1 **TITLE PAGE**

2

3 *Research Article*

4

5 **Variability in Fruit Yield and Quality of Genetically Diverse Tomato Cultivars in**

6 **Response to Different Biochars**

7

8 **Elvir Tenic¹, Daylen Isaac¹, Rishikesh Ghogare, and Amit Dhingra***

9 Affiliation: Department of Horticulture, Washington State University, Pullman, WA

10 ET - elvir.tenic@wsu.edu, DI - daylen.isaac@wsu.edu, RG - rishikesh.ghogare@wsu.edu

11 ¹These authors contributed equally to this work.

12 *Correspondence: adhingra@wsu.edu, Tel: 509-335-3625

13 Received: date; Accepted: date; Published: date

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25 **Abstract**

26 *Background:* Intensive agricultural practices have reduced soil health thereby negatively
 27 impacting crop yields. There is a need to maintain healthy soils and restore marginal lands to
 28 ensure efficient food production. Biochar, a porous carbon-rich material generated from
 29 pyrolysis of various feedstock sources is receiving attention as a soil amendment that has the
 30 potential to restore soil organic carbon content and also enhance crop yields. However, the
 31 physical and chemical properties of biochar are influenced by pyrolysis parameters. These in
 32 turn determine its interaction with the soil, thereby influencing its biological properties in
 33 terms of impact on soil microcosm and plant productivity. While most studies report the
 34 evaluation of one biochar and a single plant cultivar, the role of the plant's genetic
 35 background in responding to biochar as a soil amendment remains unanswered. The impact
 36 of six distinct biochars on agronomic performance and fruit quality of three genetically
 37 diverse tomato (*Solanum lycopersicum*) cultivars was evaluated to test the hypotheses that 1)
 38 biochars derived from different feedstock sources would produce unique phenotypes in a
 39 single cultivar of tomato, and 2) single feedstock-derived BC would produce different
 40 phenotypes in each of the three tomato cultivars.

41 *Results:* Different biochars impacted shoot dry weight, total fruit weight, and yield per plant
 42 in each cultivar differently. Both positive and negative effects were observed depending on
 43 the biochar-cultivar combination. In 'Oregon Spring', Ryegrass straw and CoolTerra biochar
 44 enhanced yield. In 'Heinz', an increase in fruit weight and citric acid was observed with
 45 several of the biochars. In 'Cobra', improved yields were accompanied by reduction in fruit
 46 quality parameters. Both hypotheses were supported by the data.

47 *Conclusions:* This study demonstrated that the genetic background of a plant is an important
48 variable in determining the outcome of using biochar as a soil amendment. Strategies for
49 application of biochar in agricultural production should consider the variables of soil type,
50 feedstock source, pyrolysis parameters and plant genetic background for enhancing crop
51 productivity and carbon sequestration.

52

53 **Keywords:** 3-10 words

54 **Abbreviations:** BC - Biochar, SOM - soil organic matter, SOC - soil organic carbon, CT -
55 Cool Terra®, RGS - Ryegrass straw, RGT - Ryegrass tailings, RT - Russian thistle, TMP -
56 Thermomechanical pulp, and W – Walnut, SEM - Scanning Electron Microscopy, EX -
57 energy-dispersive X-ray spectroscopy – EDX, w/w – weight/weight, High Pressure Sodium -
58 HPS, total soluble solids - TSS, N - nitrogen, P - phosphorus, K - potassium, Ca - calcium, S
59 - sulfur, Mg - magnesium, Mo - molybdenum, Si - silicon, Cl - chlorine, Na - sodium, Al –
60 aluminum

61

62

63

64

65

66

67

68

69

70 **1. Background**

71 Agricultural soils have been strained to reach their highest potential in productivity and now
 72 encounter several biotic and abiotic challenges. Years of intensified crop production has
 73 adversely impacted soil health. Ever-increasing application of fertilizer and irrigation has
 74 resulted in the loss of organic matter and sodification, leading to deterioration of soil tilth [1].
 75 To combat these impending detriments to soil health, management approaches are being
 76 adopted to increase soil organic matter (SOM), foster a diverse soil microcosm, improve crop
 77 productivity, and promote additional ecosystems services [2–5]. However, due to changing
 78 climatic conditions, soil organic carbon (SOC) levels are projected to decrease in the future
 79 [6]. Therefore, it is critical to pursue interventions that encourage beneficial soil practices
 80 such as implementing cover crops and reduced tillage [7–9]. Such measures will aid in the
 81 development of carbon negative ecosystems, which focus on returning carbon assimilated by
 82 plants back into the soil in a stable form with a long half-life. The carbon positive cycle
 83 promoted by intense agriculture has further heightened the challenges posed by soil erosion
 84 and changing climate conditions [10,11]. These challenges need to be addressed to secure
 85 global food supplies for the current and future generations.

86

87 The practices of early indigenous cultures of the Amazon over 2500 years ago are known to
 88 have improved soil health through incorporation of burnt biomass, resulting in production of
 89 a high-fertility ‘*Terra Preta*’ layer atop the otherwise sub-fertile Amazon soil [3,12–15]. In
 90 the 17th century, Japanese agriculturalists experimented with low-oxygen burnt rice husk as a
 91 soil amendment for more intense crop production [16]. Recently, there has been an

92 emerging emphasis on the use of burnt biomass, or biochar, to reclaim the health of marginal
93 soils.

94

95 Biochar (BC) is a carbon-rich, porous product generated by a thermochemical process known
96 as pyrolysis. It involves controlled burning of feedstock under low oxygen levels at
97 temperatures ranging from 300°C to 800°C [17,18]. Production of biochar can be achieved
98 using various feedstocks, the most common of which include agricultural crop residue,
99 organic manure, and wood [19]. With improvements in automation, and with growing
100 knowledge of the utility of BC as a soil amendment with the potential to enhance nutrient
101 availability and facilitate long-term carbon sequestration, it is now feasible to produce
102 consistent quality biochar that is expected to spur its utilization both in research and farming
103 [20–24].

104

105 Specific impacts of biochar amendment to soil include alterations in bulk density, porosity,
106 and water retention; these properties make the exchange of water, nutrients, and gases more
107 efficient, resulting in enhanced crop productivity [25,26]. Additionally, since BC is a stable
108 source of carbon and nutrients, it influences the soil microcosm by fostering the proliferation
109 of microbial communities for extended periods, which in turn enhance soil tilth and health
110 [27]. The biological, chemical, and physical influence of biochar and its role in enhancing
111 soil health is well-documented; however, its utilization in soils produces a spectrum of
112 outcomes in terms of crop productivity [28–34].

113

114 Productivity in a diverse range of crops, like tomato, lettuce and other leafy vegetables,
115 beans, potato, wheat, maize, and rice to name a few, has been evaluated in soils amended with
116 biochar derived from various feedstocks [30,35–40]. The feedstock source determines the
117 final nutrient profile of the biochar. Organic waste feedstocks generate biochar rich in
118 potassium and phosphorus, low in C levels, and low in surface area. Biochar derived from
119 wood feedstocks is enriched in organic matter and surface area; however, it has low N, P, and
120 K levels, and reduced capacity for cation exchange. Generally, crop residue-derived biochars
121 are rich in N [41–43]. The variation in nutrient profiles along with other physical properties
122 determines how the biochar interacts with the soil and collectively influences plant
123 performance.

124

125 Several recent meta-analyses of the various studies investigating the role of biochar on crop
126 productivity conclude that, overall, there is a positive impact on crop yield [22,43,44].
127 However, there are studies where biochar amendment impacts one aspect of plant
128 development but has no impact on yield or it produces a detrimental outcome [32,37,45]. It is
129 well-known that the genetic background of a plant influences how it responds to a given
130 stimulus [46–48]. Interestingly, most previous reports evaluating the impact of biochar have
131 studied one cultivar's response to biochar derived from a single feedstock. The question then
132 emerges of whether different cultivars will respond differently to biochars derived from
133 different feedstocks.

134

In this study, the impact of biochars derived from six different feedstocks on the growth and development of three genotypically-distinct cultivars of tomato (*Solanum lycopersicum* L.) was evaluated. Experiments were conducted to test the following hypotheses: 1) Biochars derived from different feedstock sources will produce unique phenotypes in a single cultivar of tomato, and 2) a single feedstock-derived biochar will produce different phenotypes in each of the three tomato cultivars.

