

# ACCEPTED VERSION

E.-L. Ng, A.F. Patti, M.T. Rose, C.R. Scheffe, R.J. Smernik, T.R. Cavagnaro

**Do organic inputs alter resistance and resilience of soil microbial community to drying?**

Soil Biology and Biochemistry, 2015; 81:58-66

©2014 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

[10.1016/j.soilbio.2014.10.028](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soilbio.2014.10.028)

NOTICE: this is the author's version of a work that was accepted for publication in Soil Biology and Biochemistry. Changes resulting from the publishing process, such as peer review, editing, corrections, structural formatting, and other quality control mechanisms may not be reflected in this document. Changes may have been made to this work since it was submitted for publication. A definitive version was subsequently published in Soil Biology and Biochemistry, 2015; 81:58-66, [10.1016/j.soilbio.2014.10.028](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soilbio.2014.10.028)

Source:

<http://www.elsevier.com/journal-authors/policies/open-access-policies/article-posting-policy>

Elsevier's Policy: An author may use the preprint for personal use, internal institutional use and for permitted scholarly posting.

...

Elsevier's AAM Policy: Authors retain the right to use the accepted author manuscript for personal use, internal institutional use and for permitted scholarly posting provided that these are not for purposes of commercial use or systematic distribution.

Elsevier believes that individual authors should be able to distribute their AAMs for their personal voluntary needs and interests, e.g. posting to their websites or their institution's repository, e-mailing to colleagues. However, our policies differ regarding the systematic aggregation or distribution of AAMs to ensure the sustainability of the journals to which AAMs are submitted. Therefore, deposit in, or posting to, subject-oriented or centralized repositories (such as PubMed Central), or institutional repositories with systematic posting mandates is permitted only under specific agreements between Elsevier and the repository, agency or institution, and only consistent with the publisher's policies concerning such repositories. Voluntary posting of AAMs in the arXiv subject repository is permitted.

...

Permitted scholarly posting: Voluntary posting by an author on open websites operated by the author or the author's institution for scholarly purposes, as determined by the author, or (in connection with preprints) on preprint servers.

**April 10, 2015**

<http://hdl.handle.net/2440/90335>



1 drying); and resilience, which measures the ability of an ecosystem to recover community  
2 structure and function post-stress. We investigated the effects of compost on the resistance and  
3 resilience of the grassland soil ecosystem under drying and drying with rewetting events, in a  
4 terrestrial model ecosystem. Overall, compost addition led to an increase in soil moisture, greater  
5 plant available P and higher plant  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ . Soil C:nutrient ratios, mineral N content ( $\text{NH}_4^+$  and  $\text{NO}_3^-$   
6 ) and soil microbial PLFA composition were similar between amended and unamended soils.  
7 Rainfall treatment led to differences in soil moisture, plant above-ground and below-ground  
8 biomass, plant  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ , soil mineral N content ( $\text{NH}_4^+$  and  $\text{NO}_3^-$ ) and microbial biomass C, N and P  
9 composition but had no effects on soil C:nutrient ratios, plant available P and soil microbial  
10 PLFA composition. There was little interaction between rainfall and compost. Generally, the soil  
11 microbial community was resistant and resilient to fluctuations in rainfall regardless of compost  
12 amendment. However, these properties of the soil microbial community were translated to  
13 resilience and not resistance in soil functions. Overall, the results below-ground showed much  
14 greater response to rainfall than compost amendment. Water was the key factor shaping the soil  
15 microbial community, and nutrients were not strong co-limiting factors. Future projections of  
16 increasing rainfall variability will have important below-ground functional consequences in the  
17 grassland, including altered nutrient cycling.

18

19 *Keywords:* carbon cycling;  $^{13}\text{C}$  NMR; PLFA; microbial activity; grassland soil microbial  
20 community

21

22

23 **1. Introduction**

1 South-eastern Australia generally experiences high climatic variability. Grassland  
2 ecosystems form an important part of this landscape, where 350 million ha are grazed for  
3 livestock and dairy production (ABS, 2013). Drought is a natural, periodic characteristic that  
4 shapes such landscapes, and although native perennial pastures are generally well-adapted to this  
5 high variability, improved pastures containing exotic, fast growing annual pastures such as  
6 ryegrass are widespread and much more susceptible to drought and other stresses (White et al.,  
7 2000). Because the quantity and timing of rainfall influence patterns of plant production (Dukes  
8 et al., 2005) and carbon storage and loss (Chou et al., 2008), effects on soil biota and their  
9 processes can be magnified beyond that caused solely by water deficit, which create further  
10 feedback that alters above-ground biota (Wardle et al., 2004).

11 As climate projections suggest a future with greater frequency and severity of drought  
12 and extreme rainfall events (Alexander and Arblaster, 2009; Hennessy et al., 2008), the ability of  
13 soil microbial communities to withstand or adapt to the changes remain unclear. Some studies  
14 have observed that soil microbial community in grassland ecosystems were resistant and  
15 resilient to climatic extremes, suggesting presence of communities adapted to regular, seasonal  
16 fluctuations in temperature and rainfall experienced by such ecosystem (Cruz-Martínez et al.,  
17 2009; Griffiths et al., 2003; Waldrop and Firestone, 2006). In a review by Allison and Martiny  
18 (2008), soil microbial composition was found to be sensitive and not immediately resilient to  
19 elevated CO<sub>2</sub>, mineral fertilization, temperature changes and carbon amendments. They  
20 suggested that functional redundancy is overestimated and different communities are not  
21 functionally similar. As such, changes in microbial composition may cascade into changes in soil  
22 ecosystem services as the soil microbial community is a key player in soil processes.

1 Nutrient availability is also an important driver of soil ecosystem function and carbon  
2 cycling. Modern agriculture is heavily dependent on regular fertilizer inputs and this trend is  
3 likely to continue in the coming decades, although some fertilizers, such as phosphorus and  
4 potassium, are derived from finite resources (Cordell et al., 2009; Odegard and van der Voet,  
5 2014; Vitousek et al., 1997). The addition of organic amendments (OA) may offer an option to  
6 supplement/augment inorganic fertilisers and support sustainable, biologically regulated nutrient  
7 supply systems. Previous studies have shown that inputs of OA affect soil biota, plants and  
8 biogeochemical cycling (Bastida et al., 2008; Ippolito et al., 2010; Ryals and Silver, 2013). OA  
9 has been observed to improve primary productivity and net ecosystem C storage (Ryals et al.,  
10 2014; Ryals and Silver, 2013). Microbial biomass and activity often increase with addition of  
11 OA (Bastida et al., 2008) and improvements in soil organic matter with OA can persist for over a  
12 decade (Ippolito et al., 2010).

13 Organic amendments are proposed to improve soil resilience to disturbance (Griffiths and  
14 Philippot, 2013). Organic matter amended soils have been observed to exhibit less pronounced  
15 changes in microbial phospholipid fatty acid or PLFA (total PLFA, bacterial PLFA, saturated  
16 and monounsaturated PFLA) compared to unamended soils under drought conditions (Hueso et  
17 al., 2012). Severe disturbances can lead to poor but stable and resistant states that require  
18 external inputs to provide a source of energy and nutrients to allow biological colonisation and  
19 increase microbial activity (Ohsowski et al., 2012). Besides energy and nutrients, OA may also  
20 improve soil structure, cation exchange capacity and water holding capacity, which combined  
21 with slow-release of nutrients may benefit below- and above-ground resilience to disturbance  
22 (Hargreaves et al., 2008; Ryals et al., 2014; Ryals and Silver, 2013). With these expected  
23 benefits to the soil on addition of compost, compost may increase both the resistance and

1 resilience of grassland soil microbial community, and therefore soil functions, to drying and  
2 rewetting cycles that are projected to increase in frequency and severity in the region.

