

1 Title: The role of microarthropods in emerging models of soil organic matter

2

3 Jennifer L. Soong<sup>a\*</sup>; Uffe N. Nielsen<sup>b</sup>

4

5 <sup>a</sup> Department of Biology, University of Antwerp, 2610 Wilrijk, Belgium, Email:

6 [Jennifer.soong@uantwerpen.be](mailto:Jennifer.soong@uantwerpen.be)

7 <sup>b</sup> Hawkesbury Institute for the Environment, Western Sydney University, Locked Bag 1797,

8 Penrith, NSW 2571, Australia. Email: [u.nielsen@westernsydney.edu.au](mailto:u.nielsen@westernsydney.edu.au)

9 \* Corresponding author: Jennifer L. Soong

This is the author's version of a work that was accepted for publication in Soil biology and biochemistry (Ed. Elsevier). Changes resulting from the publishing process, such as peer review, editing, corrections, structural formatting, and other quality control mechanisms may not be reflected in this document. Changes may have been made to this work since it was submitted for publication. A definitive version was subsequently published in Soong, J. L. and Nielsen, U. N. "The role of microarthropods in emerging models of soil organic matter" in Soil biology and biochemistry, vol. 102 (Nov. 2016), p. 37- 39. DOI 10.1016/j.soilbio.2016.06.020

10 Abstract

11 A new understanding of soil organic matter (SOM) formation and stabilization has emerged  
12 over the past decade, highlighting the importance of microbial activity, mineral association of  
13 organic matter and aggregate occlusion of organic matter to SOM persistence. To date, the  
14 contribution of microarthropods to litter decomposition and SOM formation processes has not  
15 received due consideration and theoretical and empirical models should be modified to include  
16 how these organisms impact SOM protection. Here, we highlight the biological, chemical and  
17 physical mechanisms by which microarthropods influence SOM formation both directly and  
18 indirectly. Although more data is needed to quantify the impacts of different microarthropods  
19 on SOM dynamics, we highlight areas where inclusion of microarthropods in emerging models  
20 of SOM formation could reduce model uncertainties.

21

22 Key words: Carbon cycling; Food web interactions; Litter decomposition; Microarthropods;

23 Nutrient cycling; Soil organic matter

24 Over the past decade a new understanding of soil organic matter (SOM) formation has  
25 emerged (Cotrufo et al., 2015; Lehmann and Kleber, 2015). Advances in molecular and  
26 analytical techniques have revealed the importance of organo-mineral interactions and soil  
27 aggregation, rather than simply biochemical recalcitrance, as key factors in organic matter  
28 persistence in the soil (von Lutzow et al., 2006; Kleber, 2010; Schmidt et al., 2011). Thus, the  
29 focus of litter decomposition and SOM formation studies is shifting from determining solely the  
30 *rates* of decomposition toward tracking the *fate* and *transformation pathways* of organic  
31 matter in the soil.

32 SOM is derived mainly from plant inputs. Low molecular weight compounds may leach  
33 into the soil and be metabolized by soil microbes, leach down through the soil profile or adsorb  
34 to mineral surfaces (mineral associated organic matter, MAOM). Fragments of particulate  
35 organic matter can be mixed into the soil as free particulate organic matter (fPOM) or become  
36 occluded in aggregates (oPOM), protected from further biological attack.

37 Adsorption/desorption of MAOM on mineral particles and disruption and reformation of soil  
38 aggregates creates dynamics of SOM governed by soil properties, environmental conditions and  
39 biological activity. Soil microbes are the primary decomposers of plant litter and SOM (Swift et  
40 al., 1979); however, the role of soil organisms at higher trophic levels has long been recognized  
41 (Petersen and Luxton, 1982; Seastedt, 1984). The importance of macroinvertebrates such as  
42 earthworms and termites on soil processes is relatively well quantified (e.g., van Groenigen et  
43 al., 2014). In contrast, the impact of other faunal groups such as microarthropods is less well  
44 understood and their contribution to SOM dynamics are rarely considered in models (but see  
45 Hunt and Wall, 2002; Soong et al., 2016).