2. Methods

a. Biochar source

Five types of BC generated from their respective feedstocks were provided by Ag Energy Systems, (Spokane, WA). The feedstocks used were as follows: Ryegrass straw (RGS), Ryegrass tailings (RGT), Russian thistle (RT), thermomechanical pulp waste (TMP), and Walnut shell (W). A commercially available BC product, Cool Terra® (CT), manufactured by Cool Planet (Greenwood Village, CO), was also used in the study. All experiments were conducted with 0.5% and 1% w/w rates of BC amendment.

b. SEM and EDX Analysis

Scanning Electron Microscopy (SEM) was performed on each biochar at the Franceschi Microscopy and Imaging Center at Washington State University. A sample of each biochar was fixed to a pin stub and sputter coated in gold. SEM samples were imaged on a Tescan

157 Vega SEM equipped with an Energy-dispersive X-ray spectroscopy (EDX) detector in order
158 to make a qualitative visual assessment of porosity and general particle size. Qualitative
159 elemental composition data for each biochar was collected with the EDX detector.

160

161 c. Plant growth conditions

162

163 Three cultivars of tomato (*Solanum lycopersicum* L.) representing unique market
164 applications and diverse genetic backgrounds were selected for this experiment. ‘Oregon
165 Spring’, an heirloom determinate variety was selected due to its popularity in home
166 gardening. ‘Heinz 2653’, also a determinate variety, is commonly used as a commercial
167 processing tomato. ‘Cobra F1’, an indeterminate variety, was selected due to its commercial
168 use as a greenhouse variety.

169

170 Seeds for the three cultivars were obtained from Territorial Seed Company (Cottage Grove,
171 Oregon). Seeds were germinated in 4-inch rockwool squares and grown to 4-5 nodes (15-20
172 cm) in height. Afterwards, plantlets were transplanted into 2.8 L pots with either organic
173 Sunshine Mix#1/LC1 (Sun Gro Horticulture, Massachusetts) as a control or Sunshine Mix
174 containing biochar (BC) at 0.5% or 1% (w/w) rate. One week after transplant, each pot was
175 fertilized twice a week with 450 mL of dilute (20 mL/L water) organic Alaska 5-1-1 Fish
176 Fertilizer (Lilly Miller Brands, CA). Plants were maintained in the glasshouse at the
177 Washington State University Plant Growth Facilities with temperatures held at 24°C/18°C
178 (day/night); relative humidity was maintained at 40-60%. High Pressure Sodium (HPS)

lights provided supplemental lighting, extending day length to 16 hours as needed. Young plants were watered every other day, while the larger, mature plants were watered daily.

181

182 d. Experimental Design

183

Six individual experiments were conducted, with two experiments each for Oregon Spring', 'Heinz 2653' ('Heinz'), and 'Cobra' F1, as reported in Table 1A and B. Experiments with 'Heinz' and 'Oregon Spring' were conducted over a period of 102 days while with 'Cobra' F1 over a period of 182 days. All six experiments were conducted independently with randomized design in the Washington State University Glasshouse. Each experiment consisted of 56 plants: eight plants contained 0% BC and served as controls, while four plants were randomly assigned to each of the 13 treatment groups (Table 1B).

191

192 e. Plant growth parameters and assessment of fruit quality

193

Dry Weight: Aboveground shoot biomass was collected at the conclusion of each experiment. Fruits were removed, plants were cut at soil level to remove the roots, and the shoots were completely dried in large paper bags at 60°C for 48 hours prior to weighing.

197

Yield: To measure yield, four random fruits per plant were selected for sampling at 'Breaker' stage, which is defined as the point in developmental where less than 10% of surface area displays color change [49]. Following achievement of the 'Red' stage, the point in

development where greater than 90% of a fruit's surface area displays color change, fruit
 were collected at regular intervals throughout the remainder of the experiment [49]. The yield
 for each plant was quantified based on the total number of fruits and cumulative fruit weight.
 Quality: Fruit quality was assessed by quantifying total soluble solids, sugars, and organic
 acid content. Briefly, a handheld rotary Bio-Homogenizer (model M133/1281-0 from
 Biospec Products Inc. Bartlesville, OK) was used to extract juice from five grams of fruit
 (flesh and peel tissue) from each of the four sampled fruit. Juice extracted from 'Red' stage
 fruit was filtered through cheese cloth and used for refractometer-based quantification of
 total soluble solids (TSS). An aliquot of the juice sample was quickly centrifuged, the
 resulting supernatant was filtered using 0.45 µm pore size filters, and the sample stored at
 -80°C for later use in quantification of sugar and organic acid profiles. Fructose, glucose,
 citric acid, malic acid, and fumaric acid were quantified using a Varian Prostar 230 HPLC
 equipped with an Aminex HPX 87H column coupled to a refractive index (RI) and UV (210
 nm) detector. The column was eluted with 0.005M H₂SO₄ at a flow rate of 0.6 mL/min at
 65°C [50]. Identification and quantification of sugars and organic acids was done by the
 external standard method [50].

218

219 f. Statistical analysis

220

221 All experiments were assessed independently. Data was analyzed with Rstudio (Version
 222 1.1.463) utilizing the Ggplot2 (Version 3.3.0), Tidyverse (Version 1.2.1), and Ggpubr

(Version 0.2.3) packages. Significance was tested using pairwise t-tests with α set for 0.1, .05, and 0.01. Figures with one, two, and three stars represent significance at p-value of <0.1, <0.05 and <0.01, respectively. All raw data, statistical representations of the data, and t-test outputs are available in Supplementary Files 1 - 3.

3. Results and Discussion

a. Electron microscopy and EDX

Micrographs were recorded for each biochar at 100x and 1000x magnification. The plant residue biochars RGT and RT exhibited a more heterogeneous composition, exemplified by a broader range of particle sizes, in comparison with the walnut and thermomechanical pulp BC (Figure 1). The proprietary Cool Terra BC featured a more consistent structure, possibly due to post-pyrolysis modification. The micrographs represent a very small sample from each biochar and while more detailed analyses are needed, these results have allowed for the development of several hypotheses regarding how the BC molecular structure might impact various parameters when added to soil. Suffice to say that each feedstock generates biochar with unique microscopic structure, which more than likely imparts different physical and chemical properties (Figure 1).

Characterization of all BCs with EDX spectra facilitated qualitative estimation of the specific elements present in each BC. The EDX method is an analytical technique that relies on X-ray

excitation and its interaction with a given sample. The unique atomic structure of each element in a sample corresponds to distinctive peaks on the electromagnetic emission spectrum, allowing for chemical and elemental characterization [51]. Nitrogen (N), phosphorus (P), potassium (K), calcium (Ca), and silicon (Si) were the most abundant elements in all BC varieties (Table 1). Sulfur (S) and aluminum (Al) were found in three BCs (RT, Russian thistle, W, walnut, and CT, Cool Terra®), while chlorine (Cl), molybdenum (Mo), magnesium (Mg) and sodium (Na) were only scarcely distributed among the BCs. Ryegrass tailings (RT)-derived BC contained all analyzed elements except Cl and Na, while the only elements identified in walnut BC were N, P, Ca, and Al (Table 2). While this study used EDX to qualitatively assess BC elemental composition, it is feasible to use this methodology for quantitative elemental analysis [52]. The elemental composition observed is consistent with results of other studies that examined the chemical properties of BCs. These results indicate that feedstocks influence the chemical composition of their biochar derivatives, which vary further based on pyrolysis temperature, and retention time [53].

b. Plant growth parameters

The impact of different biochars on three cultivars of tomato was assessed by quantifying growth and fruit development parameters of the plants grown in the greenhouse, including: shoot dry weight, total fruit weight, and yield per plant.

i. Shoot Dry Weight

267

268 In ‘Oregon Spring,’ decreased shoot dry weight was observed under CT 0.5% (Exp1), RGS
269 1% (Exp2), and RGT 0.5% (Exp2) BC treatments. However, RGS 1% (Exp1), RGT 1%
270 (Exp1), and TMP 0.5% (Exp1) BC treatments resulted in increased shoot dry weight over
271 control plants (Figure 2A). In ‘Heinz’, increased dry shoot biomass accumulation was
272 observed following all BC treatments except RGS treatments and RGT 1% application in
273 Exp 1. In Exp 2, biochar treatments RGT 0.5%, TMP 0.5% and W 0.5% resulted in decreased
274 shoot dry weight (Figure 3A). For ‘Cobra’, an increase in shoot dry weight was observed in
275 Exp1 with CT, RGS, RGT, and TMP BC applications of 1%, and with 0.5% Russian thistle
276 BC. In Exp2, a decreased in shoot dry weight was recorded with RGS 0.5%, RGT 1%, and
277 TMP 0.5% (Figure 4A).

