Dear Dr. Sara Vicca,

Thank you for accepting our revised manuscript with technical corrections.

Based on your suggestion, we thoroughly revised the manuscript and improved the formulations in many places to improve the readability.

Even if the new version has many changes, such changes are just textual improvements and the contents and interpretations are the same as the previous version.

We hope that our revisions are satisfactory.

Sincerely yours,

Greta Formaglio

Herbicide weed control increases nutrient leaching compared to mechanical weeding in a large-scale oil palm plantation

Greta Formaglio[1], Edzo Veldkamp[1], Xiaohong Duan [2], Aiyen Tjoa[3], Marife D. Corre[1]

[1]Soil Science of Tropical and Subtropical Ecosystems, University of Göttingen, Göttingen, 37073, Germany

[2]Institute of Biochemical Plant Pathology, Helmholtz Zentrum Munich, 85764, Germany

[3]Faculty of Agriculture, Tadulako University, Palu, 94118, Indonesia

Correspondence to: Greta Formaglio (gformag@gwdg.de)

Abstract

Nutrient leaching in intensively managed oil palm plantations can diminish soil fertility and water quality. There is a need to reduce this environmental footprint without sacrificing yield. In a large-scale oil palm plantation on Acrisol soil, w~~W~~e quantified nutrient leaching ~~in a large-scale oil palm plantation on Acrisol soil with~~ using a full factorial ~~treatment combinations of~~experiment with two fertilization rates (260 N, 50 P, 220 K kg ha^{-1} yr^{-1} as conventional practice, and 136 N, 17 P, 187 K kg ha^{-1} yr^{-1}, equal to harvest export, as reduced management) and two weeding methods (conventional herbicide application, and mechanical weeding as reduced management)~~. Each of the four treatment combinations was represented by a 2500 m^2 plot~~, replicated in four blocks. ~~In each plot~~Over the course of one year, we collected~~,~~ monthly soil-pore water ~~was collected monthly~~ at 1.5 m depth ~~for one year~~ in three distinct management zones: palm circle, inter-row, and frond-stacked area. Nutrient leaching ~~In~~ in the palm circle~~,~~ ~~nutrient leaching~~ was low due to low solute concentrations and small drainage fluxes, probably resulting from large plant uptake. ~~Conversely~~In contrast, nitrate and aluminum leaching losses were high in the inter-row, ~~nitrate and aluminum leaching losses were high~~ due to the~~ir~~ high concentrations and~~,~~ large drainage fluxes, possibly~~probably~~ resulting from low plant uptake~~,~~ and ~~acidic~~ low~~er~~ pH. In the frond-stacked area, base cation leaching was high, presumably from frond litter decomposition, but N leaching was low. Mechanical weeding reduced leaching losses of all nutrients compared to the conventional herbicide weeding, probably because herbicides decreased ground vegetation, and ~~thereby~~ thus reduced soil nutrient retention. L~~The~~ ~~l~~eaching of total ~~N~~ nitrogen in ~~our~~the mechanical weeding with reduced fertilization treatment (32 ± 6 kg N ha^{-1} yr^{-1}) was less than half of the ~~the highest with~~ conventional management (73 ± 20 kg N ha^{-1} yr^{-1}) ~~and the lowest in mechanical weeding with reduced fertilization (32 ± 6 kg N ha^{-1} yr^{-1})~~ whereas ~~its~~ yields ~~remained comparable among all~~were not affected by ~~our~~these treatments. Our findings suggest that mechanical weeding and reduced fertilization should be included in the program by the Indonesian Ministry of Agriculture ~~program~~ for precision

farming (e.g. variable rates with plantation age), particularly for large-scale oil palm plantations. We further~~more~~ suggest to include mechanical weeding and reduced fertilization~~, and~~ in ~~the~~ science-based policy recommendations, such as those endorsed by the Roundtable for Sustainable Palm Oil association.

1 Introduction

Agricultural expansion is a major driver of tropical deforestation (Geist and Lambin, 2002), which has global impacts on ~~reducing~~ carbon sequestration (Asner et al., 2010; van Straaten et al., 2015; Veldkamp et al. *in press*), greenhouse gas regulation (e.g. Murdiyarso et al., 2010; Meijide et al., 2020; Veldkamp et al. *in press*) and~~,~~ biodiversity (e.g. Clough et al., 2016)~~ and increasing profit gains at the expense of ecosystem multifunctionality (Grass et al., 2020)~~. Oil palm is the ~~most important rapidly expanding~~dominant tree-cash crop that replaces tropical forest in Southeast Asia (Gibbs et al., 2010; Carlson et al., 2013) due to its high yields, ~~with~~ low production costs and rising global demand (Carter et al., 2007; Corley, 2009~~;~~,)~~Grass et al., 2020)~~. Currently, Indonesia ~~produces~~ contributes 57% of the global palm oil production ~~worldwide~~ (FAO, 2018), which~~ and this production~~ is projected to further expand in the future, threatening the ~~the~~ remaining tropical forests (Pirker et al., 2016; Vijay et al., 2016). ~~Forest~~ Forest-~~to~~ to-oil palm conversion is associated with a decrease in soil fertility because of high nutrient export via harvest, reduced rates of soil-N cycling, and decreases in soil organic carbon (SOC) and nutrient stocks (van Straaten et al., 2015; Allen et al., 2015; Allen et al., 2016). D~~The~~ ~~d~~eclines in soil fertility ~~reinforces~~ promote the dependency on fertilizer inputs and threaten~~s~~ the long-term productivity ~~of the area~~ (Syers 1997), which could further ~~exacerbate~~ stimulate expansion of oil palm production in new areas~~land-use conversion~~. Leaching ~~can~~ contributes to the ~~impoverishment~~ reduction of soil nutrient stocks~~s~~ ~~as well as reduction in~~and negatively affects water quality, ~~and~~ potentially leading to eutrophication of water bodies. ~~Increased~~ High ~~nutrient~~ loads of nutrients ~~to~~ in water bodies due to agricultural expansion and intensification,

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

common in temperate areas (Carpenter et al., 1998), are increasingly reported ~~for~~ in humid tropical regions (Figueiredo et al., 2010; Teklu et al., 2018). ~~Given the~~Because of the ~~typically~~ high precipitation rates, leaching losses can be ~~large~~ substantial in intensively managed plantations in the tropics, although deeply weathered tropical soils also have the capacity to ~~store~~ retain large quantities of N and P (Neill et al., 2013; Jankowski et al., 2018). Indeed, nitrate (NO_3^-)~~, the most leachable form of N,~~ can be ~~retained~~ adsorbed ~~in the subsoil~~ by the anion exchange capacity in the subsoil of highly weathered acidic soils (Wong et al., 1990), whereas P can be fixed to Fe and Al (hydr)oxides, ~~of~~ common in heavily weathered tropical soils (Roy et al., 2016). Nevertheless, ~~there are some evidences of~~reductions in stream water quality ~~reductions due to~~have been reported in oil palm cultivation in Malaysia (Luke et al., 2017; Tokuchi et al., 2019). This illustrates~~, signifying~~ the importance of quantifying nutrient leaching losses in ~~other~~ areas with expansive oil palm plantations, ~~especially in~~such as Jambi, Indonesia, one of the hotspots of forest conversion to oil palm in Indonesia (Drescher et al., 2016).

Nutrient l~~L~~eaching losses in o~~O~~il palm plantations are calculated from water drainage fluxes and solute ~~nutrient~~ concentrations ~~in the soil water~~ (Kurniawan et al., 2018~~Tarigan et al., 2020~~). Despite their relatively low drainage fluxes (as a consequence of high evapotranspiration; Röll et al., 2019; ~~a result from higher evapotranspiration and deeper rooting depth than annual crops~~Tarigan et al., 2020), ~~Can have low leaching losses, as a consequence of high evapotranspiration and thus low drainage fluxes (Tarigan et al., 2020). However, most~~ large-scale oil palm plantations ~~are large-scale enterprises that arewith their characterized by intensive management with~~ typically have high fertilization rates, that may result in ~~typically have~~ high nitrate (NO_3^-) concentrations in the soil water and ~~, resulting in~~ large ~~and sustained,~~ nitrate ~~(NO_3^-)~~ leaching losses ~~and herbicide application. Intensive agriculture in the tropics is associated with high N leaching losses (Huddell et al., 2020). Even in tree-cash or perennial crop plantations, despite their generally higher evapotranspiration and deeper rooting depth than~~

~~annual crops, high fertilization rates can result in sustained, large nutrient leaching losses~~ (e.g. Wakelin et al., 2011; Cannavo et al., 2013). In the leachate,~~Large~~ NO_3^- ~~leaching from high N fertilization~~ is ~~always~~ accompanied by ~~leaching of~~ cations (normally bases) because of its negative charge (Cusack et al., 2009; Dubos et al., 2017), further impoverishing highly weathered tropical soils that are inherently low in base cations (Allen et al., 2016; Kurniawan et al., 2018). High f~~F~~ertilization rates are typically applied~~is necessary~~ to support the high yields of oil palm plantations;~~,~~ ~~but~~ however, ~~reduction in~~~~better balanced~~well-adjusted fertilization rates, e.g. to levels that compensate for nutrient export through harvest, may create opportunities to reduce nutrient leaching losses while maintaining high productivity.

Herbicides are commonly used for weed control ~~On the other hand, the use of herbicides for weed control can exacerbate nutrient leaching losses, as prolonged absence of ground vegetation reduces uptake of redistributed nutrients from applied fertilizers (Abdalla et al., 2019). Chemical weeding with herbicides is commonly practiced~~ in large-scale oil palm plantations. H~~: the h~~erbicides ~~is~~ are applied ~~placed in the area where the fertilizers are applied,~~close to the palm stems to reduce competition by weeds for nutrients and water~~ with ground vegetation~~, and in the inter-rows, to facilitate access during harvest (Corley and Tinker, 2016). Herbicides do not only eradicate~~s~~ aboveground vegetative parts but also remove~~s~~ roots, slowing ~~down~~ weed regeneration. Consequently, the use of herbicides for weed control can exacerbate nutrient leaching losses, because the absence of ground vegetation reduces the uptake and thus retention of nutrients from applied fertilizers (Abdalla et al., 2019). In contrast to herbicide application, mechanical weeding does not ~~kill~~eradicate the roots and ~~only removes aboveground part,~~ allow~~ings~~ for relatively fast regeneration of ground vegetation, which could take up redistributed nutrients and ~~could~~ thus reduce leaching losses.

In oil palm plantations, different management zones can be distinguished, which have to be taken into account ~~To~~ when ~~investigate~~ investigating nutrient leaching losses. ~~in an oil~~

~~palm plantation, the spatial structure created by the planting design and by the management practices must be taken into account, which is only partly considered in the sampling designs of previous studies.~~ Typically, we can i~~n~~dentify t~~T~~hree contrasting management zones in oil palm plantations~~ can be identified~~: (1) the palm circle, an area of 2 m radius around the palm´s stem where the fertilizers are applied and weeded; (2) the inter-row, which is unfertilized and weed control is ~~ed~~ less frequent~~ly~~ than the palm circle ~~but unfertilized~~; and (3) the frond-stacked area, usually every second inter-row, where the ~~cut~~ pruned senesced fronds are piled up and no weeding or fertilization is done. In ~~these~~ each management zone~~s~~, the extent of nutrient leaching losses depend on the interplay of water fluxes, root uptake and soil nutrient ~~contents determine~~concentrations~~ the extent of nutrient leaching losses~~. Root uptake, which is related to root density, ~~which~~ is high inside the palm circle and lower in the inter-row (Lamade et al. 1996; Jourdan and Rey, 1997). In t~~‘T~~he palm circle, ~~receives the~~ fertilizer~~-~~s are applied~~directly~~, but also ~~takes up high amounts~~uptake of water and nutrients is highest (Nelson et al., 2006). Hence, large leaching losses may only occur shortly following ~~pulse high~~ fertilization if ~~and during~~ high drainage fluxes occur, e.g. directly following intensive rain showers~~ (from high precipitation) events~~ (Banabas et al., 2008a). The inter-row ~~experiences~~ has higher water input from precipitation than the palm circle because of the lower interception by the canopy ~~interception~~ (Banabas et al., 2008b). Here, root density and thus root uptake is low, resulting in a~~, and~~ large water fluxes~~ within the soil because of low root uptake, stimulating nutrient transport to lower depths~~. However, nutrient leaching may be low in the inter-row because there is no direct fertilizer application. The frond-stacked area receives nutrients from decomposition of nutrient-rich fronds (Kotowska et al., 2016). Furthermore,~~ and such~~ mulching with senesced fronds prevents runoff and promotes water infiltration ~~as a consequence of enhanced~~owing to the high macroporosity, a result of high~~ by increased~~ organic matter and biological activity (Moradi et al., 2015). Low canopy interception and h~~H~~igh water infiltration ~~,~~ may generate high water drainage fluxes, resulting in intermediate nutrient leaching losses in ~~the frond-stacked~~this ~~area~~management zone.

In this study, we aimed to quantify nutrient leaching losses in our experiment that was established in an intensively managed, large-scale oil palm plantation~~,~~ in order ~~and~~ to assess ~~if~~ whether ~~reduced~~ lower ~~intensity of~~ management intensity (i.e. reduced fertilization rates equal to harvest export and mechanical weeding) can reduce leaching losses without affecting yield ~~in oil palm plantations~~. We tested the following hypotheses: (1) leaching losses in the palm circle are larger than in ~~the~~ other management zones because of direct fertilizer application; (2) leaching losses under herbicide application are higher than mechanical weeding because of ~~slower regeneration of ground vegetation that can augment~~the reduced nutrient retention owing to reduced weed growth; (3) nutrient leaching fluxes under reduced ~~under conventional high~~ fertilization rates are ~~substantial~~ lower compared to ~~reduced~~ conventional, high rates~~-~~, but yield not affected~~because of excessive nutrient inputs~~. Our study provides the first ~~a~~ systematic quantification of leaching losses, an important environmental footprint of oil palm production, taking into consideration ~~its spatial variation in~~the different management zones, and evaluates the effectiveness of alternative management practices ~~for~~ ~~to reduce~~on leaching and yield ~~reduction~~.

