



Smith, P., Cotrufo, M. F., Rumpel, C., Paustian, K., J. Kuikman, P., A. Elliott, J., ... C. Scholes, M. (2015). Biogeochemical cycles and biodiversity as key drivers of ecosystem services provided by soils. *Soil Discussions*, 2, 537-586. 10.5194/soild-2-537-2015

Peer reviewed version

Link to published version (if available):
[10.5194/soild-2-537-2015](https://doi.org/10.5194/soild-2-537-2015)

[Link to publication record in Explore Bristol Research](#)
PDF-document

University of Bristol - Explore Bristol Research

General rights

This document is made available in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite only the published version using the reference above. Full terms of use are available:
<http://www.bristol.ac.uk/pure/about/ebr-terms.html>

Take down policy

Explore Bristol Research is a digital archive and the intention is that deposited content should not be removed. However, if you believe that this version of the work breaches copyright law please contact open-access@bristol.ac.uk and include the following information in your message:

- Your contact details
- Bibliographic details for the item, including a URL
- An outline of the nature of the complaint

On receipt of your message the Open Access Team will immediately investigate your claim, make an initial judgement of the validity of the claim and, where appropriate, withdraw the item in question from public view.

Abstract

Soils play a pivotal role in major global biogeochemical cycles (carbon, nutrient and water), while hosting the largest diversity of organisms on land. Because of this, soils deliver fundamental ecosystem services, and management to change a soil process in support of one ecosystem service can either provide co-benefits to other services or can result in trade-offs. In this critical review, we report the state-of-the-art understanding concerning the biogeochemical cycles and biodiversity in soil, and relate these to the provisioning, regulating, supporting and cultural ecosystem services which they underpin. We then outline key knowledge gaps and research challenges, before providing recommendations for management activities to support the continued delivery of ecosystem services from soils.

We conclude that although there are knowledge gaps that require further research, enough is known to start improving soils globally. The main challenge is in finding ways to share knowledge with soil managers and policy-makers, so that best-practice management can be implemented. A key element of this knowledge sharing must be in raising awareness of the multiple ecosystem services underpinned by soils, and the natural capital they provide. The International Year of Soils in 2015 presents the perfect opportunity to begin a step-change in how we harness scientific knowledge to bring about more sustainable use of soils for a secure global society.

1 Introduction

Soils play a critical role in delivering a variety of ecosystem services (Scholes and Scholes, 2013). Management aimed at improving a particular ecosystem service can either provide co-benefits to other services or can result in trade-offs (Robinson et al., 2013). Examples of some of the synergies and trade-offs (Smith et al., 2013) and the role of soils in supporting ecosystem services, and their role in underpinning natural capital (Dominati et al., 2010; Robinson et al., 2009, 2014) have recently been re-

SOILD

2, 537–586, 2015

Biogeochemistry, biodiversity and soil ecosystem services

P. Smith et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



SOILD

2, 537–586, 2015

Biogeochemistry, biodiversity and soil ecosystem services

P. Smith et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



and spices); raw materials (including timber, pulp, skins, animal and vegetable fibres, organic matter, fodder, and fertilizer); genetic resources (including genes for crop improvement and health care); freshwater; minerals; medicinal resources (including pharmaceuticals, chemical models, and test and assay organisms); energy (hydropower, biomass feedstocks including biofuels, wood and charcoal,); and ornamental resources (including fashion, handicraft, jewellery, pets, worship, decoration and souvenirs like furs, feathers, ivory, orchids, butterflies, aquarium fish, shells, etc.).

Regulating services are “Benefits obtained from the regulation of ecosystem processes” and include: carbon sequestration and climate regulation; waste decomposition and detoxification; pollutant immobilization and detoxification; purification of water and air; regulation of water flow (including flood alleviation); and pest and disease control.

Supporting services are “Ecosystem services that are necessary for the production of all other ecosystem services” and include: soil formation; nutrient cycling; water cycling, primary production and habitat for biodiversity.

Cultural services are “Nonmaterial benefits people obtain from ecosystems through spiritual enrichment, cognitive development, reflection, recreation, and aesthetic experiences” and include: cultural (including use of nature as motif in books, film, painting, folklore, national symbols, architectural, advertising, etc.); spiritual and historical (including use of nature for religious or heritage value or sense of place); recreational experiences (including ecotourism, outdoor sports, and recreation); science and education (including use of natural systems for school excursions, and scientific discovery).

Figure 1 summarises the ecosystem services underpinned by soils. In the following sections, we examine the state-of-the-art understanding of carbon, nutrient and water cycles and biodiversity in soils, and show how these underpin the provisioning, regulating, supporting and cultural ecosystem services described above. We then discuss the knowledge gaps across all of these areas, recommend key foci for future research, and present recommendations for policies to support the continued delivery of these ecosystem services from soils.

2 Soils and the Carbon cycle

2.1 Soil C stocks

Carbon (C) storage is an important ecosystem function of soils that has gained increasing attention in recent years. Changes in soil C impacts on, and feedbacks with, the Earth's climate system through emissions of CO₂ and CH₄, and storage of carbon removed from the atmosphere during photosynthesis (climate regulation). Soil organic matter itself also confers multiple benefits for human society e.g. enhancing water purification and water holding capacity, protecting against erosion risk, and enhancing food and fibre provision through improved soil fertility (Pan et al., 2013, 2014).

Soil is an important C reservoir that contains more C (at least 1500–2400 PgC) than the atmosphere (590 PgC) and terrestrial vegetation (350–550 PgC), combined (Schlesinger and Bernhardt, 2013; Ciais et al., 2013), and an increase in soil C storage can reduce atmospheric CO₂ concentrations (Whitmore et al., 2014). All three reservoirs of C are in constant exchange but with various turnover times, with soil as the largest active terrestrial reservoir in the global C cycle (Lal, 2008). Carbon storage in soils occur both in organic and inorganic form. Organic C stocks in the world's soils have been estimated to comprise 1500 Pg of C to 1 m depth and 2500 Pg to 2 m (Batjes, 1996). Recent studies showed that the soil C pool to 1 m depth may be even greater and could account for as much as 2000 Pg. These higher values are mainly based on increased estimates of the C stored in boreal soils under permafrost conditions (Tarnocai et al., 2009), in which decomposition is inhibited by low temperature, and lack of oxygen and low pH in waterlogged soils (e.g. peats; Smith et al., 2010). Although the highest C concentrations are found in the top 30 cm of soil, the major proportion of total C stock is present below 30 cm depth (Batjes, 1996). In the northern circumpolar permafrost region, at least 61 % of the total soil C is stored below 30 cm depth (Tarnocai et al., 2009). Peatlands are particularly important component of the global soil carbon store, covering only 3 % of the land area, but containing around

SOILD

2, 537–586, 2015

Biogeochemistry, biodiversity and soil ecosystem services

P. Smith et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



500 PgC in organic rich deposits ranging from 0.5 m up to 8 m deep (Gorham, 1991; Yu, 2012).

In arid and semi-arid soils, significant inorganic C can be present as carbonate minerals (typically Ca / MgCO₃, called “calcrete” or “caliche” in various parts of the world), formed from the reaction of biocarbonate (derived from CO₂ in the soil) with free base cations, which can then be precipitated in subsoil layers (Nordt et al., 2000). Also soils derived from carbonate-containing parent material (e.g. limestone) can have significant amounts of inorganic C. The inorganic C pool globally is large, estimated to be ~ 750 PgC to a depth of 1 m (Batjes, 1996). However, in most cases, changes in inorganic C stocks are slow and not amenable to traditional soil management practices, and do not play a significant role in terms of most ecosystem services (though a major exception is the geoengineering proposal to add finely-ground silicate minerals to soils, which will then weather to carbonates, taking up CO₂ in the process; Köhler et al., 2010). Thus, further discussion of soil C in this review will focus on soil organic C.

The net balance of soil C depends on the C inputs to soils relative to C losses. Losses can occur via mineralization (i.e. decomposition), leaching of dissolved C and carbonate weathering (Smith, 2012; Schlesinger and Bernhardt, 2013). Thus the soil organic C stock may either increase or decrease in response to changes in climate and land use practices. Furthermore, rates of SOC stock change in different parts of the profile can vary for different soils and types of perturbation, because some portion of the C stored in soil mainly in top soil turns over rapidly, while other soil C fractions in particular mineral associated C and subsoil C can have a long residence time, on the order of centuries or millennia (von Lützow et al., 2008; Rumpel and Kögel-Knabner, 2011). The accumulation of stabilised C with long residence times in deep soil horizons may be due to continuous transport, temporary immobilisation and microbial processing of dissolved organic matter within the soil profile (Kalbitz and Kaiser, 2012) and/or efficient stabilisation of root-derived organic matter within the soil matrix (Rasse et al., 2005). The process of soil formation – i.e. the development of depth, horizons and specific properties - is itself a supporting service.

