Applied Soil Ecology

Greenhouse gas emissions from a sandy loam soil amended with digestate-derived nitrogen fertilisers – a microcosm study --Manuscript Draft--

Manuscript Number:	APSOIL-D-22-00308				
Article Type:	Research Paper				
Section/Category:	Microorganism-related Submissions				
Keywords:	biobased fertilisers, digestate, N2O emission, microcosm, global warming potential				
Corresponding Author:	Caleb Elijah Egene Ghent University: Universiteit Gent Gent, BELGIUM				
First Author:	Caleb Elijah Egene				
Order of Authors:	Caleb Elijah Egene				
	Inge Regelink				
	Ivona Sigurnjak				
	Fabrizio Adani				
	Filip Tack				
	Erik Meers				
Abstract:	Nutrient recovery from anaerobic digestion systems provides several side streams that are useful as biobased fertilisers (BBFs). A microcosm approach was employed to assess the short-term greenhouse gas emissions from a sandy-loam soil enriched with 18 BBFs in comparison with mineral fertilisers (urea and calcium ammonium nitrate). In total, 20 different fertilisers were homogeneously incorporated into an arable sandy loam soil at a rate of 170 kg nitrogen (N) ha -1 and incubated at 80% water-filled pore space. Over 18 days, the fluxes of nitrous oxide (N 2 O), methane (CH 4), and carbon dioxide (CO 2) released in the headspace of the microcosms were measured using a Gasera One Multi-gas analyser. Cumulative N 2 O emissions from the BBF treatments were either comparable or lower ($0.04 - 0.09$ %N applied) than the mineral fertilisers ($0.10 - 0.14$ %N applied). Nitrification of the initial ammonium-N present in the BBFs was likely the dominant biological process driving N 2 O production. The application of digestate and evaporator concentrates led to an increase in CO 2 emissions (8–51% of applied carbon (C)), mostly in the first days of the incubation. Meanwhile, the solid fraction of digestate exhibited slow mineralisation patterns ($3-7$ % of applied C). The variability in CO 2 respiration was strongly influenced by the availability of labile C. Fertilisation had no effect on soil-borne CH 4 emissions. Estimation of global warming potential, with respect to added N, suggests that BBFs obtained from the post-digestion treatment of digestate have a lower environmental impact compared to the unprocessed digestate due to lower N 2 O emissions.				
Suggested Reviewers:	Mart Ros Researcher, Wageningen UR: Wageningen University & Research Mart.ros@wur.nl He is an expert in GHG emissions from agrosystems. Maria Luz Cayuela Researcher, Spanish National Research Council: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Cientificas mlcayuela@cebas.csic.es Recently published on the subject Nele Ameloot Researcher, Ghent University: Universiteit Gent nele.ameloot@ugent.be Recently published on the subject				

Researcher, University of the Chinese Academy of Sciences whchenyouchao@163.com Recently published on the subject				
Di Wu Researcher, Institute of bio and geosciences, Agrosphere w.di@fz-juelich.de Recently published on the subject				

Caleb Elijah Egene, MSc. Department of Green Chemistry and Technology Faculty of Bioscience Engineering Ghent University Coupure-Links 653, B-9000 Ghent, Belgium calebelijah.egene@UGent.be

Professor Judith Ascher-Jenull Editor-in-Chief Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment

17 March, 2022

Dear Professor Ascher-Jenull,

I am pleased to submit an original research article entitled "Greenhouse gas emissions from a sandy loam soil amended with digestate-derived nitrogen fertilisers – a microcosm study" for consideration for publication in the *Applied Soil Ecology* Journal.

In our study, we assessed and compared the short-term emissions of N_2O , CO_2 , and CH_4 from a sandy-loam soil enriched with 18 different fertilisers obtained from treated and untreated digestates. We adopted a microcosm approach to closely monitor and quantify the fertilisation effects on soil GHG emissions and C and N turnover processes. Our results showed that the differences in fertiliser characteristics, linked to the types of digestate treatment techniques, can influence the soil N_2O and CO_2 emissions after fertilisation. In short, our findings provide a first look at the GHG emission potential of several biobased fertilisers derived from novel digestate processing techniques.

We believe that this manuscript is appropriate for publication in *Applied Soil Ecology* because it discusses the potential effects of digestate fertilisation on environmental quality and the dynamics of nitrogen transformations in soils.

This manuscript has not been published and is not under consideration for publication elsewhere.

Thank you for your kind consideration.

Sincerely,

Caleb Elijah Egene, MSc. Department of Green Chemistry and Technology Ghent University

Highlights

- Nitrification was the dominant biological process driving N₂O production.
- CO₂ respiration was strongly influenced by the availability of labile C.
- Fertilisation had no effect on soil-borne CH4 emissions
- Global warming potential of biobased fertilisers did not exceed that of mineral fertilisers.

1	Greenhouse gas	emissions from	n a sandy I	loam soil	amended	with digestate	-derived nitroge	n
---	----------------	----------------	-------------	-----------	---------	----------------	------------------	---

- 2 fertilisers a microcosm study
- ³ Caleb Elijah Egene^a*, Inge Regelink^b, Ivona Sigurnjak^a, Fabrizio Adani^c, Filip MG Tack^a,
- 4 Erik Meers^a
- 5
- ⁶ ^aDepartment of Green Chemistry and Technology, Faculty of Bioscience Engineering, Ghent
- 7 University, Ghent, Belgium.
- ⁸ ^bWageningen Environmental Research, Wageningen University and Research, Wageningen,
- 9 the Netherlands
- ¹⁰ ^cDipartimento di Produzione Vegetale, Università degli Studi di Milano, Via Celoria 2, 20133
- 11 Milano, Italy
- 12 *Corresponding author: calebelijah.egene@ugent.be
- 13

14 Abstract

15 Nutrient recovery from anaerobic digestion systems provides several side streams that are useful as biobased fertilisers (BBFs). A microcosm approach was employed to assess the 16 short-term greenhouse gas emissions from a sandy-loam soil enriched with 18 BBFs in 17 comparison with mineral fertilisers (urea and calcium ammonium nitrate). In total, 20 18 different fertilisers were homogeneously incorporated into an arable sandy loam soil at a rate 19 of 170 kg nitrogen (N) ha⁻¹ and incubated at 80% water-filled pore space. Over 18 days, the 20 fluxes of nitrous oxide (N₂O), methane (CH₄), and carbon dioxide (CO₂) released in the 21 headspace of the microcosms were measured using a Gasera One Multi-gas analyser. 22 Cumulative N₂O emissions from the BBF treatments were either comparable or lower (0.04 -23 0.09 %N applied) than the mineral fertilisers (0.10 - 0.14 %N applied). Nitrification of the 24 initial ammonium-N present in the BBFs was likely the dominant biological process driving 25 26 N₂O production. The application of digestate and evaporator concentrates led to an increase in CO₂ emissions (8–51% of applied carbon (C)), mostly in the first days of the incubation. 27 Meanwhile, the solid fraction of digestate exhibited slow mineralisation patterns (3-7 % of 28 applied C). The variability in CO₂ respiration was strongly influenced by the availability of 29 labile C. Fertilisation had no effect on soil-borne CH4 emissions. Estimation of global 30 31 warming potential, with respect to added N, suggests that BBFs obtained from the postdigestion treatment of digestate have a lower environmental impact compared to the 32 unprocessed digestate due to lower N₂O emissions. 33

34

Keywords: biobased fertilisers, digestate, N₂O emission, microcosm, global warming
potential

- 37
- 38

39 **1. Introduction**

62

Anaerobic digestion (AD) of organic wastes enables the production of biogas as a 40 renewable energy carrier and provides a promising alternative to the use of fossil fuels (Holm-41 Nielsen et al., 2009). By converting food and animal wastes to energy, AD plays a significant 42 role in reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from conventional energy sources. In 43 addition, evidence suggests that the digestate, which is the residual matter after AD, may be 44 useful as a fertiliser or soil improver because it retains most of the plant nutrients contained in 45 the initial feedstock (Möller, 2009). Therefore, its use in agriculture is expected to improve 46 soil fertility while reducing farmers' input of fossil-dependent mineral fertilisers. 47 The increase in soil available nitrogen (N) from the application of N fertilisers 48 enhances nitrification and denitrification, which are soil processes that release nitrous oxide 49 (N₂O) into the atmosphere (IPCC, 2006; Senbayram et al., 2010). N₂O is critical from the 50 climate perspective because it is an ozone-depleting gas, with a global warming potential 51 52 (GWP) 296 times that of carbon dioxide (CO₂) and 12 times that of methane (CH₄) in a 100year time horizon (IPCC, 2007). Recent data revealed that transformations of N in agricultural 53 soils by nitrifying and denitrifying microorganisms account for approximately 70% of the 54 annual N₂O budget globally (Tian et al., 2019). This represents a major increase compared to 55 the 50% contribution estimated in the early nineties (Bouwman, 1990). Therefore, for 56 digestate-derived bio-based fertilisers (BBFs) to be used sustainably in agriculture as N 57 fertilisers, it is necessary to ensure that their environmental impact is minimal. Moreover, 58 fertiliser N lost from soils in gaseous form (N₂O, nitric oxide, and dinitrogen) reduces the 59 fertiliser efficiency (Holland and Weitz, 2003). 60 Besides N availability, other factors that influence the magnitude of N₂O emission 61

al., 2003). In particular, the soil moisture content plays a crucial role as it impacts soil

from soil include moisture content, pH, and carbon (C) supply (Akiyama et al., 2005; Dalal et

aeration, diffusion of dissolved nutrients, and the rate of microbial activities (Hütsch et al., 64 1999). Nitrification by heterotrophic microorganisms proceeds under sufficiently aerobic 65 conditions while heterotrophic denitrification increases as oxygen availability become 66 restricted (Hütsch et al., 1999; Le Roux et al., 2013). The addition of organic substrates with 67 high organic C concentration is likely to favour denitrification since heterotrophic denitrifiers 68 utilize organic C as electron donors (Hattori, 1983). Digestate, however, have lower 69 availability of labile C since a large fraction of the easily degradable organic matter in the 70 feedstock is consumed during AD (Alburquerque et al., 2012). This partly explains why some 71 studies found that N₂O emissions from the soil after the application of digestate are generally 72 lower than those after application of untreated feedstock (Cayuela et al., 2010; Johansen et al., 73 2013; Möller, 2009). Differences in N₂O emission rates from those studies were related to the 74 form of N in the digestate (mineral N or organic N) as well as the quantity and quality of 75 76 organic C.

Bodelier and Laanbroek (2004) demonstrated that the application of N fertiliser could 77 indirectly stimulate the oxidation of CH4 because the increase in available N increases the 78 activity of methanotrophic and nitrifying bacteria in the soil. Existing literature on CH4 79 emissions after digestate fertilisation is often focused on paddy fields since they are the main 80 sources of CH₄ from soils (Odlare et al., 2012; Singla and Inubushi, 2014; Walling and 81 Vaneeckhaute, 2020). In the few studies that have explored CH₄ emission dynamics in 82 digestate-fertilised upland soils, emission rates were related to the soil moisture content and 83 the availability of labile C (Czubaszek and Wysocka-Czubaszek, 2018; Pezzolla et al., 2012; 84 Rosace et al., 2020). As such, organic C mineralization into CO₂ and CH₄ is useful as a 85 measure of soil microbial activity and the intensity of N transformations (Liu et al., 2019; 86 Shao et al., 2014). 87

In recent years, emphasis has been placed on nutrient recovery and reuse (NRR) 88 technologies which enable the processing of digestate into concentrated end-products with 89 high fertilisation value (Vaneeckhaute et al., 2017). At the basic refinement level, phase 90 partitioning of digestate is carried out to obtain a phosphorus- (P) rich solid fraction (SF) and 91 an N-rich liquid fraction (LF). The SF is sometimes subjected to drying or composting. 92 Meanwhile, further processing of the LF using advanced NRR technologies such as N-93 stripping, vacuum evaporation, membrane filtration, among others, can deliver multiple 94 cascades of nutrient-rich BBFs (Brienza et al., 2021; Logan and Visvanathan, 2019). 95 Examples of such BBFs include ammonium sulphate solution (Brienza et al., 2020; Sigurnjak 96 97 et al., 2019), ammonia water (Jamaludin et al., 2018; Vondra et al., 2019), evaporator concentrate (Vondra et al., 2019), reverse osmosis concentrate and permeate water (mineral 98 Logan and Visvanathan, 2019). Based on the compositional differences of these novel BBFs, 99 100 compared to the unprocessed digestate, it can be assumed that their behaviour as fertilisers could differ considerably. While a few studies have investigated the soil fertilisation potential 101 of these novel BBFs (Ehlert et al., 2019; Sigurnjak et al., 2017), there is a paucity of data on 102 their GHG emission potential when applied to the soil. 103

To close this knowledge gap, the short-term and long-term effects of the application of 104 105 digestate-derived BBFs on soil GHG production ought to be evaluated. In this context, this work aimed to evaluate and compare the short-term N₂O, CO₂ and CH₄ emissions from a 106 sandy-loam soil fertilised with (i) untreated anaerobic digestate (ii) BBFs derived from 107 different post-digestion treatment processes of digestate (iii) two mineral N fertilisers - urea 108 and calcium ammonium nitrate (CAN). It has been previously shown that soil processes such 109 as respiration, nitrification, and denitrification respond sensitively to C and N availability as 110 well as changes in redox conditions (Le Roux et al., 2013). Therefore, it is predicted that the 111 differences in the forms and availabilities of N and C in the digestate-derived BBFs will 112

113	influence the production of GHGs after their addition to soil. We hypothesized that the short-
114	term emissions of N ₂ O, CO ₂ , and CH ₄ from different BBF-amended soils are variable and this
115	variability is due to differences in concentrations of ammonium-N (NH ₄ ⁺ -N) and labile C.

