UC Irvine

UC Irvine Previously Published Works

Title

Precipitation regime drives warming responses of microbial biomass and activity in temperate steppe soils

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/5qp6f8sg>

Journal

Biology and Fertility of Soils, 52(4)

ISSN

0178-2762

Authors

Liu, W
Allison, SD
Xia, J
et al.

Publication Date

2016-05-01

DOI

10.1007/s00374-016-1087-7

Peer reviewed

53 Foot note
information

The online version of this article (doi:10.1007/s00374-016-1087-7) contains supplementary material, which is available to authorized users.

Electronic supplementary material

Figure S1

The relationships between annual precipitation and aboveground net primary productivity (ANPP) and microbial properties including soil microbial biomass C (MBC; a, b), N (MBN; c, d), and respiration (MR; e, f) for all replicates across sites and years. (DOCX 103 kb)

Figure S2

Warming-induced changes in (a) aboveground net primary productivity (ANPP) and (b) belowground net primary productivity (BNPP) in the desert, typical, and meadow steppes in 2006, 2007, 2008, and 2009. (DOCX 38 kb)

Figure S3

Relationships between soil temperature (T) and soil microbial biomass C (MBC; a, b, c), N (MBN; d, e, f), and respiration (MR; g, h, i) across the 3 sites in each year. (DOCX 96 kb)

Precipitation regime drives warming responses of microbial biomass and activity in temperate steppe soils

Weixing Liu¹ · Steven D. Allison^{2,3} · Jianyang Xia⁴ · Lingli Liu¹ · Shiqiang Wan⁵

Received: 8 March 2015 / Revised: 3 January 2016 / Accepted: 7 January 2016
© Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg 2016

Abstract Although numerous warming experiments have examined the impacts of elevated temperature on soil microbial activities, most are based on responses from a single site. To investigate how precipitation regime regulates warming effects on the carbon cycle, we conducted manipulative warming experiments in desert steppe, typical steppe, and meadow steppe along a precipitation gradient in northern China. Soil temperature, moisture, microbial biomass C (MBC), N (MBN), and microbial respiration were measured from 2006 to 2009. Soil moisture was significantly reduced by warming in the typical steppe but not affected in the desert and meadow steppe. Across the 4 years, warming decreased MBC and microbial respiration in the desert and typical steppe but not in the meadow steppe. The magnitude of warming-induced reductions in MBC and microbial respiration declined as site precipitation increased. Across the three sites, the

changes in soil MBC, MBN, and microbial respiration were all positively correlated with annual precipitation and changes in belowground net primary productivity. Our results suggest that precipitation regime controls the response of soil microbial activity and biomass to warming, possibly by regulating soil moisture and substrate availability. With increasing precipitation, the stimulatory effects of warming on soil microbial activity and biomass outweigh the inhibitory effects due to declining soil moisture.

Keywords Drought · Elevated temperature · Grassland · Microbial activities · Precipitation · Soil moisture · Substrate availability

Electronic supplementary material The online version of this article (doi:10.1007/s00374-016-1087-7) contains supplementary material, which is available to authorized users.

✉ Weixing Liu
lwxsx@ibcas.ac.cn

¹ State Key Laboratory of Vegetation and Environmental Change, Institute of Botany, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Xiangshan, Beijing 100093, China

² Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, University of California, Irvine, California 92697, USA

³ Department of Earth System Science, University of California, Irvine, California 92697, USA

⁴ Department of Microbiology and Plant Biology, University of Oklahoma, 770 Van Vleet Oval, Norman, Oklahoma 73019, USA

⁵ Key State Laboratory of Cotton Biology, College of Life Sciences, Henan University, Kaifeng, Henan 475004, China

Introduction

Soil microbes exert a strong influence on carbon cycling in terrestrial ecosystems via decomposition of plant litter and soil organic matter (Bardgett et al. 2008; Wardle et al. 2004; Zhou et al. 2012). Consequently, the responses of soil microbes to elevated temperature have impacts on the responses of soil C inputs and feedbacks to warming (Allison et al. 2010). A better understanding of how soil microbes respond to elevated temperature would therefore facilitate predictions of soil C cycling under climate warming.

Elevated temperature directly influences soil C turnover (Melillo et al. 2002) and soil microbial growth and activity (Blagodatskaya et al. 2014; Natali et al. 2012) in both lab incubations and field experiments. Warming can affect soil microbial activities by altering both soil temperature and moisture (Carlyle et al. 2011) as well as biotic processes such as plant production, litter input, root growth, and root exudates (Hobbie and Chapin 1998; Natali et al. 2012; Yin et al. 2013).