**Biogeochemistry,
biodiversity and soil
ecosystem services**

P. Smith et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



SOILD

2, 537–586, 2015

**Biogeochemistry,
biodiversity and soil
ecosystem services**

P. Smith et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



In many regions of the world SOM accumulates because of inhibition of microbial SOM decomposition, due to cold, dry or anoxic conditions (Trumbore, 2009). In general, when water is not limiting, higher soil temperatures increase the rate of microbial decomposition of organic matter. Thus soil temperature is a major control of SOM storage in soil C cycle models (Peltoniemi et al., 2007). The temperature sensitivity of SOM decomposition is not, however, as straight-forward as represented in most models, but varies between the many different forms of chemical and physical protection of organic matter in soil (Conant et al., 2011; Zheng et al., 2012). Water influences soil C storage through several processes. Moist, but well-aerated, soils are optimal for microbial activity and decomposition rates decrease as soils become drier. However, flooded (saturated) soils have lower rates of organic matter decay due to restricted aeration and thus often have very high amounts of soil C (e.g. peat soils). High precipitation may also lead to C transport down the soil profile as dissolved and/or particulate organic matter, as well as lateral transport through soil erosion and deposition. During dry periods, SOM decomposition is decreased, but after rewetting there may be an accelerated pulse of CO₂ emission in aerobic soils (Borken and Matzner, 2008), whereas drought and lowering water tables may increase decomposition in naturally anaerobic peats (Freeman et al, 2001; Clark et al., 2012). However, the effect of drought is not only direct via soil microbial activity. There are feedback loops concerning drought and C storage via plant activities, such as litter input and rhizodeposition. Drought was found to affect plant litter composition (Sanaullah et al., 2014), plant C flow and root exudation (Sanaullah et al., 2012), as well as the resulting enzyme activities in the rhizosphere (Sanaullah et al., 2011).

C cycling in soils is strongly linked to the cycling of N and P. Since the C : N : P stoichiometry in SOM is generally lower than in plant material – i.e. there is more N and P per unit C – C generally accumulates in aerobic soil where nutrients are not limiting (Alberti et al., 2014). Nevertheless, increase in organic C is often accompanied by increased N resource use efficiency in croplands (Pan et al., 2009), especially when SOC is increased with biochar (Huang, et al., 2013). In nutrient limited peatlands, in-

**Biogeochemistry,
biodiversity and soil
ecosystem services**

P. Smith et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



puts of nitrogen and/or phosphorus within the tolerance levels of sensitive plant species have increased rates of carbon accumulation (Aerts et al., 1992; Turunen et al., 2004; Olid et al., 2014). The relationship between nutrients and C cycling is not straight forward, since nutrients are also needed by soil microbes to degrade SOM. Thus nutrient addition can either decrease or increase C storage, depending on the initial SOM stoichiometry, the ability of the soil minerals to stabilize microbial products of decomposition and the simultaneous effects on plant productivity and organic matter inputs to soils.

The amount and type of clay particles (and to a lesser extent silt particles) are the major factor controlling the quantity and composition of soil C (Sollins et al., 1996; von Lützow et al., 2006). Clays are mainly sheet-like crystals of silicon and aluminium, known as phyllosilicates, often located as skins coating soil aggregates. In clay-rich soils, higher organic matter content and a greater concentration of O-alkyl C derived from polysaccharides may be expected compared to sandy soil, which are characterised by lower C contents and high concentrations of alkyl C (Rumpel and Kögel-Knabner, 2011). Aliphatic material may be responsible for the hydrophobicity of soils, which can lead to reduced microbial accessibility and therefore increased C storage (Lorenz et al., 2007). Many of the OM-matrix interactions are driven by expandable and non-expandable phyllosilicates, which interact with organic compounds through their large surface areas, micro pores and micro aggregation, particularly in acid soils. By contrast, in neutral and calcareous soils, polyvalent cations (especially Ca^{2+}) predominate in the interaction mechanism, forming bridges between the largely negatively charged SOM and negatively charged phyllosilicates (Cotrufo et al., 2013). Short order silicates, like allophane, provide some of the strongest organo-mineral interactions and stabilize both proteins and carbohydrate monomers, though their occurrence is much more geographically restricted (Buurman et al., 2007; Dümig et al., 2012; Mikutta and Kaiser 2011). In rice paddies, iron oxyhydrates usually act as coating of soil mineral particles and stabilize carbon, contributing to a higher C storage and stability than in iron-poor soils (Song et al., 2012).

support food production. Table 1 summarises management actions affecting the soil carbon cycle and their impacts on ecosystem services.

3 Soils and nutrient cycles

Soils support primary production among other services, which in turn delivers the provisioning services of food and fibre production. As such, soils are vital to humanity since they provide essential nutrients, such as nitrogen (N), phosphorous (P) and potassium (K) and many trace elements that support biomass production, which is essential for supply of human and animal food, for energy and fibre production and as a (future) feedstock for the chemical industry. Since the 1950s, higher biomass production and yield increases have been supported through fertilizers derived from mined minerals or industrially synthesised (Fig. 2). Intensification of agricultural practices and land use has in many regions resulted in a decline in the content of organic matter in agricultural, arable soils (Matson et al., 1997). In some areas, extensive use of mineral fertilizers has led to atmospheric pollution, greenhouse gas emissions (e.g. N₂O, very important for climate regulation), water eutrophication, and human health risks (Galloway et al., 2008), thereby negatively affecting the regulating services of soil, air and water quality (Smith et al., 2013). During the 21st century, it is likely that the human population and demand for food, feed and energy will rise. In order to sustain biomass production in the future, and to avoid negative environmental impacts, fertile soils need to be preserved and soil fertility needs to be restored where lost. This can be done through both the recycling and accumulation of sufficient amounts of organic matter in soils (Janzen, 2006), through a combination of plant production and targeted additions of organic and mineral amendments to soils (see Sect. 2).

The soil function “fertility” refers to the ability of soil to support and sustain plant growth; which relates to making available N, P, other nutrients, water and oxygen for root uptake in the amounts and proportions needed, when they are needed. This is facilitated by (i) their storage and buffering in soil organic matter, (ii) nutrient recycling

Biogeochemistry, biodiversity and soil ecosystem services

P. Smith et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



SOILD

2, 537–586, 2015

Biogeochemistry, biodiversity and soil ecosystem services

P. Smith et al.

[Title Page](#)[Abstract](#)[Introduction](#)[Conclusions](#)[References](#)[Tables](#)[Figures](#)[Back](#)[Close](#)[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)

tion on land (Vitousek and Mason, 1993; Erisman et al., 2008). However, since mineral fertilizer use efficiency is generally low, and fertilizers are generally applied substantially in excess of plant demand, a high percentage of N fertilizer is lost from the soil. This phenomenon is spread over most of the globe. However, in some regions of the world, in particular in Sub-Saharan Africa where economic constraints limit the use of fertilizers, productivity is still strongly limited by soil available N and other nutrients, notably P and K (N and P; Fig. 3).

Phosphorus derived from parent material, though weathering, cycles internally in the plant-soil system between biochemical molecules (e.g. nucleic acid, phospholipids, etc.) and mineral forms after decomposition (e.g. H_3PO_4). In soils, P is among the most limiting of nutrients, since it occurs in small amounts and is only available to plants in its dissolved ionic forms, which promptly react with calcium, iron and aluminium cations to form highly insoluble compounds. Largely in these forms, P is lost to the aquatic system through erosion and surface runoff. Losses may also occur in dissolved form, for instance via sub-surface flow and groundwater (McDowell et al., 2015). An important form of loss is in the export of organic P in agricultural products. Due to widespread agricultural P deficiencies, humans started to mine “primary” P from guano or rock phosphate deposits and added it to soils in the form of mineral fertilizer (Fig. 2). This external input has led to positive agronomic P balances (McDonald et al., 2011) and excesses of P and N in many regions (West et al., 2014; Fig. 3). There are large variations across the world, with high surpluses in the USA, Europe and Asia, and deficits in Russia, Africa and South-America (Fig. 3). Since plant P uptake is a relatively inefficient process with roughly 60% of the total P input to soils not taken up in the short term, a threefold increase in the export of P to water bodies has been estimated, with significant impacts on water quality (Bennett et al., 2001).

Clearly, management practices need to be implemented that sustain, restore or increase soil fertility and biomass production by promoting the accrual of SOM and nutrient recycling, applying balanced C amendments and fertilization of N, P and other nutrients to meet plant and soil requirements, while limiting the addition of excess fer-

Biogeochemistry, biodiversity and soil ecosystem services

P. Smith et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



tilizer and retaining nutrients in the soil-plant system. Carbon, N and P cycling in soils is coupled by tight stoichiometric relationships (e.g. relatively fixed C:N:P in plants and microorganisms; Gusewell, 2004), thus their management needs to be studied in concert. Nutrient management has been extensively studied, with the aim of identifying and proposing management practices (e.g. precision agriculture) that improve nutrient use efficiency and productivity, and reduce potentially harmful losses to the environment (van Groenigen et al., 2010; Venterea et al., 2011). Yet, our ability to predict the ecosystem response to balanced fertilization is still limited, and effectiveness and reliability would benefit from continued monitoring of efforts. Further benefits are anticipated from improved plant varieties with root morphologies that have better capacity to extract P from soils or use it more efficiently, perhaps in concert with mycorrhizal symbionts. Fertilization with nutrients other than N and P has been less well explored within the realm of understanding soil organic matter responses to agricultural C inputs and the potential to restore and increase soil organic matter (e.g. Lugato et al., 2006). Hence, we stress the importance of an integrated approach to nutrient management, which supports plant productivity while preserving or enhancing SOM stocks, and reducing nutrient losses to the atmosphere or water resources. Several issues exist where prediction and optimization of performance would benefit from relevant and continued data acquisition for the range of climate and environmental and agro-ecological conditions. Table 2 summarises some management actions affecting soil nutrient cycles and their impacts on ecosystem services.

