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#### Abstract

Decomposition of crop residues may affect soil organic carbon (C) stocks, which are key for soil fertility improvement and mitigation of climate change. Numerous independent studies across the world point to contradictory results but their existence provides an opportunity to conduct a comprehensive analysis of the impact of crop type on residue decomposition. In the present study, data from 394 trials from across the world were used to assess cumulative $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions from residues of 17 crops during 0-30, 0-90 and 0-120 days (i.e. $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{R}} 30, \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{R}} 90$ and $C_{R} 120 ; 1-\left[C_{R} 30 / C_{R} 120\right]$ ratio as a stability index of $C$ emissions) and to relate the results with residue quality ( $\mathrm{C}, \mathrm{N}$ and lignin concentrations) and selected soil properties (texture, pH , soil organic carbon concentration). At all durations, legumes exhibited the highest $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions per gram of C added ( $1003 \mathrm{mg} \mathrm{CO}_{2}-\mathrm{C} \mathrm{g}^{-1} \mathrm{C}$ after 120 days) followed by grasses (947), oilseed crops (944) and cereals (846), with the legumes and grasses showing the lowest temporal stability of C emission as pointed out by a $1-\left[\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{R}} 30 / \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{R}} 120\right]$ of 0.78 and 0.79 , respectively, versus 0.82 and 0.83 for cereals and oilseed crops. At all durations, maize residues emitted the least $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{CO}_{2}\left(86,275\right.$ and $495 \mathrm{mg} \mathrm{CO} 2-\mathrm{C} \mathrm{g}^{-1} \mathrm{C}$ ), followed by two other lignin rich crops (cotton and sunflower), while the highest emissions


were from Alfalfa residues that produced about 4 times more $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ (e.g. 359 at $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{R}} 30$ and 1319 at $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{R}} 120$ ) than maize. Overall, $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions were positively correlated with soil clay concentration ( $\mathrm{r}>0.22$ ), residue C concentration (e.g. $\mathrm{r}=0.46$ at $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{R}} 90$ and $\mathrm{r}=0.37$ with emission stability, $\mathrm{P}<0.05$ ) but negatively to residue N concentration ( $\mathrm{r}=-0.26$ at $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{R}} 120$, $\mathrm{P}<0.05$ ). The global trend pointed to decreased $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions with increasing residue lignin. Contrary to what is generally believed, providing the soil with high lignin and high N concentration may foster C stabilization into soils by soil microbes.
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## 1. Introduction

The carbon (C) cycle has received considerable attention in recent years, due to concerns over the continued increase in atmospheric carbon dioxide $\left(\mathrm{CO}_{2}\right)$ concentration. Annual increases of $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ concentration in the atmosphere were observed on a global scale for the years 2018 (2.7\%) and 2019 ( $0.6 \%$ ) (Ritchie and Roser, 2020). Global warming, as a result of high atmospheric $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ causes climate change, characterized by increase in mean temperature and higher variability in precipitation. Consequently, the need to sequester carbon in agricultural soils has been identified as a sustainable strategy to mitigate climate change and promote agricultural sustainability.

Soil is the second largest C reservoir with $11 \%$ ( 4655 Pg C), after the $87 \%$ of global carbon stocks being oceanic ( $38,000 \mathrm{Pg} \mathrm{C}$ ) and has higher C than the $2 \%$ found in the atmosphere (860 Pg C) (Xiao, 2015; Venter et al., 2021). Carbon transfer from the atmosphere to soil is achieved by plants through photosynthesis, leading to exudation of C compounds from roots during the growth cycle, and by the retention of plant root and shoot residues. Some of the C from plant residues or exudates can be mineralized and emitted back to the atmosphere as $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ while a significant proportion can be stabilized as soil organic matter (Ontl and Schulte, 2012; Dignac, 2017). Therefore, the rate of residue decomposition and associated $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions is often used as a proxy for evaluating the potential of plant residues to become soil organic matter (e.g. Johnson et al., 2007).

The potential to increase soil C stocks is mostly on managed agricultural land where numerous studies exist on the fate of C from different crop residues. Curtin et al. (2008) for instance, observed that barley straw emitted significantly higher ( $\mathrm{p}<0.05$ ) amount of $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ ( $55 \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{CO}_{2}-\mathrm{C} \mathrm{m}^{-2}$ ) compared to wheat straw ( $47 \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{CO}_{2}-\mathrm{C} \mathrm{m}^{-2}$ ) after 158 days. Ajwa and Tabatabai (1994) found $58 \%$ of organic C evolved as $\mathrm{CO}_{2}-\mathrm{C}$ from alfalfa-treated soils in 30 days which was higher compared to maize residues (30\%), which was attributed to the higher

C : N of maize residues. Zeng et al. (2010) attributed the higher $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions from peanut root (maximum of $60 \%$ ) compared to maize root residues (35\%) to biological nitrogen fixation, which increases N in leguminous plants, and thus lower their C : N ratio, and overall quality of the crop residues. Not only does crop residue decomposition depend on the type and quality of crop residues but also on the internal soil conditions (Mathew, et al., 2017; Stewart et al., 2015).

Mathew et al. (2017) concluded that higher plant C stocks and C transfer to soils occurred in carbon rich clayey soils of tropical humid areas due to higher biomass production potential compared to sandy soils. Clayey soils also support high C stocks through their aggregation and ability to provide physical protection as well as mineral adsorption of C constituents (Elliott, 1986; Ajwa and Tabatabai, 1994; Martens, 2000; Clark, 2007; Mathew, et al., 2017). Several studies have also reported disparities in $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions from residues of different crops under different soil types and climates, which has led to a lack of consensus on the impact of these factors on $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions from soils (Li et al., 1994; Paustian et al., 2000; Gregorich et al., 2001; Alvarez, 2005; Abdalla et al., 2016; McClelland et al., 2021; Shakoor et al., 2021). However, the existence of multiple individual studies across the world provides an opportunity to conduct a comprehensive analysis of the main factors that control crop residue decomposition and $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions and the consequences for the building of soil carbon stocks. Therefore, the objective of the current study was to evaluate the impact of crop type, soil and environmental factors on $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions from residues of selected crops using available global data from published studies.

## 2. Materials and methods

### 2.1. Study setup: Database preparation

Data on $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions from crop residues incubated in soil at laboratories were collated from studies across the world, published in peer reviewed journals and accessible from public domains such as Google scholar, Ref-seek, Science Direct, Sci-Finder, Scopus, Springer Link, Research-Gate and Web of Science. Key words such as "litter decomposition", "residue decomposition", "C mineralisation", "crop residue $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions", "C gases", "carbon dynamics" and "decomposition rate" were used to search for relevant journal articles. The available papers had to report on $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions from crops (sorghum, wheat, maize, among others) and on crop quality factors affecting residue decomposition (e.g. total C and $\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{C}: \mathrm{N}$ ratio, lignin, cellulose or hemicellulose). Furthermore, environmental factors such as climatic information (mean annual precipitation and mean annual temperature), geographic variables (latitude, longitude) as well as soil variables (physicochemical properties) measured during both laboratory or/and field experiments were considered as controlling variables. The studies had to strictly compare $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions between soils incubated with and without (considered as the control) residues under the same conditions. Moreover, the mass of residues used must have been clearly stated or able to be deduced. The data were used to compile a database with quantitative and qualitative data on plant litter quality.