46           Microarthropods, dominated by Acari and Collembola (i.e. mites and springtails), are a  
47 highly diverse and abundant group of organisms, ubiquitous in most ecosystem types (Nielsen  
48 et al., 2015). Their diverse feeding preferences range from primary decomposers and litter  
49 transformers, to saprotrophs, microbial grazers, and predators of other soil fauna (Petersen and  
50 Luxton, 1982; Pollierer et al., 2009; Nielsen et al., 2015), thus their impact on SOM formation  
51 spans all trophic levels of the soil food web. Microarthropods redistribute organic matter and  
52 microbes in the soil matrix, creating hot spots of microbial activity and soil aggregation (Maaß  
53 et al., 2015). It has been estimated using chemical and litterbag exclusion studies that  
54 microarthropods increase litter decomposition rates (Santos and Whitford, 1981; Seastedt,  
55 1984; Garcia-Palacios et al., 2013), and more recent model-based inferences show that the  
56 negative effects of microarthropod suppression on SOM formation during litter decomposition  
57 may accumulate over time (Soong et al., 2016). The impact of microarthropod suppressions is  
58 most pronounced in temperate and wet tropical regions, indicating that microarthropod  
59 disturbances due to land use and climate change might have particularly large impacts on SOM  
60 dynamics in these ecosystems (Wall et al., 2008 ; Garcia-Palacios et al., 2013).

61           One of the most widely recognized roles of microarthropods in SOM dynamics is  
62 through the release of nitrogen (N) and phosphorus (P) during litter decomposition (Anderson  
63 and Ineson, 1984; Carrillo et al., 2011), generally increasing  $\text{NO}_3^-$  availability and altering SOM  
64 stoichiometry (Teuben and Verhoef, 1992; Wickings and Grandy, 2011). The release of nutrients  
65 by microarthropods could increase plant productivity and alter microbial responses to plant  
66 inputs with potential feedbacks to ecosystem productivity and SOM decomposition (Bardgett  
67 and Chan, 1999; Dijkstra et al., 2013; Soong et al., 2016). Altered nutrient availability impacts

68 microbial substrate use efficiency (Sinsabaugh et al., 2013), but increased N mineralization can  
69 also lead to greater leaching and export of nutrients.

70 Microarthropods affect oPOM and MAOM formation directly and indirectly and the net  
71 effect of these interactive processes in different ecosystems and conditions is uncertain.

72 MAOM derives mainly from adsorption reactions between clay surfaces and microbial products  
73 or other low molecular weight compounds (Grandy and Neff, 2008; Mambelli et al., 2011;  
74 Keiluweit et al., 2015). Microarthropods are most likely to influence MAOM indirectly through  
75 altering SOM chemistry and leachate, and through top-down controls on microbial abundance,  
76 turnover and composition. Direct alterations to MAOM complexes during passage through the  
77 microarthropod gut are also possible. Microarthropods directly influence soil aggregation and  
78 oPOM through the deposition of organic matter in the form of fecal pellets, eggs and molting  
79 residues, and necromass that can form a nucleus for soil aggregates and become oPOM (Maaß  
80 et al., 2015). In contrast, their movement and feeding on organic matter and fungal hyphae  
81 may disrupt aggregates resulting in the release of oPOM (Maaß et al., 2015). More data on the  
82 extent of microarthropod influence on these processes would greatly help to integrate  
83 microarthropods into SOM models.