Soil microbial activity and biomass responses to warming have been investigated in numerous field manipulations across various terrestrial ecosystems with both increases and declines observed. For example, elevated temperature increased soil microbial biomass or respiration in an old field (Bell et al. 2010), Arctic tundra (Sistla and Schimel 2013), temperate heathland (Haugwitz et al. 2014), and in some incubation experiments (Blagodatskaya et al. 2014; Menichetti et al. 2015) by enhancing microbial metabolic rates or by extending the plant growing season. Conversely, warming reduced soil microbial activities by amplifying soil drying in a semiarid temperate steppe (Liu et al. 2009). In a tallgrass prairie, soil microbial activity showed no response to warming despite an increased fungal to bacterial ratio (Zhang et al. 2005). Given these different responses across sites, coordinated manipulative warming experiments along environmental gradients could help reveal the mechanisms driving soil microbial responses to warming at a regional scale (Fraser et al. 2013).

In the temperate steppe of northern China, soil moisture is a primary factor controlling plant growth and soil microbial activities (Xia et al. 2009). Warming-induced changes in soil moisture negatively affected soil microbial activities in a typical steppe ecosystem (Liu et al. 2009). To investigate warming effects on activity and biomass of soil microbial communities and the underlying mechanisms at a broader regional scale, warming manipulations have been conducted at three sites along a precipitation gradient in this region since 2006 (Zhang et al. 2015). Given that soil microbial activities are often driven by soil moisture rather than temperature as moisture declines (Liu et al. 2009; Shaver et al. 2000), we hypothesized that warming would inhibit microbial activity by increasing soil drought stress in the gradient sites with lower precipitation (Xia et al. 2009). In contrast, we expected warming to increase microbial activity in the meadow steppe site with the highest rainfall. We also hypothesized that warming effects on microbial activity would depend on inter-annual variation in precipitation, with greater magnitude of warming effects in wetter years due to the moisture limitation being removed. We further examined the mechanisms underlying these hypotheses by correlating microbial responses with metrics of net primary production at the gradient sites.

Materials and methods

Study sites and experimental design

The manipulative warming experiment was conducted in three steppe ecosystems spanning a natural precipitation gradient in Northern China. Two sites are located in Siziwang Banner (desert steppe) and Duolun County (typical steppe) in Inner Mongolia. The third (meadow steppe) site is located

in Changling County in Jilin Province. Site characteristics are listed in Table 1, and annual precipitation is shown in Fig. 1a.

The warming experiment was established in the desert, typical, and meadow steppe sites in April 2006. This study was a part of large experiment that included warming and N manipulation in a randomized block design. We used the experiment to test the effect of warming treatments on microbial biomass and activity at a regional scale. At each site, we analyzed 12 plots, with 6 randomly assigned to the warming treatment and the other 6 randomly assigned as controls. In each warming plot, one MSR-2420 infrared radiator (Kalglo Electronics Inc., Bethlehem, PA, USA) was suspended 2.25 m above the ground in each warmed plot starting in April 2006. To stimulate the shading effects of the infrared radiator, a “dummy” heater with the same shape and size as the infrared heater was also suspended 2.25 m high in each warming control plot. Plots were 2 × 3 m and located within a 667-m² area at each site.

Soil samples (12 total per site) were collected from warming and control plots once per year in August from 2006 to 2009 (samples were not collected from meadow steppe in 2007). Sampling was timed to coincide with maximum aboveground biomass in each site. In each plot, three soil cores (15 cm depth and 5 cm diameter) were taken randomly and combined into a composite sample. After removing roots and stones by sieving (2 mm mesh), the samples were stored on ice and transferred to the lab for dissolved organic carbon (DOC), inorganic N concentration, and microbial analyses. Subsamples were taken to measure gravimetric water content and soil chemical properties (air-dried, finely ground, and sieved to <250 µm).

Measurements

Soil temperature (°C) at 10 cm depth was measured using a thermocouple probe (Li-8100-201) once per week over the growing season. Gravimetric soil moisture was measured using fresh soil samples once each year in August. Soil inorganic N (NH₄⁺-N and NO₃⁻-N) was extracted with 2 M KCl solution, and concentrations of NH₄⁺-N and NO₃⁻-N in the extracts were measured using a flow injection analyzer (SAN-System, Netherlands). Soil pH values were determined with a combination glass electrode (soil to water w/v ratio 1:2.5).

Soil microbial biomass C (MBC) and microbial biomass N (MBN) were estimated using the chloroform fumigation-extraction method (Vance et al. 1987). Briefly, fresh soil samples were transferred to the lab, and field moist samples (15 g dry weight equivalent) were fumigated for 24 h with ethanol-free CHCl₃. Fumigated and unfumigated samples were extracted with 60 ml 0.5 M K₂SO₄ for 30 min on a shaker. K₂SO₄ extracts were filtered through 0.45-µm filters and frozen at -20 °C prior to analyzing extractable C and N by an elemental analyzer (liqui TOC, Analysensysteme, Germany).

