



**HAL**  
open science

# How root nutrient uptake affects rhizosphere pH: A modelling study

Jean-Marc Custos, Christian Moyne, Thibault Sterckeman

► **To cite this version:**

Jean-Marc Custos, Christian Moyne, Thibault Sterckeman. How root nutrient uptake affects rhizosphere pH: A modelling study. *Geoderma*, 2020, 369, pp.1-12. 10.1016/j.geoderma.2020.114314 . hal-02972170

**HAL Id: hal-02972170**

**<https://hal.univ-lorraine.fr/hal-02972170>**

Submitted on 20 May 2022

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial 4.0 International License

1 **How root nutrient uptake affects rhizosphere pH: A modelling study**

2

3 Jean-Marc Custos<sup>a</sup>, Christian Moyne<sup>b</sup>, Thibault Sterckeman<sup>a\*</sup>

4

5 <sup>a</sup> Université de Lorraine, INRA, Laboratoire Sols et Environnement, F-54000 Nancy, France.

6 <sup>b</sup> Université de Lorraine, CNRS, Laboratoire Énergies et Mécanique Théorique et Appliquée,

7 F-54000 Nancy, France.

8

9 \*Corresponding author:

10 Thibault Sterckeman

11 Phone: + 33 (0)3 72 74 41 16.

12 Fax: + 33 (0)3 72 74 41 32

13 E-mail: [Thibault.Sterckeman@univ-lorraine.fr](mailto:Thibault.Sterckeman@univ-lorraine.fr)

14

15 Co-authors' e-mails

16 Jean-Marc Custos: [jm.custos@gmail.com](mailto:jm.custos@gmail.com)

17 Christian Moyne: [christian.moyne@univ-lorraine.fr](mailto:christian.moyne@univ-lorraine.fr)

18

19 Declarations of interest: none

20

21

22 **Abstract**

23 Rhizosphere pH is the consequence of numerous, complex processes and is a key factor of  
24 biogeochemistry at the soil-root interface. This work aimed at evaluating the impact of  
25 nutrient root absorption on rhizosphere pH using a mechanistic model formalizing major  
26 nutrient cation and anion transport, under the influence of concentration, electric potential  
27 gradients and of convection. The electrical neutrality of the system was maintained through a  
28  $H^+$  root efflux or influx (or equivalent opposite  $OH^-$  fluxes). The model outputs were  
29 compared to the rhizosphere pH of maize (*Zea mays* L.), ryegrass (*Lolium perenne* L.) and  
30 Alpine pennycress (*Noccaea caerulescens* (J. & C. Presl) F. K. Mey.) grown in three different  
31 soils, determined with planar optodes. A global sensitivity analysis was carried out in order to  
32 highlight the dominating factors. The composition of 37 soil solutions from the literature was  
33 used to predict rhizosphere pH. The model most of the time predicts the alkalisation of the  
34 rhizosphere by up to +3.3 pH units, given that in aerobic soils, nitrate is the most absorbed  
35 nutrient and its internalization is equilibrated by  $H^+$  root absorption (or equivalent  $OH^-$   
36 excretion). This alkalisation is close to that observed in the rhizosphere of ryegrass and  
37 Alpine pennycress. The rhizosphere pH predictions are very sensitive to the initial  
38 composition of the soil solution and quite insensitive to root absorption kinetics and soil  
39 buffer power for the various nutrients. Because it favours nitrate diffusion, water content is  
40 positively correlated with rhizosphere alkalisation. Moreover, the lower the root density, the  
41 lower the effect of the root uptake on both ion concentrations and on rhizosphere pH.  
42 Convection has little influence on rhizosphere pH. This study confirms the prominent role of  
43 mineral nutrition in the determination of rhizosphere pH. The model therefore constitutes a  
44 tool for understanding and predicting rhizosphere pH.

45

46 **Keywords:** soil solution; nutrient; root uptake; nitrate; sensitivity analysis

## 47 **1. Introduction**

48 It has long been established that soil pH in the vicinity of the roots may differ from that of the  
49 bulk soil, by up to two units. The sign of this difference, i.e. alkalisation or acidification of  
50 the rhizosphere, and its intensity depends on plant and soil factors. Indeed, the root-mediated  
51 pH changes in the rhizosphere has been explained by cation-anion exchange between root and  
52 soil, root excretion of organic anions, root respiration (CO<sub>2</sub> production) and root-induced  
53 redox processes (O<sub>2</sub> emission). These processes may be affected by nutritional constraints,  
54 such as Fe and P deficiencies or Al toxicity, whose effect on rhizosphere pH varies according  
55 to the soil buffering capacity (Hinsinger et al., 2003; Neumann and Römheld, 2012).

56 Of these different processes, the cation and anion exchange balance appears to be most  
57 influential, because soil solution pH depends on the net charge from ions which do not react  
58 to OH<sup>-</sup> and H<sup>+</sup> (Sposito, 1989) and all living plants have to take up ions (mainly as nutrients)  
59 from this solution, modifying the net charge. The impact of plant mineral nutrition on  
60 rhizosphere pH has often been shown to be strong (Haynes, 1990; Marschner et al., 1986).

61 When more cations than anions are absorbed by the root cells, protons are released into the  
62 apoplast to compensate for the excess positive charges in the cell, thereby resulting in a  
63 decrease in the rhizosphere pH. However, when more anions are absorbed, either H<sup>+</sup> is taken  
64 up, or OH<sup>-</sup> or HCO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> (resulting from the reaction of OH<sup>-</sup> with CO<sub>2</sub>) is excreted, thence leading  
65 to the alkalisation of the rhizosphere (Haynes, 1990; Riley and Barber, 1969; Riley and  
66 Barber, 1971). The release or uptake of H<sup>+</sup> by roots is therefore equivalent to the cation-anion  
67 balance of root-absorbed ions (Hinsinger et al., 2003; Rufyikiri et al., 2001). However, it has  
68 yet to be clearly established whether roots have a general tendency to acidify or to alkalise  
69 their neighbourhood. Although Cunningham (1964) showed that on average, plants absorb  
70 more anions than cations, plants are often considered to acidify their rhizosphere, arguing that  
71 they absorb more cations than anions (Sposito, 2016).

72 These modifications to the rhizosphere pH can have a feed-back effect on the mineral  
73 nutrition of plants. They can affect the roots' uptake properties through competition between  
74  $H^+$  and  $OH^-$  for sorption sites in apoplast and cell membrane, through modification of the  
75 external electrochemical gradient or alterations to the root metabolism (Chaignon et al., 2009;  
76 Neumann and Römheld, 2012). However, the main effects of the rhizosphere pH on mineral  
77 nutrition of plants occur through modification of the nutrient availability in soil. Rhizosphere  
78 acidification can be regarded as a process selectively evolved in some species or group of  
79 species to overcome P and Fe deficiencies. Indeed, most plant species, except *Poaceae*, can  
80 be gathered into the Strategy I group, which possesses an enhanced capacity to excrete  $H^+$  and  
81 to reduce Fe(III) through a reductase system, in order to acquire Fe when it is poorly  
82 available. Similarly, increased proton exudation can also be triggered by P deficiency in  
83 various plant species (Hinsinger et al., 2003; Neumann and Römheld, 2012). Alternatively, an  
84 alkalinisation of the rhizosphere can reduce the availability of elements as demonstrated for P  
85 (Riley and Barber, 1971) and Cu (Bravin et al., 2009; Chaignon et al., 2009).

86 Mechanistic modelling based on the diffusion-convection equation of solutes in the  
87 rhizosphere (Barber, 1995) has continuously developed in order to predict plant uptake of  
88 both nutrients (Darrah et al., 2006; Keyes et al., 2013; Leitner et al., 2010; Ptashnyk et al.,  
89 2011) and of metallic contaminants (Custos et al., 2014; Lin et al., 2014; Mullins et al., 1986;  
90 Puschenreiter et al., 2005; Sterckeman et al., 2004). One approach to improving the solute  
91 uptake model would be to couple it to a model predicting rhizosphere pH (Gérard et al., 2017;  
92 Szegedi et al., 2010).

93 Nye (1972; 1981) was the first author to model the changes in rhizosphere pH from a constant  
94  $H^+$  or  $HCO_3^-$  flux from the root surface and the diffusion of these species according to Fick's  
95 law, taking into account the pH buffer capacity of the soil. Given that plants, except legumes,  
96 on average absorb more anions than cations (Cunningham, 1964), root excretion of  $HCO_3^-$

97 was fixed at a value estimated from the literature. The proton emission from well-nodulated  
98 legume roots was fixed in a similar way. Close agreement between Nye's theory and  
99 experimental results was found in the case of rhizosphere acidification of submerged rice  
100 (Kirk and Bajita, 1995) or of the growth zone of maize root tip (Schaller and Fischer, 1985).  
101 Nevertheless, these validations of Nye's model did not cover the case of a  $\text{HCO}_3^-$  efflux  
102 which often occurs above root tips, in well-aerated soils where nitrate is the main form of  
103 absorbed nitrogen (Blossfeld et al., 2010; Nye, 1981). Moreover, Nye's model is based on an  
104 *a priori* setting, namely an estimated  $\text{H}^+$  or  $\text{OH}^-$  (or  $\text{HCO}_3^-$ ) proton efflux to fit a situation  
105 known to cause an acidification or alkalisation of the root vicinity, respectively. This  
106 approach does not apply to the general case, when the efflux of acid-base species resulting  
107 from the plant mineral nutrition is unknown. Therefore, a model determining the root efflux  
108 of acid-base species from the balance of cation and anion root absorption would be an  
109 improvement of the rhizosphere pH prediction.

110 We consequently developed such a model, and used it to evaluate the effect of major nutrient  
111 root uptake on rhizosphere pH. The model describes the transport of major cations and anions  
112 under the influence of both a concentration and an electric potential gradient, as well as their  
113 reaction with the soil solid phase (soil buffer power). At the root surface, the elements are  
114 taken up according to Michaelis-Menten kinetics and the electrical neutrality of the system is  
115 maintained through a proton or hydroxyl efflux (Bouldin, 1989). The model was tested by  
116 comparing its outputs with the pH measured in the rhizosphere of three plants species  
117 (ryegrass, maize and Alpine pennycress) grown in three different soils, using a non-invasive  
118 optical method (Blossfeld et al., 2010). A global sensitivity analysis was then carried out in  
119 order to highlight the most influential factors on the rhizosphere pH. This approach was  
120 completed by simulations using the composition of 37 soil solutions from various origins,  
121 taken from the literature.

122

## 123 2. Materials and methods

### 124 2.1. Model development

125 The new and original model to compute the rhizosphere pH is derived rigorously from first  
126 principles. A simplified description of the model is given here, while an extensive version can  
127 be found in the [Supplementary Material](#). The soil is divided into two compartments: the soil  
128 solution, where the electro-neutrality condition is verified locally and the solid phase,  
129 including the very thin electrical double layer (thickness  $\approx 10$  nm) at the surface of the solid  
130 phase. The electrical double layer is neglected because of its very small volume compared to  
131 that of the pore solution. Its influence is supposed to be part of the buffer power.