### 2.2. Variables of $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emission

The effect of adding crop residues on soil $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions were calculated as the difference between $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emitted from the soil containing residues and $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ evolved from the control. The values were converted from their original units and normalized to common units (mg $\mathrm{CO}_{2}-\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{g} \mathrm{C}$ added of soil over 30, 90 and 120 day periods of incubation) (Table 2). The amounts of total $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions were recorded over 0-30; 30-90 and 90-120 day periods and were cumulatively representing lability of residue decomposition. The studies that did not cover the $0-30,30-90$ and $90-120$ periods were estimated by use of linear trendline equation.

In addition, a ratio between $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions at 30 relative to 120 days was calculated, which was used as an index of temporal stability of $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions $=1-\left(\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{R}} 30 / \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{R}} 120\right)$. The greater the index, the greater stability of the emissions over time.

### 2.3. Crop quality, soil and environmental factors

Crops were categorized into cereals, legumes, grasses and oilseed (Table 3), (i.e., cerealsbarley, maize, oat, rice, rye, sorghum, wheat; grass- grass; legumes-alfalfa, bean, clover, pea, soyabean, vetch; and oilseed-canola, cotton, and sunflower). Cereals and grasses were separated due to their functional differences, with cereals having evolved and undergone selection by farmers, making them different from natural or forage grasses. In this study, grasses refer to natural or forage grass that are not used for human consumption while cereal refers to monocot grasses that are used primarily for grain production for human consumption. Legumes are defined as any crop that has a natural ability to fix nitrogen, while oilseed crops are those that are primarily used for extraction of vegetable oil from their seed. Soyabean was considered as a legume crop in this study. Furthermore, crop quality was defined by residue chemical composition, such as initial C (TC) and lignin concentrations, C:N ratio, total nitrogen (TN), dissolved carbon (DC) and total phosphorus (TP); cellulose, polyphenols and lignin: N ratios. In addition, soil properties such as texture (clay, silt and sand concentration), soil $\mathrm{pH}\left(\mathrm{CaCl}_{2}\right)$ and organic carbon (SOC) were considered and classified into different categories (Table 3) following Abdalla et al. (2016); Mutema et al. (2015) and Mathew et al. (2017). Water-based pH was converted to $\mathrm{CaCl}_{2} \mathrm{pH}$ following the equation of Lierop (1981): $(\mathrm{y}=0.53+0.98 \mathrm{x})$. Where y is pH on the $\mathrm{CaCl}_{2}$ scale and x is the water-based pH .

Climatic factors included a 30 -year average rainfall and temperature (mean annual precipitation: MAP) and (mean annual temperature: MAT). The climate was further classified
as tropical (hot and wet), sub-tropical (warm and arid to humid) or temperate (cool to cold and mild to warm). In cases where climatic characteristics were not present in a particular study, appropriate data such as annual precipitation and temperature were obtained using the location coordinates or surrogate data for nearby prominent features (e.g. town) through Google search. In addition, the geographical positioning system (GPS) using latitude and longitude coordinates were used to depict the global distribution of the studies used in the review (Fig. 1).

A total of 58 journal articles (Table 1) were used, detailing different studies across the world, which provided 394 observations. The name of authors, year of paper publication, country and geographical location of experimental site, nature of experiment, experimental duration (time periods), crop(s) or crop types used in the experiments, quantitative information on plant quality, soil properties as well as C variables and environmental conditions were captured onto a database. The definitions and acronyms adopted in this paper are used to simplify the terms and definitions of variables for purposes of this analysis.

### 2.4. Data analyses

The data were compiled into a database and tested for normality of variables, linearity and homoscedasticity prior to statistical analyses. Descriptive summary statistics (minimum, maximum, median, mean, SEM: standard error of mean, $25^{\text {th }}$ and $75^{\text {th }}$ percentiles, skewness (Skew), kurtosis (Kurt) and coefficient of variation (CV\%) were calculated for all variables (Table 6). Furthermore, box plots were constructed to depict the distribution of the data showing minimum, $25^{\text {th }}$ quartile median, mean, $75^{\text {th }}$ quartile and maximum values within the 5 and $95^{\text {th }}$ percentiles. Mean $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions were computed for different crops, with different crop residue quality, soil properties and environmental factor classes. Because the $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emission data did not conform to normal distributions for us to use parametric analysis, the non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis analysis was performed. Significant differences between factor classes were tested with non-parametric analysis (Kruskal-Wallis), at chi-square probability of $<0.001$. In addition, bivariate Pearson correlations coefficients at $\mathrm{p}<0.05$ were calculated among the variables (Table 7). Subsequently, principal component analysis (PCA), which converts non-linear factors and variables into linear combinations for visualization (Jambu, 1991), were conducted to investigate the multiple correlations between the variables (Fig. 10 and 11). Finally, because of low number of data points the variable of residue dissolved carbon, total residue phosphorus, cellulose and polyphenols were discarded. SiAll analyses were performed using Statistica 10.0 software (Weiß, 2007).

## 3. Results

## 3.1. $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions from crop residues

The summary statistics (Table 4) which were computed from all study sites showed that the 30-days cumulative $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions $\left(\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{R}} 30\right)$ ranged between 0.3 and $920.1 \mathrm{mg} \mathrm{CO}-\mathrm{Cg}_{2}-1 \mathrm{C}^{\text {, }}$
with a mean value at $196.5 \mathrm{mg} \mathrm{CO}_{2}-\mathrm{C} \mathrm{g}^{-1} \mathrm{C}$. Cumulative 120 days emissions ( $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{R}} 120$ ) were between 3.2 and $3640 \mathrm{mg} \mathrm{CO}_{2}-\mathrm{C} \mathrm{g}^{-1} \mathrm{C}$ with a mean at $914.2 \mathrm{mg} \mathrm{CO}_{2}-\mathrm{C} \mathrm{g}^{-1} \mathrm{C}$ (Table 4). The resulting emission stability index showed a mean at 0.8 .

Cumulative emissions also varied among different crops, with legumes exhibiting the highest mean cumulative emissions of $228.0 \mathrm{mg} \mathrm{CO} 2-\mathrm{Cg}^{-1} \mathrm{C}$ after 30 days, $586.7 \mathrm{mg} \mathrm{CO}_{2}-\mathrm{C} \mathrm{g}^{-1} \mathrm{C}$ after 90 days and $1003.0 \mathrm{mg} \mathrm{CO}_{2}-\mathrm{C} \mathrm{g}^{-1} \mathrm{C}$ after 120 days (Table 5). Grasses ranked second with respectively, 217.0, 529.7 and $946.8 \mathrm{mg} \mathrm{CO}_{2}-\mathrm{C} \mathrm{g}^{-1} \mathrm{C}$, while oilseed crops ranked third and cereals fourth (Table 5). The average difference between legumes and cereals was $25 \%$ after 30 days, $19 \%$ after 90 days and $16 \%$ after 120 days, which corresponded for $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{R}} 30$ and $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{R}} 90$ to significant differences at $\mathrm{P}<0.001$. On average, legumes had the lowest temporal C emissions stability (0.78) followed by grass (0.79), cereals (0.82) and oilseed (0.83) (Table 5).

