



Rethinking soil water repellency and its management

Article

Accepted Version

Ruthrof, K. X., Hopkins, A. J. M., Danks, M., O'Hara, G., Bell, R., Henry, D., Standish, R., Tibbett, M., Howieson, J., Burgess, T. and Harper, R. (2019) Rethinking soil water repellency and its management. *Plant Ecology*, 220 (10). pp. 977-984. ISSN 1385-0237 doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11258-019-00967-4> Available at <http://centaur.reading.ac.uk/85730/>

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the work. See [Guidance on citing](#).

To link to this article DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11258-019-00967-4>

Publisher: Springer

All outputs in CentAUR are protected by Intellectual Property Rights law, including copyright law. Copyright and IPR is retained by the creators or other copyright holders. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in the [End User Agreement](#).

www.reading.ac.uk/centaur

CentAUR

Central Archive at the University of Reading

Reading's research outputs online

1 **Rethinking soil water repellency and its management**

2

3 Katinka X. Ruthrof (CO)^{1,2*}, Anna J.M. Hopkins (CO)³, Melissa Danks³, Graham O'Hara⁴, Richard
4 Bell⁴, David Henry⁵, Rachel Standish¹, Mark Tibbett⁶, John Howieson⁴, Treena Burgess¹ and Richard
5 Harper¹

6

7 ¹Environmental and Conservation Sciences, Murdoch University, Murdoch, 6150, Western Australia,
8 Australia.

9 ²Biodiversity and Conservation Science, Department of Biodiversity, Conservation and Attractions,
10 Kensington, 6151, Western Australia, Australia.

11 ³Centre for Ecosystem Management, Edith Cowan University, Joondalup, 6027, Western Australia,
12 Australia.

13 ⁴Agricultural Sciences, Murdoch University, Murdoch, 6150, Western Australia, Australia.

14 ⁵Chemistry and Physics, Murdoch University Murdoch, 6150, Western Australia, Australia

15 ⁶School of Agriculture, Policy and Development, Reading University, Berkshire, RG6 6AH, United
16 Kingdom.

17 *Corresponding author: Katinka Ruthrof: k.ruthrof@murdoch.edu.au

18 (CO): KXR and AJMH are co-first authors of this paper.

19

20 ORCID Numbers:

21 Katinka Ruthrof: orcid.org/0000-0003-2038-2264

22 Anna Hopkins: orcid.org/0000-00018090-5544
23 Melissa Danks: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4044-6694>
24 Graham O’Hara:
25 Richard Bell: orcid.org/0000-0002-7756-3755
26 David Henry: orcid.org/0000-0002-9629-4423
27 Rachel Standish: orcid.org/0000-0001-8118-1904
28 Mark Tibbett: orcid.org/0000-0003-0143-2190
29 John Howieson: orcid.org/0000-0002-1235-1903
30 Treena Burgess: orcid.org/0000-0002-7962-219X
31 Richard Harper: orcid.org/0000-0003-0268-2917

32

33 **Abstract** Soil water repellency (SWR) is a widespread challenge to plant establishment and growth.
34 Despite considerable research, it remains a recalcitrant problem for which few alleviation technologies
35 or solutions have been developed. Previous research has focused on SWR as a problem to be overcome,
36 however, it is an inherent feature of many native ecosystems where it contributes to ecosystem
37 functions. Therefore, we propose a shift in the way SWR is perceived in agriculture and in ecological
38 restoration, from a problem to be solved, to an opportunity to be harnessed. A new focus on potential
39 ecological benefits of SWR is particularly timely given increasing incidence, frequency and severity of
40 hotter droughts in many regions of the world. Our new way of conceptualising SWR seeks to
41 understand how SWR can be temporarily alleviated at a micro-scale to successfully establish plants,
42 and then harnessed in the longer term and at larger spatial scales to enhance soil water storage to act as
43 a “drought-proofing” tool for plant survival in water-limited soils. For this to occur, we suggest research
44 focusing on the alignment of physico-chemical and microbial properties and dynamics of SWR and,
45 based on this mechanistic understanding, create products and interventions to improve success of plant
46 establishment in agriculture, restoration and conservation contexts. In this paper, we outline the
47 rationale for a new way of conceptualising SWR, and the research priorities needed to fill critical
48 knowledge gaps in order to harness the ecological benefits from managing SWR.

