

**NITROGEN FIXATION IN HIGH
YIELDING SOYBEAN (*Glycine Max.*, *L. Merr*)**

by

Fernando Salvagiotti

A DISSERTATION

Presented to the Faculty of
The Graduate College at the University of Nebraska
In Partial Fulfillment of Requirements
For the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Major: Agronomy

Under the Supervision of Professor James E. Specht

Lincoln, Nebraska

June, 2008

UMI Number: 3315056

Copyright 2008 by
Salvagiotti, Fernando

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleed-through, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

PREVIEW

The logo for University Microfilms International (UMI), consisting of the letters "UMI" in a bold, serif font, with a registered trademark symbol (®) to the upper right.

UMI Microform 3315056
Copyright 2008 by ProQuest LLC
All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest LLC
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

NITROGEN FIXATION IN HIGH YIELDING SOYBEAN (*Glycine Max.*, *L. Merr*)

Fernando Salvagiotti, Ph.D.

University of Nebraska, 2008

Adviser: James E. Specht

Under the hypothesis that grain yield is limited by nitrogen (N) supply in late reproductive stages when soybean is grown in high-yielding environments, a 2-year study was conducted in order to evaluate whether N fertilization increases grain yield and N uptake, and to what extent N₂ fixation is complemented when fertilizer N was applied both on surface as well as below the nodules. Four N fertilization treatments were established in the soybean main plots of each year's soybean/maize rotation in a long-term experiment. Treatments were: a non-fertilized plot (N1) and 180 kg N ha⁻¹ applied as i) polymer-coated controlled release urea placed 20 cm below the surface before planting (N2, late N fertilization strategy); ii) ammonium nitrate on the surface before planting and at V6 (N3, early N fertilization strategy) and, iii) ammonium nitrate on the surface at R5 (N4, late N fertilization strategy). All treatments were superimposed on two contrasting fertilizer management histories for maize (M1=recommended nutrient management; M2=intensive nutrient management). Grain yield in N1 averaged 4850 kg ha⁻¹, and a 5% increase was observed in response to N fertilization. This response was accompanied by a 9% increase in N uptake. Biological N₂ fixation accounted for 50% of N uptake in N1, but only 32 and 38% in N3 and N4, respectively. All N fertilization strategies succeeded in providing the additional N needed to attain the apparent maximum grain yield, but the amount of fertilizer N needed to achieve grain yield response was larger with ammonium nitrate applied on the surface N. This was because a proportion of total N derived from surface applied ammonium nitrate depressed N₂ fixation. In contrast, deep placement of slow-release urea did not depress biological N₂ fixation, and thus, showed the advantage of providing the additional N needed to reach grain yield potential with minimal trade-off between fixed N and fertilizer N. The greater photosynthesis response to light observed in fertilized soybean suggests that N

fertilization in high-yielding soybean should simultaneously take into account management practices intended to maximize canopy light capture.