116 **2. Materials & Methods**

117

2.1 Origin of the biobased fertilisers

Digestate samples were obtained from five full-scale AD plants. The digestates were treated to produce thirteen different biobased fertilisers, depending on the type of NRR technology present at each plant (Table 1).

Groot Zevert Vergisting (GZV, Beltrum, the Netherlands) operates a mesophilic (~35 121 °C) AD plant that is fed with pig slurry (81% w/w) and residue from the agro-food industry 122 (a.o. grain and rice husk, potato skins and coffee grounds, 19% w/w). A decanter centrifuge is 123 used to dewater the digestate (D-GZV) to obtain the solid fraction (SF-GZV). Part of the SF is 124 further processed in an installation to remove and recover P which includes washing the SF 125 with water and sulphuric acid to obtain an SF with a reduced P content and a fibrous structure 126 (SF-GZV_{P-poor}). The N-rich LF is treated through micro-filtration followed by reverse osmosis 127 to produce an N-potassium (K)-rich concentrate (RO-GZV) and permeate water. 128

Am-Power (AmP, Pittem, Belgium) treats residues from the food processing industry 129 130 and source-segregated food waste via thermophilic (~55 °C) AD with a retention time of about 60 days. The digestate (D-AmP) from this installation is dewatered to obtain a solid 131 fraction (SF-AmP). The solid fraction is passed through a fluidized bed dryer at 60°C to 132 obtain a dried solid fraction (SFD-AmP). The LF of digestate is sent to a vacuum evaporator 133 to evaporate water, leaving behind an evaporator concentrate rich in N and K (E-AmP). 134 Ammonium-rich condensed water from the vacuum evaporator is passed through a reverse 135 osmosis unit resulting in a reverse osmosis concentrate (RO-AmP) and permeate water. 136

Waterleau NewEnergy (WNE, Ieper, Belgium) operates an AD plant used for the 137 mesophilic (~35 °C) digestion of residues from agro-industry (potatoes and grain, 40% w/w), 138 sludge from industrial wastewater treatment plants (15% w/w) and animal manure (45% 139 w/w). Digestate (D-WNE) is passed through a decanter to obtain a SF which is then dried in a 140 Hydrogone dryer to obtain a solid organic fertiliser (SFD-WNE). The evaporated water from 141 the dryer, together with the LF of digestate (LF-WNE) is treated in a biological aerobic 142 reactor to reduce the chemical oxygen demand. Ammonium is then transferred to the gas 143 phase via evaporation resulting in a K-rich concentrate (E-WNE). The ammonia-rich gas is 144 condensed with water vapour and condensed ammonia water (AW-WNE) is recovered. 145 Benas (BNS, Ottersberg, Germany) treats energy crops (silage maize, silage rye and 146 corn, 85% w/w) and poultry litter (15% w/w) using thermophilic digestion. The ammonia 147 content of a side stream of digestate (D-BNS) is lowered using a modified stripping process to 148 obtain ammonium nitrogen to which gypsum is added to produce a concentrated marketable 149 ammonium sulphate solution (AS-BNS). 150 Acqua & Sole (A&S, Vellezzo Bellini, Italy) processes sewage sludge from 151 wastewater treatment plants (86% w/w) and coproducts (digestate from anaerobic treatment of 152 source-segregated domestic food waste, 14% w/w) in a thermophilic (~55 °C) AD. The 153 process is equipped with an ammonia stripping unit, whereby biogas acts as a stripping agent. 154 Ammonia is extracted from biogas by adding acid (H₂SO₄) resulting in an inorganic 155 ammonium sulphate solution (AS-A&S). The digestate from the plant is denoted as D-A&S. 156 GZV, AmP, WNE, BNS, and A&S are demonstration plants within the EU project 157 SYSTEMIC and more information is available on www.systemicproject.eu and in Brienza et 158 al. (2021). 159

2.2 Soil characteristics

The soil samples for the incubation were collected from the top layer (0-25 cm) of an 161 arable field in Bottelare, Belgium. Composite samples of the sandy-loam (55% sand, 6% clay, 162 39% silt) soil was taken in April 2020 with the following characteristics: pH-H₂0 7.5, total N 163 (TN) 0.76 g/kg dry weight (DW), total carbon (TC) 10.4 g/kg DW. This soil was used in the 164 incubation experiments with BBFs from GZV and AmP. Soil was taken again from the same 165 location in April 2022 having a slightly different composition (pH-H₂0 7.11, TN 1.30 g/kg 166 DW, TC 12.8 g/kg DW) and used for the incubation experiments with BBFs from WNE, 167 BNS, and A&S. The soils were air-dried until constant mass, sieved (2 mm) then stored in a 168 cool dry room before being used in the experiments. 169 2.3 Analytical methods for fertiliser characterisation 170 The dry matter (DM) content was determined by drying to constant weight (48 h) at 80 171 172 °C and was calculated as a percentage of wet weight. Organic matter (OM) was measured on dried solids by incineration at 550 °C in a muffle furnace for 4 h (Dean, 1974; Santisteban et 173 al., 2004). TC was determined using a PRIMACS100 Analyzer series (Skalar B.V., 174 Netherlands). TN was determined using the Kjeldahl destruction method (EN13654-1, 2002). 175

176 Ammonium-N (NH₄⁺-N) was determined spectrophotometrically after 1M KCl extraction at a

177 sample to solution ratio of 1:10. For the determination of dissolved organic carbon (DOC) and

total dissolved nitrogen (TDN) in the BBFs, fresh samples were weighed into a 50 cm^3

179 centrifuge flask and extracted with 0.01 M CaCl₂ (sample to solution ratio of 1:10) by shaking

180 for 2 h followed by centrifugation for 10 min at 3000 rpm (Houba et al., 1990). TDN and

181 DOC in the extracts were measured using the Dumas Dry Combustion Method for TN and TC

182 content (Bertsch and Ostinelli, 2019).

2.4 Microcosm setup

The incubation experiments were conducted in soil microcosms which enable studying 184 the effects of amendment addition on soil respiration under controlled conditions. Each 185 microcosm consisted of a 1L Duran bottle adapted with a GL45-thread Smart Cap (model: 186 SW45-2A). The smart cap has two 2 mm threaded openings that can either be closed with 187 blind plugs or fitted with valves that enable gas sampling. The incubation experiments were 188 carried out in four batches from February to June 2021 at a mean room temperature of 20 °C 189 (diurnal temperature range: 18.5 – 21.5 °C). Each batch included four or five BBFs from the 190 demonstration plants, one blank (unfertilized control soil), and two mineral fertilisers (urea 191 and CAN as positive controls). The same urea (46% urea N; Yara Benelux B.V.) and CAN 192 (30% N) was used in all four incubation batches. 193

The soil was pre-incubated for one week at 40% water-filled pore space (WFPS) to 194 activate the soil microorganisms. Next, 568 g of pre-incubated soil was thoroughly mixed 195 with a biobased or mineral fertiliser in a steel bowl and then transferred into the microcosm. 196 Prior to mixing, the mineral fertiliser granules were ground to <0.5 mm. The soil-fertiliser 197 mixtures were carefully packed to attain an equivalent bulk density of 1.3 kg m⁻³. All 198 fertilisers were applied at a rate of 170 kg N ha⁻¹. The equivalent amounts of NH₄⁺-N, organic 199 N (N_{org}), TC applied in each treatment are summarized in Table 2. The moisture content in 200 each bottle was brought to 80% WFPS and maintained throughout the experiment according 201 to Cayuela et al. (2010). A 2 mm opening at the top of the microcosm was left uncovered to 202 allow for aerobic respiration. The microcosms were laid out in a randomised block design 203 with three replicates per treatment. 204

2.5 Measurement

Over an incubation period of 18 days, emissions of CO₂, N₂O, and CH₄ were 207 measured using the Gasera One Multi-gas analyser (Turku, Finland) equipped with a photo-208 acoustic infrared analyser. Measurements were performed on days 0, 1, 2, 4, 7, 9, 11, 14, 16, 209 18. Measurements on day 0 were taken on average 2.5 hours after fertiliser incorporation. The 210 analyser was connected to the microcosm using two 1 m-long non-reactive Teflon tubes with 211 a 2 mm internal diameter. During measurement, the gases were pumped out from the 212 headspace (at 800 mL min⁻¹ flow rate), passed through the analyser then returned to the 213 microcosm in a closed loop. This method ensures non-intrusive sampling and reduces the risk 214 215 of systematic errors. The gas concentration in the headspace of the microcosms was measured at 4, 8, 12, and 16 minutes after connecting the tubes to the microcosm. During each 4 min 216 time step, the analyser detected the change in concentration of the measured gases. Fluxes of 217 CO₂, N₂O, and CH₄ were then calculated from the change in concentration over time 218 considering the volume of the headspace, tubing, and area of the soil surface. Sample sets 219 with a linear regression value of $R^2 < 0.90$ were rejected. At the end of the incubation period, 220 soil mineral N (NH₄⁺-N and NO₃⁻-N) in each treatment was analysed in a 1:10 ($w v^{-1}$) 221 suspension of soil and 1 M KCl and shaken end-over-end for 30 min. The extracts were 222 filtered (Whatman No. 45) and analysed for their NH₄⁺-N and NO₃⁻-N contents with a 223 continuous flow auto-analyser (Chemlab System 4, Skalar, the Netherlands). 224

225

5 **2.6 Calculations**

Gas concentrations measured in ppm were converted to emission flux using the idealgas law according to Equation (1) (Comeau et al., 2018):

228
$$Flux = \frac{\Delta gas}{\Delta t} \times \frac{P \times M \times n}{R \times T} \times \frac{V}{A}$$
 Equation (1)

Where flux is the elemental flux which is released as gas in μ g m⁻² h⁻¹; $\frac{\Delta gas}{\Delta t}$ is the slope of the linear regression of gas concentration (ppm) vs. time (h); P is the sampling pressure of the device (0.838 atm); M is the elemental molar mass (e.g. 12 for C, 14 for N); n is the number of atoms of the element in the gas (e.g. 2N in N₂O); R is the ideal gas constant (0.08206 L atm mol⁻¹ K⁻¹); T is the average atmospheric temperature (294 K); V is the sum volume of the headspace, tubing, and analyser cell (0.623 L); A is the surface area of soil in the microcosm (0.0069 m²).

The cumulative flux for each gas was calculated using a linear interpolation between two consecutive measurement days (Cai et al., 2013). Cumulative fluxes obtained with the soil control were subtracted for all cumulative fertiliser emissions.

Net N release (N_{rel}) in the soil at the end of the incubation was calculated according to
Equation (2) (De Neve and Hofman, 1996):

241
$$N_{rel} (\%) = \frac{\left[(Mineral N_{fertiliser}) - (Mineral N_{control}) \right]}{total N applied} \times 100 \qquad \text{Equation (2)}$$

where mineral $N_{\text{fertiliser}}$ is the soil mineral N content of the fertiliser treatment and mineral N_{control} is the soil mineral N content of the unfertilised control soil.