4 Soils and the water cycle

Soils provide important ecosystem services through their control on the water cycle. These services include provisioning services of food and water security, regulating services associated with moderation and purification of water flows, and cultural services such as landscapes and water bodies that meet recreation and aesthetic values (Dymond, 2014). At the pedon to hillslope scale, water stored in soil is used for evapo-

SOILD

2, 537–586, 2015

Biogeochemistry, biodiversity and soil ecosystem services

P. Smith et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



transpiration and plant growth that supplies food, stabilizes the land surface to prevent erosion and regulates nutrient and contaminant flow. At a catchment and basin scale, the capacity of the soil to infiltrate water attenuates stream and river flows and can prevent flooding, while water that percolates through soil can replenish groundwater that can maintain water supplies and sustain surface water ecosystems while promoting a continued flow during periods of reduced precipitation.

The soil functions of accepting, storing, transmitting and cleaning of water shown in Table 3 are inter-related. Soil water storage depends on the rate of infiltration into the soil relative to the rate of precipitation. Soil hydraulic conductivity redistributes water within and through the soil profile. The infiltration rate and hydraulic conductivity both depend on the water stored in the soil. The initially high rate of infiltration into dry soil declines as the soil water content increases and water replaces air in the pore space. Conversely, hydraulic conductivity increases with soil moisture content as a greater proportion of the pores are transmitting water. Water content and transmission times are also important to the filtering function of soil because contact with soil surfaces and residence time in soil are important controls on contaminant supply and removal.

The quantity of water which a soil can store depends on the thickness of the soil layer, its porosity and soil matrix-water physical interactions. The latter are expressed as a water retention curve, the relationship between the soil water content and the forces holding it in place. The porosity and water retention curve are in turn influenced primarily by the particle size distribution and the soil bulk density, but also the amount of SOM and the macropores created by biotic activity.

Optimum growth of most plants occurs when roots can access both oxygen and water in the soil. The soil must therefore infiltrate water, drain quickly from saturation to allow air to reach plant roots, and retain and redistribute water for plant use. An ideal soil for plant production depends on the climatic conditions. Soil structural stability and porosity are also important for the infiltration of water into soil. In addition to soil texture, organic matter improves soil aggregate stability. While plant growth and surface mulches can help protect the soil surface, a stable, well-aggregated soil struc-

6 Knowledge gaps and research needs concerning soil carbon, nutrient and water cycles, and the role of soil biodiversity

6.1 Soil carbon cycle

Substantial progress has been made in recent years towards more fundamental understanding of the processes controlling soil C storage and in improving and deploying predictive models of soil C dynamics that can guide decision makers and inform policy. However, it is equally true that many new (and some old) gaps in our knowledge have been identified and research needs articulation. New research on soil C dynamics has been driven in part by increasing awareness of (1) the importance of small scale variability for microbial C turnover (Vogel et al., 2014), (2) interactions between the C cycle with other biogeochemical cycles (Gårdenäs et al., 2011) and (3) the importance of soil C, not only at the field scale, but at regional to global scales (Todd-Brown et al., 2013). The most cited gaps in basic knowledge include plant effects on SOM storage and turnover, controls on microbial efficiency of organic matter processing, including biodiversity, association/separation of organic matter and decomposing microbial communities in the mineral soil matrix (Bardgett et al., 2008), role of soil fauna in controlling carbon storage and cycling, dynamics of dissolved organic carbon and its role in determining C storage and decomposition (Moore et al., 2013; Butman et al., 2014), black C stabilization and interactions of black C including biochar with native soil C and mineral nutrients, and the role of soil erosion in the global C cycle (Quinton et al., 2010). For predictive modelling and assessment, most frequently cited knowledge gaps are: closer correspondence of measured and modelled SOM fractions (Zimmermann et al., 2007), improved modelling of C in subsurface soil layers, distributed soil C observational and monitoring networks for model validation, more realistic and spatially-resolved representation of soil C in global-scale models, and the response to climatic extremes (Reichstein et al., 2013).

SOILD

2, 537–586, 2015

Biogeochemistry, biodiversity and soil ecosystem services

P. Smith et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



6.2 Soil nutrient cycles

In the second half of the 20th century, higher biomass yields were supported by higher use of fertilizer (N, P) inputs. Today, at the beginning of the 21st century, this is not considered sustainable. Alternatives are needed that will use inherent soil fertility and improved resource use efficiencies, and to prevent losses of N and P. Examples in agriculture include ecological intensification and new crop varieties with improved ability to extract P and use from soils. At the food system level, more effective nutrient management would benefit from a focus on a “5R strategy”: (1) re-align P and N inputs, (2) re-duce P and N losses to minimize eutrophication impacts, (3) re-cycle the P and N in bio – resources, (4) re-cover P (and N) from wastes into fertilizer, and (5) re-define use and use-efficiency of N and P in the food chain including diets and regional and spatial variability (e.g. Snyder et al., 2014).

6.3 Soil water

The soil management practices that maintain the ecosystem services of food and water provision, flow regulation, water purification, and aesthetic value within the soil and water cycle are well known. However, their application is not universal and poor management leads to a loss of function. Under scenarios of increased climatic variability with more extremes of precipitation and increased severity of droughts, soil functions will be stressed and the level of good soil management will be required to improve (Walthall et al., 2012). Research into these interactions, and future-proofing of current good practice is required.

6.4 Soil biota

Despite recent advances in knowledge regarding stocks and changes in soil biodiversity, global scale syntheses is still largely absent. Indeed many of these highly pertinent issues were raised more than 20 years ago (Furusaka, 1993), and to date none

SOILD

2, 537–586, 2015

Biogeochemistry, biodiversity and soil ecosystem services

P. Smith et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



Biogeochemistry, biodiversity and soil ecosystem services

P. Smith et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



the best management system for a range of other ecosystem services, potentially adversely affecting supporting services (e.g. soil formation through erosion), regulating services (e.g. climate regulation through greenhouse gas emissions; air, water and soil quality through leaching of agrochemicals; pollination through adverse impacts on pollinators) and cultural services (e.g. reduced aesthetic value of the landscape through large scale monoculture; Smith et al., 2013). Balancing the trade-offs between different ecosystems services is, therefore, more difficult than designing management strategies that support soil C, nutrients, water and biota. Tables 1, 2, 4 and 5 present some examples of management activities that affect a range of soil functions, and a number of beneficial management actions occur in most/all of the tables. The most important of these beneficial management activities are described below.

7.1 Land cover and use change

A number of meta-analyses (Wei et al., 2014; Guo and Gifford, 2002; Don et al., 2011) show that natural systems lose carbon when converted to agriculture, with the exception of forest to pasture conversion where some studies indicate carbon gain (Guo and Gifford, 2002) while others indicate carbon loss (Don et al., 2011). Given the link between organic matter and soil carbon, nutrients, water and biota, conversion of natural systems to agriculture is likely to adversely impact all of these factors. Protection of natural ecosystems, therefore, benefits soil carbon, nutrients, water and biota. Rewilding of surplus agricultural land would be expected to enhance soil carbon, nutrients, water and biota, as seen in set-aside or reforestation of former cropland (Don et al., 2011). In the absence of land cover/land use change, improved management of agricultural soils can improve soil carbon, nutrient, water and biota, as described below.

7.2 Improved agricultural management

Reducing soil disturbance (e.g. through reduced or zero-tillage) can increase SOC stocks (West and Post, 2002; Ogle et al., 2005), though the C benefits of no-till may

SOILD

2, 537–586, 2015

Biogeochemistry, biodiversity and soil ecosystem services

P. Smith et al.

[Title Page](#)[Abstract](#)[Introduction](#)[Conclusions](#)[References](#)[Tables](#)[Figures](#)[Back](#)[Close](#)[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)

be limited to the top 30 cm of soil and some authors argue that the C benefits have been over-stated (Powlson et al., 2014). Baker et al., (2006) found similar soil C in conventional and no-till systems, suggesting that C accumulation is occurring at different depths in the soil profile under different management schemes. Given the tight coupling of soil C and N, increased organic matter also tends to increase nutrient supply, and also enhances water holding capacity (Lal, 2004), and can increase soil biota. Zero tillage also gives rise to greater earthworm and arthropod populations (House and Parmelee, 1985). Perennial crops also reduce the need for annual tillage, and can provide similar benefits. Cultivation of perennial plants with improved rooting systems are likely to increase soil C stocks in C depleted subsoil horizons (Kell, 2012). Land-use change, such as removal of perennial plants and subsequent cultivation, were found to affect both short-lived and long-lived C pools (Beniston et al., 2014).