84 The direct and indirect effect of microarthropod activities can and should now be  
85 incorporated into the evolving concepts of SOM formation (Fig. 1). With the evolution of our  
86 understanding from inherent resistance to degradation of organic matter toward MAOM and  
87 oPOM mechanisms of protection of SOM in the soil, our concepts of the impact of  
88 microarthropods beyond litter mass loss must also be revisited. For example, litter-  
89 transforming microarthropods may increase the input of litter fragments into the soil as fPOM

90 or eventually oPOM (Fig. 1). Fragmentation also leads to more surface area for leaching of  
91 water-soluble litter components into the soil that may subsequently be utilized by microbes,  
92 lost through leaching or adsorbed to mineral surfaces (Soong et al., 2014). Although soil fauna  
93 themselves are not thought to contribute significantly to soil respiration during decomposition  
94 (Berg et al., 2001), microbial grazers stimulate microbial turnover, control microbial biomass  
95 and influence community composition (Maaß et al., 2015), which in turn will influence SOM  
96 decomposition. Finally, the influence of microarthropods on SOM stoichiometry due to their  
97 stimulation of nutrient mineralization over C mineralization may be an important control of the  
98 balance between ecosystem C storage and productivity (Soong et al., 2016).

99 Our conceptual framework (Fig. 1) illustrates some of the key pathways through which  
100 microarthropods impact SOM formation, but how these can be included in SOM models is a  
101 question ripe for exploration. Experiments across various ecosystem types that quantify the  
102 effects of microarthropods on SOM formation through such pathways are still needed to  
103 parameterize new models. These experiments would benefit from focusing on broad functional  
104 groups or traits to allow results to be generalizable. For example, the contribution of  
105 microarthropods to pyrogenic organic matter decomposition is largely unknown (Ameloot et  
106 al., 2013). This is particularly relevant given that land use practices and global change affect  
107 microarthropod abundances and activities, with cascading effects on ecosystem functioning  
108 (Nielsen et al., 2015). The challenges lie mainly in disentangling the direct and indirect impacts  
109 of microarthropods from other aspects of the soil food web. Physical exclusion of  
110 microarthropods using litterbags inhibits fragmentation and the input of fPOM to the soil, but  
111 litterbag-free isotopic tracing combined with direct soil community manipulations or chemical

112 exclusion using naphthalene may be a promising way forward (Cotrufo et al., 2014). The main  
113 effects and side effects of any manipulation of the microarthropod community should be  
114 carefully quantified and reported in order to accurately measure effects. Based on the known  
115 impacts of microarthropods on SOM formation and dynamics, as well as their variable yet  
116 ubiquitous presence in most ecosystems, we believe that the inclusion of microarthropods in  
117 emerging mechanistic models of SOM dynamics is a viable and worthwhile effort that will help  
118 to advance the next generation of SOM models.

119

## 120 Acknowledgements

121 We would like to thank Mark Bradford for inviting us to contribute to this special issue and  
122 Jocelyn Lavallee for her feedback on our concept. J. Soong is supported by the European  
123 Research Council Synergy grant ERC-2013-SyG 610028-IMBALANCE-P.

124

125

## 126 References

- 127 Ameloot, N., Graber, E.R., Verheijen, F.G.A., De Neve, S., 2013. Interactions between biochar  
128 stability and soil organisms: review and research needs. *European Journal of Soil Science* 64,  
129 379-390.
- 130 Anderson, J.M., Ineson, P., 1984. Interactions between microorganisms and soil invertebrates in  
131 nutrient flux pathways of forest ecosystems, In: Anderson, J.M., Raynor, A.D.M., Walton,  
132 D.W.H. (Eds.), *Invertebrate Microbial Interactions*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp.  
133 59-88.
- 134 Bardgett, R., Chan, K., 1999. Experimental evidence that soil fauna enhance nutrient  
135 mineralization and plant nutrient uptake in a montane grassland ecosystem. *Soil Biology &*  
136 *Biochemistry* 31, 1007-1014.
- 137 Berg, M., De Ruiter, P., Didden, W., Janssen, M., Schouten, T., Verhoef, H., 2001. Community  
138 food web, decomposition and nitrogen mineralisation in a stratified Scots pine forest soil. *Oikos*  
139 94, 130-142.

