CRITIQUE & DEBATE

EARTH SCIENCES

Reply to: Beyond microbial carbon use efficiency

Feng Tao¹, Johannes Lehmann², Ying-Ping Wang³, Lifen Jiang², Bernhard Ahrens⁴, Kostiantyn Viatkin², Stefano Manzoni⁵, Benjamin Z. Houlton^{1, 6}, Yuanyuan Huang⁷, Xiaomeng Huang^{8, *}, and Yiqi Luo^{2, *}

¹Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, Cornell University, Ithaca NY, USA
²Soil and Crop Sciences Section, School of Integrative Plant Science, Cornell University, Ithaca NY, USA
³CSIRO Environment, Private Bag 10, Clayton South, Victoria, 3168 Australia
⁴Max Planck Institute for Biogeochemistry, Jena, Germany
⁵Department of Physical Geography and Bolin Centre for Climate Research, Stockholm University, Stockholm, Sweden
⁶Department of Global Development, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY, USA
⁷Key Laboratory of Ecosystem Network Observation and Modeling, Institute of Geographic Sciences and Natural Resources Research, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China
⁸Department of Earth System Science, Ministry of Education Key Laboratory for Earth System Modelling, Institute for Global Change Studies, Tsinghua University, Beijing, China

*Corresponding Authors: Yiqi Luo: yiqi.luo@cornell.edu; Xiaomeng Huang: hxm@tsinghua.edu.cn

In their commentary¹, Xiao et al. cautioned that the conclusions on the critical role of microbial carbon use efficiency (CUE) in global soil organic carbon (SOC) storage in the paper by Tao et al. (2023)² might be too simplistic. They claimed that Tao et al.'s study lacked mechanistic consideration of SOC formation and excluded important datasets. Xiao et al. brought up important points, which can be largely reconciled with our findings by understanding the differences in expressing processes in empirical studies and in models.

Mechanistic understanding of complex processes from empirical research is usually translated into mathematical models with some level of simplification. For example, processes involved in SOC stabilization and persistence, as brought up by Xiao et al., were considered by the model and evaluated together with microbial CUE for their relative importance to global SOC storage in Tao et al. (2023). The mechanisms for stabilizing necromass in soils with soil minerals are implicitly represented as the non-microbial carbon transfer by various chemical and physical processes (see carbon flows in Extended Data Fig. 3 in Tao et al. (2023)). Parameter $a_{mSOC,MIC}$ represents the fraction of microbial necromass (subscript MIC) that is stabilized as mineral-associated SOC (subscript mSOC) via organomineral interactions (i.e., the *in vivo* pathway of stabilization; see ref³); parameter $a_{mSOC,LL}$ indicates the fraction of lignin litter (subscript LL) that is directly stabilized as SOC with minerals and without going through microbial processes (i.e., the ex vivo pathway of stabilization; see Supplementary Table 6 in Tao et al. 2023). The organic compounds associated with microbial products and necromass that Xiao et al. suggested to be stabilized against decomposition through various chemical and physical processes are expressed in the model by decomposition coefficients, k_i (where subscript *i* refers to the *i*th pool of carbon in a multi-pool ecosystem). The inverses of k_i represent the residence time, which is a measure of persistence, of various organic compounds in soil. Tao et al. (2023) compared the relative importance of non-microbial carbon transfer and decomposition coefficients with microbial CUE. The latter was found to be more important than the formers in determining SOC storage and its distributions at the global scale.

The dominant role of CUE in global SOC storage emerging from Bayesian inference by Tao et al. (2023) does not imply that CUE is the only process to drive carbon storage, but it is likely a necessary process as soil might have less organo-mineral interactions without microbial metabolites. Our current understanding of stabilization mechanisms is highly fragmented from empirical research, which makes a fully process-based model representation very challenging. For instance, data syntheses have suggested statistically significant correlations between mineralogical or soil chemical variables (e.g., clay and silt fraction, short range-order iron, aluminium, and exchangeable calcium) with soil carbon stocks at the continental scale⁴⁻⁶. However, mechanistic interpretations of the observed patterns at the global scale are still under development, leaving their mathematical representations in models at an early stage⁷. In the future, identifying new functional relationships and parameters that describe in a mechanistic way mineral stabilization is essential. Meanwhile, the inferred role

of CUE in global SOC storage from our PRODA approach should be further tested by more studies. We expect that not only other processes may be dominant in individual empirical studies, but that the relationship of CUE and SOC may vary among individual laboratory or site case studies.