PREVIEW

PREVIEW

TO SILVIA, MILENA, AILEN AND MAURO FOR THEIR CONTINUOUS SUPPORT

IN OUR LIFE PROJECT

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I gratefully acknowledge Achim Dobermann who served as main advisor the first two years of the project and help me to devise the research project. Special thanks to James Specht who served as main advisor the last part of the PhD program and whose help in field activities was central for the present research. Sincere appreciation is directed to the rest of the supervisory committee, Daniel Walters, Kenneth Cassman, and Albert Weiss for their support, mentoring and their teachings about how to think science. My gratitude to Kathi Cockrill for her help in all administrative issues and to Jose Aponte, Darren Binder, Sarah Brownell, Jonathan Chaky, Sadal Hwang, Adam Liska, Mike Livingston, Paul Nabity, Piyapoprn Phansak, Kyla Ronhovde, Watcharin Soonswon, Greg Teichmeier, and Travis Wegner for their help in field activities. Special thanks to Arlene Adviento, whose help was central for developing the chemical determinations in xylem sap in the laboratory. The author also acknowledges Fulbright Foundation who granted the first two years of my studies, and to the Graduate Studies Department of University of Nebraska-Lincoln who granted the third year. I also thank the Department of Agronomy and Horticulture at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln for providing the funding for this study. The author is also very thankful to Tri Setiyono, with whom I enjoyed research discussions. The author is grateful of my friends in Lincoln, specially Octavio, Nayade and Patricio that make life in USA very comfortable. Obviously I also recognize the constant support from the family members in Argentina, and a special dedication to my dad where ever he is now.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLES	iv
FIGURES	vii
APPENDICES	xiv
CHAPTER 1 – General Introduction	1
CHAPTER 2 - Nitrogen uptake, fixation and response to fertilizer N in soybeans: a review.....	3
Introduction	5
Data Sources and Analysis	8
Relationships between grain yield, nitrogen uptake and nitrogen fixation	12
Nitrogen fixation and N fertilization	18
Grain yield response to N fertilization	19
Inoculation and grain yield potential	23
Nitrogen fertilization. Is it economical?	24
Conclusions and perspectives on future research needs	26

CHAPTER 3 - Grain yield, Crop growth, Nitrogen uptake and Nitrogen fixation in high yielding soybean under different N fertilization strategies	29
Introduction	31
Material and methods	37
Results	47
Crop phenology	47
Grain yield, grain number and grain weight	48
Biomass production, crop growth rate and biomass partition at maturity	49
Time course of N uptake and N partition at maturity	52
Nitrogen fixation	55
Discussion	57
Conclusion	69
CHAPTER 4 - Leaf Photosynthesis as affected by N fertilization during the seed-filling period in high-yielding soybean.....	71
Introduction	73
Material and methods	77
Results	89
Time course of light response parameters during the seed filling period	89
Light response parameters and leaf N content	90
Effects of leaf photosynthesis on canopy C assimilation.....	92

Discussion	94
Conclusion.....	98
 CHAPTER 5 – Summary and Future Research.....	100
 REFERENCES	103

PREVIEW

TABLES

Table 1 - Summary statistics of a meta analysis of data published in the literature relative to N uptake and N ₂ fixation in soybean and variables related to N nutrition in soybean. The data were collected from experiments spanning a wide range of management and environmental conditions (Data set A).	136
Table 2 - Magnitude of grain yield response to N fertilization (Data set B). Information presented here was divided according to the application of N fertilizer before and after R3 stage..	137
Table 3 - Magnitude of grain yield response to foliar fertilization (Data set B). Information was divided according to the application of N fertilizer before and after R3 stage.	139
Table 4 - Soybean phenology in 2006 and 2007. (DAE: days after emergence).	141
Table 5 – ANOVA F-test probabilities and mean values of grain yield, grain number and grain weight of soybean under different nitrogen fertilization strategies (N) combined with two fertilizer management histories (M) in two years (Y). (SE=standard error of the mean).....	141
Table 6 – ANOVA F-test probabilities and mean values of total aboveground biomass, harvest index and biomass in vegetative tissues, abscised leaves and podwalls at R7 of soybean under different nitrogen fertilization strategies (N) combined with two fertilizer management histories (M) in two years (Y). (SE=standard error of the mean)	142

Table 7 – ANOVA F-test probabilities and mean values of biomass at R5, crop growth rate (CGR) in the periods from R1 to R5 and during the grain filling period (R5 to R7) and apparent biomass mobilized between R5 and R7 of soybean under different nitrogen fertilization strategies (N) combined with two fertilizer management histories (M) in two years (Y). (SE=standard error of the mean)143

Table 8 – ANOVA F-test probabilities and mean values of nitrogen uptake in aboveground biomass and partitioning between seeds and vegetative parts at R7 of soybean under different nitrogen fertilization strategies (N) combined with two fertilizer management histories (M) in two years (Y). (SE=standard error of the mean)144