#### 132 2.1.1. Transport in soil solution

133 The various ions contained in the soil solution are  $\text{H}_3\text{O}^+$ ,  $\text{OH}^-$ ,  $\text{HCO}_3^-$  and  $n$  ionic species  
134  $\text{M}_i^{z_i+}$  of valence  $z_i$  ( $\text{Ca}^{2+}$ ,  $\text{K}^+$ ,  $\text{Mg}^{2+}$ ,  $\text{Na}^+$ ,  $\text{NH}_4^+$ ,  $\text{Cl}^-$ ,  $\text{NO}_3^-$ , P ions and  $\text{SO}_4^{2-}$  as well as  $\text{Zn}^{2+}$   
135 in a specific soil). Organic ions, such as organic or amino acids were not taken into account.  
136 The valence of the P ions is taken as -1.5, as in soil solution at pH around 7, phosphates in the  
137 soil solution are constituted in nearly equal parts of  $\text{H}_2\text{PO}_4^-$  et  $\text{HPO}_4^{2-}$  (Barber, 1995). The  
138 concentrations of the  $\text{OH}^-$  and  $\text{HCO}_3^-$  ions are given from the  $\text{H}_3\text{O}^+$  concentration according  
139 to the following equilibrium conditions:

$$140 \quad [\text{H}_3\text{O}^+][\text{OH}^-] = K_e \quad (1)$$

$$141 \quad [\text{H}_3\text{O}^+][\text{HCO}_3^-] = k_{\text{CO}_2} \quad (2)$$

142 where  $K_e$  is the water ionic product and  $k_{\text{CO}_2}$  is assumed to be proportional to the (uniform)  
143 partial pressure of  $\text{CO}_2$  ( $P_{\text{CO}_2}$ ) in the soil. Micro-organism mediated processes and root  
144 emissions of  $\text{CO}_2$  were not formalized.

145 As the objective is to compute the pH, the electro-neutrality of the soil solution

146 
$$[\text{H}_3\text{O}^+] + \sum_{j=1}^n z_j [\text{M}_j^{z_j+}] = [\text{OH}^-] + [\text{HCO}_3^-] = \frac{K_e + k_{\text{CO}_2}}{[\text{H}_3\text{O}^+]} \quad (3)$$

147 has to be verified rigorously. Using Eqs. (1-3) gives for a given partial  $\text{CO}_2$  pressure  
 148 ( $P_{\text{CO}_2}$ ) the concentrations  $[\text{H}_3\text{O}^+]$ ,  $[\text{OH}^-]$  and  $[\text{HCO}_3^-]$  as a function of the sum of the ion  
 149 charges ( $\sum_{j=1}^n z_j [\text{M}_j^{z_j+}]$ ). Fulfilling the electro-neutrality condition (i.e. adding Eq. (3) to the  
 150 transport equations) requires adding a supplementary unknown, the (electric) streaming  
 151 potential  $\psi$ . Therefore, the molar mass fluxes for the  $n$  ion species ( $\text{M}_i^{z_i+}$ ) are given as the  
 152 sum of a convective term due to the water movement with the velocity  $\mathbf{v}$ , as well as a  
 153 diffusive term written in the Nernst-Planck form to take into account the electric effects on the  
 154 ions diffusive motion:

155 
$$\mathbf{J}_{\text{M}_i^{z_i+}} = [\text{M}_i^{z_i+}] \mathbf{v} - \mathcal{D}_{\text{M}_i^{z_i+}} \left( \nabla [\text{M}_i^{z_i+}] + \frac{F z_i [\text{M}_i^{z_i+}]}{RT} \nabla \psi \right) \quad 1 \leq i \leq n \quad (4)$$

156 
$$\frac{\partial [\text{M}_i^{z_i+}]}{\partial t} = -\nabla \cdot \mathbf{J}_{\text{M}_i^{z_i+}} \quad 1 \leq i \leq n+3 \quad (5)$$

157 Similar equations are written for the molar flux of  $\text{H}_3\text{O}^+$ ,  $\text{OH}^-$  and  $\text{HCO}_3^-$ . The introduction  
 158 of the diffusion equation in the Nernst-Planck form allows a rigorous determination of the  
 159 evolution of the rhizosphere pH from the properties of the soil and the mineral nutrition of the  
 160 plant for the mineral nutrients  $[\text{M}_i^{z_i+}]$  ( $1 \leq i \leq n$ ) without any additional hypotheses.

161 Due to the electro-neutrality condition, adding the  $n$  transport equations for the nutrients plus  
 162 the transport equations for  $\text{H}_3\text{O}^+$ ,  $\text{OH}^-$  and  $\text{HCO}_3^-$  weighted by the valence of each ion leads  
 163 to

164 
$$\nabla \cdot \mathbf{I}_c = 0 \quad (6)$$

165 with 
$$\mathbf{I}_c = F \left( \sum_{i=1}^n z_i \mathbf{J}_{\text{M}_i^{z_i+}} + \mathbf{J}_{\text{H}_3\text{O}^+} - \mathbf{J}_{\text{OH}^-} - \mathbf{J}_{\text{HCO}_3^-} \right) \quad (7)$$

166 The electric current in the soil solution is divergence free. The convective part being  
 167 necessarily 0 due to the electro-neutrality condition,  $\mathbf{I}_c$  only depends on the  $n+1$  gradients  
 168  $\nabla[M_i^{z_i^+}]$  and  $\nabla\psi$ . As no electric current occurs in the soil, the electric current  $\mathbf{I}_c$  is locally  
 169 zero in the soil solution (see SM for details) and the gradient of the streaming potential  $\nabla\psi$  is  
 170 easily deduced from the gradients of  $\nabla[M_i^{z_i^+}]$  ( $1 \leq i \leq n$ ). The molar flux  $\mathbf{J}_{M_i^{z_i^+}}$  for the  $n$   
 171  $M_i^{z_i^+}$  species is consequently written:

$$172 \quad \mathbf{J}_{M_i^{z_i^+}} = [M_i^{z_i^+}] \mathbf{v} - \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{D}_{ij} \nabla[M_j^{z_j^+}] \quad 1 \leq i \leq n \quad (8)$$

173 where the diffusion coefficient  $\mathbb{D}_{ij}$  is given as a function of the molecular diffusive  
 174 coefficients  $\mathcal{D}_{M_j^{z_j^+}}$  as

$$175 \quad \mathbb{D}_{ij} = \mathcal{D}_{M_i^{z_i^+}} \left\{ \delta_{ij} + \frac{z_i z_j [M_k^{z_k^+}] (D_H - \mathcal{D}_{M_j^{z_j^+}})}{\sum_{k=1}^n z_k^2 \mathcal{D}_{M_k^{z_k^+}} [M_k^{z_k^+}] + \left( [H_3O^+] + \frac{K_e + k_{CO_2}}{[H_3O^+]} \right) D_H} \right\} \quad 1 \leq i, j \leq n \quad (9)$$

176 where  $\delta_{ij}$  is the Kronecker symbol and the diffusion coefficient  $D_H$  is given by

$$177 \quad \left( 1 + \frac{K_e + k_{CO_2}}{[H_3O^+]} \right) D_H = \mathcal{D}_{H_3O^+} + \frac{K_e}{[H_3O^+]^2} \mathcal{D}_{OH^-} + \frac{k_{CO_2}}{[H_3O^+]^2} \mathcal{D}_{HCO_3^-} \quad (10)$$

178 Finally, the proton concentration  $[H_3O^+]$  is computed from the electro-neutrality condition  
 179 (Eq. 3).

180

### 181 **2.1.2. Transport in soil**

182 The transport equations in the soil solution are then up-scaled to the soil scale using a  
 183 classical two-scale homogenization technique. At the interface between the soil solution and  
 184 the solid phase (including the thin electric double layer), the  $M_i^{z_i^+}$  species ( $1 \leq i \leq n$ ) are  
 185 adsorbed according to the soil buffer power  $b_{M_i^{z_i^+}}$ . A simultaneous flux of  $H_3O^+$ ,  $OH^-$  or

186  $\text{HCO}_3^-$  is necessary to maintain the electro-neutrality of the soil solution. These fluxes are  
 187 implicitly computed. The final result (see [Supplementary Material](#)) is

$$188 \quad \left( \theta + b_{M_i^{z_i^+}} \right) \frac{\partial [M_i^{z_i^+}]}{\partial t} + \mathbf{v}_D \cdot \nabla [M_i^{z_i^+}] = \nabla \cdot \left( \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{D}_{ij}^* \nabla [M_i^{z_i^+}] + S_{M_i^{z_i^+}} \right) \quad 1 \leq i \leq n \quad (11)$$

189 where  $\theta$  is the volumetric liquid fraction of the soil (considered to be constant), and  $\mathbf{v}_D$  the  
 190 Darcy velocity (water volumetric flux per unit surface area of the soil). The buffer power  $b_{M_i^{z_i^+}}$   
 191 is calculated as the ratio of the concentration of solid-phase sorbed ion (i.e. exchangeable, mol  
 192  $\text{m}^{-3}$  soil) to that of the ion in solution (mol  $\text{m}^{-3}$  solution) (Roose et al., 2001). No feedback  
 193 effect of pH on soil buffer power for ions was taken into account. The source term  $S_{M_i^{z_i^+}}$  is  
 194 added in order to describe the production of nitrate from organic matter ([Supplementary](#)  
 195 [Material](#)).

196 A simple approximation of the homogenized diffusion coefficient at the soil scale is provided  
 197 by the relation:

$$198 \quad \mathbb{D}_{ij}^* = \theta^{3/2} \mathbb{D}_{ij} \quad (12)$$

### 199 **2.1.3. Boundary conditions**

200 The model is solved in a cylindrical unit soil volume around the root. At the surface of the  
 201 roots in cylindrical coordinates ( $r = r_0$ ) the mass flux of species  $M_i^{z_i^+}$  ( $1 \leq i \leq n$ ) is given by  
 202 a Michaelis-Menten relation ( $\mathbf{v}_D < 0$ ):

$$203 \quad \mathbf{v}_D [M_i^{z_i^+}] - \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{D}_{ij} \frac{\partial [M_j^{z_j^+}]}{\partial r} \Big|_{r=r_0} = -I_{max}^i \frac{[M_i^{z_i^+}]}{K_m^i + [M_i^{z_i^+}]} \quad (13)$$

204 As with the interface conditions between the soil solution and the solid phase, a simultaneous  
 205 flux of  $\text{H}_3\text{O}^+$ ,  $\text{OH}^-$  or  $\text{HCO}_3^-$  at the surface of the root is necessary to maintain the electro-  
 206 neutrality of the system, which is implicitly calculated ([Eq. \(14\) in Supplementary Material](#)).

207 Note that all fluxes are in the soil and not in the plant as some chemical reactions (including

208 CO<sub>2</sub> release) may occur at the soil/plant interface, but with the constraint of charge  
 209 conservation. The periodicity condition around each root is simulated by setting a null flux for  
 210 each ionic species  $i$  at the boundary of the root zone of influence:

$$211 \quad v_D[M_i^{z_i^+}] - \sum_{j=1}^n D_{ij} \left. \frac{\partial[M_j^{z_j^+}]}{\partial r} \right|_{r=r_1} = 0 \quad (14)$$

212 The root absorption functions along the root, above the growth zone are assumed to be  
 213 invariable in space and time for all the ions considered (Barber, 1995). This corresponds to  
 214 young active and growing roots, as those for which variations in the rhizosphere pH have  
 215 been measured (e.g. Blossfeld et al. (2010); Marschner and Römheld (1983); Marschner et al.  
 216 (1986); Marschner et al. (1982)). The ion transport is supposed to be purely radial, in a zone  
 217 sufficiently distant from the root apex for the growth effects (as described by Kim et al.  
 218 (1999)) to be negligible. The realism of the simulated uptakes according to the mean plant  
 219 composition is discussed in Supplementary Material (2.2, Table S1).

