project.org/package=HydroMe](https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=HydroMe)
- 590 Pearl, J. 2010. An introduction to causal inference. *International Journal of Biostatistics* 6(2). doi:  
591 10.2202/1557-4679.1203.
- 592 Practical Farmers of Iowa. 2018. Winter cereal rye cover crop effect on cash crop yield Year 10.  
593 Available online (Accessed September 2021): [https://practicalfarmers.org/wp-](https://practicalfarmers.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/Winter_Rye_Effect_on_Yield_Final.pdf)  
594 [content/uploads/2020/01/Winter\\_Rye\\_Effect\\_on\\_Yield\\_Final.pdf](https://practicalfarmers.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/Winter_Rye_Effect_on_Yield_Final.pdf)
- 595 Qi, Z. and M.J. Helmers. 2010. Soil water dynamics under winter rye cover crop in central Iowa. *Vadose*  
596 *Zone Journal*, 9(1), pp.53-60.
- 597 Rizzo, G., J.I.R. Edreira, S.V. Archontoulis, H.S. Yang, and P. Grassini. 2018. Do shallow water tables  
598 contribute to high and stable maize yields in the US Corn Belt? *Global Food Security* 18: 27–34.  
599 doi: 10.1016/J.GFS.2018.07.002.
- 600 Rorick, J.D., and E.J. Kladvko. 2017. Cereal rye cover crop effects on soil carbon and physical properties  
601 in southeastern Indiana. *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation* 72(3). doi: 10.2489/jswc.72.3.260.
- 602 Ruehlmann, J., and M. Körschens. 2009. Calculating the effect of soil organic matter concentration on  
603 soil bulk density. *Soil Science Society of America Journal* 73(3): 876–885. doi:  
604 10.2136/sssaj2007.0149.
- 605 Saxton, K.E., and W.J. Rawls. 2006. Soil water characteristic estimates by texture and organic matter for  
606 hydrologic solutions. *Soil Science Society of America Journal* 70(5): 1569–1578. doi:  
607 10.2136/sssaj2005.0117.
- 608 Scott, N.A., C.V. Cole, E.T. Elliott, S.A. Huffman. 1996. Soil textural control on decomposition and soil  
609 organic matter dynamics. *Soil Science Society of America Journal*, 60(4), pp.1102-1109.
- 610 Smith, R.G., A.S. Davis, N.R. Jordan, L.W. Atwood, A.B. Daly, et al. 2014. Structural equation modeling  
611 facilitates transdisciplinary research on agriculture and climate change. *Crop Science* 54(2): 475–  
612 483. doi: 10.2135/cropsci2013.07.0474.



- SSSA. 2008. Glossary of Soil Science Terms 2008. American Society of Agronomy and Soil Science Society of America, Madison, WI, USA.
- Strock, S.J., P.M. Porter, and M.P. Russelle. 2004. Cover cropping to reduce nitrate loss through subsurface drainage in the northern U.S. corn belt. *Journal of environmental quality* 33(3): 1010–1016. doi: 10.2134/jeq2004.1010.
- Unger, P.W., and M.F. Vigil. 1998. Cover crop effects on soil water relationships. *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation* 53(3): 200–207.
- Villamil, M.B., G.A. Bollero, R.G. Darmody, F.W. Simmons, and D.G. Bullock. 2006. No-till corn/soybean systems including winter cover crops. *Soil Science Society of America Journal* 70(6): 1936–1944. doi: 10.2136/sssaj2005.0350.
- Wade, J., S.W. Culman, J.A.R. Logan, H. Poffenbarger, M.S. Demyan, et al. 2020. Improved soil biological health increases corn grain yield in N fertilized systems across the Corn Belt. *Scientific Reports* 10(1): 3917. doi: 10.1038/s41598-020-60987-3.
- Wickham, H., M. Averick, J. Bryan, W. Chang, L. McGowan, et al. 2019. Welcome to the Tidyverse. *Journal of Open Source Software* 4(43): 1686. doi: 10.21105/joss.01686.
- Williams, A., N.R. Jordan, R.G. Smith, M.C. Hunter, M. Kammerer, D.A. Kane, R.T. Koide, A.S. Davis, 2018. A regionally-adapted implementation of conservation agriculture delivers rapid improvements to soil properties associated with crop yield stability. *Scientific Reports* 8(1): 1-8.
- Williams, A., M.C. Hunter, M. Kammerer, D.A. Kane, N.R. Jordan, et al. 2016. Soil water holding capacity mitigates downside risk and volatility in US rainfed maize: Time to invest in soil organic matter? *PLoS ONE* 11(8): 1–11. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0160974.
- Williams, C.L., M. Liebman, J.W. Edwards, D.E. James, J.W. Singer, et al. 2008. Patterns of regional yield stability in association with regional environmental characteristics. *Crop Science* 48(4): 1545–1559. doi: 10.2135/cropsci2006.12.0837.
- Williams, S.M., and R.R. Weil. 2004. Crop cover root channels may alleviate soil compaction effects on soybean crop. *Soil Science Society of America Journal* 68(4): 1403–1409. doi: 10.2136/sssaj2004.1403.

**Site-specific effects of winter cover crops on soil water storage**~~Effect of Winter Cover  
Cropping on Soil Water Storage Varies by Site~~

V.A. Nichols<sup>1\*</sup>, E. B. Moore<sup>2</sup>, S. Gailans<sup>3</sup>, T.C. Kaspar<sup>4</sup>, M. Liebman<sup>5</sup>

**Affiliations:**

<sup>1</sup>Swette Center for Sustainable Food Systems, PO Box 875502, [Arizona State University](#), Tempe  
AZ, 85287

<sup>2</sup>Department of Environmental Sciences, 601 S. College Road, University of North Carolina  
Wilmington, Wilmington NC, 28403

<sup>3</sup>Practical Farmers of Iowa, 1615 Golden Aspen Dr, Ames IA 50010

<sup>4</sup>USDA-Agricultural Research Service, National Laboratory for Agriculture and the  
Environment, 1015 North University Boulevard, Ames, IA 50011

<sup>5</sup>Department of Agronomy, 716 Farmhouse Lane, Iowa State University, Ames IA, 50011

\*corresponding author

**Abbreviations:**

CC, cover crop

USDA, United States Department of Agriculture

**Core ideas**



- Cover crop effects on soil water storage at 10-18 cm soil depth were not consistent
- Cover crops increased water held at field capacity in two of four trials
- Cover crops did not affect water held at saturation or increase percentage of macropores
- Causal model suggests cover crop roots may be a key driver of variable results

## ABSTRACT

Addition of an over-wintering cereal rye (*Secale cereale* L.) cover crop (CC) to Midwestern maize (*Zea mays* L.)-based systems offers several environmental benefits, but the long-term effects of this practice on soil hydrological properties are not well-understood. We utilized four long-term (10+ year) trials (two commercial fields, two research plots) in Iowa, USA that included a replicated winter rye CC and no-cover treatment in no-till maize/soybean (*Glycine max* [L.] Merr) systems. We took intact 7.62 cm diameter soil samples from a 10-18 cm depth shortly after cash crop planting in the spring. We measured the soil water retention curve using matric potentials ranging from saturation to -500 cmH<sub>2</sub>O. Additionally, we measured organic matter, textural composition, and bulk densities of the soil samples. At the depth sampled, CCs did not meaningfully affect bulk density, water contents at saturation, or air-entry potentials at any trial, nor increase the percentage of macropores. At two trials, soil water content at field capacity (-100 cmH<sub>2</sub>O) in the CC treatments was 2.5 vol% (SE: 1.2%; commercial field) and 2.4 vol% (SE: 1.3%; research plot) higher, ~~respectively~~, compared to the no-cover treatments. This increase could meaningfully reduce the amount of water drained from a field after a saturating rain and should be considered when assessing CC impacts on landscape hydrology. The presence or absence of a CC effect on field capacity was not related to CC above-ground biomass production, previous cash crop, or soil texture at the trial sites. Based on our results, a causal

model, and previous literature we hypothesize ÷ CC root characteristics ~~are~~<sup>may be</sup> key to understanding variable effects of CCs on soil water storage. Our results indicate it is possible for CCs to meaningfully affect soil water storage, but more research is needed on the mechanisms by which these changes occur.

## INTRODUCTION

Addition of an over-wintering cereal rye (*Secale cereale* L.) cover crop (CC) to Midwestern maize (*Zea mays* L.)-based systems potentially offers several environmental benefits including reduced soil erosion and nutrient pollution (Strock et al., 2004; Kaspar et al., 2007; Kaspar and Singer, 2011; Kladvko et al., 2014). On average, rye CCs have no effect on maize yields compared to winter fallow in the short term (Marcillo and Miguez, 2017), but it is possible repeated use of CCs could stabilize cash crop yields over time (Williams et al. 2018). In Midwestern rain-fed systems, crops rely on stored soil water and often suffer from drought stress (Campos et al., 2006). Using CCs may induce changes in soil characteristics such as increased organic matter, lower bulk densities, increased water-stable aggregates, and more macro-pores (Blanco-Canqui and Jara, 2019; Haruna et al., 2020). In theory, these changes could result in more water storage capacity (Hudson, 1994; Minasny and McBratney, 2018; King et al., 2020), and therefore buffer crop yields against drought stress (Williams et al., 2016; Kane et al., 2021). Cover crops might also benefit crop-water relations by increasing water infiltration or reducing evaporation through a mulching effect (Unger and Vigil, 1998; Leuthold et al., 2021). Two global meta-analyses suggest that on average, CCs increase soil's capacity to store water and increase infiltration rates (Basche and DeLonge, 2017, 2019). However, to our knowledge there are few studies supporting these findings in Midwestern cover cropping contexts, and the few existing studies report contradictory results (Villamil et al., 2006; Haruna and Nkongolo, 2015; Basche et al., 2016; Rorick and Kladvko, 2017; Irmak et al., 2018). Region-specific studies are needed, as climatic and management constraints of maize-soybean rotations can limit CC options and growth potential (Strock et al., 2004; Baker and Griffis, 2009; Nichols et al., 2020a). Furthermore, to our knowledge there are no studies that report results from fields of commercial

farms, and it is therefore unclear whether results observed in a controlled research setting are transferable to large-scale production fields.

In addition to regional differences in CC effects, the number of years that CCs have been used in a field may also influence whether changes in soil are detected. Long-term studies on tillage practices have shown significant, but slow changes to the soil after implementing no-till (Al-Kaisi et al., 2014; Cusser et al., 2020). Addition of CCs might likewise require several years before changes in soil hydrological properties can be detected, necessitating data collection from long-term experiments.