Table 9 – ANOVA F-test probabilities and mean values of N uptake at R1 and at R5 and daily N uptake rate (NUR) from R1 to R5 of soybean under different nitrogen fertilization strategies (N) combined with two fertilizer management histories (M) in two years (Y). (SE=standard error of the mean).....145

Table 10 – ANOVA F-test probabilities and mean values of N uptake at R7 in pods and vegetative tissues, N uptake rate (NUR) and remobilized N from R5 to R7 of soybean under different nitrogen fertilization strategies (N) combined with two fertilizer management histories (M) in two years (Y). (SE=standard error of the mean)146

Table 11 – ANOVA F-test probabilities and mean values of biologically fixed N in aboveground biomass at R7 and at R5, and daily N fixation rate (NFR) between R1-R5 and R5-R7 periods of soybean under different nitrogen fertilization strategies (N) combined with two fertilizer management histories (M) in two years (Y). (SE=standard error of the mean)147

Table 12 – Sources of N and partial N balance during the soybean cycle under different nitrogen fertilization strategies (N) combined with two fertilizer management histories (M) in two years (Y). Each value is the average of M1 and M2 and two years148

Table 13 - Estimates \pm standard error of the parameters of the negative exponential relationship between Pmax and relative seed filling duration (Figure 17, upper panel) and the logistic function between Pmax and leaf N content (Figure 20, lower panel) in soybean grown with different N fertilization strategies in a 2-year study149

Table 14 – Canopy gross and net C assimilation and C loss as respiration in soybean under different N fertilization strategies in two years150

Table 15 – Sensitivity analysis showing variation in gross and net photosynthesis (kg C ha⁻¹) in whole canopy and in the sunlit and shaded leaves layers when LDa and LDb were each varied 20%. Leaf area index at R5 = 6.8. Climatic data used here were those of the year 2006.....151

FIGURES

Figure 1 - Relationship between grain yield (13% seed moisture content) and nitrogen uptake in aboveground biomass in soybean. The solid line is the average fit of the data, with a slope of 0.0127 Mg grain kg⁻¹ N. Dashed lines show the boundaries of maximum N dilution (upper) and maximum N accumulation (lower) of N. Values shown refer to N in total aboveground biomass.152

Figure 2 - Relationship between N₂ fixed by soybean and nitrogen uptake in aboveground biomass. The dashed 1:1 line represents values for which all N uptake would be expected to be derived from biological N₂ fixation. Data were divided into four different categories of applied N fertilizer as denoted by the symbols. The solid line is the best linear fit for N fertilizer rates of less than 10 kg ha⁻¹ ($y = 0.66x - 19$; $R^2 = 0.59$). Values shown refer to N in total aboveground biomass.153

Figure 3 - Relationship between nitrogen fixed by soybeans and N applied as fertilizer. The curve ($y = 337 e^{-0.0098x}$) shows the maximum level of N₂ fixation as a function of fertilizer-N rate in those experiments in which N was applied pre-plant or during early growth in the nodulation zone (upper few cm to 20 cm of soil), or on the soil surface at later growth stages. Values shown refer to N in total aboveground biomass.154

Figure 4 - Relationship between grain yields in control plots (no N fertilizer added) to grain yield in N fertilized plots (a) and the yield response ($\square Y$) to N fertilizer in soybean (b). This Figure summarizes only those experiments in which N fertilizer additions increased yields significantly (Table 2). Dashed lines in the upper panel are isolines of relative yield increase (%) over the control.155

Figure 5 - Relative soybean yield (yield in control plot/yield in fertilized plot) in different N treatments in relation to the maximum grain yield for each site-year. Symbols: Experiments in which crops had no constraints for normal growth (●). Crops with constraints for normal growth: Low soil pH (*); Low efficient Rhizobium strains (□); Low temperature (◇); Low fertility soils (○); No soybean history (△); Drought (×).156