2 Materials and methods

2.1 Study area and experimental design

~~This~~ Our study was conducted in a state-owned oil palm plantation in Jambi province, Indonesia (1° 43' 8" S, 103° 23' 53" E, 73 m above sea level). Mean annual air temperature is 26.7 ± 1.0 °C and mean annual precipitation is 2235 ± 385 mm (1991–2011; data from Sultan Thaha airport, Jambi). During our study period (March 2017–February 2018), the mean daily air temperature was 26.3 °C and annual precipitation was 2772 mm, with a dry period between July and October (precipitation < 140 mm month^{-1}). The soil is highly weathered, loam Acrisol soil (Allen et al., 2015) and nutrient inputs from bulk precipitation in the area, measured in 2013, were 12.9 kg N, 0.4 kg P, 5.5 kg K ha^{-1} yr^{-1} (Kurniawan et al., 2018).

This oil palm plantation was established between 1998 and 2002, and ~~so~~ the palms were 16–20 years old during our study period. The plantation ~~has a~~is mostly located on flat terrain, and it encompassed 2025 ha, with a planting density of approximately 142 palms ha^{-1}, spaced 8 m apart ~~on rows~~. The rows between palms are used alternately for harvesting operations and to pile-up senesced fronds, which are regularly ~~cut~~ pruned to facilitate harvesting of fruits; this frond-stacked area covers approximately 15% of the plantation area. The palm circle, a ~~-~~2 m radius from the stem~~,~~ where~~in~~ both fertilizers ~~are applied~~ and ~~chemically weeded~~herbicides are applied ~~four times a year~~, covers 18% of the plantation. The remaining 67% ~~can be~~we ~~classified~~ classified as inter-row, which is not fertilized but weeded ~~two times~~twice a year.

In November 2016, a ~~two (fertilization rates) by two (weeding methods)~~ factorial management experiment was established with two fertilization rates and two weeding methods (~~in this plantation as part of the framework of the EFForTS project, described in detail by~~ Darras et al., ~~(~~2019). For ~~fertilization~~ fertilizer treatments, the conventional rates were 260 N, 50 P, 220 K kg ha^{-1} yr^{-1}, whereas the reduced rates were 136 N, 17 P, 187 K kg ha^{-1} yr^{-1}. Reduced fertilization rates were ~~determined~~ established to compensate for nutrient exports via fruit harvest and were ~~based~~ assessed ~~on~~ by multiplying the nutrient concentrations measured in the fruit bunches ~~multiplied by~~with the annual yield. The fertilizer sources were urea (CH_4N_2O), triple superphosphate ($Ca(H_2PO_4)_2 \cdot H_2O$) and muriate of potash (KCl), in granular forms. ~~These~~ Fertilizers were applied ~~according to~~following the plantation’s standard practices: split in two applications per year (in April and October), spread in a band ~~within a~~at approximately 2 m radius from the palm~~,~~ ~~and this area~~~~which~~that was raked before fertilizer application. For both

~~fertilization~~ fertilizer treatments, we also applied lime (426 kg dolomite ha^{-1} yr^{-1}; $CaMg(CO_3)_2$) and micronutrients (142 kg Micro-Mag ha^{-1} yr^{-1} with 0.5% B_2O_3, 0.5% CuO, 0.25% Fe_2O_3, 0.15% ZnO, 0.1% MnO and 18% MgO), ~~were also applied besides the N, P and K fertilizers,~~ as commonly practiced in large-scale plantations on acidic Acrisol soils (Pahan, 2010). ~~For weeding treatments, t~~C~~he c~~onventional ~~method~~ weed control was ~~the use of~~done using a herbicide~~s~~ (glyphosate), whereas the ~~reduced~~ alternative method was mechanical weeding using a brush cutter~~;~~ ; ~~,~~the cut plant materials were left on the ground. Herbicide ~~Glyphosate~~ was applied following plantation's standard practice: 1.5 L g~~G~~lyphosate ha^{-1} yr^{-1} to the palm circle, split four times a year, and 0.75 L g~~G~~lyphosate ha^{-1} yr^{-1} to the inter-row, split two times a year. ~~The m~~Mechanical weeding was carried out in the same areas and frequencies as herbicide application. This management experiment comprised of four replicate blocks,~~;~~ ~~and~~ each ~~had~~ with four plots (50 m x 50 m each) assigned to four treatment combinations: conventional rate–herbicide, conventional rate–mechanical weeding, reduced rate–herbicide, and reduced rate–mechanical weeding.

2.2 Soil water sampling

Over the course of one year, w~~W~~e collected monthly soil-pore water samples~~ over one year~~, using suction cup lysimeters (P80 ceramic, maximum pore size 1 µm; CeramTec AG, Marktredwitz, Germany). We installed the lysimeters in January 2017, randomly choosing two palms per plot and sampling in the three management zones: 1) within in the palm circle, at 1 m from the palm stem, 2) in the frond-stacked area, at about 4 m from the palm stem, and 3) in the inter-row, at approximately 4 m from the palm stem (Fig. A1). In total, we installed~~,~~ 96 lysimeters ~~were installed~~ (4 treatments x 4 replicates x 2 subplots x 3 management zones). The lysimeters were inserted into the soil to 1.5 m depth, so that the soil-pore water was collected well below the rooting depth of 1 m, which is common ~~to~~ for oil palm plantations on loam

Acrisol soils near our study site (Kurniawan et al., 2018). Starting in March 2017, we sampled soil water ~~was sampled~~ by applying 40 kPa vacuum (Kurniawan et al., 2018; Dechert et al., 2005) to the lysimeters. Water samples were ~~and~~ collected in dark glass bottles, which were stored in a bucket buried in the field. We consider ~~Although there was only~~the two-month acclimatization of lysimeters ~~between their installation and the beginning of~~before sampling ~~,~~ ~~we considered this to be~~ sufficient, because ~~as~~ soil disturbance was minimized and biochemical processes are rapid in tropical soils. During sampling, ~~Once a week,~~ we transferred once a week the collected water into plastic bottles ~~and~~ which were transported ~~them~~ to the field station, where they were ~~stored~~ frozen for storage. ~~The~~ Soil water collection continued ~~over~~ during a month until a volume of 100 mL was collected from each lysimeter, or until the end of the month. The frozen water samples were transported by air ~~freight~~ to the University of Goettingen, Germany, where element concentrations were determined. We measured the concentrations of mineral N (NH_4^+ and NO_3^-), total dissolved N (TDN) and Cl$^-$~~-~~ ~~by~~ using continuous flow injection colorimetry (SEAL Analytical AA3, SEAL Analytical GmbH, Norderstadt, Germany), as described in detail~~s~~ by Kurniawan et al. (2018). We calculated d~~D~~issolved organic N (DON) ~~was calculated~~ as the difference between TDN and mineral N. We measured the concentrations of base cations (Na, K, Ca, Mg), total Al, total Fe, total Mn, total S, and total P ~~with~~ using an inductively coupled plasma–atomic emission spectrometer (iCAP 6300; Thermo Fischer Scientific GmbH, Dreieich, Germany).

We determined a partial cation-anion charge balance of the major elements (concentrations > 0.03 mg L^{-1}) in soil-pore water by converting the concentrations to μmol_{charge} L^{-1}. For this, we~~We~~ assumed S to be in the form of sulfate (SO_4^{2-}) and total Al to have a charge of 3^+. We calculated the combined contribution of organic acids ($RCOO^-$) and bicarbonate (HCO_3^-) as the difference between the measured cations and anions (Kurniawan et al., 2018).

Formatted: Superscript

2.3 Modeling water drainage

The water balance was modeled using the water sub-model of the Expert-N software, version 5.0 (Priesack, 2005), which was successfully used in previous research to estimate drainage fluxes from different land uses in Indonesia (Dechert et al., 2005; Kurniawan et al., 2018). The model inputs were climate data (solar radiation, temperature, precipitation, relative humidity, and wind speed), and soil (texture, bulk density, and hydraulic functions) and vegetation characteristics (biomass, leaf area index, and root distribution). The climate data were ~~taken~~ collected from the climatological station in the plantation (described in detail by Meijide et al., 2017), whereas~~and~~ ~~the~~ for the oil palm biomass we~~as~~ used ~~taken~~ ~~used~~ published data from ~~a study on~~ oil palm plantations near our study site (Kotowska et al., 2015). We measured s~~S~~oil bulk density and porosity in the top 10 cm ~~were measured in~~of each management zone at our study site, whereas for the 10–50-~~-~~cm depth these were measured in the inter-row. F~~Data f~~or soil bulk density and porosity for the 50–200-~~-~~cm depth, as well as soil texture, soil hydraulic parameters (i.e. water retention curve, saturated hydraulic conductivity and Van Genuchten parameters~~ for the water retention curve~~), and root distribution ~~were taken~~we used published data from Allen et al. (2015) and Kurniawan et al. (2018), choosing their studied oil palm plantations closest to our study site. The Expert-N water sub-model calculates daily water drainage based on precipitation, evapotranspiration, canopy interception, runoff, and change in soil water storage. Evapotranspiration is calculated using the Penman-Monteith method (Allen, 1998), applying a plant factor of 1.06 (Meijide et al., 2017), with plant transpiration based on leaf area index (LAI), plant biomass, and maximum rooting depth. The canopy interception is calculated from the percentage of throughfall and the maximum water storage capacity of the canopy. Runoff is calculated from soil texture and bulk density, which determine the water infiltration rate, and from the slope, which was 5% (Röll et al., 2019). The vertical water movement is calculated using Richards equation based on soil hydraulic functions (Hillel, 1982).

To model the drainage in the different management zones, we used the measured soil bulk density and porosity in the top 10 cm and adjusted other input parameters to simulate differences in water balance in each management zone (Table A1). For the palm circle, we set the LAI to 3.65, which is the maximum LAI measured at our site (Fan et al., 2015), to simulate high water uptake in the palm circle (Nelson et al., 2006) and maximum rooting depth to 1 m, which is reported for oil palm plantations near our site (Kurniawan et al., 2018). The percentage throughfall in the palm circle was set ~~to~~ at 10% and the water storage capacity of oil palm stem was set to 8.4 mm (Tarigan et al., 2018). For the inter-row, we set the LAI and the maximum rooting depth ~~as~~ at half the values of the palm circle (1.8 LAI, 50 cm rooting depth), as roots are shallower between palms (Nelson et al., 2006); ~~the~~ throughfall was set ~~to~~ at 50%, and the palm stem's water storage capacity was set ~~to~~ at 4.7 mm (based on canopy storage capacity reported by Tarigan et al., 2018). For the frond-stacked area, the LAI was set to 0.75, which is half of the minimum measured in the studied plantation (Darras et al., 2019), ~~as~~ because understory vegetation is absent at this zone. Values for interception in the frond-stacked area was set to the same values as the inter-row, whereas the runoff was set to 0 (no overland runoff), ~~as~~ because mulching with senesced fronds increases water infiltration and ~~slows down~~prevents runoff (Tarigan et al., 2016).

For validation of the Expert-N water sub-model outputs, we measured weekly soil water matric potential at ~~depths of~~ 30 cm and 60 cm depths over the study period and compared the measured values with the modeled matric potential. Matric potential was measured by installing a tensiometer (with a P80 ceramic, maximum pore size 1 µm; CeramTec AG, Marktredwitz, Germany) at each depth in each management zone near ~~to~~ two palms in two treatments (i.e. conventional rate–herbicide, and reduced rate–mechanical weeding), for a total of 12 tensiometers. We summed the modeled daily drainage at 1.5 m depth to get the monthly drainage fluxes, which we then multiplied with the element concentrations in soil water to get the monthly nutrient leaching fluxes.

2.4 Soil biochemical characteristics and nutrient retention efficiency

We measured soil biochemical properties in the same sampling locations (Figure A1) at the following four depth intervals: 0–5 cm, 5–10 cm, 10–30 cm, and 30–50 cm. In each plot, s~~S~~oil samples from the same management zone ~~in each plot~~ were pooled to make one composite sample, totaling 192 soil samples (4 treatments x 4 replicates x 3 management zones x 4 depths). The samples were air-dried and sieved (2 mm). We ~~and~~ measured ~~for~~ pH ~~(~~on a 1:4 soil-to-water ratio~~)~~ and ~~for~~ effective cation exchange capacity (ECEC), by percolating the soils with unbuffered 1 mol L^{-1} NH_4Cl and ~~measuring~~ analyzing the cations (Ca, Mg, K, Na, Al, Fe, Mn) in percolates using ICP-AES. A subsample was finely ground and analyzed for organic C and total N using a CN analyzer (Vario EL Cube, Elementar Analysis Systems GmbH, Hanau, Germany), and for ^{15}N natural abundance signature using isotope ratio mass spectrometer (IRMS; Delta Plus, Finnigan MAT, Bremen, Germany). We calculated the soil element stocks for each depth by multiplying the element concentration with the measured bulk density and ~~summed~~ adding them for the top 50 cm; other soil characteristics (e.g. pH, ECEC, base saturation) in the top 50 cm soil were calculated as the depth-weighted average of the sampled depths.

In addition, we calculated the N and base cation retention efficiency in the soil for each experimental treatment and management zone following the formula: nutrient retention efficiency = 1 – (nutrient leaching loss / soil-available nutrient) (Kurniawan et al., 2018). We used the gross N mineralization rates in the top 5 cm ~~soil~~depth (Table A2) as an index of soil-available N whereas soil-available base cations was the sum of the stocks of K, Na, Mg and Ca in the top 10 cm depth ~~soil~~, expressed in mol$_{\text{charge}}$ m^{-2}.