On average, 75% of both maize and soybean root mass is located in the top 30 cm of the soil profile (Nichols et al. 2019), indicating soil water storage in this increment will have important implications for crop water use. Shallow soil depths (0-10 cm) may be more responsive to CC effects compared to deeper soil layers (e.g. Atwood and Wood, 2021; Kaspar et al., 2006; Moore et al., 2014), but modelling and isotope studies suggest soil water below 10 cm may be more important when considering the soil's contribution to a crop's water supply (Williams et al., 2008; Asbjornsen et al., 2008; Rizzo et al., 2018).

In general, there is less information available about CC effects on soil at depths greater than 10 cm, particularly about soil water retention curve parameters. Therefore, measurements taken from 10-30 cm depth ranges at multiple sites would provide valuable information about whether cover cropping can potentially affect crop yield stability through crop-water relations.

Lastly, to our knowledge the causal relationships between CCs and soil water storage have not been explicitly presented. Causal models can help identify gaps in the literature and help target data collection, data needs, and when sufficient data are available, causal models can be used to construct structural equation models that estimate the relative strength of causal factors (Smith et al., 2014). Causal modelling can also be used to frame hypotheses, resulting in more targeted research questions that directly test the presence or absence of causal links (Pearl, 2010). Therefore, a credible causal model can aid in advancing future research.

Given (i) the need to quantify long-term benefits of cover cropping in both research and commercial production settings, (ii) the scarcity of Midwest-specific data at depths relevant to crop water-use, and (iii) the lack of a framework for organizing relevant knowledge, the objectives of our study were to:

- (1) Determine what aspects of a soil's hydrological characteristics are affected by long-term cover cropping at a depth relevant to crop production
- (2) Identify factors that affect the soil's response to cover cropping
- (3) Propose a causal model connecting CCs to changes in soil properties to aid in targeting future research.

To achieve our objectives, we collected soil samples at a 10-18 cm depth increment from four long-term (10+ years) no-till cover crop trials located in Iowa, USA. Two trials were on commercial farm fields, and two trials were part of a United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) research experiment. We assessed the effects of long-term cover cropping on soil water content at saturation, soil water content at matric potentials approximating field capacity ( $\sim 100$  cm  $H_2O$ ; Moore 2021), and the soil water retention curve. To complement and contextualize these data, we also measured soil texture, soil organic matter, and bulk densities of the soil samples. We used our results in combination with previous literature to construct a proposed causal model.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

### *Site descriptions*

Three long-term sites that had been in place for at least 10 years were used for this study (**Supplemental material S1**), with one site having two trials. Therefore, a total of four trials were sampled (**Table 1**). Each trial consisted of two treatments that had been in place for at least 10 years: (1) a maize/soybean rotation (either grain- or silage-based) with a winter rye CC planted yearly in the fall following cash crop harvest and terminated in the spring, and (2) the same rotation without a CC. The West-grain and East-

113 grain trials were production fields on commercial farms, and only one phase of the maize/soybean  
114 rotation was present each year. The Central site was a larger research study managed by the USDA and  
115 included both phases of each rotation (Korucu et al. 2018). For the present study, one commercial trial  
116 was sampled following the soybean phase (West-grain), one commercial trial following the maize phase  
117 (East-grain), and the USDA site samples were only taken following the maize or maize-silage phase due  
118 to time constraints. For the present study, at the USDA site samples were only taken following the maize  
119 or maize-silage phase due to time constraints. Every trial was arranged in a randomized complete block  
120 design with four (commercial trials) or five (USDA trials) replicates. The plots within each trial were  
121 managed identically except for the planting of the CC in the fall. The exact herbicide and nutrient  
122 programs varied by site, reflective of their managers and contexts (**Supplemental material S2**). More  
123 detailed accounts of agronomic management practices at the sites have been published elsewhere (Moore  
124 et al., 2014; Nichols et al., 2020b). All sites had sub-surface tile drainage at approximately 1.2 m depth  
125 and had been managed without tillage since initiation of the trials.

126

127 Table 1. Geographical, experimental, soil, weather, and sampling information for the four trials

| Plot Size and<br>Average Slope*   | Treatment<br>Replications | Dominant<br>Soil Types,<br>Depth to<br>Water<br>Table* | Sand/Silt/Clay,<br>Organic<br>Matter<br>Content** | 30-year Annual Mean |                             | Mean Cover Crop<br>Biomass |                           | 2018<br>Crop    | 2019<br>Sample<br>Date |
|---|---------------------------|--|---|---------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|------------------------|
|   |                           |  |   | Air<br>Temperature  | Cumulative<br>Precipitation | 5-year                     | 10-year                   |                 |                        |
| <i>m</i>  |                           |  | %   | °C                  | <i>mm</i>                   | <i>Mg ha<sup>-1</sup></i>  | <i>Mg ha<sup>-1</sup></i> |                 |                        |
| <i>West-grain (commercial farm), 41°55'N 94°36'W, initiated in 2008</i> |                           |  |   |                     |                             |                            |                           |                 |                        |
| 25 x 250<br>(1-3%)  | 4                         | Nicollet<br>loam;<br>67 cm                             | 29/43/28<br>2.86%                                 | 9.5                 | 880                         | 0.24                       | 0.45                      | Soybean         | May 23                 |
| <i>East-grain (commercial farm), 41°18'N 92°48'W, initiated in 2009</i> |                           |  |   |                     |                             |                            |                           |                 |                        |
| 25 x 275<br>(0-2%)  | 4                         | Taintor silty<br>clay loam;<br>0 cm                    | 11/56/33<br>3.62%                                 | 10.2                | 947                         | 1.73                       | 1.32                      | Maize           | June 10                |
| <i>Central (USDA research plots), 42°00'N 93°48'W</i>                   |                           |  |   |                     |                             |                            |                           |                 |                        |
| <i>Silage-based, initiated in 2002</i>                                  |                           |  |   |                     |                             |                            |                           |                 |                        |
| 3.8 x 55<br>(1-3%)  | 5                         | Clarion loam;<br>100 cm                                | 30/41/29<br>2.57%                                 | 9.8                 | 907                         | 2.38                       | 1.98                      | Maize<br>silage | June 6                 |
| <i>Grain-based, initiated in 2009</i>                                   |                           |  |   |                     |                             |                            |                           |                 |                        |
| 3.8 x 55<br>(1-3%)  | 5                         | Clarion loam;<br>100 cm                                | 32/40/28<br>2.42%                                 | 9.8                 | 907                         | 1.53                       | 0.88                      | Maize           | June 6                 |

\* From Web Soil Survey data using map unit area weighted estimates  
\*\* Field measurements averaged by trial, see Materials and Methods

Cover crop biomass sampling occurred each spring at every trial by removing two or four aboveground biomass samples from an area ranging from 0.25-0.36 m<sup>2</sup> from each plot, depending on the trial. Details about methodology are reported elsewhere (Nichols et al., 2020b) and historical values are available in both supplementary material and in a published dataset (Nichols et al. 2020c). Maize grain, maize silage, and soybean grain yields were measured yearly. Results from the commercial fields showed the effect of cover cropping on grain yields varied by trial and by year (Practical Farmers of Iowa, 2018). While understanding how long-term use of cover crops affects crop yields in different weather-years is a valuable topic of research, it is not the focus of the present study.

### ***Soil Sampling***

An aluminum ring 7.62 cm in diameter and 7.62 cm in length was used to extract intact soil samples. Sampling occurred in May or June of 2019 after maize (West-grain) or soybean (East-grain, Central-grain, Central-silage) emergence at each site. Sampling was conducted immediately following crop emergence to minimize the effects of live roots in the samples and was done two to four days following a rain to ensure the soil was fully drained, but wet enough to remain in the ring during sampling (Al-Shammary et al., 2018).

At all trials, one sample was taken in the middle of the plot between planted rows in a non-traffic area in order to minimize the effects of soil changes related to planting activities (wheel-row compaction, drill disturbance) on the results. To get intact soil cores from a 10-18 cm depth increment, a hole 10 cm deep was dug, and soil was smoothed by hand to create a flat area approximately 30 cm square. The ring was placed on the soil surface in the center of the flat area, a hollow metal cap was placed on it, and a 15 kg weight was used to evenly drive the ring into the undisturbed soil. Once the ring was fully inserted into the soil, a hole was dug around the ring. A flat sheet of metal was slid under the ring to extract it, and a knife was used to remove soil from the top and bottom of the ring by sawing in a Z-cutting motion (three sawing motions per core). The ring was wrapped in aluminum foil with the soil orientation (top, bottom)

marked. The foil-wrapped ring was then placed in an individual plastic container in a cooler. This process was repeated for each plot (eight plots at East-grain, eight at West-grain, 10 at Central-silage, and 10 at Central-grain; Table 1). Samples remained in the cooler for no more than four hours before being placed in a refrigerator.

### ***Soil-water-retention curve***

Analytical equipment could accommodate 12 samples at a time, so each trial's samples were run together in a batch for a total of four batches (e.g., the eight samples from the West-grain trial were run together in one batch). Our interest was in comparing relative effects within a trial, so variation between runs was included statistically in variation between trials. The samples were analyzed in the order they were collected. A given trial's cores had cheesecloth taped to the bottom of each core and an additional ring taped to the top. The batch of samples was then placed in a vacuum chamber for at least 12 hours in a solution of 0.01 M  $\text{CaCl}_2$  filled to the top of the first ring, allowing the samples to saturate with minimal air entrapment. Following saturation, the top ring was removed from the cores. The cores were weighed, then transferred to a custom-built pressure cell apparatus (Ankeny et al. 1992). Measurements were made according to the protocol described by Kool et al. (2019). Cores were drained at atmospheric pressure for 12 hours to obtain a measurement for gravity-drained matric potential ( $\Psi_m = -3.8 \text{ cmH}_2\text{O}$ ). Subsequent measurements were taken at  $\Psi_m$  of -10, -25, -50, -100, -200, and -500  $\text{cmH}_2\text{O}$ . The samples were then oven dried at 60 °C for at least 48 hours, then weighed. Bulk densities were estimated by dividing the oven-dried weight of soil by the ring volume (347.5  $\text{cm}^3$ ; Grossman et al., 2002). A water balance was constructed for each core individually as quality control, resulting in the removal of one replicate from the no-cover treatment of the Central-silage trial, which had a large hole visible in the center of the core upon destructive inspection, confirming its justified removal from the dataset.



### ***Soil texture and organic carbon***

The oven-dried soil was ground and passed through a 2 mm sieve. Two teaspoons of soil (~10 grams) from each core were used for soil texture measurements. Soil texture was quantified using laser diffractometry (Miller and Schaetzl, 2012) with a Malvern Mastersizer 3000 and a HydroEV attachment (Malvern Panalytical Ltd, UK), producing estimates for the percentage of the soil that was sand (50-2000 µm), silt (6-50 µm), and clay (0.1-6 µm). Half of the remaining oven-dried soil cores were sent for organic matter analysis (Agsources, Ellsworth Iowa, USA) using the loss-on-ignition method (Nelson and Sommers, 1996). While this method may not produce reliable absolute estimates of organic matter (Hoogsteen et al., 2015), our interest was in pairwise comparisons of treatments rather than in obtaining absolute estimates of organic matter.