Table 6 shows variations in $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions between different crop types, with alfalfa having the highest emissions of $359.0 \mathrm{mg} \mathrm{CO} 2-\mathrm{C} \mathrm{g}^{-1} \mathrm{C}$, amongst legumes ( $48 \%$ higher than clover and pea), while canola (293.5) had the highest amongst oilseed crops, and sorghum (261.1) had the highest amongst cereals ( $67 \%$ more than maize) at $C_{R} 30$. Maize emitted the least cumulative $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ at $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{R}} 30$ ( $85.8 \mathrm{mg} \mathrm{CO} \mathrm{CO}_{2}-\mathrm{C} \mathrm{g} \mathrm{g}^{-1} \mathrm{C}$ ), $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{R}} 90$ (275.1) and $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{R}} 120$ (495.0) but exhibited with 0.84 the highest $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emission stability over time. In contrast, alfalfa exhibited the lowest stability of $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions with a mean value at 0.76 , followed by rye (0.77), clover and pea (0.78), canola, grass and oat (0.79) (Table 6; Fig. 2D).

### 3.2.The influence of crop residue quality on $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions

The quality of crop residues, determined by the initial $\mathrm{C}, \mathrm{N}$ and lignin concentrations, significantly ( $\mathrm{p}<0.05$ ) affected $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions (Table 7). There was a systematic decrease in $C$ emissions with the increase in residue nitrogen content with $r$ from -0.22 at $C_{R} 30,-0.26$ at $C_{R} 120$ and -0.28 at $C_{R} 90$. The $r$ values with lignin content were from -0.08 at $C_{R} 30$ to -0.12 at $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{R}} 120$. Emissions also decreased with increasing $\mathrm{C}: \mathrm{N}$ with the highest $\mathrm{r}(-0.14)$ found for $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{R}}$ 30. In contrast C emissions increased with increasing residue C content from 0.40 at $C_{R} 120$ to 0.59 at $C_{R} 30$. Furthermore, the increase in residue $C$ content significantly enhanced the temporal stability of C emissions $(\mathrm{r}=0.37)$.

### 3.3. The impact of soil and environmental properties on $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions from different crop residues

There were significant variations in cumulative $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions among the three different soil textural classes throughout the incubation periods (Fig. 4). For instance, clayey soils exhibited significantly higher cumulative 30 -days $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions ( $224 \mathrm{mg} \mathrm{CO}_{2}-\mathrm{C} \mathrm{g}^{-1} \mathrm{C}$ ) as compared to sandy soils ( $178 \mathrm{mg} \mathrm{CO}_{2}-\mathrm{C} \mathrm{g}^{-1} \mathrm{C}$ ), while silty soils had intermediate emissions. Decreasing emissions with increasing sand content was a trend also found for $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{R}} 90$ and $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{R}} 120$. Finally, the temporal stability of $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions was surprisingly the highest under silty conditions $\left(1-\left(\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{R}} 30 / \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{R}} 120\right)=0.81\right)$ and decrease to 0.80 under clayey conditions and to 0.79 for sandy soils (Fig. 4).

Cumulative $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions also varied due to soil pH (Fig. 5). For all incubation durations, the lowest emissions were observed for strongly acidic soils while the highest emissions were found for slightly acidic soils. Additionally, there was a trend for emissions to lessen from slightly acidic to alkaline through neutral while the temporal stability of the emissions consistently rose from acidic to alkaline (Fig. 5D).

Figure 6 which depicts the impact of climate points to a significant decrease of emissions from tropical to temperate through sub-tropical. In the case of $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{R}} 30, \mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions decreased from an average of $252 \mathrm{mg} \mathrm{CO} 2-\mathrm{C} \mathrm{g}^{-1} \mathrm{C}$ for tropical to $193 \mathrm{mg} \mathrm{CO} 2-\mathrm{Cg}^{-1} \mathrm{C}$ for subtropical and to $150 \mathrm{mg} \mathrm{CO}_{2}-\mathrm{C} \mathrm{gC}^{-1}$ for temperate, which corresponded in all cases to significant differences at $\mathrm{P}<0.01$ (Fig. 6A). Similar trends (i.e. a decrease of emissions from tropical to temperate) were also observed for $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{R}} 90$ and $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{R}} 120$ but the temporal stability of the emissions consistently rose from tropical to temperate, the differences between subtropical and temperate being however non-significant (Fig. 6D).

Multivariate correlations between $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emission variables on the one hand and soil and crop residue variables on the other hand are displayed on Figure 7. The two principal components of this PCA explained $99 \%$ of the total variation in the data with the first principal component (PC1) accounting for $79 \%$ of data variance and PC 2 accounting for $20 \%$. Cumulative emissions to 30,90 and 120 days showed a positive correlation to PC 1 and this axis can be thus interpreted as an axis of crop residue decomposition. The temporal stability of $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions had a negative coordinate on Axis 2, meaning that PC2 could be interpreted as an axis of decomposition in-stability. Residue content in lignin, N and C showed negative coordinates on PC1 while the $\mathrm{C}: \mathrm{N}$ ratio showed a positive coordinate. There was thus a tendency for emissions to increase as $\mathrm{C}: \mathrm{N}$ increases but $\mathrm{C}, \mathrm{N}$ and lignin concentration decreases. Finally, emission instability decreased with increasing pH as pointed by a negative coordinate of pH on PC2 (Fig. 7). Amongst crops, canola and alfalfa correlated to the high $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions level and low $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emission stability pole, while maize, cotton and sunflower correlated to the low emissions and high stability pole.

## 4. Discussion

4.1. Causes of variation in residue decomposition and soil C building amongst crop types

The different crop types exhibited large variations in $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions with legumes emitting the highest cumulative $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions and with decreasing emissions over time versus cereals pointing to lower emissions but of higher stability. Such variations were shown to correlate with the quality of crop residues (Machinet, et al., 2009). Ajwa and Tabatabai (1994) revealed that the significantly higher amounts of $\mathrm{CO}_{2}-\mathrm{C}$ released from alfalfa were to be attributed to their ability to fix N , as they had higher initial N concentration, of $12.6 \%$ as compared to the $6.9 \%$ of maize and the $1.3 \%$ of oilseed crops. The underlying hypothesis of greater emissions at high initial N concentration was, as suggested by Gezahegn, et al., (2016), the enhanced microbial activity leading to high decomposition and $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions. But the present study, which was based on 394 trials from across the world, tends to contradict this past statement as it pointed to a negative correlation between $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions and residue N concentration. Such a trend might be due to the fact that N availability enhances $C$ uptake by microbes and thus humus formation versus $C$ emissions to the atmosphere as $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$, a mechanism that was described by authors such as Henriksen and Breland (1999), Rousk and Bååth (2007), Bai et al. (2016) and Köbke et al. (2018). The fact that legumes, especially Alfalfa which accounted for the most emissions amongst crops during the maximum 120 days period, emitted large amounts of $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ despite a high N concentration was most likely due to its low lignin concentration.

