



# Can the presence of plantain (*Plantago lanceolata* L.) improve nitrogen cycling of dairy grassland systems on peat soils?

Jeroen Pijlman, Stijn J. Berger, Fay Lexmond, Jaap Bloem, Jan Willem van Groenigen, Eric J. W. Visser, Jan Willem Erisman & Nick van Eekeren

**To cite this article:** Jeroen Pijlman, Stijn J. Berger, Fay Lexmond, Jaap Bloem, Jan Willem van Groenigen, Eric J. W. Visser, Jan Willem Erisman & Nick van Eekeren (2020) Can the presence of plantain (*Plantago lanceolata* L.) improve nitrogen cycling of dairy grassland systems on peat soils?, New Zealand Journal of Agricultural Research, 63:1, 106-122, DOI: 10.1080/00288233.2019.1698620

To link to this article: <u>https://doi.org/10.1080/00288233.2019.1698620</u>

| 9         | © 2019 The Author(s). Published by Informa<br>UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis<br>Group | + | View supplementary material 🕼                 |
|-----------|--|---|---|
|           | Published online: 04 Dec 2019.   |   | Submit your article to this journal $arsigma$ |
| 111       | Article views: 1538  | ď | View related articles 🗹                       |
| CrossMark | View Crossmark data 🗹  | ආ | Citing articles: 2 View citing articles 🗹     |

**RESEARCH ARTICLE** 

Taylor & Francis Taylor & Francis Group

**∂** OPEN ACCESS

Check for updates

# Can the presence of plantain (*Plantago lanceolata* L.) improve nitrogen cycling of dairy grassland systems on peat soils?

Jeroen Pijlman <sup>(D)</sup><sup>a</sup>, Stijn J. Berger<sup>b</sup>, Fay Lexmond<sup>c</sup>, Jaap Bloem<sup>d</sup>, Jan Willem van Groenigen<sup>c</sup>, Eric J. W. Visser<sup>b</sup>, Jan Willem Erisman<sup>a,e</sup> and Nick van Eekeren<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Louis Bolk Institute, Bunnik, The Netherlands; <sup>b</sup>Department of Experimental Plant Ecology, Institute for Water and Wetland Research, Radboud University Nijmegen, Nijmegen, The Netherlands; <sup>c</sup>Soil Biology Group, Wageningen University, Wageningen, The Netherlands; <sup>d</sup>Wageningen Environmental Research, Wageningen, The Netherlands; <sup>e</sup>Faculty of Science, Earth and Climate, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

#### ABSTRACT

Reactive nitrogen (N) losses, and in particular nitrous oxide losses, from dairy grasslands on peat soils are generally high as a result of relative high soil organic matter contents, potential N mineralisation rates and shallow groundwater levels. Effects of the inclusion of the temperate forage species plantain (Plantago lanceolata L.) (PL), which produces secondary compounds with biological nitrification inhibition capacity, on the fate of soil mineral N were studied in a combined mesocosm and field experiment. The experiments comprised four treatments differing in intentional herbage share of plantain versus perennial ryegrass (Lolium perenne L.) (100%PL, 66%PL, 33%PL and 0%PL). Potential nitrification in the mesocosm experiment was significantly lower at 100%PL versus 0%PL (p = 0.018), but soil nitrate concentrations were not. Nitrous oxide fluxes reduced by 39% (p = 0.021) in the presence of plantain in the field experiment, without an obvious link to the quantity of plantain. N use efficiency of plantain tended to increase with the quantity of plantain in the sward in the mesocosm experiment (p = 0.098), but not in the field experiment. Our results suggest that the presence of plantain can affect the fate of soil mineral N of dairy grasslands on peat soils.

#### **ARTICLE HISTORY**

Received 25 July 2019 Accepted 25 November 2019

#### **KEYWORDS**

Plantain; nitrogen; peat; grassland; nitrification; nitrous oxide

# Introduction

Agriculture is the largest contributor to global reactive nitrogen (N) production (Galloway et al. 2008). This causes environmental pollution, disrupts N cycles of natural ecosystems and results in a significant biodiversity loss (Galloway et al. 2008; Erisman et al. 2013). It is clear that reactive N exceeds the limits of interference with the global N cycle (Rockström et al. 2009). In commercial dairy farms N losses during conversion of N into milk and meat are often high, and include gaseous forms (N<sub>2</sub>, N<sub>2</sub>O, NOx, NH<sub>3</sub>) as well as losses to groundwater through erosion, runoff or leaching of nitrate (NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>) (Jarvis 1993;

CONTACT Jeroen Pijlman 🖂 j.pijlman@louisbolk.nl

Supplemental data for this article can be accessed https://doi.org/10.1080/00288233.2019.1698620

© 2019 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, and is not altered, transformed, or built upon in any way.

Kohn et al. 1997; Nevens et al. 2006; Powell et al. 2010). Dairy grassland systems on peat soils are particularly prone to high N<sub>2</sub>O losses as a result of relative high soil organic matter contents, high potential N mineralisation rates and shallow groundwater levels (Koops et al. 1996; Van den Pol-van Dasselaar et al. 1998).

Due to the increase of mineral N use in agriculture since the introduction of mineral fertilisers,  $NO_3^-$  nowadays accounts for >95% of N plant uptake in modern agriculture (Subbarao et al. 2015), despite the fact that  $NO_3^-$  is more easily lost from the soil through leaching or denitrification than  $NH_4^+$ . Inhibition of soil nitrification has therefore been identified as a potential measure to increase herbage mineral N uptake efficiency and to reduce  $NO_3^-$  leaching and gaseous N emissions (mainly  $N_2O$  and  $N_2$ ) (Di et al. 2009; Butterbach-Bahl et al. 2013; Ruser and Schulz 2015; Subbarao et al. 2015; Bowatte et al. 2016).

Synthetic nitrification inhibitors such as dicyandiamide (DCD) and 3,4-dimethypyrazole phosphate (DMPP) have shown to reduce the release of compounds such as  $N_2O$  from soil to the environment under different conditions (Ruser and Schulz 2015). But, further study on their efficacy under different conditions and long term applications is still needed, as well as on the impact of their toxicity on plant growth and human health (Ruser and Schulz 2015; Yang et al. 2016). Biological nitrification inhibition (BNI) might be an interesting alternative to reduce N losses from agriculture to the environment (Subbarao et al. 2015). BNI is defined as the release of compounds from plant roots that directly influence nitrifying organisms, i.e. via the reduction of ammonia monooxygenase (AMO) enzymatic activity by inhibiting or inactivating AMO enzymatic pathways (Arp and Stein 2003; Subbarao et al. 2015). For example, the tropical pasture species *Brachiaria* spp., which is adapted to low-N environments, can release significant amounts of compounds with BNI capacity depending on the presence of NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> in the soil (Subbarao et al. 2007). However, more recently the presence of compounds with BNI capacity has been identified in plantain (Plantago lanceaolata L.) (Dietz et al. 2013). Plantain is a pasture species which is known to grow on a wide variety of soils in temperate climates, is highly responsive to soil N, has good forage quality, has been cultivated to produce large amounts of forage (Stewart 1996; Lee et al. 2015) and could therefore be included in grassland mixtures in the search for improving farming system N use efficiency. The major secondary metabolites of plantain that have been identified as potentially causing BNI due to their chemical structure, are aucubin, catalpol, verbascoside and their aglyca (Dietz et al. 2013).