278

279 The biomass data across treatments varied between the individual experiments conducted
280 during different times of the year. This was most likely due to the well-documented changes
281 in solar radiation during the year in greenhouse production, and the resulting influence on
282 plant’s photosynthetic performance [54].

283

284 In several previous studies, an increase in dry weight was reported following BC application.
285 When wheat bran-derived BC was applied at 14 t/ha rate in tomato production in the field,
286 dry shoot and root vegetative biomass increased, reportedly due to increased soil fertility
287 [32]. Similar results were reported with low-temperature cotton stalk BC in a greenhouse
288 study [55]. A significant increase of up to 52% in shoot dry weight (and 36% increase in root

dry weight) was observed in BC-treated plants, in comparison to control plants irrigated with ground water, heavy metal-contaminated water, and sewage water irrigation.

ii. Fruit weight

a. 'Oregon Spring'

A range of responses was recorded in both experiments under certain treatments with 'Oregon Spring' (Figure 3A). Interestingly, the two applications of TMP biochar induced contrasting plant responses in Exp1. The lower dose of TMP 0.5% resulted in fruit with an average mass of 89.9 grams per plant (se +/- 4.3) ($p < 0.05$) compared to 99.6 grams (se +/- 3.9) in control plants, a 9.7% decrease. The opposite result was obtained with the application of 1% TMP, with the fruit weight increasing 10.5% over control plants to 110.1 grams (se +/- 6.6) ($p < 0.05$).

b. 'Heinz'

Fruit weight was significantly increased in multiple biochar treatments for the 'Heinz' cultivar (Figure 3A). Average weight of control fruit samples ranged from 42.8 grams (se +/- 1) in Exp1 to 49.4 grams (se +/- 1.6) in Exp2. The increase in average fruit weight with applications of CT 0.5% ranged from 47.9 grams (se +/- 1.7) in Exp1 to 57.5 grams (se +/- 2.4) in Exp2 with a p-value of < 0.01 for both experiments. This resulted in an increased

average fruit weight of 11% in Exp1 and 16% in Exp2. Compared to control samples, RGT 1% treatment also significantly increased average fruit weight in ‘Heinz’ by 4% ($p<0.10$) in Exp1 and 9% ($p<0.05$) in Exp2. Additionally, ‘Heinz’ fruit weight increased with both treatments of RT biochar with RT 1% in Exp2 increasing fruit weight by 14% resulting in an average fruit weight of 56.7 grams (se +/- 2.1) with significance at p value of <0.01 . Walnut biochar at 1% application rate also significantly increased fruit weight in Exp1 to 46.2 grams (se +/- 1.8) ($p<0.05$) and to 57.5 grams (se +/- 3.6) in Exp2 ($p<0.01$), an increase of 7.9% and 16.7%, respectively.

c. ‘Cobra’

‘Cobra’ cultivar demonstrated only two significant changes in Exp1 for fruit weight (Figure 4A). A 16% decrease in fruit weight was found following applications of TMP 0.5% ($p<0.01$), while an 11% increase was shown with W 1% application ($p<0.01$). In Exp2, both applications of RGT (Exp1, $p<0.1$; Exp2, $p<0.01$) and TMP (Exp1, $p<0.01$; Exp2, $p<0.05$) resulted in increased fruit weights over control plants in addition to the lower doses of RGS ($p<0.05$) and W at 0.5% ($p<0.05$).

Previous studies with *Solanum lycopersicum* cv. ‘Brickyard’ in potted bags also showed a different trend. Tomato yield was reported to remain unchanged with 0.5, 1, 2, 4, or 8% BC applications versus controls in trials with ‘Cobra’ cultivar [56,57]. A field study with wheat bran BC applied at 14 t ha⁻¹ reported no impact on fruit weight [32]. The lack of change in

average fruit weight most likely indicates that these studies did not have the appropriate biochar type for the specific cultivar to produce any significant effect. In this study, different treatments led to increased average fruit weights observed in ‘Heinz’, ‘Oregon Spring’ and ‘Cobra’, lending support to the original hypotheses.

iii. Yield Per Plant

In order to evaluate the BC effect on overall crop productivity, average yield per plant (YPP) was recorded. Two of the three cultivars demonstrated an increase in YPP, and no detrimental impact on yield was observed with any biochar treatment.

a. ‘Oregon Spring’

Biochar treatments resulted in a significant yield change in ‘Oregon Spring’ cultivar. With applications of CT at 1%, significant increases were found in both experiments, with Exp 2 data indicating a 17% increase ($p < 0.01$) in yield. The average yield was 834.4 grams (se +/- 43.9) compared to control plants at 710.3 grams (se +/- 33.4). In Exp 1, control plants averaged 634.9 grams (se +/- 27.5) and the CT 1% treatment resulted in a significant increase of 12% ($p < 0.01$). Addition of RGS 1% and TMP 1% also significantly increased yields in comparison to the controls in both experiments, especially in Exp1, resulting in a 22% and 12% increase ($p < 0.01$), respectively. An increase in yield was also observed with RT and W biochars in both experiments, with no yield penalties recorded for any BC in either experiment.

355

356 b. 'Heinz'

357

358 In case of 'Heinz,' the YPP data varied across all BC treatments. Contrasting results for both
 359 experiments were obtained with 1% concentrations of RT, TMP, and W biochars. In Exp 2,
 360 addition of W BC at 0.5% resulted in decreased average yield per plant by 21% ($p < 0.01$). In
 361 some cases, increased YPP was observed in Exp 1. Addition of RT 1% and W 0.5% increased
 362 yields by 28% and 25%, respectively. This translated to 686.6 grams and 672.2 grams of fruit
 363 per plant compared to 535.4 grams in control plants although, the results were reversed in
 364 Exp 2.

365

366 c. Cobra

367

368 The YPP in 'Cobra' varied across the BC treatments. In Exp 1, control plants averaged
 369 1488.2 grams (se +/- 54.9) of fruit while applications of RGT at 1% significantly increased
 370 the yield per plant by 20% ($p < 0.01$) to an average of 1788.3 grams (se +/- 29.7). While
 371 control plants averaged 1053.7 grams (se +/- 74.1) in Exp 2, application of RGS at 0.5%
 372 resulted in an increase to 1380.7 grams (se +/- 126.5), a significant increase of 31% ($p < 0.01$).
 373 Additional significant changes were found in Exp 2 for RT 1% applications, for which a yield
 374 increase of 25% ($p < 0.01$) was observed. W 1% also raised yield by 19% ($p < 0.05$).
 375 TMP-derived biochar at both concentrations had no effect on YPP.

376

377 The results of this study demonstrate that different BCs had a positive impact on the
378 productivity of two cultivars, 'Cobra' and 'Oregon Spring', and only fruit quality metrics in
379 'Heinz' (Figures 2A, 3A, and 4A). Also, a single biochar produced different responses in
380 different cultivars. RGT biochar consistently enhanced yield in 'Cobra' but had no effect on
381 the other cultivars. To the best of our knowledge this study is the first to demonstrate an
382 interaction between different feedstock-derived biochars and the genetic background of the
383 plant species.

384
385 The observations in this study are in concordance with a recent meta-analysis that
386 summarized the results of 371 independent reports on the effect of biochar on plant
387 productivity and nutrient cycling [44]. While the study found overall positive impact on
388 aboveground biomass ($n=67$, $P < 0.01$), there were some instances where the BC had a
389 neutral or even a negative impact on plant productivity. In this study, some BC-cultivar
390 combinations enhanced the measured trait, while the majority were neutral, and some
391 produced a negative effect. Interestingly, the experiments yielded contradictory results across
392 the two experiments conducted at different times of the year. Additionally, a recent review on
393 biochar and the effects on agriculture also supports the role of BC as a viable soil amendment
394 to help improve crop productivity while stimulating other soil properties and microbial
395 communities [43].

396
397 Previous reports on tomato and other crops have demonstrated mixed results. It was noted
398 that there was an increase in tomato fruit diameter, and a significant yield increase in grape,

with BC and compost-amended soils [58]. Additional studies on tomato growth and development with biochar reported similar trends. A field trial with cultivar 'Trust' with 10 or 20% (v/v) hardwood BC generated from balsam fir and spruce showed no difference in crop yield [59]. Tomato cultivar cv. 1402 grown in fertigated soilless media also reported no yield increases but did increase plant stature and leaf size. Pepper plants (*Capsicum annuum* L.) reported beneficial yield gains with addition of citrus wood biochar [60]. Enhanced abundance of rhizosphere microbes in addition to a hormesis effect that stimulated plant growth was reported [60].

