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Introduction

Despite grains productivity improvements arising from CA, the gap between yields in growers’ paddocks and the physiologically determined water limited yield potential throughout many cropping regions remains large (Hochman et al. 2016). Although a variety of factors are responsible for this, many areas of the Australian grain belt with the largest proportional yield gaps contain a range of physicochemical soil constraints (Adcock et al. 2007, Dang et al. 2010, MacEwan et al. 2010, Page et al. 2018, Van Gool 2016, see Table 1). These constraints can result in significant reductions in grain yield potential by restricting root growth and access to soil water and nutrient supplies or directly inhibit growth via toxicities. Often a variety of constraints occur simultaneously and can be present in either the top or subsoils (or both) and are associated with both fine and coarser textured soils. In this chapter we have defined ‘subsoil’ as the part of the profile below normal depth of sowing or routine cultivation for weed control (ca. 0.1 m). Whilst some subsoil constraints reflect the inherent nature of the soil, those occurring in the top 0.5 m of the profile, such as acidity or compaction from machinery, result from agricultural management practices.

A range of strategies have been proposed to manage these soil constraints including:
- ‘genetic solutions’ involving increased tolerance to soil toxicities;
- agronomic management to maximise profitability rather than productivity;
- ‘amelioration’, almost inevitably involving some form of physical intervention and/or application of an amendment (Sumner et al. 1986, Adcock et al. 2007, Gill et al. 2008, 2012, Davies et al. 2015a, b).

‘Biological drilling’ (‘primer plants’) involving use of plant roots to modify subsoils has been assessed (Yunusa and Newton 2003, McCallum et al. 2004, Nuttall et al. 2008), but in recent years there has been increased attention on strategic deep tillage, which is one-off or occasional tillage typically to depths of 0.3 m or more. Strategic deep tillage includes deep ripping (Hamza and Anderson 2005), deep soil mixing (Scanlan and Davies 2019), soil inversion (Davies et al. 2013), deep placement, or clay spreading and delving with deep incorporation (Cann 2000, Rebbeck et al. 2007, Hall et al. 2010). The size and reliability of yield responses associated with strategic deep tillage differ across soil types and regions, but they can have significant and sustained profitability benefits (Davies et al. 2015b, Sale and Malcolm 2015, Davies et al. 2018).

If the constraint is chemical, such as sodicity, acidity or a nutrient deficiency, some form of amendment is required, either inorganic (e.g. gypsum or lime) or organic (e.g. manures, compost). Such amendments have typically been applied to the topsoil (e.g. Armstrong et al. 2007, Li et al. 2019) but direct placement into subsoil is gaining interest (Davies et al. 2008, Condon et al. 2018, Sale et al. 2019), although the mechanisms of yield improvements appear to vary with soil type and seasonal conditions and are contested (Celestina et al. 2018, Gill et al. 2019). Many subsoil amelioration practices have a high cost to implement and so are strategic in application and need to have a long residual benefit to make economic sense.

Soil constraints

In Australian dryland cropping systems, soil constraints typically align with broad soil types (Table 1). Low water holding capacity, topsoil water repellence, compaction, soil acidity and associated aluminium and manganese toxicity, and poor fertility are common on deep sands, sandy earths and sandy A-horizons of duplex (texture contrast) soils. High alkalinity, sodicity and chemical toxicities such as boron, chloride, bicarbonate and salt are common on finer textured loamy earth and clay subsoils and in the clay B-horizon of duplex profiles (Table 1).
Table 1. Association of common constraints of agricultural soils and the Australian Soil Classification soil orders (Isbell and National Committee on Soil and Terrain 2016). Dominant soil texture is shown include sand (S), texture contrast (TC), loam (L) and clay (C).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Australian Soil Classification</th>
<th>Tenosols</th>
<th>Rudosols</th>
<th>Kandosols</th>
<th>Calcarosols</th>
<th>Sodosols</th>
<th>Kurosols</th>
<th>Chromosols</th>
<th>Vertosols</th>
<th>Dermosols</th>
<th>Ferrosols</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soil Texture</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S, TC</td>
<td>TC</td>
<td>TC</td>
<td>TC</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water repellence</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low water holding capacity</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsoil compaction</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorly structured dense subsoil</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor subsoil fertility</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acidity (Al and Mn toxicity)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alkalinity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sodicity</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary water logging</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boron toxicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other toxicities (e.g. Chloride)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

x = commonly occurring; α = variable occurrence

Soil water repellence occurs when hydrophobic organic compounds and waxes of plant and fungal origin coat topsoil sand particles resulting in slow and uneven water infiltration (Chan 1992, Franco et al. 1995, 2000, Doerr et al. 2000, Unkovich 2014). It is most common on sandy-topsoils with low clay content (<5 %) and has been recognised as a major constraint since land clearing in the late 1940s (Bond 1964, Roberts and Carbon 1971). Water repellence results in uneven and slow soil wetting causing:

- poor and delayed crop establishment;
- staggered weed germination;
- susceptibility to wind and water erosion;
- high leaching risk due to preferential flow; and

Concentration of organic matter at the soil surface through reduced tillage (Chan 1992), a shift towards earlier and dry seeding (Fletcher et al. 2016), and smaller, less reliable break-of-season rainfall events, have likely contributed to increased expression of soil water repellence (Roper et al. 2015).