Table 1 Mean annual temperature (MAT), precipitation (MAP), soil properties and the dominant plant species in the three sites, respectively

Sites	Coordinates	MAT (°C)	MAP (mm)	Soil type	Sand content (%)	Soil C (g kg ⁻¹)	Soil N (g kg ⁻¹)	C:N	Soil pH	DOC (g kg ⁻¹)	Inorganic N (g kg ⁻¹)	Dominant plant species
Desert	41° 47' N	3.4	183	Chestnut (China)	71.6 ± 0.07	11 ± 0.7	1.13 ± 0.07	9.3 ± 0.4	8 ± 0.04	56.6 ± 4.1	14.4 ± 1.8	<i>Stipa breviflora</i> Griseb.
steppe	111° 53' E 1456 m a.s.l.			Kastanozem (FAO)								<i>Artemisia frigida</i> Willd.
Typical	42° 02' N	2.1	385	Chestnut (China)	62.9 ± 0.04	14.1 ± 0.8	1.45 ± 0.05	9.7 ± 0.5	7.2 ± 0.08	54.7 ± 4.3	18.3 ± 1.8	<i>Cleistogenes songorica</i> (Roshev.) Ohwi.
steppe	116° 17' E 1324 m a.s.l.			Haplic calcisols (FAO)								<i>Stipa krylovii</i> Roshev.
Meadow	44° 45' N	6.4	471	Chernozem (China)	57.3 ± 0.06	9.1 ± 0.8	0.95 ± 0.09	10 ± 0.6	9.3 ± 0.18	44.2 ± 3.5	9.7 ± 0.5	<i>Artemisia frigida</i> Willd.
steppe	123° 45' E 160 m a.s.l.			Chernozem (FAO)								<i>Potentilla acaulis</i> L.
												<i>Leymus chinensis</i> (Trin.) Tzvel.
												<i>Chloris virgate</i> Sw.
												<i>Carex duriuscula</i> C. A. Mey.

Fig. 1 Annual precipitation (a), warming-induced changes in soil temperature (T) (b) and soil moisture (M) (c) in the desert, typical, and meadow steppes in 2006, 2007, 2008, and 2009. Each column represents the mean (±SE, n = 6) difference in soil temperature and moisture between the control and warming treatments

MBC and MBN were calculated from the difference between extractable C or N content in the fumigated versus the unfumigated samples using a conversion factor of 0.45. DOC was measured as C in the unfumigated soil extracts.

Microbial respiration was measured by alkali absorption of CO₂ evolved at 25 °C for 14 days, followed by titration of the residual OH⁻ with a standardized acid (Hu and vanBruggen 1997). Soil samples (20 g oven-dried equivalent,) were placed

168 Aboveground net primary production (ANPP) was estimat-
169 ed by clipping living biomass at the end of August each year
170 from 2006 to 2009. All living plant tissues were harvested
171 from a 1 × 1-m quadrat in each plot, and surface litter in the
172 same quadrat was also collected. All plant samples, including
173 litter, were oven-dried at 70 °C for 48 h and weighed to de-
174 termine biomass.

175 Belowground net primary productivity (BNPP) was esti-
176 mated with the root in-growth method. In early May of each
177 year, we excavated two 40-cm-deep cylindrical holes using an
178 8-cm diameter soil core sampler in each plot. The soils were
179 replaced in the same hole after removing roots via 2-mm
180 sieves. We collected root in-growth samples in late October
181 by using a 5-cm diameter soil core sampler at the center of the
182 original root ingrowth holes. The dry mass of roots was deter-
183 mined by oven-drying at 70 °C to constant weight.

184 Statistical analysis

185 Soil temperature was averaged to calculate a mean value for
186 each year. To improve data normality (based on the Shapiro-
187 Wilk test), soil M, MBN, and microbial respiration were log-
188 transformed. A three-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was
189 used to examine the effects of site, year, and warming treat-
190 ment on soil temperature, moisture, and microbial parameters
191 (Table 2). Likelihood ratio tests showed that adding block as a
192 random factor did not improve the ANOVA model, so we
193 omitted it. Due to the presence of significant interactions be-
194 tween site and warming treatment, we also used two-way
195 ANOVAs within sites to determine the effects of year,
196 warming, and their interaction on the response variables
197 (Table 3). ~~Two-way ANOVAs were also applied to test the~~

t2.1 **Table 2** Results of three-way analysis of variance on the effects of
warming (W), site (S), year (Y), and their interactions on soil
microclimate and microbial parameters

t2.2 Source	df	Soil T	Soil M	MBC	MBN	MR
t2.3 Y	3, 110	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
t2.4 S	2, 110	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
t2.5 W	1, 110	<0.001	<0.001	0.118	<0.001	0.026
t2.6 Y × S	5, 110	<0.001	<0.001	1	0.066	1
t2.7 Y × W	3, 110	0.162	0.259	0.596	0.061	0.157
t2.8 S × W	2, 110	<0.001	<0.001	0.006	0.003	0.009
t2.9 Y × S × W	5, 110	0.833	0.635	0.694	1	1