Carbon stabilization into soils in microbial biomass thus seems to be favoured by the supply of residues with a C and N stoichiometric ratio close to that of living microorganisms. Results on maize, sunflower and cotton tend to show that lignin rich residues experience low decomposition rates which constitutes a second route of carbon stabilization into soils.

### 4.2.The impact of crop residues on the loss of soil carbon through priming

Recent studies have indeed shown that the activity of decomposers and their ability to decompose soil organic matter for their living can be stimulated by the addition of fresh organic matter resulting in an increase in soil respiration beyond C addition, which is referred to as 'priming' (e.g. Fontaine et al. 2003; Kuzyakov, 2010). In the present study and as pointed out in Table 8, 43\% of the respiration data points showed 120 days cumulative emissions beyond C addition, which points to the existence of significant C losses from soil organic matter. All crop types experienced priming with the proportion of studies with C losses over residue C from $25 \%$ for maize, sunflower and beans to over $55 \%$ for sorghum, alfalfa and canola and with differences between legumes, cereals and oilseed crops being non-significant at $\mathrm{p}<0.05$.

Several authors have suggested that chemically recalcitrant residues, such as those rich in lignin decompose more slowly than residues with low lignin and high N concentrations, thus leading to enhanced C stabilization into soils and increased soil organic matter (Johnson et al. 2007, Berg and Mc Claugherty, 2008). However, several other authors such as Stewart et al. (2015), pointed out that high lignin residues are used inefficiently by the soil microbial community that decompose SOM (priming effect) to acquire key nutrients resulting in much greater respiration losses and less C stabilization into soils. The present study which points to a global tendency for $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions to decrease with the increase in residue lignin and N concentration tend to show that providing the soil with high lignin and high N concentration may limit priming and foster C stabilization into soils by soil microbes. Moreover, the present data showed that lignin concentration minimally impacted the temporal stability of the emissions but that emissions decreased more sharply over time at higher initial residue C concentration.

Soil texture and pH had significant impact on cumulative $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions from crop residues. The higher cumulative $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions from clayey soils could be due to favorable living conditions for decomposers than under coarser soil conditions. Moreover, Schmatz, et al., (2017) also found higher C emissions from clay soils as compared to sandy-loam soils due to high organic carbon concentration in clayey soils and enhanced water retention capability, thus favoring the activity of microorganisms responsible for residue break-down. Contrarily, most previous studies generally had described clay soils to enhance the physical protection and mineral adsorption of C constituents, which was not confirmed by the present analysis of world data from 120 days duration in which clay soils experiences higher $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions per gram of residue C added. Addition of labile organic materials (crop residues) to clayey soils, with higher organic carbon, could result in more $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions (priming effect) than from sandy loam soils. In addition, such an increase in $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions with the increase in soil clay concentration might come as suggested above from higher soil moisture and bacteria concentration, favoring the rapid turnover of residue C .

We had no explanation for slightly acidic soils ( pH of 5.5-6.4) to experience consistently higher $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions ( $>50 \%$ ) than the other pH levels irrespective of incubation durations as conditions for fungi and bacteria are not optimal (Hågvar, 1994; Stott and Martin, 1989). A possible reason for the higher $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions could be the liming effect of residues that foster the priming of soil organic matter (Wang et al. 2017; Yaowu et al. 2016).

### 4.4.Climate impact on $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions

The finding of this study pointed to higher residue $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions under tropical conditions than under the other climates throughout the incubation days. Tropical climates tend to experience high temperature and rainfall conditions that are conducive for production of high plant biomass and microbial activity for decomposition. On the other hand, soils of sub-
tropical or temperate climates have lower rainfall and cooler temperature thus limiting microbial activity and the biochemical processes involved in residue decomposition (Ontl and Schulte, 2012). As the data used in the present study come from laboratory experiments with controlled conditions of temperature and humidity, the higher decomposition rates and cumulative $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions under tropical climates could be due to favourable conditions for microbial activity.

## 5. Conclusions

The analysis of 394 laboratory trials worldwide revealed that on average, legumes exhibited significantly higher $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions than cereals, oilseed and fiber crops, with for instance alphalfa emitting 2.7 times more $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ after 120 days than maize (Figure 2, Table 6). Additionally, legumes (especially alfalfa) showed the lowest stability of $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions over time (i.e., the highest decrease from 30 to 120 days) followed by grasses, cereals and oilseed crops.

Amongst the two models for enhanced C sequestration into soils the present analysis points to a global tendency for $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions to decrease with the increase in residue lignin. This contrasted with the studies showing that high lignin concentration induce enhanced microbial decomposition and thus C outputs from soils i.e., alfalfa (low lignin and high N concentration) versus maize residue (high lignin and low N concentration). Providing soils with residues with high lignin such as through maize residues may improve $C$ uptake by microbes (a key process in humus formation).

A large proportion of the variance in the data remained however unexplained thus calling for further analysis of variables such as soil nutrients, microbial communities and quality of lignin, and of other organic matter compounds. More work is also to be done on selecting crop cultivars for generating superior ones in our fight against land and climate degradation. Finally, the question whether the carbon remaining into the soil after 120 days of incubation will be stabilized to contribute to soil carbon stocks calls for further research to understand the fate and underlying mechanisms of C sequestration into soils.
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Figure 1: Global distribution map of the study sites used in the present study.
$C_{R} 120 ;$ and $\left.D: 1-\left[C_{R} 30 / C_{R} 120\right]\right)$. The data were sorted by mean (dotted line).
cumulative $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emitted from crop residues to 30 days, $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{R}} 30 ; \mathrm{B}$ : to 90 days, $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{R}} 90$; C : to 120 days
Figure 2: $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions from residues of different crops incubated at different time periods ( A :

$\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions ( $\mathrm{mg} \mathrm{CO}_{2}-\mathrm{Cg}^{-1}$ )



Figure 3: $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions from residues of different crop types incubated at different time periods (A: $C_{R} 30 ; B: C_{R} 90 ; C: C_{R} 120$; and $D: 1-C_{R} 30 / C_{R} 120$ ). Plots with the same lower-case letters are not significantly different at Chi-square probability of $<0.001$ ( Chi and H values= $=16.5 .24$ at A ; 0.08. 6.72 at $\mathrm{B} ; 0.00$. 13.79 at C and 0.00 . 21005 at D . respectively).


Figure 4: $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions from soils of different texture ((\%) -clayey. silt and sandy soil) at different day time periods. Plots with the same lower-case letters are not significantly different at Chi-square probability of $<0.001$ ( Chi and H values $=0.26$. 2.67 at $\mathrm{A} ; 0.63 .0 .92$ at $\mathrm{B} ; 0.10$. 4.70 at C ; and 0.00 .14 .07 at D . respectively).


