Differential contribution of soil biota groups to plant litter decomposition as mediated by soil use

Ricardo A Castro-Huerta, Liliana B Falco, Rosana V Sandler, Carlos Coviella

Plant decomposition is dependant on the activity of the soil biota and its interactions with climate, soil properties, and plant residue inputs. This work assessed the roles of different groups of the soil biota on litter decomposition, and the way they are modulated by soil use. Litterbags of different mesh sizes for the selective exclusion of soil fauna by size (macro, meso, and microfauna) were filled with standardized dried leaves and placed on the same soil under different use intensities: Naturalized grasslands, recent agriculture, and intensive agriculture fields. During five months, litterbags of each mesh size were collected once a month per system with five replicates. The remaining mass was measured and decomposition rates calculated. Differences were found for the different biota groups, and they were dependant on soil use. Within systems, the results show that in the naturalized grasslands, the macrofauna had the highest contribution to decomposition. In the recent agricultural system it was the combined activity of the macro and mesofauna, and in the intensive agricultural use it was the mesofauna activity. These results underscore the relative importance and activity of the different groups of the edaphic biota and the effects of different soil uses on soil biota activity.

¹Ricardo A. Castro-Huerta, ¹Liliana B. Falco, ¹Rosana V. Sandler, and ¹Carlos E. Coviella

¹Ecology Laboratory, Terrestrial Ecology Research Program, Basic Sciences Department – Ecology and Sustainable Development Institute, National University of Luján. Av. Constitución y Ruta 5 (6700). Luján, Buenos Aires, Argentina.

Corresponding author:

Eng. Ricardo A. Castro-Huerta
Ecology Laboratory, Terrestrial Ecology Research Program, Basic Sciences Department –National University of Luján.
Av. Constitución y Ruta 5 (6700). Luján, Buenos Aires, Argentina.
+54-2323-420380 #249
Mail: ricardoach@yahoo.com

21 1. Introduction

22 The edaphic biota is the main factor directly responsible for soil organic matter turnover and
 23 nutrient cycling due to the diversity of processes in which it takes part (Lavelle and Spain, 2001;
 24 Lavelle *et al.*, 2006; Brussaard *et al.*, 2007; Culliney, 2013). Among these, the fragmentation and
 25 incorporation of plant residues into the soil; the construction and maintenance of the structural porosity
 26 and soil aggregation, are some of the processes the edaphic biota is involved with that have effects on
 27 other organisms (Lavelle *et al.*, 2006; Culliney, 2013). This way, multiple interactions with other
 28 organisms are developed, on different scales and through the entire range of chemical, physical, and
 29 biological processes that support the ecosystem services provided by the soil (Brussaard *et al.*, 2007;
 30 Culliney, 2013). Lavelle *et al.* (1993) found that the activity of macroorganisms is particularly
 31 important in the regulation of the decomposition process. In particular, these authors state that
 32 interactions between macro and microorganisms are very intense in areas where climate is more or less
 33 constant. In turn, this biological interaction is associated with the energy source, fungi and bacteria
 34 communities, and macroorganisms which create conditions suitable for optimal microbial activity.
 35 When environmental traits like the climate are not limiting (drought or flooding) and clay minerals are
 36 not very reactive (or do not make a significant contact with the biota), the biological regulation systems
 37 take a predominant role in the decomposition of leaf litter (Lavelle *et al.*, 1993; Gonzalez and Seastedt,
 38 2001; Dechaine *et al.*, 2005).

39 Soil fauna largely control the decomposition process through breakdown of litter. digestion, and
 40 stimulation of microorganism activities (Yang and Chen,2009). Their study indicated that soil fauna
 41 assemblage provided a significant contribution to litter decomposition in all three sites of their study
 42 (rainforest, broad-leaf forest and secondary forest), while the contribution of soil fauna to plant litter
 43 decomposition was more pronounced in the rainforest than the other two sites. Fauna effects increased
 44 N concentration and decreased C concentration in litter with high initial C/N ratio, which may explain

the significant fauna effect on litter decomposition in the rain forest. A similar observation regarding the relation C/N was presented by Li et al (2014).