3         With this aim in mind, this study identified the responses of an intensively grazed  
4 grassland ecosystem to altered rainfall and organic amendment, focusing on soil microbial  
5 community responses. To do so, we determined (1) the above-ground and below-ground  
6 responses to drying and rewetting and, (2) examined if compost alters the resistance and  
7 resilience of the soil microbial community to drying and rewetting cycles. Specifically, we  
8 examined the hypothesis that compost amendment increases the resistance and resilience of soil  
9 microbial community to altered rainfall; and therefore, similarly increase the resistance and  
10 resilience of the processes of C, N and P that they govern to altered rainfall. We also tested the  
11 hypothesis that grassland soil microbial activity is more responsive to drying-rewetting  
12 compared to soil microbial community composition, i.e. resistance and resilience of soil  
13 microbial composition are greater than that of soil functions. Any increase in the resistance and  
14 resilience of the soil microbial community with compost amendment would be indicated by a  
15 stable microbial community composition in response to drying, and the ability of the community  
16 composition to recover post drying-rewetting respectively. Correspondingly, any increase in the  
17 resistance and resilience of the soil C, N and P processes with compost amendment would be  
18 indicated by stable level of soil processes in response in response to drying, and the recovery in  
19 process rates (as indicated by microbial activity) post drying-rewetting respectively.

20

21

22

23

## 1 2. Materials and Methods

### 2 2.1 Soil, Experimental Design and Sampling

3 In a terrestrial model ecosystem experiment, we collected intact soil cores from an  
4 intensively grazed grassland in the Toomuc Valley at Pakenham (38°0' S, 145°28' E). The field  
5 site was covered predominantly by ryegrass (*Lolium* sp.) and some ribwort plantain (*Plantago*  
6 *lanceolata*), carpet grass (*Axonopus affinis*) and finger grass (*Digitaria* sp.). The soil was a  
7 Brown Chromosol with 7.5% organic matter, C:N ratio of 11.1,  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  of -29.5‰,  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  of 3.9‰  
8 and pH of 5.39 (H<sub>2</sub>O). Intact soil cores (40cm length\*15cm diameter), including the living  
9 vegetation, were then housed in carts connected to a cooling unit and placed within a glasshouse.  
10 Such terrestrial model ecosystem setup simulates natural processes and interactions while  
11 allowing control over some environmental variables such as rainfall (see Knacker et al., 2004 for  
12 details of terrestrial model ecosystem approach).

13 We used a fully factorial design with two compost application rates and three rain  
14 regimes. The green waste was collected from municipal green waste and composted following  
15 the method of Ng *et al.* (2014). Its characteristics were: total C (16.9%), total N (1.49%), total P  
16 (2440 mg/kg),  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  (-27.8‰);  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  (7.3‰),  $\text{NO}_3^-$  (485 mg/kg),  $\text{NH}_4^+$  (30 mg/kg) and pH 8.36  
17 (H<sub>2</sub>O). Compost was applied on the surface at the rate of 30 ton/ ha (based on dry mass), which  
18 was equivalent to 86 g (wet weight) per core. The control treatment received no compost.

19 Rain treatments were based on rainfall data from 1948 to 2012 for Pakenham from the  
20 Australian Bureau of Meteorology (2012) weather station at Scoresby, located 32 km to the  
21 northwest. The frequency of rain was determined by calculating the median number of rain  
22 events and the number of days where the rainfall is greater than 1 mm, followed by random  
23 number generation using R 2.15.1. A rain event is defined by any precipitation in a day or over

1 consecutive days. Accordingly, in this experiment, rain was applied once at each rain event for  
2 March and April and over two consecutive days for each rain event in May. For normal rain,  
3 which is the control rain treatment, we determined total amount of rain from the decile 5  
4 (median) rainfall for each autumn month (March, April and May) over 1948 to 2012. This  
5 corresponds to 47.8 mm, 65.0 mm and 83.2 mm for March, April and May, respectively. For  
6 drying (drought) treatment, we used the lowest rainfall recorded over the same period. This  
7 corresponds to 4.0 mm, 18.4 mm and 12.4 mm for March, April and May respectively. The  
8 rewetting (heavy rainfall) after drought treatment on day 87 (150 mm in a day) was based on  
9 record high rainfalls in Victoria.

10 Cores were assigned in a randomised complete block design. Each full set of treatments  
11 was housed in a temperature-regulated cart and each treatment was replicated five times. The  
12 cores were equilibrated for 2 weeks and maintained under normal rain conditions using deionised  
13 water. The cores were organised into randomised blocks, housed within a controlled environment  
14 glasshouse. The photoperiod was 16 h day/ 8 h night. Day temperature was maintained at  
15 maximum 24 °C, 20 °C and 16 °C, respectively, for March, April and May. The cores were  
16 destructively sampled after 3 months. Samples were taken from the 0-5 cm depth and sieved to  
17 less than 2 mm. Subsamples were kept at 4 °C for enzyme analysis or -20 °C for other analyses,  
18 followed by air drying of the remaining sample for chemical analysis.

19

## 20 2.2 Soil physical and chemical properties

21 Unamended and amended soil samples were analysed for a suite of chemical properties.  
22 A high-frequency induction furnace (LECO Pty Ltd) was used to measure total soil C and N.  
23 Mineral N was extracted with 2 M KCl (1:4 soil extractant) and measured colorimetrically



1 following Forster (1995) and Miranda et al. (2001) for  $\text{NH}_4^+$  and  $\text{NO}_3^-$ , respectively.  $\text{NH}_4^+$  was  
2 determined by reaction with salicylate and hypochlorite in a buffered alkaline solution in the  
3 presence of sodium nitroprusside.  $\text{NO}_3^-$  was determined by reduction of nitrate using vanadium  
4 (III) combined with detection by acidic Griess reaction. Total soil P was determined by method  
5 17C1 in Rayment and Lyons (2011). Air-dried soil was subjected to aqua regia block digestion  
6 followed by measurement using ICP-AES. Plant available P, measured as Colwell P was  
7 extracted with 0.5 M  $\text{NaHCO}_3$  (1:100 soil extractant) and measured following D'Angelo *et al.*  
8 (2001) using malachite green colorimetric procedure

9

## 10 2.3 Plant Biomass

11 The above-ground biomass was obtained by cutting the grass close to the soil surface.  
12 Roots were extracted by wet sieving using 1 mm and 0.25 mm sieves. Samples were dried at  
13 40 °C for 3 days. Plant C, N,  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  and  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  content were determined on an ANCA GSL2  
14 elemental analyser interfaced to a Hydra 20-22 continuous-flow isotope ratio mass spectrometer  
15 (Sercon Ltd., UK). Stable isotope data are expressed in the delta notation ( $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  and  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ ),  
16 relative to the stable isotopic ratio of Vienna Pee Dee Belemnite standard ( $R_{\text{VPDB}} = 0.0111797$ )  
17 for C and atmospheric  $\text{N}_2$  ( $R_{\text{Air}} = 0.0036765$ ) for nitrogen.