Figure 5: $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions from soils of different pH (highly basic. neutral. slightly acidic and highly acidic) at different day time periods. Strongly acidic ( $\mathrm{pH}<5.4$ ); slightly acidic (5.5-6.4); neutral (6.5-7.4); alkaline ( $>7.5$ ) soil pH . Plots with the same lower-case letters are not significantly different at Chi-square probability of $<0.001$ (Chi and H values= 0.01 .10 .99 at A ; 0.01 . 12.64 at B. 0.25. 4.09 at C. and 0.00. 20.92 at D. respectively).


Figure 6: $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions from climate of different rainfall and temperature level (as in tropical. sub-tropical and temperate (MAT. MAP) at different day time periods. Plots with the same lower-case letters are not significantly different at Chi-square probability of $<0.001$ (Chi and H values $=0.84 .0 .34$ at $\mathrm{A} ; 0.11 .4 .40$ at $\mathrm{B} ; 0.68 .0 .77$ at C . and 0.00 . 18.13 at D . respectively).

1 Table 1: References included in database with author, country, crops type, soil texture and
2 climatic zones under which the studies were conducted.

| No. | Author | Country | Crop type | Soil texture | Climate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Abiven et al. (2005) | Brazil | Brachiaria; Rice; Sorghum; Soyabean; Wheat | Clayey | Tropical |
| 2 | Abiven and Recous (2007) | Brazil | Brachiaria; Rice; Sorghum; Soyabean; Wheat | Clayey | Tropical |
| 3 | Abro et al. (2011) | China | Maize | Clayey | Subtropical |
| 4 | Ajwa and Tabatabai (1994) | USA | Alfalfa; Maize; Sorghum; Soyabean | Silt | Subtropical |
| 5 | Angers and Recous (1997) | France | Rye; Wheat | Silt | Temperate |
| 6 | Anguria et al. (2017) | Uganda | Cowpea; groundnut; millet; sorghum | (blank) | Subtropical |
| 7 | Arunachalam et al. (2003) | India | Bean and pea | Sandy | Tropical |
| 8 | Aulakh et al. (1991) | USA | Vetch and wheat | Silt | Tropical |
| 9 | Begum et al. (2014) | Australia | Canola; Sorghum; Soyabean; Wheat | Clayey | Subtropical |
| 10 | Bertrand, et al. (2006) | France | Wheat | Silt | Subtropical |
| 11 | Blaise \& Bhaskar (2003) | India | Cotton | clayey, | Subtropical |
| 12 | Cayuela et al. (2009) | Italy | Cotton; wheat | Sandy | Subtropical |
| 13 | Clark et al. (2007) | Australia | Alfalfa; Wheat | Clayey | Subtropical |
| 14 | Cong et al. (2015) | China | Bean; Maize; Wheat | Sandy | Temperate |
| 15 | Corbeels et al. (2000) | Morocco | Sunflower, Wheat | Clayey | Temperate |
| 16 | Curtin et al. (2008) | New Zealand | Barley; Wheat | Silt | Subtropical |
| 17 | Datta et al. (2019) | India | Maize; Rice; Wheat | Silt | Subtropical |
| 18 | De Neergaard et al. (2002) | Denmark | Clover; Grass | Silt | Temperate |
| 19 | Duong et al. (2009) | Australia | Wheat | Sandy | Subtropical |
| 20 | Finn et al. (2015) | Australia | Alfalfa; Grass; Wheat | clayey, Silt\& sandy | Subtropical |
| 21 | Fruit et al. (1999) | France | Wheat | Silt | Subtropical |
| 22 | Gezahegn et al. (2016) | Malaysia | Maize; Soyabean | Sandy | Subtropical |
| 23 | Ghimire et al. (2017) | USA | Canola; Oat; Pea | Clayey | Subtropical |
| 24 | Havstad et al. (2010) | Norway | Barley; Clover; Grass; Meadow; Wheat | Silt | Subtropical |
| 25 | Henriksen and Breland (2002) | Norway | Barley; Clover; Wheat | Silt, sandy | Temperate |
| 26 | Jha et al. (2012) | India | Wheat | Clayey | Subtropical |
| 27 | Jin et al. (2008) | China | Peanut; Wheat | Silt | Tropical |
| 28 | Johnson et al. (2017) | USA | Alfalfa; Cuphea; Maize; Soyabean; Switchgrass | Silt | Subtropical |
| 29 | Juan et al. (2009) | China | Rice; Wheat | (blank) | Subtropical |
| 30 | Khali et al. (2005) | Bangladesh | Bean; wheat | clayey, Silt \&sandy | Tropical |
| 31 | Liet al. (2013) | China | Maize; Soyabean | Silt | Temperate |
| 32 | Lou et al. (2007) | China | Rice | Clayey | Tropical |
| 33 | Luxhoi et al. (2002) | Denmark | Clover; Grass; Rye | Sandy | Tropical |
| 34 | Machinet et al. (2009) | France | Maize | Silt | Temperate |
| 35 | Machinet et al. (2011) | France | Maize | Clayey | Temperate |
| 36 | Magid et al. (2004) | Denmark | Clover; Radish; Rye; Sugarcane; Vetch | Sandy | Temperate |
| 37 | Marstorp and kirchmann (1991) | Sweden | Clover | Sandy | Temperate |
| 38 | Martens (2000) | USA | Alfalfa; Canola; Maize; Oat; Prairie | Sandy | Subtropical |
| 39 | Moreno-Cornejo et al. (2014) | Spain | Pepper | Silt | Subtropical |
| 40 | Muhammad et al. (2011) | Australia | Cotton; Maize; Sorghum, Sugarcane | Clayey | Subtropical |
| 41 | Müller et al. (2003) | Denmark | Barley; Clover; Grass; Rape | Sandy | Temperate |
| 42 | Mungai and Motavalli (2006) | Kenya | Grass; Maize; Soyabean | clayey, Silt | Temperate |
| 43 | Murungu et al. (2011) | South Africa | Oat; Peas; Vetch | Sandy | Temperate |
| 44 | Nourbakhsh (2006) | Iran | Alfalfa; Wheat | Clayey | Subtropical |
| 45 | Pascault et al. (2010) | France | Alfalfa; Rape; Wheat | Clayey | Temperate |
| 46 | Quemada and Cabrera, (1995) | USA | Clover; Oat; Rye; Wheat | Sandy | Subtropical |
| 47 | Raiesi; (20065) | Iran | Alfalfa; Wheat | Clayey | Subtropical |
| 48 | Redin et al. (2014) | Brazil | Maize; Sorghum; Wheat, Soyabean; Sunflower; Vetch | Sandy | Tropical |
| 49 | Schmatz et al. (2017) | Brazil | Pea; Vetch; Wheat | clayey, sandy | Tropical |
| 50 | Shahande et al. (2011) | USA | Switchgrass | Silt | Subtropical |
| 51 | Shi et al. (2013) | Australia | Barley; Grass | Silt | Subtropical |
| 52 | Stewart et al. (20157) | USA | Maize; Sorghum; Soyabean; Sunflower; Wheat | Silt | Temperate |
| 53 | Vachon and Oelbermann (2011) | Argentina | Maize; Soyabean | Silt | Subtropical |
| 54 | Vahdat et al; (2010) | Iran | Alfalfa; Barley; Clover; Grass; Wheat | Clayey | Subtropical |
| 55 | Wang et al. (2004) | Australia | Brigalow; Grass; Sugarcane; Wheat | Sandy | Subtropical |
| 56 | Xu et al. (2006) | Australia | Alfalfa; Chickpea; Medic; Wheat | Sandy | Tropical |
| 57 | Zaccheo et al. (2002) | Italy | Alfalfa; Maize | Sandy | Temperate |
| 58 | Zeng et al. (2010) | China | Maize; Peanut; Poplar | Sandy | Temperate |

