



Sampling the control bulk soil for rhizosphere and drilosphere microbial studies

Manuel Blouin, Samuel Jacquiod

► To cite this version:

Manuel Blouin, Samuel Jacquiod. Sampling the control bulk soil for rhizosphere and drilosphere microbial studies. *Geoderma*, 2020, 380, pp.114674. 10.1016/j.geoderma.2020.114674 . hal-02963964

HAL Id: hal-02963964

<https://institut-agro-dijon.hal.science/hal-02963964>

Submitted on 22 Aug 2022

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial 4.0 International License

1 **Sampling the control bulk soil for rhizosphere and drilosphere microbial studies.**

2

3 Manuel Blouin^{1*#}, Samuel Jacquiod¹

4

5 ¹Agroécologie, AgroSup Dijon, INRAE, Univ. Bourgogne Franche-Comté, France

6

7 #Corresponding author : manuel.blouin@agrosupdijon.fr

8 AgroSup Dijon, D2A2E, 26 Bd Docteur Petitjean, BP 87999, 21079 Dijon Cedex, FRANCE

9

10

11

12 **Abstract**

13 Microbial communities dwelling in biogenic structures shaped by soil macroorganisms (e.g.
14 rhizosphere of plants, drilosphere of earthworms) are often compared to communities in the bulk soil
15 taken as a control. Two strategies are currently applied, by sampling either bulk soil surrounding the
16 biogenic structures inside the same experimental unit (“surrounding bulk”) or soil from a distinct
17 control unit without macroorganism (“pristine bulk”). While surrounding bulk is commonly used, no
18 studies explicitly compared these two bulk types. Moreover, the potential effect of plants and
19 earthworms on microbial communities in the surrounding bulk could depend on soil properties. In
20 controlled conditions, we exposed three soils with contrasting properties to either a plant, earthworms,
21 both, or without macroorganisms (pristine bulk). Root-adhering soil, casts and their surrounding bulk
22 were retrieved by meticulous sampling. We found that molecular abundances of bacteria, fungi and
23 archaea were modified in surrounding compared to pristine bulk. In a non-trivial manner, bacterial
24 community structure from surrounding bulk was significantly altered by plants in all soils, while the
25 influence of earthworms was soil-dependent, in a way related to C and N contents rather than texture.
26 When comparing macroorganism influenced versus non-influenced soils, the pristine bulk should thus
27 be preferred, whereas the surrounding bulk is appropriate to characterize the sphere of influence of
28 biogenic structures.

29

30 Keywords: Bacteria community structure; earthworm; experimental control; microbial abundance;
31 plant; soil matrix

32

33

Soil physics, biogeochemistry and ecology studies investigating the effect of organisms on soil properties all require an experimental control. When studying the effects of these macroorganisms on soil microbial communities dwelling in biogenic structures, e.g. rhizosphere or drilosphere (Lavelle, 2002), two different methodological approaches relying on their own controls exist. The first assesses the impact of macroorganisms by comparing microbial communities of the biogenic structures with the surrounding and visually non-aggregated soil inside the same experimental unit (so-called “surrounding bulk soil”) (Lundberg et al., 2012; Monard et al., 2011; Tkacz et al., 2015; Whalley et al., 2005). The second, less frequent, compares biogenic structures with the bulk soil of an independent control unit, without macroorganisms (so-called “pristine bulk soil”) (Bomberg et al., 2011; Edwards et al., 2015; Hoeffner et al., 2018). Because controls are fundamentally used to calculate effect size, which enables generalization in meta-analyses (Borenstein et al., 2009), standardizing the reference situation is crucial. However, if beyond the biogenic structure, the surrounding bulk soil is also affected by the presence of a macroorganism (Lipiec et al., 2016), this could introduce a bias in effect size estimation. This potential long-range influence of macroorganisms on surrounding bulk microbial communities may depend on soil properties, which could modify microorganisms dispersal and growth. For instance, soil texture is expected to affect passive dispersal of microbes with water fluxes, while organic matter content may affect sorption and resource availability for microbes (Lindqvist and Bengtsson, 1991). Moreover, while plants gradually influence the soil from the rhizoplane towards the bulk soil (Tkacz et al., 2015), earthworms ingest and transform soil into casts (Medina-sauza et al., 2019). Thus, soil microbial dispersion patterns may significantly differ depending on the macroorganism and its associated biogenic structure, with a potential interaction with the type of soil considered.