2.5 Statistical analyses

For soil biochemical properties measured once, we tested for differences among management zones and experimental treatments for the entire 50 cm depth, using the analysis of variances (ANOVA) with Tukey HSD as a post hoc test. The soil variables that showed non-normal distribution or unequal variances were log-transformed prior to the analysis ~~, tested~~ with Shapiro–Wilk and Levene's tests, respectively~~, were log-transformed prior to the analysis~~. Base cation and N retention efficiency were also tested for differences between experimental treatments in the same way. For repeatedly measured variables, i.e. soil-pore water solute concentrations and leaching fluxes, we used linear mixed-effects models (LME; Bates et al., 2015) to assess the differences among management zones and treatments. For testing ~~management zone~~ differences among management zones, we conducted the LME with management zone as fixed effect and random effects for sampling months and experimental treatments nested with replicate plots, which were also nested with subplots. For testing treatment differences, we calculated for each replicate plot on each sampling month the area-weighted average of the three management zones (i.e. palm circle accounts for 18% of the plantation area, the frond-stacked area 15%, and the inter-row 67%), and LME was carried out with treatment as fixed effect and random effects for sampling months and replicate plots nested with subplots. If the residuals of the LME models were not normally distributed, we applied either logarithmic or square root transformation. Differences were assessed with ANOVA (Kuznetsova et al., 2017) followed by Tukey HSD (Hothorn et al., 2008). We also used LME to assess differences in soil water matric potential among management zones, with management zone as fixed effect and measurement day~~s~~ and depth nested with treatment as random effects.

Comparability between modeled and measured soil water matric potential for each depth in each management zone ($n = 50$ field measurements) was assessed using Pearson correlation test. All tests were considered significant at $P \leq 0.05$, except for soil pH, for which ~~we considered accepted~~there was a marginal significance at $P = 0.06$. All statistical analyses were performed with R version 3.6.1 (R Core Team, 2019).

3 Results

3.1 Soil biochemical properties and water balance

Soil biochemical properties in the top 50 cm did not differ between experimental treatments (all $P > 0.05$) but strongly differed among management zones (Table 1). The frond-stacked area, where senesced fronds were regularly piled like mulch material, had higher SOC and total N stocks ($P < 0.01$) compared to the other management zones. The inter-row, with regular weeding but without direct fertilizer and lime inputs, showed lower exchangeable base cation contents (i.e. Ca, Mg, K) compared to the other management zones ($P \leq 0.02$) and higher exchangeable Al content than the palm circle ($P = 0.01$). This was reflected in the lower base saturation and higher Al saturation in the inter-row compared to the other zones ($P < 0.01$). Also, inter-row had the lowest ECEC ($P < 0.01$) and marginally lower pH than the palm circle ($P = 0.06$). The palm circle, where fertilizers and lime were applied, had generally comparable exchangeable element contents with the frond-stacked area, except for K, which was higher in the palm circle ($P < 0.01$), and for Mn, which was higher in the frond-stacked area ($P < 0.01$).

There were strong positive correlations between field-measured and modeled soil water matric potential (Fig. 1). The matric potential was generally lowest in the palm circle, intermediate in the inter-row, and highest in the frond-stacked area ($P < 0.01$). This pattern was also reflected in the low drainage flux in the palm circle and high drainage flux in the frond-stacked area (Table 2; Fig. 2). In the palm circle, the low drainage flux had resulted from high plant transpiration and interception whereas the high drainage flux in the frond-stacked area was due to low evapotranspiration and runoff with the senesced frond mulch (Table 2). Compared to annual precipitation, the calculated annual evapotranspiration was 51%, 31%, and 38% in the palm circle, frond-stacked area, and inter-row, respectively; annual drainage fluxes at 1.5-~~-~~m depth were 20% of precipitation in the palm circle, 65% in the frond-stacked area, and 43% in the inter-row. Over the course of one year, the monthly drainage fluxes displayed two peaks, in May and November, which occurred following several~~Seasonally, the monthly drainage fluxes had two peak periods, May and November, after consecutive~~ days of moderate rainfall. Lowest drainage fluxes were measured~~, and were lowest~~ during the end of the dry season ~~towards the start of the wet season ~~(Fig. 2).

3.2 Differences in leaching losses among management zones and treatments

We detected clear treatment differences ~~F~~for element concentrations in soil-pore water at 1.5 m depth, ~~treatment differences were clear in~~between the palm circle and inter-row (Fig. 3), with the herbicide treatment showing higher element concentrations than the mechanical weeding ($P \leq 0.02$). The frond-stacked area had generally lower ionic charge concentrations compared to the other management zones (Fig. 3). D~~The d~~ominant cations in leachate were Al^{3+}, Ca^{2+}, Mg^{2+}, K^+, and Na^+ across experimental treatments and management zones. Dissolved ~~Among the management zones, ~~Al~~$^{3+}$~~ concentrations were highest in the inter-row, intermediate in the palm circle, and lowest in the frond-stacked area ($P < 0.01$). The Ca^{2+} concentrations ~~of Ca^{2+}~~ were similar in the palm circle and frond-stacked area ($P = 0.42$), and ~~these ~~both were higher than in the inter-row ($P < 0.01$). The concentrations of Mg^{2+} and K^+ were higher in the palm circle than in the other two management zones ($P < 0.01$). The Na^+ concentrations were higher in the palm circle and inter-row than in the frond-stacked area ($P < 0.01$). As for N, NH_4^+

concentrations were lowest in the frond-stacked area, followed by the palm circle, and highest in the inter-row (*P* = 0.01). Across treatments, NH_4^+ was 4–18% of TDN whereas DON was only 1-7% of TDN. Thus, NO_3^- was ~~thus~~ the main form of dissolved N, ~~and~~ which was ~~this was~~ highest in the inter-row, followed by the frond-stacked area, and lowest in the palm circle ($P <$ 0.01). The dominant anion was Cl^- with higher concentrations in the palm circle than in the other zones ($P < 0.01$).

Monthly leaching fluxes showed a common pattern among the major solutes (Fig. 4): ~~there were~~ two peaks of leaching losses (May and November)~~, that~~ followed fertilizer applications, ~~and~~ whereas lower leaching losses occurred during the dry season from July to October. Leaching fluxes of NO_3^- ~~showed~~ followed a similar spatial pattern as NO_3^- ~~its~~ concentrations: higher in the inter-row, followed by the frond-stacked area, and lowest in the palm circle ($P < 0.01$; Fig. 4). Total Al leaching fluxes were also higher in the inter-row than the other zones ($P < 0.01$; Fig. 4). ~~On the other hand~~In contrast, base cation leaching fluxes ~~showed~~ displayed opposite spatial patterns ~~than their~~compared to their concentrations: Ca, K, and Mg leaching were higher in the frond-stacked area than the palm circle and inter-row (all $P < 0.01$; Fig. 4). Leaching of Na was higher in both the frond-stacked area and inter-row than the palm circle ($P < 0.01$; Fig. 4).

Reduced intensity of management ~~clearly~~ strongly influenced nutrient leaching losses (Fig. 5; Table 3). M~~Specifically, m~~echanical weeding reduced NO_3^- and cation leaching compared to herbicide weed control ($P \leq 0.03$; Fig. 5; Table 3). Leaching of NO_3^- was highest in the conventional fertilization–herbicide treatment and lowest in reduced management treatments ($P \leq 0.02$; Fig. 5). This was also reflected in the leaching fluxes of accompanying cations; specifically, total Al and Ca leaching were higher in conventional fertilization–herbicide treatment than the reduced management treatments (all $P \leq 0.02$; Fig. 5). For the other base cations, mechanical weeding ~~clearly~~ lowered leaching losses compared to herbicide weeding, in particular K and Na leaching in both fertilization rates and Mg leaching in conventional fertilization (all $P \leq 0.03$; Fig. 5).

3.3 Annual leaching losses and nutrient retention efficiency

In proportion to the applied fertilizer, annual leaching losses of TDN (Table 3) were 28% of the applied N in the herbicide treatment for both conventional and reduced fertilization rates, 24% in the mechanical weeding with conventional fertilization, and only 19% in the mechanical weeding with reduced fertilization. The annual leaching of K (Table 3) was 4% of the applied K fertilizer in the herbicide treatment and 3% in the mechanical weeding for both fertilization rates. In this highly weathered Acrisol soils with high capacity for P fixation by Fe and Al (hydr)oxides, ~~there was~~we detected no leaching of dissolved P (Table 3).

Both N and base cation retention efficiencies were generally lower in the inter-row compared to the other management zones ($P \leq 0.03$), except for reduced fertilization–mechanical weeding where there were no differences among management zones (Table 4). The area-weighted average N retention efficiency was comparable among experimental treatments ($P = 0.89$) but there was a trend of increasing efficiency with decreasing management intensity (Table 4). Base cation retention efficiency showed ~~clear~~ strong differences among experimental treatments for each management zones: in the palm circle, it was highest in mechanical weeding and lowest in the herbicide treatment ($P = 0.04$); in the frond-staked area and inter-row, it was lowest in the most intensive management treatment (conventional fertilization–herbicide) and highest in either mechanical weeding or reduced fertilization ($P \leq 0.05$; Table 4). The area-weighted averaged base cation retention efficiency was also ~~clearly~~ influenced by weeding method, being lowest in herbicide treatment and highest in mechanical weeding both with conventional fertilization ($P = 0.03$; Table 4).

4 Discussion

4.1 Water model and temporal pattern of nutrient leaching losses

To our knowledge, ~~this~~ our study is the first ~~attempt~~ that~~to model~~ has modeled water drainage fluxes from the different management zones of an oil palm plantation, which makes comparison with other published values challenging~~limiting our comparison with literature values~~. M~~Our~~ ~~m~~odeled annual transpiration rates in the palm circle (Table 2) ~~was~~ were remarkably similar to the values estimated with the eddy covariance technique in the same oil palm plantation (827–829 mm yr^{-1}; Meijide et al., 2017; Röll et al., 2019). Furthermore~~, and,~~ our average daily transpiration rate (2.3 mm d^{-1}) was within the range of ~~that~~ rates measured with drone-based photogrammetry (3 ± 1 mm d^{-1}; Ahongshangbam et al., 2019), also in the same plantation~~l in the same oil palm plantation~~. ~~Also, t~~The modeled annual runoff in the palm circle and inter-row (Table 2) ~~was~~ were also within the range of runoff estimates in oil palm plantations in Jambi province (10–20% of rainfall; Tarigan et al., 2016) and in Papua New Guinea (1.4–6% of rainfall; Banabas et al., 2008b). Considering the areal proportions of the three management zones, the weighted-average drainage flux (1161 mm yr^{-1}) was lower than ~~that~~ the estimate~~d~~ for smallholder oil palm plantations near our study site (1614 mm drainage flux with 3418 mm precipitation measured in 2013; Kurniawan et al., 2018). However, higher evapotranspiration rates in large-scale compared to smallholder oil palm plantations in our study area (Röll et al., 2019)~~,~~ may explain these differences. Nevertheless,~~However,~~ ratios of drainage flux to annual precipitation were comparable between our study and ~~that by~~the study by ~~-~~Kurniawan et al. (~~(~~2018). We conclude from ~~Also, evapotranspiration rate is higher in large-scale than smallholder oil palm plantations in our study area (Röll et al., 2019), which could have led to a lower drainage flux in large-scale plantations. Based on~~ these comparisons with literature values and on the good agreement between modeled and measured soil water matric potential (Fig. 1)~~, we conclude~~ that our modeled water drainage fluxes were reliable. T~~Moreover, t~~he frond-stacked areas had larger drainage fluxes, caused by ~~as a result of~~ a ~~combined~~ combination of~~with~~ low evapotranspiration and runoff (Table 2) and enhanced porosity (indicated by lower bulk density;~~,~~ Table1) from organic matter that facilitates water infiltration (Moradi et al., 2015)~~, as indirectly indicated by its low soil bulk density (Table 1)~~. This suggests that piling senesced fronds may amend groundwater recharge~~,~~ which, in turn, ~~-~~could moderate discharge fluctuations in water catchments of oil palm-~~-~~converted areas (Tarigan et al., 2020).

The temporal peaks of nutrient leaching fluxes (May and November; Fig. 4) likely resulted from the combined effect of high drainage flux and fertilizer application. ~~High~~ Large drainage fluxes might have stimulated the downward transport of nutrients and decreased their residence time in the soil, and thus their adsorption onto the soil exchange sites (Lohse and Matson, 2005). L~~Although l~~arge drainage fluxes usually dilute the nutrient concentrations in the soil-pore water~~; ~~;~~,~~ however, the combined fertilizer and lime applications were able to maintain~~ed~~ high nutrient concentrations as manifested by the parallel peaks of drainage and nutrient leaching fluxes (Figs. 2 and 4). The high NO_3^- leaching following urea-N fertilization (Fig. 4) suggests ~~increased~~ rapid nitrification (Silver et al., 2005), fast NO_3^- transport through the soil column, and ~~reduced~~ limited anion adsorption capacity (Wong et al., 1990). The latter was possibly ~~aggravated~~ affected by the ~~additional~~ added Cl^- from fertilization with KCl (Fig. 3), which ~~could~~ may have saturated the soil anion exchange sites, particularly ~~at~~ in this mature plantation, ~~with already~~which has been intensively fertilized for 16–20 years~~ of high fertilization rates~~. Due to its negative charge, ~~Large~~ NO_3^- ~~–~~leaching fluxes ~~is~~ are always accompanied by comparable ~~large~~ leaching fluxes of ~~buffering~~ positive cations (Dubos et al., 2017; Kurniawan et al., 2018), resulting in ~~their~~ similar temporal leaching patterns (Fig. 4). ~~These~~ Our findings ~~showed~~ illustrate that fertilization should be avoided during periods of high drainage fluxes, which were ~~. Generally, the high drainage was a consequence of a~~related to ~~protracted~~ extended period of moderate rainfall (Fig. 2). However, it is expected that reliable p~~P~~rediction of periods ~~of~~ with high ~~precipitation~~ rainfall and drainage will become even more difficult with ~~will further be confounded by~~ climate change, which is ~~widening the range between wet and dry seasons and~~ increasing ~~the~~ uncertainties in rainfall intensity and distribution (Chou et al., 2013; Feng et al., 2013). Fertilization during the dry ~~period~~ season is also not advisable ~~given the high volatilization of applied~~because plant uptake is low during this period (Corley and Tinker, 2016) and application of urea together with lime will cause urea to volatilize easily, even in these acidic soils ~~as this is always accompanied by liming~~ (Goh et al., 2003; Pardon et al., 2016) ~~and the low palm uptake during the dry season (Corley and Tinker, 2016)~~.