The edaphic biota is classified according to the size of the adults into three groups: the microfauna, the mesofauna, and the macrofauna (Lavelle and Spain, 2001; Eisenbeis, 2006; Lavelle *et al.*, 2006). Each component fulfills a specific role in its specific ecological niche that is hard to replace with other components present in the system (Lavelle *et al.*, 2006) taking part in different processes affecting soil fertility in at least two main ways. Firstly, by promoting decomposition directly through the conversion of plant litter into their own tissues, and indirectly transforming the plant litter physically and chemically into substances amenable to further degradation by microflora. Secondly, by their effects on the physical structure of the soil (Culliney, 2013) that may be affected by agricultural soil use (Baker, 1998; Bardgett and Cook, 1998)

Agroecosystems are continuously under the anthropic impact of different agricultural practices, which causes changes in their biotic and abiotic components both in time and in space. These changes in turn, affect the structure and function of the soil biota (Dominguez *et al.* 2014, Liiri *et al.*, 2012), thus mediating the biological processes in the soil, which affects the flow of matter and energy in the entire system (Lubchenko *et al.*, 1991). Ponge et al.(2013) show that soil animals (except epigeal springtails) and microbial community are adversely affected by the increase in agricultural intensification. The soil fauna responds to the agricultural management as a result of the physico-chemical disturbances that are produced in its habitat, of the distribution of the residues, and of the plant communities present (Lavelle and Spain, 2001; Kautz *et al.*, 2006).

In order to understand in greater detail the role of the different soil fauna groups in the decomposition process, the hierarchical model proposed by Lavelle *et al.* (1993) was followed. To isolate the effects of different agricultural management practices, fields with the same soil and climate in three levels of agricultural use intensity were selected, and factors such as resource quality were

standardized. To assess the different contributions of the soil fauna in the decomposition process the technique of the litterbags (Crossley and Hoglund, 1962) was used.

Three litterbag mesh sizes were used to hierarchically exclude each group of the edaphic biota according to size. Therefore, the contribution of each group to organic matter decomposition was evaluated.

The working hypothesis was that plant litter decomposition rates would differ between the different soil fauna groups, and that those differences would be modulated by the different soil use intensities.

2. Materials and Methods

The study was carried out in the rolling pampas of central Argentina. With over fifty million hectares of agricultural land, it is one of the biggest and most productive plains in the world (Navarrete *et al.*, 2007; Faggi *et al.*, 2008). Three agroecosystem types with different intensities of soil use were selected as treatments. The agroecosystems were located near Chivilcoy city in the Buenos Aires province, Argentina (35°03'00" S; 59°41'00" W) (Fig. 1).

The soil for all treatments was a mollisol from the typical arguidoll group (USDA, 2010). In increasing order of soil use intensity, the selected agroecosystems were: 1- Naturalized grasslands with no anthropic impact in almost 50 years (NG). Natural litter in this agroecosystem was typically from naturally occurring grasses dominated by *Festuca* sp., 2- Cattle-grazing fields turned into agriculture 2 years before the start of the study (RA). Litter in this place was dominated by agricultural species, such as soybean and corn in summer and wheat in winter, and 3- Intensive Agriculture fields with almost 40 years of continuous and intensive agriculture (IA). Litter in this place was dominated by soybean. All the fields were left fallow during the duration of this experiment. The experimental sites ranged in size from 0.5 to 45 hectares.

Five different sites per treatment (soil use intensity) were selected as replicates. At each site,

decomposition bags (20 x 20 cm) were placed with three different mesh sizes for the selective exclusion of the epigeic soil organisms according to size: 4 mm mesh size (Microfauna + Mesofauna + Macrofauna, hereafter Total Biota); 2 mm mesh size for the selective exclusion of the Macrofauna (Microfauna + Mesofauna); and 0.25 mm mesh size to further exclude the Mesofauna (hereafter Microfauna). These different size-excluded groups represent three different complexity groups of the soil biota.