Several studies performed on sand and loamy sand soils have reported effects of plantain on soil nitrifying activity and the fate of soil mineral N. Verhagen et al. (1995) observed more than 200-fold lower numbers of nitrifying bacteria as well as lowered potential  $NH_4^+$ -oxidising activities in the presence of plantain, after application of  $NH_4^+$ fertiliser. Dietz et al. (2013) found that aucubin as well as soil incubated with plantain leaf material negatively affected soil mineralisation and nitrification. Carlton et al. (2019) observed a lower abundance of  $NH_4^+$ -oxidising bacteria and a significant decrease of  $NO_3^-$  eutrophication if plantain was present in the forage in a ryegrass-clover sward on which urine-N was applied in patches at a rate of 7.0 g m<sup>-2</sup>. Luo et al. (2018) and Simon et al. (2019) observed lower  $N_2O$  emissions in the presence of plantain, after cattle urine applications on silt loam soils.

There are no known reports on the effects of plantain or other plants secreting compounds with potential BNI capacity on N cycling under nutrient rich conditions such as dairy grasslands on peat soils. Therefore, we studied the effects of the presence of 108 👄 J. PIJLMAN ET AL.

plantain in a mixture with perennial ryegrass (*Lolium perenne* L.) on the fate of soil mineral N in a combined mesocosm experiment with peat soil and in a field experiment on a dairy grassland on peat soil. We hypothesised that the presence of plantain in a mixture with perennial ryegrass, compared to a monoculture of perennial ryegrass, (1) reduces the process of soil nitrification, (2) lowers soil  $NO_3^-$  concentrations, (3) reduces soil  $N_2O$  emissions and (4) leads to an increased efficiency of herbage N uptake.

# **Material and methods**

# Mesocosm experiment

The mesocosm experiment comprised four treatments differing in proportions of plantain (PL) and perennial ryegrass (RG) (100%PL, 66%PL, 33%PL and 0%PL). Thirty-two mesocosms were allocated to the treatments according to a completely randomised design, resulting in eight replicates per treatment. Mesocosms were made up of glass containers ( $25 \text{ cm} \times$  $25 \text{ cm} \times 30 \text{ cm}$  height) which were filled with 5 cm of gravel, which in turn was topped with root fabric and 25 cm of soil. Within the gravel, a porous cup (Rhizon SMS, Eijkelkamp, Giesbeek, the Netherlands) was placed in order to collect water leaching from the system. Peat soil (terric histosol, IUSS Working Group WRB 2015) from a depth of ±10-20 cm below surface was obtained from a perennial dairy grassland with a mean groundwater table of 60 cm below surface (Knowledge Transfer Centre (KTC), Zegveld, the Netherlands, 52°08'25.7" N, 4°50'22.0" E) (see Table 1 for soil parameters). Before filling, the soil was thoroughly mixed by hand. Mesocosms were placed in a temperature-regulated water bath and maintained at  $\pm 12^{\circ}$ C soil temperature using a cryostat (ThermoFlex 1400, ThermoFisher Scientific, Waltham, MA, USA). The experiment was performed in the greenhouse facilities of Radboud University (Nijmegen, the Netherlands), and ran from 28 July till 23 December 2017 (148 days). Within the facilities, the temperature was maintained between 16.6 and 17.5°C, relative humidity at 50% and irradiance at 111 W  $\,m^{-2}$  or higher for 16 h per day, using grow lights if sunlight was not sufficient. Mesocosms received on average twice a week equal amounts of demineralised water.

|               |                       |                        | Mesocosm<br>experiment |       | Field experiment |       | ıt  |
|---------------|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|-------|------------------|-------|-----|
|               |                       |                        | Mean                   | Range | Mean             | Range | SD  |
| Soil          | Organic matter        | %                      | 47.8                   | 1.0   | 44.2             | 3.7   |     |
|               | Lutum                 | %                      | 36                     | 1     | 27               | 2     |     |
|               | Total C               | g 100 g <sup>-1</sup>  | 26.2                   | 1.2   | 20.3             | 4.7   |     |
|               | Total N               | mg 100 $g^{-1}$        | 2244                   | 89    | 2028             | 64    |     |
|               | Total P               | mg 100 g <sup>-1</sup> | 187                    | 22    | 195              | -     |     |
|               | P <sub>AL</sub>       | mg 100 g <sup>-1</sup> | 7.2                    | 0.4   | 12.2             | 3.5   |     |
|               | Total K               | mg 100 g <sup>-1</sup> | 14                     | -     | 36               | 1     |     |
|               | pH-KCl                | _                      | 4.6                    | 0.0   | 4.9              | 0.2   |     |
| Temperature   | Mar. – Oct. 2017      | °C                     |                        |       | 14.0             |       | 3.8 |
|               | Mar. – Oct. 2018      | °C                     |                        |       | 14.6             |       | 5.0 |
|               | Mar. – Oct. 1999–2018 | °C                     |                        |       | 13.6             |       | 4.1 |
| Precipitation | Mar. – Oct. 2017      | mm month <sup>-1</sup> |                        |       | 72               |       | 38  |
|               | Mar. – Oct. 2018      | mm month <sup>-1</sup> |                        |       | 43               |       | 26  |
|               | Mar. – Oct. 1999–2018 | mm month <sup>-1</sup> |                        |       | 69               |       | 17  |

**Table 1.** Properties of soil used (n = 2 per experiment) for the mesocosm and field experiment and monthly mean air temperatures and precipitation sums for the field experiment.

Note: SD = standard deviation.

After an acclimatisation period of 17 days, plantain (*Plantoga lanceolata* L. var. 'Hercules', Pelgrum Vink Materials, Lobith, the Netherlands) was planted at rates of 24, 16, 8 or 0 seedlings per mesocosm and ryegrass (*Lolium perenne* L. var. 'Barimero' (50%) and var. 'Toronto' (50%), BG3 Superplus, Barenbrug Holland, Nijmegen the Netherlands) was sown at rates of 0.0, 1.5, 3.0 and 4.5 g m<sup>-2</sup> in the treatments 100%PL, 66%PL, 33%PL and 0%PL, respectively. The day of seeding and planting was considered as day 0 of the experiment. Plantain seeds were placed on a humid paper cloth at room temperature and seedlings were planted three days after germination.

Above ground herbage was harvested at  $\pm 5$  cm stubble height on days 41, 61, 95 and 116. At each harvest, the total herbage of each mesocosm was manually separated into plantain and ryegrass, and the dry matter (DM) content of both species was determined by oven drying at 70°C for 48 h. Ryegrass and plantain harvested at day 116 were also analysed for total N content using an elemental analyser (EA NA1500 Carlo Erba, Thermo-Fisher Scientific, Waltham, MA, USA) after thoroughly grinding the dried plant material using a mixer mill (MM400, Retsch, Haan, Germany).

On days 5, 74, 95 and 116 soil cores and soil leachate samples were collected. Leachate was obtained via the porous cups by connecting a vacuumed syringe to the cups until 20 mL fluid was collected. Soil cores (0-20 cm depth) were obtained by using a 17 mm diameter gouge, and the resulting hole was filled with a 20 mm diameter PVC pipe which was closed off on top to prevent interactions other than soil surface interactions with the atmosphere. Soil samples were weighed and split into two equal parts. Samples were incubated in 100 mL HDPE-bottles either with 50 mL type I purified water in order to remove water soluble ions or with 50 mL of 0.2M NaCl solution in order to remove cations. Incubated samples were shaken at 105 rpm for 2 h at room temperature and a porous cup was placed in each HDPE-bottle connected to a 100 mL vacuumed bottle to obtain fluid samples. NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> and NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> concentrations in the soil fluid and leachate samples were measured colorimetrically with two continuous flow AutoAnalyzer III systems (Bran + Luebbe, Norderstedt, Germany), using hydrazine sulphate and salicylate, respectively (for details see Geurts et al. 2008). Soil core sample DM contents were determined by oven drying at 70°C for 48 h in order to express results per kg of soil DM.