Our results suggest that there are several viable options to reduce leaching losses without sacrificing production. ~~Thus, sp~~Spreading ~~the~~ fertiliz~~ation~~er applications over a longer period ~~of time~~ and reducing fertilization rates, e.g. at compensatory level equal to harvest export, as we tested in our experiment, are recommendable alternatives to present practices~~, seem viable options to reduce leaching losses without sacrificing production~~. In addition, t~~One other option is t~~he use of organic amendments, such as empty fruit bunches, compost, palm oil mill effluent, or slow-release fertilizers, which have been shown to reduce N leaching in tropical cropping systems (Nyamangara et al., 2003; Steiner et al., 2008; Mohanty et al., 2018), will also reduce leaching losses. O~~In addition, o~~rganic fertilizer have the additional advantage ~~that~~ of ~~can improve~~ improving soil fertility ~~can be improved~~ in oil palm plantations (Comte et al., 2013; Boafo et al., 2020), as was also ~~evident with~~shown by mulching of senesced oil palm fronds (i.e. high SOC, total N, ECEC and base saturation in the frond-stacked area; Table 1).

4.2 Leaching losses in the different management zones

A surprising result, in contrast ~~Contrary~~ to our first hypothesis, was that nutrient leaching losses among management zones were generally large in the inter-row, especially for mineral N (largely NO_3; Fig. 3), and lower in the palm circle (Fig. 4). ~~This strikingly large mineral N leaching losses in the inter-row were surprising~~We did not expect this ~~given that~~because the inter-row~~ this area~~ did not receive direct fertilizer inputs (see section 2.1). ~~This~~ Our results suggest~~s~~ that mineral N was transported via surface and/or subsurface lateral flows from the ~~directly~~ fertilized palm circle to the inter-row ~~via surface and subsurface lateral flow as these two zones~~which were ~~just~~ only 3 m apart (Fig. A1). We expect that the contribution of s~~S~~urface transport of mineral N was ~~probably a~~ minor process at our site, ~~-~~because of the low runoff (Table 2~~);~~). Also in an oil palm plantation in Papua New Guinea, the loss of N fertilizer via surface runoff wa~~i~~s only 0.3–2.2 kg N ha^{-1} yr^{-1} (Banabas et al., 2008b). The dominant form of transport of mineral N in our experiment ~~Mineral N~~ was ~~probably~~ likely ~~predominantly transported to the inter-row via~~by subsurface lateral flow. Acrisol soils are characterized by clay translocation to a subsurface soil horizon ~~from upper to lower depths~~ that ~~could~~ can create a~~n~~ ~~impeding~~ stagnating layer above which ~~conducive to~~ lateral water flow can occur (Elsenbeer, 2001). Indeed, the clay contents of the Acrisol soils at our study area increase with depth, and soil bulk density at 100–150 cm ~~is~~ was larger ~~at 100–150 cm~~ than at 150–200 cm depth (Allen et al., 2016). In addition, ~~the~~ palm roots spreading from the palm circle to the inter-row may create channels for subsurface lateral flow of dissolved ions such as~~like~~ NO_3^- (Li and Ghodrati, 1994). Higher mineral N leaching in the inter-row than palm circle ~~was~~ had~~s~~ also been observed in a study in Brazil ~~and~~ where it was attributed to lower root density and higher N mineralization at increasing distance from the palm´s stem (Schroth et al., 2000). Hence, a combination of lower root uptake, higher N mineralization, and subsurface lateral transport (particularly for NO_3^-) all may ~~all~~ have contributed to higher mineral N leaching losses in the inter-row than the palm circle. In the inter-row, t~~T~~he main ~~accompanying~~ cation that accompanied the~~of~~ leached NO_3^- ~~in the inter-row~~ was Al^{3+} (Figs. 3 and 4). This is because this zone's soil pH (Table 1) was within the Al-buffering range (pH 3–5; van Breemen et al., 1983) ~~as~~ ~~because~~as this zone ~~had~~ ~~receives~~ had no direct lime application and consequently had~~s~~ a low base saturation (Table 1). Our findings also show~~ed~~ that if leaching is measured only within the palm circle, this could lead to a substantial~~ly~~ ~~underestimate~~ underestimation of mineral N and Al leaching losses.

Despite the direct application of fertilizer, ~~T~~the palm circle had relatively low N leaching losses (Figs. 3 and 4), which ~~despite the direct application of fertilizer. This~~ was probably due to the large root density, ~~in this zone that~~ facilitat~~es~~ing an efficient nutrient uptake (Edy et al., 2020; Nelson et al., 2006). T~~Hence, t~~he dominant anion in soil-pore water in the palm circle was Cl^- (Fig. 3), which was enhanced by the applied KCl fertilizer, which was accompanied by high base cation concentrations relative to dissolved Al (Fig. 3). The former was due to the applied micromag fertilizer and dolomite (section 2.1), which increased pH and exchangeable bases and rendered Al in insoluble form (~~i.e. lower exchangeable Al;~~ Table 1; Schlesinger and Bernhardt, 2013). Despite their high concentrations, base cation~~s~~ ~~the~~ leaching fluxes ~~of base cations~~ in the palm circle (Fig. 4) were constrained by the low water drainage flux ~~due to high evapotranspiration~~ (Table 2).

Although t~~T~~he frond-stacked area was at the same distance from the palm circle as the inter-row (Fig. A1), ~~but had substantially lower~~ mineral N leaching losses were substantially lower (Figs. 3 and 4). Decomposition of nutrient-rich fronds (Kotowska et al., 2016) resulted in high SOC and N stocks (Table 1), which can support a large microbial biomass in this zone (Haron et al., 1998). Immobilization of mineral N by the large microbial biomass, converting mobile NO_3^- to less mobile organic N, may have caused~~Thus,~~ the low mineral N leaching in the frond-stacked area ~~may be attributed to immobilization of mineral N by large microbial biomass, converting mobile NO_3^- to less mobile organic N~~ (e.g. Corre et al., 2010). In addition, ~~it could be possible that~~ palm root uptake of nutrients (including mineral N) ~~was~~ may have been higher in the frond-stacked area ~~compared to~~than in the inter-row ~~as~~ because roots tend to proliferate in nutrient-rich zones (Table 1; Hodge, 2004). Indeed, ~~This is supported by~~ studies ~~that showed~~have shown higher root density and higher water uptake under the frond piles compared to the inter-row (Nelson et al., 2006; Rüegg et al., 2019). The larger base cation~~s~~ leaching in the frond-stacked area compared to the inter-row (Fig. 4) were probably a reflection of t~~T~~he high ECEC, base saturation and pH in frond-stacked area (Table 1). These favorable soil characteristics ~~, despite having no direct lime application, were due to~~were probably caused by the release of nutrients from decomposition of frond litter, which contain high ~~levels of~~ base cation~~s~~ concentrations (Kotowska et al., 2016). ~~Thus, the larger base cations leaching in the frond-stacked area compared to the inter-row (Fig. 4) merely mirrored their high exchangeable concentrations (Table 1).~~ Finally, the low Al leaching ~~of Al was low~~ in the frond-stacked area (Figs. 3 and 4) can be explained by the higher soil pH, ~~because Al becomes insoluble and exchangeable Al decreases as pH increases (i.e. lower exchangeable Al;~~ (Table 1). ~~Altogether, these~~Our results highlight~~ed~~ the benefits of piling senesced fronds on~~to~~ the soil to reduce leaching of mineral N and Al, which could otherwise ~~can potentially diminish~~affect ground water quality. In other areas such as Borneo, o~~O~~il palm plantations ~~in other areas (e.g. Borneo; Rahman et al., 2018)~~ were reported to practice piling of senesced fronds on every inter-row (Rahman et al., 2018). I~~, which we did not observed i~~n our study region this is rare~~seldom~~ly practiced ~~as that is claimed~~because it ~~to~~ hinders access to palms during harvest. Maybe chopping~~-~~-up senesced leaves with a shredder before spreading them on the soil can both improve access and at the same time ~~Nonetheless, our findings implied that increase in the frond-stacked area can contribute to sustainable~~enhance nutrient management of oil palm plantations.

4.3 Leaching losses under different intensity of management

~~There was a clear influence of m~~Management intensity treatments ~~on~~ strongly affected nutrient leaching losses with generally lower leaching fluxes ~~in~~ under less intensive~~reduced~~ management ~~intensity~~ (Fig. 5; Table 3). In line with our second hypothesis, ~~the weeding methods clearly influenced leaching losses: the~~ mechanical weeding ~~treatment~~ had lower nutrient leaching fluxes than the herbicide ~~treatment~~ application (Fig. 5; Table 5). Plots with m~~M~~echanical weeding ~~was associated with~~ had ~~a better~~~~more~~higher ground vegetation cover (Darras et al., 2019) and higher nutrient retention efficiency than herbicide weeding (Table 4). Leaching losses were probably retained better by~~, suggesting that~~ faster regrowth of understory vegetation ~~by~~ under mechanical weeding ~~has additionally contributed to the uptake of nutrients and thus reducing leaching losses~~. This is in line with ~~some~~ studies in temperate forests and in a cedar plantation ~~that~~ show~~ed~~ing that understory vegetation can take up excess NO_3^- in the soil (Olsson and Falkengren-Grerup, 2003) and reduce NO_3^- leaching and the mobilization of Ca and Mg (Fukuzawa et al., 2006; Baba et al., 2011). ~~Enhanced~~ Denser understory vegetation in oil palm plantations may also positively impact biodiversity by increasing plant species richness and soil macrofauna diversity and abundance (Ashton-Butt et al., 2018; Luke et al., 2019), which may facilitate nutrient uptake and recycling ~~of nutrients~~. In addition, s~~Increase in s~~oil macrofauna ~~might~~ may have contributed to lower Na leaching ~~of Na~~ with mechanical weeding (Fig. 5), ~~since~~ because herbivores and decomposers can take up a ~~large~~ substantial amounts of Na (Kaspari et al., 2009). Following the first three years after establishment of the experiment, oil palm y~~The y~~ield ~~in the first three years following the experiment establishment~~ was ~~on average~~approximately 30 Mg of fresh fruit bunches ha^{-1} yr^{-1} and did ~~it was comparable~~not differ~~ent~~ among experimental treatments (Figure A2;~~,~~ Darras et al. 2019). This ~~indicated~~ ~~shows~~attests that during the first three years the reduced management intensity did not affect productivity. However, ~~at least during the first three years, but the~~ long-term monitoring of yield is essential as it may take a longer ~~time~~ period before ~~the~~ yield ~~to~~ responds to our experimental ~~the t~~treatments (e.g. Tao et al. 2017). C~~Also, the c~~osts of the two weeding treatments (i.e. herbicide vs mechanical) ~~was comparable~~were not different because it is a common practice to combine the use of herbicide with the periodic mechanical cutting of resistant ground vegetation (Pahan, 2010; Darras et al., 2019). In addition, the use of glyphosate ~~is~~ has been associated with possible health risks to workers and the environment (van Bruggen et al., 2018). ~~Therefore, these~~In summary, our results ~~altogether~~ advocate for a ~~higher~~ more sustainable management ~~sustainability of~~with mechanical weeding ~~over~~ compared to herbicide application.

The decrease in NO_3^- leaching with reduc~~tion of~~ed N fertilization rates ~~decreased NO_3^- leaching~~, without affecting yield, support~~ing~~s our third hypothesis. Our results suggest that excess N applied with the conventional fertilization~~er~~ rate (above harvest export; section 2.1) was largely lost through leaching (Table 3), as ~~Comparing conventional and reduced fertilization rates,~~ there were no differences in total N stocks (section 3.1), mineral N levels (Darras et al., 2019), N retention efficiency (Table 4) and oil palm yield (Darras et al., 2019).~~,~~ We attribute t~~suggesting that excess N (above harvest export; section 2.1) from high N fertilization was largely lost through leaching (Table 3). T~~he ~~decreased~~ declines in Al and Ca leaching with reduced fertilization ~~can be attributed~~ to the lower~~ed~~ NO_3^- leaching, ~~since~~ because Al and Ca cations accompanied the leached NO_3^- ~~these were the accompanying cations~~ (Figs. 4 and 5). The~~Also, a~~ reduction of Ca leaching may ~~also~~ be also related to ~~could have resulted from~~ the lower application rate of triple superphosphate fertilizer, which contains 16% of Ca. The reduced K fertilization ~~had no effect on~~did not affect K leaching (Fig. 5) probably because K fertilization rates ~~was~~ were only reduced by 15% of the conventional rate ~~due~~ owing to high K ~~requirements of~~export with harvested oil palm fruits (section 2.1). ~~We conclude~~Our study provides evidence that this mature (16–20 years old) plantation with conventional management was ~~overly~~ over-fertilized with N, and ~~that~~ we suggest that inclusion of lower ~~a reduction in~~ N fertilization rates (related to N export with fruit bunches) ~~may be included~~ in the Indonesian

Formatted: Subscript

Formatted: Superscript

program for precision farming (Ministry of Agriculture of Indonesia, 2016) will substantially and quickly improve the~~to reduce~~ environmental footprint of oil palm production.