#### 220 **2.1.4. Initial conditions**

221 The initial soil composition is assumed to be uniform. The initial value of  $P_{CO_2}$  is deduced  
 222 from the initial pH and composition of the soil solution, according to Eq. (3) and does not  
 223 vary with time.

#### 224 **2.1.5. Model parameters and numerical solution**

225 The model parameters concern self-ionization of water, the solubility of CO<sub>2</sub> in water, soil  
 226 water content, soil buffer power for each ion, diffusion properties of the ions in water, root  
 227 geometry and root ion absorption properties ( $K_m^i$  and  $I_{max}^i$  for each nutrient  $1 \leq i \leq n$ ). These  
 228 are given in Table 1. The root absorption parameters are set at the same level for the three  
 229 plant species, based on the relatively little data available from the literature (see  
 230 [Supplementary Material](#)).

231 The equations were solved using the pdepe function of Matlab®, using hundred space steps  
232 logarithmically distributed and an adaptive time step.

233

## 234 **2.2. Model validation**

235 The model was experimentally evaluated by comparing its output, *i.e.* the soil pH at the root  
236 surface (rhizoplane), to pH measured in the rhizosphere of ryegrass (*Lolium perenne* L., Prana  
237 cultivar), maize (*Zea mays* L. cv INRA MB862) and the Zn and Cd hyperaccumulator Alpine  
238 pennycress (*Noccaea caerulea* (J. & C. Presl) F. K. Mey., Viviez population) grown in  
239 three different soils. For this, data previously produced by Blossfeld et al. (2010) were used  
240 (see 2.2.2).

### 241 **2.2.1. Plant cultivation**

242 Plants were grown on three soils, designated as A, B and C, sampled in the Ap horizon of  
243 Cambisols (Table 2). Soils A and B were a loam with a pH (H<sub>2</sub>O) of 6.2 and a silt loam soil  
244 with a pH (H<sub>2</sub>O) of 8.1, respectively. Soil C was chosen because it was also a loam and its  
245 bulk soil pH fell between those of soils A and B. Soil C also enabled the measurement of pH  
246 in the rhizosphere of ryegrass on a slightly acidic soil, as this plant only rarely grew on soil A  
247 in pot cultivation, because of the toxicity of a highly available Zn content (Blossfeld et al.,  
248 2010). This Zn level, however, affected neither the growth of Alpine pennycress which is  
249 hypertolerant to this metal, nor that of maize, probably because this is still heterotrophic (see  
250 below).

251 Plants were transplanted to or sown in PVC rhizoboxes (height 300 mm, width 150 mm,  
252 depth 50 mm) that were filled with the soil. During cultivation, the rhizoboxes were placed on  
253 a rack inclined at 45° in order to force the roots to grow along the front plates. The transparent  
254 side being placed against the rack, the roots were protected from light. The plants were grown  
255 and investigated in a growth chamber. The cultivation period of the three species in the

256 rhizoboxes prior to the measurements differed due to the specific root growth of individual  
257 species, *i.e.* 6-8 weeks for alpine pennycress, 4-5 weeks for ryegrass and 8-9 days for maize.

### 258 **2.2.2. Measurement of rhizosphere pH**

259 Rhizosphere pH was measured using planar pH optodes, according to the device described by  
260 Blossfeld *et al.* (2010). The optode, a 10  $\mu\text{m}$  inert polymer film measuring a few square  
261 centimetres, was placed on a single root or on several roots, at the soil surface, behind the  
262 rhizobox glass. This film contained a dispersed and immobilized dye which reacts to protons.  
263 The measurement was based on the fluorescence decay time of the dye and was carried out  
264 *via* an optical glass fibre from outside the rhizobox, which was connected to a light source and  
265 measuring device. The glass fibre was moved automatically by an x-y stepper motor device.  
266 By this means, the pH value could be measured in a line scanning mode, at 2 to 3 mm steps  
267 and 4 s intervals. This enabled the evolution of the pH in the rhizosphere to be mapped, as  
268 illustrated in Blossfeld *et al.* (2010).

269 To evaluate the model, we used three types of measured data (Table 3):

- 270 • The average pH along the axis of a single root, which can be considered as the pH at  
271 the rhizoplane. This was available for all the plant species in the three soils, except  
272 ryegrass which did not grow in soil A.
- 273 • The average pH in a portion of the root network, a planar optode being placed on  
274 several young roots. This was not available for ryegrass in soil A.
- 275 • The pH of the bulk soil as measured with the optode.

276 The latter was used as the initial pH value, while the other two were compared to the model  
277 outputs. The pH measurements showed that the functioning of roots was rather uniform along  
278 their axes, except for maize, as will be shown and discussed later.

### 279 **2.2.3. Analysis of the soil solution and rhizosphere pH simulations**

280 Because the initial concentrations of anions and cations in the soil solutions were not  
 281 determined in the work of Blossfeld et al. (2010), these were measured *de novo* for the  
 282 validation of the model, in the following manner. Approximately one kilogram of soil was put  
 283 in a pot and maintained close to the water holding capacity (WHC) for 21 days by regular  
 284 watering from the bottom. A microsuction cup (Rhizon soil moisture sampler, Eijkelkamp,  
 285 Giesbeek, The Netherlands), placed in the centre of the soil, enabled us to sample the soil  
 286 solution. The day before the solution sampling, the soil was watered to WHC. Less than 30  
 287 minutes were required to sample around 10 ml of soil solution. Anions ( $\text{Cl}^-$ ,  $\text{NO}_3^-$ ,  $\text{PO}_4^{3-}$ ,  
 288  $\text{SO}_4^{2-}$ ) and cations ( $\text{Ca}^{2+}$ ,  $\text{K}^+$ ,  $\text{Mg}^{2+}$ ,  $\text{Na}^+$ ,  $\text{NH}_4^+$ ) were determined using ionic chromatography  
 289 (Dionex AS50/EG40/IC25, Sunnyvale, CA, USA) and a certified solution from Sigma-  
 290 Aldrich (reference number 89886). Induced coupled plasma atomic emission spectrometry  
 291 (iCAP 6300 DUO, Thermo Scientific, UK) was used to determine Al, Fe, Mn and Zn in the  
 292 solution. In this case, three certified solutions from SCP Science were used (reference  
 293 numbers 701-021-067, 701-021-432 and 140-025-038).

294 Using these soil solution compositions (Table 4), soil pH at the root surface or in the  
 295 rhizosphere (mean value over  $r_l$ ) was simulated for the three plant species (for Alpine penny-  
 296 cress, ryegrass and maize) in the three soils (A, B and C), fixing the initial pH at the value in  
 297 the bulk soil and neglecting the nitrate source, so  $S_{M_i^{z_i+}} = S_{\text{NO}_3^-} = 0$ . The simulation  
 298 conditions were adapted to the root age and density (Table 3). In total, the model outputs were  
 299 compared to 15 measurements of the rhizosphere pH.

### 300 2.3. Sensitivity analysis

301 A sensitivity analysis was carried out using Matlab® in order to evaluate which of the 41  
 302 factors (including the nitrate source) had the greatest impact on the variation of the pH at the  
 303 root surface ( $\Delta pH$ ):

$$304 \quad \Delta pH = Y = pH_f - pH_i \quad (15)$$

305 where  $pH_i$  is the initial pH, corresponding to that of the non-rhizospheric (bulk) soil and  $pH_f$   
 306 is the soil pH at the end of the simulation.

307 Factors ( $X_j$ ) were ranked according to standardized regression coefficients ( $SRC$ ) (Faivre et  
 308 al., 2013; Saltelli et al., 2004).

$$309 \quad SRC_j = \beta_j \sqrt{\frac{Var(X_j)}{Var(Y)}} \quad (16)$$

310 in which  $Var()$  is the variance,  $\beta_j$  is the regression coefficient of  $X_j$ , according to the  
 311 correlation

$$312 \quad Y = \sum_{j=1}^N \beta_j X_j + \varepsilon \quad (17)$$

313 where  $Y$  is the output of the model and  $\varepsilon$  the model error,  $N = 41$ .

314 The factors were sampled using random sampling of uniform distributions (Table S2). The  
 315 initial pH (Figure S3) was calculated according to Eq. 3, randomly sampling  $P_{CO_2}$ , as follows.

316 After sampling all the concentrations of the transported ions, their charge balance ( $CB$ , mol<sub>c</sub>  
 317 m<sup>-3</sup>) was calculated according to

$$318 \quad CB = \sum_{j=1}^n z_j [M_j^{z_j^+}] \quad (18)$$

319 as well as the sum of absolute charges:

$$320 \quad \sum_{j=1}^n |z_j| [M_j^{z_j^+}] \quad (19)$$

321 Solution compositions were retained when the relative charge balance ( $CB_r$ , dimensionless)  
 322 satisfied the following condition:

$$323 \quad 0 < CB_r = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^n z_j [M_j^{z_j^+}]}{\sum_{j=1}^n |z_j| [M_j^{z_j^+}]} < 0.2 \quad (20)$$

324 Negative charge balances were discarded, as they led to very acidic initial pH, falling beyond  
 325 of the range of natural pH. The upper limit of  $CB_r$  (0.2) was chosen by rounding the mean  
 326 relative charge balance measured on soils worldwide (see 2.4), which is 0.12.  $P_{CO_2}$  was then  
 327 randomly sampled between  $3 \cdot 10^3$  ppmv and  $10^5$  ppmv (Sposito, 2016), to calculate the

328 corresponding solution pH according to Eq. (3). The final sample size was 20,000. The model  
329 was run for two durations: one and four weeks.

330

#### 331 **2.4. Simulating rhizosphere pH in 37 soils sampled worldwide**

332 As the 20,000 random cases simulated in the sensitivity analysis could not all be  
333 representative of the reality of soil solution composition, we analysed the output of the model  
334 on a set of data originating from real soils. In Tables 7.2 and 7.3 of his book, Wolt (1994)  
335 summarized the solution composition of soil horizons sampled worldwide by various authors.  
336 From this data set, we kept the solution composition from 35 surface horizons, for which our  
337 calculations based on Eq. 3 led to an initial pH close to that measured. Indeed, for some of  
338 them, it was impossible to reproduce the measured pH, probably because of errors or missing  
339 data in the reported solution composition. In most of the solutions, there was no phosphate  
340 content, probably because this ion was below the detection limits. The  $\text{NH}_4^+$  and the  $\text{SO}_4^{2-}$   
341 contents were not always available. However, as will be shown later, these ions have a limited  
342 influence on rhizosphere pH and the simulations could usefully be carried out with null values  
343 for P ions,  $\text{NH}_4^+$  and  $\text{SO}_4^{2-}$ . The solution composition of soils used to validate the model, i.e.  
344 soils B and C were added to those from Wolt (1994). Solutions from soil A were not used  
345 because of its exceptionally high Zn content. The 37 solutions (Table S3) were used to  
346 simulate  $\Delta pH$ . For these simulations, nitrate source ( $S_{\text{NO}_3^-}$ ), soil buffer powers and root  
347 absorption parameters of the different ions were taken as averages of the distributions used in  
348 the sensitivity analysis (Table S2). The root radius ( $r_0$ ), the mean distance between roots ( $r_l$ )  
349 and the volumetric water content ( $\theta$ ) were taken as  $1 \cdot 10^{-4}$  m,  $5.5 \cdot 10^{-3}$  m (Lin et al., 2016) and  
350 0.25, respectively.  $P_{\text{CO}_2}$  was taken as  $3 \cdot 10^3$  ppmv (around 10 times the atmospheric pressure).  
351 The water volumetric flux  $v_D$  was  $2.5005 \cdot 10^{-8}$  m s<sup>-1</sup> and  $S_{\text{NO}_3^-}$  was zero. The model also

352 enabled a calculation of other variables, such as the final composition of the rhizosphere  
353 solution and the amounts of ions taken up by the root.