### ***Statistical analysis***

All data analysis, figure creation, and model fitting were done using *R* version 4.0.3 (R Core Team, 2020) and the *tidyverse* meta-package (Wickham et al., 2019). Non-linear models were fit using the *nlraa* (Miguez, 2021) package functionality, with specific equation fits from the *HydroMe* (Omuto et al., 2021) and *soilphysics* (de Lima et al., 2021) packages. Linear models were fit and summarized using the *lme4* (Bates et al., 2015) package, which fits mixed effects models, and the *emmeans* (Lenth et al., 2018) package, which estimates both marginal and conditional means and confidence intervals and performs pairwise comparisons.

We fit the Gardner (Gardner, 1958) and van Genuchten (van Genuchten, 1980) models to describe the relationship between soil moisture and soil water matric potential in our datasets. We found the models produced similar Akaike's Information Criteria (AIC; Bozdogan, 1987) values, with the Gardner model showing a slightly better fit. The Gardner equation is as follows:

$$\theta(\psi) = \theta_r + \frac{\theta_s - \theta_r}{1 + a\psi^n}$$

198 where  $\theta$  is the volumetric moisture content at a given soil water potential  $\psi$ ; the remaining variables are  
199 fitted parameters.  $\theta_r$  and  $\theta_s$  are the residual and saturated water contents, respectively;  $a$  approximates the  
200 inverse of the pressure at which the retention curve is steepest (e.g., air-entry potential; van Genuchten  
201 1980); and  $n$  is an index for the pore size distribution, with higher values indicating a broader distribution  
202 of pore sizes. We fit the Gardner model to each experimental unit, then analyzed the air-entry and pore-  
203 size distribution parameters as response variables, described below. Residual water contents ( $\theta_r$ ) are  
204 estimated by the model, and can occur at suction pressures greater than -15,000 cmH<sub>2</sub>O (SSSA, 2008).  
205 The highest suction pressure applied to samples in this study was -500 cmH<sub>2</sub>O, which could lead to less  
206 stable model fits due to lack of an anchoring value (Groenevelt and Grant, 2004). To determine whether  
207 the model produced reasonable estimates without these anchoring values, we compared (1) the model-  
208 estimated saturated water contents with the measured values, and (2) the pore-size distribution parameter  
209 estimate against values estimated using capillary rise equations, which assumes the mean pore neck  
210 diameter (in cm) of drained pores at a given pressure is equal to 0.3 divided by the head pressure  
211 (cmH<sub>2</sub>O). Pores with mean neck diameters greater than 30  $\mu$ m were considered macropores (Kirkham,  
212 2014). The percent macropores was assessed as a response variable, described below.

213 Volumetric water contents at saturation were extracted directly from the measured values. Volumetric  
214 water contents at field capacity were estimated as the measured volumetric water content at a matric  
215 potential of -100 cmH<sub>2</sub>O (Moore 2021). We used this approximation because the matric potential that  
216 approximates field capacity depends on the depth to the water table. The trials sampled all had artificial  
217 tile drainage installed at ~1.2 meter depths and had shallow water tables (**Table 1**), meaning field capacity  
218 will be at matric potentials less negative than the commonly assumed value of -330 cmH<sub>2</sub>O (Bonfante et  
219 al., 2020). Soil water retention curve data from Moore (2021) suggest that -100 cmH<sub>2</sub>O is a better  
220 approximation for field capacity in mollic epipedons with shallow water tables, such as those sampled in  
221 the present study.

The effects of trial, CC treatment, and their interaction on response variables (soil texture, organic matter, water contents at saturation and field capacity, air-entry pressures, pore-size distribution index, percent macropores) were assessed using mixed-effect models. Trial, CC treatment, and their interaction were included as fixed effects. Percent sand was investigated as a covariate in appropriate models because texture is the dominant driver of water retention curve parameters (de Jong et al., 1983; Saxton and Rawls, 2006), has a large influence on bulk densities, and can affect soil organic matter accumulation. Models without a sand covariate had random intercept effects for replicates nested within location (East, Central, West), and models that included a sand covariate had fixed effects only. Models were compared using AIC. All statistical results are available in **Supplementary material S3**.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### *Soil texture, organic matter, and bulk density*

~~Within~~In certain trials, the CC treatment was coincident with differences in sand, silt, as well as clay percentages ( $p < 0.001$ ). The percent sand did not vary by CC treatment in the Central-silage trial, but varied significantly ( $p < 0.01$ ) at the other three trials (**Supplementary material S3, S4**). Likewise, the percent clay varied by CC treatment in three of the four trials while the percent silt varied by CC treatment in only one trial (West-grain). However, the significant differences between CC and no-cover plots were only of a meaningful magnitude ( $> 1\%$  difference) at the two commercial farm trials (East-grain, West-grain; **Table 2**). In the East-grain trial, the CC plots had 3% more sand compared to the no-cover plots ( $p < 0.001$ ). In the West-grain trial, the CC plots had 5% more sand compared to the no-cover plots ( $p < 0.001$ ). The increased sand in the CC plots was compensated for by a decrease in clay (East-grain) or a decrease in both clay and silt (West-grain). At both of the Central trials, texture components of the CC and no-cover plots were within 1% of each other.

**Table 2.** Summary of soil texture components for rye cover crop (CC) and no-cover treatments at each trial, bolded text indicates significant differences at  $p<0.01$  greater than 1% in magnitude; totals may not add to 100% due to rounding, see Supplemental material S4 for more precise values.

| Trial                           | Sand                   | Silt                   | Clay                   |
|---------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
|                                 | <i>Rye CC/No-cover</i> | <i>Rye CC/No-cover</i> | <i>Rye CC/No-cover</i> |
| West-grain<br>(commercial farm) | <b>31/26%</b>          | <b>42/45%</b>          | <b>27/30%</b>          |
| East-grain<br>(commercial farm) | <b>13/10%</b>          | 56/56%                 | <b>32/35%</b>          |
| Central-silage                  | 30/29%                 | 41/41%                 | 29/30%                 |
| Central-grain                   | 32/32%                 | 40/40%                 | 28/28%                 |

While the plots in the commercial farm fields (East-grain, West-grain) were randomly assigned a CC treatment, the treatments were close to regularly alternating strips, with the four blocks laid out side-by-side. If a field has a uniform texture gradient perpendicular to the blocking, this regularly alternating pattern could result in one treatment having significantly different textures compared to the other, as we observed. Additional samples taken at a later date from East-grain trial confirmed the soil texture pattern we observed in the present study (unpublished data), providing further evidence our observations were not due to chance, but rather reflected a true soil texture gradient at the sites. The Central site had six treatments in small plots and the five blocks were located in two rows within the field, with each treatment being randomly assigned within the block; this arrangement may have better randomized treatments with respect to natural patterns of soil texture within the site. Based on these results, sand was included as a covariate in statistical models for response variables potentially affected by soil texture.

Soil organic matter contents ranged from 1.8 to 4.6%, with a significant trial-by-CC treatment interaction ( $p<0.001$ ). Soil organic matter accumulation may be affected by soil texture (Scott et al., 1996; Bosatta and Agren, 1997), so statistics were run both with and without a sand co-variate to account for the different soil textures in the CC and no-cover treatments observed in some trials. The Central-silage trial showed a significant ( $p<0.01$ ) but small (+0.25%) absolute increase in organic matter with cover

cropping, regardless of inclusion of a sand covariate. In the other three trials, the results depended on whether sand was included as a co-variate. Without a sand co-variate, organic matter was estimated to decrease with cover cropping compared to no-cover in three trials (p-values ranging from 0.001-0.048). When a sand co-variate was included in the statistical analysis, organic matter either did not change (Central-grain) or significantly ( $p < 0.01$ ) increased with cover cropping by small amounts (+0.19% and +0.26% in the East-grain and West-grain trials, respectively). Due to the sensitivity of the results and the small effect sizes, we conclude cover cropping did not meaningfully affect soil organic matter at this depth in the three grain trials, but may have resulted in a slightly higher organic matter content in the Central-silage trial. This is consistent with a previous study at this same trial, which found higher organic matter in the top 5 cm of soil in CC treatments compared to no-cover, but small differences below that depth (Moore et al., 2014).

Bulk densities varied from  $1.2 \text{ g cm}^{-3}$  to  $1.7 \text{ g cm}^{-3}$ . The large size of sand particles reduces packing efficiencies compared with clay, meaning a sandy soil may have lower bulk densities simply due to packing arrangements. However, regardless of the statistical model fit, all estimated CC effects were less than measurement precision of the core method for measuring bulk density ( $\pm 0.12 \text{ g cm}^{-3}$ , Han et al., 2016), rendering their interpretation questionable. A recent summary of research on the effects of CCs on bulk densities likewise found few studies where an overwintering rye CC grown in the US reduced bulk densities more than typical measurement errors (Haruna et al., 2020). We therefore found no evidence that CCs meaningfully affected soil bulk density at 10-18 cm soil depths at any trial.


## **Soil hydrological properties**

Soil texture is the dominant factor determining soil water retention (de Jong et al., 1983; Saxton and Rawls, 2006), particularly under wet conditions (i.e. saturation and field capacity; Manns and Berg, 2014). Because soil texture varied by CC treatment in the two commercial field trials (East-grain, West-

grain), sand was included as a co-variate in statistical models assessing the effects of cover cropping on these response variables.

*Air-entry potential and pore distribution*

The Gardner equation fitting process converged for all experimental units (**Figure 1**), with  $a$  (an estimate of the inverse of air-entry potential) ranging from 0.001 to 0.284, and  $n$  (pore-size distribution index) ranging from 0.45 to 1.49.



**Figure 1.** The Gardner equation was fit to each experimental unit (dotted lines); mean values (solid lines) for each trial and cover crop treatment are presented to aid in interpretation.

There was not a significant interaction between trial and CC treatment for either parameter. While both parameters differed significantly by trial ( $p<0.001$ ), cover cropping did not significantly affect either parameter, with or without a sand covariate (**Table 3; Supplemental material S3**).