Subsoil compaction, plough pans and inherent hard layers as a result of cementation (Needham et al. 2004a) have long been recognised as significant soil constraints (Hamblin and Tennant 1979, Henderson et al. 1988). Growth in the scale of cropping enterprises has led to the use of larger, heavier machinery with resultant higher axle loads causing deeper, more severe, compaction (Henderson et al. 1988, Hagan et al. 2015, Isbister et al. 2016). Current agricultural machinery such as harvesters, air carts, tractors, sprayers and chaser bins have axle loads exceeding 10 tonnes, resulting in deeper compaction to 0.4 m or more (Isbister et al. 2016). Degree of compactibility for soils with less than 20% clay is related to the particle size distribution (Needham et al. 2004b). Soils with more even (well-graded) distribution of soil particles can be more susceptible to compaction than poorly-graded sand, though these may still have high bulk density (Needham et al. 2004b).
Agricultural practices have acidified soils. Soil acidity is a common soil constraint in cropping zones of south eastern and Western Australia (WA) and occurs in both coarse and fine textured soils. The acidification rate has increased as cropping has intensified, with higher inputs of N fertilisers and increased product export (Mason et al. 1994, Dolling and Porter 1994, Dolling et al. 1994). Where lime applications have been inadequate, there has been extensive development of subsurface acidity (Williams 1980, Tang et al. 2000, Tang 2004, Gazey et al. 2013) and associated aluminium and manganese toxicity. Whilst lime application can ameliorate acidity within the 0-10 cm layer, the slow dissolution and movement of lime limits the effectiveness of surface-applied lime to address deeper, subsoil acidity (and see Chapter 7).

Grain production in the low and medium rainfall regions of Australia is mostly conducted on neutral to alkaline soils (Adcock et al. 2007, Dang et al. 2010, van Gool et al. 2018). Clay content typically increases with depth (to more than 60%), often concurrent with an increase in the severity of a range of physicochemical subsoil constraints. These limit crop productivity via impeding subsoil root growth and function, leading to poor utilisation of subsoil water and nutrients (Nuttall et al. 2003). Lack of available water is the principal yield constraint in these environments and subsoil constraints tend to restrict grain yields in seasons with ‘dry finishes’ (Nuttall and Armstrong 2010) when the crop is more reliant on subsoil water reserves to complete grain fill. Most subsoils contain multiple constraints, the most common being sodicity and salinity, but many also have toxic concentrations of boron (B), chloride (Cl), bicarbonate (HCO₃⁻) and potentially aluminium (Al) arising from high pH, as well as reduced nutrient availability (Adcock et al. 2007, Dang et al. 2010, Brautigan et al. 2012). Poor subsoil structure and high soil strength resulting from both sodicity (Shaw et al. 1994) and compaction (McGarry 1993, Hamza and Anderson 2005) is common. Poor subsoil structure often leads to restricted drainage, temporary water logging and restricted aeration (Rengasamy et al. 2003). Many texture contrast soils can also have alkaline clay-rich B-horizons that are sodic, poorly structured and may also be saline (Hall et al. 2009), restricting crop root growth and nutrient availability (Tennant et al. 1992, Belford et al. 1992).

**Strategic deep tillage tools and approaches**

Deep ripping, also known as subsoiling, involves the loosening of soils for the purpose of removing hardpans, either natural or induced, and loosening dense subsoils to improve soil structure, porosity and water infiltration (Spoor 2006). Deep ripping is undertaken using deep working tynes which may be rigid or have high-breakout pressure. Typically, deep rippers do not intentionally incorporate much topsoil into the subsoil (Scanlan and Davies 2019). The type and geometry of the deep ripper can influence soil mixing as rippers with parabolic, wider or angled chisel-point tyes can delve and mix the soil more than narrow-tyed rippers (Spoor 2006). Addition of wings or wider points can also result in more breakout and soil disturbance, depending on working depth and soil conditions, especially moisture content (Spoor 2006). Narrow-tyed rippers can incorporate around 5-10% of the topsoil into soil layers below 0.1 m, but this would typically only be to a maximum depth of 0.15 m (Scanlan and Davies 2019; Table 2). This ‘mixing’ is passive with topsoil falling into temporary voids around and behind the ripping tyes as they pass through the soil.

In Australia, deep ripping has been practised for more than 40-years (Jarvis 1983, 1986a, Ellington 1986) and has long included the possibility of incorporating or deep placing soil amendments, such as lime, nutrients and organic matter (Robertson et al. 1957, Parr 1959). In continuous or intensive grain cropping systems of WA, deep sandy-textured soils have been the most responsive to deep ripping (Jarvis 1986b) and consequently the most commonly ripped soils. Ripping depths have traditionally been 0.3-0.4 m (Jarvis 1986b) but in recent years ripping depths on deep sands and sandy earths have increased to 0.7-0.8 m (Blackwell et al. 2016). The move to even deeper ripping has been driven by:

- recognition of deeper and more severe compaction layers arising from larger and heavier machinery (Isbister et al. 2016) coupled with increased cropping intensity;
- increased availability of high horsepower tractors and deeper working rippers; and
- larger yield and potential profit benefits when used on responsive soil types.
### Table 2. Summary of strategic deep tillage approaches, working depth, incorporation characteristics, soil constraints addressed and approximate cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic deep tillage method</th>
<th>Implement working depth (m)</th>
<th>Implement impact on incorporation of soil amendment and/or topsoil</th>
<th>% topsoil buried below 0.1 m*</th>
<th>Constraints addressed</th>
<th>Approximate cost ($/ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deep ripping</td>
<td>0.3-0.7</td>
<td>Minimal incorporation, depending on ripper type. Backfill to 0.15 m.</td>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>Compaction Hardpans</td>
<td>$45-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep ripping with topsoil slotting</td>
<td>0.3-0.7</td>
<td>Topsoil slots from surface typically to depths of 0.35-0.40 m, but ripping depths can extend to 0.70 m. Can partially incorporate surface spread amendments (e.g. lime, nutrients, organic matter).</td>
<td>10-15</td>
<td>Compaction Hardpans Subsoil acidity Subsoil sodicity</td>
<td>$55-120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep subsoil placement, using ripper</td>
<td>0.3-0.7</td>
<td>Direct deep placement of amendments (e.g. organic matter, lime, gypsum, nutrients) in bands at depths up to 0.70 m.</td>
<td>5-15</td>
<td>Compaction Hardpans Subsoil acidity Subsoil fertility</td>
<td>$300-1400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsoil clay Delving + incorporation</td>
<td>0.6-1.2</td>
<td>Backfill likely due to wide tyres and high disturbance, subsequent clay incorporation will mix soils to 0.15-0.45 m. Soil amendments can be mixed into soil profile by incorporation process.</td>
<td>n.m.</td>
<td>Water repellence Compaction Fertility of A-horizon</td>
<td>$300-450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil mixing – large offset discs</td>
<td>0.2-0.3</td>
<td>Offsets throw soil one way then back again, mixing of topsoil and surface spread amendments, (e.g. lime, subsoil clay, organic matter) typically occurs between 0.15-0.25 m.</td>
<td>n.m.</td>
<td>Subsoil acidity Water repellence Compaction</td>
<td>$50-70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil mixing – one pass tillage</td>
<td>0.3-0.35</td>
<td>Mixing of topsoil and surface spread amendments to 0.15 m and some deeper inclusion to 0.30 m possible depending on tine design.</td>
<td>n.m.</td>
<td>Subsoil acidity Compaction</td>
<td>$70-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil mixing – rotary spader</td>
<td>0.35-0.4</td>
<td>Mixes to maximum working depth of 0.35-40 m. Can incorporate a range of surface spread amendments (e.g. lime, gypsum, organic matter, subsoil clay, nutrients etc.)</td>
<td>50-60</td>
<td>Subsoil acidity Compaction Water repellence Fertility of A-horizon</td>
<td>$120-150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil inversion – mouldboard plough</td>
<td>0.35-0.45</td>
<td>Buries a layer typically between 0.15-0.40 m. Can bury surface applied amendments (e.g. lime, organic matter, nutrients etc.) at depth. For subsoil acidity low pH subsoil brought to the surface after ploughing will need to be limed.</td>
<td>80-90</td>
<td>Water repellence Compaction Subsoil fertility Weeds</td>
<td>$100-150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil inversion – modified one way disc plough</td>
<td>0.3-0.4</td>
<td>Buries topsoil or surface applied amendments, such as lime or organic matter, in an arc from surface down to a depth of 0.25-0.35 m.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Water repellence Compaction Subsoil fertility Weeds</td>
<td>$40-60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The proportion of topsoil buried below 0.1 m based on Scanlan and Davies 2019, Ucgul et al. 2017, 2018, 2019. n.m. = not measured.

Costs of ‘deeper’ ripping are considerably higher with greater fuel use as a result of increased draft force, reduced work rate with narrower rippers and slower operating speeds and greater wear and fatigue of engines and machinery components working under high load (Blackwell et al. 2016, Isbister et al. 2016). Blackwell et al. (2016) found that fuel use at least doubled when ripping to 0.55 m on sand compared with ripping to 0.3 m. Shallow leading tyres can reduce the deeper ripping draft force and fuel use compared with conventional ripping and provide more effective removal of deep compaction.
(Hamza et al. 2013). Depending on the tyne arrangement, shallow-leading tynes were shown to reduce draft by up to 11-25% on deep loamy sand and by up to 18% on a clay soil (Hamza et al. 2013).

Other developments in deep ripping include topsoil slotting (Blackwell et al. 2016, Davies et al. 2015a, Parker et al. 2017) and direct deep placement of amendment (Gill et al. 2008, Davies et al. 2008, Sale et al. 2019). Topsoil slotting is achieved through placement of an opener behind the ripping tyne which operates just below the topsoil, holding the subsoil open to allow loosen topsoil and surface applied amendment to fall into slots (Davies et al. 2015a, Blackwell et al. 2016, see Figure 1). Deeper inclusion of surface organic matter to depths up to 0.35-0.40 m may help maintain the ripping slot in softer condition for a longer time (Blackwell et al. 2016).

Direct placement of organic or other soil amendments directly into the subsoil typically involves placement of pipes directly behind deep ripper tynes (Gill et al. 2008, Davies et al. 2008). Large diameter pipes are used for deep placement of dry, sometimes pelletised, amendments which flow via gravity or are blown into the subsoil (Gill et al. 2008, Davies et al. 2008). Liquid amendments can be pumped through smaller diameter tubes, although the volume of amendment that can be applied is restricted (Anderson and Hendrick 1983).

Clay delving, like deep ripping, uses deep working tynes to interact with the subsoil. In this instance tynes are fixed, often angled at ~45°, broad-faced and typically work at depths of at least 0.6 m or more, typically with only 2-3 tynes spaced about 1 m apart (Desbiolles et al. 1997, Bailey and Hughes 2012, Betti et al. 2015). Delving tynes penetrate the clay B-horizon of texture contrast, or duplex, soils and lift clay-rich subsoil into the sandy A-horizon (Bailey and Hughes 2012) while at the same time physically breaking up compacted and cemented layers (Figure 1). Following delving, soils are typically worked with offset discs or a rotary spader (described below) to mix further and incorporate the clay (Bailey and Hughes 2012). Increasing the clay content of sandy topsoils can reduce soil water repellence and improve soil wettability (Betti et al. 2015, 2016), while also improving fertility (Hall et al. 2010), soil carbon storage (Schapel et al. 2017, 2018) and crop yield (Bailey et al. 2010, Hall et al. 2010, Betti et al. 2017).

Deep soil mixing involves occasional cultivation of soils to depths of 0.2 m or more (Scanlan and Davies 2019), as opposed to traditional ploughing or cultivation practices that are shallower and were traditionally practised regularly, rather than as a strategic or one-off practice. Deep soil mixing can be beneficial by reducing topsoil water repellence and partial weed seed burial (Davies et al. 2013). Deep mixing can also be effective to incorporate stubbles and place surface organic matter and associated nutrients deeper into the soil profile. In Australia, deep mixing is typically undertaken using large, deep working, offset disc ploughs, one-pass tillage system implements or, more recently, rotary spaders (Davies et al. 2010, 2013, 2015a, see Table 2).

