



HAL
open science

Ensuring planetary survival: balancing the multifunctional nature of soils

Peter Kopittke, Asmeret Asefaw Berhe, Yolima Carrillo, Timothy Cavagnaro, Deli Chen, Qing-Lin Chen, Mercedes Román Dobarco, Feike Dijkstra, Damien Field, Michael Grundy, et al.

► To cite this version:

Peter Kopittke, Asmeret Asefaw Berhe, Yolima Carrillo, Timothy Cavagnaro, Deli Chen, et al.. Ensuring planetary survival: balancing the multifunctional nature of soils. *Critical Reviews in Environmental Science and Technology*, 2022, 52 (23), pp.4308-4324. 10.1080/10643389.2021.2024484 . hal-03852445

HAL Id: hal-03852445

<https://cnrs.hal.science/hal-03852445v1>

Submitted on 19 Nov 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.

1 **Ensuring planetary survival: Balancing the multifunctional nature of soils**

2

3 Peter M. Kopittke^{*,1}, Asmeret A. Berhe², Yolima Carrillo³, Timothy R. Cavagnaro⁴, Qing-Lin
4 Chen⁵, Feike A. Dijkstra⁶, Damien J. Field⁶, Michael J. Grundy⁶, Ji-Zheng He⁵, Frances C.
5 Hoyle⁷, Ingrid Kögel-Knabner⁸, Shu Kee Lam⁵, Petra Marschner⁴, Cristina Martinez¹, Alex B.
6 McBratney⁶, Neal W. Menzies¹, Luke M. Mosley⁹, Carsten W. Mueller¹⁰, Daniel V. Murphy⁷,
7 Uffe N. Nielsen³, Anthony G. O'Donnell⁷, Elise Pendall³, Jennifer Pett-Ridge¹¹, Cornelia
8 Rumpel¹², Iain M. Young⁶, Budiman Minasny^{6,*}

9 ¹*The University of Queensland, School of Agriculture and Food Sciences, St Lucia,*
10 *Queensland, 4072, Australia.*

11 ²*University of California, Department of Life and Environmental Sciences, Merced, CA,*
12 *95343, USA*

13 ³*Western Sydney University, Hawkesbury Institute for the Environment, Penrith, NSW 2751,*
14 *Australia*

15 ⁴*The University of Adelaide, School of Agriculture, Food & Wine, Adelaide, South Australia,*
16 *5005, Australia*

17 ⁵*The University of Melbourne, School of Agriculture and Food, Parkville, Victoria, 3010,*
18 *Australia*

19 ⁶*The University of Sydney, School of Life & Environmental Sciences, Sydney Institute of*
20 *Agriculture, Faculty of Science, Sydney, NSW 2006, Australia*

21 ⁷*Murdoch University, SoilsWest, Centre for Sustainable Farming Systems, Food Futures*
22 *Institute, Western Australia, 6150, Australia*

23 ⁸*Technical University of Munich, Soil Science, 85354 Freising, Germany*

24 ⁹*The University of Adelaide, School of Biological Sciences, Adelaide, South Australia, 5005,*
25 *Australia*

26 ¹⁰*University of Copenhagen, Department of Geosciences and Natural Resource Management,*
27 *Geography, Copenhagen, Denmark*

28 ¹¹*Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Physical and Life Science Directorate,*
29 *Livermore, CA, 94550, USA*

30 ¹²*CNRS, Institute for Ecology and Ecological Sciences, (iEES Paris, UMR Sorbonne*
31 *Université, CNRS, INRAE, UPEC, IRD), Paris, France*

32

33 *Corresponding author. Email: budiman.minasny@sydney.edu.au

34

35 **Abstract**

36 Not only do soils provide 98.7% of the calories consumed by humans, they also provide
37 numerous other functions upon which planetary survivability closely depends. However, our
38 continuously-increasing focus on soils for biomass provision (food, fiber, and energy) through
39 intensive agriculture is rapidly degrading soils and diminishing their capacity to deliver other
40 vital functions, including climate regulation, nutrient cycling, biodiversity protection, and
41 water cycling. These trade-offs in soil functionality – the increased provision of one function
42 at the expense of other critical planetary functions – are the focus of this review. We examine
43 how land-use change for biomass provision in the spiral of ever increasing economic growth
44 has decreased the ability of soils to provide regulating services including global climate,
45 biodiversity, the cycling of water and nutrients, which sustain plant growth and ecosystem
46 health, and protection of the Earth’s freshwater supplies. Given the existential threats facing
47 humanity and their economies, it is imperative that we increase our focus on the multiple
48 functions that soils provide for long-term human welfare and survival of the planet rather than
49 focusing almost blindly on the short-term provision of biomass for economic profit. For this,
50 there is an urgent need for predictive, multiscale models that quantify soil functional
51 complexity and its link to economic models that can be used to guide policy and decision-
52 making processes.

53

54 *Keywords:*

55

56 **1 Introduction**

57 Seven global existential cornerstones for the sustainable development of human societies are
58 threatened, namely: Food Security, Water Security, Energy Security, Health, and Climate,
59 Biodiversity, and Ecosystem Service Delivery. Although threats to these seven existential
60 cornerstones are all global, complex, inter-related, and difficult to resolve, soil is related to all
61 of them – soil is the single most important common variable in sustaining life on our planet
62 (Kopittke et al. 2021; McBratney et al. 2014).

63

64 Soils are diverse and multifunctional –they contribute to provisioning functions that are as
65 basis of human life and economies easily tangible such as the provision of food, fiber, and
66 energy. Moreover, they also provide less tangible regulating and support functions with
67 longer-term benefits such as regulation of climate, and biogeochemical cycles, and
68 biodiversity protection supporting human health and the quality of life on our planet. Because
69 of their critical importance, soils contribute to at least 12 of the sustainable development goals
70 (SDGs) of the United Nations (Figure 2). Despite the multiple benefits of soils, society has
71 historically focused almost exclusively on one single function – the provision of biomass
72 (food, fiber and energy). The reason is that societal development is intimately linked to
73 agricultural production, which is the basis of economic growth (Dethier and Effenberger,
74 2012; Davis, 2017). However, by prioritizing biomass production, the capacity for soils to
75 deliver the remaining functions has been compromised. Whilst agricultural production is
76 clearly essential, society’s narrow recognition of the soils’ production function at the expense
77 of its other functions, is limiting our understanding of how soil can be best managed to secure
78 and capitalize on its multifunctionality. This is however imperative to address the global
79 challenges, threatening the hospitability and survivability of our planet by worsening the
80 existential challenges.

81

82 Here, we address the multifunctionality of soil and consider trade-offs in these functions,
83 focusing on how the constant, global demand for productive agriculture is profoundly
84 decreasing the ability of soil to provide other functions critical for planetary health (Vazquez
85 et al. 2021; Zwetsloot et al. 2021). Indeed, it is increasingly clear globally that soil
86 management to increase delivery of one function (especially food and fibre production) has
87 substantially reduced the soils' capacity to deliver other functions (such as nutrient cycling,
88 biodiversity protection, and climate regulation), as shown in Europe by Zwetsloot et al.
89 (2021). To better inform policy and guide decision-making processes, there is an urgent need
90 to develop predictive, multiscale models that quantify soil functional complexity and their
91 contribution to ecosystem services (Lehmann et al. 2020) in view of their importance for
92 progress towards stable economies, planetary health and sustainable development goals.
93 Currently, this information is lacking, and the multifunctionality of soils is largely excluded
94 from broader assessments of ecosystem services despite their role as a planetary master
95 variable.

96

97 We build on previous reviews, such as that of McBratney et al. (2014) who developed a
98 framework for 'soil security', that of Amundson et al. (2015) who examined the
99 interconnection between soil, climate and food security, and that of Kopittke et al. (2019) who
100 examined how agricultural intensification is degrading soils. First, we examine the multiple
101 functions of soils, considering their importance for the health of both humans and the planet.
102 Next, we examine how land-use changes, driven by the need for increased agricultural
103 production, are causing trade-offs in the ability of soils to deliver its other key functions. We
104 also consider how the decreasing ability of soil to provide these other functions, such as
105 climate regulation, can be halted and reversed. We make the case for soil organic carbon
106 (SOC; for simplicity and brevity, we use the term 'SOC' to also include soil organic matter,
107 SOM) as the integral component of the soil matrix that links and underpins critical soil

108 functions, and argue for a better understanding of carbon (C) fluxes and persistence. Finally,
109 we contend that it is imperative to develop a better understanding of the trade-offs in soil
110 multifunctionality, including approaches to quantify and model these broad trade-offs and
111 their implication to enable more efficient and effective soil management practices that
112 promote sustainable agricultural production to support economies and planetary health to
113 ensure the prosperity and survival of human societies of our planet.