Table 3. Summary of estimated mean values, standard error of the mean (SE), and significance of the comparison between rye cover crop (CC) and no-cover treatments within a trial (p-value) for Gardner parameters and percent macropores.

| Cover crop<br>(CC)<br>treatment     | Inverse air-entry potential<br>(Gardner model<br>parameter $a$ ) |         | Pore-size distribution<br>(Gardner model<br>parameter $n$ ) |         | Percent macropores<br>(capillary rise equation) |         |
|-------------------------------------|--|---------|---|---------|---|---------|
|                                     | mean(SE)   | p-value | mean(SE)  | p-value | mean(SE)  | p-value |
|                                     | $\text{cmH}_2\text{O}^{-1}$                                      |         | $\text{unitless}$   |         | %   |         |
| <i>West-grain (commercial farm)</i> |  |         |   |         |   |         |
| Rye CC                              | 0.03(0.01)   | 0.15    | 0.83(0.09)  | 0.60    | 48(5)   | 0.05    |
| No cover                            | 0.05(0.01)   |         | 0.90(0.09)  |         | 61(5)   |         |
| <i>East-grain (commerical farm)</i> |  |         |   |         |   |         |
| Rye CC                              | 0.11(0.01)   | 0.14    | 0.83(0.09)  | 0.96    | 73(5)   | 0.75    |
| No cover                            | 0.08(0.01)   |         | 0.82(0.08)  |         | 71(5)   |         |
| <i>Central-grain</i>                |  |         |   |         |   |         |
| Rye CC                              | 0.02(0.01)   | 0.97    | 1.15(0.08)  | 0.67    | 59(4)   | 0.61    |
| No cover                            | 0.02(0.01)   |         | 1.10(0.08)  |         | 62(4)   |         |
| <i>Central-silage</i>               |  |         |   |         |   |         |
| Rye CC                              | 0.03(0.01)   | 0.32    | 0.90(0.08)  | 0.52    | 54(4)   | 0.40    |
| No cover                            | 0.04(0.01)   |         | 0.82(0.09)  |         | 59(5)   |         |

When compared across trials, the  $a$  parameter was strongly related to the percentage of sand in the trial's soil, with the East-grain trial having the lowest sand content (mean of 11%) and highest  $a$  estimate (mean of 0.09), and the Central-grain trial having the highest sand content (mean of 32% sand) and lowest  $a$  estimate (mean of 0.02). This inverse relationship is consistent with empirical equations relating air-entry potential to soil texture (Saxton and Rawls 2006). However, even with a sand co-variate, cover cropping did not significantly affect air-entry pressures nor pore-size distributions.

Consistent with the lack of CC effect on the Gardner equation's pore-size distribution parameter ( $n$ ) manual estimation of the pore-size distribution confirmed CCs did not increase the percentage of macropores in any trial (**Table 3; Supplemental material S5**. In a review of published studies, Haruna et al. (2020) found the effect of CCs on macropore makeup of the soil highly variable, but with an overall


average increase. The wide variation may be partially due to varying cut-offs in pore sizes for macropore categorization (Luxmoore, 1981), but the variability in combination with our results again demonstrates using literature averages to predict CC impacts in Midwestern systems may be inappropriate.

#### *Soil water at saturation and field-capacity*

For these analyses we assigned significance at p-values less than 0.10. With or without a sand covariate, no trial exhibited a significant increase in water held at saturation with the use of cover cropping (**Figure 2**). Water held at saturation is largely dependent on bulk density, so these findings are consistent with the lack of meaningful effect of CCs on bulk densities in our study. Field capacities were significantly higher in the cover cropped plots at one commercial farm (West-grain;  $p = 0.07$ ) and one USDA trial (Central-silage;  $p = 0.05$ ). At the West-grain trial, the soil water at field capacity increased (after sand correction) from 33.6 to 36.0 vol%, and at the Central-silage trial from 38.1 to 40.6 vol%, respectively. An increase in the soil's ability to hold water after gravity drainage may also contribute to peak water flow regulation. By increasing volumetric water content at field capacity by 2 vol% in the 0-20 cm profile, CC fields could hold an additional 40,000 L of water in each 20-cm hectare slice, which could meaningfully reduce the amount of water drained from a field after a saturating rain. For comparison, evapotranspiration rates in an over-wintered rye cover crop with modest biomass production can be  $\sim 24,000 \text{ L ha}^{-1} \text{ day}^{-1}$  (Qi and Helmers, 2010), and peak flows from sub-surface drainage tiles in central Iowa can be  $\sim 22,000 \text{ L ha}^{-1} \text{ hour}^{-1}$  (Daigh et al. 2014). To our knowledge there are limited studies examining the potential for CCs to reduce flood damage in the Midwest, but the one we are aware of accounts for only the increased evapotranspiration with the use of CCs (Antolini et al., 2020). Our study suggests that in addition to reducing run-off (Korucu et al. 2018), considering how CC-induced increases in the amount of water held in a soil at field capacity affect flood incidence and severity would be worth investigating. Furthermore, as other studies have noted, an increase in the amount of water held at field capacity results in more precipitation being stored for cash crop use (Basche et al. 2016; Leuthold et al. 2021), meaning in some cases long-term use of CCs could lead to more stable cash crop yields (Williams et al. 2018).



337



**Figure 2.** Soil volumetric water contents at saturation and field capacity (-100 cmH<sub>2</sub>O) with 10+ years of winter rye cover cropping (green) or winter fallow (brown) in a maize-soybean rotation at four trials. Bars show estimated means, line ranges are the 95% confidence intervals around the mean. Text

presents the estimated effect of cover cropping on volumetric water content in instances of a significant effect.

### 338 *Factors explaining variable results*


339 The West-grain and Central-silage trials both exhibited significantly higher soil water at field capacity  
340 with the use of cover cropping compared to winter fallows. However, the West-grain trial consistently  
341 produced the lowest above-ground CC biomass, and the Central-silage trial the highest (**Table 1**),  
342 indicating the changes in water held at field capacity are likely not associated with CC above-ground  
343 biomass production. Although a previous study suggested soil texture could mediate the effects of long-  
344 term CC-use (Blanco-Canqui and Jasa, 2019), in our dataset there was no pattern between soil textural  
345 characteristics and the magnitude of CC effect on water held at field capacity. This means knowledge of a  
346 soil's texture did not help predict whether a CC would affect water held at field capacity in our study.

347 The West-grain trial was sampled following a soybean crop, and the Central-silage following a silage  
348 crop, while the two trials without significant CC effects were both sampled following a maize-grain crop  
349 (**Table 1**). Soybean and maize-silage crops would leave less residue compared to a preceeding maize-  
350 grain crop, however this study did not measure residue amounts at the time of sampling. Given the lack of  
351 insight into what may be driving the variable effects given the available data, we explored potential  
352 causes for our variable results and identified additional measurements that may aid in identifying drivers  
353 of the variable effects of CCs on soil hydrological properties.

### 354 *Causal model*

355 There are several pathways by which CCs might affect a soil's capacity to hold water (**Figure 3**). The  
356 causal model was built using literature relevant to Midwestern systems, and when applicable was limited  
357 to evidence drawn from research conducted with a cereal rye cover crop (**Supplemental material S6**).  
358 The model was simplified to exclude the effects of soil erosion, soil texture, tillage, and landscape

position, which are all factors that could potentially influence how soil responds to cover cropping (Moore 2021). Rather, we present this simple casual model to provide a base from which to build.



**Figure 3.** Pathways by which cover crops may affect the soil pore size distributions, the amount of water stored at field capacity, and the amount of water at saturation in no-till systems. The effects of soil erosion are not included. X→Y should be read as ‘X affects Y’.

Causal diagrams such as **Figure 3** are the basis for constructing structural equation models, which can greatly enhance researchers' ability to address complex research questions in agriculture (Smith et al., 2014; Wade et al., 2020). For example, in our proposed causal diagram, below-ground biomass measurements are necessary for estimating direct effects of cover cropping on pore size distributions, field capacity, and saturation. This is further supported by recent studies and reviews that identify CC roots as being a crucial component to understanding CC effects on soil properties (Williams and Weil, 2004; Haruna et al., 2020; Ogilvie et al., 2021). While there is limited data available pairing above- and below-ground biomass of CCs, data collected in Iowa over a five-year period showed no relationship between above- and below-ground rye biomass, with root-to-shoot ratios varying from 0.16-1.94 at similar levels of aboveground biomass production (Martinez-Feria et al., 2016). Therefore, above-ground biomass production cannot be used as a proxy for below-ground production with much confidence, and studies that pair above- and below-ground CC biomass with soil measurements would be advantageous in enhancing our understanding of CC effects on soil.

## CONCLUSIONS

We found CCs increased water held at field capacity at the 10-18 cm soil range in two of the four trials sampled. The observed increases were of a meaningful magnitude that could contribute to cash crop water needs, and may have implications for flooding severity in agricultural regions and should be considered when modelling cover crop effects on landscape water balances. We were unable to explain the trial-dependent effects using the available measurements and information. Based on a proposed causal model, we suggest researchers measure CC root biomass in addition to above-ground biomass when examining the effects of CCs on soil properties. Effects of growing over-wintering CCs need to be explicitly investigated in the

Midwestern US, as the constraints of maize-soybean systems may render the effects smaller in magnitude compared to averages reported by global meta-analyses.

## **SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIAL**

S1 - A map of trial locations

S2 - Detailed description of management practices and historical cover crop biomass production for each trial

S3 - Statistical summaries

S4 – Detailed soil texture results

S6 – Causal model literature support

## **DATA AVAILABILITY**

The data are available as downloadable csv files in supplementary material. Additionally, all data are available in an R package (<https://github.com/vanichols/PFIswhc>) and the R code used in processing and summarizing data for this publication is available in a github repository (will be created once paper is accepted).

## **CONFLICT OF INTEREST**

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

## **AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS**

VN contributed to conceptualization, data curation, formal analysis, funding acquisition, investigation, methodology, project administration, writing of original draft, and review/editing. ML contributed to funding acquisition, project administration, supervision, and review/editing of draft. SG contributed to project administration, resources, and review/editing. EM contributed to methodology, resources, and review/editing.

408

**ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

409 We would like to acknowledge Dr. Robert Horton for generously allowing us to use his lab space and  
 410 equipment for this project, and Dr. Michael Castellano for providing suggestions about the manuscript.  
 411 We also thank the two farmers and Keith Kohler and Tom Kaspar for allowing us to collect data in their  
 412 long-term plots, and Wyatt Westfall for his help collecting and preparing samples. We also thank the  
 413 Practical Farmers of Iowa staff and members for their support throughout this project. This material is  
 414 based upon work supported in part by the National Science Foundation (Grant No. DGE-1828942), the  
 415 North Central Region Sustainable Research and Education Program (Grant No. 2017-38640-26916), and  
 416 endowment funds for the Henry A. Wallace Chair for Sustainable Agriculture at Iowa State University.  
 417 Lastly we thank three reviewers for their constructive comments that helped us improve this manuscript.