244 **2.7 Statistical analysis**

The data were subjected to one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) and when 245 significant (p < 0.05), means were compared using Tukey's test. In addition, a principal 246 component analysis (PCA) was performed to evaluate the relationships between the 247 fertilisers' characteristics (pH, TN, NH4, OM, TC, C/N, DOC, DOC/TC, TDN/TN) and 248 cumulative GHG emissions. PCA is an exploratory statistical tool that is used to quickly 249 visualize and analyse correlations between variables. Pearson's correlation analysis was 250 performed to test the relationships between product characteristics and cumulative GHG 251 emissions. All analyses were performed using XLSTAT 2021 software (Addinsoft, 2021). 252

254 **3. Results**

3.1 Composition of the biobased fertilisers

The studied BBFs differed considerably in their physicochemical composition (Table 256 3). The pH of most BBFs was alkaline (7.0 - 9.4) and any deviations from this range were 257 258 attributed to the use of sulphuric acid during digestate processing, e.g., in SF-GZV_{P-poor} with pH 5.5. On a fresh weight (FW) basis, OM constituted between 17 and 67% of the SFs of 259 digestate. The low OM content (<3% FW) in the R, LF, AW, and AS fertilisers indicates 260 these BBFs are dominantly mineral in nature and are, hereinafter, collectively referred to as 261 organo-mineral BBFs. DM content in the whole digestate varied between 5.2% in D-WNE 262 and 9.3% in D-A&S. For the organo-mineral BBFs, DM was below 5% except in the 263 ammonium salt solutions with 21 and 38 %DM due to their high salt content. The large 264 variation in DM content of the SFs of digestate (26 - 94%) was attributed to the type of 265 266 dewatering equipment used and whether a drying step was included during processing. Nitrogen was present mostly (>95%) in mineral form in the R, AW, and AS fertilisers. 267 This, in addition to their high total N content, makes these BBFs comparable to CAN and urea 268 in terms of potential N availability to crops. Unlike in AmP, the LF of digestate fed to the 269 evaporator implemented at WNE is not acidified, resulting in a lower NH₄-N content in E-270 271 WNE, compared to E-AmP (Table 3). Organic N was the dominant fraction in E-WNE, SFD-AmP, SFD-WNE, and SF-GZV_{P-poor}, corresponding to 97%, 95%, 77%, and 73% of total N, 272 respectively. 273 All five SFs of digestate had high TOC content, ranging from 85 g/kg in SF-AmP to 274

All five SFs of digestate had high FOC content, fanging from 85 g/kg in SF-AllF to 335 g kg⁻¹ in SFD-WNE. Lower TOC levels were measured in the whole digestate (15 - 30g/kg) while the organo-mineral BBFs were characterised by very low amounts of TOC (<5 g kg⁻¹). The variation in TN and TC content among the BBFs was reflected in the C/N ratio. As

278	expected, the C/N ratio was high in the SFs of digestate $(11 - 27)$, low in the whole digestate
279	and evaporator concentrates $(2.3 - 8.4)$, and less than 1 in the organo-mineral BBFs.
280	A higher relative concentration of labile C, indicated by the DOC/TC ratio, was
281	observed in D-GZV, D-WNE, D-BNS, and E-AmP, with 0.19, 0.33, 0.17, and 0.34,
282	respectively. Meanwhile, in the SF fertilisers, DOC constituted a much lower fraction of TC,
283	ranging between $0.01 - 0.03$. The TDN concentration of AW and AS fertilisers were not
284	analytically determined since N in those fertilisers is present almost entirely in dissolved form
285	as NH4 ⁺ -N. Concentrations of TDN in the BBFs varied widely and ranged between 1.3 to 76 g
286	kg ⁻¹ FW. This variation was also reflected in the TDN/TN ratio.
287	

288 **3.2** N₂O emission

N₂O emission dynamics differed considerably among the different treatments. 289 However, the overall trend of N₂O fluxes indicated a gradual decrease towards background 290 levels (Figure 1), in agreement with studies by Cayuela et al. (2010) and Dietrich et al. 291 (2020). Daily mean N₂O fluxes ranged between 5 to 246 μ g N₂O-N m⁻² h⁻¹ and peaked within 292 the first four days after fertiliser application in all treatments, except E-WNE which peaked on 293 day 11. Average daily N₂O emissions from the CAN and urea followed similar flux patterns 294 in the four incubation batches and were not significantly different from each other (p < 0.01). 295 Within each plant, the highest N2O peaks were observed in the D fertilisers except for AmP 296 where the highest peak was measured in E-AmP on day 0. 297

Cumulative N_2O (N_2O_{cum}) emissions among the different groups of fertilisers were not easily differentiated, at least not statistically. Soil amended with urea showed a significantly higher N_2O_{cum} release than most other treatments, except for CAN, D-AmP, D-WNE, E-AmP, E-WNE, and AW-WNE (Table 4). It is important to note that the N_2O_{cum} data for the mineral fertilisers are means of the measurements in the four incubation batches which ranged

303	between 0.11 to 0.14 % of urea N applied and $0.10 - 0.12$ % of CAN N applied. The SF with
304	depleted P (SF-GZV _{P-poor}) and the AS fertilisers induced the lowest N_2O_{cum} emissions (0.04 %
305	of applied N) compared to the other fertilisers. However, this value was not significantly
306	different from SF-GZV, AS-A&S, AS-BNS, D-BNS, LF-WNE, and R-AmP. N ₂ O _{cum}
307	emissions from the D fertilisers from the five plants varied between $0.06 - 0.09$ % of applied
308	N. When considering the end-products originating from the individual biogas plants, the D
309	fertilisers emitted more N_2O_{cum} compared to the fertilisers derived from D processing,
310	although the difference was not statistically significant in A&S and BNS (Table 4).
311	The net N_{rel} from the BBFs and mineral fertilisers expressed as a percentage of applied
312	total N is shown in Table 4. This parameter indicates the amount of fertiliser-derived available
313	N present in the soil at the end of the incubation period under the conditions of the
314	experiment. There were large variations in the net N_{rel} within the different fertiliser groups.
315	The highest N_{rel} was observed in the mineral fertilisers (102 – 108%) and AW-WNE (108%).
316	N immobilisation occurred in the SF with depleted P (SF-GZV _{P-poor}). The net N_{rel} was
317	significantly negatively correlated with C/N ratio (r = 0.67; $p < 0.01$).
318	

319 **3.3 CO₂ emission**

Figure 2 shows the cumulative CO₂ emissions from BBFs where greater than 300 kg 320 C/ha was applied. At the end of the incubation, the D fertilisers mineralised between 13 and 321 52% of applied C. The highest cumulative CO₂ emission was from the D-WNE treatment 322 (p<0.01). Soils amended with SFs of digestate showed a significantly lower release of CO₂ 323 than other soils, with 3 to 8% of applied C mineralised. CO₂ emissions of treatments with 324 AmP, A&S, and BNS fertilisers were not significantly different from each other, probably due 325 to the high variability in the measurements. The CO₂ emission data for CAN, R, LF, AW and 326 AS fertilisers were not shown because they contain little or no organic C, therefore, amounts 327

of C added to soil after their application was deemed to be negligible. Any additional CO₂
emitted was attributed to the positive priming effect of native soil organic C which stimulates
mineralisation (Fontaine et al., 2003). Urea which contains 20% C showed rapid
mineralisation (>70%) within the first 2 days of incubation in all the batches due to its fast
hydrolysis after application to soil.

Table 4 indicates that for most of the fertilisers studied, cumulative CH₄ emissions were lower than the control. The exceptions were E-AmP and E-WNE with net positive emission of 4 and 1 mg m⁻², respectively. However, no significant difference (p<0.05) was observed among the treatments due to high variability in the flux measurements.

339

340

3.5 Principal component and correlation analyses

The overall grouping of individual observations and variable correlations is depicted in 341 Figure 3. CH₄ was not included as a variable in the principal component analysis (PCA) since 342 there was no significant difference in CH₄ emission among the treatments. The first two 343 factors explained 61% of the total variance in all variables. The grouping of individual 344 345 observations shows a separation of the different BBFs into three distinct groups based on their properties in relation to cumulative N₂O and CO₂. Separation along F1, which accounts for 346 24% of the total variation, was explained by differences in TN, TC, NH₄, OM, C/N, DOC, 347 TDN/TN. The second factor (F2) which accounts for 36% of the total variation, was described 348 by differences in N₂O_{cum} and CO_{2cum} emissions. 349

The D and E fertilisers were grouped at the upper part of the diagram indicating BBFs with the highest average DOC concentrations, pH, and N_2O_{cum} and CO_{2cum} emissions. The SF fertilisers were clustered along the positive quadrant of the F1 axis where the fertilisers with

the highest average TC and C/N ratio are represented. The AS, AW, R and LF fertilisers were
found more displaced along the left side of the F1 axis, where TN, NH₄⁺, and TDN/TN are the
dominant variables.

Significant linear correlations were established between N2Ocum emissions and the 356 characteristics of the different fertiliser groups. When omitting fertilisers LF, R, AW, AS, 357 which are outliers regarding TC (i.e., <5%), N₂O_{cum} correlated negatively with C/N ratio (r = -358 0.68, p < 0.05) and positively with TDN/TN ratio (r = 0.75, p < 0.01). Also, N₂O_{cum} emission 359 from the SF fertilisers was positively related to TN (r = 0.92, p < 0.05) and DOC (r = 0.70, p360 < 0.05). In the dominantly mineral fertilisers (i.e., LF, R, AS, AW), pH appeared to be 361 positively correlated with N_2O_{cum} emissions (r = 0.81), but this relationship was not 362 statistically significant (p = 0.10). 363 Cumulative CO₂ emission in SF, D, and E fertilisers was correlated positively with TN (g 364 kg⁻¹ DW) (r = 0.85, p < 0.01), TDN/TN ratio (r = 0.57, p < 0.05), and DOC/TC ratio (r = 0.83, 365 p < 0.01), and negatively to C/N ratio (r = 0.60, p < 0.05). 366 367

- 368 **4. Discussion**

369

370

4.1 Physicochemical properties of the biobased fertilisers

The high OM and/or N contents of the studied BBFs underline their potential as soil improvers or fertilisers. Elevated OM contents in the SFs of digestate make them better suited as organic soil improvers (Egene et al., 2020; Peters and Jensen, 2011) with the potential to increase C sequestration in soils (Veeken et al., 2017). Drying of the SF of digestate (as in SFD-AmP and SFD-WNE), concentrates the N (24 and 31 g kg⁻¹, respectively), making them also applicable as N or P fertilisers (Regelink et al., 2021). On the other hand, ammonia stripping of the LF of digestate produces pure mineral N fertilisers – as in AW-WNE, AS- A&S and AS-BNS with total N contents of 53, 76, and 41 g kg⁻¹, respectively. The large
variation in total N within the D fertilisers was attributed to differences in the N contents of
the feedstock. The D with the highest total N content was obtained from GZV where animal
waste constituted a high proportion (81% w/w) of the feedstock. On the other hand, D
obtained from the processing of industrial food waste had the lowest total N content.
The pH of the studied BBFs was mostly alkaline which can influence soil pH and
processes, including nutrient availability and nitrification rate. Fertilisers with a strong

volatilisation when applied to soils. Low pH in some BBFs was related to the use of sulphuric acid during digestate processes. For example, SF-GZV_{P-poor} (pH 5.5) was treated with sulphuric acid to lower its P content. Similarly, the digestate acidification step before vacuum evaporation explains the slightly acidic pH of E-AmP (pH 6.2).

alkaline character, as was measured in AW-WNE (pH 9.7), indicates a high risk of NH₃

385

For most of the BBFs, the TDN concentration, which represents the sum of dissolved 390 organic N and mineral N (Christou et al., 2005), was higher than the NH₄⁺ concentration. This 391 indicates the presence of a sizeable dissolved organic N pool in the BBFs, especially in E-392 WNE. As explained in section 2.1, E-WNE is the concentrate that is obtained after NH₃ is 393 evaporated from the LF of digestate. This explains the low NH₄⁺ content in the fertiliser. 394 395 The PCA of variables related to the cumulative N₂O and CO₂ emissions showed a clear separation among the different groups of BBFs. TC and C/N ratio were the most important 396 variables for separating the SF fertilisers from the others (along F2), while DOC and DOC/TC 397 ratio differentiated the D and E fertilisers from the LF, R, AW and AS fertilisers. Except for 398 SF_GZV_{P-poor}, the TOC/N ratio in the BBFs was below 20 which is favourable for N 399 mineralisation (Mendham et al., 2004; Wagner and Wolf., 1999). In organic substrates with a 400 high C/N ratio as in SF_GZV_{P-poor} (27), mineralisation is slow and N immobilisation may 401 dominate (Egene et al., 2020). 402

4.2 N₂O emissions and N mineralisation

The principal factors that regulate soil-borne N₂O emissions are soil mineral N 404 concentration, availability of decomposable organic C, soil moisture, soil temperature, soil 405 pH, and the activity of (de)nitrifying organisms (Dalal et al., 2003; Šimek and Cooper, 2002; 406 Wang et al., 2021). In this study, we aimed to create the conditions optimal for N_2O 407 production by using soil with a neutral pH, pre-incubating the soil for one week to activate 408 microorganisms, and maintaining a high WFPS (80%) (Cayuela et al., 2010). As such, 409 differences in N₂O flux from the different treatments may be attributable to differences in 410 mineral N and labile organic C availability. The N2O emissions in the first days of incubation 411 412 were likely driven by nitrification of the initial NH₄⁺ present in the fertilisers (Alburquerque et al., 2012a; Askri et al., 2016; de la Fuente et al., 2013; Egene et al., 2020). Some studies 413 (Askri et al., 2016; Pampillón-González et al., 2017) on digestate fertilised soils reported 414 positive correlations between N₂O_{cum} emissions and the initial NH₄⁺ content in the digestate. 415 However, this was not observed in the current study. This may be because NH4⁺ was not a 416 limiting factor in most of the fertilisers investigated, except for E-WNE which has a low 417 NH₄⁺/TN ratio of 0.026. Moreover, the mineral N content at the end of the incubation in all 418 treatments mainly consisted of NO₃⁻-N (Table 4) which supports our assumption that NH₄⁺ in 419 420 the treatments was nitrified (or immobilized) during the 18-day incubation. The urea fertilised soil produced the highest N₂O_{cum} emission with 0.12% of applied 421 N, although this value was not statistically differentiated from CAN, D-AmP, D-WNE, E-422

