## **WHAT SOIL MEASUREMENTS RELATE BEST TO CORN ECONOMIC OPTIMAL N RATE?**

Jason Clark<sup>1</sup>, Péter Kovács<sup>1</sup>, Anthony Bly<sup>1</sup>, and Chris Graham<sup>1</sup> 1South Dakota State University–Brookings, SD Jason.D.Clark@sdstate.edu (801) 644-4857

# **INTRODUCTION**

The use of nitrogen (N) fertilizer is critical for optimizing corn (*Zea mays* L.) yield. However, improper applications can reduce fertilizer efficiency, create environmental issues, and reduce grower profits (Lawlor et al., 2008; Struffert et al., 2016; McCasland et al., 2020). One way to improve the accuracy of corn fertilizer-N rate guidelines is to improve soil testing and its use in making management decisions (Dinnes et al., 2002). To most effective in improving N rate guidelines, soil tests will likely need to account for both plant-available inorganic N and N that will be mineralized during the growing season.

To this point much research has been completed in using inorganic soil N to improve N rate guidelines accuracy (Vanotti and Bundy, 1994; Osterhaus et al., 2008; Sainz Rozas et al., 2008). Since 20% to 100% of N needed by corn to obtain optimal growth can be supplied by mineralization processes (Roberts et al., 2011; Yost et al., 2012; Morris et al., 2018), including biological soil tests along with inorganic N soil tests has the potential to improve upon current N rate guidelines. Recent research has shown that that improvements in soil biological health, improves corn yield potential (Wade et al., 2020). Soil tests that have shown some promise in being used to improve corn N rate guidelines include soil respiration or flush of  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  after rewetting soil (Yost et al., 2018; Bean et al., 2020; Franzluebbers, 2020). However, there are many other soil biological tests that may be able to be used in improving corn N rate guidelines (Karlen et al., 2019; Norris et al., 2020). Therefore, the inclusion of biological soil tests alone or in combination with other soil chemical and physical properties may enable us to improve the accuracy of corn N fertilizer needs to optimize yield. The objective of this study was to determine the relationship between EONR of corn and various soil chemical, physical, and biological properties.

### **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

This study was conducted in 28 sites across central and eastern SD from 2018- 2021 (Table 1). Sites varied in tillage practice, crop rotation, and soil type. The study was arranged as a randomized complete block design with four replications. Nitrogen fertilizer was applied at rates from zero to 200 lbs N  $ac^{-1}$  in 40 lb increments prior to planting. Urea (46%N) with N-(n-butyl) thiophosphoric triamide and dicyandiamide, SuperU) (Koch Fertilizer LLC) was broadcast on the soil surface.

Soil samples were collected prior to planting and fertilization from each replication using a 10-core composite sample for depths of 0-6 and 6-24 in. Soil samples were sieved through an 8-mm sieve and organic matter removed then air-

		<b>Nearest</b>		<b>Previous</b>		<b>Mean Nitrate-N</b>
Year	County	City	<b>Soil Texture</b>	Crop	<b>Tillage</b>	0-24 in., lbs $ac^{-1}$
2018	<b>Brookings</b>	<b>Brookings</b>	NA	<b>NA</b>	Conventional	51
2018	Codington	Southshore	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	Conventional	92
2018	Clay	<b>Beresford</b>	<b>NA</b>	NA	No-till	65
2018	Codington	Southshore	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	Conventional	49
2018	<b>Brookings</b>	Volga	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	Conventional	76
2018	Faulk	Chelsea	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	No-till	62
2018	Faulk	Chelsea	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	No-till	53
2019	<b>Brookings</b>	Aurora	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	Conventional	74
2019	Codington	Southshore	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	Conventional	75
2019	Clay	<b>Beresford</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	Conventional	95
2019	<b>Brookings</b>	Volga	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	Conventional	63
2019	Edmunds	Ipswich	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	No-till	61
2019	Spink	Mansfield	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	No-till	56
2019	<b>Brookings</b>	<b>Bushnell</b>	<b>NA</b>	NA	Conventional	32
2019	<b>Brookings</b>	<b>Bushnell</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	Conventional	26
2019	Minnehaha	Garretson	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	No-till	25
2019	Minnehaha	Garretson	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	No-till	78
2020	<b>Brookings</b>	<b>Brookings</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	Conventional	52
2020	Clay	<b>Beresford</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	No-till	53
2020	Codington	Southshore	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	Conventional	39
2020	<b>McCook</b>	Salem	Clay Loam	Soybean	Reduced till	30
2021	Roberts	Wilmot	Loam	Soybean	Reduced till	37
2021	Yankton	Yankton	Clay Loam	Wheat	No-till	26
2021	<b>Brookings</b>	Aurora	Clay Loam	Soybean	Conventional	30
2021	Roberts	Wilmot	Clay Loam	Soybean	Reduced till	28
2021	Aurora	Plankinton	Clay Loam	Sunflower	No-till	19
2021	Hutchinson	Freeman	Sandy Clay Loam	Soybean	No-till	30
2021	Turner	Freeman	Clay Loam	Soybean	Reduced till	27
2021	Lincoln	Lennox	Clay Loam	Soybean	Reduced till	36
2021	Codington	Southshore	Clay Loam	Soybean	Conventional	45
2021	Clay	<b>Beresford</b>	Clay Loam	Soybean	No-till	19
2021	Minnehaha	Renner	Sandy Loam	Corn	Conventional	30
2021	Minnehaha	Garretson	Silty Clay Loam	Corn	Conventional	32
2021	<b>Brookings</b>	Volga	Clay Loam	Soybean	Conventional	39