49

50 **Keywords:** Drought, Fertiliser, Hydrophobicity, Microbial Activity, Nonwetting Soils, Run-off

51

52 **Introduction**


53 Soil water repellency (SWR) restricts soil water infiltration (DeBano 1981) and is a widespread
54 challenge to plant establishment and growth in many regions (Blackwell 2000; Doerr et al. 2000). It
55 has been ranked as one of the major soil constraints to successful agriculture, for example, production
56 losses of up to 80% have been reported in Australia (Blackwell 1993). Soil water repellency is not

57 limited to particular climates, soil types or land uses. It occurs in tropical to subarctic climates, in dry
58 regions such as the United States (California, Oregon, and Utah), southern Australia (New South Wales,
59 South Australia, and Western Australia), the Mediterranean Basin (Italy, Portugal), but also in wetter
60 regions such as British Columbia, Sweden, Great Britain the Netherlands, and Columbia) (Mallik and
61 Rahmann 1985; Berglund and Persson 1996; Doerr et al. 2000). It affects soils of different textures from
62 sand to clay (Dekker et al. 1998, Fig. 1), but is predominantly associated with soils with smaller surface
63 areas and coarse texture, such as sands (Woche et al. 2005). In the Netherlands, an estimated 75% of
64 crop and grassland soils exhibit SWR (Dekker & Ritsema 1994) and across southern Australia, 2-5
65 million hectares are affected (House 1991). Soil water repellency is also induced by forest fires, under
66 some vegetation types (Debano 2000; Doerr et al. 2000). Soil water repellency has been reported for
67 cropping, pasture, shrubland, and forest soils. However, its specific occurrence is difficult to predict
68 (McKissock et al. 1998). Collectively, these studies underscore the diversity of environments where
69 SWR occurs and highlight the need for research to deliver practical outcomes for management.

70

71 Current understanding of the key factors causing SWR centre around the presence of hydrophobic,
72 aliphatic C-H compounds, derived from plant residues and exudates and micro-organisms, or from
73 decomposing soil organic matter, which also originates from plants, animals and microbes (Doerr et al.
74 2005) (Fig. 1). It is most likely that low molecular weight, amphiphilic organic molecules are directly
75 responsible for SWR. These hydrophobic organic compounds coat the surface of sand grains, or are
76 intermixed with soil particles, and cause reduced and uneven infiltration of water into soils (Bond 1964).
77 However, such hydrophobic compounds only represent a small proportion of soil organic matter.
78 Moreover, such compounds may occur even in wettable soils. Hence, the degree of hydrophobicity has
79 been explained by the amount of the hydrophobic aliphatic compounds, their origin, hydration status
80 and intermolecular arrangement on the soil particles and soil surface area (Doerr et al. 2005; Diehl 2013;
81 Uddin et al. 2017; Daniel et al. 2019). Dynamic changes in hydrophobicity can occur due to changes in
82 soil water content, pH, ionic strength and temperature (Diehl 2013). Microbial transformations of soil
83 organic matter are also likely to determine the type and concentration of low molecular weight, water-
84 soluble organic compounds responsible for SWR (Fig. 1) (Lowe et al. 2019).

85



86


87 **Fig. 1** How water repellency develops, and its controlling factors (adapted from Doerr et al. (2000)).

88

89 *Emerging tools to overcome soil water repellency in the short-term*

90 Despite considerable research on SWR, it remains a recalcitrant problem for which alleviation
 91 technologies or solutions have mixed levels of success in agricultural or restoration activities. Perhaps
 92 this failure is due in part to a search for treatments that completely alleviate SWR rather than short-term
 93 solutions specifically targeted at seedling establishment. In this research space, recent developments
 94 over the past decade include the targeted use of surfactants to overcome SWR such as seed coatings
 95 and tree tablets (Madsen et al. 2012; Madsen et al. 2016; Ruthrof et al. 2015; Anderson et al. 2019).
 96 These technologies can enhance infiltration and improve water availability in hydrophobic soils (Fig.
 97 2). The combination of water harvesting and treatment of water repellency around the seed resulted in
 98 uniform seed emergence, increased soil moisture availability below the seed and improved nutrient
 99 uptake (Yeap et al. 2018). Other methods of increasing vigour in water repellent soils have been
 100 investigated by Ward et al. (2013), including the use of zero tillage seeding with disc openers, which
 101 was shown to preserve old root channels, thus increasing water infiltration in water repellent soil (Roper