114

115 **2 Functions of soils**

116 It is first prudent to delineate between soil ‘functions’ and broader ‘ecosystem services’ – soil
117 functions provide a soil-related contribution to ecosystem services, with these ecosystem
118 services requiring an inter- and transdisciplinary approach given that soils do not act
119 independently (Bouma 2014). Soil functions can be categorized in multiple ways, including
120 provisioning functions, support functions, regulating functions, and cultural functions.
121 Provisioning functions provide humans with biomass (food, energy, and fiber), raw materials,
122 and a physical environment, with humanity generally focusing on those functions that provide
123 tangible benefits such as food, fibre and energy production to sustain economic growth.
124 Support functions are roles of soils that underpin other functions, and include nutrient cycling,
125 water cycling, and biodiversity. Although support functions are generally not economically
126 evaluated due to double-counting (Jónsson and Davíðsdóttir 2016), we include information in
127 the present review to highlight the importance of soils in this regard. Regulating functions
128 include climate regulation, biological control of pests and diseases, and the recycling of
129 wastes and detoxification, with these being directly economically valued (Jónsson and
130 Davíðsdóttir 2016). Finally, the cultural functions of soil include heritage and recreational
131 functions (Jónsson and Davíðsdóttir 2016).

132

133 Here, we focus on (i) biomass production (food, fiber, and energy), (ii) climate regulation,
134 (iii) biodiversity protection and habitat provision, (iv) nutrient cycling, and (v) water cycling
135 as five of the key soil dimensions describing soil multifunctionality (Figure 3) linked to
136 planetary survivability of human societies (Kopittke et al. 2019; Steffen et al. 2015; Vazquez
137 et al. 2021; Vogel et al. 2019; Zwetsloot et al. 2021).

138

139 *2.1 Production of biomass (food, fiber, and energy) through land-use change*

140 Humans rely almost entirely on soils to provide their biomass: food, fiber, and energy. Indeed,
141 an estimated 98.7% of the daily calories consumed by humans have their origins in soils
142 (2,895 kcal per capita), with only 1.3% from aquatic systems (38 kcal per capita) (FAO 2021).
143 Although soils have sustained humans by providing biomass for millennia through social
144 practices such as hunting and gathering, the establishment of agriculture and the rapidly
145 increasing population growth over the last centuries has led to land-use change and the
146 adoption of intensive production systems to satisfy the increasing demand. To produce their
147 food and other commodities, humans currently use 1,600 million ha (12% of the ice-free land)
148 of productive land for cropland, with a further 3,200 million ha (25%) dedicated to permanent
149 grassland and pasture (FAO 2021). It is often this profound global land-use change, largely
150 for agriculture, that is decreasing the ability of soils to provide the other functions described
151 in later sections.

152

153 Of key importance is that the demand for food (plus fiber and energy) has grown markedly
154 over the last one-and-half centuries, and is correlated with an increase in land-use change
155 (Figure 1). For example, the human population increased from 2.5 billion in 1950 to 7.8
156 billion in 2020, with a concomitant increase in cereal production from 0.74 Gt in 1961 to 2.9
157 Gt in 2016. The human population will continue to increase even further, reaching a projected
158 9.8 billion by 2050. Accordingly, demand for food will also continue to increase coupled with

159 changes in diets, with food production required to increase by 70% between 2005 and 2050
160 (ELD 2015).

161

162 As the demand for food increases, there is likely to be a concomitant increase in demand for
163 fiber and energy (biofuels) production from soils. For example, ethanol production, which
164 was 20 GL per year in 2000, is projected to increase to ca. 130 GL per year in 2030
165 (OECD/FAO 2021), with biofuel production estimated to account for 32 million ha of land
166 globally in 2013 (Langeveld et al. 2013).

167

168 Thus, the challenge is how best to increase biomass production whilst maintaining soil
169 resources. To a large extent, this is expected to be achieved by improving production
170 efficiency and yield rather than by increasing the area of land under agriculture (Tillman et
171 al., 2011). Indeed, over the decade to 2030, 87% of the projected increase in global crop
172 production is expected to come from yield improvements, 7% from increased cropping
173 intensity, and only 6% from an expansion of cropland (OECD/FAO 2021). Similarly,
174 increased production in livestock will likely result from intensification, although herd
175 enlargement will contribute significantly to emerging and low-income countries (OECD/FAO
176 2021). Globally, changing climates already require the adaptation of current farming practices
177 and areas used for agricultural production. There are also other approaches that can be used
178 for increasing food security, such as decreasing food wastage or changing dietary habits, but
179 these and other approaches are beyond the scope of this review.

180

181 2.2 *Climate regulation*

182 2.2.1 *Role of soil in climate regulation*

183 Soils play a critical role in climate regulation, primarily through their importance in the global
184 C cycle. Indeed, soils store more organic C (ca. 2344 Pg of organic C within the surface 3 m,

185 and ca. 1500 Pg C in the surface 1 m) (Scharlemann et al. 2014), than in the atmosphere (875
186 Pg C in 2019) and vegetation (600 Pg C) combined. Not only is the total SOC stock large, but
187 SOC is highly dynamic – each year, ca. 61 Pg of C enter soils from vegetation with similar
188 amounts being lost from soils to the atmosphere due to mineralization (Lehmann and Kleber
189 2015). Thus, ca. 7 % of the atmospheric C pool is cycled through soils every year. As such,
190 any human-induced decrease in the quantity of C either entering soils (inputs) or increases in
191 the quantity lost from soils (outputs) can result in marked increases in atmospheric CO₂
192 concentrations. Furthermore, most productive (and hence C-rich) ecosystems are founded in
193 soils, and thus the loss of soils also results in the loss of the associated biomass C. It has been
194 estimated that the economic value of soil climate regulation is up to US\$268 per hectare per
195 year (Jónsson and Davíðsdóttir 2016); on a global scale this roughly equates to US\$3.5
196 trillion per year for the global ice-free land area (13,000 million ha).

197

198 2.2.2 *Effects of anthropogenic land use change on soil climate regulation*

199 Although SOC stocks are large, it has long been recognized that, for the most part, the use of
200 soils for agricultural production has resulted in a marked loss of this SOC. In global meta-
201 analyses, following conversion of forest to cropping, SOC stocks have reportedly decreased
202 an average of ca. 42% (Guo and Gifford 2002; Kopittke et al. 2017). Associated with the loss
203 of SOC, the release of CO₂ from soils following land-use change is estimated to have resulted
204 in the release of ca. 133 Pg of C, primarily in the last 200 y (Sanderman et al. 2017). This
205 represents ca. 25% of total cumulative global anthropogenic emissions of CO₂ since ? and
206 some 16% of the total increase in radiative forcing due to greenhouse gases (Kopittke et al.
207 2021).

208

209 The need to increase SOC concentrations is recognized through programs such as the ‘4 per
210 mille’ initiative which intends to encourage the introduction of sustainable practices with an

211 aspirational goal to increase global SOC stocks by 0.4% (4 per 1000) per year (Rumpel et al.,
212 2020). There are adjustments to conventional cropping systems that can be used to potentially
213 increase SOC stocks, though highly dependent on environment. For example, the use of
214 conservation agriculture can, in some circumstances, result in a modest increase in SOC
215 stocks, as can the addition of organic materials to the soil. In the meta-analysis of Kopittke et
216 al. (2017), the use of no-till resulted in an average 8% increase in SOC stocks, whilst the
217 addition of organic amendments to the soil resulted in a 25% increase. Whilst such increases
218 in SOC stocks by alternate management practices are critical, the gains in C stocks obtained
219 by improved management remain smaller than the original decrease in C stocks caused by
220 land-use change. Thus, it is clear that consideration could also be given to the conversion of
221 soil used for agricultural production to a system with a higher density of vegetation such as
222 ‘carbon farms’. For example, Guo and Gifford (2002) calculated that the conversion of
223 cropland to secondary forest increased C stocks by 53% whilst conversion to pasture
224 increased C stocks by 19%. For this to occur, there need to be a clear approach for quantifying
225 benefits in terms of increasing climate regulation along with trade-offs in form of greenhouse
226 gas emissions and the value of lost agricultural production.

227

228 Brief mention should also be given to the contribution of the soil N cycle in agricultural
229 systems to climate regulation. Globally, 109 Tg of N fertilizers are applied, with the
230 application of these fertilizers to soils contributing to the release of greenhouse gases due to
231 the production of nitrous oxide (N₂O). Indeed, soils account for 60% of total N₂O emissions
232 (Tian et al. 2019), being a total of 3.7% of the global increase in radiative forcing due to
233 anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions (Kopittke et al. 2021). In this regard, it is imperative
234 to increase the efficiency of N fertilizer usage which has decreased from 68% in 1961 to 47%
235 in 2010 (Lassaletta et al. 2014). This could be achieved through the development of more

236 efficient fertilizers, utilization of other management approaches to increase uptake of N by
237 plants, or increased incorporation of N-fixing legumes in cropping systems.