18

## 19 2.4 Microbial community analyses

20 Soil microbial biomass C, N and P were determined by the chloroform fumigation-  
21 extraction technique as described by Vance et al (1987), but using 4 g of fresh soil for both

1 fumigated and un-fumigated sub-samples. Microbial biomass C was quantified by dichromate  
2 digestion of fumigated and unfumigated samples as described by Cai *et al.* (2011). Microbial  
3 biomass N was determined using the method of Joergensen and Brookes (1990) to quantify  
4 ninhydrin-reactive N, and microbial biomass P was determined via the method of Jeanotte *et al.*  
5 (2004) using malachite green colorimetric procedure.

6       Soil microbial phospholipid fatty acid (PLFA) was extracted using a method modified  
7 from Bligh and Dyer (1959) using citrate buffer (Nielsen & Petersen 2000) and alkaline  
8 methanolysis of phospholipids (Bossio and Scow, 1998). The PLFA profile was identified using  
9 a Varian CP 38/00 gas chromatograph fitted with 5 % phenyl:95 % methylsiloxane column  
10 (Varian, Walnut Creek CA, USA). The fatty acids i15:0, a15:0, 15:0, i16:0, 16:1 $\omega$ 7, i17:0, a17:0,  
11 17:0cy, 17:0, and 19:0cy were chosen as bacterial biomarkers and linoleic acid (18:2 $\omega$ 6,9) was  
12 chosen as the biomarker for decomposer fungi (see Frostegård and Bååth, 1996 and references  
13 therein).

14

## 15 2.5 Microbial activity

16       We assayed the activities of five enzymes in soil.  $\beta$ -glucosidase (BGL), phosphatase  
17 (PHOS) and polyphenol oxidase (PPO) activities were determined according to procedures  
18 modified from Allison and Jastrow (2006). We have found these assays to provide a good  
19 indication of soil microbial community activity in our earlier work on the impact of organic  
20 amendments to the soil (Ng *et al.*, 2014). Peroxidase (POX) was assayed using a method  
21 modified from Frey *et al.* (2000) and Johnsen and Jacobsen (2008). Urease (URE) was assayed  
22 following a method modified from Kandeler and Gerber (1988). 0.5 mL of homogenised soil

1 slurry in sodium acetate buffer (pH 5, 50 mM; 5g in 50 mL) was combined with 0.5 mL of  
2 substrate solution made using the acetate buffer. BGL, PHOS, URE, PPO and POX were  
3 incubated for 2h, 2h, 5h, 1h and 10 mins, respectively. A background soil control and a substrate  
4 control were analysed for all enzymes. For URE, an additional 0.01 mL of toluene was added in  
5 all replicates and controls. At the end of incubation,  $\text{NH}_4^+$  was extracted using 4 M KCl and  
6  $\text{NH}_4^+$  measured using the Forster (1995) method modified for a 96-well microplate.

7

## 8 2.6 Statistical Analysis

9 Randomised block design ANOVA was performed. Where assumptions of normality and  
10 homoscedasticity were not met, transformations were carried out and compared to results of  
11 untransformed data. Where similar statistical significance was obtained, results of the  
12 untransformed data were presented. Transformation was retained for the analysis of the  
13 following: log (n+1) transformation for aboveground biomass for May and  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ , and rank  
14 transformation for BGL and PHOS. Post-hoc multiple comparisons were carried out using a least  
15 significant difference (LSD) test with *p*-values adjusted using Bonferroni.

16 To assess the resistance of the soil microbial communities (i.e. their ability to resist  
17 change following a disturbance), we calculated the difference in soil microbial structure between  
18 drying and control relative to the control using bacterial biomass, fungal biomass and bacteria-to-  
19 fungal ratio (B:F ratio). To assess the resilience of the microbial communities (i.e. their ability to  
20 recover after disturbance), we calculated the difference between the rewetting and control  
21 relative to the control using bacterial biomass, fungal biomass and B:F ratio. The resistance of  
22 microbial activities (BGL, PHOS, PPO, POX, URE), as indicators of soil functions, was

1 calculated as the difference of soil function between drying and control relative to the control.  
2 Therefore, the resistance of soil functions was examined with respect to controls. The resilience  
3 of the soil functions was calculated as the difference between the rewetting and control  
4 treatments relative to the control treatments. Compost-amended soils under normal rainfall were  
5 used as controls for amended samples and unamended soils under normal rainfall were used as  
6 controls for unamended samples. Randomised block design ANOVA was carried out as above on  
7 the actual response variables for all treatments to minimise introduced errors due to multiple one-  
8 way ANOVAs.

9         Multivariate analysis was carried out using standardised data. Microbial biomass and  
10 PLFA data were standardised using chord transformation. Kendall  $\tau$  ( $\tau$ ) was used to examine  
11 correlation between fatty acids. Most fatty acids were correlated. Five fatty acids had < 50%  
12 correlation with other variables. Sequential addition of fatty acids to the analysis did not add  
13 meaningful patterns to the ordination. Therefore these five fatty acids were sufficient for the final  
14 nonmetric multidimensional scaling (NMDS). All results were checked by using chi-square  
15 transformation, cluster analysis and principal component analysis (PCA). Cluster analysis was  
16 done using Ward's hierarchical clustering on the Bray-Curtis dissimilarity matrix. The results  
17 were generally the same and only NMDS and cluster analysis are shown.

18         Data analysis was carried out on R 2.15.1 (R Core Team 2012) using the *alr3* package  
19 (Weisberg, 2005) and the *agricolae* package (Mendiburu, 2012) for randomised block ANOVA  
20 and LSD test, respectively. Ordinations were carried out using the *vegan* package (Oksanen et  
21 al., 2012).

22

### 1 3. Results

#### 2 3.1 Soil physical and chemical properties

3 Soil moisture differed across the different rainfall treatments applied (Fig. 1;  $F_{2,22} =$   
4 204.1,  $p < 0.001$ ). Soil moisture was highest in rewetting, followed by normal rainfall and drying  
5 treatments. Additionally, amended soils had consistently higher soil moisture than unamended  
6 soils ( $F_{1,22} = 10.4$ ,  $p = 0.039$ ). Soil C:N, C:P and N:P ratios were similar across treatments (Fig.  
7 1). Mineral N content ( $\text{NH}_4^+$  and  $\text{NO}_3^-$ ) was different only between rain treatments (Fig. 1;  $F_{2,22} =$   
8 11.4,  $p < 0.001$  for  $\text{NH}_4^+$ ;  $F_{2,22} = 53.9$ ,  $p < 0.001$  for  $\text{NO}_3^-$ ). Soil  $\text{NH}_4^+$  and  $\text{NO}_3^-$  were higher in the  
9 drying and rewetting treatments compared to normal rain. Plant available (Colwell) P was only  
10 different between amended and unamended treatments ( $F_{1,22} = 6.4$ ,  $p = 0.019$ ). Compost  
11 amended soils had higher Colwell-P compared to unamended soils.

12

#### 13 3.2 Plant biomass and elemental content

14 Plant biomass was mainly affected by rain treatment (Fig. 2;  $F_{2,22} = 37.3$ ,  $p < 0.001$  in  
15 April;  $F_{2,22} = 65.3$ ,  $p < 0.001$  in May;  $F_{2,22} = 8.2$ ,  $p = 0.002$  for roots), where above-ground  
16 biomass was higher under normal rain in the second and third months of the experiment. Root  
17 biomass was also higher under normal rain compared to drying, but similar when compared to  
18 rewetting. The addition of OA also affected above-ground biomass at the end of the experiment  
19 (May) ( $F_{1,22} = 12.1$ ,  $p = 0.002$ ); specifically, above-ground biomass was lower in compost  
20 amended than unamended soils.