102 et al. 2013). Clay has been applied to large areas of cropping soils to increase soil reactive surface area
103 in sands (Ward and Oades 1993; McKissock et al. 2000). The use of soil microbes, particularly fungi,
104 to alleviate SWR has potential (Fig. 1), through breaking down SWR, or creating SWR, but is
105 underexplored, though see Roper (2004, 2006) (see section: *Directions for future research*).
106



107
108 **Fig. 2** Illustration of a seed coated with a surfactant (left). Precipitation releases the surfactant into the
109 soil, overcoming soil water repellency and creating a hydrophilic conduit within the microsite of the
110 seed (middle). Enhanced access to soil moisture facilitates seedling survival (right) (reproduced from
111 Madsen et al. (2016), and using Vecteesy.com).
112


113 *Long-term management*

114 Soil water repellency may be more severe in native soil than in agricultural soils (Harper et al. 2000).
115 Indeed, inputs of organic matter from native vegetation induced SWR to a greater extent than equivalent
116 amounts of organic matter from agricultural species (Harper et al. 2000; Walden et al. 2015). The
117 contribution of specific residual organic compounds from former native vegetation to SWR in farmland
118 soils is not known but may be significant and help to explain the spatially variable distribution of SWR
119 in these soils (Harper et al. 2000). Indeed, most likely the legacy of former native vegetation contributes
120 to SWR rather than agricultural land use per se (Harper et al. 2000). That said, SWR has been induced
121 under plantation eucalypts established in lands previously used to grow annual pastures, which suggests
122 its expression is sensitive to land-use and specifically to established vegetation (Walden et al. 2015).
123 This last observation is particularly significant, because it suggests SWR can be managed through
124 selection of appropriate land uses and vegetation types. Based on these findings, we have further
125 explored the potential beneficial roles of, and the concept that SWR is an inherent feature of many soils
126 that does not need to be alleviated permanently, but rather, managed.
127

128 *Ecological benefits*

129 Perceptions about SWR need to change towards understanding its potential long-term benefits rather
130 than on developing blanket treatments to overcome SWR (Fig. 3). A focus on the beneficial ecological
131 roles of SWR could lead to effective on-ground solutions with significant benefits for conservation,
132 restoration and agricultural activities. The beneficial roles of SWR are evident in the preservation of
133 moisture in soils under native vegetation (e.g. beneath *Pinus* and *Quercus* spp. Lozano et al. 2013; see
134 Fig. 3 for further explanation).

135



136

137 **Fig. 3** Potential benefits of soil water repellency.

138

139 The ecological implications of SWR in native ecosystems are not fully explained, however, SWR may:
140 a) reduce the loss of soil water by evaporation directly from the soil surface (Imeson et al. 1992; Rye
141 and Smettem 2017), or under water repellent mulches (Hiller and Berliner 1974); b) help sequester
142 carbon (Spaccini et al. 2002; Goebel et al. 2011); and c) act as a bioengineering tool by deep rooted
143 plants to optimize their water and nutrient supply (Müller & Deurer 2011) (Fig. 3). Furthermore, SWR
144 may inhibit seed germination and water use by potential competing species (Scott 1993).

145

146 Paradoxically, soil profiles remain moist below water repellent surfaces where there has been little plant
147 growth (Harper et al 2014). The structured patterning of preferential flow pathways created by SWR
148 substances, provide a system for trapping water runoff and for conserving it against evaporation
149 (Imerson et al., 1992; Rye and Smettem). By contrast, there are also plant-soil feedbacks that remain to
150 be explored in this context, in that plants growing in SWR soils may transpire less water. Research to
151 develop deep-rooted perennial farming systems able to cope with uncertain seasonal rainfall, and

152 prevent recharge to groundwaters, has suggested the conservation of this stored water may enable plants
153 with deeper roots to access it during drought conditions (Howieson et al. 2008; Harper et al. 2014).
154 Success in this approach has recently been reported by Edwards et al. (2019). Thus, SWR could have
155 marked potential benefit in water-limited ecosystems. The spatio-temporal heterogeneity of SWR and
156 other characteristics could be harnessed to improve plant survival, notwithstanding the need to locally
157 ameliorate SWR around seeds to ensure successful plant establishment. We propose that the key
158 research challenge is to understand SWR with the aim of temporarily overcoming it to successfully and
159 uniformly establish plants, and then preserve it to act as a “drought- proofing” tool.