238

239 2.2.3 *Quantifying the contribution of soils in climate regulation*

240 For any given soil, the actual (current) contribution to climate regulation can be quantified by
241 measuring the SOC stocks and their change, with SOC being a direct measurement of the
242 primary indicator of this function. For managed systems (such as in soils used for cropping),
243 it is necessary to compare this actual state to its potential value in a restored system or in any
244 other system with alternative management practices. These potential values can be estimated
245 through pedotransfer functions that rely upon various other parameters, including soil texture,
246 bulk density, and climate (Vogel et al. 2019). Hence, for managed systems, the difference
247 between the potential and the actual contribution represents the magnitude of climate
248 regulation which has been lost due to human use of soils, such as clearing land for agricultural
249 production.

250

251 2.3 *Nutrient cycling*

252 2.3.1 *Role of soil in nutrient cycling*

253 The importance of the role that soils play in storing and cycling of nutrients cannot be
254 overstated – without nutrient storage and (re-)cycling in soils, plant growth in both natural
255 ecosystems and agricultural systems would cease almost entirely. For example, global soils
256 contain huge amounts of nitrogen (N) and phosphorus (P), 200 Pg N and 50 Pg P, with this
257 being equivalent to 50% of N in plants and 10% of P (Smil 2000; Stevenson and Cole 1999).
258 To provide context, these soil N stocks (200 Pg N) are ca. 1800-times larger than annual
259 production of reactive N through the Haber-Bosch process for fertilizers (109 Tg N) (FAO
260 2021), with the annual production of N fertilizers accounting for ca. 1.5% of global energy
261 use. Although soils contain huge reserves of nutrients, only a small fraction is immediately

262 available to plants. In this regard, SOC plays a central role in nutrient storage and cycling in
263 soils – the gradual mobilization of nutrients by mineralization or solubilization, which is
264 critical for nutrient cycling between plants and soil, is mainly mediated by soil
265 microorganisms (Marschner 2012). Accordingly, it has been estimated that the value of this
266 nutrient cycling through soil, using replacement cost, is up to US\$180 per hectare per year
267 (Jónsson and Davíðsdóttir 2016), which equates to a value of up to US\$2.3 trillion per year
268 for the global, ice-free land.

269

270 *2.3.2 Effects of anthropogenic land use change on soil nutrient cycling*

271 Through its effect on plant biomass, plant diversity, and soil properties (including changes to
272 microbial diversity), land-use change alters both total stocks of soil nutrients as well as their
273 cycling. This is particularly important for nutrients closely associated with SOC (especially N,
274 P, and S) given both the profound decrease in SOC stocks and concentrations with land-use
275 change (see Section 2.2), as well as the critical role of SOC in soil fertility. For example, it
276 has been reported in a global meta-analysis that upon conversion of forest to cropping land,
277 the median decrease in soil N stocks was 42%, with corresponding decreases being 31% for P
278 and 32% for S (Kopittke et al. 2017). Not only does land use change alter nutrient stocks in
279 soils, but there is a concomitant influence on microbial abundance, diversity and activity (see
280 later), and hence nutrient cycling. Indeed, land use change from natural to agricultural
281 ecosystems can disrupt nutrient cycling by decreasing organic matter and nutrient return to the
282 soil, accelerating SOC decomposition rates through tillage, and also increasing nutrient losses
283 through runoff, erosion, volatilization and leaching (Magdoff et al. 1997). Further, conversion
284 of naturally diverse ecosystems to agricultural use can have detrimental effects on nutrient
285 cycling by reducing the diversity of organic materials entering the soil, which reduces food
286 web diversity and thus nutrient cycling (Kostin et al. 2021; Tsiafouli et al. 2015). This loss of
287 SOC from agricultural systems, together with the coupled decrease in nutrient cycling, has

288 flow-on effects for agricultural production and its economic returns due to a loss of soil
289 fertility. For example, in a meta-analysis, it was found that increases in SOC concentrations
290 would potentially increase yields of wheat by 10% and maize by 23% (Oldfield et al. 2019).
291 The same study showed that lower amounts of N-fertiliser are needed to produce similar
292 yields in SOC rich soils as compared to SOC poor ones.

293

294 The deleterious effect of land use change on nutrient stocks and the cycling of these nutrients
295 can be reversed, at least in part, by a range of management strategies. This can be achieved,
296 for example, by using higher plant diversity, such as rotations or mixed cropping, ensuring
297 that the organic materials entering the soil have a wide range of properties which enhance
298 diversity of soil biota and hence nutrient cycling (Kostin et al. 2021; Liu et al. 2020). Cover
299 cropping can also enhance nutrient cycling by increasing microbial activity and mobilizing
300 nutrients, such as N and P (Hallama et al. 2019). Permanent plant cover and the associated
301 minimal soil disturbance also increase the amount of organic materials available for
302 breakdown by soil biota and reduce soil erosion which improves nutrient cycling (Steven et
303 al. 2021). Reduced tillage or no tillage practices can help to retain SOC and improve soil
304 structure, reducing erosion and nutrient loss (Magdoff et al. 1997). Finally, the application of
305 organic amendments can cause marked increases in nutrient cycling and fertility, with Sandhu
306 et al. (2008) reporting that the economic value of nutrient cycling was US\$260 per hectare per
307 year in organically managed fields compared to US\$142 per hectare per year in
308 conventionally managed fields. At the expense of food production, cropped soils can also be
309 returned to secondary forest, which may substantially increase SOC stocks (see Section
310 2.2.2), concomitantly increasing the ability of soil to store and cycle nutrients.

311

312 If soil is considered solely from the perspective of the short-term goal of biomass production,
313 a number of soil functions can be replaced with the application of readily available inorganic

314 nutrients and other agrochemicals. Indeed, this is the basis of many agricultural production
315 systems that utilise relatively cheap synthetic inputs to mitigate the risk of low yielding crops.
316 The ease and economic benefits of using synthetic fertilisers to optimise yield has also meant
317 that modern plant varieties are typically selected under conditions that select against certain
318 soil biota. This further diminishes the contribution of these species to soil biological fertility
319 and also limits their adaptability to extreme climatic events, such as drought, which may lead
320 to economic losses due to crop failures.

321

322 2.3.3 *Quantifying the contribution of soils in nutrient cycling*

323 Soil nutrient cycling and storage is determined by a range of mechanisms before their uptake
324 by plants, including their fate as part of SOC and linked to soil cation exchange capacity
325 (CEC, being especially important for storage of nutrients such as Ca, Mg, and K). Hence,
326 quantification of the contribution of soil to nutrient cycling is complex, but generally includes
327 an assessment of SOC as well as the CEC, with the CEC itself depending upon soil texture
328 and mineralogy, as well as the SOC content. However, a range of other factors also influence
329 soil nutrient cycling, including pH, soil depth, and the exogenous application of fertilizers and
330 other amendments. Regardless, given the central role of SOC in nutrient cycling within soils,
331 this parameter is often used when quantifying the contribution of soils to inherent nutrient
332 cycling [for example, see Sandhu et al. (2008)]. As a result, for managed soils, where the
333 nutrient cycling capacity has been degraded, it is possible to estimate the difference between
334 the potential contribution to nutrient cycling and the actual contribution by estimating the loss
335 of SOC.

336

337 2.4 *Biodiversity protection and habitat provision*

338 2.4.1 *Role of soil in biodiversity protection*

339 Soils are the most biologically diverse habitat on Earth with soil biota represented across all
340 three domains in the tree of life, Bacteria, Archaea and Eukaryota, accounting for
341 approximately one-quarter of total biodiversity (Bach and Wall 2017) and with > 40% of
342 living organisms in terrestrial ecosystems associated directly with soils (Decaëns et al. 2006).
343 Microorganisms are the most abundant component of the soil biota with a handful of soil
344 containing billions of individual microbial cells, as well as meters of fungal hyphae and a
345 variety of microfauna. For example, it has been estimated that there are ca. 4.4×10^{20}
346 nematodes (with a total biomass of ca. 3×10^8 t) in global surface soils (van den Hoogen et al.
347 2019). These soil fauna contribute to both carbon and nitrogen mineralization, with their
348 contribution often being greater in soils with low fertility. Up to 40% of total net nitrogen
349 mineralized is estimated to be due to soil fauna, with nematodes and protozoa contributing the
350 most (Brussaard et al. 1996). At a global scale, the total mass of soil microorganisms (termed
351 the microbial biomass) is influenced by the soil, climate and plant productivity, with soil
352 biodiversity intricately linked to the SOC providing an energy source for growth and
353 maintenance (Jones et al. 2019).

