

## **Supplementary Material “Behaviour of bentazon as influenced by water and tillage management in rice growing conditions”**

**Text S1.** Soil samples (5 g) were treated with 10 mL of initial bentazon solutions (10, 20, 40, 60, 80 and 100  $\mu\text{M}$  in 0.01 M in  $\text{CaCl}_2$ ) by shaking mechanically at  $20\pm 1^\circ\text{C}$  for 24 h. Equilibrium concentrations in the supernatants were determined by high performance liquid chromatography (HPLC). The amount of bentazon sorbed ( $C_s$ ) was calculated from the difference between the initial ( $C_i$ ) and the equilibrium ( $C_e$ ) solution concentrations. The measurements with control samples containing only bentazon showed that there were no losses of bentazon due to microbial activity, volatilization or sorption onto the surface of the tubes.

The desorption percentage was calculated as  $\%D = [(C_{sa} - C_{sd})/C_{sa}] \times 100$ , where  $C_{sa}$  is the amount of bentazon sorbed in the sorption process and  $C_{sd}$  is the amount of bentazon sorbed in the desorption process.

**Text S2.** Soil water content for the field capacity ranged between 0.28-0.33  $\text{m}^3 \text{m}^{-3}$  for TF and NTS7, respectively. Prior to the addition of bentazon, soils were pre-incubated for 7 days in the dark at  $20\pm 1^\circ\text{C}$  to allow the soil microorganisms to adapt to the incubation conditions, and also to allow the development of reducing conditions in the flooded soils, then the amount of bentazon corresponding to an application rate of 2  $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$  dissolved in distilled water was applied. The tubes were then incubated in the dark at  $20\pm 1^\circ\text{C}$  for 49 days. The moisture content was maintained at a constant level throughout the experiment by adding distilled water as necessary. Three replicate tubes from each treatment were removed periodically (at 2 hours and at 3, 5, and 7 days after herbicide application, and then at 7-day intervals for 49 days) to measure the herbicide concentration. Recoveries were greater than 95% of the bentazon applied to the soil. The bentazon dissipation curves in soils and water were fitted to first-order kinetics (C

=  $C_0 e^{-kt}$ ), and the half-lives ( $DT_{50}$ ) were calculated, where  $C$  is the herbicide concentration at time  $t$  (days),  $C_0$  is the initial herbicide concentration, and  $k$  ( $\text{day}^{-1}$ ) is the degradation constant.

**Text S3.** To measure the dehydrogenase activity (DHA), three replicate tubes from each treatment were removed periodically at the same times as for the dissipation experiment. The tubes were incubated for 20 h at  $20 \pm 1^\circ\text{C}$  in the dark with 1 mL of 0.4% 2-p-iodophenyl-3p-nitrophenyl-5 tetrazolium chloride (INT) as substrate. At the end of the incubation, the iodinitrotetrazolium formazan (INTF) produced was extracted with methanol, and the absorbance was measured at 490 nm.

**Text S4.** Leaching studies were carried out using disturbed soil columns. To minimize losses of soil during the experiment, the top 5 cm of the columns was filled with sea sand and the bottom 5 cm with sea sand plus glass wool. The remaining 20 cm was hand-packed with air-dried soil. The soil columns were saturated with 0.01 M  $\text{CaCl}_2$  and allowed to drain for 24 h. Leachates containing the herbicide were collected daily, filtered, and assayed by HPLC. On average, the value of the pore-space in the soil columns was 148 mL.

**Text S5.** The values of TOC were low in all treatments (Table S1); the highest was in treatment NTS7, reflecting a major effect of long-term NT practices on this parameter. Indeed, the TOC value in NTS7 was, on average, 2.1-times higher than for the other treatments. Similarly, the WSOC, HA, and FA values were also significantly higher in NTS7 than in the rest of the treatments (Table S1). So, this accentuates the importance of looking at long-term effects, especially of management practices such as no-till. Furthermore, the differences between treatments TS and TF in terms of WSOC might be explained by the irrigation method used in each treatment. The EC values varied significantly among treatments, reflecting the great spatial variability of this parameter

in field conditions. In 2013, the lowest value of EC corresponded to TS and the highest to NTS7 and NTS (Table S1). The TOC accumulation in the no-tillage management regimes and the organic matter depletion in TS may help to explain these contrasting trends. There was acidification of NTS soil in 2013, relative to 2011 (Table S1). However, the pH of the TS soil rose from 5.63 in 2011 to 6.24 in 2013. The TF soil showed a similar trend, but with a much smaller increase in pH. These increases in pH could be due to losses of organic matter in soils CTS and CTF.

**Table S1.** Some physicochemical properties of the soil for each management regime (0-20 cm).

	<b>TOC</b> (g kg <sup>-1</sup> )	<b>DOC</b> (mg kg <sup>-1</sup> )	<b>HA</b> (g kg <sup>-1</sup> )	<b>FA</b> (g kg <sup>-1</sup> )	<b>HI</b> (%)	<b>EC</b> (μS cm <sup>-1</sup> )	<b>pH</b>
<b>2011</b>							
<b>NTS7</b>	15.6cA	219.6dA	1.60cB	1.03cA	10.2bB	1.51dC	5.84cA
<b>NTS</b>	7.93aA	133.1cC	0.833bB	0.532aA	10.5bB	0.906bB	5.91cB
<b>TS</b>	9.23abC	96.1bB	0.604aB	0.676bB	6.55aA	0.698aA	5.63bA
<b>TF</b>	9.92bB	74.4aB	0.627aB	0.634bA	6.32aA	1.26cB	5.15aA
<b>2012</b>							
<b>NTS7</b>	15.5cA	198.4cA	1.33bA	0.993cA	8.62cA	0.490aA	5.92dA
<b>NTS</b>	6.80aA	66.4aA	0.514aA	0.579aB	7.32bA	0.857bA	5.92cB
<b>TS</b>	8.22bB	97.1bB	0.515aA	0.685bB	6.27aA	1.09cB	5.84bB
<b>TF</b>	8.25bA	61.2aA	0.481aA	0.661bA	5.83aA	1.27dB	5.21aB
<b>2013</b>							
<b>NTS7</b>	16.2dA	213.9dA	1.76dC	0.998dA	10.8aB	1.26cB	5.84cA
<b>NTS</b>	7.67bA	112.4cB	1.13cC	0.764cC	14.8cC	1.38dC	5.22aA
<b>TS</b>	7.03aA	80.5bA	0.908aC	0.586aA	12.9bB	0.753aA	6.24dC
<b>TF</b>	8.60cA	64.9aA	0.984bC	0.639bA	11.4aB	1.08bA	5.33bC
<b>Y</b>	**	***	***	**	***	***	*
<b>M</b>	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
<b>Y*M</b>	***	***	***	***	***	***	***

**TOC:** total organic carbon; **DOC:** dissolved organic carbon; **HA:** humic acid; **FA:** fulvic acid; **HI:** humic index; **EC:** electrical conductivity; ANOVA factors are **Y:** year; **M:** management regime; **Y\*M:** interaction year\*management regime; \*, \*\*, and \*\*\* significant at  $\alpha$  levels of 0.05, 0.01, and 0.001, respectively. Different letters indicate significant differences ( $p < 0.05$ ) between management regimes in the same year (lower case letters) and between years within the same management regime (upper case letters).