160

161 In a warming climate with predicted increases in extreme events, the stability of soil organic matter is
162 enhanced in water repellent soils as microbes under water stress transfer less carbon to the atmosphere
163 and thus, SWR could be an important soil organic matter stabilisation mechanism in the future (Goebel
164 et al. 2011; Mao et al. 2019). Indeed, Spaccini et al. (2002) found the higher the hydrophobicity of
165 humic material, the larger the soil organic carbon sequestration. However, it is not straightforward to
166 determine the role of SWR in carbon sequestration without more quantitative analyses (Mao et al. 2019).

167

168 Soil water repellency could also prevent soil aggregates from breaking down rapidly due to slowing
169 down water infiltration; that is, delayed wetting could protect fragile aggregates from disruptive forces
170 associated with sudden wetting (Bisdorf et al. 1993; Zheng et al. 2016). Additionally, as wetting/drying
171 cycles and patchiness alter microbial communities, this could explain why fungi contribute to SWR, as
172 fungi can function at low water potentials (Zheng et al. 2016).

173

174 *Directions for future research*

175 Microbial activity has been established as one of the most important factors influencing the severity
176 and persistence of SWR (Mao et al. 2019). Soil microbes are intrinsically linked to SWR through their
177 transformation of soil organic matter (Fig. 1). Many species of bacteria produce hydrophobic
178 compounds, which influence the distribution and prevalence of SWR (Mao et al. 2019). Hyphae of
179 fungi and some of their metabolites are also significantly hydrophobic (Lin et al. 2006). The mycelium
180 of the arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi, *Glomus intraradices*, for example, has been reported to increase
181 SWR (Rillig et al. 2010). Fungal biomass is patchy in space within the soil (Ritz 2007; Tibbett 2000)
182 and so it is reasonable to assume that the deposition of hydrophobic compounds will be similarly patchy.
183 Stimulating microbial biomass with nutrient addition has been shown to enhance SWR in agricultural
184 soil (Hallett and Young 1999), and, although a strong relationship has been reported between fungal
185 biomass and SWR (Feeney 2004; Feeney et al. 2006), another study showed no relationship (Feeney et
186 al. 2006). Clearly these types of interactions, and the mechanisms underpinning them require further
187 investigation, and could include: a) further enhancing microbial growth conditions in order to increase
188 the capacity to record the production of hydrophobic compounds, including altering abiotic conditions

189 such as pH and moisture; b) undertaking measurements at a higher frequency, as SWR may be
190 consumed by other soil organisms and only peaking briefly; and c) as microbes are only able to expand
191 into limited amounts of soil, spatially intensive measurements should be undertaken. Clearly, since
192 these factors, and their interactions illustrate the heterogeneity of SWR in time and space, further
193 research is warranted (Zheng et al. 2016). In addition, research into harnessing these SWR-producing
194 microbes, could lead to, for example, broad-scale agricultural products that could be sprayed onto soils
195 to create a layer of water repellent soil, that retains moisture below the soil surface.

196
197 Conversely, bacteria and fungi are also involved in the decomposition of hydrophobic compounds
198 (Lowe et al. 2019) (Fig. 1). For example, inoculation with *Rhodococcus* spp. and *Mycobacterium* sp.
199 resulted in significantly lower SWR under laboratory conditions (Roper 2004), and under field
200 conditions, two inoculants, *Rhodococcus* sp. and *Roseomonas* sp. resulted in improvements in water
201 infiltration, without any additional nutrients or soil conditioners (Roper 2006). The addition of soil
202 treatments in certain soil types, such as lime, have also been shown to promote the activity by bacteria
203 responsible for wax degradation (Roper 2005). Characterising the molecular basis for microbial
204 determination of SWR, perhaps focusing on fungal communities), is a key area for future research.
205 Traditional and state-of-the-art molecular techniques (genomics and metabolomics), could be used to
206 study spatio-temporal changes in soil microbial activity, the expression of SWR and the interactive
207 effects on plant establishment to improve our knowledge of SWR and methods of overcoming it, such
208 as harnessing native microbes capable of decomposing hydrophobic compounds and creating microbial
209 formations for use in newly developed seed coatings or fertilisers. For example, newly developed seed
210 coatings could contain SWR-degrading microbes plus germination enhancement chemicals such as
211 karrikinolide (Flematti et al. 2004), or, new fertilisers could be formulated to deliver site and crop-
212 specific microbes to target SWR and nutrient limitations simultaneously.