**Table 1.** Soil and management characteristics at each site.

aNA, Not available.

dried, and ground through a 2-mm sieve. Soil samples were sent to Ward Laboratories (Kearney, NE) for soil analyses. Both the 0-6 and 6-24 in. samples were analyzed for  $NO<sub>3</sub>–N$  and NH<sub>4</sub>–N following recommended practices by the North Central Region (Nathan et al., 2015). The 0-6 in. depth was also analyzed for several other soil physical, chemical, and biological measurements along with their associated methods that are included in table 2.

Corn grain yield was determined by harvesting the center two rows of each plot and adjusting grain weight to 15.5% moisture. SAS software version 9.4 (SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC) was used to complete all statistical analyses. The PROC REG and PROC NLIN procedures were used to evaluate the linear, quadratic, linear-plateau, and quadratic-plateau models for the corn N response to N fertilizer rate applications. A model averaging approach using both the linear- and quadratic-plateau model were used following the approach described by Miguez and Poffenbarger (2022) to calculate

economic optimal N rate (N price =  $$0.40$  lb<sup>-1</sup> and corn price =  $$4.00$  bu<sup>-1</sup>), yield at economic optimal N rate, and yield without N fertilization. Sites were noted as nonresponsive and EONR set to 0 lbs N ac<sup>-1</sup> when no plateau was reached. The EONR was noted as the maximum N rate applied (200 lbs N  $ac^{-1}$ ) when no plateau was reached and a linear model best described the N response.





# **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

### **EONR Related to Soil Health**

The acid citrate extractable (ACE) protein test had the best relationship with EONR ( $R^2$  = 0.34) (Table 3). All other soil health tests did not have a significant relationship with EONR. These results demonstrate that out of the six commonly used soil health measurements (POXC, soil respiration, ACE protein, and 3 enzymes: Arylsufatase, β-Glucosidase, N-acetyl-β-Glucosaminidase) evaluated in this study, the ACE protein test was the most likely test to help us further improve N rate guidelines. Although, these other tests do not relate well to EONR, they can still likely be used to evaluate general soil health and nutrient cycling.



**Table 3.** Relationship between corn economic optimal N rate (EONR) and various soil parameters.

Note: Units are the same as in table 1 unless otherwise noted.

# **EONR Related to Soil N Measurements**

In areas in the US that are semi-arid to arid like that of South Dakota, the soil NO3–N test is typically used to adjust N rate guidelines (Morris et al., 2018). However, the relationship between EONR and the traditionally used KCI extractable  $NO<sub>3</sub>$ –N and  $NH_4$ –N from the top 6 or 24 inches never had a significant relationship ( $P < 0.05$ ) with EONR (Table 3). This lack of relationship provides evidence to re-evaluate South Dakota's current N rate guidelines that use soil  $NO<sub>3</sub>–N$  from the top 24 inches to adjust N rate recommendations. Also, important to note from these findings is that even though KCl extractable NO<sub>3</sub>-N and NH<sub>4</sub>-N did not relate to EONR, the H2O and H3A extractable NO<sub>3</sub>–N tests from the top 6 inches had a relationship with EONR ( $R^2$  = 0.17). Thus, providing evidence that H2O and H3A extractable N should be further evaluated for its ability to be used to improve current N rate guidelines. All other soil N tests evaluated in this study either had no relationship or a very weak relationship ( $R^2$  < 0.10) with EONR.