Data are *P* values

Soil *T* soil temperature, Soil *M* soil moisture, *MBC* microbial biomass C,
MBN microbial biomass N, *MR* microbial respiration

Table 3 Results of two-way analysis of variance on the effects of
warming (W), year (Y), and their interaction on soil microclimate and
microbial parameters

Sites	Source	df	Soil T	Soil M	MBC	MBN	MR	
Desert	Y	3, 40	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	t3.1
	W	1, 40	<0.001	0.161	<0.001	<0.001	0.023	t3.2
	Y × W	3, 40	0.959	0.284	0.521	0.187	0.895	t3.3
Typical	Y	3, 40	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	0.045	t3.4
	W	1, 40	<0.001	0.064	0.024	0.015	0.018	t3.5
	Y × W	3, 40	0.918	0.855	0.97	0.746	0.384	t3.6
Meadow	Y	2, 30	0.017	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	t3.7
	W	1, 30	<0.001	0.242	0.18	0.488	0.091	t3.8
	Y × W	2, 30	0.246	0.128	0.404	0.718	0.760	t3.9

Data are *P* values

Soil *T* soil temperature, Soil *M* soil moisture, *MBC* microbial biomass C,
MBN microbial biomass N, *MR* microbial respiration

~~effects of soil substrate and soil moisture on soil microbial~~
~~respiration from the laboratory incubation.~~ We used analysis
of covariance with soil moisture as the covariate and site and
warming treatment as main effects to test for soil moisture
effects on microbial parameters.

Stepwise multiple regressions and simple linear regressions
were used to test for the relationships between warming-
induced changes in soil microbial properties, warming-
induced changes in BNPP, and annual precipitation. These
regressions were conducted on annual mean differences cal-
culated for each of the sites. Data on changes in belowground
net primary productivity were provided by the three field ex-
perimental stations where the manipulative experiments were
set up. We used a similar regression approach to test for rela-
tionships among the raw microbial data (rather than warming-
induced changes), precipitation, and ANPP. Significance was
accepted at the *P* < 0.05 level of probability. All statistical
analyses were performed with SAS software (SAS Institute
Inc., Cary, NC, USA).

Results

Treatment-induced changes in soil temperature and moisture
differed among the three sites (Table 2, significant site ×
warming interactions). Averaged across the 4 years, experi-
mental warming significantly increased soil temperature by
0.83, 0.92, and 2.96 °C (all *P* < 0.001, *t* test) in the desert,
typical, and meadow steppes, respectively (Table 3; Fig. 1b).
In response to warming, soil moisture declined by 4.32 % in
the desert steppe and 6.43 % in the typical steppe but in-
creased by 9.39 % in the meadow steppe (Fig. 1c), although
only the change in the typical steppe was significant (*P* = 0.02,
t test). No interactions between warming and year were found

to affect either soil temperature or soil moisture in any of the sites.

There was significant variability in soil MBC, MBN, and microbial respiration across the three sites (Table 2, $P < 0.001$ for site effects). Warming effects on these variables also varied significantly by site (Table 2, $P < 0.01$ for site $\times$ warming interactions). Averaged over the 4 years in the desert steppe (Table 3), warming reduced MBC (Fig. 2a), MBN (Fig. 2b), and microbial respiration (Fig. 3a) by 17.3 ($P < 0.001$), 20.1 ($P < 0.001$), and 13.5 % ($P < 0.05$), respectively. These values also declined under warming in the typical steppe by 10.3, 12.6, and 9.3 % (all $P < 0.05$, Figs. 2c, d, 3b), respectively. There was no warming effect on soil MBC (Fig. 2e), MBN (Fig. 2f), or microbial respiration (Fig. 3c) in the meadow steppe. All microbial parameters differed significantly by year ($P < 0.001$, Table 2), likely resulting from interannual differences in precipitation (Fig. 1) and their effects on soil moisture (Fig. 4). Averaged across sites and years, all microbial parameters increased with increasing soil moisture ($P < 0.001$, ANCOVA).