At day 148, 0–10 cm depth soil cores of treatment 100%PL and 0%PL were taken for analyses of DM content and  $NO_3^-$  and  $NH_4^+$  concentrations as described above, and for analyses of potential nitrification (ISO 15685:2012). For potential nitrification, soil was sieved over a 5 mm screen in order to remove roots. Autotrophic  $NH_4^+$  oxidising bacteria were exposed to ammonium sulphate in soil slurry buffered at pH 7.2. Oxidation of the nitrite, performed by nitrite-oxidising bacteria in the slurry, was inhibited by the addition of sodium chlorate. The subsequent accumulation of nitrite was measured over a 6 h incubation period, and taken as an estimate of the potential activity of  $NH_4^+$  oxidising bacteria at the time of sampling. For details see Belser and Mays (1980).

#### Field experiment

The field experiment was established by sowing plantain and ryegrass at 18 May 2017 on a dairy grassland on peat with a mean groundwater table of 60 cm below surface (KTC

Zegveld, 52°08′23.3″N, 4°50′12.9″E). Ten days before sowing, the field was treated with 2.5 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> glyphosate (Roundup<sup>\*</sup>+, Monsanto, Saint Louis, MO, USA), and on the day before sowing, the present grass sod was rotavated at a depth of ±10 cm. The treatments 100%PL, 66%PL, 33%PL and 0%PL were allocated to twenty-four plots of  $2.5 \times 10.0$  m according to a complete randomised block design, resulting in six replicates per treatment. Plantain seed was sown at 1.00, 0.66, 0.33 and 0.00 g m<sup>-2</sup> for the treatments 100%PL, 66% PL, 33%PL and 0%PL, respectively, and ryegrass seed was sown at 3 g m<sup>-2</sup> in all treatments (Remmelink et al. 2018), following advised sowing rates for monocultures and mixtures and reported sowing rates for plantain monocultures by Minneé et al. (2013) and Lee et al. (2015). The same varieties and seedlines were used in the mesocosm and field experiment.

In June 2017, above ground herbage was mulched and left in place, and in September 2017, herbage was harvested and removed from the fields (mean stubble height  $\pm$  5 cm). In March 2018, all plots were fertilised with 5.0 g N m<sup>-2</sup>, 8.3 g K m<sup>-2</sup> and 1.8 g P m<sup>-2</sup> and in May 2018 with 6.6 g K m<sup>-2</sup>. N, K and P were applied in the form of calcium ammonium nitrate (CAN), potassium chloride and diphosphorus pentoxide, respectively. On 12 September 2018 all fields were again fertilised with 5.0 g CAN-N m<sup>-2</sup> prior to the measurements of soil N<sub>2</sub>O fluxes.

Soil samples (0–10 cm depth) were taken before the start of the experiment and in November 2018 and were pooled per sampling moment for further analyses (Table 1). In the year of establishment (2017) and measurements (2018), average temperatures during the growing season (Mar. – Oct.) were 0.4°C and 1.0°C higher, respectively, compared to 20 year averages (KNMI, de Bilt, the Netherlands, Table 1). Monthly precipitations were on average 3 mm higher (2017) and 26 mm lower (2018) compared to 20 year averages. The growing season of 2018 had the 5th highest mean potential precipitation deficit since 1901 (Sluijter et al. 2018). Between 1 May and 31 July 2018, cumulative precipitation was 55 mm while 20 year averages for that period were 216 mm.

Herbage yields were determined at a stubble height of  $\pm 5$  cm on 16 May, 13 June, 24 July, 4 September and 29 October 2018 using a 'Haldrup' small plot harvester (J. Haldrup, Løgstør, Denmark). Two subsamples were taken per harvest date and plot. The first was used for analyses of total herbage DM content (oven drying at 70°C for 48 h). The second subsample of at least 0.2 kg was manually separated into plantain, grasses and other herbs and forbs to obtain the sward species composition, as described in Hoekstra et al. (2018). The separated plantain, total grasses and other herbs and forbs were analysed for total N contents (NEN-ISO 5983-2, Kjeldahl method, Eurofins Agro, Wageningen, the Netherlands).

Soil N<sub>2</sub>O fluxes were measured five times with six to eight day intervals from 20 September 2018 onwards. Within each of the 24 plots three fixed locations were randomly chosen, and each measurement day sealed off airtight for at least 30 min (exact time was recorded) using 3.1 L polyethylene caps equipped with tube fittings. The build-up of N<sub>2</sub>O concentrations in the caps was measured using a photo-acoustic multi-gas monitor (Innova 1312, Innova AirTech Instruments, Ballerup, Denmark) by connecting Teflon tubes to the fittings. Fluxes were corrected for background concentrations, determined each fifth measurement. After correction, flux data were averaged per field. Cumulative soil N<sub>2</sub>O fluxes were calculated assuming a linear flux between the measurement dates. For more details see Velthof et al. (2002).

#### Statistical analyses

All statistical analyses were done in R (R Core Team 2017). Soil and leachate  $NO_3^-$  and  $NH_4^+$  concentrations measured in the mesocosm experiment were log-transformed before analyses since data did not fit a normal distribution. Analyses for statistical differences between treatments of soil, leachate, herbage and cumulative  $N_2O$  data were done by one or two-way ANOVA in which mesocosms and plots were considered as an experimental unit in the mesocosm and field experiment, respectively. Block effects of the replications were included in the analyses of the field experiment data. Differences between treatments were analysed by Least Significant Differences (LSD). In all analyses a *p*-value  $\leq 0.05$  was considered as significant.

Models for the approximation of herbage N uptake of both experiments were fitted by stepwise regression. Model selection was done based on the lowest Akaike information criterion. Following the hypotheses that plantain can increase plant N use efficiency, candidate predictors for total herbage, grass and plantain herbage N uptake were plantain and grass DM yield. Linear and quadratic effects of candidate predictors were allowed.

#### Results

#### Mesocosm experiment

Potential soil nitrification at day 148 of the experiment was significantly lower for the 100%PL treatment compared to 0%PL (39.7 versus 65.0 µmol NO<sub>2</sub> g<sup>-1</sup> h<sup>-1</sup>, p = 0.018). Soil NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> concentrations were negatively correlated to potential nitrification (r = -0.83, p = 0.011 for 100%PL and r = -0.75, p = 0.033 for 0%PL) (Figure 1). The presence and amount of plantain did not affect leachate and soil NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> and NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> concentrations, since there were no significant differences between the treatments at any of the sampling moments (Table 2). Soil NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> concentrations decreased during the experiment, while NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> concentrations were highest at day 95 and lower at the subsequent sampling days.



**Figure 1.** Mesocosm experiment. Correlation between soil potential nitrification and soil NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> concentrations in treatments 100%PL (*open dots*, r = -0.83, p = 0.011) and 0%PL (*squares*, r = -0.75, p = 0.033) at day 148.