418

419

**REFERENCES**

- 420 Abiven, S., S. Menasseri, and C. Chenu. 2009. The effects of organic inputs over time on soil aggregate  
 421 stability - A literature analysis. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry* 41(1): 1–12. doi:  
 422 10.1016/j.soilbio.2008.09.015.
- 423 Al-Kaisi, M.M., A. Douelle, and D. Kwaw-Mensah. 2014. Soil microaggregate and macroaggregate  
 424 decay over time and soil carbon change as influenced by different tillage systems. *Journal of Soil*  
 425 *and Water Conservation* 69(6). doi: 10.2489/jswc.69.6.574.
- 426 Al-Shammary, A.A.G., A.Z. Kouzani, A. Kaynak, S.Y. Khoo, M. Norton, et al. 2018. Soil bulk density  
 427 estimation methods: A review. *Pedosphere* 28(4): 581–596. doi: 10.1016/S1002-0160(18)60034-7.
- 428 Ankeny, M.D., Brown, H.J., Cruse, R.M., 1992. Means and method of soil water desorption. U.S. Patent  
 429 268 5,161,407.
- 430 Antolini, F., E. Tate, B. Dalzell, N. Young, K. Johnson, et al. 2020. Flood risk reduction from agricultural  
 431 best management practices. *Journal of the American Water Resources Association* 56(1): 161–179.  
 432 doi: 10.1111/1752-1688.12812.
- 433 Asbjornsen, H., G. Shepherd, M. Helmers, and G. Mora. 2008. Seasonal patterns in depth of water uptake  
 434 under contrasting annual and perennial systems in the Corn Belt region of the Midwestern US. *Plant*  
 435 *and Soil* 308(1–2): 69–92. doi: 10.1007/s11104-008-9607-3.
- 436 Atwood, L.W., and S.A. Wood. AgEvidence: Agro-environmental responses of conservation agricultural  
 437 practices in the US Midwest published from 1980 to 2017. Knowledge Network for Biocomplexity.
- 438 Austin, E.E., K. Wickings, M.D. McDaniel, G.P. Robertson, and A.S. Grandy. 2017. Cover crop root  
 439 contributions to soil carbon in a no-till corn bioenergy cropping system. *GCB Bioenergy* 9(7):  
 440 1252–1263. doi: 10.1111/gcbb.12428.

- 441 Baker, J.M., and T.J. Griffis. 2009. Evaluating the potential use of winter cover crops in corn-soybean  
442 systems for sustainable co-production of food and fuel. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*  
443 149(12): 2120–2132. doi: 10.1016/j.agrformet.2009.05.017.
- 444 Basche, A., and M. DeLonge. 2017. The impact of continuous living cover on soil hydrologic properties:  
445 A meta-analysis. *Soil Science Society of America Journal* 81(5): 1179–1190. doi:  
446 10.2136/sssaj2017.03.0077.
- 447 Basche, A.D., and M.S. DeLonge. 2019. Comparing infiltration rates in soils managed with conventional  
448 and alternative farming methods: A meta-analysis. *PLoS ONE* 14(9): 1–22. doi:  
449 10.1371/journal.pone.0215702.
- 450 Basche, A.D., T.C. Kaspar, S. v. Archontoulis, D.B. Jaynes, T.J. Sauer, et al. 2016. Soil water  
451 improvements with the long-term use of a winter rye cover crop. *Agricultural Water Management*  
452 172: 40–50. doi: 10.1016/j.agwat.2016.04.006.
- 453 Bates, D., M. Mächler, B. Bolker, and S. Walker. 2015. Fitting linear mixed-effects models using lme4.  
454 *Journal of Statistical Software* 67(1): 1–48. doi: 10.18637/jss.v067.i01.
- 455 Blanco-Canqui, H., and P.J. Jasa. 2019. Do grass and legume cover crops improve soil properties in the  
456 long term? *Soil Science Society of America Journal*. 83:1181-1187.
- 457 Bonfante, A., A. Basile, and J. Bouma. 2020. Exploring the effect of varying soil organic matter contents  
458 on current and future moisture supply capacities of six Italian soils. *Geoderma* 361: 114079. doi:  
459 10.1016/j.geoderma.2019.114079.
- 460 Bosatta, E. and G.I. Ågren. 1997. Theoretical analyses of soil texture effects on organic matter  
461 dynamics. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry*, 29(11-12), pp.1633-1638.
- 462 Boyle, M., W.T. Frankenberger, and L.H. Stolzy. 1989. The influence of organic matter on soil  
463 aggregation and water infiltration. *Journal of Production Agriculture* 2(4): 290–299. doi:  
464 10.2134/jpa1989.0290.
- 465 Bozdogan, H. 1987. Model selection and Akaike's Information Criterion (AIC): The general theory and  
466 its analytical extensions. *Psychometrika* 52(3): 345–370. doi: 10.1007/BF02294361.
- 467 Campos, H., M. Cooper, O. Edmeades, C. Löffler, J.R. Schussler, et al. 2006. Changes in drought  
468 tolerance in maize associated with fifty years of breeding for yield in the US corn belt. *Maydica*  
469 51(2).
- 470 Cotrufo, M.F., M.D. Wallenstein, C.M. Boot, K. Denef, and E. Paul. 2013. The Microbial Efficiency-  
471 Matrix Stabilization (MEMS) framework integrates plant litter decomposition with soil organic  
472 matter stabilization: Do labile plant inputs form stable soil organic matter? *Global Change Biology*  
473 19(4): 988–995. doi: 10.1111/gcb.12113.
- 474 Cusser, S., C. Bahlai, S.M. Swinton, G.P. Robertson, and N.M. Haddad. 2020. Long-term research avoids  
475 spurious and misleading trends in sustainability attributes of no-till. *Global Change Biology* 26(6).  
476 doi: 10.1111/gcb.15080.

- 477 Edwards, W.M., L.D. Norton, and C.E. Redmond. 1988. Characterizing macropores that affect infiltration  
478 into non-tilled soil. *Soil Science Society of America Journal* 52(2): 483–487. doi:  
479 10.2136/sssaj1988.03615995005200020033x.
- 480 Gardner, W.R. 1958. Some steady-state solutions of the unsaturated moisture flow equation with  
481 application to evaporation from a water table. *Soil Science* 85(4): 228–232. doi: 10.1097/00010694-  
482 195804000-00006.
- 483 van Genuchten, M.Th. 1980. A closed-form equation for predicting the hydraulic conductivity of  
484 unsaturated soils. *Soil Science Society of America Journal* 44(5): 892–898. doi:  
485 10.2136/sssaj1980.03615995004400050002x.
- 486 Groenevelt, P.H., and C.D. Grant. 2004. A new model for the soil-water retention curve that solves the  
487 problem of residual water contents. *European Journal of Soil Science* 55(3): 479–485. doi:  
488 10.1111/j.1365-2389.2004.00617.x.
- 489 Grossman, R.B., and T.G. Reinsch. 2002. Bulk density and linear extensibility. In J. H. Dane & G. C.  
490 Topp (Eds.), *Methods of soil analysis: Part 4, physical methods* (pp. 201–228). SSSA.  
491 <https://doi.org/10.2136/sssabookser5.4.c9>
- 492 Han, Y., J. Zhang, K.G. Mattson, W. Zhang, and T.A. Weber. 2016. Sample sizes to control error  
493 estimates in determining soil bulk density in California forest soils. *Soil Science Society of America*  
494 *Journal* 80(3): 756–764. doi: 10.2136/sssaj2015.12.0422.
- 495 Haruna, S.I., S.H. Anderson, R.P. Udawatta, C.J. Gantzer, N.C. Phillips, et al. 2020. Improving soil  
496 physical properties through the use of cover crops: A review. *Agrosystems, Geosciences &*  
497 *Environment* 3(1). doi: 10.1002/agg2.20105.
- 498 Haruna, S.I., and N.V. Nkongolo. 2015. Cover Crop Management Effects on Soil Physical and Biological  
499 Properties. *Procedia Environmental Sciences* 29: 13–14. doi: 10.1016/j.proenv.2015.07.130.
- 500 Hoogsteen, M.J.J., E.A. Lantinga, E.J. Bakker, J.C.J. Groot, and P.A. Tittonell. 2015. Estimating soil  
501 organic carbon through loss on ignition: Effects of ignition conditions and structural water loss.  
502 *European Journal of Soil Science* 66(2): 320–328. doi: 10.1111/ejss.12224.
- 503 Hudson, B.D. 1994. Available water capacity and soil organic matter. *Journal of Soil and Water*  
504 *Conservation* 49(2): 189–194. doi: 10.1081/E-ESS-120018496.
- 505 Irmak, S., V. Sharma, A.T. Mohammed, and K. Djaman. 2018. Impacts of cover crops on soil physical  
506 properties: Field capacity, permanent wilting point, soil-water holding capacity, bulk density,  
507 hydraulic conductivity, and infiltration. *Transactions of the ASABE* 61(4). doi:  
508 10.13031/trans.12700.
- 509 de Jong, R., C.A. Campbell, and W. Nicholaichuk. 1983. Water retention equations and their relationship  
510 to soil organic matter and particle size distribution for disturbed samples. *Canadian Journal of Soil*  
511 *Science* 63(2): 291–302. doi: 10.4141/cjss83-029.



- 512 Kane, D.A., M.A. Bradford, E. Fuller, E.E. Oldfield, and S.A. Wood. 2021. Soil organic matter protects  
513 US maize yields and lowers crop insurance payouts under drought. *Environmental Research Letters*  
514 16(4). doi: 10.1088/1748-9326/abe492.
- 515 Kaspar, T.C., D.B. Jaynes, T.B. Parkin, and T.B. Moorman. 2007. Rye cover crop and gamagrass strip  
516 effects on NO<sub>3</sub> concentration and load in tile drainage. *Journal of environmental quality* 36(5):  
517 1503–1511. doi: 10.2134/jeq2006.0468.
- 518 Kaspar, T.C., D.B. Jaynes, T.B. Parkin, T.B. Moorman, and J.W. Singer. 2012. Effectiveness of oat and  
519 rye cover crops in reducing nitrate losses in drainage water. *Agricultural Water Management* 110(3):  
520 25–33. doi: 10.1016/j.agwat.2012.03.010.
- 521 Kaspar, T.C., T.B. Parkin, D.B. Jaynes, C.A. Cambardella, D.W. Meek, et al. 2006. Examining changes  
522 in soil organic carbon with oat and rye cover crops using terrain covariates. *Soil Science Society of*  
523 *America Journal* 70(4): 1168–1177. doi: 10.2136/sssaj2005.0095.
- 524 Kaspar, T., and J. Singer. 2011. The Use of Cover Crops to Manage Soil. Publications from the USDA-  
525 ARS/UNL Faculty. p. 1382. <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/usdaarsfacpub/1382/>
- 526 Kay, B.D., A.P. da Silva, J.A. Baldock, D. Silva, A.P. And Baldock, et al. 1997. Sensitivity of soil  
527 structure to changes in organic carbon content: Predictions using pedotransfer functions. *Canadian*  
528 *Journal of Soil Science* 77(4): 655–667.
- 529 Kim, N., M.C. Zabaloy, K. Guan, and M.B. Villamil. 2020. Do cover crops benefit soil microbiome? A  
530 meta-analysis of current research. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry* 142: 107701. doi:  
531 10.1016/j.soilbio.2019.107701.
- 532 King, A.E., G.A. Ali, A.W. Gillespie, and C. Wagner-Riddle. 2020. Soil organic matter as catalyst of crop  
533 resource capture. *Frontiers in Environmental Science* 8. doi: 10.3389/fenvs.2020.00050.
- 534 Kirkham, M.B. 2014. Principles of soil and plant water relations, 2nd Edition. Elsevier Inc. ISBN  
535 9780124200227
- 536 Kladviko, E.J., T.C. Kaspar, D.B. Jaynes, R.W. Malone, J. Singer, et al. 2014. Cover crops in the upper  
537 midwestern United States: Potential adoption and reduction of nitrate leaching in the Mississippi  
538 River Basin. *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation* 69(4): 279–291. doi: 10.2489/jswc.69.4.279.
- 539 Kool, D., B. Tong, Z. Tian, J.L. Heitman, T.J. Sauer, et al. 2019. Soil water retention and hydraulic  
540 conductivity dynamics following tillage. *Soil and Tillage Research* 193: 95–100. doi:  
541 10.1016/j.still.2019.05.020.
- 542 Korucu, T., M.J. Shipitalo, T.C. Kaspar. 2018. Rye cover crop increases earthworm populations and  
543 reduces losses of broadcast, fall-applied, fertilizers in surface runoff. *Soil and Tillage*  
544 *Research*, 180:99-106.
- 545 Lenth, R., H. Singmann, and J. Love. 2018. Emmeans: Estimated marginal means, aka least-squares  
546 means. R package version 1.5.4. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=emmeans>