1 Plant aboveground C content was affected by OA only under normal and rewetting  
2 treatments (Fig 2B;  $F_{2,22} = 5.5$ ,  $p = 0.013$ ). Under normal rain, there was higher plant C in  
3 unamended compared to compost amended soil but the reverse was found in the rewetting  
4 treatment, i.e. plant biomass C was higher in compost amended soil compared to unamended  
5 soil. Plant  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  varied over a narrow range between -27 and -29 ‰ (Fig. 2C). Plant aboveground  
6 N content was similar across all treatments (Fig. 2D). However, their  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  value was affected by  
7 rain treatment ( $F_{2,22} = 3.6$ ,  $p = 0.04$ ) and addition of OA (Fig. 2E;  $F_{1,22} = 18.5$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ).  
8 Specifically, plant  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  was more similar between drying and rewetting treatments compared to  
9 normal rainfall. Plant  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  was also higher with addition of OA; this is consistent with the OA  
10 having a higher  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  than the soil.

11

### 12 3.3 Soil microbial composition and structure

13 Soil microbial biomass C, N and P composition under normal and rewetting treatments  
14 were more similar than for the drying treatment (Fig. 3A). Additionally, cluster analysis  
15 indicated that soil microbial biomass C, N and P composition was more similar between  
16 amended soil under rewetting and soils under normal rain (Fig. 3C). Soil microbial PLFA  
17 composition showed no clear pattern with regards to the treatments (Fig 3B). OA altered the  
18 resistance of bacterial biomass to drying ( $F_{2,22} = 15.7$ ,  $p < 0.001$ , Fig. 4A). Bacterial biomass in  
19 unamended soil was resistant to drying. The addition of compost further increased the bacterial  
20 biomass even with drying. Fungal biomass was resistant to drying regardless of OA treatment  
21 ( $F_{1,22} = 0.8$ ,  $p = 0.371$ , Fig. 4A). The B:F ratio was similarly resistant to drying regardless of OA  
22 treatment ( $F_{1,22} = 2.2$ ,  $p = 0.152$ , Fig. 4A).

1 With rewetting, the resilience of bacteria to drying differed between amended and  
2 unamended soil ( $F_{2,22} = 15.7$ ,  $p < 0.001$ , Fig. 4B). With the addition of OA, bacterial biomass  
3 after rewetting was similar to that of normal rain levels. The addition of OA did not alter the  
4 resilience of fungal biomass or B:F ratio. Fungal biomass under the rewetting regime was similar  
5 to that of normal rainfall regardless of the addition of OA ( $F_{1,22} = 0.8$ ,  $p = 0.371$ , Fig. 4B). The  
6 B:F ratio was higher in rewetting compared to drying treatment regardless of OA treatment ( $F_{2,22}$   
7  $= 13.8$ ,  $p < 0.001$ , Fig. 4B).

8

### 9 3.4 Microbial activities

10  $\beta$ -glucosidase (BGL), phosphatase (PHOS), polyphenol oxidase (PPO) and peroxidase  
11 (POX) activities had low resistance to drying (Fig. 4C;  $F_{2,22} = 4.2$ ,  $p = 0.029$ ;  $F_{2,22} = 9.5$ ,  $p =$   
12  $0.001$ ;  $F_{2,22} = 7.5$ ,  $p = 0.003$ ;  $F_{2,20} = 35.4$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). This was indicated by the observed lower  
13 than control microbial activity with drying. The addition of OA did not alter the resistance of  
14 BGL, PPO or POX to drying but improved PHOS resistance to drying. URE was unaffected by  
15 drying regardless of the amendment treatment ( $F_{2,22} = 0.9$ ,  $p = 0.406$ ).

16 BGL was resilient to drying with or without OA ( $F_{2,22} = 4.2$ ,  $p = 0.029$ , Fig. 4D). PPO  
17 was similarly resilient to drying with or without OA ( $F_{2,22} = 7.5$ ,  $p = 0.003$ , Fig. 4D). Both BGL  
18 and PPO returned to control levels with rewetting in both amended and unamended soils. PHOS  
19 resilience was low but the addition of OA improved PHOS resilience to drying ( $F_{2,22} = 9.5$ ,  $p =$   
20  $0.001$ , Fig. 4D). URE was unaffected by rewetting regardless of the amendment treatment ( $F_{2,22}$   
21  $= 0.9$ ,  $p = 0.406$ , Fig. 4D). The addition of OA reduced the resilience of POX to drying ( $F_{2,20} =$   
22  $5.9$ ,  $p = 0.009$ , Fig. 4D).

1

## 2 **4. Discussion**

3 Overall, compost addition led to an increase in soil moisture, greater plant available  
4 Colwell-P and higher plant  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ . Soil C:nutrient ratios, mineral N content ( $\text{NH}_4^+$  and  $\text{NO}_3^-$ ) but  
5 soil microbial PLFA composition were similar between amended and unamended soils. Rainfall  
6 treatment led to differences in soil moisture, plant above-ground and below-ground biomass,  
7 plant  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  content, mineral N content ( $\text{NH}_4^+$  and  $\text{NO}_3^-$ ) and microbial biomass C, N and P  
8 composition but had no effects on soil C:nutrient ratios, plant available Colwell-P and soil  
9 microbial PLFA composition. There was little interaction between rainfall and compost  
10 amendment, which was found to affect only plant above-ground C content, bacterial biomass,  
11 POX activity and microbial biomass C, N and P composition. We expected that compost  
12 amendment would improve the resistance and resilience of the soil microbial community to  
13 drying and rewetting cycles. Bacterial biomass was resistant to drying and bacterial biomass  
14 further increased with compost despite drying, but the resistance and resilience of fungal biomass  
15 and B:F ratio to drying were unaffected by compost addition. Compost addition also did not alter  
16 the resistance and resilience of most soil functions to drying and rewetting.

17 Cluster analysis of soil microbial biomass C, N and P composition indicated a possible  
18 interaction effect of rainfall and OA treatments, where the analysis indicated two main groups.  
19 One group consisted of compost amended soil under rewetting, and both amended and  
20 unamended soils under normal rainfall. The other group consisted of unamended soil under  
21 rewetting, and both amended and unamended soils under drying. Given these differences in  
22 microbial biomass elemental composition between amended and unamended soil under rewetting



1 occurred while their microbial PLFA composition and B:F ratio remained similar, this may  
2 indicate that the compost amendment altered soil microbial behaviour and physiology  
3 (Blagodatskaya et al., 2007; Manzoni et al., 2010). Prior studies have also found physiological  
4 responses to rewetting without changes in microbial community composition (Griffiths et al.,  
5 2003).

6         The low B:F ratio under drying and the high B:F ratio after rewetting indicated a rapid  
7 change in microbial structure. Fungi can be resistant to drying and are less sensitive to changes  
8 in moisture although they tend to decrease when the soil becomes saturated (Drenovsky et al.,  
9 2004; Unger et al., 2009; Yuste et al., 2011). We did not observe water saturation in our soils but  
10 we did observe lower fungal biomass with rewetting compared to soils under drying conditions.  
11 In a mild rewetting study using two soils, an inconsistent response from fungal biomass was  
12 observed whereby one soil had higher fungal biomass with rewetting while the other did not  
13 respond to rewetting (Steenwerth et al., 2005). Changes in other physicochemical properties of  
14 the environment and interactions of microbes with other soil biota have been proposed to be at  
15 play. Furthermore, we measured these changes less than three days after the rewetting and soil  
16 moisture remained higher in the rewetting treatment, so these differences in microbial structure  
17 may merely reflect the temporal dynamics in the soil physicochemical environment.  
18 Interestingly, bacterial biomass in the compost amended soils returned to control levels with  
19 rewetting but unamended soil had a significantly higher bacterial biomass. It is unclear what  
20 could have caused this response and this is worthy of further investigation.