213
214 Priorities for future research should include studies to develop an understanding of the dynamics of
215 SWR in soils and to create methods of improving the success of plant establishment. These include
216 developing an understanding of the cause and effect relationship between physico-chemical, microbial
217 dynamics and properties of SWR in native systems at the micro (i.e. plant) to macro scale. For example,
218 which fungal and bacterial communities are associated with soils with SWR, and those without?
219 Furthermore, investigation could be undertaken to develop a range of plant-scale and broadacre, farm-
220 scale products and/or management activities that ameliorate SWR at the micro-scale, and yet facilitate
221 SWR at the macro scale to reduce evaporation, to enhance plant survival and community resilience to
222 hotter droughts. For example, can native fungal and bacterial communities capable of breaking down
223 SWR be kept active while encased in seed coating in agricultural systems?

224
225 **Conclusions**

226 Soil water repellency is a major challenge to plant establishment and growth. Despite considerable
227 research, it remains a recalcitrant problem for which alleviation solutions have mixed success. We
228 propose a shift from focussing on SWR as a problem, to a focus on its potential long-term benefits. Soil
229 water repellency need only be temporarily alleviated to ensure successful establishment of plants, and
230 then it can be utilised to improve soil water conservation, which in turn will improve the success of
231 conservation, restoration, and agricultural activities. Understanding the role of microbial community
232 dynamics is critical, given the fundamental role microbes play in SWR. Productive lines of enquiry
233 include whether native microbes can be harnessed to manage SWR and whether microbial formulations
234 in seed coatings or plant tablets can reduce SWR at the microscale to increase plant establishment
235 success in conservation, restoration and production landscapes.

236

237 **Acknowledgements** Financial support was provided by ECU Centre for Ecosystem Management, Edith
238 Cowan University (ECU Industry Award and Athena Swan Kick-Start Science Prize) and Murdoch
239 University. The work was partly undertaken under the Centre of Climate Change, Woodland and Forest
240 Health, which is a partnership between private industry, community groups, Universities, and the
241 Government of Western Australia. The authors would also like to thank Jodi Burgess for graphic design
242 (jajographics.com.au).

243

244 **References**

245 Bisdom EBA, Dekker LW, Schoute JFT (1993) Water repellency of sieve fractions from sandy soils
246 and relationships with organic material and soil structure. *Geoderma* 56:105-118.

247 Blackwell PS (1993) Improving sustainable production from water repellent sands. *Western Australian*
248 *J Agric* 34:160-167.

249 Blackwell PS (2000) Management of water repellency in Australia, and risks associated with
250 preferential flow, pesticide concentration and leaching. *J Hydrol* 231:384-395.

251 Bond RD (1964) The influence of the microflora on the physical properties of soils II. *Aust. J. Soil Res.*
252 2:123-131.

253 Daniel NRR, Uddin SMM, Harper RJ, Henry DJ (2019) Soil water repellency: A molecular-level
254 perspective of a global environmental phenomenon. *Geoderma* 338: 56-66.

255 DeBano L (1981) Water repellent soils: a state-of-the-art. United States Department of Agriculture.
256 Forest Service. General Technical Report PSW-46.

257 DeBano LF (2000) The role of fire and soil heating on water repellency in wildland environments: a
258 review. *J Hydrol* 231:195-206.

259 Dekker LW, Ritsema CJ, Oostindie K, Boersma OH (1998) Effect of drying temperature on the severity
260 of soil water repellency. *Soil Sci* 163:780-796.

261 Dekker LW, Ritsema CJ (1994) How water moves in a water repellent sandy soil: 1. Potential and actual
262 water repellency. *Water Resour Res* 30:2507-2517.

263 Diehl D (2013) Soil water repellency: Dynamics of heterogeneous surfaces. *Colloids and Surfaces A:*
264 *Physicochem. Eng. Aspects*, 432:8–18.

265 Doerr SH, Shakesby RA, Walsh RPD (2000) Soil water repellency: its causes, characteristics and
266 hydrogeomorphological significance. *Earth-Sci. Rev.* 51:33–65.