407

Results from the above mentioned studies imply that there is a need to further characterize BC-plant interactions. Both the impact of the biological, physical and chemical changes in soil characteristics, and the role of genetic background of the plant will need to be considered if BC is to be deployed widely in agricultural production [43]. The observations summarized in Figures 2, 3 and 4 indicate that different BC treatments generated a unique response in each cultivar and that each cultivar responded uniquely to each BC treatment supporting both hypotheses of this study.

415

c. Assessment of fruit quality

417

i. °Brix

419

420 Total Soluble Solids (TSS) assays were conducted for each cultivar. The data indicated
 421 mixed results; two of the three cultivars displayed decreased °Brix, with only ‘Heinz’
 422 demonstrating an increased TSS level. The majority of BC treatments had no or negative
 423 effect on °Brix.

424

425 a. ‘Oregon Spring’

426

427 A range of TSS response in ‘Oregon Spring’ were observed. Amendment with Cool Terra®
 428 (CT) biochar at 1% resulted in fruit with significantly lower °Brix. In Exp 1, control fruit
 429 °Brix averaged 5.34 (se +/- 0.10) compared to the significantly lowered CT treatment °Brix
 430 of 5.04 (se +/- 0.14), a 5% decrease ($p < 0.05$). A similar response in Exp 2 resulted in an 8%
 431 decrease of °Brix levels in CT 1% fruit versus control fruit. Surprisingly, the lower dose
 432 application of CT at 0.5% resulted in the highest TSS level measured in Exp 2, a 8.9%
 433 increase, at 6.58 (se +/- 0.15) with a p-value of < 0.01 . These contrasting results necessitate
 434 further research to reveal the underlying plant-BC interaction mechanisms.

435

436 b. ‘Heinz’

437

438 Three BC feedstocks in ‘Heinz’ significantly impacted fruit TSS trends with no detrimental
 439 effects measured with any BC treatment or application rate. The data revealed consistently
 440 increased °Brix compared to controls with CT 0.5% and 1% ($p < 0.01$), significantly
 441 increasing TSS by ~13% in Exp 1. This resulted in increased °Brix levels of 5.85 (se +/- 0.18)

in CT 0.5% and 5.84 (se +/- 0.17) in CT 1% treatments. More changes were found with RGS 0.5% and RGT 0.5% resulting in °Brix levels increased 10% and 11%, respectively, over controls in Exp 1.

c. ‘Cobra’

The ‘Cobra’ cultivar responded comparably with only one biochar type, Ryegrass tailings. The RGT amendment resulted in decreased °Brix at both rates and experimental trials. The largest change was measured in Exp 1 with control fruit °Brix averaging 5.13 (se +/- 0.08), while TMP 1% treatment reduced °Brix by 8% to 4.71 (se +/- 0.14). Further decreases of TSS were found with all tested biochars in at least one experiment and one concentration.

Only the processing tomato, ‘Heinz,’ revealed increased °Brix concentrations in all biochar treatments (except TMP 0.5%) and in both experiments. Conversely, ‘Cobra’ fruit displayed significantly decreased °Brix levels for four of the six biochars. However, a spectrum of effects was observed for the ‘Oregon Spring’ cultivar. These data supported both of the tested hypotheses.

The beneficial results with ‘Heinz’ indicate this cultivar may be a potential candidate for targeted fruit quality improvement with BC amendment. However, careful consideration of other biochar-cultivar combinations is necessary, as demonstrated by the significantly lowered °Brix levels in ‘Cobra’ cultivar. In a previous study with tomato cultivar ‘Rio

Grande', no substantial changes to the TSS levels were reported when grown in wheat-straw, poplar tree, or olive-residue BC-amended soils at 10% and 20% [61]. Variable response to different BC treatment in terms of °Brix was observed in this study as well. The multi-variable BC-plant-soil interactions along with the genetic background of the plant most likely influences TSS levels.

ii. Sugars

Producing flavorful tomatoes could be an advantage to producers, processors, and consumers alike. Sugars were quantified with HPLC to determine the carbohydrate load in tomato fruit in response to BC amendment.

a. 'Oregon Spring'

A wide range of responses were recorded in 'Oregon Spring' cultivar in response to various BC treatments (Figure 2B). Significant changes in glucose and fructose levels were recorded with RGS treatment at 0.5% in both experiments. In Exp 1, glucose concentrations were significantly increased by 18% ($p < 0.01$) from 14.35 $\mu\text{g}/\mu\text{L}$ (se $\pm$ 0.80) in control plants to 16.98 $\mu\text{g}/\mu\text{L}$ (se $\pm$ 1.26) in RGS treated plants. In Exp 2, fructose levels were also increased by 25% in RGS 0.5% treatment as indicated by the increase from 38.58 $\mu\text{g}/\mu\text{L}$ (se $\pm$ 1.4) in control fruit to 48.28 $\mu\text{g}/\mu\text{L}$ (se $\pm$ 3.37) ($p < 0.01$).

486 b. 'Heinz'

487

488 Various significant differences were observed in 'Heinz' fruit carbohydrate levels (Figure
489 3B). 'Heinz' demonstrated significantly increased glucose and fructose levels over control
490 plants, with TMP 0.5% BC treatment ($p < 0.01$). In Exp 1, TMP 0.5% increased fruit glucose
491 levels by 27% from 13.06 $\mu\text{g}/\mu\text{L}$ (se $\pm$ 0.95) in control fruit to 16.7 $\mu\text{g}/\mu\text{L}$ (se $\pm$ 1.67).
492 Fructose levels responded similarly, with a 30% increase from 25.52 $\mu\text{g}/\mu\text{L}$ (se $\pm$ 2.16) in
493 control fruit to 33.28 $\mu\text{g}/\mu\text{L}$ (se $\pm$ 2.71) ($p < 0.01$). However, applications of CT at 1%
494 significantly decreased glucose by 24% ($p < 0.01$) and fructose by 27% ($p < 0.01$) in Exp 1,
495 with similar trends in Exp 2.

496

497 c. 'Cobra'

498

499 Although significant differences were found in glucose levels, no consistent results were
500 observed between the BC treatments in 'Cobra' (Figure 4B). Fructose levels were impacted
501 by several biochar feedstocks and demonstrated significant decreases with 1% applications
502 of CT, RGS, and RT. A steep decline in fructose was observed with both applications of W
503 BC in Exp 1 lowering the levels by 25% and 27% compared to control fruit. The CT
504 treatments incrementally lowered fructose levels with increasing BC rates from 30.18 $\mu\text{g}/\mu\text{L}$
505 (se $\pm$ 1.91) in the 0.5% treatment (13.8% decrease) to 27.78 $\mu\text{g}/\mu\text{L}$ (se $\pm$ 3.54) in the 1%
506 treatment (20.9% decrease) compared to 35.02 $\mu\text{g}/\mu\text{L}$ (se $\pm$ 1.14) in the control fruits
507 ($p < 0.01$).

508

509 The impact of BC on carbohydrate levels in the three cultivars was highly diverse. In a
510 previous study demonstrated that tomato TSS was negatively affected by olive-residue BC,
511 indicative of BC-specific effects on tomato quality. Another study showed lower temperature
512 (300 C°) BC treatments resulted in increased sugar levels in ‘Micro-Tom’ tomato in a pot
513 study with BC derived from bamboo feedstock [62]. These results further indicate a BC
514 specific effect on fruit quality that is also dependent on the genetic background of the
515 cultivar.

516

517 iii. Organic acids

518

519 Similar to other traits, a range of responses was recorded for the quantified organic acids.
520 ‘Oregon Spring’ demonstrated a strong response to BC treatments, especially in terms of
521 malic acid (MA) levels, which increased in both the experiments and rates using RGS, RGT,
522 and RT BC. Compared to controls, plants amended with RGT 1% resulted in significantly
523 higher MA production as shown in Exp 1 (63%) and Exp 2 (30%). Additionally, in Exp 1,
524 RT 0.5% amendment resulted in a significant increase of 80% in MA levels from 0.89 µg/µL
525 (se +/- 0.07) in control fruits to 1.60 µg/µL (se +/- 0.15) in treated fruits (p<0.01). Other BC
526 treatments in Exp 1 also significantly (p<0.01) altered MA levels in ‘Oregon Spring’ as W
527 1% and TMP 1% increased MA by 74% and 80% while CT 1% decreased MA by 18% to
528 0.73 µg/µL (se +/- 0.05) (Figure 2B).