21         We expected soil microbial activity to be more responsive to drying and rewetting  
22 compared to soil microbial composition or structure. Indeed we observed that soil functions  
23 changed with rainfall regimes, with a general decline in all enzyme activities under drying.

1 However, microbial activity returned rapidly to that of control levels with rewetting, indicating  
2 soil functional resilience. Upon rewetting, rapid resuscitation of the soil microbial community,  
3 together with an immediate increase in activity, maximises the temporal pulse in resource  
4 availability (Dijkstra et al., 2012; Placella et al., 2012). The increases in microbial activity,  
5 however, did not alter the available N content in soils that experienced rewetting, which were  
6 similar in both amended and unamended soils, and similar to that of soils which experienced  
7 drying. As URE activity was unaffected by rainfall or compost, N was unlikely to be limiting in  
8 this system.

9 As microbial activity is sensitive to drying, we expected that the addition of compost may  
10 improve resistance and resilience of soil functions to drying. However, we found that BGL,  
11 PHOS and PPO were only affected by rainfall. The only interaction effect observed for soil  
12 functions was POX activity. The addition of compost did not improve the resistance of POX to  
13 drying but it reduced POX resilience to drying. POX activity has been reported to decrease with  
14 drying and this decline has been associated with reductions in fungal biomass and species  
15 richness but these observations did not extend beyond a drought period (Toberman et al., 2008).  
16 Besides fungi, actinomycetes are central to the production of phenol oxidase and peroxidases for  
17 the degradation of phenolic compounds indicative of more recalcitrant organic matter (Kirk and  
18 Farrell, 1987; Sinsabaugh, 2010). As we observed fungal biomass was similar between amended  
19 soil that experienced rewetting and its normal rainfall control, actinomycetes may have an  
20 important role in our ecosystem. It is unclear why POX resilience to drying should be reduced  
21 with compost addition. It could be a simple case of the soil microbes preferentially exploiting the  
22 sudden pulse of labile resources from compost and plant exudates. Measures of POX over a  
23 longer period post-rewetting would be necessary to test this possibility.

1           The similarity of the overall microbial PLFA composition across compost amendment  
2 and rainfall variations, the general resistance and resilience of microbial structure and resilience  
3 of soil functions in this grassland can be attributed to various factors. First, the chemical nature  
4 of the compost is an important determinant of its decomposition and transformation (Fontaine et  
5 al., 2011; Kallenbach and Grandy, 2011; Pascault et al., 2013). For example, prior study has  
6 shown that the carbon composition of the OA strongly influences microbial PLFA composition  
7 and activity through changes in soil carbon composition (Ng et al., 2014). The carbon  
8 composition of the soil organic matter influences its chemical, physical and biological interaction  
9 within the soil matrix and determines its stability and accessibility to the soil microbial  
10 community (Kögel-Knabner et al., 2008). We found that the soil carbon composition, as  
11 determined by  $^{13}\text{C}$ -solid state NMR, was relatively similar across all our treatments (see  
12 supplementary Fig S1). As compost is a form of stabilised organic matter, its chemical nature  
13 makes it palatable only to a subset of the soil microbial community (Fontaine et al., 2003;  
14 Pascault et al., 2010). As such, depending on the environment and therefore organo-mineral  
15 interactions, the decomposition of compost may be slow. In one field study, it has been observed  
16 that only 12% of compost was decomposed 3 years after amendment (Ryals and Silver, 2013).  
17 This slow rate of decomposition means that hysteresis may have an important role that cannot be  
18 addressed within the time scale of this study.

19           Second, previous studies have reported that soil microbial communities inhabiting  
20 environments that regularly observe great fluctuations in environmental conditions are relatively  
21 resistant and resilient to such fluctuations in their environment (Fierer et al., 2003; Griffiths et  
22 al., 2003). This in part is attributed to physiological properties of the soil inhabitants and in part  
23 to permanent changes in the physical domain of the soil with such fluctuations. For example, the

1 collapse of macro- and meso-pores in soil or organic matter aggregates when hydrogen-bonded  
2 water is lost is irreversible with rewetting. These can explain the similarity in responses from soil  
3 microbial communities of different farming systems in California's hot, rain-free summer to soil  
4 drying and re-wetting (Lundquist et al., 1999). Combined with a history of intensive land use, a  
5 soil microbial community that is resistant and resilient to disturbances may have evolved earlier  
6 to inhabit this habitat (Ge et al., 2008; Martiny et al., 2006; Ohsowski et al., 2012). A  
7 comparison of microbial communities across eight land use across California has found that  
8 agricultural management had larger effects on microbial composition than elevation or  
9 precipitation regime (Drenovsky et al., 2010). Furthermore, the biotic legacy and site history also  
10 influences soil physicochemical properties which have important effects on microbial  
11 community composition and physiology (Griffiths and Philippot, 2013). As our study site is an  
12 intensively grazed grassland with moderate nutrient availability, this may explain the lack of  
13 microbial activity response to compost amendment.

14 Third, the timing of rainfall, rather than quantity has been proposed to be critical to  
15 grassland community response (Chou et al., 2008; Cruz-Martínez et al., 2009; Weltzin et al.,  
16 2003; Zeglin et al., 2013). Following 5 years of rainfall addition in a grassland experiment, soil  
17 bacteria and archaea were found to be relatively similar to those found under ambient rainfall  
18 conditions (Cruz-Martínez et al., 2009). The changes that were subsequently observed during the  
19 sixth and seventh year occurred only when additional rainfall exacerbated or alleviated periods  
20 of aberrant conditions in the ambient climate. When rainfall occurs over a cold winter, lower  
21 evaporation rates translate to increased soil water, less oxygen and translocation of oxides of iron  
22 and aluminium leading to lower soil redox potential (Berhe et al., 2012). When rainfall occurs in  
23 a warmer spring, an increase in plant growth leads to higher evaporation rates and soil redox

1 potential (Berhe et al., 2012). These changes in soil chemical properties affect soil organic matter  
2 stabilisation, and may help to explain some of the responses seen in the microbial communities  
3 that rely on soil organic matter to support their activity for cell growth and maintenance.

4         The addition of compost did not improve the resistance of plant growth responses to  
5 drying. Both plant above-ground and below-ground productivity were negatively affected by  
6 drying, although plant  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  showed no clear indication of drought stress. Despite the differences  
7 in availability of mineral N and indications from  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  that the plants did utilise the N from OA,  
8 this was not translated to higher plant N in compost amended soils, although there seemed to be a  
9 trend of higher plant N with compost amendment. In fact, the above-ground N content of plants  
10 indicated that they were marginally deficient despite compost amendment. We do not discuss  
11 plant resilience here as this study focuses on soil microbial community, and therefore we have  
12 measured rewetting responses less than three days post-wetting. This duration is insufficient for  
13 examining plant resilience. However, it is important to note that while semi-arid grasslands are  
14 adapted to moisture limitation, a study on semi-arid shortgrass steppe in Colorado, USA, found  
15 that it took more than 4 to 7 years of drought before significant differences in plant species  
16 composition were observed (Evans et al., 2011). The Victoria region of study has just emerged in  
17 mid-2010 from a 13-year period drought, and therefore this study presents an interesting insight  
18 into the state of ecosystem processes post prolonged stress.