| $\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $   |                                       |       |                                | Treatment |                   |                   |                   |                    |         |       |  |
|--|---------------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|-----------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------|---------|-------|--|
| $\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $   |                                       | Depth |                                | 100%      |                   |                   |                   | <i>p</i> -         |         |       |  |
| $ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$  | Parameter                             | (cm)  | Unit                           | Day       | PL                | 66%PL             | 33%PL             | 0%PL               | value   | SEM   |  |
| $ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$  | Leachate NO <sub>3</sub>              |       | mg $L^{-1}$                    | 5         | 0.37              | 0.43              | 0.34              | 0.46               | 0.912   | 0.198 |  |
| Leachate $NH_4^+$ $mg  L^{-1}$ $\overset{95}{5}$ $\overset{0.27}{0.20}$ $\overset{0.21}{0.21}$ $\overset{0.19}{0.585}$ $\overset{0.585}{0.058}$ $\overset{0.058}{0.027}$ $\overset{0.585}{0.53}$ $\overset{0.0977}{0.225}$ $\overset{0.21}{0.225}$ $\overset{0.21}{74}$ $\overset{0.225}{4.23}$ $\overset{0.216}{3.73}$ $\overset{0.225}{0.244}$ $\overset{0.225}{3.23}$ $\overset{0.216}{3.77}$ $\overset{0.343}{0.296}$ $\overset{0.236}{0.255}$ $\overset{0.2}{74}$ $\overset{0.2}{4.28}$ $\overset{0.2}{2.84}$ $\overset{4.07}{4.07}$ $\overset{0.2}{3.51}$ $\overset{0.206}{0.265}$ $\overset{0.236}{0.255}$ $\overset{0.2}{0.216}$ $\overset{0.343}{0.39}$ $\overset{0.2}{0.66}$ $\overset{0.2}{0.255}$ $\overset{0.2}{0.216}$ $\overset{0.343}{0.39}$ $\overset{0.2}{0.216}$ $\overset{0.343}{0.39}$ $\overset{0.2}{0.216}$ $\overset{0.343}{0.379}$ $\overset{0.2}{0.216}$ $\overset{0.2}{0.369}$ $\overset{0.2}{0.216}$ $\overset{0.369}{0.369}$ $\overset{0.2}{0.20}$ $\overset{0.2}{95}$ $\overset{0.2}{564.1}$ $\overset{0.4}{54.4}$ $\overset{4.12}{412}$ $\overset{4.36.5}{3.65}$ $\overset{0.798}{0.788}$ $\overset{0.2}{5.40}$ $\overset{0.2}{0.20}$ $\overset{0.2}{95}$ $\overset{0.2}{564.1}$ $\overset{0.2}{54.4}$ $\overset{0.2}{4.12}$ $\overset{0.2}{3.65}$ $\overset{0.2}{0.21}$ $\overset{0.2}{0.21}$ $\overset{0.2}{5.42}$ $\overset{0.2}{0.216}$ $\overset{0.2}{5.42}$ $\overset{0.2}{0.20}$ $\overset{0.2}{95}$ $\overset{0.2}{5.44.4}$ $\overset{0.2}{4.12}$ $\overset{0.2}{3.65}$ $\overset{0.2}{0.794}$ $\overset{0.2}{4.52}$ $\overset{0.2}{0.21}$ $\overset{0.2}{6.60}$ $\overset{0.2}{5.44}$ $\overset{0.2}{4.52}$ $\overset{0.2}{0.21}$ $\overset{0.2}{6.60}$ $\overset{0.2}{5.44}$ $\overset{0.2}{6.60}$ $\overset{0.2}{5.44}$ $\overset{0.2}{6.61}$ $\overset{0.2}{$ | 5                                     |       |                                | 74        | 0.16              | 0.23              | 0.15              | 0.24               | 0.425   | 0.083 |  |
| $ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$  |                                       |       |                                | 95        | 0.27              | 0.20              | 0.21              | 0.19               | 0.585   | 0.058 |  |
| $ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$  |                                       |       |                                | 116       | 0.45              | 0.44              | 0.55              | 0.53               | 0.977   | 0.587 |  |
| $ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$  | Leachate NH <sub>4</sub> <sup>+</sup> |       | mg $L^{-1}$                    | 5         | 3.73              | 2.44              | 3.23              | 3.15               | 0.247   | 0.225 |  |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$   |                                       |       |                                | 74        | 4.28              | 2.84              | 4.07              | 3.51               | 0.206   | 0.255 |  |
| $ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$  |                                       |       |                                | 95        | 5.28              | 3.76              | 4.57              | 2.39               | 0.216   | 0.343 |  |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$   |                                       |       |                                | 116       | 4.95              | 3.78              | 3.79              | 3.17               | 0.559   | 0.369 |  |
| $ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$  | Soil NO <sub>3</sub> <sup></sup>      | 0–20  | mg kg <sup>-1</sup> DM<br>soil | 5         | 6.6*              |                   |                   |                    |         |       |  |
| $ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$  |                                       | 0-20  |                                | 74        | 103.9             | 90.6              | 86.7              | 77.8               | 0.521   | 5.42  |  |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$   |                                       | 0-20  |                                | 95        | 564.1             | 544.4             | 441.2             | 436.5              | 0.798   | 54.40 |  |
| Soil $NH_4^+$ $\begin{array}{c} 0-10\\ 0-20\\ mg kg^{-1} DM\\ soil \end{array}$ 148111.1<br>5NDND108.5 $0.942$ 16.60 $\begin{array}{c} 0-20\\ 0-2$   |                                       | 0-20  |                                | 116       | 45.4              | 40.8              | 36.0              | 51.8               | 0.540   | 4.52  |  |
| $ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$  |                                       | 0-10  |                                | 148       | 111.1             | ND                | ND                | 108.5              | 0.942   | 16.60 |  |
| $ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$  | Soil NH <sub>4</sub> <sup>+</sup>     | 0–20  | mg kg <sup>-1</sup> DM<br>soil | 5         | 62.0*             |                   |                   |                    |         |       |  |
| $ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$  |                                       | 0–20  |                                | 74        | 111.8             | 142.3             | 73.2              | 117.8              | 0.113   | 14.02 |  |
| $ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$  |                                       | 0-20  |                                | 95        | 22.3              | 15.5              | 18.9              | 16.0               | 0.618   | 2.09  |  |
| Soil moisture $     0-10 \\     0-20 \\     0-20 \\     0-20 \\     0-20 \\     0-20 \\     0-20 \\     0-10     148     1.2 ND ND 8.9 0.354 3.99Soil moisture     0-20 \\     0-20 \\     0-20 \\     0-10     174     727     724   $  |                                       | 0-20  |                                | 116       | 2.5               | 2.1               | 1.5               | 2.8                | 0.635   | 0.67  |  |
| Soil moisture $0-20$<br>$0-20$ $g kg^{-1} soil$ $5$ $660^*$ $0-20$<br>$0-20$ $74$ $727$ $724$ $690$<br>$600^b$ $710$ $0.704$ $7.1$ $0-20$<br>  |                                       | 0-10  |                                | 148       | 1.2               | ND                | ND                | 8.9                | 0.354   | 3.99  |  |
| $ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$  | Soil moisture                         | 0-20  | a ka <sup>-1</sup> soil        | 5         | 660*              |                   |                   |                    |         |       |  |
| $ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$  |                                       | 0-20  | 5 5                            | 74        | 727               | 724               | 690               | 710                | 0.704   | 7.1   |  |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$   |                                       | 0-20  |                                | 95        | 647 <sup>a</sup>  | 618 <sup>b</sup>  | 607 <sup>b</sup>  | 600 <sup>b</sup>   | 0.010   | 3.7   |  |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$  |                                       | 0-20  |                                | 116       | 560               | 560               | 547               | 574                | 0.925   | 10.1  |  |
| Total biomass DM<br>yield $g m^{-2}$ $cum$ $294^b$ $430^a$ $483^a$ $465^a$ $<0.001$ $32.5$ Plantain DM yield $g m^{-2}$ $cum$ $294^a$ $173^b$ $94^c$ $<0.001$ $14.9$ Ryegrass DM yield $g m^{-2}$ $cum$ $258^b$ $390^a$ $465^a$ $<0.001$ $26.6$ Total biomass N $g m^{-2}$ $cum$ $3.85^b$ $5.03^a$ $5.04^a$ $4.13^{ab}$ $0.045$ $0.19$ yield $m^{-2}$ $cum$ $3.85^a$ $1.85^b$ $0.93^c$ $<0.001$ $0.26$ Plantain N yield $g m^{-2}$ $cum$ $3.19$ $4.10$ $4.13$ $0.118$ $0.18$   |                                       | 0–10  |                                | 148       | 593               | ND                | ND                | 583                | 0.525   | 7.3   |  |
| $ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$  | Total biomass DM<br>yield             |       | $\mathrm{g}~\mathrm{m}^{-2}$   | cum       | 294 <sup>b</sup>  | 430 <sup>a</sup>  | 483 <sup>a</sup>  | 465ª               | <0.001  | 32.5  |  |
| Ryegrass DM yield g m <sup>-2</sup> cum 258 <sup>b</sup> 390 <sup>a</sup> 465 <sup>a</sup> <0.001 26.6   Total biomass N g m <sup>-2</sup> cum 3.85 <sup>b</sup> 5.03 <sup>a</sup> 5.04 <sup>a</sup> 4.13 <sup>ab</sup> 0.045 0.19   yield g m <sup>-2</sup> cum 3.85 <sup>a</sup> 1.85 <sup>b</sup> 0.93 <sup>c</sup> <0.001  | Plantain DM yield                     |       | g m <sup>-2</sup>              | cum       | 294 <sup>a</sup>  | 173 <sup>b</sup>  | 94 <sup>c</sup>   |                    | < 0.001 | 14.9  |  |
| Total biomass N g m <sup>-2</sup> cum 3.85 <sup>b</sup> 5.03 <sup>a</sup> 5.04 <sup>a</sup> 4.13 <sup>ab</sup> 0.045 0.19   yield g m <sup>-2</sup> cum 3.85 <sup>a</sup> 1.85 <sup>b</sup> 0.93 <sup>c</sup> <0.001   | Ryegrass DM yield                     |       | $g m^{-2}$                     | cum       |                   | 258 <sup>b</sup>  | 390 <sup>a</sup>  | 465 <sup>a</sup>   | < 0.001 | 26.6  |  |
| Plantain N yield g m <sup>-2</sup> cum 3.85 <sup>a</sup> 1.85 <sup>b</sup> 0.93 <sup>c</sup> <0.001 0.26<br>Ryegrass N yield g m <sup>-2</sup> cum 3.19 4.10 4.13 0.118 0.18   | Total biomass N<br>yield              |       | g m <sup>-2</sup>              | cum       | 3.85 <sup>b</sup> | 5.03ª             | 5.04 <sup>a</sup> | 4.13 <sup>ab</sup> | 0.045   | 0.19  |  |
| Ryegrass N yield g m <sup>-2</sup> cum 3.19 4.10 4.13 0.118 0.18   | Plantain N yield                      |       | g m <sup>-2</sup>              | cum       | 3.85 <sup>a</sup> | 1.85 <sup>b</sup> | 0.93 <sup>c</sup> |                    | < 0.001 | 0.26  |  |
|  | Ryegrass N yield                      |       | $\tilde{g} m^{-2}$             | cum       |                   | 3.19              | 4.10              | 4.13               | 0.118   | 0.18  |  |