One-pass tillage implements combine a series of tillage tools on the one implement, typically a leading set of shallow working offset discs followed by ripping tydes and then levelling discs or harrows and a soil packer (Davies et al. 2015a). While they may have a working depth of 0.3-0.35 m, depth of incorporation is often 0.25 m or less. Large offset discs can also have disc diameters up to 0.8-1.0 m and work as deep as 0.3 m; however effective incorporation of the surface often only occurs to a depth of 0.2-0.25 m (Davies et al. 2015a, see Table 2). Rotary spading typically follows deep ripping and has a working depth of 0.35-0.4 m (Scanlan and Davies 2019, Ucgul et al. 2018, see Table 2).

Rotary spaders have a shaft which rotates, typically at ~90 revolutions per minute in the direction of travel. Attached are sets of curved tydes, on the end of which are, typically, triangular-shaped spades that help bury topsoil at depth while also lifting some subsoil to the surface (Scanlan and Davies 2019, Ucgul et al. 2018). Incorporation by a spader is not uniform; rather the spades bury deeper ‘pockets’ of topsoil (Figure 1) in a grid pattern when viewed from above, through various soil layers (Ucgul et al. 2018). Rotary spaders typically bury about 50-60% of the topsoil (Ucgul et al. 2018, Scanlan and Davies 2019, see Table 2).
Figure 1. Images demonstrating a range of strategic deep tillage implements and the impact they have on the soil profile. Note incorporation dark coloured topsoil caused by each implement (Photos: Stephen Davies, Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development WA and Erin Cahill, agVivo image modified one-way plough).

Soil inversion is perhaps the most extreme strategic deep tillage option, resulting in the topsoil being nearly completely buried underneath a layer of subsoil 0.15-0.35 m deep (Figure 1). This provides an opportunity to:

- bury water repellent topsoil and lift wettable subsurface soil to the surface;
- incorporate lime, deeper into the soil profile;
- redistribute topsoil nutrients and organic matter into the crop root zone; and
- lift higher clay content subsoil to the surface, depending on soil type (Davies et al. 2013).

The principal advantage of inversion over soil mixing is more effective amelioration of topsoil water repellence (Roper et al. 2015) and the near complete burial of weed seeds (Peltzer and Matson 2006, Davies et al. 2010, Newman and Davies 2010, Aulakh et al. 2012) which can slow the evolution of herbicide resistance (Renton and Flower 2015). Soil inversion is typically undertaken with a mouldboard or ‘square’ plough but more recently modified one-way disc ploughs have also been used. The modifications involve removal of every second disc and fitment of larger and often more concave discs, increased break-out pressure on the jump arms and may involve adding more weight to the
plough, depending on the model used. These modifications allow deeper working, more space for soil to turn over and a greater degree of inversion. Mouldboard ploughs provide the most complete inversion (Ucgul et al. 2017, Scanlan and Davies 2019), but square and one-way ploughs are cheaper to purchase and effective with good setup and soil conditions (Ucgul et al. 2019), though weed seed burial is inferior to the mouldboard plough. Mouldboard ploughs typically bury 80-95% of the topsoil below the top 0.1 m (Ucgul et al. 2017, Scanlan and Davies 2019, see Table 2) while one-way ploughs bury 60-75% of the topsoil (Scanlan and Davies 2019, Ucgul et al. 2019, see Table 2).

Strategic deep tillage practices are often implemented in combination, either at the same time or in series over several years (Davies et al. 2018). The most common combinations involve deep ripping together with either soil mixing or inversion (Davies et al. 2018) or clay delving with subsequent incorporation. Timing of this ripping after inversion can vary, but generally occurs within 2-4 years. Use of controlled traffic farming systems can increase the longevity of soil loosening benefit from strategic deep tillage by confining machinery compaction to permanent wheel-tracks (Ellington 1986, Chan et al. 2006). However, some subsoils naturally ‘re-compact’ after loosening and may require occasional deep ripping (Needham et al. 2004a).

Effects on crop growth and yield

Deep ripping to alleviate subsoil hardpans is most beneficial on deep sands and deep sandy duplex soils (Jarvis 1986, Hamza and Anderson 2003), with responses on heavier-textured soils more variable and less reliable (Ellington 1986, Kirkegaard et al. 2008, Armstrong et al. 2009). Yield benefits from ripping result from improved root growth extension rates and final rooting depth which contribute to subsoil water access and more efficient nitrogen capture (Delroy and Bowden 1986). In sandy soils, deep ripping typically results in substantial increases in grain yield, of the order of 20-40% in the first season after ripping (Hamza and Anderson 2003, Armstrong et al. 2009). Yield benefits from deep ripping typically decline substantially in subsequent seasons. Despite yield increases of 19% in the year of ripping (sandy duplex), Hamza and Anderson (2003) report that by the third year the yield benefit had disappeared. Reasons for a neutral or negative response to ripping include:

- enhanced vegetative crop growth driving greater water use with insufficient moisture left for grain filling (Delroy and Bowden 1986);
- bringing excessive clay or hostile subsoil to the surface on heavier-textured soils (Kirkegaard et al. 2008, Armstrong et al. 2009, Blackwell et al. 2016);
- loss of soil structure; or
- not fully overcoming compaction or other soil constraints present, such as acidity (Coventry et al. 1987).

On deeper sands, increasing ripping depth up to 0.8 m to remove deeper compaction can substantially increase the crop yield benefit in situations where traditional ripping depths of 0.3-0.4 m have not improved yield (Blackwell et al. 2016, Isbister et al. 2016, Davies et al. 2018). Blackwell et al. (2016) reported yield increases of 83-137% following ripping to 0.55 m, compared with minimal response following ripping to 0.3 m.