~~Comparing the N leaching losses in the studied plantation with~~Compared to other fertilized tropical plantations (Table A3), our plantation had similar N leaching estimates reported in another oil palm study using a model validated with field data from Su~~a~~matra (Pardon et al. 2020). In contrast, ~~higher~~ lower N leaching losses were~~than~~ reported in other large-scale oil palm plantations on similar soils with comparable fertilization rates (Omoti et al., 1983; Tung et al., 2009). However, in these studies, ~~the~~ leaching losses were exclusively measured in the palm circle (Omoti et al., 1983) or the sampling location was not specified (Tung et al., 2009). Both studies may thus have ~~, such that N leaching may be~~ underestimated N leaching, because~~as~~ our results showed the highest contribution ~~of the inter-row~~ to leaching losses from the inter-row (Figs. 3 and 4). ~~Last, our values are in the same range as the N leaching estimated in another oil palm plantation study using a model that was validated with field data from Sumatra (Pardon et al. 2020).~~~~The~~ N leaching fluxes in our plantation were also higher than fluxes reported from ~~in~~ smallholder oil palm plantations in the same area, ~~which typically had much~~owing to their lower fertilization rates (Kurniawan et al., 2018). In contrast, N leaching ~~On the other hand,~~in our plantation ~~had~~ was lower ~~N leaching losses~~ than from ~~an~~ an oil palm plantation ~~and~~ or coffee agroforestry systems on volcanic soils (Banabas et al., 2008b; Tully et al., 2012; Cannavo et al., 2013). This may be caused by the~~, which have high~~ inherently higher nutrient contents, and high~~ly~~ poro~~u~~sity of these volcanic soils ~~which~~that facilitates ~~soils and~~ high infiltration rates. ~~The~~ N leaching losses from our plantation were also lower ~~than in~~compared to banana plantations, which had substantially higher ~~characterized by very high~~ fertilization rates (Wakelin et al., 2011; Armour et al., 2013). ~~Last, our values are in the same range as the N leaching estimated in another oil palm plantation study using a model that was validated with field data from Sumatra (Pardon et al. 2020).~~

The high fluxes of NO_3^- and Al~~nutrients leached~~ at 1.5 m depth ~~should be considered lost from uptake of oil palm roots, as the majority of the root mass and the highest root density are in the top 0.5 m depth (Nelson et al., 2006; Schroth et al., 2000; Kurniawan et al., 2018). The high leaching fluxes of~~ ~~NO_3^-~~ ~~and Al~~ implies~~yied~~ a substantial risk of groundwater pollution. During the period of high drainage fluxes following fertilization, NO_3^- concentrations in soil-pore water reached ~~to~~ concentrations of 20–40 mg NO_3^- L^{-1} in the inter-row (covering 67% of the plantation area), which ~~was~~ is close to the~~-~~ upper limit of 50 mg NO_3^- L^{-1} ~~limit~~ for drinking water (WHO, 2011). ~~, and~~ Al concentrations in soil-pore water even~~-~~ exceeded the limit of 0.2 mg Al L^{-1} in 60% of the samples. ~~Nevertheless, before reaching streams and rivers,~~This does not automatically mean that surface water will be contaminated, as~~: –~~ ~~these~~ NO_3^- and Al concentrations can be diluted ~~by surface flow~~ and partially retained in the soil ~~along flow paths:~~ ~~NO_3^-~~ ~~can be temporarily adsorbed in the deeper layers of highly weathered soils by its inherently high anion exchange capacity~~ (Harmand et al., 2010; Jankowski et al., 2018) ~~and can be consumed by~~or denitrifi~~ed~~~~cation~~ (Wakelin et al., 2011). Such processes are especially effective in r~~. R~~iparian buffers, which~~-~~ can mitigate the transport of these agricultural pollutants to streams (Luke et al., 2017; Chellaiah and Yule, 2018). Our results thus ~~also~~ support the importance of restoring ~~Restoring~~ riparian buffers in areas ~~former forests~~ converted to oil palm plantations, which is also an important ~~have been listed as one~~ sustainability ~~criteria~~criterion ~~,~~ endorsed by the Roundtable for Sustainable Palm Oil association (RSPO, 2018), ~~and~~ that may ~~also~~ provide additional regulation services (Woodham et al., 2019).

5 Conclusions

Our findings show that nutrient leaching losses in an oil palm plantation differed among management zones, as a result of fertilization, liming, mulching and of different drainage fluxes. ~~The reduction of management intensity, i.e.~~Implementation of~~-~~ mechanical weeding with reduced fertilization rates~~,~~ was effective in reducing nutrient leaching losses without

~~reduction in~~affecting yield ~~at least~~ during the first three years of this experiment. Long-term investigation of this management experiment is important and planned in order to get a reliable response of yield and to make a more holistic economic analysis that ~~,~~includ~~ing~~es valuation of regulation services. Greenhouse gas emissions should also be quantified, as another important parameter of the environmental footprint of oil palm production. ~~Our~~ Our ultimate goal is that our present and future findings ~~and these further investigations should~~ will be incorporated into science-based policy recommendations such as those endorsed by the RSPO.

Data availability

All data of this study are deposited at the EFForTS-IS data repository (https://efforts-is.uni-goettingen.de), an internal data-exchange platform, which is accessible to all members of the Collaborative Research Center (CRC) 990. Based on the data sharing agreement within the CRC 990, these data are currently not publicly accessible but will be made available through a written request to the senior author.

Author contribution

GF performed the ~~experiments~~field measurements, analysed the data and wrote the manuscript in consultation with MDC. EV and MDC conceived and planned the experiment. XD helped carry out the water model simulations. AT aided in organizing the field activities ~~organization~~ and facilitating the ~~granting~~ collaboration~~s agreement~~s among partners. All authors contributed to the final version of the manuscript.

Competing interests

No conflict of interest to declare

Aknowledgments

This study was part of the project A05 in the CRC990-EFForTS, funded by the German Research Foundation (DFG, Project ID: 192626868 – SFB 990). We acknowledge the collaborations with PTPN VI plantation, Kevin Darras, and project Z01, for the implementation and maintenance of this field experiment. We thank Christian Stiegler, with project A03, for the climate data, and Eckart Priesack for the Expert-N water sub-model. We especially thank our field and laboratory assistants for their valuable dedications in all field and laboratory activities. This research was conducted under the research permit of Ministry of Research and Technology of Indonesia, 539351/SIP/FRP/E5/Dit.KI/X/2016.

References

Abdalla, M., Hastings, A., Cheng, K., Yue, Q., Chadwick, D., Espenberg, M., Truu, J., Rees, R. M., and Smith, P.: A critical review of the impacts of cover crops on nitrogen leaching, net greenhouse gas balance and crop productivity, Global Change Biology, 25, 2530–2543, doi:10.1111/gcb.14644, 2019.

Ahongshangbam, J., Khokthong, W., Ellsäßer, F., Hendrayanto, H., Hölscher, D., and Röll, A.: Drone-based photogrammetry-derived crown metrics for predicting tree and oil palm water use, Ecohydrology, 12, 1–18, doi:10.1002/eco.2115, 2019.

Allen, K., Corre, M. D., Kurniawan, S., Utami, S. R., and Veldkamp, E.: Spatial variability surpasses land-use change effects on soil biochemical properties of converted lowland landscapes in Sumatra, Indonesia, Geoderma, 284, 42–50, doi:10.1016/j.geoderma.2016.08.010, 2016.

Allen, K., Corre, M. D., Tjoa, A., and Veldkamp, E.: Soil nitrogen-cycling responses to conversion of lowland forests to oil palm and rubber plantations in Sumatra, Indonesia, PloS One, 10, e0133325, doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0133325, 2015.

Allen, R. G.: Crop evapotranspiration: Guidelines for computing crop water requirements, FAO irrigation and drainage paper, 56, Rome, 300 pp., 1998.

Armour, J. D., Nelson, P. N., Daniells, J. W., Rasiah, V., and Inman-Bamber, N. G.: Nitrogen leaching from the root zone of sugarcane and bananas in the humid tropics of Australia, Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment, 180, 68–78, doi:10.1016/j.agee.2012.05.007, 2013.

Ashton-Butt, A., Aryawan, A. A. K., Hood, A. S. C., Naim, M., Purnomo, D., Suhardi, Wahyuningsih, R., Willcock, S., Poppy, G. M., Caliman, J.-P., Turner, E. C., Foster, W. A., Peh, K. S. H., and Snaddon, J. L.: Understory vegetation in oil palm plantations benefits soil biodiversity and decomposition rates, Frontiers in Forests and Global Change, 1, 1–13, doi:10.3389/ffgc.2018.00010, 2018.

Asner, G. P., Powell, G. V. N., Mascaro, J., Knapp, D. E., Clark, J. K., Jacobson, J., Kennedy-Bowdoin, T., Balaji, A., Paez-Acosta, G., Victoria, E., Secada, L., Valqui, M., and Hughes, F. R.: High-resolution forest carbon stocks and emissions in the Amazon, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 107, 16738–16742, doi:10.1073/pnas.1004875107, 2010.

Baba, M., Abe, S., Kasai, M., Sugiura, T., and Kobayashi, H.: Contribution of understory vegetation to minimizing nitrate leaching in a Japanese cedar plantation, Journal of Forest Research, 16, 446–455, doi:10.1007/s10310-010-0244-3, 2011.

Banabas, M., Scotter, D. R., and Turner, M. A.: Losses of nitrogen fertiliser under oil palm in Papua New Guinea: 2. Nitrogen transformations and leaching, and a residence time model, Soil Research, 46, 340–347, doi:10.1071/SR07174, 2008a.

Banabas, M., Turner, M. A., Scotter, D. R., and Nelson, P. N.: Losses of nitrogen fertiliser under oil palm in Papua New Guinea: 1. Water balance, and nitrogen in soil solution and runoff, Australian Journal of Soil Research, 46, 332–339, doi:10.1071/SR07171, 2008b.

Bates, D., Maechler, M., Bolker, B., and Walker, S.: Fitting linear mixed-effect models using lme4, Journal of Statistical Software, 67, 1–48, 2015.

Boafo, D. K., Kraisornpornson, B., Panphon, S., Owusu, B. E., and Amaniampong, P. N.: Effect of organic soil amendments on soil quality in oil palm production, Applied Soil Ecology, 147, 103358, doi:10.1016/j.apsoil.2019.09.008, 2020.

Cannavo, P., Harmand, J.-M., Zeller, B., Vaast, P., Ramírez, J. E., and Dambrine, E.: Low nitrogen use efficiency and high nitrate leaching in a highly fertilized Coffea arabica–Inga densiflora agroforestry system: a 15N labeled fertilizer study, Nutrient Cycling in Agroecosystems, 95, 377–394, doi:10.1007/s10705-013-9571-z, 2013.

Carlson, K. M., Curran, L. M., Asner, G. P., Pittman, A. M., Trigg, S. N., and Marion Adeney, J.: Carbon emissions from forest conversion by Kalimantan oil palm plantations, Nature Climate Change, 3, 283–287, doi:10.1038/nclimate1702, 2013.

Carpenter, S. R., Caraco, N. F., Correll, D. L., Howarth, R. W., Sharpley, A. N., and Smith, V. H.: Nonpoint pollution of surface waters with phosphorus and nitrogen, Ecological Applications, 8, 559–568, doi:10.1890/1051-0761(1998)008[0559:NPOSWW]2.0.CO;2, 1998.

Carter, C., Finley, W., Fry, J., Jackson, D., and Willis, L.: Palm oil markets and future supply, European Journal of Lipid Science and Technology, 109, 307–314, doi:10.1002/ejlt.200600256, 2007.

Chellaiah, D. and Yule, C. M.: Effect of riparian management on stream morphometry and water quality in oil palm plantations in Borneo, Limnologica, 69, 72–80, doi:10.1016/j.limno.2017.11.007, 2018.

Chou, C., Chiang, J. C. H., Lan, C.-W., Chung, C.-H., Liao, Y.-C., and Lee, C.-J.: Increase in the range between wet and dry season precipitation, Nature Geoscience, 6, 263–267, doi:10.1038/ngeo1744, 2013.

Clough, Y., Krishna, V. V., Corre, M. D., Darras, K., Denmead, L. H., Meijide, A., Moser, S., Musshoff, O., Steinebach, S., Veldkamp, E., Allen, K., Barnes, A. D., Breidenbach, N., Brose, U., Buchori, D., Daniel, R., Finkeldey, R., Harahap, I., Hertel, D., Holtkamp, A. M., Hörandl, E., Irawan, B., Jaya, I. N. S., Jochum, M., Klarner, B., Knohl, A., Kotowska, M. M., Krashevska, V., Kreft, H., Kurniawan, S., Leuschner, C., Maraun, M., Melati, D. N., Opfermann, N., Pérez-Cruzado, C., Prabowo, W. E., Rembold, K., Rizali, A., Rubiana, R., Schneider, D., Tjitrosoedirdjo, S. S., Tjoa, A., Tscharntke, T., and Scheu, S.: Land-use choices follow profitability at the expense of ecological functions in Indonesian smallholder landscapes, Nature Communications, 7, 13137, doi:10.1038/ncomms13137, 2016.

Comte, I., Colin, F., Grünberger, O., Follain, S., Whalen, J. K., and Caliman, J.-P.: Landscape-scale assessment of soil response to long-term organic and mineral fertilizer application in an industrial oil palm plantation, Indonesia, Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment, 169, 58–68, doi:10.1016/j.agee.2013.02.010, 2013.

Corley, R. H. V. and Tinker, P. B.: The oil palm, 5th ed., John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, Hoboken, NJ, 2016.

Corley, R.H.V.: How much palm oil do we need?, Environmental Science & Policy, 12, 134–139, doi:10.1016/j.envsci.2008.10.011, 2009.