**Table 2.** Mesocosm experiment: Back log-transformed mean values of leachate and soil  $NO_3^-$  and  $NH_4^+$  concentrations, and soil moisture concentrations at different sampling days.

Note: Cumulative dry matter (DM) yields of herbage harvested at days 41, 61, 95 and 116, and N-contents and N yields of herbage harvested at day 116 of the experiment. Values not sharing the same superscript letter differ significantly (p < 0.05). DM = dry matter, cum = cumulative data, ND = not determined and SEM = standard error of the mean. Note the difference in soil sampling depth for the soil NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>, NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> and moisture concentrations. \*Pooled sample analysis

Soil moisture concentration was significantly higher for 100%PL versus the other treatments at day 95 (p = 0.004), but not significantly different between treatments at any other sampling time.

Plants did not flower during the experiment. Cumulative herbage DM yield after 116 days of growth was significantly lower for 100%PL compared to the other treatments (p < 0.001, Table 2). At day 116, treatment 100%PL showed a lower N yield compared to the treatments 66%PL and 33%PL (p = 0.045). Ryegrass made up the greatest part of the cumulative DM yield and the N yield at day 116 in the 66%PL and 33%PL treatments. Stepwise regression revealed that plantain N yields tended to increase quadratically (p = 0.098) in addition of a linear effect (p = 0.014) to plantain DM yields, while ryegrass N yields only increased linearly per unit of ryegrass DM yield (p < 0.001) (Figure 2, Table S1). Total herbage N yields (plantain + ryegrass) were significantly (p < 0.001) positively correlated to PL and ryegrass DM yields; however, the total herbage N yield increase



**Figure 2.** Mesocosm experiment. Nitrogen (N) yields of plantain (*open dots*) and ryegrass (*squares*) versus plantain and ryegrass dry matter (DM) yields at day 116 of the experiment, grown in a mono-culture or in a plantain ryegrass mixture. For model details on the fitted lines see Table S1.

was greater per gram of plantain DM yield  $(1.94 \cdot 10^{-2} \text{ g g}^{-1})$  than per gram of ryegrass DM yield  $(1.60 \cdot 10^{-2} \text{ g g}^{-1})$ , respectively.

No significant correlations were observed between soil  $NO_3^-$  or  $NH_4^+$  concentrations and plantain or ryegrass N uptake at day 116, between soil  $NH_4^+$  concentrations and potential nitrification at day 148 or between plantain or ryegrass N uptake at day 116 and potential nitrification at day 148.

#### Field experiment

N<sub>2</sub>O-N fluxes were significantly higher for 0%PL compared to the other treatments at 21 days after the CAN-N application (p = 0.009, Figure 3). Cumulative N<sub>2</sub>O-N fluxes differed significantly for all combined plantain treatments compared to the control without plantain (p = 0.021) (Figure 4). Overall, the highest mean N<sub>2</sub>O-N fluxes ( $0.53 \pm 0.53$  mg m<sup>-2</sup> h<sup>-1</sup>) were observed 15 days after the N application and after the first significant precipitation during the measurement period (32 mm, Figure 4). After day 15, observed mean fluxes were lower at each subsequent measurement day. The lowest mean N<sub>2</sub>O-N fluxes were observed at 35 days after the CAN-N application ( $0.12 \pm 0.06$  mg m<sup>-2</sup> h<sup>-1</sup>).

At each harvest, plantain had produced inflorescences while ryegrass had not. Except for the fifth harvest, treatments significantly affected the total herbage DM yield (p < 0.001 for all four harvests) (Figure 5). At the first harvest, herbage DM yields were highest for 0%PL and lowest for 100%PL, while at the second, third and fourth harvest yields were the lowest for 0%PL and at the third harvest highest for 100%PL. Total grasses N yield at the second harvest was negatively associated with the DM yield of plantain (p = 0.049), while total grasses N yield at the fourth harvest tended to be positively associated with the DM yield of plantain (p = 0.049), while total grasses N yield at the fourth harvest tended to be positively associated with the DM yield of plantain (p = 0.066) (Figure 7, Table S2). Total grasses N yields in the first, third and fifth harvest and plantain N yields in all harvests were only related linearly to total grasses and plantain DM yields respectively (Figures 6 and 7, Table S2).



**Figure 3.** Field experiment. N<sub>2</sub>O-N fluxes at days 8 till 35 after CAN-N application (5 g m<sup>-2</sup>). Bars represent standard errors. Bars with the same letters are not significantly different (p > 0.05).

# Discussion

### Mesocosm experiment

The nearly 40% lower potential nitrification found for a monoculture of plantain versus a monoculture of ryegrass at day 148 of the experiment is in line with the suggested BNI capacity of plantain (Dietz et al. 2013; Subbarao et al. 2015). However, in contrast to our hypothesis that the presence of plantain would lead to lower soil  $NO_3^-$  concentrations,



**Figure 4.** Field experiment. Precipitation (*grey bars*, KNMI, Zegveld, the Netherlands) since CAN-N application (5 g m<sup>-2</sup>) and cumulative N<sub>2</sub>O-N fluxes between 8 till 35 days after CAN-N application of treatment 0%PL (*open dots, solid line*) versus all treatments with plantain (33%PL, 66%PL and 100%PL) (*squares, dashed line*). Error bars represent N<sub>2</sub>O-N fluxes standard errors. Cumulative N<sub>2</sub>O-N fluxes were significantly lower in the presence of plantain (p = 0.021).