140 Carrillo, Y., Ball, B.A., Bradford, M.A., Jordan, C.F., Molina, M., 2011. Soil fauna alter the effects  
141 of litter composition on nitrogen cycling in a mineral soil. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry* 43,  
142 1440-1449.

143 Cotrufo, M.F., Soong, J.L., Horton, A.J., Campbell, E.E., Haddix, M.L., Wall, D.H., Parton, W.J.,  
144 2015. Soil organic matter formation from biochemical and physical pathways of litter mass loss.  
145 *Nature Geoscience* 8, 776-779.

146 Cotrufo, M.F., Soong, J.L., Vandegehuchte, M.L., Nguyen, T., Deneff, K., Ashley Shaw, E., Sylvain,  
147 Z.A., de Tomasel, C.M., Nielsen, U.N., Wall, D.H., 2014. Naphthalene addition to soil surfaces: A  
148 feasible method to reduce soil micro-arthropods with negligible direct effects on soil C  
149 dynamics. *Applied Soil Ecology* 74, 21-29.

150 Dijkstra, F.A., Carrillo, Y., Pendall, E., Morgan, J.A., 2013. Rhizosphere priming: a nutrient  
151 perspective. *Frontiers in microbiology* 4.

152 Garcia-Palacios, P., Maestre, F.T., Kattge, J., Wall, D.H., 2013. Climate and litter quality  
153 differently modulate the effects of soil fauna on litter decomposition across biomes. *Ecology*  
154 *Letters* 16, 1045-1053.

155 Grandy, A.S., Neff, J.C., 2008. Molecular C dynamics downstream: The biochemical  
156 decomposition sequence and its impact on soil organic matter structure and function. *Science*  
157 *of the Total Environment* 404, 297-307.

158 Hunt, H.W., Wall, D.H., 2002. Modelling the effects of loss of soil biodiversity on ecosystem  
159 function. *Global Change Biology* 8, 33-50.

160 Keiluweit, M., Bougoure, J.J., Nico, P.S., Pett-Ridge, J., Weber, P.K., Kleber, M., 2015. Mineral  
161 protection of soil carbon counteracted by root exudates. *Nature Climate Change* 5, 588-595.

162 Kleber, M., 2010. What is recalcitrant soil organic matter? *Environmental Chemistry* 7, 320-332.

163 Lehmann, J., Kleber, M., 2015. The contentious nature of soil organic matter. *Nature advance*  
164 *online publication*.

165 Maaß, S., Caruso, T., Rillig, M.C., 2015. Functional role of microarthropods in soil aggregation.  
166 *Pedobiologia* 58, 59-63.

167 Mambelli, S., Bird, J.A., Gleixner, G., Dawson, T.E., Torn, M.S., 2011. Relative contribution of  
168 foliar and fine root pine litter to the molecular composition of soil organic matter after in situ  
169 degradation. *Organic Geochemistry* 42, 1099-1108.

170 Nielsen, U.N., Wall, D.H., Six, J., 2015. Soil Biodiversity and the Environment. *Annual Review of*  
171 *Environment and Resources* 40, 63-90.

172 Petersen, H., Luxton, M., 1982. A Comparative Analysis of Soil Fauna Populations and Their Role  
173 in Decomposition Processes. *Oikos* 39, 288-388.

174 Pollierer, M.M., Langel, R., Scheu, S., Maraun, M., 2009. Compartmentalization of the soil  
175 animal food web as indicated by dual analysis of stable isotope ratios ( $^{15}\text{N}/^{14}\text{N}$  and  $^{13}\text{C}/^{12}\text{C}$ ).  
176 *Soil Biology and Biochemistry* 41, 1221-1226.

177 Santos, P.F., Whitford, W.G., 1981. The Effects of Microarthropods on Litter Decomposition in a  
178 Chihuahuan Desert Ecosystem. *Ecology* 62, 654-663.