Corre, M. D., Veldkamp, E., Arnold, J., and Wright, S. J.: Impact of elevated N input on soil N cycling and losses in old-growth lowland and montane forests in Panama, Ecology, 91, 1715–1729, doi:10.1890/09-0274.1, 2010.

Cusack, D. F., Silver, W., and McDowell, W. H.: Biological nitrogen fixation in two tropical forests: ecosystem-level patterns and effects of nitrogen fertilization, Ecosystems, 12, 1299–1315, doi:10.1007/s10021-009-9290-0, 2009.

Darras, K. F. A., Corre, M. D., Formaglio, G., Tjoa, A., Potapov, A., Brambach, F., Sibhatu, K. T., Grass, I., Rubiano, A. A., Buchori, D., Drescher, J., Fardiansah, R., Hölscher, D., Irawan, B., Kneib, T., Krashevska, V., Krause, A., Kreft, H., Li, K., Maraun, M., Polle, A., Ryadin, A. R., Rembold, K., Stiegler, C., Scheu, S., Tarigan, S., Valdés-Uribe, A., Yadi, S., Tscharntke, T., and Veldkamp, E.: Reducing fertilizer and avoiding herbicides in O oil palm plantations—ecological and economic valuations, Frontiers in Forests and Global Change, 2, doi:10.3389/ffgc.2019.00065, 2019.

Dechert, G., Veldkamp, E., and Brumme, R.: Are partial nutrient balances suitable to evaluate nutrient sustainability of land use systems? Results from a case study in central Sulawesi, Indonesia, Nutrient Cycling in Agroecosystems, 72, 201–212, doi:10.1007/s10705-005-1546-2, 2005.

Drescher, J., Rembold, K., Allen, K., Beckschäfer, P., Buchori, D., Clough, Y., Faust, H., Fauzi, A. M., Gunawan, D., Hertel, D., Irawan, B., Jaya, I. N. S., Klarner, B., Kleinn, C., Knohl, A., Kotowska, M. M., Krashevska, V., Krishna, V., Leuschner, C., Lorenz, W., Meijide, A., Melati, D., Nomura, M., Pérez-Cruzado, C., Qaim, M., Siregar, I. Z., Steinebach, S., Tjoa, A., Tscharntke, T., Wick, B., Wiegand, K., Kreft, H., and Scheu, S.: Ecological and socio-economic functions across tropical land use systems after rainforest conversion, Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B, Biological sciences, 371, doi:10.1098/rstb.2015.0275, 2016.

Dubos, B., Snoeck, D., and Flori, A.: Excessive use of fertilizer can increase leaching processes and modify soil reserves in two Ecuadorian oil palm plantations, Experimental Agriculture, 53, 255–268, doi:10.1017/S0014479716000363, 2017.

Edy, N., Yelianti, U., Irawan, B., Polle, A., and Pena, R.: Differences in root nitrogen uptake between tropical lowland rainforests and oil palm plantations, Frontiers in Plant Science, 11, 92, doi:10.3389/fpls.2020.00092, 2020.

Elsenbeer, H.: Hydrologic flowpaths in tropical rainforest soilscapes - a review, Hydrological Processes, 15, 1751–1759, doi:10.1002/hyp.237, 2001.

Fan, Y., Roupsard, O., Bernoux, M., Le Maire, G., Panferov, O., Kotowska, M. M., and Knohl, A.: A sub-canopy structure for simulating oil palm in the Community Land Model (CLM-Palm): phenology, allocation and yield, Geoscientific Model Development, 8, 3785–3800, doi:10.5194/gmd-8-3785-2015, 2015.

Feng, X., Porporato, A., and Rodriguez-Iturbe, I.: Changes in rainfall seasonality in the tropics, Nature Climate Change, 3, 811–815, doi:10.1038/nclimate1907, 2013.

Figueiredo, R. O., Markewitz, D., Davidson, E. A., Schuler, A. E., Watrin, O. d. S., and Silva, P. d. S.: Land-use effects on the chemical attributes of low-order streams in the eastern Amazon, Journal of Geophysical Research, 115, doi:10.1029/2009JG001200, 2010.

Food and Agricolture Organization, FAOSTAT: http://faostat.fao.org/site/339/default.aspx, last access: 30 March 2020.

Fukuzawa, K., Shibata, H., Takagi, K., Nomura, M., Kurima, N., Fukazawa, T., Satoh, F., and Sasa, K.: Effects of clear-cutting on nitrogen leaching and fine root dynamics in a cooltemperate forested watershed in northern Japan, Forest Ecology and Management, 225, 257–261, doi:10.1016/j.foreco.2006.01.001, 2006.

Geist, H. J. and Lambin, E. F.: Proximate causes and underlying driving forces of tropical deforestation, BioScience, 52, 143–150, doi:10.1641/0006-3568(2002)052[0143:PCAUDF]2.0.CO;2, 2002.

Gibbs, H. K., Ruesch, A. S., Achard, F., Clayton, M. K., Holmgren, P., Ramankutty, N., and Foley, J. A.: Tropical forests were the primary sources of new agricultural land in the 1980s and 1990s, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 107, 16732–16737, doi:10.1073/pnas.0910275107, 2010.

Goh, K.-J., Härdter, R., and Fairhurst, T.: Fertilizing for maximum return, Oil Palm Management for Large and Sustainable Yields, 279–306, 2003.

Grass, I., Kubitza, C., Krishna, V. V., Corre, M. D., Mußhoff, O., Pütz, P., Drescher, J., Rembold, K., Ariyanti, E. S., Barnes, A. D., Brinkmann, N., Brose, U., Brümmer, B., Buchori, D., Daniel, R., Darras, K. F. A., Faust, H., Fehrmann, L., Hein, J., Hennings, N., Hidayat, P., Hölscher, D., Jochum, M., Knohl, A., Kotowska, M. M., Krashevska, V., Kreft, H., Leuschner, C., Lobite, N. J. S., Panjaitan, R., Polle, A., Potapov, A. M., Purnama, E., Qaim, M., Röll, A., Scheu, S., Schneider, D., Tjoa, A., Tscharntke, T., Veldkamp, E., and Wollni, M.: Trade-offs between multifunctionality and profit in tropical smallholder landscapes, Nature Communications, 11, 1186, doi:10.1038/s41467-020-15013-5, 2020.

Harmand, J.-M., Ávila, H., Oliver, R., Saint-André, L., and Dambrine, E.: The impact of kaolinite and oxi-hydroxides on nitrate adsorption in deep layers of a Costarican Acrisol under coffee cultivation, Geoderma, 158, 216–224, doi:10.1016/j.geoderma.2010.04.032, 2010.

Haron, K., Brookes, P. C., Anderson, J. M., and Zakaria, Z. Z.: Microbial biomass and soil organic matter dynamics in oil palm (Elaeis Guineensis Jacq.) plantations, West Malaysia, Soil Biology and Biochemistry, 30, 547–552, doi:10.1016/S0038-0717(97)00217-4, 1998.

Hillel, D: Introduction to Soil Physics, 107–114, Academic Press, California, USA, 1982.

Hodge, A.: The plastic plant: root responses to heterogeneous supplies of nutrients, New Phytologist, 162, 9–24, doi:10.1111/j.1469-8137.2004.01015.x, 2004.

Hothorn, T., Bretz, F., and Westfall, P.: Simultaneous inference in general parametric models, Biometrical Journal, 50, 346–363, 2008.

~~Huddell, A. M., Galford, G. L., Tully, K. L., Crowley, C., Palm, C. A., Neill, C., Hickman, J. E., and Menge, D. N. L.: Meta-analysis on the potential for increasing nitrogen losses from intensifying tropical agriculture, Global Change Biology, 26, 1–13, doi:10.1111/gcb.14951, 2020.~~

Jankowski, K., Neill, C., Davidson, E. A., Macedo, M. N., Costa, C. J., Galford, G. L., Santos, L. M., Lefebvre, P., Nunes, D., Cerri, C. E. P., McHorney, R., O’Connell, C., and Coe, M. T.: Deep soils modify environmental consequences of increased nitrogen fertilizer use in intensifying Amazon agriculture, Scientific Reports, 13478, doi:10.1038/s41598-018-31175-1, 2018.

Jourdan, C. and Rey, H.: Modelling and simulation of the architecture and development of the oil-palm (Elaeis guineensis Jacq.) root system, Plant and Soil, 190, 235–246, doi:10.1023/A:1004270014678, 1997.

Kaspari, M., Yanoviak, S. P., Dudley, R., Yuan, M., and Clay, N. A.: Sodium shortage as a constraint on the carbon cycle in an inland tropical rainforest, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 106, 19405–19409, doi:10.1073/pnas.0906448106, 2009.

Kotowska, M. M., Leuschner, C., Triadiati, T., and Hertel, D.: Conversion of tropical lowland forest reduces nutrient return through litterfall, and alters nutrient use efficiency and seasonality of net primary production, Oecologia, 180, 601–618, doi:10.1007/s00442-015-3481-5, 2016.

Kotowska, M. M., Leuschner, C., Triadiati, T., Meriem, S., and Hertel, D.: Quantifying above- and belowground biomass carbon loss with forest conversion in tropical lowlands of Sumatra (Indonesia), Global Change Biology, 21, 3620–3634, doi:10.1111/gcb.12979, 2015.

Kurniawan, S., Corre, M. D., Matson, A. L., Schulte-Bisping, H., Utami, S. R., van Straaten, O., and Veldkamp, E.: Conversion of tropical forests to smallholder rubber and oil palm plantations impacts nutrient leaching losses and nutrient retention efficiency in highly weathered soils, Biogeosciences, 15, 5131–5154, doi:10.5194/bg-15-5131-2018, 2018.

Kuznetsova, A., Brockhoff, P. B., and Christensen, R. H. B.: LmerTest package: tests in linear mixed effects models, Journal of Statistical Software, 82, doi:10.18637/jss.v082.i13, 2017.

Lamade, E., Djegui, N., and Leterme, P.: Estimation of carbon allocation to the roots from soil respiration measurements of oil palm, Plant and Soil, 181, 329–339, doi:10.1007/BF00012067, 1996.

Li, Y. and Ghodrati, M.: Preferential transport of nitrate through soil columns containing root channels, Soil Science Society of America Journal, 58, 653–659, doi:10.2136/sssaj1994.03615995005800030003x, 1994.

Lohse, K. A. and Matson, P.: Consequences of nitrogen additions for soil losses from wet tropical forests, Ecological Applications, 15, 1629–1648, doi:10.1890/03-5421, 2005.

Luke, S. H., Barclay, H., Bidin, K., Chey, V. K., Ewers, R. M., Foster, W. A., Nainar, A., Pfeifer, M., Reynolds, G., Turner, E. C., Walsh, R. P. D., and Aldridge, D. C.: The effects of catchment and riparian forest quality on stream environmental conditions across a tropical rainforest and oil palm landscape in Malaysian Borneo, Ecohydrology:

ecosystems, land and water process interactions, ecohydrogeomorphology, 10, 1-17, doi:10.1002/eco.1827, 2017.

Luke, S. H., Purnomo, D., Advento, A. D., Aryawan, A. A. K., Naim, M., Pikstein, R. N., Ps, S., Rambe, T. D. S., Soeprapto, Caliman, J.-P., Snaddon, J. L., Foster, W. A., and Turner, E. C.: Effects of understory vegetation management on plant communities in oil palm plantations in Sumatra, Indonesia, Frontiers in Forests and Global Change, 2, 1–13, doi:10.3389/ffgc.2019.00033, 2019.

Meijide, A., La Rua, C. de, Guillaume, T., Röll, A., Hassler, E., Stiegler, C., Tjoa, A., June, T., Corre, M. D., Veldkamp, E., and Knohl, A.: Measured greenhouse gas budgets challenge emission savings from palm-oil biodiesel, Nature Communications, 11, 1089, doi:10.1038/s41467-020-14852-6, 2020.

Meijide, A., Röll, A., Fan, Y., Herbst, M., Niu, F., Tiedemann, F., June, T., Rauf, A., Hölscher, D., and Knohl, A.: Controls of water and energy fluxes in oil palm plantations: environmental variables and oil palm age, Agricultural and Forest Meteorology, 239, 71–85, doi:10.1016/j.agrformet.2017.02.034, 2017.

Ministry of Agriculture of Indonesia: Oil palm replanting guideline, Regulation No: 18/Permentan/KB.330/5/2016, 2016.

Mohanty, S., Swain, C. K., Tripathi, R., Sethi, S. K., Bhattacharyya, P., Kumar, A., Raja, R., Shahid, M., Panda, B. B., Lal, B., Gautam, P., Munda, S., and Nayak, A. K.: Nitrate leaching, nitrous oxide emission and N use efficiency of aerobic rice under different N application strategy, Archives of Agronomy and Soil Science, 64, 465–479, doi:10.1080/03650340.2017.1359414, 2018.

Moradi, A., Teh, C. B. S., Goh, K. J., Husni, A. M. H., and Ishak, C. F.: Effect of four soil and water conservation practices on soil physical processes in a non-terraced oil palm plantation, Soil and Tillage Research, 145, 62–71, doi:10.1016/j.still.2014.08.005, 2015.

Murdiyarso, D., Hergoualc'h, K., and Verchot, L. V.: Opportunities for reducing greenhouse gas emissions in tropical peatlands, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 107, 19655–19660, doi:10.1073/pnas.0911966107, 2010.

Neill, C., Coe, M. T., Riskin, S. H., Krusche, A. V., Elsenbeer, H., Macedo, M. N., McHorney, R., Lefebvre, P., Davidson, E. A., Scheffler, R., Figueira, A. M. e. S., Porder, S., and Deegan, L. A.: Watershed responses to Amazon soya bean cropland expansion and intensification, Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B, Biological sciences, 368, 20120425, doi:10.1098/rstb.2012.0425, 2013.