**Figure 5.** Field experiment. Total herbage dry matter yields per harvest and treatment, and contribution of plantain (*dark grey fill*), grasses (*light grey fill*) and other herbs and forbs (*white fill*) to the total herbage dry matter yield. *p*-values and errors bars represent probabilities for statistical differences and standard errors of the total herbage dry matter yield. Total herbage dry matter yields of bars with the same letters are not significantly different (p > 0.05).

no differences between treatments were observed. Soil  $NO_3^-$  concentrations were rather variable, possibly as the result of spatial and temporal heterogeneity of denitrification patterns caused by the nature of the process (e.g. Van den Pol-van Dasselaar et al. 1998). Furthermore, soil  $NO_3^-$  concentrations were lower when potential nitrification was higher (Figure 1). Low  $NO_3^-$  concentrations could be the result of a greater microbial and/or bacterivore activity coinciding with higher soil respiration and mineralisation rates (Bloem et al. 1994). Higher respiration rates can result locally in micro patches with lower soil oxygen concentrations favouring denitrification and decreasing soil  $NO_3^-$  concentrations (Firestone and Davidson 1989).

Plants may also influence nitrification in soils by altering the identity or activity of the microbial community as the result of effects on the physical and/or chemical soil environment (e.g. pH, moisture). Additionally, plants influence nitrification by competing with the microbial community for N and thus reducing the amount of  $NH_4^+$  available for nitrifiers (Bowatte et al. 2016). Since in our experiment effects of exudated secondary metabolites with BNI capacity on nitrification were not directly assessed, we cannot exclude effects on potential nitrification caused by the soil environment or by competition for



Figure 7. Field experiment. Grasses nitrogen (N) yields versus grasses dry matter (DM) yields per harvest, grown in a monoculture or in a plantain ryegrass mixture, respectively. For model details on the fitted lines see Table S2.



Figure 6. Field experiment. Plantain nitrogen (N) yields versus plantain dry matter (DM) yields per harvest, grown in a monoculture or in a plantain ryegrass mixture, respectively. For model details on the fitted lines see Table S2.

N. However, several studies showed that secondary metabolites with BNI capacity are produced by plantain and are present in above ground biomass and roots (Marak et al. 2000; De Deyn et al. 2009; Dietz et al. 2013; Miehe-Steier et al. 2015; Box and Judson 2018). Box and Judson (2018) reported for the plantain var. 'Hercules', used in our experiments, mean leaf concentrations of 39.1 mg g<sup>-1</sup> DM verbascoside, 39.1 mg g<sup>-1</sup> DM aucubin and <5 mg g<sup>-1</sup> DM catalpol over a year on a silt loam soil in New Zealand. Miehe-Steier et al. (2015) showed that leaf aucubin, catalpol and verbascoside concentrations are similar to root concentrations under high nutrient and high light conditions. Moreover, Fuchs and Bowers (2004) showed that aucubin and catalpol concentrations in plantain leaves increased from

116

0.5% dry weight at the age of 7 weeks to 6% dry weight at the age of 11 weeks. Therefore, it seems likely that in our experiment, in treatments with plantain, compounds with BNI capacity were present in the roots and rhizosphere. However, to confirm the hypotheses that the reduced potential nitrification resulted of the presence of compounds with BNI capacity, more detailed research is needed on the bacterial activity and the release and mode of action of these compounds in the rhizosphere.

According to Verhagen et al. (1995), to determine the exclusive effects of secondary metabolites on inhibition of nitrification, soil mineral N conditions should not be limiting for this process. Effects of competition for N on nitrification seemed unlikely in our experiment due to the high soil organic matter,  $NO_3^-$  and  $NH_4^+$  concentrations. In comparison, in our experiment soil  $NO_3^-$  and  $NH_4^+$  concentrations were on average about 1.000 times higher than in experiments on sandy soils reported by Dietz et al. (2013), who observed lower soil  $NO_3^-$  and  $NH_4^+$  concentrations. Possibly, in our experiment the level and heterogeneity of soil  $NO_3^-$  and  $NH_4^+$  concentrations were such that the potential effects of compounds with BNI capacity on these concentrations were too limited to be determined. Moreover, genotype may have played a role, since we used a different plantain variety than Dietz et al. (2013) and concentrations of BNI compounds have been shown to be genotype specific (Box and Judson 2018).

The observed quadratic increase of plantain N yields at higher plantain DM yields partly confirmed our hypothesis that the presence of plantain can increase the N use efficiency of grassland on peat soil since on the other hand no effects of the presence and yield of plantain on ryegrass N yields were observed (Figure 2). In our experiment plant N contents were low  $(1.94 \pm 0.32 \text{ g kg}^{-1} \text{ DM})$  compared to field conditions (typically summer and autumn N contents without fertilisation are  $\geq 2.40 \text{ g kg}^{-1} \text{ DM}$ ) (Vellinga and Andre 1999; Sonneveld and Lantinga 2011; Deru et al. 2019). Soil mineral N, P<sub>AL</sub>, K and pH conditions were not likely to have limited plant N uptake (CBGV 2017). Therefore, besides a potential effect of compounds with BNI capacity in the treatments with plantain, likely other chemical, biological and/or physical soil properties affected herbage N uptake in general in the experiment. However, since soil NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> and NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> concentrations between treatments did not differ significantly (Table 2), apparently these conditions did not differently affect soil mineral N concentrations between treatments.

#### Field experiment

In the presence of plantain cumulative  $N_2O$  fluxes were 39% lower compared to the monoculture of perennial ryegrass (Figures 3 and 4). These substantially lower  $N_2O$  fluxes in the presence of plantain confirmed our hypothesis that plantain can reduce  $N_2O$  formation in grassland on peat soil compared to ryegrass. Measured  $N_2O$  fluxes were in range with others studies on drained peat grasslands (Velthof et al. 1996; Koops et al. 1997; Van den Pol-van Dasselaar et al. 1998). During the  $N_2O$  flux measurement period, herbage N uptakes between treatments were similar, indicating no differences were present in available mineral N for herbage uptake between treatments.

Similar to our results, Luo et al. (2018) found lower  $N_2O$  fluxes when urine-N was applied at a rate of 62 g m<sup>-2</sup> on a monoculture of plantain compared to ryegrass and

lucerne on a well-drained silt loam soil, and suggested the effect of the BNI potential of plantain as the dominant mechanism reducing N<sub>2</sub>O fluxes. Simon et al. (2019) observed a linear decreasing N<sub>2</sub>O emission factor as the proportion of plantain increased from 0% to 100% in a ryegrass/white clover sward, after a urine-N application of 61 g m<sup>-2</sup> on a silt loam soil. In our experiment, above ground biomass of plantain (plantain made up 43%-86% of the total harvested herbage DM at 29 October in treatments 33%PL, 66%PL and 100%PL) was not correlated to cumulative N<sub>2</sub>O fluxes. Thus, if the BNI potential of plantain was the dominant mechanism reducing N<sub>2</sub>O fluxes, apparently the presence rather than the amount of plantain was an important factor for the reduction of the  $N_2O$  flux, at least within the studied conditions. For example differences in applied N sources, soil N concentrations and soil types resulted in different conditions between studies. Luo et al. (2018) and Simon et al. (2019) applied before  $N_2O$  measurements urine-N on silt loam soils while in the current study CAN-N was applied on peat soil. Urine-N consists mainly of urea which first needs to be transformed to  $NO_3^-$  to be available for denitrification, while CAN-N consists of 50% NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> and 50% NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>. Furthermore, urine applications temporary increase water filled pore space (WFPS) and possibly pH which both can (in)directly stimulate denitrification (Luo et al. 2018). Peat soils differ in many aspects from mineral soils which can (in)directly affect soil N cycling (Pihlatie et al. 2004); for example peat soils generally contain relative higher mineral N and organic carbon pools, have a relative higher moisture retention capacity, often have a lower pH and a different soil texture compared to mineral soils. In comparison, the grassland on silt loam soil used by Luo et al. (2018) had nearly four times lower total N and soil organic matter contents compared to the peat soil in the current study (Table 1). Moreover, in the current study measurements were only in the first year after glyphosate treatment and soil tillage, which likely both (in)directly affected the soil food web compared to an undisturbed grassland system (Wardle 1995), and likely thus also affected soil N cycling.

