

**This item is the archived peer-reviewed author-version of:**

The role of microarthropods in emerging models of soil organic matter

**Reference:**

Soong Jennifer, Nielsen Uffe N.- The role of microarthropods in emerging models of soil organic matter  
Soil biology and biochemistry - ISSN 0038-0717 - 102(2016), p. 37-39  
Full text (Publisher's DOI): <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.SOILBIO.2016.06.020>  
To cite this reference: <https://hdl.handle.net/10067/1404150151162165141>

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

8 Bag 1797, Penrith, NSW 2571, Australia. Email: [u.nielsen@westernsydney.edu.au](mailto:u.nielsen@westernsydney.edu.au)

9 \*Corresponding author: Jennifer L. Soong

10 Abstract

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

22

23 Key words: Carbon cycling; Litter decomposition; Microarthropods; Nutrient  
24 cycling; Soil organic matter

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

34 Soil organic matter is derived mainly from plant inputs. Low molecular  
35 weight compounds may leach into the soil and be metabolized by soil microbes,  
36 leach down through the soil profile or adsorb to mineral surfaces (mineral  
37 associated organic matter= MAOM). Fragments of particulate organic matter can be  
38 mixed into the soil as free particulate organic matter (fPOM) or become occluded in  
39 aggregates (oPOM) and protected from further biological attack. Adsorption and  
40 desorption of MAOM on clay particles, as well as disruption and reformation of soil  
41 aggregates, creates dynamics of SOM governed by soil properties, environmental  
42 conditions and biological activity. Soil microbes are the primary decomposers of  
43 plant litter and SOM (Swift et al., 1979); however, the role of soil organisms at  
44 higher trophic levels has long been recognized (Petersen and Luxton, 1982;  
45 Seastedt, 1984). The importance of macroinvertebrates such as earthworms and  
46 termites on soil processes is relatively well quantified (e.g., van Groenigen et al.  
47 (2014)). In contrast, the impact of other faunal groups such as microarthropods (i.e.

48 mites and springtails) is less well understood and their contribution to SOM  
49 dynamics are rarely considered in models (but see Hunt and Wall (2002); Soong et  
50 al. (2016)).

51         Microarthropods, dominated by Acari and Collembola (i.e. mites and  
52 springtails), is a highly diverse and abundant group of organisms, ubiquitous in  
53 most ecosystem types (Nielsen et al., 2015). They influence SOM formation at all  
54 trophic levels of the soil food web, with feeding preferences ranging from primary  
55 decomposers and litter transformers, to saprotrophs, microbial grazers, and even  
56 predators of other soil fauna (Petersen and Luxton, 1982; Pollierer et al., 2009;  
57 Nielsen et al., 2015).. Microarthropods also redistribute organic matter and  
58 microbes in the soil matrix, creating hot spots of microbial activity and soil  
59 aggregation and turnover (Maaß et al., 2015). It has been estimated using chemical  
60 and litter bag exclusion studies that microarthropods increase litter decomposition  
61 rates (Seastedt, 1984; Garcia-Palacios et al., 2013), and more recent model-based  
62 inferences show that the effects of microarthropod suppression on SOM formation  
63 during litter decomposition may accumulate over time (Soong et al., 2016).

64         One of the most widely recognized roles of microarthropods in SOM  
65 dynamics is through the release of nitrogen (N) and phosphorus (P) during litter  
66 decomposition (Anderson and Ineson, 1984; Carrillo et al., 2011), generally  
67 increasing  $\text{NO}_3^-$  availability and altering SOM stoichiometry (Teuben and Verhoef,  
68 1992; Wickings and Grandy, 2011). Microbes in the soil are generally more limited  
69 by C availability than by nutrients so the effects of nutrient mobilization on SOM  
70 formation are more likely to be by alleviating nutrient stress on plants. The release

71 of nutrients by microarthropods could increase plant uptake and productivity with  
72 potential feedbacks to ecosystem productivity and organic matter inputs to the soil  
73 (Bardgett and Chan, 1999) (Soong et al., 2016). However, N mineralization could  
74 also lead to greater leaching and export of nutrients.

75         Microarthropods likely have a greater effect on the formation and turnover  
76 of oPOM than MAOM. Mineral associated organic matter derives mainly from  
77 adsorption reactions between clay surfaces and microbial products and other low  
78 molecular weight compounds (Grandy and Neff, 2008; Mambelli et al., 2011;  
79 Keiluweit et al., 2015). Therefore, microarthropods are most likely to influence  
80 MAOM through altering SOM chemistry and leachate, and through top-down  
81 controls on microbial abundance, turnover and composition. Alterations to MAOM  
82 complexes during passage through the microarthropod gut are also possible.  
83 However, microarthropods directly influence soil aggregation and oPOM through  
84 the deposition of organic matter in the form of fecal pellets, eggs residues, molting  
85 residues and necromass that can form a nucleus for soil aggregates and become  
86 oPOM (Maaß et al., 2015). Furthermore, their movement and feeding on organic  
87 matter may disrupt aggregates resulting in the release of oPOM (Maaß et al., 2015).  
88 Similarly, microbial grazing by microarthropods indirectly influences aggregate  
89 formation and stability, particularly by disrupting mycorrhizal fungi hyphae but also  
90 through selective feeding that can modify microbial community composition.  
91 Moreover, microarthropod feeding can contribute to the redistribution and  
92 dispersal of bacteria and fungi in the soil, which may in turn influence SOM  
93 dynamics (Maaß et al., 2015).