Simple regression analyses showed that precipitation explained 53 % of the variation in mean MBC change with warming ($n = 11$, Fig. 5a); only precipitation was retained in a stepwise multiple regression that also included change in belowground net primary productivity ($n = 8$). For mean MBN and microbial respiration change with warming, only change in belowground net primary productivity was retained

in the multiple regressions, and it explained 69 and 68 % of the variation, respectively ($n = 8$, Fig. 5d, f). For the absolute amount of MBC, precipitation explained 65 % of the variance and was the only variable retained in a multiple regression that also included ANPP ($n = 132$, Fig. S1a). For the absolute amount of MBN and microbial respiration, ANPP explained 52 and 53 % of the variance, respectively, and was the only variable retained in the multiple regressions ($n = 132$, Fig. S1d, S1f).

Discussion

Warming effects on soil microbial activity depend on site characteristics

In partial agreement with our first hypothesis, we found that reductions in both MBC and MBN with warming were evident at lower precipitation but attenuated with increasing site precipitation across the three steppes (Figs. 2, 3 and 6). We had originally hypothesized that warming would stimulate microbial activity at our wettest site, but instead, there was no significant effect. It is possible that high sand content in our steppe soils limits the effects of higher moisture and the potential for respiration response to warming (Moyano et al. 2012). Differences in microbial community composition (i.e., fungal to bacterial ratios) across the sites could also cause

Fig. 2 The effects of warming on (a, c, e) soil microbial C (MBC), and (b, d, f) N (MBN) in the desert, typical, and meadow steppes in 2006, 2007, 2008, and 2009. Each column represents the means ($\pm$ SE, $n = 6$) under the control and warming treatments

Fig. 3 The effects of warming on soil microbial respiration (MR) in the desert (a), typical (b), and meadow (c) steppes in 2006, 2007, 2008, and 2009. Each column represents the means ($\pm$ SE, $n = 6$) under the control and warming treatments

differences in warming responses of microbial activity, although the microbial differences are not consistent from year to year (Zhang et al. 2015).

Still, our results are consistent with soil moisture as a controlling factor for soil microbial responses to elevated temperature (Garten et al. 2009). Warming has been found to decrease soil microbial activities due to declines in soil moisture in semiarid (Liu et al. 2009) and semidesert ecosystems (Sharp et al. 2013). A previous study at our sites found that most microbial groups (defined by phospholipid fatty acids) responded negatively to warming in a drier year (2007) but positively in a wetter year (2006) (Zhang et al. 2015). The desert and typical temperate steppe ecosystems regularly experience drought because of the low annual precipitation levels of 180 and 385 mm, respectively. Also, the relationship between soil moisture and microbial parameters is stronger in the desert steppe than in the meadow and especially the typical

steppe (Fig. 4). The slight but significant decreases in soil moisture indicate that warming can exacerbate drought and induce substantial negative effects on microbial physiology (Allison et al. 2010; Schimel et al. 2007).

Warming-induced drought can also influence soil microbial activities through indirect abiotic or biotic factors. For example, drought reduces water-filled pore space in soil, facilitates physical and chemical protection of organic matter, and decreases substrate diffusivity, thereby dampening positive microbial responses to warming (Davidson and Janssens 2006; Moyano et al. 2013). Moreover, the changes in plant growth resulting from warming have impacts on soil microbial activities via substrate availability. In contrast to the stimulation of warming on plant growth and belowground C inputs under warming in tundra ecosystems (Natali et al. 2012), warming-induced drought decreased belowground net primary productivity by 18 % (Fig. S2, $P < 0.05$) in the desert steppe and thus reduced substrate availability. These results support our first hypothesis that soil microbial activity would be suppressed due to exacerbation of drought in the desert and typical steppe.

Long-term drought could select for increased drought tolerance of soil microbial communities (Schimel et al. 2007). Hence, the inhibitory effects of elevated temperature-induced drought on soil microbial biomass and activity should be weaker in the desert steppe than in the typical steppe. However, we found evidence for greater negative effects of increasing soil temperature on soil MBN in the desert steppe ($P < 0.001$ for site $\times$ temperature interaction), potentially due to increased competition for N between plants and soil microbes under these conditions. This result suggests that desert steppe microbes are not more tolerant of warming and drought (Fig. S3). One possible explanation is that changes in soil water repellency may have contributed to greater declines in soil microbial variables in the desert steppe as in other semi-arid regions (Doerr et al. 2000; Goebel et al. 2011). Initial reductions in surface soil moisture under warming may have increased soil water repellency and reduced infiltration capacity with negative consequences for microbial respiration (Goebel et al. 2011). This effect may have been more pronounced in the desert soils because they contain more sand (71.6 ± 0.07 versus 62.9 ± 0.04 % in the typical steppe and 57.3 ± 0.06 % in the meadow steppe), and sandy soils are more susceptible to increasing water repellency with drying (Doerr et al. 2000).