Nelson, P. N., Banabas, M., Scotter, D. R., and Webb, M. J.: Using soil water depletion to measure spatial distribution of root activity in oil palm (Elaeis Guineensis Jacq.) plantations, Plant and Soil, 286, 109–121, doi:10.1007/s11104-006-9030-6, 2006.

Nyamangara, J., Bergström, L. F., Piha, M. I., and Giller, K. E.: Fertilizer use efficiency and nitrate leaching in a tropical sandy soil, Journal of environmental quality, 32, 599–606, doi:10.2134/jeq2003.5990, 2003.

Olsson, M. O. and Falkengren-Grerup, U.: Partitioning of nitrate uptake between trees and understory in oak forests, Forest Ecology and Management, 179, 311–320, doi:10.1016/S0378-1127(02)00544-3, 2003.

Omoti, U., Ataga, D. O., and Isenmila, A. E.: Leaching losses of nutrients in oil palm plantations determined by tension lysimeters, Plant and Soil, 73, 365–376, doi:10.1007/BF02184313, 1983.

Pahan, I.: Complete guide to oil palm, 8th ed., Penebar Swadaya, Jakarta, Indonesia, 160-164, 2010.

Pardon, L., Bessou, C., Nelson, P. N., Dubos, B., Ollivier, J., Marichal, R., Caliman, J.-P., and Gabrielle, B.: Key unknowns in nitrogen budget for oil palm plantations. A review, Agronomy for Sustainable Development, 36, 20, doi:10.1007/s13593-016-0353-2, 2016.

Pardon, L., Bockstaller, C., Marichal, R., Sionita, R., Nelson, P. N., Gabrielle, B., Laclau, J.-P., Pujianto, Caliman, J.-P., and Bessou, C.: IN-Palm: An agri-environmental indicator to assess nitrogen losses in oil palm plantations, Agronomy Journal, 112, 786–800, doi:10.1002/agj2.20109, 2020.

Pirker, J., Mosnier, A., Kraxner, F., Havlík, P., and Obersteiner, M.: What are the limits to oil palm expansion?, Global Environmental Change, 40, 73–81, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2016.06.007, 2016.

Priesack, E.: Expert-N model library documentation, Institute of Soil Ecology, 2005.

R Core Team: R: A language and environment for statistical computing, Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria, 2019.

Rahman, N., Neergaard, A. de, Magid, J., van de Ven, G. W. J., Giller, K. E., and Bruun, T. B.: Changes in soil organic carbon stocks after conversion from forest to oil palm plantations in Malaysian Borneo, Environmental Research Letters, 13, 105001, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/aade0f, 2018.

Röll, A., Niu, F., Meijide, A., Ahongshangbam, J., Ehbrecht, M., Guillaume, T., Gunawan, D., Hardanto, A., Hendrayanto, Hertel, D., Kotowska, M. M., Kreft, H., Kuzyakov, Y., Leuschner, C., Nomura, M., Polle, A., Rembold, K., Sahner, J., Seidel, D., Zemp, D. C., Knohl, A., and Hölscher, D.: Transpiration on the rebound in lowland Sumatra, Agricultural and Forest Meteorology, 274, 160–171, doi:10.1016/j.agrformet.2019.04.017, 2019.

Roy, E. D., Richards, P. D., Martinelli, L. A., Della Coletta, L., Lins, S. R. M., Vazquez, F. F., Willig, E., Spera, S. A., VanWey, L. K., and Porder, S.: The phosphorus cost of agricultural intensification in the tropics, Nature plants, 2, 16043, doi:10.1038/nplants.2016.43, 2016.

RSPO: Principles and criteria: For the production of sustainable palm oil, 2018.

Rüegg, J., Quezada, J. C., Santonja, M., Ghazoul, J., Kuzyakov, Y., Buttler, A., and Guillaume, T.: Drivers of soil carbon stabilization in oil palm plantations, Land Degradation & Development, 30, 1–12, doi:10.1002/ldr.3380, 2019.

Schlesinger, W. H. and Bernhardt, E. S.: Biogeochemistry: An analysis of global change, 3rd ed., Academic Press, Waltham, Mass, 672 pp., 2013.

Schroth, G., Rodrigues, M.R.L., and D'Angelo, S. A.: Spatial patterns of nitrogen mineralization, fertilizer distribution and roots explain nitrate leaching from mature Amazonian oil palm plantation, Soil Use and Management, 16, 222–229, doi:10.1111/j.1475-2743.2000.tb00197.x, 2000.

Silver, W. L., Thompson, A. W., Reich, A., Ewel, J. J., and Firestone, M. K.: Nitrogen cycling in tropical plantation forests: potential controls on nitrogen retention, Ecological Applications, 15, 1604–1614, doi:10.1890/04-1322, 2005.

Steiner, C., Glaser, B., Geraldes Teixeira, W., Lehmann, J., Blum, W. E.H., and Zech, W.: Nitrogen retention and plant uptake on a highly weathered central Amazonian Ferralsol amended with compost and charcoal, Journal of Plant Nutrition and Soil Science, 171, 893–899, doi:10.1002/jpln.200625199, 2008.

Syers, J. K.: Managing soils for long-term productivity, Phil. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. B, 352, 1011–1021, doi:10.1098/rstb.1997.0079, 1997.

Tao, H.-H., Snaddon, J. L., Slade, E. M., Caliman, J.-P., Widodo, R. H., Suhardi, and Willis, K. J.: Long-term crop residue application maintains oil palm yield and temporal stability of production, Agronomy for Sustainable Development, 37, 33, doi:10.1007/s13593-017-0439-5, 2017.

Tarigan, S., Stiegler, C., Wiegand, K., Knohl, A., and Murtilaksono, K.: Relative contribution of evapotranspiration and soil compaction to the fluctuation of catchment discharge: case study from a plantation landscape, Hydrological Sciences Journal, 58, 1–10, doi:10.1080/02626667.2020.1739287, 2020.

Tarigan, S., Wiegand, K., Sunarti, and Slamet, B.: Minimum forest cover required for sustainable water flow regulation of a watershed: a case study in Jambi Province, Indonesia, Hydrology and Earth System Sciences, 22, 581–594, doi:10.5194/hess-22-581-2018, 2018.

Tarigan, S. D., Sunarti, Wiegand, K., Dislich, C., Slamet, B., Heinonen, J., and Meyer, K.: Mitigation options for improving the ecosystem function of water flow regulation in a watershed with rapid expansion of oil palm plantations, Sustainability of Water Quality and Ecology, 8, 4–13, doi:10.1016/j.swaqe.2016.05.001, 2016.

Teklu, B. M., Hailu, A., Wiegant, D. A., Scholten, B. S., and van den Brink, P. J.: Impacts of nutrients and pesticides from small- and large-scale agriculture on the water quality of Lake Ziway, Ethiopia, Environmental Science and Pollution Research, 25, 13207–13216, doi:10.1007/s11356-016-6714-1, 2018.

Tokuchi, N., Samejima, H., Hon, J., and Fukushima, K.: Influence of herbicide use in oil palm plantations on stream water chemistry in Sarawak, Anthropogenic Tropical Forests, 209–216, doi:10.1007/978-981-13-7513-2_11, 2019.

Tully, K. L., Lawrence, D., and Scanlon, T. M.: More trees less loss: nitrogen leaching losses decrease with increasing biomass in coffee agroforests, Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment, 161, 137–144, doi:10.1016/j.agee.2012.08.002, 2012.

Tung, P. G. A., Yusoff, M. K., Majid, N. M., Joo, G. K., and Huang, G. H.: Effect of N and K fertilizers on nutrient leaching and groundwater quality under mature oil palm in Sabah during the monsoon period, American Journal of Applied Sciences, 6, 1788–1799, 2009.

van Breemen, N., Mulder, J., and Driscoll, C. T.: Acidification and alkalization of soils, Plant and Soil, 283–308, 1983.

van Bruggen, A.H.C., He, M. M., Shin, K., Mai, V., Jeong, K. C., Finckh, M. R., and Morris, J. G.: Environmental and health effects of the herbicide glyphosate, Science of the Total Environment, 616-617, 255–268, doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2017.10.309, 2018.

van Straaten, O., Corre, M. D., Wolf, K., Tchienkoua, M., Cuellar, E., Matthews, R. B., and Veldkamp, E.: Conversion of lowland tropical forests to tree cash crop plantations loses up to one-half of stored soil organic carbon, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 112, 9956–9960, doi:10.1073/pnas.1504628112, 2015.

Veldkamp, E., Schmidt, M., Powers, J. S., and Corre, M. D.: Deforestation and reforestation impacts on soils in the tropics, Nature Reviews Earth & Environment, *in press*.

Vijay, V., Pimm, S. L., Jenkins, C. N., and Smith, S. J.: The impacts of oil palm on recent deforestation and biodiversity loss, PloS One, 11, e0159668, doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0159668, 2016.

Wakelin, S. A., Nelson, P. N., Armour, J. D., Rasiah, V., and Colloff, M. J.: Bacterial community structure and denitrifier (nir-gene) abundance in soil water and groundwater beneath agricultural land in tropical North Queensland, Australia, Soil Research, 49, 65–76, doi:10.1071/SR10055, 2011.

WHO: Guidelines for drinking-water quality, 4th ed., World Health Organization, Geneva, 2011.

Wong, M. T.F., Hughes, R., and Rowell, D. L.: Retarded leaching of nitrate in acid soils from the tropics: measurement of the effective anion exchange capacity, Journal of Soil Science, 655–663, 1990.

Woodham, C. R., Aryawan, A. A. K., Luke, S. H., Manning, P., Caliman, J.-P., Naim, M., Turner, E. C., and Slade, E. M.: Effects of replanting and retention of mature oil palm riparian buffers on Ecosystem functioning in oil palm plantations, Frontiers in Forests and Global Change, 2, 29, doi:10.3389/ffgc.2019.00029, 2019.

Formatted: Font: Italic

Tables and figures

Table 1 Soil physical and biochemical characteristics (mean ± standard errors, *n* = 4 plots) in the top 50 cm depth for each management zone, averaged across experimental treatments. Means within a row followed by different letters indicate significant differences among management zones (one-way ANOVA with Tukey HSD or Kruskal–Wallis H test with multiple comparisons extension at $P \leq 0.05$). Bulk density measured in the top 10 cm of soil, whereas all the other parameters are for the 0–50 cm soil depth: element stocks are the sum of the sampled soil depths (0–5 cm, 5–10 cm, 10–30 cm and 30–50 cm) and the rest are depth-weighted averages, calculated for each replicate plot. ECEC, effective cation exchange capacity

Soil properties		Palm circle	Frond-stacked area	Inter-row
Bulk density	g cm^{-3}	1.37 ± 0.01^{a}	0.89 ± 0.01^{b}	1.36 ± 0.01^{b}
Soil organic C	kg m^{-2}	6.2 ± 0.6^{b}	9.1 ± 0.8^{a}	6.4 ± 0.2^{b}
Total N	g m^{-2}	402 ± 31^{b}	571 ± 39^{a}	426 ± 15^{ab}
soil C:N ratio		15.5 ± 0.5^{a}	15.7 ± 0.3^{a}	15.0 ± 0.5^{a}
^{15}N natural abundance	‰	5.9 ± 0.1^{a}	5.3 ± 0.2^{a}	5.7 ± 0.2^{a}
pH	1:4 (H_2O)	5.05 ± 0.08^{a}	5.00 ± 0.08^{ab}	4.81 ± 0.05^{b}
ECEC	mmol$_c$ kg^{-1}	35 ± 2^{a}	28 ± 2^{a}	18 ± 1^{b}
Base saturation	%	48 ± 3^{a}	46 ± 4^{a}	20 ± 2^{b}
Aluminum saturation	%	52 ± 4^{b}	50 ± 2^{b}	78 ± 2^{a}
Mg	g m^{-2}	32 ± 3^{a}	28 ± 6^{a}	9 ± 1^{b}
Ca	g m^{-2}	169 ± 21^{a}	157 ± 15^{a}	37 ± 5^{b}
K	g m^{-2}	39 ± 13^{a}	13 ± 1^{b}	6 ± 1^{b}
Na	g m^{-2}	1.5 ± 0.4^{a}	0.7 ± 0.2^{a}	0.6 ± 0.2^{a}
Al	g m^{-2}	66 ± 4^{b}	71 ± 4^{ab}	87 ± 3^{a}

Fe	g m^{-2}	1.4 ± 0.2^{a}	1.8 ± 0.4^{a}	1.8 ± 0.5^{a}
Mn	g m^{-2}	0.7 ± 0.1^{b}	1.8 ± 0.3^{a}	0.6 ± 0.2^{b}
H	g m^{-2}	0.2 ± 0.0^{a}	0.2 ± 0.0^{a}	0.2 ± 0.1^{a}

Table 2 Annual water balance simulated from March 2017 to February 2018 for each management zone.

Water flux (mm yr^{-1})	Palm circle	Frond-stacked area	Inter-row
Precipitation	2772	2772	2772
Transpiration	828	448	401
Evaporation	228	214	434
Interception	351	209	209
Runoff	338	0	216
Drainage (at 1.5 m depth)	556	1806	1179

Table 3 Annual leaching losses at 1.5 m depth for each experimental treatment from March 2017 to February 2018. Values are area-weighted averages of leaching losses in each management zone (mean ± standard error, *n* = 4 plots). Means followed by different letters indicate differences among experimental treatments (linear-mixed effect models on monthly values followed by Tukey HSD test for multiple comparisons at $P \leq 0.05$). Treatments: ch = conventional fertilization–herbicide; cw = conventional fertilization–mechanical weeding; rh = reduced fertilization–herbicide; rw = reduced fertilization–mechanical weeding. DON = dissolved organic N; TDN = total dissolved N.