Figure 6 – Relationship between grain yield and individual grain weight (left panel) and grain number per unit area (right panel). Open and closed symbols represent 2006 and 2007 values, respectively157

Figure 7 – Time course from R5 to R8 of accumulated biomass in abscised leaves during two years of soybean under different nitrogen fertilization strategies (N). Vertical bars are the standard error of the mean. Each point is the average of M1 and M2158

Figure 8 – Time course of stand leaf biomass during two years of soybean under different nitrogen fertilization strategies (N). Vertical bars are the standard error of the mean. Each point is the average of M1 and M2159

Figure 9 – Time course of leaf N concentration during two years of soybean under different nitrogen fertilization strategies (N). Vertical bars are the standard error of the mean. Each point is the average of M1 and M2	160
Figure 10 – Time course of stem N concentration during two years of soybean under different nitrogen fertilization strategies (N). Vertical bars are the standard error of the mean. Each point is the average of M1 and M2	161
Figure 11 – Time course of leaf N yield during two years of soybean under different nitrogen fertilization strategies (N). Vertical bars are the standard error of the mean. Each point is the average of M1 and M2	162
Figure 12 – Time course of stem N yield during two years of soybean under different nitrogen fertilization strategies (N). Vertical bars are the standard error of the mean. Each point is the average of M1 and M2.	163
Figure 13 – Time course from R5 to R8 of leaf N concentration in abscised leaves during two years of soybean under different nitrogen fertilization strategies (N). Vertical bars are the standard error of the mean. Each point is the average of M1 and M2.	164
Figure 14 – Proportion of the various N constituents in the xylem sap of soybean plants grown in four different nitrogen fertilization strategies (N) combined with two fertilizer management histories (M). Upper panels show the relative proportions at R4 and lower panels at R6.....	165

Figure 15a – Time course of N fixation during 2006 season of soybean under different nitrogen fertilization strategies (N) combined with two fertilizer management background (M1 =left panels; M2 right panels). Vertical bars are the standard error of the mean.....166

Figure 15b – Time course of N fixation during 2007 season of soybean under different nitrogen fertilization strategies (N) combined with two fertilizer management background (M1 =left panels; M2 right panels). Vertical bars are the standard error of the mean.....167

Figure 16 – A graph of the non-rectangular hyperbola model used for the light response curve. The initial slope α is the quantum efficiency; the convexity θ is the ratio of physical diffusion resistance to total CO₂ resistance, and P_{max} is the maximum photosynthesis rate.....168

Figure 17 – Photosynthesis rate at light saturation (P_{max}) (upper panel) and respiration rate (R) (lower panel) during the seed-filling period in soybean grown with three N fertilization strategies in a 2-year study. Data correspond to a central leaflet fully exposed to sun. Dashed and solid lines in the upper panel (P_{max}) are the negative exponential fit for N₂+N₄ and N₁, respectively (see Table 13). The solid line in the lower panel is the linear fit for the combined data over N treatments since there were no significant differences among treatments. Vertical bars are the standard error of the mean. Seed-filling duration was 38 and 40 days for 2006 and 2007, respectively.169

Figure 18 – Quantum efficiency (α) (upper panel) and resistance to CO₂ diffusion (θ) (lower panel) during the seed-filling period in soybean grown with three N fertilization strategies in a 2-year study. Data correspond to a central leaflet fully exposed to sun. The solid line in the lower panel is the linear fit for the combined data over N treatments since there were no significant differences among treatments. Vertical bars are the standard error of the mean. Seed-filling duration was 38 and 40 days for 2006 and 2007, respectively.170

Figure 19 – Time course of leaf N concentration in soybean grown with different N fertilization strategies in a 2-year study. The solid line is the linear fit for the combined data over N treatments since there were no significant differences among treatments. Vertical bars are the standard error of the mean. Seed filling duration was 38 and 40 days for 2006 and 2007, respectively.....171