354

### 355 **3. Results and discussion**

#### 356 **3.1. Model validation**

##### 357 **3.1.1. Ryegrass and Alpine pennycress**

358 The simulated rhizosphere pH was compared to 15 measured values (Table 5). In the case of  
359 ryegrass and Alpine pennycress, along the surface of a single young root and in root network,  
360 an alkalinisation of the rhizosphere was systematically measured. In soil A, the alkalinisation  
361 ranged from 1.2 to 1.4 pH unit. In soil B, this ranged from 0.4 to 0.9 pH units, while in soil C,  
362 it varied between 0.3 and 1.7 pH units. It must be noted that pH measured in the bulk soil with  
363 the planar optodes was close to that determined with dry soil dispersed in a 0.01 M CaCl<sub>2</sub>  
364 solution, and was slightly lower than that measured in water (Table 2).

365 All the simulations predicted a clear alkalinisation of the rhizosphere. In soil A, the simulated  
366 pH at the root surface was 6.4, i.e. 0.8 units above the initial pH (= 5.6) and 0.4 units below  
367 the measured value (Table 5). In the root network, the simulated pH was 7.7, i.e. 0.7 unit  
368 above the measured one. In soil B, the simulation produced a rhizoplane alkalinisation of 0.2  
369 pH unit. The rhizoplane pH was 0.2 units below that measured at the rhizoplane of ryegrass  
370 (7.6 against 7.8) and 0.8 units below that measured at the rhizoplane of Alpine pennycress  
371 (7.6 against 8.4). For root networks, the simulations (pH = 8.0) were closer to the measured  
372 values (pH = 7.9) in both ryegrass and Alpine pennycress. In soil C, the simulated rhizoplane  
373 pH was 0.7 pH units above that in the bulk soil (= 6.2). It was 0.9 units below that measured  
374 at the rhizoplane of Alpine pennycress (6.9 against 7.8), but 0.4 units above that measured at  
375 the rhizoplane of ryegrass (6.9 against 6.5). In all the simulations, the initial  $P_{\text{CO}_2}$  fell within

376 the range that has been observed in soils [up to 100 times the atmospheric partial pressure  
377 (Sposito, 2016)].

378 Overall, these results show a reasonably good fit between the model predictions and the  
379 measured pH values at the root surface of ryegrass and Alpine pennycress. To interpret the  
380 differences between measurements and simulations, it is important to bear in mind the  
381 relationship between the solution pH, the ion charge balance (*CB*) and the CO<sub>2</sub> partial  
382 pressure ( $P_{\text{CO}_2}$ ) (Eq. (3), Figure 1). There is a quasi-discontinuity in the function  $pH = f(CB)$   
383 at  $CB = 0$ . Therefore, when the charge balance is close to zero, the pH varies strongly with  
384 even a very small changes in charge balance. Moreover, in the case of a positive charge  
385 balance, the value at which  $P_{\text{CO}_2}$  is fixed also has a considerable impact on the calculated pH,  
386 as shown by the curves for different  $P_{\text{CO}_2}$ . The characteristics of the function determining the  
387 pH explain the variability of the deviations between measured and simulated rhizospheric pH.  
388 Indeed, this law may transform small uncertainties in the composition of the soil solution and  
389 the CO<sub>2</sub> pressure, related to sampling and analysis, into wide variations in the pH calculation.  
390 However, this does not prevent the model from being used. Indeed, instead of using the initial  
391 solution composition to predict the initial soil pH, the latter measured in the bulk soil can be  
392 imposed, thereby slightly adjusting the composition of the soil solution or of the partial CO<sub>2</sub>  
393 pressure. To illustrate this, slightly increasing the NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> content of 0.08 mol m<sup>-3</sup> in soil A, i.e.  
394 +0.7% of the total charges in solution, gives a simulated alkalinisation of the rhizosphere of  
395 1.3 pH units (corresponding to the measured alkalinisation), instead of 0.8 units.

### 396 **3.1.2. Maize**

397 This adequation was not observed in the case of maize, whose rhizosphere pH was clearly  
398 different from that of the two other species and from the simulation results. Indeed, when  
399 measured along a single young root, the rhizoplane pH decreased from 0.2 to 0.7 pH units  
400 (Table 5). At the rhizoplane of a single older root, this increased by only 0.1 to 0.3 pH units

401 when measured in soils B and C, while it decreased by 0.1 units in soil A. None of the  
402 rhizoplane pH simulations led to an acidification, but did generate alkalisation which most  
403 frequently, was above that of the single older root in soil B and C.

404 As already shown by Blossfeld et al. (2010) (particularly in Fig. 6 of their article), there was  
405 an acidification of the rhizosphere of maize, at about 15 to 25 mm from the apex. This  
406 phenomenon had already been observed by other authors (Peters and Felle, 1999; Pilet et al.,  
407 1983) Schaller and Fischer (1985). This acidification could be explained by the acid growth  
408 theory (Rayle and Cleland, 1992), which states that growing cells excrete protons into the  
409 cell-wall at an enhanced rate, resulting in a cell-wall loosening to facilitate the root  
410 elongation. This acidification zone is alternatively explained by a higher nutrient uptake in the  
411 growth zone that would constitute a large nutrient sink, particularly for  $K^+$ , whose root  
412 absorption would be equilibrated by proton excretion (Kim et al., 1999; Taylor and Bloom,  
413 1998).

414 On the other hand, the lower alkalisation observed here in the root network or in older  
415 maize roots (i.e. away from the apex) could be due to a much lower nitrate uptake by the  
416 maize than by ryegrass and Alpine pennycress. Indeed, maize is completely heterotrophic  
417 from 0 to around 75 degree-days (about 7 days after germination) and completely autotrophic  
418 from around 250 degree-days (Girardin, 2000; Nadeem et al., 2014). Between 75 degree-days  
419 and 250 degree-days, maize becomes progressively autotrophic. Therefore, 8-9 day-old maize  
420 seedlings (that is 88 to 99 degree-days), as used in the present experiment, were only slightly  
421 autotrophic. That means that the seedling was mostly provided with mineral nutrients from  
422 the caryopsis reserves and that it absorbed only a minor part of these nutrients from the soil  
423 solution. Nadeem et al. (2014) demonstrated that phosphorus was exclusively provided by the  
424 maize seed until 75 degree-days and was increasingly absorbed from the soil solution from  
425 that date until complete autotrophy was attained and the seed P reserves were exhausted.

426 Similar schemes could be drawn for the other nutrients, and particularly for nitrogen (Mollier,  
427 2015, personal communication). Eight to nine day-old maize would therefore consume  
428 nitrogen mostly from the seed reserves and absorb fewer nitrates from the soil solution than  
429 ryegrass and Alpine pennycress, which are much older and completely autotrophic. Therefore,  
430 at the rhizoplane of maize behind the acidification zone, the sum of charges is only slightly  
431 higher, as is, consequently the pH of the solution.

432

## 433 **3.2. Sensitivity analysis**

### 434 **3.2.1. Simulating root uptake over one week**

435 Those ions which most frequently accumulated at the root surface, i.e. their concentrations at  
436 the rhizoplane was higher at the end of the simulations than at in the initial condition, were  
437  $\text{Ca}^{2+}$ ,  $\text{Mg}^{2+}$ ,  $\text{Na}^+$ ,  $\text{SO}_4^-$  and  $\text{Cl}^-$ . In contrast,  $\text{K}^+$ ,  $\text{NH}_4^+$ ,  $\text{NO}_3^-$  and P ions were clearly depleted  
438 (Fig S2). The sum of these balances led to a positive final charge balance of the transported  
439 ions, resulting from the mostly negative initial and final charge uptakes (Fig 2). As a  
440 consequence, in the vast majority of the cases,  $\Delta\text{pH}$  was positive, reflecting an alkalinisation  
441 of the rhizosphere, whose mean value was 0.36 (Fig 2).

442 The most influential factor on  $\Delta\text{pH}$  was the initial nitrate concentration in the soil solution  
443 ( $[\text{NO}_3^-]$ ) (Fig. 3) ( $\text{SRC} = 0.81$ ). The more  $\text{NO}_3^-$  in the soil solution, the more the pH increased  
444 at the root surface. This is due to the root uptake of  $\text{NO}_3^-$ , as shown by the depletion of this  
445 ion in the rhizosphere in most of the simulations (Fig. S2), which is compensated for by the  
446 root absorption of  $\text{H}^+$  (or equivalent excretion of  $\text{OH}^-$ ). Nitrate was the most taken-up ion,  
447 representing 64% of the absorbed ion absolute charges (Table 6).

448 The second factor was the initial  $\text{Ca}^{2+}$  concentration ( $[\text{Ca}^{2+}]$ ) in the soil solution ( $\text{SRC} = -$   
449 0.63). This could be explained by the fact the higher  $[\text{Ca}^{2+}]$ , the higher its uptake by the roots

450 in exchange for  $H^+$ , which tended to reduce  $\Delta pH$ . However, this explanation would be  
451 contradictory to the fact that,  $Ca^{2+}$  generally accumulated at the root surface (Fig. S2). The  
452 explanation can be found in another phenomenon. During the random sampling for the  
453 constitution of the simulation dataset, the initial solutions with a negative charge balance were  
454 discarded (Eq. (20)). This process favoured the higher  $[Ca^{2+}]$ , as can be seen from the initial  
455 distribution of this factor (Fig. S3). Because the initial charge balance is a linear combination  
456 of the charges of each ion, there is therefore a positive correlation between the initial charge  
457 balance and the  $[Ca^{2+}]$ . Moreover, the relationship between the pH and the charge balance  
458 (Fig. 1) shows that the pH curve slope decreases as the charge balance increases. Therefore,  
459 as  $[Ca^{2+}]$  rises, the initial charge balance increases and the higher it is, the lower  $\Delta pH$  will be.