We agree with Xiao et al. that causal relations between CUE and SOC need to be supported by more empirical evidence and mechanistic modelling studies. Tao et al. (2023) showed both statistical (from the meta-analysis) and process-based (from the microbial model) evidence that microbial CUE promotes SOC storage at the global scale. First, Tao et al. (2023) applied mixed-effects modeling to ensure the statistical rigor of the meta-analysis. The positive CUE-SOC relationship was robust after considering the influence of various predictors (e.g., temperature, soil depth, etc.) and their potential interactions (Extended Data Table 1 in Tao et al. 2023). Second, Tao et al. (2023) investigated relationships among microbial CUE, microbial biomass, and non-microbial biomass storage (i.e., the remaining amount of organic carbon after excluding microbial biomass; see Supplementary Table 2 in Tao et al. 2023). The results showed that a high CUE accompanied not only high microbial biomass carbon, but also high non-microbial biomass carbon. Third, the above findings in the meta-analysis were further verified by the results of the microbial model after data assimilation (Extended Data Table 2 and Supplementary Tables 3-4 in Tao et al. 2023). While the microbial model can theoretically generate positive, negative, or null relationships between CUE and SOC, as noticed by Xiao et al., Tao et al. (2023) applied Bayesian data assimilation to identify the most probable regulatory pathway of CUE to SOC storage. That is, microbial partitioning of carbon toward microbial growth enhances SOC accumulation via microbial by-products and necromass. We acknowledge that this is inferred and not a conclusive proof. The relationship of CUE and SOC might have complex interactions with other processes even though the result shown in Tao et al (2023) is an important step forward to mechanistically understand SOC formation at the global scale and identify what needs to be investigated in the future.

We greatly appreciate the point made by Xiao et al. that more data on microbial growth and respiration, especially from tropical and arid regions, are needed to avoid biased analyses. Our results support a positive relationship between microbial CUE and SOC storage based on two distinct lines of evidence. While the meta-analysis based on 132 data points showed an emerging positive CUE-SOC relationship across regions, the PRODA analysis of 57,267

globally distributed vertical SOC profiles supported this finding at the global scale and, thus, avoided potential regional biases in the meta-analysis. Nonetheless, we welcome any more field-measured microbial CUE and SOC data to further test the CUE-SOC relationship.

We thank Xiao et al. for bringing up the point that soil pH may alter the CUE-SOC relationship as shown in Malik et al. (2018)⁸. Including the data from Malik et al. (2018) and considering pH as a fixed effect in the meta-analysis does not influence the overall positive CUE-SOC relationship (Table 1). Similarly, using the microbial model data assimilation results, the Supplementary Table 3 of Tao et al. (2023) further showed that other variables, such as bulk density, cation exchange capacity, clay content, and net primary productivity, do not influence the positive CUE-SOC relationship across the globe. In their Fig. 2, Xiao et al. used a linear regression between CUE and SOC without considering any other factors, such as sampling depth, temperature, and methodological differences across studies. These factors influence the CUE-SOC relationship and weaken the correlation. When discussing the relationship between two variables, accounting for potentially confounding factors is essential in a statistical analysis. Tao et al. (2023) applied the mixed-effects models that accounted for the above factors to explore the relationship between microbial CUE and SOC. As a result, the positive CUE-SOC relationship explains 55% variation in observations.

Moreover, while conventional machine learning methods are powerful tools for exploring spatial relationships between variables, exercising caution is necessary when interpreting their results. In addition to the concern about whether a small sample size is suitable for training a machine learning model, the random forest used by Xiao et al. lacks uncertainty analyses to support their assertion. Meanwhile, using the increased prediction error of a random forest to quantify variables' importance to SOC merely indicates statistical correlations. In contrast, Tao et al. (2023) combined deep learning with a process-based model to quantify the relative importance of mechanism-related components to global SOC storage.