19         In this study, we found that the grassland soil microbial communities are generally  
20 resistant and resilient to fluctuations in rainfall regardless of compost amendment. These  
21 properties of the soil microbial community were translated to resilience but not resistance in soil  
22 functions. Overall, the results below-ground showed much greater response to rainfall than

1 compost amendment. This indicates that in this grassland, water is the main limiting factor for  
2 the soil microbial community, and nutrients are not strong co-limiting factors.

3         Such robustness observed in grassland soil microbial community to rainfall alteration is  
4 not seen in overlying macro-organisms (Cruz-Martínez et al., 2009). In our study, we observed  
5 that plant growth was sensitive to rainfall and compost amendment, but interaction among main  
6 treatments were rare, or at least not discernible based on our measures. It also appeared that soil  
7 fertility and climate factors differ in their relative importance as drivers for the above- and  
8 below-ground communities.

9         Rainfall and organic amendment impact plant-soil interactions across a range of spatial  
10 and temporal scales, at which the potential for decoupling increases with increasing scale  
11 (Bardgett et al., 2013). For example, at physiological level, rainfall affects photosynthetic rate  
12 and the production of plant exudates. On a higher level, it may lead changes in plant community  
13 composition, thereby altering the amount and quality of plant exudates entering the soil (Bardgett  
14 et al., 2013). Such differences in above- and below-ground responses may lead to decoupling  
15 between below- and above-ground dynamics and affect biogeochemical cycling (Bardgett et al.,  
16 2013; Cruz-Martínez et al., 2009). On the other hand, others have found that microbial and plant  
17 processes can be synchronised following a water pulse (Dijkstra et al., 2012). We have also  
18 observed in our study that both soil functions and plant productivity was similarly poor in  
19 resistance to drying despite organic input, but soil functions were resilient to drying. There is  
20 possible that plant processes are similarly resilient in this ecosystem. Given there may be a time  
21 lag and longer duration in plant-microbial feedback that cannot be captured in our study, such  
22 interpretations remain to be confirmed by future studies. This study represents one of the few  
23 studies examining interactions between organic matter amendment and environmental change.

1 Such studies, particularly if longer-termed, will allow us to identify climate-management-plant-  
2 soil microbial interactions and identify ways forward to sustainable management of productive  
3 ecosystems under global change.

4

#### 5 **4. Acknowledgement**

6 This work was supported by funding from the Monash Sustainability Institute Australia, Brown  
7 Coal Innovation Australia and the Australian Research Council (ARC). NEL wishes to thank  
8 Pablo Galaviz, Mattia Pierangelini, Alicia Brown, Mani Shresta for assisting field and lab work.  
9 TRC also thanks the ARC for the award of a Future Fellowship (FT120100463). We thank Kate  
10 Scow and two anonymous reviewers for their detailed and constructive suggestions for the  
11 manuscript's improvement.

12

#### 13 **5. References**

14 ABS, A.B.o.S., 2013. Agricultural commodities, Australia 2011-12, 31 May 2013 ed. Australian  
15 Bureau of Statistics.

16 Alexander, L.V., Arblaster, J.M., 2009. Assessing trends in observed and modelled climate  
17 extremes over Australia in relation to future projections. *International Journal of Climatology* 29,  
18 417-435.

19 Allison, S.D., Jastrow, J.D., 2006. Activities of extracellular enzymes in physically isolated  
20 fractions of restored grassland soils. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry* 38, 3245-3256.

1 Allison, S.D., Martiny, J.B.H., 2008. Resistance, resilience, and redundancy in microbial  
2 communities. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*  
3 105, 11512-11519.

4 Bardgett, R.D., Manning, P., Morriën, E., De Vries, F.T., 2013. Hierarchical responses of plant-  
5 soil interactions to climate change: Consequences for the global carbon cycle. *Journal of Ecology*  
6 101, 334-343.

7 Bastida, F., Kandeler, E., Moreno, J.L., Ros, M., García, C., Hernández, T., 2008. Application of  
8 fresh and composted organic wastes modifies structure, size and activity of soil microbial  
9 community under semiarid climate. *Applied Soil Ecology* 40, 318-329.

10 Berhe, A., Suttle, K., Burton, S., Banfield, J., 2012. Contingency in the direction and mechanics  
11 of soil organic matter responses to increased rainfall. *Plant and Soil* 358, 371-383.

12 Blagodatskaya, E.V., Blagodatsky, S.A., Anderson, T.H., Kuzyakov, Y., 2007. Priming effects in  
13 Chernozem induced by glucose and N in relation to microbial growth strategies. *Applied Soil*  
14 *Ecology* 37, 95-105.

15 Bossio, D.A., Scow, K.M., 1998. Impacts of carbon and flooding on soil microbial communities:  
16 Phospholipid fatty acid profiles and substrate utilization patterns. *Microbial Ecology* 35, 265-  
17 278.

18 Cai, Y., Peng, C., Qiu, S., Li, Y., Gao, Y., 2011. Dichromate digestion-spectrophotometric  
19 procedure for determination of soil microbial biomass carbon in association with fumigation-  
20 extraction. *Communications in Soil Science and Plant Analysis* 42, 2824-2834.

21 Chou, W.W., Silver, W.L., Jackson, R.D., Thompson, A.W., Allen-Diaz, B., 2008. The  
22 sensitivity of annual grassland carbon cycling to the quantity and timing of rainfall. *Global*  
23 *Change Biology* 14, 1382-1394.



1 Cordell, D., Drangert, J.-O., White, S., 2009. The story of phosphorus: Global food security and  
2 food for thought. *Global Environmental Change* 19, 292-305.

3 Cruz-Martínez, K., Suttle, K.B., Brodie, E.L., Power, M.E., Andersen, G.L., Banfield, J.F., 2009.  
4 Despite strong seasonal responses, soil microbial consortia are more resilient to long-term  
5 changes in rainfall than overlying grassland. *ISME Journal* 3, 738-744.

6 D'Angelo, E., Crutchfield, J., Vandivere, M., 2001. Rapid, sensitive, microscale determination  
7 of phosphate in water and soil. *Journal of Environmental Quality* 30, 2206-2209.

8 Dijkstra, F.A., Augustine, D.J., Brewer, P., von Fischer, J.C., 2012. Nitrogen cycling and water  
9 pulses in semiarid grasslands: Are microbial and plant processes temporally asynchronous?  
10 *Oecologia* 170, 799-808.

11 Drenovsky, R.E., Steenwerth, K.L., Jackson, L.E., Scow, K.M., 2010. Land use and climatic  
12 factors structure regional patterns in soil microbial communities. *Global Ecology and*  
13 *Biogeography* 19, 27-39.

14 Drenovsky, R.E., Vo, D., Graham, K.J., Scow, K.M., 2004. Soil water content and organic  
15 carbon availability are major determinants of soil microbial community composition. *Microbial*  
16 *Ecology* 48, 424-430.

17 Dukes, J.S., Chiariello, N.R., Cleland, E.E., Moore, L.A., Rebecca Shaw, M., Thayer, S.,  
18 Tobeck, T., Mooney, H.A., Field, C.B., 2005. Responses of grassland production to single and  
19 multiple global environmental changes. *PLoS Biology* 3, e319.