Crop response to ripping with topsoil slotting to incorporate surface organic matter and amendments deeper into the profile have been mixed (Blackwell et al. 2016, Davies et al. 2015a). Blackwell et al. (2016) reported that, for deep ripping to 0.55 m following spreading of surface-applied lime on deep sand and sandy duplex sites, wheat yield benefits from topsoil slotting ranged from 16-32% over deep ripping with no slotting. Lime addition improved the benefit at several of the more acidic sites, consistent with previous research (Coventry et al. 1987, Davies et al. 2008). In contrast Davies et al. (2018) found no significant benefit to wheat yields (-12-10%) from topsoil slotting across two sites and two ripping depths compared with ripping alone. Parker et al. (2017) reported reduced yields from topsoil slotting for lupin in the second season, noting that the soil opener which facilitates topsoil slotting had also acted to re-compact the soil between the tynes. On heavier soil types, including a calcareous loam, loamy duplex and grey clay, crop yield response to topsoil slotting showed no positive
yield responses in the first year (Blackwell et al. 2016) but on the grey clay in the second season increased barley yield by 0.67 t/ha over ripping only (Parker et al. 2017).

Broad-faced ripping tynes can delve (lift) clay-rich subsoil within the 0.3-0.6 m layer into the sandy textured surface A-horizon of duplex (texture contrast) soils. This results in benefits from deep subsoil loosening and removal of hardpans and topsoil water repellence but can also improve the fertility, pH and moisture holding of the sandy A-horizon (Bailey et al. 2010, Bailey and Hughes 2012, Betti et al. 2015, 2016, 2017). Variability in crop response to delving has been attributed to differences in the machinery used, the depth and extent of mixing between the soil horizons, and the timing of operation.

Crop grain yields are increased by around 50% on average in the first two years following rotary spading on deep sands and deep sandy duplex soils (Davies et al. 2019). This represents a yield increase of 0.42-0.73 t/ha depending on soil type. Growth and yield increases are in part driven by increased mineralisation of organic matter, leading to greater nutrient supply, along with nutrient redistribution, establishment, soil loosening and soil pH benefits. Once these effects subside, residual yield responses appear soil type dependent, falling to 11% (0.22 t/ha) on average for pale deep sands but remaining at 33% (0.55 t/ha) for stronger deep sands, sandy earths and deep duplex soils (Davies et al. 2019). Current research indicates that benefits from rotary spading can last at least 4-5 years on better sands but may be more limited on infertile and low clay content deep sands (Davies et al. 2019).

Crop grain yield responses to soil inversion can be large and sustained for 8 or more years (Davies et al. 2015b, Davies et al. 2019). Soil inversion on average increases cereal grain yield by 30-60% (0.54-0.88 t/ha) in the first 2-years depending on soil type (Davies et al. 2019). As with deep soil mixing, responses tend to be lower on low fertility deep sands, and higher on deep sandy duplex and repellent gravel soils. Residual cereal yield benefits average 21-27% (0.51-0.68 t/ha) for most soils. For pale deep sands residual yield benefits typically decline after several years except for severely repellent deep sands where the untreated condition is particularly poor (Davies et al. 2019).

While benefits of ameliorating sands through deep soil mixing and soil inversion are apparent, there are numerous substantive risks, including:

- acute short-term wind erosion risk with complete stubble burial;
- surface crusting from lifting higher clay content subsoil to the surface with low organic matter;
- increased activity of pre-emergent herbicides resulting in greater risk of crop damage (Edwards et al. 2018) as well as opportunity for improved weed control;
- loss of soil organic carbon from tillage effect;
- poor seed depth control on loosened soils;
- re-compaction, especially if traffic is not controlled; and
- run-down of soil fertility.

These risks can be managed by growers but highlight the complexity and management required to achieve an ‘optimal’ outcome.

**Strategic deep tillage with soil amendments**

For soils with a combination of soil physicochemical constraints, soil amendments together with strategic deep tillage may be needed to address the interacting constraints, stabilise or improve soil structure or improve subsoil fertility all of which may improve the size and longevity of the amelioration benefit (Ellington 1986, Coventry et al. 1987, Hamza and Anderson 2003).

**Lime incorporation into acidic subsoils**

Movement of lime to depth is influenced by soil properties (texture, initial pH, pH buffering capacity), rainfall (duration and intensity) and lime (quality, particle size and rate of application, Whitten et al. 2000) but is generally very slow without physical intervention (Li et al. 2019). Conyers and Scott (1989) demonstrated that application rates of 8 t/ha were required to increase pH several centimetres below the depth of incorporation in loam topsoil of a southern NSW duplex soil. However, the mechanism of
alkali movement is related to the pH following liming and not the rate of lime itself (Scott and Conyers 1995). They recommended liming to a pH$_{Ca} > 5.5$ to facilitate alkali movement below the incorporation layer to the 0.1-0.2 m layer in their example. However long-term field experimentation demonstrates that the rate of subsoil pH increase remains slow, 0.04 pH units per year in the 0.1-0.2 m layer (Li et al. 2019).

Use of tillage to incorporate liming products to greater depth allows for more immediate amelioration of soil acidity in the subsoil. On acidic deep sandy textured soils with low pH buffering capacity, compaction and minimal subsoil structure, surface liming followed by incorporation using strategic deep tillage is an effective amelioration intervention (Gazey and Davies 2009). Rotary spaders, large offset discs and mouldboard ploughs have been used to incorporate lime into acidic sands (Davies et al. 2015a). The interaction of soil inversion with a mouldboard plough and lime application improved barley yield and reduced ryegrass biomass in a replicated experiment on deep yellow sand in WA, eight seasons after the amelioration was applied (Figure 2, Davies et al. 2015b).