Establishing a globally causal link between CUE and SOC and evaluate the relative importance of soil carbon processes needs leveraging the potentials of empirical studies, process-based models, and big data. We acknowledge that the model we used, as any models, remains a simplified representation of real-world complexities of the soil system. Indeed, navigating sophisticated observations to a reasonable abstraction for useful predictions is part of the essence of modelling. Meanwhile, we agree with Xiao et al. that more sophisticated empirical measurements could improve our understanding of SOC formation. While models allow us to holistically evaluate soil as a system and the relative importance of their components, data from field measurements could provide direct evidence on key relationships in the soil carbon cycle. Tao et al. (2023) developed the PRODA approach to effectively incorporate process-based models with big data to gain emerging understanding of global SOC storage. To our knowledge, it is presently of great challenge to experimentally evaluated the relative importance of the seven components of soil carbon dynamics in any laboratory and field studies. PRODA provides a common tool for both modellers and experimentalists to reconcile mechanistic understanding from empirical evidence and theoretical reasoning from modelling. New findings and relationships revealed by the PRODA approach will stimulate new experimental studies in laboratory and field, and improvement of soil carbon cycling models.

Table 1 | Unstandardized coefficients of CUE-SOC relationship in the mixed-effects model including data from Malik et al. (2018). CUE, depth, mean annual temperature (MAT), and pH were set as the fixed effects to logarithmic SOC content. The study source was set as the random effect. We set random intercepts with common slopes to test the CUE-SOC relationship. The total observation size $n_{sample} = 295$; the random effects size $n_{study} =$ 17.

	~	Intercept	CUE	Depth	MAT	pН
	log10(SOC	$C) \sim CUE + Depth$	n + MAT + pH -	+ (1 Study Sou	rce)	
		variance explaine	ed by mixed mod	del: 50%		
Fixed Effects	Estimates	1.47	0.76	-0.019	0.012	-0.046
	Std. Error	0.15	0.16	0.0034	0.0053	0.019
	t value	10.02	4.82	-5.70	2.32	-2.50
	Р	< 0.0001	< 0.0001	< 0.0001	0.021	0.013
Random Effects	Standard	0.22	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Deviation					
Y						

References:

- 1 Xiao, K.-Q. *et al.* Beyond microbial carbon use efficiency. (2023).
- 2 Tao, F. *et al.* Microbial carbon use efficiency promotes global soil carbon storage. *Nature*, 1-5 (2023).
- 3 Liang, C., Schimel, J. P. & Jastrow, J. D. The importance of anabolism in microbial control over soil carbon storage. *Nature microbiology* **2**, 1-6 (2017).
- 4 Rasmussen, C. *et al.* Beyond clay: towards an improved set of variables for predicting soil organic matter content. *Biogeochemistry* **137**, 297-306 (2018).
- 5 von Fromm, S. F. *et al.* Continental-scale controls on soil organic carbon across sub-Saharan Africa. *Soil Discussions* **2020**, 1-39 (2020).
- 6 Viscarra Rossel, R. *et al.* How much organic carbon could the soil store? The carbon sequestration potential of Australian soil. *Global Change Biology* **30**, e17053 (2024).
- 7 Liao, C. *et al.* Microbe-iron interactions control lignin decomposition in soil. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry* **173**, 108803 (2022).
- 8 Malik, A. A. *et al.* Land use driven change in soil pH affects microbial carbon cycling processes. *Nature communications* **9**, 1-10 (2018).

Acknowledgement:

F.T. is supported by the Eric and Wendy Schmidt AI in Science Postdoctoral Fellowship, a

Schmidt Futures program. S.M. has received funding from the European Research Council

(ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation Programme

(grant agreement no 101001608).

Author contributions:

F. T. and Y. L. wrote the first draft. All authors contributed to revisions of the reply and approved the final version.

Competing Interest Declaration The authors declare that they have no competing interests.