AmP, E-WNE, and AW-WNE. Generally, mineral N fertilisers quickly dissolve after addition
to soil leading to increased NH₄⁺ availability followed by nitrification and N₂O production
(Saggar et al., 2013a; van der Weerden et al., 2016). The hydrolysis of urea or the dissolution

426 of CAN in the soil can result in the loss of NH_3 which is a precursor to the formation of N_2O

427 (Forrestal et al., 2016; Huang et al., 2014; Saggar et al., 2013b). It is, therefore, conceivable

428	that the high N_2O emissions observed in urea and CAN may be due to the combination of
429	direct N_2O production (from nitrification of NH_4^+) and the indirect N_2O release (due to NH_3
430	oxidation). This phenomenon could also explain the high N_2O emission from the soil
431	amended with NH ₃ -water (AW-WNE).
432	Despite their high mineral N contents (~100%), significantly lower N ₂ O emissions
433	were measured in AS-BNS and AS-A&S compared to the mineral fertiliser treatments. This
434	was attributed to the low pH of the AS fertilisers which inhibits N_2O production from
435	nitrification (Dalal et al., 2003). In contrast, the hydrolysis of urea may have caused
436	alkalinisation of the soil, especially in the microsites close to the urea granules (Clayton et al.,
437	1997), thereby creating conditions more favourable for N_2O production from nitrification
438	(Dalal et al., 2003). Similar observations were found in other studies that compared N_2O
439	emissions between mineral AS, urea, and nitrate fertilisers (Clayton et al., 1997; Tierling and
440	Kuhlmann, 2018). According to Clayton et al. (1997), N_2O_{cum} emissions from a clayey-loam
441	soil fertilised with AS, urea, and calcium nitrate over 12 months were 0.2, 0.8, and 0.5% of
442	applied N, respectively. Meanwhile, Tierling and Kuhlmann (2018) performed a 21-day
443	incubation of a loamy-sand soil supplemented with AS, urea, and potassium nitrate fertilisers
444	and reported N_2O_{cum} emissions of 0.07, 0.26, and 0.02% of applied N, respectively. In both
445	studies, differences in N ₂ O production between the fertilisers were also attributed to pH
446	effects in the soil.

447 Cumulative N₂O emissions from the D, SF, E, LF and R fertilisers could hardly be 448 differentiated, at least not statistically. The exception was the SF with depleted P (SF-GZV_P. 449 $_{poor}$) which induced significantly lower N₂O emissions compared to the other fertilisers. As 450 previously described, the low emissions may have been caused by the acidic pH (5.5) of SF-451 GZV_{P-poor}. However, its high C/N ratio (27) may have also played an important role in 452 limiting nitrification (Egene et al., 2020) and consequently, N₂O production. Elevated C/N

ratio in organic substrates slows down their decomposition and subsequent release of DOC and NH_4^+ through mineralisation, both of which are linked to increased N₂O emissions (Huang et al., 2004). Among the SF fertilisers, differences in C/N ratio (r = -0.87) and DOC (r = 0.70) could explain the variation in N₂O emission. Similar results were reported by Huang et al. (2004) who found that N₂O_{cum} of N₂O were negatively correlated with C/N ratio and positively correlated with DOC of solid organic residues after a 21-day incubation study.

The pH effect described above was not apparent in E-WNE which has a slightly acidic 459 pH of 6.2 but produced N₂O_{cum} emission comparable to the mineral fertilisers (Table 4). 460 Remarkably, soil amended with E-WNE emitted less than the control at the start of incubation 461 462 before showing rapid N₂O release from the ninth day (Figure 1). This was attributed to its low initial NH_4^+ (0.26 g kg⁻¹) meaning there was almost no readily available N to be nitrified. This 463 N deficiency enhanced microbial decomposition of labile organic matter to obtain N, 464 465 otherwise known as "microbial mining" (Craine et al., 2007; Moorhead and Sinsabaugh, 2006) which resulted in temporary N immobilisation in the first days of the incubation. The 466 high TDN concentration in E-WNE (7.9 g kg⁻¹) indicates that microorganisms could easily 467 access the dissolved organic N in the fertilisers to release NH4⁺. At this point, nitrification of 468 the released mineral N could progress rapidly. 469

Despite the short duration of our incubation experiment (18 days), the N₂O_{cum} values 470 for D fertilisers were strongly agreed with results from a 110-day field study by Baral et al. 471 (2017) who measured N₂O_{cum} of 0.10% of applied N due to digestate fertilisation applied at 472 167 kg N ha⁻¹. Nitrification of NH₄⁺-N in fertilised "hotspots" within the soil, characterized 473 by enhanced microbial activity and oxygen demand, was determined as the principal factor 474 controlling N₂O production, with most of the emissions occurring in the first 35 days. After a 475 one year investigation of N₂O emissions from mineral and organic fertilisers, Meijide et al. 476 (2009) also reported N₂O_{cum} emissions of 0.12 and 0.11% of applied N from digestate and 477

urea fertilised agricultural fields, respectively. The authors determined that nitrification and
denitrification occurred at different stages of the experiment but concluded that environmental
factors, mainly WFPS, strongly influenced N₂O emission rates.

Overall, the results from our incubation study show that the differences in N₂O 481 emission flux among the BBFs were small and in some cases, marginal. Therefore, the rate of 482 N₂O emissions was probably more affected by the soil type and condition than by the fertiliser 483 properties. In a study by Abubaker et al. (2013), large differences in N₂O emissions were 484 found between different biogas residues when incubated for 24 days a sandy and clayey soil. 485 However, the same digestate showed comparable N2Ocum emissions when they were 486 487 incubated in loamy soil, with values between 0.08 to 0.09% of applied N. The characteristics of the soil used in our study closely resemble the loam soil used in Abubaker et al.'s (2013) 488 study, at least in terms of soil texture. This suggests that the BBFs discussed in this study may 489 490 induce different N₂O emission fluxes when incubated in differently textured soils.

491

492 **4.3 CO₂ emissions**

Cumulative CO₂ emissions from the soils amended with the D, E, and SF fertilisers 493 were related to the proportion of readily available C, as evidenced by the strong positive 494 495 correlation between CO_{2cum} emission and DOC/TC ratio (r = 0.83). Cysneiros et al. (2008) and Jacobi et al. (2009) have previously shown that considerable amounts of volatile fatty 496 acids are formed as intermediates during AD. These organic compounds are easily 497 metabolized by soil microorganisms within a few days, releasing CO₂ in the process. The 498 slower C mineralisation in the SF treatments (3.5 - 7% of applied C) suggests that the organic 499 C in SF fertilisers is more stable than those in the D and E fertilisers. This may be because 500 solid-liquid separation of the whole digestate resulted in the separation of the stable 501 particulate C, mainly associated with the solid phase, from the easily degradable C which 502

remained mostly in the liquid phase. These results reaffirm the findings from other incubation 503 504 studies with biogas residues, that the availability of labile C favours the production of soilborne CO₂ (Askri et al., 2016; Cardelli et al., 2018; Mukherjee et al., 2016). 505 It is worth noting that the enhanced degradation of native soil C (priming effect) 506 and/or the reduction of carbonates in the fertilisers may have contributed to the CO₂ emissions 507 in the BBF-fertilised soils (Kuzyakov et al., 2000; Yoshida et al., 2015). However, the 508 differentiation of the origins of soil-borne CO₂ emissions was not investigated in this study. 509 510 4.4 CH₄ emissions 511

512 The low CH₄ emissions from the treatments highlight the fact the incubations were carried out under sufficiently aerobic conditions. Our results are in agreement with studies by 513 Odlare et al. (2012) and Pampillón-González et al. (2017) who reported negative or negligible 514 CH₄ emissions from the soil after the application of biogas residues. In this study, CH₄ 515 oxidation was likely driven by the presence of methanotrophic (CH₄ oxidizing) bacteria in the 516 soil whose activity was stimulated by the addition of N fertiliser. Conrad (1996) and Steven et 517 al. (2006) testified that agricultural soils are common habitats for methanotrophic bacteria 518 who, in the presence of oxygen, utilize CH₄ as a source of carbon and energy. 519

520

521

4.5 Global warming potential

The global warming potential (GWP) of N₂O and CH₄ emissions were determined and expressed as CO₂ equivalents per 100 grams of N added, using a conversion factor of 298 for N₂O and 25 for CH₄ (IPCC, 2007). CO₂ emission was not considered for GWP emissions calculation since, from the life cycle assessment perspective, the biodegradation of organic matter releases biogenic carbon (USEPA, 2010; WRI, 2014). Therefore, the mineralization of BBFs in soils does not contribute to the net increase of CO₂. As shown in Figure 4, the GWP of the BBFs was either equal to or lower than the GWP of the mineral fertilisers. In all the fertilisers, N₂O emissions contributed significantly more to GWP than CH₄ emissions. Generally, CH₄ was taken up rather than emitted, however, the benefit gained by CH₄ consumption was offset by the increase in N₂O emissions. The fertilisers derived from the NRR processing of digestate appear to decrease the GWP relative to the unprocessed digestate fertilisers. This trend is particularly noticeable in fertilisers from WNE and AmP.

GWP values varied between 0.08 and 0.35 kg CO_2 eq kg⁻¹ N and are hence low as 535 compared to values obtained from long-term field studies. Over ten months, Zilio et al. (2022) 536 measured net N_2O_{cum} emissions between 1.2 and 3% of N applied, from digestate+AS and 537 urea+AS fertilised fields, corresponding to 3.80 and 9.84 kg CO₂ eq kg⁻¹ N, respectively. The 538 authors concluded that the environmental impact in terms of GHG emissions from fertilisation 539 540 with the tested BBFs or urea were comparable, in agreement with findings from this study. Meanwhile, Walling and Vaneeckhaute (2020) found in their review that N2O-derived GWP 541 due to digestate fertilisation can range between 0.15 to 17.6 kg CO_2 eq kg⁻¹ N, depending on 542 the application technique. This means that the impact of GHG emissions related to the 543 application of digestate N fertilisers could still exceed the impact of synthetic N fertilisers and 544 hence, N₂O emissions from N fertilising products from digestates remain a point of 545 environmental concern. 546

547

4.6 Limitations of the laboratory incubation approach

The microcosm approach employed in this study enables the close monitoring and
quantification of fertilisation effects on soil GHG emissions and C and N turnover processes.
However, the standardized conditions (for temperature and moisture) under which the
incubations were performed greatly differ from field conditions. Generally, field

measurements give higher N₂O emissions due to pulses of N₂O release after a rainfall event or
from management practices such as tillage (Wang et al., 2021). The method of fertiliser
application also influences the N₂O production dynamics as reported by Velthof and
Mosquera (2011) who found that injection of slurry increased the average emission factor of
N₂O in comparison to surface application.

Furthermore, our incubation was performed only on sandy-loam soil even though 557 fertilisation effects on GHG emissions are modulated by soil texture (Pelster et al., 2012). A 558 meta-analysis by Charles et al. (2017) found that N₂O emissions from fertilisation were 2.8 559 times greater in fine- than in coarse-textured soils. Future studies should investigate the effect 560 561 of soil texture on GHG emissions from BBF enriched soils through similar microcosm incubation experiments. Finally, other pathways of N losses such as NH₃ and N₂ emissions as 562 well as NO₃⁻ leaching were currently not explored. Quantifying these loss pathways is 563 564 necessary to get a full picture of soil N cycling after fertilisation with BBFs and should be investigated in future studies. 565

566 **5. Conclusions**

The key finding from this study was that none of the biobased fertilisers (BBFs) 567 emitted more N₂O than the mineral N fertilisers (urea and calcium ammonium nitrate). Soil-568 borne N2O emission from the BBFs was attributed to nitrification of the initial ammonium N 569 shortly after the fertilisers were applied. Differences in C/N ratio and TDN/TN ratio could 570 partly explain the variation in N₂O emissions in the unprocessed digestate, evaporator 571 concentrates, and solid and liquid fractions of digestate. CO2 respiration in the BBF 572 treatments was strongly influenced by the availability of labile C while CH₄ emissions due to 573 fertilisation were negligible. Global warming potential (GWP) of the BBFs was comparable 574 575 or lower than that of the mineral fertilisers. Furthermore, the GWP of BBFs derived from the

576	processing of digestate was generally lower than that of whole digestate. These findings not
577	only revealed the important factors driving short-term GHG emissions in BBF-fertilised soils,
578	but also suggested that the refinement of digestate into concentrated fertilising products does
579	not increase the risk of soil-borne GHG emissions.
580	
581	
582	6. References
583	
584	Abubaker, J., Odlare, M., Pell, M., 2013. Nitrous Oxide Production from Soils Amended with
585	Biogas Residues and Cattle Slurry. J. Environ. Qual. 42, 1046–1058.
586	https://doi.org/10.2134/jeq2012.0247
587	Addinsoft, 2021. XLSTAT statistical and data analysis solution.
588	Akiyama, H., Yagi, K., Yan, X., 2005. Direct N2O emissions from rice paddy fields:
589	Summary of available data. Global Biogeochem. Cycles 19, 1–10.
590	https://doi.org/10.1029/2004GB002378
591	Alburquerque, J.A., de la Fuente, C., Ferrer-Costa, A., Carrasco, L., Cegarra, J., Abad, M.,
592	Bernal, M.P., 2012. Assessment of the fertiliser potential of digestates from farm and
593	agroindustrial residues. Biomass Bioenerg. 40, 181–189.
594	https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biombioe.2012.02.018
595	Askri, A., Laville, P., Trémier, A., Houot, S., 2016. Influence of Origin and Post-treatment on
596	Greenhouse Gas Emissions After Anaerobic Digestate Application to Soil. Waste and
597	Biomass Valorization 7, 293-306. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12649-015-9452-6
598	Baral, K.R., Labouriau, R., Olesen, J.E., Petersen, S.O., 2017. Nitrous oxide emissions and
599	nitrogen use efficiency of manure and digestates applied to spring barley. Agric. Ecosyst.
600	Environ. 239, 188–198. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2017.01.012