In each bag 5 g of dry, senescent soybean leaves (*Glycine max* L.) were placed. Soybean leaves were used to standardize the litter material offered, because it was the last crop in the agricultural systems, and it has been the most common crop in the region during the last ten years. The senescent leaves were collected in the same field on autumn before harvest and dried at 30 °C. The bags were placed on the surface of the soil and covered lightly with plant residues after harvest to improve the natural decomposition of this crop in the pampas on end-autumn, winter and spring. A total of 270 litterbags were distributed among treatments and replicates, with no more than 10 bags per square meter at any site. The experiment was set to run for six sampling dates, but it was terminated after five months when one of the replicates approached zero RM. Bags were retrieved at 17, 53, 94, 126, and 171 days after the bags were placed. Every sampling date, one bag of each mesh size (3) was retrieved per replicate (5) and agroecosystem (3), thus processing 45 litterbags each sampling date, for a total of 225 litterbags over the 5 sampling dates. The material was then dried at 30 °C to constant weight. The remaining material was weighted and the percentage of remaining mass (%RM) calculated.

With these data, we performed a two-way ANOVA for discriminate the effects of both factors mesh-size and agricultural use, in case of found any difference, the decomposition rate for each case was calculated, assuming a negative exponential model following Olsen (1963):

$$RM = IM * e^{-kt}$$

Where:

RM= Remaining Mass

IM = Initial Mass

t = Time (Days)

k = Decomposition rate

This exponential model was linearized using the natural logarithm of the remaining mass (%RM) and the transformed data were analyzed with ANCOVA to compare the slopes of each case with the Tukey test (HSD) between different cases with a 95% confidence interval.

All the statistical analysis were performed under the R language environment for statistical computing (2010).

3. Results

The results of percentage remaining mass (%RM) found for each edaphic biota group within agricultural systems analyzed by two-way ANOVA can be seen on table 1. Statistical differences were found for the mesh size factor. No differences were found for agricultural use alone, or the interaction between main factors.

These results allow for the analysis of the slopes of the decomposition rates between different mesh sizes within agricultural uses (Figs. 2, 3, and 4). A covariance analysis using the natural logarithm values of the remaining mass (In %RM) measured for the different groups of the soil fauna showed statistically significant differences for the different groups within each soil use (Tukey LSD, $p < 0.05$).

In the less disturbed system, the Naturalized Grassland (Figure 2), the decomposition rate (k) calculated for the Total Biota was significantly higher and different ($p < 0.05$) from the other two groups, with no differences between them. In the Recent Agriculture system (Figure 3), the decomposition rate (k) of the Total Biota was significantly higher than that of the Microfauna alone,

while the Microfauna + Mesofauna group did not differ with the other two groups. In the Intensive Agriculture, the decomposition rate of the Microfauna was significantly lower than the other two groups that did not differ from each other (Figure 4).

When analyzed between systems, the only significant difference found in decomposition rate was for the Microfauna. Decomposition rate for this group was significantly higher in the less disturbed system (NG) when compared to the two agricultural systems (Fig. 5).

Overall, a total of five collembola families, twenty one acari superfamilies and nine earthworm species were identified in all the sampling sites altogether (data not shown).

4. Discussion

In this work, two of the selected agroecosystems had been each under the same use for several decades, while the third system was of intermediate disturbance. It was assumed that by the time of the experiment, the structure and composition of the edaphic fauna in each system was already in equilibrium with the inputs and local use regime of each agroecosystem. Therefore, the results on decomposition rates are proper of the fauna already adapted to each agroecosystem.

In this way, the original edaphic fauna of the region was assumed to be best represented by the edaphic fauna in the NG system. In the intensive agriculture system the original fauna was subjected to decades of strong habitat changes brought about by tillage, fertilizers, pesticides, changes in temperature regime, water availability, and soil structure (Domínguez *et al.*, 2014).

The results show that the relative contribution of each fauna group to decomposition rate is different between systems, which is an indication that the structure and composition of the edaphic fauna is different from one system to another.