Our data show that the warming treatment was more effective in heating the soils in the meadow steppe than in the other two sites. Greater soil moisture in the meadow steppe might have conducted surface heat to depth more efficiently compared with the drier soils in the desert and typical steppes. Still, this larger soil warming effect was not associated with significant changes in microbial activity in the meadow steppe, despite ample moisture availability.

Fig. 4 Soil microbial variables in response to soil moisture in the desert, typical, and meadow steppe

Dependence of microbial warming responses on interannual precipitation variability

Consistent with our second hypothesis, we found that responses of microbial activity and biomass to warming depended on annual precipitation within sites (Fig. 5). Not only were warming effects on microbial activity greater in wetter sites, but they were also greater in wetter years. In addition to affecting the warming response, interannual variation in precipitation affects absolute microbial activity (Fig. S1) (Yan and Marschner 2014) and ANPP, with greater values in wetter years.

The interannual variation in precipitation may have affected microbial responses to warming directly via interannual variation in soil moisture (Fig. 4) (Moyano et al. 2013) or indirectly via increasing belowground C resource availability (Kaiser et al. 2010; Koranda et al. 2013). This interannual variability of warming effects, to some degree, is similar to a study in California annual grassland where soil microbial responses to climate manipulation were affected by the level of stress imposed by interannual variation in climate (Gutknecht et al. 2012). Similarly, other ecosystems have also shown distinct seasonal responses of soil microbial activities to warming because of soil moisture variation (Rinnan et al. 2009; Suseela and Dukes 2013).

Mechanisms of microbial response to warming manipulation

Warming-induced changes in soil moisture may also affect primary production with indirect consequences for microbial activity. Our multiple regression results showed a positive dependence of soil MBN and microbial respiration on ANPP (Fig. S1), implying that greater moisture availability may stimulate microbial activity through greater plant growth and associated soil inputs of carbon and nutrients (Kaiser et al. 2010). However, greater inputs in the more productive meadow steppe did not increase the DOC pool there (Table 1) probably because the greater microbial respiration in the meadow steppe resulted in a greater consumption of labile C (Sistla et al. 2013). Since root exudates and litter are the most important source of easily assimilable C for soil microbes (Brant et al. 2006), changes in belowground carbon inputs under warming could also impact soil microbial activity (Bardgett et al. 2008; Scott-Denton et al. 2006).

Consistent with this idea, we observed positive correlations between changes in soil microbial respiration and MBN and changes in belowground net primary productivity (Fig. 5). Although the change in BNPP was

Fig. 5 Simple linear regressions for mean warming-induced changes in soil microbial biomass C (MBC), changes in soil microbial biomass N (MBN), and changes in soil microbial respiration (MR) with annual precipitation (**a**, **c**, and **e**, $n = 11$) and with mean changes in belowground net primary productivity (BNPP) (**b**, **d**, and **f**, $n = 8$) across the three sites from 2006 to 2009. Belowground net primary productivity data were available in the desert and typical steppes from 2006 to 2008 and in the meadow steppe in 2006 and 2008. The open circles, solid triangles, and solid circles represent desert, typical, and meadow steppe, respectively

not a statistically significant driver of the change in MBC according to stepwise multiple regression, there was a clear positive relationship. With our small sample sizes, it is difficult to disentangle the drivers of microbial biomass through multiple regressions, leading us to conclude that both precipitation and changes in BNPP may be important. Overall, our study suggests the potential for warming to affect microbial biomass and activity directly through temperature change and indirectly through changes in plant productivity.

Conclusions

Warming has direct and indirect effects on soil microbial biomass and respiration with implications for C cycling in terrestrial ecosystems. Here, warming effects on soil microbial biomass and respiration were regulated by variation in precipitation across sites and years. In drier sites and years, warming reduced soil microbial activity by reducing soil moisture. With increasing precipitation along our gradient, the inhibitory effects of warming diminished or reversed as soil moisture increased. Our study indicates that predictions of ecosystem C

response to warming should account for spatial and temporal variation in precipitation and resulting effects on soil moisture. Temperature and precipitation constraints should be combined to evaluate warming effects on ecosystems in future C cycle models.

Acknowledgments This study was financially supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (31372188), China Scholarship Council, and Chinese National Key Development Program for Basic Research (2013CB956304).