- Bertsch, F., Ostinelli, M., 2019. Standard operating procedure for soil total carbon, Food and
 Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Global Soil Laboratory Network
 GLOSOLAN. Rome, Italy.
- Bodelier, P.L.E., Laanbroek, H.J., 2004. Nitrogen as a regulatory factor of methane oxidation
 in soils and sediments. FEMS Microbiol. Ecol. 47, 265–277.
- 606 https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-6496(03)00304-0
- Bouwman, A.F., 1990. Exchange of greenhouse gases between terrestrial ecosystems and the
 atmosphere, in: Bouwman, A.F. (Ed.), Soils and the Greenhouse Effect. Wiley,
- 609 Chichester, pp. 61–127.
- Brienza, C., Sigurnjak, I., Meier, T., Michels, E., Adani, F., Schoumans, O. Vaneeckhaute, C.,
- E., M., 2021. Techno-economic assessment at full scale of a biogas refinery plant
- 612 receiving nitrogen rich feedstock and producing renewable energy and biobased
- 613 fertilisers. J. Clean. Prod. 308, 127408. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2021.127408
- Brienza, C., Sigurnjak, I., Michels, E., Meers, E., 2020. Ammonia Stripping and Scrubbing
- 615 for Mineral Nitrogen Recovery. Biorefinery of Inorganics 95–106.
- 616 https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118921487.ch3-3
- 617 Cai, Y., Wang, X., Ding, W., Tian, L., Zhao, H., Lu, X., 2013. Potential short-term effects of
- yak and Tibetan sheep dung on greenhouse gas emissions in two alpine grassland soils
- under laboratory conditions. Biol. Fertil. Soils. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00374-013-08217
- 621 Cardelli, R., Giussani, G., Marchini, F., Saviozzi, A., 2018. Short-term effects on soil of
- biogas digestate, biochar and their combinations. Soil Res. 56, 623–631.
- 623 https://doi.org/10.1071/SR18017
- 624 Cayuela, Maria Luz, Oenema, O., Kuikman, P.J., Bakker, R.R., van groenigen, J.W., 2010.
- Bioenergy by-products as soil amendments? Implications for carbon sequestration and

- greenhouse gas emissions. GCB Bioenergy 2, 201–213. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.17571707.2010.01055.x
- 628 Cayuela, M. L., Velthof, G.L., Mondini, C., Sinicco, T., van Groenigen, J.W., 2010. Nitrous
- oxide and carbon dioxide emissions during initial decomposition of animal by-products
 applied as fertilisers to soils. Geoderma 157, 235–242.
- 631 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoderma.2010.04.026
- 632 Charles, A., Rochette, P., Whalen, J.K., Angers, D.A., Chantigny, M.H., Bertrand, N., 2017.
- Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment Global nitrous oxide emission factors from
- agricultural soils after addition of organic amendments: A meta-analysis. Agric. Ecosyst.
- 635 Environ. 236, 88–98. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2016.11.021
- 636 Christou, M., Avramides, E.J., Roberts, J.P., Jones, D.L., 2005. Dissolved organic nitrogen in
- 637 contrasting agricultural ecosystems. Soil Biol. Biochem. 37, 1560–1563.
- 638 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soilbio.2005.01.025
- 639 Clayton, H., McTaggart, I.P., Parker, J., Swan, L., Smith, K.A., 1997. Nitrous oxide
- emissions from fertilised grassland: A 2-year study of the effects of N fertiliser form and
- environmental conditions. Biol. Fertil. Soils 25, 252–260.
- 642 https://doi.org/10.1007/s003740050311
- 643 Comeau, L.P., Lai, D.Y.F., Cui, J.J., Hartill, J., 2018. Soil heterotrophic respiration
- assessment using minimally disturbed soil microcosm cores. MethodsX 5, 834–840.
- 645 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mex.2018.07.014
- 646 Conrad, R., 1996. Soil microorganisms as controllers of atmospheric trace gases (H2, CO,
- 647 CH4, OCS, N2O, and NO). Microbiol. Rev. 60, 609–640.
- 648 https://doi.org/10.1128/mr.60.4.609-640.1996
- 649 Craine, J.M., Morrow, C., Fierer, N., 2007. Microbial nitrogen limitation increases
- decomposition. Ecology 88, 2105–2113. https://doi.org/10.1890/06-1847.1

- 651 Cysneiros, D., Banks, C.J., Heaven, S., 2008. Anaerobic digestion of maize in coupled leach-
- bed and anaerobic filter reactors. Water Sci. Technol. 58, 1505–1511.

653 https://doi.org/10.2166/wst.2008.518

- 654 Czubaszek, R., Wysocka-Czubaszek, A., 2018. Emissions of carbon dioxide and methane
- 655 from fields fertilized with digestate from an agricultural biogas plant. Int. Agrophysics
- 656 32, 29–37. https://doi.org/10.1515/intag-2016-0087
- Dalal, R.C., Wang, W., Robertson, G.P., Parton, W.J., 2003. Nitrous oxide emission from
 Australian agricultural lands and mitigation options: a review. Aust. J. Soil Res. 41, 165–
 195.
- 660 De Neve, S., Hofman, G., 1996. Modelling N mineralization of vegetable crop residues
- during laboratory incubations. Soil Biol. Biochem. 28, 1451–1457.

662 https://doi.org/10.1016/S0038-0717(96)00154-X

- Dean, W.E.J., 1974. Determination of carbonate and organic matter in calcareous sediments
 and sedimentary rocks by loss on ignition: comparison with other methods. J. Sediment.
- 665 Petrol. 242–248.
- Dietrich, M., Fongen, M., Foereid, B., 2020. Greenhouse gas emissions from digestate in soil.
- 667 Int. J. Recycl. Org. Waste Agric. 9, 1–19. https://doi.org/10.15036/arerugi.45.811_1
- 668 Egene, C.E., Sigurnjak, I., Regelink, I.C., Schoumans, O.F., Adani, F., Michels, E., Sleutel,
- 669 S., Tack, F.M.G., Meers, E., 2020. Solid fraction of separated digestate as soil improver:
- 670 implications for soil fertility and carbon sequestration. J. Soils Sediments.
- 671 https://doi.org/10.1007/s11368-020-02792-z
- Ehlert, P., Sigurnjak, I., Meers, E., Verbeke, M., Adani, F., Zilio, M., Tambone, F.,
- 673 Schoumans, O., 2019. Nitrogen fertilising products based on manure and organic
- residues Supporting literature of the SYSTEMIC factsheets. Wageningen.
- EN13654-1, 2002. Soil improvers and growing media Determination of nitrogen Part 1:

- 676 Modified Kjeldahl method. Brussels.
- 677 Fontaine, S., Mariotti, A., Abbadie, L., 2003. The priming effect of organic matter: A
- question of microbial competition? Soil Biol. Biochem. 35, 837–843.
- 679 https://doi.org/10.1016/S0038-0717(03)00123-8
- 680 Forrestal, P.J., Harty, M., Carolan, R., Lanigan, G.J., Watson, C.J., Laughlin, R.J., Mcneill,
- G., Chambers, B.J., Richards, K.G., 2016. Ammonia emissions from urea, stabilized urea
- and calcium ammonium nitrate: Insights into loss abatement in temperate grassland. Soil
- 683 Use Manag. 32, 92–100. https://doi.org/10.1111/sum.12232
- Hattori, A., 1983. Denitrification and dissimilatory nitrate reduction, in: Carpenter, E.J.,
- 685 Capone, D.G. (Eds.), Nitrogen in the Marine Environment. Academic Press, Inc., pp.
- 686 191–232. https://doi.org/10.1016/b978-0-12-160280-2.50014-6
- Holland, E.A., Weitz, A.M., 2003. Nitrogen Cycle, Biological Elisabeth, in: Encyclopedia of
 Physical Science and Technology. pp. 441–448.
- Holm-Nielsen, J.B., Al Seadi, T., Oleskowicz-Popiel, P., 2009. The future of anaerobic
- digestion and biogas utilization. Bioresour. Technol. 100, 5478–5484.
- 691 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2008.12.046
- Houba, V.J.G., Novozamsky, I., Lexmond, T.M., Jvnn Der, L., 1990. Applicability of 0.01 M
- 693 CaCl2 as a single extraction solution for the assessment of the nutrient status of soils and
- other diagnostic purposes. Commun. Soil Sci. Plant Anal. 21, 2281–2290.
- 695 https://doi.org/10.1080/00103629009368380
- 696 Huang, T., Gao, B., Hu, X.K., Lu, X., Well, R., Christie, P., Bakken, L.R., Ju, X.T., 2014.
- 697 Ammonia-oxidation as an engine to generate nitrous oxide in an intensively managed
- calcareous Fluvo-aquic soil. Sci. Rep. 4, 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1038/srep03950
- Huang, Y., Zou, J., Zheng, X., Wang, Y., Xu, X., 2004. Nitrous oxide emissions as influenced
- by amendment of plant residues with different C:N ratios. Soil Biol. Biochem. 36, 973–

- 701 981. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soilbio.2004.02.009
- Hütsch, B.W., Wang, X., Feng, K., Yan, F., Schubert, S., 1999. Nitrous oxide emission as
- affected by changes in soil water content and nitrogen fertilization. J. Plant Nutr. Soil
- 704 Sci. 162, 607–613. https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1522-2624(199912)162:6<607::AID-
- 705 JPLN607>3.0.CO;2-0
- ⁷⁰⁶ IPCC, 2007. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the
- 707 Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Cambridge University Press.
- 708 https://doi.org/10.1256/wea.58.04
- 709 IPCC, 2006. N2O emissions from managed soils, and CO2 emissions from lime and urea
- application, IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories.
- Jacobi, H.F., Moschner, C.R., Hartung, E., 2009. Use of near infrared spectroscopy in
- monitoring of volatile fatty acids in anaerobic digestion. Water Sci. Technol. 60, 339–
- 713 346. https://doi.org/10.2166/wst.2009.345
- Jamaludin, Z., Rollings-Scattergood, S., Lutes, K., Vaneeckhaute, C., 2018. Evaluation of
- sustainable scrubbing agents for ammonia recovery from anaerobic digestate. Bioresour.

716 Technol. 270, 596–602. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2018.09.007

- Johansen, A., Carter, M.S., Jensen, E.S., Hauggard-Nielsen, H., Ambus, P., 2013. Effects of
- digestate from anaerobically digested cattle slurry and plant materials on soil microbial
- community and emission of CO2 and N2O. Appl. Soil Ecol. 63, 36–44.
- 720 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apsoil.2012.09.003
- Kuzyakov, Y., Friedel, J.K., Stahr, K., 2000. Review of mechanisms and quantification of
 priming effects. Soil Biol. Biochem. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0038-0717(00)00084-5
- Le Roux, X., Schmid, B., Poly, F., Barnard, R.L., Niklaus, P.A., Guillaumaud, N., Habekost,
- M., Oelmann, Y., Philippot, L., Salles, J.F., Schloter, M., Steinbeiss, S., Weigelt, A.,
- 725 2013. Soil Environmental Conditions and Microbial Build-Up Mediate the Effect of

Plant Diversity on Soil Nitrifying and Denitrifying Enzyme Activities in Temperate

Grasslands. PLoS One 8. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0061069

- Liu, J., Zang, H., Xu, H., Zhang, K., Jiang, Y., Hu, Y., Zeng, Z., 2019. Methane emission and
- soil microbial communities in early rice paddy as influenced by urea-N fertilization.
- 730 Plant Soil 445, 85–100. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11104-019-04091-0
- Logan, M., Visvanathan, C., 2019. Management strategies for anaerobic digestate of organic
- fraction of municipal solid waste: Current status and future prospects. Waste Manag.
- 733 Res. 37, 27–39. https://doi.org/10.1177/0734242X18816793
- 734 Meijide, A., García-Torres, L., Arce, A., Vallejo, A., 2009. Nitrogen oxide emissions affected
- by organic fertilization in a non-irrigated Mediterranean barley field. Agric. Ecosyst.
- 736 Environ. 132, 106–115. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2009.03.005
- 737 Mendham, D.S., Heagney, E.C., Corbeels, M., O'Connell, A.M., Grove, T.S., McMurtrie,
- R.E., 2004. Soil particulate organic matter effects on nitrogen availability after
- afforestation with Eucalyptus globulus. Soil Biol. Biochem. 36, 1067–1074.
- 740 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soilbio.2004.02.018
- 741 Möller, K., 2009. Influence of different manuring systems with and without biogas digestion
- on soil organic matter and nitrogen inputs, flows and budgets in organic cropping
- systems. Nutr. Cycl. Agroecosystems 84, 179–202. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10705-0089236-5
- Moorhead, D.L., Sinsabaugh, R.L., 2006. A theoretical model of litter decay and microbial
 interaction. Ecol. Monogr. 76, 151–174. https://doi.org/10.1890/0012-
- 747 9615(2006)076[0151:ATMOLD]2.0.CO;2
- Mukherjee, S., Weihermueller, L., Tappe, W., Vereecken, H., Burauel, P., 2016. Microbial
- respiration of biochar- and digestate-based mixtures. Biol. Fertil. Soils 52, 151–164.
- 750 https://doi.org/10.1007/s00374-015-1060-x