The sharp increase in the N<sub>2</sub>O flux observed after the first significant precipitations nine to thirteen days after fertiliser application (total 32 mm, Figure 4) is probably the result of an increase in soil moisture content since denitrification activity and WFPS in the top soil are positively correlated (Koops et al. 1996). Significant differences in soil moisture contents between the treatments seemed unlikely as we measured nitrous oxide fluxes under relative (very) dry field conditions, resulting from the high potential precipitation deficit preceding the measurement period (Sluijter et al. 2018). Luo et al. (2018) found WFPS to be lower in a monoculture of plantain and lucerne compared to ryegrass, and lower N<sub>2</sub>O fluxes after urine applications on plantain versus lucerne or ryegrass pastures. However, Luo et al. (2018) concluded that effects of plantain on N<sub>2</sub>O fluxes could not have only been induced by different soil moisture contents since they observed lower N<sub>2</sub>O fluxes at plantain at similar WFPS contents between lucerne and plantain in their study. Therefore, it seems likely that also in our experiment root-released compounds with BNI capacity at least partially contributed to the lower N<sub>2</sub>O flux observed in the presence of plantain.

The negative effect of plantain DM yield on grasses N yields at the second harvest and linear relations between herbage N uptake and herbage DM growth at other harvests (Figures 6 and 7, Table S2) suggested that our hypothesis of plantain increasing soil mineral N use efficiency in a grassland on peat soil had to be rejected, at least within

the conditions of the field experiment. Lower total grasses N yields associated with higher plantain DM yields indicate increased herbage N uptake competition rather than an increase of available N for plant uptake.

Herbage N contents in the field experiment were well in range with other field measurements (Vellinga and Andre 1999; Sonneveld and Lantinga 2011; Deru et al. 2019). Possibly, the tendency towards the positive effect of plantain presence on plantain N uptake efficiency as observed in the mesocosm experiment was overruled by the relative higher herbage N uptake rate in the field experiment. Soil temperatures in the field experiment (increasing from about 11°C around 1 May to more than 20°C around 1 August) exceeded soil temperatures in the mesocosm experiment (maintained around 12°C), which positively affected soil mineralisation (Bloem et al. 1994). Furthermore, long periods without precipitation in the second, third and fourth harvest of the field experiment may have limited denitrification and leaching of  $NO_3^-$  to below the main rooting depth, leaving relative more  $NO_3^-$  available for herbage uptake.

#### Conclusions

Plantain grown in mesocosms significantly reduced soil potential nitrification but did not affect soil  $NO_3^-$  concentrations. Plantain N uptake efficiency increased at a higher herbage plantain share in the mesocosm experiment, but the plantain share did not affect herbage N uptake efficiency under field conditions. Under field conditions, N<sub>2</sub>O fluxes were nearly 40% lower in the presence of plantain, without an obvious link to the amount of plantain present. Therefore, our results strongly suggest that the presence of plantain influences the fate of soil mineral N in a dairy grassland on peat soil, but more integrated research is needed to fully confirm this.

#### Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank all people who were involved for their help in the implementation of the experiments, with special thanks to Karel van Houwelingen, Riekje Bruinenberg, Hans Dullaert, Wim Dimmers and Hannie de Caluwe for their efforts with field work, sample handling and laboratory analyses.

#### **Disclosure statement**

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

# Funding

This work was part of the project *Proeftuin Veenweiden*. The project was funded by the province Zuid-Holland, the Dutch Ministry of Economic Affairs, the Dutch Melkveefonds and LTO Noord Fondsen. The provinces Utrecht and Noord-Holland funded specific parts of the project.

#### ORCID

Jeroen Pijlman D http://orcid.org/0000-0002-5341-5555

# References

- Arp DJ, Stein LY. 2003. Metabolism of inorganic N compounds by ammonia-oxidizing bacteria. Critical Reviews in Biochemistry and Molecular Biology. 38:471–495.
- Belser LW, Mays EL. 1980. Specific inhibition of nitrite oxidation by chlorate and its use in assessing nitrification in soils and sediments. Applied Environmental Microbiology. 39:505–510.
- Bloem J, Lebbink G, Zwart KB, Bouwman LA, Burgers SLGE, de Vos JA, de Ruiter PC. 1994. Dynamics of microorganisms, microbivores and nitrogen mineralisation in winter wheat fields under conventional and integrated management. Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment. 51:129–143.
- Bowatte S, Newton PCD, Hoogendoorn CJ, Hume DE, Stewart AV, Brock SC, Theobald PW. 2016. Wide variation in nitrification activity in soil associated with different forage plant cultivars and genotypes. Grass and Forage Science. 71:160–171.
- Box LA, Judson HG. 2018. The concentration of bioactive compounds in plantago lanceolata is genotype specific. Journal of New Zealand Grasslands. 80:113–118.
- Butterbach-Bahl K, Baggs EM, Dannenmann M, Kiese R, Zechmeister-Boltenstern S. 2013. Nitrous oxide emissions from soils: how well do we understand the processes and their controls? Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences. 368:20130122.
- Carlton AJ, Cameron KC, Di HJ, Edwards GR, Clough TJ. 2019. Nitrate leaching losses are lower from ryegrass/white clover forages containing plantain than from ryegrass/white clover forages under different irrigation. New Zealand Journal of Agricultural Research. 62:150–172.
- CBGV. 2017. Bemestingsadvies [Internet]. [cited 2019 Apr 3]. Available from: https://www. verantwoordeveehouderij.nl/nl/bemestingsadvies.htm.
- De Deyn GB, Biere A, van der Putten WH, Wagenaar R, Klironomos JN. 2009. Chemical defense, mycorrhizal colonization and growth responses in plantago lanceolata L. Oecologia. 160:433–442.
- Deru JGC, Bloem J, de Goede R, Hoekstra N, Keidel H, Kloen H, Nierop A, Rutgers M, Schouten T, van den Akker J, et al. 2019. Predicting soil N supply and yield parameters in peat grasslands. Applied Soil Ecology. 134:77–84.
- Di HJ, Cameron KC, Shen JP, Winefield CS, O'Callaghan M, Bowatte S, He JZ. 2009. Nitrification driven by bacteria and not archaea in nitrogen-rich grassland soils. Nature Geoscience. 2:621–624.
- Dietz M, Machill S, Hoffmann HC, Schmidtke K. 2013. Inhibitory effects of plantago lanceolata L. on soil N mineralization. Plant and Soil. 368:445–458.
- Erisman JW, Galloway JN, Seitzinger S, Bleeker A, Dise NB, Petrescu RAM, Leach AM, de Vries W. 2013. Consequences of human modification of the global nitrogen cycle. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B. 368:20130116.
- Firestone MK, Davidson EA. 1989. Microbiological basis of NO and N2O production and consumption in soil. In: Andrea MO, Schimel DS, editors. Exchange of trace gases between terrestrial ecosystems and the atmosphere: report of the Dahlem workshop on exchange of trace gases between terrestrial ecosystems and the atmosphere. New York: Wiley; p. 7–21.
- Fuchs A, Bowers MD. 2004. Patterns of iridoid glycoside production and induction in plantago lanceolata and the importance of plant age. Journal of Chemical Ecology. 30:1723–1741.
- Galloway JN, Townsend AR, Erisman JW, Bekunda M, Cai Z, Freney JR, Martinelli LA, Seitzinger SP, Sutton MA. 2008. Transformation of the nitrogen cycle: recent trends, questions, and potential solutions. Science. 320:889–892.
- Geurts JJM, Smolders AJP, Verhoeven JTA, Roelofs JGM, Lamers LPM. 2008. Sediment Fe:PO4 ratio as a diagnostic and prognostic tool for the restoration of macrophyte biodiversity in fen waters. Freshwater Biology. 53:2101–2116.
- Hoekstra NJ, Deyn GBD, Xu Y, Prinsen R, Eekeren NV. 2018. Red clover varieties of Mattenklee type have higher production, protein yield and persistence than Ackerklee types in grass-clover mixtures. Grass and Forage Science. 73:297–308.
- IUSS Working Group WRB. 2015. World reference base for soil resources 2014, update 2015. International soil classification system for naming soils and creating legends for soil maps. Rome: FAO.