Figure 20 – Maximum leaf photosynthesis rate (P_{\max}), in relation to leaf N content in soybean grown with different N fertilization strategies in a 2-year study. Solid line in the lower panel is the logistic fit for the combined data over N treatments since there were no significant differences among treatments. Leaf N (g m^{-2}) in the lower panel was calculated by multiplying observed N concentration shown in the upper panel and specific leaf area simulated from radiation, temperature and phenological stage (Setiyono, 2007)172

Figure 21 – Leaf respiration rate (R) in relation to leaf N content in soybean grown with different N fertilization strategies in a 2-year study. Solid line is the linear fit for the combined data over N treatments since there were no significant differences among treatments. Leaf N (g m^{-2}) in the lower panel was calculated by multiplying observed N concentration shown in the left panel and specific leaf area simulated from radiation, temperature and phenological stage (Setiyono, 2007).....173

Figure 22 – Quantum efficiency (α) in relation to leaf N content in soybean grown with different N fertilization strategies in a 2-year study. Leaf N (g m^{-2}) in the lower panel was calculated by multiplying observed N concentration shown in the upper panel and specific leaf area simulated from radiation, temperature and phenological stage (Setiyono, 2007)174

Figure 23 – Resistance to CO_2 diffusion (θ) in relation to leaf N content in soybean grown with different N fertilization strategies in a 2-year study. Solid line is the linear fit for the combined data over N treatments since there were no significant differences among treatments. Leaf N in the lower panel was calculated by multiplying observed N concentration shown in the left panel and specific leaf area simulated from radiation, temperature and phenological stage (Setiyono, 2007).....175

Figure 24 – Cumulative canopy C gains via photosynthesis (black lines) and C losses via leaf respiration (gray lines) by the whole canopy in soybean under different N fertilization strategies in two years. Data were estimated by scaling leaf photosynthesis up to the canopy level176

Figure 25 – Cumulative canopy C gains via photosynthesis (black lines) and C losses via leaf respiration (gray lines) by shaded leaves in soybean under different N fertilization strategies in two years. Data were estimated by scaling leaf photosynthesis up to the canopy level177

Figure 26 – Cumulative canopy C gains via photosynthesis (black lines) and C losses via leaf respiration (gray lines) by sunlit leaves in soybean under different N fertilization strategies in two years. Data were estimated by scaling leaf photosynthesis up to the canopy level178

Figure 27 – Fraction of sunlit leaves and leaf area density calculated when LDa and LD_b were each varied 20%. Values obtained at mid seed-filling period. Leaf area index at R5 = 6.8. Climatic data used here were those of the year 2006179

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A – SOIL CONDITIONS.....	180
APPENDIX B – CLIMATIC CONDITIONS	186
APPENDIX C1 – Routine procedure for ureides determination in VES	191
APPENDIX C2 – Routine procedure for Total Amino acids by ninhydrin method in VES	192
APPENDIX C3 – Routine procedure for nitrate determination in VES by Salicylic method.....	193
APPENDIX C4 – Calculations involved in estimating N fixation using VES	195
APPENDIX D – Nitrogen rates, sources and other treatment factors evaluated in different studies on nitrogen fertilization in soybeans (Data set B).	196

CHAPTER 1

General Introduction

Nitrogen (N) is essential in crop production because it is directly involved in the photosynthesis process. In soybean (*Glycine max.* [L] Merr), high yields are associated with greater N remobilization from vegetative tissues to the seed. Then, this N mobilization will diminish leaf N content and thus, it will reduce leaf photosynthesis rate. Therefore, in a high-yielding environment, grain yield potential may be restricted by N supply. Soil fertilizer may complement the N requirements of high-yielding soybean, but soil nitrate supply causes an inverse down-regulation of biological N₂ fixation which may limit the use of fertilizer N. This dissertation is concerned with the role of biological N₂ fixation and N fertilization in high-yielding soybean, the likely ways in which N fertilizer may be efficiently used in complementing soybean N requirements and, the likely mechanisms by which this additional N may improve grain yield.