354

355 Within the soil, this biodiversity makes numerous critical contributions, many of which are
356 related to the other functions of soil described in this review. Soil biodiversity contributes to
357 nutrient cycling, food (biomass) production, the provision of water, climate regulation, and
358 human health (FAO 2020). For example, ca. 80% of all antibacterial agents approved between
359 1983 and 1994 originated from soils, whilst ca. 60% of all drugs approved between 1989 and
360 1995 originated from soils (Mbila 2013). The total value of soil biodiversity is estimated to be
361 US\$2.1 trillion per year (Jónsson and Davíðsdóttir 2016).

362

363 Soil biodiversity and the associated ecosystem multifunctionality cannot be ignored when
364 establishing ecosystem protection priorities (Guerra et al. 2021). To protect soil biodiversity,
365 it is imperative to understand the biogeographic patterns and the predictors of soil biodiversity
366 at multiple trophic levels, as well as the role of multiple factors in driving soil functionalities
367 and biodiversity (Rillig et al. 2019). Recent advances in molecular and sequencing
368 technologies have marked the beginning of a new era in exploring the genetic diversity,
369 genetic functions, and ecological preferences of soil organisms at global scales. Indeed, as
370 noted by FAO (2020), “understanding the value of ecosystem services linked to soil
371 organisms is vital for decision-makers when considering soil use and land management
372 changes”.

373

374 *2.4.2 Effects of anthropogenic land use change on soil biodiversity*

375 Land-use change, including the use of soils for agricultural production, results in a marked
376 decrease in SOC and soil biodiversity (Marques et al. 2019; Newbold et al. 2015) and there
377 are numerous reports showing that intensive agricultural production greatly reduces the
378 complexity of soil food webs and reduces the mass of soil fauna (Geisen et al. 2019; Tsiafouli
379 et al. 2015). For example, pesticides can control target pests and pathogens, but may harm
380 non-target soil organisms and disturb soil food web interactions (Damalas and
381 Eleftherohorinos 2011). Furthermore, excessive applications of fertilizer cause soil
382 degradation and acidification with a negative impact on soil biodiversity (Guo et al. 2010;
383 Savci 2012).

384

385 Achieving sustainable agricultural production whilst halting (and reversing) the deleterious
386 effects of agricultural production on soil biodiversity will require various approaches such as
387 crop diversification, regenerative agriculture, organic fertilization, and biological control. For
388 example, agricultural diversification – the intentional addition of functional biodiversity to

389 cropping systems to regenerate biotic interactions underpinning yield-supporting ecosystem
390 services (Kremen et al. 2012), has emerged as a strategy to contribute to the Sustainable
391 Development Goals (SDGs) of the United Nations. Although trade-offs regularly exist
392 between crop yield and multiple ecosystem services (such as discussed throughout this
393 review), a recent meta-analysis has demonstrated that agricultural diversification can actually
394 promote biodiversity and the delivery of ecosystem services without compromising crop yield
395 (Tamburini et al. 2020). Organic, conservation, and regenerative agriculture have distinct
396 impacts on productivity, carbon sequestration, economic performance and ecosystem
397 multifunctionality. A recent study conducted in Europe found that organic and conservation
398 cropping promoted ecosystem multifunctionality including biodiversity preservation, soil and
399 water quality, and climate mitigation, along with economic benefits (Wittwer et al. 2021). In
400 addition, the crop microbiome, as the second genome of its host, promotes the host's
401 phenotype such as growth and tolerance to pathogens, pests, and environmental stresses. For
402 example, root-associated fungi, such as mycorrhiza and plant growth promoting bacteria are
403 beneficial for nutrient acquisition and cycling (Richardson et al., 2009). This plant-
404 microbiome interaction is largely unexplored but has great potential to achieve sustainable
405 agriculture and ameliorate threats to soil biodiversity (Chen et al. 2021).

406

407 *2.4.3 Quantifying the contribution of soils in biodiversity protection*

408 Soil biodiversity can be measured through a range of approaches, including species richness,
409 diversity indices, or the presence of keystone species and functional diversity (Vogel et al.
410 2019). However, a key challenge remains to relate these measures of soil biodiversity to the
411 actual functions of the soil, and to understand how to relate changes in soil biodiversity to soil
412 functioning.

413

414 Soil biodiversity depends upon a large number of factors, including SOC, the water balance,
415 temperature, texture, bulk density, and pH. However, it is increasingly clear that, within any
416 given soil, biodiversity is very closely linked to SOC content, such as shown throughout
417 Europe where it has been reported that “high SOC was a common attribute amongst croplands
418 with a high biodiversity habitat provision” (Vazquez et al. 2021). This is perhaps not
419 surprising given that the SOC is the energy source that drives soil communities. Thus,
420 changes in biodiversity are often most closely related to the changes in SOC (both quality and
421 concentration) caused by changes in land use or management.

422

423 2.5 *Water cycling*

424 2.5.1 *Role of soil in water cycling*

425 Soils are the largest store of fresh water in the terrestrial ecosystem (McColl et al. 2017).
426 Globally, soil can store 121,800 km³ of water (Webb et al. 1993); and yet on average, soils
427 contain only about a tenth of its capacity (approximately 17,000 km³), which is still larger
428 than that held in the atmosphere (13,000 km³) and living organisms (1 km³) (Oki and Kanae
429 2006). This interface between the atmosphere, plant and groundwater is an essential part of
430 the hydrological cycle, providing services of: storing and supplying water to plants,
431 transmitting and filtering water for storage in groundwater, supporting runoff generation to
432 rivers, exchanging water in the soil-plant-atmosphere system, moderating drought and flood
433 potentials (Wu et al. 2015), and a buffer in climate change’s impact on the hydrological cycle.

434

435 Soil aggregation is largely responsible for water regulation where water is held and
436 transmitted in the soil due to its unique pore size distribution expressed by the soil water
437 retention curve, with this soil aggregation occurring due to a range of processes including
438 interplays between the soil biodiversity and SOC. No other porous material can hold water
439 over the energy range that many soils are able to. The pore network of the soil simultaneously

440 controls gaseous and solute flow (Ghezzehei et al. 2019; Young and Ritz 2000) and provides
441 a habitat for soil microbes in the water-films and bio-films surrounding the organo-mineral
442 components of soil. These water films in the pore network can restrict oxygen flow through
443 the pore network and thus affect biological activity. Conversely, soil microorganisms such as
444 nematodes, protozoa and bacteria rely on water films for their movement through the soil.
445 Fungi however rely on a moist atmosphere in soil with good air connectivity to extend their
446 hyphae. Thus, soil architecture controls the hydrological cycle as well as critical microbially
447 mediated processes.

448

449 *2.5.2 Effects of anthropogenic land use change on soil water cycling*

450 Land use change and conventional agricultural practices have severely impacted these soil
451 water cycling functions. Both tillage and the loss of SOC, together with other factors, have
452 caused compaction and the associated loss of soil aggregation. In turn, this degradation has
453 enhanced runoff, reduced infiltration, increased evaporation, lessened water storage, and
454 reduced recharge. Land use not only affects the physical condition of the soil and its ability to
455 transmit and store water, but also has an impact on the hydrological cycle of the area. For
456 example, in a semiarid area in southwestern Australia, a 750 km rabbit proof fence established
457 around 1901-1907 that separated natural vegetation from agricultural land provided a
458 comparison between soils under native vegetation and agriculture. Observations from this site
459 have demonstrated that agricultural land, compared to natural vegetation, has distinct
460 characteristics such as albedo, surface roughness, and canopy resistance. These, in turn, affect
461 the energy balance and decrease cloud formation and precipitation on agricultural land (Lyons
462 2002). The impact of land use on the availability and loss of water through precipitation and
463 runoff will continue to be further impacted locally by climate change, and combined with the
464 condition of the soil, will cause soil moisture droughts (Samaniego et al. 2018).

465

466 Conservation agriculture, including the use of minimum tillage, stubble retention, and cover
467 crops, has been found to reduce the deleterious effect of land use related to water
468 management. These beneficial practices result in increased soil aggregation and macropores,
469 which in turn increased water infiltration into the soil, higher water storage and reduced soil
470 erosion, and act as natural flood management infrastructure (Palm et al. 2014; Thomas et al.
471 2007). Nevertheless, the relationships between conservation tillage, SOC and soil water
472 parameters are not always clear. Increased organic matter has been widely promoted to
473 increase soil water retention or available water capacity. However, a detailed analysis of
474 experimental data from Minasny and McBratney (2018) reveals that organic matter only
475 affects large pores and hence has only a small effect on available water capacity.
476 Additionally, the classic concept of more organic matter means more water retention is no
477 longer held – ongoing research is also showing that organic matter can exhibit significant
478 repellence, with this directly impacting upon water ingress into the soil (particularly on sandy
479 soils) and subsequent water distribution (Hallett et al. 2001) with preferential flow of water
480 leaving large volumes of soil dry. Furthermore, although comparisons between conventional
481 tillage and no-tillage systems often show a higher infiltration rate in the no-till system, other
482 studies show the reverse (Palm et al. 2014). These apparently conflicting results suggest that
483 we cannot measure soil functions using few parameters, rather soil needs to be studied as a
484 system to understand all the complexities and interactions.