179 Schmidt, M.W.I., Torn, M.S., Abiven, S., Dittmar, T., Guggenberger, G., Janssens, I.A., Kleber, M.,  
180 Kogel-Knabner, I., Lehmann, J., Manning, D.A.C., Nannipieri, P., Rasse, D.P., Weiner, S.,  
181 Trumbore, S.E., 2011. Persistence of soil organic matter as an ecosystem property. *Nature* 478,  
182 49-56.



183 Seastedt, T.R., 1984. The Role of Microarthropods in Decomposition and Mineralization  
184 Processes. *Annual Review of Entomology* 29, 25-46.

185 Sinsabaugh, R.L., Manzoni, S., Moorhead, D.L., Richter, A., 2013. Carbon use efficiency of  
186 microbial communities: stoichiometry, methodology and modelling. *Ecology Letters* 16, 930-  
187 939.

188 Soong, J.L., Calderon, F.J., Betzen, J., Cotrufo, M.F., 2014. Quantification and FTIR  
189 characterization of dissolved organic carbon and total dissolved nitrogen leached from litter: a  
190 comparison of methods across litter types. *Plant and Soil* 385, 125-137.

191 Soong, J.L., Vandegehuchte, M.L., Horton, A.J., Nielsen, U.N., Deneff, K., Shaw, E.A., De Tomasel,  
192 C.M., Parton, W.J., Wall, D.H., Cotrufo, M.F., 2016. Soil microarthropods support ecosystem  
193 productivity and soil C accrual: evidence from a litter decomposition study in the tallgrass  
194 prairie. *Soil Biology & Biochemistry* 92, 230-238.

195 Swift, M.J., Heal, O.W., Anderson, J.M., 1979. *Decomposition in Terrestrial Ecosystems*.  
196 University of California Press.

197 Teuben, A., Verhoef, H.A., 1992. Direct contribution by soil arthropods to nutrient availability  
198 through body and faecal nutrient content. *Biology and Fertility of Soils* 14, 71-75.

199 van Groenigen, J.W., Lubbers, I.M., Vos, H.M.J., Brown, G.G., De Deyn, G.B., van Groenigen, K.J.,  
200 2014. Earthworms increase plant production: a meta-analysis. *Scientific Reports* 4, 6365.

201 von Lutzow, M., Kogel-Knabner, I., Ekschmitt, K., Matzner, E., Guggenberger, G., Marschner, B.,  
202 Flessa, H., 2006. Stabilization of organic matter in temperate soils: mechanisms and their  
203 relevance under different soil conditions - a review. *European Journal of Soil Science* 57, 426-  
204 445.

205 Wickings, K., Grandy, A.S., 2011. The oribatid mite *Scheloribates moestus* (Acari: Oribatida)  
206 alters litter chemistry and nutrient cycling during decomposition. *Soil Biology & Biochemistry*  
207 43, 351-358.

208

209

210 Figure legend

211

212 **Figure 1.** Schematic representation of the main pathways of soil organic matter (SOM)

213 formation and dynamics where microarthropods have measurable impacts. Mineral associated

214 organic matter (MAOM), and aggregate occluded particulate organic matter (oPOM) summarize

215 the main stabilizing mechanisms in emerging models of SOM, while free particulate organic

216 matter (fPOM) is SOM unprotected by aggregates or mineral adsorption. Microarthropods may

217 influence SOM formation in this context through 1) Influencing the turnover of microbial

218 biomass and the release of dissolved nutrients via grazing, which is possible to quantify using

219 measures of impacts on microbial activity and turnover rates and stable isotope labelling; 2)

220 Fragmentation of litter by litter transforming springtails and mites, which increases fPOM

221 inputs to the soil while also increasing the surface area available for leaching of dissolved

222 organic matter and is possible to quantify using microarthropod suppression and isotope

223 labelling techniques; 3) All microarthropods will contribute to the transfer of nutrients and

224 carbon from MAOM to oPOM, and vice versa, through their role in aggregate formation and

225 turnover. Litter mass inputs to the soil are dominated by leaching early in decomposition, with

226 fragmentation becoming more important over time.

227

228

229

230