For soils with higher clay content, deep tillage to depths of 0.3-0.4 m requires large energy inputs, can damage soil structure and increase erosion risk, especially if poorly structured A$_2$ horizons are brought to the soil surface (Kirchhof et al. 1995). For example, broadcasting lime at high rates (20 t lime/ha) prior to ripping or delving was shown to have limited benefit in ameliorating subsoil acidity (Kirchhof et al. 1995, see Figure 3a). Thus, deep tillage to incorporate lime into bulk soil is not commonly used on the loam and clay soils of south-eastern Australia, though beneficial interactions have been measured (Coventry et al. 1987). On sandy clay loam with a dense hardpan and subsoil acidity in north-east Victoria, lime application was necessary to achieve a deep ripping response and the ripping was still effective after 4-years (Coventry et al. 1987).

Where deep tillage of bulk soil may be uneconomic or impractical, techniques that amend specific portions of the soil profile or areas under or adjacent to seeding rows have been assessed (e.g. Davies et al. 2008, Blackwell et al. 2016, Sale et al. 2019). Lime slotting by mechanically cutting slots, 0.15 m wide and 0.8 m deep, in the profile to remove soil, mixing that soil with lime at 20 t lime/ha and then replacing the amended soil back to the slot, was effective in increasing soil pH (Figure 3a) in the slot (Kirchhof et al. 1995) and resulted in 46% of the yield of a completely amended soil (Jayawardane et al. 1995). However the use of such high lime rates and specialised intensive machinery limit the practicality of this method in dryland cropping systems.

Figure 2. Impact of lime application and mouldboard ploughing (MBP) applied in 2007 on: a) barley grain yield (t/ha); b) above-ground ryegrass biomass (t/ha, right) in 2014. For treatments with lime, all were surface applied at total rate of 2 t/ha either without incorporation (2t Lime); split with half (1 t/ha) before and after MBP (1t + MBP + 1t); all applied before MBP (2t + MBP); or all applied after MBP (MBP + 2t). Bars show standard error of the mean of 4 replicates (adapted from Davies et al. 2015b)
Figure 3. Impact of lime application and placement on soil pH profiles for: a) a yellow Podosol showing untreated (control), lime followed by ripping or delving and slotting of lime amended soil (adapted from Kirchhof et al. 1995); and b) a Chromosol at Rutherglen, Victoria, showing untreated (control), surface lime and direct deep (0.3 m) lime placement (adapted from Condon et al. 2018).

Direct placement of lime has been achieved with modified deep rippers, fertiliser spreaders and air delivery systems to create machines that blow lime into subsoil seams to a depth of 0.3 to 0.4 m (Davies et al. 2008, Li and Burns 2016). This machinery can ameliorate subsoil acidity to the depth of placement (Figure 3b) and also decrease soil strength (Davies et al. 2008, Li and Burns 2016, Condon et al. 2018). Yield responses from this approach have been mixed, with crop yields failing to respond at a range of sites in southern NSW (Swan et al. 2011, Li and Burns 2016) but was shown to increase wheat yield by 20-30% in WA deep sands with acidic subsoils (Davies et al. 2008, Gazey and Davies 2009). For the southern NSW sites, drought conditions experienced during the trial years 2007-9 may have limited the opportunity for a crop response (Swan et al. 2011). Direct lime placement and partial amelioration of acidic subsoils enables lime application rates to be decreased, potentially to economically viable rates.

Application rates of dolomite or lime of 2.3 and 2.5 t/ha, respectively, ameliorated the acidity in the 10-30 cm of a Chromosol at Rutherglen, Victoria (Figure 3b) resulting in more than a 10% increase in canola yield compared with an unlimed control (Condon et al. 2018). Some versions of direct placement equipment can apply organic material and other inorganic amendments to specific layers of the soil, allowing amelioration of acidity and provision of subsoil nutrition, thereby addressing multiple crop productivity constraints (Condon et al. 2018). Apart from the need of specialised equipment and slow application process, a major limitation to success of direct deep lime placement is poor vertical distribution and a discontinuity of the ameliorated subsoil which would likely limit the benefit obtained.

Clay spreading and incorporation on sands

Addition of clay-rich subsoil to sands, known as claying, was first trialled in 1968 by South Australian farmer, Clem Obst, near Bordertown. After spreading a clay-rich subsoil on a sandy rise following excavation of a new dam, Obst (1994) recalls an immediate and long-lasting improvement in soil wettability, successfully growing clover and lucerne on clay-spread areas in following years. It is now estimated that 0.16 Mha of land have been clay modified in southern and Western Australia (Churchman et al. 2014).

Where available, incorporation of clay subsoil provides a permanent amelioration of soil water repellence but can also modify soil pH, nutritional status, moisture dynamics, carbon sequestration, soil stability and biological activity. Improved plant nutrition, particularly potassium from the applied clay, and greater water infiltration are key factors behind improved productivity on clayed soils (Hall et al. 2010). Substantial benefits (up to 22 t/ha increases) to soil organic carbon (SOC) stocks (0-30 cm) have also been associated with increased clay content (Schapel et al. 2017, 2018), although the benefits of
this on improved biological fertility and nutrient retention and supply have been poorly quantified to date.

Surface spreading of clay is undertaken when clay B-horizon subsoils are too deep to be delved effectively. Clay spreading involves excavation and broadcast spreading of a clay-rich subsoil from a large pit over deep, typically repellent, sands (Davenport et al. 2011). Spreading is typically undertaken using carry graders, purpose-built spreaders or heavy-duty multi-spreaders. Once spread, a range of deep cultivation approaches (e.g. tynes, off-set discs, harrows, rotary hoe) are used to incorporate the clay into the top 0.1 to 0.2 m. Subsoil clays are typically spread at rates of 100-300 t/ha, aiming to increase the topsoil clay content to the 3-6% clay required to overcome repellence (Hall et al. 2010, Davenport et al. 2011). High rates (200 t/ha or more) can be difficult to incorporate effectively and can lead to negative impacts, such as soil sealing, poor emergence and restricted root development (Davenport et al. 2011). Implements for deeper incorporation, such as rotary spaders and large-diameter deep working offset discs help minimise this risk.