Jarvis SC. 1993. Nitrogen cycling and losses from dairy farms. Soil Use and Management. 9:99–104.

- Kohn RA, Dou Z, Ferguson JD, Boston RC. 1997. A sensitivity analysis of nitrogen losses from dairy farms. Journal of Environmental Management. 50:417–428.
- Koops JG, Oenema O, van Beusichem ML. 1996. Denitrification in the top and sub soil of grassland on peat soils. Plant and Soil. 184:1–10.
- Koops JG, van Beusichem ML, Oenema O. 1997. Nitrogen loss from grassland on peat soils through nitrous oxide production. Plant and Soil. 188:119–130.
- Lee JM, Hemmingson NR, Minnee EMK, Clark CEF. 2015. Management strategies for chicory (Cichorium intybus) and plantain (plantago lanceolata): impact on dry matter yield, nutritive characteristics and plant density. Crop and Pasture Science. 66:168–183.
- Luo J, Balvert SF, Wise B, Welten B, Ledgard SF, de Klein CAM, Lindsey S, Judge A. 2018. Using alternative forage species to reduce emissions of the greenhouse gas nitrous oxide from cattle urine deposited onto soil. Science of the Total Environment. 610–611:1271–1280.
- Marak HB, Biere A, Damme JMMV. 2000. Direct and correlated responses to selection on iridoid glycosides in plantago lanceolata L. Journal of Evolutionary Biology. 13:985–996.
- Miehe-Steier A, Roscher C, Reichelt M, Gershenzon J, Unsicker SB. 2015. Light and nutrient dependent responses in secondary metabolites of plantago lanceolata offspring are due to phenotypic plasticity in experimental grasslands. PLoS One. 10:1–17.
- Minneé EMK, Clark CEF, Clark DA. 2013. Herbage production from five grazable forages. Proceedings of the New Zealand Grassland Association. 75:245–250.
- Nevens F, Verbruggen I, Reheul D, Hofman G. 2006. Farm gate nitrogen surpluses and nitrogen use efficiency of specialized dairy farms in flanders: evolution and future goals. Agricultural Systems. 88:142–155.
- Pihlatie M, Syväsalo E, Simojoki A, Esala M, Regina K. 2004. Contribution of nitrification and denitrification to N2O production in peat, clay and loamy sand soils under different soil moisture conditions. Nutrient Cycling in Agroecosystems. 70:135–141.
- Powell JM, Gourley CJP, Rotz CA, Weaver DM. 2010. Nitrogen use efficiency: a potential performance indicator and policy tool for dairy farms. Environmental Science & Policy. 13:217–228.
- R Core Team. 2017. R: a language and environment for statistical computing. [Internet]. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing. Available from: https://www.R-project.org/.
- Remmelink G, van Middelkoop J, Ouweltjes W, Wemmenhove H. 2018. Handboek Melkveehouderij 2018/19 [Internet]. Wageningen Livestock Research: Wageningen. Available from: https://doi.org/10.18174/458502.
- Rockström J, Steffen W, Noone K, Persson Å, Chapin F, Lambin E, Lenton T, Scheffer M, Folke C, Schellnhuber H, et al. 2009. Planetary boundaries: exploring the safe operating space for humanity. Ecology and Society. 14(2):32.
- Ruser R, Schulz R. 2015. The effect of nitrification inhibitors on the nitrous oxide (N2O) release from agricultural soils—a review. Journal of Plant Nutrition and Soil Science. 178:171–188.
- Simon PL, de Klein CAM, Worth W, Rutherford AJ, Dieckow J. 2019. The efficacy of plantago lanceolata for mitigating nitrous oxide emissions from cattle urine patches. Science of the Total Environment. 691:430–441.
- Sluijter R, Plieger M, van Oldenborgh GJ, Beersma J, de Vries H. 2018. De droogte van 2018 Een analyse op basis van het potentiële neerslagtekort [Internet]. De Bilt: KNMI; [cited 2019 Feb 20]. Available from: https://ruimtelijkeadaptatie.nl/vaste-onderdelen/serviceblok/bibliotheek/@ 204145/de-droogte-van-2018/.
- Sonneveld MPW, Lantinga EA. 2011. The contribution of mineralization to grassland N uptake on peatland soils with anthropogenic A horizons. Plant and Soil. 340:357–368.
- Stewart AV. 1996. Plantain (plantago lanceolata) a potential pasture species. Proceedings of the New Zealand Grassland Association. 58:77–86.
- Subbarao GV, Wang HY, Ito O, Nakahara K, Berry WL. 2007. NH4 + triggers the synthesis and release of biological nitrification inhibition compounds in brachiaria humidicola roots. Plant and Soil. 290:245–257.
- Subbarao GV, Yoshihashi T, Worthington M, Nakahara K, Ando Y, Sahrawat KL, Rao IM, Lata J-C, Kishii M, Braun H-J. 2015. Suppression of soil nitrification by plants. Plant Science. 233:155–164.

- 122 👄 J. PIJLMAN ET AL.
- Van den Pol-van Dasselaar A, Corré WJ, Priemé A, Klemedtsson ÅK, Weslien P, Klemedtsson L, Stein A, Oenema O. 1998. Spatial variability of methane, nitrous oxide, and carbon dioxide emissions from drained grasslands. Soil Science Society of America Journal. 62:810–817.
- Vellinga TV, Andre G. 1999. Sixty years of dutch nitrogen fertiliser experiments, an overview of the effects of soil type, fertiliser input, management and of developments in time. Netherlands Journal of Agricultural Science. 47:215–241.
- Velthof GL, Brader AB, Oenema O. 1996. Seasonal variations in nitrous oxide losses from managed grasslands in The Netherlands. Plant and Soil. 181:263–274.
- Velthof GL, Kuikman PJ, Oenema O. 2002. Nitrous oxide emission from soils amended with crop residues. Nutrient Cycling in Agroecosystems. 62:249–261.
- Verhagen FJM, Laanbroek HJ, Woldendrop JW. 1995. Competition for ammonium between plant roots and nitrifying and heterotrophic bacteria and the effects of protozoan grazing. Plant and Soil. 170:241–250.
- Wardle DA. 1995. Impacts of disturbance on detritus food webs in agro-ecosystems of contrasting tillage and weed management practices. In: Begon M, Fitter AH, editors. Advances in ecological research. Vol. 26. Cambridge: Academic Press; p. 105–185.
- Yang M, Fang Y, Sun D, Shi Y. 2016. Efficiency of two nitrification inhibitors (dicyandiamide and 3, 4-dimethypyrazole phosphate) on soil nitrogen transformations and plant productivity: a metaanalysis. Scientific Reports. 6:22075.