751	Odlare, M., Abubaker, J., Lindmark, J., Pell, M., Thorin, E., Nehrenheim, E., 2012. Emissions
752	of N2O and CH4 from agricultural soils amended with two types of biogas residues.
753	Biomass and Bioenergy 44, 112-116. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biombioe.2012.05.006
754	Pampillón-González, L., Luna-Guido, M., Ruíz-Valdiviezo, V.M., Franco-Hernández, O.,
755	Fernández-Luqueño, F., Paredes-López, O., Hernández, G., Dendooven, L., 2017.
756	Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Growth of Wheat Cultivated in Soil Amended with
757	Digestate from Biogas Production. Pedosphere 27, 318–327.
758	https://doi.org/10.1016/S1002-0160(17)60319-9
759	Pelster, D.E., Chantigny, M.H., Rochette, P., Angers, D.A., Rieux, C., Vanasse, A., 2012.
760	Nitrous Oxide Emissions Respond Diff erently to Mineral and Organic Nitrogen Sources
761	in Contrasting Soil Types. J. Environ. Qual. 41, 427–435.
762	https://doi.org/10.2134/jeq2011.0261
763	Peters, K., Jensen, L.S., 2011. Biochemical characteristics of solid fractions from animal
764	slurry separation and their effects on C and N mineralisation in soil. Biol. Fertil. Soils 47,
765	447-455. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00374-011-0550-8
766	Pezzolla, D., Bol, R., Gigliotti, G., Sawamoto, T., López, A.L., Cardenas, L., Chadwick, D.,
767	2012. Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from soils amended with digestate derived from
768	anaerobic treatment of food waste. Rapid Commun. Mass Spectrom. 26, 2422-2430.
769	https://doi.org/10.1002/rcm.6362
770	Regelink, I.C., Egene, C.E., Tack, F.M.G., Meers, E., 2021. Speciation of P in solid organic
771	fertilisers from digestate and biowaste. Agronomy 11.
772	https://doi.org/10.3390/agronomy11112233

- Rosace, M.C., Veronesi, F., Briggs, S., Cardenas, L.M., Jeffery, S., 2020. Legacy effects
- override soil properties for CO2 and N2O but not CH4 emissions following digestate
- application to soil. GCB Bioenergy 12, 445–457. https://doi.org/10.1111/gcbb.12688

- Saggar, S., Singh, J., Giltrap, D.L., Zaman, M., Luo, J., Rollo, M., Kim, D.G., Rys, G., Der
- 777 Weerden, T.J. va., 2013a. Quantification of reductions in ammonia emissions from
- fertiliser urea and animal urine in grazed pastures with urease inhibitors for agriculture
- inventory: New Zealand as a case study. Sci. Total Environ. 465, 136–146.
- 780 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2012.07.088
- 781 Saggar, S., Singh, J., Giltrap, D.L., Zaman, M., Luo, J., Rollo, M., Kim, D.G., Rys, G., Der
- 782 Weerden, T.J. va., 2013b. Quantification of reductions in ammonia emissions from
- fertiliser urea and animal urine in grazed pastures with urease inhibitors for agriculture
- inventory: New Zealand as a case study. Sci. Total Environ. 465, 136–146.
- 785 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2012.07.088
- 786 Santisteban, J.I., Mediavilla, R., López-Pamo, E., Dabrio, C.J., Zapata, M.B.R., García,
- J.G.M., Castaño, S., Martínez-Alfaro, P.E., 2004. Loss on ignition: a qualitative or
- quantitative method for organic matter and carbonate mineral content in sediments? J.
- 789 Paleolimnol. 32, 287–299.
- Senbayram, M., Chen, R., Muhling, K.H., Dittert, K., 2010. Contribution of nitrification and
- denitrification to nitrous oxide emissions from soils after application of biogas waste and

other fertilizers. Rapid Commun. Mass Spectrom. 24, 2489–2498.

- 793 https://doi.org/10.1002/rcm
- Shao, R., Deng, L., Yang, Q., Shangguan, Z., 2014. Nitrogen fertilization increase soil carbon
- dioxide efflux of winter wheat field: A case study in Northwest China. Soil Tillage Res.
- 796 143, 164–171. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.still.2014.07.003
- 797 Sigurnjak, I., Brienza, C., Snauwaert, E., De Dobbelaere, A., De Mey, J., Vaneeckhaute, C.,
- Michels, E., Schoumans, O., Adani, F., Meers, E., 2019. Production and performance of
- bio-based mineral fertilizers from agricultural waste using ammonia
- 800 (stripping-)scrubbing technology. Waste Manag. 89, 265–274.

- 801 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wasman.2019.03.043
- Sigurnjak, I., De Waele, J., Michels, E., Tack, F.M.G., Meers, E., De Neve, S., 2017.
- 803 Nitrogen release and mineralization potential of derivatives from nutrient recovery
- processes as substitutes for fossil fuel-based nitrogen fertilizers. Soil Use Manag. 33,
- 805 437–446. https://doi.org/10.1111/sum.12366
- 806 Šimek, M., Cooper, J.E., 2002. The influence of soil pH on denitrification: Progress towards
- the understanding of this interaction over the last 50 years. Eur. J. Soil Sci. 53, 345–354.
 https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2389.2002.00461.x
- Singla, A., Inubushi, K., 2014. Effect of biogas digested liquid on CH4 and N2O flux in
- paddy ecosystem. J. Integr. Agric. 13, 635–640. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2095-
- 811 3119(13)60721-2
- Steven, M.D., Smith, K.L., Beardsley, M.D., Colls, J.J., 2006. Oxygen and methane depletion
 in soil affected by leakage of natural gas. Eur. J. Soil Sci. 57, 800–807.
- 814 https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2389.2005.00770.x
- Tian, H., Yang, J., Xu, R., Lu, C., Canadell, J.G., Davidson, E.A., Jackson, R.B., Arneth, A.,
- 816 Chang, J., Ciais, P., Gerber, S., Ito, A., Joos, F., Lienert, S., Messina, P., Olin, S., Pan,
- S., Peng, C., Saikawa, E., Thompson, R.L., Vuichard, N., Winiwarter, W., Zaehle, S.,
- 818 Zhang, B., 2019. Global soil nitrous oxide emissions since the preindustrial era estimated
- by an ensemble of terrestrial biosphere models: Magnitude, attribution, and uncertainty.
- Glob. Chang. Biol. 25, 640–659. https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.14514
- Tierling, J., Kuhlmann, H., 2018. Emissions of nitrous oxide (N2O) affected by pH-related
- nitrite accumulation during nitrification of N fertilizers. Geoderma 310, 12–21.
- 823 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoderma.2017.08.040
- van der Weerden, T.J., Luo, J., Di, H.J., Podolyan, A., Phillips, R.L., Saggar, S., de Klein,
- 825 C.A.M., Cox, N., Ettema, P., Rys, G., 2016. Nitrous oxide emissions from urea fertiliser

- and effluent with and without inhibitors applied to pasture. Agric. Ecosyst. Environ. 219,
- 827 58–70. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2015.12.006
- 828 Vaneeckhaute, C., Lebuf, V., Michels, E., Belia, E., Vanrolleghem, P.A., Tack, F.M.G.,
- Meers, E., 2017. Nutrient Recovery from Digestate: Systematic Technology Review and
- Product Classification. Waste and Biomass Valorization 8, 21–40.
- 831 https://doi.org/10.1007/s12649-016-9642-x
- Veeken, A., Adani, F., Fangueiro, D., Jensen, S., 2017. The value of recycling organic matter
 to soils: Classification as organic fertiliser or organic soil improver. EIP-AGRI Focus Gr.
- 834 Nutr. Recycl. 10.
- 835 Velthof, G.L., Mosquera, J., 2011. The impact of slurry application technique on nitrous oxide
- emission from agricultural soils. Agric. Ecosyst. Environ. 140, 298–308.
- 837 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2010.12.017
- 838 Vondra, M., Touš, M., Teng, S.Y., 2019. Digestate evaporation treatment in biogas plants: A
- techno-economic assessment by Monte Carlo, neural networks and decision trees. J.
- 840 Clean. Prod. 238. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.117870
- 841 Walling, E., Vaneeckhaute, C., 2020. Greenhouse gas emissions from inorganic and organic
- 842 fertilizer production and use: A review of emission factors and their variability. J.
- Environ. Manage. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2020.111211
- 844 Wang, C., Amon, B., Schulz, K., Mehdi, B., 2021. Factors that influence nitrous oxide
- emissions from agricultural soils as well as their representation in simulation models: A
- review. Agronomy 11. https://doi.org/10.3390/agronomy11040770
- 847 Yoshida, H., Nielsen, M.P., Scheutz, C., Jensen, L.S., Christensen, T.H., Nielsen, S., Bruun,
- 848 S., 2015. Effects of sewage sludge stabilization on fertilizer value and greenhouse gas
- emissions after soil application. Acta Agric. Scand. Sect. B Soil Plant Sci. 65, 506–516.
- 850 https://doi.org/10.1080/09064710.2015.1027730

- Zilio, M., Pigoli, A., Rizzi, B., Herrera, A., Tambone, F., Geromel, G., Meers, E., Schoumans,
- 852 O., Giordano, A., Adani, F., 2022. Using highly stabilized digestate and digestate-
- derived ammonium sulphate to replace synthetic fertilizers: The effects on soil,
- environment, and crop production. Sci. Total Environ. 815, 152919.
- 855 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2022.152919
- 856



Figure 1. Kinetics of N2O emission rates measured during incubation of digestate-derived biobased fertilisers (A-E) and mineral N fertilisers (F), applied to a sandy-loam soil. Values are means with standard deviation represented by vertical bars; n = 3 for the BBFs; For control, urea and CAN, data points represent the means of measurements in the four incubation batches, n = 9). For abbreviations, refer to Table 1 in Materials and methods.



Figure 2. Cumulative CO₂ emission measured during incubation of digestate-derived biobased fertilisers applied to a sandy-loam soil. Different lower-case letters indicate significant differences between C mineralisation means according to Tukey's test (p<0.05). Values are means with standard deviations represented by vertical bars (n = 3). For abbreviations, refer to Table 1 in Materials and methods.





Figure 3. Biplot showing ordination of the BBFs (blue text) based on a PCA of variables (red 81 text) related to cumulative N₂O and CO₂ emissions. F1 explains 36% of the variance in the 82 data and F2 explains 24% of the variance in the data. Variables far from the centre and close 83 to each other are significantly positively correlated (Pearson's correlation; r close to 1); 84 Variables in orthogonal positions are not correlated (r close to 0); variables on opposite sides 85 of the origin are significantly negatively correlated (r close to -1). The arrows point in the 86 direction of treatments with an above-average signal. Variable abbreviations: OM: organic 87 matter; TN: total N; TC: total C; DOC: dissolved organic carbon; TDN: total dissolved N; 88 C/N: carbon to nitrogen ratio. For abbreviations of BBFs, refer to Table 1 in Materials and 89 methods. 90



- 121 18 days. For abbreviations, refer to Table 1 in Materials and methods.