While effects of plants and earthworms on rhizosphere and drilosphere microbial communities are extensively studied, there is, to the best of our knowledge, no investigation aiming at comparing the different bulk soil controls (the surrounding and pristine bulks) to determine to which extent they might differ. Here, we hypothesized that (h1) microbial communities dwelling in the bulk soil

surrounding the rhizosphere and the drilosphere differ from those living in pristine bulk soil, and (h2) effects of plants and earthworms on surrounding bulk microbial communities depend on soil properties. We thus compared microbial communities from the bulk soil surrounding root-adhering soil and casts to the pristine bulk of a control treatment without macroorganisms in a controlled experiment using three contrasting soils (sand, loam, clay, properties described in Table S1) under the presence/absence of one plant (barley, *Hordeum vulgare* L. (1753)), three endogeic earthworms (*Aporrectodea caliginosa caliginosa*, Bouché (1972)), with a total average weight of 1 g) or both (design in Fig. S1). Microcosms were made of 1 kg of dry soil, maintained at 80% of the field capacity in a climatic chamber at 18/20°C night/day, 75% air humidity and 12h photoperiod for 28 days.

Soil at 70 % w/w humidity was meticulously dismantled by manual sorting of aggregates, i.e. root-adhering soil for the rhizosphere and belowground casts for the drilosphere (no burrow sampling). As soil was sieved before the experiment, it was easy to visually identified casts as round-shaped aggregates (Velasquez et al., 2007), whereas the surrounding bulk consisted in non aggregated soil. We focused on molecular microbial abundances (i.e. bacteria, archaea and fungi) based on quantitative PCR estimates, followed by bacterial community structure via 16S rRNA gene amplicon sequencing due to their importance in plant-earthworm interactions (Medina-sauza et al., 2019). A detailed description of the experimental protocol, sampling and molecular analyses is available in a previous study (Jacquiod et al., 2020).

First, we focussed on the effects of plant and earthworms on the abundance of bacteria, fungi and archaea in the surrounding bulk relative to the pristine bulk (Fig. 1, with z-score corresponding to molecular copy counts standardized against average and standard deviation values of the pristine bulk from the same soil). Plants were responsible for an increased abundance of bacteria in the soil surrounding the rhizospheres, whereas earthworms reduced it in the soil surrounding the casts, with a neutralization of effects when both macroorganisms were present (Fig. 1a). Plants had no effect on archaea but earthworms had a strong negative effect that disappeared under the presence of plant (Fig. 1b). Finally, plants stimulated the fungal abundance, but no significant effect was observed for earthworms and the combination of both macroorganisms (Fig. 1c). Bacteria, archaea and fungal

abundances were thus all influenced in the bulk surrounding biogenic structures (h1), being often stimulated by the plant while inhibited by earthworms.

Bacteria community structure clearly differed inside and outside biogenic structures, ruling out the possibility that we inadvertently mixed root-adhering soil or casts with the surrounding bulk during sampling. Indeed, rhizospheres (Fig. 2a-c) separated from surrounding and pristine bulks for all soils (CAP1 = 34-55% of the explained variance). Casts separated from surrounding and pristine bulks in the sand soil (Fig. 2f, CAP1 = 20%), and to a lesser extent in the clay soil (Fig. 2d, CAP2 = 8%).