Maintaining ground cover through improved residue management and use of cover crops during traditional bare fallow periods helps to improve C returns to the soil, prevent erosion and surface sealing, maintain soil nutrients and supports an active level of soil biota (Lal, 1997). Similar benefits can be achieved through well designed rotations and use of perennial crops or agroforestry (e.g. Mbow et al., 2014).

Use of organic amendments increases SOM content (Lal, 2004; Smith, 2012; Gattinger et al., 2012), which, as described above benefits soil C, nutrients, water and biota. Organic amendments traditionally include crop residues, animal manures, slurries and composts. These organic matter additions were found to improve C storage and other regulating ecosystem services if repeated regularly. Recent developments, such as the use of biochar or hydrochar from the pyrolysis or hydrothermal carbonization of crop residues or other biomass, can increase SOC stocks and can also reduce soil N₂O emissions and enhance soil fertility (Zhang et al., 2010), which could be effective over multiple years (Liu et al., 2014). However, the properties of these materials and their net effect on ecosystem services, is strongly dependent on production conditions (Wiedner et al., 2013; Naisse et al., 2015). Soil amendment with compost and biochar or their mixture may be particularly useful for increasing the regulating and

decrease the ability of these soils to carry out services like water purification (e.g. through denitrification). Drainage of peatlands has been associated with increased runoff and flood risk (Ballard et al., 2012). In terms of biodiversity, productivity of drained marginal lands can increase at the expense of plant genetic diversity.

5 *Improved grazing management* (e.g. optimised stocking density) can reduce soil degradation, and thereby maintain and enhance organic matter content (McSherry and Ritchie, 2013) benefiting soil C, nutrients, water and biota as described above. Higher productivity and deep rooted grasses can do similarly (Kell, 2012), while also modifying water use efficiency, but potentially at the expense of plant genetic diversity.
10 Reduction in grazing density can reduce soil compaction, and therefore increase infiltration and water storage and reduce risk of runoff and flooding downstream (Marshall et al., 2009). Fire management can also increase soil C and nutrient status of soils (e.g. Certini, 2005).

8 Conclusions

15 Many practices are known to enhance all or most of the functions of soils considered in this review is encouraging for our efforts to protect soils into the future. There are still knowledge gaps (outlined in Sect. 6), and fundamental research is still needed to better understand the relationships between different facets of soils and the array of ecosystem services they underpin, but we know enough to start to make a difference now. Despite a growing population and increasing demands for resources, enough is
20 known to discriminate the extremes of beneficial and detrimental agricultural practices, and their interactions with different types of soils. However, more knowledge is required on where specific agricultural systems are best placed to utilise and deliver ecosystem services most efficiency, to protect and enhance our soils in the long-term. A significant challenge is to find effective ways to share this knowledge with soil managers
25 and policy makers, so that best management can be implemented. A key element of this knowledge exchange must be in raising awareness of the ecosystems services

SOILD

2, 537–586, 2015

Biogeochemistry, biodiversity and soil ecosystem services

P. Smith et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



underpinned by soils, and thus the natural capital they provide (Robinson et al., 2013). The International Year of Soils in 2015 presents the perfect opportunity to begin this process.

Acknowledgements. The input from P. Smith and P. J. Kuikman contributes to the EU-funded FP7 project, SmartSOIL (Grant Agreement no. 289694). The input from P. C. West and J. S. Gerber was supported by the Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation. Input from G. Pan was supported by funding from the Priority Academic Program Development of Jiangsu Higher Education Institutions, China. J. I. House was funded by a Leverhulme early career research fellowship.

References

- Aerts, R., Wallen, B., and Malmer, N.: Growth-limiting nutrients in sphagnum-dominated bogs subject to low and high atmospheric nitrogen supply, *J. Ecol.*, 80, 131–140, 1992.
- Alberti, G., Vicca, S., Inghima, I., Beilelli-Marchesini, L., Genesisio, L., Miglietta, F., Marjanovic, H., Martinez, C., Matteucci, G., D'Andrea E., Peressotti, A., Petrella, F., Rodeghiero, M., and Cotrufo, M. F.: Soil C:N stoichiometry controls carbon sink partitioning between above-ground tree biomass and soil organic matter in high fertility forests, *iForest*, 8, 195–206, doi:10.3832/ifor1196-008, 2014.
- Allison, S. D. and Martiny, J. B. H.: Resistance, resilience, and redundancy in microbial communities, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*, 105, 11512–11519, 2008.
- Averill, C., Turner, B. L., and Finzi, A. C.: Mycorrhiza-mediated competition between plants and decomposers drives soil carbon storage, *Nature*, 505, 543–545, 2014.
- Baker, J. M., Ochsner, T. E., Venterea, R. T., and Griffis, T. J.: Tillage and soil carbon sequestration – What do we really know?, *Agric. Ecosyst. Env.*, 118, 1–5, 2006.
- Ballard, C. E., McIntyre, N., and Wheeler, H. S.: Effects of peatland drainage management on peak flows, *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci.*, 16, 2299–2310, doi:10.5194/hess-16-2299-2012, 2012.
- Bardgett, R. D., Freeman, C., and Ostle, N. J. Microbial contributions to climate change through carbon cycle feedbacks, *ISME J.*, 2, 805–814, 2008.
- Batjes, N. H.: Total carbon and nitrogen in the soils of the world, *Eur. J. Soil Sci.*, 47, 151–163, 1996.

Biogeochemistry, biodiversity and soil ecosystem services

P. Smith et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



Biogeochemistry, biodiversity and soil ecosystem services

P. Smith et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



- Ciais, P. and Sabine, C.: Carbon and other biogeochemical cycles, in: *Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis, Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, edited by: Edenhofer, O., Pichs-Madruga, R., and Sokonaet, Y., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, 2013.
- Clark, J. M., Heinemeyer, A., Martin, P., and Bottrell, S. H.: Processes controlling DOC in pore water during simulated drought cycles in six different UK peats, *Biogeochem.*, 109, 253–270, 2012.
- Conant, R. T., Ryan, M. G., Ågren, G. I., Birge, H. E., Davidson, E. A., Eliasson, P. E., Evans, S. E., Frey, S. D., Giardina, C. P., Hopkins, F. M., Hyvönen, R., Kirschbaum, M. U. F., Lavellee, J. M., Leifeld, J., Parton, W. J., Steinweg, J. M., Wallenstein, M. D., Wetterstedt, J. A. M., and Bradford, M. A.: Temperature and soil organic matter decomposition rates – synthesis of current knowledge and a way forward, *Glob. Change Biol.*, 17, 3392–3404, 2011.
- Cotrufo, M. F., Wallenstein, M. D., Boot, C., Deneff, K., and Paul, E.: The microbial efficiency-matrix stabilisation (MEMS) framework integrates plant litter decomposition with soil organic matter stabilization: do labile plant inputs form stable organic matter?, *Glob. Change Biol.*, 19, 988–995, 2013.
- Decaëns, T., Jiménez, J. J., Gioia, C., Measey, G. J., and Lavelle, P.: The value of soil animals for conservation biology, *Eur. J. Soil. Biol.*, 60, 807–819, 2006.
- Dominati, E., Patterson, M., and Mackay, A.: A framework for classifying and quantifying the natural capital and ecosystem services of soils, *Ecol. Econ.*, 69, 1858–1868, 2010.
- Don, A., Schumacher, J., and Freibauer, A.: Impact of tropical land-use change on soil organic carbon stocks – a meta-analysis, *Glob. Change Biol.*, 17, 1658–1670, 2011.
- Dümig, A., Häusler, W., Steffens, M., and Kögel-Knabner, I.: Clay fractions from a soil chronosequence after glacier retreat reveal the initial evolution of organo–mineral associations, *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta*, 85, 1–18, 2012.
- Dungait, J. A. J., Hopkins, D. W., Gregory, A. S., and Whitmore, A. P.: Soil organic matter turnover is governed by accessibility not recalcitrance, *Glob. Change Biol.*, 18, 1781–1796, 2012.
- Dymond, J.: *Ecosystem services in New Zealand*, Manaaki Whenua Press, Lincoln, New Zealand, 540 pp., 2014.
- Erismann, J. W., Sutton, M. A., Galloway, J., Klimont, Z., and Winiwarter, W.: How a century of ammonia synthesis changed the world, *Nat. Geosci.*, 1, 636–639, 2008.

SOILD

2, 537–586, 2015

**Biogeochemistry,
biodiversity and soil
ecosystem services**

P. Smith et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



European Commission: Eurostat, United Nations, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, International Monetary Fund, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development and World Bank: System of Environmental-Economic Accounting 2012 Central Framework, New York, Luxembourg, UNO, [Publications Office], available at: <http://bookshop.europa.eu/uri?target=EUB:NOTICE:KS0114120:EN:HTML> (last access: 27 May 2015), 2014.