### **EONR Related to C, Soil Texture, and Other Measurements**

Similar to soil N tests, the various organic matter, C, and soil texture measurements also had at best marginal relationships with EONR ( $R^2 \le 0.20$ ) (Table 3). Of the C measurements, water extractable total C ( $R^2$  = 0.20) had the strongest relationship followed by total organic C ( $R^2$  = 0.19) and total C ( $R^2$  = 0.19). When evaluating the components of soil texture (% sand, silt, and clay) and their ratios with each other, their relationships with EONR varied with R-squared results ranging between <0.01 (% clay) to 0.19 (silt:sand ratio). The best relationship alone of the three texture components was silt ( $R^2$  = 0.15), sand ( $R^2$  = 0.09), and lastly clay ( $R^2$  = < 0.01). From these results, the various C measurements regardless of method and sand and silt percentage were the most likely to be able to be used to help improve current fertilizer-N rate guidelines.

Overall, the preliminary results from this study showed that the ACE protein test, C measurements, and the silt to sand ratio were the soil tests most likely to help us improve prediction of corn EONR. Continued evaluation of these soil tests relationship with EONR will continue for at least one more year at 12 locations throughout South Dakota.

### **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

Research funded by the SD Nutrient Research and Education Council and NIFA Hatch project SD000H676-18.