Regarding our two hypotheses, we found that the bulk soil surrounding rhizospheres was always separated from the pristine bulk in all soils, although weakly (CAP2 = 4-8%, Fig. 2a-c). The pattern was variable for earthworms (Fig. 2d-f): in the clay soil, the main source of variance was the difference between the surrounding and pristine bulk (CAP1 = 23%), being less important for the sand soil (CAP2 = 6%) and not significant for the loam soil ($p = 0.07$). Plants and earthworms were thus influencing bacterial community structure beyond the physical boundaries of their own biogenic structures (h1), whatever the soil for plants but only in some soils for earthworms (h2). A confirmation of the soil-independent plant effect and soil-dependent earthworm effect was observed when both macroorganisms were present (Fig. 2g-i).

When restricting the analysis to the bulk samples of the four treatments (pristine bulk in the control without macroorganisms and surrounding bulk in the others) (Fig. S2), we found that bacterial communities differed significantly between the different bulks (h1), except in the loam soil when considering only the presence/absence of Operational Taxonomic Units (OTUs) (Fig. S2b). In the clay soil, the presence of the plant, earthworms and their interaction had a significant effect on the bacterial community structure in the different bulks, either based on presence/absence (Fig. S2a) or abundance (Fig. S2d). For the sand soil, only the plant effect was significant (Fig. S2c and f). For the loam soil, plant and earthworm effects were found only based on abundances (Fig. S2e). These results concur with Fig. 2, stressing the soil-dependent effect of earthworms and their interaction with plant (h2).

Analysis of OTUs distribution from these four bulks in Venn diagrams (systematic presence amongst the four biological replicates in the three soils simultaneously) showed diversity fractions specifically found in each bulk soil and not shared with the others (Fig. S3). There were 15 OTUs specific of pristine bulks, 19 from cast-surrounding bulks, 16 from rhizosphere-surrounding bulks and 18 from cast and rhizosphere-surrounding bulks (Fig. S3a). In the four bulks, about 80% of these specific OTUs were members of the Actinobacteria, Proteobacteria and Acidobacteria (Fig. S3b), which are taxa typically reported in casts (Medina-sauza et al., 2019) or rhizosphere (Philippot et al., 2013).

Our results demonstrated that the influence of macroorganisms on microbial abundance (Fig 1) and community structure (Fig. 2) goes beyond what is considered as rhizosphere and drilosphere on the basis of physical aggregation. Some studies have investigated the gradual influence of a macroorganism on microbial community structures by comparing the endosphere, rhizoplane, rhizosphere and bulk soil (Edwards et al., 2015), or on enzymatic activities and functional diversity between the burrow wall (0-3 mm from the burrow), the “transitional zone” (3-7 mm), the bulk soil (at least 20 mm) and the casts (Lipiec et al., 2016). Our study shows that when the research objectives are to quantify the effect of a macroorganism on microbial communities by comparing two *a priori* “influenced” and “non-influenced” soils or to characterize the influence gradient of a macroorganism, pristine bulk soil without macroorganism should be preferred as a control when the range of influence is not known. Otherwise, the effect size of a macroorganism influence could be biased by not taking into account its impact on the bulk soil surrounding biogenic structures. While this can be easily achieved with microcosms, including such controls can be challenging for field experiments (Furlong et al., 2002; Smalla et al., 2001). Meta-analyses aiming at establishing quantitative assessments of plants, earthworms (and likely other soil invertebrates) on microbial communities should consider the type of control bulk, either for laboratory or field experiments, through “sub-group analyses” (Borenstein et al., 2009).