267 Doerr SH, Llewellyn CT, Douglas P, Morley CP, Mainwaring KA, Haskins C, Johnsey L, Ritsema CJ,
268 Stagnitti F, Allinson G, Ferreira AJD, Keizer JJ, Ziogas AK, Diamantis J (2005) Extraction of
269 compounds associated with water repellency in sandy soils of different origin. *Aust. J. Soil Res* 43:225-
270 237.

271 Edwards TJ, Nutt BJ, Yates RJ, O'Hara GW, Van-Wyk BE, Howieson JG (2019) A ley-farming system
272 for marginal lands based upon self-regenerating perennial pasture legume. *Agron Sustainable Dev*
273 39:13. doi.org/10.1007/s13593-019-0558-2

274 Feeney DS (2004) Impact of fungi upon soil water relations PhD Thesis. University of Abertay Dundee,
275 United Kingdom.

276 Feeney DS, Hallett PD, Rodger S, Bengough AG, White NA, Young IM (2006) Impact of fungal and
277 bacterial biocides on microbial induced water repellency in arable soil. *Geoderma* 135:72-80.

278 Flematti G, Ghisalberti EL, Dixon KW, Trengove RD (2004) A compound from smoke that promotes
279 seed germination. *Science* 304:977.

280 Goebel MO, Bachmann J, Reichstein M, Janssens IA, Guggenberger G (2011) Soil water repellency
281 and its implications for organic matter decomposition – is there a link to extreme climatic events?
282 *Global Change Biol* 17:2640-2656.

283 Hallett PD, Young IM (1999) Changes to water repellence of soil aggregates caused by substrate-
284 induced microbial activity. *Eur J. Soil Sci.* 50:35-40.

285 Harper RJ, McKissock I, Gilkes RJ, Carter DJ, Blackwell PS (2000) A multivariate framework for
286 interpreting the effects of soil properties, soil management and landuse on water repellency. *J. Hydrol*
287 231:371-383.

288 Harper RJ, Sochacki SJ, Smettem KRJ, Robinson N (2014) Managing water in agricultural landscapes
289 with short-rotation biomass plantations. *GCB Bioenergy* 6:544-555.

290 Hiller D, Berliner J (1974) Waterproofing surface-zone soil aggregates for water conservation. *Soil Sci.*
291 118: 131–135.

292 House MG (1991) Select Committee Enquiry into Land Conservation, Legislative Assembly, W.A.

293 Howieson JG, Yates RJ, Foster KJ, Real D, Besier RB (2008) Prospects for the future use of legumes,
294 In: *N-fixing Leguminous Symbiosis*, vol 7, 363-394.

295 Imeson AC, Verstraten JM, van Mulligan EJ, Sevink J (1992) The effects of fire and water repellency
296 on infiltration and runoff under Mediterranean type forest. *Catena* 19:345-361.

297 Lin C, Chou W, Tsai J, Lin W (2006) Water repellency of *Casuarina* windbreaks (*Casuarina*
298 *equisetifolia* Forst.) caused by fungi in central Taiwan. *Ecol Eng* 26:283-292.

299 Lowe M, Mathes F, Loke MH, McGrath G, Murphy DV, Leopold M (2019) *Bacillus subtilis* and
300 surfactant amendments for the breakdown of soil water repellency in a sandy soil. *Geoderma* 244:108-
301 118.

302 Lozano E, Jimenez-Pinilla P, Mataix-Solera J, Arcenegui V, Barcenas GM, Gonzalez-Perez JA, Garcia-
303 Orenes F, Torres MP, Mataix-Beneyto J (2013) Biological and chemical factors controlling the patchy
304 distribution of soil water repellency among plant species in a Mediterranean semiarid forest. *Geoderma*
305 207-208:212-220.

306 Madsen MD, Kostka SJ, Inouye AL, Zvirzdin DL (2012) Postfire restoration of soil hydrology and
307 wildland vegetation using surfactant seed coating technology. *Rangeland Ecol & Manage* 65:253-259.

308 Madsen MD, Davies KW, Boyd CS, Kerby JD, Svejcar TJ (2016) Emerging seed enhancement
309 technologies for overcoming barriers to restoration. *Restor Ecol* 24:S77-S84.