529

530 A similar pattern of variable but significant changes was recorded in the ‘Heinz’ cultivar. In
531 Exp 1, applications of RT BC at 1% increased citric acid levels by 66% ($p<0.01$) and malic
532 acid concentrations by 58% ($p<0.05$). A significant difference ($p<0.01$) was found with CT
533 1% treatment, which reduced the MA levels from $1.08 \mu\text{g}/\mu\text{L}$ (se ± 0.09) in control fruit to
534 $0.63 \mu\text{g}/\mu\text{L}$ (se ± 0.10), a 41% decrease in Exp 1. Conversely, MA levels in Exp 2
535 significantly increased ($p<0.01$) by 25% with TMP 0.5% treatment compared to control fruit
536 (Figure 3B).

537

538 In the ‘Cobra’ cultivar citric acid (CA) and malic acid (MA) levels decreased significantly
539 ($p<0.01$) in Exp 1 with 0.5% Walnut biochar: CA decreased 27% and MA decreased by 16%.
540 No decreases were observed in Exp 2 with W BC but RGT BC at 0.5% increased CA (21%)
541 and MA (11.5%) concentrations significantly ($p<0.01$) (Figure 4B).

542

543 A previous study showed that tomato fruit quality, specifically CA, did not statistically
544 improve between BC treatments and even showed a significant decrease with 10%
545 olive-residue BC [61]. The generally positive response to BC amendment in the ‘Oregon
546 Spring’ cultivar in terms of organic acids compared to the other cultivars most likely
547 indicates a more favorable plant-soil-genetic background interaction. These data support
548 both hypotheses as each biochar affected fruit quality differently, and each cultivar had a
549 unique response to each BC (Figure 2B, 3B, and 4B).

550

551 4. Conclusion

552

553 The data presented in this study supports both the hypotheses, 1.) Biochars derived from
554 different feedstock sources will produce unique phenotypes in a single cultivar of tomato,
555 and 2.) a single feedstock-derived biochar will produce different phenotypes in each of the
556 three tomato cultivars. The results indicate towards future experiments to focus on
557 understanding all BC-related variables, the significance of their contribution individually and
558 in an interactive context when added to soil. There is a need to adopt a customized approach
559 for BC application in order to enhance yield and quality of the crop [24,33,43,63]. Future BC
560 studies should evaluate multiple crop cultivars in conjunction with different classes of
561 biochar (ex. manure, hardwood, or crop residue), to dissect the nature of the complex
562 interactions.

563

564 In summary, in ‘Oregon Spring’, a preferred tomato variety for backyard production, the
565 yield per plant and malic acid were seen to be enhanced, and there was a general consensus
566 between the two experiments for these two traits. Overall, CT 0.5%, and RGS 0.5%
567 treatments were most suitable for enhancing fruit quality traits. The results from the
568 processing tomato, ‘Heinz,’ were different. Most BC-treatments enhanced growth and
569 development traits. However, °Brix and other fruit quality traits were negatively impacted
570 except for TMP 0.5% treatment. ‘Cobra’, a variety bred for greenhouse production, showed
571 enhanced yields in all experiments and most BC combinations; however, fruit quality traits
572 varied across all BC treatments. While additional experimentation is required to understand
573 the wide-ranging variability in responses, several possible variables can influence the

outcomes, including: feedstock, potting mix, biochar characteristics, microcosm,
environmental factors, production management and the genetic background of the plant.
The observations recorded in this study should be considered with the caveat that the
experiments were conducted in a greenhouse. Use of potting mix eliminated all the
soil-related dynamics that may have influenced the agronomic performance and fruit traits.
Nevertheless, the study demonstrates that the genetic background of the plant is an important
variable. Prospective field evaluation of biochar should include different cultivars of the
species being tested. Moreover, the productivity of future agroecosystems will be measured
by the intensity of current attempts to improve soil health; therefore, methods that improve
and maintain soil health should be incorporated and evaluated rigorously.

584

585 **Declarations**

586 Ethics approval and consent to participate: Not applicable

587 Consent for publication: Not applicable

588 Availability of data and material: The datasets supporting the conclusions of this article are
589 included within the article and its additional files.

590 Competing interests: AD serves as a consultant for AgEnergy Solutions – a biochar
591 production startup company based in Spokane, WA, USA. AgEnergy Solutions had no role
592 in the design of the study; in the collection, analyses, or interpretation of data; in the writing
593 of the manuscript, or in the decision to publish the results.

594 Funding: This work in the Dhingra lab was supported in part by Washington State University
595 Agriculture Research Center Hatch Grant WNP00011 and support from the Stump Farmer
596 Farms, Sprague, WA and the Cowles Family, Spokane, WA.

597 Author Contributions: Conceptualization, AD, DI; Methodology, DI, ET, RG, AD; Formal
598 Analysis, ET, RG, AD; Resources, AD; Writing – Original Draft Preparation, ET, AD;
599 Writing – Review & Editing, ET, RG, AD; Supervision, AD; Funding Acquisition, AD,

600 Acknowledgments: The authors thank Dr. Seanna Hewitt and Evan Stowe for their critical
601 reading of the manuscript and their feedback. The authors also thank Milica Radanovic for
602 help with statistical analysis. The authors are thankful to Dr. Seanna Hewitt and Robert Nica
603 for designing the graphical abstract.

604 Figure Title and Legends

605 Figure 1: Scanning electron micrographs of different biochars used in this study. (100x
606 magnification and a 1mm scale bar standard). The high heterogeneity of BC is apparent when
607 BC is derived from different feedstocks.

608

609 Figure 2: Impact of different Biochars on *Solanum lycopersicum* var. 'Oregon Spring'
610 production. A. Agronomic response of 'Oregon Spring' cultivar to different BC amendments
611 recorded in terms of biomass, average total fruit weight, and yield per plant (YPP). B. Impact
612 of different Biochars on fruit quality parameters - °Brix, Glucose, Fructose, Citric Acid and
613 Malic Acid.

614

615 Figure 3: Impact of different Biochars on *Solanum lycopersicum* var. 'Heinz' production.
616 A. Agronomic response of 'Heinz' cultivar to different BC amendments recorded in terms of
617 biomass, average total fruit weight, and yield per plant (YPP). B. Impact of different
618 Biochars on fruit quality parameters - °Brix, Glucose, Fructose, Citric Acid and Malic Acid.

619

620 Figure 5 Impact of different Biochars on *Solanum lycopersicum* var. 'Cobra' production. A.
621 Agronomic response of 'Cobra' cultivar to different BC amendments recorded in terms of
622 biomass, average fruit weight, and yield per plant (YPP). B. Impact of different Biochars on
623 fruit quality parameters - °Brix, Glucose, Fructose, Citric Acid and Malic Acid.

624

625

626 **References**

- 627 1. Cotching WE. Organic matter in the agricultural soils of Tasmania, Australia – A review.
628 Geoderma. Elsevier B.V.; 2018. p. 170–82.
- 629 2. Lal R. Soil health and carbon management. Food Energy Secur [Internet].
630 Wiley-Blackwell Publishing Ltd; 2016 [cited 2020 Apr 16];5:212–22. Available from:
631 <http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/fes3.96>
- 632 3. Novotny EH, Hayes MHB, Madari BE, Bonagamba TJ, deAzevedo ER, de Souza AA, et
633 al. Lessons from the Terra Preta de Índios of the Amazon Region for the utilisation of
634 charcoal for soil amendment. J. Braz. Chem. Soc. Sociedade Brasileira de Quimica; 2009. p.
635 1003–10.
- 636 4. Steiner C, Teixeira WG, Lehmann J, Nehls T, De MacÊdo JLV, Blum WEH, et al. Long
637 term effects of manure, charcoal and mineral fertilization on crop production and fertility on
638 a highly weathered Central Amazonian upland soil. Plant Soil. Springer; 2007;291:275–90.
- 639 5. Zech W, Haumaier L, Reinhold H. Ecological aspects of soil organic matter in tropical
640 land use. Humic Subst soil Crop Sci Sel readings. Soil Science Society of America;
641 1990;187–202.
- 642 6. Basso B, Dumont B, Maestrini B, Shcherbak I, Robertson GP, Porter JR, et al. Soil
643 Organic Carbon and Nitrogen Feedbacks on Crop Yields under Climate Change. Agric
644 Environ Lett [Internet]. Wiley; 2018 [cited 2020 Apr 16];3:180026. Available from:
645 <http://doi.wiley.com/10.2134/aes2018.05.0026>
- 646 7. Magdoff F. Ecological agriculture: Principles, practices, and constraints [Internet]. Renew.
647 Agric. Food Syst. Cambridge University Press; [cited 2020 Jun 19]. p. 109–17. Available

648 from: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/44491442>

649 8. Doran JW, Zeiss MR. Soil health and sustainability: Managing the biotic component of
650 soil quality. *Appl Soil Ecol.* Elsevier; 2000;15:3–11.