- 547 Leslie, A.W., K.H. Wang, S.L.F. Meyer, S. Marahatta, and C.R.R. Hooks. 2017. Influence of cover crops  
548 on arthropods, free-living nematodes, and yield in a succeeding no-till soybean crop. *Applied Soil*  
549 *Ecology* 117–118: 21–31. doi: 10.1016/j.apsoil.2017.04.003.
- 550 Leuthold, S.J., M. Salmerón, O. Wendroth, and H. Poffenbarger. 2021. Cover crops decrease maize yield  
551 variability in sloping landscapes through increased water during reproductive stages. *Field Crops*  
552 *Research* 265. doi: 10.1016/j.fcr.2021.108111.
- 553 de Lima, R.P., A.R. da Silva, and Á.P. da Silva. 2021. soilphysics: An R package for simulation of soil  
554 compaction induced by agricultural field traffic. *Soil and Tillage Research* 206: 104824. doi:  
555 10.1016/j.still.2020.104824.
- 556 Luxmoore, R.J. 1981. Micro-, meso-, and macroporosity of soil. *Soil Science Society of America Journal*  
557 45(3): 671–672. doi: 10.2136/sssaj1981.03615995004500030051x.
- 558 Manns, H.R., and A.A. Berg. 2014. Importance of soil organic carbon on surface soil water content  
559 variability among agricultural fields. *Journal of Hydrology* 516: 297–303. doi:  
560 10.1016/j.jhydrol.2013.11.018.
- 561 Marcillo, G.S.S., and F.E.E. Miguez. 2017. Corn yield response to winter cover crops: An updated meta-  
562 analysis. *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation* 72(3): 226–239. doi: 10.2489/jswc.72.3.226.
- 563 Martinez-Feria, R.A., R. Dietzel, M. Liebman, M.J. Helmers, and S.V. Archontoulis. 2016. Rye cover  
564 crop effects on maize: A system-level analysis. *Field Crops Research* 196: 145–159. doi:  
565 10.1016/j.fcr.2016.06.016.
- 566 Miguez, F. 2021. nlraa: Nonlinear regression for agricultural applications. R package version 0.83.  
567 <https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/nlraa/index.html>
- 568 Miller, B.A., and R.J. Schaetzl. 2012. Precision of soil particle size analysis using laser diffractometry.  
569 *Soil Science Society of America Journal* 76(5): 1719. doi: 10.2136/sssaj2011.0303.
- 570 Minasny, B., and A.B. McBratney. 2018. Limited effect of organic matter on soil available water  
571 capacity. *European Journal of Soil Science* 69(1): 39–47. doi: 10.1111/ejss.12475.
- 572 Moore, E.B., M.H. Wiedenhoef, T.C. Kaspar, and C.A. Cambardella. 2014. Rye cover crop effects on  
573 soil quality in no-till corn silage-soybean cropping systems. *Soil Science Society of America Journal*  
574 78(3): 968–976. doi: 10.2136/sssaj2013.09.0401.
- 575 Moore, E.B. 2021. Management effects on near-surface soil properties in a temperate corn-soybean  
576 cropping system. Graduate Theses and Dissertations. 18564. <https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/etd/18564>
- 577 Nelson, D.W. and Sommers, L.E., 1996. Total carbon, organic carbon, and organic matter. *Methods of*  
578 *soil analysis: Part 3 Chemical methods*. pp 961-1010.
- 579 Nichols, V.A., R.A. Ordóñez, E.E. Wright, M.J. Castellano, M. Liebman, J.L. Hatfield, M. Helmers, S.V.  
580 Archontoulis. 2019. Maize root distributions strongly associated with water tables in Iowa,  
581 USA. *Plant and Soil*, 444(1), pp.225-238. doi: 10.1007/s11104-019-04269-6

- 582 Nichols, V., R. Martinez-Feria, D. Weisberger, S. Carlson, B. Basso, et al. 2020a. Cover crops and weed  
583 suppression in the U.S. Midwest: A meta-analysis and modeling study. *Agricultural &*  
584 *Environmental Letters* 5(1). doi: 10.1002/ael2.20022.
- 585 Nichols, V., L. English, S. Carlson, S. Gailans, and M. Liebman. 2020b. Effects of long-term cover  
586 cropping on weed seedbanks. *Frontiers in Agronomy* 2: 591091. doi: 10.3389/fagro.2020.591091.
- 587 Nichols, V., English, L. E., and Liebman, M. (2020c). Long term cover cropping effects on weed  
588 seedbanks [Dataset]. Iowa State University. doi: 10.25380/iastate.12762011.v1
- 589 Ogilvie, C.M., W. Ashiq, H.B. Vasava, and A. Biswas. 2021. Quantifying root-soil interactions in cover  
590 crop systems: A review. *Agriculture (Switzerland)* 11(3). doi: 10.3390/agriculture11030218.
- 591 Omuto, C.T., M. Maechler, and V. Too. 2021. HydroMe: Estimating water retention and infiltration  
592 model parameters using experimental data. R package version 2.0-1. [https://CRAN.R-](https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=HydroMe)  
593 [project.org/package=HydroMe](https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=HydroMe)
- 594 Pearl, J. 2010. An introduction to causal inference. *International Journal of Biostatistics* 6(2). doi:  
595 10.2202/1557-4679.1203.
- 596 Practical Farmers of Iowa. 2018. Winter cereal rye cover crop effect on cash crop yield Year 10.  
597 Available online (Accessed September 2021): [https://practicalfarmers.org/wp-](https://practicalfarmers.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/Winter_Rye_Effect_on_Yield_Final.pdf)  
598 [content/uploads/2020/01/Winter\\_Rye\\_Effect\\_on\\_Yield\\_Final.pdf](https://practicalfarmers.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/Winter_Rye_Effect_on_Yield_Final.pdf)
- 599 Qi, Z. and M.J. Helmers. 2010. Soil water dynamics under winter rye cover crop in central Iowa. *Vadose*  
600 *Zone Journal*, 9(1), pp.53-60.
- 601 Rizzo, G., J.I.R. Edreira, S.V. Archontoulis, H.S. Yang, and P. Grassini. 2018. Do shallow water tables  
602 contribute to high and stable maize yields in the US Corn Belt? *Global Food Security* 18: 27–34.  
603 doi: 10.1016/J.GFS.2018.07.002.
- 604 Rorick, J.D., and E.J. Kladvko. 2017. Cereal rye cover crop effects on soil carbon and physical properties  
605 in southeastern Indiana. *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation* 72(3). doi: 10.2489/jswc.72.3.260.
- 606 Ruehlmann, J., and M. Körschens. 2009. Calculating the effect of soil organic matter concentration on  
607 soil bulk density. *Soil Science Society of America Journal* 73(3): 876–885. doi:  
608 10.2136/sssaj2007.0149.
- 609 Saxton, K.E., and W.J. Rawls. 2006. Soil water characteristic estimates by texture and organic matter for  
610 hydrologic solutions. *Soil Science Society of America Journal* 70(5): 1569–1578. doi:  
611 10.2136/sssaj2005.0117.
- 612 Scott, N.A., C.V. Cole, E.T. Elliott, S.A. Huffman. 1996. Soil textural control on decomposition and soil  
613 organic matter dynamics. *Soil Science Society of America Journal*, 60(4), pp.1102-1109.
- 614 Smith, R.G., A.S. Davis, N.R. Jordan, L.W. Atwood, A.B. Daly, et al. 2014. Structural equation modeling  
615 facilitates transdisciplinary research on agriculture and climate change. *Crop Science* 54(2): 475–  
616 483. doi: 10.2135/cropsci2013.07.0474.

- SSSA. 2008. Glossary of Soil Science Terms 2008. American Society of Agronomy and Soil Science Society of America, Madison, WI, USA.
- Strock, S.J., P.M. Porter, and M.P. Russelle. 2004. Cover cropping to reduce nitrate loss through subsurface drainage in the northern U.S. corn belt. *Journal of environmental quality* 33(3): 1010–1016. doi: 10.2134/jeq2004.1010.
- Unger, P.W., and M.F. Vigil. 1998. Cover crop effects on soil water relationships. *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation* 53(3): 200–207.
- Villamil, M.B., G.A. Bollero, R.G. Darmody, F.W. Simmons, and D.G. Bullock. 2006. No-till corn/soybean systems including winter cover crops. *Soil Science Society of America Journal* 70(6): 1936–1944. doi: 10.2136/sssaj2005.0350.
- Wade, J., S.W. Culman, J.A.R. Logan, H. Poffenbarger, M.S. Demyan, et al. 2020. Improved soil biological health increases corn grain yield in N fertilized systems across the Corn Belt. *Scientific Reports* 10(1): 3917. doi: 10.1038/s41598-020-60987-3.
- Wickham, H., M. Averick, J. Bryan, W. Chang, L. McGowan, et al. 2019. Welcome to the Tidyverse. *Journal of Open Source Software* 4(43): 1686. doi: 10.21105/joss.01686.
- Williams, A., N.R. Jordan, R.G. Smith, M.C. Hunter, M. Kammerer, D.A. Kane, R.T. Koide, A.S. Davis, 2018. A regionally-adapted implementation of conservation agriculture delivers rapid improvements to soil properties associated with crop yield stability. *Scientific Reports* 8(1): 1-8.
- Williams, A., M.C. Hunter, M. Kammerer, D.A. Kane, N.R. Jordan, et al. 2016. Soil water holding capacity mitigates downside risk and volatility in US rainfed maize: Time to invest in soil organic matter? *PLoS ONE* 11(8): 1–11. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0160974.
- Williams, C.L., M. Liebman, J.W. Edwards, D.E. James, J.W. Singer, et al. 2008. Patterns of regional yield stability in association with regional environmental characteristics. *Crop Science* 48(4): 1545–1559. doi: 10.2135/cropsci2006.12.0837.
- Williams, S.M., and R.R. Weil. 2004. Crop cover root channels may alleviate soil compaction effects on soybean crop. *Soil Science Society of America Journal* 68(4): 1403–1409. doi: 10.2136/sssaj2004.1403.