20 Evans, S.E., Byrne, K.M., Lauenroth, W.K., Burke, I.C., 2011. Defining the limit to resistance in  
21 a drought-tolerant grassland: Long-term severe drought significantly reduces the dominant  
22 species and increases ruderals. *Journal of Ecology* 99, 1500-1507.

1 Fierer, N., Schimel, J.P., Holden, P.A., 2003. Influence of drying-rewetting frequency on soil  
2 bacterial community structure. *Microbial Ecology* 45, 63-71.

3 Fontaine, S., Henault, C., Aamor, A., Bdioui, N., Bloor, J.M.G., Maire, V., Mary, B., Revaillet,  
4 S., Maron, P.A., 2011. Fungi mediate long term sequestration of carbon and nitrogen in soil  
5 through their priming effect. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry* 43, 86-96.

6 Fontaine, S., Mariotti, A., Abbadie, L., 2003. The priming effect of organic matter: A question of  
7 microbial competition? *Soil Biology and Biochemistry* 35, 837-843.

8 Forster, J.C., 1995. 3 - Soil sampling, handling, storage and analysis, In: Kassem, A., Paolo, N.  
9 (Eds.), *Methods in Applied Soil Microbiology and Biochemistry*. Academic Press, London, pp.  
10 49-121.

11 Frey, A., Meckelein, B., Externest, D., Schmidt, M.A., 2000. A stable and highly sensitive  
12 3,3',5,5'-tetramethylbenzidine-based substrate reagent for enzyme-linked immunosorbent assays.  
13 *Journal of Immunological Methods* 233, 47-56.

14 Frostegård, A., Bååth, E., 1996. The use of phospholipid fatty acid analysis to estimate bacterial  
15 and fungal biomass in soil. *Biology and Fertility of Soils* 22, 59-65.

16 Ge, Y., He, J.-z., Zhu, Y.-g., Zhang, J.-b., Xu, Z., Zhang, L.-m., Zheng, Y.-m., 2008. Differences  
17 in soil bacterial diversity: driven by contemporary disturbances or historical contingencies?  
18 *ISME J* 2, 254-264.

19 Griffiths, B.S., Philippot, L., 2013. Insights into the resistance and resilience of the soil microbial  
20 community. *FEMS Microbiology Reviews* 37, 112-129.

21 Griffiths, R.I., Whiteley, A.S., O'Donnell, A.G., Bailey, M.J., 2003. Physiological and  
22 Community Responses of Established Grassland Bacterial Populations to Water Stress. *Applied*  
23 *and Environmental Microbiology* 69, 6961-6968.

1 Hargreaves, J.C., Adl, M.S., Warman, P.R., 2008. A review of the use of composted municipal  
2 solid waste in agriculture. *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment* 123, 1-14.

3 Hennessy, K., Fawcett, R., Kirono, D., Mpelasoka, F., Jones, D., Bathols, J., Whetton, P.,  
4 Stafford Smith, M., Howden, M., Mitchell, C., Plummer, N., 2008. An assessment of the impact  
5 of climate change on the nature and frequency of exceptional climatic events. Bureau of  
6 Meteorology, Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO),  
7 Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry, p. 33.

8 Hueso, S., García, C., Hernández, T., 2012. Severe drought conditions modify the microbial  
9 community structure, size and activity in amended and unamended soils. *Soil Biology and*  
10 *Biochemistry* 50, 167-173.

11 Ippolito, J.A., Barbarick, K.A., Paschke, M.W., Brobst, R.B., 2010. Infrequent composted  
12 biosolids applications affect semi-arid grassland soils and vegetation. *Journal of Environmental*  
13 *Management* 91, 1123-1130.

14 Jeannotte, R., Sommerville, D.W., Hamel, C., Whalen, J.K., 2004. A microplate assay to  
15 measure soil microbial biomass phosphorus. *Biology and Fertility of Soils* 40, 201-205.

16 Joergensen, R.G., Brookes, P.C., 1990. Ninhydrin-reactive nitrogen measures of microbial  
17 biomass in 0.5 M K<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub> soil extracts. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry* 22, 1023 - 1027.

18 Johnsen, A.R., Jacobsen, O.S., 2008. A quick and sensitive method for the quantification of  
19 peroxidase activity of organic surface soil from forests. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry* 40, 814-  
20 821.

21 Kallenbach, C., Grandy, A.S., 2011. Controls over soil microbial biomass responses to carbon  
22 amendments in agricultural systems: A meta-analysis. *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment*  
23 144, 241-252.

1 Kandeler, E., Gerber, H., 1988. Short-term assay of soil urease activity using colorimetric  
2 determination of ammonium. *Biology and Fertility of Soils* 6, 68-72.

3 Kirk, T.K., Farrell, R.L., 1987. Enzymatic "combustion": the microbial degradation of lignin.  
4 *Annual Review of Microbiology* 41, 465-505.

5 Knacker, T., van Gestel, C.A.M., Jones, S.E., Soares, A.M.V.M., Schallnaß, H.-J., Förster, B.,  
6 Edwards, C.A., 2004. Ring-Testing and Field-Validation of a Terrestrial Model Ecosystem  
7 (TME) – An Instrument for Testing Potentially Harmful Substances: Conceptual Approach and  
8 Study Design. *Ecotoxicology* 13, 9-27.

9 Kögel-Knabner, I., Ekschmitt, K., Flessa, H., Guggenberger, G., Matzner, E., Marschner, B.,  
10 Von Lützow, M., 2008. An integrative approach of organic matter stabilization in temperate  
11 soils: Linking chemistry, physics, and biology. *Journal of Plant Nutrition and Soil Science* 171,  
12 5-13.

13 Lundquist, E.J., Scow, K.M., Jackson, L.E., Uesugi, S.L., Johnson, C.R., 1999. Rapid response  
14 of soil microbial communities from conventional, low input, and organic farming systems to a  
15 wet/dry cycle. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry* 31, 1661-1675.

16 Manzoni, S., Trofymow, J.A., Jackson, R.B., Porporato, A., 2010. Stoichiometric controls on  
17 carbon, nitrogen, and phosphorus dynamics in decomposing litter. *Ecological Monographs* 80,  
18 89-106.

19 Martiny, J.B.H., Bohannan, B.J.M., Brown, J.H., Colwell, R.K., Fuhrman, J.A., Green, J.L.,  
20 Horner-Devine, M.C., Kane, M., Krumins, J.A., Kuske, C.R., Morin, P.J., Naeem, S., Øvreås, L.,  
21 Reysenbach, A.L., Smith, V.H., Staley, J.T., 2006. Microbial biogeography: Putting  
22 microorganisms on the map. *Nature Reviews Microbiology* 4, 102-112.

1 Mendiburu, F., 2012. *Agricolae: Statistical Procedures for Agricultural Research*, R package  
2 version 1.1-2 ed.

3 Miranda, K.M., Espey, M.G., Wink, D.A., 2001. A rapid, simple spectrophotometric method for  
4 simultaneous detection of nitrate and nitrite. *Nitric Oxide - Biology and Chemistry* 5, 62-71.

5 Ng, E.L., Patti, A.F., Rose, M.T., Scheffe, C.R., Wilkinson, K., Smernik, R.J., Cavagnaro, T.R.,  
6 2014. Does the chemical nature of soil carbon drive the structure and functioning of soil  
7 microbial communities? *Soil Biology and Biochemistry* 70, 54-61.

8 Odegard, I.Y.R., van der Voet, E., 2014. The future of food - Scenarios and the effect on natural  
9 resource use in agriculture in 2050. *Ecological Economics* 97, 51-59.