In the Naturalized Grasslands, the less anthropized system, the only significant difference was found when the Macrofauna was excluded. This is an indication that it was this group the one that contributed most significantly to decomposition in this system ($k = 0.0074$), since no difference was

found when the Mesofauna was further excluded ($k = 0.0032$) (Fig. 2). In the system with intermediate anthropic impact, Recent Agriculture, the only statistical difference occurred when comparing Total Biota ($k = 0.0088$) with Microfauna alone ($k = 0.001$) (Fig. 3). This result indicates that the most significant contribution to decomposition in this system is the interaction of the Macrofauna with the Mesofauna together. Indeed, no difference was found when only the Macrofauna or only the Mesofauna were excluded. In the Intensive Agriculture system the group that significantly contributed to the decomposition was the Mesofauna because the only significant difference in this agro-ecosystem occurred with its exclusion that lowers the decomposition rate (k) from 0.0086 to 0.0025. (Fig. 4). When examined across systems, only the Microfauna presented significant differences between agroecosystems (Figure 5). This group showed significantly higher decomposition rate in the less impacted system when compared to both intermediate and high anthropic impacts. No significant differences were found between systems for either Total Fauna or Mesofauna + Microfauna groups. This result underscores the sensitivity of the Microfauna to anthropic activities.

Interestingly, and despite what other authors found for similar soils (Dominguez *et al*, 2014), there were no significant differences due to land use intensity alone or its interaction with the edaphic biota. This is consistent with Geissen *et al* (2009), who found that intensive management in Banana fields in Mexico did not differ in litter decomposition rate when compared to successional forests on the same soil.

In interpreting the results presented, it is important to keep in mind that the litterbag system employed and the way they were deployed on the soil surface attract mainly epigeic soil fauna. Therefore, most of the results are relevant mainly to this group.

The results obtained in this work clearly support the working hypothesis. The data show that the different groups of the epigeic soil biota contribute differently to litter decomposition and that this differential contribution is being mediated by the differences in soil use. Interestingly enough, these

groups present complementary activities depending on soil use intensity, since no differences in decomposition rates were found between uses when the decomposition rates of the entire soil biota were compared. However, the contribution of each group of the soil fauna to the total litter decomposition changed across soil uses.

Being the less disturbed system, the Naturalized Grassland is the closest to the original, pristine condition of the soil systems studied. In these conditions, the Macrofauna is the relevant group as reflected by the lowering of the decomposition rate brought about by its selective exclusion with no further effect when the Mesofauna was also excluded. Indeed, results from previous authors (Brussaard *et al.*, 2007; Kampichler and Bruckner, 2009) indicate that in the less disturbed ecosystems, the contribution of the Mesofauna to litter decomposition is only marginal respect to that of the Macrofauna. Those results are in agreement with the ones presented in this work.

In the Recent Agriculture system, of intermediate disturbance, the combined effects of both the Macrofauna and Mesofauna are relevant, since the only significant difference is the result of their exclusion together.

The results from the most disturbed system, the Intensive Agriculture, show the Mesofauna as the relevant group, for the only significant decrease in decomposition rate takes place when this group is excluded. These results are thoroughly consistent with the hierarchical model proposed by Lavelle *et al.* (1993).

When analyzed across systems the results for the Microfauna showed higher decomposition rates for the least anthropized Naturalized Grasslands when compared to both agricultural systems. No differences were found for the Total Fauna or the Macro + Mesofauna across systems. These results suggests a negative effect of the agricultural practices on the Microfauna in particular. This is consistent with previous research showing evidence that agricultural management affects the structure of the microbial community (Wakelin *et al.*, 2009; Zhong *et al.*, 2010). Results by Lavelle *et al.* (2006).

212 It also indicates that this particular group is very sensitive to any disturbance of the soil environment.

213 Despite their recognized importance, the interactions between the different groups of the soil
214 biota are still largely unknown and one of the most studied topics in soil ecology (Hättenschwiler *et al.*,
215 2005; Fitter *et al.*, 2005; Kampichler and Bruckner, 2009; Culliney, 2013). Coûteaux *et al.* (1991) and
216 Bradford *et al.* (2002) found a significant increase in the decomposition rates when these three groups
217 (micro, meso and macrofauna) were found acting together, when compared to less complex soil fauna
218 groups.

219 It was also found that under organic agricultural management, the Mesofauna increases its
220 abundance (Kautz *et al.*, 2006; Peredo *et al.*, 2009) possibly due to the specialization in the
221 consumption of the sources of litter left by crops (Kautz *et al.*, 2006; Milcu *et al.*, 2006). The results
222 presented here also support that assumption.