# Supplementary Material for ‘Winter Cover Cropping Effects on Soil Water-Holding Capacity Vary by Site’

Nichols et al. 2021

6/15/2021

## Supplemental material S1. Map of sites




Figure 1: Map of site locations in Iowa

Supplemental material S2. General Site Management Summary

Table 1: General Site Description

| Site Description | General Location           | Treatment Description  | Year of Initiation | Crop Planted in 2019 | Number of Treatment Replicates | Sampled in 2019 |
|------------------|----------------------------|--|--------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|
| Central Grain    | Boyd Farm, Boone, field 44 | maize/soybean grain rotation, with and without rye cover crop        | 2009               | maize                | 5                              | Y               |
|                  | Boyd Farm, Boone, field 42 | maize/soybean grain rotation, with and without rye cover crop        | 2009               | soy                  | 5                              | Y               |
| Central Silage   | Boyd Farm, Boone, field 44 | maize silage/soybean grain rotation, with and without rye cover crop | 2002               | maize silage         | 5                              | Y               |
|                  | Boyd Farm, Boone, field 42 | maize silage/soybean grain rotation, with and without rye cover crop | 2002               | soy                  | 5                              | N               |
| West             | Jefferson, IA              | maize/soybean grain rotation, with and without rye cover crop        | 2008               | maize                | 4                              | Y               |
| East             | Washington, IA             | maize/soybean grain rotation, with and without rye cover crop        | 2009               | soybeans             | 4                              | Y               |

Table 2: 2018-2019 Herbicide Use

| Site Description | Herbicides Used in 2018 Growing Season  | Herbicides Used in Fall 2018 | Herbicides Used in Spring 2019   |
|------------------|---|------------------------------|--|
| Central Grain    | glyphosate 1 week before soybean planting   | none                         | glyphosate 1 week before maize planting; metalochlor, atrazine, and mesotrione at planting                           |
| Central Grain    | glyphosate 1 week before maize planting; metalochlor, atrazine, and mesotrione at planting  | none                         | glyphosate 1 week before soybean planting  |
| Central Silage   | glyphosate 1 week before soybean planting   | none                         | glyphosate 1 week before maize planting; metalochlor, atrazine, and mesotrione at planting                           |
| Central Silage   | glyphosate 1 week before maize planting; metalochlor, atrazine, and mesotrione at planting  | none                         | glyphosate 1 week before soybean planting  |
| West             | glyphosate before planting; glyphosate and fluthiacet-methyl at planting  | none                         | glyphosate before planting; glyphosate and fluthiacet-methyl at planting   |
| East             | glyphosate and acetochlor before planting (April 15), atrazine, acetochlor at planting (May 14); acetochlor and glyphosate after planting (June 15) | none                         | chlorimuron-ethyl, flumioxazin, pyroxasulfone, and glyphosate before planting, dicamba and acetochlor after planting |

Table 3: General Management

| Site Description | General<br>Herbicide<br>Regime  | General<br>Date of<br>Cover Crop<br>Termination | General<br>Date of<br>Crop<br>Planting | Inorganic<br>Fertilizer<br>Used | Organic<br>Fertilizer<br>Used   | Tillage<br>Used |
|------------------|---|---|--|---------------------------------|---|-----------------|
| Central Grain    | burndown,<br>residual<br>herbicide at<br>maize planting   | 15-Apr  | 26-Apr                                 | Y                               | NA  | N               |
| Central Grain    | burndown,<br>residual<br>herbicide at<br>maize planting   | 25-Apr  | 5-May                                  | Y                               | NA  | N               |
| Central Silage   | burndown,<br>residual<br>herbicide at<br>maize planting   | 15-Apr  | 26-Apr                                 | Y                               | NA  | N               |
| Central Silage   | burndown,<br>residual<br>herbicide at<br>maize planting   | 25-Apr  | 5-May                                  | Y                               | NA  | N               |
| West             | burndown,<br>pre-emergent<br>herbicide  | 1-May   | 10-May                                 | Y                               | chicken or<br>turkey<br>manure  | N               |
| East             | burndown,<br>residual<br>herbicide at<br>planting,<br>another<br>application on<br>maize at ~V6 | 1-May   | 5-May                                  | Y                               | liquid<br>swine,<br>~3000<br>gal/ac<br>every other<br>year to<br>entire field | N               |



Cover crop biomass production over past 10 years of trials

Table 4: Historical cover crop biomass production (Mg/ha) by trial

| trial          | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2019 | 2018 |
|----------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Central_grain  | 0.86 | 0.28 | 1.37 | 0.25 | 0.47 | 0.61 | 2.22 | 2.76 | 1.29 | NA   |
| Central_silage | 1.59 | 1.72 | 3.32 | 1.26 | 0.91 | 1.76 | 4.23 | 2.21 | 2.05 | NA   |
| East_grain     | 2.11 | 1.46 | 0.00 | 0.92 | 0.00 | 0.36 | 0.51 | 7.30 | 0.30 | 0.19 |
| West_grain     | 2.11 | 0.21 | 1.33 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.04 | 0.45 | 0.63 | 0.00 | 0.09 |

For Review Only

## Supplemental material S3. Statistical summaries

### Clay, silt, and sand components

Table 5: Statistical analysis of cover crop effect on clay

| site_sys       | respvar | cc     | no     | contrast | est_diff | diff_se | diff_pval |
|----------------|---------|--------|--------|----------|----------|---------|-----------|
| Central_grain  | clay    | 27.740 | 28.000 | cc - no  | -0.260   | 0.186   | 0.164     |
| Central_silage | clay    | 28.751 | 29.895 | cc - no  | -1.144   | 0.208   | <0.001    |
| East_grain     | clay    | 31.730 | 34.606 | cc - no  | -2.876   | 0.208   | <0.001    |
| West_grain     | clay    | 27.349 | 29.511 | cc - no  | -2.162   | 0.208   | <0.001    |

Table 6: Statistical analysis of cover crop effect on silt

| site_sys       | respvar | cc     | no     | contrast | est_diff | diff_se | diff_pval |
|----------------|---------|--------|--------|----------|----------|---------|-----------|
| Central_grain  | silt    | 39.772 | 40.399 | cc - no  | -0.627   | 0.206   | 0.003     |
| Central_silage | silt    | 41.313 | 40.793 | cc - no  | 0.520    | 0.230   | 0.025     |
| East_grain     | silt    | 55.552 | 55.557 | cc - no  | -0.005   | 0.230   | 0.983     |
| West_grain     | silt    | 41.896 | 44.728 | cc - no  | -2.831   | 0.230   | <0.001    |

Table 7: Statistical analysis of cover crop effect on sand

| site_sys       | respvar | cc     | no     | contrast | est_diff | diff_se | diff_pval |
|----------------|---------|--------|--------|----------|----------|---------|-----------|
| Central_grain  | sand    | 32.486 | 31.600 | cc - no  | 0.886    | 0.299   | 0.003     |
| Central_silage | sand    | 29.811 | 29.233 | cc - no  | 0.578    | 0.335   | 0.085     |
| East_grain     | sand    | 12.715 | 9.837  | cc - no  | 2.877    | 0.335   | <0.001    |
| West_grain     | sand    | 30.506 | 25.610 | cc - no  | 4.896    | 0.335   | <0.001    |

### Soil organic matter

Table 8: Statistical analysis of cover crop effect on organic matter, with and without sand covariate

| cov  | site_sys       | respvar | cc    | no    | contrast | est_diff | diff_se | diff_pval |
|------|----------------|---------|-------|-------|----------|----------|---------|-----------|
| none | Central_grain  | om      | 2.360 | 2.480 | cc - no  | -0.120   | 0.051   | 0.02      |
|      | Central_silage | om      | 2.640 | 2.416 | cc - no  | 0.224    | 0.057   | <0.001    |
|      | East_grain     | om      | 3.575 | 3.675 | cc - no  | -0.100   | 0.057   | 0.082     |
|      | West_grain     | om      | 2.750 | 2.975 | cc - no  | -0.225   | 0.057   | <0.001    |
| sand | Central_grain  | om      | 3.034 | 3.066 | cc - no  | -0.032   | 0.082   | 0.696     |
|      | Central_silage | om      | 3.049 | 2.772 | cc - no  | 0.278    | 0.088   | 0.002     |
|      | East_grain     | om      | 2.290 | 2.105 | cc - no  | 0.185    | 0.093   | 0.048     |
|      | West_grain     | om      | 3.228 | 2.968 | cc - no  | 0.260    | 0.096   | 0.007     |

## Soil bulk density

Table 9: Mean bulk density (g/cm<sup>3</sup>) by trial

| site_name | sys_trt | crop_trt | cc_trt | bulkden_mean | bulkden_sd |
|-----------|---------|----------|--------|--------------|------------|
| Central   | grain   | soy      | cc     | 1.42         | 0.08       |
| Central   | grain   | soy      | no     | 1.37         | 0.07       |
| Central   | silage  | soy      | cc     | 1.46         | 0.06       |
| Central   | silage  | soy      | no     | 1.44         | 0.07       |
| East      | grain   | soy      | cc     | 1.44         | 0.05       |
| East      | grain   | soy      | no     | 1.49         | 0.04       |
| West      | grain   | corn     | cc     | 1.57         | 0.14       |
| West      | grain   | corn     | no     | 1.47         | 0.21       |

Table 10: Statistical analysis of cover crop effect on bulk density, with and without sand covariate

| cov  | site_sys       | respvar | cc    | no    | contrast | est_diff | diff_se | diff_pval |
|------|----------------|---------|-------|-------|----------|----------|---------|-----------|
| none | Central_grain  | bd      | 1.422 | 1.374 | cc - no  | 0.048    | 0.010   | <0.001    |
| none | Central_silage | bd      | 1.464 | 1.436 | cc - no  | 0.028    | 0.011   | 0.012     |
| none | East_grain     | bd      | 1.437 | 1.488 | cc - no  | -0.050   | 0.011   | <0.001    |
| none | West_grain     | bd      | 1.573 | 1.472 | cc - no  | 0.101    | 0.011   | <0.001    |
| sand | Central_grain  | bd      | 1.309 | 1.275 | cc - no  | 0.033    | 0.013   | 0.011     |
| sand | Central_silage | bd      | 1.395 | 1.386 | cc - no  | 0.010    | 0.014   | 0.483     |
| sand | East_grain     | bd      | 1.653 | 1.752 | cc - no  | -0.098   | 0.015   | <0.001    |
| sand | West_grain     | bd      | 1.493 | 1.473 | cc - no  | 0.020    | 0.015   | 0.188     |