485

486 2.5.3 *Quantifying the contribution of soils in water cycling*

487 For any given soil, the actual contribution to water cycling depends upon the climate, a range
488 of soil physical properties (including texture, aggregation, porosity, and water retention), and
489 various chemical properties (including SOC content). Quantifying water cycling is
490 challenging as water in soil is highly dynamic. The most commonly quantified parameter is

491 water holding capacity, which is related to biomass production. A fully quantified function
492 should balance minimal runoff and erosion, persistence of moisture storage, and drainage.

493

494 **3 Optimizing trade-offs in soil functions to ensure planetary survivability: A central** 495 **role for soil carbon as an indicator of functioning**

496 It is clear from the preceding discussion that whilst we rely on agricultural production systems
497 for our survival and the functioning of our economies, the land-use change that has occurred,
498 and continues to occur, to produce this food is having profound effects on the ability of soil to
499 provide other critical functions related to human wellbeing and quality of life. Given the
500 existential threats humanity now faces, it is critical that we increase our focus on the multiple
501 globally-important functions that soil provides. For this, there is an urgent need to develop
502 predictive, multiscale models that quantify soil functional complexity to guide policy and
503 decision-making processes (Lehmann et al. 2020). These multiscale models are required
504 because information is required at scales that are broad enough to facilitate policy
505 interventions whilst simultaneously being local enough to reflect the functional complexity of
506 the specific soils (Lehmann et al. 2020).

507

508 Multiple studies have examined approaches for quantifying and predicting soil functioning
509 (Greiner et al. 2017; Jónsson and Davíðsdóttir 2016; Vogel et al. 2019; Zwetsloot et al. 2021).
510 However, despite the extreme complexity of soil functions, it is clear that SOC plays a central
511 role and is a master indicator for examining changes in soil functioning. Indeed, within any
512 given soil, SOC is the primary indicator of climate regulation by soils, it is central for nutrient
513 storage and cycling, and is closely linked to soil biodiversity. For example, consider a
514 managed system where anthropogenic use of the soil has resulted in a substantial decrease in
515 SOC stocks. In this system, differences in C stocks between the actual state (i.e. the current,
516 degraded state of the managed system) and the potential state (i.e. an estimate of the state if

517 the soil was restored) (Vogel et al. 2019) can be used to estimate the additional capability
518 (value) (McBratney et al. 2019) of a soil to regulate the climate, protect biodiversity, and
519 cycle nutrients. However, the mechanisms by which increased SOC fulfills these functions in
520 quantitatively poorly understood. The most prominent role of managing soil C is the
521 possibility to link the mitigation of climate changes with beneficial effects in agricultural
522 production, thus closing yield gaps (Amelung et al. 2020). These authors demonstrate that the
523 potential of soils to store additional C, and thus provide beneficial effects on the multitude of
524 soil functions discussed above, strongly depends upon the specific ecoregion, with this
525 differing between soil types and land use history. As land use, together with soil type, soil
526 structure, and soil mineral composition, directly determine the capacity of soils to store and
527 sequester C (Wiesmeier et al. 2019), future research has to address the mechanistic
528 underpinnings of these relationships.

529

530 Thus, we contend that a focus should be given to better understanding the factors driving C
531 persistence in soils (both biotic and abiotic), along with the dynamics of labile pools. Both are
532 needed to predicting how SOC stocks change depending upon management, land-use, and
533 other stressors such as climate change, and to understand the multiple soil functions related to
534 biological activity. Economic considerations should be coupled to such an approach to
535 determine the consequences of alteration of multiple soil functions for human societies. In this
536 regard, it is clear that we need novel management approaches to increase soil functionality,
537 and it is also imperative that we identify areas where the environmental benefits obtained by
538 restoring degraded soils, and hence allowing them to maximize provision of other functions,
539 exceeds their value when continuing to be used for food, fiber, and energy.

540

541 **4 Knowledge gaps**

542 In order to effectively develop multiscale models that quantify the functional complexity of
543 soils and their contributions to broad ecosystem services sustaining the wellbeing of human
544 societies, it is clear that there are multiple knowledge gaps that must be addressed.

545

546 *4.1 Understanding carbon persistence in soils and the scaling of information*

547 Given the central role of SOC across multiple soil functions, we need not only to develop a
548 better understanding of the factors controlling the behavior and persistence of C in soils but
549 also to assess the importance and dynamics of labile pools. Although the critical importance
550 of SOC has long been recognized, soil scientists are now refuting the traditional assumptions
551 that SOC is based on ‘humic substances’, with these previous assumptions having now
552 diverted research efforts for multiple decades (Lehmann and Kleber 2015). Rather, there is
553 now increasing evidence that C persistence is driven by molecular diversity, spatial
554 heterogeneity, and temporal variability intimately related to microbial accessibility (Lehmann
555 et al. 2020). However, much remains only poorly understood in this regard with a concerted
556 research effort required to continue probing the factors determining SOC dynamics in soils,
557 including in subsoils, which remain comparatively understudied. Such information is critical
558 in developing ‘models with intent’ in order to predict how changes in land use, management,
559 or other stressors (such as climate change) alter SOC concentrations and persistence
560 (Lehmann et al. 2020), with this being central to predicting soil functionality.

561

562 In addition, we currently do not have an adequate, multiscale, theoretical framework that
563 bridges the gap from the fine scales (nano-scale to micro-scale) where C accumulates, to the
564 large scales which are relevant for C-management policy (kilometer-scale) (Lehmann et al.
565 2020). Similarly, observations of soil C at the field and regional scale cannot be linked back
566 to the processes at the nano-scale. One possible solution to bridge these scales is through the

577 application of statistical physics framework that could describe how the mineral and organic
578 components intervene in aggregation using an equilibrium thermodynamic model of self-
579 assembly. This framework had been successfully developed for protein spontaneous
580 formation (Sartori and Leibler 2020), and thus the assembly of aggregates based on physical
581 and chemical potential and binding energy could be described in a set of parameters through
582 algebraic relations that enabled scaling laws to be applied. Thus, we can link how nanoscale
583 interactions of minerals and organic matter affect water and gas flow, biodiversity interactions
584 and biogeochemical processes are relevant to regional and national scale assessment of soil
585 functional change.

586

587 4.2 *Soil biodiversity and functionality*

588 Although soil biodiversity contributes substantially to multiple critical soil processes and
589 hence to the provision of functions that support human well-being, much remains unknown
590 about soil biodiversity. Of utmost importance, we require an understanding of how measures
591 of soil biodiversity (such as species richness or diversity indices) relate to the functioning of
592 the soil, and critically, to understand how human-induced changes in soil biodiversity impact
593 upon soil functioning. In this regard, Young and Bengough (2018) stated: “in perhaps the
594 most exhaustive analysis and review of research on soil biodiversity, (there were) no
595 consistent links between soil species diversity and function”. For example, it remains unclear
596 how the decreasing complexity of soil food webs observed in intensive agricultural systems
597 (Geisen et al. 2019; Tsiafouli et al. 2015) impacts upon the provision of soil functions such as
598 nutrient cycling, biomass production, or SOC stocks.

589

590 Indeed, it is imperative that we gain a better understanding of how modifying uses of soils by
591 humans alters soil biodiversity, their interactions with environments, and most importantly,
592 the effect of these impacts on their ability to provide long-term soil functioning. It is also

593 important to understand how the soil matrix and rhizosphere microbial community interact via
594 their effects on water availability and nutrient cycling from both inorganic and organic
595 sources, with this potentially allowing optimization of plant productivity whilst also
596 mitigating greenhouse gas emissions.

597

598 *4.3 Novel approaches for increasing multifunctional capacity of soils*

599 Poor management and climate change are degrading soils and having detrimental effects on
600 soil C and productivity. A range of management approaches have been developed to
601 ameliorate degraded soils, but detailed analysis of their effect on soil properties and how the
602 effects vary across scales are missing. This information is critical for improving existing
603 management approaches and developing new strategies. There is an urgent need to develop
604 new strategies to alleviate degraded soils and optimize SOC dynamics leading to increased
605 soil C sequestration and productivity, with this generating new ways to rejuvenate and
606 regenerate soil functionalities and its resilience. Such approaches might include methods to
607 optimize the soil matrix functionality throughout the entire profile, design novel rhizosphere
608 systems, or find new methods to minimize greenhouse gas emissions whilst maintaining soil
609 productivity.