94           The direct and indirect effect of these microarthropod activities can now be  
95 incorporated into the evolving understanding of SOM formation (Fig. 1). With the  
96 evolution of our understanding from inherent resistance to degradation of organic  
97 matter toward MAOM and oPOM mechanisms of protection of SOM in the soil, our  
98 concepts of the impact of microarthropods beyond litter mass loss must also be  
99 revisited. For example, litter-transforming microarthropods may increase the input  
100 of litter fragments into the soil as fPOM or eventually oPOM (Fig. 1). Fragmentation  
101 also leads to more surface area for leaching of water-soluble litter components into  
102 the soil that may subsequently be utilized by microbes, lost through leaching or  
103 adsorb to mineral surfaces (Soong et al., 2014). Although soil fauna themselves are  
104 not thought to contribute significantly to soil respiration during decomposition  
105 (Berg et al., 2001), microbial grazers stimulate microbial turnover, control microbial  
106 biomass and influence community composition (Maaß et al., 2015), which in turn  
107 will influence SOM decomposition. Finally, the influence of microarthropods on SOM  
108 stoichiometry due to their stimulation of nutrient mineralization over C  
109 mineralization may control the balance between ecosystem C storage and  
110 productivity (Soong et al., 2016).

111           The contributions of microarthropods to SOM formation can and should  
112 therefore be considered in emerging models of SOM formation and transformation  
113 for more accurate model predictions. This is particularly relevant given that land  
114 use practices and global change affect microarthropod abundances and activities,  
115 with cascading effects on ecosystem functioning (Nielsen et al., 2015). However,  
116 data on the functional effects of these impacts on SOM formation processes

117 described here must still be collected. Furthermore, the contribution of  
118 microarthropods to pyrogenic organic matter decomposition is largely unknown  
119 (Ameloot et al., 2013). The challenges lie mainly in disentangling the direct and  
120 indirect impacts of microarthropods from other aspects of the soil food web.  
121 Physical exclusion of microarthropods using litterbags inhibits the input of fPOM to  
122 the soil, but litterbag-free isotopic tracing combined with direct soil community  
123 manipulations or chemical exclusion using naphthalene may be a promising way  
124 forward (Cotrufo et al., 2014). However, the main effects and side effects of any  
125 manipulation of the microarthropod community should be carefully quantified in  
126 order to accurately measure effects. Due to the direct and indirect role of  
127 microarthropods in SOM formation and dynamics presented here, as well as their  
128 variable yet ubiquitous presence in most ecosystems, we believe that the inclusion  
129 of microarthropods in emerging models of SOM dynamics is a viable and worthwhile  
130 effort that will help to shed light on unexplained variation in existing SOM models.

131

### 132 Acknowledgements

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

137

138

139 References



140 Ameloot, N., Graber, E.R., Verheijen, F.G.A., De Neve, S., 2013. Interactions between  
141 biochar stability and soil organisms: review and research needs. *European Journal*  
142 *of Soil Science* 64, 379-390.

143 Anderson, J.M., Ineson, P., 1984. Interactions between microorganisms and soil  
144 invertebrates in nutrient flux pathways of forest ecosystems, In: Anderson, J.M.,  
145 Raynor, A.D.M., Walton, D.W.H. (Eds.), *Invertebrate Microbial Interactions*.  
146 Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 59-88.

147 Bardgett, R., Chan, K., 1999. Experimental evidence that soil fauna enhance nutrient  
148 mineralization and plant nutrient uptake in a montane grassland ecosystem. *Soil*  
149 *Biology & Biochemistry* 31, 1007-1014.

150 Berg, M., De Ruiter, P., Didden, W., Janssen, M., Schouten, T., Verhoef, H., 2001.  
151 Community food web, decomposition and nitrogen mineralisation in a stratified  
152 Scots pine forest soil. *Oikos* 94, 130-142.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

174 Kleber, M., 2010. What is recalcitrant soil organic matter? *Environmental Chemistry*  
175 *7*, 320-332.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

199 Soong, J.L., Vandegehuchte, M.L., Horton, A.J., Nielsen, U.N., Deneff, K., Shaw, E.A., De  
200 Tomasel, C.M., Parton, W.J., Wall, D.H., Cotrufo, M.F., 2016. Soil microarthropods  
201 support ecosystem productivity and soil C accrual: evidence from a litter  
202 decomposition study in the tallgrass prairie. *Soil Biology & Biochemistry* 92, 230-  
203 238.

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

206 Teuben, A., Verhoef, H.A., 1992. Direct contribution by soil arthropods to nutrient  
207 availability through body and faecal nutrient content. *Biology and Fertility of Soils*  
208 14, 71-75.

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

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

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

219

220

221 Figure legend

222

223 **Figure 1.** A schematic representation of the main pathways of soil organic matter  
224 (SOM) formation highlighting where microarthropods have measurable impacts.  
225 Mineral associated organic matter (MAOM), and aggregate occluded particulate  
226 organic matter (oPOM) summarize the main stabilizing mechanisms in emerging  
227 models of SOM, while free particulate organic matter (free POM) is SOM unprotected  
228 by aggregates or mineral adsorption. Microarthropods may influence SOM  
229 formation in this context by, 1) Influencing the turnover of microbial biomass and  
230 the release of dissolved nutrients via grazing, which is possible to quantify using  
231 measures of impacts on microbial activity and turnover rates and stable isotope  
232 labelling exercises; 2) Fragmentation of litter by litter transforming springtails and  
233 mites, which increases free POM inputs to the soil while also increasing the surface  
234 area available for leaching of dissolved organic matter; 3) All microarthropods will  
235 contribute to the transfer of nutrients and carbon from MAOM to oPOM, and vice  
236 versa, through their role in aggregate formation and turnover. Litter mass loss is  
237 dominated by leaching early in decomposition, with fragmentation becoming more  
238 important over time.

239