Although expensive, claying practices have been shown to double crop yields, with an expectation of permanence (Cann 2000). Yield increases of 0.3-0.6 t/ha have been reported on a WA sandplain soil (Hall et al. 2010).

**Incorporation of organic amendments**

Organic amendments have the potential to provide benefits over and above their nutritional value alone including altering:

- physical condition through changing structural stability, porosity and bulk density, which impact root growth and water dynamics;
- chemical condition through changing pH buffering, cation exchange capacity, and chelation which affect nutrient supply and retention; and
- biological functions including nutrient cycling rates, and the balance between beneficial and pathogenic organisms.

The use of organic amendments in agriculture has been reviewed previously (Edmeades 2003, Quilty and Cattle 2011, Abbott et al. 2018). In general, these reviews focus on results from surface application of amendments, often in terms of disposal of ‘wastes’, where there has been a focus on nutrient budgets. These overseas studies have often failed to account for other potential benefits to productivity by using these organic amendments if soil physicochemical constraints are present. A recent Australian study (Celestina et al. 2018) compared surface and subsoil application of organic amendments or additional matching inorganic fertiliser applications and found that over the first two years following application the yield response could generally be attributed to additional nutrient supply, particularly nitrogen. The impact of any amendment in overcoming a physicochemical constraint in the subsoil will be negated if there is either no subsoil water, as occurs in very low rainfall years, or when the crop can rely on water in the topsoil and so can be highly season-dependant (Nuttall and Armstrong 2010). Similarly, no long-term beneficial effect of the amendments will occur if there are no physical constraints present, such as occurs on many well-structured soils, such as vertosols. Furthermore, it may take several years for the benefits of organic amendments to become evident, as they result not only from the short-term direct nutrient effects, but longer-term indirect effects. Indirect effects include those resulting from altered root growth and distribution, as well as enhanced aggregation resulting from microbial processes (hyphal binding, extracellular polymer binding, Six et al. 2004, Tisdall and Oades 1978). This has been demonstrated in recent research targeting poorly structured sodic subsoils where subsoil manuring (chicken litter placed at 0.3-0.4 m) improved grain yields through both improved crop nutrition and soil structure (Gill et al. 2019, Sale et al. 2019). Gill et al. (2019) demonstrated seasonal impacts on response with no difference between surface and subsoil manuring at one site in an ‘average’ rainfall season but a significant advantage of subsoil manuring over surface manuring in a season with a dry spring, where the crop was reliant on subsoil water reserves during grain filling. Transport and application costs can be challenging for profitability of organic amendments although, where successfully applied to overcome subsoil constraints, the potential for profitable outcomes has been demonstrated (Sale and

In sands, rotary spading, topsoil slotting, soil inversion or direct deep placement can be used to incorporate organic amendments into the profile. In South Australia (SA) the combination of deep ripping to 0.3 m with surface applied chicken litter (5 t/ha) and/or high fertiliser rates has been evaluated (Trengove and Sherriff 2018). The outcomes demonstrate strong seasonal and rotational effects, with barley (2016) responding to increased nutrition, and lentils (2017) responding to ripping. Overall, the cumulative three-year yield gains for a wheat-barley-lentil rotation above the 4.4 t/ha control were +3 t/ha, +2.4 t/ha, and +2 t/ha under high annual fertiliser rates, deep ripping and chicken litter treatments, respectively. The costs associated with high fertiliser treatments, compared with lower costs of ripping or chicken litter, result in ripping alone having the highest return on investment, followed by ripping with chicken litter (Trengove and Sherriff 2018).

For neutral-toalkaline soils with clay subsoils and multiple physicochemical constraints, it is generally necessary to ameliorate chemically these subsoils using amendments such as gypsum or nutrient-rich organic matter. Purely physical amelioration of these soils, such as deep ripping, are often ineffective (Nuttall et al. 2005, Armstrong et al. 2009). Use of nutrient-rich organic matter has proven effective but the processes underpinning this remains unclear. Improved productivity is associated with additional nutrition (Celestina et al. 2018) and increased use of subsoil water from improvements in both physical structure and fertility of the subsoil (Gill et al. 2012, Gill et al. 2019). Yield responses of 27 up to 250% over an untreated control have been achieved in the Victorian High Rainfall Zone (Sale et al. 2019, Gill et al. 2019). These yield increases arising from deep placement of amendments generally last several years, which is an important consideration when needing to offset high upfront costs of implementation (Sale and Malcolm 2015).

**Economic consequences of strategic deep tillage**

For the purpose of understanding the economic impacts of strategic deep tillage, tillage treatments have been categorised as either deep ripping or soil mixing/inversion.

**Deep ripping** is most effective on deep sandy-textured soils and less effective on heavy clay soils. Armstrong et al. (2009) provides a summary of yield responses to deep ripping by soil type. On responsive soils, average wheat yield responses were found to be 33% in New South Wales, 10-23% in SA, 23-25% in Victoria and 20-47% in WA.

Deep ripping generally costs $40-100/ha depending on soil type (Table 2), with benefits lasting about 3 seasons (Isbister 2017). Deep ripping is generally not cost-effective unless conducted on a soil with high productive potential, or in conjunction with other amelioration options to address other soil constraints, such as acidity, nutrient deficiency or toxicity, sodicity or topsoil water repellence (Armstrong et al. 2009, Petersen et al. 2019).