610

611 *4.4 Refine models for ecosystem services to incorporate multifunctionality of soils*

612 Due to the complexity of the soil system, the multifunctionality of soil has generally been
613 excluded from broader models that assess interactions between humans and the environment.
614 Indeed, most models of ecosystem services include a maximum of one or two soil-based
615 functions (Greiner et al. 2017). While these models may address individual problems,
616 optimization of systems by focusing on only one or two soil-based functions will result in
617 unknown and unintended consequences. This requires the expansion of models to be truly
618 multifunctional, with this necessitating the identification of indicators that can be easily

619 monitored for evaluating the soil's multifunctionality. Such an approach will ultimately
620 expose the trade-offs that are being made when certain land-use and management options are
621 prioritized over others. Furthermore, these indicators not only need to meet the requirements
622 and rigor of the biophysical sciences, but also provide data and information that is valued by
623 the economic and policy arenas, with this requiring a clear multidisciplinary effort. Such
624 models will be implemented locally, whilst their outputs need be mapped across broader areas
625 to identify which soil functions are threatened (i.e. multiscale). From this present review, we
626 identify SOC as being a master indicator for multiple soil functions given that it is responsive
627 to the impacts of land-use change and is a biophysical indicator that is valued and relevant to
628 assessments made by the economic and social sciences (Dowell et al. 2020; Pascual et al.
629 2015; Sykes et al. 2020).

630

631 **5 Conclusions**

632 As befits the most complex biomaterial on the planet, there are no easy solutions to solving
633 the ongoing soil security crisis of the planet. We need to find innovative practices that ensure
634 the survival of future generations by sustainably using soils for the wide range of functions
635 highlighted in this review. To do this, we need a highly collaborative effort across basic
636 science, where new discoveries await to be revealed, and translational science, where we
637 better connect laboratory and field. The answers do not lie in any one discipline, but rather, in
638 a close cooperation across disciplines, connecting experimental research with the broader
639 modelling community to ensure accurate predictions of the state of soils as we use them for
640 food production and more general, but equally important, functions.

641

642 **6 Acknowledgements**

643

644

645 **7 References**

- 646 ADEME. Organic carbon in soils: Meeting climate change and food security challenges.
647 Angers, France: French Environment and Energy Management Agency (ADEME);
648 2015
- 649 Amelung, W.; Bossio, D.; de Vries, W.; Kögel-Knabner, I.; Lehmann, J.; Amundson, R.; Bol,
650 R.; Collins, C.; Lal, R.; Leifeld, J.; Minasny, B.; Pan, G.; Paustian, K.; Rumpel, C.;
651 Sanderman, J.; van Groenigen, J.W.; Mooney, S.; van Wesemael, B.; Wander, M.;
652 Chabbi, A. Towards a global-scale soil climate mitigation strategy. *Nature*
653 *Communications* 2020;11:5427
- 654 Amundson, R.; Berhe, A.A.; Hopmans, J.W.; Olson, C.; Sztein, A.E.; Sparks, D.L. Soil and
655 human security in the 21st century. 2015;348:1261071
- 656 Bach, E.M.; Wall, D.H. Trends in Global Biodiversity: Soil Biota and Processes. in: Dellasala
657 D.A., Goldstein M.I., eds. *Encyclopedia of the Anthropocene*: Elsevier; 2017
- 658 Bouma, J. Soil science contributions towards Sustainable Development Goals and their
659 implementation: linking soil functions with ecosystem services. *Journal of Plant*
660 *Nutrition and Soil Science* 2014;177:111-120
- 661 Brussaard, L.; Bakker, J.P.; Olf, H. Biodiversity of soil biota and plants in abandoned arable
662 fields and grasslands under restoration management. *Biodiversity & Conservation*
663 1996;5:211-221
- 664 Chen, Q.-L.; Hu, H.-W.; He, Z.-Y.; Cui, L.; Zhu, Y.-G.; He, J.-Z. Potential of indigenous crop
665 microbiomes for sustainable agriculture. *Nature Food* 2021;2:233-240
- 666 Damalas, C.A.; Eleftherohorinos, I.G. Pesticide exposure, safety issues, and risk assessment
667 indicators. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*
668 2011;8:1402-1419
- 669 Davis, J., 2017. The business case for soil. *Nature*, 543, 309-311.

670 Decaëns, T.; Jiménez, J.J.; Gioia, C.; Measey, G.J.; Lavelle, P. The values of soil animals
671 for conservation biology. *Eur J Soil Biol* 2006;42:S23-S38

672 Dethier, J.J., Effenberger, A., 2012. Agriculture and development: A brief review of the
673 literature. *Economic Systems*, 36, 175-205.

674 Dowell, G.; Niederdeppe, J.; Vanucchi, J.; Dogan, T.; Donaghy, K.; Jacobson, R.; Mahowald,
675 N.; Milstein, M.; Zelikova, T.J. Rooting carbon dioxide removal research in the social
676 sciences. *Interface Focus* 2020;10:20190138

677 ELD. Report for policy and decision makers: Reaping economic and environmental benefits
678 from sustainable land management. Bonn, Germany: Economics of Land Degradation
679 (ELD) Initiative; 2015

680 FAO. FAO Statistical Databases, <http://www.fao.org/faostat/>. Food and Agriculture
681 Organization of the United Nations (FAO); 2021

682 FAO, I., GSBI, CBD, EC,. State of knowledge of soil biodiversity - Status, challenges and
683 potentialities. Rome: FAO; 2020

684 Geisen, S.; Wall, D.H.; van der Putten, W.H. Challenges and opportunities for soil
685 biodiversity in the Anthropocene. *Curr Biol* 2019;29:R1036-R1044

686 Ghezzehei, T.A.; Sulman, B.; Arnold, C.L.; Bogie, N.A.; Berhe, A.A. On the role of soil
687 water retention characteristic on aerobic microbial respiration. *Biogeosciences*
688 2019;16:1187-1209

689 Greiner, L.; Keller, A.; Grêt-Regamey, A.; Papritz, A. Soil function assessment: review of
690 methods for quantifying the contributions of soils to ecosystem services. *Land Use*
691 *Policy* 2017;69:224-237

692 Guerra, C.A.; Bardgett, R.D.; Caon, L.; Crowther, T.W.; Delgado-Baquerizo, M.;
693 Montanarella, L.; Navarro, L.M.; Orgiazzi, A.; Singh, B.K.; Tedersoo, L. Tracking,
694 targeting, and conserving soil biodiversity. *Science* 2021;371:239-241

695 Guo, J.H.; Liu, X.J.; Zhang, Y.; Shen, J.L.; Han, W.X.; Zhang, W.F.; Christie, P.; Goulding,
696 K.W.T.; Vitousek, P.M.; Zhang, F.S. Significant acidification in major chinese
697 croplands. *Science* 2010;327:1008-1010

698 Guo, L.B.; Gifford, R.M. Soil carbon stocks and land use change: a meta analysis. *Glob*
699 *Change Biol* 2002;8:345-360

700 Hallama, M.; Pekrun, C.; Lambers, H.; Kandeler, E. Hidden miners – the roles of cover crops
701 and soil microorganisms in phosphorus cycling through agroecosystems. *Plant Soil*
702 2019;434:7-45

703 Hallett, P.D.; Baumgartl, T.; Young, I.M. Subcritical water repellency of aggregates from a
704 range of soil management practices. *Soil Sci Soc Am J* 2001;65:184-190

705 Jones, D.L.; Cooledge, E.C.; Hoyle, F.C.; Griffiths, R.I.; Murphy, D.V. pH and exchangeable
706 aluminum are major regulators of microbial energy flow and carbon use efficiency in
707 soil microbial communities. *Soil Biol Biochem* 2019;138:107584

708 Jónsson, J.Ö.G.; Davíðsdóttir, B. Classification and valuation of soil ecosystem services.
709 *Agric Sys* 2016;145:24-38

710 Klein Goldewijk, K.; Beusen, A.; Doelman, J.; Stehfest, E. Anthropogenic land use estimates
711 for the Holocene – HYDE 3.2. *Earth System Science Data* 2017;9:927-953

712 Kopittke, P.M.; Dalal, R.C.; Finn, D.; Menzies, N.W. Global changes in soil stocks of carbon,
713 nitrogen, phosphorus, and sulphur as influenced by long-term agricultural production.
714 *Glob Change Biol* 2017;23:2509-2519

715 Kopittke, P.M.; Menzies, N.W.; Dalal, R.C.; McKenna, B.A.; Husted, S.; Wang, P.; Lombi,
716 E. The role of soil in defining planetary boundaries and the safe operating space for
717 humanity. *Environ Int* 2021;146:106245