651 9. Bender SF, Wagg C, van der Heijden MGA. An Underground Revolution: Biodiversity
652 and Soil Ecological Engineering for Agricultural Sustainability. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* Elsevier
653 Ltd; 2016. p. 440–52.

654 10. Lehtinen T, Schlatter N, Baumgarten A, Bechini L, Krüger J, Grignani C, et al. Effect of
655 crop residue incorporation on soil organic carbon and greenhouse gas emissions in European
656 agricultural soils. *Soil Use Manag* [Internet]. Blackwell Publishing Ltd; 2014 [cited 2020 Jun
657 19];30:524–38. Available from: <http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/sum.12151>

658 11. Quinton JN, Govers G, Van Oost K, Bardgett RD. The impact of agricultural soil erosion
659 on biogeochemical cycling. *Nat Geosci.* Nature Publishing Group; 2010;3:311–4.

660 12. Neves EG, Petersen JB, Bartone RN, Augusto Da Silva C. Historical and Socio-cultural
661 Origins of Amazonian Dark Earth. In: Lehmann J, Kern DC, Glaser B, Wodos WI, editors.
662 *Amaz Dark Earths* [Internet]. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers; 2004. p. 29–50.
663 Available from: http://link.springer.com/10.1007/1-4020-2597-1_3

664 13. Rasyid G, Saputra N. A review paper: the potency of biochar as bioconditioner and
665 carbon-offset. *IOP Conf Ser Earth Environ Sci.* 2020;415:12008.

666 14. Bezerra J, Turnhout E, Vasquez IM, Rittl TF, Arts B, Kuyper TW. The promises of the
667 Amazonian soil: shifts in discourses of Terra Preta and biochar. *J Environ Policy Plan.*
668 Routledge; 2019;21:623–35.

669 15. Daniele C de O, Mauro W de O, Vinicius SG da S, Terezinha BAO, Hugo HC do N,

- 670 Siglea S de FC. Nutritional status of three sugarcane varieties grown in the northeast region
671 of Brazil. *African J Agric Res. Academic Journals*; 2019;14:532–8.
- 672 16. Ogawa M, Okimori Y. Pioneering works in biochar research, Japan. *Soil Res* [Internet].
673 CSIRO PUBLISHING; 2010 [cited 2020 Apr 16];48:489. Available from:
674 <http://www.publish.csiro.au/?paper=SR10006>
- 675 17. Spokas KA, Cantrell KB, Novak JM, Archer DW, Ippolito JA, Collins HP, et al. Biochar:
676 A Synthesis of Its Agronomic Impact beyond Carbon Sequestration. *J Environ Qual. Wiley*;
677 2012;41:973–89.
- 678 18. Laird DA. The charcoal vision: A win-win-win scenario for simultaneously producing
679 bioenergy, permanently sequestering carbon, while improving soil and water quality. *Agron*
680 *J.* 2008;100:178–81.
- 681 19. Gurwick NP, Moore LA, Kelly C, Elias P. A Systematic Review of Biochar Research,
682 with a Focus on Its Stability in situ and Its Promise as a Climate Mitigation Strategy. Sun Q,
683 editor. *PLoS One* [Internet]. 2013;8:e75932. Available from:
684 <http://dx.plos.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0075932>
- 685 20. Nair A, Lang K, Snyder D. Impact of Biochar and Fertility Management on Potato
686 Production [Internet]. 2018. Available from:
687 <https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1432&context=farmprogressreports&unstamped=1>
688
- 689 21. Muhammad N, Dai Z, Xiao K, Meng J, Brookes PC, Liu X, et al. Changes in microbial
690 community structure due to biochars generated from different feedstocks and their
691 relationships with soil chemical properties. *Geoderma* [Internet]. Elsevier; 2014 [cited 2019

692 Nov 15];226–227:270–8. Available from:

693 <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0016706114000500>

694 22. Jiang Z, Lian F, Wang Z, Xing B. The role of biochars in sustainable crop production and

695 soil resiliency. *J Exp Bot* [Internet]. 2019;71:520–42. Available from:

696 <https://doi.org/10.1093/jxb/erz301>

697 23. Smith P. Soil carbon sequestration and biochar as negative emission technologies. *Glob*

698 *Chang Biol* [Internet]. Blackwell Publishing Ltd; 2016 [cited 2020 Feb 18];22:1315–24.

699 Available from: <http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/gcb.13178>

700 24. Panwar NL, Pawar A, Salvi BL. Comprehensive review on production and utilization of

701 biochar. *SN Appl Sci* [Internet]. Springer; 2019 [cited 2019 Dec 14];1:168. Available from:

702 <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s42452-019-0172-6>

703 25. Flowers MD, Lal R. Axle load and tillage effects on soil physical properties and soybean

704 grain yield on a mollic ochraqualf in northwest Ohio. *Soil Tillage Res.* Elsevier;

705 1998;48:21–35.

706 26. Dai Z, Zhang X, Tang C, Muhammad N, Wu J, Brookes PC, et al. Potential role of

707 biochars in decreasing soil acidification-A critical review. *Sci Total Environ.* Elsevier;

708 2017;581:601–11.

709 27. Laghari M, Naidu R, Xiao B, Hu Z, Mirjat MS, Hu M, et al. Recent developments in

710 biochar as an effective tool for agricultural soil management: a review. *J Sci Food Agric*

711 [Internet]. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd; 2016 [cited 2019 Nov 12];96:4840–9. Available from:

712 <http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/jsfa.7753>

713 28. Bruun EW, Petersen CT, Hansen E, Holm JK, Hauggaard-Nielsen H. Biochar

714 amendment to coarse sandy subsoil improves root growth and increases water retention. Soil
715 Use Manag [Internet]. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd (10.1111); 2014;30:109–18. Available from:
716 <https://doi.org/10.1111/sum.12102>

717 29. Chen Q, Qin J, Sun P, Cheng Z, Shen G. Cow dung-derived engineered biochar for
718 reclaiming phosphate from aqueous solution and its validation as slow-release fertilizer in
719 soil-crop system. J Clean Prod [Internet]. Elsevier; 2018 [cited 2019 Nov 21];172:2009–18.
720 Available from: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0959652617328974>

721 30. Liu B, Cai Z, Zhang Y, Liu G, Luo X, Zheng H. Comparison of efficacies of peanut shell
722 biochar and biochar-based compost on two leafy vegetable productivity in an infertile land.
723 Chemosphere [Internet]. Pergamon; 2019 [cited 2019 Dec 18];224:151–61. Available from:
724 <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0045653519303248>

725 31. Haider G, Steffens D, Moser G, Müller C, Kammann CI. Biochar reduced nitrate leaching
726 and improved soil moisture content without yield improvements in a four-year field study.
727 Agric Ecosyst Environ [Internet]. Elsevier; 2017 [cited 2019 Dec 4];237:80–94. Available
728 from: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0167880916306016?via%3Dihub>

729 32. Vaccari F., Maienza A, Miglietta F, Baronti S, Di Lonardo S, Giagnoni L, et al. Biochar
730 stimulates plant growth but not fruit yield of processing tomato in a fertile soil. Agric Ecosyst
731 Environ [Internet]. Elsevier; 2015 [cited 2019 Dec 6];207:163–70. Available from:
732 <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0167880915001474>

733 33. El-Naggar A, Lee SS, Rinklebe J, Farooq M, Song H, Sarmah AK, et al. Biochar
734 application to low fertility soils: A review of current status, and future prospects. Geoderma
735 [Internet]. Elsevier; 2019 [cited 2019 Dec 14];337:536–54. Available from:

- 736 <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0016706118309686>
- 737 34. Ding Y, Liu Y, Liu S, Li Z, Tan X, Huang X, et al. Biochar to improve soil fertility. A
- 738 review. Agron. Sustain. Dev. Springer-Verlag France; 2016. p. 1–18.
- 739 35. Thi Thu Hien T, Shinogi Y, Taniguchi T, Hien TTT, Shinogi Y, Taniguchi T. The
- 740 Different Expressions of Draft Cherry Tomato Growth, Yield, Quality under Bamboo and
- 741 Rice Husk Biochars Application to Clay Loamy Soil. Agric Sci [Internet]. Scientific
- 742 Research Publishing; 2017 [cited 2019 Dec 5];08:934–48. Available from:
- 743 <http://www.scirp.org/journal/doi.aspx?DOI=10.4236/as.2017.89068>
- 744 36. Woldetsadik D, Drechsel P, Marschner B, Itanna F, Gebrekidan H. Effect of biochar
- 745 derived from faecal matter on yield and nutrient content of lettuce (*Lactuca sativa*) in two
- 746 contrasting soils. Environ Syst Res [Internet]. SpringerOpen; 2018 [cited 2019 Dec 5];6:2.
- 747 Available from:
- 748 [http://environmentalsystemsresearch.springeropen.com/articles/10.1186/s40068-017-0082-](http://environmentalsystemsresearch.springeropen.com/articles/10.1186/s40068-017-0082-9)
- 749 9
- 750 37. Velez TI, Moonilall NI, Reed S, Jayachandran K, Scinto LJ. Impact of melaleuca
- 751 quinquenervia biochar on phaseolus vulgaris growth, soil nutrients, and microbial gas flux. J
- 752 Environ Qual. American Society of Agronomy, Crop Science Society of America, Soil
- 753 Science Society of America; 2018;47:1487–95.
- 754 38. Nzediegwu C, Prasher S, Elsayed E, Dhiman J, Mawof A, Patel R. Effect of biochar on
- 755 heavy metal accumulation in potatoes from wastewater irrigation. J Environ Manage.
- 756 2019;232:153–64.
- 757 39. Li S, Shangguan Z. Positive effects of apple branch biochar on wheat yield only appear at

758 a low application rate, regardless of nitrogen and water conditions. J Soils Sediments
759 [Internet]. 2018 [cited 2019 Dec 5];18:3235–43. Available from:
760 <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s11368-018-1994-3>

761 40. Faloye OT, Alatis MO, Ajayi AE, Ewulo BS. Effects of biochar and inorganic fertiliser
762 applications on growth, yield and water use efficiency of maize under deficit irrigation. Agric
763 Water Manag. Elsevier B.V.; 2019;217:165–78.

764 41. Gao S, DeLuca TH. Wood biochar impacts soil phosphorus dynamics and microbial
765 communities in organically-managed croplands. Soil Biol Biochem [Internet]. Pergamon;
766 2018 [cited 2019 Nov 22];126:144–50. Available from:
767 <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0038071718302979>

768 42. Xiao X, Chen B, Chen Z, Zhu L, Schnoor JL. Insight into Multiple and Multilevel
769 Structures of Biochars and Their Potential Environmental Applications: A Critical Review.
770 Environ Sci Technol [Internet]. American Chemical Society; 2018 [cited 2019 Nov
771 21];52:5027–47. Available from: <https://pubs.acs.org/doi/10.1021/acs.est.7b06487>

772 43. Tenic E, Ghogare R, Dhingra A. Biochar - A Panacea for Agriculture or Just Carbon?
773 Preprints; 2020;

774 44. Biederman LA, Harpole WS. Biochar and its effects on plant productivity and nutrient
775 cycling: a meta-analysis. GCB Bioenergy [Internet]. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd;
776 2013;5:202–14. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcbb.12037>

777 45. Takaragawa H, Yabuta S, Watanabe K, Kawamitsu Y. Effects of Application of Bagasse-
778 and Sunflower Residue-derived Biochar to Soil on Growth and Yield of Oilseed Sunflower.
779 Trop Agric Dev. 2017;61:32–9.

- 780 46. Beauchamp EG, Kannenberg LW, Hunter RB. Nitrogen Accumulation and Translocation
781 in Corn Genotypes Following Silking1. Agron J [Internet]. 1976;68:418. Available from:
782 <https://www.agronomy.org/publications/aj/abstracts/68/2/AJ0680020418>
- 783 47. Siciliano SD, Fortin N, Mihoc A, Wisse G, Labelle S, Beaumier D, et al. Selection of
784 Specific Endophytic Bacterial Genotypes by Plants in Response to Soil Contamination. Appl
785 Environ Microbiol [Internet]. 2001;67:2469–75. Available from:
786 <http://aem.asm.org/cgi/doi/10.1128/AEM.67.6.2469-2475.2001>
- 787 48. Richard-Molard C, Krapp A, Brun F, Ney B, Daniel-Vedele F, Chaillou S. Plant response
788 to nitrate starvation is determined by N storage capacity matched by nitrate uptake capacity
789 in two Arabidopsis genotypes. J Exp Bot [Internet]. 2008;59:779–91. Available from:
790 <https://academic.oup.com/jxb/article-lookup/doi/10.1093/jxb/erm363>
- 791 49. López Camelo AF, Gómez PA. Comparison of color indexes for tomato ripening. Horti-
792 Bras. FapUNIFESP (SciELO); 2004;22:534–7.
- 793 50. Hewitt SL, Ghogare R, Dhingra A. Glyoxylic acid overcomes 1-MCP-induced blockage
794 of fruit ripening in *Pyrus communis* L. var. ‘D’Anjou.’ Sci Rep [Internet]. Nature Research;
795 2020 [cited 2020 Jun 20];10:1–14. Available from:
796 <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41598-020-63642-z>
- 797 51. Goldstein JI, Newbury DE, Echlin P, Joy DC, Lyman CE, Lifshin E, et al. X-Ray Spectral
798 Measurement: EDS and WDS. Scanning Electron Microsc X-ray Microanal. Springer US;
799 2003. p. 297–353.
- 800 52. Ma X, Zhou B, Budai A, Jeng A, Hao X, Wei D, et al. Study of Biochar Properties by
801 Scanning Electron Microscope – Energy Dispersive X-Ray Spectroscopy (SEM-EDX).

802 Commun Soil Sci Plant Anal. Taylor and Francis Inc.; 2016;47:593–601.

803 53. Prakongkep N, Gilkes RJ, Wiriyaakittatekul W. Forms and solubility of plant nutrient
804 elements in tropical plant waste biochars. J Plant Nutr Soil Sci [Internet]. John Wiley & Sons,
805 Ltd; 2015 [cited 2019 Dec 9];178:732–40. Available from:
806 <http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/jpln.201500001>

807 54. Higashide T. Prediction of tomato yield on the basis of solar radiation before anthesis
808 under warm greenhouse conditions. HortScience. 2009;44:1874–8.

809 55. Abid M, Danish S, Zafar-ul-Hye M, Shaaban M, Iqbal MM, Rehim A, et al. Biochar
810 increased photosynthetic and accessory pigments in tomato (*Solanum lycopersicum* L.)
811 plants by reducing cadmium concentration under various irrigation waters. Environ Sci
812 Pollut Res [Internet]. Springer Berlin Heidelberg; 2017 [cited 2019 Dec 6];24:22111–8.
813 Available from: <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s11356-017-9866-8>

814 56. Goldy R, Wendzel V, Care P. Biochar as a Soil Amendment in a High Tunnel , Polybag
815 Growth System. Midwest Veg Trial Rep. 2014;1–7.

816 57. Goldy R, Andres C, Wendzel V. Second year results using biochar as a soil amendment in
817 a high-tunnel, poly bag growth system. 2016.

818 58. Sánchez-Monedero MA, Cayuela ML, Sánchez-García M, Vandecasteele B, D’Hose T,
819 López G, et al. Agronomic Evaluation of Biochar, Compost and Biochar-Blended Compost
820 across Different Cropping Systems: Perspective from the European Project FERTIPLUS.
821 Agronomy [Internet]. Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute; 2019 [cited 2019 Dec
822 9];9:225. Available from: <https://www.mdpi.com/2073-4395/9/5/225>

823 59. Dorais M, Gagnon F, Laurin-Lancôt S, Thériault M, Ménard C, Pepin S. Short-term

improvement of soil biological activity in biochar-amended organic greenhouse tomato
crops. *Acta Hort* [Internet]. 2017 [cited 2019 Dec 9];249–56. Available from:
https://www.actahort.org/books/1164/1164_32.htm

60. Graber ER, Harel YM, Kolton M, Cytryn E, Silber A, David DR, et al. Biochar impact on
development and productivity of pepper and tomato grown in fertigated soilless media. *Plant
Soil*. Springer; 2010;337:481–96.