#### **REFERENCES**

- Bean, G. Mac, N.R. Kitchen, K.S. Veum, J.J. Camberato, R.B. Ferguson, F.G. Fernandez, D.W. Franzen, C.A.M. Laboski, E.D. Nafziger, J.E. Sawyer, and M. Yost. 2020. Relating four-day soil respiration to corn nitrogen fertilizer needs across 49 U.S. Midwest fields. Soil Science Society of America Journal 84: 1195–1208. doi: 10.1002/saj2.20091.
- Dinnes, D.L., D.L. Karlen, D.B. Jaynes, T.C. Kaspar, J.L. Hatfield, T.S. Colvin, and C.A. Cambardella. 2002. Nitrogen management strategies to reduce nitrate leaching in tile-drained Midwestern soils. Agronomy Journal 94: 153–171. doi: 10.2134/agronj2002.0153.
- Franzluebbers, A.J. 2020. Soil-test biological activity with the flush of CO2: V. Validation of nitrogen prediction for corn production. Agronomy Journal 112: 2188–2204. doi: 10.1002/agj2.20094.
- Gelderman, R.H., and D. Beegle. 2014. Nitrate-nitrogen. Recommended chemical soil test procedures for the North Central Region. North Central Regional Res. Publ. no. 221 (revised Oct. 2012). University of Missouri, Columbia. p. 5.1-5.4
- Haney, R.L., E.B. Haney, L.R. Hossner, and J.G. Arnold. 2010. Modifications to the new soil extractant H3A-1: A multinutrient extractant. Communications in Soil Science and Plant Analysis 41(12): 1513– 1523. doi: 10.1080/00103624.2010.482173.
- Karlen, D.L., K.S. Veum, K.A. Sudduth, J.F. Obrycki, and M.R. Nunes. 2019. Soil health assessment: Past accomplishments, current activities, and future opportunities. Soil and Tillage Research 195: 104365. doi: 10.1016/j.still.2019.104365.
- Lawlor, P.A., M.J. Helmers, J.L. Baker, S.W. Melvin, and D.W. Lemke. 2008. Nitrogen application rate effect on nitrate-nitrogen concentration and loss in subsurface drainage for a corn-soybean rotation. Transactions of the ASABE 51: 83–94. http://lib.dr.iastate.edu/abe\_eng\_pubs/308/ (accessed 2 September 2014).
- McCasland, M., N.M. Trautmann, K.S. Porter, and R.J. Wagenet. 2020. Nitrate: Health effect in drinking water. Pesticide Safety Education Program. http://psep.cce.cornell.edu/facts-slides-self/facts/nit-heefgrw85.aspx (accessed 2 September 2021).
- Miguez, F.E., and H. Poffenbarger. 2022. How can we estimate optimum fertilizer rates with accuracy and precision? Agricultural and Environmental Letters 7(1): 1–5. doi: 10.1002/ael2.20075.
- Moebius-Clune, B., D. Moebius-Clune, B. Gugino, O. Idowu, R. Schindelbeck, A. Ristow, H. van Es, J. Thies, H. Shayler, M. McBride, K. Kurtz, D. Wolfe, and G. Abawi. 2016. Comprehensive Assessment of Soil Health – The Cornell Framework. 3.2. Cornell University, Geneva, NY.
- Morris, T.F., T.S. Murrell, D.B. Beegle, J.J. Camberato, R.B. Ferguson, J. Grove, Q. Ketterings, P.M. Kyveryga, C.A.M. Laboski, J.M. McGrath, J.J. Meisinger, J. Melkonian, B.N. Moebius-Clune, E.D. Nafziger, D.L. Osmond, J.E. Sawyer, P.C. Scharf, W. Smith, J.T. Spargo, H.M. Van Es, and H. Yang. 2018. Strengths and limitations of nitrogen rate recommendations for corn and opportunities for improvement. Agronomy Journal 110: 1–37. doi: 10.2134/agronj2017.02.0112.
- Nathan, M. V, R. Gelderman, B. Joern, A. Mallarino, D. Mengel, J. Dahl, D. Kaiser, T. Shaver, D. Franzen, S. Culman, and J. Peters. 2015. Recommended chemical soil test procedures for the North Central Region. North Central Regional Publication no. 221 (R.
- Nelson, D.W., and L.E. Sommers. 1996. Total carbon, organic carbon, and organic matter. In: Sparks, D.L., editor, Methods of soil analysis. Part 3, Chemical methods. SSSA book series: 5. ASA, CSSA, and SSSA, Madison, WI. p. 961–1010
- Norris, C.E., G. Mac Bean, S.B. Cappellazzi, M. Cope, K.L.H. Greub, D. Liptzin, E.L. Rieke, P.W. Tracy, C.L.S. Morgan, and C.W. Honeycutt. 2020. Introducing the North American project to evaluate soil health measurements. Agronomy Journal 112: 3195–3215. doi: 10.1002/agj2.20234.
- Osterhaus, J.T., L.G. Bundy, and T.W. Andraski. 2008. Evaluation of the Illinois Soil Nitrogen Test for Predicting Corn Nitrogen Needs. Soil Science Society of America Journal 72(1): 143. doi: 10.2136/sssaj2006.0208.
- Peters, J., M. Nathan, and C. Laboski. 2014. pH an lime requirement. In: Brown, J.., editor, Recommended Chemical Soil Test Procedures for the North Central Region. North Central Region Publication No. 221. University of Missouri, Columbia
- Roberts, T., W. Ross, R. Norman, N. Slaton, and C. Wilson. 2011. Predicting nitrogen fertilizer needs for rice in Arkansas using alkaline hydrolyzable-nitrogen. Soil Science Society of America Journal 75: 1161–1171. doi: 10.2136/sssaj2010.0145.
- Sainz Rozas, H., P.A. Calvino, H.E. Echeverría, P.A. Barbieri, and M. Redolatti. 2008. Contribution of anaerobically mineralized nitrogen to the reliability of planting or presidedress soil nitrogen test in maize. Agronomy Journal 100: 1020–1025. doi: 10.2134/agronj2007.0077.
- Soil Survey Staff. 2014. Kellogg soil survey laboratory methods manual. Soil survey investigations report No. 42, Version 5.0 (R. Burt and Soil Survey Staff, editors). U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS).
- Struffert, A.M., J.C. Rubin, F.G. Fernandez, and J.A. Lamb. 2016. Nitrogen management for corn and groundwater quality in Upper Midwest irrigated sands. Journal of Environment Quality 45: 1557–1564. doi: 10.2134/jeq2016.03.0105.
- Vanotti, M.B., and L.G. Bundy. 1994. Corn nitrogen recommendations based on yield response data. Journal of Production Agriculture 7: 249–256.
- Wade, J., S.W. Culman, J.A.R. Logan, H. Poffenbarger, M.S. Demyan, J.H. Grove, A.P. Mallarino, J.M. McGrath, M. Ruark, and J.R. West. 2020. Improved soil biological health increases corn grain yield in N fertilized systems across the Corn Belt. Scientific Reports 10(1): 1–9. doi: 10.1038/s41598-020- 60987-3.
- Weil, R.R., K.R. Islam, M.A. Stine, J.B. Gruver, and S.E. Samson-Liebig. 2003. Estimating active carbon for soil quality assessment: A simplified method for laboratory and field use. American Journal of Alternative Agriculture 18: 3–17. doi: 10.1079/AJAA2003003.
- Yost, M.A., J.A. Coulter, M.P. Russelle, C.C. Sheaffer, and D.E. Kaiser. 2012. Alfalfa nitrogen credit to firstyear corn: Potassium, regrowth, and tillage timing effects. Agronomy Journal 104: 953–962. doi: 10.2134/agronj2011.0384.
- Yost, M.A., K.S. Veum, N.R. Kitchen, J.E. Sawyer, J.J. Camberato, P.R. Carter, R.B. Ferguson, F.G. Fernandez, D.W. Franzen, C.A. Laboski, and E.D. Nafziger. 2018. Evaluation of the Haney Soil Health Tool for corn nitrogen recommendations across eight Midwest states. Journal of Soil and Water Conservation 73(5): 587–592. doi: 10.2489/jswc.73.5.587.
- Zibilske, L.M. 1994. Carbon mineralization. In: Weaver, R., Angle, S., Bottomley, P., Bezdicek, D., Smith, S., and Tabatabai, A., editors, Methods of Soil Analysis. Part 2. Microbiological and Bochemical Properties, 5.2. Soil Science Society of America, Madison, WI. p. 835–863