718 Kopittke, P.M.; Menzies, N.W.; Wang, P.; McKenna, B.A.; Lombi, E. Soil and the
719 intensification of agriculture for global food security. *Environ Int* 2019;132:105078

720 Kostin, J.E.; Cesarz, S.; Lochner, A.; Schädler, M.; Macdonald, C.A.; Eisenhauer, N. Land-
721 use drives the temporal stability and magnitude of soil microbial functions and
722 modulates climate effects. *Ecol Appl* 2021;31:e02325

723 Kremen, C.; Iles, A.; Bacon, C. Diversified farming systems: An agroecological, systems-
724 based alternative to modern industrial agriculture. *Ecology and Society* 2012;17

725 Langeveld, J.W.A.; Dixon, J.; van Keulen, H.; Quist-Wessel, P.M.F. Analyzing the effect of
726 biofuel expansion on land use in major producing countries: evidence of increased
727 multiple cropping. *Biofuels Bioprod Biorefining* 2013;8:49-58

728 Lassaletta, L.; Billen, G.; Grizzetti, B.; Anglade, J.; Garnier, J. 50 year trends in nitrogen use
729 efficiency of world cropping systems: the relationship between yield and nitrogen
730 input to cropland. *Environmental Research Letters* 2014;9:105011

731 Lehmann, J.; Hansel, C.M.; Kaiser, C.; Kleber, M.; Maher, K.; Manzoni, S.; Nunan, N.;
732 Reichstein, M.; Schimel, J.P.; Torn, M.S.; Wieder, W.R.; Kögel-Knabner, I.
733 Persistence of soil organic carbon caused by functional complexity. *Nature*
734 *Geoscience* 2020;13:529-534

735 Lehmann, J.; Kleber, M. The contentious nature of soil organic matter. *Nature* 2015;528:60-
736 68

737 Liu, L.; Zhu, K.; Wurzbürger, N.; Zhang, J. Relationships between plant diversity and soil
738 microbial diversity vary across taxonomic groups and spatial scales. *Ecosphere*
739 2020;11:e02999

740 Lyons, T.J. Clouds prefer native vegetation. *Meteorology and Atmospheric Physics*
741 2002;80:131-140

742 Magdoff, F.; Lanyon, L.; Liebhardt, B. Nutrient cycling, transformations, and flows:
743 Implications for a more sustainable agriculture. *Adv Agron* 1997;60:1-73

744 Marques, A.; Martins, I.S.; Kastner, T.; Plutzer, C.; Theurl, M.C.; Eisenmenger, N.;
745 Huijbregts, M.A.J.; Wood, R.; Stadler, K.; Bruckner, M.; Canelas, J.; Hilbers, J.P.;

746 Tukker, A.; Erb, K.; Pereira, H.M. Increasing impacts of land use on biodiversity and
747 carbon sequestration driven by population and economic growth. *Nature Ecology &*
748 *Evolution* 2019;3:628-637

749 Marschner, P. *Marschner's Mineral Nutrition of Higher Plants* ed^{eds}. London: Elsevier; 2012

750 Mbila, M. Soil Minerals, Organisms, and Human Health Medicinal Uses of Soils and Soil
751 Materials. in: Brevik E.C., Burgess L.C., eds. *Soils and Human Health*. Boca Raton,
752 Florida: CRC Press; 2013

753 McBratney, A.; Field, D.J.; Koch, A. The dimensions of soil security. *Geoderma*
754 2014;213:203-213

755 McBratney, A.B.; Field, D.; Morgan, C.L.S.; Huang, J. On soil capability, capacity, and
756 condition. *Sustainability* 2019;11:3350

757 McColl, K.A.; Alemohammad, S.H.; Akbar, R.; Konings, A.G.; Yueh, S.; Entekhabi, D. The
758 global distribution and dynamics of surface soil moisture. *Nature Geoscience*
759 2017;10:100-104

760 Minasny, B.; McBratney, A.B. Limited effect of organic matter on soil available water
761 capacity. *Eur J Soil Sci* 2018;69:39-47

762 Newbold, T.; Hudson, L.N.; Hill, S.L.L.; Contu, S.; Lysenko, I.; Senior, R.A.; Börger, L.;
763 Bennett, D.J.; Choimes, A.; Collen, B.; Day, J.; De Palma, A.; Díaz, S.; Echeverria-
764 Londoño, S.; Edgar, M.J.; Feldman, A.; Garon, M.; Harrison, M.L.K.; Alhusseini, T.;
765 Ingram, D.J.; Itescu, Y.; Kattge, J.; Kemp, V.; Kirkpatrick, L.; Kleyer, M.; Correia,
766 D.L.P.; Martin, C.D.; Meiri, S.; Novosolov, M.; Pan, Y.; Phillips, H.R.P.; Purves,
767 D.W.; Robinson, A.; Simpson, J.; Tuck, S.L.; Weiher, E.; White, H.J.; Ewers, R.M.;
768 Mace, G.M.; Scharlemann, J.P.W.; Purvis, A. Global effects of land use on local
769 terrestrial biodiversity. *Nature* 2015;520:45-50

770 OECD/FAO. *OECD-FAO Agricultural Outlook 2021-2030*. Paris, France: OECD Publishing;
771 2021

772 Oki, T.; Kanae, S. Global hydrological cycles and world water resources. *Science*
773 2006;313:1068-1072

774 Oldfield, E.E.; Bradford, M.A.; Wood, S.A. Global meta-analysis of the relationship between
775 soil organic matter and crop yields. *SOIL* 2019;5:15-32

776 Palm, C.; Blanco-Canqui, H.; DeClerck, F.; Gatere, L.; Grace, P. Conservation agriculture
777 and ecosystem services: An overview. *Agric Ecosyst Environ* 2014;187:87-105

778 Pascual, U.; Termansen, M.; Abson, D.J. The economic value of soil carbon. in: Banwart
779 S.A., Noellemeier E., Milne E., eds. *Soil Carbon: Science, Management and Policy*
780 *for Multiple Benefits*. Croydon, UK: CAB International; 2015

781 Richardson, A.E., Barea, J.M., Mcneill, A.M., Prigent-Combret, C., 2009. Acquisition of
782 phosphorus and nitrogen in the rhizosphere and plant growth promotion by
783 microorganisms. *Plant Soil* 321: 305-339.

784 Rillig, M.C.; Ryo, M.; Lehmann, A.; Aguilar-Trigueros, C.A.; Buchert, S.; Wulf, A.; Iwasaki,
785 A.; Roy, J.; Yang, G. The role of multiple global change factors in driving soil
786 functions and microbial biodiversity. *Science* 2019;366:886-890

787 Rumpel, C., Amiraslani, F., Chenu, C., Garcia Cardenas, M., Kaonga, M., Koutika, L.-S.
788 Ladha, J., Madari, B., Shirato, Y., Smith, P., Souidi, B., Soussana, J.-F., Whitehead,
789 D., Wollenberg, E., 2020: The 4p1000 Initiative: opportunities, limitations and
790 challenges for implementing soil organic carbon sequestration as a sustainable
791 development strategy. *Ambio*, 49, 350-360.

792 Samaniego, L.; Thober, S.; Kumar, R.; Wanders, N.; Rakovec, O.; Pan, M.; Zink, M.;
793 Sheffield, J.; Wood, E.F.; Marx, A. Anthropogenic warming exacerbates European
794 soil moisture droughts. *Nature Climate Change* 2018;8:421-426

795 Sanderman, J.; Hengl, T.; Fiske, G.J. Soil carbon debt of 12,000 years of human land use.
796 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 2017;114:9575-9580

797 Sandhu, H.S.; Wratten, S.D.; Cullen, R.; Case, B. The future of farming: The value of
798 ecosystem services in conventional and organic arable land. An experimental
799 approach. *Ecol Econ* 2008;64:835-848

800 Sartori, P.; Leibler, S. Lessons from equilibrium statistical physics regarding the assembly of
801 protein complexes. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 2020;117:114-
802 120

803 Savci, S. An agricultural pollutant: chemical fertilizer. *International Journal of Environmental*
804 *Science and Development* 2012;3:73

805 Scharlemann, J.P.W.; Tanner, E.V.J.; Hiederer, R.; Kapos, V. Global soil carbon:
806 understanding and managing the largest terrestrial carbon pool. *Carbon Management*
807 2014;5:81-91

808 Tilman D, Balzer C, Hill J, Befort BL. (2011) Global food demand and the sustainable
809 intensification of agriculture. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science USA*
810 108, 20 260–20 264.