Table 3: Crop quality, soils and environmental variables classification used in the study.

| Variable | Variable remarks | Category | Symbol | Class | Ref. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Crop class | All different crop types categorised into four classes | Wheat, sorghum, | Crop class | Cereal, | Mathew, et al. (2017) |
|  |  | grass, |  | Grass, |  |
|  |  | vetch bean, soyabean |  | Legume and |  |
|  |  | Canola, cotton |  | Oilseed |  |
| Residue lignin concentration (\%) | Initial lignin concentration of residues | <10 | Lignin | Low |  |
|  |  | $>10$ |  | High |  |
| Residue lignin: $\mathbf{N}$ ratio | Residue lignin to nitrogen ratio | $>10$ | lignin: N | High |  |
|  |  | <10 |  | Low |  |
| Residue C:N ratio | Crop residue carbon to nitrogen ratio | <20 | C: N | Low | Puyuelo, (2011) and Probert (2005) |
|  |  | 20-30 |  | Medium |  |
|  |  | $>30$ |  | High |  |
| Residue $\mathbf{N}$ concentration (\%) | Initial nitrogen concentration of residues | >10 | TN | High |  |
|  |  | $<10$ |  | Low |  |
| Residue C concentration (\%) | Initial carbon concentration of residues | $>50$ | TC | High | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Abdalla et al., } \\ & (2016) \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | <50 |  | Low |  |
| Clay concentration (\%) | Soil Texture based on clay fraction | $>10$ | Soil texture | Clayey | Mathew et al., (2017) and Abdalla et al., (2016) |
|  |  | 20-32 |  | Silt |  |
|  |  | <20 |  | Sandy |  |
| Soil pH concentration $\left(\mathrm{CaCl}_{2}\right)$ | Soil pH | <5.4 | pH | Strongly acidic | Davies, 1971; <br> Mathew et al. (2017) |
|  |  | 5.5-6.4 |  | Slightly acidic |  |
|  |  | 6.5-7.4 |  | Neutral |  |
|  |  | $>7.5$ |  | Alkaline |  |
| Soil bulk density (g $\mathrm{cm}^{-3}$ ) | Average bulk density in soil profile | <1.3 | BD | Low BD | Mathew et al., (2017) |
|  |  | $>1.3$ |  | High BD |  |
| CEC (cmolckg) | Soil cation exchange capacity | $>20$ | CEC | Low CEC |  |
|  |  | <20 |  | High CEC |  |
| Climate | Based on the average annual temperature and precipitation of the study site | $>20$ | MAT |  | Mutema et al., (2015) and Mathew et al., 2017 |
|  |  | $>1500$ | MAP | Tropical |  |
|  |  | 20-10 | MAT | Sub-tropical |  |
|  |  | 100-1110 | MAP |  |  |
|  |  | <10 | MAT | Temperate |  |
|  |  | 120-1000 | MAP |  |  |

Table 4: Summary Statistics of plant, soil and environmental variables along with residue $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions in different time period.

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \& \begin{tabular}{l}
Lignin \\
\%
\end{tabular} \& \(\mathrm{C}: \mathrm{N}\) \& TC \& TN
\(\qquad\) \& \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Clay } \\
--\mathrm{g} \mathrm{~kg}^{-1}
\end{gathered}
\] \& \begin{tabular}{c} 
Sand \\
\\
\hline--------1
\end{tabular} \& Silt \& pH \& SOC
\(\%\) \& MAP
mm \& MAT

${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ \& \[
\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{R}} 30

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{gathered}
\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{R}} 90 \\
\mathrm{CO}_{2}-\mathrm{C} \mathrm{~g}
\end{gathered}
$$

\] \& \[

\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{R}} 120
\]

$\qquad$ \& $$
\begin{gathered}
1- \\
{\left[\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{R}} 30 / \mathrm{C}\right.} \\
\mathrm{R} 120]
\end{gathered}
$$ <br>

\hline N \& 192 \& 304 \& 394 \& 365 \& 295 \& 259 \& 243 \& 333 \& 293 \& 386 \& 386 \& 394 \& 394 \& 394 \& 394 <br>
\hline Mean \& 9.55 \& 58.45 \& 13.24 \& 9.38 \& 29.53 \& 37.81 \& 32.40 \& 6.73 \& 13.13 \& 906.16 \& 17.01 \& 196.5 \& 519.0 \& 914.2 \& 0.80 <br>
\hline Median \& 7.70 \& 39.16 \& 1.15 \& 4.00 \& 25.30 \& 32.00 \& 28.00 \& 6.80 \& 9.50 \& 656.00 \& 17.00 \& 138.0 \& 415.6 \& 795.0 \& 0.80 <br>
\hline Min. \& 0.02 \& 7.80 \& 0.04 \& 0.01 \& 2.00 \& 1.00 \& 1.00 \& 3.87 \& 0.50 \& 89.40 \& 3.90 \& 0.3 \& 1.1 \& 3.2 \& 0.49 <br>
\hline Max. \& 29.40 \& 409.00 \& 165.76 \& 407.00 \& 77.30 \& 96.00 \& 83.00 \& 8.60 \& 39.00 \& 2500.00 \& 30.00 \& 920.1 \& 3205 \& 3640 \& 0.98 <br>
\hline Q1 \& 5.35 \& 20.30 \& 0.40 \& 0.90 \& 14.30 \& 17.90 \& 16.30 \& 5.60 \& 8.41 \& 551.00 \& 10.00 \& 31.0 \& 118.4 \& 200.4 \& 0.75 <br>
\hline Q3 \& 12.55 \& 75.40 \& 4.12 \& 11.00 \& 40.00 \& 60.00 \& 47.00 \& 7.66 \& 17.40 \& 1095.00 \& 24.00 \& 304.9 \& 858.9 \& 1431.0 \& 0.86 <br>
\hline Variance \& 36.07 \& 3257.25 \& 1164.81 \& 592.74 \& 370.64 \& 737.14 \& 483.34 \& 1.34 \& 65.33 \& 263814.21 \& 46.19 \& 37353.5 \& 213397 \& 585331 \& 0.01 <br>
\hline SD. \& 6.01 \& 57.07 \& 34.13 \& 24.35 \& 19.25 \& 27.15 \& 21.99 \& 1.16 \& 8.08 \& 513.63 \& 6.80 \& 193.3 \& 461.9 \& 765.1 \& 0.07 <br>
\hline SE. \& 0.43 \& 3.27 \& 1.72 \& 1.27 \& 1.12 \& 1.69 \& 1.41 \& 0.06 \& 0.47 \& 26.14 \& 0.35 \& 7.7 \& 18.4 \& 30.5 \& 0.00 <br>
\hline CV \& 63.30 \& 98.10 \& 13.70 \& 262.70 \& 64.90 \& 75.40 \& 67.60 \& 17.30 \& 61.60 \& 56.50 \& 40.30 \& 98.4 \& 89.0 \& 83.7 \& 9.11 <br>
\hline Skewness \& 1.06 \& 2.52 \& 2.97 \& 12.47 \& 0.92 \& 0.51 \& 0.68 \& $-0.30$ \& 1.04 \& 1.15 \& 0.10 \& 1.07 \& 1.10 \& 0.73 \& -0.25 <br>
\hline Kurtosis \& 0.83 \& 8.30 \& 7.69 \& 197.12 \& 0.13 \& -0.79 \& -0.32 \& -1.03 \& 0.69 \& 0.51 \& -1.12 \& 0.58 \& 2.11 \& -0.15 \& -0.23 <br>
\hline
\end{tabular}