310 Mao J, Nierop KGJ, Dekker SC, Dekker LW, Chen B (2019) Understanding the mechanisms of soil
311 water repellency from nanoscale to ecosystem scale: a review. *JSoils Sediments* 19:171-185.

312 McKissock I, Gilkes RJ, Harper RJ, Carter DJ (1998) Relationships of water repellency to soil
313 properties for different spatial scales of study. *Aust. J. Soil Res.* 36:495-507.

314 Müller K, Deurer M (2011) Review of the remediation strategies for soil water repellency. *Agr., Eco.*
315 *& Env.* 144:208-221.

316 Rillig CM, Mardatin NF, Leifheit EF, Antunes PM (2010) Mycelium of arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi
317 increases soil water repellency and is sufficient to maintain water-stable soil aggregates. *Soil Biol.*
318 *Biochem.* 42:1189-1191.

319 Ritz K (2007) The plate debate: cultivable communities have no utility in contemporary environmental
320 microbial ecology. *FEMS Microbiol Ecol* 60:358-362.

321 Roper MM (2004) The isolation and characterisation of bacteria with the potential to degrade waxes
322 that cause water repellency in sandy soils. *Aust. J. Soil Res.* 42:427-434.

323 Roper MM (2005) Managing soils to enhance the potential for bioremediation of water repellency.
324 *Aust. J. Soil Res.* 43:803-810.

325 Roper MM (2006) Potential for remediation of water repellent soils by inoculation with wax-degrading
326 bacteria in south-western Australia. *Biologia Bratislava* 61/Suppl. 19:S358-S362.

327 Roper MM, Ward PR, Keulen AF, Hill JR (2013) Under no-tillage and stubble retention, soil water
328 content and crop growth are poorly related to soil water repellency. *Soil & Tillage Res* 126: 143–150.

329 Roper MM, Davies SL, Blackwell PS, Hall DJM, Bakker DM, Jongepier R, Ward PR (2015)
330 Management options for water-repellent soils in Australian dryland agriculture. *Soil Res* 53:786-806.

331 Ruthrof KX, Bader MKF, Matusick G, Jakob S, Hardy GEJ (2015) Promoting seedling physiological
332 performance and early establishment in degraded Mediterranean-type ecosystems. *New For* 47:357-
333 376.

334 Rye, K., Smettem, KRJ (2017) The effect of water repellent soil surface layers on preferential flow and
335 bare soil evaporation. *Geoderma* 207-208: 212-220.

336 Scott DF (1993) The hydrological effects of fire in South African mountain catchments. *J. Hydrol.*
337 150:409-432.

338 Spaccini R, Piccolo A, Conte P, Haberbauer G, Gerzabek MH (2002) Increased soil organic carbon
339 sequestration through hydrophobic protection by humic substances. *Soil Biol Biochem* 34:1839-1851.

340 Tibbett M (2000) Roots, foraging and the exploitation of soil nutrient patches: the role of mycorrhizal
341 symbiosis. *Funct Ecol.* 14:397-399.

342 Uddin SMM, Daniel NRR, Harper RJ, Henry DJ (2017) Why do biogenic volatile organic compounds
343 (BVOCs) derived from vegetation fire not induce soil water repellency? *Biogeochemistry* 134:147–
344 161.

345 Walden LL, Harper RJ, Mendham DS, Henry DJ, Fontaine JB (2015). Eucalyptus reforestation induces
346 soil water repellency. *Soil Res* 53:168–177.

347 Ward PR, Oades JM (1993) Effect of clay mineralogy and exchangeable cations on water repellency in
348 clay-amended sandy soils. *Aust J Soil Res* 31:351-364.

349 Woche SK, Goebel MO, Kirkham MB, Horton R, Van DerPloeg RR, Bachmann J (2005) Contact angle
350 of soils as affected by depth, texture and land management. *Eur J Soil Sci* 56:239–251.

351 Yeap SGH, Bell RW, Scanlan C, and Harper RJ (2018) Topsoil water repellence increased early wheat
352 growth and nutrition. *Proceedings of the National Soils Conference, Canberra 18-23 November, 2018.*

353 Hulugalle N, Biswas T, Greene R, and Bacon P (Eds).

354 Zheng W, Morris EK, Lehmann A, Rillig MC (2016) Interplay of soil water repellency, soil aggregation
355 and organic carbon. *A meta-analysis. Geoderma* 283:39-47.