**Soil mixing or inversion** provides long-term and reliable benefits for most repellent soils. Davies et al. (2019) reviewed trial data from WA during 2009-2018 and found that cereal responses to soil mixing/inversion range from 56-86% in the first and second year after treatment, and 11-49% in the third and subsequent years. Yield response for canola was approximately 24%, and that for lupin 20-50%. Field research results in SA are similar, although soil mixing/inversion resulted in very high yield increases (200%) on some soils with low (0.5 t/ha) control yields (Fraser et al. 2016, Macdonald et al. 2019).

Soil mixing/inversion can cost $50-150/ha depending on the soil type and technique (Table 2) and benefits last more than 10 years (Davies et al. 2015b). Soil mixing or inversion is generally worthwhile even when yield potential is low and other soil constraints are present.

Significantly higher benefits are generated when strategic deep tillage and other amelioration options are combined to address limiting constraints within a soil. This may include use of more than one
strategic deep tillage method (e.g. deep ripping as well soil mixing/inversion) as well as incorporating amendments such as fertilisers, clay, lime, and/or organic matter.

Recent research in Victoria on a Sodosol in a High Rainfall environment (550 mm annual rainfall) showed deep ripping alone to have little impact on yields, but deep ripping in conjunction with gypsum, nutrients, wheat straw+ nutrients or chicken manure resulted in yield responses of 12-16% on high yielding soils (mean grain yield of control = 6.3 t/ha, unpublished data). Even higher yield responses (up to 200%) have been recorded following application of nutrient-rich organic matter to clay soils in high rainfall environments in South Australia and southern NSW (unpublished data). Assuming a $300/t grain price, this is a gross benefit of $225-300/ha. Sale and Malcolm (2015) found amending sodic soils by subsoil manuring (20 t/ha) to be expensive ($1,300-$1,400/ha) but cost effective, generating a net present value over 4 years of $1,390-$1,810/ha. The question about whether similar or better returns could be achieved with improved nutrition alone remains open (Celestine et al. 2019).

Higher profits are generally gained by spending a limited budget addressing all constraints within an area of the farm, rather than addressing one constraint over a larger area. This is because the full yield benefit of any one soil amelioration technique cannot be realised until other limiting constraints are addressed. However, it can also be profitable to undertake low cost and easy to implement partial-amelioration options if they can be applied to larger areas of the farm in a given year, and still provide a portion of the yield benefit (Blackwell et al. 2014). Prioritising constraints to be addressed, or regions of the farm to ameliorate, depends on local soil conditions, the cost of amelioration, the attainable yield and the price of grain. The WA Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development have developed a decision tool called ROSA (Ranking Options for Soil Amelioration) to help consultants and farmers make this comparison (Petersen et al. 2019).

ROSA can be used to illustrate the benefits of addressing multiple constraints rather than single constraints in WA. For example, a sandy or deep sandy duplex soil with significant topsoil water repellence, subsoil compaction and acidity (pH: 0-0.1 m = 4.8, pH: 0.1-0.3 m = 4.5) issues. The net present value (NPV) over a five-year period of addressing single constraints of water repellence (through soil mixing/inversion) or subsoil compaction (through deep ripping) is approximately $140/ha and $30/ha, respectively. However, addressing multiple constraints of water repellence, subsoil compaction and acidity (through soil mixing, deep ripping and liming) results in a 5-year NPV of approximately $1,440/ha.

It is important to note that the benefits and costs of strategic deep tillage differ significantly across regions of Australia; these examples should be considered as indicative only of the benefits that can be gained from strategic deep tillage for soil amelioration.

**Future directions in strategic deep tillage**

Strategic deep tillage, often in conjunction with an amendment, can be used successfully to overcome a range of soil physicochemical constraints. The high cost of such approaches are a barrier and grain growers need greater confidence that the interventions will likely result in profitable productivity increases over the medium to long-term. Following amelioration with strategic deep tillage, management strategies based on long-term controlled traffic, no-till and stubble retention will enable the improved yield potential from overcoming soil constraints to be maximised and sustained and reduce the risk of negative environmental impacts.

The most convincing current evidence for strategic deep tillage exists for deep sandy-textured soils or texture contrast soils with deep A-horizons. On these soils, improved rooting depths can be obtained by removal of constraints and the weakly developed soil structure is less susceptible to damage from deep tillage intervention. There is a need to better understand how soil fertility and biological activity can be improved and maintained following amelioration to sustain higher potential yields on these soils. Soil amelioration may provide an opportunity to build soil organic carbon levels as more of the soil profile becomes biologically active, soils are mixed and production of above- and below-ground plant biomass
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increases. However, apart from clay addition to sands, a cost-effective system or strategy to build soil carbon on many dryland cropping soils remains elusive.

The nature of physicochemical constraints associated with higher clay content neutral-alkaline soils used for grain production presents particular challenges. High clay content, combined with low rainfall and high evaporation environments, results in high soil strengths and increased energy costs to physically alter the subsoils. Furthermore, many of the constraints are chemical, such as high sodicity, leading to dispersion and poor structure when soils are wet and high penetrometer resistance when dry. The severity also usually increases with depth. Amelioration then almost always requires amendment addition, likely at depth, further increasing cost and reducing the feasibility of such approaches. In regions with higher, more reliable rainfall, large increases in yields may sometimes justify the initial significant financial investment required, but there remains considerable uncertainty in predicting when such interventions will improve yield and profit. Targeted subsoil interventions and the promise of stimulating further ‘biological’ improvement of the subsoil condition following intervention requires further research. Where amelioration is not financially or logistically feasible, growers will need use better adapted, more tolerant crop varieties or species and manage agronomic inputs to match the constrained yield potential.

Amelioration of soil constraints can, in part, enable a reduction in the gap between current and potential water limited grain yields but capturing and sustaining this benefit will require the simultaneous implementation of a range of management strategies to reduce the range of abiotic and biotic constraints that limit grains productivity.
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