The first chapter of this dissertation shows a quantitative meta-analysis of published reports in the scientific literature, exploring relationships among soybean seed yield, N uptake, biological N₂ fixation, and the yield response to N fertilization. The extent to which available information explains the role of biological N₂ fixation and fertilizer N in high-yielding soybean is discussed.

The successive chapters summarize the results of a 2-year study on soybean within an intensive maize-soybean system experiment aimed at understanding the yield potential of maize and soybean. The second chapter shows that biological N_2 fixation was not sufficient to meet the N demand required to reach the apparent maximum grain yield. Also, this chapter shows that different N fertilization strategies supplied this additional N, but with a different efficiency. Physiological mechanisms associated with the response, the contribution of biological N_2 fixation and the offset with N fertilizer in the different strategies are also discussed.

In the third chapter, the increase in carbon assimilation observed in response to N fertilization at the whole plant level is discussed in terms of photosynthesis response to light at the leaf level. Changes in the light response curve associated with N fertilization were scaled up to the canopy level to determine the significance of these modifications. Finally, the last chapter provides a general summary of the main results of these experiments and future needed research.

CHAPTER 2

Nitrogen uptake, fixation and response to fertilizer N in soybeans: a review

Abstract

Although relationships among soybean (*Glycine max.* [L] Merr) seed yield, nitrogen (N) uptake, biological N₂ fixation (BNF), and response to N fertilization have received considerable coverage in the scientific literature, a comprehensive summary and interpretation of these interactions with specific emphasis on high yield environments is lacking. Six hundred and thirty seven data sets (site-year-treatment combinations) were analyzed from field studies that had examined these variables and had been published in refereed journals from 1966 to 2006. A mean linear increase of 0.013 Mg soybean seed yield per kg increase in N accumulation in aboveground biomass was evident in these data. The lower (maximum N accumulation) and upper (maximum N dilution) boundaries for this relationship had slopes of 0.0064 and 0.0188 Mg grain kg⁻¹ N, respectively. On average, 50 to 60% of soybean N demand was met by biological N₂ fixation. In most situations the amount of N fixed was not sufficient to replace N export from the field in harvested seed. The partial N balance (fixed N in aboveground biomass – N in seeds) was negative in 80% of all data sets, with a mean net soil N mining of -40 kg N ha⁻¹. However, when an average estimated belowground N contribution of 24% of total plant N was included, the average N balance was close to neutral (-4 kg N ha⁻¹). The gap between crop N uptake and N supplied by BNF tended to increase at higher seed yields

for which the associated crop N demand is higher. Soybean yield was more likely to respond to N fertilization in high-yield ($>4.5 \text{ Mg ha}^{-1}$) environments. A negative exponential relationship was observed between N fertilizer rate and N_2 fixation when N was applied on the surface or incorporated in the topmost soil layers. Deep placement of slow-release fertilizer below the nodulation zone, or late N applications during reproductive stages, may be promising alternatives for achieving a yield response to N fertilization in high-yielding environments. The results from many N fertilization studies are often confounded by insufficiently optimized BNF or other management factors that may have precluded achieving BNF-mediated yields near the yield potential ceiling. More studies will be needed to fully understand the extent to which the N requirements of soybean grown at potential yields levels can be met by optimizing BNF alone as opposed to supplementing BNF with applied N. Such optimization will require evaluating new inoculant technologies, greater temporal precision in crop and soil management, and most importantly, detailed measurements of the contributions of soil N, BNF, and the efficiency of fertilizer N uptake throughout the crop cycle. Such information is required to develop more reliable guidelines for managing both BNF and fertilizer N in high-yielding environments, and to also improve soybean simulation models.