Inputs	Code	Fertiliser and processing information
Pig slurry (81% w/w) and	D-GZV	Digestate, unprocessed
residues from agro-food industry	SF-GZV	Solid fraction (SF) of digestate, separated via decanter
(a.o. grain and rice husk, potato		centrifugation
skins and coffee grounds, 19%	$SF-GZV_{P-poor}$	Low phosphorus (P) soil improver, obtained after
w/w).		leaching P from GZV-SF with water and sulphuric acid
	R-GZV	Reverse osmosis concentrate, obtained after the liquid
		fraction (LF) of digestate is treated via dissolved air
		floatation and membrane filtration
Residues from food processing	D-AmP	Digestate, unprocessed
industry and source-segregated	SF-AmP	Solid fraction of digestate, separated via decanter
food waste		centrifugation
	SFD-AmP	Dried SF of digestate, obtained after drying AmP-SF in
		fluidized bed dryer at 60 °C
	E-AmP	Evaporator concentrate, obtained after the LF of
		digestate is passed through a vacuum evaporator
	R-AmP	Reverse osmosis concentrate, obtained after ammonia
		water from vacuum evaporator is treated via reverse
		osmosis.
Residues from agro-industry	D-WNE	Digestate, unprocessed
(potatoes and grain, 40% w/w),	LF-WNE	LF of digestate, separated via decanter centrifugation
sludge from industrial wastewater	E-WNE	Evaporator concentrate, the fraction of LF of digestate
treatment plants (15% w/w) and		retained after NH3 removed via evaporation
animal manure (45% w/w)	SFD-WNE	Dried SF of digestate, obtained after drying the SF of
		digestate in a Hydrogone dryer
	AW-WNE	Condensed ammonia water, obtained after NH3-rich gas
		is condensed with water vapour
Sewage sludge from wastewater	D-A&S	Digestate, unprocessed
treatment plants (86% w/w) and	AS-A&S	Ammonium sulphate solution, obtained after ammonia is
coproducts (digestate from		extracted from biogas using H ₂ SO ₄
anaerobic treatment of source-		
segregated domestic food waste,		
14% w/w)		
Energy crops (silage maize, silage	D-BNS	Digestate, unprocessed
rye and corn, 85% w/w) and	AS-BNS	Ammonium sulphate solution, obtained after gypsum is
poultry litter (15% w/w)		added to ammonia stripped from digestate

1 **Table 1.** Overview of feedstock and produced biobased fertilisers at five biogas plants

kg ha ⁻¹ Digestate (D) D-GZV 113 57 595 D-AmP 109 61 1334 D-WNE 89 81 392 D-A&S 108 62 671 D-BNS 81 89 1000 Solid fractions of digestate SF-GZV 154 16 2838 (SF) SF-GZV _{P-poor} 46 124 4489 SFD-AmP 39 131 1778 SFD-AmP 39 131 1778 SFD-WNE 39 131 1814 Evaporator concentrates (E) E-AmP 138 32 570 E-WNE 4.0 156 748 Liquid fraction of digestate LF-WNE 95 75 151 Reverse osmosis concentrates RO-GZV 162 8 86 (R) RO-AmP 143 27 197 Ammonia water (AW) AW-WNE 170 0 0 <td< th=""><th>Fertiliser groups</th><th>Fertiliser</th><th>NH₄⁺-N</th><th>Norg</th><th>C adde</th></td<>	Fertiliser groups	Fertiliser	NH ₄ ⁺ -N	Norg	C adde
Digestate (D) D-GZV 113 57 595 D-AmP 109 61 1334 D-WNE 89 81 392 D-A&S 108 62 671 D-BNS 81 89 1000 Solid fractions of digestate SF-GZV 154 16 2838 (SF) SF-GZV 154 16 2838 SFD SF-GZV 46 124 4489 SFD-AmP 39 131 1778 SFD-AmP 39 131 1814 Evaporator concentrates (E) E-AmP 138 32 570 E-WNE 4.0 156 748 Liquid fraction of digestate (LF) LF-WNE 95 75 151 Reverse osmosis concentrates RO-GZV 162 8 86 (R) RO-AmP 143 27 197 Ammonia water (AW) AW-WNE 170 0 0 (AS) AS-BNS			kg ha ⁻¹		
D-AmP 109 61 1334 D-WNE 89 81 392 D-A&S 108 62 671 D-BNS 81 89 1000 Solid fractions of digestate SF-GZV 154 16 2838 (SF) SF-GZV _{P-poor} 46 124 4489 SF-AmP 39 131 1778 SFD-AmP 8.0 162 2047 SFD-AmP 39 131 1814 Evaporator concentrates (E) E-AmP 138 32 570 E-WNE 4.0 156 748 Liquid fraction of digestate LF-WNE 95 75 151 (LF) RO-AmP 143 27 197 Ammonia water (AW) AW-WNE 170 0 0 (AS) AS-BNS 169 1 0 Mineral fertilisers CAN 170 0 0	Digestate (D)	D-GZV	113	57	595
D-WNE8981392D-A&S10862671D-BNS81891000Solid fractions of digestateSF-GZV154162838(SF)SF-GZV461244489SF-AmP391311778SFD-AmP8.01622047SFD-WNE391311814Evaporator concentrates (E)E-AmP13832570E-WNE4.0156748Liquid fraction of digestate (LF)LF-WNE9575151Reverse osmosis concentratesRO-GZV162886(R)RO-AmP14327197Ammonia water (AW)AW-WNE17000(AS)AS-BNS16910Mineral fertilisersCAN17000Urea170074		D-AmP	109	61	1334
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		D-WNE	89	81	392
D-BNS81891000Solid fractions of digestateSF-GZV154162838(SF)SF-GZV _{P-poor} 461244489SF-AmP391311778SFD-AmP8.01622047SFD-WNE391311814Evaporator concentrates (E)E-AmP13832570E-WNE4.0156748Liquid fraction of digestate (LF)LF-WNE9575151Reverse osmosis concentratesRO-GZV162886(R)RO-AmP14327197Ammonia water (AW)AW-WNE17000(AS)AS-A&S16910Mineral fertilisersCAN17000Urea170074		D-A&S	108	62	671
Solid fractions of digestate SF-GZV 154 16 2838 (SF) SF-GZV _{P-poor} 46 124 4489 SF-AmP 39 131 1778 SFD-AmP 8.0 162 2047 SFD-MP 8.0 162 2047 SFD-WNE 39 131 1814 Evaporator concentrates (E) E-AmP 138 32 570 E-WNE 4.0 156 748 Liquid fraction of digestate (LF) LF-WNE 95 75 151 Reverse osmosis concentrates RO-GZV 162 8 86 (R) RO-AmP 143 27 197 Ammonia water (AW) AW-WNE 170 0 0 (AS) AS-BNS 169 1 0 Mineral fertilisers CAN 170 0 0		D-BNS	81	89	1000
$ \begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	Solid fractions of digestate	SF-GZV	154	16	2838
$\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	(SF)	$SF-GZV_{P-poor}$	46	124	4489 1
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		SF-AmP	39	131	1778
SFD-WNE 39 131 1814 Evaporator concentrates (E)E-AmP 138 32 570 E-WNE 4.0 156 748 Liquid fraction of digestate (LF)LF-WNE 95 75 151 Reverse osmosis concentratesRO-GZV 162 8 86 (R)RO-AmP 143 27 197 Ammonia water (AW)AW-WNE 170 0 0 Ammonium sulphate solutionsAS-A&S 170 0 0 (AS)AS-BNS 169 1 0 Mineral fertilisersCAN 170 0 0 Urea 170 0 74		SFD-AmP	8.0	162	2047
Evaporator concentrates (E)E-AmP13832570E-WNE4.0156748Liquid fraction of digestate (LF)LF-WNE9575151Reverse osmosis concentratesRO-GZV162886(R)RO-AmP14327197Ammonia water (AW)AW-WNE17000(AS)AS-BNS16910Mineral fertilisersCAN17000Urea170074		SFD-WNE	39	131	1814
E-WNE4.0156748Liquid fraction of digestate (LF)LF-WNE9575151Reverse osmosis concentratesRO-GZV162886(R)RO-AmP14327197Ammonia water (AW)AW-WNE17000Ammonium sulphate solutionsAS-A&S16910(AS)CAN170000Urea1700740	Evaporator concentrates (E)	E-AmP	138	32	570
Liquid fraction of digestate (LF)LF-WNE9575151Reverse osmosis concentratesRO-GZV162886(R)RO-AmP14327197Ammonia water (AW)AW-WNE17000Ammonium sulphate solutionsAS-A&S17000(AS)AS-BNS16910Mineral fertilisersCAN17000Urea170074		E-WNE	4.0	156	748
LF-WNE9373131Reverse osmosis concentratesRO-GZV162886(R)RO-AmP14327197Ammonia water (AW)AW-WNE17000Ammonium sulphate solutionsAS-A&S17000(AS)AS-BNS16910Mineral fertilisersCAN17000Urea170074	Liquid fraction of digestate	I E WNE	05	75	151
Reverse osmosis concentratesRO-GZV162886(R)RO-AmP14327197Ammonia water (AW)AW-WNE17000Ammonium sulphate solutionsAS-A&S17000(AS)AS-BNS16910Mineral fertilisersCAN17000Urea170074	(LF)		95	15	151
(R)RO-AmP14327197Ammonia water (AW)AW-WNE17000Ammonium sulphate solutionsAS-A&S17000(AS)AS-BNS16910Mineral fertilisersCAN17000Urea170074	Reverse osmosis concentrates	RO-GZV	162	8	86
Ammonia water (AW)AW-WNE17000Ammonium sulphate solutionsAS-A&S17000(AS)AS-BNS16910Mineral fertilisersCAN17000Urea170074	(R)	RO-AmP	143	27	197
Ammonium sulphate solutionsAS-A&S17000(AS)AS-BNS16910Mineral fertilisersCAN17000Urea170074	Ammonia water (AW)	AW-WNE	170	0	0
(AS)AS-BNS16910Mineral fertilisersCAN17000Urea170074	Ammonium sulphate solutions	AS-A&S	170	0	0
Mineral fertilisersCAN17000Urea170074	(AS)	AS-BNS	169	1	0
Urea 170 0 74	Mineral fertilisers	CAN	170	0	0
		Urea	170	0	74

Table 2. Fertiliser and equivalent amounts of NH₄⁺-N, organic N (N_{org}), and total carbon (C)
added to soil at the total N application rate of 170 kg ha⁻¹

19 **Table 3.** Main physicochemical characteristics of biobased and mineral fertilisers included in

20 the study. DM: Dry matter; FW: fresh weight; OM: organic matter; TN: total N; TC: total C;

Fortilisor	pН	DM	OM	TN	TC	$\mathrm{NH_{4}^{+}}$	TDN	DOC	C/N	DOC/TC	TDN/TN
rentinser	-	%	%FW			g kg ⁻¹ F	W			-	
D-GZV	8.20	7.9	5.7	8.12	30.0	5.42	5.30	5.13	3.7	0.19	0.63
D-AmP	8.10	8.1	5.0	3.44	29.0	2.20	2.44	3.20	8.4	0.09	0.93
D-WNE	8.57	5.2	3.2	6.50	17.0	3.41	4.91	5.05	2.7	0.33	0.78
D-A&S	8.60	9.3	5.5	6.95	29.0	4.40	1.27	4.40	4.1	0.05	0.63
D-BNS	8.30	8.1	6.5	5.10	33.0	2.42	5.19	2.80	6.5	0.17	0.55
SF-GZV	8.80	33	25	11.8	136	7.24	2.97	3.30	17	0.02	0.41
SF-GZV _{P-poor}	5.50	27	24	4.50	120	1.22	0.53	1.32	27	0.00	0.29
SF-AmP	8.30	26	17	9.10	100	2.10	3.01	2.40	11	0.03	0.26
SFD-AmP	8.10	47	47	24.0	310	1.10	2.44	1.00	13	0.01	0.04
SFD-WNE	7.90	94	67	31.4	343	7.14	8.73	3.20	11	0.03	0.10
E-AmP	6.20	6.3	6.3	7.80	29.0	6.30	8.77	7.70	3.7	0.34	0.99
E-WNE	7.00	17	9.5	10.0	51.0	0.26	2.96	7.90	3.4	0.07	0.81
LF-WNE	8.85	2.4	1.2	4.94	5.90	2.77	1.10	4.34	1.2	0.25	0.88
R-GZV	8.30	3.6	1.0	9.10	5.70	8.65	8.85	-	0.6	-	0.97
R-AmP	7.30	1.5	1.4	3.10	3.60	2.60	3.04	-	1.2	-	0.98
AW-WNE	9.70	<1	0.0	53.2	0.50	53.2	-	-	-	-	1^{**}
AS-A&S	5.90	38	0.0	76.1	0.10	75.9	-	-	-	-	1^{**}
AS-BNS	6.30	21	0.0	41.3	0.26	41.0	-	-	-	-	1^{**}
CAN	7.39	99	0.0	300	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Urea	7.91	99	0.0	460	200^{*}	-	-	-	-	-	-