Element leaching (kg ha^{-1} yr^{-1})	ch	cw	rh	rw
NO_3^--N	71.5 ± 20.1^{a}	48.2 ± 13.0^{ab}	36.3 ± 20.1^{b}	30.0 ± 5.7^{b}
NH_4^+-N	1.7 ± 0.2^{a}	1.7 ± 0.1^{a}	1.8 ± 0.1^{a}	1.7 ± 0.2^{a}
DON	0.5 ± 0.5^{a}	0.6 ± 0.3^{a}	0.4 ± 0.1^{a}	0.3 ± 0.0^{a}
TDN	73.6 ± 20.2^{a}	50.4 ± 13.1^{ab}	38.4 ± 8.9^{b}	32.0 ± 5.8^{b}
Ca	26.6 ± 4.3^{a}	19.4 ± 4.4^{b}	18.2 ± 1.8^{b}	17.0 ± 2.1^{b}
Mg	11.6 ± 2.5^{a}	7.7 ± 0.8^{b}	9.1 ± 0.7^{ab}	10.8 ± 3.6^{ab}
K	8.1 ± 1.3^{a}	6.2 ± 0.7^{b}	8.9 ± 0.6^{a}	5.7 ± 1.1^{b}
Na	15.9 ± 3.5^{ab}	13.6 ± 2.4^{b}	18.9 ± 3.1^{a}	13.1 ± 1.2^{b}
Mn	0.3 ± 0.1^{a}	0.2 ± 0.0^{b}	0.2 ± 0.0^{bc}	0.1 ± 0.0^{c}
Total Al	40.8 ± 11.5^{a}	20.8 ± 7.6^{b}	19.9 ± 6.8^{b}	21.8 ± 3.1^{b}
Total S	2.4 ± 0.5^{a}	1.8 ± 0.4^{a}	2.1 ± 0.6^{a}	4.9 ± 3.3^{a}
Total Fe	0.2 ± 0.0^{a}	0.5 ± 0.3^{a}	0.2 ± 0.0^{a}	0.5 ± 0.3^{a}
Total P	0.0 ± 0.0^{a}	0.1 ± 0.0^{a}	0.0 ± 0.0^{a}	0.0 ± 0.0^{a}

Cl	79.7± 15.8^{a}	36.9 ± 8.3^{b}	67.7 ± 8.7^{a}	78.3 ± 7.5^{a}

Table 4 N and base cation retention efficiencies in the soil for each management zone and experimental treatment (means ± standard error, *n* = 4 plots). Means followed by different lowercase letters indicate differences among experimental treatments for each management zone, whereas different uppercase letters indicate differences among management zones for each experimental treatment (one-way ANOVA with Tukey HSD or Kruskal−Wallis H test with multiple comparisons extension at $P \leq 0.05$). Weighted-average is based on the areal coverage of each management zone: 18% for palm circle, 15% for frond-stacked area, and 67% for inter-row. Treatments: ch = conventional fertilization–herbicide; cw = conventional fertilization–mechanical weeding; rh = reduced fertilization–herbicide; rw = reduced fertilization–mechanical weeding. See section 2.4 for calculations of N and base cation retention efficiency.

	ch	cw	rh	rw
N retention efficiency (mg N m^{-2} d^{-1} / mg N m^{-2} d^{-1})				
Palm circle	0.987 ± 0.002$^{a\ A}$	0.982 ± 0.007$^{a\ AB}$	0.986 ± 0.003$^{a\ AB}$	0.997 ± 0.000$^{a\ A}$
Frond-stacked area	0.984 ± 0.004$^{a\ A}$	0.989 ± 0.004$^{a\ A}$	0.993 ± 0.001$^{a\ A}$	0.987 ± 0.002$^{a\ A}$
Inter-row	0.877 ± 0.025$^{a\ B}$	0.870 ± 0.022$^{a\ B}$	0.900 ± 0.018$^{a\ B}$	0.906 ± 0.039$^{a\ A}$
Weighted-average	0.925 ± 0.022^{a}	0.934 ± 0.020^{a}	0.945 ± 0.012^{a}	0.946 ± 0.018^{a}
Base cation retention efficiency (mol$_{c}$ m^{-2} yr^{-1} / mol$_{c}$ m^{-2} yr^{-1})				

Palm circle	0.967 ± 0.008$^{ab\ A}$	0.982 ± 0.002$^{a\ A}$	0.937 ± 0.013$^{b\ A}$	0.974 ± 0.010$^{ab\ A}$
Frond-stacked area	0.884 ± 0.013$^{b\ A}$	0.950 ± 0.004$^{a\ A}$	0.960 ± 0.002$^{a\ A}$	0.928 ± 0.016$^{ab\ A}$
Inter-row	0.588 ± 0.086$^{b\ B}$	0.875 ± 0.022$^{a\ B}$	0.704 ± 0.048$^{ab\ B}$	0.822 ± 0.063$^{ab\ A}$
Weighted-average	0.876 ± 0.009^{b}	0.945 ± 0.007^{a}	0.902 ± 0.019^{ab}	0.934 ± 0.012^{ab}

Figure 1 Pearson correlation test between modeled (red line) and field-measured soil water matric potential (black points) (*n* = 50 field measurements over one year) for each management zone at 30 cm and 60 cm depths.



Figure 2 Monthly water drainage at 1.5 m depth, simulated in each management zone, and daily rainfall from March 2017 to February 2018. The gray shaded area represent the dry season (precipitation < 140 mm month^{-1})



Figure 3. Partial cation-anion charge balance of the major solutes (with concentrations > 0.03 mg L^{-1}) in soil water at 1.5 m depth for each experimental treatment in the different management zones. The combined concentrations of organic acids ($RCOO^-$) and carbonates (HCO_3^-) are calculated as the difference between the measured cations and anions. Treatments: ch = conventional fertilization–herbicide; cw = conventional fertilization–mechanical weeding; rh = reduced fertilization–herbicide; rw = reduced fertilization–mechanical weeding.



Figure 4 Monthly leaching losses at 1.5 m depth (mean ± standard errors, *n* = 4 plots) for each management zone. Black arrows indicate fertilizer applications and the gray shaded area represents the dry season (precipitation < 140 mm $month^{-1}$).


palm circle
frond-stacked area
inter-row
NO_3^- leaching
(g N m^{-2} month^{-1})
Al leaching
(g m^{-2} month^{-1})
Ca leaching
(g m^{-2} month^{-1})
K leaching
(g m^{-2} month^{-1})
Mg leaching
(g m^{-2} month^{-1})
Na leaching
(g m^{-2} month^{-1})
0.0
0.5
1.0
1.5
0.0
0.2
0.5
0.8
1.0
0.0
0.2
0.5
0.8
1.0
0.0
0.1
0.2
0.3
0.0
0.1
0.2
0.3
0.0
0.1
0.2
0.3
0.4
0.5
Mar
Apr
May
Jun
Jul
Aug
Sep
Oct
Nov
Dec
Jan
Feb
2017-2018

Figure 5 Average monthly leaching losses at 1.5 m depth for each experimental treatment from March 2017 to February 2018. Values are area-weighted averages of leaching losses in each management zone (means ± standard errors, $n = 4$ plots). For each parameter, different letters indicate significant differences among treatments (linear-mixed effect models on monthly values followed by Tukey HSD test for multiple comparisons at $P \leq 0.05$). Treatments: ch = conventional fertilization–herbicide; cw = conventional fertilization–mechanical weeding; rh = reduced fertilization–herbicide; rw = reduced fertilization–mechanical weeding



Appendices

Table A1 Parameters used ~~for~~ in the Expert-N water sub-model for each management zone.

Parameters	Depth (cm)	Palm circle	Inter-row	Frond-stacked area
Interception				
Saturation capacity (mm d^{-1})		8.4	4.7	4.7
Throughfall (%)		50	10	10
Plant water uptake				
Plant height (cm)		874	874	874
Leaf area index		3.64	1.8	0.75
Leaf number		40	40	40
Aboveground biomass (kg ha^{-1})		47400	47400	47400
Maximum rooting depth (cm)		100	50	50
Crop cover		0.8	0.6	0.6
Root biomass (kg ha^{-1})		15600	15600	15600
Root partition (%)	0–10	29	29	29
	10–30	31	31	31
	30–50	18	18	18
	50–100	15	15	15
	100–150	5	5	5
	150–200	2	2	2
Soil properties				
Bulk density (g cm^{-3})	0–10	1.37	1.36	0.8
	10–30	1.36	1.36	1.26
	30–50	1.52	1.52	1.52
	50–100	1.50	1.50	1.50
	100–150	1.58	1.58	1.58
	150–200	1.46	1.46	1.46
Texture – Clay (%)	0–10	15.8	15.8	15.8
	10–30	24.5	24.5	24.5
	30–50	37.5	37.5	37.5
	50–100	41.0	41.0	41.0
	100–150	43.3	43.3	43.3
	150–200	47.6	47.6	47.6
Texture – Sand (%)	0–10	53.3	53.3	53.3
	10–30	47.6	47.6	47.6
	30–50	35.9	35.9	35.9
	50–100	34.4	34.4	34.4
	100–150	31.7	31.7	31.7

	150–200	29.8	29.8	29.8
Organic matter (%)	0–10	3.2	2.9	8.7
	10–30	2.8	2.6	3.7
	30–50	2.0	1.6	2.0
	50–100	2.5	2.5	2.5
	100–150	2.0	2.0	2.0
	150–200	1.2	1.2	1.2
Porosity (Vol %)	0–10	48.8	48.8	70.0
	10–30	45.7	45.7	45.7
	30–50	41.9	41.9	41.9
	50–100	43.3	43.3	43.3
	100–150	40.3	40.3	40.3
	150–200	45.0	45.0	45.0
Field capacity (Vol %)	0–10	27.2	27.2	27.2
	10–30	27.4	27.4	27.4
	30–50	21.3	21.3	21.3
	50–100	23.1	23.1	23.1
	100–150	24.5	24.5	24.5
	150–200	28.1	28.1	28.1
Wilting point (Vol %)	0–10	18.3	18.3	18.3
	10–30	17.3	17.3	17.3
	30–50	17.9	17.9	17.9
	50–100	17.3	17.3	17.3
	100–150	20.4	20.4	20.4
	150–200	24.5	24.5	24.5
Saturated hydraulic conductivity (mm d^{-1})	0–10	400	400	200
	10–30	200	200	400
	30–50	200	200	300
	50–100	150	150	150
	100–150	260	260	260
	150–200	260	260	260
Van Genuchten α (cm^{-1})	0–10	0.059	0.059	0.059
	10–30	0.025	0.025	0.035
	30–50	0.010	0.010	0.020
	50–100	0.008	0.008	0.015
	100–150	0.021	0.021	0.021
	150–200	0.021	0.021	0.021
Van Genuchten n	0–10	1.70	1.70	1.70
	10–30	1.71	1.71	1.81
	30–50	1.12	1.12	1.25
	50–100	1.09	1.09	1.15
	100–150	1.21	1.21	1.21
	150–200	1.23	1.23	1.23

Table A2 Gross N mineralization rates **(**means ± SE, *n* = 4 plots) in the top 5 cm soil for each treatment and management zone in a large-scale plantation in Jambi, Indonesia. Measurements were done on intact soil cores in February 2018 using the ^{15}N pool dilution technique, as described in details by Allen et al. (2015). Treatments: ch = conventional fertilization–herbicide; cw = conventional fertilization–mechanical weeding; rh = reduced fertilization–herbicide; rw = reduced fertilization–mechanical weeding

Gross N mineralization (mg N m^{-2} d^{-1})

	ch	cw	rh	rw
palm circle	135 ± 39	115 ± 25	111 ± 34	210 ± 13
frond-stacked area	584 ± 100	845 ± 207	581 ± 188	430 ± 134
inter-row	288 ± 64	239 ± 39	227 ± 51	262 ± 56

Note: These data are not included in the main manuscript to avoid redundant publication as they were already included in another manuscript presently in review.

Table A3 Literature comparison of annual N fertilization and total N leaching losses across tropical plantations.

Author	Soil type	rainfall (mm yr^{-1})	Type of plantation management	N applied (kg ha^{-1} yr^{-1})	Total N leaching (kg ha^{-1} yr^{-1})	Percentage N leached (%)
Present study	loam Acrisol	2772	intensive oil palm	260	74	28
Present study	loam Acrisol	2772	intensive oil palm	130	38	28
Omoti et al. 1983	sandy clay Acrisol	2000	intensive oil palm	150	9	6
Kurniawan et al. 2018	loam Acrisol	3418	smallholder oil palm	88	11	12.5
Tung et al. 2009	Acrisol	-	intensive oil palm	128	3 (150 days)	2
Tung et al. 2009	Acrisol	-	intensive oil palm	251	3 (150 days)	1
Banabas et al. 2008	clay loam Andosol	2398	intensive oil palm	100	37	37
Banabas et al. 2008	sandy loam Andosol	3657	intensive oil palm	100	103	103
Cannavo et al. 2013	clay loam Andosol	2678	coffee agroforestry	250	157	63

Tully et al., 2012	clay loam Andosol	2700	coffee agroforestry	120	119	99
Armour et al. 2013	clay Acrisol	1958	intensive banana	476	164	34
Wakelin et al. 2011	loam Acrisol	2685	intensive banana	305	116	38

Figure A1 Lysimeter locations at each treatment plot, with two subplots (blue rectangles) that each included the three management zones (blue crosses): 1) lysimeters in the palm circle were at 1 m from the palm stem, 2) in the frond-stacked area, at about 4 m from the palm stem, and 3) in the inter-row, at approximately 4 m from the palm stem.



Figure A2 Annual yield of each experimental treatment from 2017 to 2019. Treatments: ch = conventional fertilization–herbicide; cw = conventional fertilization–mechanical weeding; rh = reduced fertilization–herbicide; rw = reduced fertilization–mechanical weeding.



Note: yield was measured by weighing the harvested fresh fruit bunches from each palm in the inner 30 m x 30 m area of each plot.