Statistics: Min and Max =minimum and maximum, respectively. Q1 and Q3= first and third quartile, SD = standard deviation. C emission variables: $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{R}} 30 ; \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{R}} 90 ; \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{R}} 120$ for cumulative residue $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions to day 30,90 and 120 . Crop quality: lignin; C: N ratio; $\mathrm{TC}=$ total residue carbon; $\mathrm{TN}=$ total residue nitrogen. Soil variables: Clay concentration; sand concentration; silt concentration; soil $\mathrm{pH}(\mathrm{CaCl})$. $\mathrm{SOC}=$ soil organic carbon concentration; Climatic variables: $\mathrm{MAP}=$ mean annual precipitation; MAT= mean annuat temperature. " $\dagger$ " values are not zero. but rounded off to one decimal place.

Table 5: Sample sizes of crop quality ( n ), soil and climatic factor categories in association with carbon emissions from residues.

|  |  | $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{R}} 30$ |  |  | $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{R}} 90$ |  |  | $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{R}} 120$ |  |  | $1-\left[\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{R}} 30 / \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{R}} 120\right]$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | n | Mean | STDEV | n | Mean | STDEV | n | Mean | STDEV | n | Mean | STDEV |
| Overall |  | 394 | 196.3 | 193.3 | 394 | 518.8 | 461.9 | 394 | 914.2 | 765.1 | 394 | 0.81 | 0.07 |
| Crop type | Cereal | 195 | 171.0 | 185.9 | 195 | 473.9 | 445.4 | 195 | 846.6 | 777.1 | 195 | 0.82 | 0.07 |
|  | Grass | 54 | 217.0 | 185.8 | 54 | 529.7 | 426.7 | 54 | 946.8 | 741.0 | 54 | 0.79 | 0.06 |
|  | Legume | 120 | 228.0 | 203.2 | 120 | 586.7 | 505.7 | 120 | 1003.0 | 758.3 | 120 | 0.78 | 0.08 |
|  | Oilseed | 25 | 196.0 | 211.9 | 25 | 519.2 | 459.2 | 25 | 944.0 | 742.5 | 25 | 0.83 | 0.07 |
| Residue lignin | High | 73 | 173.0 | 165.2 | 73 | 457.0 | 402.3 | 73 | 816.9 | 694.2 | 73 | 0.80 | 0.07 |
| Concentration | Low | 119 | 218.0 | 188.9 | 119 | 602.3 | 524.3 | 119 | 1055.0 | 853.0 | 119 | 0.84 | 0.05 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Residue C: N } \\ & \text { Ratio } \end{aligned}$ | High | 142 | 144.9 | 159.0 | 142 | 447.0 | 424.9 | 142 | 837.9 | 777.4 | 142 | 0.78 | 0.07 |
|  | Low | 103 | 273.7 | 223.4 | 103 | 686.9 | 537.4 | 103 | 1163.1 | 814.7 | 103 | 0.80 | 0.07 |
|  | Medium | 59 | 201.1 | 214.7 | 59 | 484.9 | 449.7 | 59 | 856.8 | 734.8 | 59 | 0.80 | 0.08 |
| TC | High | 284 | 201.8 | 198.7 | 284 | 524.6 | 450.5 | 284 | 927.3 | 759.9 | 284 | 0.80 | 0.08 |
|  | Low | 110 | 181.9 | 168.9 | 110 | 503.6 | 635.6 | 110 | 880.2 | 803.9 | 110 | 0.82 | 0.07 |
| Soil texture | Clayey | 121 | 224.4 | 179.0 | 121 | 587.5 | 440.7 | 121 | 1060.6 | 777.5 | 121 | 0.81 | 0.07 |
|  | Silt | 130 | 191.1 | 215.6 | 130 | 505.8 | 523.9 | 130 | 894.3 | 819.4 | 130 | 0.82 | 0.08 |
|  | Sandy | 137 | 178.2 | 184.7 | 137 | 454.7 | 417.8 | 137 | 789.9 | 699.2 | 137 | 0.79 | 0.08 |
| Soil pH | Alkaline | 133 | 178.1 | 170.0 | 133 | 487.2 | 410.7 | 133 | 869.2 | 712.5 | 133 | 0.82 | 0.07 |
|  | Neutral | 57 | 195.4 | 165.4 | 57 | 532.3 | 362.0 | 57 | 919.4 | 613.8 | 57 | 0.79 | 0.07 |
|  | Slightly acidic | 86 | 262.1 | 203.3 | 86 | 634.6 | 560.3 | 86 | 1140.2 | 874.0 | 86 | 0.78 | 0.07 |
|  | Strongly acidic | 57 | 175.3 | 222.3 | 57 | 414.7 | 443.4 | 57 | 709.9 | 687.7 | 57 | 0.79 | 0.09 |
| Soil organic carbon Concentration | High | 39 | 149.4 | 148.9 | 39 | 356.7 | 529.6 | 39 | 591.4 | 695.8 | 39 | 0.81 | 0.07 |
|  | Low | 153 | 157.5 | 188.9 | 153 | 421.3 | 430.9 | 153 | 746.9 | 725.8 | 153 | 0.81 | 0.07 |
|  | Medium | 101 | 230.3 | 184.9 | 101 | 595.2 | 432.0 | 101 | 1066.4 | 746.6 | 101 | 0.81 | 0.07 |
| Climate | Subtropical | 198 | 192.5 | 181.8 | 198 | 522.8 | 427.3 | 198 | 912.2 | 736.5 | 198 | 0.81 | 0.07 |
|  | Temperate | 101 | 149.8 | 213.8 | 101 | 430.3 | 536.5 | 101 | 779.7 | 828.1 | 101 | 0.82 | 0.08 |
|  | Tropical | 95 | 253.4 | 193.7 | 95 | 604.5 | 444.7 | 95 | 1061.2 | 755.8 | 95 | 0.78 | 0.08 |

Table 6: Sample sizes of crop type categories associated with residue carbon emission variables.