Our study also shows that soil properties interacted with macroorganism’s influence in a non-trivial way: they were modifying the influence of earthworms but not plants (Fig. 2 & S2). The aim of this study was not to identify a specific soil property associated with the soil-dependant effect of

earthworms. Noteworthy, we observed that the progressive decrease in the effect size from the clay, to sand and loam soils was not correlating with soil texture, which was predicted to alter water fluxes and microbes' dispersal. Instead, it was correlating with carbon and nitrogen contents (Table S1), which could reflect the nutrient availability status for microorganisms. The soil-independent effect of plant may be due to volatile signals, known to trigger specific microbial responses (Lebeis et al., 2015), or a stronger priming of microbial activities by plants compared to earthworms. The specific OTU fractions identified in the pristine, cast-surrounding, rhizosphere-surrounding and cast/rhizosphere-surrounding bulks respectively, showed that bacterial species can segregate their niches according to the influence of macroorganisms and their interactions, even in the non-aggregated soil. A precise sampling with relevant control will become mandatory to understand the complex interaction network between soil macroorganism's and microorganism's communities.

Acknowledgements

We thank Valérie Serve for technical help, Beatriz Decenci re, Amandine Hansart and Florent Massol of the CEREEP - Ecotron IDF/UMS CNRS/ENS 3194 for the sand soil, Sandrine Salmon of the UMR 7179 / CNRS-MNHN for the clay soil and Christophe Montagnier of the UE Grandes cultures / INRA for the loam soil. This work was supported by grants from the French national program CNRS/INSU [EC2CO-Biohefect-MicrobiEn-AuxAzote]. The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

- Bomberg, M., Münster, U., Pumpanen, J., Ilvesniemi, H., Heinonsalo, J., 2011. Archaeal communities in boreal forest tree rhizospheres respond to changing soil temperatures. *Microb. Ecol.* 62, 205–217. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00248-011-9837-4>
- Borenstein, M., Hedges, L. V, Higgins, J.P.T., Rothstein, H.R., 2009. *Introduction to Meta-Analysis*. John Wiley & Sons, Chichester, UK.
- Edwards, J., Johnson, C., Santos-Medellín, C., Lurie, E., Podishetty, N.K., Bhatnagar, S., Eisen, J.A., Sundaresan, V., Jeffery, L.D., 2015. Structure, variation, and assembly of the root-associated microbiomes of rice. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 112, E911–E920. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1414592112>
- Furlong, M.A., Singleton, D.R., Coleman, D.C., Whitman, W.B., 2002. Molecular and culture-based analyses of prokaryotic communities from an agricultural soil and the burrows and casts of the earthworm *Lumbricus rubellus*. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* 68, 1265–1279.
- Hoeffner, K., Monard, C., Santonja, M., Cluzeau, D., 2018. Feeding behaviour of epi-anecic earthworm species and their impacts on soil microbial communities. *Soil Biol. Biochem.* 125, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soilbio.2018.06.017>
- Jacquioud, S., Puga-Freitas, R., Spor, A., Mounier, A., Monard, C., Mougel, C., Philippot, L., Blouin, M., 2020. A core microbiota of the plant-earthworm interaction conserved across soils. *Soil Biol. Biochem.* 144, 107754.
- Lavelle, P., 2002. Functional domains in soils. *Ecol. Res.* 17, 441–450.
- Lebeis, S.L., Paredes, S.H., Lundberg, D.S., Breakfield, N., Gehring, J., McDonald, M., Malfatti, S., del Rio, T.G., Jones, C.D., Tringe, S.G., Dangl, J.L., 2015. Salicylic acid modulates colonization of the root microbiome by specific bacterial taxa. *Science (80-.).* 349, 860–864. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aaa8764>

183 Lindqvist, R., Bengtsson, G., 1991. Dispersal dynamics of groundwater bacteria. *Microb. Ecol.* 21,
184 49–72.

185 Lipiec, J., Magdalena Frac, Brzezinska, M., Turski, M., Oszust, K., 2016. Linking microbial
186 enzymatic activities and functional diversity of soil around earthworm burrows and casts. *Front.*
187 *Microbiol.* 7, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2016.01361>