61. Petrucci R, Bonetti A, Traversi ML, Faraloni C, Valagussa M, Pozzi A. Influence of
biochar application on nutritional quality of tomato (*Lycopersicon esculentum*). *Crop Pasture
Sci* [Internet]. CSIRO PUBLISHING; 2015 [cited 2019 Dec 6];66:747. Available from:
<http://www.publish.csiro.au/?paper=CP14247>

62. Suthar R, Wang C, Nunes M, Chen J, Sargent S, Bucklin R, et al. Bamboo Biochar
Pyrolyzed at Low Temperature Improves Tomato Plant Growth and Fruit Quality.
Agriculture [Internet]. Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute; 2018 [cited 2019 Dec
9];8:153. Available from: <http://www.mdpi.com/2077-0472/8/10/153>

63. Yu H, Zou W, Chen J, Chen H, Yu Z, Huang J, et al. Biochar amendment improves crop
production in problem soils: A review. *J Environ Manage* [Internet]. Academic Press; 2019
[cited 2019 Dec 14];232:8–21. Available from:
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0301479718312593>

A. Agronomic response of ‘Oregon Spring’ cultivar to different biochar amendments.

‘Oregon Spring’	Biochar	CT		RGS		RGT		RT		TMP		W	
	%	0.5	1	0.5	1	0.5	1	0.5	1	0.5	1	0.5	1
Biomass	Exp1				***		*			*			
	Exp2				*	*							
	Consensus	N			O	N	N			N			
Fruit weight	Exp1			**	**	*		***	**	**	**	*	***
	Exp2		***	**		***						**	
	Consensus		N	O	N	O		N	N	N	N	O	N
Yield per plant	Exp1		***		***		***		*	*	*		*
	Exp2		***	***	***			**			*	**	
	Consensus		Y	N	Y		N	N	N	N	Y	N	N

B. Impact of different biochars on ‘Oregon Spring’ fruit quality parameters.

‘Oregon Spring’	Biochar	CT		RGS		RGT		RT		TMP		W	
	%	0.5	1	0.5	1	0.5	1	0.5	1	0.5	1	0.5	1
°Brix	Exp1		**				*		***		*	***	
	Exp2	***	***		*	**			**	***			
	Consensus	N	Y		N	N	N		O	N	N	N	
Glucose	Exp1			**			**			**	***	***	**
	Exp2	*	***	*		*		***	***	***	***		
	Consensus	N	N	Y		N	N	N	N	O	O	N	N
Fructose	Exp1			***		***		*			***	***	
	Exp2		***	***	***		**			***	***		
	Consensus		N	Y	N	N	N	N		N	O	N	
Citric acid	Exp1	**		***	*			***	*	**	***		***
	Exp2							***	***		***	**	**
	Consensus	N		N	N			O	O	N	O	N	Y
Malic acid	Exp1		***	***	*	***	***	***	***	**	***	***	***
	Exp2	***		***	***	***	***	***	***				**
	Consensus	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y

Key: CT - Cool Terra®, RGS - Ryegrass straw, RGT - Ryegrass tailings, RT - Russian thistle, TMP - Thermomechanical pulp, and W - Walnut. Green boxes indicate a significant enhancement and red boxes indicate a significant reduction in the trait. * = p-value <0.10, ** = p-value <0.05, and *** = p-value <0.01. Y – Yes, N – No, O - Opposite.

A. Agronomic response of ‘Heinz’ cultivar to different biochar amendments.

‘Heinz’ metrics	Biochar %	CT		RGS		RGT		RT		TMP		W	
		0.5	1	0.5	1	0.5	1	0.5	1	0.5	1	0.5	1
Biomass	Exp1	***	***			**		**	***	**	***	***	***
	Exp2					**				*		*	
	Consensus	N	N			O		N	N	O	N	O	N
Fruit weight	Exp1	***	**			***	*	**	**				**
	Exp2	***		***	***		**	**	***	*			***
	Consensus	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N			Y
Yield per plant	Exp1	*	***	***		**	**		***	***	***	***	*
	Exp2				***				**		**	***	**
	Consensus	N	N	N	N	N	N		O	N	O	O	O

B. Impact of different biochars on ‘Heinz’ fruit quality.

‘Heinz’ metrics	Biochar %	CT		RGS		RGT		RT		TMP		W	
		0.5	1	0.5	1	0.5	1	0.5	1	0.5	1	0.5	1
°Brix	Exp1	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***		***	***	***
	Exp2	**	***	**		*							
	Consensus	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N		N	N	N
Glucose	Exp1		***	**	***		***		***	***	**	**	
	Exp2	**	**		**	***		***		***	**	***	**
	Consensus	N	Y	N	O	N	N	N	N	Y	O	O	N
Fructose	Exp1		***	**	***		***		***	***	*	**	
	Exp2		***			***		***	**	***	***	***	***
	Consensus		Y	N	N	N	N	N	O	Y	O	O	N
Citric acid	Exp1	**	***	***	**		***		***				
	Exp2	***		**	***	**		**	**	***	**		***
	Consensus	O	N	O	O	N	N	N	O	N	O		N
Malic acid	Exp1	**	***	***	***		***		**	**		*	
	Exp2	*	***		***	***		***	***	***	**	***	***
	Consensus	O	Y	N	O	N	N	N	O	Y	N	O	N

Key: CT - Cool Terra®, RGS - Ryegrass straw, RGT - Ryegrass tailings, RT - Russian thistle, TMP - Thermomechanical pulp, and W - Walnut. Green boxes indicate a significant enhancement and red boxes indicate a significant reduction in the trait. * = p-value <0.10, ** = p-value <0.05, and *** = p-value <0.01. Y – Yes, N – No, O - Opposite..

A. Agronomic response of ‘Cobra’ cultivar to different biochar amendments.

‘Cobra’ metrics	Biochar	CT		RGS		RGT		RT		TMP		W	
	%	0.5	1	0.5	1	0.5	1	0.5	1	0.5	1	0.5	1
Biomass	Exp 1		**		***		**	***			**		
	Exp 2			**			*			***			
	Consensus		N	O	N		O	N		N	N		
Fruit Weight	Exp 1									***			**
	Exp 2			**		*	***		***	***	**	**	
	Consensus			N		N	N		N	O	N	N	N
YPP	Exp 1	**	***	***	***	**	***		***			**	**
	Exp 2			***		***	**		***				**
	Consensus	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y		Y			N	Y

B. Impact of different biochars on ‘Cobra’ fruit quality.

‘Cobra’ metrics	Biochar	CT		RGS		RGT		RT		TMP		W	
	%	0.5	1	0.5	1	0.5	1	0.5	1	0.5	1	0.5	1
°Brix	Exp1		***	*		***	***		***	*	***	**	**
	Exp2	***		**		**	**	**		*		*	
	Consensus	N	N	O		Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	O	N
Glucose	Exp1	**			*	***	***				***	***	***
	Exp2			***	***	***				**	***	***	**
	Consensus	N		N	O	O	N			N	O	O	O
Fructose	Exp1	***	***		**	***	***		**	***	***	***	***
	Exp2	***	***		**			**	***	**		***	
	Consensus	Y	Y		Y	N	N	N	Y	O	N	O	N
Citric acid	Exp1	***	**			***	***	***	***	**	***	***	***
	Exp2			**	*	***	**			*			**
	Consensus	N	N	N	N	O	O	N	N	O	N	N	O
Malic acid	Exp1		*				**		*	**	***	***	***
	Exp2	**		**	*	***	***			***	**	***	***
	Consensus	N	N	N	N	N	O		N	O	O	O	O

Key: CT - Cool Terra®, RGS - Ryegrass straw, RGT - Ryegrass tailings, RT - Russian thistle, TMP - Thermomechanical pulp, and W - Walnut. Green boxes indicate a significant enhancement and red boxes indicate a significant reduction in the trait. * = p-value <0.10, ** = p-value <0.05, and *** = p-value <0.01. Y – Yes, N – No, O - Opposite.

Table 2. Qualitative elemental composition of different biochars using EDX spectral analysis.

Boxes with Y indicate the presence of elements, while blank boxes denote that the element was either not detected or below the detection threshold.

Biochar Feedstock	N	P	K	Ca	S	Mg	Mo	Si	Cl	Na	Al
Ryegrass tailings (RGT)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y			Y
Ryegrass straw (RGS)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y			Y	Y		
Thermo-mechanical pulp waste (TMP)	Y	Y	Y	Y				Y			
Walnut (W)	Y	Y		Y							Y
Russian thistle (RT)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y		
Cool Terra® (CT)	Y		Y					Y		Y	Y