460 The initial sulphate concentration had a positive effect on  $\Delta pH$  ( $SRC = 0.55$ ). One could  
461 expect that the root absorption of  $SO_4^{2-}$  would alkalinise the rhizosphere, as that of  $NO_3^-$  did.  
462 However,  $SO_4^{2-}$  accumulated in the rhizosphere (Fig. S2). Again, the explanation of the  $[SO_4^{2-}]$   
463 effect relies on the dataset sampling process and the calculation of the initial charge balance,  
464 which made the initial sulphate concentration negatively correlated to that of the initial charge  
465 balance (Fig. S3). The relationship between the pH and the charge balance (Fig. 1) shows that  
466 in the vicinity of a zero charge balance, the slope of the pH curve strongly increases as the  
467 charge balance decreases. It is this trend which explains that the higher the  $[SO_4^{2-}]$ , the lower  
468 the initial charge balance and pH and the greater the variation in pH ( $\Delta pH$ ) will be.

469 The fourth influential factor is  $[Mg^{2+}]$ , with  $SRC = -0.26$ . Its effect can be explained in a  
470 similar manner to that of  $[Ca^{2+}]$ , although being less intense, because the initial concentration  
471 of  $Mg^{2+}$  is lower than that of  $Ca^{2+}$  (Fig. S3).

472 The average distance between roots  $r_I$ , also had a negative effect on  $\Delta pH$  (Fig. 3,  $SRC = -$   
473 0.15). This can be explained by the fact that the higher  $r_I$ , the greater the amount of ions in the

474 rhizosphere and as a consequence, the lower the effect of the root uptake on ion  
475 concentrations and therefore, on solution pH. The water content  $\theta$  also had a positive effect on  
476  $\Delta pH$  ( $SRC = 0.12$ ). This variable takes part in the calculation of the element content in soil  
477 (term  $(\theta + b_{M_i^{z_i+}}) \frac{\partial [M_i^{z_i+}]}{\partial t}$  in Eq. (11)), although its contribution is very slight when compared  
478 to the buffer power  $b_{M_i^{z_i+}}$ .  $\theta$  is also involved in the calculation of the homogenized diffusion  
479 coefficient at the soil scale (Eq. (12)). Increasing  $\theta$  enhances ion diffusion in general and  $\text{NO}_3^-$   
480 in particular, whose contribution dominates those of the other ions. Therefore,  $\theta$  is positively  
481 correlated to  $\Delta pH$  because it favours  $\text{NO}_3^-$  uptake.

482 It must be noted that although absorbed by the root in such a way that their concentrations  
483 decreased in the rhizosphere during uptake,  $\text{K}^+$ ,  $\text{NH}_4^+$  and P ions had no strong effect on  $\Delta pH$   
484 because their concentration variations (and those of the associated charges) was small  
485 compared to that of  $\text{NO}_3^-$ . Whatever the ion, the buffer power and the root absorption  
486 parameters had very little or no significant influence on the variation of pH in the rhizosphere.  
487 The nitrate source term ( $S_{\text{NO}_3^-}$ ) had no significant influence: over one week, it represented on  
488 average only 2% of the initial stock of  $\text{NO}_3^-$ .

### 489 **3.2.2. Simulating root uptake over four weeks**

490 After a four-week uptake,  $\Delta pH$  had a mean value of 0.45 and was therefore slightly more  
491 positive than after a one-week uptake (Fig. 2). This again corresponded to the positive final  
492 charge balance of the transported ions.

493 The four most influential factors were the same as for the one-week uptake simulations -  
494  $[\text{NO}_3^-]$  ( $SRC = 0.97$ ),  $[\text{Ca}^{2+}]$  ( $SRC = -0.75$ ),  $[\text{SO}_4^{2-}]$  ( $SRC = 0.70$ ) and  $[\text{Mg}^{2+}]$  ( $SRC = -0.32$ ) -  
495 and  $\Delta pH$  were affected in the same sense, but a little more intensively, as reflected by higher  
496  $SRC$  (Fig 4). Compared to the one-week simulations,  $r_I$  regressed to the seventh place ( $SRC =$

497 -0.08), indicating that the buffer effect of the rhizosphere volume would decrease with uptake  
498 duration, because of the depletion of nitrate in the rhizosphere solution. In contrast,  $\theta$  gained  
499 one place compared to the one-week uptake, as did  $[\text{Cl}^-]$ , which appears to positively affect  
500  $\Delta\text{pH}$  because, as with  $[\text{SO}_4^{2-}]$ , this is negatively correlated to the initial charge balance. As  
501 after four weeks,  $S_{\text{NO}_3^-}$  represented only 8% of the initial  $\text{NO}_3^-$  stock, the nitrate source only  
502 slightly reduced the nitrate depletion and had nearly no effect on  $\Delta\text{pH}$ .

### 503 **3.2.3. Main lessons from the sensitivity analysis**

504 The first conclusion which can be drawn from the sensitivity analysis is that the general trend  
505 to rhizosphere pH is alkalisation. The second point is that the main factor affecting the  
506 alkalisation level is by far the initial nitrate concentration in solution. The third conclusion  
507 is that the soil buffer power and the root absorption parameters ( $K_m$  and  $I_{max}$ ), whatever the  
508 ion, have little or no influence on the rhizosphere pH. This justifies the use of the same root  
509 absorption parameters for the three different plant species. The sensitivity analysis also  
510 showed that the root density (or  $r_l$ ) and the soil humidity could both have an influence on the  
511 rhizosphere pH.

512 The final conclusion concerns the sensitivity analysis itself. Despite the conditions imposed  
513 for the sampling of the ion concentrations in the initial solution (Eq. (20)), there was a  
514 dependency of the initial charge balance on major ion concentrations ( $\text{Ca}^{2+}$ ,  $\text{Mg}^{2+}$ ,  $\text{SO}_4^{2-}$ ),  
515 which artificially made the latter influential variables. This bias in the sensitivity analysis also  
516 shows how strongly  $\Delta\text{pH}$  depends on the initial ionic composition of the solution. This  
517 justifies a statistical analysis of the model using more realistic soil solution compositions.

518

### 519 **3.3. Simulating rhizosphere pH in 37 soils**

520 To test the model in more realistic conditions, the rhizosphere pH was simulated using a well-  
521 documented series of various soil solutions taken from Wolt (1994).

### 522 **3.3.1. General trend of rhizosphere pH and effect of solution composition**

523 Let us consider first the results of the simulation of a four-week uptake of ions. The simulated  
524 initial pH was close to the measured one (Fig. S4). On average, the rhizosphere pH increased  
525 by 1.1 units (Table S4). For each soil, the sign of  $\Delta pH$  corresponded to that of  $\Delta CB$ , the  
526 variation in charge balance in the soil solution at the root surface being expressed as

$$527 \quad \Delta CB = CB_f - CB_i \quad (21)$$

528 with the subscript  $f$  for “final” ( $t = 1$  or 4 week) and  $i$  for “initial” ( $t = 0$ ).  $CB_f$  results from ion  
529 root uptake and ion accumulation at the root surface through convection.

530 In 32 of the 37 soils (i.e. 86% of the soils),  $\Delta pH$  was positive. In 26 soils over the 32 where  
531  $\Delta pH$  was positive, the charge balance of the ions absorbed by the roots ( $RCB$ ,  $\text{mol}_c \text{ m}^{-1}$ ) was  
532 negative, indicating that the root absorbed mainly anions (Table S4). This absorption of  
533 anions caused the alkalinisation of the rhizosphere. This alkalinisation was not perturbed by  
534 the accumulation of ions due to convection, *i.e.* the convection leading to the accumulation of  
535 cations or the accumulation of anions was not sufficient to counteract anion root absorption.

536 In these 26 cases,  $\text{NO}_3^-$  uptake represented 80% (against an overall mean of 62%) of the total  
537 absolute charge uptake, showing that the rhizosphere alkalinisation was mainly the  
538 consequence of nitrate uptake. Fourteen soils had a particularly high  $\Delta pH$ , ranging from  
539 nearly 1.7 to 3.3. These values explain the mean  $\Delta pH$  of 1.1, higher than that estimated during  
540 the sensitivity analysis ( $\Delta pH = 0.45$  after 4 weeks of uptake), the rest of the soils having a  
541 mean  $\Delta pH$  of 0.30. Thirteen of these high  $\Delta pH$  soils had an initial pH between *ca* 4.7 and 6.0,  
542 which corresponds to the pH zone, where a small change in charge balance can strongly affect  
543 the solution pH (Fig. 1). One of them (Tujung), had an initial pH of 7.0, beyond the high

544 variation zone of this parameter. However, this soil with high initial cation contents, showed a  
545 very positive charge balance ( $23.7 \text{ mol}_c \text{ m}^{-3}$  versus  $5.2 \text{ mol}_c \text{ m}^{-3}$  on average) after 4 weeks,  
546 due to an elevated uptake of  $\text{NO}_3^-$  (representing 91% of the absorbed charges).

547 In 6 soils out of the 32 where  $\Delta pH$  was positive (for instance in soils Cecil unamended,  
548 Fyfield, and Grove),  $RCB$  was positive (i.e. dominated by cation absorption) (Table S4). In  
549 these cases, however,  $\Delta CB$  was still positive, leading to a positive  $\Delta pH$ . Although the root  
550 absorption, after 4 weeks of uptake, tended to acidify the rhizosphere, this was not sufficient  
551 to significantly reduce the positive charge balance created at the rhizoplane after the initial  
552 uptake. This shows that the initial uptake plays an important role in rhizosphere pH, in  
553 determining a charge balance which will be slow to modify afterwards. At the beginning of  
554 uptake, nitrate is quickly absorbed, causing alkalinisation at the rhizoplane. Afterwards,  
555 although nitrate is less absorbed than cations, the absorption of cations is not quick enough to  
556 acidify the rhizoplane solution.

557 In the 5 soils where  $\Delta pH$  was negative, correlatively with  $\Delta CB$ ,  $RCB$  was positive, indicating  
558 that the plant predominantly absorbed cations, which was compensated for by an acidification  
559 at the rhizoplane. In these soils, nitrate represented only 3.6% of the absorbed charges, while  
560  $\text{K}^+$  represented 68%. This is due to a lack of  $\text{NO}_3^-$  in the initial solution ( $0.03 \text{ mol}_c \text{ m}^{-3}$  against  
561  $8.3 \text{ mol}_c \text{ m}^{-3}$  on average), and not to an excess of  $\text{K}^+$  ( $0.25 \text{ mol}_c \text{ m}^{-3}$  against  $0.85 \text{ mol}_c \text{ m}^{-3}$  on  
562 average).

### 563 **3.3.2. Effect of uptake duration**

564 The results obtained after a one-week uptake simulation were close to those of a four-week  
565 uptake.  $\Delta pH$  after a one-week uptake was on average 0.2 unit lower than that after a four-  
566 week uptake (Table 7). Up to 1 week of uptake, concentrations of  $\text{Ca}^{2+}$ ,  $\text{Cl}^-$ ,  $\text{Mg}^{2+}$ ,  $\text{Na}^+$  and  
567  $\text{SO}_4^{2-}$  in the soil solution increased slightly because of convection and then stabilized over

568 time, probably because of an equilibrium between convection and retro-diffusion.  
569 Concentrations of  $K^+$ ,  $NH_4^+$ ,  $NO_3^-$  and P ions decreased because of root absorption. The  
570 decrease rate of  $NO_3^-$  was much higher than that of the other ions (Table 7). The charge  
571 balance in the rhizoplane solution regularly increased from  $+1.20 \text{ mol}_c \text{ m}^{-3}$  to  $+8.12 \text{ mol}_c \text{ m}^{-3}$   
572 after 12 weeks. The proportion of  $Ca^{2+}$ ,  $Mg^{2+}$ ,  $K^+$ , P ions and  $SO_4^{2-}$  in the total absolute  
573 charge uptake continuously increased, while that of  $NO_3^-$  strongly decreased from 69.8% to  
574 51.7% as did that of  $NH_4^+$  also, but to a far lesser extent (Table 8).

575 As mentioned above, the first week of uptake determined most of  $\Delta pH$  at the rhizoplane even  
576 for the consecutive weeks and on average, increasing the simulation time to 8 and 12 weeks  
577 only slightly increased  $\Delta pH$ , by a few hundredths of pH units. This is due to the fact that  
578 within the first week, there is a strong decrease in anion (i.e. mainly nitrate) concentration in  
579 the solution, and therefore an increase in the charge balance and in the pH. This initial  
580 increase in rhizosphere pH is sharp, because of the discontinuity in  $pH = f(CB)$  (Figure 1).  
581 However, after this increase, the same function shows that pH only slightly increases with  
582 CB. In some cases,  $\Delta pH$  after four weeks was slightly lower than those after one week (Table  
583 S4), indicating the beginning of a depletion of the rhizosphere solution with the ions  
584 dominating the initial root uptake. This was particularly the case in the Xanthozem soil, which  
585  $\Delta pH$  was clearly positive after one week (+2.5), decreased to 0.6 after 4 weeks and became  
586 negative (-0.55) after 8 weeks of uptake. In this exceptional soil, nitrate uptake was relatively  
587 low after 8 weeks, representing only 15% of the absorbed charges, while it was 50% after 1  
588 week. The uptake of  $K^+$  after 8 weeks was higher, with 24% of the absorbed charges, and  
589  $NH_4^+$  exceptionally high, with 53%. This is the consequence of an exceptionally high  
590 ammonium concentration in the soil solution ( $4.03 \text{ mol}_c \text{ m}^{-3}$  against  $0.75 \text{ mol}_c \text{ m}^{-3}$  on average).

591 Simulations taking into account a nitrate source ( $S_{NO_3^-}$ ) in the model were also carried out.  
592 After a one-week uptake, with the nitrate source,  $\Delta pH$  was on average 2.3% lower than  
593 without a source. After 12 weeks, the difference was 0.6% (Table S4). This confirms the  
594 sensitivity analysis which showed that nitrification had nearly no effect on rhizosphere pH  
595 variation.

#### 596 **4. Conclusions**

597 Many simplifications have been made during the modelling, because of a lack of knowledge  
598 and for the sake of mathematical and numerical simplicity: the same absorption parameters  
599 were used for the three plant species, soil water content was considered to be constant, micro-  
600 organism mediated processes and root emissions of  $O_2$  and  $CO_2$  were not formalized, no  
601 feedback effect of pH on soil buffer power for ions was taken into account and organic ion  
602 release and uptake was neglected. However, the model predicted the same alkalisation trend  
603 as that measured with the planar optodes. The simplifications therefore appear reasonable and  
604 the result supports the theory that the nutrient root uptake, in aerobic soils, is the important  
605 process responsible for the modification of the pH in the root vicinity (Hinsinger et al., 2003).  
606 The simulations also suggest that among the nutrients, nitrogen is the one which most  
607 influences the rhizosphere pH. In aerobic soils without ammonium fertilization, nitrate is  
608 around 5 to 400 times more absorbed than the other ions. As its depletion in the root vicinity  
609 is compensated for by the root absorption of  $H^+$  (or the equivalent excretion of  $OH^-$ ), the  
610 rhizosphere of non-leguminous crops in non-flooded soils might generally be more alkaline  
611 than the bulk soil.  
612 This work also showed that the variations in the rhizosphere pH were dependent on the initial  
613 pH, more than on its evolution through root ion absorption. It highlighted how extremely this  
614 initial pH was sensitive to the initial composition of the soil solution, in such a way that small  
615 errors in analyses would produce a strong uncertainty about the calculated initial pH.

616 Therefore, it seems nearly impossible to precisely predict the initial pH from the initial  
617 solution composition. This is contrary to the pH at the rhizoplane which after a few weeks of  
618 root uptake, should generally stabilize from then on. However, it is the charge balance (*CB*)  
619 which determines the trend of the rhizosphere pH and generally, the plant roots increase *CB*,  
620 as they take up nitrates more than the other ions. Therefore, there is no doubt that most  
621 frequently the rhizosphere pH is higher than that of the bulk soil. Moreover, despite the  
622 uncertainty on the initial pH prediction, the model can be used to predict the rhizosphere pH,  
623 fixing the initial pH (which can be measured in 0.01 CaCl<sub>2</sub>).

624 The model considers that the partial pressure of carbon dioxide is constant, being adjusted to  
625 the initial solution composition. However, in presence of roots and micro-organisms,  $P_{\text{CO}_2}$   
626 probably vary, influencing both the pH and the solution composition. Therefore, it would be  
627 logical that  $P_{\text{CO}_2}$  should be measured, in the rhizosphere and CO<sub>2</sub> concentration taken into  
628 account in the model. Indeed, excretion of CO<sub>2</sub> could for instance limit the extent of the  
629 alkalisation zone.

630

### 631 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

632 Jean-Marc Custos had a PhD grant from Région Lorraine (Décision 613-2008) and from  
633 Département Environnement et Agronomie of INRA. The authors are grateful to Romain  
634 Goudon for carrying out the analyses of the soil solutions.

635

636

### 637 **REFERENCES**

638 Barber, S.A., 1995. Soil nutrient bioavailability. A mechanistic approach. Second ed. John  
639 Wiley & Sons, New York.

640 Blossfeld, S., Perriguet, J., Sterckeman, T., Morel, J.L., Lösch, R., 2010. Rhizosphere pH  
641 dynamics in trace-metal-contaminated soils, monitored with planar pH optodes. *Plant*  
642 *Soil* 330, 173-184.

643 Bouldin, D.R., 1989. A multiple ion uptake model. *J. Soil Sci.* 40(2), 309-319.

644 Bravin, M.N., Tentscher, P., Rose, J., Hinsinger, P., 2009. Rhizosphere pH gradient controls  
645 copper availability in a strongly acidic soil. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 43(15 ), 5686–  
646 5569.

647 Chaignon, V., Quesnoit, M., Hinsinger, P., 2009. Copper availability and bioavailability are  
648 controlled by rhizosphere pH in rape grown in an acidic Cu-contaminated soil.  
649 *Environ. Pollut.* 157(12), 3363-3369.

650 Cunningham, R., 1964. Cation-anion relationships in crop nutrition: III. Relationships  
651 between the ratios of sum of the cations: sum of the anions and nitrogen  
652 concentrations in several plant species. *The Journal of Agricultural Science* 63(1),  
653 109-111.

654 Custos, J.-M., Moyne, C., Treillon, T., Sterckeman, T., 2014. Contribution of Cd-EDTA  
655 complexes to cadmium uptake by maize: a modelling approach. *Plant Soil* 374(1),  
656 497-512.

657 Darrah, P.R., Jones, D.L., Kirk, G.J.D., Roose, T., 2006. Modelling the rhizosphere: a review  
658 of methods for 'upscaling' to the whole-plant scale. *Eur. J. Soil Sci.* 57(1), 13-25.

659 Faivre, R., Ioos, B., Mahévas, S., Makowski, D., Monod, H. (Eds.), 2013. *Analyse de*  
660 *sensibilité et exploration de modèles. Savoir faire. Editions Quae, Versailles, 324 pp.*

661 Gérard, F., Blitz-Frayret, C., Hinsinger, P., Pagès, L., 2017. Modelling the interactions  
662 between root system architecture, root functions and reactive transport processes in  
663 soil. *Plant Soil* 413(1-2), 161-180.

664 Girardin, P., 2000. Ecophysiologie du maïs. Association Générale des Producteurs de Maïs  
665 (AGPM).

666 Haynes, R.J., 1990. Active ion uptake and maintenance of cation-anion balance: A critical  
667 examination of their role in regulating rhizosphere pH. *Plant Soil* 126(2), 247-264.

668 Hinsinger, P., Plassard, C., Tang, C., Jaillard, B., 2003. Origins of root-mediated pH changes  
669 in the rhizosphere and their responses to environmental constraints: A review. *Plant*  
670 *Soil* 248(1), 43-59.

671 Keyes, S.D., Daly, K.R., Gostling, N.J., Jones, D.L., Talboys, P., Pinzer, B.R., Boardman, R.,  
672 Sinclair, I., Marchant, A., Roose, T., 2013. High resolution synchrotron imaging of  
673 wheat root hairs growing in soil and image based modelling of phosphate uptake. *New*  
674 *Phytol.* 198(4), 1023-1029.

675 Kim, T.K., Silk, W.K., Cheer, A.Y., 1999. A mathematical model for pH patterns in the  
676 rhizospheres of growth zones. *Plant Cell Environ.* 22(12), 1527-1538.

677 Kirk, G.J.D., Bajita, J.B., 1995. Root-induced iron oxidation, pH changes and zinc  
678 solubilization in the rhizosphere of lowland rice. *New Phytol.* 131(1), 129-137.

679 Kirkby, E., 2012. Introduction, definition and classification of nutrients. In: P. Marshner  
680 (Ed.), *Marschner's mineral nutrition of higher plants*. Elsevier, London, pp. 3-5.

681 Leitner, D., Klepsch, S., Ptashnyk, M., Marchant, A., Kirk, G.J.D., Schnepf, A., Roose, T.,  
682 2010. A dynamic model of nutrient uptake by root hairs. *New Phytol.* 185(3), 792-  
683 802.

684 Li, Y.-H., Gregory, S., 1974. Diffusion of ions in sea water and in deep-sea sediments.  
685 *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta* 38, 703-714.

686 Lin, Z., Schneider, A., Nguyen, C., Sterckeman, T., 2014. Can ligand addition to soil enhance  
687 Cd phytoextraction? A mechanistic model study. *Environ. Sci. Pollut. Res.* 21(22),  
688 12811-12826.

689 Lin, Z., Schneider, A., Sterckeman, T., Nguyen, C., 2016. Ranking of mechanisms governing  
690 the phytoavailability of cadmium in agricultural soils using a mechanistic model. *Plant*  
691 *Soil* 399, 89-107.

692 Marschner, H., Römheld, V., 1983. In vivo measurement of root-induced pH changes at the  
693 soil-root interface: Effect of plant species and nitrogen source. *Zeitschrift für*  
694 *Pflanzenphysiologie* 111(3), 241-251.

695 Marschner, H., Römheld, V., Horst, W.J., Martin, P., 1986. Root-induced changes in the  
696 rhizosphere: Importance for the mineral nutrition of plants. *Zeitschrift für*  
697 *Pflanzenernährung und Bodenkunde* 149(4), 441-456.

698 Marschner, H., Römheld, V., Ossenberg-Neuhaus, H., 1982. Rapid method for measuring  
699 changes in pH and reducing processes along roots of intact plants. *Zeitschrift für*  
700 *Pflanzenphysiologie* 105(5), 407-416.

701 Mullins, G.L., Sommers, L.E., Barber, S.A., 1986. Modelling the plant uptake of cadmium  
702 and zinc from soils treated with sewage sludge. *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.* 50, 1245-1250.

703 Nadeem, M., Mollier, A., Morel, C., Prud'homme, L., Vives, A., Pellerin, S., 2014.  
704 Remobilization of seed phosphorus reserves and their role in attaining phosphorus  
705 autotrophy in maize (*Zea mays* L.) seedlings. *Seed Science Research* 24(03), 187-194.

706 Neumann, G., Römheld, V., 2012. Rhizosphere chemistry in relation to plant nutrition. In: P.  
707 Marschner (Ed.), *Marschner's mineral nutrition of higher plants*. Academic Press,  
708 London, pp. 347-368.

709 Nye, P.H., 1972. The measurement and mechanism of ion diffusion in soils. VIII - A theory  
710 for the propagation of changes of pH in soils. *J. Soil Sci.* 23(1), 82-92.

711 Nye, P.H., 1981. Changes of pH across the rhizosphere induced by roots. *Plant Soil* 61, 7-26.

712 Peters, W.S., Felle, H.H., 1999. The correlation of profiles of surface pH and elongation  
713 growth in maize roots. *Plant Physiol.* 121(3), 905-912.

714 Pilet, P.-E., Versel, J.-M., Mayor, G., 1983. Growth distribution and surface pH patterns along  
715 maize roots. *Planta* 158(5), 398-402.

716 Ptashnyk, M., Roose, T., Jones, D.L., Kirk, G.J.D., 2011. Enhanced zinc uptake by rice  
717 through phytosiderophore secretion: a modelling study. *Plant Cell Environ.* 34(12),  
718 2038-2046.

719 Puschenreiter, M., Schnepf, A., Molina Millan, I., Fitz, W.J., Horak, O., Klepp, J., Schrefl, T.,  
720 Lombi, E., Wenzel, W.W., 2005. Changes of Ni biogeochemistry in the rhizosphere of  
721 the hyperaccumulator *Thlaspi goesingense*: experimental evidence and modeling.  
722 *Plant Soil* 271, 205-218.

723 Rayle, D.L., Cleland, R.E., 1992. The acid growth theory of auxin-induced cell elongation is  
724 alive and well. *Plant Physiol.* 99(4), 1271-1274.

725 Riley, D., Barber, S.A., 1969. Bicarbonate accumulation and pH changes at the soybean  
726 (*Glycine max* (L.) Merr.) root-soil interface. *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.* 33(6), 905-908.

727 Riley, D., Barber, S.A., 1971. Effect of ammonium and nitrate fertilization on phosphorus  
728 uptake as related to root-induced pH changes at the root-soil interface. *Soil Sci. Soc.*  
729 *Am. J.* 35(2), 301-306.

730 Roose, T., Fowler, A.C., Darrah, P.R., 2001. A mathematical model of plant nutrient uptake.  
731 *J. Math. Biol.* 42, 347-360.

732 Rufyikiri, G., Dufey, J.E., Nootens, D., Delvaux, B., 2001. Effect of aluminium on bananas  
733 (*Musa* spp.) cultivated in acid solutions. II. Water and nutrient uptake. *Fruits* 56(01),  
734 5-16.

735 Saltelli, A., Tarantola, S., Campolongo, F., Ratto, M., 2004. Sensitivity analysis in practice. A  
736 guide to assessing scientific models. John Wiley & Sons, Chichester.

737 Schaller, G., Fischer, W.R., 1985. pH-Änderungen in der Rhizosphäre von Mais- und  
738 Erdnußwurzeln. *Zeitschrift für Pflanzenernährung und Bodenkunde* 148(3), 306-320.

739 Sposito, G., 1989. The chemistry of soils. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

740 Sposito, G., 2016. The chemistry of soils. Third ed. Oxford University Press, New York  
741 (USA).

742 Sterckeman, T., Perrigüey, J., Caël, M., Schwartz, C., Morel, J.L., 2004. Applying a  
743 mechanistic model to cadmium uptake by *Zea mays* and *Thlaspi caerulescens*:  
744 Consequences for the assessment of the soil quantity and capacity factors. *Plant Soil*  
745 262(1-2), 289-302.

746 Szegedi, K., Vetterlein, D., Jahn, R., 2010. Modelling rhizosphere transport in the presence of  
747 goethite, including competitive uptake of phosphate and arsenate. *Plant Soil* 330(1),  
748 481-501.

749 Taylor, A.R., Bloom, A.J., 1998. Ammonium, nitrate, and proton fluxes along the maize root.  
750 *Plant Cell Environ.* 21(12), 1255-1263.

751 Wolt, J., 1994. Soil solution chemistry. Applications to environmental science and agriculture.  
752 John Wiley & Sons, New York.

753

754

755 **Figure captions**

756

757 **Fig. 1.** Relationship between pH, partial CO<sub>2</sub> pressure ( $P_{CO_2}$ ) and sum of ion charges

758  $(\sum_j z_j [M_j^{z_j+}])$  in soil solution, as deduced from Eq. (3).

759

760 **Fig. 2.** Global sensitivity analysis of the model. Frequency distribution of a)  $\Delta pH$  and b) of

761 the charge balance ( $CB$ , Eq. (18)) after 1 and 4 weeks of uptake. Mean values of  $\Delta pH$  are 0.36

762 and 0.45 for 1 and 4 weeks of uptake, respectively. Mean values of  $CB$  are 3.12 mol<sub>c</sub> m<sup>-3</sup>, 7.35

763 mol<sub>c</sub> m<sup>-3</sup> and 9.72 mol<sub>c</sub> m<sup>-3</sup> for initial, 1 and 4 weeks of uptake, respectively.

764

765 **Fig. 3.** Global sensitivity analysis of the model. Ranking of the model variables based on their

766 standardized regression coefficients ( $SRC$ ) for the simulation of  $\Delta pH$  after one week of uptake

767 (Eqs. (16) and (17)). Variables are described in Table 1.

768

769 **Fig. 4.** Global sensitivity analysis of the model. Ranking of the model variables based on their

770 standardized regression coefficients ( $SRC$ ) for the simulation of  $\Delta pH$  after four weeks of

771 uptake (Eqs. (16) and (17)). Variables are described in Table 1.

772

773

774

775

Symbol	Definition	Value
$K_e$	Water self-ionization constant	$10^{-14} \text{ mol}^2 \text{ L}^{-2}$
$k_{\text{CO}_2}$	CO <sub>2</sub> dissolution constant	$3.7 \cdot 10^{-8} P_{\text{CO}_2} / \ln 10$ in $\text{mol}^2 \text{ L}^{-2} \ddagger$
$\mathcal{D}_{\text{H}_3\text{O}^+}$	Diffusion coefficient of H <sub>3</sub> O <sup>+</sup> in water	$9.31 \cdot 10^{-9} \text{ m}^2 \text{ s}^{-1} \ddagger$
$\mathcal{D}_{\text{HCO}_3^-}$	Diffusion coefficient of HCO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup> in water	$1.18 \cdot 10^{-9} \text{ m}^2 \text{ s}^{-1} \ddagger$
$\mathcal{D}_{\text{OH}^-}$	Diffusion coefficient of OH <sup>-</sup> in water	$5.27 \cdot 10^{-9} \text{ m}^2 \text{ s}^{-1} \ddagger$
$\mathcal{D}_{\text{Ca}^{2+}}$	Diffusion coefficient of Ca <sup>2+</sup> in water	$7.93 \cdot 10^{-10} \text{ m}^2 \text{ s}^{-1} \ddagger$
$\mathcal{D}_{\text{K}^+}$	Diffusion coefficient of K <sup>+</sup> in water	$1.96 \cdot 10^{-9} \text{ m}^2 \text{ s}^{-1} \ddagger$
$\mathcal{D}_{\text{Mg}^{2+}}$	Diffusion coefficient of Mg <sup>2+</sup> in water	$7.05 \cdot 10^{-10} \text{ m}^2 \text{ s}^{-1} \ddagger$
$\mathcal{D}_{\text{Zn}^{2+}}$	Diffusion coefficient of Zn <sup>2+</sup> in water	$7.15 \cdot 10^{-10} \text{ m}^2 \text{ s}^{-1}$
$\mathcal{D}_{\text{Na}^+}$	Diffusion coefficient of Na <sup>+</sup> in water	$1.13 \cdot 10^{-9} \text{ m}^2 \text{ s}^{-1} \ddagger$
$\mathcal{D}_{\text{NH}_4^+}$	Diffusion coefficient of NH <sub>4</sub> <sup>+</sup> in water	$1.98 \cdot 10^{-9} \text{ m}^2 \text{ s}^{-1} \ddagger$
$\mathcal{D}_{\text{Cl}^-}$	Diffusion coefficient of Cl <sup>-</sup> in water	$2.03 \cdot 10^{-9} \text{ m}^2 \text{ s}^{-1} \ddagger$
$\mathcal{D}_{\text{NO}_3^-}$	Diffusion coefficient of NO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup> in water	$1.90 \cdot 10^{-9} \text{ m}^2 \text{ s}^{-1} \ddagger$
$\mathcal{D}_{\text{SO}_4^{2-}}$	Diffusion coefficient of SO <sub>4</sub> <sup>2-</sup> in water	$1.07 \cdot 10^{-9} \text{ m}^2 \text{ s}^{-1} \ddagger$
$\mathcal{D}_P$	Diffusion coefficient of P ions in water	$7.9 \cdot 10^{-10} \text{ m}^2 \text{ s}^{-1}$
$\theta$	Volumetric water content	$0.24 \text{ m}^3 \text{ m}^{-3}$
$b_{M_i^{z_i+}}$	Buffer power	See Table 2
$r_0$	Mean root radius	$10^{-4} \text{ m} \S \P$
$r_1$	Thickness of the rhizosphere	$2.5 \cdot 10^{-2} \text{ m} \S$
$I_{max}^{\text{Ca}}$	Maximum root influx of Ca <sup>2+</sup>	$1.042 \cdot 10^{-9} \text{ mol m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1} \#$
$K_m^{\text{Ca}}$	Michaelis constant for Ca <sup>2+</sup>	$3.9 \cdot 10^{-2} \text{ mol m}^{-3}$
$I_{max}^{\text{K}}$	Maximum root influx of K <sup>+</sup>	$5.02 \cdot 10^{-8} \text{ mol m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$
$K_m^{\text{K}}$	Michaelis constant for K <sup>+</sup>	$3.2 \cdot 10^{-2} \text{ mol m}^{-3}$
$I_{max}^{\text{Mg}}$	Maximum root influx of Mg <sup>2+</sup>	$6.5 \cdot 10^{-9} \text{ mol m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$
$K_m^{\text{Mg}}$	Michaelis constant for Mg <sup>2+</sup>	$0.44 \text{ mol m}^{-3}$
$I_{max}^{\text{Na}}$	Maximum root influx of Na <sup>+</sup>	0
$K_m^{\text{Na}}$	Michaelis constant for Na <sup>+</sup>	-
$I_{max}^{\text{NH}_4}$	Maximum root influx of NH <sub>4</sub> <sup>+</sup>	$1.0 \cdot 10^{-7} \text{ mol m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$
$K_{max}^{\text{NH}_4}$	Michaelis constant for NH <sub>4</sub> <sup>+</sup>	$5.4 \cdot 10^{-2} \text{ mol m}^{-3}$
$I_{max}^{\text{Zn-Nc}}$	Maximum root influx of Zn <sup>2+</sup> in <i>N. caerulea</i>	$1.66 \cdot 10^{-12} \text{ mol m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$
$K_m^{\text{Zn-Nc}}$	Michaelis constant for Zn <sup>2+</sup> in <i>N. caerulea</i>	$2.83 \cdot 10^{-3} \text{ mol m}^{-3}$
$I_{max}^{\text{Zn}}$	Maximum root influx of Zn <sup>2+</sup> in other species	$9 \cdot 10^{-13} \text{ mol m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$
$K_m^{\text{Zn}}$	Michaelis constant for Zn <sup>2+</sup> in other species	$2.8 \cdot 10^{-3} \text{ mol m}^{-3}$
$I_{max}^{\text{Cl}}$	Maximum root influx of Cl <sup>-</sup>	0
$K_m^{\text{Cl}}$	Michaelis constant for Cl <sup>-</sup>	-
$I_{max}^{\text{NO}_3^{\text{CH}}}$	Constitutive maximum root influx of NO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup>	$3.75 \cdot 10^{-8} \text{ mol m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$
$K_m^{\text{NO}_3^{\text{CH}}}$	Constitutive Michaelis constant for NO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup>	$1.6 \cdot 10^{-2} \text{ mol m}^{-3}$
$I_{max}^{\text{NO}_3^{\text{IH}}}$	Induced maximum root influx of NO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup>	$1.9 \cdot 10^{-7} \text{ mol NO}_3^- \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$

$K_m^{NO_3^{IH}}$	Induced Michaelis constant for $NO_3^-$	$8.5 \cdot 10^{-2} \text{ mol m}^{-3}$
$I_{max}^{SO_4}$	Maximum root influx of $SO_4^{2-}$	$1.1 \cdot 10^{-9} \text{ mol m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$
$K_m^{SO_4}$	Michaelis constant for $SO_4^{2-}$	$7 \cdot 10^{-2} \text{ mol m}^{-3}$
$I_{max}^P$	Maximum root influx of P ions	$3.26 \cdot 10^{-8} \text{ mol m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$
$K_m^{P^4}$	Michaelis constant for P ions	$5.8 \cdot 10^{-3} \text{ mol m}^{-3}$
$S_{NO_3^-}$	Source of $NO_3^-$ from mineralization	$1.70 \cdot 10^{-7} \text{ mol m}^{-3} \text{ s}^{-1} \#$

---

778 † Source: Nye (1972).

779 ‡ Source: Li and Gregory (1974).

780 § Source: Blossfeld et al. (2010);

781 ¶ Source: Sterckeman et al. (2004).

782 # Source: for root absorption parameters and source of nitrate, references are given in

783 Supplementary Material.

784

785

786 **Table 2.** Main characteristics of the soils used to validate the model.

Soil parameter	Soil A	Soil B	Soil C	
Particle size distribution (g kg <sup>-1</sup> )	Clay	208	162	204
	Silt	469	602	454
	Sand	323	236	342
pH (H <sub>2</sub> O)	6.2	8.1	6.3	
pH (CaCl <sub>2</sub> )	5.7	7.4	5.9	
CaCO <sub>3</sub> (g kg <sup>-1</sup> )	0	13	<1	
Organic C (g kg <sup>-1</sup> )	26.4	16.9	15.7	
P Olsen (mg P kg <sup>-1</sup> )	4.6	34.1	5.5	
C/N ratio	16.8	12.9	8.9	
CEC cmol <sub>c</sub> kg <sup>-1</sup>	11.8	12.0	11.0	
Exchangeable cations (cmol <sub>c</sub> kg <sup>-1</sup> ) 1)	Ca <sup>2+</sup>	7.1	12.6	9.0
	K <sup>+</sup>	0.6	0.5	0.3
	Mg <sup>2+</sup>	1.2	0.4	3.5
Buffer power, $b_{M_i^{z_i+}}$	Ca <sup>2+</sup>	30.3	33.5	14.6
	Mg <sup>2+</sup>	22.4	20.9	8.5
	K <sup>+</sup>	23.1	23.7	48.3
	Na <sup>+</sup>	23.0	23.0	23.0
	Zn <sup>2+</sup>	300	2760	270
	Cl <sup>-</sup>	0.4	0.4	0.4
	NO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup> †	0.4	0.4	0.4
SO <sub>4</sub> <sup>2-</sup> †	6.0	6.0	6.0	

787 † Source: Barber (1995)

788

789 **Table 3.** Conditions of the model validation. The pH measurement conditions refer to  
 790 Blossfeld et al. (2010).

pH measurement conditions	Simulation conditions		
	$r_l$ mm	Time days	pH location
	Ryegrass		
Average pH along the surface of a single young root	25.0	4	Rhizoplane
Average pH in root network	5.5	28	Mean in simulation domain
	Alpine pennycress		
Average pH along the surface of a single young root	25.0	4	Rhizoplane
Average pH in root network	5.5	42	Mean in simulation domain
	Maize		
Average pH along the surface of a single young root	25.0	4	Rhizoplane
Average pH along the surface of a single young root	25	8	Rhizoplane

791

792

793

794

795

796

797

798

799 **Table 4.** Ionic composition of the soil solutions of soils A, B and C.

Ion	Unit	Soil A	Soil B	Soil C
Ca <sup>2+</sup>	mol m <sup>-3</sup>	1.638	2.632	4.322
K <sup>+</sup>		0.363	0.295	0.087
Mg <sup>2+</sup>		0.375	0.134	2.868
Mn <sup>2+</sup>		0.029	< 7.1 10 <sup>-6</sup>	< 7.1 10 <sup>-6</sup>
Na <sup>+</sup>		0.399	0.023	0.636
NH <sub>4</sub> <sup>+</sup>		0.071	< 1.9 10 <sup>-3</sup>	0.020
Zn <sup>2+</sup>		0.411	< 7.8 10 <sup>-6</sup>	< 7.8 10 <sup>-6</sup>
Cl <sup>-</sup>	mol m <sup>-3</sup>	0.480	0.436	1.242
NO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup>		3.842	3.219	11.907
P ions		< 2.5 10 <sup>-4</sup>	0.174	< 2.5 10 <sup>-4</sup>
SO <sub>4</sub> <sup>2-</sup>		0.653	0.416	0.793
Charge balance	mol <sub>c</sub> m <sup>-3</sup>	0.112	1.102	0.387

800

801

802 **Table 5.** Comparison of measured and simulated pH in the rhizosphere of three plant species grown in three soils. The simulation conditions are  
803 given in Table 3.

pH measurement conditions	Soil A		Soil B		Soil C	
	Measured	Simulated	Measured	Simulated	Measured	Simulated
	Ryegrass					
Average pH along the surface of a single young root			7.8***	7.6	6.5*	6.9
Average pH in root network			7.9***	8.0	7.7***	7.6
Bulk soil (start of simulation)			7.4	7.4	6.2	6.2
	Alpine pennycress					
Average pH along the surface of a single young root	6.8***	6.4	8.4***	7.6	7.8***	6.9
Average pH in root network	7.0***	7.7	7.9***	8.0	n.d.‡	7.7
Bulk soil (start of simulation)	5.6	5.6	7.5	7.5	6.1	6.1
	Maize					
Average pH along the surface of a single young root	4.9***	6.4	7.1***	7.6	6.0	6.9
Average pH along the surface of a single older root	5.5***	6.5	7.5***	7.6	6.5*	6.9
Bulk soil (start of simulation)	5.6	5.6	7.4	7.4	6.2	6.2

804 ‡ n.d.: not determined.

805 \* Significant at the 0.05 probability level

806 \*\*\* Significant at the 0.001 probability level

807

808

809 **Table 6.** Global sensitivity analysis. Mean percentage of each ion in the total absolute charge  
810 uptake.

811

Ion	Part in the total absolute charge uptake (%)	
	1 week	4 weeks
Ca <sup>2+</sup>	0.83	1.36
K <sup>+</sup>	16.69	21.10
Mg <sup>2+</sup>	3.65	6.01
NH <sub>4</sub> <sup>+</sup>	6.79	5.91
NO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup>	63.69	54.88
P ions <sup>-</sup>	7.51	9.32
SO <sub>4</sub> <sup>2-</sup>	0.85	1.40

812

813

814

815

816

817

818

819

820

821 **Table 7.** Simulation of the rhizosphere pH using the composition of 37 soils sampled  
822 worldwide. Mean ion concentrations at the rhizoplane after 0, 1, 4, 8 and 12 weeks of root  
823 uptake.

Ion	Concentration at the rhizoplane, mol m <sup>-3</sup>				
	Initial	1 week	4 weeks	8 weeks	12 weeks
Ca <sup>2+</sup>	4.81	5.10	5.16	5.16	5.16
Mg <sup>2+</sup>	1.02	1.09	1.10	1.10	1.09
K <sup>+</sup>	0.72	0.68	0.66	0.63	0.61
NO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup>	7.83	6.69	4.39	2.48	1.26
SO <sub>4</sub> <sup>2-</sup>	1.57	1.70	1.70	1.70	1.70
NH <sub>4</sub> <sup>+</sup>	0.28	0.24	0.20	0.18	0.16
P ions	4.70E-03	3.20E-03	2.74E-03	2.51E-03	2.36E-03
Na <sup>+</sup>	1.05	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.11
Cl <sup>-</sup>	1.54	1.60	1.60	1.60	1.60
Charge balance	+1.20	+2.74	+5.08	+6.95	+8.12
$\Delta pH$	0	0.9	1.1	1.1	1.1

824

825

826

827

828

829

830

831

832

833

834

835

836

837

838 **Table 8.** Simulation of the rhizosphere pH using the composition of 37 soils sampled worldwide. Cumulated root uptake of the different ions and  
 839 part in the total absolute charge uptake after 1, 4, 8 and 12 weeks of root uptake.

Ion	Cumulated root uptake, mol m <sup>-1</sup>				Part in the total absolute charge uptake, %			
	1 week	4 weeks	8 weeks	12 weeks	1 week	4 weeks	8 weeks	12 weeks
Ca <sup>2+</sup>	3.85E-07	1.54E-06	3.08E-06	4.62E-06	1.0	1.4	1.8	2.1
Mg <sup>2+</sup>	1.26E-06	5.07E-06	1.01E-05	1.52E-05	2.8	3.5	4.3	4.9
K <sup>+</sup>	1.55E-05	6.10E-05	1.20E-04	1.76E-04	20.3	26.8	32.0	35.2
NO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup>	1.20E-04	3.95E-04	6.28E-04	7.79E-04	69.8	61.8	55.6	51.7
SO <sub>4</sub> <sup>2-</sup>	2.95E-07	1.18E-06	2.36E-06	3.54E-06	0.9	1.2	1.5	1.7
NH <sub>4</sub> <sup>+</sup>	7.45E-06	2.54E-05	3.96E-05	4.87E-05	4.8	4.7	4.1	3.7
P ions	3.20E-07	1.27E-06	2.54E-06	3.80E-06	0.4	0.5	0.7	0.8
Na <sup>+</sup>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cl <sup>-</sup>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cations					29.0	36.5	42.2	45.8
Anions					70.6	63.0	57.1	53.3
Charge balance	-9.47E-05	-2.99E-04	-4.51E-04	-5.27E-04				

840

841

842