References

- Allison SD, Wallenstein MD, Bradford MA (2010) Soil-carbon response to warming dependent on microbial physiology. *Nature Geosci* 3: 336–340
- Bardgett RD, Freeman C, Ostle NJ (2008) Microbial contributions to climate change through carbon cycle feedbacks. *ISME J* 2:805–814
- Bell TH, Klironomos JN, Henry HAL (2010) Seasonal responses of extracellular enzyme activity and microbial biomass to warming and nitrogen addition. *Soil Sci Soc Am J* 74:820–828
- Blagodatskaya E, Zheng X, Blagodatsky S, Wiegand R, Dannenmann M, Butterbach-Bahl K (2014) Oxygen and substrate availability interactively control the temperature sensitivity of CO₂ and N₂O emission from soil. *Biol Fertil Soils* 50:775–783

- 440 Brant JB, Myrold DD, Sulzman EW (2006) Root controls on soil micro-
441 bial community structure in forest soils. *Oecologia* 148:650–659
- 442 Carlyle CN, Fraser LH, Turkington R (2011) Tracking soil temperature
443 and moisture in a multi-factor climate experiment in temperate
444 grassland: do climate manipulation methods produce their intended
445 effects? *Ecosystems* 14:489–502
- 446 Davidon EA, Janssens IA (2006) Temperature sensitivity of soil carbon
447 decomposition and feedbacks to climate change. *Nature* 440:165–
448 173
- 449 Doerr SH, Shakesby RA, Walsh RPD (2000) Soil water repellency: its
450 causes, characteristics and hydro-geomorphological significance.
451 *Earth-Sci Rev* 51:33–65
- 452 Fraser FC, Hallett PD, Wookey PA, Hartley IP, Hopkins DW (2013) How
453 do enzymes catalysing soil nitrogen transformations respond to
454 changing temperatures? *Biol Fertil Soils* 49:99–103
- 455 Garten CT, Classen AT, Norby RJ (2009) Soil moisture surpasses elevat-
456 ed CO₂ and temperature as a control on soil carbon dynamics in a
457 multi-factor climate change experiment. *Plant Soil* 319:85–94
- 458 Goebel MO, Bachmann J, Reichstein M, Janssens IA, Guggenberger G
459 (2011) Soil water repellency and its implications for organic matter
460 decomposition—is there a link to extreme climatic events? *Glob*
461 *Change Biol* 17:2640–2656
- 462 Gutknecht JLM, Field CB, Balser TC (2012) Microbial communities and
463 their responses to simulated global change fluctuate greatly over
464 multiple years. *Glob Change Biol* 18:2256–2269
- 465 Haugwitz MS, Bergmark L, Prieme A, Christensen S, Beier C, Michelsen
466 A (2014) Soil microorganisms respond to five years of climate
467 change manipulations and elevated atmospheric CO₂ in a temperate
468 heath ecosystem. *Plant Soil* 374:211–222
- 469 Hobbie SE, Chapin FS (1998) The response of tundra plant biomass,
470 aboveground production, nitrogen, and CO₂ flux to experimental
471 warming. *Ecology* 79:1526–1544
- 472 Hu S, vanBruggen AHC (1997) Microbial dynamics associated with
473 multiphasic decomposition of C-14-labeled cellulose in soil.
474 *Microb Ecol* 33:134–143
- 475 Kaiser C, Koranda M, Kitzler B, Fuchslueger L, Schnecker J, Schweiger
476 P, Rasche F, Zechmeister-Boltenstern S, Sessitsch A, Richter A
477 (2010) Belowground carbon allocation by trees drives seasonal pat-
478 terns of extracellular enzyme activities by altering microbial com-
479 munity composition in a beech forest soil. *New Phytol* 187:843–858
- 480 Koranda M, Kaiser C, Fuchslueger L, Kitzler B, Sessitsch A,
481 Zechmeister-Boltenstern S, Richter A (2013) Seasonal variation in
482 functional properties of microbial communities in beech forest soil.
483 *Soil Biol Biochem* 60:95–104
- 484 Liu W, Zhang Z, Wan S (2009) Predominant role of water in regulating
485 soil and microbial respiration and their responses to climate change
486 in a semiarid grassland. *Glob Change Biol* 15:184–195
- 487 Melillo JM, Steudler PA, Aber JD, Newkirk K, Lux H, Bowles FP,
488 Catricala C, Magill A, Ahrens T, Morrisseau S (2002) Soil warming
489 and carbon-cycle feedbacks to the climate system. *Science* 298:
490 2173–2176
- 491 Menichetti L, Ortigoza ALR, Garcia N, Giagnoni L, Nannipieri P,
492 Renella G (2015) Thermal sensitivity of enzyme activity in tropical