223 In terrestrial ecosystems, the empirical evidence is scarce but it is known that when a soil
224 community has a high diversity of functional traits, it has effects that facilitate interactions promoting
225 decomposition (Gessner *et al.*, 2010). More evidence from size-exclusion studies is needed in order to
226 thoroughly assess to what extent agricultural practices affect soil fauna diversity (Hättenschwiler *et al.*,
227 2005; Gessner *et al.*, 2010; Culliney, 2013) and to improve agricultural practices for soil biota
228 conservation that ensure decomposition and mineralization processes in agro-ecosystems.

229 The continuous disturbances in the studied agricultural systems could be selectively pressing
230 certain organisms or groups over others. In this way, disturbances would allow for the establishment
231 and development of soil biota adapted to anthropized systems, in detriment of the original soil biota,
232 most likely close to the one in the Naturalized Grassland system.

233 From the results presented here, it can also be concluded that the Microfauna is the most
234 sensitive group to anthropic disturbances, and therefore, it should be the group to be taken particularly
235 into account when devising sustainable agricultural practices.

236 5. Conclusions

237 In conclusion, when looked at them separately the different soil uses studied in this work
 238 strongly modulate the decomposition activity of each group of the soil fauna, even though the total
 239 decomposition rate remains the same for all the studied systems when the whole soil biota is present.
 240 These differences are likely due to changes in the structure and functioning of each one of the faunal
 241 groups of the soil biota studied, brought about by the different soil use intensities.

242 Finally, the results shown in this work point to a replacement of the relative contribution to
 243 decomposition of the different faunal groups as use intensity increases. In the less disturbed
 244 environments, it is the Macrofauna the group contributing the most to decomposition, which is
 245 consistent with the hierarchical model presented by Lavelle *et al.* (1993). As intensity of use increases,
 246 the Mesofauna activity gains in relative importance, being the most important group in the most
 247 disturbed environment.

248

249

250 Acknowledgements:

251 The authors wish to thank Edgardo Ferrari and Pablo Peretto for allowing the use of their
 252 properties as sampling sites. Loreta Gimenez provided great help with the fieldwork and laboratory
 253 analyses. The comments by Dr. Esperanza Huerta and two other anonymous reviewers helped to
 254 greatly improve the final draft of this manuscript.

255

256 Bibliography.

- 257 Baker, G. 1998. Recognising and responding to the influences of agriculture and others land-use practices on
258 soil fauna in Australia. *Appl. Soil Ecol.* 9 :303-310.
- 259 Bardgett, R., Cook, R. 1998. Functional aspects of soil animal diversity in aricultural grasslands. *Appl. Soil*
260 *Ecol.* 10: 263-276.
- 261 Bradford, M., Jones, T., Bardgett, R., Black, H., Boag, B., Bonkowski, M., Cook, R., Eggers, T., Gange, A.,
262 Grayston, S., McCaig, A., Kandeler, E., Newington, J., Prosser, J., Setälä, H., Staddon, P., Tordoff, G.,
263 Tschirko, D. and Lawton, J. 2002. Impacts of soil faunal community composition on model grassland
264 ecosystems. *Science* 298: 615-618.
- 265 Brussaard, L., de Ruiter, P., Brown, G. 2007. Soil biodiversity for agricultural sustainability. *Agric. Ecosyst.*
266 *Environ.* 121: 233-244.
- 267 Coûteaux, M., Mousseau, M., Célrier, L., Bottner, P. 1991. Increased atmospheric CO₂ and litter quality:
268 decomposition of sweet chestnut leaf litter with animal food webs of different complexities. *Oikos* 61:
269 54-64.
- 270 Crossley, Jr. D., Hoglund, M. 1962. A Litter-Bag Method for the Study of Microarthropods Inhabiting Leaf
271 Litter. *Ecology* 43(3): 571-573.
- 272 Culliney, T. 2013. Role of arthropods in maintaining soil fertility. *Agriculture* 3: 629-659.
- 273 Dechaine, J., Ruan, H., Sanchez-De León, Y., Zou, X. 2005. Correlation between earthworms and plant
274 litter decomposition in a tropical wet forest of Puerto Rico. *Pedobiologia* 49: 601-607.
- 275 Domínguez, A., Bedano, J.C., Becker, A.R., Arolfo, R.V. (2014), Organic farming Fosters agroecosystem
276 functioning in Argentinian temperate soils: Evidence from litter decomposition and soil fauna. *Applied*
277 *Soil Ecology*, 83: 170-176.
- 278 Eisenbeis, G. 2006. Biology of soil invertebrates. In: *Soil biology Vol. 6: Intestinal microorganism of soil*
279 *invertebrates*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, pp. 3-53.
- 280 Faggi, A., Krellemberg, K., Castro, R., Arriaga, M., Endlicher, W. 2008. Biodiversity in the argentinean rolling
281 pampa ecoregion: Changes caused by agriculture and urbanisation. In: *Urban Ecology: An international*