188 Lundberg, D.S., Lebeis, S.L., Paredes, S.H., Yourstone, S., Gehring, J., Malfatti, S., Tremblay, J.,
189 Engelbrektson, A., Kunin, V., del Rio, T.G., Edgar, R.C., Eickhorst, T., Ley, R.E., Hugenholtz,
190 P., Tringe, S.G., Dangl, J.L., 2012. Defining the core *Arabidopsis thaliana* root microbiome.
191 *Nature* 488, 86–90. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature11237>

192 Medina-sauza, R.M., Álvarez-jiménez, M., Delhal, A., Reverchon, F., Blouin, M., Guerrero-Analco,
193 J.A., Cerdán, C.R., Guevara, R., Villain, L., Barois, I., 2019. Earthworms building up soil
194 microbiota, a review. *Front. Environ. Sci.* 7, article 81. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fenvs.2019.00081>

195 Monard, C., Vandenkoornhuyse, P., Le Bot, B., Binet, F., 2011. Relationship between bacterial
196 diversity and function under biotic control: the soil pesticide degraders as a case study. *ISME J.*
197 5, 1048–1056. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ismej.2010.194>

198 Philippot, L., Raaijmakers, J.M., Lemanceau, P., van der Putten, W.H., 2013. Going back to the roots:
199 the microbial ecology of the rhizosphere. *Nat. Rev. Microbiol.* 11, 789–99.
200 <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrmicro3109>

201 Smalla, K., Wieland, G., Buchner, A., Zock, A., Parzy, J., Kaiser, S., Roskot, N., Heuer, H., Berg, G.,
202 2001. Bulk and rhizosphere soil bacterial communities studied by denaturing gradient gel
203 electrophoresis: plant-dependent enrichment and seasonal shifts revealed. *Appl. Environ.*
204 *Microbiol.* 67, 4742–51. <https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.67.10.4742>

205 Tkacz, A., Cheema, J., Chandra, G., Grant, A., Poole, P.S., 2015. Stability and succession of the
206 rhizosphere microbiota depends upon plant type and soil composition. *ISME J.* 9, 2349–2359.
207 <https://doi.org/10.1038/ismej.2015.41>

208 Velasquez, E., Pelosi, C., Brunet, D., Grimaldi, M., Martins, M., Rendeirod, A.C., Barrios, E., Lavelle,
209 P., 2007. This ped is my ped: Visual separation and near infrared spectra allow determination of
210 the origins of soil macroaggregates. *Pedobiologia (Jena)*. 51, 75–87.

211 Whalley, W.R., Riseley, B., Leeds-Harrison, P.B., Bird, N.R.A., Leech, P.K., Adderley, W.P., 2005.
212 Structural differences between bulk and rhizosphere soil. *Eur. J. Soil Sci.* 56, 353–360.
213 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2389.2004.00670.x>

214

215


216 Figure legends

217 Fig. 1. qPCR estimation of bacterial (16S rRNA), fungal (ITS) and archaeal (16S rRNA) genetic
218 markers in the surrounding bulk, reported to the pristine bulk (0 value). Molecular copy counts were
219 standardized against average and standard deviation values of pristine bulk from the same soil (z-
220 score). Bar charts are representing z-score averages $\pm$ standard error ($n = 3-5$). Significance between
221 treatments were assessed by two-sample, two-sided Student tests (top horizontal lines between
222 treatments). Significance relative to the reference pristine bulk (0 value) were assessed by one-sample,
223 two-sided Student tests (indications above bars). Significance codes: *** $p < 0.001$; ** $p < 0.01$; * p
224 < 0.05 ; • $p < 0.1$.

225

226 Fig. 2. Distance-based redundancy analysis showing the principal constrained coordinates of bacterial
227 communities in each soil (weighted unifrac distances, 10.000 permutations). The four treatments are
228 indicated by different colors ; microhabitats (bulk soil, rhizosphere, casts) are indicated by different
229 marker shapes.

230






Clay soil




Loam soil

Sand soil




Plant



Earthworms



P + E



■ Pristine bulk ■ Earthworms ■ Plant ■ P+E ○ Bulk △ Cast □ Rhizosphere