493 soils assessed by the Q(10) and equilibrium model. *Biol Fertil Soils*
494 51:299–310
- 495 Moyano FE, Vasilyeva N, Bouckaert L, Cook F, Craine J, Curiel Yuste J,
496 Don A, Epron D, Formanek P, Franzluebbers A, Ilstedt U, Kätterer
497 T, Orchard V, Reichstein M, Rey A, Ruamps L, Subke JA, Thomsen
498 IK, Chenu C (2012) The moisture response of soil heterotrophic
499 respiration: interaction with soil properties. *Biogeosciences* 9:
500 1173–1182
- 501 Moyano FE, Manzoni S, Chenu C (2013) Responses of soil heterotrophic
502 respiration to moisture availability: an exploration of processes and
503 models. *Soil Biol Biochem* 59:72–85
- 504 Natali SM, Schuur EAG, Rubin RL (2012) Increased plant productivity
505 in Alaskan tundra as a result of experimental warming of soil and
506 permafrost. *J Ecol* 100:488–498
- 507 Rinnan R, Stark S, Tolvanen A (2009) Responses of vegetation and soil
508 microbial communities to warming and simulated herbivory in a
509 subarctic heath. *J Ecol* 97:788–800
- 510 Schimel J, Balser TC, Wallenstein M (2007) Microbial stress-response
511 physiology and its implications for ecosystem function. *Ecology* 88:
512 1386–1394
- 513 Scott-Denton LE, Rosenstiel TN, Monson RK (2006) Differential con-
514 trols by climate and substrate over the heterotrophic and
515 rhizospheric components of soil respiration. *Glob Change Biol* 12:
516 205–216
- 517 Sharp ED, Sullivan PF, Steltzer H, Csank AZ, Welker JM (2013)
518 Complex carbon cycle responses to multi-level warming and sup-
519 plemental summer rain in the high Arctic. *Glob Change Biol* 19:
520 1780–1792
- 521 Shaver GR, Canadell J, Chapin FS, Gurevitch J, Harte J, Henry G, Ineson
522 P, Jonasson S, Melillo J, Pitelka L, Rustad L (2000) Global warming
523 and terrestrial ecosystems: a conceptual framework for analysis.
524 *Bioscience* 50:871–882
- 525 Sistla SA, Schimel JP (2013) Seasonal patterns of microbial extracellular
526 enzyme activities in an arctic tundra soil: identifying direct and
527 indirect effects of long-term summer warming. *Soil Biol Biochem*
528 66:119–129
- 529 Sistla SA, Moore JC, Simpson RT, Gough L, Shaver GR, Schimel JP
530 (2013) Long-term warming restructures Arctic tundra without
531 changing net soil carbon storage. *Nature* 497:615–620
- 532 Suseela V, Dukes JS (2013) The responses of soil and rhizosphere respi-
533 ration to simulated climatic changes vary by season. *Ecology* 94:
534 403–413
- 535 Vance ED, Brookes PC, Jenkinson DS (1987) An extraction method for
536 measuring soil microbial biomass-C. *Soil Biol Biochem* 19:703–
537 707
- 538 Wardle DA, Bardgett RD, Klironomos JN, Setälä H, van der Putten WH,
539 Wall DH (2004) Ecological linkages between aboveground and be-
540 lowground biota. *Science* 304:1629–1633
- 541 Xia J, Niu S, Wan S (2009) Response of ecosystem carbon exchange to
542 warming and nitrogen addition during two hydrologically contrast-
543 ing growing seasons in a temperate steppe. *Glob Change Biol* 15:
544 1544–1556
- 545 Yan N, Marschner P (2014) Previous water content influences the re-
546 sponse of soil respiration to changes in water content in non-saline
547 and saline soils. *Biol Fertil Soils* 50:1129–1140
- 548 Yin H, Li Y, Xiao J, Xu Z, Cheng X, Liu Q (2013) Enhanced root
549 exudation stimulates soil nitrogen transformations in a subalpine
550 coniferous forest under experimental warming. *Glob Change Biol*
551 19:2158–2167
- 552 Zhang W, Parker KM, Luo Y, Wan S, Wallace LL, Hu S (2005) Soil
553 microbial responses to experimental warming and clipping in a
554 tallgrass prairie. *Glob Change Biol* 11:266–277
- 555 Zhang NL, Wan SQ, Guo JX, Han GD, Gutknecht J, Schmid B, Yu L, Liu
556 WX, Bi J, Wang Z, Ma KP (2015) Precipitation modifies the effects
557 of warming and nitrogen addition on soil microbial communities in
558 northern Chinese grasslands. *Soil Biol Biochem* 89:12–23
- 559 Zhou J, Xue K, Xie J, Deng Y, Wu L, Cheng X, Fei S, Deng S, He Z, Van
560 Nostrand JD, Luo Y (2012) Microbial mediation of carbon-cycle
561 feedbacks to climate warming. *Nature Climate Change* 2:106–110