# SINGLE-IMPACT FICHE SOIL AMENDMENT WITH LIME OR GYPSUM

## IMPACT: SOIL PHYSICO-CHEMICAL QUALITY

Data extracted in April 2021

**Note to the reader:** This fiche summarises the impact of soil amendment with lime or gypsum on SOIL PHYSICO-CHEMICAL QUALITY. It is based on 3 peer-reviewed synthesis research papers<sup>1</sup>. Each synthesis paper includes a number of individual studies, which in this case is of 39, 59 and 175.

#### 1. WEIGHT OF THE EVIDENCE

• CONSISTENCY OF THE IMPACT:

Soil amendment with both gypsum and lime, compared to no amendment, showed a positive effect on Soil physical-chemical quality in the 3 synthesis papers reviewed (see **Table 1**).

From the 3 reviewed synthesis papers, only 1 includes data collected in Europe (on lime).

**Table 1.** Summary of effects. The numbers between parenthesis indicate the number of synthesis papers with a quality scoreof at least 50%. Details on quality criteria can be found in the next section.

| Impact                        | Intervention | Control   | Positive | Negative | No effect | Uncertain |
|-------------------------------|--------------|-----------|----------|----------|-----------|-----------|
| Improve soil-physical quality | Gypsum       | No gypsum | 1(1)     | 0        | 0         | 0         |
|                               | Lime         | No lime   | 2 (2)    | 0        | 0         | 0         |

• QUALITY OF THE SYNTHESIS PAPERS: The quality score summarises 16 criteria assessing the quality of three main aspects of the synthesis papers: 1) the literature search strategy and studies selection; 2) the statistical analysis; 3) the potential bias. Details on quality criteria can be found in the methodology section of this WIKI.

#### 2. IMPACTS

The main characteristics and results of the synthesis papers are summarized in **Table 2**. Summaries of the metaanalyses provide fuller information about the results reported in each synthesis paper, in particular about the modulation of effects by factors related to soil, climate and management practices.

**Table 2.** Main characteristics of the synthesis papers reporting impacts of soil amendment with lime or gypsum on soil physico-chemical quality. The references are ordered chronologically with the most recent publication date first.

| Reference                                 | Population                                 | Scale | Num.<br>papers | Intervention  | Comparator                              | Metric                                  | Conclusion  | Quality<br>score |
|---|--|-------|----------------|---|---|---|---|------------------|
| Wang Y,<br>Wang Z,<br>Liang F,<br>Jing X, | Saline-sodic<br>and alkaline<br>soil types | China | 59             | Soil amendment<br>with flue gas<br>desulfurization<br>gypsum (FGDG) | No gypsum<br>control under<br>identical | Soil pH, Soil<br>exchangeable<br>sodium | Application of flue gas<br>desulfurization gypsum<br>(FGDG) significantly | 62%              |

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Research synthesis papers include a formal meta-analysis or systematic reviews with some quantitative results. Details can be found in the methodology section of the WIKI.

| Reference  | Population   | Scale      | Num.<br>papers | Intervention   | Comparator  | Metric   | Conclusion   | Quality<br>score |
|--|--|------------|----------------|--|---|--|--|------------------|
| Feng W<br>2021                                       |  |            |                |  | experimental conditions   | percentage<br>(ESP)  | reduced soil pH (–8.1%) and<br>ESP (–37.4%).   |                  |
| Kong L,<br>Guo Z,<br>Peng C,<br>Xiao X, He<br>Y 2021 | Rice<br>cultivation  | Asia       | 39             | Liming treatment,<br>including CaCO <sub>3</sub> ,<br>Ca(OH)2, and CaO   | No-liming<br>control under<br>identical<br>experimental<br>conditions | Soil pH  | Liming significantly<br>increases acidic-soil pH in<br>rice cultivation.   | 94%              |
| Li Y.; Cui<br>S.; Chang<br>S.X., Zhang<br>Q. 2019    | Field-studies,<br>laboratory<br>incubation or<br>greenhouse<br>pot studies | (including | 175            | Liming treatment,<br>including dolomite<br>(CaMg (CO3)2),<br>calcium hydroxide<br>(Ca (OH)2),<br>calcium carbonate<br>(CaCO3), and<br>calcium oxide<br>(CaO) | No-liming<br>control under<br>identical<br>experimental<br>conditions | Soil pH, Cation<br>exchange<br>capacity (CEC),<br>soil nutrients<br>availability | To effectively neutralize soil<br>acidity, the optimum liming<br>duration, rate, and material<br>type were < 3 years, 3–6 Mg<br>ha–1, and Ca (OH)2,<br>respectively. Liming<br>significantly ameliorated<br>soil Al3+, increased basic<br>cations (Ca2+ and Mg2+),<br>neutralized soil pH across<br>different cropping systems,<br>and improved the soil<br>nutrient status (increasing<br>exchangeable nitrogen,<br>potassium, and<br>phosphorous). | 81%              |

### 3. KNOWLEDGE GAPS

Li Y.et al. The complexity of responses identified in this study emphasizes the need for adopting more advanced data-science algorithms coupled with high-dimensional data sets in the future that could enhance our understanding of the underlying mechanisms of liming on an agroecosystem basis.