10 Ohsowski, B.M., Klironomos, J.N., Dunfield, K.E., Hart, M.M., 2012. The potential of soil  
11 amendments for restoring severely disturbed grasslands. *Applied Soil Ecology* 60, 77-83.

12 Oksanen, J., Blanchet, F.G., Kindt, R., Legendre, P., Minchin, P.R., O'Hara, R.B., Simpson,  
13 G.L., Solymos, P., Stevens, M.H.H., Wagner, H., 2012. *Vegan: Community Ecology Package*, R  
14 package version 2.0-4 ed.

15 Pascault, N., Cécillon, L., Mathieu, O., Hénault, C., Sarr, A., Lévêque, J., Farcy, P., Ranjard, L.,  
16 Maron, P.A., 2010. In Situ Dynamics of Microbial Communities during Decomposition of  
17 Wheat, Rape, and Alfalfa Residues. *Microbial Ecology* 60, 816-828.

18 Pascault, N., Ranjard, L., Kaisermann, A., Bachar, D., Christen, R., Terrat, S., Mathieu, O.,  
19 Lévêque, J., Mougél, C., Hénault, C., Lemanceau, P., Péan, M., Boiry, S., Fontaine, S., Maron,  
20 P.A., 2013. Stimulation of different functional groups of bacteria by various plant residues as a  
21 driver of soil priming effect. *Ecosystems*, 1-13.

1 Placella, S.A., Brodie, E.L., Firestone, M.K., 2012. Rainfall-induced carbon dioxide pulses result  
2 from sequential resuscitation of phylogenetically clustered microbial groups. *Proceedings of the*  
3 *National Academy of Sciences* 109, 10931-10936.

4 R Core Team 2012. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for  
5 Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.

6 Rayment, G.E., Lyons, D.J., 2011. *Soil chemical methods - Australasia*. CSIRO Publishing,  
7 Collingwood, Australia, p. 495.

8 Ryals, R., Kaiser, M., Torn, M.S., Berhe, A.A., Silver, W.L., 2014. Impacts of organic matter  
9 amendments on carbon and nitrogen dynamics in grassland soils. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry*  
10 68, 52-61.

11 Ryals, R., Silver, W.L., 2013. Effects of organic matter amendments on net primary productivity  
12 and greenhouse gas emissions in annual grasslands. *Ecological Applications* 23, 46-59.

13 Sinsabaugh, R.L., 2010. Phenol oxidase, peroxidase and organic matter dynamics of soil. *Soil*  
14 *Biology and Biochemistry* 42, 391-404.

15 Steenwerth, K.L., Jackson, L.E., Calderini, F.J., Scow, K.M., Rolston, D.E., 2005. Response of  
16 microbial community composition and activity in agricultural and grassland soils after a  
17 simulated rainfall. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry* 37, 2249-2262.

18 Toberman, H., Evans, C.D., Freeman, C., Fenner, N., White, M., Emmett, B.A., Artz, R.R.E.,  
19 2008. Summer drought effects upon soil and litter extracellular phenol oxidase activity and  
20 soluble carbon release in an upland Calluna heathland. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry* 40, 1519-  
21 1532.

22 Unger, I.M., Kennedy, A.C., Muzika, R.-M., 2009. Flooding effects on soil microbial  
23 communities. *Applied Soil Ecology* 42, 1-8.

1 Vance, E.D., Brookes, P.C., Jenkinson, D.S., 1987. An extraction method for measuring soil  
2 microbial biomass C. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry* 19, 703-707.

3 Vitousek, P.M., Aber, J.D., Howarth, R.W., Likens, G.E., Matson, P.A., Schindler, D.W.,  
4 Schlesinger, W.H., Tilman, D.G., 1997. Human alteration of the global nitrogen cycle: Sources  
5 and consequences. *Ecological Applications* 7, 737-750.

6 Waldrop, M.P., Firestone, M.K., 2006. Response of microbial community composition and  
7 function to soil climate change. *Microbial Ecology* 52, 716-724.

8 Wardle, D.A., Bardgett, R.D., Klironomos, J.N., Setälä, H., Van Der Putten, W.H., Wall, D.H.,  
9 2004. Ecological linkages between aboveground and belowground biota. *Science* 304, 1629-  
10 1633.

11 Weisberg, S., 2005. *Applied Linear Regression*. Wiley, Hoboken NJ.

12 Weltzin, J.F., Loik, M.E., Schwinning, S., Williams, D.G., Fay, P.A., Haddad, B.M., Harte, J.,  
13 Huxman, T.E., Knapp, A.K., Lin, G., Pockman, W.T., Shaw, M.R., Small, E.E., Smith, M.D.,  
14 Smith, S.D., Tissue, D.T., Zak, J.C., 2003. Assessing the Response of Terrestrial Ecosystems to  
15 Potential Changes in Precipitation. *Bioscience* 53, 941-952.

16 White, R. E., Helyar, K. R., Ridley, A. M., Chen, D., Heng, L. K., Evans, J., Fisher, R., Hirth,  
17 J.R., Mele, P. M., Morrison, G. R., Cresswell, H. P., Paydar, Z., Dunin, F. X. , Dove H.,  
18 Simpson, R. J., 2000. Soil factors affecting the sustainability and productivity of perennial and  
19 annual pastures in the high rainfall zone of south-eastern Australia. *Animal Production Science*  
20 40, 267-283.

21 Yuste, J.C., Peñuelas, J., Estiarte, M., Garcia-Mas, J., Mattana, S., Ogaya, R., Pujol, M., Sardans,  
22 J., 2011. Drought-resistant fungi control soil organic matter decomposition and its response to  
23 temperature. *Global Change Biology* 17, 1475-1486.

1 Zeglin, L.H., Bottomley, P.J., Jumpponen, A., Rice, C.W., Arango, M., Lindsley, A., McGowan,  
2 A., Mfombep, P., Myrold, D.D., 2013. Altered precipitation regime affects the function and  
3 composition of soil microbial communities on multiple time scales. *Ecology* 94, 2334-2345.

4

5



1 Figures

2 Fig. 1 Chemical and moisture properties of soil with compost treatment (mean  $\pm$  standard error)  
3 under different rainfall. All bar plots are similarly grouped from left to right for drying, normal  
4 and rewetting treatments. (+) = compost amended soils, (-) = unamended soils.

5 Fig. 2(A) Plant aboveground in March, April and May, and root biomass in May; where (+) =  
6 compost amended soils, (-) = unamended soils. (B,D) Plant C and N contents and, (C,E) Plant  
7  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  and  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  in May.

8 Fig. 3 Variations in soil microbial composition with amendment treatment under variations in  
9 rainfall. Nonmetric multidimensional scaling (NMDS) plots of (A) microbial biomass C, N and P  
10 composition and (B) microbial PLFA composition. Distances among points express relative  
11 dissimilarities in microbial composition. (C) Cluster analysis of microbial biomass C,N and P  
12 composition. (+) = compost amended soils, (-) = unamended soils.

13 Fig. 4 (A,C) Effects of compost on resistance of soil microbial PLFA composition and microbial  
14 activity to drying. (B,D) Effects of compost on resilience of microbial composition and microbial  
15 activity following rewetting. Abbreviations stand for bacterial-to-fungal ratio (B:F ratio), B-  
16 glucosidase (BGL), phosphatase (PHOS), polyphenol oxidase (PPO) and peroxidase (POX). (+)  
17 = compost amended soils, (-) = unamended soils.

18

19

20

21