European Commission: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, United Nations and World Bank: System of Environmental-Economic Accounting 2012. Experimental-Economic Accounting, White cover publication, 2013.

FAOSTAT: available at: <http://faostat3.fao.org/home/E>, last access: 28 March 2015.

Farrell, M., Hill, P. W., Wanniarachchi, S. D., Farrar, J., Bardgett, R. D., and Jones, D. L.: Rapid peptide metabolism: A major component of soil nitrogen cycling?, *Glob. Biogeochem. Cy.*, 25, GB3014, doi:10.1029/2010GB003999, 2011.

Fierer, N. and Jackson, R. B.: The diversity and biogeography of soil bacterial communities, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*, 103, 626–631, 2006.

Fierer, N., Ladau, J., Clemente, J. C., Leff, J., Owens, S. M., Pollard, K. S., Knight, R., Gilbert, J. A., and McCulley, R. L.: Reconstructing the microbial diversity and function of pre-agricultural tallgrass prairie soils in the United States, *Science*, 342, 621–624, 2013.

Finzi, A. C., Abramoff, R. Z., Spiller, K. S., Brzostek, E. R., Darby, B. A., Kramer, M. A., and Phillips, R. P.: Rhizosphere processes are quantitatively important components of terrestrial carbon and nutrient cycles, *Glob. Change Biol.*, 21, 2082–2094, doi:10.1111/gcb.12816, 2015.

Fisher, B. R., Turner, K., and Morling, P.: Defining and classifying ecosystem services for decision making, *Ecol. Econ.*, 68, 643–653, 2009.

Fontaine, S., Mariotti, A., and Abbadie, L.: The priming effect of organic matter: a question of microbial competition, *Soil Biol. Biochem.*, 35, 837–843, 2003.

Freeman, C., Ostle, N., and Kang, H.: An enzymic “latch” on a global carbon store, *Nature*, 409, p. 149, 2001.

Furusaka, C.: Global environment and microorganisms, *Bull. Jpn. Soc. Microb. Ecol.*, 8, 127–131, 1993.

Fuss, S., Canadell, J. G., Peters, G. P., Tavoni, M., Andrew, R. M., Ciais, P., Jackson, R. B., Jones, C. D., Kraxner, F., Nakicenovic, N., Le Quéré, C., Raupach, M., Sharifi, A., Smith, P., and Yamagata, Y.: Betting on negative emissions, *Nat. Clim. Change*, 4, 850–853, 2014.

SOILD

2, 537–586, 2015

**Biogeochemistry,
biodiversity and soil
ecosystem services**

P. Smith et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



- Galloway, J. N., Townsend, A. R., Erisman, J. W., Bekunda, M., Cai, Z., Freney, J. R., Martinelli, L. A., Seitzinger, S. P., and Sutton, M. A.: Transformation of the nitrogen cycle: recent trends, questions, and potential solutions, *Science*, 320, 889–892, 2008.
- Gans, J., Wolinsky, M., and Dunbar, J.: Computational improvements reveal great bacterial diversity and high metal toxicity in soil, *Science*, 309, 1387–1390, 2005.
- Gärdenäs, A. I., Ågren, G. I., Bird, J. A., Clarholm, M., Hallin, S. Ineson, P., Kätterer, T., Knicker, H., Nilsson, S. I., Näsholm, T., Ogle, S., Paustian, K., Persson, T., and Stendahl, J.: Knowledge gaps in soil carbon and nitrogen interactions – From molecular to global scale, *Soil Biol. Biochem.*, 43, 702–717, 2011.
- 5 Gättinger, A., Muller, A., Haenia, M., Skinner, C., Fließbach, A., Buchmann, N., Mädera, P., Stolze, M., Smith, P., El-Hage Scialabba, N. and Niggli, U.: Enhanced top soil carbon stocks under organic farming – a global meta-analysis, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*, 109, 18226–18231, 2012.
- Ghassemi, F., Jakeman, A. J., and Nix, H.: Salinisation of land and water resources: human causes, extent, management and case studies, Canberra, Australia: Centre for Resource and Environmental Studies, 544 pp., 1995.
- 15 Godbold, D. L., Hoosbeek, M. R., Lukac, M. Cotrufo, M. F., Janssens, I. A., Ceulemans, R., Polle, A., Velthorst, E. J., Scarascia-Mugnozza, G., De Angelis, P., Miglietta, F., and Peressotti, A.: Mycorrhizal hyphal turnover as a dominant process for carbon input into soil organic matter, *Plant Soil*, 281, 15–24, 2006.
- 20 Gorham, E.: Northern peatlands: Role in the carbon cycle and probable responses to climatic warming, *Ecol. Appl.*, 1, 182–195, 1991.
- Griffiths, R. I., Thomson, B. C., James, P., Bell, T., Bailey, M., and Whiteley, A. S.: The bacterial biogeography of British soils, *Environ. Microbiol.*, 13, 1642–1654, 2011.
- 25 Guo, L. B. and Gifford, R. M.: Soil carbon stocks and land use change: a meta-analysis, *Glob. Change Biol.*, 8, 345–360, 2002.
- Güsewell, S.: N:P ratios in terrestrial plants: variation and functional significance, *New Phytol.*, 164, 243–266, 2004.
- Haines-Young, R. and Potschin, M.: CICES Version 4: Response to Consultation. Centre for Environmental Management, University of Nottingham, 2012.
- 30 House, G. J. and Parmelee, R. W.: Comparison of soil arthropods and earthworms from conventional and no-tillage agroecosystems, *Soil Till. Res.*, 5, 351–360, 1985.

Biogeochemistry, biodiversity and soil ecosystem services

P. Smith et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



- Liu, Z. H., Jiang, L. H., Zhang, W. J., Zheng, F. L., Wang, M., and Lin, H. T.: Evolution of fertilization rate and variation of soil nutrient contents in greenhouse vegetable cultivation in Shandong, *Pedologica Sinica*, 45, 296–303, 2008.
- Lorenz, K., Lal, R., Preston, C. M., and Nierop, K. G. I. M: Strengthening the soil organic carbon pool by increasing contributions from recalcitrant aliphatic bio(macro)molecules, *Geoderma*, 142, 1–10, 2007.
- Lugato, E., Berti, A., and Giardini, L.: Soil organic carbon (SOC) dynamics with and without residue incorporation in relation to different nitrogen fertilisation rates, *Geoderma*, 135, 315–321, 2006.
- MacDonald, G. K., Bennett, E. M., Potter, P. A., and Ramankutty, N.: Agronomic phosphorus imbalances across the world's croplands, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*, 108, 3086–3091, 2011.
- Marshall, M. R., Francis, O. J., Frogbrook, Z. L., Jackson, B. M., McIntyre, N., Reynolds, B., Soloway, I., Wheeler, H. S., and Chell, J.: The impact of upland land management on flooding: results from an improved pasture hillslope, *Hydrol. Proc.*, 23, 464–475, 2009.
- Matson, P. A., Parton, W. J., Power, A. G., and Swift, M. J.: Agricultural intensification and ecosystem properties, *Science*, 277, 504–509, 1997.
- Mbow, C., Smith, P., Skole, D., Duguma, L., and Bustamante, M.: Achieving mitigation and adaptation to climate change through sustainable agroforestry practices in Africa, *Curr. Op. Env. Sust.*, 6, 8–14, 2013.
- McDowell, R. W., van der Weerden, T. J., and Campbell, J.: Nutrient losses associated with irrigation, intensification and management of land use: a study of large scale irrigation in North Otago, New Zealand, *Agric. Water Manage.*, 98, 877–885, 2011.
- McDowell, R. W., Cox, N., Daughney, C. J., Wheeler, D., and Moreau, M.: A national assessment of the potential linkage between soil, and surface and groundwater concentrations of phosphorus, *J. Am. Water Res. Assoc.*, in press, 2015.
- McSherry, M. E. and Ritchie, M. E.: Effects of grazing on grassland soil carbon: a global review, *Glob. Change Biol.*, 19, 1347–1357, 2013.
- Mikutta, R. and Kaiser, K.: Organic matter bound to mineral surfaces: Resistance to chemical and biological oxidation, *Soil Biol. Biochem.*, 43, 1738–1741, 2011.
- Millennium Ecosystem Assessment: Ecosystems and Human Well-Being: Synthesis. World Resource Institute, 2005.
- Miltner, A., Bombach, P., Schmidt-Brücken, B., and Kästner M.: SOM genesis: microbial biomass as a significant source, *Biogeochem.*, 111, 41–55, 2012.

SOILD

2, 537–586, 2015

**Biogeochemistry,
biodiversity and soil
ecosystem services**

P. Smith et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



Moore, S., Evans, C. D., Page, S. E., Garnett, M. H., Jones, T. G., Freeman, C., Hooijer, A., Wiltshire, A. J., Limin, S. H., and Gauci, V.: Deep instability of deforested tropical peatlands revealed by fluvial organic carbon fluxes, *Nature*, 493, 660–663, 2013.