## Soil moisture (%vol) at saturation

Table 11: Statistical analysis of cover crop effect on soil water at saturation, with and without sand covariate

| cov  | site_sys       | term   | contrast  | estimate | std.error | df     | statistic | adj.p.value | param      |
|------|----------------|--------|-----------|----------|-----------|--------|-----------|-------------|------------|
| sand | Central_grain  | cc_trt | cc effect | -0.013   | 0.008     | 26.000 | -1.688    | 0.103       | saturation |
| sand | Central_silage | cc_trt | cc effect | 0.004    | 0.008     | 26.000 | 0.510     | 0.614       | saturation |
| sand | East_grain     | cc_trt | cc effect | 0.011    | 0.009     | 26.000 | 1.271     | 0.215       | saturation |
| sand | West_grain     | cc_trt | cc effect | -0.007   | 0.009     | 26.000 | -0.729    | 0.473       | saturation |
| none | Central_grain  | cc_trt | cc effect | -0.016   | 0.008     | 13.050 | -1.959    | 0.072       | saturation |
| none | Central_silage | cc_trt | cc effect | 0.002    | 0.009     | 14.068 | 0.246     | 0.809       | saturation |
| none | East_grain     | cc_trt | cc effect | 0.002    | 0.009     | 13.050 | 0.228     | 0.823       | saturation |
| none | West_grain     | cc_trt | cc effect | -0.022   | 0.009     | 13.050 | -2.430    | 0.030       | saturation |

Soil moisture (%vol) at field capacity (-100 cm water)

Table 12: Statistical analysis of cover crop effect on soil water at field capacity, with and without sand covariate

| cov  | site_sys       | term   | contrast  | estimate | std.error | df     | statistic | adj.p.value | param          |
|------|----------------|--------|-----------|----------|-----------|--------|-----------|-------------|----------------|
| sand | Central_grain  | cc_trt | cc effect | -0.002   | 0.006     | 26.000 | -0.430    | 0.671       | field capacity |
|      | Central_silage | cc_trt | cc effect | 0.012    | 0.006     | 26.000 | 2.041     | 0.052       | field capacity |
| sand | East_grain     | cc_trt | cc effect | -0.002   | 0.006     | 26.000 | -0.353    | 0.727       | field capacity |
| sand | West_grain     | cc_trt | cc effect | 0.012    | 0.007     | 26.000 | 1.835     | 0.078       | field capacity |
| none | Central_grain  | cc_trt | cc effect | -0.004   | 0.005     | 13.044 | -0.800    | 0.438       | field capacity |
|      | Central_silage | cc_trt | cc effect | 0.012    | 0.006     | 14.005 | 2.242     | 0.042       | field capacity |
| none | East_grain     | cc_trt | cc effect | -0.007   | 0.006     | 13.044 | -1.317    | 0.211       | field capacity |
| none | West_grain     | cc_trt | cc effect | 0.003    | 0.006     | 13.044 | 0.597     | 0.561       | field capacity |

For Review Only

## Fitted parameters a and n

Table 13: Table of 'a' Gardener parameter estimate

| site_sys       | cc_trt | rep | estimate | std.error |
|----------------|--------|-----|----------|-----------|
| Central_grain  | cc     | 1   | 0.043    | 0.010     |
|                |        | 2   | 0.025    | 0.006     |
|                |        | 3   | 0.015    | 0.012     |
|                |        | 4   | 0.021    | 0.010     |
|                |        | 5   | 0.002    | 0.001     |
|                | no     | 1   | 0.020    | 0.010     |
|                |        | 2   | 0.025    | 0.009     |
|                |        | 3   | 0.010    | 0.005     |
|                |        | 4   | 0.013    | 0.007     |
|                |        | 5   | 0.041    | 0.014     |
| Central_silage | cc     | 1   | 0.028    | 0.014     |
|                |        | 2   | 0.030    | 0.013     |
|                |        | 3   | 0.011    | 0.008     |
|                |        | 4   | 0.015    | 0.011     |
|                |        | 5   | 0.044    | 0.013     |
|                | no     | 1   | 0.049    | 0.029     |
|                |        | 2   | 0.046    | 0.014     |
|                |        | 3   | 0.048    | 0.014     |
|                |        | 4   | 0.016    | 0.007     |
|                |        | 5   | 0.092    | 0.029     |
| East_grain     | cc     | 1   | 0.100    | 0.027     |
|                |        | 2   | 0.180    | 0.046     |
|                |        | 3   | 0.054    | 0.022     |
|                |        | 4   | 0.085    | 0.024     |
|                |        | 5   | 0.088    | 0.022     |
|                | no     | 1   | 0.088    | 0.022     |
|                |        | 2   | 0.080    | 0.028     |
|                |        | 3   | 0.073    | 0.026     |
|                |        | 4   | 0.080    | 0.024     |
|                |        | 5   | 0.092    | 0.029     |
| West_grain     | cc     | 1   | 0.007    | 0.008     |
|                |        | 2   | 0.026    | 0.006     |
|                |        | 3   | 0.039    | 0.016     |
|                |        | 4   | 0.032    | 0.015     |
|                | no     | 1   | 0.013    | 0.013     |
|                |        | 2   | 0.029    | 0.012     |
|                |        | 3   | 0.051    | 0.017     |
|                |        | 4   | 0.102    | 0.017     |

Table 14: Table of 'n' Gardener parameter estimate

| site_sys       | cc_trt | rep | estimate | std.error |
|----------------|--------|-----|----------|-----------|
| Central_grain  | cc     | 1   | 0.987    | 0.079     |
|                |        | 2   | 1.099    | 0.073     |
|                |        | 3   | 1.106    | 0.219     |
|                |        | 4   | 1.086    | 0.141     |
|                |        | 5   | 1.468    | 0.198     |
|                | no     | 1   | 0.999    | 0.154     |
|                |        | 2   | 1.007    | 0.110     |
|                |        | 3   | 1.291    | 0.139     |
|                |        | 4   | 1.264    | 0.153     |
|                |        | 5   | 0.949    | 0.112     |
| Central_silage | cc     | 1   | 0.813    | 0.158     |
|                |        | 2   | 0.850    | 0.137     |
|                |        | 3   | 1.006    | 0.220     |
|                |        | 4   | 1.173    | 0.212     |
|                |        | 5   | 0.639    | 0.116     |
|                | no     | 1   | 0.923    | 0.197     |
|                |        | 2   | 0.705    | 0.108     |
|                |        | 3   | 0.614    | 0.121     |
|                |        | 4   | 1.041    | 0.125     |
|                |        | 5   | 0.772    | 0.104     |
| East_grain     | cc     | 2   | 0.817    | 0.115     |
|                |        | 3   | 0.994    | 0.140     |
|                |        | 4   | 0.740    | 0.105     |
|                |        | 1   | 0.651    | 0.099     |
|                |        | 2   | 0.973    | 0.133     |
|                | no     | 3   | 0.880    | 0.131     |
|                |        | 4   | 0.880    | 0.110     |
|                |        | 5   | 0.737    | 0.116     |
|                |        | 1   | 1.009    | 0.305     |
|                |        | 2   | 0.834    | 0.071     |
| West_grain     | cc     | 3   | 0.488    | 0.175     |
|                |        | 4   | 0.997    | 0.145     |
|                |        | 1   | 1.039    | 0.268     |
|                |        | 2   | 0.970    | 0.133     |
|                | no     | 3   | 0.837    | 0.110     |
|                |        | 4   | 0.743    | 0.064     |
|                |        |     |          |           |
|                |        |     |          |           |




Figure 2: Non-linear model fitted parameters

## Macro-pore percentages

Table 15: Table of macropores estimates and comparisons

| site_sys       | cc_trt | estimate | df     | conf.low | conf.high | contrast | est_diff | pval_diff |
|----------------|--------|----------|--------|----------|-----------|----------|----------|-----------|
| Central-grain  | cc     | 0.589    | 26.228 | 0.518    | 0.660     | cc - no  | -0.029   | 0.606     |
|                | no     | 0.618    | 26.228 | 0.547    | 0.689     | cc - no  |          |           |
| Central-silage | cc     | 0.535    | 26.228 | 0.464    | 0.606     | cc - no  | -0.051   | 0.403     |
|                | no     | 0.586    | 26.989 | 0.506    | 0.665     | cc - no  |          |           |
| East-grain     | cc     | 0.731    | 26.989 | 0.651    | 0.811     | cc - no  | 0.019    | 0.750     |
|                | no     | 0.712    | 26.228 | 0.641    | 0.783     | cc - no  |          |           |
| West-grain     | cc     | 0.478    | 26.989 | 0.399    | 0.558     | cc - no  | -0.127   | 0.053     |
|                | no     | 0.605    | 26.989 | 0.525    | 0.685     | cc - no  |          |           |

Supplemental material S4. Detailed soil texture results




Figure 3: Soil texture components varied by trial and cover crop treatment, with the cover cropped plots having significantly more sand bolded orange color, and significantly less clay at the West-grain and East-grain trials both, commercial fields

Table with values:

Table 16: Table of values

| site_sys       | cc_trt | clay | sand | silt | tot | sig_sand_diff |
|----------------|--------|------|------|------|-----|---------------|
| Central-grain  | cc     | 0.28 | 0.32 | 0.40 | 1   | No            |
|                | no     | 0.28 | 0.32 | 0.40 | 1   |               |
| Central-silage | cc     | 0.29 | 0.30 | 0.41 | 1   | Yes           |
|                | no     | 0.30 | 0.29 | 0.41 | 1   |               |
| East-grain     | cc     | 0.32 | 0.12 | 0.56 | 1   | Yes           |
|                | no     | 0.35 | 0.09 | 0.56 | 1   |               |
| West-grain     | cc     | 0.27 | 0.31 | 0.42 | 1   | Yes           |
|                | no     | 0.30 | 0.25 | 0.45 | 1   |               |



Table 17: Table of sand statistics

| site_sys       | respvar | cc     | no     | contrast | est_diff | diff_se | pval   |
|----------------|---------|--------|--------|----------|----------|---------|--------|
| Central_grain  | sand    | 32.486 | 31.600 | cc - no  | 0.886    | 0.299   | 0.003  |
| Central_silage | sand    | 29.811 | 29.233 | cc - no  | 0.578    | 0.335   | 0.085  |
| East_grain     | sand    | 12.715 | 9.837  | cc - no  | 2.877    | 0.335   | <0.001 |
| West_grain     | sand    | 30.506 | 25.610 | cc - no  | 4.896    | 0.335   | <0.001 |

For Review Only