- perspective on the interaction between humans and nature. Springer, New York, pp. 377-389.
- Fitter, A., Gilligan, C., Hollingworth, K., Kleczkowski, A., Twyman R., Pitchford, J. 2005. Biodiversity and ecosystem function in soil. *Functional Ecology* 19: 369-377.
- Geissen, V., Peña-Peña, K., Huerta, E. (2009). Effects of different land use on soil chemical properties, decomposition rate and earthworm communities in tropical Mexico. *Pedobiologia*, 53: 75-86.
- Gessner, M., Swan, C., Dang, C., McKie, B., Bardgett, R., Wall, D., Hättenschwiler, S. 2010. Diversity meets decomposition. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 25 (6): 372-380.
- Gonzalez, G., Seastedt, T. 2001. Soil fauna and plant litter decomposition in tropical and subalpine forests. *Ecology* 82:955-964.
- Hättenschwiler, S., Tiunov, A., Scheu, S. 2005. Biodiversity and litter decomposition in terrestrial ecosystems. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst.* 36: 191-218.
- Kampichler, C., Bruckner, A. 2009. The role of microarthropods in terrestrial decomposition: A meta análisis of 40 years of litterbags studies. *Biological Reviews* 84: 375-389.
- Kautz, T., Lopez-Fando, C., Ellmer, F. 2006. Abundance and biodiversity of soil microarthropods as influenced by different types of organic manure in a long-term field experiment in Central Spain. *Appl. Soil Ecol.* 33: 278-285.
- Lavelle, P., Blanchart, E., Martin, A., Martin, S. and Spain, A. 1993. A hierarchical model for decomposition in terrestrial ecosystems: Application to soil of the humid tropics. *Biotropica* 25(2): 130-150.
- Lavelle, P., Spain, A. 2001. *Soil Ecology*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, New York, pp. 25-100.
- Lavelle, P., Decaëns, T., Aubert, M., Barot, S., Blouin, M., Bureau, F., Margerie, P., Mora, P., Rossi, J. 2006. Soil invertebrates and ecosystem services. *Eur. J. Soil Biol.* 42: 3-15.
- Li, X., Yin, X Wang, Z., Fan, W., 2014. Interaction between decomposing litter and soil fauna of the *Betula ermanii* forest floor of the Changbai Mountains, China. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research*, 2014, 44(12): 1507-1514, 10.1139/cjfr-2014-0248