Naisse, C., Girardin, C., Lefèvre, R., Pozzi, A., Maas, R., Stark, A., and Rumpel, C.: Effect of physical weathering on the carbon sequestration potential of biochars and hydrochars in soil, *Glob. Change Biol. Bioenergy*, 7, 488–496, 2015.

Ngo, P. T., Rumpel, C., Doan T. T., Henry-des-Tureaux, T., Dang, D.-K., and Jouquet, P.: Use of organic substrates for increasing soil organic matter quality and carbon sequestration of tropical degraded soil (a 3 years mesocosms experiment), *Carbon Manage*, 5, 155–168, 2014.

Nordt, L. C., Wilding, L. P., and Drees, L. R.: Pedogenic carbonate transformations in leaching soil systems: Implications for the global C cycle, in: *Global Climate Change and Pedogenic Carbonates*, edited by: Lal, R., Kimble, J. M., Eswaran, H., and Stewart B. A., Lewis Publishers, Boca Raton, FL, USA., 43–64, 2000.

Ogle, S. M., Breidt, F. J., and Paustian, K.: Agricultural management impacts on soil organic carbon storage under moist and dry climatic conditions of temperate and tropical regions, *Biogeochem.*, 72, 87–121, 2005.

Olid, C., Nilsson, M. B., Eriksson, T., and Klaminder, J.: The effects of temperature and nitrogen and sulfur additions on carbon accumulation in a nutrient-poor boreal mire: Decadal effects assessed using 210 Pb peat chronologies, *J. Geophys. Res.-Biogeosci.*, 119, 392–403, 2014.

Pan, G., Zhou, P., Li, Z. P., Smith, P., Li, L. Q., Qiu, D. S., Zhang, X. H., Xu, X. B., Shen, S. Y., and Chen, X. M.: Combined inorganic/organic fertilization enhances N efficiency and increases rice productivity through organic carbon accumulation in a rice paddy from the Tai Lake region, China, *Agr. Ecosys. Env.*, 131, 274–280, 2009.

Pan, G., Huang, Z. Q., Wang, J. K., Li, H., Chabbi, A., Paustian, K., and Smith, P.: Soil organic matter dynamics: beyond carbon; A report of the 4th International Symposium on Soil Organic Matter Dynamics, *Carbon Manage.*, 4, 485–489, 2013.

Pan, G., Li, L. Q., Zheng, J. F., Cheng, K., Zhang, X. H., Zheng, J. W., and Li, Z. C.: Managing soil organic carbon for multiple benefits case studies – positive exemplars. Benefits of SOM in agro-ecosystems: A case of China, Chapter 27, in: *Benefits of Soil Carbon*, edited by: Banwart, S., SCOPE Volume 71, CAB International, 383–401, 2014.

Paul, E. A.: *Soil microbiology, ecology and biochemistry*, Academic Press, 2014.

SOILD

2, 537–586, 2015

**Biogeochemistry,
biodiversity and soil
ecosystem services**

P. Smith et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



- Paustian, K., Andr n, O., Janzen, H. H., Lal, R., Smith, P., Tian, G., Woomer, P. L.: Agricultural soils as a sink to mitigate CO₂ emissions, *Soil Use Manage.*, 13, 230–244, 1997.
- Peltoniemi, M., Th rig, E., Ogle, S., Palosuo, T., Shrumph, M., W tzler, T., Butterbach-Bahl, K., Chertov, O., Komarov, A., Mikhailov, A., G rden s, A., Perry, C., Liski, J., Smith, P., and M kip  , R.: Models in country scale carbon accounting of forest soils, *Silva Fennica*, 41, 575–602, 2007.
- Powelson, D. S., Stirling, C. M., Jat, M. L., Gerard, B. G., Palm, C. A., Sanchez, P. A., and Cassman, K. G.: Limited potential of no-till agriculture for climate change mitigation, *Nature Clim. Change*, 4, 678–683, 2014.
- Quinton, J. N., Govers, G., Van Oost, K., and Bardgett, R. D.: The impact of agricultural soil erosion on biogeochemical cycling, *Nat. Geosci.*, 3, 311–314, 2010.
- Radajewski, S., Ineson, P., Parekh N. R., and Murrell, J. C.: Stable-isotope probing as a tool in microbial ecology, *Nature*, 403, 646–649, 2000.
- Rasse, D. P., Rumpel, C., and Dignac, M.-F.: Is soil carbon mostly root carbon? Mechanisms for a specific stabilisation, *Plant Soil*, 269, 341–356, 2005.
- Reichstein, M., Bahn, M., Ciais, P., Frank, D., Mahecha, M. D., Seneviratne, S. I., Zscheischler, J., Beer, C., Buchmann, N., Frank, D. C., Papale, D., Rammig, A., Smith, P., Thonicke, K., van der Velde, M., Vicca, S., Walz, A., and Wattenbach, M.: Climate extremes and the carbon cycle, *Nature*, 500, 287–295, 2013.
- Rillig, M. C.: Arbuscular mycorrhizae, glomalin and soil aggregation, *Can. J. Soil Sci.*, 84, 355–363, 2004.
- Robinson, D. A., Hockley, N., Cooper, D. M., Emmett, B. A., Keith, A. M., Lebron, I., Reynolds, B., Tipping, E., Tye, A. M., Watts, C. W., Whalley, W. R., Black, H. I. J., Warren, G. P., and Robinson, J. S.: Natural capital and ecosystem services, developing an appropriate soils framework as a basis for valuation, *Soil Biol. Biochem.*, 57, 1023–1033, 2013.
- Robinson, D. A., Fraser, I., Dominati, E. J., Davi sd ttir, B., J nsson, J. O. G., Jones, L. Jones, S. B., Tuller, M., Lebron, I., Bristow, K. L., Souza, D. M., Banwart, S., and Clothier, B. E.: On the value of soil resources in the context of natural capital and ecosystem service delivery, *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.*, 78, 685–700, 2014.
- Robinson, D. A., Lebron, I., and Vereecken, H.: On the definition of the natural capital of soils: A framework for description, evaluation, and monitoring, *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.*, 73, 1904–1911, 2009.

SOILD

2, 537–586, 2015

Biogeochemistry, biodiversity and soil ecosystem services

P. Smith et al.

[Title Page](#)[Abstract](#)[Introduction](#)[Conclusions](#)[References](#)[Tables](#)[Figures](#)[Back](#)[Close](#)[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)

- Rumpel, C. and Kögel-Knabner, I.: Deep soil organic matter – a key but poorly understood component of terrestrial C cycle, *Plant Soil*, 338, 143–158, 2011.
- Sanauallah, M., Blagodatskaya, E., Chabbi, A., Rumpel, C., and Kuzyakov, Y.: Drought effects on microbial biomass and enzyme activities in the rhizosphere of grasses depend on plant community composition, *Appl. Soil Ecol.*, 48, 38–44, 2011.
- Sanauallah, M., Chabbi, A., Rumpel, C., and Kuzyakov, Y.: Carbon allocation in grassland communities under drought stress followed by ^{14}C pulse labelling, *Soil Biol. Biochem.*, 55, 132–139, 2012.
- Sanauallah, M., Chabbi, A., Girardin, C., Durand, J. L., Poirier, M., and Rumpel, C.: Effects of drought and elevated temperature on biochemical composition of forage plants and their impact on carbon storage in grassland soil, *Plant Soil*, 374, 767–778, 2014.
- Sato, T., Qadir, M., Yamamoto, S., Endo, T., and Zahoor, A.: Global, regional, and country level need for data on wastewater generation, treatment, and use, *Agric. Water Manage.*, 130, 1–13, 2013.
- Schlesinger, W. M. and Bernhardt, E. S.: *Biogeochemistry. An analysis of global change*, 3rd Edn., Academic Press, NY, USA, 2013.
- Schmidt, M. W. I. and Noack, A. G.: Black carbon in soils and sediments: Analysis, distribution, implications, and current challenges, *Global Biogeochem. Cyc.*, 14, 777–793, 2000.
- Scholes, M. J. and Scholes, R. J.: Dust unto dust, *Science*, 342, 565–566, 2013.
- Setia, R., Marschner, P., Baldock, J., Chittleborough, D., Smith, P., and Smith, J. U.: Salinity effects on carbon mineralization in soils of varying texture, *Soil Biol. Biochem.*, 43, 1908–1916, 2011.
- Singh, N., Abiven, S., Torn, M. S., and Schmidt, M. W. I.: Fire-derived organic carbon in soil turns over on a centennial scale, *Biogeosciences*, 9, 2847–2857, doi:10.5194/bg-9-2847-2012, 2012.
- Smil, V.: Phosphorus in the environment: natural flows and human interferences, *Annual Rev. Energy Environ.*, 25, 53–88, 2000.
- Smith, J. U., Gottschalk, P., Bellarby, J., Chapman, S., Lilly, A., Towers, W., Bell, J., Coleman, K., Nayak, D. R., Richards, M. I., Hillier, J., Flynn, H. C., Wattenbach, M., Aitkenhead, M., Yeluripturi, J. B., Farmer, J., Milne, R., Thomson, A., Evans, C., Whitmore, A. P., Falloon, P., and Smith, P.: Estimating changes in national soil carbon stocks using ECOSSE – a new model that includes upland organic soils. Part I. Model description and uncertainty in national scale simulations of Scotland, *Clim. Res.*, 45, 179–192, 2010.