| Crop type | Crop | $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{R}} 30$ |  |  | $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{R}} 90$ |  |  | $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{R} 120}$ |  |  | 1-[CR30/CR 120$]$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | n | Mean | STDEV | n | Mean | STDEV | n | Mean | STDEV | n | Mean | STDEV |
|  | Overall | 394 | 196.3 | 193.3 | 394 | 518.8 | 461.95 | 394 | 914.2 | 765.07 | 394 | 0.81 | 0.07 |
| Cereal | Barley | 9 | 177.7 | 156.8 | 9 | 547.2 | 436.1 | 9 | 1005 | 778.6 | 9 | 0.84 | 0.05 |
|  | Maize | 59 | 85.8 | 124.3 | 59 | 275.1 | 319.8 | 59 | 495.0 | 541.7 | 59 | 0.84 | 0.08 |
|  | Oat | 8 | 212.1 | 190.8 | 8 | 501.9 | 425.5 | 8 | 872.7 | 724.5 | 8 | 0.79 | 0.06 |
|  | Rice | 10 | 251.9 | 255.7 | 10 | 657.1 | 662.3 | 10 | 1211 | 1196.6 | 10 | 0.82 | 0.08 |
|  | Rye | 12 | 199.3 | 190.8 | 12 | 501.6 | 453.5 | 12 | 824.2 | 729.5 | 12 | 0.77 | 0.04 |
|  | Sorghum | 16 | 261.1 | 218.8 | 16 | 714 | 496.7 | 16 | 1303 | 855.9 | 16 | 0.83 | 0.08 |
|  | Wheat | 81 | 196.3 | 194.8 | 81 | 533.6 | 452.3 | 81 | 950.7 | 791.8 | 81 | 0.81 | 0.07 |
| Grass | Grass | 54 | 217 | 184.9 | 54 | 529.7 | 420.3 | 54 | 946.8 | 734.2 | 54 | 0.79 | 0.06 |
| Legume | Alfalfa | 24 | 359.0 | 262.7 | 24 | 796.0 | 515.0 | 24 | 1319.0 | 801.0 | 24 | 0.76 | 0.07 |
|  | Bean | 12 | 223.7 | 239.9 | 12 | 538.7 | 471.0 | 12 | 962.1 | 667.0 | 12 | 0.80 | 0.06 |
|  | Clover | 26 | 184.2 | 139.6 | 26 | 580.6 | 661.0 | 26 | 940.3 | 866.5 | 26 | 0.78 | 0.06 |
|  | Pea | 27 | 184.2 | 152.7 | 27 | 452 | 343.8 | 27 | 809 | 554.1 | 27 | 0.78 | 0.07 |
|  | Soyabean | 23 | 207.8 | 157.0 | 23 | 577.5 | 401.7 | 23 | 1039 | 715.6 | 23 | 0.81 | 0.10 |
|  | Vetch | 8 | 190.2 | 182.6 | 8 | 531.1 | 433.4 | 8 | 870.4 | 696.1 | 8 | 0.80 | 0.05 |
| Oilseed | Canola | 8 | 293.5 | 327.3 | 8 | 670.5 | 717.3 | 8 | 1211 | 1184.5 | 8 | 0.79 | 0.07 |
|  | Cotton | 9 | 135.5 | 98.8 | 9 | 442.5 | 281.0 | 9 | 841.1 | 513.9 | 9 | 0.85 | 0.03 |
|  | Sunflower | 8 | 166.5 | 208.7 | 8 | 454.2 | 451.7 | 8 | 792.5 | 667.4 | 8 | 0.84 | 0.10 |

$\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{R}} 30 . \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{R}} 90$ and $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{R}} 120=$ Amount of $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emitted from crop residues to day 30,90 and 120 of the experiment, respectively.

Table 7: Correlation matrix statistic table of plant, soil and climatic influence on residue $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions.

|  | Lignin | C:N | TC | TN | Clay | Sand | Silt | pH | SOC | MAP | MAT | $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{R} 30}$ | $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{R}} 90$ | $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{R} 120}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1- \\ \text { [CR30/CR1 } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lignin | 1.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C:N | 0.15 | 1.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TC | -0.06 | -0.06 | 1.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TN | 0.03 | -0.19 | -0.02 | 1.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Clay | -0.08 | -0.11 | 0.51* | -0.19 | 1.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sand | -0.02 | -0.15 | -0.42 | 0.32* | -0.64* | 1.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Silt | 0.10 | 0.30* | -0.02 | -0.19 | -0.26* | -0.57* | 1.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pH | 0.02 | 0.15 | 0.16 | -0.63* | 0.26* | -0.45* | 0.29* | 1.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SOC | -0.03 | 0.03 | 0.23* | -0.10 | 0.31* | -0.37* | 0.14 | -0.08 | 1.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MAP | -0.02 | -0.03 | -0.16 | 0.19 | -0.41* | 0.4* | -0.07 | -0.58* | -0.20 | 1.00 |  |  |  |  |  |
| MAT | 0.00 | -0.20 | -0.21 | 0.16 | -0.40* | 0.41* | -0.08 | -0.40* | 0.03 | 0.43* | 1.00 |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{R}} 30$ | -0.08* | -0.14* | 0.59* | -0.22 | 0.34* | -0.38* | 0.12 | 0.38* | 0.15 | -0.31* | 0.07 | 1.00 |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{R}} 90$ | -0.11* | -0.10* | 0.46* | -0.28* | 0.26* | -0.32* | 0.13 | 0.44* | 0.09 | -0.32* | 0.10 | 0.96* | 1.00 |  |  |
| Cr120 | -0.12* | -0.09* | 0.40* | -0.26* | 0.22 | -0.29* | 0.14 | 0.42* | 0.07 | -0.31* | 0.10 | 0.93* | 0.99* | 1.00 |  |
| 1-[CR30/CR120] | 0.15 | -0.07* | 0.37* | 0.11 | 0.10 | -0.12 | 0.05 | -0.19 | 0.27* | 0.19 | 0.21 | 0.27* | 0.07 | -0.03 | 1.00 |

Residue $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emission to day 30,90 and 120 of the experiment. lignin: residue lignin concentration; $\mathrm{C}: \mathrm{N}$ : residue carbon to nitrogen ratio; TC: Initial residue carbon concentration; Clay. sand \& silt: soil texture based on clay fraction (\%clay); pH : soil $\mathrm{pH}(\mathrm{KCl})$; SOC: soil organic carbon concentration; MAP\&MAT: climatic factors-mean annual precipitation and mean annual temperature. * Significant at $\mathrm{p}<0.05$.

Table 8: Proportion of data points with "priming", i.e. with a 120 days cumulative $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions above the amount of C added to the soil.

| Crop | \% |
| :--- | :---: |
| Alfalfa | 58 |
| Barley | 44 |
| Bean | 25 |
| Canola | 63 |
| Clover | 27 |
| Cotton | 44 |
| Grass | 48 |
| Maize | 25 |
| Oat | 50 |
| Pea | 33 |
| Rice | 50 |
| Rye | 58 |
| Sorghum | 56 |
| Soyabean | 48 |
| Sunflower | 25 |
| Vetch | 38 |
| Wheat | 36 |
| Mean | $\mathbf{4 3}$ |