- 308 Liiri, M., Häsä, M., Haimi, j., Setälä, H., 2012. History of land- use intensity can modify the relationship
309 between functional complexity of soil fauna and soil ecosystem services—A microcosm study.
310 *Applied Soil Ecology* 55: 53 – 61.
- 311 Lubchenko, J., Olson, A., Brubaker, L., Carpenter, S., Holland, M., Hubbell, S., Levin, S., Macmahon, J.,
312 Matson, P., Melillo, J., Mooney, H., Peterson, C., Puig, H., Real, L., Regal, P., Risser, P. 1991. The
313 sustainable biosphere initiative: an ecological research agenda. *Ecology* 72: 371-412.
- 314 Milcu, A., Partsch, S., Langel, R., Scheu, S. 2006. The response of decomposers (earthworms, springtails and
315 microorganisms) to variations in species and functional group diversity of plants. *Oikos* 112: 513-524.
- 316 Navarrete M, D Gallopín, G Blanco, M Díaz-Zorita, M Ferraro, D Herzer, H Laterra, P Murmis, G
317 Podestá, J Rabinovich, E Satorre, F Torres, E Viglizzo, (2007) Multi-causal and integrated
318 assessment of sustainability: the case of agriculturization in the argentine pampas.
319 *Environment, Development and Sustainability*. 11(3):621–638.
- 320 Olson J. 1963. Energy stores and the balance of producers and decomposers in ecological systems. *Ecology* 44:
321 322-331.
- 322 Peredo, S., Parada, E., Vega, M., Barrera, C. 2009. Edafic mesofauna community structure in organic and
323 conventional management on cranberry (*Vaccinium* sp.) plantations: An agroecological approach. *J. Soil*
324 *Sci. Plant Nutr.* 9(3): 236-244.
- 325 Ponge, JF., Pérès, G., Guernion, M., Ruiz-Camacho, N., Cortet, J., Pernin, C., Vllanave, C., Chaussod,
326 R., Martin-Laurent, F., Bispo, A., Cluzeau, D., 2013. The impact of agricultural practices on
327 soil biota: A regional study. *Soil Biology & Biochemistry* 67: 271 – 284.
- 328 R Development Core Team, 2010. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for
329 Statistical Computing, Viena,. ISBN 3-900051-07-0, URL <http://www.R-project.org>
- 330 Soil Survey Staff. 2010. Keys to soil taxonomy. 11th ed. USDA–NRCS, Washington, DC.
- 331 Wakelin, S., Gregg, A., Simpson, R., Li, G., Riley, I., McKayd, A. 2009. Pasture management clearly affects
332 soil microbial community structure and N-cycling bacteria. *Pedobiologia* 52: 237-251.

333 Yang, X., Chen,J.,2009. Plant litter quality influences the contribution of soil fauna to litter
 334 decomposition in humid tropical forests, southwestern China. *Soil Biology & Biochemistry* 41: 910–
 335 918

336 Zhong, W., Gu, T., Wang, W., Zhang, B., Lin, X., Huang, Q., Shen, A. 2010. The effects of mineral fertilizer
 337 and organic manure on soil microbial community and diversity. *Plant Soil* 326: 511-522.

338

339

Table 1 (on next page)

ANOVA Table

Two-way ANOVA for Mesh size, Agricultural use and the interaction. No significant interaction or effect of agricultural use, mesh size is the main significant effect found.

2
3

Two-Way ANOVA	SS	DF	MS	F	p-value
Intercept	4,758.675	1	4,758.675	19,980.80	0.000000
Agricultural use	0.682	2	0.341	1.43	0.240816
Mesh-size	6.427	2	3.214	13.49	0.000003
Agr-use * Mesh-size	0.685	4	0.171	0.72	0.579533
Error	62.160	261	0.238		

1

Sampling location

Map showing the location of the sampling sites

2

Remaining mass for the Naturalized grasslands system

Results for remaining mass (%) found for the Naturalized Grassland. A significant reduction in decomposition rate occurs when the Macrofauna is excluded. Negative exponential curve and R² values are shown for each fauna group. Decomposition rate (k) corresponds to the loss of mass per day. Different letters indicate significant differences (ln MR%) through covariance analysis contrasted with Tukey HSD test ($\alpha < 0,05$).

Naturalized Grassland

3

Remaining mass for the Recent agriculture system

Results for remaining mass (%) found for the Recent Agriculture. Significant reduction in decomposition rate occurs when both Macro and Mesofauna are excluded together. Data shown as in figure 2.

Recent Agriculture

4

Remaining mass for the Intensive agriculture system.

Results for remaining mass (%) found for the Intensive Agriculture. Significant decrease in decomposition rate occurs when the Mesofauna is excluded. Data shown as in figure 2.

Intensive Agriculture

5

Remaining mass results for the Microfauna

Results for remaining mass (%) found for the Microfauna when compared across treatments; Decomposition rate due to Microfauna activity is higher in the less anthropized system when compared to both agricultural ones. No significant differences were found for the macro or the Mesofauna across systems. Data shown as in figure 2.