SOILD

2, 537–586, 2015

**Biogeochemistry,
biodiversity and soil
ecosystem services**

P. Smith et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



- Smith, P.: Soils as carbon sinks - the global context, *Soil Use Manage.*, 20, 212–218, 2004.
- Smith, P.: Soils and climate change, *Curr. Op. Env. Sust.*, 4, 539–544, 2012.
- Smith, P., Ashmore, M., Black, H., Burgess, P. J., Evans, C., Quine, T., Thomson, A. M., Hicks, K., and Orr, H.: The role of ecosystems and their management in regulating climate, and soil, water and air quality, *J. Appl. Ecol.*, 50, 812–829, 2013.
- Smith P., Bustamante, M., Ahammad, H., Clark, H., Dong, H., Elsiddig, E.A., Haberl, H., Harper, R., House, J., Jafari, M., Masera, O., Mbow, C., Ravindranath, N. H., Rice, C. W., Robledo Abad, C., Romanovskaya, A., Sperling, F., and Tubiello, F.: Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use (AFOLU), in: *Climate Change 2014: Mitigation of Climate Change, Contribution of Working Group III to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, edited by: Edenhofer, O., Pichs-Madruga, R., Sokona, Y. Farahani, E., Kadner, S., Seyboth, K., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, 2014.
- Snyder, C. S., Davidson, E. A., Smith, P., and Venterea, R. T.: Agriculture: sustainable crop and animal production to help mitigate nitrous oxide emissions, *Curr. Op. Environ. Sust.*, 9–10, 46–54, 2014.
- Sollins, P., Homann, P., and Caldwell, B. A.: Stabilization and destabilization of soil organic matter: mechanisms and controls, *Geoderma*, 74, 65–105, 1996.
- Song, X. Y., Li, L. Q., Zheng, J. F., Pan, G., Zhang, X. H., Zheng, J. W., Hussain, Q., Han, X. J., and Yu, X. Y.: Sequestration of maize crop straw C in different soils: role of oxyhydrates in chemical binding and stabilization as recalcitrance, *Chemosphere*, 87, 649–654, 2012.
- State Bureau of Statistics- China: 50 Years Rural Statistics of New China; China Statistics Press, Beijing, China, 2005.
- Steinfeld, H., Gerber, P., Wassenaar, C. V., Rosales, M., and de Haan, C.: Livestock's long shadow, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Rome, Italy, available at: <http://www.fao.org/docrep/010/a0701e/a0701e00.htm> (last access: August 2014), 2006.
- Stewart, C. E., Zheng, J. Y., Botte, J., and Cotrufo, M. F.: Co-generated fast pyrolysis biochar mitigates greenhouse gas emissions and increases carbon sequestration in temperate soils, *Glob. Change Biol. Bioenergy*, 5, 153–164, 2013.
- Sutton, M. A., Nemitz, E., Erisman, J. W., Beier, C., Butterbach Bahl, K., Cellier, P., de Vries, W., Cotrufo, F., Skiba, U., Di Marco, C., Jones, S., Laville, P., Soussana, J. F., Loubet, B., Twigg, M., Famulari, D., Whitehead, J., Gallagher, M. W., Neftel, A., Flechard, C. R., Herrmann, B., Calanca, P. L., Schjoerring, J. K., Daemmgen, U., Horvath, L., Tang, Y. S., Emmett, B. A.,

Biogeochemistry, biodiversity and soil ecosystem services

P. Smith et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



Tietema, A., Peñuelas, J., Kesik, M., Brueggemann, N., Pilegaard, K., Vesala, T., Campbell, C. L., Olesen, J. E., Dragosits, U., Theobald, M. R., Levy, P., Mobbs, D. C., Milne, R., Viovy, N., Vuichard, N., Smith, J. U., Smith, P., Bergamaschi, P., Fowler, D., and Reis, S.: Challenges in quantifying biosphere-atmosphere exchange of nitrogen species, *Environ. Poll.*, 150, 125–139, 2007.

Tarnocai, C., Canadell, J. G., Schuur, E. A. G., Kuhry, P., Mazhitova, G., and Zimov, S.: Soil organic carbon pools in the northern circumpolar permafrost region, *Global Biogeochem. Cyc.*, 23, GB2023, doi:10.1029/2008GB003327, 2009.

Thévenot, M., Dignac, M.-F., and Rumpel, C.: Fate of lignins in soils: a review, *Soil Biol. Biochem.*, 42, 1200–1211, 2010.

Tilman, D., Cassman, K. G., Matson, P. A., Naylor, R., and Polasky, S.: Agricultural sustainability and intensive production practices, *Nature*, 418, 671–677, 2002.

Todd-Brown, K. E. O., Randerson, J. T., Post, W. M., Hoffman, F. M., Tarnocai, C., Schuur, E. A. G., and Allison, S. D.: Causes of variation in soil carbon simulations from CMIP5 Earth system models and comparison with observations, *Biogeosciences*, 10, 1717–1736, doi:10.5194/bg-10-1717-2013, 2013.

Trumbore, S.: Radiocarbon and soil carbon dynamics, *Ann. Rev. Earth Planet. Sci.*, 37, 47–66, 2009.

Turunen, J., Roulet, N. T., Moore, T. R. and Richard, P. J. H.: Nitrogen deposition and increased carbon accumulation in ombrotrophic peatlands in eastern Canada, *Global Biogeochem. Cy.*, 18, GB3002, doi:10.1029/2003GB002154, 2004.

UKNEA: The UK National Ecosystem Assessment, Synthesis of the Key Findings, UNEP-WCMC, Cambridge, 2011.

Van Groenigen, J. W., Velthof, G. L., Oenema, O., Van Groenigen, K. J., and Van Kessel, C.: Towards an agronomic assessment of N₂O emissions: a case study for arable crops, *Eur. J. Soil Sci.*, 61, 903–913, doi:10.1111/j.1365-2389.2009.01217.x, 2010.

Van Oost, K., Quine, T. A., Govers, G., De Gryze, S., Six, J., Harden, J. W., Ritchie, J. C., McCarty, G. W., Heckrath, G., Kosmas, C., Giraldez, J. V., da Silva, J. R. M., and Merckx, R.: The impact of agricultural soil erosion on the global carbon cycle, *Science*, 318, 626–629, 2007.

Venterea, R. T., Maharjan, B., and Dolan M. S.: Fertilizer source and tillage effects on yield-scaled nitrous oxide emissions in a corn cropping system, *J. Environ. Qual.*, 40, 1521–1531, 2011.

**Biogeochemistry,
biodiversity and soil
ecosystem services**

P. Smith et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



Vitousek, P. M. and Matson, P. A.: Biological diversity and terrestrial ecosystem biogeochemistry, in: *The biogeochemistry of global change: radiative trace gases*, edited by: Oremland, R. S., Chapman and Hall, New York, 193–208, 1993.

Vogel, C., Mueller, C. W., Hoschen, C., Buegger, F., Heister, K., Schulz, S., Schloter, M., and Kogel-Knabner, I.: Submicron structures provide preferential spots for carbon and nitrogen sequestration in soils, *Nature Comm.*, 5, 2947, doi:10.1038/ncomms3947, 2014.

von Lützw, M., Kögel-Knabner, I., Ekschmitt, K., Matzner, E., Guggenberger, G., Marschner, B., and Flessa, H.: Stabilization of organic matter in temperate soils: Mechanisms and their relevance under different soil conditions – a review, *Euro. J. Soil Sci.*, 57, 426–445, 2006.

von Lützw, M., Kögel-Knabner, I., Ludwig, B., Matzner, E., Flessa, H., Ekschmitt, K., Guggenberger, G., Marschner, B., and Kalbitz, K.: Stabilization mechanisms of organic matter in four temperate soils: Development and application of a conceptual model, *J. Plant Nut. Soil Sci.*, 171, 111–124, 2008.

Wall, D. H., Bardgett, R. D., Behan-Pelletier, V., Herrick, J. E., Jones, H., Ritz, K., Six, J., Strong, D. R., and van der Putten, W. H.: *Soil Ecology and Ecosystem Services*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK, 2012.

Walthall, C. L., Hatfield, J., Backlund, P., Lengnick, L., Marshall, E., Walsh, M., Adkins, S., Aillery, M., Ainsworth, E. A., Ammann, C., Anderson, C. J., Bartomeus, I., Baumgard, L. H., Booker, F., Bradley, B., Blumenthal, D. M., Bunce, J., Burkey, K., Dabney, S. M., Delgado, J. A., Dukes, J., Funk, A., Garrett, K., Glenn, M., Grantz, D. A., Goodrich, D., Hu, S., Izaurralde, R. C., Jones, R. A. C., Kim, S.-H., Leaky, A. D. B., Lewers, K., Mader, T. L., McClung, A., Morgan, J., Muth, D. J., Nearing, M., Oosterhuis, D. M., Ort, D., Parmesan, C., Pettigrew, W. T., Polley, W., Rader, R., Rice, C., Rivington, M., Rosskopf, E., Salas, W. A., Sollenberger, L. E., Srygley, R., Stöckle, C., Takle, E. S., Timlin, D., White, J. W., Winfree, R., Wright-Morton, L., and Ziska, L. H.: *Climate change and agriculture in the united states: effects and adaptation*, USDA Technical Bulletin 1935, Washington, DC, 186 pp., 2012.

Wei, X., Shao, M., Gale, W., and Li, L.: Global pattern of soil carbon losses due to the conversion of forests to agricultural land, *Scientific Reports*, 4, 4062, doi:10.1038/srep04062, 2014.

West, P. C., Gerber, J. S., Engstrom, P. M., Mueller, N. D., Brauman, K. A., Carlson, K. M., Cassidy, E. S., Johnston, M., MacDonald, G. K., Ray, D., and Siebert, S.: Leverage points for improving global food security and the environment, *Science*, 345, 325–328, 2014.

West, T. O. and Post W. M.: Soil organic carbon sequestration rates by tillage and crop rotation: A global data analysis, *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.*, 66, 1930–1946, 2002.

Biogeochemistry, biodiversity and soil ecosystem services

P. Smith et al.

Title Page	
Abstract	Introduction
Conclusions	References
Tables	Figures
◀	▶
◀	▶
Back	Close
Full Screen / Esc	
Printer-friendly Version	
Interactive Discussion	

Table 1. Management actions affecting the soil carbon cycle and their impact on ecosystem services.

Management action or other driver of change	Provisioning service impact	Regulating service impact	Supporting service impact	Cultural service impact
Land-use change (conversion of forest/grassland/wetland to cropland)	Increased production of food, fibre, and energy crops; reduced availability of natural raw materials; potential change in hydrology/water availability	Decreased soil C sequestration and storage – increased GHG flux; increased erosion and sediment yield – reduced regulations of water flow and quality;.	Primary production may be changed; nutrient recycling reduced if no inputs, increased if there are inputs;	Lower recreation value; may have impact on cultural value in recreating diverse landscapes
Land-use-change (establishment of forest or grassland on agricultural land)	Raw material provision may be increased; agricultural production likely decreased (but not always e.g. agroforestry)	Increased C sequestration; increased regulation of water flow and quality	Primary production may be changed, increased water recycling	Increased recreation value; may have impact on cultural value in recreating diverse landscapes
Intensified nutrient management through fertilisation and liming	Increased production of food and other raw materials	Effect on net soil C sequestration uncertain; increased GHG flux from fertiliser production and use; water and air pollution	Increased primary production; increased nutrient recycling	
Soil amelioration using organic amendments such as compost and biochar	Increased food production; more raw materials; more water available for plant growth	Increased C sequestration; increased water purification value	Increased primary production; increased nutrient cycling; improved water infiltration and retention	
Diversification of crop production systems (i.e., more perennials, reduced bare fallow)	Potential impact on agricultural production (±); more diverse products	Increased C sequestration; increased purification value	Changed primary production; increased nutrient retention; improved water infiltration and retention	Improved cultural value from more diverse landscapes
Replacement of hay forage production with pasture use on grasslands	No impact	Effect on C sequestration uncertain		Increased recreation value; may have impact on cultural value in recreating diverse landscapes
Improved grazing management	Increased food production; reduced runoff and improved water use	Increased C sequestration; increased purification value; water flow regulation	Increased primary production; improved water infiltration and retention	



SOILD

2, 537–586, 2015

**Biogeochemistry,
biodiversity and soil
ecosystem services**

P. Smith et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

**Table 3.** Soil functions related to the water cycle and ecosystem services.

Soil Function	Mechanism	Consequence	Ecosystem service
Stores (Storage)	Water held in soil pores supports plant and microbial communities	Biomass production Surface protection	Food Aesthetics Erosion control
Accepts (Sorptivity)	Incident water infiltrates into soil with excess lost as runoff	Storm runoff reduction	Erosion control Flood protection
Transmits (Hydraulic conductivity)	Water entering the soil is redistributed and excess is lost as deep percolation	Percolation to groundwater	Groundwater recharge Stream flow maintenance
Cleans (Filtering)	Water passing through the soil matrix interacts with soil particles and biota	Contaminants removed by biological degradation/retention on sorption sites	Water quality

Biogeochemistry, biodiversity and soil ecosystem services

P. Smith et al.

Table 4. Management actions affecting the soil water cycle and their impact on ecosystem services.

Management action or other driver of change	Provisioning service impact	Regulating service impact	Supporting service impact	Cultural service impact
Land use change (increase change of agricultural to urban)	Decreased biomass, decreased availability of water for agricultural use.	Increased impervious surface, decreased infiltration, storage, soil mediated water regulation	Decreased genetic diversity; reduction of rainfall recycling e.g. in the tropics	Decreased natural environment
Land use change (increase change of arable to intensive grassland)	Increased yield of animal over vegetable protein.	Increased C sequestration, greater requirement of water, stress on ecosystem health of downstream waterways	Increased genetic diversity associate with mixed pastures	Change in aesthetic value away from traditional norm
Irrigation (increase)	Increased biomass over dryland agriculture, decreased availability of water for urban use	Increased C sequestration, but decreased filtration potential	Improved habitat for plant species	Infrastructure alters landscape decreasing spiritual connection with catchment
Drainage (increasing in marginal land)	Decreased soil saturation, increased biomass, removal of wetlands	Decreased C sequestration, denitrification and flood attenuation	Better habitat for productive grassland plants, but loss of genetic diversity	Decreased recreational potential (e.g. ecotourism)

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



Biogeochemistry, biodiversity and soil ecosystem services

P. Smith et al.

[Title Page](#)

[Abstract](#) [Introduction](#)

[Conclusions](#) [References](#)

[Tables](#) [Figures](#)

[◀](#) [▶](#)

[◀](#) [▶](#)

[Back](#) [Close](#)

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)



Table 5. Management actions affecting the soil biota and their impacts on ecosystem services.

Management action or other driver of change	Provisioning service impact	Regulating service impact	Supporting service impact	Cultural service impact
Land use change of natural vegetation to agricultural intensification	Changed genetic resources, changed production of (precursors to) industrial and pharmaceutical products	Decreased C sequestration, changed pest and disease control	Changed elemental transformation	Changed diversity of soil organisms (elimination of some soil animals, etc.)
Use of organic amendments	Increased genetic resources, decreased production of (precursors to) industrial and pharmaceutical products	Increased C sequestration	Increased soil formation, increased primary production by phototrophs, changed elemental transformation	Increase of soil organisms
Use of broad spectrum bioactive agrochemicals	Decreased genetic resources, decreased production of (precursors to) industrial and pharmaceutical products	Possible decreased waste decomposition and detoxification	Decreased primary production by phototrophs, changed elemental transformation	Decreased diversity of soil organisms (elimination of some soil animals, etc.)
Pollution by heavy metals or xenobiotics	Decreased genetic resources, decreased production of (precursors to) industrial and pharmaceutical products	Possible decreased waste decomposition and detoxification	Decreased primary production by phototrophs, changed elemental transformation	Decreased diversity of soil organisms (elimination of some soil animals, etc.)
Climate change (global warming)		Possible decreased C sequestration	Changed elemental transformation	

SOILD

2, 537–586, 2015

Biogeochemistry, biodiversity and soil ecosystem services

P. Smith et al.




Figure 1. Schematic representation of where soil carbon, nutrient and water cycles, and soil biota underpin ecosystem services (adapted from Smith et al., 2014). Role in underpinning each ecosystem service shown by C = soil carbon, N = soil nutrients, W = soil water, B = soil biota.

Title Page	
Abstract	Introduction
Conclusions	References
Tables	Figures
◀	▶
◀	▶
Back	Close
Full Screen / Esc	
Printer-friendly Version	
Interactive Discussion	



**Biogeochemistry,
biodiversity and soil
ecosystem services**

P. Smith et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion




Figure 2. Global (a) nitrogen (N) and (b) phosphorus (P) fertilizer use between 1961 and 2012 split for the different continents in Mt P per year; plotted from FAOSTAT data (FAOSTAT, 2015).

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion




Figure 3. Applied and excess nitrogen and phosphorus in croplands. Nitrogen and phosphorus inputs and excess were calculated using a simple mass balance model (West et al., 2014), extend to include 175 crops. To account for both the rate and spatial extent of croplands, the data are presented as kg per ha of the landscape. **(a)** Applied Nitrogen, including N deposition; **(b)** applied Phosphorus; **(c)** excess Nitrogen; **(d)** excess Phosphorus.