21 DOC: dissolved organic carbon; TDN: total dissolved N

22 *based on the molecular composition of urea

23 **assumed values since $NH_4^+-N\approx TN$

Pertuitser mg kg ⁻¹ % N applied mg m ² 28 D_GZV 1 122 88 0.06^{bede} -1^a 29 D_AmP 1 151 97 0.11^{ab} -7^a 30 D_WNE 2 105 75 0.09^{abcde} -14^a 31 D_A&S 2 77 45 0.08^{bcdefg} -16^a 32 D_BNS 2 67 34 0.06^{efgh} -9^a 33 SF_GZV 1 93 57 0.05^{fgh} -16^a 34 SF_GZV_P.poor 0 38 -3 0.04^h -24^a 35 SFD_AmP 1 91 54 0.06^{fgh} -7^a 36 SFD_WNE 1 60 26 0.07^{cdefgh} -15^a 39 E_AmP 0 118 84 0.10^{abc} 4^a 40 E_WNE 2 90 56 0.08^{abcdef}	Fertiliser	$\mathrm{NH_4^+}$	NO ₃ -	N _{rel}	N_2O_{cum}	CH _{4cum}	-27
D_GZV112288 0.06^{bcde} -1^a 29D_AmP115197 0.11^{ab} -7^a 30D_WNE210575 0.09^{abcde} -14^a 31D_A&S27745 0.08^{bcdefg} -16^a 32D_BNS26734 0.06^{efgh} -9^a 33SF_GZV19357 0.05^{fgh} -16^a 34SF_GZV19357 0.06^{fgh} -7^a 36SF_AmP19154 0.06^{fgh} -7^a 36SFD_AmP15823 0.07^{edefgh} -3^a 37SFD_WNE16026 0.07^{edefgh} -15^a 38E_AmP011884 0.10^{abc} 4a40E_WNE29056 0.08^{abcdef} 1a41LF_WNE112589 0.05^{fgh} -16^a 42R_GZV111783 0.09^{abcde} -8^a 45AS_A&S211282 0.04^{fgh} -13^a 46AS_BNS211788 0.04^{gh} -9^a 47CAN1135108 0.10^{abcd} -6^a 48Urea1130102 0.12^a -8^a 49		mg kg ⁻¹		% N applied		mg m ⁻² 28	
D_AmP115197 0.11^{ab} -7^a 30D_WNE210575 0.09^{abcde} -14^a 31D_A&S27745 0.08^{bcdefg} -16^a 32D_BNS26734 0.06^{efgh} -9^a 33SF_GZV19357 0.05^{fgh} -16^a 34SF_GZV19357 0.06^{efgh} -24^a 35SF_AmP19154 0.06^{fgh} -7^a 36SFD_AmP15823 0.07^{defgh} -3^a 37SFD_WNE16026 0.07^{cdefgh} -15^a 38E_AmP011884 0.10^{abc} 4a40E_WNE29056 0.08^{abcdef} 1^a 41LF_WNE112589 0.05^{fgh} -16^a 43R_GZV111783 0.09^{abcde} -8^a 45AS_A&S211287 $0.07^{bcdefgh}$ -16^a 43AS_BNS211788 0.04^{ah} -9^a 47CAN1135108 0.10^{abcd} -6^a 48Urea1130102 0.12^a -8^a 47	D_GZV	1	122	88	0.06 ^{bcde}	-1 ^a	29
D_WNE210575 0.09^{abcde} -14^{a} 31D_A&S27745 0.08^{bcdefg} -16^{a} 32D_BNS26734 0.06^{efgh} -9^{a} 33SF_GZV19357 0.05^{fgh} -16^{a} 34SF_GZV_P.poor038 -3 0.04^{h} -24^{a} 35SF_AMP19154 0.06^{fgh} -7^{a} 36SFD_AMP15823 0.07^{defgh} -3^{a} 37SFD_WNE16026 0.07^{cdefgh} -15^{a} 39E_AMP011884 0.10^{abc} 4^{a} 40E_WNE29056 0.08^{abcdef} 1^{a} 41LF_WNE112589 0.05^{fgh} -16^{a} 43R_GZV111783 0.09^{abcde} e^{a} 45AS_A&S211287 $0.07^{bcdefgh}$ -6^{a} 44AW_WNE2135108 0.09^{abcde} e^{a} 45AS_A&S211788 0.04^{fgh} -13^{a} 46AS_BNS211788 0.04^{gh} -9^{a} 47CAN1135108 0.10^{abcd} -6^{a} 48Urea1130102 0.12^{a} e^{a} 49	D_AmP	1	151	97	0.11 ^{ab}	-7 ^a	30
D_A&S27745 0.08^{bcdefg} -16^a 32D_BNS26734 0.06^{efgh} -9^a 33SF_GZV19357 0.05^{fgh} -16^a 34SF_GZV_{P,poor}038 -3 0.04^h -24^a 35SF_AmP19154 0.06^{fgh} -7^a 36SFD_AmP15823 0.07^{defgh} -3^a 37SFD_WNE16026 0.07^{cdefgh} -15^a 38E_AmP011884 0.10^{abc} 4^a40E_WNE29056 0.08^{abcdef} 1^a 41LF_WNE112589 0.05^{fgh} -16^a 43R_AmP112187 $0.07^{bcdefgh}$ -6^a 44AW_WNE2135108 0.09^{abcde} -8^a 45AS_A&S211788 0.04^{efh} -9^a 47CAN1135108 0.10^{abcd} -6^a 48Urea1130102 0.12^a -8^a 47	D_WNE	2	105	75	0.09 ^{abcde}	-14 ^a	31
D_BNS26734 0.06^{efgh} -9^a 33SF_GZV19357 0.05^{fgh} -16^a 34SF_GZV _{P-poor} 038 -3 0.04^h -24^a 35SF_AmP19154 0.06^{fgh} -7^a 36SFD_AmP15823 0.07^{defgh} -3^a 37SFD_WNE16026 0.07^{cdefgh} -15^a 39E_AmP011884 0.10^{abc} 4^a40E_WNE29056 0.08^{abcdef} 1^a 41LF_WNE112589 0.05^{fgh} -16^a 42R_GZV111783 0.05^{fgh} -16^a 43R_AmP122135108 0.09^{abcde} -8^a 45AS_A&S211282 0.04^{fgh} -13^a 46AS_BNS211788 0.04^{gh} -9^a 47CAN1135108 0.10^{abcd} -6^a 48Urea1130102 0.12^a -8^a 49	D_A&S	2	77	45	0.08^{bcdefg}	-16 ^a	32
SF_GZV19357 0.05^{fgh} -16^{a} 34SF_GZV_P.poor038 -3 0.04^{h} -24^{a} 35SF_AMP19154 0.06^{fgh} -7^{a} 36SFD_AMP15823 0.07^{delgh} -3^{a} 37SFD_WNE16026 0.07^{cdelgh} -15^{a} 39E_AMP011884 0.10^{abc} 4a40E_WNE29056 0.08^{abcdef} 1a41LF_WNE112589 0.05^{fgh} -16^{a} 43R_GZV111783 0.05^{fgh} -6^{a} 44AW_WNE2135108 0.09^{abcde} -8^{a} 45AS_A&S211788 0.04^{gh} -9^{a} 47CAN1135108 0.10^{abcd} -6^{a} 48Urea1130102 0.12^{a} -8^{a} 49	D_BNS	2	67	34	0.06 ^{efgh}	-9 ^a	33
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	SF_GZV	1	93	57	0.05^{fgh}	-16 ^a	34
SF_AmP19154 0.06^{fgh} -7^a 36SFD_AmP15823 0.07^{defgh} -3^a 37SFD_WNE16026 0.07^{cdefgh} -15^a 38E_AmP011884 0.10^{abc} 4a40E_WNE29056 0.08^{abcdef} 1a41LF_WNE112589 0.05^{fgh} -16^a 43R_GZV111783 0.05^{fgh} -16^a 43R_AmP112187 $0.07^{bcdefgh}$ -6^a 44AW_WNE2135108 0.09^{abcde} -8^a 45AS_A&S211788 0.04^{fgh} -9^a 47CAN1130102 0.12^a -8^a 49	SF_GZV_{P-poor}	0	38	-3	0.04 ^h	-24 ^a	35
SFD_AmP15823 0.07^{defgh} -3^a 37SFD_WNE16026 0.07^{cdefgh} -15^a 39E_AmP011884 0.10^{abc} 4a40E_WNE29056 0.08^{abcdef} 1a41LF_WNE112589 0.05^{fgh} -16^a 42R_GZV111783 0.05^{fgh} -16^a 43R_AmP112187 $0.07^{bcdefgh}$ -6^a 44AW_WNE2135108 0.09^{abcde} -8^a 45AS_A&S211788 0.04^{fgh} -9^a 47CAN1135108 0.10^{abcd} -6^a 48Urea1130102 0.12^a -8^a 49	SF_AmP	1	91	54	0.06 ^{fgh}	-7ª	36
SFD_WNE16026 0.07^{cdefgh} -15^{a} 38E_AmP011884 0.10^{abc} 4a40E_WNE29056 0.08^{abcdef} 1a41LF_WNE112589 0.05^{fgh} -16^{a} 42R_GZV111783 0.05^{fgh} -16^{a} 43R_AmP112187 $0.07^{bcdefgh}$ -6^{a} 44AW_WNE2135108 0.09^{abcde} -8^{a} 45AS_A&S211282 0.04^{fgh} -13^{a} 46AS_BNS211788 0.04^{gh} -9^{a} 47CAN1135108 0.10^{abcd} -6^{a} 48Urea1130102 0.12^{a} -8^{a} 49	SFD_AmP	1	58	23	0.07^{defgh}	-3ª	37
E_AmP011884 0.10^{abc} 4a39E_WNE29056 0.08^{abcdef} 1a41LF_WNE112589 0.05^{fgh} -16^{a} 42R_GZV111783 0.05^{fgh} -16^{a} 43R_AmP112187 $0.07^{bcdefgh}$ -6^{a} 44AW_WNE2135108 0.09^{abcde} -8^{a} 45AS_A&S211282 0.04^{fgh} -13^{a} 46AS_BNS211788 0.04^{gh} -9^{a} 47CAN1135108 0.10^{abcd} -6^{a} 48Urea1130102 0.12^{a} -8^{a} 49	SFD_WNE	1	60	26	0.07^{cdefgh}	-15 ^a	38
E_WNE29056 0.08^{abcdef} 1^a 41LF_WNE112589 0.05^{fgh} -16^a 42R_GZV111783 0.05^{fgh} -16^a 43R_AmP112187 $0.07^{bcdefgh}$ -6^a 44AW_WNE2135108 0.09^{abcde} -8^a 45AS_A&S211282 0.04^{fgh} -13^a 46AS_BNS211788 0.04^{gh} -9^a 47CAN1135108 0.10^{abcd} -6^a 48Urea1130102 0.12^a -8^a 49	E_AmP	0	118	84	0.10 ^{abc}	4 ^a	39
LF_WNE112589 0.05^{fgh} -16^{a} 42R_GZV111783 0.05^{fgh} -16^{a} 43R_AmP112187 $0.07^{bcdefgh}$ -6^{a} 44AW_WNE2135108 0.09^{abcde} -8^{a} 45AS_A&S211282 0.04^{fgh} -13^{a} 46AS_BNS211788 0.04^{gh} -9^{a} 47CAN1135108 0.10^{abcd} -6^{a} 48Urea1130102 0.12^{a} -8^{a}	E_WNE	2	90	56	0.08 ^{abcdef}	1 ^a	40
R_GZV111783 0.05^{fgh} -16^{a} 43R_AmP112187 $0.07^{bcdefgh}$ -6^{a} 44AW_WNE2135108 0.09^{abcde} -8^{a} 45AS_A&S211282 0.04^{fgh} -13^{a} 46AS_BNS211788 0.04^{gh} -9^{a} 47CAN1135108 0.10^{abcd} -6^{a} 48Urea1130102 0.12^{a} -8^{a}	LF_WNE	1	125	89	0.05 ^{fgh}	-16 ^a	42
R_AmP112187 $0.07^{bcdefgh}$ -6^{a} 44AW_WNE2135108 0.09^{abcde} -8^{a} 45AS_A&S211282 0.04^{fgh} -13^{a} 46AS_BNS211788 0.04^{gh} -9^{a} 47CAN1135108 0.10^{abcd} -6^{a} 48Urea1130102 0.12^{a} -8^{a}	R_GZV	1	117	83	0.05^{fgh}	-16 ^a	43
AW_WNE2135108 0.09^{abcde} -8^a 45AS_A&S211282 0.04^{fgh} -13^a 46AS_BNS211788 0.04^{gh} -9^a 47CAN1135108 0.10^{abcd} -6^a 48Urea1130102 0.12^a -8^a	R_AmP	1	121	87	$0.07^{bcdefgh}$	-6 ^a	44
AS_A&S211282 0.04^{fgh} -13^a 46AS_BNS211788 0.04^{gh} -9^a 47CAN1135108 0.10^{abcd} -6^a 48Urea1130102 0.12^a -8^a 49	AW_WNE	2	135	108	0.09 ^{abcde}	-8 ^a	45
AS_BNS211788 0.04^{gh} -9^a 47CAN1135108 0.10^{abcd} -6^a 48Urea1130102 0.12^a -8^a 49	AS_A&S	2	112	82	0.04^{fgh}	-13 ^a	46
CAN 1 135 108 0.10^{abcd} -6^a 48 Urea 1 130 102 0.12^a -8^a 49	AS_BNS	2	117	88	0.04 ^{gh}	-9 ^a	47
Urea 1 130 102 0.12^{a} -8 ^a 49	CAN	1	135	108	0.10 ^{abcd}	-6 ^a	48
	Urea	1	130	102	0.12 ^a	-8 ^a	49 50

Table 4. Soil concentrations of NH_4^+ and NO_3^- and net* mineral N release (N_{rel}) at the end of the incubation (18 days); and net* cumulative fertiliser-derived N₂O and CH₄ emissions

51 In a column, values followed by the same letter do not differ significantly according to Tukey's test (p < 0.05).

 N_2O_{cum} values in bold are significantly lower than CAN and urea; italicized values are significantly lower than

53 urea but not different from CAN.

54 *After subtracting the control

Declaration of interests

⊠The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

□The authors declare the following financial interests/personal relationships which may be considered as potential competing interests: