



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

The negative effects of soil microorganisms on plant growth only extend to the first weeks

Zhang, J.; Klinkhamer, P.G.L.; Vrieling, K.; Bezemer, T.M.

Citation

Zhang, J., Klinkhamer, P. G. L., Vrieling, K., & Bezemer, T. M. (2022). The negative effects of soil microorganisms on plant growth only extend to the first weeks. *Journal Of Plant Ecology*. doi:10.1093/jpe/rtac022

Version: Accepted Manuscript

License: [Creative Commons CC BY 4.0 license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3304431>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

The negative effects of soil microorganisms on plant growth only extend to the first weeks

Jing Zhang^{1*}, Peter G.L. Klinkhamer¹, Klaas Vrieling¹, and T. Martijn Bezemer^{1,2}

¹ *Institute of Biology Leiden (IBL), Leiden University, Sylviusweg 72, 2333BE, Leiden, The Netherlands*

² *Netherlands Institute of Ecology (NIOO-KNAW), Droevendaalsesteeg 10, 6708 PB Wageningen, The Netherlands*

*Corresponding author: Jing Zhang

Email: jingzhang042810@hotmail.com

Tel: +31(0)687881186

This article has been accepted For publication And undergone full peer review but has Not been through the copyediting, typesetting, pagination And proofreading process, which may lead to differences between this Version And the Version of Record. Please cite this article as doi: 10.1093/jpe/rtac022.

© The Author(s) 2022. Published by Oxford University Press on behalf of the Institute of Botany, Chinese Academy of Sciences and the Botanical Society of China.
This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted reuse, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Abstract

Aims

Soil biotic communities can strongly impact plant performance. So far, most studies on plant-soil-interactions have estimated the effect of the soil microbial community on plant mass after a fixed duration of plant growth. However, these interactions may change over time and several studies have argued that plant-soil interactions are more important for young seedlings than for older plants. In this paper we ask the question: how long-lasting the effect of the soil microbial community on plant growth is. This is important as the growth rate of a plant is not only determined by the growing conditions but also by the size of the plant itself. Therefore, plant with a reduced growth rate early in life, due to negative effects of the soil microbial community, may increase less in biomass for a much longer period even though the relative growth rates do not differ any longer.

Methods

We examined the plant growth rates at three stages: early growth (0-21 days), mid growth (22 to 42 days) and late growth (43 to 63 days). We performed two growth experiments with *Jacobaea vulgaris* lasting 49 and 63 days. Plants were grown in sterilized soil or in sterilized soil inoculated with natural dune soil. In a third experiment, we examined the effect of the timing of soil inoculation prior to planting on the (relative-) growth rate of *J. vulgaris* plants with four different timing treatments.

Important findings

In all experiments, differences in biomass of plants grown in sterilized soil and inoculated soil (live soil) increased throughout the experiment. Interestingly, linear regression models with \ln transformed dry weight against time for younger plants and for older plants in sterilized soil and live soil, respectively, showed that the relative growth rate of plants in the sterilized soil was only significantly higher than that of plants in the live soil in the first two to three weeks. After that period there was no longer a negative effect of the live soil on the relative growth rate of plants. In the third experiment, plant biomass decreased with increasing time between inoculation and planting. Overall, our results show that plants of *J. vulgaris* grew less well in live soil than in sterilized soil. The negative effects of soil inoculation on plant mass appeared to extend over the whole growth period but arise from the

negative effects on relative growth rates that occurred in the first weeks after planting when plants have only less than 5% of the mass they obtained after 42 days. Our study highlights the importance of examining relative growth rates rather than final biomass to estimate the effects of soil microbial communities on plants.

Keywords: Plant-soil interactions, Relative growth rate, Sterilized soil, Live soil, Dry plant biomass, Plant performance, Pathogenic soil microbial community, Growth analysis, *Jacobaea vulgaris*

Accepted Manuscript

Introduction

Interactions between plants and soil microbial communities are vital in mediating the balance and functioning of terrestrial ecosystems (Bever 1994; Churchland and Grayston 2014; Teste *et al.* 2017; Erktan *et al.* 2018). The soil microbiome is an important driver of plant performance. Soil microbial species e.g., pathogenic organisms, plant-growth-promoting rhizobacteria (PGPR, like *Pseudomonas* and *Burkholderia*) and arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi (AMF), play an active role in modifying the development of plants (Johnson *et al.* 1997; Arora and Mishra 2016; Artursson *et al.* 2016; Gil-Martinez *et al.* 2018). Evidence has mounted that the effect of the soil microbial community on plant growth in laboratory experiments is mostly negative for many species (Mangan *et al.* 2010; van de Voorde *et al.* 2012; Cortois *et al.* 2016).

One potential explanation for the negative effect of soil microbes on plant performance is that microbes and plants compete for nutrients (Kardol *et al.* 2013). Alternatively, pathogens may accumulate in the soil over time, eventually resulting in a negative overall effect on plant performance (Dobson and Crawley 1994; Wardle *et al.* 2004; Raaijmakers *et al.* 2009; Mordecai 2011; van der Putten *et al.* 2013; Jacoby *et al.* 2017). So far, most studies on the effect of the soil microbial community on plant growth are conducted in pots (Hodge and Fitter 2013). In such experiments, the negative effects of any treatment on plant mass often decline after some period of plant growth (typically six to eight weeks) (Bezemer *et al.* 2018; Dudenhöffer *et al.* 2018). This is often attributed to restricted root growth due to limitations in pot size or to a decline in nutrient availability, and therefore considered an artefact of the experimental design (Smith and Reynolds 2012; Van de Voorde *et al.* 2012; Jing *et al.* 2015). It is also possible, however, that the pathogenic effect of the soil microbial community only last for a short period because (1) only seedlings are susceptible or (2) because over time plants alter the composition of the microbial community in the soil in which they grow so that it becomes less harmful (Bezemer *et al.* 2018; Dudenhöffer *et al.* 2018).

Previous studies on plant-soil-interactions typically focused on the effect of the soil microbial community on final plant biomass (van de Voorde *et al.* 2012; Bezemer *et al.* 2013; Anacker *et al.* 2014). It is important to note, however, that the effects of the soil microbial community on plant growth depend on the life stages of the plant (Arrigoni *et al.* 2018; Bezemer *et al.* 2018; Dudenhöffer *et al.* 2018). Seedlings are often highly vulnerable to

pathogenic microbes in the soil (Packer and Clay 2000). In contrast, older plants with a more developed root system are typically less vulnerable (Kardol *et al.* 2013; Bezemer *et al.* 2018).

The increase in plant biomass is not only determined by growing conditions but also by the biomass of the plant itself. Effects on plant growth that occur during early life stages can, therefore, still affect plant size and plant phenology in late life stages. When plants after some period grow with a similar relative growth rate, differences in absolute plant mass will still continue to increase. In Fig. 1 it is assumed that plants in sterilized soil grow with a constant relative growth rate (solid line). Plants in live soil either grow with a constant relative growth rate lower than that of the plants in the live soil (gray dashed line) or they first grow with a lower relative growth rate but after an initial period (t_1) their relative growth rate becomes similar to that of plants in the sterilized soil (black dashed line). In the latter case, although the effect of the soil microbial community only is present until t_1 , differences in plant mass continue to increase (Fig. 1b). Hence, to study the effect of soil microbes on plants, it is important to also analyze relative growth rates. In this study, we used linear regression models and \ln transformed biomass data from repeated harvests to estimate r growth rates in sterilized and live soil. We hypothesized that i) plant relative growth rates are smaller in live soil than in sterilized soils ii) the negative effect on relative growth lasts only for a short period during the early plant life stages iii) the differences in plant mass between plants grown in live soils and sterilized soils will continue to increase during the experiment.

Previously we observed in experiments with ample nutrient supply that the negative effect of the soil microbial community on plant growth was mitigated if the plant's defense system is activated by foliar application of salicylic acid. This led us to hypothesize that the negative effect of the soil microbial community on plant growth in our system is due to an overall pathogenic effect of the soil microbial community. Although this effect was consistent, we did not find this effect to increase over several generations of plant growth. An important question is therefore how long the negative effects of the soil microbial community on plant growth lasts. We used *Jacobaea vulgaris* to test these hypotheses. *J. vulgaris* is native to The Netherlands. In a former experiment, we found that plant mass of *J. vulgaris* growing in soil containing a live microbial community was 66% lower than when plants were grown in sterilized soil (unpublished data). This negative effect of live soil on plant growth is in line with previous findings (van de Voorde *et al.* 2012; Kos *et al.* 2015; Wang *et al.* 2019). In the present study, to avoid nutrient limitation during the growth of *J. vulgaris*, nutrients were supplied regularly according to estimates of nutrient demand obtained from previous experiments (Steiner 1980; Joosten *et al.* 2009). We carried out growth experiments with

multiple harvesting points to estimate changes in (relative-) growth rates in live and sterilized soils. Additionally, we grew *J. vulgaris* plants in soil that had been inoculated with live soil at varying time points before planting to manipulate the abundance of the microbial community in the soil. With the latter experiment we aimed to examine how the timing of inoculation of sterilized soil impacts the growth of *J. vulgaris*.

Materials and methods

J. vulgaris (common ragwort) was used as plant species. We chose this species because it is a common species in The Netherlands that is strongly affected by plant-soil interactions (van de Voorde *et al.* 2011; van de Voorde *et al.* 2012; Bezemer *et al.* 2013). Seeds and soil were collected from Meijndel, a calcareous sandy dune area north of The Hague, The Netherlands (52°11'N, 4°31'E).

Seeds

Before seed germination, all seeds were shaken for two min in 70% ethanol, then washed with sterilized water, put for 12 min in 2% bleach, and finally rinsed four times with sterilized water to avoid influences of seed-borne microbes. The surface-sterilized seeds were then placed in standard Petri dishes containing filter paper, which was moistened with Milli-Q water. Afterwards, all Petri dishes containing seeds were placed in plastic zip-lock bags and stored in a climate room (humidity 70%, light 16 h at 20 °C, dark 8 h at 20 °C) for the duration of germination.

Soil

Topsoil was collected at Meijndel to a depth of 15 cm after removing the grassland vegetation and the organic layer of the surface. The soil was sieved using a 5 mm sized mesh to remove plant roots and various soil fauna, homogenized with a concrete mixer and then stored into 20-liter plastic bags (Nasco Whirl-Pak Sample Bag). Bags were either sterilized by 35-K Gray gamma-irradiation (Synergy Health Company, Ede, The Netherlands) or kept at 4 °C for inoculation. Potting soil (Slingerland potgrond, Zoeterwoude, The Netherlands) was also sterilized by 35-K Gray gamma-irradiation.

Plant growth

After germination, seedlings were randomly transferred individually to 500 ml pots containing either “sterilized soil” or “live soil”. Per pot contains only one plant. The live soil treatment consisted of a mixture of 87.5% sterilized dune soil, 2.5% sterilized potting soil and 10% live soil. The sterilized soil treatment contained 97.5% of sterilized dune soil and 2.5% of sterilized potting soil. Sterilized potting soil was added to all pots to increase the organic matter content of the soil. Sterilized soil and live soil were kept in bags and left in the climate room for 14 days (relative humidity 70%, light 16 h at 20 °C, dark 8h at 20 °C) to enable the establishment of microbial communities in the inoculated soil before potting. Before filling the pots, the soil in each bag was mixed. After filling, pots were randomly distributed over the climate room. Plants were watered regularly with Milli-Q water and 5 ml Steiner nutrient solution was added per plant on day 7, 10 ml Steiner nutrient solution was added on day 13, and 20 ml Steiner nutrient solution was added on days 19, 28, 37, and 42. The Steiner nutrient solution (Steiner, 1980) was prepared from 7 different stock solutions (106.2 g $\text{Ca}(\text{NO}_3)_2 \cdot 4\text{H}_2\text{O}$, 29.3 g KNO_3 , 13.6 g KH_2PO_4 , 49.2 g $\text{MgSO}_4 \cdot 7\text{H}_2\text{O}$, 25.2 g K_2SO_4 and 2.24 g KOH , 3.29 g Fe-EDTA added to 1 liter demineralized water, and a stock solution with micro elements (a mixed solution of 0.181 g $\text{MnCl}_2 \cdot 4\text{H}_2\text{O}$, 0.286 g H_3BO_3 , 0.022 g $\text{ZnSO}_4 \cdot 7\text{H}_2\text{O}$, 0.0078 g $\text{CuSO}_4 \cdot 5\text{H}_2\text{O}$ and 0.0126 g $\text{NaMoO}_4 \cdot 2\text{H}_2\text{O}$ added to 1 liter demineralized water). Ten ml of each stock solution was diluted in 1 liter of demineralized water before use.

The effect of live soil on the growth of *J. vulgaris*

Experiment 1: An experiment to measure the growth of *J. vulgaris* over time was performed starting with 1-week-old seedlings, two soil treatments and eight harvesting time points over seven weeks. The harvests were on day 0 (germinated seedlings), 7, 14, 21, 28, 35, 42 and 49 after planting. Pots were randomly labeled and allocated to the different harvests. Ten replicates were used for each treatment resulting in two treatments \times eight harvesting points \times ten replicates = 160 plants. Harvested plants (shoots and roots) were oven-dried at 60 °C for approximately one week and dry mass was determined.

Experiment 2: The growth experiment was repeated using the same soil treatments, but with more harvests during the first three weeks. In this experiment, plants were harvested at day 0, 3, 6, 9, 12, 15, 18, 21, 28, 35, 42, 49, 56 and 63 after planting. Ten plants per soil

treatment were harvested at each harvesting time point thus resulting in two treatments \times 14 harvest points \times ten replicates = 280 plants. In this experiment, at each harvest, the plants were gently removed from the pot. Shoots were separated from roots with a pair of scissors just above the root crown, and roots were cleaned with water and then put into aluminum foil. Then, all the harvested plant parts were freeze-dried for approximately one week, and dry mass was determined.

The effect of time of inoculation on the growth of *J. vulgaris*

Experiment 3: To examine the effect of the timing of soil inoculation on the relative growth rate of *J. vulgaris* plants, sterilized soils were inoculated at different time points prior to planting the seedlings. In this experiment, 1-week-old seedlings were planted into 500 ml pots containing either “sterilized soil” or four different “live soil” treatments. For these four treatments, a mixture of 10% of live soil was mixed with 90% sterilized soil, and then the mixed soil was kept in the climate room for 0, 1, 2 and 4 weeks (relative humidity 70%, light 16 h at 20 °C, dark 8h at 20 °C) to enable different build-up times for the microbial community in the soil at the time of planting. The live soil treatments were labeled as “live-0”, “live-1”, “live-2” and “live-4” respectively. Seedlings were randomly distributed over the five soil treatments and nine harvests over six weeks. Plants were harvested on days 0 (as seedlings), 4, 8, 12, 16, 20, 28, 35 and 42. Eight replicates were used per treatment combination resulting in five treatments \times nine harvests \times eight replicates totaling 360 plants. Fresh weight was recorded, because leaves were frozen immediately as we intended to quantify the levels of SA in the plant material. However, due time limitations these data have not been collected.

Calculations and statistical analyses

Biomass was plotted against time for plants grown in sterilized and live soil. A student t-test was then performed to test for differences between dry plant mass in sterilized and live soils at each time point. \ln transformed biomass was also plotted against time. The regression coefficient for this relationship provides an estimate for the relative growth rates of the plants. Plant growth was divided into three stages: early growth (0-21 days), mid growth (22 to 42 days) and late growth (43 to 63 days). For each experiment, a separate line was then fitted through the dry plant mass data for these different periods. Late growth was only measured in experiment 2. Because this division in two time periods is somewhat arbitrary,

we backed this analyses up with a sequential backward regression approach for the entire growth period for each experiment. We started this analysis with the two latest harvesting points and then sequentially added the previous data point. In this way we could test for which time periods differences in relative growth rate were significant. For each regression the slope and standard error (SE) of the slope were determined and differences between the slopes for the linear regression models in sterilized and live soil were then tested with a *t*-test ($t = \frac{\text{Slope1} - \text{Slope2}}{\text{SQRT}(\text{SE1}^2 + \text{SE2}^2)}$) in IBM SPSS Statistics 25.

Relative growth rates were calculated as: $\text{rgr} = (\text{Ln biomass2} - \text{Ln biomass1}) / (\text{time2} - \text{time1})$ and these results are presented in supplementary figure 1. The effects of the soil treatments (sterilized and live soil) and harvest time point on the plant biomass of *J. vulgaris* were tested using a two-way ANOVA with ln-transformed plant dry mass as a dependent variable and soil (2 levels) as a fixed factor and harvest time point (7 levels for experiment 1, 14 levels for experiment 2, 9 levels for experiment 3 in each live soil) as a continuous factor. Differences between treatments were compared with a Tukey post-hoc test.

Results

The effect of live soil on the growth of *J. vulgaris*

Experiment 1: Soil inoculation had a strong negative effect on plant dry mass throughout the experiment (Fig. 2a). The difference in plant dry mass between the sterilized and live soil treatments increased during the entire experiment. From day 21 onward, the dry plant mass of *J. vulgaris* in sterilized soil was significantly larger than the dry mass of plants grown in the live soil (Fig. 2). For young plants (0-21 days) the relative growth rate (slope in Fig. 2b, c) in sterilized soil was significantly larger than that for live soil while relative growth rates did not differ for mid-aged plants (22-49 days, Fig. 2b, c). This result was backed up by the sequential backward regression that showed that the relative growth rates were not significantly different for the periods between 49 to 22 days (Table S1). The difference of plant dry biomass in response to live soils among the different harvest time points was reflected by highly significant interaction between soil \times harvest time in the two-way ANOVA (Table S4, experiment 1). The relative growth rates of experiment 1 differed among different harvest time points (Fig S1-1).

Experiment 2: The first experiment was repeated with more harvesting points during the first 21 days and an extended growth period. Again, the effect of live soil on plant growth was negative (Fig. 3a). The difference in absolute plant biomass increased until day 56. Young plants (0-21 days) had significantly higher relative growth rates in sterilized soil, mid-aged plants (22-42 days) had similar relative growth rates; while for older plants (49-63 days) the relative growth rates were even higher in live soil (Fig. 3b, c). Backward regression showed that the relative growth rate was higher for the plants in the live soil for the period 63-28 days. If younger ages were included differences were no longer significant (Table S2). The difference of plant dry biomass in response to live soils among the different harvest time points is not reflected by a significant interaction between soil \times harvest time in the two-way ANOVA (Table S4, experiment 2). The relative growth rates of experiment 2 differed among different harvest time points (Fig S1-2).

The effect of time of inoculation before planting on the growth of *J. vulgaris*

Experiment 3: Plants produced less biomass in inoculated soils than in sterilized soil (Fig. 4a). For young plants (0-21 days) the relative growth rate in sterilized soil was significantly larger than that for live-0, live-1, live-2 or live-4 soil. relative growth rates did not differ for mid-aged plants between live-0, live-1 and live-2 soil. Interestingly, relative growth rate of plants from live-4 soil for the mid-aged period was significantly higher than the relative growth rate of plants in sterilized soil (Fig. 3c; Table S3). Timing of the inoculation did affect the relative growth rate of plants in the early phase (0-21 days). The longer the time between inoculation and planting the lower the relative growth rate of young plants was ($R^2 = 0.99$, $P < 0.05$, $df = 3$). This was no longer true for the mid-aged period ($R^2 = 0.71$, $P = 0.15$, $df = 3$). These results were largely backed up by the backward sequential regression, which showed that relative growth rates were only higher for plants grown in the sterilized soil if very young plant ages were included. Especially for the live-4 soil the relative growth rate was even higher for plants grown in lives soil when only older plants were included (Table S3). The difference of plant dry biomass in response to live-0, live-1, live-2 and live-4 soils among the different harvest time points was reflected by a highly significant interaction between soil \times harvest time in the two-way ANOVA (Table S4, experiment 3-a, 3-b, 3-c and 3-d). The relative growth rates of experiment 3 were largely

different among sterilized soil and live soils, but the overall trends of the relative growth rates among live-0, live-1, live-2 and live-4 were similar (Fig S1-1).

Discussion

In this study, we report the results of three experiments in which we measured the growth of *J. vulgaris* to test how the effects of soil microbial communities on plant growth change over time. We found a consistent negative effect of the soil microbial community in all three experiments. Biomass was larger in sterilized soil than in live soil. However, analyses of the \ln transformed data, show that the relative growth rates were significantly higher in sterilized soil than in live soil only for young plants, and not for mid-aged plants. Moreover, in experiment 2, which was continued for a longer period, older plants even had a higher relative growth rate in the live soil. Hence, all data sets showed that the negative effects of soil inoculation on plant mass appear to extend over a long period but arise from the negative effects that occur in the first weeks after planting when plants have only obtained less than 5% of the mass they obtain after 42 days.

It is plausible that the observed effect was due to a net pathogenic effect of the soil microbial community on plant growth (Klironomos 2002; Joosten *et al.* 2009; Harrison and Bardgett 2010; Cortois *et al.* 2015). This hypothesis has been widely verified in other studies. For example, bacterial species such as *Ralstonia solanacearum*, *Agrobacterium tumefaciens*, *Erwinia amylovora* and *Streptomyces scabies* have been frequently isolated from natural soils (Curl *et al.* 1998; Michel *et al.* 1998; Gómez *et al.* 2017; Sharifazizi *et al.* 2017). These pathogenic microbes can adversely affect plant health and production (Huang *et al.* 2013; Cesarano *et al.* 2017). Several studies have indicated that soil microbes compete with plants for available nutrients in the soil, and this could also result in negative effects on plant growth in inoculated soil (Bardgett *et al.* 2003; Fontaine *et al.* 2003; Dunn *et al.* 2006). However, in our study, we grew plants in a nutrient-rich environment by supplying a nutrient solution, and hence we argue that it is unlikely that the negative effect of live soil on plant growth was due to plant-microbe competition for nutrients. In an unpublished data, application of SA mitigated the negative effects of the live soil on the growth of *J. vulgaris*. In combination with the fact that activation of SA-dependent signaling pathways leads to the expression of pathogenesis-related proteins (PRP) contributing to resistance (Glazebrook 2005; Spoel *et al.* 2007), this together suggests that the negative soil effect on plant growth was due to microbial pathogens.

Our study exemplifies that the negative effects of soil inoculation on plant mass can extend over the entire growth period, even though the differences are due to negative effects that occur during the first weeks after planting. There are several explanations for the observation that older plants (≥ 22 days) do not exhibit a negative response to live soils. First, younger plants (≤ 21 days) or seedlings may be more vulnerable and susceptible to pathogenic microbes in the soil than older plants with well-developed root systems (Packer and Clay 2000). Root development plays an important role for plants in suppressing soil-borne pathogens (Watt *et al.* 2006; Emmett *et al.* 2014) and is correlated with soil abiotic or biotic characteristics (Kardol *et al.* 2013; Arrigoni *et al.* 2018; Bezemer *et al.* 2018). Herms and Mattson (1992) demonstrated that plants have to invest in their roots first before they can defend themselves against biotic stress. Hence, it may take a while for plants to build-up their defense systems (Raaijmakers *et al.* 2009; Hayat *et al.* 2010). Alternatively, it is well established that plants influence the soil microbial community during growth and hence, it is also possible that the differences in the response of younger and older plants to live soil is due to changes that have occurred in the soil microbial community. Previous work with the same plant species, *J. vulgaris*, where seedlings were planted in soil in which plants of the same species had been grown first, showed that the differences between responses of young and old plants are likely related to the sensitivity of plant stages and not due to changes in the soil community. Young *J. vulgaris* exhibited a strong negative conspecific feedback, but this effect diminished over time and became neutral in older plants (Bezemer *et al.* 2018).

The results of experiment 1 suggest that the negative response of plant growth to live soil are due to a time lag in plant biomass accumulation during the early stage (≤ 21 days) of plant development. Interestingly, data in experiment 2 showed plants were able to “catch-up” and that plants exhibited compensatory increased growth rate to obtain similar final biomass under both treatments. Altogether, our results seem to suggest that there was a delayed start (a prolonged “lag phase”) to the log (exponential) phase of the associating with a net-negative soil community. To confirm this, further studies should examine changes in relative growth rates of single plants (i.e. growth measured repeatedly on the same individuals) and also do this for an extended growth period.

Interestingly we observed that the longer the time since the soil was inoculated the stronger the negative effect of the inoculum on plant growth. This also indicates that the negative effects of live soil on plant growth that are commonly observed for this plant species

are mediated by the soil microbial community. Variation that is typically observed in plant growth experiments with this species may result from the different densities of soil-borne microbes. We expect that the oldest inoculated live soil contained the highest density of pathogenic microbes, leading to a stronger negative effect on plant growth (Pernilla *et al.* 2010; Dudenhöffer, *et al.* 2018). However, in this study, we did not quantify the microbial density in the soil nor measure plant defense-related compounds such as salicylic acid, or pyrrolizidine alkaloids, and we suggest future work should focus on these two aspects.

In conclusion, our results indicate that live soil negatively affected growth of *J. vulgaris*. In most cases the difference between plant biomass of plants grown in sterilized soil and live soil increased during the entire experiment. However, the relative growth rates of plants in the sterilized soil and live soil only differed for young plants. Moreover, there was a negative correlation between the time of soil inoculation before planting and the relative growth rate of *J. vulgaris* plants, but for all incubation periods the negative effects were only present for young plants. Hence, our results suggest that young *J. vulgaris* plants (≤ 21 days) or seedlings are most sensitive to soil pathogens while older plants (≥ 22 days) are no longer affected.

Accepted Manuscript

Funding

This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Karin van der Veen-van Wijk for assistance at the final biomass harvest, Jan Vink for driving us to the field site to collect soil used for the inoculation experiment, and Jorian van Kampen, Gang Chen for collecting soil. We would also like to thank the China Scholarship Council for financial support.

Accepted Manuscript

References

- Anacker BL, Klironomos JN, Maherali H, *et al.* (2014) Phylogenetic conservatism in plant-soil feedback and its implications for plant abundance. *Eco Lett* **12**: 1613-1621.
- Arora NK, Mishra J (2016) Prospecting the roles of metabolites and additives in future bioformulations for sustainable agriculture. *Appl Soil Ecol* **107**: 405-407.
- Arrigoni E, Antonielli L, Pindo M, *et al.* (2018) Tissue age and plant genotype affect the microbiota of apple and pear bark. *Microbiol Res* **211**: 57-68.
- Artursson V, Finlay RD, Jansson JK (2006) Interactions between arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi and bacteria and their potential for stimulating plant growth. *Environ Microbiol* **1**: 1-10.
- Bardgett RD, Streeter TC, Bol R (2003) Soil microbes compete effectively with plants for organic-nitrogen inputs to temperate grasslands. *Ecol* **5**: 1277-1287.
- Bever JD (1994) Feedback between plants and their soil communities in an old field community. *Ecol* **7**: 1965-1977.
- Bezemer TM, van der Putten WH, Martens H, *et al.* (2013) Above- and below-ground herbivory effects on below-ground plant-fungus interactions and plant-soil feedback responses. *J Ecol* **2**: 325-333.
- Bezemer TM, Jing J, Bakx-Schotman JT, *et al.* (2018) Plant competition alters the temporal dynamics of plant-soil feedbacks. *J Ecol* **6**: 2287-2300.
- Cesarano G, Zotti M, Antignani V, *et al.* (2017) Soil sickness and negative plant-soil feedback: A reappraisal of hypotheses. *J Plant Pathol* **3**: 545-570.
- Churchland C, Grayston SJ (2014) Specificity of plant-microbe interactions in the tree mycorrhizosphere biome and consequences for soil C cycling. *Front Microbiol* **5**: 261.
- Cortois R, Schröder-Georgi T, Weigelt A, *et al.* (2016) Plant-soil feedbacks: role of plant functional group and plant traits. *J Ecol* **6**: 1608-1617.
- Curl EA, Lartey R, Peterson CM (1988) Interactions between root pathogens and soil microarthropods. *Agric Ecosyst Environ* **1-3**: 249-261.
- Dobson A, Crawley M (1994) Pathogens and the structure of plant communities. *Trends Ecol Evol* **10**: 393-398.


- Dudenhöffer JH, Ebeling A, Klein AM, *et al.* (2018) Beyond biomass: Soil feedbacks are transient over plant life stages and alter fitness. *J Ecol* **1**: 230-241.
- Dunn RM, Mikola J, Bol R, *et al.* (2006) Influence of microbial activity on plant–microbial competition for organic and inorganic nitrogen. *Plant and Soil*, **1-2**: 321-334.
- Emmett B, Nelson EB, Kessler A, *et al.* (2014) Fine-root system development and susceptibility to pathogen colonization. *Planta* **2**: 325-340.
- Erktan A, McCormack ML, Roumet C (2018) Frontiers in root ecology: recent advances and future challenges. *Plant Soil* **424**: 1-9.
- Fontaine S, Mariotti A, Abbadie L, (2003) The priming effect of organic matter: a question of microbial competition? *Soil Biol Biochem* **6**: 837-843.
- Gil-Martínez M, López-García Á, Domínguez MT, *et al.* (2018) Ectomycorrhizal fungal communities and their functional traits mediate plant-soil interactions in trace element contaminated soils. *Front Plant Sci* **9**: 1682.
- Gómez Expósito R, De Bruijn I, Postma J, *et al.* (2017) Current insights into the role of rhizosphere bacteria in disease suppressive soils. *Front Microbiol* **8**: 2529.
- Glazebrook J (2005) Contrasting mechanisms of defense against biotrophic and necrotrophic pathogens. *Annu Rev Phytopathol* **43**: 205-227.
- Harrison KA, Bardgett RD (2010) Influence of plant species and soil conditions on plant-soil feedback in mixed grassland communities. *J Ecol* **2**: 384-395.
- Hayat R, Ali S, Amara U, *et al.* (2010) Soil beneficial bacteria and their role in plant growth promotion: a review. *Ann Microbiol* **4**: 579-598.
- Hermes DA, Mattson WJ (1992) The dilemma of plants: to grow or defend. *Q Rev Biol* **3**: 283-335.
- Hodge A, Fitter AH (2013) Microbial mediation of plant competition and community structure. *Func Ecol* **4**: 865-875.
- Huang LF, Song LX, Xia XJ, *et al.* (2013) Plant-soil feedbacks and soil sickness: from mechanisms to application in agriculture. *J Chem Ecol* **2**: 232-242.
- Jacoby R, Peukert M, Succurro A, *et al.* (2017) The role of soil microorganisms in plant mineral nutrition-current knowledge and future directions. *Front Plant Sci* **8**: 1617.

- Jing J, Bezemer TM, van der Putten WH (2015) Complementarity and selection effects in early and mid- successional plant communities are differentially affected by plant-soil feedback. *J Ecol* **3**: 641-647.
- Johnson NC, Graham JH, Smith FA (1997) Functioning of mycorrhizal associations along the mutualism-parasitism continuum. *New Phytol* **4**: 575-585.
- Joosten L, Mulder PP, Klinkhamer PG *et al.* (2009) Soil-borne microorganisms and soil-type affect pyrrolizidine alkaloids in *Jacobaea vulgaris*. *Plant Soil* **1-2**: 133.
- Kardol P, De Deyn GB, Laliberté E, *et al.* (2013) Biotic plant-soil feedbacks across temporal scales. *J Ecol* **2**: 309-315.
- Klironomos JN (2002) Feedback with soil biota contributes to plant rarity and invasiveness in communities. *Nature* **6884**: 67-70.
- Kos F, Poland D, Simmons-Duffin D, *et al.* (2015) Bootstrapping the O (N) archipelago. *JHEP* **11**: 106.
- Mangan SA, Schnitzer SA, Herre EA, *et al.* (2010) Negative plant-soil feedback predicts tree-species relative abundance in a tropical forest. *Nature* **7307**: 752-755.
- Michel VV, Mew TW (1998) Effect of a soil amendment on the survival of *Ralstonia solanacearum* in different soils. *Phytopathol* **4**: 300-305.
- Mordecai EA (2011) Pathogen impacts on plant communities: unifying theory, concepts, and empirical work. *Ecol Monogr* **3**: 429-441.
- Packer A, Clay K (2000) Soil pathogens and spatial patterns of seedling mortality in a temperate tree. *Nature* **6775**: 278-281.
- Pernilla Brinkman E, van der Putten WH, Bakker EJ, *et al.* (2010) Plant-soil feedback: experimental approaches, statistical analyses and ecological interpretations. *J Ecol* **5**: 1063-1073.
- Raaijmakers JM, Paulitz TC, Steinberg C, *et al.* (2009) The rhizosphere: a playground and battlefield for soilborne pathogens and beneficial microorganisms. *Plant Soil* **1-2**: 341-361.
- Sharifazizi M, Harighi B, Sadeghi A (2017) Evaluation of biological control of *Erwinia amylovora*, causal agent of fire blight disease of pear by antagonistic bacteria. *Biol Control* **104**: 28-34.
- Smith LM, Reynolds HL (2012) Positive plant-soil feedback may drive dominance of a woodland invader, *Euonymus fortunei*. *Plant Ecol* **5**: 853-860.

- Spoel SH, Johnson JS, Dong X (2007) Regulation of tradeoffs between plant defenses against pathogens with different lifestyles. *PNAS* **47**: 18842-18847.
- Steiner AA (1980) The selective capacity of plants for ions and its importance for the composition and treatment of the nutrient solution. *Acta Hort* **98**: 87-98.
- Teste FP, Kardol P, Turner BL, *et al.* (2017) Plant-soil feedback and the maintenance of diversity in Mediterranean-climate shrublands. *Sci* **6321**: 173-176.
- van der Putten WH, Bardgett RD, Bever JD, *et al.* (2013) Plant-soil feedbacks: the past, the present and future challenges. *J Ecol* **2**: 265-276.
- van de Voorde TF, van der Putten WH, Martijn Bezemer T (2011) Intra-and interspecific plant-soil interactions, soil legacies and priority effects during old-field succession. *J Ecol* **4**: 945-953.
- van de Voorde TF, van der Putten WH, Bezemer, *et al.* (2012) Soil inoculation method determines the strength of plant-soil interactions. *Soil Biol Biochem* **55**: 1-6.
- Wang M, Ruan W, Kostenko O, *et al.* (2019) Removal of soil biota alters soil feedback effects on plant growth and defense chemistry. *New Phytol* **3**: 1478-1491.
- Wardle DA, Bardgett RD, Klironomos JN, *et al.* (2004) Ecological linkages between aboveground and belowground biota. *Sci* **5677**: 1629-1633.
- Watt M, Silk WK, Passioura JB (2006) Rates of root and organism growth, soil conditions, and temporal and spatial development of the rhizosphere. *Ann Bot* **5**: 839-855.

Accepted Manuscript

Fig. 1 Conceptual figures showing relative growth rate and plant mass of *J. vulgaris* in both sterilized soil and live soil over time. (a) The biomass of plants plotted against time. (b) Ln biomass plotted against time. The regression coefficients (slopes) in b are equal to the relative growth rates of the plants. The relative growth rate in sterilized soil (solid line) is higher than that in live soil (gray dashed line) (hypothesis 1) and this difference is maintained during the entire plant growth period. The black dashed line indicates an initial lower relative growth rate of plants in the live soil but at t_1 these plants obtain an equal relative growth rate as plants in the live soil (Fig. b, hypothesis 2). Note that even when relative growth rates become equal after an initial difference in in the early stage of life (the solid line and the black dashed line in Fig. 1a) the difference in absolute biomass continues to increase after that period (the solid line and the black dashed line in Fig. 1b). The grey dashed lines show a case in which both the absolute and relative growth are lower for plants in live soil.



Accepted

Script

Fig. 2 Experiment 1. (a) Mean (\pm SE) biomass of *J. vulgaris* in sterilized and live soil over 49 days. For each time point, differences between the biomass of the plants in the two soils were tested for significance with a t-test, * indicates a significant difference ($P < 0.05$). (b) Two linear regression models (day 7-21, and day 28-49) of \ln transformed biomass of *J. vulgaris* in both sterilized and live soil. The slopes of the lines present an estimate for the relative growth rate. The extrapolated dashed parts of the lines are based on the linear regression models for day 28-49. (c) Slopes (mean \pm SE) of the regression lines in (b). Differences between the slopes for live-soil and control soil were tested for significance with a t-test. *** indicates $P < 0.001$.




Fig. 3 Experiment 2. (a) Mean (\pm SE) of dry plant mass of *J. vulgaris* in sterilized and live soil over 63 days. For each time point, differences between the biomass of the plants in the two soils were tested for significance with a t-test, * indicates a significant difference at $P < 0.05$. (b) Three linear regression models (day 0-19, 22-42, 49-63) of \ln transformed biomass of *J. vulgaris* in both sterilized and live soil. The two extrapolated gray dashed parts of the lines are based on the linear regression models for day 0-19 and 49-63 (c) Slope (\pm SE) of the linear regression lines in (b). Differences between the slopes for live soil and sterilized soil were tested for significance with a t-test. * indicates $P < 0.05$.




Fig. 4 Experiment 3. Plant growth of *J. vulgaris* in sterilized soil and in live soil 0, 1, 2 or 4 weeks before planting (live-0, live-1, live-2 and live-4). (a) Mean (\pm SE) fresh biomass of *J. vulgaris* in sterilized and live soil over 42 days. For each time point differences between the biomass of the plants in the sterilized soil and overall live soil (combining four live soils as an overall live soil treatment) were tested for significance with a t-test, * indicates a significant difference at $P < 0.05$. (b) Two linear regression models (0-20, 28-42) of \ln transformed fresh biomass of *J. vulgaris* in sterilized soil and four live soils. The extrapolated dashed parts of the lines are based on the linear regression models of day 28-42. (c) Mean slope (\pm SE) of linear lines in (b). Differences between the slopes for live-soil and sterilized soil were tested for significance with a t-test. *** indicates significant difference at $P < 0.001$; ** indicates significant difference at $P < 0.01$.