811 Smil, V. Phosphorus in the environment: Natural flows and human interferences. *Annual*
812 *Review of Energy and the Environment* 2000;25:53-88

813 Steffen, W.; Richardson, K.; Rockström, J.; Cornell, S.E.; Fetzer, I.; Bennett, E.M.; Biggs, R.;
814 Carpenter, S.R.; de Vries, W.; de Wit, C.A.; Folke, C.; Gerten, D.; Heinke, J.; Mace,
815 G.M.; Persson, L.M.; Ramanathan, V.; Reyers, B.; Sörlin, S. Planetary boundaries:
816 Guiding human development on a changing planet. *Science* 2015;347:1259855

817 Steven, B.; Phillips, M.L.; Belnap, J.; Gallegos-Graves, L.V.; Kuske, C.R.; Reed, S.C.
818 Resistance, resilience, and recovery of dryland soil bacterial communities across
819 multiple disturbances. *Frontiers in Microbiology* 2021;12

820 Stevenson, F.J.; Cole, M.A. Cycles of soils: carbon, nitrogen, phosphorus, sulfur,
821 micronutrients ed[^]eds. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons; 1999

822 Sykes, A.J.; Macleod, M.; Eory, V.; Rees, R.M.; Payen, F.; Myrgiotis, V.; Williams, M.;
823 Sohi, S.; Hillier, J.; Moran, D.; Manning, D.A.C.; Goglio, P.; Seghetta, M.; Williams,
824 A.; Harris, J.; Dondini, M.; Walton, J.; House, J.; Smith, P. Characterising the
825 biophysical, economic and social impacts of soil carbon sequestration as a greenhouse
826 gas removal technology. *Glob Change Biol* 2020;26:1085-1108

827 Tamburini, G.; Bommarco, R.; Wanger, T.C.; Kremen, C.; van der Heijden, M.G.; Liebman,
828 M.; Hallin, S. Agricultural diversification promotes multiple ecosystem services
829 without compromising yield. *Science advances* 2020;6:eaba1715

830 Thomas, G.A.; Titmarsh, G.W.; Freebairn, D.M.; Radford, B.J. No-tillage and conservation
831 farming practices in grain growing areas of Queensland a review of 40 years of
832 development. *Aust J Exp Agric* 2007;47:887-898

833 Tian, H.; Yang, J.; Xu, R.; Lu, C.; Canadell, J.G.; Davidson, E.A.; Jackson, R.B.; Arneeth, A.;
834 Chang, J.; Ciais, P.; Gerber, S.; Ito, A.; Joos, F.; Lienert, S.; Messina, P.; Olin, S.; Pan,
835 S.; Peng, C.; Saikawa, E.; Thompson, R.L.; Vuichard, N.; Winiwarter, W.; Zaehle, S.;
836 Zhang, B. Global soil nitrous oxide emissions since the preindustrial era estimated by
837 an ensemble of terrestrial biosphere models: Magnitude, attribution, and uncertainty.
838 *Glob Change Biol* 2019;25:640-659

839 Tsiafouli, M.A.; Thébault, E.; Sgardelis, S.P.; de Ruiter, P.C.; van der Putten, W.H.;
840 Birkhofer, K.; Hemerik, L.; de Vries, F.T.; Bardgett, R.D.; Brady, M.V.; Bjornlund,
841 L.; Jørgensen, H.B.; Christensen, S.; Hertefeldt, T.D.; Hotes, S.; Gera Hol, W.H.;
842 Frouz, J.; Liiri, M.; Mortimer, S.R.; Setälä, H.; Tzanopoulos, J.; Uteseny, K.; Pižl, V.;
843 Stary, J.; Wolters, V.; Hedlund, K. Intensive agriculture reduces soil biodiversity
844 across Europe. *Glob Change Biol* 2015;21:973-985

845 van den Hoogen, J.; Geisen, S.; Routh, D.; Ferris, H.; Traunspurger, W.; Wardle, D.A.; de
846 Goede, R.G.M.; Adams, B.J.; Ahmad, W.; Andriuzzi, W.S.; Bardgett, R.D.;
847 Bonkowski, M.; Campos-Herrera, R.; Cares, J.E.; Caruso, T.; de Brito Caixeta, L.;

848 Chen, X.; Costa, S.R.; Creamer, R.; Mauro da Cunha Castro, J.; Dam, M.; Djigal, D.;
849 Escuer, M.; Griffiths, B.S.; Gutiérrez, C.; Hohberg, K.; Kalinkina, D.; Kardol, P.;
850 Kergunteuil, A.; Korthals, G.; Krashevskaya, V.; Kudrin, A.A.; Li, Q.; Liang, W.;
851 Magilton, M.; Marais, M.; Martín, J.A.R.; Matveeva, E.; Mayad, E.H.; Mulder, C.;
852 Mullin, P.; Neilson, R.; Nguyen, T.A.D.; Nielsen, U.N.; Okada, H.; Rius, J.E.P.; Pan,
853 K.; Peneva, V.; Pellissier, L.; Carlos Pereira da Silva, J.; Pitteloud, C.; Powers, T.O.;
854 Powers, K.; Quist, C.W.; Rasmann, S.; Moreno, S.S.; Scheu, S.; Setälä, H.; Sushchuk,
855 A.; Tiunov, A.V.; Trap, J.; van der Putten, W.; Vestergård, M.; Villenave, C.;
856 Waeyenberge, L.; Wall, D.H.; Wilschut, R.; Wright, D.G.; Yang, J.-i.; Crowther, T.W.
857 Soil nematode abundance and functional group composition at a global scale. *Nature*
858 2019;572:194-198

859 Vazquez, C.; de Goede, R.G.M.; Rutgers, M.; de Koeijer, T.J.; Creamer, R.E. Assessing
860 multifunctionality of agricultural soils: Reducing the biodiversity trade-off. *Eur J Soil*
861 *Sci* 2021;72:1624-1639

862 Vogel, H.-J.; Eberhardt, E.; Franko, U.; Lang, B.; Ließ, M.; Weller, U.; Wiesmeier, M.;
863 Wollschläger, U. Quantitative evaluation of soil functions: Potential and state.
864 *Frontiers in Environmental Science* 2019;7

865 Webb, R.S.; Rosenzweig, C.E.; Levine, E.R. Specifying land surface characteristics in general
866 circulation models: Soil profile data set and derived water-holding capacities. *Global*
867 *Biogeochem Cy* 1993;7:97-108

868 Wiesmeier, M.; Urbanski, L.; Hobbey, E.; Lang, B.; von Lützow, M.; Marin-Spiotta, E.; van
869 Wesemael, B.; Rabot, E.; Ließ, M.; Garcia-Franco, N.; Wollschläger, U.; Vogel, H.-J.;
870 Kögel-Knabner, I. Soil organic carbon storage as a key function of soils - A review of
871 drivers and indicators at various scales. *Geoderma* 2019;333:149-162

872 Wittwer, R.A.; Bender, S.F.; Hartman, K.; Hydbom, S.; Lima, R.A.; Loaiza, V.; Nemecek, T.;
873 Oehl, F.; Olsson, P.A.; Petchey, O. Organic and conservation agriculture promote
874 ecosystem multifunctionality. *Science Advances* 2021;7:eabg6995

875 Wu, W.-Y.; Lan, C.-W.; Lo, M.-H.; Reager, J.T.; Famiglietti, J.S. Increases in the annual
876 range of soil water storage at northern middle and high latitudes under global
877 warming. *Geophysical Research Letters* 2015;42:3903-3910

878 Young, I.M.; Bengough, A.G. The search for the meaning of life in soil: an opinion. *Eur J*
879 *Soil Sci* 2018;69:31-38

880 Young, I.M.; Ritz, K. Tillage, habitat space and function of soil microbes. *Soil Tillage Res*
881 2000;53:201-213

882 Zwetsloot, M.J.; van Leeuwen, J.; Hemerik, L.; Martens, H.; Simó Josa, I.; Van de Broek, M.;
883 Debeljak, M.; Rutgers, M.; Sandén, T.; Wall, D.P.; Jones, A.; Creamer, R.E. Soil
884 multifunctionality: Synergies and trade-offs across European climatic zones and land
885 uses. *Eur J Soil Sci* 2021;72:1640-1654

886

887




Figure 1. Land-use changes for cropland and grazing as a percentage of the global ice-free land (shaded areas) and the change in human population (grey points). Data were obtained using the HYDE 3.2 database (Klein Goldewijk et al. 2017) and updated from Kopittke et al. (2019).




Figure 2. The role of soil functions in supporting at least 12 of the 17 sustainable development goals (SDGs) of the United Nations.




Figure 3. A simplified diagram illustrating the five interconnected key dimensions describing soil multifunctionality, being (1) provision of biomass (black), (2) climate regulation (red), (3) nutrient cycling (white), (4) biodiversity (green), and (5) water cycling (blue).